37387000507259

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/cyclopaediaofbib0008revj_m7j4

CYCLOPÆDIA

OF

BIBLICAL,

THEOLOGICAL, AND ECCLESIASTICAL

LITERATURE.

PREPARED BY

THE REV. JOHN M'CLINTOCK, D.D.,

AND

JAMES STRONG, S.T.D.

VOL. VIII.—**PET–RE.**

This is the property of
Southern Evangelical Seminary
3000 Tilley Morris Rd., Matthews, NC 28105

NEW YORK:
HARPER & BROTHERS, PUBLISHERS,
FRANKLIN SQUARE.
1894.

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1879, by
HARPER & BROTHERS,
In the Office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington.

LIST OF WOOD-CUTS IN VOL. VIII.

Jerome Savonarola as St. Peter Martyr....Page 32
St. Peter Nolasco.... 34
Map of Petra.... 41
The "Khuzneh" in Petra.... 42
The Theatre at Petra.... 43
Rock-hewn Temple at Petra.... 43
Interior of a Tomb at Petra.... 44
Tomb of Petrarch.... 46
Pew at Headington.... 51
Pew at Steeple Aston.... 51
Philadelphia in Asia Minor.... 80
Coin of Philip V of Macedon.... 86
Coin of the Roman emperor Philip 86
Coin of Herod Philip.... 89
Coin of Philippi.... 93
Plan of Philippi and its Vicinity.. 94
Philistine Ship attacked by Egyptians.... 103
Philistine Wagons attacked by Egyptians.... 103
Heads of Philistine Prisoners.... 105
Map of the Coast near Lutro.... 148
Coin of Tyre, Antiochus IV.... 155
Lid of Phœnician Sarcophagus.... 162
Phœnician Tablet.... 162
Phœnician Inscription.... 163
Antique Representations of the Phœnix.... 164
Phylactery for the Arm.... 175
Phylactery for the Head.... 176
Phylactery on the Arm.... 176
Ancient Egyptian Doctors (or Barbers?) and Patients.... 178
Coin of Judæa struck under Pontius Pilate.... 200
Solitary Pillar in the Wilderness.. 209
Pillar in St. Peter's, Northampton. 210
Sections of Pillars.... 210
Druidical Pillars.... 210
Pillar at Welford.... 211
Section of Pillar.... 211
Pillar at Orton-on-the-Hill.... 211
Pillar at Stogumber.... 211
Ancient Egyptian Wooden Pillow. 213
Ancient Egyptian Toilet-pins.... 214
Stone-Pine Cone and Nuts.... 216
Pinnacle of Battle Church.... 217
Pinnacle of Peterborough Cathedral.... 218
Pinnacle at Lincoln.... 218
Pious Worker.... 222
Ancient Egyptian Pipes.... 222
Ancient Egyptian Reed-pipes.... 222
The Oriental *Nâ'ĭ*, or Flute, with Case.... 223
Modern Egyptian Pipes.... 223
Monk of the Piquepuz Order.... 224
Piscina at Crowmarsh.... 231
Piscina at Warmington.... 231
Piscina at Cumnor.... 231
Piscina at Tackley.... 231
View westward from the summit of Mount Pisgah.... 232
Map of Mount Pisgah.... 233
Coin of Antioch in Pisidia.... 235
Egyptian Pitchers.... 239
Antique Bust of Plato.....Page 282
Ancient Egyptians Playing at Draughts and *Mora*.... 289
Ancient Egyptian Plough.... 300
Plough of Asia Minor.... 300
Ploughing in Palestine.... 300
Birthplace of Pollok.... 359
The Pomegranate.... 384
Pool of Hezekiah.... 399
Regalia of the Pope of Rome.... 404
The Pope Seated in the Pontifical Chair.... 405
Styrax officinale.... 416
Ordinary Poppie.... 416
Poppie at Kidlington.... 416
Porch at Bicester, Oxfordshire.... 417
Porch at Great Addington.... 418
Tomb of Bishop Porteus, at Tunbridge, Kent.... 430
Temple of Vesta.... 430
A Tartar Courier.... 443
Holy-water Pot.... 448
Potent.... 448
Name of Pot-pherah, Pet-phre, or Pet-re.... 450
Ancient Egyptian Potters.... 451
Modern Egyptian Potters.... 452
Figure of Powtai.... 462
Premonstrant Monk.... 509
Ancient Egyptian Drawers and Girdle.... 570
Ancient Egyptian Tunic.... 571
Ancient Egyptian Tunic and Girdle.... 571
Ancient Egyptian Priestly Robe, Ephod, and Girdle.... 572
Ancient Egyptian Priestly Breastplate.... 572
Ancient Egyptian Priestly Mitres. 573
Habit of a Roman Catholic Priest. 582
Processional Cross, and Part of its Staff.... 612
Triangular Musical Instrument from Herculaneum.... 759
Miscellaneous Ancient Stringed Instruments.... 759
Pentadrachm of Ptolemy I.... 762
Octodrachm of Ptolemy II.... 763
Octodrachm of Ptolemy III.... 763
Tetradrachm of Ptolemy IV.... 763
Tetradrachm of Ptolemy V.... 764
Tetradrachm of Ptolemy VI.... 764
Fac-simile of the Pudens Inscription at Chichester.... 772
Coin of Pulcheria.... 777
Figure of Pulear.... 777
Pulpit at Fotheringay.... 779
Pulpit at Beaulieu, Hants.... 779
The Feast of Purim in a Modern Synagogue.... 803
Tyrian Rock-shell—*Murex trunculus*.... 814
Dog-whelk—*Purpura lapillus*.... 814
Specimen of the *Codex Purpureus*. 814
Map of the Bay of Puteoli.... 819
Mole of Puteoli.... 819
Addax Antelope.... 821
General View of the Pyramids Page 822
Hieroglyph of Memphis.... 822
Plan of the Pyramids of Gizeh... 823
Hieroglyph of Cheops.... 823
Entrance of the Great Pyramid.. 823
Section of the Great Pyramid of Gizeh.... 824
Hieroglyph of Chephren.... 824
Hieroglyph of Mycerinus.... 824
Pyx, Ashmolean Museum, Oxford 831
Sand-grouse.... 832
Common Quail.... 833
Enormous Stone in the Quarry near Baalbek.... 835
Ancient Egyptian Queen.... 838
Phœnician Coin with Head of Astarte.... 839
Ancient Persian with Bow and Quiver.... 850
Assyrian Warrior with Quiver... 850
Assyrian Chariot with Quiver.... 850
Ancient Egyptian Archer and Quiver.... 850
Quivers on Greek Sculptures.... 850
Coin of Philadelphia.... 864
Ruins of Rabbath-Ammon.... 864
Amman, as seen from the South. 865
Modern Jewish Rabbi, attired for Prayer.... 867
The Stadium at Ephesus.... 873
Ancient Greek Horse-race.... 874
Ancient Greek Chariot-race.... 874
Ancient Greek Foot-race.... 874
Ancient Greek Torch-race on Foot 874
Ancient Greek Torch-race on Horseback.... 875
Medal Commemorating an Isthmian Victory.... 875
Rachel's Tomb.... 876
Ramoth-gilead.... 902
The Original Rauhe Haus.... 927
Raven.... 930
Ancient Egyptians Reaping.... 943
A Recollet.... 957
The Red Sea and Jebel Atâkah, near Suez.... 962
Map of the Region between the Nile and the Red Sea.... 965
Map of the Head of the Gulf of Suez 968
Map of the Bay of Suez.... 969
Ayûn Mûsa.... 970
Redemptorist.... 974
Andropogon schœnanthus.... 975
Portrait of Rehoboam.... 1022
Hieroglyph of Rehoboam.... 1022
Ancient Portable Reliquaries.... 1034
Modern Stationary Reliquaries... 1034
Babylonian Cylinders, with figures of gods and stars.... 1037
Central Pavilion of the Tuileries. 1038
Reredos of Altar, Enstone.... 1047
Respond, Fotheringay, North Hants.... 1049
Ressaunt, Redcliffe Church, Bristol.... 1050
Map of the Tribe of Reuben.... 1060

PET.

Petach. See PETHACH.

Petachia(s), MOSES BEN-JACOB, a learned rabbi who flourished towards the latter half of the 12th century (Regensburg), is the author of the סִבּוּב הָעוֹלָם, also called סִבּוּב רַ׳ פְּתַחְיָה, in which he relates his travels, made between 1075 and 1090 through Poland, Russia, Tartary, Syria, Mesopotamia, ancient Syria, Persia, etc., and wherein he describes the manners and usages of his co-religionists. It was first printed at Prague (1595), and reprinted by Wagenseil, entitled *Itinerarium cum versione Wagenseilii*, in his *Sex exercitationes varii argumenti* (Altorf, 1687; Zolkiew, 1792). It has been translated into French, with notes, by E. Carmoly, *Tour de Monde de Petachia de Ratisbonne, traduit en Français et accompagné du texte et des notes historiques, géographiques, et littéraires* (Paris, 1831); into German by D. Ottensosser, with a Hebrew commentary (Fürth, 1844); into English by Dr. A. Benisch. See Fürst, *Bibl. Jud.* iii, 79 sq.; Wolf, *Bibl. Hebr.* i, 888; iii, 956; Basnage, *Histoire des Juifs*, p. 655 (Taylor's English transl.); Grätz, *Gesch. der Juden*, vi, 259, 424; Zunz, *Zur Geschichte u. Literatur*, p. 166; the same author in Asher's edition of Tudela's *Itinerary*, vol. ii, No. 40, 43, 44, 47; Etheridge, *Introd. to Hebr. Lit.* p. 214; Da Costa, *Israel and the Gentiles*, p. 187. (B. P.)

Petāni, a sort of cakes used anciently in Athens in making libations to the gods. They were substituted for animal sacrifices by the command of Cecrops.

Petavel, ALFRED F., a Swiss Protestant clergyman of note, was born near the close of the last century. He studied at the university in Berlin, and was the first recipient from that high school of the doctorate in philosophy. He was greatly instrumental in the establishment of the Swiss Missionary Society, and subsequently took no inconsiderable share in the doings of the Evangelical Alliance. The principal work, however, to which he devoted his best time, his talents, his energies, and his whole heart, was to bring the Jewish people into a more intimate personal contact with the Christians, and it is especially in this respect that his influence has extended beyond his little country. He was a zealous member of the Universal Israelitish Alliance and of the Evangelical Alliance. He did not, at first, impress one as a pastor, a missionary, an apostle, a father of the Church, but rather as one of those individuals described in the book of Genesis, who walked with God, who communed with him, like a patriarch or a seer. He died at the age of eighty. The addresses which he delivered were collected under the title of *Discourses on Education*. His *Daughter of Zion*, his *Letter to the Synagogues of France*, and many other writings, will always remain as imperishable records of the zeal which animated him for the re-establishment of the Jews as a people.

Petavius, DIONYSIUS (also called DENIS PETAU), one of the most celebrated of French scholars, and influential in the councils of the Jesuits, to whose order he belonged, was born at Orleans Aug. 21, 1583. His father, who was a man of learning, seeing strong parts and a genius for letters in his son, took all possible means to improve them to the utmost. He used to tell his son that he ought to qualify himself so as to be able to attack and confound "the giant of the Allophylæ;" meaning the redoubtable Joseph Scaliger, whose abilities and learning were supposed to have done such service to the Reformed. Young Petavius seems to have entered into his father's views; for he studied very intensely, and afterwards levelled much of his erudition against Scaliger. He joined the study of mathematics with that of belles-lettres; and then applied himself to a course in philosophy, which he began in the College of Orleans, and finished at Paris. After this he maintained theses in Greek and in Latin, which he is said to have understood as well as his native language, the French. In maturer years he had free access to the king's library, which he often visited in order to consult Latin and Greek manuscripts. Among other advantages which accompanied his literary pursuits was the friendship of Isaac Casaubon, whom Henry IV called to Paris in 1600. It was at his instigation that Petavius, young as he was, undertook an edition of *The Works of Synesius;* that is, to correct the Greek from the manuscripts, to translate that part which yet remained to be translated into Latin, and to write notes upon the whole. He was but nineteen when he was made professor of philosophy in the University of Bourges; and spent the two following years in studying the ancient philosophers and mathematicians. In 1604, when Morel, professor of Greek at Paris, published *The Works of Chrysostom*, some part of Petavius's labors on Synesius was added to them. (From the title of this work we learn that he then Latinized his name *Pætus*, which he afterwards changed into *Petavius*. His own edition of *The Works of Synesius* did not appear till 1612.) He entered the Society of the Jesuits in 1605, and did great honor to it afterwards by his vast and profound erudition. He became zealous for the Roman Catholic Church; and there was no way of serving it more agreeable to his humor than by criticising and abusing its adversaries. Scaliger was the person he was most bitter against; but he did not spare his friend Casaubon whenever he came in his way. There is no occasion to enter into detail about a man whose whole life was spent in reading and writing books, and in performing the several offices of his order. The history of a learned man is the history of his works; and by far the greater part of Petavius's writings were to support popish doctrines and discipline. But it must be confessed that in order to perform his task well he made himself a universal scholar. He died at Paris Dec. 11, 1652. In 1633 he published an excellent work entitled *Rationale Temporum;* it is

an abridgment of universal history, from the earliest times down to 1632, digested in chronological order, and supported all the way by references to proper authorities. It went through several editions; many additions and improvements have been made to it, both by Petavius himself, and by Perizonius and others after his death; and Le Clerc published an abridgment of it as far down as to 800, under the title of *Compendium Historiæ Universalis*, in 1697 (12mo). Petavius's chef-d'œuvre is his "*Opus de Theologicis Dogmatibus*, nunc primum septem voluminibus comprehensum, in meliorem ordinem redactum, auctoris ipsius vita, ac libris quibusdam numquam in hoc opere editis locupletatum, Francisci Antonii Zachariæ ex eadem Societate Jesu extensium principum Bibliothecæ Præfecti dissertationibus, ac notis uberrimis illustratum" (Ven. 1757, 7 vols. fol.). It is full of choice erudition, but unfortunately his death cut it short, and it lacks completeness. Besides other services, Petavius deserves to be acknowledged as the first theologian who brought into proper relations history and dogmatics. Muratori regards him as the restorer of dogmatic theology. In the opinion of Gassendus (*Vit. Pereschii*) Petavius was the most consummate scholar the Jesuits ever had; and indeed we cannot suppose him to have been inferior to the first scholars of any order, while we consider him waging war, as he did frequently with success, against Scaliger, Salmasius, and other like chiefs in the republic of letters. His judgment, as may easily be conceived, was inferior to his learning; and his controversial writings are full of that sourness and spleen which appears so manifest in all the prints of his countenance. Bayle has observed that Petavius did the Socinians great service, though unawares and against his intentions. The Jesuit's original design, in the second volume of his *Dogmata Theologica*, was to represent ingenuously the doctrine of the first three centuries. Having no particular system to defend, he did not carefully state the opinions of the fathers, but only gave a general account of them. By this means he unawares led the public to believe that the fathers entertained false and absurd notions concerning the mystery of the Three Persons; and, against his intentions, furnished arguments and authorities to the Antitrinitarians. When made aware of this, and being willing to prevent the evil consequences which he had not foreseen, he wrote his Preface, in which he labored solely to assert the orthodoxy of the fathers, and thus was forced to contradict what he had advanced in the *Dogmata*. (Comp. Bull, *On the Trinity*.) See Werner, *Geschichte der apologet. und polem. Literatur*, vol. iv; idem, *Geschichte der katholischen Theologie* (Munich, 1866); Dupin, *Nouvelle Bibliothèque des Auteurs ecclésiastiques*, s. v.; Simon, *Hist. crit. des principaux Commentateurs;* Alzog, *Kirchengeschichte*, ii, 435; *Christian Remembrancer*, lv, 484. (J. H. W.)

Pe'ter (Πέτρος, *a rock*, for the Aram. כֵּיפָא), originally SIMON (see below), the leader among the personal disciples of Christ, and afterwards the special apostle to the Jews. We shall treat this important character first in the light of definite information from the New Testament and early Church historians, and disputed questions under a subsequent head, relegating many minor details to separate articles elsewhere.

I. *Authentic History.*—1. *His Early Life.*—The Scripture notices on this point are few, but not unimportant, and enable us to form some estimate of the circumstances under which the apostle's character was formed, and how he was prepared for his great work. Peter was the son of a man named Jonas (Matt. xvi, 17; John i, 43; xxi, 16), and was brought up in his father's occupation, a fisherman on the sea of Tiberias. The occupation was of course an humble one, but not, as is often assumed, mean or servile, or incompatible with some degree of mental culture. His family were probably in easy circumstances (see below). He and his brother Andrew were partners of John and James, the sons of Zebedee, who had hired servants; and from various indications in the sacred narrative we are led to the conclusion that their social position brought them into contact with men of education. In fact the trade of fishermen, supplying some of the important cities on the coasts of that inland lake, may have been tolerably remunerative, while all the necessaries of life were cheap and abundant in the singularly rich and fertile district where the apostle resided. He did not live, as a mere laboring man, in a hut by the sea-side, but first at Bethsaida, and afterwards in a house at Capernaum belonging to himself or his mother-in-law, which must have been rather a large one, since he received in it not only our Lord and his fellow-disciples, but multitudes who were attracted by the miracles and preaching of Jesus. It is certain that when he left all to follow Christ, he made what he regarded, and what seems to have been admitted by his Master, as being a considerable sacrifice (Matt. xix, 27). The habits of such a life were by no means unfavorable to the development of a vigorous, earnest, and practical character, such as he displayed in after-years. The labors, the privations, and the perils of an existence passed in great part upon the waters of that beautiful but stormy lake, the long and anxious watching through the nights, were calculated to test and increase his natural powers, his fortitude, energy, and perseverance. In the city he must have been brought into contact with men engaged in traffic, with soldiers and foreigners, and may have thus acquired somewhat of the flexibility and geniality of temperament all but indispensable to the attainment of such personal influence as he exercised in after-life. It is not probable that he and his brother were wholly uneducated. The Jews regarded instruction as a necessity, and legal enactments enforced the attendance of youths in schools maintained by the community. See EDUCATION. The statement in Acts iv, 13, that "the council perceived they (i. e. Peter and John) were unlearned and ignorant men," is not incompatible with this assumption. The translation of the passage in the A. V. is rather exaggerated, the word rendered "unlearned" (ἰδιῶται) being nearly equivalent to "laymen," i. e. men of ordinary education, as contrasted with those who were specially trained in the schools of the rabbins. A man might be thoroughly conversant with the Scriptures, and yet be considered ignorant and unlearned by the rabbins, among whom the opinion was already prevalent that "the letter of Scripture was the mere shell, an earthen vessel containing heavenly treasures, which could only be discovered by those who had been taught to search for the hidden cabalistic meaning." Peter and his kinsmen were probably taught to read the Scriptures in childhood. The history of their country, especially of the great events of early days, must have been familiar to them as attendants at the synagogue, and their attention was there directed to those portions of Holy Writ from which the Jews derived their anticipations of the Messiah.

The language of the apostles was of course the form of Aramaic spoken in Northern Palestine, a sort of *patois*, partly Hebrew, but more nearly allied to the Syriac. Hebrew, even in its debased form, was then spoken only by men of learning, the leaders of the Pharisees and Scribes. The men of Galilee were, however, noted for rough and inaccurate language, and especially for vulgarities of pronunciation (Matt. xxvi, 73). It is doubtful whether our apostle was acquainted with Greek in early life. It is certain, however, that there was more intercourse with foreigners in Galilee than in any district of Palestine, and Greek appears to have been a common, if not the principal, medium of communication. Within a few years after his call Peter seems to have conversed fluently in Greek

with Cornelius, at least there is no intimation that an interpreter was employed, while it is highly improbable that Cornelius, a Roman soldier, should have used the language of Palestine. The style of both of Peter's epistles indicates a considerable knowledge of Greek; it is pure and accurate, and in grammatical structure equal to that of Paul. That may, however, be accounted for by the fact, for which there is very ancient authority, that Peter employed an interpreter in the composition of his epistles, if not in his ordinary intercourse with foreigners. There are no traces of acquaintance with Greek authors, or of the influence of Greek literature upon his mind, such as we find in Paul, nor could we expect it in a person of his station, even had Greek been his mother-tongue. It is on the whole probable that he had some rudimental knowledge of Greek in early life, which may have afterwards been extended when the need was felt, but not more than would enable him to discourse intelligibly on practical and devotional subjects. That he was an affectionate husband, married in early life to a wife who accompanied him in his apostolic journeys, are facts inferred from Scripture, while very ancient traditions, recorded by Clement of Alexandria (whose connection with the Church founded by Mark gives a peculiar value to his testimony), and by other early but less trustworthy writers, inform us that her name was Perpetua, that she bore a daughter, and perhaps other children, and suffered martyrdom. (See below.)

2. *As a Disciple merely.*—It is uncertain at what age Peter was called by our Lord. The general impression of the fathers is that he was an old man at the date of his death, A.D. 64, but this need not imply that he was much older than our Lord. He was probably between thirty and forty years of age at the date of his first call, A.D. 26. That call was preceded by a special preparation. He and his brother Andrew, together with their partners, James and John, the sons of Zebedee, were disciples of John the Baptist (John i, 35). They were in attendance upon him when they were first called to the service of Christ. From the circumstances of that call, which are recorded with graphic minuteness by St. John, we learn some important facts touching their state of mind and the personal character of our apostle. Two disciples, one named by the evangelist Andrew, the other in all probability St. John himself, were standing with the Baptist at Bethany on the Jordan, when he pointed out Jesus as he walked, and said, Behold the Lamb of God! that is, the antitype of the victims whose blood (as all true Israelites, and they more distinctly under the teaching of John, believed) prefigured the atonement for sin. The two at once followed Jesus, and upon his invitation abode with him that day. Andrew then went to his brother Simon, and said to him, We have found the Messias, the Anointed One, of whom they had read in the prophets. Simon went at once, and when Jesus looked on him he said, "Thou art *Simon the son of Jona;* thou shalt be called *Cephas.*" The change of name is of course deeply significant. As son of Jona (a name of doubtful meaning, according to Lampe equivalent to *Johanan* or *John*, i. e. *grace of the Lord;* according to Lange, who has some striking but fanciful observations, signifying *dove*) he bore as a disciple the name Simon, i. e. hearer; but as an apostle, one of the twelve on whom the Church was to be erected, he was hereafter (κληθήσῃ) to be called Rock or Stone. It seems a natural impression that the words refer primarily to the original character of Simon: that our Lord saw in him a man firm, steadfast, not to be overthrown, though severely tried; and such was generally the view taken by the fathers. But it is perhaps a deeper and truer inference that Jesus thus describes Simon, not as what he was, but as what he would become under his influence—a man with predispositions and capabilities not unfitted for the office he was to hold, but one whose permanence and stability would depend upon union with the living Rock. Thus we may expect to find Simon, as the natural man, at once rough, stubborn, and mutable, whereas Peter, identified with the Rock, will remain firm and immovable to the end. (See below.)

This first call led to no immediate change in Peter's external position. He and his fellow-disciples looked henceforth upon our Lord as their teacher, but were not commanded to follow him as regular disciples. There were several grades of disciples among the Jews, from the occasional hearer to the follower who gave up all other pursuits in order to serve a master. At the time a recognition of his Person and office sufficed. They returned to Capernaum, where they pursued their usual business, waiting for a further intimation of his will.

The second call is recorded by the other three evangelists. It took place on the Sea of Galilee near Capernaum, where the four disciples, Peter and Andrew, James and John, were fishing. A.D. 27. Peter and Andrew were first called. Our Lord then entered Simon Peter's boat, and addressed the multitude on the shore; after the conclusion of the discourse he wrought the miracle by which he foreshadowed the success of the apostles in the new but analogous occupation which was to be theirs—that of fishers of men. The call of James and John followed. From that time the four were certainly enrolled formally among his disciples, and although as yet invested with no official character, accompanied him in his journeys, those especially in the north of Palestine.

Immediately after that call our Lord went to the house of Peter, where he wrought the miracle of healing on Peter's wife's mother, a miracle succeeded by other manifestations of divine power which produced a deep impression upon the people. Some time was passed afterwards in attendance upon our Lord's public ministrations in Galilee, Decapolis, Peræa, and Judæa—though at intervals the disciples returned to their own city, and were witnesses of many miracles, of the call of Levi, and of their Master's reception of outcasts, whom they in common with their zealous but prejudiced countrymen had despised and shunned. It was a period of training, of mental and spiritual discipline preparatory to their admission to the higher office to which they were destined. Even then Peter received some marks of distinction. He was selected, together with the two sons of Zebedee, to witness the raising of Jarius's daughter.

The special designation of Peter and his eleven fellow-disciples took place some time afterwards, when they were set apart as our Lord's immediate attendants, and as his delegates to go forth wherever he might send them, as apostles, announcers of his kingdom, gifted with supernatural powers as credentials of their supernatural mission (see Matt. x, 2–4; Mark iii, 13–19, the most detailed account; Luke vi, 13). They appear then first to have formally received the name of Apostles, and from that time Simon bore publicly, and as it would seem all but exclusively, the name Peter, which had hitherto been used rather as a characteristic appellation than as a proper name.

From this time there can be no doubt that Peter held the first place among the apostles, to whatever cause his precedence is to be attributed. There was certainly much in his character which marked him as a representative man; both in his strength and in his weakness, in his excellences and his defects he exemplified the changes which the natural man undergoes in the gradual transformation into the spiritual man under the personal influence of the Saviour. The precedence did not depend upon priority of call, or it would have devolved upon his brother Andrew, or that other disciple who first followed Jesus. It seems scarcely probable that it depended upon seniority, even supposing, which is a mere conjecture, that he was older than his fellow-disciples. The special designation by Christ alone ac-

counts in a satisfactory way for the facts that he is named first in every list of the apostles, is generally addressed by our Lord as their representative, and on the most solemn occasions speaks in their name. Thus when the first great secession took place in consequence of the offence given by our Lord's mystic discourse at Capernaum (see John vi, 66–69), "Jesus said unto the twelve, Will ye also go away? Then Simon Peter answered him, Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life: and we believe and are sure that thou art that Christ, the Son of the living God." Thus again at Cæsarea Philippi, soon after the return of the twelve from their first missionary tour, Peter (speaking as before in the name of the twelve, though, as appears from our Lord's words, with a peculiar distinctness of personal conviction) repeated that declaration, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." The confirmation of our apostle in his special position in the Church, his identification with the rock on which that Church is founded, the ratification of the powers and duties attached to the apostolic office, and the promise of permanence to the Church, followed as a reward of that confession. The early Church regarded Peter generally, and most especially on this occasion, as the representative of the apostolic body—a very distinct theory from that which makes him their head or governor in Christ's stead. Even in the time of Cyprian, when connection with the bishop of Rome as Peter's successor for the first time was held to be indispensable, no powers of jurisdiction or supremacy were supposed to be attached to the admitted precedency of rank. *Primus inter pares* Peter held no distinct office, and certainly never claimed any powers which did not belong equally to all his fellow-apostles. (See below.)

This great triumph of Peter, however, brought other points of his character into strong relief. The distinction which he then received, and it may be his consciousness of ability, energy, zeal, and absolute devotion to Christ's person, seem to have developed a natural tendency to rashness and forwardness bordering upon presumption. On this occasion the exhibition of such feelings brought upon him the strongest reproof ever addressed to a disciple by our Lord. In his affection and self-confidence Peter ventured to reject as impossible the announcement of the sufferings and humiliation which Jesus predicted; and he heard the sharp words —"Get thee behind me, Satan, thou art an offence unto me—for thou savorest not the things that be of God, but those that be of men." That was Peter's first fall; a very ominous one: not a rock, but a stumbling-stone; not a defender, but an antagonist and deadly enemy of the faith, when the spiritual should give place to the lower nature in dealing with the things of God. It is remarkable that on other occasions when Peter signalized his faith and devotion he displayed at the time, or immediately afterwards, a more than usual deficiency in spiritual discernment and consistency. Thus a few days after that fall he was selected together with John and James to witness the transfiguration of Christ, but the words which he then uttered prove that he was completely bewildered, and unable at the time to comprehend the meaning of the transaction. Thus again, when his zeal and courage prompted him to leave the ship and walk on the water to go to Jesus (Matt. xiv, 29), a sudden failure of faith withdrew the sustaining power; he was about to sink when he was at once reproved and saved by his Master. Such traits, which occur not unfrequently, prepare us for his last great fall, as well as for his conduct after the resurrection, when his natural gifts were perfected and his deficiencies supplied by "the power from on high." We find a mixture of zeal and weakness in his conduct when called upon to pay tribute-money for himself and his Lord, but faith had the upper hand, and was rewarded by a significant miracle (Matt. xvii, 24–27). The question which about the same time Peter asked our Lord as to the extent to which forgiveness of sins should be carried, indicated a great advance in spirituality from the Jewish standpoint, while it showed how far as yet he and his fellow-disciples were from understanding the true principle of Christian love (Matt. xviii, 21). We find a similar blending of opposite qualities in the declaration recorded by the synoptical evangelists (Matt. xix, 27; Mark x, 28; Luke xviii, 28), "Lo, we have left all and followed thee." It certainly bespeaks a consciousness of sincerity, a spirit of self-devotion and self-sacrifice, though it conveys an impression of something like ambition; but in that instance the good undoubtedly predominated, as is shown by our Lord's answer. He does not reprove Peter, who spoke, as usual, in the name of the twelve, but takes the opportunity of uttering the strongest prediction touching the future dignity and paramount authority of the apostles, a prediction recorded by Matthew only.

Towards the close of our Lord's ministry (A.D. 29) Peter's characteristics become especially prominent. Together with his brother and the two sons of Zebedee he listened to the last awful predictions and warnings delivered to the disciples in reference to the second advent (Matt. xxiv. 3; Mark xiii, 3, who alone mentions these names; Luke xxi, 7). At the last supper Peter seems to have been particularly earnest in the request that the traitor might be pointed out, expressing of course a general feeling, to which some inward consciousness of infirmity may have added force. After the supper his words drew out the meaning of the significant, almost sacramental act of our Lord in washing his disciples' feet—an occasion on which we find the same mixture of goodness and frailty, humility and deep affection, with a certain taint of self-will, which was at once hushed into submissive reverence by the voice of Jesus. Then too it was that he made those repeated protestations of unalterable fidelity, so soon to be falsified by his miserable fall. That event is, however, of such critical import in its bearings upon the character and position of the apostle, that it cannot be dismissed without a careful, if not an exhaustive discussion. Judas had left the guest-chamber when Peter put the question, Lord, whither goest thou? words which modern theologians generally represent as savoring of idle curiosity or presumption, but in which the early fathers (as Chrysostom and Augustine) recognised the utterance of love and devotion. The answer was a promise that Peter should follow his Master, but accompanied with an intimation of present unfitness in the disciple. Then came the first protestation, which elicited the sharp and stern rebuke, and distinct prediction of Peter's denial (John xiii, 36–38). From comparing this account with those of the other evangelists (Matt. xxvi, 33–35; Mark xiv, 29–31; Luke xxii, 33, 34), it seems evident that with some diversity of circumstances both the protestation and warning were thrice repeated. The tempter was to sift all the disciples, our apostle's faith was to be preserved from failing by the special intercession of Christ, he being thus singled out either as the representative of the whole body, or, as seems more probable, because his character was one which had special need of supernatural aid. Mark, as usual, records two points which enhance the force of the warning and the guilt of Peter, viz. that the cock would crow twice, and that after such warning he repeated his protestation with greater vehemence. Chrysostom, who judges the apostle with fairness and candor, attributes this vehemence to his great love, and more particularly to the delight which he felt when assured that he was not the traitor, yet not without a certain admixture of forwardness and ambition such as had previously been shown in the dispute for pre-eminence. The fiery trial soon came. After the agony of Gethsemane, when the three, Peter, James, and John, were, as on former occasions, selected to be with our Lord, the only witnesses of his passion, where also all three had alike failed to prepare themselves by prayer and watching, the arrest of Jesus took place. Peter did not shrink from the danger. In

the same spirit which had dictated his promise he drew his sword, alone against the armed throng, and wounded the servant (*τὸν δοῦλον*, not *a* servant) of the high-priest, probably the leader of the band. When this bold but unauthorized attempt at rescue was reproved, he did not yet forsake his Master, but followed him with John into the focus of danger, the house of the high-priest. There he sat in the outer hall. He must have been in a state of utter confusion: his faith, which from first to last was bound up with hope, his special characteristic, was for the time powerless against temptation. The danger found him unarmed. Thrice, each time with greater vehemence, the last time with blasphemous asseveration, he denied his Master. The triumph of Satan seemed complete. Yet it is evident that it was an obscuration of faith, not an extinction. It needed but a glance of his Lord's eye to bring him to himself. His repentance was instantaneous and effectual. The light in which he himself regarded his conduct is clearly shown by the terms in which it is related by Mark, who in some sense may be regarded as his reporter. The inferences are weighty as regards his personal character, which represents more completely perhaps than any in the New Testament the weakness of the natural and the strength of the spiritual man—still more weighty as bearing upon his relations to the apostolic body, and the claims resting upon the assumption that he stood to them in the place of Christ.

On the morning of the resurrection we have proof that Peter, though humbled, was not crushed by his fall. He and John were the first to visit the sepulchre; he was the first who entered it. We are told by Luke (in words still used by the Eastern Church as the first salutation on Easter Sunday) and by Paul that Christ appeared to him first among the apostles—he who most needed the comfort was the first who received it, and with it, as may be assumed, an assurance of forgiveness. It is observable, however, that on that occasion he is called by his original name, Simon, not Peter; the higher designation was not restored until he had been publicly reinstituted, so to speak, by his Master. That reinstitution took place at the Sea of Galilee (John xxi), an event of the very highest import. We have there indications of his best natural qualities, practical good-sense, promptness, and energy; slower than John to recognise their Lord, Peter was the first to reach him: he brought the net to land. The thrice-repeated question of Christ, referring doubtless to the three protestations and denials, was thrice met by answers full of love and faith, and utterly devoid of his hitherto characteristic failing, presumption, of which not a trace is to be discerned in his later history. He then received the formal commission to feed Christ's sheep; not certainly as one endued with exclusive or paramount authority, or as distinguished from his fellow-disciples, whose fall had been marked by far less aggravating circumstances; rather as one who had forfeited his place, and could not resume it without such an authorization. Then followed the prediction of his martyrdom, in which he was to find the fulfilment of his request to be permitted to follow the Lord.

With this event closes the first part of Peter's history. It was a period of transition, during which the fisherman of Galilee had been trained, first by the Baptist, then by our Lord, for the great work of his life. He had learned to know the person and appreciate the offices of Christ; while his own character had been chastened and elevated by special privileges and humiliations, both reaching their climax in the last recorded transactions. Henceforth he with his colleagues were to establish and govern the Church founded by their Lord, without the support of his presence.

3. *Apostolical Career.*—The first part of the Acts of the Apostles is occupied by the record of transactions in nearly all of which Peter stands forth as the recognised leader of the apostles; it being, however, equally clear that he neither exercises nor claims any authority apart from them, much less over them. In the first chapter it is Peter who points out to the disciples (as in all his discourses and writings drawing his arguments from prophecy) the necessity of supplying the place of Judas. He states the qualifications of an apostle, but takes no special part in the election. The candidates are selected by the disciples, while the decision is left to the searcher of hearts. The extent and limits of Peter's primacy might be inferred with tolerable accuracy from this transaction alone. To have one spokesman, or foreman, seems to accord with the spirit of order and humility which ruled the Church, while the assumption of power or supremacy would be incompatible with the express command of Christ (see Matt. xxiii, 10). In the second chapter again, Peter is the most prominent person in the greatest event after the resurrection, when on the day of Pentecost the Church was first invested with the plentitude of gifts and powers. Then Peter, not speaking in his own name, but with the eleven (see ver. 14), explained the meaning of the miraculous gifts, and showed the fulfilment of prophecies (accepted at that time by all Hebrews as Messianic) both in the outpouring of the Holy Ghost and in the resurrection and death of our Lord. This discourse, which bears all the marks of Peter's individuality, both of character and doctrinal views, ends with an appeal of remarkable boldness. It is the model upon which the apologetic discourses of the primitive Christians were generally constructed. The conversion and baptism of three thousand persons, who continued steadfast in the apostle's doctrine and fellowship, attested the power of the Spirit which spake by Peter on that occasion.

The first miracle after Pentecost was wrought by Peter (Acts iii); and John was joined with him in that, as in most important acts of his ministry; but it was Peter who took the cripple by the hand, and bade him "in the name of Jesus of Nazareth rise up and walk," and when the people ran together to Solomon's porch, where the apostles, following their Master's example, were wont to teach, Peter was the speaker: he convinces the people of their sin, warns them of their danger, points out the fulfilment of prophecy, and the special objects for which God sent his Son first to the children of the old covenant. This speech is at once strikingly characteristic of Peter and a proof of the fundamental harmony between his teaching and the more developed and systematic doctrines of Paul; differing in form, to an extent utterly incompatible with the theory of Baur and Schwegler touching the object of the writer of the Acts; identical in spirit, as issuing from the same source. The boldness of the two apostles, of Peter more especially as the spokesman, when "filled with the Holy Ghost" he confronted the full assembly headed by Annas and Caiaphas, produced a deep impression upon those cruel and unscrupulous hypocrites: an impression enhanced by the fact that the words came from comparatively ignorant and unlearned men. The words spoken by both apostles, when commanded not to speak at all nor teach in the name of Jesus, have ever since been the watchwords of martyrs (iv, 19, 20).

This first miracle of healing was soon followed by the first miracle of judgment. The first open and deliberate sin against the Holy Ghost—a sin combining ambition, fraud, hypocrisy, and blasphemy—was visited by death, sudden and awful as under the old dispensation. Peter was the minister in that transaction. As he had first opened the gate to penitents (Acts ii, 37, 38), he now closed it to hypocrites. The act stands alone, without a precedent or parallel in the Gospel; but Peter acted simply as an instrument, not pronouncing the sentence, but denouncing the sin, and that in the name of his fellow-apostles and of the Holy Ghost. Penalties similar in kind, though far different in degree, were inflicted or commanded on various occasions by Paul. Peter appears, perhaps in consequence of that act, to have become the object of a reverence bordering, as it

would seem, on superstition (Acts v, 15), while the numerous miracles of healing wrought about the same time, showing the true character of the power dwelling in the apostles, gave occasion to the second persecution. Peter then came in contact with the noblest and most interesting character among the Jews, the learned and liberal tutor of Paul, Gamaliel, whose caution, gentleness, and dispassionate candor stand out in strong relief contrasted with his colleagues, but make a faint impression compared with the steadfast and uncompromising principles of the apostles, who, after undergoing an illegal scourging, went forth rejoicing that they were counted worthy to suffer shame for the name of Jesus. Peter is not specially named in connection with the appointment of deacons, an important step in the organization of the Church; but when the Gospel was first preached beyond the precincts of Judæa, he and John were at once sent by the apostles to confirm the converts at Samaria, a very important statement at this critical point, proving clearly his subordination to the whole body, of which he was the most active and able member.

Up to this time it may be said that the apostles had one great work, viz. to convince the Jews that Jesus was the Messiah; in that work Peter was the master builder, the whole structure rested upon the doctrines of which he was the principal teacher; hitherto no words but his are specially recorded by the writer of the Acts. Henceforth he remains prominent, but not exclusively prominent, among the propagators of the Gospel. At Samaria he and John established the precedent for the most important rite not expressly enjoined in Holy Writ, viz. confirmation, which the Western Church has always held to belong exclusively to the functions of bishops as successors to the ordinary powers of the apostolate. Then also Peter was confronted with Simon Magus, the first teacher of heresy. See Simon Magus. As in the case of Ananias he had denounced the first sin against holiness, so in this case he first declared the penalty due to the sin called after Simon's name. About three years later (comp. Acts ix, 26 and Gal. i, 17, 18) we have two accounts of the first meeting of Peter and Paul. In the Acts it is stated generally that Saul was at first distrusted by the disciples, and received by the apostles upon the recommendation of Barnabas. From the Galatians we learn that Paul went to Jerusalem especially to see Peter; that he abode with him fifteen days, and that James was the only other apostle present at the time. It is important to note that this account, which, while it establishes the independence of Paul, marks the position of Peter as the most eminent of the apostles, rests not on the authority of the writer of the Acts, but on that of Paul—as if it were intended to obviate all possible misconceptions touching the mutual relations of the apostles of the Hebrews and the Gentiles. This interview was preceded by other events marking Peter's position—a general apostolical tour of visitation to the churches hitherto established (*διερχόμενον διὰ πάντων*, Acts ix, 32), in the course of which two great miracles were wrought on Æneas and Tabitha, and in connection with which the most signal transaction after the day of Pentecost is recorded, the baptism of Cornelius. A.D. 32. That was the crown and consummation of Peter's ministry. Peter, who had first preached the resurrection to the Jews, baptized the first converts, confirmed the first Samaritans, now, without the advice or co-operation of any of his colleagues, under direct communication from heaven, first threw down the barrier which separated proselytes of the gate from Israelites, thus establishing principles which in their gradual application and full development issued in the complete fusion of the Gentile and Hebrew elements in the Church. The narrative of this event, which stands alone in minute circumstantiality of incidents and accumulation of supernatural agency, is twice recorded by Luke. The chief points to be noted are, first, the peculiar fitness of Cornelius, both as a representative of Roman force and nationality, and as a devout and liberal worshipper, to be a recipient of such privileges; and, secondly, the state of the apostle's own mind. Whatever may have been his hopes or fears touching the heathen, the idea had certainly not yet crossed him that they could become Christians without first becoming Jews. As a loyal and believing Hebrew, he could not contemplate the removal of Gentile disqualifications without a distinct assurance that the enactments of the law which concerned them were abrogated by the divine Legislator. The vision could not therefore have been the product of a subjective impression. It was, strictly speaking, objective, presented to his mind by an external influence. Yet the will of the apostle was not controlled, it was simply enlightened. The intimation in the state of trance did not at once overcome his reluctance. It was not until his consciousness was fully restored, and he had well considered the meaning of the vision, that he learned that the distinction of cleanness and uncleanness in outward things belonged to a temporary dispensation. It was no mere acquiescence in a positive command, but the development of a spirit full of generous impulses, which found utterance in the words spoken by Peter on that occasion—both in the presence of Cornelius, and afterwards at Jerusalem. His conduct gave great offence to all his countrymen (Acts xi, 2), and it needed all his authority, corroborated by a special manifestation of the Holy Ghost, to induce his fellow-apostles to recognise the propriety of this great act, in which both he and they saw an earnest of the admission of Gentiles into the Church on the single condition of spiritual repentance. The establishment of a Church, in great part of Gentile origin, at Antioch, and the mission of Barnabas, between whose family and Peter there were the bonds of near intimacy, set the seal upon the work thus inaugurated by Peter.

This transaction was followed, after an interval of several years, by the imprisonment of our apostle. A.D. 44. Herod Agrippa, having first tested the state of feeling at Jerusalem by the execution of James, one of the most eminent apostles, arrested Peter. The hatred which at that time first showed itself as a popular feeling may most probably be attributed chiefly to the offence given by Peter's conduct towards Cornelius. His miraculous deliverance marks the close of this second great period of his ministry. The special work assigned to him was completed. He had founded the Church, opened its gates to Jews and Gentiles, and distinctly laid down the conditions of admission. From that time we have no continuous history of Peter. It is quite clear that he retained his rank as the chief apostle, equally so that he neither exercised nor claimed any right to control their proceedings. At Jerusalem the government of the Church devolved upon James the brother of our Lord. In other places Peter seems to have confined his ministrations to his countrymen—as apostle of the circumcision. He left Jerusalem, but it is not said where he went. Certainly not to Rome, where there are no traces of his presence before the last years of his life; he probably remained in Judæa, visiting and confirming the churches; some old but not trustworthy traditions represent him as preaching in Cæsarea and other cities on the western coast of Palestine; three years later we find him once more at Jerusalem when the apostles and elders came together to consider the question whether converts should be circumcised. Peter took the lead in that discussion, and urged with remarkable cogency the principles settled in the case of Cornelius. Purifying faith and saving grace (xv, 9 and 11) remove all distinctions between believers. His arguments, adopted and enforced by James, decided that question at once and forever. It is, however, to be remarked that on that occasion he exercised no one power which Romanists hold to be inalienably attached to the chair of Peter. He did not preside at the meeting; he neither summoned nor dismissed it; he neither collected the

suffrages nor pronounced the decision. It is a disputed point whether the meeting between Paul and Peter of which we have an account in the Galatians (ii, 1–10) took place at this time. The great majority of critics believe that it did, but this hypothesis has serious difficulties. Lange (*Das apostolische Zeitalter*, ii, 378) fixes the date about three years after the council. Wieseler has a long excursus to show that it must have occurred after Paul's second apostolic journey. He gives some weighty reasons, but wholly fails in the attempt to account for the presence of Barnabas, a fatal objection to his theory. (See *Der Brief an die Galater*, *Excursus*, p. 579.) On the other side are Theodoret, Pearson, Eichhorn, Olshausen, Meyer, Neander, Howson, Schaff, etc. The only point of real importance was certainly determined before the apostles separated, the work of converting the Gentiles being henceforth specially intrusted to Paul and Barnabas, while the charge of preaching to the circumcision was assigned to the elder apostles, and more particularly to Peter (Gal. ii, 7–9). This arrangement cannot, however, have been an exclusive one. Paul always addressed himself first to the Jews in every city; Peter and his colleagues undoubtedly admitted and sought to make converts among the Gentiles. It may have been in full force only when the old and new apostles resided in the same city. Such at least was the case at Antioch, where Peter went soon afterwards. There the painful collision took place between the two apostles; the most remarkable, and, in its bearings upon controversies at critical periods, one of the most important events in the history of the Church. Peter at first applied the principles which he had lately defended, carrying with him the whole apostolic body, and on his arrival at Antioch ate with the Gentiles, thus showing that he believed all ceremonial distinctions to be abolished by the Gospel—in that he went far beyond the strict letter of the injunctions issued by the council. That step was marked and condemned by certain members of the Church of Jerusalem sent by James. It appeared to them one thing to recognise Gentiles as fellow-Christians, another to admit them to social intercourse, whereby ceremonial defilement would be contracted under the law to which all the apostles, Barnabas and Paul included, acknowledged allegiance. Peter, as the apostle of the circumcision, fearing to give offence to those who were his special charge, at once gave up the point, suppressed or disguised his feelings, and separated himself not from communion, but from social intercourse with the Gentiles. Paul, as the apostle of the Gentiles, saw clearly the consequences likely to ensue, and could ill brook the misapplication of a rule often laid down in his own writings concerning compliance with the prejudices of weak brethren. He held that Peter was infringing a great principle, withstood him to the face, and, using the same arguments which Peter had urged at the council, pronounced his conduct to be indefensible. The statement that Peter compelled the Gentiles to Judaize probably means, not that he enjoined circumcision, but that his conduct, if persevered in, would have that effect, since they would naturally take any steps which might remove the barriers to familiar intercourse with the first apostles of Christ. Peter was wrong, but it was an error of judgment: an act contrary to his own feelings and wishes, in deference to those whom he looked upon as representing the mind of the Church; that he was actuated by selfishness, national pride, or any remains of superstition, is neither asserted nor implied in the strong censure of Paul. Nor, much as we must admire the earnestness and wisdom of Paul, whose clear and vigorous intellect was in this case stimulated by anxiety for his own special charge, the Gentile Church, should we overlook Peter's singular humility in submitting to public reproof from one so much his junior, or his magnanimity both in adopting Paul's conclusions (as we must infer that he did from the absence of all trace of continued resistance) and in remaining on terms of brotherly communion (as is testified by his own written words) to the end of his life (1 Pet. v, 10; 2 Pet. iii, 15, 16). See PAUL.

From this time until the date of his Epistles we have no distinct notices in Scripture of Peter's abode or work. The silence may be accounted for by the fact that from that time the great work of propagating the Gospel was committed to the marvellous energies of Paul. Peter was probably employed for the most part in building up and completing the organization of Christian communities in Palestine and the adjoining districts. There is, however, strong reason to believe that he visited Corinth at an early period; this seems to be implied in several passages of Paul's first epistle to that Church, and it is a natural inference from the statements of Clement of Rome (*First Epistle to the Corinthians*, c. 4). The fact is positively asserted by Dionysius, bishop of Corinth (A.D. 180 at the latest), a man of excellent judgment, who was not likely to be misinformed, nor to make such an assertion lightly in an epistle addressed to the bishop and Church of Rome. The reference to collision between parties who claimed Peter, Apollos, Paul, and even Christ for their chiefs, involves no opposition between the apostles themselves, such as the fabulous Clementines and modern infidelity assume. The name of Peter as founder, or joint founder, is not associated with any local Church save those of Corinth, Antioch, and Rome, by early ecclesiastical tradition. That of Alexandria may have been established by Mark after Peter's death. That Peter preached the Gospel in the countries of Asia mentioned in his First Epistle appears from Origen's own words (κεκηρυκέναι ἔοικεν) to be a mere conjecture (Origen, ap. Euseb. iii, 1, adopted by Epiphanius, *Hær.* xxvii, and Jerome, *Catal.* c. 1), not in itself improbable, but of little weight in the absence of all positive evidence, and of all personal reminiscences in the Epistle itself. From that Epistle, however, it is to be inferred that towards the end of his life Peter either visited or resided for some time at Babylon, which at that time, and for some hundreds of years afterwards, was a chief seat of Jewish culture. This of course depends upon the assumption, which on the whole seems most probable, that the word Babylon is not used as a mystic designation of Rome, but as a proper name, and that not of an obscure city in Egypt, but of the ancient capital of the East. There were many inducements for such a choice of abode. The Jewish families formed there a separate community; they were rich, prosperous, and had established settlements in many districts of Asia Minor. Their language, probably a mixture of Hebrew and Nabathæan, must have borne a near affinity to the Galilæan dialect. They were on far more familiar terms with their heathen neighbors than in other countries, while their intercourse with Judæa was carried on without intermission. Christianity certainly made considerable progress at an early time in that and the adjoining districts; the great Christian schools at Edessa and Nisibis probably owed their origin to the influence of Peter; the general tone of the writers of that school is what is now commonly designated as Petrine. It is no unreasonable supposition that the establishment of Christianity in those districts may have been specially connected with the residence of Peter at Babylon. At that time there must have been some communication between the two great apostles, Peter and Paul, thus stationed at the two extremities of the Christian world. Mark, who was certainly employed about that time by Paul, was with Peter when he wrote the Epistle. Silvanus, Paul's chosen companion, was the bearer, probably the amanuensis of Peter's Epistle—not improbably sent to Peter from Rome, and charged by him to deliver that epistle, written to support Paul's authority, to the churches founded by that apostle on his return. See PETER, EPISTLES OF.

More important in its bearings upon later controversies is the question of Peter's connection with Rome. It may be considered as a settled point that he did not visit Rome before the last year of his life. Too much stress may perhaps be laid on the fact that there is no notice of Peter's labors or presence in that city in the Epistle to the Romans; but that negative evidence is not counterbalanced by any statement of undoubted antiquity. The date given by Eusebius rests upon a miscalculation, and is irreconcilable with the notices of Peter in the Acts of the Apostles. He gives A.D. 42 in the *Chronicon* (i. e. in the Armenian text), and says that Peter remained at Rome twenty years. In this he is followed by Jerome, *Catal.* c. 1 (who gives twenty-five years), and by most Roman Catholic writers. Protestant critics, with scarcely one exception, are unanimous upon this point, and Roman controversialists are far from being agreed in their attempts to remove the difficulty. The most ingenious effort is that of Windischmann (*Vindiciæ Petrinæ*, p. 112 sq.). He assumes that Peter went to Rome immediately after his deliverance from prison (Acts xii), i. e. A.D. 44, and left in consequence of the Claudian persecution between A.D. 49 and 51. (See below.)

The fact, however, of Peter's martyrdom at Rome rests upon very different grounds. The evidence for it is complete, while there is a total absence of any contrary statement in the writings of the early fathers. We have in the first place the certainty of his martyrdom in our Lord's own prediction (John xxi, 18, 19). Clement of Rome, writing before the end of the first century, speaks of it, but does not mention the *place*, that being of course well known to his readers. Ignatius, in the undoubtedly genuine Epistle to the Romans (ch. iv), speaks of Peter in terms which imply a special connection with their Church. Other early notices of less weight coincide with this, as that of Papias (Euseb. ii, 15), and the apocryphal *Prædicatio Petri*, quoted by Cyprian. In the second century, Dionysius of Corinth, in the Epistle to Soter, bishop of Rome (ap. Euseb. *H. E.* ii, 25), states, as a fact universally known, and accounting for the intimate relations between Corinth and Rome, that Peter and Paul both taught in Italy, and suffered martyrdom about the same time. Irenæus, who was connected with the apostle John, being a disciple of Polycarp, a hearer of that apostle, and thoroughly conversant with Roman matters, bears distinct witness to Peter's presence at Rome (*Adv. Hær.* iii, 1 and 3). It is incredible that he should have been misinformed. In the next century there is the testimony of Caius, the liberal and learned Roman presbyter (who speaks of Peter's tomb in the Vatican), that of Origen, Tertullian, and of the ante- and post-Nicene fathers, without a single exception. In short, the churches most nearly connected with Rome, and those least affected by its influence, which was as yet but inconsiderable in the East, concur in the statement that Peter was a joint founder of that Church, and suffered death in that city. What the early fathers do not assert, and indeed implicitly deny, is that Peter was the sole founder or resident head of that Church, or that the See of Rome derived from him any claim to supremacy: at the utmost they place him on a footing of equality with Paul. That fact is sufficient for all purposes of fair controversy. The denial of the statements resting on such evidence seems almost to indicate an uneasy consciousness, truly remarkable in those who believe that they have, and who in fact really have, irrefragable grounds for rejecting the pretensions of the papacy. Coteler has collected a large number of passages from the early fathers, in which the name of Paul *precedes* that of Peter (*Pat. Apost.* i, 414; see also Valesius, Euseb. *H. E.* iii, 21). Fabricius observes that this is the general usage of the Greek fathers. It is also to be remarked that when the fathers of the 4th and 5th centuries—for instance, Chrysostom and Augustine—use the words ὁ Ἀπόστολος, or *Apostolus*, they mean Paul, not Peter—a very weighty fact.

The time and manner of the apostle's martyrdom are less certain. The early writers imply, or distinctly state, that he suffered at or about the same time (Dionysius, κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν καιρόν) with Paul, and in the Neronian persecution. All agree that he was crucified, a point sufficiently determined by our Lord's prophecy. Origen (ap. Euseb. iii, 1), who could easily ascertain the fact, and, though fanciful in speculation, is not inaccurate in historical matters, says that at his own request he was crucified κατὰ κεφάλης; probably meaning *by the head*, and not, as generally understood, *with his head downwards*. (See below.) This statement was generally received by Christian antiquity; nor does it seem inconsistent with the fervent temperament and deep humility of the apostle to have chosen such a death—one, moreover, not unlikely to have been inflicted in mockery by the instruments of Nero's wanton and ingenious cruelty. The legend found in St. Ambrose is interesting, and may have some foundation in fact. When the persecution began, the Christians at Rome, anxious to preserve their great teacher, persuaded him to flee, a course which they had scriptural warrant to recommend and he to follow; but at the gate he met our Lord. "Lord, whither goest thou?" asked the apostle. "I go to Rome," was the answer, "there once more to be crucified." Peter well understood the meaning of those words, returned at once and was crucified. See Tillemont, *Mém.* i, 187, 555. He shows that the account of Ambrose (which is not to be found in the Bened. edit.) is contrary to the apocryphal legend. Later writers rather value it as reflecting upon Peter's want of courage or constancy. That Peter, like all good men, valued his life and suffered reluctantly, may be inferred from our Lord's words (John xxi); but his flight is more in harmony with the principles of a Christian than wilful exposure to persecution. Origen refers to the words then said to have been spoken by our Lord, but quotes an apocryphal work (*On St. John*, tom. ii).

Thus closes the apostle's life. Some additional facts, not perhaps unimportant, may be accepted on early testimony. From Paul's words it may be inferred with certainty that he did not give up the ties of family life when he forsook his temporal calling. His wife accompanied him in his wanderings. Clement of Alexandria, a writer well informed in matters of ecclesiastical interest, and thoroughly trustworthy, says (*Strom.* iii, p. 448) that "Peter and Philip had children, and that both took about their wives, who acted as their co-adjutors in ministering to women at their own homes; by their means the doctrine of the Lord penetrated without scandal into the privacy of women's apartments." Peter's wife is believed, on the same authority, to have suffered martyrdom, and to have been supported in the hour of trial by her husband's exhortation. Some critics believe that she is referred to in the salutation at the end of the First Epistle of Peter. The apostle is said to have employed interpreters. Basilides, an early Gnostic, professed to have derived his system from Glaucias, one of these interpreters. This shows at least the impression that the apostle did not understand Greek, or did not speak it with fluency. Of far more importance is the statement that St. Mark wrote his Gospel under the teaching of Peter, or that he embodied in that Gospel the substance of our apostle's oral instructions. This statement rests upon such an amount of external evidence, and is corroborated by so many internal indications, that they would scarcely be questioned in the absence of a strong theological bias. (Papias and Clem. Alex., referred to by Eusebius, *H. E.* ii, 15; Tertullian, *c. Marc.* iv, c. 5; Irenæus, iii, 1; iv, 9. Petavius [on Epiphanius, p. 428] observes that Papias derived his information from John the Presbyter. For other passages, see Fabricius [*Bibl. Gr.* iii, 132]. The slight discrepancy between Eusebius and Papias indicates independent sources of information.) The fact

is doubly important, in its bearings upon the Gospel, and upon the character of our apostle. Chrysostom, who is followed by the most judicious commentators, seems first to have drawn attention to the fact that in Mark's Gospel every defect in Peter's character and conduct is brought out clearly, without the slighest extenuation, while many noble acts and peculiar marks of favor are either omitted or stated with far less force than by any other evangelist. Indications of Peter's influence, even in Mark's style, much less pure than that of Luke, are traced by modern criticism (Gieseler, quoted by Davidson).

II. *Discussion of Particular Points.*—We subjoin a closer examination of certain special questions touched upon in the above history.

1. *Peter's Name.*—His original appellation *Cephas* (Κηφᾶς) occurs in the following passages: John i, 42; 1 Cor. i, 12; iii, 22; ix, ; xv, 5; Gal. ii, 9; i, 18; ii, 10, 14 (the last three according to the text of Lachmann and Tischendorf). Cephas is the Chaldee word *Keyphâ*, כֵּיפָא, itself a corruption of or derivation from the Hebrew *Képh*, כֵּף, "a rock," a rare word, found only in Job xxx, 6 and Jer. iv, 29. It must have been the word actually pronounced by our Lord in Matt. xvi, 18, and on subsequent occasions when the apostle was addressed by him or other Hebrews by his new name. By it he was known to the Corinthian Christians. In the ancient Syriac version of the N. T. (Peshito), it is uniformly found where the Greek has Πέτρος. When we consider that our Lord and the apostles spoke Chaldee, and that therefore (as already remarked) the apostle must always have been addressed as Cephas, it is certainly remarkable that throughout the Gospels, no less than ninety-seven times, with one exception only, the name should be given in the Greek form, which was of later introduction, and unintelligible to Hebrews, though intelligible to the far wider Gentile world among which the Gospel was about to begin its course. Even in Mark, where more Chaldee words and phrases are retained than in all the other Gospels put together, this is the case. It is as if in our English Bibles the name were uniformly given, not Peter, but Rock; and it suggests that the meaning contained in the appellation is of more vital importance, and intended to be more carefully seized at each recurrence, than we are apt to recollect. The commencement of the change from the Chaldee name to its Greek synonym is well marked in the interchange of the two in Gal. ii, 7, 8, 9 (Stanley, *Apostolic Age*, p. 116). The apostle in his companionship with Christ, and up to the time of the Lord's ascension, seems to have borne the name of *Simon;* at least he is always so called by Jesus himself (Matt. xvii, 25; Mark xiv, 37; Luke xxii, 31; John xxi, 15), and apparently also by the disciples (Luke xxiv, 34; Acts xv, 14). But after the extension of the apostolic circle and its relations (comp. Acts x, 5, 18), the apostle began to be known, in order to distinguish him from others called Simon, as *Simon Peter;* the name of *Peter*, which had at first been given him as a special mark of esteem, being added, as that of a father often was in other cases; and, in the course of time, it seems that the latter name superseded the former. Hence the evangelists call the apostle Peter oftener than Simon Peter. As to the epistles of Paul, he is always called Cephas in 1 Cor., but in the other epistles often Peter. As above suggested, the appellation thus bestowed seems to have had reference to the disciple individually and personally. Attaching himself to Christ, he would partake of that blessed spiritual influence whereby he would be enabled, in spite of the vacillations of his naturally impulsive character, to hold with persevering grasp the faith he now embraced. He would become rooted and grounded in the truth, and not be carried away to destruction by the various winds of false doctrine and the crafty assaults of Satan. The name imposed was continually to remind him of what he ought to be as a follower of Christ. Compare Wieseler, *Chronologie des Apostolischen Zeitalters*, p. 581.

2. *Peter's Domestic Circumstances.*—Of the family and connections of our apostle we know but little. His father is named in the Gospel history, and his mother's name seems to have been Joanna (see Coteler, *Ad Const. Apostol.* ii, 63). It appears from John xxi that he did not entirely give up his occupation as a fisherman on his entrance into the body of Christ's disciples. Luke iv, 38 and 1 Cor. ix, 5 seem to show that he was married, and so the Church fathers often affirm (comp. Coteler, ad Clem. *Recogn.* vii, 25; Grabe, *Ad Spicil. Patr.* § i, p. 330). But the tradition of the name of his wife varies between Concordia and Perpetua (see Meyer, *De Petri Conjugio*, Viteb. 1684). It is said that she suffered martyrdom before Peter (Clem. Alex. *Strom*, vii, p. 312). Some affirm that he left children (*ibid.* iii, p. 192; Euseb. iii, 30), among whom a daughter, Petronilla, is named (comp. *Acta Sanct.* 30; Mai, vii, 420 sq.). More recently Rauch (*Neues krit. Journ. f. Theol.* viii, 401) strives to find a son of Peter mentioned in 1 Pet. v, 13, and Neander (*Pflanz.* ii, 520) follows him, supposing that the "elected together with you" (the word *church* in the English version is not in the original) refers to the wife of the apostle. The personal appearance of Peter at the time of his martyrdom is described in Malalæ *Chronogr.* x, p. 256, in an absurd passage, of which the sense appears to be this: He was an old man, two thirds of a century old; bald in front, knob-haired (? κονδόϑριξ), with gray hair and beard; of clear complexion, somewhat pale, with dark eyes, a large beard, long nose, joined eyebrows, upright in posture; intelligent, impulsive, and timid. Comp. the description in Niceph. *H. E.* ii, 37, p. 165; and Faggini, *De Rom. P. Itin. Exerc.* xx, p. 453 sq.

3. *Peter's Prominence as an Apostle.*—From such passages as Matt. xvii, 1; Mark ix, 1; xiv, 33, there can be no doubt that Peter was among the most beloved of Christ's disciples; and his eminence among the apostles depended partly on the fact that he had been one of the first of them, and partly on his own peculiar traits. Sometimes he speaks in the name of the twelve (Matt. xix, 27; Luke xii, 41). Sometimes he answers when questions are addressed to them all (Matt. xvi, 16; Mark viii, 29); sometimes Jesus addresses him in the place of all (Matt. xxvi, 40). But that he passed, out of the circle of the apostles, as their representative, cannot be certainly inferred from Matt. xvii, 24, even if it be supposable in itself. This position of Peter becomes more decided after the ascension of Jesus, and perhaps in consequence of the saying in John xxi, 15 sq. Peter now becomes the organ of the company of apostles (Acts ii, 15; ii, 14 sq.; iv, 8 sq.; v, 27 sq.), his word is decisive (Acts xv, 7 sq.), and he is named with "the other apostles" (Acts ii, 37; v, 29. Comp. Chrysost. on John, *Hom.* lxxxviii, p. 525). The early Protestant polemic divines should not have blinded themselves to this observation. (See Baumgarten, *Polem.* iii, 370 sq.) The case is a natural one, when we compare Peter's character with that of the other apostles, and contributes nothing at all to fixing the primacy in him, after the view of the Roman Church. It may even be granted that the custom of looking upon Peter as the chief of the apostles was the cause of his always having the first place in the company of apostles in the Church traditions. The old account that Peter alone of the apostles was baptized by Jesus himself agrees well with this view. (Comp. Coteler, *Ad Herm. Past.* iii, 16.)

As to the meaning of the passage Matt. xvi, 18, there is much dispute. The accounts which have been given of the precise import of this declaration may be summed up under these heads: 1. That our Lord spoke of himself, and not of Peter, as the rock on which the Church was to be founded. This interpretation expresses a great truth, but it is irreconcilable with the context, and could scarcely have occurred to an unbiassed reader, and certainly does not

give the primary and literal meaning of our Lord's words. It has been defended, however, by candid and learned critics, as Glass and Dathe. 2. That our Lord addresses Peter as the type or representative of the Church, in his capacity of chief disciple. This is Augustine's view, and it was widely adopted in the early Church. It is hardly borne out by the context, and seems to involve a false metaphor. The Church would in that case be founded on itself in its type. 3. That the rock was not the person of Peter, but his confession of faith. This rests on much better authority, and is supported by stronger arguments. Our Lord's question was put to the disciples generally. Although the answer came through the mouth of Peter, always ready to be the spokesman, it did not the less express the belief of the whole body. So in other passages (noted below) the apostles generally, not Peter by himself, are spoken of as foundations of the Church. Every one will acknowledge that Christ, as before suggested, is pre-eminently the *first* foundation, THE Rock, on which every true disciple, on which Peter himself, must be built. It was by his faithful confession that he showed he was upon the rock. He was then Peter indeed, exhibiting that personal characteristic in the view of which Christ had long before given him the name. Such an interpretation may seem to accord best with our Lord's address, "Thou art Peter"—the firm maintainer of essential truth, a truth by the faithful grasping of which men become Christ's real disciples, living stones of his Church (John xvii, 3; Rom. x, 9; 1 Cor. iii, 11). Thus it was not the personal rock Peter, but the material rock of Gospel truth, the adherence to which was the test of discipleship. This view, that it was Peter's confession on which Christ would build his Church, has been held by many able expositors. For instance, Hilary says, "Super hanc igitur confessionis petram ecclesiæ ædificatio est" (*De Trin.* lib. vi, 36, *Op.* [Par. 1693], col. 903; comp. lib. ii, 23, col. 800). See also Cyril of Alexandria (*De Sanct. Trin.* dial. iv, *Op.* [Lut. 1638], tom. v, pars i, p. 507); Chrysostom (*In Matt.* hom. liv, *Op.* [Par. 1718–38], vii, 548); and the writer under the name of Nyssen (*Test. de Advent. Dom. adv. Jud.* in Greg. Nyssen. *Op.* [Par. 1638], ii, 162). Yet it seems to have been originally suggested as an explanation, rather than an interpretation, which it certainly is not in a literal sense. 4. That Peter himself was the rock on which the Church would be built, as the representative of the apostles, as professing in their name the true faith, and as intrusted specially with the duty of preaching it, and thereby laying the foundation of the Church. Many learned and candid Protestant divines have acquiesced in this view (e. g. Pearson, Hammond, Bengel, Rosenmüller, Schleusner, Kuinöl, Bloomfield, etc.). It is borne out by the facts that Peter on the day of Pentecost, and during the whole period of the establishment of the Church, was the chief agent in all the work of the ministry, in preaching, in admitting both Jews and Gentiles, and laying down the terms of communion. This view is wholly incompatible with the Roman theory, which makes him the representative of Christ, not personally, but in virtue of an office essential to the permanent existence and authority of the Church. Passaglia, the latest and ablest controversialist, takes more pains to refute this than any other view; but wholly without success: it is clear that Peter did not retain, even admitting that he did at first hold, any primacy of rank after completing his own special work; that he never exercised any authority over or independently of the other apostles; that he certainly did not transmit whatever position he ever held to any of his colleagues after his decease. At Jerusalem, even during his residence there, the chief authority rested with St. James; nor is there any trace of a central power or jurisdiction for centuries after the foundation of the Church. The same arguments, *mutatis mutandis*, apply to the keys. The promise was literally fulfilled when Peter preached at Pentecost, admitted the first converts to baptism, confirmed the Samaritans, and received Cornelius, the representative of the Gentiles, into the Church. Whatever privileges may have belonged to him personally died with him. The authority required for the permanent government of the Church was believed by the fathers to be deposited in the episcopate, as representing the apostolic body, and succeeding to its claims. See ROCK.

The passage is connected with another in the claims of the papacy, namely, "Unto thee will I give the keys of the kingdom of heaven," etc. (Matt. xvi, 19). The force of both these passages is greatly impaired for the purpose for which Catholics produce them, by the circumstance that whatever of power or authority they may be supposed to confer upon Peter must be regarded as shared by him with the other apostles, inasmuch as to them also are ascribed in other passages the same qualities and powers which are promised to Peter in those under consideration. If by the former of these passages we are to understand that the Church is built upon Peter, the apostle Paul informs us that it is not on him *alone* that it is built, but upon *all* the apostles (Ephes. ii, 20); and in the book of Revelation we are told that on the twelve foundations of the New Jerusalem (the Christian Church) are inscribed "the names of the *twelve apostles of the Lamb*" (xxi, 14). As for the declaration in the latter of these passages, it was in all its essential parts repeated by our Lord to the other disciples immediately before his passion, as announcing a privilege which, as his apostles, they were to possess in common (Matt. xviii, 18; John xx, 23). It is, moreover, uncertain in what sense our Lord used the language in question. In both cases his words are metaphorical; and nothing can be more unsafe than to build a theological dogma upon language of which the meaning is not clear, and to which, from the earliest ages, different interpretations have been affixed. Finally, even granting the correctness of the interpretation which Catholics put upon these verses, it will not bear out the conclusion they would deduce from them, inasmuch as the judicial supremacy of Peter over the other apostles does not necessarily follow from his possessing authority over the Church. On the other side, it is certain that there is no instance on record of the apostle's having ever claimed or exercised this supposed power; but, on the contrary, he is more than once represented as submitting to an exercise of power upon the part of others, as when, for instance, he went forth as a messenger from the apostles assembled in Jerusalem to the Christians in Samaria (Acts viii, 14), and when he received a rebuke from Paul, as already noticed. This circumstance is so fatal, indeed, to the pretensions which have been urged in favor of his supremacy over the other apostles, that from a very early age attempts have been made to set aside its force by the hypothesis that it is not of Peter the apostle, but of another person of the same name, that Paul speaks in the passage referred to (Euseb. *Hist. Eccles.* i, 13). This hypothesis, however, is so plainly contradicted by the words of Paul, who explicitly ascribes apostleship to the Peter of whom he writes, that it is astonishing how it could have been admitted even by the most blinded zealot (vers. 8, 9). While, however, it is pretty well established that Peter enjoyed no judicial supremacy over the other apostles, it would, perhaps, be going too far to affirm that no dignity or primacy whatsoever was conceded to him on the part of his brethren. His superiority in point of age, his distinguished personal excellence, his reputation and success as a teacher of Christianity, and the prominent part which he had ever taken in his Master's affairs, both before his death and after his ascension, furnished sufficient grounds for his being raised to a position of respect and of moral influence in the Church and

among his brother apostles. To this some countenance is given by the circumstances that he is called "the first" (πρῶτος) by Matthew (x, 2), and this apparently not merely as a numerical, but as an honorary distinction; that when the apostles are mentioned as a body, it is frequently by the phrase "Peter and the eleven," or "Peter and the rest of the apostles," or something similar; and that when Paul went up to Jerusalem by divine revelation, it was to Peter particularly that the visit was paid. These circumstances, taken in connection with the prevalent voice of Christian antiquity, would seem to authorize the opinion that Peter occupied some such position as that of προεστώς, or president in the apostolical college, but without any power or authority of a judicial kind over his brother apostles (Campbell, *Eccles. Hist.* lect. v and xii; Barrow, *ubi sup.*, etc.; Eichhorn, *Einleit.* iii, 599; Hug, *Introd.* p. 635, Fordick's transl.; Horne, *Introd.* iv, 432; Lardner, *Works*, vol. iv, v, vi, ed. 1788; Cave, *Antiquitates Apostolicæ*, etc.). See PRIMACY.

4. *Peter's Character.*—However difficult it might be to present a complete sketch of the apostle's temper of mind, there is no dispute as to some of the leading features; devotion to his Master's person (John xiii, 37), which even led him into extravagance (John xiii, 9), and an energetic disposition, which showed itself sometimes as resolution, sometimes as boldness (Matt. xiv, 29), and temper (John xviii, 10). His temperament was choleric, and he easily passed from one extreme to another (John xiii, 8. For a parallel between Peter and John, see Chrysost. *in Johan.* hom. lxvii, 522). But how could such a man fall into a repeated denial of his Lord? This will always remain a difficult psychological problem; but it is not necessary on this account to refer to Satan's power (Olshausen, *Bibl. Comment.* ii, 482 sq.). When Jesus predicted to Peter his coming fall, the apostle may have thought only of a formal inquiry; and the arrest of Christ drove from his mind all recollection of Christ's warning words. The first denial was the hasty repulse of a troublesome and curious question. Peter thought it not worth while to converse with a girl at such a moment, when all his thoughts were taken up with the fate of his Master; and his repulse would be the more resolute, the more he wished to avoid being driven by the curious and pressing crowd out of the vicinity of the beloved Saviour. The second and third questions compelled him still to deny, unless he would confess or leave the place; but the nearness of the Lord held him fast. Besides they are the questions only of curious servants, and he is in danger, if he acknowledges his Lord, of becoming himself the butt of ridicule to the coarse multitude, and thus of failing in his purpose. Thus again and again, with increasing hesitation, he utters his denial. Now the cock-crowing reminds him of his Master's warning, and now at length he reflects that a denial, even before such unauthorized inquiries, is yet really a denial. In this view some think that Peter's thoughts were continually on his Master, and that possibly the fear of personal danger had no part in influencing his course. The expression *fall* of Peter, often used, is in any case rather strong. For various views of this occurrence, see Luther, *on John xviii;* Niemeyer, *Charakter*, i, 586 sq.; Rau, *Præterita ad narration. Evang. de summa P. temeritate* (Erlangen, 1781); Paulus, *Comment.* iii, 647 sq.; Henneberg, *Leidensgesch.* p. 159 sq.; *Miscellen eines Landpredigers* (Glogau, 1799), p. 3 sq.; Greiling, *Leben Jesu*, p. 381 sq.; Rudolph, in Winer's *Zeitschr. f. wissensch. Theol.* i, 109 sq.; and Bellarmine, *Controv. de Benit.* ii, 16; Martin, *Diss. de Petri Denegatione* (Monaster, 1835).

5. *Paul's Dispute with Peter.*—With reference to the occurrence mentioned in Gal. ii, 11, from which some have inferred that Peter was not wholly free from the servile fear of men, we may remark that the case is altogether different from the preceding, and has much to do with the apostle's dogmatic convictions. It is known that the admission of the heathen to the Church was strange to Peter at first, and that he could only be induced to preach to them by a miraculous vision (Acts x, 10; xi, 4 sq.). Then he was the first to baptize heathen, and announced in unmistakable language that the yoke of the Mosaic law must not be placed on the Gentile converts (Acts xv, 7 sq.). But it is quite supposable that he was still anxious for Christianity to be first firmly rooted among the Jews, and thus he seems after this occurrence to have turned his preaching exclusively to the Jews (comp. Gal. ii, 7), his first epistle also being intended only for Jewish readers. The affair at Antioch (Gal. ii, 12) seems to show that he still wavered somewhat in the conviction expressed in Acts xv, 7 sq.; if, indeed, as appears to be the case, it was later than the latter. For even if Peter found it necessary to respect the prejudices of the party of James, still the necessity of firmness and consistency cannot be denied; although, on the other hand, we must not confound Peter's position with that of Paul. It is known (comp. Euseb. i, 12, 1) that in the early Church many referred the entire statement to another Cephas, one of the seventy disciples, who afterwards became bishop of Iconium, and nearly all the Catholic interpreters adopt this expedient. See Molkenbuhr, *Quod Cephas Gal. ii, 11 non sit Petrus Ap.* (Monaster, 1803). See against this view Deyling, *Observatt.* ii, 520 sq. On another view of the church fathers, see Neander, *Pflanz.* i, 292, note. It appears from the fact that at Corinth a party of Judaizing Christians called themselves by his name, that Peter was afterwards recognised as head of this class, in distinction from the Pauline Christians.

6. As to the time of Peter's journey to Rome, the Church fathers do not quite agree. Eusebius says in his *Chron.* (i, 42) that Peter went to Rome in the second year of Claudius Cæsar, after founding the first Church in Antioch; and Jerome, in his version, adds that he remained there twenty-five years, preaching the Gospel, and acting as bishop of the city (comp. also Jerome, *Script. Eccl.* p. 1). Yet this statement appears very doubtful, for three reasons: (1) Because, although we learn from Acts xii, 17 that Peter left Jerusalem for a time after the death of James the elder, yet he certainly cannot have left Palestine before the events recorded in Acts xv. (2) Because the mention of the origin of the Church in Antioch, connected by the fathers with Peter's journey to Rome, cannot easily be reconciled with Acts xi, 19 sq. (3) Because, if Peter had been bishop in Rome when Paul wrote his Epistle to the Romans, and afterwards when he was prisoner in Rome, we should expect the former to contain words of greeting to Peter, and the epistles written from Rome similar messages from Peter; the more as these epistles are very rich in such messages; but nothing of the kind appears. We may well doubt, too, whether, if Peter had been bishop or even founder of the Roman Church, Paul's principles and method (see Rom. xv, 20, 23 sq.; xxviii, 2; 2 Cor. x, 16) would have allowed him to write this epistle to Rome at all. Eusebius seems to have drawn his account from Clemens Alexandrinus and Eusebius (Euseb. *H. E.* ii, 15), the former of whom quoted from a remark of Justin Martyr (*Apol.* ii, 69), which rests upon an accidental error of language; this father referring to Simon the Magician an inscription which belonged to the Sabine-Romish deity Semo (Hug, *Einleit.* ii, 69 sq.; Credner, *Einleit.* i, 529 sq. Comp. Schulrich, *De Simonis M. fatis Roman.* Misen. 1844). Now Peter had once publicly rebuked this Simon (Acts viii, 18 sq.); this fact, connected with the inscription, gave rise to the story of Peter's residence in Rome under Claudius, in whose reign the inscription originated. After this detection of the occasion which produced the record in Eusebius, it is truly wonderful that Bertholdt (*Einleit.* v, 2685) should defend the account, and found a critical conjecture upon it. Further, the Armenian Chronicle of

Eusebius refers this statement to the third year of Caius Caligula.

But the account found in Irenæus (*Hær.* iii, 1) differs materially from that above noticed. He tells us that Peter and Paul were in Rome, and there founded a Church in company; and Eusebius (ii, 25, in a quotation from Dionysius, bishop of Corinth) adds that they suffered martyrdom together (Peter being crucified, according to Origen, in Euseb. iii, 1; Niceph. ii, 36). Eusebius in his Chronicle places their martyrdom, according to his reckoning of twenty-five years for Peter's episcopacy, in the fourteenth year of Nero's reign, which extended from the middle of October, A.D. 67, to the same time in A.D. 68. This joint martyrdom of Paul and Peter (without however any special mention of the manner of Peter's crucifixion, comp. Neander, *Pflanz.* ii, 514) is also mentioned by Tertullian (*Præscript. Hæret.* 36) and Lactantius (*Mort. Persec.* 2; *Institut. Div.* iv, 21). The graves of both apostles were pointed out in Rome as early as the close of the second century (Euseb. ii, 25). Yet the whole story rests ultimately on the testimony of Dionysius alone, who must have died about A.D. 176. (The passages in Clemens Romanus, 1 *to Cor.* v, and Ignatius, *to the Romans*, v, settle nothing.) Thus, on the one hand, we are not at liberty to reject all doubt as to the truth of this account with Bertholdt (*loc. cit.*) as hypercritical, or with Gieseler (*Ch. Hist.* i, 92 sq. 3d ed.) as partisan polemics; nor, on the other, can we suppose it to have sprung from the interpretation of 1 Peter v, 13, where at an early day *Babylon* was understood to stand for Rome (Euseb. xv, 2; Niceph. *H. E.* ii, 15. Comp. Baur, p. 215). The genetic development of the whole story attempted by Baur (in the Tübingen *Zeitschrift. f. Theol.* 1831, iv, 162 sq. Comp. his *Paulus*, p. 214 sq., 671 sq.) deserves close attention. But compare Neander, *Pflanz.* ii, 519 sq.; and further against any visit to Rome by Peter, see M. Velenus, *Lib. quo Petrum Romam non venisse asseritur* (1520); Vedelius, *De tempore utriusque Episcopatus Petri* (Geneva, 1624); Spanheim, *De ficta profectione Petri Ap. in urbem Rom.* (Lug. Bat. 1679; also in his *Opera*, ii, 331 sq.); also an anonymous writer in the *Biblioth. für theol. Schriftkunde*, vol. iv, No. 1 (extract in the *Leipz. Lit.-Zeit.* 1808, No. 130); Mayerhoff, *Einl. in d. Petrin. Schriften*, p. 73 sq.; Reiche, *Erklär. des Briefes an d. Römer*, i, 39 sq.; Von Ammon, *Fortbild.* iv, 322 sq.; Ellendorf, *Ist Petrus in Rom. u. Bischof d. Röm. Kirche gewesen?* (Darmstadt, 1841; translated in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, July, 1858; Jan. 1859; answered by Binterim, Düsseldorf, 1842). On the other side of the question, the older writings are enumerated by Fabricius, *Lux Evang.* p. 97 sq. The usual arguments of the Catholics are given by Bellarmine, *Controv. de Rom. Pontif.* lib. ii. But the chief work on that side is still that of Cortesius, *De Romano itinere gestisque princip. Apostol.* lib. ii (Venice, 1573; revised by Constantinus, Rom. 1770). Comp. esp. Foggini, *De Romano Petri itinere*, etc. (Flor. 1741). On the same side in general, though with many modifications, are the following later writers: Mynster, *Kleine theol. Schriften*, p. 141 sq., who holds that Peter was in Rome twice. See *contra*, Baur, *Op. cit.* p. 181 sq.; Herbst, in the *Tübinger Kathol.-theol. Quartalschr.* 1820, iv, 1, who places Peter in Rome at least during the last years of Nero's reign, though but for a short time. See, however, Baur, *Op. cit.* p. 161 sq.; Olshausen, *Studien u. Krit.* 1838, p. 940 sq., in answer to Baur; Stenglein, in the *Tübinger Quartalschr.* 1840, 2d and 3d parts, who makes Peter to have visited Rome in the second year of Claudius; to have been driven away by the well-known edict of that emperor; and at length to have returned under Nero. Comp. also Haiden, *De itinere P. Romano* (Prag. 1761), and Windischmann, *Vindiciæ Petri* (Ratisb. 1836). It is not in the least necessary for those who oppose the Romish Church, which makes Peter first bishop of Rome (see Van Til, *De Petro Romæ martyre non pontifice* [Lug. Bat. 1710]), and grounds on this the primacy of the pope (Matthæucci, *Opus dogmat. adversus Hetherodox* [sic!], p. 212 sq.; Bellarmine, *Controv. de Rom. Pontif.* ii, 3, and elsewhere), to be influenced in the question of Peter's journey by these views, inasmuch as this primacy, when all the historical evidences claimed are allowed, remains, in spite of every effort to defend it, without foundation (Butschang, *Untersuch. der Vorzüge des Ap. P.* [Hamb. 1788]; Baumgarten, *Polem.* iii, 370 sq.; Paulus, in *Sophroniz.* iii, 131 sq.). The first intimation that Peter had a share in founding the Roman Church, and that he spent twenty-five years there as bishop, appears in Eusebius (*Chron.* ad secund. ann. Claud.) and Jerome (*Script. Eccl.* i); while Eusebius (*H. E.* iii, 2) tells us that after the martyrdom of Peter and Paul, Linus was made the first bishop of the Church of the Romans; a most remarkable statement, if Peter had been bishop before him (comp. iii. 4). Epiphanius (xxvii, 6) even calls Paul the bishop (ἐπίσκοπος) of Christianity in Rome.

7. *Mode of Peter's Death.* — The tradition of this apostle's being crucified with his head downwards is probably to be relegated to the regions of the fabulous. Tertullian, who is the first to mention Peter's crucifixion, says simply (*De Præscr. Hæres.* 36), "Petrus passioni Dominicæ adæquatur;" which would rather lead to the conclusion that he was crucified in the usual way, as our Lord was. The next witness is Origen, whose words are, ἀνεσκολοπίσθη κατὰ κεφάλης οὕτως αὐτὸς ἀξιώσας παθεῖν (ap. Euseb. *H. E.* iii, 1); and these are generally cited as intimating the peculiarity traditionally ascribed to the mode of Peter's crucifixion. But do the words really intimate this? Allowing that the verb may mean "was crucified," can κατὰ κεφάλης mean "with the head downwards?" No instance, we believe, can be adduced which would justify such a translation. The combination κατὰ κεφάλης occurs both in classical and Biblical Greek (see Plato, *Rep.* iii, 398; Plut. *Apoph. de Scipione Jun.* 13; Mark xiv, 3; 1 Cor. xi, 4), but in every case it means "upon the head" (comp. κατὰ κόρης πατάξαι, Lucian, *Gall.* c. 30, and κατὰ κόρης παίειν, *Catapl.* c. 12). According to analogy, therefore, Origen's words should mean that the apostle was impaled, or fastened to the cross upon, i. e. by, the head. When Eusebius has to mention the crucifying of martyrs with the head downwards, he says distinctly οἱ δὲ ἀνάπαλιν κατωκάρα προσηλωθέντες (*H. E.* viii, 8). It is probably to a misunderstanding of Origen's words that this story is to be traced and it is curious to see how it grows as it advances. First, we have Origen's vague and doubtful statement above quoted; then we have Eusebius's more precise statement: Πέτρος κατὰ κεφάλης σταυροῦται (*Dem. Ev.* iii, 116, c.); and at length, in the hands of Jerome, it expands into "Affixus cruci martyrio coronatus est capite ad terram verso et in sublime pedibus elevatis, asserens se indignum qui sic crucifigeretur ut Dominus suus" (*Catal. Script. Eccles.* i). See CRUCIFY.

8. *Spurious Writings attributed to Peter.*—Some apocryphal works of very early date obtained currency in the Church as containing the substance of the apostle's teaching. The fragments which remain are not of much importance, but they demand a brief notice. See APOCRYPHA.

(1.) The *Preaching* (κήρυγμα) or *Doctrine* (διδαχή) *of Peter*, probably identical with a work called the *Preaching of Paul*, or of *Paul and Peter*, quoted by Lactantius, may have contained some traces of the apostle's teaching, if, as Grabe, Ziegler, and others supposed, it was published soon after his death. The passages, however, quoted by Clement of Alexandria are for the most part wholly unlike Peter's mode of treating doctrinal or practical subjects. Rufinus and Jerome allude to a work which they call "Judicium Petri;" for which Cave accounts by a happy conjecture, adopted by Nitzsche,

Mayerhoff, Reuss, and Schliemann, that Rufinus found κρμα for κήρυγμα, and read κρίμα. Epiphanius also names Περίοδοι Πέτρου as a book among the Ebionites (*Hæres.* xxx, 15). It is probably only a different name for the foregoing (Schwegler, *Nach-apost. Zeitalt.* ii, 30). See GOSPELS, SPURIOUS.

(2.) Another work, called the *Revelation of Peter* (ἀποκάλυψις Πέτρου), was held in much esteem for centuries. It was commented on by Clement of Alexandria, quoted by Theodotus in the *Eclogæ*, named together with the Revelation of John in the Fragment on the Canon published by Muratori (but with the remark, "Quam quidam ex nostris legi in Ecclesia nolunt"), and according to Sozomen (*Hist. Eccles.* vii, 19) was read once a year in some churches of Palestine. It is said, but not on good authority, to have been preserved among the Coptic Christians. Eusebius looked on it as spurious, but not of heretical origin. From the fragments and notices it appears to have consisted chiefly of denunciations against the Jews, and predictions of the fall of Jerusalem, and to have been of a wild, fanatical character. The most complete account of this curious work is given by Lücke in his general introduction to the Revelation of John, p. 47. See REVELATIONS, SPURIOUS.

There are traces in ancient writers of a few other writings attributed to the apostle Peter, but they seem to have wholly perished (see Smith, *Dict. of Class. Biog.* iii, 221 sq.). See ACTS, SPURIOUS.

The legends of the Clementines are wholly devoid of historical worth; but from those fictions, originating with an obscure and heretical sect, have been derived some of the most mischievous speculations of modern rationalists, especially as regards the assumed antagonism between St. Paul and the earlier apostles. It is important to observe, however, that in none of these spurious documents, which belong undoubtedly to the first two centuries, are there any indications that our apostle was regarded as in any peculiar sense connected with the Church or see of Rome, or that he exercised or claimed any authority over the apostolic body of which he was the recognised leader or representative (Schliemann, *Die Clementinen nebst den verwandten Schriften*, 1814). See CLEMENTINES.

Among other legends which have come down to us concerning Peter is that relating to his contention at Rome with Simon Magus. This seems to have no better foundation than a misunderstanding of an inscription on the part of Justin Martyr (*Apol.* i, 26). See SIMON MAGUS.

III. *Literature.*—In addition to the works copiously cited above, we may here name the following on this apostle personally, reserving for the following articles those on his writings specially. Blunt, *Lectures on the Hist. of Peter* (Lond. 1833, 1860, 2 vols. 12mo); Thompson, *Life-Work of Peter the Apostle* (ibid. 1870, 8vo); Green, *Peter's Life and Letters* (ibid. 1873, 8vo); Morich, *Leben und Lehre Petri* (Braunsch. 1873, 8vo). Among the old monographs we may name Meyer, *Num Christus Petrum baptizaverit* (Leips. 1672); Walch, *De Claudo a Petro sanato* (Jen. 1755); and on his denials of his Master, those cited by Volbeding, *Index Programmatum*, p. 58; and in Hase, *Leben Jesu*, p. 202; also the *Jour. of Sac. Lit.* July, 1862; on his dispute with Paul, Volbeding, p. 85. See APOSTLE.

PETER, FIRST EPISTLE OF, the first of the seven Catholic Epistles of the N. T. In the following account of both epistles of Peter we pass over many particulars which will be found discussed elsewhere. See PETER.

I. *Genuineness and Canonicity.*—This epistle found an early place in the canon by universal consent, ranking among the ὁμολογούμενα, or those generally received. The other epistle, by calling itself δευτέρα, refers to it as an earlier document (2 Pet. iii, 1). Polycarp, in his Epistle to the Philippians, often uses it, quoting many clauses, and some whole verses, as 1 Peter i, 13, 21, in chap. ii; iii, 9, in chap. v; ii, 11, in chap. vi; iv, 7, in chap. vi; and ii, 21–24, in chap. viii, etc. It is to be observed, however, that in no case does this father refer to Peter by name, but he simply cites the places as from some document of acknowledged authority; so that Eusebius notes it as characteristic of his epistle that Polycarp used those citations from the First Epistle of Peter as μαρτυρίαι (*Hist. Eccles.* iv, 14). The same historian relates of Papias that in his Λογίων κυριακῶν ἐξηγήσεις he in a similar way used μαρτυρίαι from this epistle (*Hist. Eccles.* iii, 39). Irenæus quotes it expressly and by name, with the common formula, "Et Petrus ait" (*Hæres.* iv, 9, 2), citing 1 Pet. i, 8; using the same quotation similarly introduced in *ibid.* v, 7, 2; and again, "Et propter hoc Petrus ait," citing 1 Pet. ii, 16; *ibid.* iv, 16, 5. Other quotations, without mention of the apostle's name, may be found, *ibid.* iii, 16, 9, and iv, 20, 2, etc. Quotations abound in Clement of Alexandria, headed with ὁ Πέτρος λέγει or φησὶν ὁ Πέτρος. These occur both in his *Stromata* and *Pædag.*, and need not be specified. Quotations are abundant also in Origen, certifying the authorship by the words παρὰ τῷ Πετρῷ; and, according to Eusebius, he calls this epistle μίαν ἐπιστολὴν ὁμολογουμένην (Euseb. *Hist. Eccles.* vi, 25). The quotations in Origen's works need not be dwelt upon. In the letter of the churches of Vienne and Lyons, A.D. 177, there is distinct use made of 1 Pet. v, 6. Theophilus of Antioch, A.D. 181, quotes these terms of 1 Pet. iv, 3—ἀθεμίταις εἰδωλολατρείαις. Tertullian's testimony is quite as distinct. In the short tract *Scorpiace* this epistle is quoted nine times, the preface in one place being "Petrus quidem ad Ponticos" (*Scorp.* c. xii), quoting 1 Pet. ii, 20. Eusebius himself says of it, Πέτρου . . . ἀνωμολόγηται (*Hist. Eccles.* iii, 25). It is also found in the Peshito, which admitted only three of the catholic epistles. See Mayerhoff, *Einleitung in die Petrin. Schriften*, p. 139, etc.

In the canon published by Muratori this epistle is not found. In this fragment occurs the clause, "Apocalypses etiam Johannis et Petri tantum recipimus." Wieseler, laying stress on *etiam*, would bring out this meaning—in addition to the epistles of Peter and John, we also receive their Revelations; or also of Peter we receive as much as of John, two epistles and an apocalypse. But the interpretation is not admissible. Rather with Bleek may the omission be ascribed to the fragmentary character of the document (*Einleit. in das N. T.* p. 643; Hilgenfeld, *Der Canon und die Kritik des N. T.* [Halle, 1833], p. 43). Other modes of reading and explaining the obscure sentence have been proposed. Hug alters the punctuation, "Apocalypsis etiam Johannis. Et Petri tantum recipimus;" certainly the *tantum* gives some plausibility to the emendation. Believing that the barbarous Latin is but a version from the Greek, he thus restores the original, καὶ Πέτρου μόνον παραδεχόμεθα, and then asks μόνον to be changed into μονήν—an alteration which of course brings out the conclusion wanted (*Einleit.* § 19). Guericke's effort is not more satisfactory. Thiersch, with more violence, changes *tantum* into *unam epistolam*, and *quam quidem* in the following clause into *alteram quidem*. This document, so imperfect in form and barbarous in style, is probably indeed a translation from the Greek, and it can have no authority against decided and general testimony (see the canon in Routh's *Reliquiæ Sacræ*, i, 396, edited with notes from Freindaller's *Commentatio* [Lond. 1862]). Nor is it of any importance whether the words of Leontius imply that this epistle was repudiated by Theodore of Mopsuestia, and if the Paulicians rejected it, Petrus Siculus gives the true reason—they were "*pessime adversus illum affecti*"—personal prejudice being implied in their very name (*Hist. Manich.* p. 17).

The internal evidence is equally complete. The author calls himself the apostle Peter (i, 1), and the whole character of the epistle shows that it proceeds from a writer who possessed great authority among those whom he addresses. The writer describes himself as "an el-

der," and "a witness of Christ's sufferings" (v, 1). The vehemence and energy of the style are altogether appropriate to the warmth and zeal of Peter's character, and every succeeding critic, who has entered into its spirit, has felt impressed with the truth of the observation of Erasmus, "that this epistle is full of apostolical dignity and authority, and worthy of the prince of the apostles."

In later times the genuineness of the epistle has been impugned, as by Cludius in his *Uransichten des Christenthums*, p. 296 (Altona, 1808). He imagined the author to have been a Jewish Christian of Asia Minor, and his general objection was that the similarity in doctrine and style to Paul was too great to warrent the belief of independent authorship. His objections were exposed and answered by Augusti (in a program, Jena, 1808) and by Bertholdt (*Einleit.* vol. vi, § 667). Eichhorn, however, took up the theory of Cludius so far as to maintain that as to material Peter is the author, but that Mark is the actual writer. De Wette also throws out similar objections, hinting that the author may have been a follower of Paul who had been brought into close attendance upon Peter. The question has been thoroughly discussed by Hug, Ewald, Bertholdt, Weiss, and other critics. The most striking resemblances are perhaps 1 Pet. i, 3 with Eph. i, 3; ii, 18 with Eph. vi, 5; iii, 1 with Eph. v, 22; and v, 5 with Eph. v, 21; but allusions nearly as distinct are found to the other Pauline epistles (comp. especially 1 Pet. ii, 13 with 1 Tim. ii, 2–4; 1 Pet. i, 1 with Eph. i, 4–7; i, 14 with Rom. xii, 2; ii, 1 with Col. iii, 8 and Rom. xii, 1; ii, 6–10 with Rom. ix, 32; ii, 13 with Rom. xiii, 1–4; ii, 16 with Gal. v, 13; iii, 9 with Rom. xii, 17; iv, 9 with Phil. ii, 14; iv, 10 with Rom. xii, 6, etc.; v, 1 with Rom. viii, 18; v, 8 with 1 Thess. v, 6; v, 14 with 1 Cor. xvi, 20). While, however, there is a similarity between the thoughts and style of Peter and Paul, there is at the same time a marked individuality, and there are also many special characteristics in this first epistle.

First, as proof of its genuineness, there is a peculiar and natural similarity between this epistle and the speeches of Peter as given in the Acts of the Apostles. Not to mention similarity in mould of doctrine and array of facts, there is resemblance in style. Thus Acts v, 30, x, 39, 1 Pet. ii, 24, in the allusion to the crucifixion and the use of *ξύλον*, the tree or cross; Acts ii, 32, iii, 15, 1 Pet. v, 1, in the peculiar use of *μάρτυς*; Acts iii, 18, x, 43, 1 Pet. i, 10, in the special connection of the old prophets with Christ and his work; Acts x, 42, 1 Pet. iv, 5, in the striking phrase "judge quick and dead;" Acts iii, 16, 1 Pet. i, 21, in the clauses *ἡ πίστις ἡ δι' αὐτοῦ—τοὺς δι' αὐτοῦ πιστούς*; and in the mode of quotation (Acts iv, 2; 1 Pet. ii, 7). Certain favorite terms occur also—*ἀναστροφή*, and *ἀγαθοποιεῖν* with its cognates and opposites. There are over fifty words peculiar to Peter in this brief document, nearly all of them compounds, as if in his profound anxiety to express his thoughts as he felt them, he had employed the first, and to him at the moment the fittest terms which occurred. He has such phrases as *ἐλπὶς ζῶσα*, i, 3; *συνείδησις θεοῦ*, ii, 19; *ὀσφύες διανοίας*, i, 13; *φίλημα ἀγάπης*, v, 14. The nouns *δόξαι*, i, 11, and *ἀρεταί*, ii, 9, occur in the plural. He uses *εἰς* before a personal accusative no less than four times in the first chapter. The article is often separated from its noun, iii, 2, 3, 19; iv, 2, 5, 8, 12. Peter has also a greater proneness than Paul to repetition—to reproduce the same idea in somewhat similar terms—as if he had felt it needless to search for a mere change of words when a similar thought was waiting for immediate utterance (comp. i, 6–9 with iv, 12, 13; ii, 12 with iii, 16, iv, 4; iv, 7 with v, 8). There are also in the epistle distinct and original thoughts—special exhibitions of the great facts and truths of the Gospel which the apostle looked at from his own point of view, and applied as he deemed best to a practical purpose. Thus the visit of Christ "to the spirits in prison" (iii, 19); the typical connection of the Deluge with baptism; the desire of the old prophets to study and know the times and the blessings of the Gospel—are not only Petrine in form, but are solitary statements in Scripture. Thus, too, the apostle brings out into peculiar relief regeneration by the "Word of God," the "royal priesthood" of believers, and the qualities of the future "inheritance," etc.

Again, in phrases and ideas which in the main are similar to those of Paul, there is in Peter usually some mark of difference. Where there might have been sameness, the result of imitation, there is only similarity, the token of original thought. For example, Paul says (Rom. vi, 10, 11), *ζῆν τῷ θεῷ*; Peter says (ii, 24), *ζῆν τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ*. The former writes (Rom. vi, 2), *ἀποθνήσκειν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ*; the latter (ii, 24), *ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις ἀπογίνεσθαι*. Besides, as Brückner remarks, the representation in these last clauses is different—death to sin in the passage from Romans being the result of union with the sufferings and death of Christ, while in Peter it is the result of Christ's doing away sin (De Wette, *Erklärung*, ed. Brückner, p. 9). So, too, the common contrast in Paul is *σάρξ* and *πνεῦμα*, but in Peter *πνεῦμα* and *ψυχή*; *ἐκλογή* is connected in Paul with *χάρις*, or it stands absolutely; but in Peter it is joined to *πρόγνωσις*; government is with the first *τοῦ θεοῦ διαταγή* (Rom. xiii, 2); but with the second it is *ἀνθρωπίνη κτίσις* (ii, 13); the expression with the one is *καινὸς ἄνθρωπος* (Eph. iv, 24); but with the other *ὁ κρυπτὸς ἄνθρωπος* (iii, 4); what is called *ἀφορμή* in Gal. v, 13 is named *ἐπικάλυμμα* in 1 Pet. ii, 16, etc. Now, not to insist longer on this similarity with variance, it may be remarked that for many of the terms employed by them, both apostles had a common source in the Septuagint. The words found there and already hallowed by religious use were free to both of them, and their acquaintance with the Sept. must have tended to produce some resemblance in their own style. Among such terms are *ἀγνωσία*, *ἀσωτία*, *εὔσπλαγχνος*, *καταλαλία*, *ὑπερέχειν*, *φρουρεῖν*, *χορηγεῖν* (comp. Mayerhoff, *Histor.-Krit. Einleitung in d. Petrin. Schriften*, p. 107 sq.). That two apostles, in teaching the same system of divine truth, should agree in many of their representations, and even in their words, is not to be wondered at, since the terminology must soon have acquired a definite form, and certain expressions must have become current through constant usage. But in cases where such similarity between Peter and Paul occurs, there is ever a difference of view or of connection; and though both may refer to ideas so common as are named by *ὑπακοή*, *δόξα*, or *κληρονομία*, there is always something to show Peter's independent use of the terms. One with his "beloved brother Paul" in the general view of the truth, he has something peculiar to himself in the introduction and illustration of it. The Petrine type is as distinct as the Pauline—it bears its own unmistakable style and character. The Galilean fisherman has an individuality quite as recognizable as the pupil of Gamaliel.

Once more, to show how baseless is the objection drawn from Peter's supposed dependence on Paul, it may be added that similarity in some cases may be traced between Peter and John. In many respects Paul and John are utterly unlike, yet Peter occasionally resembles both, though it is not surmised that he was an imitator of the beloved disciple. Such accidental resemblance to two styles of thought so unlike in themselves is surely proof of his independence of both, for he stands midway, as it were, between the objectivity of Paul and the subjectivity of John; inclining sometimes to the one side and sometimes to the other, and occasionally combining both peculiarities of thought. Thus one may compare 1 Pet. i, 22 with 1 John iii, 3 in the use of *ἁγνίζω*; 1 Pet. i, 23 with 1 John iii, 9 in the similar use of *σποράς* and *σπέρμα*, denoting the vital germ out of which regeneration springs; 1 Pet. v, 2 with John x, 16 in the use of *ποιμήν*; 1 Pet. iii, 18 and 1 John iii, 7 in the application of the epithet *δίκαιος* to Christ; 1 Pet. iii, 18, John i, 29, in calling

him ἀμνός. Such similarities only prove independent authorship. In the resemblances to James, which are sometimes adduced, the chief similarity consists in the use of Old-Test. quotations. Thus compare 1 Pet. i, 6, 7 with James i, 2, 3; i, 24 with James i, 10; ii, 1 with James i, 21; ii, 5 with James iv, 6, 10; iv, 8 with James v, 20; and v, 5 with James iv, 6. What, then, do these more frequent resemblances to Paul, and the fewer to John and James, prove? not, with De Wette, the dependence of Peter on Paul; nor, with Weiss, the dependence of Paul on Peter (*Der Petrin. Lehrbegriff*, p. 374); but that Peter, in teaching similar truths, occasionally employs similar terms; while the surrounding illustration is so various and significant that such similarity can be called neither tame reiteration nor unconscious reminiscence. With much that is common in creed, there is more that is distinctive in utterance, originating in difference of spiritual temperament, or moulded by the adaptation of truth to the inner or outer condition of the churches for whom this epistle was designed.

On the other hand, the harmony of such teaching with that of Paul is sufficiently obvious. Peter, indeed, dwells more frequently than Paul upon the future manifestation of Christ, upon which he bases nearly all his exhortations to patience, self-control, and the discharge of all Christian duties. Yet there is not a shadow of opposition here; the topic is not neglected by Paul, nor does Peter omit the Pauline argument from Christ's sufferings; still what the Germans call the eschatological element predominates over all others. The apostle's mind is full of one thought, the realization of Messianic hopes. While Paul dwells with most earnestness upon justification by our Lord's death and merits, and concentrates his energies upon the Christian's present struggles, Peter fixes his eye constantly upon the future coming of Christ, the fulfilment of prophecy, the manifestation of the promised kingdom. In this he is the true representative of Israel, moved by those feelings which were best calculated to enable him to do his work as the apostle of the circumcision. Of the three Christian graces, hope is his special theme. He dwells much on good works, but not so much because he sees in them necessary results of faith, or the complement of faith, or outward manifestations of the spirit of love, aspects most prominent in Paul, James, and John, as because he holds them to be tests of the soundness and stability of a faith which rests on the fact of the resurrection, and is directed to the future in the developed form of hope.

But while Peter thus shows himself a genuine Israelite, his teaching, like that of Paul, is directly opposed to Judaizing tendencies. He belongs to the school, or, to speak more correctly, is the leader of the school, which at once vindicates the unity of the Law and the Gospel, and puts the superiority of the latter on its true basis, that of spiritual development. All his practical injunctions are drawn from Christian, not Jewish principles, from the precepts, example, life, death, resurrection, and future coming of Christ. The apostle of the circumcision says not a word in this epistle of the perpetual obligation, the dignity, or even the bearings of the Mosaic law. He is full of the Old Testament; his style and thoughts are charged with its imagery, but he contemplates and applies its teaching in the light of the Gospel; he regards the privileges and glory of the ancient people of God entirely in their spiritual development in the Church of Christ. Only one who had been brought up as a Jew could have had his spirit so impregnated with these thoughts; only one who had been thoroughly emancipated by the Spirit of Christ could have risen so completely above the prejudices of his age and country. This is a point of great importance, showing how utterly opposed the teaching of the original apostles, whom Peter certainly represents, was to that Judaistic narrowness which speculative rationalism has imputed to all the early followers of Christ, with the exception of Paul. There are in fact more traces of what are called Judaizing views, more of sympathy with national hopes, not to say prejudices, in the Epistles to the Romans and Galatians, than in this work. In this we see the Jew who has been born again, and exchanged what Peter himself calls the unbearable yoke of the law for the liberty which is in Christ. At the same time it must be admitted that our apostle is far from tracing his principles to their origin, and from drawing out their consequences with the vigor, spiritual discernment, internal sequence of reasoning, and systematic completeness which are characteristic of Paul. A few great facts, broad solid principles on which faith and hope may rest securely, with a spirit of patience, confidence, and love, suffice for his unspeculative mind. To him objective truth was the main thing; subjective struggles between the intellect and spiritual consciousness, such as we find in Paul, and the intuitions of a spirit absorbed in contemplation like that of John, though not by any means alien to Peter, were in him wholly subordinated to the practical tendencies of a simple and energetic character. It has been observed with truth that both in tone and in form the teaching of Peter bears a peculiarly strong resemblance to that of our Lord, in discourses bearing directly upon practical duties. The great value of the epistle to believers consists in this resemblance; they feel themselves in the hands of a safe guide, of one who will help them to trace the hand of their Master in both dispensations, and to confirm and expand their faith.

But apart from the style and language of the epistle, objections have been brought against it by Schwegler, who alleges the want of special occasion for writing it, and the consequent generality of the contents (*Das Nach-apostol. Zeitalt.* ii, 7). The reply is that the epistle bears upon its front such a purpose as well suits the vocation of an apostle. Nor is there in it, as we have seen, that want of individuality which Schwegler next alleges. It bears upon it the stamp of its author's fervent spirit; nor does its use of Old-Test. imagery and allusions belie his functions as the apostle of the circumcision (Wiesinger, *Einl.* p. 21). If there be the want of close connection of thought, as Schwegler also asserts, is not this want of logical sequence and symmetry quite in keeping with the antecedents of him who had been trained in no school of human learning? Nor is it any real difficulty to say that Peter in the East could not have become acquainted with the later epistles of Paul. For in various ways Peter might have known Paul's epistles; and granting that there is a resemblance to some of the earlier of them, there is little or none to the latest of them. Schwegler holds that the epistle alludes to the persecution under Nero, during which Peter suffered, and that therefore his writing it at Babylon is inconsistent with his martyrdom at the same period at Rome. The objection, however, takes for granted what is denied. It is a sufficient reply to say that the persecution referred to was not, or may not have been, the Neronian persecution, and that the apostle was not put to death at the supposed period of Nero's reign. There is not in the epistle any direct allusion to actual persecution; the ἀπολογία (iii, 15) is not a formal answer to a public accusation, for it is to be given to every one asking it (Huther, *Kritisch-exegetisches Handbuch über den* 1. *Brief des Petrus, Einleit.* p. 27). The epistle in all its leading features is in unison with what it professes to be—an earnest and practical letter from one whose heart was set on the well-being of the churches, one who may have read many of Paul's letters and thanked God for them, and who, in addressing the churches himself, clothes his thoughts in language the readiest and most natural to him, without any timid selection or refusal of words and phrases which others may have used before him.

II. *Place and Time.*—The place is indicated in v, 13, in the clause ἀσπάζεται ὑμᾶς ἡ ἐν Βαβυλῶνι συνεκλεκτή. Babylon is named as the place where the apostle was

when he wrote the epistle, as he sends this salutation from it, on the part of a woman, as Mayerhoff, Neander, Alford, and others suppose; or on the part of a Church, as is the opinion of the majority. It is remarkable, however, that from early times Babylon has here been taken to signify Rome. This opinion is ascribed by Eusebius on report to Papias and Clement of Alexandria (*Hist. Eccles.* ii, 15). Jerome and Œcumenius also held it. In later times it has been espoused by Grotius, Cave, Lardner, Hengstenberg, Windischmann, Wiesinger, Baur, Thiersch, Schott (*Der* 1. *Brief Pet. erklärt*, p. 346, Erlangen, 1861), and Hofmann (*Schriftb.* i, 201). But why discover a mystical sense in a name set down as the place of writing an epistle? There is no more reason for doing this than for assigning a like significance to the geographical names in i, 1. How could his readers discover the Church at Rome to be meant by *ἡ συνεκλεκτή* in Babylon? And if Babylon do signify a hostile spiritual power, as in the Apocalypse (xviii, 21), then it is strange that Catholic critics as a body should adopt such a meaning here, and admit by implication the ascription of this character to their spiritual metropolis. Dr. Brown, of Edinburgh, puts a somewhat parallel case—"Our own city is sometimes called Athens from its situation, and from its being a seat of learning; but it would not do to argue that a letter came from Edinburgh because it is dated from Athens" (*Expository Discourses on* 1*st Peter*, i, 548).

Some, again, think that Babylon may mean a place of that name in Egypt. Of this opinion are Le Clerc, Mill, Pearson, Pott, Burton, Greswell, and Hug. Strabo (*Geog.* xvii, 1, 30) calls it not a town, but a strong fortress built by refugees from Babylon, and a garrison for one of the three legions guarding Egypt. The opinion that this small encampment is the Babylon of our epistle has certainly little plausibility. It is equally strange to suppose it to be Ctesiphon or Seleucis; and stranger still to imagine that Babylon represents Jerusalem, as is maintained by Cappellus, Spanheim, Hardouin, and Semler. The natural interpretation is to take Babylon as the name of the well-known city. We have indeed no record of any missionary journey of Peter into Chaldæa, for but little of Peter's later life is given us in the New Test. But we know that many Jews inhabited Babylon—*οὐ γὰρ ὀλίγοι μυριάδες*, according to Josephus—and was not such a spot, to a great extent a Jewish colony or settlement, likely to attract the apostle of the circumcision? Lardner's principal argument, that the terms of the injunction to loyal obedience (ii, 13, 14) imply that Peter was within the bounds of the Roman empire, proves nothing; for as Davidson remarks—"The phrase 'the king,' in a letter written by a person in one country to a person in another, may mean the king either of the person writing, or of him to whom the letter is written." Granting that the Parthian empire had its own government, he is writing to persons in other provinces under Roman jurisdiction, and he enjoins them to obey the emperor as supreme, and the various governors sent by him for purposes of local administration. Moreover, as has often been observed, the countries of the persons addressed in the epistle (i, 1) are enumerated in the order in which a person writing from Babylon would naturally arrange them, beginning with those lying nearest to him, and passing in circuit to those in the west and the south, at the greatest distance from him. The natural meaning of the designation Babylon is held by Erasmus, Calvin, Beza, Lightfoot, Wieseler, Mayerhoff, Bengel, De Wette, Bleek, and perhaps the majority of modern critics.

But if Peter wrote from Babylon on the Euphrates, at what period was the epistle written? The epistle itself contains no materials for fixing a precise date. It does not by its allusions clearly point to the Neronian persecution; it rather speaks of evil and danger suffered now, but with more in prospect. Suffering was endured and was also impending, and yet those who lived a quiet and blameless life might escape it, though certainly trials for righteousness' sake are implied and virtually predicted. About the year 60 the dark elements of Nero's character began to develop themselves, and after this epoch the epistle was written. The churches addressed in it were mostly planted by Paul, and it is therefore thought by some that Paul must have been deceased ere Peter would find it his duty to address them. Paul was put to death about A.D. 64; but such a date would be too late for our epistle, as time would not, on such a hypothesis, be left for the apostle's going to Rome, according to old tradition, and for his martyrdom in that city. It may be admitted that Peter would not have intruded into Paul's sphere had Paul been free to write to or labor in the provinces specified. Still it may be supposed that Paul may have withdrawn to some more distant field of labor, or may have been suffering imprisonment at Rome. Davidson places the date in 63; Alford between 63 and 67. If the Mark of v, 13 be he of whom Paul speaks as being with him in Rome (Col. iv, 10), then we know that he was purposing an immediate journey to Asia Minor; and we learn from 2 Tim. iv, 11 that he had not returned when this last of Paul's epistles was written. It is surely not impossible for him to have gone in this interval to Peter at Babylon; and as he must have personally known the churches addressed by Peter, his salutation was naturally included by the apostle. Silvanus, by whom the epistle was sent—if the same with the Silvanus mentioned in the greetings 1 Thess. i, 1; 2 Thess. i, 1—seems to have left Paul before the epistles to Corinth were written. He may have in some way become connected with Peter, and, as the Silas of the Acts, he was acquainted with many of the churches to whom this epistle was sent. The terms "a faithful brother as I suppose" (*the faithful brother as I reckon*) do not imply any doubt of his character, but are only an additional recommendation to one whose companionship with Paul must have been known in the provinces enumerated by Peter.

But Schwegler ascribes the epistle to a later period—to the age of Trajan; and of course denies its apostolic authorship (*Nach-apostol. Zeitalter*, ii, 22). The arguments, however, for so late a date are very inconclusive. He first of all assumes that its language does not tally with the facts of the Neronian persecution, and that the tone is unimpassioned—that Christians were charged with definite crime under Nero—that his persecution did not extend beyond Rome—that it was tumultuary, and not, as this epistle supposes, conducted by regular processes, and that the general condition of believers in Asia Minor, as depicted in the epistle, suits the age of Trajan better than that of Nero. The reply is obvious—that the tranquillity of tone in this epistle would be remarkable under any persecution, for it is that of calm, heroic endurance, which trusts in an unseen arm, and has hopes undimmed by death; that the persecution of Christians simply for the name which they bore was not an irrational ferocity peculiar to Trajan's time; that in the provinces Christians were always exposed to popular fury and irregular magisterial condemnation; that there is no allusion to judicial trial in the epistle, for the word *ἀπολογία* does not imply it; and that the sufferings of Christians in Asia Minor as referred to or predicted do not agree with the recorded facts in Pliny's letter, for according to it they were by a formal investigation and sentence doomed to death (Huther, *Einleit.* p. 28). The persecutions referred to in this epistle are rather such as Christians have always to encounter in heathen countries from an ignorant mob easily stirred to violence, and where the civil power, though inclined to toleration in theory, is yet swayed by strong prejudices, and prone, from position and policy, to favor and protect the dominant superstition.

Supposing this epistle to have been written at Babylon, it is a probable conjecture that Silvanus, by whom it was transmitted to those churches, had joined Peter

after a tour of visitation, either in pursuance of instructions from Paul, then a prisoner at Rome, or in the capacity of a minister of high authority in the Church, and that his account of the condition of the Christians in those districts determined the apostle to write the epistle. From the absence of personal salutations, and other indications, it may perhaps be inferred that Peter had not hitherto visited the churches; but it is certain that he was thoroughly acquainted both with their external circumstances and spiritual state. It is clear that Silvanus is not regarded by Peter as one of his own coadjutors, but as one whose personal character he had sufficient opportunity of appreciating (v, 12). Such a testimonial as the apostle gives to the soundness of his faith would of course have the greatest weight with the Asiatic Christians, to whom the epistle appears to have been specially, though not exclusively addressed. The assumption that Silvanus was employed in the composition of the epistle is not borne out by the expression "by Silvanus I have written unto you," such words, according to ancient usage, applying rather to the bearer than to the writer or amanuensis. Still it is highly probable that Silvanus, considering his rank, character, and special connection with those churches, and with their great apostle and founder, would be consulted by Peter throughout, and that they would together read the epistles of Paul, especially those addressed to the churches in those districts: thus, partly with direct intention, partly it may be unconsciously, a Pauline coloring, amounting in passages to something like a studied imitation of Paul's representations of Christian truth, may have been introduced into the epistle. It has been observed above [see PETER] that there is good reason to suppose that Peter was in the habit of employing an interpreter; nor is there anything inconsistent with his position or character in the supposition that Silvanus, perhaps also Mark, may have assisted him in giving expression to the thoughts suggested to him by the Holy Spirit. We have thus, at any rate, a not unsatisfactory solution of the difficulty arising from correspondences both of style and modes of thought in the writings of two apostles who differed so widely in gifts and acquirements.

III. *Persons for whom the Epistle was intended.*—It was addressed to the churches of Asia Minor, which had for the most part been founded by Paul and his companions. From some expressions in the epistle many have thought that it was meant for Jewish Christians. The words of the salutation are—ἐκλεκτοῖς παρεπιδήμοις διασπορᾶς Πόντου, etc.—"to the elect strangers of the dispersion," etc. Viewed by themselves the words seem to refer to Jews—διασπορά being often employed to designate Jews living out of Palestine. This opinion is held by many of the fathers, as Eusebius, Jerome, and Theophylact, and by Erasmus, Calvin, Beza, Grotius, Bengel, Hug, and Pott. A modification of this extreme view is maintained by Gerhard, Wolf, Jachmann, and Weiss, viz. that Jewish converts were chiefly regarded in the mass of Gentile believers. The arguments of Weiss need not be repeated, and they are well met by Huther (*Einleit.* p. 21). But there are many things in the epistle quite irreconcilable with the idea of its being meant either solely or principally for Jewish believers. He tells his readers that "sufficient was the past for them to have wrought out the will of the Gentiles—as indeed ye walked in lasciviousness, wine-bibbing, revellings, drinking-bouts, and forbidden idolatries"—sins all of them, and the last particularly, which specially characterized the heathen world. Similarly does he speak (i, 14) of "former lusts in your ignorance;" (iii, 6), of Sarah, "whose daughters ye have become"—ἐγενήθητε—they being not so by birth or blood. In ii, 9, 10, they are said to be "called out of darkness," to have been "in time past not a people, but now the people of God." The last words, referring originally to Israel, had already been applied by Paul to Gentile believers in Rom. ix, 25. The term διασπορά may be used in a spiritual sense, and such a use is warranted by other clauses of the epistle—i, 17, "the time of your sojourning;" ii, 11, "strangers and pilgrims." Peter, whose prepossessions had been so Jewish, and whose soul moved so much in the sphere of Jewish ideas from his very function as the apostle of the circumcision, instinctively employs national terms in that new and enlarged spiritual meaning which, through their connection with Christianity, they had come to bear. Besides, the history of the origin of these churches in Asia Minor shows that they were composed to a large extent of Gentile believers. Many of them may have been proselytes, though, as Wieseler has shown, it is wrong in Michaelis, Credner, and Neudecker to apply to such exclusively the terms in the address of this epistle. Nor is it at all a likely thing that Peter should have selected one portion of these churches and written alone or mainly to them. The provinces (i, 1) included the churches in Galatia which are not named in Acts, as Ancyra and Pessinus, and the other communities in Iconium, Lystra, the Pisidian Antioch, Miletus, Colossæ, Laodicea, Philadelphia, Thyatira, Ephesus, Smyrna, Pergamus, Troas, etc. (Steiger, *Einleit.* sec. 6). That the persons addressed in the epistle were Gentiles is the view of Augustine, Luther, Wetstein, Steiger, Brückner, Mayerhoff, Wiesinger, Neander, Reuss, Schaff, and Huther. Reuss (p. 133) takes πάροικοι and παρεπίδημοι as=גרים, Israelites by faith, not by ceremonial observance. See also Weiss, *Der Petrinische Lehrbegriff*, p. 28, n. 2.

IV. *Design, Contents, and Characteristics.*—The objects of the epistle, as deduced from its contents, coincide with the above assumptions. They were: 1. To comfort and strengthen the Christians in a season of severe trial. 2. To enforce the practical and spiritual duties involved in their calling. 3. To warn them against special temptations attached to their position. 4. To remove all doubt as to the soundness and completeness of the religious system which they had already received. Such an attestation was especially needed by the Hebrew Christians, who were wont to appeal from Paul's authority to that of the elder apostles, and above all to that of Peter. The last, which is perhaps the very principal object, is kept in view throughout the epistle, and is distinctly stated (v, 12).

These objects may come out more clearly in a brief analysis. The epistle begins with salutations and a general description of Christians (i, 1, 2), followed by a statement of their present privileges and future inheritance (ver. 3–5); the bearings of that statement upon their conduct under persecution (ver. 6–9); reference, according to the apostle's wont, to prophecies concerning both the sufferings of Christ and the salvation of his people (ver. 10–12); and exhortations based upon those promises to earnestness, sobriety, hope, obedience, and holiness, as results of knowledge of redemption, of atonement by the blood of Jesus, and of the resurrection, and as proofs of spiritual regeneration by the Word of God. Peculiar stress is laid upon the cardinal graces of faith, hope, and brotherly love, each connected with and resting upon the fundamental doctrines of the Gospel (ver. 13–25). Abstinence from the spiritual sins most directly opposed to those graces is then enforced (ii, 1); spiritual growth is represented as dependent upon the nourishment supplied by the same Word which was the instrument of regeneration (ver. 2, 3); and then, by a change of metaphor, Christians are represented as a spiritual house, collectively and individually as living stones, and royal priests, elect, and brought out of darkness into light (ver. 4–10). This portion of the epistle is singularly rich in thought and expression, and bears the peculiar impress of the apostle's mind, in which Judaism is spiritualized, and finds its full development in Christ. From this condition of Christians, and more directly from the fact that they are thus separated from the world, pilgrims and sojourners, Peter deduces an en-

tire system of practical and relative duties, self-control, care of reputation, especially for the sake of Gentiles; submission to all constituted authorities; obligations of slaves, urged with remarkable earnestness, and founded upon the example of Christ and his atoning death (ver. 11–25); and duties of wives and husbands (iii, 1–7). Then generally all Christian graces are commended, those which pertain to Christian brotherhood, and those which are especially needed in times of persecution, gentleness, forbearance, and submission to injury (ver. 8–17): all the precepts being based on imitation of Christ, with warnings from the history of the deluge, and with special reference to the baptismal covenant. In the following chapter (iv, 1, 2) the analogy between the death of Christ and spiritual mortification, a topic much dwelt upon by Paul, is urged with special reference to the sins committed by Christians before conversion, and habitual to the Gentiles. The doctrine of a future judgment is inculcated, both with reference to their heathen persecutors as a motive for endurance, and to their own conduct as an incentive to sobriety, watchfulness, fervent charity, liberality in all external acts of kindness, and diligent discharge of all spiritual duties, with a view to the glory of God through Jesus Christ (ver. 3–11). This epistle appears at the first draught to have terminated here with the doxology, but the thought of the fiery trial to which the Christians were exposed stirs the apostle's heart, and suggests additional exhortations. Christians are taught to rejoice in partaking of Christ's sufferings, being thereby assured of sharing his glory, which even in this life rests upon them, and is especially manifested in their innocence and endurance of persecution: judgment must come first to cleanse the house of God, then to reach the disobedient: suffering according to the will of God, they may commit their souls to him in well-doing as unto a faithful Creator. Faith and hope are equally conspicuous in these exhortations. The apostle then (v, 1–4) addresses the presbyters of the churches, warning them as one of their own body, as a witness (*μάρτυς*) of Christ's sufferings, and partaker of future glory, against negligence, covetousness, and love of power; the younger members he exhorts to submission and humility, and concludes this part with a warning against their spiritual enemy, and a solemn and most beautiful prayer to the God of all grace. Lastly, he mentions Silvanus with special commendation, and states very distinctly what we have seen reason to believe was a principal object of the epistle, viz. that the principles inculcated by their former teachers were sound, the true grace of God, to which they are exhorted to adhere. A salutation from the Church in Babylon and from Mark, with a parting benediction, closes the epistle.

A few characteristic features may be more distinctly looked at. The churches addressed were in trials—such trials as the spirit of that age must necessarily have brought upon them (iii, 17; iv, 12–19). Those trials originated to some extent in their separation from the heathen amusements and dissoluteness in which they had mingled prior to their conversion (iv, 4, 5). They are exhorted to bear suffering patiently, and ever to remember the example, and endure in the spirit, of the Suffering One—the Righteous One who had suffered for them. While affliction would come upon them in the present time, they are ever encouraged to look with joyous anticipation to the future. Peter indeed might be called the apostle of hope. Doctrine and consolation alike assume this form. The "inheritance" is future, but its heirs are begotten to a "living hope" (i, 3, 4). Their tried faith is found unto glory "at the appearance of Jesus Christ" (i, 7). The "end" of their faith is "salvation" (i, 9), and they are to "hope to the end for the grace to be brought at the revelation of Jesus Christ" (i, 13). Their ruling emotion is therefore "the hope that is in them" (iii, 15); so much lying over in reserve for them in the future, their time here is only a "sojourning" (i, 17); they were merely "strangers and pilgrims" (ii, 11); nay, "the end of all things is at hand" (iv, 7). Suffering was now, but joy was to come when his "glory shall be revealed" (v, 1). In Christ's own experience as Prototype suffering led to glory (i, 11; iv, 13); the same connection the apostle applies to himself, and to faithful ministers (v, 1–4). There are also allusions to Christ's words, or, rather, reminiscences of them mingle with the apostle's thoughts. Comp. i, 4 with Matt. xxv, 34; i, 8 with John xx, 29; i, 10 with Luke x, 24; i, 13 with Luke xii, 35; ii, 12 with Matt. v, 16; iii, 13–15 with Matt. v, 16, x, 28; v, 6 with Matt. xxxiii, 12, etc.

There were apparently some tendencies in those churches that required reproof — some temptations against which they needed to be warned, as "former lusts," "fleshly lusts" (i, 14, 11); dark and envious feelings (ii, 1; iii, 8, 9); love of adornment on the part of women (iii, 3); and ambition and worldliness on the part of Christian teachers (v, 1–4). God's gracious and tender relationship to his people was a special feature of the old covenant, and Peter reproduces it under the new in its closer and more spiritual aspects (ii, 9, 10; iv, 17; v, 2). The old economy is neither eulogized nor disparaged, and no remark is made on its abolition, the reasons of it, or the good to the world springing out of it. The disturbing question of its relation to Gentile believers is not even glanced at. In the apostle's view it had passed away by its development into another and grander system, one with it in spirit, and at the same time the realization of its oracles and types. His mind is saturated with O.-T. imagery and allusions, but they are freely applied to the spiritual Israel, which, having always existed within the theocracy, had now burst the national barriers, and was to be found in all the believing communities, whatever their lineage or country. To him the Jewish economy was neither supplanted by a rival faith nor superseded by a sudden revolution; Israel had only put off its ceremonial, the badge of its immaturity and servitude, and now rejoiced in freedom and predicted blessing. What was said of the typical Israel may now be asserted with deeper truth of the spiritual Israel. But the change is neither argued from premises laid down nor vindicated against Jews or Judaizers, and the results of the new condition are not held up as matter of formal congratulation; they are only seized and put forward as recognised grounds of joy, patience, and hope. The Redeemer stood out to Jewish hope as the Messiah; so Peter rejoices in that appellation, calling him usually Jesus Christ, and often simply Christ (i, 11; ii, 21; iii, 16–18; iv, 1, 13, 14); and it is remarkable that in nearly all those places the simple name Christ is used in connection with his sufferings, to the idea of which the Jewish mind had been so hostile. The centre of the apostle's theology is the Redeemer, the medium of all spiritual blessing. The relation of his expiatory work to sinners is described by *ὑπέρ* (ii, 12; iii, 18); or it is said he bore our sins—*τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἀνήνεγκεν*; or died *περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν*. "The sprinkling of blood" and the "Lamb without spot" were the fulfilment of the old economy, and the grace and salvation now enjoyed were familiar to the prophets (i, 10). Christ who suffered is now in glory, and is still keeping and blessing his people.

In fine, the object, as told by the author (v, 12), is essentially twofold. "I have written briefly, exhorting" (*παρακαλῶν*); and the epistle is hortatory—not didactic or polemical; "and testifying (*ἐπιμαρτυρῶν*) that this is the true grace of God wherein ye stand." The true grace of God—*ἀληθὴς χάρις*—could not be doctrine imparted through the apostle's personal teaching. Some of the fathers, indeed, affirm that Peter visited the provinces specified in this epistle. Origen gives it as a probable conjecture; and Eusebius says that the countries in which Peter preached the doctrine of Christ appear from his own writings, and may be seen from this epistle. The assertion has thus no basis, save in

the idea that Peter must have preached in the churches to which he sent an epistle. Jerome repeats the statement, and Epiphanius, as his wont is, intensifies it; but it has no foundation. Nay, the apostle, by a change of person, distinguishes himself from "them that have preached the Gospel unto you" (i, 12). So that the "true grace" in which those churches stood was the Gospel which they had heard from others, and especially from Paul, by whom so many of them had been founded. The epistle, then, becomes a voucher for the genuineness of the Gospel preached in Asia Minor by the apostle of the uncircumcision. Not that, as Schwegler supposes, it attempts to mediate between James and Paul; for it proclaims the same truths, touching the peculiar aspects common to the two, without any dilution of Paul's distinctive forms, or any modification of Peter's as given in his oral addresses—both being in inner harmony, and differing only in mode of presentation, caused by mental diversity, or suggested by the peculiar circumstances, tendencies, or dangers of the churches which were warned or addressed.

V. *Style.*—The epistle is characterized by its fervor. The soul of the writer stamped its image on his thoughts and words—ὁ *πανταχοῦ θερμός* is the eulogy of Chrysostom. The epistle bears his living impress in his profound emotions, earnest convictions, and zealous thoroughness. He was never languid or half-hearted in what he said or did, though the old impulsiveness is chastened; and the fire which often flashed up so suddenly is more equable and tranquil in its glow. He is vivid without vehemence, and hurries on without impetuosity or abruptness. The epistle is throughout hortative, doctrine and quotation being introduced as forming the basis or warrant, or as showing the necessity and value of practical counsel or warning. There is in it little that is local or temporary; it is suited to the Church of all lands and ages; for believers are always in the present time "strangers and sojourners," with their gaze fixed on the future, exposed to trial and borne through by hope. The apostle infuses himself into the epistle, portrays the emotions which swayed and cheered him, as he reveals his own experience, which had been shaped by his past and present fellowship with a suffering and glorified Lord. What he unfolds or describes never stands apart as a theme by itself to be wrought out and argued; nor is it lifted as if to a lofty eminence that it may be admired from afar; but all is kept within familiar grasp, and inwrought into the relations, duties, and dangers of everyday Christian existence. The truths brought forward are treated not in themselves, but in their immediate bearing on duty, trial, and hope; are handled quite in the way which one would describe air and food in their essential connection with life.

The language, though not rugged, is not without embarrassment. Ideas are often linked together by a relative pronoun. There is no formal development of thought, though the order is lucid and logical. Some word employed in the previous sentence so dwells in the writer's mind that it suggests the sentiment of the following one. The logical formulas are wanting—*οὖν* not preceding an inference, but introducing a practical imperative, and *ὅτι* and *γάρ* not rendering a reason, but prefacing a motive conveyed in some fact or quotation from Scripture. Thoughts are reintroduced, and in terms not dissimilar. What the apostle has to say, he must say in words that come the soonest to an unpracticed pen. In short, we may well suppose that he wrote under the pressure of the injunction long ago given to him—"When thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren;" and this divine mandate might be prefixed to the epistle as its motto.

V. *Commentaries.*—The following are special exegetical helps on *both* epistles: Didymus Alexandrinus, *In Ep. Petri* (in *Bibl. Max Patr.* v; and Galland. *Bibl. Patr.* vi); Bede, *Expositio* (in *Opp.* v); Luther, *Auslegung* (1st Ep., Vitemb. 1523. 4to: with 2d Ep., ibid. 1524. 4to and 8vo, and later; also in Lat. and Germ. eds. of his works; in English, Lond. 1581, 4to); Bibliander, *Commentarii* (Basil. 1536, 8vo); Laurence, *Scholia* (Amst. 1540; Genev. 1669, 4to); Foleng, *Commentaria* [includ. James and 1 John] (Lugd. 1555, 8vo); Weller, *Enarratio* (Leips. 1557, 8vo); Selnecker, *Commentaria* (Jen. 1567, 8vo); Feuardent, *Commentarius* (Par. 1600, 8vo); Winckelmann, *Commentarius* (Giess. 1608, 8vo); Turnemann, *Meditationes* (Frankf. 1625, 4to); Ames, *Explicatio* (Amst. 1635, 1643, 8vo; in English, Lond. 1641, 8vo); Byfield, *Sermons* [on i–iii] (Lond. 1637, fol.); Gerhard, *Commentarius* (ed. fil. Jen. 1641, 4to, and later); Nisbet, *Exposition* (Edinb. 1658, 8vo); Goltz, *Verklaringe* (Amst. 1689, 1690, 1721, 2 vols. 4to); Antonio, *Verklaringe* (Amst. 1693–7, 2 vols. 4to; also in Germ., Brem. 1700, fol.); Anon, *Untersuchung* (Amsterd. 1702, 8vo); Lange, *Exegesis* (Halle, 1712, 4to, and later); Streso, *Meditationes* (Amst. 1717, 4to); Boyson, *Erklär.* (Halle, 1775, 8vo); Schirmer, *Erklär.* (Bresl. and Leips. 1778, 4to); Semler, *Paraphrasis* [includ. Jude] (Hal. 1783–4, 2 vols. 8vo); Baumgärtel, *Anmerk.* (Leips. 1788, 8vo); Morus, *Prælectiones* [includ. James], ed. Douat (Leips. 1794, 8vo); Hottinger, *Commentaria* [includ. 1 Pet.] (Leips. 1815, 8vo); Eisenschmid, *Erläut.* (Ronneb. 1824, 8vo); Mayerhoff, *Einleitung* (Hamb. 1835, 8vo); Windischmann (Rom. Cath.), *Vindiciæ* (Ratisb. 1836, 8vo); Schlichthorst, *Entwickelung* (Stuttg. 1836 sq., 2 pts. 8vo); Demarest, *Exposition* (N. Y. 1851–65, 2 vols. 8vo); Wiesinger, *Erklär.* [includ. Jude] (Königsb. 1856–62, 2 vols. 8vo); Besser, *Ausleg.* (2d ed. Halle, 1857, 12mo); Schott, *Erklär.* [includ. Jude] (Erlang. 1861–3, 2 vols. 8vo); Lillie, *Lectures* (Lond. and New York, 1869, 8vo). There are also articles on the authorship of the two epistles by Rauch, in Winer's *Krit. Journ.* 1828, p. 385 sq.; by Seyler, in the *Theol. Stud. u. Krit.* 1832, p. 44 sq.; by Bleek, *ibid.* 1836, p. 1021 sq.; by J. Q., in Kitto's *Journ. of Sac. Lit.*, Jan. and July, 1861; by Baur, in the *Theol. Jahrb.* 1856, p. 193 sq.; by Weiss, *ibid.* 1865, p. 619; and 1865, p. 255. See EPISTLE.

The following are on the *first* epistle exclusively: Hessels, *Commentarius* (Lovan. 1568, 8vo); Schotan, *Commentarius* (Franek. 1644, 4to); Rogers, *Exposition* (Lond. 1650, fol.); Leighton, *Commentary* (Lond. 1693, 2 vols. 8vo, and later); Van Alphen, *Verklar.* (Utr. 1734, 4to); Klemm, *Anacrisis* (Tub. 1748, 4to); Walther, *Erklär.* (Hanov. 1750, 4to); Moldenhauer, *Erklär.* Hamb. n. d. 8vo); Hensler, *Commentar* (Sulzb. 1813, 8vo); Steiger, *Ausleg.* (Berlin, 1832, 8vo; in English, Edinb. 1836, 2 vols. 8vo); Lecoultre, *Prem. Ep. de P.* (Genev. 1839, 8vo); Brown, *Discourses* (2d ed. Edinb. 1849, 2 vols. 8vo; ibid. 1866, 3 vols. 8vo, N. Y. 1850, 8vo); Kohlbrügge, *Predigten* [on ch. ii and iii] (Leips. 1850, 8vo; in English, Lond. 1854, 8vo). See COMMENTARY.

PETER, SECOND EPISTLE OF, follows immediately the other, but it presents questions of far greater difficulty than the former. See ANTILEGOMENA.

I. *Canonical Authority.*—The genuineness of this second epistle has long been disputed, though its author calls himself "Simon Peter," *δοῦλος καὶ ἀπόστολος*, "a servant and an apostle of Jesus Christ."

1. *History of Opinion.*—It is hard to say whether the alleged quotations from it by the fathers are really quotations, or are only, on the one hand, allusions to the O. T., or, on the other, the employment of such phrases as had grown into familiar Christian commonplaces. Thus Clement of Rome, in his First Epistle to the Corinthians (ch. vii), says of Noah, *ἐκήρυξε μετάνοιαν*, and of those who obeyed him, *ἐσώθησαν*, language not unlike 2 Pet. ii, 5; but the words can scarcely be called a quotation. The allusion in the same epistle to Lot (ch. xi) is of a similar nature, and cannot warrant the allegation of any proof from it. A third instance is usually taken from ch. xxiii, in which Clement says, "Miserable are the double-minded," a seeming reminiscence of Jas. i, 5; but he adds, "We are grown old, and none of those things have happened to us" (*γεγηράκαμεν καὶ οὐδὲν*

ἡμῖν τούτων συμβέβηκεν), as if in allusion to 2 Pet. iii, 4. The appeal to Hermas is as doubtful; in lib. i, *Vis.* iii, 7, the words *reliquerunt viam veram* have a slight resemblance to 2 Pet. ii, 15; in another place (I, iv, 3) the clause *qui effugistis sæculum hoc* is not a citation of *ἀποφυγόντες τὰ μιάσματα τοῦ κοσμοῦ*, 2 Pet. ii, 20. Justin Martyr says, "A day with the Lord is as a thousand years" (*Dialog. cum Tryph.* cap. 81; *Opera*, ii, 278, ed. Otto, Jenæ, 1843), but the clause may as well be taken from Psa. xc, 4 as from 2 Pet. iii, 8. Similar statements occur twice in Irenæus, and have probably a similar origin, as citations from the O. T. The epistle is not quoted by Tertullian, the Alexandrian Clement, nor Cyprian, who speaks only of one epistle. A passage in Hippolytus (*De Antichristo*, ii), in asserting of the prophets that they did not speak "by their own power" (*ἐξ ἰδίας δυνάμεως*), but uttered things which God had revealed, appears to be a paraphrase of 2 Pet. i, 21. Another statement made by Theophilus (*Ad Autolycum*, lib. ii, p. 87), in which he describes the prophets as *πνευματοφόροι πνεύματος ἁγίου*, is not unlike 2 Pet. i, 20, *ὑπὸ πνεύματος ἁγίου φερόμενοι*. Theophilus again describes the word shining as a lamp in a house —*φαίνων ὥσπερ λύχνος ἐν οἰκήματι*; but the figure is different from that in 2 Pet. i, 19, *ὡς λύχνῳ φαίνοντι ἐν αὐχμηρῷ τόπῳ*—"as a light shining in a dark place." Clement of Alexandria commented, we are told by Eusebius and Cassiodorus, on all the canonical Scriptures, Eusebius specifying among them "Jude and the other Catholic epistles"—*καὶ τὰς λοιπὰς καθολικὰς ἐπιστολάς* (*Hist. Eccles.* vi, 14). But a second statement of Cassiodorus mentions expressly the first epistle of Peter, as if the second had been excluded, and adds, "1 and 2 John and James," thereby also excluding Jude, which Eusebius, however, had distinctly named (*De Institut.* cap. viii). The testimony of Origen is no less liable to doubt, for it seems to vary. In the translation of Rufinus, who certainly was not a literal versionist, we find the epistle at least three times referred to, one of them being the assertion, "Petrus enim duabus epistolarum suarum personat tubis" (*Hom. iv*, on Joshua). In *Hom. iv* on Leviticus, 2 Pet. i, 4 is quoted, and in *Hom. xiii* on Numbers, 2 Pet. ii, 16 is quoted. Somewhat in opposition to this, Origen, in his extant works in Greek, speaks of the first epistle as *ἐν τῇ καθολικῇ ἐπ.*; nay, as quoted by Eusebius (*Hist. Eccles.* vi, 25), he adds that "Peter left one acknowledged epistle," adding—*ἔστω δὲ καὶ δευτέραν· ἀμφιβάλλεται γάρ*. This is not a formal denial of its genuineness, but is tantamount to it. Nor can the words of Firmilian be trusted in their Latin version. Yet in his letter to Cyprian he seems to allude to 2 Peter, and the warnings in it against heretics (Cypriani *Opera*, p. 126, ed. Paris, 1836). In a Latin translation of a commentary of Didymus on the epistle it is called *falsata, non in canone*. Now *falsare*, according to Du Fresne in his *Glossar. med. et infim. Latinitat.*, does not mean to interpolate, but to pronounce spurious. Eusebius has placed this epistle among the *ἀντιλεγόμενα* (*Hist. Eccles.* iii, 25), and more fully he declares, "That called his second epistle we have been told has not been received, *οὐκ ἐνδιάθετον*; but yet appearing to many to be useful it has been diligently studied with the other Scriptures." Jerome says explicitly, "Scripsit duas epistolas . . . quarum secunda a plerisque ejus esse negatur;" adding as the reason, "propter styli cum priore dissonantiam," and ascribing this difference to a change of amanuensis, *diversis interpretibus* (*De Script. Eccles.* cap. i, epist. cxx, ad Hedib. cap. xi). Methodius of Tyre makes two distinct allusions to a peculiar portion of the epistle (iii, 6, 7, 12, 13), the conflagration and purification of the world (Epiphan. *Hæres.* lxiv, 31, tom. i, pars post. p. 298, ed. Oehler, 1860). Westcott (*On the Canon*, p. 57) points out a reference in the martyrdom of Ignatius, in which (cap. ii) the father is compared to "a divine lamp illuminating the hearts of the faithful by his exposition of the Holy Scriptures" (2 Pet. i, 19). The epistle is not found in the Peshito, though the Philoxenian version has it, and Ephrem Syrus accepted it. The canon of Muratori has it not, and Theodore of Mopsuestia rejected it. But it was received by Athanasius, Philastrius, Cyril, Rufinus, and Augustine. Gregory of Nazianzum, in his *Carmen* 33, refers to the seven catholic epistles. It was adopted by the Council of Laodicea, 367, and by the Council of Carthage, 397. From that period till the Reformation it was acknowledged by the Church. Not to refer to other quotations often given, it may suffice to say that, though the epistle was doubted, it usually had a place in the canon; that the objections against it were not historical, but critical in nature, and had their origin apparently among the Alexandrian scholars; and that in one case at least, that of Cosmas Indicopleustes, doctrinal prepossessions led to its rejection. Gregory, at the end of the 6th century, seems to allude to others whose hostility to it had a similar origin, adding, "Si ejusdem epistolæ verba pensare voluissent, longe aliter sentire potuerant." (See Olshausen, *Opuscula*, where the citations are given at length.) The old doubts about the epistle were revived at the time of the Reformation, and not a few modern critics question or deny its genuineness. In earlier times strong disbelief was expressed by Calvin, Erasmus, Grotius, and Salmasius. Scaliger, Semler, Credner, De Wette, Neander, and Mayerhoff deny its Petrine origin. Pott, Windischmann, Dahl, Gaussen, and Bonnet, on the other hand, make light of many objections to it. But the proofs adduced on its behalf by Dietlein (*Die 2. Ep. Petri*, 1851) are many of them unsatisfactory, the result of a dextrous and unscrupulous ingenuity on behalf of a foregone conclusion. Yet amid early doubts and modern objections we are inclined to accept this epistle, and to agree with the verdict of the early churches, which were not without the means of ample investigation, and to whom satisfactory credentials must have been presented.

The objections, as Jerome remarks, were based on difference of style, and we admit that there is ground for suspicion on the point. Still no doubter or impugner who placed the epistle among the *ἀντιλεγόμενα* gives any historical ground for his hostility. No one of old is ever brought forward as having denied it in his own name, or in the name of any early Church, to be Peter's. If the apostolic fathers do not quote it, it can only be inferred either that it was not in universal circulation, or that they had no occasion to make any use of it. We observe that it was not likely to be quoted frequently; it was addressed to a portion of the Church not at that time much in intercourse with the rest of Christendom: the documents of the primitive Church are far too scanty to give weight to the argument (generally a questionable one) from omission. Their silence would not warrant the assertion that the epistle was not in the canon during their period, and for half a century afterwards. The earliest impugners never speak of it as a book recently admitted into the canon, or admitted on insufficient evidence or authority. One objection of this nature would have been palpable and decisive. The silence of the fathers is accounted for more easily than its admission into the canon after the question as to its genuineness had been raised. It is not conceivable that it should have been received without positive attestation from the churches to which it was first addressed. We know that the autographs of apostolic writings were preserved with care. It may be added that there appears to be no probable motive for a forgery. Neither personal ambition nor ecclesiastical pretensions are in any way forwarded by the epistle. There is nothing in it that an apostle might not have written, nothing that comes into direct conflict with Peter's modes of thought, either as recorded in the Acts or as found in the first epistle. No little circumstantial evidence can be adduced in its favor, and its early appearance in the canon is an element of proof which cannot easily be turned aside.

The doubts as to its genuineness appear to have originated with the critics of Alexandria, where, nevertheless, the epistle itself was formally recognised at a very early period. Those doubts, however, were not quite so strong as they are now generally represented. The three greatest names of that school may be quoted on either side. On the one hand there were evidently external credentials, without which it could never have obtained circulation; on the other, strong subjective impressions, to which these critics attached scarcely less weight than some modern inquirers. They rested entirely, so far as can be ascertained, on the difference of style. The opinions of modern commentators may be summed up under three heads. Many, as we have seen, reject the epistle altogether as spurious, supposing it to have been directed against forms of Gnosticism prevalent in the early part of the 2d century. A few consider that the first and last chapters were written by Peter or under his dictation, but that the second chapter was interpolated. So far, however, is either of these views from representing the general results of the latest investigations, that a majority of names, including nearly all the writers of Germany opposed to Rationalism, who in point of learning and ability are at least upon a par with their opponents, may be quoted in support of the genuineness and authenticity of this epistle. The statement that all critics of eminence and impartiality concur in rejecting it is simply untrue, unless it be admitted that a belief in the reality of objective revelation is incompatible with critical impartiality, that belief being the only common point between the numerous defenders of the canonicity of this document. If it were a question now to be decided for the first time upon the external or internal evidences still accessible, it may be admitted that it would be far more difficult to maintain this than any other document in the New Testament; but the judgment of the early Church is not to be reversed without far stronger arguments than have been adduced, more especially as the epistle is entirely free from objections which might be brought, with more show of reason, against others now all but universally received: it inculcates no new doctrine, bears on no controversies of post-apostolical origin, supports no hierarchical innovations, but is simple, earnest, devout, and eminently practical, full of the characteristic graces of the apostle, who, as we believe, bequeathed this last proof of faith and hope to the Church. Olshausen's deliberate conclusion is—"1. That our epistle, as far as we can ascertain from history, was used by the Church, and was generally read, along with the other catholic epistles; 2. There were those who denied that Peter was the author of this epistle, but they were influenced particularly by critical and, perhaps, by doctrinal reasons; 3. That there were historical considerations which led them to assail our epistle is not probable; certainly it cannot be demonstrated. *History, then, avails scarcely anything in overthrowing the authority of our epistle*" (*Integr. and Authent. of Second Epistle of Peter*, transl. in *Amer. Bibl. Repos.* July, 1836, p. 123–131).

2. *Internal Evidence.*—There are points of similarity in style between it and the first epistle. The salutation in both epistles is the same, and there are peculiar words common to both, though found also in other parts of the N. T. Both epistles refer to ancient prophecy (1 Pet. i, 16; 2 Pet. i, 20, 21); both use *ἀρετή* as applicable to God (1 Pet. ii, 9; 2 Pet. i, 3), and both have *ἀπόθεσις* (1 Pet. iii, 21; 2 Pet. i, 14), which occurs nowhere else in the N. T.; *ἀναστροφή* is a favorite term (1 Pet. i, 15, 17, 18; ii, 12; iii, 1, 2, 16; 2 Pet. ii, 7–18; iii, 11); the verb *ἐποπτεύειν* in 1 Pet. ii, 12; iii, 20, corresponds to the noun *ἐπόπτης* (2 Pet. i, 16); the peculiar collocation *ἄσπιλος καὶ ἄμωμος* (1 Pet. i, 19) has an echo of itself (2 Pet. ii, 13; iii, 14); *πέπανται ἁμαρτίας* (1 Pet. iv, 1) is not unlike *ἀκαταπαύστους ἁμαρτίας*, etc. (2 Pet. ii, 14). We have also, as in the first epistle, the intervention of several words between the article and its substantive (2 Pet. i, 4; ii, 7; iii, 2). The frequent use of *ἐν* in a qualifying clause is common to both epistles (2 Pet. i, 4; ii, 3; iii, 10). The recurrence of similar terms marks the second epistle, but it is not without all parallel in the first. Thus 2 Pet. i, 3, 4, *δεδωρημένης, δεδώρηται*; ii, 7, 8, *δίκαιος*, three times; ii, 12, *φθορᾶν, ἐν τῇ φθορᾷ καταφθαρήσονται*. So, too, in 1 Pet. iii, 1, 2, *ἀναστροφῆς, ἀναστροφή*; and ii, 17, *τιμήσατε, τιμᾶτε*, etc. Then too, as in the first epistle, there are resemblances to the speeches of Peter as given in the Acts. Comp. *ἡμέρα κυρίου* (iii, 10) with Acts ii, 20—the phrase occurring elsewhere only in 1 Thess. v. 24; *λαχοῦσιν* (i, 1) with *ἔλαχε* (Acts i, 17); *εὐσεβείαν* (i, 6) with Acts iii, 12; and *εὐσεβεῖς* (ii, 9) with Acts x, 2–7: *κολαζομένους* (ib.) with Acts iv, 21—an account which Peter probably furnished. We have likewise an apparent characteristic in the double genitives (2 Pet. iii, 2; Acts v, 32).

It is also to be borne in mind that the epistle asserts itself to have been written by the apostle Peter, and distinctly identifies its writer with the author of the first epistle—"This epistle now, a second, I write unto you, in both which I stir up"—averring also to some extent identity of purpose. It is not anonymous, like the epistle to the Hebrews, but definitely claims as its author Peter the apostle. Nay, the writer affirms that he was an eye-witness of the transfiguration, and heard "the voice from the excellent glory." He uses, moreover, two terms in speaking of that event which belong to the account of it in the Gospels; comp. i, 13, *σκηνώματι*, with his own words *σκηνὰς τρεῖς*; also in 15, *ἔξοδον*, in reference to his own death—the same word being employed to denote Christ's death, *τὴν ἔξοδον αὐτοῦ*, this being the theme of conversation on the part of Moses and Elias (Luke ix, 31). Ullmann supposes the reference in the words *δίκαιον δὲ ἡγοῦμαι διεγείρειν* (i, 13) to be to Mark's Gospel said to have been composed on Peter's authority; but the allusion seems to be to the paragraph immediately under his hand. It would have been a profane and daring imposture for any one to personate an apostle, and deliver to the churches a letter in his name, with so marked a reference to one of the most memorable circumstances and glories in the apostle's life. A forgery so glaring could make no pretence to inspiration—to be a product of the Spirit of Truth. The inspiration of the epistle is thus bound up with the question of its authorship, so that if it is not the work of Peter it must be rejected altogether from the canon. The opinion of critics of what is called the liberal school, including all shades from Lücke to Baur, has been decidedly unfavorable, and that opinion has been adopted by some able writers in England. There are, however, very strong reasons why this verdict should be reconsidered. No one ground on which it rests is unassailable. The rejection of this book affects the authority of the whole canon, which, in the opinion of one of the keenest and least scrupulous critics (Reuss) of modern Germany, is free from any other error. It is not a question as to the possible authorship of a work like that of the Hebrews, which does not bear the writer's name. The Church, which for more than fourteen centuries has received it, has either been imposed upon by what must in that case be regarded as a satanic device, or derived from it spiritual instruction of the highest importance. If received, it bears attestation to some of the most important facts in our Lord's history, casts light upon the feelings of the apostolic body in relation to the elder Church and to each other, and, while it confirms many doctrines generally inculcated, is the chief, if not the only, voucher for eschatological views touching the destruction of the framework of creation, which from an early period have been prevalent in the Church.

3. *Objections.*—There are serious difficulties, however, in the way of its reception; and these are usually said to be difference of style, difference of doctrine, and the marked correspondence of portions of the epistle with that of Jude. Yet Gaussen makes the astounding state-

ment—"The two epistles when carefully compared reveal more points of agreement than difference," but he has not taken the trouble of noting them (*On the Canon*, p. 359). The employment of ὡς is different in the second epistle from the first. There, though it occurs otherwise, it is generally employed in comparisons, and its frequency makes it a characteristic of the style; but it occurs much more rarely in the second epistle, and usually, though not always, with a different meaning and purpose. The use of ἀλλά after a negative clause and introducing a positive one is common in the first epistle, and but rare in the second. There are many ἅπαξ λεγόμενα in the second epistle. The first and second epistles differ also in the use of Χριστός. In the first epistle X. stands in the majority of instances without the article and by itself, either simply I. X. or X. I.; but in the second epistle it has usually some predicate attached to it (i, 1, 2, 8; ii, 14–16). The name Θεός occurs nearly forty times in the first epistle, but only seven times in the second. Again, κύριος is applied to Christ only once in the first epistle (i, 3), but in the second epistle it is a common adjunct to other names of the Saviour. In the first epistle it means the Father in all cases but one (ii, 3), but in the second epistle it denotes the Son, in harmony with Peter's own declaration (Acts ii, 36; x, 36). The epithet σωτήρ, so often applied to Christ in the second epistle, is not found in the first. The second coming of our Lord is also expressed differently in the two epistles, ἀποκάλυψις, or its verb, being used in the first epistle (i, 5, 7, 13; iv, 13; v, 1); or it is called τὸ τέλος πάντων (v, 7); or χρόνοι ἔσχατοι (i, 20). But in the second epistle it is called ἡμέρα κρίσεως (ii, 9), παρουσία (iii, 4), ἡμέρα κυρίου (iii, 10), ἡμέρα Θεοῦ (iii, 12). These are certainly marked diversities, and it is difficult to offer a satisfactory explanation of them. It may, however, be replied that with the sacred writers the divine names are not used, as with us, without any prominent or distinctive application. In the first epistle the Redeemer's names are his common ones, the familiar ones in the mouths of all believers—for the writer brings into prominence the oneness of believers with him in suffering and glory; with him still as Jesus wearing his human name and his human nature with all its sympathies; or as the Christ who, as the Father's servant, obeyed, suffered, and was crowned, the Spirit that anointed him still being "the unction from the Holy One" to all his people. In the second epistle the writer has in view persons who are heretics, rebellious, dissolute, false teachers; and in warning them his mind naturally looks to the authority and lordship of the Saviour, which it was so awful to contemn and so vain to oppose. If the last day be set in different colors in the two epistles, the difference may be accounted for on the same principle; for to those suffering under trial it shines afar as the hope that sustains them, but to those who are perverse it presents itself as the time of reckoning which should alarm them into believing submission.

The aspects under which the Gospel is represented in this second epistle differ from those in the first. The writer lays stress on ἐπίγνωσις, or γνῶσις (i, 2, 3, 5, 8; ii, 20, 11; iii, 18). In this epistle the Gospel is generally Χριστοῦ δύναμις καὶ παρουσία (i, 16), ὁδὸς τῆς δικαιοσύνης (ii, 21), ἁγία ἐντολή, etc.; whereas the first epistle throws into prominence ἐλπίς, σωτηρία, ῥαντισμὸς αἵματος I. X., χάρις (i, 10) ἀλήθεια (i, 22), λόγος (ii, 8), πίστις, etc. The reason may be ventured that the persons addressed in the second epistle were in danger of being tempted into error; and that a definite and progressive knowledge of Christianity was the safeguard against those loose speculations which were floating around them. On this account, too, we have admonition suggested and pointed by their perilous circumstances, "to make their calling and election sure" (i, 10; iii, 14); nay, the purpose of the epistle seems to be given in iii, 17: "Ye therefore, beloved, knowing beforehand, take heed lest, being led away with the error of the lawless, ye fall away from your own steadfastness; but grow in grace, and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ." The ἐπίγνωσις is the grand theme of counsel and the real prophylactic presented, for it embodies itself in that δικαιοσύνη on the possession of which so much depends, as is seen in the allusions to Noah and Lot, and to the want of which are traced in contrast the judgment of the flood and the fate of Sodom, the selfish character of Balaam, and the dark and deceitful ways and works of the false teachers.

There is also a characteristic difference in the mode of quotation from the O. T. Quotations are abundant in the first epistle, either formally introduced by διότι γέγραπται (i, 16), or by διότι περιέχει ἐν τῇ γραφῇ (ii, 6), or are woven into the discourse without any prefatory statement, as if writer and readers were equally familiar with them (i, 24; ii, 3, 4, 5, 7, 9, 10, 22, 24, 25; iii, 9, 10, 11, 15). But in the second epistle quotations are unfrequent, though we have Psa. xc, 4 in iii, 8, and Isa. lxv, 17 in iii, 13. Of a different kind are the allusions to Noah and the flood, to Lot and Sodom, and to Balaam. But we may still explain that the modes of handling and applying the O. T. may differ according to the purpose which any writer has in view. In a longer and fuller epistle there may be quotations at length, but in a shorter one only apposite allusions to facts and incidents. The objection would have been stronger if in an epistle ascribing itself to Peter there had been no use made of the O. T. at all; but a third of this epistle consists of references to the O. T. or to warnings drawn from it.

The peculiar similarity of a large portion of this epistle to that of Jude has often been commented on. The second chapter and a portion of the third are so like Jude that the resemblance cannot be accidental, for it is found in words as well as in thoughts. It has been conjectured by some that both borrowed from a common source. Bishop Sherlock supposed that this source was some ancient Hebrew author who had portrayed the false teachers, Jude having used the epistle of Peter as well as this old authority (*Use and Intent of Prophecy*, Dissert. i, 200, Lond. 1725). Herder and Hasse, holding this theory, conjecture the document common to both writers to be the Zendavesta. This opinion has no foundation, and relieves us of no difficulty. Others imagine that Jude followed Peter, and several reasons have been alleged in favor of this opinion by Mill, Michaelis, Storr, Dahl, Wordsworth, Thiersch, Heydenreich, Hengstenberg, and Gaussen. Their general argument is that Peter predicts what Jude describes as actually existing (Jude 18), and that Jude refers to prophecies which are found only in Peter. But it is really doubtful if both epistles refer to the same class of errorists. Those described by Peter are rather speculators, though their immoral practices are also noted, while those branded by Jude are specially marked as libertines and sensualists, whose life has perverted and undermined their creed. Others again hold that Peter took from Jude; such is the view of Hug, Eichhorn, Credner, Neander, Mayerhoff, De Wette, Guericke, and Bleek. One argument of no small force is that the style of Jude is the simpler and briefer, and Peter's the more ornate and amplified; that Jude's is more pointed and Peter's more indefinite; and that some allusions in Peter are so vague that they can be understood only by a comparison with Jude (comp. 2 Pet. ii, 4 with Jude 6; 2 Pet. ii, 11 with Jude 9). Thus Peter says, generally, "Angels bring not railing accusations;" Jude gives the special instance, Michael and Satan. Peter speaks of the "angels that sinned;" Jude says more precisely, they "kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation." Olshausen and Augusti in part think that the similarity may be accounted for by a previous correspondence between the writers; that Jude may have described to Peter the character and practices of the false teachers, and that Peter, relying on the truthfulness of the statement, made his own use of it without hesitation when he had

occasion to refer to the same or a similar class of pernicious subverters of truth and purity. This hypothesis is scarcely probable, and it is more likely that Peter had read the epistle of Jude, and reproduced in his own epistle and in his own way its distinctive clauses, which must have deeply impressed him, but with such differences at the same time as show that he was no mere copyist. Is it unworthy of an apostle to use another writing divinely authorized, and can Peter's appropriation of so much of Jude's language be stigmatized, as by Reuss, as "a palpable plagiarism?" Thus Jude uses the phrase "clouds without water," but Peter "wells without water," this figure being more suited to his immediate purpose. The σπιλάδες of Jude 12 was from reminiscence of sound before Peter's mind, but it is changed of purpose into σπῖλοι; and Jude's phrase ἐν ταῖς ἀγάπαις ὑμῶν becomes in the same connection in Peter ἐν ταῖς ἀπάταις αὐτῶν. 2 Pet. ii, 17 shows a like similarity and difference compared with Jude 13. The claim of originality thus lies on the side of Jude, while original thinking characterizes Peter's use of Jude's terser and minuter diction. There is no ground for Bertholdt's suggestion to reject the second chapter as spurious; or for Ullmann's, to refer both second and third chapters to a post-apostolic period; or for Lange to brand as spurious the whole of the second chapter with the last two verses of the first chapter, and the first ten verses of the third—that is, from the first τοῦτο πρῶτον γινώσκοντες to the other; or for Bunsen to receive only the first twelve verses and the concluding doxology (Bertholdt, *Einleit. in d. N. T.* vol. vi; Ullmann, *Der zweite Brief Petri;* Lange, *Apostol. Zeitalter*, i, 152; and in Herzog's *Encyklop.* s. v.; Bunsen, *Ignatius von Antiochien.* p. 175).

Other more specific objections against the epistle may be briefly alluded to. According to Mayerhoff (*Einleit.* p. 187), the writer in iii, 2 separates himself from the apostles; Bleek (*Einleit.* p. 576) and others supposing that he intended to characterize himself as an apostle, and having before him the somewhat parallel expression of Jude, he so far altered it, but in the alteration has failed to give lucid utterance to his purpose. The phrase, with the double genitive καὶ τῆς τῶν ἀποστόλων ὑμῶν ἐντολῆς τοῦ κυρίου, naturally means, "and the commandment of the Lord given by your apostles." The pronoun ὑμῶν is the best-sustained reading, and the English version does violence to the position of the words. As Olshausen and Windischmann have shown, the use of ὑμῶν does not exclude Peter, even though it be rendered "the commandments of your apostles of the Lord Jesus." In fact, it neither denies nor affirms his apostleship; though if ἡμῶν had been employed, and the phrase rendered "our apostles," the conclusion against its genuineness would certainly have some weight. But this objection that the writer excludes himself from the apostles neutralizes another, to wit, that the writer betrays too great anxiety to show himself as the apostle Peter. He could not certainly do both in the same document without stultifying himself. Does not the apostle Paul when it serves his object use pointedly the first person singular, refer to himself, and assert his apostolic office as Peter does in i, 12, 13, 14, 15? The use of the name Συμεών in i, 1 can neither tell for the genuineness, as Dietlein supposes, nor against it, as Mayerhoff argues. The reference in iii, 1 to a former epistle is not for the purpose of identifying himself with the author of that epistle, but naturally comes in as a proof of his anxiety for his readers that they should bear in memory the lessons already imparted to them.

It is said that the first epistle was addressed to a particular circle of churches (1 Pet. i, 1), while the second was to Christians in general (2 Pet. i, 1), yet it assumed (iii, 1) that the readers were in both cases the same, the confusion being increased by the fact that in ch. i, 16 the writer speaks as if he had been their personal instructor, whereas in iii, 15 he treats them as the disciples of Paul. But we may well suppose that the first epistle, directed to a large enough circle at first, must soon have taken its place as a general epistle. The inspired penmen knew well that, though there was a particular occasion for their writing and special counsels to be given, yet their teachings were to be for the guidance of the whole Church. Hence we sometimes find them directing that their letters should be read beyond the first community to which they came (Col. iv, 16; 1 Thess. v, 27). Peter might therefore properly write a second time to Christians without express limitation of country, and still regard his readers as those whom he had admonished before. It is not necessary to suppose that by his expression in i, 16 he means personal instruction: the reference was to what he had said in his former letter. We must consider too the circumstances under which he wrote at all. There was a spurious kind of wisdom corrupting the Church (Col. ii, 8, 16-23). Jewish traditions had their influence; and sensual indulgence was sure to follow. Paul, who had carefully watched the churches he had planted, had been long a prisoner, and was thus withdrawn from active superintendence of them. Very fitting therefore it was that Peter, the apostle of the circumcision, should write as he did at first, to confirm the doctrine learned of Paul, and to inculcate the holy principles and unblemished conduct which could alone fortify believers against impending persecution. Yet he anticipates in the first letter a further declension, and a greater necessity for faithful resistance of error (1 Pet. iv, 1-4). Now we know that the evil did increase; and Paul in the pastoral epistles speaks of serious depravation of doctrine, and more open lawlessness of conduct (1 Tim. i, 19, 20; iv, 1; 2 Tim. ii, 17, 18; iii, 1-7). The second epistle of Peter was called for, then, to check the progress of false teaching and of unbecoming conduct: it takes up the matter at a point historically later than the first; but it handles the same topics, and so is a proper supplement to it. Thus, as Schott says (p. 162), "That which presented itself in the first epistle we see also in the second; the same uncertainty respecting the gospel-standing of Gentile Christians, and the gospel-teaching of Paul (i, 1, 10, 12; iii, 2, 15, etc.); the same questionings about the revelation of Christ, the resurrection of the body, and the final judgment (i, 4, etc., 11, 12, etc., 16, etc.; ii, 9; iii, 2, 8, etc., 10, etc., 18); the same tendency to relax in the work of Christian sanctification (i, 5-12, etc.; iii, 11, etc., 14, 17)." Other noteworthy traces he believes he can detect of a relationship between the two. Some of these are a debased state of religious knowledge grounded on Jewish writings alien from the true teaching of Scripture, and an affected spirituality which fostered sensual indulgence. Evidence that such evils existed at the time of writing may be found more clearly in the second, more faintly, but yet noticeably, in the first epistle.

Three arguments have been adduced to prove that the epistle must belong to post-apostolic times. 1. It is alleged that the doubts about Christ's second coming, referred to in iii, 3, 4, could not have arisen in apostolic times, when the belief in it was so firm and glowing; and a period of some length must have elapsed ere it could be said that the "fathers had fallen asleep." But the scoffers referred to were probably Gnostics who never believed that event, or at all events spiritualized the truth of it away; and after one generation had passed they might use the language imputed to them; or "the fathers" may denote the Jewish patriarchs, since whose decease uniformity had characterized all the processes and laws of nature. The Gnostic spiritualism which treated the resurrection as past early troubled the Church, and its disciples might cast ridicule on the faith and hopes of others in the challenge which Peter quotes. 2. It is said that the allusion to Paul's epistles indicates a late date, as it supposes them to be collected in part at least, and calls them by the sacred name of γραφαί (iii, 15, 16). But surely it may be granted that towards the close of Peter's life several epistles of Paul

may have been brought together and placed in point of authority on the same level as the O. T.; and that other documents also — *τὰς λοιπὰς γραφάς* — already occupied a similar place. Whatever exegesis be adopted, this is the general result. The writings of Paul, so well known to the readers of this epistle, are mentioned not as a completed whole; the phrase *ἐν πάσαις*, etc., is not to be taken absolutely, but relatively, as if denoting "in all his epistles which he writes." The "things" referred to as discussed in these epistles (*περὶ τούτων*) are not their general contents, but the coming of our Lord and the end of the world, and in these discussions "are some things hard to be understood." The allusion certainly presupposes a late age, and the writer, as he informs us, was very near his death. The date of Peter's death is not precisely known, and the common traditions concerning it may therefore be modified. As Alford says, a later date than the usual one may be assigned to it. 3. Again, it is held, as by Neander, that the epithet "holy mount," as applied to the hill of transfiguration, indicates a late period, for Zion only was so designated; and Mayerhoff affirms that the epithet suits Mount Zion alone. But the scene on which the glory of Jesus had been so displayed might many years afterwards be well called "holy" by one who was an eyewitness, when he referred to it as a proof and symbol of "the power and coming of the Lord Jesus."

Still, while a partial reply may be given to objections based on difference of style and of doctrinal representation, it must in honesty be added that these differences are not all of them wholly accounted for. The style and matter, as a whole, are so unlike the first epistle, that one has considerable difficulty in ascribing both epistles to the same author. While there is similarity in some words or phrases, the spirit, tone, and manner of the whole epistle are widely diverse. Minute criticism may discover *ἅπαξ λεγόμενα*, and arrange them in proof parallel to similar usage in the first epistle; but such minutiæ do not hide the general dissimilitude. It may be argued, and the argument is not without weight, that a forger would have imitated the salient peculiarities of the first epistle. No one of ordinary critical discernment would have failed to attempt the reproduction of its characteristic features of style and thought. But the absence of such studied likeness is surely in favor of the genuineness. It may be added also that, as there are in the first epistle statements so peculiar to it as to be found nowhere else, the same specialty in what seems to be undesigned coincidence marks the second epistle in the declarations of its third chapter. It would have been difficult in the second century to impose on the churches a second epistle forged in Peter's name, and so unlike in many points to his first. A direct imitation of his style might have deceived some of the churches by its obvious features of similitude, but the case is widely different when a writing so obviously unlike the first epistle won its way into circulation unchallenged in its origin and history, and was not doubted save at length by scholars and mainly on critical grounds. Why did not Origen and others tell us of the time of its first appearance, and how and by whom it was placed in the canon? Possibly on such points they were ignorant, or at least they knew nothing that warranted suspicion. Still the difference of manner between the two epistles remains, and perhaps one might account for it, as Jerome has hinted and Calvin has supposed, by the supposition that Peter dictated the epistle in Aramaic, and that the amanuensis was left to express the thoughts in his own forms and phrases. Difference of condition and purpose may account for difference of topic, and the change of style may be ascribed to the Greek copyist and translator. If, moreover, we admit that some time intervened between the composition of the two works; that in writing the first the apostle was aided by Silvanus, and in the second by another, perhaps Mark; that the circumstances of the churches addressed by him were considerably changed, and that the second was written in greater haste, not to speak of a possible decay of faculties, the differences may be regarded as insufficient to justify more than hesitation in admitting its genuineness. The authenticity of the epistle has been maintained more or less decidedly by Michaelis, Nitzsche, Flatt, Augusti, Storr, Dahl, Hug, Heydenreich, Lardner, Windischmann, Guericke, Thiersch, Stier, Dietlein, Hofmann, Luthardt, Brückner, and Olshausen. Feilmoser and Davidson incline to the same side. These are great names; yet, though we agree with their opinion, we cannot venture to say, with Bonnet, that "of all the books of the N. T. which have been controverted at certain times, there is not one whose authenticity is so certain as that of the second epistle of Peter" (*Nouv. Test.*, Introd., ii, 701, Genève, 1852).

II. *Time, Place, Design, and Persons addressed.* — When and where the epistle was written cannot be definitely known. The place was Rome in all probability; for Peter, after coming to Rome, did not, so far as we know, leave that city till his death. His death is usually placed in 64, but it may have been later, and this epistle was written just before it. Mayerhoff ascribes it to a Jewish Christian of Alexandria about the middle of the second century. Huther places it in the last quarter of the first century or the beginning of the second.

The persons for whom the epistle is intended are "those who have obtained like precious faith with us;" and iii, 1 identifies them with those addressed in the first epistle. It is objected that this epistle asserts that Peter had taught them in person—such not being the case with those addressed in the first epistle. But the phrase adduced—*ἐγνωρίσαμεν ὑμῖν* (i, 16), "we made known unto you"—seems to refer not to oral discourse, but to various portions of the first epistle in which the coming and glory of Christ are dwelt on. The object of the epistle is to warn against "false teachers," "bringing in damnable heresies," "denying the Lord that bought them," holding a peculiar dæmonology—covetous, sensual, and imperious apostates, the victims and propagators of Antinomian delusion. Probably they taught some early form of Gnostic error, which, denying the Lord's humanity and atoning death, ridiculed his second advent in man's nature, set aside the authority of law, and by this effrontery justified itself in licentious impurity. The false teachers were like the "false prophets," perhaps claiming divine basis for their teachings, and therefore the more able to shake the faith of others, and seduce them into perilous apostasy. Thus, in brief, as the writer himself describes it (iii, 17), his object is, first, warning, or to caution his readers against seduction: "Beware lest ye also, being led away with the error of the wicked, fall from your own steadfastness"—*προγινώσκοντες*—"as ye know those things beforehand," that is, from his descriptive accounts; and, secondly, counsel, or to urge on them, as the best of all antidotes to apostasy, to "grow in grace, and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ." For this *χάρις* and *γνῶσις* would fortify them and make them invincible against those assaults which so often succeeded with the unwary who fell in their heedlessness, the graceless who trusted in their own strength, and the ignorant or half-informed, so liable from their partial knowledge to be imposed upon by any system that dealt in novel speculations, professed to unfold mysteries, or give license and warrant for lawless practices. The supposition of Grotius, that it was written in the reign of Trajan against the Carpocratians, and by Simeon, bishop of Jerusalem, is without any probability, as Bertholdt has more than sufficiently shown. The arguments of Schwegler for its place as Rome, its date the end of the second century, and its purpose as an effort to conciliate Petrine and Pauline theological differences, are answered conclusively by Huther.

III. The *contents* of the epistle seem quite in accordance with its asserted origin. The customary opening salutation is followed by an enumeration of Christian blessings and exhortation to Christian duties, with special reference to the maintenance of the truth which had already been communicated to the Church (i, 1–13). Referring then to his approaching death, the apostle assigns as grounds of assurance for believers his own personal testimony as an eye-witness of the transfiguration, and the sure word of prophecy, that is the testimony of the Holy Ghost (14–21). The danger of being misled by false prophets is dwelt upon with great earnestness throughout the second chapter; their covetousness and gross sensuality, combined with pretences to spiritualism, in short all the permanent and fundamental characteristics of Antinomianism, are described; while the overthrow of all opponents of Christian truth is predicted (ii, 1–29) in connection with prophecies touching the second advent of Christ, the destruction of the world by fire, and the promise of new heavens and a new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness. After an exhortation to attend to Paul's teaching, in accordance with the less explicit admonition in the previous epistle, and an emphatic warning, the epistle closes with the customary ascription of glory to our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

IV. *Commentaries.*—Exegetical helps on the whole of this epistle exclusively are the following: Simson, *Commentary* (Lond. 1632, 4to); Adams, *Commentary* (ibid. 1633, fol.); Smith, *Commentaries* (ibid. 1690, 4to); Deurhof, *Erklaringe* (Amst. 1713, 4to); Nitzsche, *Vindicatio* (Lips. 1785, 8vo); Flatt, *Defensio* (Tub. 1806, 8vo); Dahl, *De αὐθεντίᾳ*, etc. [includ. Jude] (Rost. 1807, 4to); Richter, *De Origine*, etc. [includ. Jude] (Vit. 1810, 8vo); Ullmann, *Auslegung* (Lips. 1822, 8vo); Olshausen, *De Integ. et Authent.* etc. (Regiom. 1822–3, 4to; in English in the *Bibl. Repos.* July and Oct. 1863); Picot, *Recherches*, etc. (Genev. 1829, 8vo); Moutier, *Authentie*, etc. [includ. Jude] (Strasb. 1829, 8vo); Delille, *Authentie*, etc. (ibid. 1835, 8vo); Magnus, *id.* (ibid. 1835, 8vo); Heydenreich, *Aechtheit*, etc. (Herb. 1837, 8vo); Audemars, *La 2d Ep. de P.* (Genev. 1838, 8vo); Daumas, *Introduction critique* (Strasb. 1845, 8vo); Brown, *Discourses* [on ch. i] (Edinb. 1856, 8vo); Smith, *Lectures* (Lond. 1878, 8vo). See PETER, FIRST EPISTLE OF.

Peter OF ALCANTARA, *St.*, was born in the place after which he is surnamed in 1499, studied at the university in Salamanca, and when sixteen years old became a Franciscan monk. In 1519 he became prior at Badajoz, and in 1524 priest. For several years he lived in retirement, but in 1538 he was made general-superior of his order in Estremadura. In 1555 he founded, with the consent of pope Julius III, a separate reformed congregation, called the *Observantists* (q. v.), and assisted St. Theresa in her reforms of the Carmelites. He died in 1562, and was canonized in 1569. His work *De oratione et meditatione* was long and widely circulated. The *De animi pace seu tranquillitate* is not genuine. According to the legend, Peter walked on the sea by faith. In a picture in the Munich gallery, he not only walks himself, but a lay brother goes with him, whom Peter seems to encourage by pointing to heaven. See *Acta Sanctorum*, vol. viii.

Peter OF ALEXANDRIA (1), the first of that name in the list of bishops, and noted for the part he took against the Meletian schism, was born in the 3d century. He was placed over the see of Alexandria after the death of Theonas, which occurred April 9, 300. Peter had not occupied the position quite three years when the persecution commenced by the emperor Diocletian, and continued by his successors, broke out in 304. Peter was obliged to hide himself, and fled from one place to another, as we learn from a discourse said to have been delivered by him in prison, in which he states that he found shelter at different times in Mesopotamia, in Phœnicia, in Palestine, and in various islands. Cave conjectures that he was imprisoned during the reign of Diocletian or Maximian Galerius, but, if so, Peter must have obtained his release before the schism in the Egyptian churches. In 306 he assembled a council, which passed upon the misdemeanors of Meletius, bishop of Lycopolis. This prelate, in publishing calumnies against Peter and his council, finally created a schism in the Church of Alexandria, which lasted 150 years. Peter was obliged to seek his safety in flight. In the ninth year of the persecution he was, suddenly and contrary to all expectation, again arrested by order of Maximin Daza, and, without any distinct charge being brought against him, was beheaded Nov. 25, 311. Eusebius speaks with the highest admiration of his piety and his attainments in sacred literature, and he is revered as a saint and martyr both in the Eastern and Western churches. His memory is now celebrated by the Latin and Greek churches on the 26th, except in Russia, where the more ancient computation, which placed it on the 25th, is still followed. Peter wrote several works, of which there are very scanty remains: (1.) *Sermo de Pœnitentia:*—(2.) *Sermo in Sanctum Pascha.* These discourses are not extant in their original form, but fifteen canons relating to the lapsi, or those who in time of persecution had fallen away—fourteen of them from the *Sermo de Pœnitentia* (λόγος περὶ μετανοίας), the fifteenth from the *Sermo in Sanctum Pascha*—are contained in all the *Canonum Collectiones.* They were published in a Latin version in the *Micropresbyticon* (Basle, 1550); in the *Orthodoxographa* of Heroldus (ibid. 1555), and of Grynæus (ibid. 1569); in the first and second editions of De la Bigne's *Bibliotheca Patrum* (Paris, 1575 and 1589), and in the Cologne edition (1618). They are given also in the *Concilia.* It is only in some MSS. and editions that the separate source of the fifteenth canon is pointed out:—(3.) *Liber de Divinitate s. Deitate.* There is a citation from this treatise in the *Acta Concilii Ephesini;* it occurs in the *Actio prima*, and a part of it is again cited in the *Defensio Cyrilli*, which is given in the sequel of the *Acta:*—(4.) *Homilia de Adventu Salvatoris s. Christi.* A short citation from this occurs in the Latin version of the work of Leontius of Byzantium, *Contra Nestorianos et Eutychianos*, lib. i:—(5, 6.) Two fragments, one described, *Ex primo Sermone, de eo quod nec præexistit Anima, nec cum peccasset propterea in Corpus missa est*, the other as *Ex Mystagogia quam fecit ad Ecclesiam cum Martyrii Coronam suscepturus esset*, are cited by the emperor Justinian in his *Epistola ad Mennam CPolitanum adversus Origenem*, given in the *Acta Concilia CPolitani II s. Œcumenici V* (*Concilia*, vol. v, col. 652, ed. Labbé; vol. iii, col. 256, 257, ed. Hardouin). Another fragment of the same discourse is contained in the compilation *Leontii et Joannis Rerum Sacrarum lib. ii*, published by Mai in the above-cited *Collectio*, vii, 85:—(7.) *Epistola S. Petri Episcopi ad Ecclesiam Alexandrinam*, noticing some irregular proceedings of the schismatic Meletius. This letter, which is very short, was published in a Latin version by Scipio Maffei in the third volume of his *Observazione Letterarie* (Veronæ, 1737–40, 6 vols. 12mo):—(8.) *Doctrina.* A fragment of this work is cited by Leontius and Joannes, and was published by Mai (ibid. p. 96). The published fragments of Peter's works, with few exceptions, are given in the fourth volume of Galland's *Bibliotheca Patrum*, p. 91, etc. See Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* vii, 32; viii, 13; ix, 6, cum notis Valesii; Athanasius, *Apolog. contra Arianos*, c. 59; Epiphanius, *l. c.; Concilia*, l. c.; Cave, *Hist. Litt.* ad ann. 301, i, 160 (Oxford ed. 1740–43); Tillemont, *Mémoires*, v, 436, etc.; Fabricius, *Biblioth. Græc.* ix, 316, etc.; Ceillier, *Hist. des Auteurs sacrés et ecclésiastiques*, iv, 17 sq.; Dupin, *Bibliothèque des Auteurs ecclés.;* Galland, *Biblioth. Patrum*, proleg. ad vol. iv, c. 6.—Smith, *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. and Mythol.* iii, 219. Comp. Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xl, 138; Dorner, *Christologie*, i, 810; Hefele, *Conciliengesch.* i, 327 sq.; Schaff, *Church Hist.* vol. i.

Peter of Alexandria (2), another patriarch of that see, was born near the beginning of the 4th century, during the life of Athanasius, whom he for many years accompanied, sharing his variable fortunes, as presbyter of the Church at Alexandria. He was designated by Athanasius as his successor, and upon the death of that celebrated Church father (A.D. 373) was appointed to the place, to the great satisfaction of the orthodox among the people, and with the approval of the neighboring bishops. The Arians, however, who had, either from fear or reverence, conceded quiet possession to Athanasius, were by no means disposed to acquiesce in the appointment of an orthodox successor; and Peter was at once deposed and imprisoned. Making his escape, he fled to Rome, where he was kindly received by pope Damasus I, leaving his Arian competitor, Lucius, in possession of the Church of Alexandria. After five years' absence, Peter returned with letters from the pope confirming his title to the see, and regained possession of the church by favor of the people, who deposed Lucius, and forced him to flee to Constantinople. Peter enjoyed the highest esteem of his contemporaries, but survived his restoration only a short time. He died Feb. 14, 381, and was succeeded by his brother Timothy. Valesius speaks of him as the abettor of Maximus the Cynic in his usurpation of the see of Constantinople in place of St. Gregory (Nazianzen), but this is scarcely probable, since Gregory himself eulogizes him. Theodoret ascribes this act to Timothy. Of the writings of Peter, parts of two letters have been preserved to us by Theodoret and Facundus; the first giving an account of the persecutions and acts of violence perpetrated by Lucius and the Arians; the second, *Epistola ad Episcopos et Presbyteros atque Diaconos pro vera Fide in exsilio constitutos, s. ad Episcopos, Presbyteros, atque Diaconos qui sub Valente Imperatore Diocœsaream fuerant exules missi.* See Ceillier, *Hist. des Auteurs sacrés et ecclés.* viii, 464 sq.; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xl, 138; Smith, *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. and Mythol.* iii, 220.

Peter of Amiens. See Peter the Hermit.

Peter (*Pierre*) of St. André (known also as *Jean-Antoine Rampalle*), a French ecclesiastic, was born in 1624 at L'Isle (comté Venaissin). After having taken in 1640 the garb of the barefoot Carmelites under the name of *Pierre de St. André*, he taught philosophy and theology; became about 1667 general definitor of his order, and died at Rome, in the exercise of these duties, Nov. 29, 1671. Although he left only some odes in praise of St. Theresa, father Cosmo de Villiers claims that he had so much facility in Latin poetry that he was regarded as a second Baptiste Mantouan. We have of his works, *Historia generalis Fratrum Discalceatorum ord. de Monte-Carmelo* (Rome, 1668–1671, 2 vols. fol.); this history is the continuation of that undertaken by father Isidore de St. Joseph, who died in 1666:—*Le Religieux dans la Solitude* (Lyons, 1668, 12mo):—*La Vie du B. Jean de la Croix* (Aix, 1675, 8vo). He has translated into French the *Voyage à l'Orient* (1659, 8vo), and the *Vie du Père Dominique de Jésus-Marie*, two works of Esprit Julien, as well as the *Madeleine penitente et convertie*, and the *Alexis* of father Brignole-Sale. A *Traité de la Physionomie naturelle* and two sacred tragedies are also attributed to him, which, in all probability, are by an homonymous poet, Antoine Rampalle, known by a verse from the *Art Poétique* of Boileau (ch. iv, ver. 35). See De Villiers, *Biblioth. Carmelitana*, ii, 545; Achard, *Dict. Hist. de la Provence;* Barjavel, *Biog. du Vaucluse*, ii, 295.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xl, 198.

Peter of Anolo, a Swiss theologian of the 15th century, flourished at Basle as doctor and professor of canon law. He wrote about 1460, *Libellus de Cœsarum Monarchia ad Fridericum*, etc. (under the title *De Imperio Romano*, edited by Faber, Strasburg, 1603; Nuremb. 1657). The work takes the ground that the German empire is the continuance of the Roman imperium (a view in very recent times espoused by Freeman in his *Comparative Politics*). All princes are subordinate to the emperor; the emperor is the subordinate of the pope, who has received his authority from God.

Peter of Antioch (1). See Peter Fullo.

Peter of Antioch (2), the third patriarch of that name in the current tables of the occupants of that see, which commence with the apostle Peter, was born near the beginning of the 11th century. Contemporary with Michael Cerularius, patriarch of Constantinople, and Leo of Achridia, he united with them in hostility to the Latin Church. According to Cave, Peter bitterly inveighed against the lives and doctrines of the Latin clergy, and especially against the addition of the word *filioque* to the creed; while, according to Le Quien, he preserved a more impartial tone, and showed everywhere "a disposition averse to schism." Peter obtained the patriarchate in the year 1053, and in the same year he sent synodical letters to the patriarchs of Alexandria, Jerusalem, and Constantinople, and to pope Leo IX, signifying his accession. Cave states that he sent to the pope "a profession of his faith," but it is probable that he has applied this term to the synodical letter, of which a Latin version appears among the letters of Leo IX. Le Quien, who had in his possession the Greek text of these synodical letters, complains of the great discrepancy between the Greek text and the Latin version. Two letters of Peter appear in Greek, with a Latin version, in the *Monumenta Ecclesiæ Græcæ* of Cotelerius (ii, 112, 145). The first is entitled *Epistola ad Dominicum Gradensem*, and is an answer to Dominicus Gradensis s. Venetus, patriarch of Venice or Aquileia, whose letter, in the collection of Cotelerius, precedes that of Peter; the second is addressed to Michael Cerularius (*Epistola ad Michaelem Cerularium*), and is preceded by a letter of Michael to Peter, to which it is the answer. A considerable part of this letter had previously been published by Leo Allatius, in his *De Consensu Ecclesiarum Orient. et Occident.* lib. iii, c. 12, § 4. There is extant in MS. at Vienna another letter of Peter, *Petri Epistola ad Joannem Tranensem in Apulia Episcopum*, relating to the matters in dispute between the Eastern and Western churches. See Cave, *Hist. Litt.* ad ann. 1040, ii, 132; Oudin, *Comment. de Scriptorib. et Scriptis Eccles.* ii, 605; Lambec, *Comment. de Biblioth. Cæsaræa;* Le Quien, *Oriens Christian.* ii, 754.

Peter (*Pierre*) of Baume (Lat. *Petrus de Palma*), general of the Dominicans, was born at Baume (county of Bourgogne) in the latter part of the 13th century. Having early embraced the rule of St. Dominic, he was sent in 1321 to Paris, and there gave public lessons upon the *Livre des Sentences* of Pierre Lombard. In 1343 he was elected general of his order by a unanimity of votes. He died in Paris March 1, 1345. He wrote *Postillæ in quatuor Evangelia*, some copies of which are preserved at Basle and at Tours, and two *Lettres Encycliques*, which have not been printed. See Quétif et Echard, *Script. ord. Prædic.* i, 614.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xl, 198.

Peter (*Pierre*), son of Béchin, was a French historian, who died in the 12th century. It is supposed that he was canon of St. Martin of Tours. He left a *Chronique*, which begins with the creation of the world and ends with 1137. For ancient times, it is a compilation from Eusebius, from St. Jerome, Isidore of Seville, Gregory of Tours; for modern times, from Frédégaire, St. Odon, etc. However, some passages from this *Chronique*, relative to St. Martin of Tours, to the abbey of Cormery, and to the counts of Anjou, are not without interest. It has never been published entire. Short fragments of it may be found in the *Recueil* of Duchesne (iii, 365–372), and in that of Bouquet (iii, v, vi, viii, x, xi, xii); but M. Salmon has recently published the best part of it in his *Chroniques de Touraine*, after three

MSS., one from the Imperial Library, two from the Vatican. See *Hist. Litt. de la France*, xii, 80; xiii, 57; André Salmon, *Notices sur les Chroniques de Touraine.* —Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xl, 191.

Peter Bernardinus, an Italian reformer, the intimate companion of Savonarola, was a Florentine by birth and of humble descent. He was attracted by the teaching of the great Italian reformer, and after the execution of Savonarola frequently met his followers secretly, and encouraged them in steadfastness to the faith. He finally became a leader among the Italian reformed, and as such forbade all participation in the sacraments of the Church of Rome, favored communistic life, diligence in prayer, and simplicity in dress. Pursued by the Church and by the State, he fled with all his family to the home of count Picus de Mirandola, but on the way he was captured and, after a hasty trial, was condemned to be burned.

Peter of Blois (*Petrus Blesensis*), so called from the place of his birth, a learned ecclesiastical writer, flourished in the 12th century. He studied at Paris, Bologna, and Oxford, and there was so interested in scholastic pursuits that he became a student of John of Salisbury. In 1167 he was appointed the teacher and secretary of young king William II of Sicily. Fear of assassination, prompted by jealousy of his success, made him leave Italy, and he remained for a while in France. In 1168 he was invited to England by Henry II; was nominated archdeacon of Bath, and afterwards became chancellor of Canterbury and archdeacon of London. For the space of fourteen years he was one of the most influential men in England, both as a politician and a churchman. He died in 1200. He is said to have first used the word transubstantiation. His letters are very interesting; they are admired for their elegance and perspicuity of language. Besides, Peter of Blois deserves to be pointed out as one of those ecclesiastics of the Middle Ages who dared to speak out against the abuses in school, Church, and State. He complains bitterly of the superficial ways of the clergy, who were then the educators of the world. He reproaches those who moot questions respecting time and space, and the nature of universals (*universalia*), before they had learned the elements of science. These charlatans strove after high things, and neglected the doctrines of salvation. Peter of Blois's writings have been collected under the title, *Opera omnia, nunc primum in Anglia ope codicum manuscriptorum editionumque optimarum*, edidit J. A. Giles, LL.D. (4 vols. 8vo). See Wright, *Biog. Brit. Litter.* ii, 366 sq.; Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliogr.* vol. ii, s. v.; Baur, *Dogmengesch.*; Hardwick, *Ch. Hist. of the Middle Ages*; Neander, *Hist. of Christian Dogmas.* (J. H. W.)

Peter of Bruys (*Pierre de Brois*), a French ecclesiastic of the 12th century, is noted as the representative of those anti-hierarchical tendencies which so generally prevailed in Southern France. He was a priest, but resigned his orders, preferring to become a leader of the people against the corruptions of the Church, about 1104. Peter of Clugny, whose pastoral epistles to the bishops of the south of France are the principal source of information concerning Peter of Bruys, reproaches him with heretical opinions; and, although the account of an enemy is always to be read with suspicion, the high and disinterested character of the abbot of Clugny gives more than ordinary value to his narrative. The time of the composition of the preface to the refutation (the body of which was of early date) was shortly after the death of De Bruys, which took place about A.D. 1125. At this time, the author tells us, the heresy had been flourishing for twenty years. Peter of Bruys seems to have rejected infant baptism, because he felt that baptism without faith was of no avail, and with Abelard he rebaptized adults. He also rejected all public divine service, for God, he argued, "ante altare vel ante stabulum invocatus"—is heard as well in the inn as in the church. The crosses he would burn, and not honor, for that is a reproach to the sufferings of the Saviour. Peter of Bruys even maintained that the Supper was not instituted by Christ as a rite of perpetual observation; that he only once distributed his body and blood among his disciples. This expression is obscure: perhaps he meant to say that Christ had observed this rite once for all. He also rejected the mass and sacrifices for the dead. He found many followers, known as the *Petrobrusians* (q. v.). Peter of Bruys was burned at St. Gilles on Still Friday, in 1124, in the Arelatensia diocese, by a mob, in an emeute caused by his preaching, and probably instigated by the Romish ecclesiastics. See Gieseler, *Kirchengesch.* vol. ii, pt. ii, p. 536; Engelhardt, *Dogmengesch.* vol. ii, ch. iii, p. 51 sq.; Münscher, *Dogmengesch.* (edit. by Cöhn), p. 209, 210. (J. H. W.)

Peter of Cellæ (*Petrus Cellensis*), a French prelate of some note, flourished in the second half of the 12th century. He was abbot at Moutier la Celle from 1150; in 1162 he filled a like office at St. Remis, near Rheims; and in 1181 was made bishop of Chartres. He died in 1183. Peter of Cellæ left mystical interpretations of the Scriptures, and letters to the popes and bishops and many princes, who highly esteemed him. He had reformatory ideas, and did not hesitate to express them. His works have been collected and published several times. One edition is by Sirmond (Par. 1613; Ven. 1728).

Peter (*Pierre*) of Chartres, a French ecclesiastic who flourished in the first half of the 10th century, died about 1039. The authors of the *Histoire Littéraire de la France* attribute to him several works. We mention only *Manuale Ecclesiasticum*, *Manuale de Mysteriis Ecclesiæ*, and *Speculum Ecclesiæ*. This last treatise, which offers us curious details upon the origin or meaning of liturgical usages, is unpublished; but we indicate three manuscript copies in the Imperial Library of Saint-Victor, under the numbers 513, 724, 923. Number 923 has one chapter more than the other two. Jean Garet, canon of Louvain, Gesner, Possevin, and after them the authors of the *Histoire Littéraire*, designate also among the works of our chancellor a *Paraphrase of the Psalms*, likewise unpublished. There is, finally, in the library of Mont-Saint-Michel, *Glossæ in Job, secundum Petrum, cancellarium Carnutensem.* See Gesner, *Bibl. Universalis*, p. 669; Possevin, *Apparatus*, ii, 246; *Hist. Litt. de la France*, vii, 341.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xl, 184.

Peter Chrysolanus, an Italian prelate, was born in the latter part of the 11th century. He was raised to the archbishopric of Milan in 1110, having previously held some less important see. He was sent by pope Paschal II on a mission to the emperor Alexius I Comnenus, and engaged eagerly in the controversy on the procession of the Holy Spirit. His principal work is, *Ad Imperatorem Dominum Alexium Comnenum Oratio*, etc., designed to prove the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Son as well as from the Father, published in the *Græcia Orthodoxa* of Allatius, i, 379, etc. (Rome, 1652, 4to), and given in a Latin version by Baronius, *Annal. Eccles.* ad ann. 1116, vol. viii, etc.

Peter Chrysologus, *St.*, an Italian prelate, was born at Imola, in the northern part of Italy, towards the close of the 4th century. He was educated by Cornelius, a bishop, and received ordination as deacon from the same prelate. In 433 he was consecrated archbishop of Ravenna by pope Sixtus III, who knew all his merit. He labored to reform several abuses which had been introduced into his diocese, and to extirpate the remnants of pagan superstition. In A.D. 448 St. Germain d'Auxerre having come to Ravenna, Peter received him with marks of the most profound veneration. Shortly afterwards the heresiarch Eutyches wrote to him complaining of the condemnation passed on him by Flavianus of Constantinople, and Peter replied to him in

June, 449, expressing his grief to see that the disputes upon the mystery of the incarnation were not ended. He died Dec. 2, 450. His zeal for the instruction of his flock is shown by one hundred and seventy-six *Sermones*, collected in 708 by Felix, archbishop of Ravenna, under the title, *Divi Petri Chrysologi archiepiscopi Ravennatis, viri eruditissimi atque sanctissimi, insigne et pervetustum opus Homiliarum nunc primum in lucem editum* (Par. 1544, 12mo), which have frequently been reprinted. They appear in the seventh volume of the Lyons edition of the *Bibliotheca Patrum* (1677, fol.):—*Epistola Petri Ravennatis Episcopi ad Eutychem Abbatem.* This letter was published by Gerard Vossius in the original Greek, with a Latin version, at the end of the works of Gregory Thaumaturgus (Mayence, 1604, 4to). It is reprinted in the *Concilia* (vol. iv, col. 36, ed. Labbé; vol. ii, col. 21, ed. Hardouin). See Smith, *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. and Mythol.* iii, 222; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xl, 138.

Peter Collivacinus (also called *Morra*), an ecclesiastical character of the 13th century, flourished as teacher of canonical law at Bologna; was then secretary to Innocent III, by whose order he collected the decretals of that pope during the first eleven years of his reign, and published them in 1210 by the help of the so-called *Compilatio Romana* of Bernhard of Compostella. This collection was approved by the University of Bologna, and received the name *Compilatio tertia.* (The so-called *Compilatio secunda* is younger, but contains older material. See Richter, *Kirchenrecht*, § 74.) Later, Peter was cardinal legate, and as such labored to restore order to the Church of South France, in his day so greatly broken up by the wars of the Albigenses (q. v.).

Peter the Deacon (1) flourished near the beginning of the 6th century. In the controversy excited by the monks whom ecclesiastical writers call *Scythæ*, who came from the diocese of Torni, on the south bank of the Danube, Peter took a prominent part. He had accompanied the delegates sent to Rome by the monks, and while in the Eternal City united with his colleagues in addressing to Fulgentius, and the other African bishops who were then in exile in Sardinia, a work entitled *De Incarnatione et Gratia Domini nostri Jesu Christi Liber.* To this Fulgentius and his companions replied in another treatise on the same subject. The work of Peter, which is in Latin, was published in the *Monumenta SS. Patrum Orthodoxographa* of Grynæus (Basle, 1569), and has been reprinted in various editions of the *Bibliotheca Patrum.* It is in the ninth volume of the Lyons edition of Galland (Ven. 1776, fol.).

Peter the Deacon (2), a learned Benedictine of Monte-Cassino, of a Roman patrician family, was born about the close of the 11th century, in the reign of Alexius I Comnenus. In the *Jus Græco-Romanum* of Leunclavius (lib. vi, 395–397) are given *Interrogationes quas solvit reverendissimus Chartularius, Dominus Petrus, idemque Diaconus Majoris Ecclesiæ* (sc. of St. Sophia at Constantinople), A.M. 6600 = A.D. 1092. We learn from this title when the author lived, and that he held the offices described. He seems to have been admitted into the Benedictine Order at the very early age of fifteen. In a controversy of his convent with pope Innocent II, he defended the monastic interests to great advantage before the emperor Lothaire in 1138, while he was in South Italy. So well pleased was the emperor with Peter that he was made chartularius and chaplain of the Roman realm. Later he was intrusted by pope Alexander with the management of the convent of Monte-Cassino, where he died after the middle of the 12th century. The following of his writings are instructive for the contemporaneous history of the Church. *De vitæ et obitu Justorum Cœnobii Casinensis: — Lib. illustrium virorum Casinensis Archisterii: — Lib. de locis sanctis:*—and *De Novissimis temporibus.* There are, or were, extant in MS. in the king's library at Paris, *Petrus Diaconus et Philosophus de Cyclo et Indictione*, and *Petri Diaconi et Philosophi Tractatus de Sole, Luna, et Sideribus* (Codd. CMXXIX, No. 7, and MMMLXXXV), but whether this Petrus Diaconus is the canonist is not clear.—Smith, *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. and Mythol.* iii, 223; Potthast, *Bibl. Med. Ævi*, p. 490; Fabricius, *Bib. Græca*, xi, 334 sq.; Cave, *Hist. Litt.* ii, 161.

Peter the Dominican. See Peter Martyr.

Peter (*Pierre*) of Dresden, a German reformer, was born at Dresden in the latter part of the 14th century. Driven from that city for having spread the doctrines of the Vaudois, Pierre sought refuge in Prague, where, in order to subsist, he opened a small school for children. Some time after he attracted to himself one of his friends called Jacobel, with whom he published his opinions. Pierre inveighed especially against the communion in one kind. "To his influence," says Gillett, "is to be attributed in large measure the origin of that discussion in respect to the communion of the cup which almost revolutionized Bohemia, and brought down upon it the energies of crusading Christendom." He was evidently a man of superior talent, and one who possessed great power over the minds of others. At Prague, among the thousands congregated at its university, he had large opportunity for insinuating his peculiar views. The very fact that he was instrumental in shaping the enlarged views of Jacobel suffices to rescue his name and memory from oblivion. He afterwards united with the Hussites against the primacy of the pope, and propagated their ideas upon the nature of the Church. To establish his doctrines he wrote several works now completely forgotten. He died at Prague in 1440. See Eneas Sylvius, *Bohem.* ch. 5; Bonfinius, *Hist. Bohem.*; Moréri, *Dict. Hist.*; Jöcher, *Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon*; Gillett, *Huss and the Hussites*, i, 38, 483, 519. (J. H. W.)

Peter of Edessa, a Syrian by birth, and a presbyter of the Church at Edessa, and an eminent preacher, wrote *Tractatus variarum Causarum*, treatises on various subjects, and composed Psalms in metre like those of Ephrem the Syrian. Trithemius ascribes to him *Commentarii in Psalmos*, and says that he wrote in Syriac. All his works have perished.

Peter (*St.*) Exorcista and Marcellinus (It. *SS. Pietro e Marcellino*), two Romish saints always represented together, flourished during the last persecutions under Diocletian, about the opening of the 4th century. Their religious convictions, openly avowed, brought them to jail, and it so happened that even there they were sorely tried. Their jailer, Artemius, had a daughter, Paulina, who was sick. Peter promised to restore her to health if Artemius would believe in God. Then the jailer ridiculed him, saying, "If I put thee into the deepest dungeon, and load thee with heavier chains, will thy God then deliver thee?" To this Peter replied that it mattered little to God whether he believed or not, but that Christ might be glorified he desired that it should be done. And it was so; and in the night Peter and Marcellinus, dressed in shining white garments, came to Artemius in his own chamber. Then he believed, and was baptized with all his family, and three hundred others. When they were to die, it was ordered that the executioner should take them to a forest three miles from Rome, in order that the Christians should not know of their burial-place. So when they were come to a solitary place, and the executioner pointed it out as the spot where they were to die, they themselves cleared a space and dug their grave, and died encouraging each other. In the paintings of the churches they are represented in priestly habits bearing palms. They are commemorated by the Romish Church on June 2.

Peter Fullo (also called *Cnapheus*, i. e. the Fuller), a patriarch of Antioch, was born near the commence-

ment of the 5th century. He was abbot of a monastery at or near Constantinople, but various accusations (including heresy) being made against him, he fled to Antioch, accompanying Zeno, son-in-law of the emperor Leo I, who was sent thither. Peter appears to have held the doctrine of the Monophysites, the controversy concerning which was at that time agitating the entire Eastern Church. On his arrival at Antioch, the patriarchate of which city was held by Martyrius, a supporter of the Council of Chalcedon, he determined to attempt the usurpation of that office, engaging Zeno and a number of those who favored the Monophysite doctrine in the enterprise. Great tumult and confusion ensued, one cause of which was that Peter added to the sacred hymn called the *Trisagion* the words "who wast crucified for us"—which constituted one of the tests of the Monophysites—and anathematized all who did not sanction the alteration. Martyrius, unable to maintain order, went to Constantinople, where he was kindly received by Leo I, through whose influence he hoped to be able, on his return to Antioch, to quell the disturbance. Failing in this, and disgusted with his failure, he abdicated the patriarchate, which was immediately assumed by Peter. Leo, however, at the instigation of Gennadius, patriarch of Constantinople, promptly expelled the intruder, in whose place Julian was elected, with general approval. Peter was banished to Upper Egypt, but, contriving to escape from his exile, he returned to Constantinople and obtained refuge in a monastery, where he remained until the revolt of Basiliscus against Zeno, having bound himself by oath to abstain from exciting further troubles. The revolt succeeding, and Zeno being driven from Constantinople, Basiliscus exerted himself to gain the Monophysites, and issued an encyclical letter to the various prelates of the Church, anathematizing the decrees of the Synod of Chalcedon. Peter gave formal assent to this letter, and was immediately restored to the patriarchate of Antioch (A.D. 476). Julian soon after died of grief, and Peter, resuming authority, restored the obnoxious clause "who wast crucified for us;" and by repeating his anathemas excited fresh tumults, which resulted in plunder and murder. Zeno, however, recovering the imperial power, a synod was assembled and Peter was deposed, chiefly through the agency of one of his own partisans, John Codonatus, whom he had made a bishop. He was banished to Pityus, from whence he escaped, and, going to Euchaïta, obtained refuge in the church of St. Theodore. After a period of nine years, during which time numerous changes had been made in the patriarchate, the Monophysites, again in the ascendant, persuaded Zeno to consent to the restoration of Peter upon his signing the emperor's "Henoticon," or decree for the unity of the Church. This event is placed by Theophanes in A.D. 485. The Western Church, which had maintained its allegiance to the Council of Chalcedon, assembled in council at Rome, and hurled its anathemas at Peter, but to no purpose. Protected by Zeno and the strength of his party, he retained the patriarchate during the remainder of his life. Theophanes charges him with various offences against ecclesiastical rule, and with many acts of oppression after his restoration; which charges are, unfortunately, corroborated by the previous character of the man. One of the latest manifestations of his ambition was the attempt to add the island of Cyprus to his patriarchate. He was succeeded by Palladius, a presbyter of Seleucia. His death is variously stated to have occurred in A.D. 488, 490, 491.

Peter THE HERMIT, an ecclesiastical character of the 11th century, is of very little significance except as the monks of the Church of Rome have given him importance by crediting him with the movement of the Christian Church against the Saracens, known as the First Crusade, for which the credit is by most competent critics awarded to pope Urban II. Von Sybel, in his *Geschichte des ersten Kreuzzuges* (Düsseldorf, 1841), examines the history of the first crusaders, and in consequence of a most searching review of all the records pronounces Peter of Amiens an apocryphal character, and his reputed efforts for the first crusade the invention of Greek legendaries of the 12th century. Even William of Tyre, who is the principal source of the history of the Crusades of all the Middle-Age historians, knows (in his *Belli sacri historiæ* about 1188) of Peter of Amiens only that he is a *persona contemptibilis*, whose fate was that of the other crusaders. The Jesuit Œltreman has made the life of Peter of Amiens the subject of a sacred romance, which is often mistaken for history. The whole scheme is intended to wrest the honor of the first Crusade from the papacy and to give it to the monks.

According to these questionable sources, Peter the Hermit was a native of Amiens, where he was born about the middle of the 11th century. He was educated first at Paris, and afterwards in Italy, and then became a soldier. After serving in Flanders without much distinction, he retired from the army, married, and had several children; but on the death of his wife he became religious, and exhausted, without satisfying the cravings of his religious zeal, all the ordinary excitements—the studies, the austerities and mortifications, the fasts and prayers—of a devout life. Still yearning for more powerful emotions, he retired into the solitude of the strictest and severest cloister. Not even content with this life of a recluse, he ultimately became a hermit. But even this failed to satisfy him, and he would not rest contented with himself until he had projected a pilgrimage to the Holy Land. For this he set out about 1093. On his visit to the East he saw with a bleeding heart that the Holy Sepulchre was in the hands of the infidel, and beheld the oppressed condition of the Christian residents or pilgrims under the Moslem rule: "his blood turned to fire," and the hermit made his vow that with the help of God these things should cease. In an interview with the patriarch Simeon he declared that the natives of the West should take up arms in the Christian cause. On his return to the West he spoke so earnestly on the subject to pope Urban II that the pontiff warmly adopted his views, and, however selfish may have been the promptings of his zeal in the cause—he foreseeing probably that, whatever might be the result to the warriors of the cross, his own power would thenceforth rest on more solid foundations—Urban eagerly bestowed his blessing on the fervent enthusiast, and commissioned him to preach throughout the West an armed confederation of Christians for the deliverance of the Holy City. Mean in figure and diminutive in stature, and gifted only with an eloquence that was as rude as it was ready, his deficiencies were more than made up by the earnestness which gave even to the glance of his eye a force more powerful than speech. His enthusiasm lent him a power which no external advantages of form could have commanded. He was filled with a fire which would not stay, and the horrors which were burnt in upon his soul were those which would most surely stir the conscience and rouse the wrath of his hearers. His fiery appeals carried everything before them. "He traversed Italy," writes the historian of Latin Christianity, "crossed the Alps, from province to province, from city to city. He rode on a mule, with a crucifix in his hand, his head and feet bare: his dress was a long robe, girt with a cord, and a hermit's cloak of the coarsest stuff. He preached in the pulpits, on the roads, in the marketplaces. His eloquence was that which stirs the heart of the people, for it came from his own—brief, figurative, full of bold apostrophes; it was mingled with his own tears, with his own groans; he beat his breast: the contagion spread throughout his audience. His preaching appealed to every passion—to valor and shame, to indignation and pity, to the pride of the warrior, to the compassion of the man, the religion of the Christian, to the love of the brethren, to the hatred of the unbeliever

aggravated by his insulting tyranny, to reverence for the Redeemer and the saints, to the desire of expiating sin, to the hope of eternal life." The results are well known as among those moral marvels of enthusiasm of which history presents occasional examples. All France especially was stirred from its very depths; and just at the time when the enthusiasm of that country had been enkindled to its full fervor, it received a sacredness and an authority from the decree of a council held at Clermont, in which Urban himself was present, and in which his celebrated harangue was but the signal for the outpouring, through all Western Christendom, of the same chivalrous emotions by which France had been borne away under the rude eloquence of the Hermit. To understand this success, we must take into account the poverty of the masses, and the alluring prospect of a residence in Eastern lands, the scenes of which were painted in glowing colors by the apostle of the holy war. Thousands of outcasts had always been ready to follow the princes in their marauding expeditions or political wars, and how much more in a war which enlisted the highest sympathies of their nature in its behalf, which received the sanction of the ministers of religion, and was regarded as the will of God! For the details of the expedition, we must refer to the article CRUSADES, our sole present concern being with the personal history of Peter. Of the enormous but undisciplined army which assembled from all parts of Europe, one portion was committed to his conduct; the other being under the command of a far more skilful leader, Walter (q. v.) the Penniless. Peter, mounted upon an ass, with his coarse woollen mantle and his rude sandals, placed himself at the head of his followers. On the march through Hungary they became involved in hostilities with the Hungarians, and suffered a severe defeat at Semlin, whence they proceeded with much difficulty to Constantinople. There the emperor Alexius, filled with dismay at the want of discipline which they exhibited, was but too happy to give them supplies for their onward march; and near Nice they encountered the army of the sultan Soliman, from whom they suffered a terrible defeat. Peter accompanied the subsequent expedition under Godfrey; but worn out by the delays and difficulties of the siege of Antioch, he was about to withdraw from the expedition, and was only retained in it by the influence of the other leaders, who foresaw the worst results from his departure. Accordingly he had a share, although not marked by any signal distinction, in the siege and capture of the Holy City in 1099, and the closing incident of his history as a crusader was an address to the victorious army delivered on the Mount of Olives. He returned to Europe, and founded a monastery at Huy, in the diocese of Liège, where he died, July 7, 1115. The movement which had been inaugurated continued to agitate Europe for nearly two centuries, and its general effect upon the march of civilization may well be pronounced incalculable. See Milman, *Hist. of Lat. Christianity*, iv, 25 sq.; Cox, *The Crusades* (N. Y. 1874, 18mo), p. 26 sq.; Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ch. xxxiii.

Peter THE LOMBARD. See LOMBARD, PETER.

Peter (*Pierre*) OF MAILLEZAIS, a French chronicler of the 11th century, was, according to Dom Rivet, a man of talent, of merit, and learning. He embraced the monastic rule in the early part of the 11th century, and flourished under Goderanne, abbé of Maillezais, in Bas-Poitou. We have an interesting article of his upon the history of his time, particularly that of the counts de Poitiers and the abbé of Maillezais. Father Labbé has comprised it (*Malleacense Chronicon*) in the monuments that he collected for the history of Aquitaine. What concerns the *translation of Saint Rigomer* has been detached from it and published again by Mabillon and the Bollandists. See *Hist. Litt. de la France*, v, 599. —Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xl, 187.

Peter (*St.*) MARTYR (1), a Roman Catholic saint of the Dominican order, is greatly beloved in the Romish fold, and in his own order ranks next to the founder himself. He was born at Verona about 1205. His parents were Catharists, but Peter early became orthodox in sentiment, and sought his education at the conventual schools of the Church. At the age of fifteen he united with the order by the persuasion of Dominic. He soon became a public character by reason of his piety and oratorical power. He turned against his own sect, and so severely persecuted the Catharists that he was universally regarded as intolerant. When the Inquisition needed an uncompromising head, Peter was made its general by approval of pope Honorius III. His high-handed disposal of the lives and property of people under him made him a general object of hatred. Two Veronian noblemen whom he had accused, and whose property was confiscated, resolved to be revenged on him. They hired assassins, who watched that they might kill him in a forest where they knew he would pass unaccompanied save by a single monk. When he appeared one of the murderers struck him down with an axe. They then pursued and killed his attendant. When they returned to Peter he was reciting the Apostles' Creed, or, as others say, was writing it on the ground with his blood, when the assassins completed their cruel work. This event occurred on April 28, A.D. 1252. In the various paintings of this saint he is represented in the habit of his order, and bears the crucifix and palm. His more peculiar attribute is either the axe stuck in his head or a gash from which the blood trickles. Fra Bartolomeo painted the head of his beloved Jerome Savonarola as St. Peter Martyr. He is also known as *St. Peter of Verona*. (J. H. W.)

Jerome Savonarola as St. Peter Martyr (by Fra Bartolomeo).

Peter (*St.*) MARTYR (2), a Romish saint of the 15th century, was born at Arona in 1455, and was probably educated at the university in Salamanca, where he taught for many years with great success. He had a part in the wars against the Moors, and in 1505 took holy orders. As prior of Granada he was frequently employed in very important missions by queen Isabella the Catholic. His travels in diplomatic interests he described in *De legatione Babylonica*. He died in 1525. His *Epistola de rebus Hispanicis* was published at Alcala in 1530, and at Amsterdam in 1670.

Peter, MAURITIUS. See PETER THE VENERABLE.

Peter MOGILAS. See MOGILAS.

Peter MONGUS, a Monophysite, flourished as patriarch of Alexandria in the 5th century. Liberatus gives

him also the surname of *the Stammerer*. He was ordained deacon by Dioscorus, successor of Cyril, who held the patriarchate for seven years (A.D. 444–451). Peter was the ready participator in the violences of Dioscorus, and earnestly embraced his cause when he was deposed by the Council of Chalcedon, withdrawing from the communion of the successor of Dioscorus, Proterius, who supported the cause of the council, and uniting in the opposition raised by Timothy Ælurus and others. Peter was consequently sentenced, apparently by Proterius, to deposition and excommunication. Whether he was banished, as well as Timothy Ælurus, is not clear, but he seems to have accompanied Timothy to Alexandria, and to have been his chief supporter when, after the death of the emperor Marcian, he returned, and either murdered Proterius or excited the tumults that led to his death, A.D. 457. Timothy Ælurus was immediately raised to the patriarchate by his partisans, but was shortly after banished by the emperor Leo I, the Thracian, who had succeeded Marcian. Peter also was obliged to flee. Another Timothy, surnamed Salofaciolus, a supporter of the Council of Chalcedon, was appointed to succeed Proterius in the patriarchate. When, in the following reign of Zeno, or rather during the short usurpation of Basiliscus, Timothy Ælurus was recalled from exile (A.D. 475), and was sent from Constantinople to Alexandria to re-occupy that see, he was joined by Peter and his party, and with their support drove out his competitor Salofaciolus, who took refuge in a monastery at Canopus. On the downfall of Basiliscus and the restoration of Zeno, Timothy Ælurus was allowed, through the emperor's compassion for his great age, to retain his see; but when on his death (A.D. 477) the Monophysite bishops of Egypt, without waiting for the emperor's directions, elected Peter (who had previously obtained the rank of archdeacon) as his successor, the emperor's indignation was so far aroused that he determined to put the new prelate to death. His anger, however, somewhat abated, and Peter was allowed to live, but was deprived of the patriarchate, to which Timothy Salofaciolus was restored. On the death of Salofaciolus, which occurred soon after, John of Tabenna, surnamed Talaia, was appointed to succeed him; but he was very shortly deposed by order of Zeno, on some account not clearly ascertained, and Peter Mongus was unexpectedly recalled from Euchaïta in Pontus, whither he had been banished, and was (A.D. 482) restored to his see. His restoration appears to have been part of the policy of Zeno to unite, if possible, all parties; a policy which Peter, whose age and misfortunes appear to have abated the fierceness of his party spirit, was ready to adopt. He consequently subscribed the Henoticon of the emperor, and readmitted the Proterian party to communion on their doing the same. John of Tabenna had meanwhile fled to Rome, where the pope, Simplicius, who, with the Western Church, steadily supported the Council of Chalcedon, embraced his cause, and wrote to the emperor in his behalf. Felix II or III, who succeeded Simplicius (A.D. 483), was equally zealous on the same side. Peter had some difficulty in maintaining his position. In order to recover the favor of his Monophysite friends, whom his subservience to Zeno's policy had alienated, he anathematized the Council of Chalcedon; and then, to avert the displeasure of Acacius of Constantinople and of the court, to whose temporizing course this decisive step was adverse, he denied that he had done so. Evagrius has preserved the letter he wrote to Acacius on this occasion, which is the only writing of Peter now extant. By this tergiversation he preserved his see, and was enabled to brave the repeated anathemas of the Western Church. When, however, to recover the attachment of the Monophysites, he again anathematized the Council of Chalcedon, and Euphemius, the newly elected patriarch of Constantinople, forsaking the policy of his predecessors, took part with the Western Church against him, his difficulties became more serious. What result this combination against him might have produced cannot now be known; death removed him from the scene of strife A.D. 490, shortly before the death of Zeno. He was succeeded in the see of Alexandria by another Monophysite, Athanasius II. See Cave, *Hist. Litt.* i. 455; Fabricius, *Bibl. Græca*, xi, 336; Le Quien, *Oriens Christianus*, vol. ii, col. 416, etc.; Tillemont, *Mémoires Ecclésiastiques*, vol. xvi.

Peter (*Pierre*), *archbishop* OF NARBONNE, the son of Ameli, was born in the last half of the 12th century. He was at first clerk of Saint-Nazaire of Béziers; canon, chamberlain, grand archdeacon of Narbonne; then elected archbishop in the month of March, 1226. The extermination of the Albigenses having ended the war so long prosecuted against these people, Peter used all his efforts to pacify his diocese. But observing the method practiced in his time, he seized, according to that custom, all the goods which had belonged to the heretics, made all the inhabitants of Narbonne take oath to massacre any one who should dare in the future to separate himself from the Roman orthodoxy, and in order to watch over, discover, and point out all the dissenters, introduced in 1231 into the city of Narbonne the St. Dominican friars. But the Albigenses were conquered, not subdued. An occasion having offered in 1234, the inhabitants rose in insurrection, and drove out their archbishop. Vainly he excommunicated them. In order to return to his metropolis, after about a year's exile, Peter was obliged to descend to conditions. The insurgents imposed upon him, among others, that of expelling from their city the Brother Preachers, and under his eyes, for greater safety, they invaded the convent of these brothers and put them (to flight. Peter dared not recall them. Yet he was a prelate energetic in his designs, courageous in his conduct, who had the temperament of a man of arms, and who oftener faced perils than turned his back upon them. In 1238 he made a campaign against the Moors with Jayme I, king of Aragon, and, according to the *Chronique* of Albéric, he took an active part in the battles fought under the walls of Valence. The following year he raised other troops, and at their head went to drive from Carcassonne Raymond de Tancarvel and some other lords in revolt against the king of France. He was less fortunate in his attempt against Aimeric; the latter drove him from Narbonne in 1242. Finally, in 1243, we see the archbishop Peter making the siege of the château of Montségur, and taking it from the heretics. This was the last exploit of this belligerent prelate. He died at Narbonne May 20, 1245. See *Gallia Christiana*, vol. vi, col. 65; *Hist. Litt. de la France*, xviii, 331; Vaissette, *Hist. du Languedoc*, iii, 352; Albéric, *Chronicon*, ad ann. 1239; Gulielmus de Podio, *Hist. bellor. adversus Albigenses*, c. 39, 40 sq.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xl, 195.

Peter OF NICOMEDIA, an Eastern ecclesiastic, was born in the early part of the 7th century. He was one of the prelates who, with certain deacons and monks, had to clear themselves in the third Constantinopolitan, or sixth œcumenical, council (A.D. 680), from the suspicion of holding the Monothelite heresy, by oath and solemn written confessions of their belief in the orthodox doctrine of two wills in Christ. The confessions were of considerable length, and all exactly alike, and are given in the original Greek with a considerable hiatus; but completely in a Latin version in the *Acta Concilii CPolitani III*, *Actio x.*; or, according to one of the Latin versions of the *Acta* given by Hardouin, in *Actio ix.* See *Concilia*, vol. vi, col. 784, 842, ed. Labbé; vol. iii, col. 1202, 1248, 1537, 1561, ed. Hardouin; Cave, *Hist. Litt.* ad ann. 680, i, 595.

Peter (*St.*) NOLASCO (Sp. *San Pedro Nolasco*), a Romish saint, noted as the founder of "the Order of Our Lady of Mercy," flourished in the first half of the 13th century. He was the son of a noble of Languedoc, and became a convert of St. John de Matha. He was

much cultivated, and greatly esteemed for his learning and application, and was made a tutor of the young king James of Aragon. As the needs of the crusaders called for help from various directions, Peter brought about the formation of the order above referred to. At first it was military, and consisted of knights and gentlemen. The king himself was placed at the head, and his arms served as a device or badge. Soon, however, the order became very popular, and extended itself on all sides. Peter Nolasco was the superior, and spent his life in expeditions to the provinces under the Moors, from which he brought back hundreds of redeemed captives. In time the order changed its character from that of a military to that of a religious institution, and as such exerted a wide influence. Peter himself, when he was old, was taken from his cell by angels, so the legend goes, and borne to and from the altar, where he received the holy Eucharist. In the paintings of the saints he is represented as old, with a white habit, and the shield of king James on his breast. His death is said to have occurred Jan. 15, 1258. (J. H. W.)

St. Peter Nolasco (by Claude de Mellan).

Peter THE PATRICIAN (1) was a Byzantine historian of the 6th century. He was born at Thessalonica, in the province of Macedonia, then included in the prefecture of Illyricum. He settled at Constantinople, where he acquired distinction as a rhetor or advocate, a profession for which his cultivated mind, agreeable address, and natural powers of persuasion were admirably adapted. These qualifications pointed him out to the discernment of the emperor Justinian I as suited for diplomatic life, and he was sent by him (A.D. 534) as ambassador to Amalasuntha, regent of the kingdom of the Ostrogoths. Before arriving in Italy Peter learned the death of the young king Athalaric, the marriage of Amalasuntha and Theodotus, one of the principal chiefs of the Ostrogoths, their exaltation to the throne of Italy, and of their subsequent dissensions and the imprisonment of Amalasuntha. Peter then received instructions to vindicate the cause of the imprisoned queen; but his arrival at Ravenna was speedily followed by the murder of Amalasuntha. Procopius charges Peter with instigating Theodotus to commit the murder, being secretly commissioned to do so by the jealousy of Theodora, Justinian's wife, who held out to him as an inducement to comply with her desire the hope of great advancement. Whether he was an abettor to the crime or not, Peter, in conformity to the orders of Justinian, demanded reparation for it, and declared war against Theodotus. The latter, terrified, commissioned him to convey to Justinian the most humble propositions of peace, and even, if necessary, the offer of his abdication. The last offer only was accepted; but when Peter returned to communicate the will of the emperor to Theodotus, the latter was not disposed to accept it. The king of the Ostrogoths even violated the law of nations by imprisoning the Byzantine ambassadors. Peter and his colleague remained in captivity until Belisarius, by detaining some Ostrogothic ambassadors, compelled Vitiges, who had succeeded Theodotus, to release him about the end of A.D. 538. On his return Peter received, as Procopius intimates, by Theodora's interest, and as a reward for his participation in procuring Amalasuntha's death, the high appointment of *magister officiorum*, but incurred general odium by the part he had acted. He exercised his authority with the most unbridled rapacity; for although he was, according to Procopius, naturally of a mild temper, and by no means insolent, he was at the same time the most dishonest of all mankind, κλεπτίστατος δὲ ἀνθρώπων ἁπάντων. Several years afterwards (about A.D. 550) Peter, who retained his post of *magister officiorum*, and had in addition acquired the dignity of patrician, was sent by Justinian to negotiate a peace with Chosroës I, king of Persia. Some negotiations with pope Vigilius (552), and a new mission into Persia (562), are the last events known of the career of Peter the Patrician. He died soon after his return from Persia, leaving one son, who succeeded him in his office of *magister officiorum*. According to Suidas, Peter composed two works, *Historiæ* and *De Statu Reipublicæ*. The *Historiæ* began with Augustus, or rather with the second triumvirate, and continued to a period a little later than the time of Constantine the Great. Considerable portions of it are preserved in the *Excerpta de Legationibus*, made by order of the emperor Constantine Porphyrogenitus. The treatise *De Statu Reipublicæ* is lost, although Mai thinks he recognises it in *De Republica*, from which he has deciphered and published long passages in his *Scriptorum Veterum Nova Collectio*. Authentic fragments from the treatise of Peter are found in the *De Cæremoniis Aulæ Byzantinæ* of Constantine Porphyrogenitus. Peter the Patrician has given a relation of his negotiations with Chosroës, which is quoted by Menander. All the remains of this historian are given in the Bonn edition of the *Excerpta de Legationibus*. See Fabricius, *Bibliotheca Græca*, vi, 135; vii, 538; viii, 33; Reiske, *Præfatio*, c. ii, to the *De Cæremoniis* of Constantine Porphyrogenitus; Niebuhr, *De Historicis quorum Reliquiæ hoc Volumine continentur*, in the *Excerpta de Legat.* ed. of Bonn; Mai, *De Fragmentis Politicis Petri Magistri*, in the *Script. Veterum Nova Collec.* ii, 571 sq.; Smith, *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. and Mythol.* iii, 226; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xl, 182.

Peter THE PATRICIAN (2) was a Greek saint who lived early in the 9th century. He had fought in the battle (A.D. 811) against the Bulgarians in which the emperor Nicephorus I was defeated and slain. A life of Peter, taken from the *Menæa* of the Greeks, is given in the original Greek, with a Latin version, and a *Commentariolus Prævius* by Joannes Pinius, in the *Acta Sanctorum* (July), i, 289, 290.

Peter THE PATRICIAN (3), a Greek, different from the foregoing, and belonging to a somewhat later period. He presented to the emperor Leo VI Sapiens, who began to reign A.D. 886, a copy of Theodoret's

Curatio Græcarum Adfectionum, to which he prefixed an *Epigramma*, which is printed at length by Lambecius in his *Commentarius de Biblioth. Cæsaræa.*

Peter (*Pierre*) OF POITIERS, was a modern Latin poet, who died after 1141. All that we learn of his life is that, having made a profession of the rule of St. Benedict in a monastery of Aquitaine, he was chosen by Peter the Venerable as secretary, and accompanied him first to Clugny, in 1134, then to Spain in 1141. His principal works are poems in elegiac verse, which, for verses of the 12th century, lack neither fluency nor elegance. Yet Peter the Venerable surpasses even the limit of hyperbole when he compares these verses with those of Horace and Virgil. The poems of Peter of Poitiers have been collected by the editors of the *Biblioth. de Cluni.* We find in the same collection, among the letters of Peter the Venerable, three letters written to this abbé by his secretary. A fourth letter from Peter of Poitiers to Peter the Venerable, published by Martène in his *Amplissima Collectio* (ii, 11), contains this curious information, that Peter of Poitiers, being in Spain, contributed some part to the translation of the Koran demanded by the abbé of Clugny. See *Hist. Litt. de la France*, xii, 349.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xl, 187.

Peter REGULATO (*St.*), a mediæval saint, appears in the later Italian and Spanish paintings of the Franciscans, to whose order he belonged. He is noted in ecclesiastical annals for his "sublime gift of prayer." He died March 30, 1456.

Peter OF REMIGIUS, also known as *Petrus Cellensis*, flourished in the fourth quarter of the 12th century as abbot of St. Remigius, and afterwards as bishop of Chartres. He published his *Opera*, containing *Sermones, Liber de panibus, Mosaici tabernaculi mystica et moralis expositio, De conscientia, De disciplina claustrali, Epistolarum libri ix* (in *Bibl. Max. Patr.* xxiii, 636), *Tractatus de disciplina claustrali* (D'Achery, *Spicil.* i, 452), *Epistolarum libri ix* (Sirmondi *Opera Varia*, iii, 659).

Peter OF SEBASTE, an Eastern prelate, was born at Cæsarea, in Cappadocia, before A.D. 349. He was the youngest of the ten children of Basil and Emmelia, who numbered among their children those eminent fathers of the Church, Basil the Great and Gregory of Nyssa. Peter's early education was conducted by his sister, St. Macrina, who, in the emphatic phrase of Gregory of Nyssa, "was everything to him—father, teacher, attendant, and mother." The quickness of the boy enabled him readily to acquire anything to which his attention was directed; but his education appears to have been conducted on a very narrow system, profane learning being disregarded. If, however, his literary culture was thus narrowed, his morals were preserved pure; and if he fell short of his more eminent brothers in variety of attainments, he equalled them in holiness of life. The place of his education appears to have been a nunnery at Annesi, or Annesa, on the river Iris, in Pontus, established by his mother and sister; and with them, or in the monastery which his brother Basil had established on the other side of the river, much of his life was passed. In a season of scarcity (A.D. 367, 368 ?), such was his benevolent exertion to provide for the destitute, that they flocked to him from all parts, and gave to the thinly peopled neighborhood in which he resided the appearance of a populous town. His mother's death appears to have occurred about the time of Basil's elevation to the bishopric of the Cappadocian Cæsarea, about A.D. 370; soon after which, apparently, Peter received from Basil ordination to the office of presbyter, probably of the Church of Cæsarea; for Basil appears to have employed his brother as his confidential agent in some affairs. A passage of Theodoret (*H. E.* iv, 30) shows that he took an active part in the struggle carried on during the reign of Valens by the bishops of the orthodox party against Arianism. It was probably after the death both of Basil and Macrina, about the year 380, as Tillemont judges, that Peter was raised to the bishopric of Sebaste (now Siwas), in the Lesser Armenia. His elevation preceded the second general council, that of Constantinople, A.D. 380-381, in which he took part. In what year he died is not known, but it was probably after A.D. 391, and certainly before the death of his brother, Gregory of Nyssa (who survived till A.D. 394, or later), for Gregory was present at Sebaste at the first celebration of his brother's memory, i. e. the anniversary of his death, which occurred in hot weather, and therefore could not have been in January or March, where the martyrologies place it. The only extant writing of Peter is a letter prefixed to the *Contra Eunomium Libri* of Gregory of Nyssa, and published with the works of that father. It is entitled *Sancti Patris nostri Petri Episcopi Sebasteni ad S. Gregorium Nyssenum suum Epistola.* Peter does not appear to have been ambitious of authorship, and probably felt the disqualification arising from his restricted education. Some of the works of his brother Gregory were, however, written at his desire, such as the above-mentioned treatises against Eunomius and the *Explicatio Apologetica in Hexaëmeron.* The *De Hominis Opificio* is also addressed to him by Gregory, who, both in this treatise and in the *Explicatio in Hexaëmeron*, speaks of him in the highest terms. See Greg. Nyssen. *De Vita S. Macrinæ;* Basil, *Maritimis Episcopis Epistola*, cciii, ed. Bened.; Tillemont, *Mémoires*, ix, 572, Le Quien, *Oriens Christianus*, vol. i, col. 424; Cave, *Hist. Litt.* ad ann. 370, i, 246.

Peter (*Pierre*), *prior of St. John* OF SENS, was born in the latter part of the 11th century. In 1111, Stephen, provost of the church of Sens, having resolved to restore the ancient monastery of Saint-Jean, called to it some regular canons, and confided the government of this house to our Peter. The authors of the *Gallia Christiana* give the highest praise to the knowledge and piety of this prior. He died after 1144. We have several of his *Letters*, published by Du Saussay in his *Annales de l'Église d'Orléans*, and by Severt, in his *Chronique des Archevêques de Lyon.* Peter is, besides, considered the author of several letters of kings, princes, and bishops, who had required, in delicate affairs, the aid of his experienced pen. See *Gallia Christ.* xii, col. 195; *Hist. Litt. de la France*, xii, 230.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xl, 188.

Peter THE SICILIAN, an Italian prelate, was born in Sicily near the beginning of the 9th century. In order to escape the persecution of the Saracens, who ruled in Sicily, he went to Byzantium in 830, and there spent a large part of his life. He gained the friendship of the emperor Basil, and the princes Constantine and Leo, his sons, who provided him with ecclesiastical benefices. He was sent by the emperor to Tabrica, in the district or on the frontier of Melitene, near the Euphrates, to negotiate an exchange of Christian prisoners, apparently with the chiefs of the Paulicians, a purpose which, after a residence of nine months, he effected. We have of his works, *Petri Siculi, humillimi Argivorum Episcopi, Funebris Oratio in B. Athanasium, Methones Episcopum.* It is given in the Latin version of the Jesuit Franciscus Blanditius, in the *Acta Sanctorum* of the Bollandists (January), ii, 1125, etc.:—*Petri Siculi Historia de vana et stolida Manichæorum Hæresi tanquam Archiepiscopo Bulgarorum nuncupata.* This account of the Paulicians was translated into Latin, and published by Matthæus Raderus (Ingoldstadt, 1604, 4to), and has been reprinted in various editions of the *Bibliotheca Patrum.*

There was another bishop of Argos of the name of Peter, author of *Eulogium Cosmæ et Damiana SS. Anargyrorum in Asia s. Oratio in sanctos et gloriosos Anargyros et Thaumaturgos Cosmum et Damianum*, which has never been printed.—Smith, *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. and Mythol.* iii, 222; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xl, 183.

Peter THE SINGER (*Pierre le Chanteur*), a French

theologian, was born in Beauvoisis near the beginning of the 12th century. The place of his birth is strongly controverted, and certain authors assert that he was born in Paris or Rheims. It is probable that, educated by the care of Henry of France, brother of the king Louis le Jeune, and bishop of Beauvais in 1149, he followed him to Rheims when he was raised to that seat in 1162. Peter went afterwards to Paris, where he taught theology, and became grand chorister of the cathedral, a dignity which gained him the surname under which he was known (1184). Elected in 1191 bishop of Tournay, he saw his election broken for want of form, and was in 1196 called to the episcopal seat of Paris, but without being more fortunate this time. He was supplanted by Eudes de Sully. The pope charged him to preach the crusade in France; but Peter, weakened by disease, confided this care to Foulques, curé of Neuilly-sur-Marne, his disciple, and died in the garb of a monk at Longpont, Sept. 22, 1197, when he had just been elected dean of Rheims. Of his numerous writings a single one has been published under the title of *Verbum abbreviatum*, because it commences with these words (Mons, 1639, 4to). See *Hist. Litt.* xv, 283–303; Muldrac, *Hist. de l'Abb. de Longpont;* Dupin, *Auteurs Ecclés. du Treizième Siècle.*—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gén.* xl, 192.

Peter THE STAMMERER. See PETER MONGUS.

Peter (*St.*) OF TARENTAISE, a French prelate, was born in 1102 at Saint-Maurier de l'Exile, diocese of Vienne. He was one of the first monks of the abbey founded in 1117 at Bonnevaux by Gui de Bourgogne, archbishop of Vienne. The abbé Jean, his superior, sent him in 1132 to found in Savoy the abbey of Tamié, which he governed for ten years, at the end of which he was called, by the advice of St. Bernard, to the bishopric of Tarentaise, now Moutiers (1142). After having worked thirteen years to repress grave disorders in this diocese, Peter went in 1155 to conceal himself in a monastery of his order in Germany, where he hoped to live unknown; but he was soon discovered, and constrained to return to his Church. He employed himself fortunately in extinguishing the war which had arisen between Humbert III, count of Savoy, and Alphonse Taillefer, son of Alphonse Jourdain, count of Toulouse; and, although a vassal of the emperor Frederick, he sustained the part of pope Alexander III without quarrelling with that prince. This pope brought him to Italy, where he acquired great influence, and employed him to negotiate peace between the young Henry, crowned king of England, and king Henry his father. Peter died May 3, 1174, at Belleveaux, diocese of Besançon. The Church honors his memory May 8, Celestin III having canonized him in 1191. See Fontenay, *Hist. de l'Église Gallic.* vol. ix; *Acta Sanctorum*, May; Baillet, *Vies des Saints*, 8 Mai; Lenain, *Hist. de Citeaux*, ii, 83.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xl, 139.

Peter (*Pierre*) TUDEBODE, a French chronicler, was born at Civray (Poitou) near the beginning of the 11th century. Like so many other priests who engaged in the first crusade, he departed in 1096 with Hugues de Lusignan, lord of Civray; his two brothers, Hervé and Arnaud, chevaliers (*optimi milites*), took the cross at the same time with himself, and were both killed in the East. Peter was present at the siege of Nice, and followed Bohemond when the crusaders were divided into three different bodies. He shared equally the fatigues that the long siege of Antioch cost the Christians, and assisted at the taking of Jerusalem. After that period no more mention is made of him. He died at the close of the year 1099. "The history of the first crusade which he has left," says Dom Rivet, "carries with it all the characteristics of an authentic, true, and sincere writing. He had been present at almost all that he relates, and seems to have written it upon the spot. . . . Raimond d'Agiles has made use of it. There is found so much conformity between these two historians that one can scarcely believe that they did not communicate their productions to each other." This narrative is given in a simple but rude style; it is divided into five books (1096–1099), and is entitled *Historia de Hierosolymitano itinere;* the most correct edition is that by Duchesne, in vol. iv of the *Historiens de France.* See *Hist. Litt. de la France*, viii, 629–640. — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xl, 187.

Peter THE VENERABLE, also called *Mauritius*, a mediæval character of note, was born in 1092 or 1094. He was educated at the Cistercian abbey at Soucilanges, and soon after the completion of his theological training was made prior of the convent at Vezelay, then at Domeine, and in 1122 abbot of Clugny. Petrus Venerabilis was more or less mixed with all the important ecclesiastical transactions of the 12th century. He took in the schism of 1130 the side of pope Innocent XI; and especially played a great part in the discussions between Bernard of Clairvaux and Abelard. His works, written with more ease than talent, have not yet been published in a collected form. He died, at Christmas, in 1157 (see *Bibl. Patr. Despont*, vol. xxii). His publications are, *Sermones* (in Martène et Durand, *Thesaur.* Nov. 5, 1419):—*Nucleus de sacrificio missæ* (Hittorpius, 1091):—*Libri ii adversus nefariam sectam Saracenorum* (in Martène et Durand, *Collectio*, ix, 1120). His life was written by the monk Rudolph, his disciple: *Vita Petri Venerabilis, abbatis Cluniacensis* (*ibid.* vi, 1187). See Hook, *Eccles. Biog.* viii, 59; Schröckh, *Kirchengesch.* vol. xxvii; Wilkins, *Peter der Ehrwürdige* (Leipsic, 1857). (J. H. W.)

Peterffi, CHARLES, a Hungarian Jesuit, was born towards the close of the 17th century. He was descended from a noble family. Admitted among the Jesuits in 1715, he taught belles-lettres at Tyrnau and philosophy at Vienna. He died Aug. 10, 1746. He made himself known by a valuable collection, *Sacra concilia in regno Hungariæ celebrata, ab a.* 1016 *usque ad a.* 1715 (Vienna, 1742, fol.), in which a good method and the variety of research are to be admired. See Feller, *Dict. Hist.* — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxxix, 691.

Peter-Löw, CHRISTIAN, a convert from Judaism, flourished in the first half of the 18th century for several years as professor of Oriental languages at the University of Upsala. He wrote, in the Swedish language, *Speculum religionis Judaicæ*, which, in fifty-eight chapters, treats of the Jewish festivals, rites, circumcision, dogmas, resurrection, etc. — Fürst, *Bibl. Jud.* iii, 80; Wolf, *Bibl. Hebr.* iv, 966; *Niedersächsische Nachrichten* (Hamburg, 1731), p. 666 sq.; and *Leipziger Gelehrte Zeitung* (Leips. 1731), p. 884, where a full index to all the chapters is given. (B. P.)

Peter-pence is the annual tribute of one penny from every Roman Catholic family, paid at Rome at a festival of the apostle Peter. It is offered to the Roman pontiff in reverence of the memory of St. Peter, of whom that bishop is believed to be the successor. From an early period the Roman see had been richly endowed; and although its first endowments were chiefly local, yet as early as the days of Gregory the Great large estates were held by the Roman bishops in Campania, in Calabria, and even in the island of Sicily. The first idea, however, of an annual tribute appears to have come from England, and is by some ascribed to Ina (A.D. 721), king of the West Saxons, who went as a pilgrim to Rome, and there founded a hospice for Anglo-Saxon pilgrims, to be maintained by an annual contribution from England; by others, to Offa and Ethelwulf, at least in the sense of their having extended it to the whole of the Saxon territory. But this seems very uncertain; and although the usage was certainly long anterior to the Norman conquest, Dr. Lingard is disposed not to place it earlier than the time of Alfred. The tribute consisted in the payment of a silver penny by every family possessing land or cattle of the yearly value of thirty pence, and was collected in the five weeks be-

tween St. Peter's and St. Paul's Day and Aug. 1. In the time of king John, the total annual payment was £199 8*s.*, contributed by the several dioceses in proportion, an account of which will be found in Lingard's *History of England*, ii, 330. The tax called *Romescot*, with some variation, continued to be paid till the reign of Henry VIII, when it was abolished. Pope Gregory VII sought to establish the Peter-pence for France; and other partial or transient tributes are recorded from Denmark, Sweden, Norway, and Poland. This tribute, however, is quite different from the payments made annually to Rome by the kingdoms which were held to be feudatory to the Roman see—as Naples, Aragon, England under the reign of John, and several other kingdoms, at least for a time."—Chambers. The pope having suffered a considerable diminution of his own revenue since the revolution of 1848, an effort has been made in several parts of Europe to revive this practice. In some countries it has been very successfully carried out, and the proceeds have been among the chief of the resources of Pius IX, as he has steadfastly refused to accept any support from the new kingdom of Italy, since his temporalities were merged in it. See Thompson, *Papal Power* (N. Y. 1877, 12mo); Riddle, *Hist. of the Papacy;* Hefele, *Conciliengesch.* vol. v; Ranke, *Hist. of the Papacy in the 16th and 17th Centuries*, i, 21, 37, 230; Inett, *Ch. Hist. of England* (see Index).

Peter's (St.) **Day** (June 29) is a festival observed in the Roman Catholic Church. Its origin has been traced back to the 3d century. In 348 Prudentius mentions that the pope celebrated the Holy Communion in both St. Peter's and St. Paul's churches at Rome on this festival, which in the 6th century was observed at Constantinople, and was kept, until the Reformation, associated with the name of St. Paul, whose conversion was not generally commemorated on Jan. 25 until the 12th century. Cathedra Sancti Petri is a commemoration virtually of SS. Peter and Paul, but its title is the Chair of St. Peter, wherein he first sat at Rome, Jan. 18. On Feb. 22 his chair at Antioch is commemorated.

Peters, Absalom, D.D., a Congregational minister, was born at Wentworth, N. H., Sept. 19, 1793, and was educated at Dartmouth College, class of 1816, and for the ministry at Princeton Seminary, class of 1819. He was the son of general Absalom Peters, a descendant of William, of Boston, brother of the noted Hugh Peters. In 1819 he was made a missionary in Northern New York, but in the following year became pastor of the First Church, Bennington, Vt., where he remained until Dec. 14, 1825. After this he was successively secretary of the Home Missionary Society until 1837, and editor of the *Home Missionary and Pastor's Journal;* and in 1838 began to edit the *American Biblical Repository.* He was professor of pastoral theology and homiletics in the Union Theological Seminary, New York, from 1842 to 1844, and pastor of the First Church, Williamstown, Mass., from 1844 to 1857. Here he originated and edited the *American Eclectic* and the *American Journal of Education*, which was afterwards merged in that of Dr. Henry Barnard. When past seventy he published a volume of poems. He died at New York May 18, 1869. During his long life he was never ill. He is the author of *A Plea for Voluntary Societies:—Sprinkling the Only Mode of Baptism*, etc.:—*Sermon against Horse-racing* (1822):—*Sacred Music* (1823):—*Colleges, Religious Institutions* (1851).

Peters, Charles, a learned English divine, was born in Cornwall near the close of the 17th century, and was educated at Exeter College, Oxford. On entering into orders he obtained the living of Boconoc. In 1727 he was made rector of St. Mabyn, Cornwall, where he died, at a very advanced age, in 1777. In his dissertation on the book of Job he displayed a deep knowledge of Hebrew, and great power of argument against Warburton. The work, which is valuable, is entitled *A critical Dissertation on the Book of Job, wherein the Account given of that Book by the Author of the Divine Legation of Moses demonstrated* [Warburton] *is particularly considered, the Antiquity of the Book vindicated, the great Text* (*xix*, 25) *explained, and a future State shown to have been the popular Belief of the ancient Jews* (2d ed. corrected, Lond. 1757, 8vo):—*An Appendix to the critical Dissertation on the Book of Job, giving a further Account of the Book of Ecclesiastes; to which is added a Reply to some Notes of the late D—n of B—l, in his new Edition of the Divine Legation, vol. ii, pt. ii, by the Author of the Critical Dissertation* (Lond. 1760). There are also extant *Sermons*, published from his MSS. by his nephew, Jon. Peters, M.A., vicar of St. Clement's, near Truro, Cornwall (Lond. 1776, 8vo). (J. H. W.)

Peters, Hugh, an English divine, who came to this country in the colonial days, and is noted both as a preacher and politician, was born at Fowey, Cornwall, Eng., in 1599. He was educated at Trinity College, Cambridge, where he graduated in 1622; then entered the ministry, and preached successfully at St. Sepulchre's, London, until he was silenced for nonconformity, and imprisoned. As soon as liberated he went to Rotterdam, and became pastor of the Independent Church in that place. In 1635 he resigned and sailed for New England, where he arrived Oct. 6, and was installed Dec. 21, 1636, pastor of the First Church, Salem, as successor to Roger Williams, whose doctrines he disclaimed and whose adherents he excommunicated. He was also active in civil and mercantile affairs, suggesting coasting and foreign voyages, and the plan of the fisheries. In March, 1638, he was appointed by the General Court to assist in collecting and revising the colonial laws, and having been chosen to "represent the sense of the colony upon the laws of excise and trade," he sailed for England Aug. 3, 1641. He became in 1643 a preacher in the Parliamentary army, in which capacity he was present at the siege of Lynn and the capture of Bridgewater. For his services he was largely rewarded, and in 1653 was one of the committee of legal reform appointed by Parliament. In 1658 he was chaplain to the garrison at Dunkirk. After the Restoration Peters, being suspected of some complicity with the death of the king, was committed to the Tower, and indicted for high-treason Oct. 13, 1660. He was convicted and executed Oct. 16, 1660. During his imprisonment he wrote several letters of advice to his daughter, subsequently (1717) published under the title of *A dying Father's last Legacy to an only Child.* His private character has been the subject of much discussion both in England and America. He was charged by his enemies with gross immorality, and the most bitter epithets were applied to him by bishops Burnet, Kennet, and others; but of late years he has been estimated more favorably. He published also *God's Doings and Man's Duty, opened in a Sermon preached before the House of Commons, the Lord Mayor, and the Assembly of Divines* (1646):—*Peters's last Report of the English Wars, occasioned by the Importunity of a Friend pressing an Answer to some Queries* (1646):—*A Word for the Army and Two Words for the Kingdom, to Clear the One and Cure the Other, forced in much Plainness and Brevity from their faithful Servant, Hugh Peters* (1647):—*A Good Work for a Good Magistrate, or a Short Cut to a Great Quiet* (1651):—*Some Notes of a Sermon preached on the 14th of October*, 1660, *in the Prison of Newgate, after his Condemnation* (1660). See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, i, 70; Drake, *Dict. of Amer. Biogr.* s. v.

Peters, Richard, D.D., a Protestant Episcopal clergyman of colonial days, was born at Liverpool, England, where he was educated as a clergyman of the Church of England, and came to Philadelphia in 1735. His services were soon engaged at Christ's Church, for which he was licensed by the bishop of London. He shortly resigned, and then held an important Church

agency, and also became secretary to a succession of governors. In May, 1749, he became a member of the provincial council, but in 1762 he resigned all civil offices and was made one of the ministers of the United Church; was afterwards chosen their rector, and in 1764 went to England to receive his license in due form. On his return he resumed his duties. He resigned in 1775, and died July 10, 1776. He published a *Sermon on Education* (1751). See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, v, 88; Dorr, *Hist. of the Christ. Church*, vol. i.

Peters, Samuel Andrew, D.D., LL.D., an eccentric Protestant Episcopal clergyman, was born at Hebron, Conn., Nov. 20, 1735, and passed A.B. in Yale, 1757, when he went to England for ordination. He returned in 1759, and in 1762 took charge of the Church at Hebron, where he continued for many years. During the Revolution, being a Tory, he retired first to Boston, and soon sailed to England, as his imprudence and loyalty to the English cause made him very obnoxious. Of course his royal master rewarded his fidelity by a pension and a grant of confiscated lands. In 1781 he published a general history of Connecticut, which has been called "the most unscrupulous and malicious of lying narratives." Its narrations are independent of time, place, and probability. In 1794 he was chosen bishop of Vermont, but he was never consecrated. After being struck off the pension roll by William Pitt, he returned home in 1805, and spent his years in useless petitions to Congress for lands granted to Jonathan Carver, the Indian traveller. In 1817 he journeyed westward, and in 1818 returned to New York, where he lived in obscurity and poverty until his death, April 19, 1826. He is the "Parson Peter" of Trumbull's *M'Fingal*. Peters published, *A General History of Connecticut, by a Gentleman of the Province* (Lond. 1781):—*A Letter on the Possibility of Eternal Punishments*, etc. (ibid. 1785):—and *The History of Rev. Hugh Peters*, etc. (ibid. 1807). See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, v, 191.

Peters, William, an English clergyman, who flourished in the latter part of the 18th century, distinguished himself especially as a painter. He was a man of wit, and possessed a lively imagination and great conversational powers, which made him a favorite. Having a passion for painting, he practiced it first as an amusement, and, by associating much with the eminent artists of the time, he greatly improved his manner, and produced many beautiful works which were greatly admired. He painted for the Shakespeare Gallery scenes from that author's dramatic works; also several pictures for Macklin's Gallery, as the *Resurrection of a Pious Family; the Guardian Angels and the Spirit of a Child; the Cherubs*, etc., all of which were very popular. He executed many fancy subjects from his own imagination, which are pleasingly sentimental. He was much patronized by the nobility, and he sometimes painted subjects not strictly in accordance with just notions of propriety. His pictures are well composed, and his coloring rich and harmonious, with an admirable *impasto*, in which he imitated Reynolds. Many of his works were engraved by Bartolozzi, Thew, Simon, Smith, Marcuard, and others. He is generally called the Rev. W. Peters. The duke of Rutland was his chief patron, and presented him with a valuable living. The bishop of Lincoln gave him a prebendal stall in his cathedral. He died in 1814.

Petersen, Johann Wilhelm, a German writer noted for his theological studies, and his heresies in certain branches of Christian doctrine, was born July 1, 1649, at Osnabrück, was educated at Lubeck in the preparatory branches, and studied theology at the universities of Giessen, Rostock, Leipsic, Wittenberg, and Jena. He then lectured for a while at Giessen, preached at Lubeck, and finally accepted a professorship at the university in Rostock. He had written a poem satirizing the Jesuits; they in turn had made it so uncomfortable for him at Lubeck that he went to Rostock, but also here, and at Hanover later, they followed him with their opposition and invectives, and in 1678 he gladly accepted the superintendency of the churches at Eutin. In 1688 he became superintendent at Lüneburg, but did not remain long, as differences sprang up between him and the pastors. In 1692 he was deposed, on the ground that he espoused chiliastic ideas. He now purchased a farm near Zerbst, and died in retirement, Jan. 31, 1727. His last years were spent in the advocacy of chiliastico-pietistic opinions, and he wrote much for that purpose. A list of all his writings is given in his autobiography (1717). This book is valuable, as it indicates the sources whence the pietism of Spener and Francke drew its strength. We must not be understood, however, to say that Spener's pietism depended on Petersen, but simply that Petersen and Spener had much in common, and that the former, by his influence and acceptance of pietistic views, strengthened Spener's hands. Petersen seems to have misapprehended Spener, and to have gone farther than he. Thus, for example, Petersen, misunderstanding Spener's doctrine concerning "better times to come" [see Eschatology; Spener], and the realization of God's kingdom on earth, announced the speedy approach of the millennial reign, and, for the sake of accommodation, even adopted the final restoration theories of Origen (q. v.), with which he became acquainted, as he tells us, in the writings of the English fanatic Jane Leade (q. v.). His wife adopted these views also, and became a propagator of this heresy and the notion of a universal *apocatastasis*. But the doctrine, though it pleased many by limiting the eternity of punishment, and some who had almost strayed from the Church beyond hope of regaining their former hold on Christ and his Church, yet met with almost universal rejection, because it obliged its advocates to embrace a physical process of redemption, or at least one which was not brought about by the Word of Christ. A train of thought which was the germ of the *Terministic* controversy of 1698–1710 might well lead farther. It had been usual so to identify the day of grace with the duration of earthly life as to allow no hope beyond it, and also to regard the term of grace as unexpired while life lasted. Though the original foundation of this opinion was a serious view of the importance of earthly life, it was yet capable of being made the basis of that levity which would delay repentance till the approach of death. To put a stop to this notion, Böse, with whom Rechenberg (q. v.) agreed, upheld the tenet that there is, even in this life, a peremptory termination of grace. This cannot depend upon so external a matter as time, but upon the inward maturity of the decision for or against Christ. Grace is taken from those who have repeatedly refused it, and the justification formerly pronounced is withdrawn. See, however, the art. Grace. To Petersen's adoption of a millennium and a universal restoration, he added, thirdly, faith in the continuation of supernatural inspiration. He was led to this step by a Miss Rosamunda Juliana Von Arnburg, who professed, after her seventh year, to see miraculous visions, especially during prayer, and to experience extraordinary divine revelations. Petersen was acquainted with her after 1691. He boasts that his house had been blessed by her presence as the house of Obed-Edom. He then busied himself with the matter, and composed a work in favor of the lady, in which he sought to establish the divine character of her revelations against all doubt. Besides, Petersen and his wife also claimed to be themselves favored with such illuminations and revelations, and they not unfrequently entertained their superstitious age with extraordinary experiences of a disorganized and infatuated brain. But notwithstanding all his peculiar views, and his too ready credulity, Petersen must be pronounced a noble and pious man. He wrote many hymns, some of which are preserved in German collections to this day. Dippel (q.v.) and Edelmann joined Petersen, though they

differed from him much on doctrinal points. See Hurst's Hagenbach, *Ch. Hist. 18th and 19th Cent.* i, 159 sq.; Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrines*, ii, 370; Dorner, *Hist. of Protestant Theology*, ii, 154; *Lebensbeschreibung* (1719). (J. H. W.)

Peterzano (or **Preterazzano**), Simone, an Italian painter, was, according to Lomazzo, a pupil of Titian, and flourished at Milan in 1591, where he executed some works for the churches, both in oil and fresco. Lanzi says: "On his *Pietà* in S. Fidela he inscribed himself 'Titiani Discipulus;' and his close imitation seems to confirm the truth. He produced several works in fresco, particularly several histories of St. Paul in S. Barnaba. He there seems to have aimed at uniting the expression, the foreshortening, and the perspective of the Milanese to the rich coloring of Venetian artists, noble works if they were thoroughly correct, and if the author had been as excellent in fresco as in oil painting." There is a fine picture by this master of the *Assumption of the Virgin* in the Chiesa di Brera.

Pethach Debaray (פֶּתַח דְּבָרַי) is the title of an excellent Hebrew grammar written in rabbinic characters by an anonymous Spanish author, the first edition of which appeared at Naples in 1492, and not, as is generally believed, at Pesaro in 1507. Another edition, with additions, appeared at Constantinople in 1515, and the same, with corrections by Elias Levita (q. v.), at Venice in 1545. Of the first edition of this valuable grammar only two copies, one at the Vatican Library, and one at Parma, are extant. The *Pethach Debaray* has been edited with Ibn-Ezra's *Moynaim* (Venice, 1546), and together with Haja ben-Sherira's work on dreams, פתרון חלומות (Constantinople, 1515, and often); and, lastly, with Moses Kimchi's (q. v.) grammatical work, *The Journey on the Paths of Knowledge*, מהלך שבילי הדעת. See De Rossi, *Dizionario storico degli autori Ebrei*, p. 262 (Germ. transl. by Hamburger); Wolf. *Bibl. Hebr.* ii, 1412 sq.; Steinschneider, *Bibliographisches Handbuch*, p. 8, No. 75 sq. (Berlin, 1859). (B. P.)

Pethahi'ah (Heb. *Pethachyah'*, פְּתַחְיָה, *freed of Jehovah;* Sept. Φεθεΐα, Ezra x, 23; Φεσσίας, Neh. ix, 5; Φαθαΐα, xi, 24; Φεθείας, 1 Chron. xxiv, 16). The name of three men.

1. The head of the nineteenth course in David's division of the priests (1 Chron. xxiv, 16). B.C. cir. 1020.

2. A Levite, who put away an idolatrous wife at the injunction of Ezra (Ezra x, 23), and joined in the hymn of praise and the covenant with Nehemiah (Neh. ix, 5). B.C. cir. 458.

3. A Hebrew, son of Meshezabeel, of the tribe of Judah, who acted as counsellor of Artaxerxes in matters concerning the Jews (Neh. xi, 24). B.C. cir. 446.

Pe'thor (Heb. *Pethor'*, פְּתוֹר, *opened;* Sept. Φαθουρά; but in Deut. xxiii, 6 Sept. omits), the name of a place in Mesopotamia, on the Euphrates, the native country of Balaam, to which Balak sent for him to come and curse Israel (Numb. xxii, 5; Deut. xxiii, 5). It is supposed to have been near Tiphsah, on the Euphrates, but this is altogether uncertain. See Balaam. The name occurs in the cuneiform inscriptions (q. v.).

Pethu'el (Heb. *Pethuel'*, פְּתוּאֵל, *stamp* or *engraving of God;* but according to others, i. q. מְתוּאֵל, *Methuel'*, i. e. *folk of God;* Sept. Βαθουήλ), the father of the prophet Joel (Joel i, 1). B.C. ante 800.

Petillianists, those who adhered to the party of *Petillian*, the Donatist bishop of Carthage, in his controversy with St. Augustine.

Petit, Samuel, a celebrated French scholar, was born at Nismes in 1594. He studied at Geneva with such success that at the age of seventeen he was admitted to the sacred ministry. Soon after he was raised to the professorship of theology, and of Greek and Hebrew, in that city. He died in 1645. He was a man of vast and profound erudition. He published *Variæ lectiones in S. Scripturam* (in the *Critici Sac.* vol. viii). His other works are, *Miscellaneorum libri ix:—Eclogæ Chronologicæ:—Diatribe de Jure, Principum Edictis*, etc.:—*Diatribe de Dissidiorum Causis, Effectis et Remediis.*

Petit-Didier, Matthew, a learned French prelate of note, was born in Lorraine in 1659. He very early in life entered the Order of the Benedictines, and later became abbot of Senones, and finally bishop of Macra (*in partibus infidelium*). He died in 1728. He is the author of several valuable works, among them, *Traité théologique sur l'autorité et l'infallibilité des Papes* (Avign. 1726, sm. 8vo). This work, asserting the infallibility of the pope, has been attacked by various writers, Romanist as well as Protestant, especially by Lenfant at the end of his *Hist. of the Council of Constance.* He also published several critical, historical, and chronological dissertations on the Scriptures (1689–1728). His brother, Jean Joseph, who was a Jesuit, flourished from 1664 to 1756. See Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliogr.* s. v.; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth.* s. v.

Petition, according to Dr. Watts, is the fourth part of prayer, and includes a desire of deliverance from evil, and a request of good things to be bestowed. On both these accounts petitions are to be offered up to God, not only for ourselves, but for our fellow-creatures also. This part of prayer is frequently called *intercession.* See Prayer.

Petitot, Jean, an eminent French painter in enamel, is noted especially as a Huguenot who spurned all efforts for his conversion, and, notwithstanding the personal intercession for his recall to Romanism on the part of king Louis XIV, died as he lived, a pious Protestant. Petitot was the son of a sculptor and architect, and was born at Geneva in 1607. Being designed for the trade of a jeweller, he was placed under the direction of Bordier, and in this occupation was engaged in the preparation of enamels for the jewelry business. He was so successful in the production of colors that he was advised by Bordier to attempt portraits. They conjointly made several trials, and though they still wanted many colors which they knew not how to prepare for the fire, their attempts had great success. After some time they went to Italy, where they consulted the most eminent chemists, and made considerable progress in their art, but it was in England, whither they removed after a few years, that they perfected it. In London they became acquainted with Sir Theodore Mayern, first physician to Charles I, and an intelligent chemist, who had by his experiments discovered the principal colors proper to be used in enamel, and the means of vitrifying them, so that they surpassed the boasted enamelling of Venice and Limoges. Petitot was introduced by Mayern to the king, who retained him in his service and gave him apartments in Whitehall. He painted the portraits of Charles and the royal family several times, and copied many pictures, after Vandyck, which are considered his finest works. That painter greatly assisted him by his advice, and the king frequently went to see him paint. On the death of Charles, Petitot retired to France with the exiled family. He was greatly noticed by Charles II, who introduced him to Louis XIV. Louis appointed him his painter in enamel, and granted him a pension and apartments in the Louvre. He painted the French king many times, and, among a vast number of portraits, those of the queens Anne of Austria and Maria Theresa. He also occupied himself in making copies from the most celebrated pictures of Mignard and Lebrun. Petitot, dreading the effects of the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, solicited leave, but for a long time in vain, to return to Geneva. Finally the king, determined to save his painter, employed Bossuet to endeavor to convert him to Romanism; in this effort, however, that elo-

quent prelate was wholly unsuccessful. At length Louis permitted him to depart, and, leaving his wife and children in Paris, Petitot proceeded to his native place, where he was soon after joined by his family. Arrived now at eighty years of age, he was sought by such numbers of friends and admirers that he was forced to remove from Geneva, and retire to Vevay, a small town in the canton of Vaud, where he continued to labor till 1691, in which year, while painting a portrait of his wife, he was suddenly attacked by apoplexy, of which he died. For his works of art, see Spooner, *Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts*, s. v.

Petit-Pied, Nicolas (1), a French canonist, was born in Paris Dec. 24, 1627. He was made doctor of the Sorbonne in 1658, and counsellor-clerk in the Châtelet in 1662. He was provided shortly after with the curacy of Saint-Martial in Paris, united later to that of Saint-Pierre-des-Arcis, and finally became under-chorister and canon of the metropolitan church. In 1678, having wished, as dean of the counsellors, to preside in the Châtelet in the absence of the lieutenants, he found a violent opposition among the lay-counsellors, who pretended that the clergy had not the right to preside and to *décaniser*. Upon the complaint of Petit-Pied, March 17, 1682, the authorities interposed a decree which gained for him the cause. The researches which he was obliged to make for the pursuit of this affair furnished him the occasion for composing an excellent *Traité du droit et des prérogatives des ecclésiastiques dans l'administration de la justice séculière* (Paris, 1705, 4to). See *Journ. des Savans*, 1705; Moréri, *Dict. Hist.; Descript. Hist. de l'Église de Paris.*—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxxix, 719.

Petit-Pied, Nicolas (2), a French theologian, nephew of the preceding, was born in Paris Aug. 4, 1665. After having finished with distinction his ecclesiastical studies, he was received doctor of the Sorbonne in 1692, and his reputation caused him to be chosen in 1701 to teach the Holy Scriptures in that celebrated school. Having signed, July 20, 1702, with thirty-nine other doctors, the famous *Cas de conscience*, which was condemned at Rome Feb. 15, 1703, he would not retract, and was therefore exiled to Beaune and deprived of his pulpit. He hastened to join in Holland his friend Quesnel, and remained in that country until 1718, producing each year, for the support of Jansenism, new articles upon the formulary, upon respectful silence, and upon other analogous matters now forgotten. The bull *Unigenitus* found in him a formidable adversary: he fought it in pamphlets, in memoirs, and in more extended works. On his return to France, Petit-Pied passed some time at Troyes, and afterwards went to Paris, where, June 1 and 6, 1719, the faculty of theology and the Sorbonne established him again in his rights as doctor. On the 15th of the same month he was again exiled, and on the 21st a *lettre de cachet* ordered the cancelling of the conclusion of the faculty in his favor. Petit-Pied had established his home and a new kind of Protestant Church in the village of Asnières, near Paris. There he made a trial of the regulations and all the liturgy practiced by the Jansenists in Holland. Renown published astonishing things of him; people hastened there in crowds from the capital, and Asnières soon became another Charenton. Petit-Pied showed himself from that time a more obstinate appellant. M. de Lorraine, bishop of Bayeux, selected him shortly after for his theologian, but on the death of that prelate, June 9, 1728, he retired again to Holland, whence he returned only in 1734. His zeal for Jansenism and the fertility of his pen were not inconsistent in this new exile; but from his return to Paris he led a more tranquil life, and contented himself with composing several works to defend the missal given to his diocese by Bossuet, bishop of Troyes. Petit-Pied died in Paris Jan. 7, 1747. The list of all his works would be too long; Moréri mentions eighty-one. We quote of his works, *Examen théologique de l'instruction pastorale approuvée dans l'assemblée du clergé . . . pour l'acceptation de la bulle* (Paris, 1713, 3 vols. 12mo):—*Examen des faussetés sur le culte Chinois avancées par le P. Jouvency* (ibid. 1714, 12mo):—and *Lettres touchant la matière de l'usure, par rapport aux contrats des rentes rachetables des deux côtés* (Lille, 1731, 4to). He also labored upon the work of Legros, *Dogma Ecclesiæ circa usuram expositum et vindicatum* (Utrecht, 1731, 4to). Sarcastic in his works, Petit-Pied was of a mild, sociable character. See *Dict. hist. des Auteurs Ecclés.* vol. iii; *Journal de Dorsanne, Calendrier ecclésiastique* (ibid. 1757, 12mo); *Nouv. ecclés.* passim; Moréri, *Dict. Hist.*—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxxix, 719.

Petosīris (Πετόσιρις), an Egyptian priest and astrologer, who is generally named along with Nechepsos, an Egyptian king. The two are said to be the founders of astrology, and of the art of casting nativities. Suidas states that Petosiris wrote on the right mode of worshipping the gods, astrological maxims, ἐκ τῶν ἱερῶν βιβλίων (which are often referred to in connection with astrology), and a work on the Egyptian mysteries. But we may infer from a statement made by Vetius Valens, of which the substance is given by Marsham (*Canon Chronicus* [ed. Lips. 1676], p. 479), that Suidas assigns to Petosiris what others attributed partly to him and partly to Nechepsos. For his Ὄργανον Ἀστρονομικόν, or Ψῆφος ρελληνιακή, containing astrological principles for predicting the event of diseases, and for his other writings, Fabricius (*Bibl. Græc.* iv, 160) may be consulted. To the list given by him may be added a translation into Latin by Bede of the astrological letter of Petosiris to Nechepsos, entitled *De Divinatione Mortis et Vitæ* (Bed. *Opera* [ed. Col. Agripp. 1612], ii, 233, 234). His name, as connected with astrology, was in high repute early in Greece, and in Rome in her degenerate days. This we learn from the praises bestowed on him by Manetho (v, 10), who, indeed, in the prologue to the first and fifth books of his *Apotelesmatica*, professes only to expand in Greek the prose rules of Petosiris and Nechepsos ("divini illi viri atque omni admiratione digni"), and from the references of Pliny (*Hist. Nat.* i, 23; vii, 49). But the best proof is the fact that, like our own Lilly, Petosiris became the common name for an astrologer, as we find in Aristophanes, quoted by Athenæus (iii, 114, *c*) in the forty-sixth epigram of Lucilius (Jacobs, *Anthol. Græc.* iii, 38), whence we learn the quantity, and in Juvenal (vi, 580). Marsham has a full dissertation on Nechepsos and Petosiris in the work above quoted (p. 474–481).

Petra (in the earlier Greek writers Πέτρα or ἡ Πέτρα, but in the later αἱ Πέτραι) was the capital of the Nabathæan Arabs in the land of Edom, and seems to have given name to the kingdom and region of *Arabia Petræa*. As there is mention in the Old Testament of a stronghold which successively belonged to the Amorites (Judg. i, 36), the Edomites (2 Kings xiv, 7), and the Moabites (Isa. xvi, 1; comp. in Heb. ch. xlii, 11), and bore in Hebrew the name of סֶלַע, *Sela*, which has the same meaning as *Petra* in Greek, viz. "a rock," that circumstance has led to the conjecture that the Petra of the Nabathæans had been the Sela of Edom. See Selah. This latter name seems, however, to have passed away with the Hebrew rule over Edom, for no further trace of it is to be found; although it is still called Sela by Isaiah (xvi, 1). These are all the certain notices of the place in Scripture. *Arcè* is said by Josephus to have been a name of Petra (*Ant.* iv, 4, 7); but probably we should read Ἀρκήμ for Ἀρκή (yet see *Amer. Bib. Rep.* for 1833, p. 536, note). See Arkite.

1. *History.*—The earliest notice of this place under the name Petra by the Greek writers is connected with the fact that Antigonus, one of Alexander's successors, sent two expeditions against the Nabathæans in Petra (Diod. Sic. xix, 94–98). The first of these, commanded

by Athenæus, and the second by Demetrius, changed the habits of the Nabathæans, who had hitherto been essentially nomadic, and led them to engage in commerce. In this way, during the following centuries, they grew up into the kingdom of Arabia Petræa, occupying very nearly the same territory which was comprised within the limits of ancient Edom. In the first expedition, Athenæus took the city by surprise while the men were absent at a neighboring mart or fair, and carried off a large booty of silver and merchandise. But the Nabathæans quickly pursued him to the number of 8000 men, and, falling upon his camp by night, destroyed the greater part of his army. Of the second expedition, under the command of Demetrius, the Nabathæans had previous intelligence; and prepared themselves for an attack by driving their flocks into the deserts, and placing their wealth under the protection of a strong garrison in Petra; to which, according to Diodorus, there was but a single approach, and that made by hand. In this way they succeeded in baffling the whole design of Demetrius. For points of history not immediately connected with the city, see EDOMITES; NABATHÆANS. Strabo, writing of the Nabathæans in the time of Augustus, thus describes their capital: "The metropolis of the Nabathæans is Petra, so called; for it lies in a place in other respects plain and level, but shut in by rocks round about, yet within having copious fountains for the supply of water and the irrigation of gardens. Beyond the enclosure the region is mostly a desert, especially towards Judæa" (*Geog.* xvi, p. 906). At this time the town had become a place of transit for the productions of the East, and was much resorted to by foreigners (Diod. Sic. xix, 95; Strabo, *l. c.*). Pliny more definitely describes Petra as situated in a valley less than two miles (Roman) in amplitude, surrounded by inaccessible mountains, with a stream flowing through it (*Hist. Nat.* vi, 28). About the same period it is often named by Josephus as the capital of Arabia Petræa (*War*, i, 6, 2; 13, 8; etc.). Petra was situated in the eastern part of Arabia Petræa, in the district called under the Christian emperors of Rome Palæstina Tertia (*Vet. Rom. Itin.* p. 74, ed. Wessel; Malala, *Chronogr.* xvi, 400, ed. Bonn). According to the division of the ancient geographers, it lay in the northern district, Gebalene; while the modern ones place it in the southern portion, Esh-Sherah, the Mount Seir of the Bible. Petra was subdued by A. Cornelius Palma, a lieutenant of Trajan (Dion Cass. lxviii, 14). Hadrian seems to have bestowed on it some advantage, which led the inhabitants to give his name to the city upon coins; several of these are still extant (Mionnet, *Med. Antiques*, v, 587; Eckhel, *Doctr. Num.* ii, 503). It remained under the Roman dominion a considerable period, as we hear of the province of Arabia being enlarged by Septimius Severus, A.D. 195 (ibid. lxxv, 1, 2; Eutrop. viii, 18). It must have been during this period that those temples and mausoleums were made, the remains of which still arrest the attention of the traveller; for, though the predominant style of architecture is Egyptian, it is mixed with florid and overloaded Roman-Greek specimens, which are but slightly modified by the native artists. In the 4th century Petra is several times mentioned by Eusebius and Jerome; and in the Greek ecclesiastical Notitiæ of the 5th and 6th centuries it appears as the metropolitan see of the third Palestine (Reland, *Palæst.* p. 215, 217); the last named of the bishops is Theodorus, who was present at the Council of Jerusalem in A.D. 536 (*Oriens Christ.* iii, 725). From that time not the slightest notice of Petra is to be found in any quarter; and as no trace of it as an inhabited site is to be met with in the Arabian writers, the probability seems to be that it was destroyed in some unrecorded incursion of the desert hordes, and was afterwards left unpeopled. It is true that Petra occurs in the writers of the æra of the Crusades; but they applied this name to Kerak, and thus introduced a confusion as to the true Petra which is not even now entirely removed. It was not until the reports concerning the wonderful remains in *Wady Mûsa* had been verified by Burckhardt that the latter traveller first ventured to assume the identity of the site with that of the ancient capital of Arabia Petræa. He expresses this opinion in a letter dated at Cairo, Sept. 12, 1812, published in 1819, in the preface to his *Travels in Nubia;* but before its appearance the eminent geographer Carl Ritter had suggested the same conclusion on the strength of Seetzen's intimations (*Erdkunde*, ii, 217). Burckhardt's view was more amply developed in his *Travels in Syria*, p. 431, published in 1822, and received the high sanction of his editor, Col. Leake, who produces in support of it all the arguments which have since been relied upon, namely, the agreement of the ancient descriptions with this site, and their inapplicability to Kerak; the coincidence of the ancient specifications of the distances of Petra from the Elanitic gulf and from the Dead Sea, which all point to Wady Mûsa, and not to Kerak; that Josephus, Eusebius, and Jerome testify that the Mount Hor where Aaron died was in the vicinity of Petra; and that to this day the mountain which tradition and circumstances point out as the same still rears its lonely head above the vale of Wady Mûsa, while in all the district of Kerak there is not a single mountain which could in itself be regarded as Mount Hor; and even if there were, its position would be incompatible with the recorded journeyings of the Israelites (Leake's Preface to Burckhardt's *Travels in Syria*, p. vii–ix; Robinson's *Palestine*, ii, 576–579, 653–659).

2. *Description of the present Site.*—The ruined city lies in a narrow valley, surrounded by lofty and, for the most part, perfectly precipitous mountains. Those which form its southern limit are not so steep as to be impassable; and it is over these, or rather through



Map of Petra. (From an original survey.)

them, along an abrupt and difficult ravine, that travellers from Sinai or Egypt usually wind their laborious way into the scene of magnificent desolation. The ancient and more interesting entrance is on the eastern side, through the deep narrow gorge called *the Sik*. It is not easy to determine the precise limits of the ancient city, though the precipitous mountains by which the site is encompassed mark with perfect distinctness the boundaries beyond which it never could have extended. These natural barriers seem to have constituted the real limits of the city; and they give an extent of more than a mile in length, nearly from north to south, by a variable breadth of about half a mile. Several spurs from the surrounding mountains encroach upon this area; but, with inconsiderable exceptions, the whole is fit for building on. The sides of the valley are walled up by perpendicular rocks from four hundred to six or seven hundred feet high. The northern and southern barriers are neither so lofty nor so steep, and they both admit of the passage of camels. A great many small recesses or side valleys open into the principal one, thus enlarging as well as varying almost infinitely the outline. With only one or two exceptions, however, they have no outlet, but come to a speedy and abrupt termination among the overhanging cliffs, as precipitous as the natural bulwark that bounds the principal valley. Including these irregularities, the whole circumference of Petra may be four miles or more. The length of this irregular outline, though it gives no idea of the extent of the area within its embrace, is perhaps the best measure of the extent of the excavations.

The valley of Wady Mûsa, which leads to the ruins, in a general westerly direction, is about one hundred and fifty feet broad at its entrance, and is shut in by cliffs of red sandstone, which gradually increase from a height of forty or fifty feet to two hundred or two hundred and fifty feet. The valley gradually contracts till at one spot it becomes only twelve feet broad, and is so overlapped by the perpendicular cliffs that the light of day is almost excluded. This is the ravine or Sîk of Wady Mûsa, which extends, with many windings, for a good English mile. This valley contains a wonderful necropolis hewn in the rocky walls. The tombs, which adjoin or surmount one another, exhibit now a front with six Ionic columns, now with four slender pyramids, and by their mixture of Greek, Roman, and Oriental architecture remind the spectator of the remains found in the valley of Jehoshaphat near Jerusalem. The entrance of the ravine is spanned by a bold arch, perhaps a triumphal one, with finely sculptured niches evidently intended for statues. This, like the other remains of this extraordinary spot, is ascribed by the natives either to the Pharaohs or to the Jins, i. e. evil genii. Along the bottom of the valley, in which it almost vanishes, winds the stream. In ancient times its bed seems to have been paved; and it appears to have been, in many places at least, covered in, so that the street passed above it. In other wider portions of the ravine, especially where it opens out into the city, it was spanned by frequent bridges, its sides strengthened with stone walls or quays, and numerous small canals derived from it supplied the inhabitants with water. But now its banks are overspread with hyacinths, oleanders, and other shrubs, and the upper portions of it are overshadowed by lofty trees.

Opposite the termination of the Sîk, or narrow part of the ravine, just where it turns at its junction with a second ravine-like but broader valley, stands the chief attraction of the whole place, the finest monument in fact in all Syria. This is the *Khuzneh*—well preserved,



The "Khuzneh" in Petra. (From a photograph by the editor.)

considering its age and site, and still exhibiting its delicate chiselled work, and all the freshness and beauty of its coloring. Like all the other wonders of the place, it is carved out of the face of the perpendicular cliff, which here rises about 150 feet high. It has two rows of six columns over one another (one of the lower ones has fallen), with statues between, surmounted by capitals and a sculptured pediment, the latter divided by a little round temple crowned with an urn. The Arabs imagine that this urn contained treasure (*khuzneh*, hence the name of the entire structure), which they ascribe to Pharaoh. The interior does not correspond with the magnificence of the façade, being a plain, lofty hall, with a chamber adjoining each of its three sides. It was either a mausoleum or, more probably, a temple.

From this spot the cliffs on both sides of the valley are pierced with numerous excavations, the chambers of which are usually small, though the fronts are occasionally of some size and magnificence; scarcely two, however, are exactly alike. After a gentle curve the valley expands still more, and here on its left side lies the theatre, entirely hewn out of the rock. Its diameter at the bottom is one hundred and twenty feet, and it has thirty-three rows of seats, capable of accommodating three thousand spectators. Strangely enough, it is entirely surrounded by tombs. One of the more northerly of these is inscribed with the name of Q. Præfectus Florentinus, probably the governor of Arabia Petræa under Hadrian or Antoninus Pius. Another has a Greek inscription not yet deciphered. Travellers are agreed that these excavations, some of the most striking of which are in the cliff directly opposite the theatre, were mostly tombs, though some think they may originally have served as dwellings. Indeed several

of them have loculi sunk in the floor as if for burial-places. A few were doubtless temples for the worship of Baal, but subsequently converted into Christian churches. They extend all along the eastern cliffs.



The Theatre at Petra.

Proceeding still down the stream, at about one hundred and fifty paces from the theatre the cliffs expand rapidly, and soon recede so far as to give place to a plain about a mile square, surrounded by gentle eminences. The brook, which now turns again to the west, traverses the middle of this plain till it reaches a ledge of sandstone cliffs, through which it pierces, and is lost in the sands of the Arabah. This little plain was the site of the city of Petra, and it is still covered with heaps of hewn stones, traces of paved streets, and foundations of houses.

The chief public buildings occupied the banks of the river and the high ground, especially on the south, as their ruins sufficiently show. One sumptuous edifice remains standing, though in an imperfect and dilapidated state. It is on the south side of the river, near the western side of the valley, and seems to have been a palace rather than a temple. It is called *Kasr Farûn*, or Pharaoh's palace, and is thirty-four paces square. The walls are nearly entire, and on the eastern side they are still surmounted by a handsome cornice. The front, which looks towards the north, was ornamented with a row of columns, four of which are standing. An open piazza behind the colonnade extended the whole length of the building. In the rear of this piazza are three apartments, the principal of which is entered under a noble arch, apparently thirty-five or forty feet high. It is an imposing ruin, though not of the purest style of architecture, and is the more striking as being the only proper edifice now standing in Petra.

A little east of this, and in a range with some of the most beautiful excavations in the mountain on the east side of the valley, are the remains of what appears to have been another triumphal arch. Under it were three passages, and a number of pedestals of columns, as well as other fragments, would lead to the belief that a magnificent colonnade was connected with it. In the same vicinity are the abutments of a massive bridge.

On an eminence south of this is a single column (o! scenely called *Zab Farûn*, i. e. hasta virilis Pharaonis) connected with the foundation walls of a temple, whose pillars lie scattered around in broken fragments, some of them five feet in diameter. Twelve of these, whose pedestals still remain in their places, adorned either side of this stately edifice. There were also four columns in front and six in the rear of the temple. They are prostrate on the ground, and Dr. Olin counted thirty-seven massive frusta of which one of them was composed.

Still farther south are other piles of ruins—columns and hewn stones—parts, no doubt, of important public buildings. The same traveller counted not less than fourteen similar heaps of ruins, having columns and fragments of columns intermingled with blocks of stone, in this part of the site of ancient Petra. They indicate the great wealth and magnificence of this ancient capital, as well as its unparalleled calamities.

These sumptuous edifices occupied what may be called the central parts of Petra. A large surface on the north side of the river is covered with substructions, which probably belonged to private habitations. An extensive region still farther north retains no vestiges of the buildings which once covered it. Public wealth was lavished on palaces and temples, while the houses of the common people were slightly and meanly built, of such materials as a few years, or at most a few centuries, were sufficient to dissolve.

The acropolis is thought to have occupied an isolated hill on the west. The whole ascent of the hills on the south, up which the toilsome passage-way out of this museum of wonders winds, is elaborately pierced with tombs, temples, or dwellings. At the north-west extremity of the cliff surrounding the plain is the *Deir* or cloister, the second most remarkable sculpture of the entire place, hewn likewise out of the face of the rock. A ravine somewhat like the Sîk, with many windings, leads to the base, and the approach up to it is in places by a path five or six feet broad, cut with immense labor in the precipitous rock. Its façade is larger than that of the Khuzneh; but, as in that building (if such we may call it), the interior does not correspond, being merely a large square chamber, with a recess resembling the niche for the altar in Greek ecclesiastical architecture, and bearing evident signs of having been converted from a heathen into a Christian temple. The cliffs on the north-east side of the basin, which here extends up a considerable valley, are in like manner cut into temples, tombs, or other architectural forms of great variety.

Laborde and Linant also thought that they traced the outline of a naumachia or theatre for sea-fights, which would be flooded from cisterns in which the water of the torrents in the wet season had been reserved—a remarkable proof, if the hypothesis be correct, of the copiousness of the water-supply, if properly husbanded, and a confirmation of what we are told of the exuberant fertility of the region, and its contrast to the barren Arabah on its immediate west (Robinson, ii, 169). Stanley (*Syr. and Pal.* p. 95) leaves little doubt that Petra was the seat of a primeval sanctuary, which he fixes at the spot now called the "Deir" or "Convent," and with which fact the choice of the site of Aaron's tomb may, he thinks, have been connected (p. 96). As regards the question of its identity with Kadesh, see KADESH; and, for the general subject, see Ritter, xiv, 69, 997 sq.

Rock-hewn Temple at Petra.

The mountain torrents which at times sweep over the lower parts of the ancient site have undermined many foundations, and carried away many a chiselled stone, and worn many a finished specimen of sculpture into unshapely masses. The soft texture of the rock seconds the destructive agencies of the elements.

Even the accumulations of rubbish which mark the site of all other decayed cities have mostly disappeared; and the extent which was covered with human habitations can only be determined by the broken pottery scattered over the surface or mingled with the sand—the universal, and, it would seem, an imperishable memorial of populous cities that exist no longer. These vestiges, the extent of which Dr. Olin took great pains to trace, cover an area one third as large as that of Cairo, excluding its large gardens from the estimate, and very sufficient, he thinks, to contain the whole population of Athens in its prosperous days.

The attention of travellers has, however, been chiefly engaged by the above-noted excavations, which, having more successfully resisted the ravages of time, constitute at present the great and peculiar attraction of the place. These excavations, whether formed for temples, tombs, or the dwellings of living men, surprise the visitor by their incredible number and extent. They not only occupy the front of the entire mountain by which the valley is encompassed, but of the numerous ravines and recesses which radiate on all sides from this enclosed area. They exist, too, in great numbers in the precipitous rocks which shoot out from the principal mountains into the southern, and still more into the northern part of the site, and they are seen along all the approaches to the place, which, in the days of its prosperity, were perhaps the suburbs of the overpeopled valley. Some of the most peculiar are found in the valley above the entrance of the Sîk. Were these excavations, instead of following all the sinuosities of the mountain and its numerous gorges, ranged in regular order, they probably would form a street not less than five or six miles in length. They are often seen rising one above another in the face of the cliff, and convenient steps, now much worn, cut in the rock, lead in all directions through the fissures and along the sides of the mountains, to the various tombs that occupy these lofty positions. Some of them are apparently not less than from two hundred to three or four hundred feet above the level of the valley. Conspicuous situations, visible from below, were generally chosen; but sometimes the opposite taste prevailed, and the most secluded cliffs, fronting towards some dark ravine, and quite hidden from the gaze of the multitude, were preferred. The flights of steps, all cut in the solid rock, are almost innumerable, and they ascend to great heights, as well as in all directions. Sometimes the connection with the city is interrupted, and one sees in a gorge, or upon the face of a cliff, fifty or a hundred feet above him, a long series of steps rising from the edge of an inaccessible precipice. The action of winter torrents and other agencies have worn the easy ascent into a channel for the waters, and thus interrupted the communication.

The situations of these excavations are not more various than their forms and dimensions. Mere niches are sometimes cut in the face of the rock, of little depth and of various sizes and forms, of which it is difficult to conjecture the object, unless they had some connection with votive offerings and religious rites. By far the largest number of excavations were manifestly designed as places for the interment of the dead; and thus exhibit a variety in form and size, of interior arrangement and external decorations, adapted to the different fortunes of their occupants, and conformable to the prevailing tastes of the times in which they were made. There are many tombs consisting of a single chamber, ten, fifteen, or twenty feet square by ten or twelve in height, containing a recess in the wall large enough to receive one or a few deposits; sometimes on a level with the floor, at others one or two feet above it, and not unfrequently near the ceiling, at the height of eight or ten feet. Occasionally, as above mentioned, oblong pits or graves are sunk in the recesses, or in the floor of the principal apartment.

Interior of a Tomb at Petra.

Some of these are of considerable depth, but they are mostly choked with stones and rubbish, so that it is impossible to ascertain it. In these plebeian tombs there is commonly a door of small dimensions, and an absence of all architectural decorations; in some of larger dimensions there are several recesses occupying two or three sides of the apartment. These seem to have been formed for family tombs. Besides these unadorned habitations of the humble dead, there is a vast number of excavations enriched with various architectural ornaments. To these unique and sumptuous monuments of the taste of one of the most ancient races of men with whom history has made us acquainted, Petra is indebted for its great and peculiar attractions. This ornamental architecture is wholly confined to the front, while the interior is quite plain and destitute of all decoration. Pass the threshold, and nothing is seen but perpendicular walls, bearing the marks of the chisel, without mouldings, columns, or any species of ornament. But the exteriors of these primitive and even rude apartments exhibit some of the most beautiful and imposing results of ancient taste and skill which have remained to our times. The front of the mountain is wrought into façades of splendid temples, rivalling in their aspect and symmetry the most celebrated monuments of Grecian art. Columns of various orders, graceful pediments, broad, rich entablatures, and sometimes statuary, all hewn out of the solid rock, and still forming part of the native mass, transform the base of the mountain into a vast splendid pile of architecture, while the overhanging cliffs, towering above in shapes as rugged and wild as any on which the eye ever rested, form the most striking and curious of contrasts. In most instances it is impossible to assign these beautiful façades to any particular style of architecture. Many of the columns resemble those of the Corinthian order; but they deviate so far, both in their forms and ornaments, from this elegant model, that it would be impossible to rank them in the class. A few are Doric, which are precisely those that have suffered most from the ravages of time, and are probably very ancient.

But nothing contributes so much to the almost magical effect of some of these monuments as the rich and various colors of the rock out of which, or more properly in which, they are formed. The mountains that encompass the vale of Petra are of sandstone, of which red is the predominant hue. Their surface is a good deal burned and faded by the elements, and is of a dull brick color, and most of the sandstone formations in this vicinity, as well as a number of the excavations of Petra, exhibit nothing remarkable in their coloring which does not belong to the same species of rock throughout a considerable region of Arabia Petræa. Many of them, however, are adorned with such a profusion of the most lovely and brilliant colors as it is scarcely possible to describe. Red, purple, yellow, azure or sky-blue, black and white, are seen in the same mass distinctly in successive layers, or blended so as to form every shade and hue of which they are

capable—as brilliant and as soft as they ever appear in flowers, or in the plumage of birds, or in the sky when illuminated by the most glorious sunset. The red perpetually shades into pale, or deep rose or flesh color, and again approaches the hue of the lilac or violet. The white, which is often as pure as snow, is occasionally just dashed with blue or red. The blue is usually the pale azure of the clear sky or of the ocean, but sometimes has the deep and peculiar shade of the clouds in summer when agitated by a tempest. Yellow is an epithet often applied to sand and sandstone. The yellow of the rocks of Petra is as bright as that of saffron. It is more easy to imagine than to describe the effect of tall, graceful columns exhibiting these exquisite colors in their succession of regular horizontal strata. They are displayed to still greater advantage in the walls and ceilings of some of the excavations where there is a slight dip in the strata.

See Irby and Mangles, *Travels*, ch. viii; Robinson, *Bibl. Research.* ii, 512 sq.; Laborde, *Voyage* (Par. 1830–33), p. 55 sq. (this work is chiefly valued for its engravings); Bartlett, *Forty Days in the Desert*, p. 126 sq.; Roberts, *Sketches* (Lond. 1842–48), vol. iii; Olin, *Travels*, ii, 1 sq.; Palmer, *Desert of the Exodus*, p. 366 sq.; Ridgaway, *The Lord's Land*, p. 139 sq.; Porter, in Murray's *Handbook for Sinai and Pal.* p. 81 sq.; Bädecker, *Palästina und Syrien*, p. 304 sq. See IDUMÆA.

Petra, VICENZO, an Italian cardinal, was born at Naples Nov. 13, 1662. He occupied at the court of Rome several considerable positions, and was created cardinal in 1724, then bishop of Prænestе. He enjoyed great influence with popes Innocent XII and Benedict XIII, who often consulted him upon grave affairs. He died at Rome March 24, 1747. He published *De sacra Pœnitentiara Apostolica* (Rome, 1712, 4to), and *Commentaria ad Constitutiones Apostolicas* (Ven. 1729, 4 vols. fol.). See *Nomini illustri del Regno di Napoli.*—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxxix, 730.

Petrarch (Ital. *Petrarca*), FRANCESCO, one of the most celebrated of Italian writers of prose and poetry, deserves a place here because he was for many years a devout and consistent ecclesiastic, and exerted a far-reaching influence on the classical culture of Italy in the later mediæval period known as the Renaissance (q. v.). Petrarch was born at Arezzo, in Tuscany, July 20, 1304. His father, a Florentine notary, had been exiled two years before, in the same disturbance which drove out the poet Dante; and he soon left Italy for Avignon, where the papal court then resided. The son was educated in this French city washed by the Rhone, and at Montpellier, and then sent to study law at Bologna. Though Petrarch certainly loved the Æneid more than the Pandects, and copied ancient manuscripts more willingly than law papers, yet the subsequent course of his public life proves that he did not neglect professional pursuits, and that he prepared himself for being a useful man of business. Returning to Avignon soon after he became of age, he found himself in possession of a small inheritance, and indulged for some years in an alternation of classical studies and political composition, with such gayety (sombre, perhaps, but not the more pure on that account) as the clerical court offered. In the year 1327 he conceived an attachment to an Avignonese lady, young but already married. Some slight obscurity still hangs over his relation to this lady, but it is almost certain that she was no less a paragon of virtue than of loveliness. He met her on April 6, 1327, in the church of St. Clara in Avignon, and at once and forever fell deeply in love with her. The lady was then nineteen, and had been married for two years to a gentleman of Avignon, named Hugues de Sade. For ten years Petrarch lived near her in the papal city, and frequently met her at church, in society, at festivities, etc. He sang her beauty and his love, under the name of his "Laura," in those sonnets whose mellifluous conceits ravished the ears of his contemporaries, and have not yet ceased to charm. The lady, whoever she was, knew how to keep Petrarch at a respectful distance, and for using the only opportunity he had of avowing his love in her presence she so severely reproved him that he never repeated the offence. About 1338 he retired for two or three years to dwell in the beautiful valley of Vaucluse, near Avignon. He himself said that his withdrawal to the retreat which he immortalized was caused by no reason more sentimental or poetic than his disgust with the licentiousness of the papal court, and the disappointment of the hopes of preferment which the pope had held out to him. Long before this time Petrarch's talents and accomplishments had procured for him not only distinguished patronage, but frequent and active employment. A most brilliant honor awaited him at Rome in 1341, where, on Easter-day, he was crowned in the Capitol with the laurel-wreath of the poet. The ceremonies which marked this coronation were a grotesque medley of pagan and Christian representations. Petrarch was, however, as ardent a scholar as he was a poet; and throughout his whole life he was occupied in the collection of Latin MSS., even copying some with his own hand. To obtain these, he travelled frequently throughout France, Germany, Italy and Spain. In 1353 Petrarch returned to Italy, and soon became the trusted counsellor and diplomatic agent of several of his country's rulers. He was sent on missions at home and abroad. He finally settled at Milan, where he spent ten years, and lived for a season also at Parma, Mantua, Padua, Verona, Venice, and Rome. Though he had never entered holy orders, he was rewarded for his faithful services to the state by ecclesiastic benefices in the north of Italy. He might have risen to positions of great influence and rich returns if he had chosen, but he preferred the quiet life of a recluse. In 1370 Petrarch removed to Arquà, a little village prettily situated among the Euganean hills, where he spent his closing years in hard scholarly work, much annoyed by visitors, troubled with epileptic fits, not over rich, but serene in heart, and displaying in his life and correspondence a rational and beautiful piety. He died July 18, 1374. Petrarch was not only far beyond his age in learning, but had risen above many of its prejudices and superstitions. He despised astrology, and the childish medicine of his times; but, on the other hand, he had no liking for the conceited scepticism of the mediæval savans; and in his *De sui ipsius et multorum aliorum Ignorantia* he sharply attacked the irreligious speculations of those who had acquired a shallow, free-thinking habit from the study of the Arabico-Aristotelian school of writers, such as Averroes. Petrarch's Latin works were the first in modern times in which the language was classically written. The principal are his *Epistolæ*, consisting of letters to his numerous friends and acquaintances, and which rank as the best of his prose works: *De Vitis Virorum Illustrium:—De Remediis utriusque Fortunæ:—De Vita Solitaria:—Rerum Memorandarum libri iv:—De Contemptu Mundi*, etc. Besides his prose epistles, he wrote numerous epistles in Latin verse, eclogues, and an epic poem called *Africa*, on the subject of the Second Punic War. It was this last production which obtained for him the laurel-wreath at Rome. Petrarch, whose life was thus active, is immortal in history by reason of more claims than one. He is placed as one of the most celebrated of poets in right of his "Rime," that is, verses in the modern Italian tongue, of which he was one of the earliest cultivators and refiners. Celebrating in these his visionary love, he modelled the Italian sonnet, and gave to it, and to other forms of lyrical poetry, not only an admirable polish of diction and melody, but a delicacy of poetic feeling which has hardly ever been equalled, and a play of rich fancy which, if it often degenerates into false wit, is as often delightfully and purely beautiful. But though Petrarch's sonnets and canzoni and "triumphs" could all be forgotten, he would still be honored as one of the benefactors of European civilization. No one but

Boccaccio shares with him the glory of having been the chief restorer of classical learning. His greatest merit lay in his having recalled attention to the higher and more correct classical authors; in his having been an enthusiastic and successful agent in reviving the study of the Greek tongue, and in his having been, in his travels and otherwise, an indefatigable collector and preserver of ancient manuscripts. To his care we owe copies of several classical works which, but for him, would, in all likelihood, have perished. Collective editions of his whole works have been repeatedly published (Basle, 1495, 1554, and 1581 sq.). His life has employed many writers, among whom may be mentioned Bellutello, Beccadelli, Tomasini, De la Bastie, De Sades, Tiraboschi, Baldelli, Ugo Foscolo, Campbell, and Geiger. In July, 1874, a Petrarch festival was held at Padua, and a statue of the great poet by Ceccon was erected. The eulogy on this occasion was pronounced by Alcardi, in the *aula magna* of the university. See, besides the complete biographies, Longfellow, *Poets and Poetry of Europe;* Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ch. lxx; Prescott, *Miscellanies*, p. 616; *For. Qu. Rev.* July, 1843; *Contemp. Rev.* July, 1874; *Revue des Deux Mondes*, July 15, 1874; Ueberweg, *Hist. of Phil.* ii, 7, 8, 462; *Révue Chrétienne*, 1869, p. 143.

Tomb of Petrarch.

Petrazzi, Astolfo, a painter of Siena, was born about 1590. He studied successively under Francesco Vanni, the younger Salimbeni, and Pietro Somi. He acquired distinction, and executed many works for the churches and public edifices of his native city, as well as for the private collections. He also opened an academy there, which was much frequented by the artists of Siena, and honored by the attendance of Borgognone, who stopped some months with Petrazzi before he proceeded to Rome. Lanzi says that Petrazzi seemed to have adhered more to the manner of Vanni than any other master. He frequently aims at pleasing, and not unfrequently chose his models from the schools of Upper Italy. His *Marriage Feast at Cana* brings Paul the Veronese strongly to our recollection. Petrazzi's *Communion of St. Jerome*, at the Agostiniani, is painted much after the manner of Caracci. Petrazzi excelled in painting children, and his pictures are generally adorned with choirs of angels. His cabinet pictures are ingeniously composed, and have a lively and pleasing effect. His pictures of the *Four Seasons*, at Volte, a seat of the noble family of Chigi, are admired for the playfulness and elegance of the groups of Cupids introduced. He died in 1663.

Petreius (Lat. for *Peeters*), Theodorus, a learned Dutchman, was born April 17, 1567, at Kempen (Over-Issel). After having been received as master of arts in Cologne, he entered the Carthusian convent of that city (1587), and was prior of Dulmen, in the bishopric of Munster; in this capacity he twice assisted at the general chapter of his order. His taste for study led him to employ the time left him from the duties of his profession in composing or translating different works for the defence of the Catholic faith. He died at Cologne April 20, 1640. We quote from him, *Confessio Gregoriana* (Cologne, 1596 or 1605, 12mo); in the same manner he made similar compilations for the collection of passages extracted from Tertullian and St. Cyprian (1603), from Leo the Great (1614), and from St. Bernard (1607):—*Bibliotheca Cartusiana* (ibid. 1609, 12mo); Moroti greatly profited from this in preparing his *Theatrum S. Cartusiensis ord.* (ibid. 1680, fol.):—*Chronologia, tam Romanorum pontificum quam imperatorum, historica* (ibid. 1626, 4to):—*Catalogus hæreticorum* (ibid. 1629, 4to); not very exact. He translated into Latin two theological works from fathers Coster and Jean David, and he edited the *Opera omnia* of St. Bruno (ibid. 1640, 3 vols. fol.). See Nicéron, *Mémoires*, vol. xl; Paquot, *Mémoires*, vol. ii.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxxix, 752.

Petreolo, Andrea, a painter of Venzone, who, according to Renaldis, was employed in the cathedral of his native city about 1586, where he "decorated the panels of the organ with very beautiful histories of S. Geronimo and S. Eustachio, together with the parable of the wise and foolish virgins, surrounded with fine architecture."

Petri (Lat. for *Peeters*), **Barthelémi**, a Belgian theologian, was born about 1547 at Op-Linter, near Tirlemont. After having taught philosophy for ten years at Louvain, in order to escape the miseries of war he was obliged to retire to Douai (1580), where he was provided with a canonicate and a theological chair. A zealous Thomist, he bequeathed all his wealth to the Dominicans. He died at Douai Feb. 26, 1630. His works are mostly scholastic, with some ecclesiastical history borrowed from Baronius; the most carefully written are a commentary upon the Acts of the Apostles (Douai, 1622, 4to), and some *Præceptiones logicæ* (ibid. 1625, 12mo). He prepared a good edition of the *Summa* of St. Thomas (ibid. 1614, fol.), and published the commentaries of Estius upon the epistles of St. Paul and St. John (ibid. 1614–1616, 2 vols. fol.). See Foppeus, *Bibl. Belgica;* Paquot, *Mémoires*, vol. viii.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxxix, 757.

Petri, Laurent, one of the three principal Swedish Reformers, a brother of the following, was born at Œrebro in 1499. After having followed at Wittenberg the teaching of Luther and Melancthon, on his return to Sweden he spread the principles of Reform in that country. Appointed by Gustavus Vasa professor of theology in the University of Upsala, of which he became rector in 1527, he was elevated in 1531 to the archiepiscopal chair of that city. He then undertook, with the aid of his brother Olaüs and of Laurent Andreä, a Swedish translation of the Bible, based principally upon Luther's version, which was printed in 1541: it is known under the name of *Gustavus's Bible*, and it has contributed greatly to the development of the Swedish language. Sent in 1534 as ambassador to the czar of Russia, he held, in the presence of that prince, a conference upon religion with the patriarch of the Russian Church; the discussion took place in Greek; but the interpreter employed by the czar to translate into Russian the word of the interlocutors often did not understand the abstract terms used by Petri, and then told what passed through his head, until one of the assistants, who understood Russian and Greek, disclosed the fraud by bursts of laughter. Petri, during the rest of his life, was occupied in consolidating Lutheranism in his own country, and in organizing the new Church, of which he was one of the principal founders. He was very beneficent, and distinguished himself advantageously over his brother by his conciliatory spirit, which did not prevent him from addressing to Eric XIV, in 1567, a severe reprimand on the subject of the murder of the Sture.

Petri died in 1573. We have of his works, *Veræ ac justæ rationes quare regnum Sueciæ Christierno captivo, Daniæ olim regi ac ejus heredibus nihil debeat* (Stockholm, 1547, 4to):—*Postille sur les Évangiles* (ibid. 1555, 1641, 8vo):—*Refutatio D. Beurei pertinens ad articulum de Cœna Domini* (Upsala, 1563):—*Discipline de l'Église Suédoise* (Stockholm, 1571, 4to); a work which, by a decision of the Diet of 1572, obtained the force of law:—*Sermons sur la Passion* (ibid. 1573, 8vo):—several other *Sermons*, and liturgic, polemical, and dogmatical works. See Schinmeier, *Lebensbeschreibung der drei Schwedischen Reformatoren, Andreä, Olaüs und Laurent Petri* (Lubeck, 1783, 4to); Hallman, *Lefvernes beskrifning ofver Olaüs och Lars Petri; Biographisk-Lexikon;* Alaux, *La Suède sous Gustave Wasa* (Paris, 1861).—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxxix, 755. Comp. Fisher, *Hist. of the Ref.* p. 176 sq.; Gieseler, *Eccles. Hist.* iv, 276.

Petri, Olaüs-Phase, a Swedish theologian, was born at Œrebro, in 1497: the son of a blacksmith, he received his early education among the Carmelites of his native town, together with his brother Laurent, with whom he attended the University of Wittenberg, where they embraced the doctrines of Luther. On their return to Sweden, in 1519, they began, after having as by a miracle escaped from the executioners of Christian II, to propagate the ideas of the Reformer. Appointed in 1523 rector of the school of Strengnäs, Olaüs won to his opinions the archdeacon Laurent Andreä, and, through the mediation of the latter, Gustavus Vasa appointed Peter preacher at Stockholm. In his sermons and in divers conferences he attacked the old religion with an increasing ardor. The first among all Protestant ecclesiastics in Sweden, he was publicly married in 1525. After having assisted at the Diet of Vesteräs in 1527, where he had a dispute upon religion with the professor of Upsala, Pierre Galle, whom Gustavus declared to have been conquered, he entered more and more into the favor of the king, who consulted him upon the most important affairs, and finally appointed him his chancellor. In 1539 Petri, tired of business, exchanged his duties for those of first pastor of the capital. The following year he was condemned to death for not having revealed, in 1536, the conspiracy formed against the life of the king by some citizens of the Hanseatic villages, one of whom had confessed to him. He purchased his pardon for a large sum. Three years after the king reinstated him in his office of pastor, and he kept it until his death, which occurred at Stockholm in 1552. He joined to quite extensive and varied learning great activity and a captivating eloquence, but he never spared his adversary, and often degenerated into abuse of a bold and rash character. He may be called the Luther of Sweden, while his brother Laurent, milder and more moderate, was the Melancthon. We have of Petri's works, in Swedish, treatises on *Marriage of Ecclesiastics* (Stockholm, 1524, 1528, 4to):—the *Difference between the Evangelical Faith and the Roman* (ibid. 1527, 1605, 4to):—on the *Duties of the Clergy and the Laity* (ibid. 1528, 4to):—on the *Inconveniences of the Monastic Life* (ibid. 1528, 4to):—*Postills on all the Evangelists* (ibid. 1530):—*Introduction to Sacred Scripture* (ibid. 1538, 4to):—some *Sermons, Odes* that are still sung in Sweden, and several other theological writings. Petri has left in manuscript some *Memoirs* upon the history of his country, which remained unpublished because Gustavus found them written with too much independence; one copy of which, preserved in the Royal Library of Paris, has been analyzed by Keralio in the *Notices et Extraits des Manuscrits*, vol. i.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxxix, 754. See also the references under the preceding article.

Petri, Pietro de', an Italian painter, was born in Premia, a district of Novara, in 1671. He studied under Carlo Maratti at Rome, and painted some works for the churches in that metropolis. Lanzi says he formed a style of his own by engrafting on that of Maratti a portion of the manner of Cortona. He did not, however, obtain the reputation which his merits deserved, on account of his infirm health and extreme modesty. His best works are a picture of *The Crucifixion*, in the church of SS. Vincento e Anastasio, and some frescos in the tribune of S. Clemente. He was called at Rome *de' Pietri*. Orlandi calls him a Roman, others a Spaniard, but Lanzi says he was a native of Premia. He died at Rome in 1716, in the prime of life. There are a few etchings heretofore attributed to him, but Bartsch gives them to another artist of the same name.

Petrobrusians. The sect of the Petrobrusians, or, as they are commonly but less correctly called, *Petrobussians*, was the earliest of the anti-sacerdotal communities which the profound discontent inspired by the tyranny of Rome called into existence at the beginning of the 12th century. They were the followers of the eloquent Peter of Bruys, who about the year 1100 began to declaim against the corruptions of the Church and the vices of the clergy. He continued the battle for twenty years most successfully, especially in Languedoc and Provence, and made many converts to his own opinions. What these really were it is difficult to state here, as there is no record among his friends. From Peter of Clugny, who replied to Peter of Bruys, we gather that his principal doctrines—which, with one exception (his repugnance to the cross), were more ably extended by his more powerful successor, Henry the Deacon—were, though somewhat rationalistic, yet upon the whole rather evangelical. At first the preaching of Peter seems to have been confined to the inculcation of a system of general morality; but time and impunity so favored him that he attacked the seeds of dogmatic errors "per xx fere annos sata et aucta quinque præcipue et venenata virgulta." The capital charges upon which he is arraigned are: (1) He rejected infant baptism, alleging that no miraculous gifts were possible in that ceremony, which he declared to be wholly void when performed on the person of an irresponsible infant. (2) He denied that any special sanctity resided in consecrated buildings; forbidding the erection of churches, and directing that such churches as did exist should be pulled down. (3) In particular he objected to the worship of the cross, alleging that the accursed tree should be held in horror by all Christians as the instrument of the torture and death of the Redeemer. (4) He denied all sort of real presence in the Eucharist. Whether or not he retained the office of the communion as a memorial rite is not known. (5) He was bitterly opposed to prayers, oblations, alms, and other good deeds done on behalf of the dead. To these five capital tenets, which form the subject of the Clugniac abbot's refutation, must be added a total prohibition of chanting and all use of sacred music. Puritanical as some of these tenets seem, Peter of Bruys was no lover of asceticism. He inculcated marriage, even of priests, as a high religious usage. The deleterious effects which the Romanists claim to have come from his teachings are thus summed up by Peter of Clugny: "The people are rebaptized, churches profaned, altars overturned, crosses are burned, meat eaten openly on the day of the Lord's passion, priests scourged, monks cast into dungeons, and by terror or torture constrained to marry." His followers continued until the end of the 13th century. See Milman, *History of Latin Christianity*, v, 412; Hardwick, *Church Hist. of the M. A.*; Baur, *Dogmengeschichte*, vol. ii; Piper, *Monumental Theology*, § 140; Jortin, *Eccles. Rev.* iii, 323; Alzog, *Kirchengeschichte*, ii, 72; Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctr.* (see Index). See PETER OF BRUYS.

Petrocorius, PAULINUS, sometimes confounded with Paulinus of Nola (q. v.), was an Eastern ecclesiastic, and, according to his own reports, flourished in the Western empire in the 5th century. He was intimate

with Perpetuus, who was bishop of Tours from A.D. 461 to 491, and whom he calls his patron. It was at the desire of Perpetuus that he put into verse the life of St. Martin of Tours; and in an epistle addressed to that prelate he humbly tells him, with an amusing reference to the history of Balaam, that, in giving him confidence to speak, he had repeated the miracle of opening the mouth of the ass. He afterwards supplied, at the desire of the bishop, some verses to be inscribed on the walls of the new church which Perpetuus finished about A.D. 473 (or, according to Oudin, A.D. 482), and to which the body of St. Martin was transferred. He sent with them some verses, *De Visitatione Nepotuli sui*, on occasion of the cure, supposed to be miraculous, which his grandson, and the young lady to whom he was married or betrothed, had experienced through the efficacy of a document, apparently the account of the miracles of St. Martin, written by the hand of the bishop. We gather that this poem was written when the author was old, from the circumstance of his having a grandson of marriageable age. Of the death of Paulinus we have no account. The works of Paulinus Petrocorius are, *De Vita S. Martini*, a poem in hexameter verse, divided into six books. It has not much poetical or other merit. The first three books are little else than a versified abridgment of the *De Beati Martini Vita Liber* of Sulpicius Severus; and the fourth and fifth comprehend the incidents mentioned in the *Dialogi II et III de Virtutibus Beati Martini* of the same author. The sixth book comprises a description of the miracles which had been wrought at the tomb of St. Martin under the eyes of Perpetuus, who had sent an account of them to Paulinus:—*De Visitatione Nepotuli sui*, a description of the miraculous cure of his grandson already mentioned, also written in hexameter verse:—*De Orantibus* (an inappropriate title, which should rather be *Orantibus* simply, or *Ad Orantes*), apparently a portion of the hexameter verses designed to be inscribed on the walls of the new church built by Perpetuus:—*Perpetuo Episcopo Epistola.* This letter was sent to Perpetuus with the verses *De Visitatione* and *De Orantibus.* The works of Paulinus Petrocorius were first printed by Franciscus Juretus (Par. 1585). After the first publication of the works they were inserted in several collections of the Christian poets, and in some editions of the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, generally, however, under the name of Paulinus of Nola. In the Lyons edition of the *Bibliotheca Patrum* (1677, fol.), vi, 297, etc., they are ascribed to their right author. They were again published by Christianus Daumius (Leips. 1686, 8vo), with ample notes of Juretus, Barthius, Gronovius, and Daumius. To the works of our Paulinus were subjoined in this edition the *Eucharisticon* of Paulinus the Penitent, or Paulinus of Pella, and the poem on Jonah and the Ninevites, ascribed to Tertullian. See *Hist. Littéraire de la France*, ii, 469, etc.; Cave, *Hist. Litt.* ad ann. 461 (Oxon. 1740–1743, fol.), i, 449; Fabricius, *Biblioth. Med. et Inf. Latinitat.* v, 206, ed. Mansi; Tillemont, *Mémoires*, xvi, 404; Oudin, *De Scriptoribus et Scriptis Eccles.* vol. i, col. 1288, 1289.

Petro-Johannites, a name given to the partisans of *Peter John Olivi* (A.D. 1279–1297), a monk of Bezières, the founder of the Fraticelli schism among the Franciscans, and a disciple of the abbot Joachim. He followed in the steps of his master, and wrote a commentary on the Revelation, containing interpretations of a similar character to the prophecies of Joachim. From his birthplace he is called *Peter of Serignan*, and from his monastery *Petrus Biterrensis.* When pope Nicholas III issued a new interpretation of the rule of St. Francis (A.D. 1279), with the view of suppressing the fanaticism which was rising among the "spirituals" of that order, a party was formed to resist it under the leadership of Olivi, and this party of Petro-Johannites, or strict Franciscans, became after his death the party out of which the *Fraticelli* took their rise. See Wadding, *Annal. Min. Fratr.*; Oudin, *De Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticum*, iii, 584; Baluze, *Miscellan.* i, 213.

Petronilla, *St.*, a Romish saint, is reputed to have been the daughter of the apostle Peter, and to have been at Rome with him. As the presence of the apostle himself at the Eternal City is still questioned, we need hardly discuss the presence of his daughter in that place. She is reputed to have become deprived of the use of her limbs by sickness. One day when some of his disciples sat at dinner with the apostle, they asked why it was that when he healed others his own child remained helpless. Peter replied that it was good for her to be ill, but, that his power might be shown, he commanded her to rise and serve them. This she did, and when the dinner was over lay down helpless as before. Years after, when she had become perfected by suffering, she was made well in answer to her earnest prayers. Now Petronilla was very beautiful, and a young noble, Valerius Flaccus, desired to marry her. She was afraid to refuse him, and promised that if he returned in three days he should then carry her home. She then earnestly prayed to be delivered from this marriage, and when the lover came with his friends to celebrate the marriage he found her dead. Flaccus lamented sorely. The attendant nobles bore her to her grave, in which they placed her crowned with roses. She is commemorated in the Roman Church May 31.

Petronius, the name of two Romans somewhat involved in Jewish history.

1. Caius Petronius succeeded Aulius Gallus in the government of Egypt, and carried on a war in B.C. 22 against the Ethiopians, who had invaded Egypt under their queen Candace (q. v.). He was a friend of Herod, and sent corn to Judæa during a famine (Josephus, *Ant.* xv, 9, 2).

2. Publius Petronius was sent by Caligula to Syria as the successor of Vitellius (A.D. 40), in the capacity of governor, with orders to erect the emperor's statue in the Temple at Jerusalem; but at the intercession of the Jews he was prevailed upon to disobey the imperial command, and escaped punishment by the opportune death of the emperor (Josephus, *Ant.* xviii, 9, 2; *War*, ii, 10).

Petronius (*St.*) of Bologna, a Roman Catholic prelate sainted for his piety, flourished in the first half of the 5th century. He was a Roman by birth, and descended of a noble family. He early entered the service of the Church, and soon rose to positions of influence and distinction. He finally became bishop of Bologna, and distinguished himself by banishing the Arians from that city. He died A.D. 430. In the paintings of the Romish saints he is represented in episcopal robes, with mitre and crosier. He has a thick black beard in an ancient representation, but generally is without it. His attribute is a model of Bologna, which he holds in his hand. His pictures are confined to Bologna; and there is in that city a beautiful church dedicated to his memory.

Petrus. See Peter.

Petrus Hispanus. See John XX.

Pettengill, Erastus, a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Newport, N. H., July 7, 1805; was converted in Orford in 1824, and was baptized by Rev. Nathan Howe and joined the Methodist Episcopal Church. He received license to preach in 1835, and labored that year on the Bethlehem charge under the direction of the presiding elder. He joined the New Hampshire Conference in 1836, and was stationed at Bristol. His subsequent appointments were as follows: in 1837, Androscoggin Mission; 1838, Stratford; 1839, Bethlehem; 1840–41, Lunenburgh, Vt.; 1842–43, St. Johnsbury; 1844–45, Barton; 1846, Newbury; 1847–48, Londonderry; 1849–50, Hartland; 1851–52, East Barnard; 1853–54, Norwich and Hartford; 1855, Union Village; 1856, Bellows Falls; 1857–58, Hardwick; 1859–60, Irasburgh; 1861, Corinth; 1862–63, Williams-

town; 1864–66, Union Village; 1867–68, Barnard. While laboring faithfully and with great acceptance on this last appointment he was stricken with a fatal disease, and after weeks of suffering, borne with great patience and Christian fortitude, he died March 8, 1869, relying upon the divine promise and trusting solely to the merits of Christ. See *Minutes of Ann. Conf.* 1870.

Pettibone, Roswell, a Presbyterian minister, was born in Orwell, Vt., Aug. 26, 1796. He had limited facilities for an early education, entered Middlebury College in 1817, graduated in 1820, taught in the academy there in 1821, studied divinity with Dr. Hopkins, and was licensed by the Addison County Association in 1822. He commenced preaching in Hopkinton, St. Lawrence County, N. Y., in 1823, and was ordained July 22, 1824; here he labored with great acceptability and success till poor health induced him to seek a milder climate, and in September, 1830, he went West, and preached at Ann Harbor, Mich., through the winter, and in the spring received a unanimous call to take charge of the Church, but ill-health prevented his doing so. During 1831 he was invited to the Church in Evans' Mills, Jefferson County, N. Y., which he served with great fidelity and success until, in November, 1837, he was called to Canton, St. Lawrence County, N. Y., and installed Feb. 14, 1838. Here he labored until April 1, 1854, when he became chaplain of Clinton State Prison, where he died, Aug. 15, 1854. Mr. Pettibone was pre-eminent in every relation and in the discharge of every duty; in spirit and conduct a progressive conservative, and strongly attached to the Calvinistic doctrines of grace; very active in organizing different benevolent societies and churches in his own and sister counties. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1864, p. 310. (J. L. S.)

Pettigrew, Charles, a prelate of the Protestant Episcopal Church, was born about 1755, in Ireland, whence his father immigrated about 1770. The family was of Scottish origin, and possessed those marked characteristics of Scotch genius which have distinguished so many of the Presbyterian brethren who have come to this country from Scotland. In 1773 Pettigrew became a teacher at Edenton, but two years later he took holy orders, and was ordained pastor of the Protestant Episcopal Church at Loudon. In May, 1794, at a convention held at Tarborough, he was elected bishop. He died at Bonaron, Lake Scuppernong, where he settled in 1774. Pettigrew took a leading part in founding the University of North Carolina.

Petto (or **Pepto**), Samuel, an English Nonconformist divine, the date of whose birth is not known, flourished near the close of the 17th century. He was educated for the Church Establishment at Catharine Hall, Cambridge, and afterwards became rector of Sancroft, in Suffolk. When the Act of Uniformity was passed in 1662 he was ejected from his living as a Nonconformist. Afterwards he became pastor in a Dissenting Church at Sudbury, where he passed the remainder of his life. He died probably about 1708, at an advanced age. His work entitled *The Revelation Unveiled* (1693) dealt with Scripture prophecies. The plan of the work was to inquire: 1. When many Scripture prophecies had their accomplishment. 2. What are now in process of fulfilment. 3. What are still to be fulfilled. His other works were, *The Difference between the Old and the New Covenant* (the preface of this work was written by Dr. Owen): — *The Voice of the Spirit: — Infant Baptism Appointed by Christ: — Scripture Catechism: — Narrative of the Wonderful and Extraordinary Fits of Thom. Ipatchel under the Influence of Witchcraft.*

Petty, John, an eminent minister of the Primitive Methodist Connection in England, was born in 1807, and died in 1868. His ability, piety, and devotedness won for him some of the most important and responsible positions in the connection. For seven years he was editor of the Primitive Methodist magazines, "and did good service in sustaining the efficiency and usefulness of these periodicals throughout the connection." He was the author of several works having a large circulation, of which the most important was *The History of the Primitive Methodist Connection*, a work performed by request of the Conference, and with great thoroughness and ability. During the last three years of his life he was governor of Elmfield School, the principal educational establishment among the Primitive Methodists. In that position he was especially useful in moulding the character and promoting the scholarship of the students for the ministry. As a Christian, Mr. Petty aimed with strong faith and blessed success at eminent personal holiness. As a scholar, "his learning was varied, accurate, profound, sanctified." As a preacher, he evinced a deep insight into Christian life and experience, and his style combined elegant simplicity with intense earnestness. Among his last words were, "O! what boundless stores of fulness there are in Jesus." (G. C. J.)

Petursson, Hallgrimur, a noted psalmist, was born in Iceland in 1614. While Hallgrimur was yet a boy, his father was appointed chorister at the cathedral in Hole (the old northern episcopal residence in Iceland), having been called thither by bishop Gudbrand Thorlaksson, who is known as the first translator of the Bible into Icelandic, and as the real founder of Protestantism in Iceland. Hallgrimur got his elementary education in the school at Hole; but for some unknown reason he was expelled from this school, whereupon he, aided by some of his friends, went abroad, first to Gluckstad, in Sleswick, and later to Copenhagen. In Copenhagen he worked for a blacksmith until Brynjolf Sveinsson (afterwards bishop of Skalholt, in Iceland), about the year 1632, got him a place in the school of Our Virgin. Here Hallgrimur made rapid progress, and in 1636 we find him studying the so-called "master's lesson." In the year 1627 Iceland was visited by Mohammedan pirates from Algeria, in the northern part of Africa, who at that time extended their tyrannical rule of the sea from the shores of the Mediterranean to the most western and northern islands of the Atlantic. A number of Icelanders were slain by them, while others were carried away as slaves. By the interference of the Danish king, Christian IV, some of the prisoners who had not already perished in the land of the barbarians were ransomed, and in 1636 thirty-eight Icelanders were brought from Algeria to Copenhagen, where they had to remain a few months until merchant-ships in the spring of 1637 could take them back to Iceland. While prisoners in Algeria they had imbibed various Mohammedan ideas, and hence it was thought necessary during their stay in Copenhagen to instruct them in the principles of Christianity; but, not understanding Danish, an Icelandic teacher had to be found for them. Hallgrimur Petursson was selected. Among those set free was a woman by name Gudrid, who had formerly been the wife of an Icelander in the Westmann Isles. Hallgrimur fell in love with this woman so much that when the people were sent back to Iceland in the spring, he left the school and returned home with his beloved. The ship which carried them landed at Keflavik, in the southern part of Iceland, and here Hallgrimur remained through the summer, doing the work of a common laborer for the Danes. Gudrid got a place to work on the farm Njardvik, not far from Keflavik, and here she gave birth to a son, whose father was Hallgrimur. Soon afterwards he married Gudrid, and lived for some time in the most abject poverty in a lonely cottage at Suderness, until the above-mentioned Brynjolf Sveinsson, who meanwhile had become bishop of Skalholt, persuaded him to enter the service of the Church, ordained him for the ministry, and gave him the poor parish of Hvalness, in Guldbringe Syssel. He entered the ministry in 1644, and remained in Hvalness until 1651, when he was removed to Saurbær, in Borgarfjord. At Saurbær he found some relief from his poverty until Aug. 15, 1662, when the parsonage and all

its contents were consumed by fire. The people were all saved, however, excepting an old stranger, who had found his lodgings there for the night. Though Hallgrimur heretofore had suffered much abuse and ridicule, he now found that he also had some friends, who assisted him in rebuilding the parsonage and furnishing him with the necessaries of life. A few years later (1665) Hallgrimur first noticed the symptoms of the disease (leprosy) which finally laid him on his death-bed. He performed his ministerial duties alone until 1667, when his illness made it necessary to get an assistant. He was compelled to resign his position in 1669, moved to a neighboring farm, Kalastad, where he remained two years, and then moved to another farm close by, Ferstikla, where, amid constantly increasing sufferings, he at last found a welcome death, Oct. 27, 1674, not having left his bed the last year of his life. He was buried near the entrance of the church at Saurbær. In 1821 a small monument was raised on the spot beneath which his bones rest. By his wife, who died in 1679, he had several children, but the most of them died very young. We have given this detailed account of this man's life because of the prominent position he holds in the religious history of Iceland. He was an eloquent preacher, a thoroughly classical writer, and one of the most gifted psalmists that ever lived. His religious poems give evidence of a Christian courage that reminds one of the martyrs during the first century after Christ. Hallgrimur Petursson's works are the following: (*a*) in prose—1. *Diarium Christianum*, consisting of religious meditations for every day in the week:—2. *A Christian's Soliloquy every Morning and Evening:*—3. *A Collection of Prayers:*—4. *Commentaries on some of the Songs in the Sagas, especially in Olaf Tryggveson's Saga.* (*b*) In poetry—1. *Psalterium Passionale*, fifty psalms on the sufferings of Christ for singing at family devotions during Lent, an unsurpassed masterpiece, whether we regard it from a poetical or Christian standpoint. This work has passed through twenty-seven large editions in Iceland, and is found in every Icelander's house. The funeral psalm found in this collection, and beginning "Allt einsog blomstrid eina," has found its way into many of the Continental languages, and the whole collection has twice been translated into Latin:—2. A poetical treatment of the first and second books of Samuel, which he left unfinished, but which was completed by the ministers Sigurd Gislesson and Jon Eyulfsson:—3. Some epic-romantic poems (the so-called *rimur*), of which all ages of Icelandic literature have furnished a large number:—4. Finally, we have from Hallgrimur Petursson a collection of all his psalms and poems that are not found in the above-named works, and of which the majority were not published until long after his death. This last collection is almost as great a favorite with the Icelandic people as the *Psalterium Passionale*. In it is found a cycle of Bible poems, morning and evening hymns, and other songs, but the best portion of it is a number of psalms, in which the poet has expressed his thoughts upon death and eternity. Some of them were composed on his death-bed. They bear testimony to the fervent love of the Saviour wherein he lived and died. His beautiful funeral hymn, which he closes by greeting the angel of death welcome, cheerful in the consciousness that his Saviour lives, has its heathen prototype in Ragnar Lodbrok's dying words: "The hours of life have glided by; I fall, but smiling shall I die." In Petursson's religious poetry the old heathen courage is regenerated into Christian life, and the pagan coldness has yielded to the genial warmth of a celestial faith. No man has exercised a greater influence upon the Christian character of the Icelandic people than Hallgrimur Petursson.—Jön Bjarnason, *Husbibliothek*, ii, 98–103. (R. B. A.)

Petzelians or **Pœschelians**, a modern sect of a politico-religious character, who derived their name from a priest of Brennan, called Petzel or Pœschel. They held the natural and legal equality of all human beings, and maintained that they had a continual and inalienable property in the earth and its natural productions. Their enemies charged them with offering human sacrifices, particularly on Good Friday. They appear to have adopted the political principles of the Spenceans, and probably their infidelity. Congregations belonging to this sect are said to have existed in Upper Austria, but by the interference of the public authorities they have been dispersed. A similar sect seems to have taken start and spread somewhat in Switzerland, who are charged with the like enormities.

Peucer, Kaspar, a German theologian of the Reformation period, was born Jan. 6, 1525, at Bautzen, and studied at the school in Goldberg and the University of Wittenberg, where he was the table and house companion of the Reformer Melancthon, who afterwards became his father-in-law. Well educated and remarkably talented, he became in 1545 a magister, in 1554 ordinary professor of mathematics, in 1560 professor of medicine. Some time after this he was introduced to the personal attention of the elector Augustus of Saxony, who was so pleased with Peucer that he put him in charge of the Saxon high school. Peucer, greatly interested in the theological controversies of his day, avowed *Philippism* (q. v.), and used his influence for its propagation in Saxony, and thus arrayed the strongly Lutheran elector against him. Peucer was imprisoned from 1575 until 1586. He died Sept. 25, 1602. He left a large number of medical, mathematical, historical, theological, and philological writings. See Henke, *Kaspar Peucer u. Nic. Krell* (Marb. 1865); Calinich, *Kampf u. Untergang des Melanchthonismus in Kursachsen* (Leips. 1866); also the art. Crypto-Calvinistic Controversy.

Peul'thai (Heb. *Peüllethay'*, פְּעֻלְתַי, *my wages;* Sept. Φολλαθί), son of Obed-edom, the last named of eight (1 Chron. xxvi, 5); he belonged to the family of Asaph of the tribe of Levi, and was one of the porters of the tabernacle in the reign of David. B.C. cir. 1020.

Peutinger, Konrad, a German writer noted for his antiquarian labors, was born at Augsburg in 1465; studied in German and Italian universities, and was employed in his native city by the authorities of the place and by the emperor as counsellor. He was a many-sided, educated man, and is celebrated not only as a writer, but also as a humanist, and was greatly interested in Luther when he first appeared against the Romanists. See Hagen, *Deutschland's literarische Zustände im Zeitalter der Reformation*, vol. i.

Pevernage, André, a Belgian writer, was born in 1541 at Courtray. At first music teacher in the collegiate church at Courtray, he abandoned this place to settle in Antwerp, where he passed the last ten or twelve years of his life in the capacity of simple musician of the cathedral. He established in his house weekly concerts, and there was heard the most beautiful music of the composers then in repute. He died at Antwerp July 30, 1589. We have of his works, *Cantiones sacræ* (Antwerp, 1574–1591, 5 pts. 4to); some masses, religious fragments, and a collection compiled from different authors under the title of *Harmonie céleste* (ibid. 1583, 1593, 4to). See Paquot, *Mémoires.*—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxxix, 776.

Pew (anciently *pue;* Old Fr. *puy;* Dutch, *puye;* Lat. *podium*, "anything on which to lean;" *s'appuyer*), an enclosed seat in churches. The old French word *puie* meant a balcony, a gallery built on bulks or posts of timber; and it has been unnecessarily suggested that *pew* may only be a form of *podium*, a book-desk, or the crutch used by monks before sitting was permitted. In the early days of the Anglo-Saxon and some of the Norman churches, a stone bench afforded the only sitting accommodation for members or visitors. In the year 1319 the people are spoken of as sitting on the ground or standing. At a later period the people introduced

low, three-legged stools, and they were placed in no order in the church. Directly after the Norman conquest seats came in fashion. Church-seats were in use in England some time before the Reformation, as is proved by numerous examples still extant, the carving on some of which is as early as the Decorated Period, i. e. before A.D. 1400, and records as old as 1450 speak of such seats by the name of *pues*. They were originally plain fixed benches, all facing east, with partitions of wainscoting about three feet high.



Headington, Oxfordshire.

After the Reformation seats were more appropriated, a crowbar guarded the entrance, bearing the initial of the owner. It was in 1508 that galleries were thought of. As early as 1614 pews were arranged to afford comfort by being baized or cushioned, while the sides around were so high as to hide the occupants; probably under the influence of the Puritans, who, objecting to some parts of the service which they were compelled to attend, sought means to conceal their nonconformity. An early specimen of a pew of this kind exists in Cuxton Church, Kent. Up to a period some time after the Reformation the naves of churches, which were occupied by the congregation, were usually fitted with fixed seats, as they had been from the 14th century downwards, at the least: these seats varied in height from about two feet and a half to three feet, and were partially enclosed at the ends next the passages, sometimes with what are called bench-ends: sometimes these rose considerably above the wainscoting, and were terminated with carved finials or poppies, but they are more frequently ranged



Steeple Aston, c. 1500.

with the rest of the work, and were often straight at the top and finished with the same capping-moulding: these end enclosures occupied about the width of the seat, and the remainder of the space was left entirely open. The partitions sometimes reached down to the floor, and sometimes only to a little below the seats: they were usually perfectly plain, but the wainscoting next the cross passages was generally ornamented with panellings, tracery, small buttresses, etc.: opposite to the seat at the back of each division or pew a board was frequently fixed, considerably narrower, intended to support the arms when kneeling. This mode of fitting the naves of churches was certainly very general, but it is difficult to ascertain when it was first introduced, the great majority of specimens that exist being of the Perpendicular style. See STANDARD.

In England pews were assigned at first only to the patrons of churches. A canon made at Exeter, in 1287, rebukes quarrelling for a seat in church, and decrees that none shall claim a seat as his own except noblemen and the patrons. Gradually, however, the system of appropriation was extended to other inhabitants of the parish, to the injury of the poor, and the multiplication of disputes. The law of pews in England is briefly this: All church-seats are at the disposal of the bishop, and may be assigned by him either (1) directly by faculty to the holders of any property in the parish; or (2) through the churchwardens, whose duty it is, as officers under the bishop, to "seat the parishioners according to their degree." In the former case the right descends with the property, if the faculty can be shown, or immemorial occupation proved. In the latter, the right can at any time be recalled, and lapses on the party ceasing to be a regular occupant of the seat. It appears that by common law every parishioner has a right to a seat in the church, and the churchwardens are bound to place each one as best they can. The practice of *letting* pews, except under the church-building acts, or special local acts of Parliament, and, much more, of *selling* them, has been declared illegal, except for the *chapels* of the Dissenters, who need the income of the pews for the payment of the pastor's salary. In Scotland pews in the parish churches are assigned by the heritors to the parishioners, who have accordingly the preferable claim on them; but when not so occupied they are legally open to all. As is well known, pews in dissenting churches are rented as a means of revenue to sustain general charges. In some parts of the United States pews in churches are a matter of annual competition, and bring large sums. Latterly in England there has been some discussion as to the injuriously exclusive character of the "pew system," and a disposition has been manifested to abolish pews altogether, and substitute movable seats available by all indiscriminately. Several pamphlets have appeared on the subject. The *Times* remarks that in dealing with this subject the first question is not the letting of pews, but the appropriation of seats. In most country churches the seats are more or less appropriated, but the pews are seldom rented. When we consider the matter from this point of view, does it not seem reasonable, as a matter of mere order and decency, that those who regularly attend a church should have their appropriated places within it? If the churches are thrown completely open, they are thrown open not only to the parish, but to the whole world. In one of the best known of the London churches the incumbent lately complained from the pulpit that his parishioners could not obtain seats in the church which had been expressly built for them, and he announced his intention of altering the system. Another church, in Wells Street, which was especially built for the accommodation of a poor district, and in which all the seats are free, is usurped every Sunday by an æsthetic congregation of well-dressed people, who come to enjoy the excellent performance of the choir. Such a result would always take place where the preacher was popular or the ser-

vice attractive. Again, the existing churches would not hold more than a certain number of persons, and they are filled as it is. If more were invited to come, it would be only driving out the rich to make way for the poor, and then we should want another national association for preaching the Gospel to the rich, or, rather, we should see the rich building proprietary chapels for themselves, in which the seats would be appropriated as before. But does any one suppose that the poor would thus force their way into the churches, and dispossess their present occupants? Whether the seats are free or not, the result would be much the same. When the question of the appropriation of seats is decided, that of pew rents is comparatively simple. If the rich are to have a certain number of seats appropriated to them, what can be more natural and convenient than that they should pay a certain sum in respect of them? In the Roman Catholic churches on the Continent pews are seldom to be seen.

The *reading pue*, first mentioned in the rubric of 1662, was the reader's stall in the chancel. It had two desks — one on the west for the Holy Bible, and the other for the Prayer-book facing eastwards, as in Hooker's Church at Drayton Beauchamp. In 1571 Grindel called it "the pulpit, where prayers are said." Calamy applies the word to designate an open-air pulpit. George Herbert made his pulpit and reading pue of equal height, so as to be of equal honor and estimation, and agree like brethren. See Walcott, *Sacred Archæol.* s. v.; Chambers, *Cyclop.* s. v.; Parker, *Glossary of Architecture*, s. v.

Peyrère, Isaac, a French Protestant writer, was born at Bordeaux in 1592. He fitted himself for military and diplomatic service, and at one time served the prince of Condé, whom he pleased by the singularity of his humor. Peyrère finally turned pious. He was at the time a Protestant. He claimed that it had been revealed to him by St. Paul that Adam was not the first man created, and he undertook to prove his theory by publishing in Holland, in 1655, a book entitled *Præadamitæ, sive exercitatio super versibus* 12, 13, 14, *capitis xv Epistolæ Pauli ad Romanos*, which work was consigned to the flames, and he himself imprisoned at Brussels. Upon recantation and the interference of the prince of Condé he was released, and went to Rome in 1655, where he published the reasons for his recantation, and abjured Calvinism and Præadamitism before pope Alexander VII. He was not believed sincere by the people, and doubtless public opinion was just. The pontiff endeavored to detain him at Rome, but he finally returned to Paris, and again entered the service of the prince of Condé, acting as his librarian. He was not thought to be attached to any particular Church, notwithstanding that he had joined the Romanists. He, however, submitted to receive the sacrament. Some time after his return to Paris he retired to the "Seminaire des Vertus," where he died in 1676. He wrote, besides the above-mentioned articles, works upon Greenland and Iceland; also one upon the *Restoration of the Jews*, etc.

Peyton, Yelverton T., a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Stafford County, Va., 1797; was converted in 1815; entered the Baltimore Conference in 1818; and after filling some of the most important stations in the Conference, died in Baltimore Jan. 15, 1831. He was a devoted pastor, a faithful minister, and a very useful preacher. See *Minutes of Ann. Conferences*, ii, 118.

Pez, Bernard, a learned German Benedictine, was born in 1683 at Ips. He early entered the monastery of Mölk. For several years he, with his brother Jerome, collected chronicles, charters, and other documents of the Middle Ages, in Austria, Bavaria, and other parts of Germany. After having spent some time in France, where he was associated with count Zinzendorf, he returned to his convent, whose library was confided to his care. He died March 27, 1735. We have of his works, *Acta et vita Wilburgis virginis cum notis* (Augsb. 1715, 4to):—*Bibliotheca Benedictino-Mauriana, seu de vitis et scriptis Patrum e congregatione S. Mauri* (ibid. 1716, 8vo):—*Thesaurus anecdotorum novissimus, seu Veterum monumentorum præcipue ecclesiasticorum collectio* (1721–1723, 5 vols. fol.):—*Bibliotheca ascetica antiquo-nova* (Ratisb. 1723–1740, 12 vols. 8vo):—*Acta S. Truperti martyris* (Vienna, 1731, 4to):—some *Notes à l'Anonymus Mellicensis de scriptoribus ecclesiasticis*, published by Fabricius; several articles in different collections, etc. See Jöcher, *Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon;* Kropf, *Biblioth. Mellicensis.*—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxxix, 789.

Pez, Hieronymus, a learned German Benedictine, brother of the preceding, was born at Ips in 1685. After having taken the Benedictine habit in the monastery of Mölk, he began, with his brother, the search for unpublished historical documents concealed in the archives and libraries of Austria and Bavaria. Placed later at the head of the library of his convent, he passed the last fifteen years of his life in the most profound retreat. He died Oct. 14, 1762. We have of his works, *Acta S. Colomani, Scotiæ regis* (Krems, 1713, 4to):—*Scriptores rerum Austriacarum veteres, cum notis et observationibus* (Leips. 1720–1725, 2 vols. fol.), followed by a third volume, published in 1745 at Ratisbon; a very precious collection:—*Historia S. Leopoldi, Austriæ marchionis, id nominis iv, ex diplomatibus adornata* (Vienna, 1747, fol.). See Meusel, *Lexikon;* Schröckh, *Leben v. Pez* (in the *Leipziger Gelehrte Zeitung* for 1762, p. 737).—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxxix, 789.

Pezel, Christoph, a German theologian, was born March 5, 1539, at Plauen; studied at Wittenberg; was then three years cantor in his native place, and in 1567 became court-preacher and professor of theology at Wittenberg. An ardent advocate of *Philippism* (q. v.), he was deposed after the condemnation of Crypto-Calvinism in 1574; in 1576 was sent out of the country; in 1577 went to Siegen, where he taught for a while, and then became pastor at Herborn. In 1580 he was called to Bremen as pastor, and in 1584 was made professor of theology at the newly founded *Gymnasium illustre*. In 1589 he again assumed the pastorate, and became also superintendent, and as such contributed to the strengthening and development of Lutheranism. He died Feb. 25, 1604. Besides theological controversial writings, and the so-called Wittenberg Catechism entitled *Catechesis continens explicationem decalogi, symboli, orationis dominicæ, doctrinæ de pœnitentia et sacramentis* (Wittenberg, 1571), he wrote also *Mellificium Historicum*, a much-used handbook of history, and edited Melancthon's letters to Hardenberg. (J. H. W.)

Pezron, Paul, a Roman Catholic monastic of much celebrity, was born at Hennebon, in Bretagne, in 1639. He embraced the monastic life in the Cistercian abbey de Prières in 1661; was appointed master of the novices and sub-prior in 1672; sub-prior of the college of the Bernardins at Paris in 1677; vicar-general of his order in 1690, and obtained the abbey of Charmoye in 1697. He resigned it finally to give himself entirely to his studies, and became a doctor of the Sorbonne. He died in 1706. His most important publication is *L'antiquité des temps rétablie et défendue, contre les Juifs et les nouveaux chronologistes* (Amst. 1687, 12mo). In this work the author maintains the authority of the Septuagint chronology against that of the Hebrew Bible. Pezron's book was extremely admired for the ingenuity and learning of it; yet created, as was natural, no small alarm among the religious. Martianay, a Benedictine, and Le Quien, a Dominican, wrote against this new system, and undertook the defence of the Hebrew text; Martianay with great zeal and heat, Le Quien with more judgment and knowledge. Pezron published *Defense de l'antiquité des temps* in 1691 (4to), which, like the work itself, abounded with curious and learned researches. Le Quien replied, but Martianay brought the affair into another court; and, in 1693, laid the books and principles of Pezron

before M. de Harlai, archbishop of Paris. Harlai communicated the representation of this adversary to Pezron, who, finding no difficulty in supporting an opinion common to all the fathers before Jerome, rendered the accusation of no effect. Other works of his are, *Essai d'un Commentaire Littéral et Historique sur les Prophètes* (1693, 12mo):—*L'Histoire Evangélique Confirmée par la Judaïque et la Romaine* (1696, 2 vols. 12mo):—*Antiquité de la Nation et de la Langue des Celtes* (1703, 12mo, etc.). See Nicéron, *Mémoires*, vol. i; *Dict. Hist. des Auteurs Eccl*és. s. v.; Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliogr.* s. v.; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.

Pfaff, Christoph Matthäus, D.D., a German Protestant theologian, son of Johann Christoph Pfaff (q. v.), was born Dec. 25, 1686, at Stuttgard. At the age of thirteen he was admitted to the university, and after having finished his theological studies, he received the means from the duke of Würtemberg, in 1706, to go to other universities to perfect himself in the knowledge of the Oriental tongues. He visited with this design several universities of Germany, Holland, and England. Upon his return to Stuttgard in 1709, he was employed to accompany the hereditary prince Charles-Alexandre to Italy, with whom he remained three years in Turin, occupied especially in copying from the libraries the unpublished fragments of ancient ecclesiastical authors. He afterwards went with the prince to Holland, where he spent two years, and to Paris, continuing his researches in the libraries, and placing himself in connection with the most renowned learned men. Appointed in 1716 professor of theology at Tübingen, he became in 1720 dean of the faculty and chancellor of the university; he also received several high ecclesiastical positions, and became among others, in 1727, abbé of Loch, which gave him the *entrée* to the states of Würtemberg. In 1724 he was gratified with the title of count-palatine, and was elected in 1731 member of the Academy of Berlin. In 1756 he became chancellor of the University of Giessen, dean of the faculty of theology, and general superintendent of the churches. Possessing extensive and varied knowledge, he carefully avoided the bitter tone of the theologians of his confession, and he even made, but without the least success, several attempts to unite the Lutheran and Calvinistic churches. He died at Giessen Nov. 19, 1760. Pfaff's erudition was immense, and his works so numerous that they fill a whole sheet of the German bibliographies. Among his numerous works and dissertations we mention, *De genuinis Librorum Novi Testamenti lectionibus* (Amst. 1709, 8vo):—*Demonstrations solides de la vérité de la Religion Protestante contre la Religion prétendue Catholique* (Tüb. 1713, 1719):—*De Evangeliis sub Anastatio imperatore non corruptis* (Tübing. 1717, 4to); reprinted, with several other dissertations of Pfaff, in his *Prinistiæ Tubingenses* (ibid. 1718, 4to):—*De liturgiis, missalibus, agendis et libris ecclesiasticis Ecclesiæ orientalis et occidentalis veteris et modernæ* (ibid. 1718, 4to):—*De origine juris ecclesiastici veraque ejus indole* (ibid. 1719, 1720, 1756, 4to):—*Dissertationes Anti-Bœlianæ tres* (ibid. 1719, 1720, 4to):—*Institutiones theologiæ dogmaticæ et moralis* (ibid. 1719, 8vo; Frankf. 1721, 8vo); one of the first theological works written in Germany in which the rationalistic tendency is recognised:—*Introductio in historiam theologiæ litterariam* (ibid. 1720, 8vo; ibid. 1724–1726, 3 vols. 4to):—*De variationibus ecclesiarum Protestantium, adversus Bossuetum* (ibid. 1720, 4to):—*Gesammelte Schriften so zur Vereinigung der protestirenden Kirchen abzielen* (Halle, 1723, 2 vols. 4to); a collection of writings tending to the reunion of the Protestant churches:—*De titulo patriarchæ œcumenici* (Tübing. 1735, 4to):—*De ecclesia sanguinem non sitiente* (ibid. 1740, 4to):—*De sterconanistis medii ævi* (ibid. 1750, 4to):—*De aureolis virginum, doctorum et martyrum* (ibid. 1753, 4to). As an editor, Pfaff published *Epitome Institutionum divinarum Lactantii* (Paris, 1712, 8vo), first edition complete:—*S. Irenæi fragmenta anecdota* (La Haye, 1715, 8vo); a publication followed by a dispute with Scip. Maffei, who had cast some doubt upon the authenticity of these fragments:—*Ecclesiæ evangelicæ libri symbolici* (Tübingen, 1730, 8vo). Finally, Pfaff directed the publication of the new German translation of the Bible, which appeared at Tübingen (1729, fol.), a work on which, in connection with others, he actively labored. Pfaff was a learned man of the very first rank, but of doubtful moral character. He is the real founder of the so-called collegial system, which regards the Church as a *collegium*: as a corporation possessing corporate rights, the Church can make her own statutes and laws, and can insist upon their observance. The attitude of the state towards her is but incidental, or similar to the position it occupies with respect to any other association. The *magistratus politicus* does not belong to her; the Church consisting solely of teachers and taught. It is only by transference, by virtue of silent or express compact, that the magistracy can receive rights originally inherent in the Church. Results were, however, at first, and till after the commencement of the 19th century, in favor of the territorial system. The Bible known among the German Protestants as "the Bible of Tübingen" was published under Pfaff's direction in one folio volume in 1727. See Strieder, *Hessische Gelehrtengesch.*; Rathlef, *Gesch. jetztlebender Gelehrten*, pt. i; Schröckh, *Unparteiische Kirchengesch.* iv, 787; Sax, *Onomasticon*, vi, 138, 648; Bauer, *Gallerie*, vol. v; Döring, *Die Gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands*, vol. iii, s. v.; Hirsching, *Handbuch*; Meusel, *Lexikon*, s. v.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxxix, 794; comp. Hurst's Hagenbach, *Ch. Hist. 18th and 19th Centuries*, i, 110 sq., 410; Ebrard, *Kirchen- u. Dogmengesch.* iv, 131. (J. H. W.)

Pfaff, Johann Christoph, a German Lutheran theologian, was born at Pfullingen in 1631, and was educated at the university in Tübingen, where he afterwards flourished as professor of theology. He was also for a time pastor at St. Leonhard's Church in Stuttgard. He died in 1720. He was the author of about forty works and exegetical and dogmatical dissertations, but none of them are of much value in our day. A list of them may be found in Winer's *Theol. Literatur*, s. v. See also Böckh, *Gesch. der Universität Tübingen*; Lepoin, *Leben der Gelehrten*, and *Bibliotheca Bremensis* (1720). (J. H. W.)

Pfauser (Phauser), Johann Sebastian, a German Roman Catholic divine, was born at Constance in 1520. He came by recommendation of the bishop of Trent to Vienna as court-preacher of emperor Ferdinand I, but was obliged to quit that place on account of his anti-Roman tendency. He was thereafter employed as confessor and preacher by the emperor's son, Maximilian, and all efforts to supplant him here were unsuccessful until the Bohemian crown question arose, and it became necessary for the court to have the favor of all Ultramontane prelates. In 1560 Pfauser became pastor at Lauingen. He died in 1569. To the last Maximilian kept up a friendly correspondence with this good man.

Pfefferkorn, Johann (originally *Joseph*), a noted Jewish convert to Christianity, was born in Moravia in 1469. He embraced Christianity, and was publicly baptized at Cologne with his wife and children in 1506, when thirty-six years old. All the efforts of this man, who, with many faults, was certainly not wanting in merit, were early directed to the conversion of his brethren according to the flesh. The means he first made use of were highly laudable; for he treated them with gentleness, and even defended his former co-religionists against the calumny of their enemies. But fanatical and misguided, his zeal afterwards was less well advised when he began to forbid and condemn the reading of any Hebrew book excepting the Old Testament. With the aid of the Dominican monks, he prevailed on the emperor Maximilian to adopt his views, and in 1509 an edict was published which enjoined that all writings emanating from the Jews against the Christian religion

should be suppressed and condemned to the flames; this edict was soon succeeded by another, July 6, 1510, enjoining the destruction of every Hebrew book with the sole exception of the Old Testament. The execution of this edict was, however, suspended until the opinion of the electoral archbishop Uriel of Mayence had been obtained. By reason of this delay, Prof. John Reuchlin, whose opinion in this matter was sought for, was enabled to publish a voluminous treatise, in which he divided the Jewish works into seven different classes, and afterwards proved which of these classes might be considered dangerous or injurious to the Christian religion. Among the books which he thinks in part harmless and in part useful, and even valuable to theology, and which he would in consequence preserve, were not only the commentaries of Rashi, the Kimchis, Ibn-Ezra, Gersonides, Nachmanides, etc., but the Talmud and the cabalistic book Sohar (q. v.). On the other hand, Reuchlin maintained that those only should be destroyed which contained blasphemies against Christ, such as the Nizzachon and Toledoth Jeshu. He further pointed out the impossibility of suppressing books by an imperial decree which were dispersed in all parts of the world, and might easily be reprinted in other places. The contest soon grew warm between the adversaries of the books and their defenders; the former consisting of the Dominicans and their partisans, and the latter of all moderate and enlightened theologians. The affair was finally left by an appeal to pope Leo X. Hochstraaten, an inquisitor, and a man fully qualified for that cruel office, repaired to Rome, supported with remonstrances from several princes to bias, with money to bribe, and menaces to intimidate. He even threatened the pope with rejecting his authority and separating from the Church, unless Reuchlin, and the Jews whom he defended, were condemned. But all his efforts were in vain, and he was obliged to return, mortified and disgraced. The victory which his opponent had gained exposed him to the enmity of the monkish party. But he informed them "he was persuaded that Martin Luther, who then began to make a figure in Germany, would find them so much employment that they would permit him to end his days in peace" (Villers *on the Reformation*, p. 107). Soon, indeed (by reason apparently of the Reformation movement), an end was put to the whole dispute. When and where Pfefferkorn died is difficult to say. Of his works, which obtained such unenviable notoriety, we mention, *Der Judenspiegel*, or *Speculum adhortationis Judaicæ ad Christum* (Nürnb. 1507):—*Die Judenbeichte*, or *Libellus de Judaica confessione sive Sabbate afflictionis cum figuris* (Colog. 1508): —*Das Osterbuch*, or *Narratio de ratione Pascha celebrandi inter Judæos recepta* (Colog. and Augsb. 1509): —*Der Judenfeind*, or *Hostis Judæorum* (ibid. 1509):—*In Lob und Ehren dem Kaiser Maximilian*, or *In laudem et honorem illustrissimi imperatoris Maximiliani*, etc. (Colog. 1510):—*Ein Brief an Geistliche und Weltliche in Betreff des Kaiserlichen Mandats die jüdischen Schriften zu vertilgen:* — *Der Handspiegel*, against Reuchlin (Mayence, 1511):—*Der Brandspiegel* (ibid. 1513):— *Die Sturmglocke*, against Reuchlin (Cologne, 1514):— *Streitbüchlein wider Reuchlin u. s. Jünger*, or *Defensio contra famosas et criminales obscurorum verorum epistolas*, dedicated to the pope and the college of cardinals (Cologne, 1516):—*Eine mitleidige Clag' gegen den ungläubigen Reuchlin* (1521). (Where the Latin title is given, the work was also translated into Latin.) Comp. Fürst, *Bibl. Jud.* iii, 82; Wolf, *Bibl. Hebr.* i, 985 sq.; iii, 940 sq.; iv, 956 sq.; Meiners, *Lebensbeschreibung der Männer aus den Zeiten der Wiederherstellung der Wissenschaften* (Zurich, 1795), i, 99 sq.; Meyerhoff, *Reuchlin u. s. Zeit;* Erhard, *Geschichte des Wiederaufblühens der wissenschaftl. Bildung*, vol. ii; Lamey, *Reuchlin u. s. Zeit;* Strauss, *Ulrich v. Hutten*, vol. i; Grätz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, ix, 98, 101 sq., 103, 110 sq., 115 sq., 130 sq., 140, 142, 158 sq., 168 sq., 209, 211, 218, and Appendix, note 2, p. vii sq.; L. Geiger, *Das Studium der hebr. Sprache in Deutschland*, p. 38 sq. (Breslau, 1870); Kalkar, *Israel u. d. Kirche*, p. 90 sq.; Basnage, *Histoire des Juifs*, p. 730 (Taylor's transl.); H. Adams, *Hist. of the Jews*, ii, 47 sq. (Boston, 1812); Da Costa, *Israel and the Gentiles*, p. 464 sq.; *Johannes Pfefferkorn*, in Geiger's *Zeitschrift für Wissenschaft u. Leben* (1869), p. 293–309; *Aktenstücke zur Confiscation der jüdischen Schriften in Frankfurt a. M. unter Kaiser Maximilian durch Pfefferkorn's Angeberei*, in Frankel-Grätz's *Monatsschr.* (July, 1875), p. 289 sq.; Weyden, *Gesch. d. Juden in Köln am Rhein* (Cologne, 1867), p. 259 sq.; Palmer, *Hist. of the Jewish Nation* (Lond. 1874), p. 288. (B. P.)

Pfefferkorn, S. Michael M., a German theologian, was born in the year 1646 at Iffta, near Eisenach, and was the son of a minister. Having received his preparatory education at Creutzburg and Gotha, he went to Jena, where in 1666 he was created magister. From Jena he went to Leipsic, and after having completed his studies, he was appointed professor at the Altenburg gymnasium. Having occupied several stations as an educator, he was called in 1676 to the pastorate of Friemar, near Gotha. For fifty years he faithfully discharged his ministerial functions. He died March 3, 1732. Besides other works, he is the author of some very fine hymns, which found their way into our hymn-books, as "Was frag' ich nach der Welt und allen ihren Schätzen" (Engl. transl. by Mills, "Can I this world esteem," in *Hymns from the German*, p. 101). See Brückner, *Kirchen- und Schulenstaat im Herzogthum Gotha* (Gotha, 1760, 3 pts.), iv, 80–82; Koch, *Gesch. d. deutschen Kirchenliedes*, iv, 63 sq. (B. P.)

Pfeiffer, Augustus, D.D., a learned German Lutheran divine, noted as an Orientalist, was born at Lauenburg Oct. 30, 1640, and was educated at Wittenberg. In 1673 he entered the ministry, and thereafter held several important pastorates. In 1681 he became archdeacon to the church of St. Thomas at Leipsic, in which city he also held a chair in theology at the university. In 1689 he was made superintendent of the churches at Lubeck, and died there Jan. 11, 1698. Pfeiffer was one of the most skilful philologists of his time. He is said to have known seventy languages. His library was rich in Hebrew, Arabic, Coptic, Armenian, Persian, and Chinese MSS., and he left many learned writings. His philological works were all collected under the title *Opera omnia philologica* (Utrecht, 1704, 2 vols. 4to). His other publications were, *Theologia Judaica atque Mohammedica* (Lips. 1687, 12mo):—*Antiquitates selectæ, ab Ugolino notis illustratæ* (in Ugolino, iv, 1173):—*Exercitatio de Theraphim* (ibid. xxiii, 549):—*Diatribe de poësi Hebr. recognita* (ibid. xxxi, 899; transl. into Engl. by D. A. Taylor, with additions, in the *Bibl. Repos.* vols. vi–ix):—*Manuductio nova et facilis ad accentuationem*, etc. (Ugol. xxxi, 927):—*Specimen de monialibus Vet. Test.* (ibid. xxxii, 657):—*Specimen de voce vexata* סלה (ibid. xxxii, 743):—*Specimen de Psalmis Graduum* (ibid. xxxii, 675). See Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliog.* s. v.; Rotermund's Suppl. to Jöcher, *Gelehrten-Lexikon*, s. v. Pipping; *Memoriæ theologorum*, s. v. (J. H. W.)

Pfeiffer, Christoph, a German divine, noted as a hymnologist, was born at Oels in the year 1689. For two years he was assistant-preacher at Dirsdorf, when he was called, March 28, 1719, by the duke H. Chr. von Landskron to the pastorate at Dittmansdorf, near Frankenstein, in the principality of Munsterburg. Having occupied this position for twenty-seven years, he was called to Stolz, where he spent the remainder of his life, and died Dec. 23, 1758. His picture in the church there has the motto, "Mea Christus Portio," and the following epigraph: "Mors tua vita mea est, tuaque, O dulcissime Jesu, vulnera sunt animæ Pharmaca certa meæ." Pfeiffer is the author of many hymns, several of which are found in our modern hymn-books. See Wezel, *Hymnop.* (Herrnstadt, 1728), iv, 397 sq.; Koch, *Gesch. d. deutschen Kirchenliedes*, v, 742 sq. (B. P.)

Pfeiffer, *Madame* **Ida**, a German lady, whose maiden name was *Reige*, is noted as a traveller in the East, and as a valuable contributor to Palestinian topography. She was born in Vienna, Oct. 15, 1797. From her very childhood she longed to see the world, and ever read with delight books of travel. In her girlhood she travelled to some extent with her parents, and subsequently with her husband. After the death of her husband and the maturity of her sons she determined to undertake a journey to Palestine, that she might have the ineffable delight of treading those spots which our Saviour had hallowed by his presence. With the accumulated wealth of twenty years, she left Vienna in March, 1842. Her journey included Constantinople, Broussa, Beirût, Jaffa, Jerusalem, the river Jordan and the Dead Sea, Nazareth, Damascus, Balbec, the Libanus, Alexandria, Cairo, and the Desert to the Red Sea; then back by Malta, Sicily, Naples, Rome, etc., to Vienna, where she arrived in December of the same year. Upon her return she published anonymously the diary she had kept during her trip, under the title of *Reise einer Wienerin in das Heilige Land* (Journey of a Vienna Woman in the Holy Land). In 1845 Madame Pfeiffer visited Sweden, Norway, and Iceland. In 1846 she made her first journey round the world. In 1851 she made a second expedition, visiting the United States, and upon her return published an account of all her travels. But of all her descriptions those of the Holy Land are far more interesting than any of the others; owing doubtless to having been less hurried then than while making her trips round the world. Throughout the whole of her arduous journeys Madame Pfeiffer displayed great courage, perseverance, and womanly tact. The mere fact of her having accomplished what no male traveller ever has done is conclusive evidence that she was possessed of great endurance and fortitude. She died Oct. 27, 1858.

Pfeil, Christoph Carl Ludwig von, a descendant of an old knightly family, was born Jan. 20, 1712, at Grünstadt, not far from Worms. When ten years of age he was left an orphan, and his uncle, the Rev. Justus S. von Pfeil, of Magdeburg, took him into his house. Here he remained for six years, when, at the age of sixteen, he entered the University of Halle for the study of jurisprudence. In the year 1729 he went to Tübingen to continue there his studies, where he became a faithful follower of Christ. In 1732, at the age of twenty, he was appointed secretary of legation of the Würtemberg government at Regensburg, and in 1737 he was appointed counsellor of law at Stuttgard. For thirty years he held the highest honors in Würtemberg, until, in the year 1763, he removed to Prussia, when Frederick the Great awarded to him new honors. Pfeil died March 28, 1776. He was a very pious man, and the different stages of his life are best marked in his poetical productions and hymns, which number about 940. Not all of his hymns have found their way into hymn-books, especially as most of them are influenced by Zinzendorf and Bengel, whose ideas are more or less reproduced in them. Those, however, which are found in our hymn-books are really jewels of German hymnology. A collection of his hymns has been published by the Rev. G. Knack, of Berlin (1850, 1853), under the title *Evangel. Herzensgesänge*. Besides his hymns, Pfeil left in MS. a rhymed translation of Job, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs, the Lord's Prayer, the apostolic epistles, etc. See Teichmann's biography in the preface to his *Christl. Hausschatz* (Stuttgard, 1852); Merz, *Das Leben des christlichen Dichters und Ministers C. C. L. von Pfeil* (ibid. 1863); Koch, *Geschichte des deutschen Kirchenliedes*, v, 176 sq. (B. P.)

Pfenninger, Johann Conrad, a German theologian, was born at Zurich, Switzerland, in 1747; studied theology at the university of his native place; in 1775 was made dean of the Orphans' Church, and later was appointed the successor of his friend Lavater (q. v.) in the pastorate, and was also made the dean of St. Peter's Church. He died in 1792. Pfenninger was a voluminous writer and much involved in controversy with the Rationalists, who then so very generally abounded in Germany. He was in close harmony with the theological views of Lavater, and with him attempted to give to his period a secure Christian impress, so as to lift Christianity from its Oriental vestments, and place it upon the ground of universal humanity. While the sceptics, and even Spalding among them, regarded modern Christianity rather as a purely comprehensible and abstract fact, and excluded every contribution of the imagination, Lavater and Pfenninger, like Klopstock (q. v.), thought it best to render aid by the Western imagination. They made Christianity not only accessible to the modern understanding, but to the modern feeling. Most valuable of all of Pfenninger's publications are his *Jüdische Briefe aus der Zeit Jesu v. Nazareth* (1783–92), which have been freely used by Stier in his *Words of Jesus* (transl. by Strong and Smith, N. Y. 3 vols. 8vo). These Jewish letters furnish a sort of Christian romance, in which the men and women of the time of Jesus write letters to each other, just as sentimental men and women of the last century would have written, and Christianity was thus modernized to make it attractive and plain to the masses, and relieve it of the Oriental garb it wears in the Bible. (J. H. W.)

Pflug, Julius, a German theologian, noted in the Reformation history of his country's Church, was born at Merseburg near the opening of the 16th century. He was the son of a nobleman, and a favorite of the emperor Charles V, who sent him in 1541 as one of the collocutors to the synod at Regensburg (q. v.), which resulted in the adoption of the Augsburg Interim (q. v.). Pflug was selected by the emperor as president of the approaching synod at Regensburg. About that time the chapter of the cathedral at Naumburg-Zeitz elected him bishop, but he was unable to assume his episcopal duties until after the battle at Mühlberg. In 1557 he presided at the Synod of Worms, and died in 1564. Pflug was a moderate Romanist, and though associated with Eck, shared none of his extravagant and extreme ideas. He earnestly desired peace, and though he may here and there have consented to measures rather equivocal and questionable, he probably sought only the peace and union of the Church. See Ranke, *Hist. of the Papacy*, i, 117 sq.; Planck, *Gesch. der protest. Theol.* vol. vi; Alzog, *Kirchengesch.* ii, 309 sq. (J. H. W.)

Pha'ath-Mo'ab (Φαὰθ Μωάβ v. r. Φθαλεὶ Μωαβείς), a Græcized form (1 Esdr. v, 11) of the Heb. name (Ezra ii, 6; Neh. vii, 11) Pahath-Moab (q. v.).

Phac'areth (Φακαρέθ v. r. Φαχαρέθ), a corrupt Græcized form (1 Esdr. v, 34) of the Heb. name (Ezra ii, 57; Neh. vii, 59) Pochereth (q. v.).

Phædo(n) of Elis, a noted ancient Grecian philosopher, was a native of Elis, and of high birth. He was taken prisoner in his youth, and passed into the hands of an Athenian slave-dealer; and being of considerable personal beauty was compelled to prostitute himself. It was in the summer of B.C. 400 that Phædo was brought to Athens. A year would thus remain for his acquaintance with Socrates, to whom he attached himself. According to Diogenes Laertius he ran away from his master to Socrates, and was ransomed by one of the friends of the latter. Suidas says that he was accidentally present at a conversation with Socrates, and besought him to effect his liberation. Various accounts mentioned Alcibiades, Crito, or Cebes as the person who ransomed him. Cebes is stated to have been on terms of intimate friendship with Phædo, and to have instructed him in philosophy. Phædo was present at the death of Socrates, while he was still quite a youth. From the mention of his long hair it would seem that he was not eighteen years of age at the time, as at that age it was customary to cease wearing the hair long (Becker, *Charikles*, ii, 382). That Phædo was

on terms of friendship with Plato appears likely from the mode in which he is introduced in the dialogue which takes its name from him. Other stories that were current in the schools spoke of their relation as being that of enmity rather than friendship. Several philosophers were ungenerous enough to reproach Phædo with his previous condition, but Æschines named one of his dialogues after Phædo. Phædo appears to have lived in Athens some time after the death of Socrates. He then returned to Elis, where he became the founder of a school of philosophy, which appears to have resembled in tendency and character the Megaric school. Anchipylus and Moschus are mentioned among his disciples. He was succeeded by Pleistanus, after whom the Elean school was merged in the Eretrian.

Of the doctrines of Phædo nothing is known, except as they made their appearance in the philosophy of Menedemus. Nothing can safely be inferred respecting them from the Phædo of Plato. None of Phædo's writings have come down to us. They were in the form of dialogues. There was some doubt in antiquity as to which were genuine, and which were not. Panætius attempted a critical separation of the two classes, and the Ζώπυρος and the Σίμων were acknowledged to be genuine. Besides these, Diogenes Laertius (ii, 105) mentions as of doubtful authenticity the Νικίας, Μήδιος, Ἀντίμαχος ἢ πρεσβίται, and Σκυθικοὶ λόγοι. In addition to these Suidas mentions the Σιμμίας, Ἀλκιβιάδης, and Κριτόλαος. It was probably from the Zopyrus that the incident alluded to by Cicero (*De Fato*, 5; *Tusc. Disp.* iv, 37, § 80), Maximus Tyr. (xxxi, 3), and others, was derived. Seneca (*Ep.* 94, 41) has a translation of a short passage from one of his pieces. See Fabricius, *Bibl. Græc.* ii, 717; Schöll, *Gesch. der Griech. Lit.* i, 475; Preller, in Ersch and Gruber's *Encyklopedie*, s. v.; Preller, *Phædons Lebensschicksale u. Schriften* in the *Rheinisches Museum für Philosophie*, 1846, p. 391 sq., now in his *Kleine Schriften*, ed. by R. Köhler.

Phædrus, an Epicurean philosopher, and contemporary of Cicero, became acquainted with the great orator in his youth at Rome, and during his residence in Athens (B.C. 80) Cicero renewed his acquaintance with him. Phædrus was at that time an old man, and was president of the Epicurean school. He was also on terms of friendship with Velleius, whom Cicero introduces as the defender of the Epicurean tenets in the *De Nat. Deor.* (i, 21, § 58). He occupied the position of head of the Epicurean school till B.C. 70, and was succeeded by Patron. Cicero (*Ad Att.* xiii, 39) mentions, according to the common reading, two treatises by Phædrus, Φαίδρου περισσῶν et Ἑλλάδος. The first title is corrected on MS. authority to Περὶ θεῶν. Some critics (as Petersen) suppose that only one treatise is spoken of, Περὶ θεῶν καὶ Παλλάδος. Others (among whom is Orelli, *Onom. Tull.* s. v. Phædrus) adopt the reading *et* Ἑλλάδος, or, at least, suppose that two treatises are spoken of. An interesting fragment of the former work was discovered at Herculaneum in 1806, and was first published, though not recognised as the work of Phædrus, in a work entitled *Herculanensia*, or *Archæological and Philological Dissertations; containing a Manuscript found among the Ruins of Herculaneum* (Lond. 1810). A better edition was published by Petersen (*Phædri Epicurei, vulgo Anonymi Herculanensis, de Nat. Deor. Fragm.* Hamb. 1833). Cicero was largely indebted to this work of Phædrus for the materials of the first book of his *De Natura Deorum*. Not only is the development of the Epicurean doctrine (c. 16, etc.) taken from it, but the erudite account of the doctrines of earlier philosophers put in the mouth of Velleius is a mere translation from Phædrus. See Fabricius, *Bibl. Græc.* iii, 608; Krische, *Forschungen auf dem Gebiete der alten Phil.* i, 27, etc.; Preller, in Ersch and Gruber's *Encykl.*—Smith, *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. and Mythol.* s. v.

Phænolium (*Φαινόλιον*). See Chasuble.

Phænomenon (*φαινόμενον*, from *φαίνομαι*, *to appear*) is that which has *appeared*. It is generally applied to some sensible appearance, some occurrence in the course of nature. But in mental philosophy it is applied to the various and changing states of mind. "How pitiful and ridiculous are the grounds upon which such men pretend to account for the very lowest and commonest *phænomena* of nature without recurring to a God and Providence!" "Among the various *phænomena* which the human mind presents to our view, there is none more calculated to excite our curiosity and our wonder than the communication which is carried on between the sentient, thinking, and active principle within us and the material objects with which we are surrounded" (Stewart, *Elements*, ch. i, sect. 1). In the philosophy of Kant, *phænomenon* means an object such as we represent it to ourselves or conceive of it, in opposition to *noumenon*, or a thing as it is in itself. "According to Kant, the facts of consciousness, in their subjective character, are produced partly from the nature of the things of which it is conscious; and hence, in their objective character, they are *phænomena*, or objects as they appear in relation to us, not things in themselves, *noumena*, or realities in their absolute nature, as they may be out of relation to the mind. The subjective elements which the mind itself contributes to the consciousness of every object are to be found, as regards intuition, in the forms of space and time; and as regards thought, in the categories, unity, plurality, and the rest. To perceive a thing in itself would be to perceive it neither in space nor in time; for these are furnished by the constitution of our perceptive faculties, and constitute an element of the *phænomenal* object of intuition only. To think of a thing in itself would be to think of it neither as one nor as many, nor under any other category; for these, again, depend upon the constitution of our understanding, and constitute an element of the *phænomenal* object of thought. The *phænomenal* is the product of the inherent laws of our own mental constitution, and, as such, is the sum and limit of all the knowledge to which we can attain" (Mansel, *Lect. on Phil. of Kant*, p. 21, 22). The definition of *phænomenon* is, "that which can be known only along with something else" (Ferrier, *Inst. of Metaphys.* p. 319). See McCosh, *Intuition; Jour. Specul. Philos.* vol. ii, No. 2, art. iii and iv; vol. iii, No. 2, art. iv; June, 1872, art. v. See Noumenon.

Phænos, the capital of Trachonitis, in the northeast of Palestine; the *Ænos* of the Peutinger Table; one of the episcopal cities of Arabia (S. Paulo, *Geogr. Sacr.* p. 297), twenty-seven Roman miles from Damascus, thirty-seven from Kenath. It is now the village of *Musmeih*, on the northern edge of the Lejah, as was proved by an inscription (Burckhardt, *Travels*, p. 117 sq.; Porter, *Damascus*, ii, 112 sq.).—Van de Velde, *Memoir*, p. 339.

Phagiphania. The name by which the *Epiphany* (q. v.) was sometimes called in the ancient Church; and it arose from connecting our Saviour's miracle of feeding five thousand men with the first miracle at Cana, as a manifestation of divine power to be celebrated on this day. See Riddle, *Christian Antiquities;* Siegel, *Christl. Alterthümer.*

Phagophania. See Phagiphania.

Phagor. See Peor.

Phai'sur [rather *Phæsur*] (*Φαισούρ* v. r. *Φαισού*), a corrupt Græcized form (1 Esdr. ix, 44) of the Heb. name (Ezra x, 22) Pashur (q. v.).

Phalæus. See Phaleus.

Phaldai'us [rather *Phaldæus*] (*Φαλδαῖος*), a corrupt Greek form (1 Esdr. ix, 44) of the Heb. name (Neh. viii, 4) Pedaiah (q. v.).

Phale'as [rather *Phalæus*] (*Φαλαῖος*), an incorrect

Græcism (1 Esdr. v, 29) of the Heb. name (Ezra ii, 44; Neh. vii, 47) PADON (q. v.).

Pha'lec (Φαλέκ), a Græcized form (Luke iii, 35) of the name of the patriarch PELEG (q. v.).

Phallicism, or Phallic Worship. See PHALLUS.

Phal'lu (Gen. xlvi, 9). See PALLU.

Phallus (*φαλλός, membrum virile*), a representation of the male generative organ, as the symbol of the fertility of nature, was carried among the ancient Greeks in the processions of the *Dionysia*, and men disguised as women, called *Ithyphalloi*, followed immediately behind it. The phallus, which was called among the Romans *fascinum*, was often used by that people as an amulet hung around the necks of children to avert evil influences. The *Satyrica signa* of Pliny probably referred to the phallus, and he says that these were placed in gardens and on hearths to protect against the fascinations of the envious. From Pollux, also, we learn that smiths were accustomed to place figures of the phallus before their forges for the same purpose. This symbol, which disgusts us by its indecency, conveyed to the ancient heathens, as the Linga (q. v.) does to the modern Hindûs, a profound and sacred meaning. Diodorus Siculus, referring to the veneration in which the phallus was held among the Greeks, tells us that by this they would signify their gratitude to God for the populousness of their country. "It was an object of common worship throughout the nature-religion of the East, and was called by manifold names, such as *Linga*, *Joni*, *Pollear*, etc. Originally it had no other meaning than the allegorical one of that mysterious union between the male and female which throughout nature seems to be the sole condition of the continuation of the existence of animated beings; but at a later period, more particularly when ancient Rome had become the hot-bed of all natural and unnatural vices, its worship became an intolerable nuisance, and was put down by the senate on account of the more than usual immorality to which it gave rise. Its origin has caused much speculation, but no certainty has been arrived at by investigators. The Phœnicians traced its introduction into their worship to Adonis, the Egyptians to Osiris, the Phrygians to Attys, the Greeks to Dionysus. The common myth concerning it was the story of some god deprived of his powers of generation — an allusion to the sun, which in autumn loses its fructifying influence. The procession in which it was carried about was called Phallagogia, or Periphallia, and a certain hymn was sung on that occasion, called the *φαλλικὸν μέλος*. The bearers of the phallus, which generally consisted of red leather, and was attached to an enormous pole, were the Phallophoroi. Phalli were on those occasions worn as ornaments around the neck, or attached to the body. Aristotle traces the origin of comedy to the ribaldry and the improvised jokes customary on these festivals. Phalli were often attached to statues, and of a prodigious size; sometimes they were even movable. At a procession of Ptolemy Philadelphus a phallus was carried about made of gold, and one hundred and twenty yards long. Before the temple of Venus at Hierapolis there stood two phalli, one hundred and eighty feet high, upon which a priest mounted annually, and remained there in prayer for seven days. The phallus was an attribute of Pan, Priapus, and to a certain extent also of Hermes" (Chambers). The believers in the development theory of course have a way of their own in accounting for the origin and progress of phallic worship. They teach that it is the most ancient and universal of the beliefs of the human race, and that it has prevailed among all known nations of antiquity, and has been handed down in both dead and living forms to the present day. They claim to see evidences of its existence not only in Egypt, Greece, and Rome, but also in Syria, Persia, Asia Minor, Italy, Spain, Germany, France, Ireland, and Scandinavia, among the mound-builders of North America, in Mexico, Central America, Peru, and Hayti, and in the islands of the Pacific Ocean, and in Africa. They even see its traces among the Jews, and in the use of certain symbols in Christianity. Thus, e. g., Westropp teaches: "The origin of the idea is coeval among primitive nations with that of the family, and rests in part upon the natural veneration of the father as the generator, the priest, and the ruler. Marriage derived much of its importance from a veneration of the principles at the foundation of the phallic worship. Its ceremony was attended with rites which marked their significance, and one of its symbols, the wedding-ring, is employed at the present day. Circumcision was in its inception a purely phallic ordinance. Although the O.-T. narrative relates that it was instituted as a covenant between Jehovah and Abraham, the rite had been practiced by the Egyptians and Phœnicians long before the birth of the Hebrew patriarch. Serpent symbolism was associated with the phallic emblems, but that there was an identity in their signification has not been clearly established. The serpent was used among most archaic nations as a symbol of wisdom and health, and yet its meaning often included the notion of life and an embodiment of the spirit." Mr. Wake, another essayist of the same school, treats the Mosaic account of the fall of man as a phallic legend, which was borrowed by the compiler of the Pentateuch from some foreign source, probably from the mysteries of Mithra, a Persian deity. The tree of the knowledge of good and evil he identifies with the fig-tree, which was highly venerated by many primitive peoples. Its leaves, it will be remembered, were sewed into aprons by Adam and Eve after their transgression. The *kerub* which guarded the tree of life is interpreted as a symbol of the Deity himself, in the form of the sacred bull of antiquity — a form under which the *kerub* is described by Ezekiel (ch. i and x). The story of the Deluge is also regarded as a myth, with decided evidences of a phallic character. In many of the incidents interwoven into the history of the Hebrews, and in many of their religious observances, Mr. Wake discovers testimony of the influence of the phallic superstition. Abraham was a Chaldæan, and by tradition declared to have been learned in astronomy, and to have taught the science to the Phœnicians. "He had higher notions of the relation of man to the Divine than his ancestors," says the writer, but there was no fundamental difference between his religious faith and that of his Syrian neighbors. The Jewish patriarchs erected pillars and planted groves, both of which were customs connected with phallic worship. Throughout the rule of the judges, and especially after the establishment of the monarchy, the Hebrews were given to derelictions from the purer religion of their nation to the idolatrous practices of their neighbors, which involved worship of phallic statues and omphalic emblems in "high places." The religion of Baal, openly denounced by the prophets, was a sort of phallism, and was conducted with lewd and abominable ceremonies, which the Jews too often imitated. Mr. Wake even holds that the basis of Christianity is more purely phallic than that of any other religion. "In the recognition of God as the universal Father, the great Parent of mankind, there is a development of the fundamental idea of phallism. In the position assigned to Mary as the mother of God the paramount principle of the primitive belief is again predominant. The nimbus, the aureole, the cross, the fish, and even the spires of churches, are symbols retained from the old phallic worship." The May-pole festival is cited as having a phallic origin, and, in the beginning, a reference to some event connected with the occurrences in the Garden of Eden. In fact, says Dr. Wilder, also of this class of writers, "There is not a fast or festival, procession or sacrament, social custom or religious symbol, existing at the present day which has not been taken bodily from phallism, or from some successive system of paganism" (comp. *Ancient Symbol Wor-*

ship: Influence of the Phallic Idea in the Religions of Antiquity, by Westropp and Wake; with Introd., etc., by Wilder [N. Y. 1871, 8vo]). These theorists lose sight altogether of the possibility that in the retrogression to which the nations cited became subject they must necessarily have manifested sensual tendencies of the very nature of phallicism, and that only in their *lowest* estate such worship was extensively indulged in. Absurd it is to point to circumcision as in anywise connected with phallic worship. The Jew practiced it as a rite of admission to the fold to distinguish him, and also as a sanitary precaution which physicians approve of in our day. We do not wonder that such ridiculous and extravagant hypotheses lead to the proposition recently made by one of the same school of thinkers as those quoted, that "there would also now appear good ground for believing that the ark of the covenant, held so sacred by the Jews, contained nothing more nor less than a phallus, the ark being the type of the Argha or Yoni (Linga worship) of India" (Sellon, in *Anthropol. Society of London*, 1863–4, p. 327 sq., 12th paper). (J. H. W.)

Phal'ti (Heb. *Palti'*, פַּלְטִי, *my deliverance;* Sept. Φαλτί), the son of Laish of Gallim, to whom Saul gave Michal in marriage after his mad jealousy had driven David forth as an outlaw (1 Sam. xxv, 44). B.C. cir. 1061. In 2 Sam. iii, 15 he is called PHALTIEL. Ewald (*Gesch.* iii, 129) suggests that this forced marriage was a piece of policy on the part of Saul to attach Phalti to his house. With the exception of this brief mention of his name, and the touching little episode in 2 Sam. iii, 16, nothing more is heard of Phalti. Michal is there restored to David. "Her husband went with her along weeping behind her to Bahurim," and there, in obedience to Abner's abrupt command, "Go, return," he turns and disappears from the scene. See DAVID.

There was another person of the same Heb. name (Numb. xiii, 9, A. V. "Palti" [q. v.]).

Phal'tiel (Heb. *Paltiel'*, פַּלְטִיאֵל, *deliverance of God;* Sept. Φαλτιήλ), Saul's son-in-law (2 Sam. iii, 15); elsewhere called PHALTI (q. v.).

Phannias (Φαννίας), son of Samuel, "of the village of Aphtha," raised by lot to the Jewish high-priesthood by the faction of John during the final siege by the Romans, A.D. 70. He was totally unfit for the position, and was compelled to go through its duties (Josephus, *War*, iv, 3, 8). He doubtless perished in the sack of the Temple.

Phantasiasts is a name given to the *Docetæ* (q. v.), and of the same import with that term.

Phantasiodocetæ is a term used by Theophylact in his commentary on the 4th chapter of John. See PHANTASIASTS.

Phanton OF PHLIUS, a Pythagorean philosopher, one of the last of that school, was a disciple of Philolaus and Eurytus, and probably in his old age contemporary with Aristoxenus the Peripatetic. B.C. 320.

Phanu'ël (Φανουήλ, probably a Græcized form of the same Heb. name with *Penuel, face of God*), a descendant of the tribe of Asher, and father of the prophetess Anna (Luke ii, 36). B.C. cir. 80.

Phar'acim (Φαρακείμ v. r. Φαρακείμ), a name mentioned in the Apocrypha (1 Esdr. v, 31) as that of a Hebrew whose "sons" returned among the servants of the Temple from the captivity with Zerubbabel; but it does not occur in the parallel lists of Ezra and Nehemiah.

Pha'raöh [vulgarly pron. *Phar'oh*] (Heb. *Paroh'*, פַּרְעֹה, Sept., New Test., and Josephus Φαραώ, but seldom in classical writers), the common title of the ancient kings of Egypt, as Ptolemy of its later kings, and Cæsar of the emperors of Rome. (The following account includes those that are of Scriptural interest, with special reference to their identification.)

The name is derived from the Egyptian word *Pirê*, or *Phrê*, signifying the *sun* (Wilkinson, *Anc. Egyptians*, i, 43). This identification, respecting which there can be no doubt, is due to the duke of Northumberland and general Felix (Rawlinson's *Herod.* ii, 293). It has been supposed that the original was the same as the Coptic *Ouro*, "the king," with the article, *Pi-ouro*, *P-ouro;* but this word appears not to have been written, judging from the evidence of the Egyptian inscriptions and writings, in the times to which the Scriptures refer. The conjecture arose from the idea that Pharaoh must signify, instead of merely implying, "king," a mistake occasioned by a too implicit confidence in the exactness of ancient writers (Joseph. *Ant.* viii, 6, 2; Euseb. ed. Scal. p. 20, v, 1). Bunsen approves of this derivation of Josephus (*Egypt's Place*, i, 191, Lond. 1848), but Wilkinson in the passage above quoted shows reasons for rejecting it. The name was probably given in the earliest times to the Egyptian kings as being the chief on earth, as the sun was the chief among the heavenly bodies, and afterwards, when this luminary became the object of idolatrous worship, as the representation or incarnation of their sun-god, Phra or Rê (Wilkinson, *Anc. Egypt.* iv, 267; Rosellini, i, 115; Trevor, *Egypt*, p. 124–136). Regarding the sun at first as the greatest of the divine works and a main element in the production of Egypt's marvellous fertility, they readily used it as significant of their monarchs, to whose wise laws in the infancy of their state Egypt is supposed to be greatly indebted for the permanence and prosperity of her institutions. "Son of the sun" was the title of every Pharaoh, and the usual comparison made by the priesthood of their monarchs when returning from a successful war was that his power was exalted in the world as the sun was in the heavens (Wilkinson, i, 400; iv, 288). In the hieroglyphics the hawk was the emblem of the king as Pharaoh (id. iii, 287), and it is perhaps of consequence to note that in the representations of, apparently, two different kings ruling contemporaneously over Upper and Lower Egypt, the hawk occurs only in connection with one of them (id. iii, 282).

Readers of Scripture will remark that Pharaoh often stands simply like a proper name (Gen. xii, 15; xxxvii, 36; xl, 2 sq.; xliv, 1 sq.; and so generally throughout the Pentateuch, and also in Cant. i, 9; Isa. xix, 11; xxx, 2). "King of Egypt" is sometimes subjoined to it (1 Kings iii, 1; 2 Kings xvii, 7; xviii, 21); and sometimes also the more specific designation, or real proper name of the monarch is indicated, as Pharaoh Necho (2 Kings xxiii, 33), Pharaoh Hophra (Jer. xliv, 30). Josephus (*Ant.* viii, 6, 2) says that while every king of Egypt from Menes to the time of Solomon took this title, no king of Egypt used it afterwards, and affirms the latter fact to be apparent from the sacred writings. This, however, is not quite correct. Several Egyptian kings were after the period in question called *by foreigners* Pharaoh, sometimes simply, sometimes in connection with a second name (2 Kings xviii, 21; xxiii, 29); but the alteration from the time of Solomon which undoubtedly took place is remarkable, and probably points to an important change in the dynastic history of Egypt.

Some writers suppose Pharaoh to have been the name given in the Bible to the *native* kings of Egypt. There were, however, probably before Solomon's time several introductions of foreign dynasties, and some of them, if we accept the usual period ascribed to the rule of the Shepherds, of long duration; yet Scripture gives the title to all alike before this period, and Josephus states that all without exception assumed it. Wilkinson supposes that it was the title of such kings as had the sole direction of affairs while Egypt was an independent state, and that the title of "melek," or king, marked such as ruled conjointly with other kings of Egypt, or who governed as viceroys under a foreign ruler, as was the case after the Persian conquest (i, 148, 179). This is very probably a satisfactory explanation for the long

period down to the reign of Solomon. Most likely throughout it "Pharaoh" marks the monarch who ruled alone in Egypt, or over its inferior and tributary kings when there were such. This may seem intimated in the speech of one of them to Joseph: "I am Pharaoh, and without thee shall no man lift up his hand or foot in all the land of Egypt" (Gen. xli, 44). Wilkinson's explanation, however, scarcely accounts for the period subsequent to the Pharaoh who gave his daughter to Solomon. Shishak, who seems to have succeeded him, was evidently the supreme ruler of Egypt, and not only independent of foreigners, but able to extend Egyptian power far beyond the limits of Egypt. A change of dynasty seems here to have caused the change of title, and was probably more or less connected with such changes in after periods. The Persian monarchs finally, administering the affairs of Egypt through tributary native kings, took the title of Pharaoh as indicative of their sovereignty (Trevor, *Egypt*, p. 331). With them this ancient name of royalty passed away forever.

The political position of the Pharaohs in Egypt is of great moment in understanding the history of that country. If it were the exclusive title of the supreme ruler, it marks the general unity of Egypt under a single monarch. If it were given indifferently to every king of Egypt at those times, which seem unquestionably to have recurred, and may have been of long duration and early date, when several kings ruled over various divisions of the country, the occurrence of the title does not necessarily mark the political unity of the land. According to the first view, for instance, the Pharaoh of Abraham or Joseph would be the supreme ruler of the whole of Egypt, with, it might happen, various dynasties of subordinate kings under him; according to the latter, he might be only king of a portion of Egypt, with other dynasties of equal rank ruling contemporaneously elsewhere. To us the former view appears the preferable one for many reasons. The unity of Egypt under a single supreme monarch is, we think, unquestionably the view according to which the Scriptures lead us to think that *foreigners* regarded that country. Whatever may have been the internal administration of the government, into which Scripture does not enter at all, the general view given us of Egypt in the Bible is that of a country united under one monarch. The earliest apparent reference to a different state of things occurs in 2 Kings vii, 6, where we read of "kings of Egypt," apparently of equal authority. Isaiah predicts great troubles arising probably from a similar dissolution of any central authority (ch. xix, 3; Wilkinson, *Egypt*, i, 178; Rawlinson's *Herodotus*, i, 51, note 4, and 391). All ancient history with which we are acquainted (Herodotus, Diodorus, and Manetho) assumes the political unity of Egypt. The titles of the Pharaohs seem to establish it. They are always called on the monuments "Lords of Upper and Lower Egypt" (Wilkinson, ii, 73; 2d ser. i, 261). This unity of Egypt from the earliest times is now generally acknowledged (Hengstenberg, *Egypt*, p. 84). The power and greatness of Egypt from the remotest times point to such a unity. Its high civilization and peaceful internal condition are a similar indication. If divided into several independent kingdoms Egypt would have exhibited the same condition which all the petty states of antiquity did, in which every man was of necessity a soldier (Hume, *Essays*, ii, xi). Whereas in Egypt soldiers formed a different class from the rest of the community, never wore arms except in actual service, while private citizens at no time carried offensive weapons (Wilkinson, i, 402). Indeed, it is impossible to imagine any country less suited by geographical configuration for divided rule than Egypt from the Cataracts to the sea. One level valley, only divided east and west by its river, shut in from the rest of the world by the Libyan and Arabian mountains and the Syrian deserts, it must of necessity form a single state.

This view of the political position of the Pharaohs is not inconsistent with the theory, for which there is very strong proof from Manetho and elsewhere, that for long periods of Egyptian history there may have been subordinate dynasties of kings ruling throughout Egypt. There may also have been, but probably for much shorter periods, a total overthrow of the central power, or a practical disregard of it even while acknowledging its nominal authority. There is a passage of Manetho preserved by Josephus which seems to point strongly to the view that the ancient internal constitution of Egypt was its government by subordinate kings under a supreme ruler (Josephus, *Con. Ap.* i, 14). Such, he expressly tells us, was its state during the oppression of the Shepherds: "These tyrannized over the kings of Thebais and of the other parts of Egypt." The general idea of ancient government was that of a supreme monarch over tributary kings; and the great probability is that the Shepherds followed this analogy, and, merely deposing the ruling Pharaoh, left the minor dynasties undisturbed. The Pharaohs are supposed to have been at all times invested with the highest sacerdotal dignity (Hengstenberg, *Egypt*, p. 35; Wilkinson, i, 245). From the circumstance that in the earliest names enclosed in ovals the title priest precedes that of king, and for other reasons, Wilkinson argues, as we think inconclusively, that Egypt was originally governed by hierarchical and not regal power (i, 16). See Egypt.

1. *The Pharaoh of Abraham.*—The first mention of a Pharaoh in the Bible is on the occasion of Abram's visit to Egypt during a famine in Canaan (Gen. xii, 10). Which of the ancient kings of Egypt is to be understood by this Pharaoh it is perhaps impossible to determine with certainty. Wilkinson supposes him to have been *Apappus;* Africanus calls him *Ramessemenes;* and some have taken him to be one of the Shepherd kings. We have, in truth, no materials in Scripture or elsewhere for fixing the name and place of this king in the dynasties of Egypt. In regard to the date also of Abraham's intercourse with him there is great uncertainty. But as the investigation of the point would involve us in a discussion on the somewhat perplexed chronology of the earlier parts of Old-Test. history, and the still more perplexed chronology of ancient Egypt, we can here only touch upon it; but see for the refutation of extreme views on the part of the Egyptologists, Hengstenberg's *Egypt and the Books of Moses*, and Sir C. Lewis's *Astronomy of the Ancients*. At the time at which the patriarch went into Egypt, according to Hales's as well as Usher's chronology, it is generally held that the country, or at least Lower Egypt, was ruled by the Shepherd kings, of whom the first and most powerful line was the fifteenth dynasty, the undoubted territories of which would be first entered by one coming from the east. Manetho relates that Salatis, the head of this line, established at Avaris, perhaps the Zoan of the Bible, on the eastern frontier, what appears to have been a great permanent camp, at which he resided for part of each year. See Zoan. It is noticeable that Sarah seems to have been taken to Pharaoh's house immediately after the coming of Abraham; and if this were not so, yet, on account of his flocks and herds, the patriarch could scarcely have gone beyond the part of the country which was always more or less occupied by nomad tribes. It is also possible that Pharaoh gave Abraham camels, for we read that Pharaoh "entreated Abram well for Sarah's sake: and he had sheep, and oxen, and he-asses, and men-servants, and maid-servants, and she-asses, and camels" (Gen. xii, 16), where it appears that this property was the gift of Pharaoh, and the circumstance that the patriarch afterwards held an Egyptian bondwoman, Hagar, confirms the inference. If so, the present of camels would argue that this Pharaoh was a Shepherd king, for no evidence has been found in the sculptures, paintings, and inscriptions of Egypt that in the Pharaonic ages the camel was used, or even known there, and this omission can be best explained by the supposition that the animal

was hateful to the Egyptians as of great value to their enemies the Shepherds. On the other hand, Abraham's possessions, especially the camels, may have been purchased by him from the nomad tribes with the proceeds of Pharaoh's liberality, and the fact that Hagar was of this Arab race hardly consists with her having been reduced to bondage while they were in the ascendant. Indeed, it appears that the Shepherd kings (q. v.) were not on good terms with the Hebrews, as their interests were rival. The date at which Abraham visited Egypt (according to the chronology which we hold most probable) was about B.C. 2081, which would not accord with the time of Salatis, the head of the fifteenth dynasty, B.C. 2006, according to our reckoning, but rather with that of Binothris of the second (Thinitic) dynasty, and that of Othoës of the sixth (Memphitic) dynasty, as well as with that of Tancheres of the fifth (Elephantinitic) dynasty, but anterior to all the other dynasties.

2. *The Pharaoh of Joseph.*—Between the Pharaoh of Abraham and the Pharaoh of Joseph there was an interval of two hundred years. During this period there may have been various changes of dynasty, art, and religion in Egypt of which we derive no information from Scripture; while the notice of the former king and of the state of the country in his time is so brief that we cannot by comparison arrive at any conclusion upon this point. Of the political position and character of the latter, and the condition of Egypt in his time, Scripture gives us very important information from his intimate connection with Joseph and the chosen people of God.

Wilkinson identifies this Pharaoh with *Osirtesen I*, one of the kings of his sixteenth dynasty of Tanites, whose reign he supposes to have exceeded forty-three years (*Egypt.* i, 42, 43). Bunsen prefers to identify him with *Osirtesen III*, of the seventeenth dynasty of Memphites, who is, according to him, the Sesostris of classical writers (Trevor, *Egypt*, p. 254). Osburn thinks him to have been *Apophis* (*ibid.* p. 216), as Eusebius states, changing the date so as to fit. The identification obviously depends simply upon a comparison of the Hebrew and Egyptian chronologies. Whether he was of one of the dynasties of the Shepherd kings is a question on which authorities differ, according to their views of the date of the Shepherd rule, and their interpretation of the scriptural account of this king. Wilkinson is decidedly of opinion that he was not a Shepherd king, an opinion with which Trevor agrees. Josephus says that he was a Shepherd. We are decidedly of opinion from the incidental notices of Scripture that he was not of a Shepherd dynasty. If we are to accept Manetho's account, we must suppose that these Shepherds conquered the most of Egypt, ruled with the greatest tyranny and cruelty over the Egyptians, disregarded the old laws of the country, and demolished its temples (Josephus, *Ap.* i, 14). Their rule was not one of policy and conciliation, but of brute force and terror, an idea strongly corroborated by the abomination in which the Bible tells us all shepherds were held in Egypt, and by the testimony which the monuments bear to the detestation and scorn in which they were universally held (Wilkinson, ii, 16; iv, 126). The Shepherds being such, it seems to us quite inconsistent with the Biblical narrative to suppose that Joseph's Pharaoh was a Shepherd king. Thus we find that the Egyptian prejudice against shepherds was carefully and jealously respected by this king. The Israelites on coming into Egypt were by him located in the border-land (Hengstenberg, *Egypt*, p. 42) of Goshen, where they would serve as a barrier against the shepherd-hating Egyptians (Gen. xlvi, 34). We cannot suppose a Shepherd king to act thus. He would not thus consult a native prejudice hostile to his own dynasty, while his own Shepherd garrisons occupied the strongholds of Egypt. Again, Pharaoh's court and household, so far as we know them, were composed of native Egyptians. Such was Potiphar, the captain of the king's bodyguard, probably the most trusted officer of Pharaoh (Gen. xxxix, 1); while the chief butler and baker of his court are the well-known officers of the native court of the Pharaohs (Trevor, p. 256). The officials of Pharaoh's prime minister, Joseph, are also native Egyptians, whose feelings of caste towards foreigners were carefully consulted (Gen. xliii, 32; see Rawlinson's *Herodotus*, bk. ii, c. 41, note 9). In the midst of universal destitution, when all others were reduced to serfdom, and the lands of Egypt passed into the possession of Pharaoh, the property of the native Egyptian priests alone was religiously respected, and they received, without any return, an ample maintenance from Pharaoh's stores for themselves and their families (Gen. xlvii, 22). When Pharaoh sought to bestow upon Joseph marks of the highest honor for his preservation of the country, one of these marks was the bestowal on him in marriage of Asenath, the daughter of Potipherah, priest of On or Heliopolis, who is thus distinguished as one of the highest and most honored personages in the land (Gen. xli, 45). These considerations lead us to conclude that this Pharaoh was a native Egyptian, not a Shepherd king, and that he ruled after the expulsion of the Shepherds, or during their supremacy, while the memory of their tyranny was still vivid in the national mind. Rawlinson (*Herod.* bk. ii, c. 108, note 2) seems to think that horses were unknown in Egypt till the time of Amosis (B.C. 1510), and would thus give a low date for this monarch, in whose time horses were in use for ordinary purposes as well as for war (Gen. xlvii, 17). The testimony of Herodotus on which he comments seems, however, opposed to this view. According to the chronology which we adopt, the period of Joseph's deliverance from prison was B.C. 1883, which will fall, according to our view of the Egyptian dynasties, under the reign of Aphobis, the fourth king of the fifteenth (Shepherd) dynasty. But as the Shepherd kings do not seem to have been friendly to the Hebrews, and for the other reasons enumerated above, we presume that these foreigners were not at this time (if indeed they ever were) in possession of the whole of Egypt. We therefore incline to identify the Pharaoh in question with one of the eighth (Memphitic) dynasty, whose names are unrecorded, but who were contemporaneous with the twelfth (Diospolitic) as well as with the fifteenth (Shepherd) dynasty. There is one indication in Scripture which seems to attribute a very considerable antiquity to this period. In Joseph's time the territory allocated to the Israelites was called Goshen (Gen. xlv, 10). In the time of Moses this ancient name appears to have been almost forgotten, and to have yielded to that of the land of Rameses (Gen. xlvii, 11).

The religion of Egypt during the reign of this Pharaoh appears to have been far less corrupt than it subsequently presents itself in the time of Moses. The Scriptures give us several indications of this; and these of no indistinct kind. Thus Joseph speaks to his master's wife as if she recognised the same God that he did (Gen. xxxix, 9). His language to the chief butler and baker in the prison conveys a similar idea (xl, 8), as does his address to Pharaoh when called before him (xli, 16-32). Pharaoh in his speech to his servants and to Joseph speaks of God precisely as Joseph had done, and as if he recognised but one God (xli, 38, 39). Joseph, without any fear of injurious consequences to himself, and as if it were no extraordinary thing, allows the identity of his religion with that of the sons of Jacob (xlii, 18). Joseph's steward, probably a native Egyptian, evidently recognises their God (xliii, 23). No doubt corruption had now been introduced into the pure religion derived from Noah. In the magicians and wise men (xli, 8) of Egypt we see probably a caste who had already

given a superstitious coloring to religion, introduced new rites of worship, and paved the way for a total declension from theism to gross polytheism. But this latter condition does not appear to have been reached in the time of Joseph. Symbolic worship, if now, as is most likely, in common use, had still to a very great extent left undestroyed the notion of one supreme God ruling over all the nations; nor have we reason to suppose that Potipherah, the father-in-law of Joseph, and priest of On, was an upholder of the idolatry of a later time. The sun, now introduced into Egyptian worship, was by him in all likelihood explained as the sign and symbol of deity, but not as partaking of deity itself. No doubt we see from this the danger of any alteration by man of the worship ordained by God, but at the same time the religion of Egypt may have been comparatively true and pure, though it had now introduced that symbolism which quickly degenerated into the grossest idolatry the world has ever seen. Symbolic worship was now probably regarded as a high proof of religious wisdom (Rom. i, 22); a short time proved it to be utter folly.

The government of Pharaoh seems to have been of an absolute kind (Gen. xli, 40–43; see Wilkinson, i, 45). The supposition that at this time Egypt was governed by several independent dynasties seems inconsistent with the language and conduct of Pharaoh in making by his own mere will Joseph to be ruler "over all the land of Egypt," only inferior to himself throughout its whole extent. But this language is evidently that of courtly assumption, and may very naturally be applied only to that region over which he ruled. The evidence is very strong from the monuments and other sources that even under the Shepherd rule there were kings in other parts of Egypt largely if not wholly independent of them. The appointment of coregents decorated with royal titles is thought to have been characteristic of this dynasty (Trevor, *Egypt*, p. 258). This Pharaoh's personal character seems to have been that of a wise and prudent monarch, anxious for the welfare of his people, and superior to popular prejudice against strangers. Wilkinson thinks he was pacific in his policy, and his conduct in receiving a blessing from the aged Jacob shows a humility of mind and a respect for worth which contrasts very favorably with the conduct of other despotic kings. The situation of his capital was near the land of Goshen (Gen. xlv, 10), and the civilization and flourishing condition of Egypt during his reign were very great (Wilkinson, i, 43). Whether he were the same monarch whom we find ruling Egypt at the time of Jacob's death, seventeen years subsequently to his removal into Goshen, has been differently viewed (Gen. l, 4). It has been thought by some that Joseph's using the intercession of Pharaoh's household to procure a favor from the king indicates a less intimate acquaintance than we should expect between him and that king who ruled at the time of the famine. But local customs, probably connected with the habits of Egyptian mourning, may account for this, without supposing a different king (Hengstenberg, *Egypt*, p. 71).

3. *The Pharaoh of the First Persecution of the Israelites.*—The interval which elapsed between the Pharaoh of Joseph's time and the Pharaoh who commenced the persecution of Israel is much affected by opinion as to the length of the sojourn in Egypt. See CHRONOLOGY. According to our view, the interval between Jacob's removal into Egypt and the birth of Moses was a little over one hundred and thirty-five years. The unknown quantity is the period from the commencement of the persecution to the birth of Moses. It was the same Pharaoh that began to afflict Israel who reigned when Moses was born (Acts vii, 20), and the persecution must have continued a considerable time previous to allow for the events mentioned in the first chapter of Exodus. These included the building of two considerable cities and other labor, for which a period of several years seems to be required. The name and dynasty of this king have been differently given (*Jour. of Sac. Lit.* [new ser.] i, 491). Wilkinson supposes him to have been *Amosis* or *Ames*, the first of the eighteenth dynasty of Theban or Diospolitan kings, and supports his view of the change of dynasty at this time, and the accession of kings from the distant province of Thebes, from the scriptural account of him as "a new king that knew not Joseph" (i, 47, 76). Lord Prudhoe, in an able paper given by Wilkinson (i, 78), argues that the new king was *Rameses I*, who was also, according to him, the head of a new dynasty, and as such ignorant of the history of Joseph, while it was for Rameses II that the Israelites built the treasure cities. According to the fragment of Manetho preserved by Theophilus, the new king was *Tethmosis* (Bunsen, *Egypt*, i, 655). He is very commonly supposed to have been the king who crushed the power of the Shepherds in Egypt. From a picture on the walls of a very interesting tomb of Roshere, "superintendent of the great buildings" to king Thothmes III, Trevor (*Egypt*, p. 72) thinks it likely that it was during his dynasty, the eighteenth, that the oppression of Israel occurred, and that most likely Amosis, the first king, was the originator of it (p. 275). Josephus (*Ant.* ii, 9, 1) considers him to have been of a new family called to the throne; but Hengstenberg (*Egypt*, p. 252) argues that the appellation of "new king," in the Bible, which is very often referred to in proof of a change of dynasty, indicates only a disregard of the services of Joseph, and a forgetfulness of the old affection that used to be entertained in Egypt and by its kings for the great preserver of their country. According to Manetho's story of the Exodus—a story so contradictory to historical truth as scarcely to be worthy of mention—the Israelites left Egypt in the reign of Meneptah, who was great-grandson of the first Rameses, and son and successor of the second. This king is held by some Egyptologists to have reigned about the time of the rabbinical date of the Exodus, which is virtually the same as that which has been supposed to be obtainable from the genealogies. There is, however, good reason to place these kings much later; in which case Rameses I would be the oppressor; but then the building of Rameses could not be placed in his reign without a disregard of Hebrew chronology. But the argument that there is no earlier known king Rameses loses much of its weight when we bear in mind that one of the sons of Aähmes, head of the eighteenth dynasty, who reigned about two hundred years before Rameses I, bore the same name, besides that very many names of kings of the Shepherd period, perhaps of two whole dynasties, are unknown. Against this one fact, which is certainly not to be disregarded, we must weigh the general evidence of the history, which shows us a king apparently governing a part of Egypt, with subjects inferior to the Israelites, and fearing a war in the country. Like the Pharaoh of the Exodus, he seems to have dwelt in Lower Egypt, probably at Avaris. (When Moses went to see his people, and slew the Egyptian, he does not seem to have made any journey, and the burying in sand shows that the place was in a part of Egypt, like Goshen, encompassed by sandy deserts.) Compare this condition with the power of the kings of the latter part of the eighteenth and of the nineteenth dynasties: rulers of an empire, governing a united country from which the head of their line had driven the Shepherds. The view that this Pharaoh was of the beginning or middle of the eighteenth dynasty seems at first sight extremely probable, especially if it be supposed that the Pharaoh of Joseph was a Shepherd king. The expulsion of the Shepherds at the commencement of this dynasty would have naturally caused an immediate or gradual oppression of the Israelites. But it must be remembered that what we have just said of the power of some kings of this dynasty is almost as true of their

predecessors. The silence of the historical monuments is also to be weighed, when we bear in mind how numerous the gaps are, and that we might expect many of the events of the oppression to be recorded even if the exodus were not noticed. If we assign this Pharaoh to the age before the eighteenth dynasty, which our view of Hebrew chronology would probably oblige us to do, we have still to determine whether he were a Shepherd or an Egyptian. If a Shepherd, he must have been of the sixteenth or the seventeenth dynasty; and that he was Egyptianized does not afford any argument against this supposition, since it appears that foreign kings, who can only be assigned to one of these two lines, had Egyptian names. In corroboration of this view we quote a remarkable passage that does not seem otherwise explicable: "My people went down aforetime into Egypt to sojourn there; and the Assyrian oppressed them without cause" (Isa. lii, 4): which may be compared with the allusions to the exodus in a prediction of the same prophet respecting Assyria (x, 24, 26). Our inference is strengthened by the discovery that kings bearing a name almost certainly an Egyptian translation of an Assyrian or Babylonian regal title are among those apparently of the Shepherd age in the Turin Papyrus (Lepsius, *Königsbuch*, Tafel xviii, xix, 275, 285). According to our view of the Hebrew chronology, the birth of Moses occurred B.C. 1738. The scheme of Egyptian chronology which we have adopted places the beginning of the sixteenth (Shepherd) dynasty in B.C. 1755, and it would therefore be under the reign of one of the first kings of this dynasty, whose names are unknown, that the persecution of the Israelites began.

4. *The Pharaoh of Moses's Exile.*—It is often supposed that the Pharaoh who ruled Egypt at the birth of Moses is the same Pharaoh who ruled it when Moses fled into Midian (Exod. ii, 15). There is nothing in the narrative of Scripture to lead us to this conclusion, though it may possibly have been the case. The probabilities, however, seem to point the other way. We have allowed about eight years of his reign to have elapsed prior to the birth of Moses, who at the period of flight was forty years of age (Acts vii, 23). The monarch, therefore, if the same, must have reigned forty-eight years, which is an unusual length. (The entire 16th dynasty of thirty-two kings seems to have lasted but 112 years.) The jealousy also with which Moses was regarded by this Pharaoh seems to indicate that he did not stand towards him in the relation of his grandfather by adoption. The view is further confirmed by the intimation in Exod. iv, 19, which seems to tell us that the Pharaoh who sought Moses's life lived nearly to the time of his return into Egypt, a period of forty years. If this were so, it is impossible for this king to have been the monarch who began the persecution of Israel. We prefer, therefore, to regard him as different, and as probably chosen by adoption, to continue the succession of a childless family. We would make the year during his reign at the flight of Moses to have been B.C. 1698, and his attempt upon the life of the great lawgiver is the only event of his reign recorded in Scripture.

5. *The Pharaoh of the Exode.*—The Pharaoh in whose reign the deliverance of the Israelites was achieved would appear to have succeeded to the throne not very long before the return of Moses to Egypt after his forty years' sojourn in Midian (Exod. iv, 19). His relationship to his predecessor is not told us, but he was probably of the same dynasty, and carried on the traditional policy of a grinding oppression of the Israelites. We do not read of any effort of his to reduce the numbers of that nation: he seems rather to have looked on their numbers as an additional source of grandeur and power to Egypt by an enforced system of labor. The name of this Pharaoh is very variously related. Wilkinson supposes him to have been *Thothmes III*, the fourth or fifth monarch, according to him, of the eighteenth dynasty of Theban or Diospolitan kings; while Manetho, according to Africanus, makes him to have been *Amos*, the first of that line of monarchs; and lord Prudhoe would have him to have been *Pthahmen*, the last of that dynasty (Wilkinson, *Egypt.* i, 31, 41, 81). Ptolemy, the priest of Mendis, agrees in opinion with Manetho (Bunsen, *Egypt*, i, 90). Various reasons are given in the *Journal of Sacred Literature* (new ser. i, 490) for supposing him to have been *Sethos II.* Respecting the time of this king, we can only be sure that he was reigning for about a year or more before the exodus, which we place B.C. 1658.

His acts show us a man at once impious and superstitious, alternately rebelling and submitting. At first he seems to have thought that his magicians could work the same wonders as Moses and Aaron, yet even then he begged that the frogs might be taken away, and to the end he prayed that a plague might be removed, promising a concession to the Israelites, and as soon as he was respited failed to keep his word. This is not strange in a character principally influenced by fear, and history abounds in parallels to Pharaoh. His vacillation only ended when he lost his army in the Red Sea, and the Israelites were finally delivered out of his hand. Whether he himself was drowned has been considered matter of uncertainty, as it is not so stated in the account of the exodus. Another passage, however, appears to affirm it (Psa. cxxxvi, 15). It seems to be too great a latitude of criticism either to argue that the expression in this passage indicates the overthrow, but not the death of the king, especially as the Hebrew expression "shook off" or "threw in" is very literal, or that it is only a strong Shemitic expression. Besides, throughout the preceding history his end is foreshadowed, and is, perhaps, positively foretold in Exod. ix, 15; though this passage may be rendered, "For now I might have stretched out my hand, and might have smitten thee and thy people with pestilence; and thou wouldest have been cut off from the earth," as by Kalisch (*Commentary*, ad loc.), instead of as in the A. V.

Although we have already stated our reasons for abandoning the theory that places the exodus under the nineteenth dynasty, it may be well to notice an additional and conclusive argument for rejecting as unhistorical the tale preserved by Manetho, which makes *Meneptah*, the son of Rameses II, the Pharaoh in whose reign the Israelites left Egypt. This tale was commonly current in Egypt, but it must be remarked that the historian gives it only on the authority of tradition. M. Mariette's recent discoveries have added to the evidence we already had on the subject. In this story the secret of the success of the rebels was that they had allotted to them by Amenophis, or Meneptah, the city of Avaris, formerly held by the Shepherds, but then in ruins. That the people to whom this place was given were working in the quarries east of the Nile is enough of itself to throw a doubt on the narrative, for there appear to have been no quarries north of those opposite Memphis, from which Avaris was distant nearly the whole length of the Delta; but when it is found that this very king, as well as his father, adorned the great temple of Avaris, the story is seen to be essentially false. Yet it is not improbable that some calamity occurred about this time, with which the Egyptians wilfully or ignorantly confounded the exodus: if they did so ignorantly, there would be an argument that this event took place during the Shepherd period, which was probably in after-times an obscure part of the annals of Egypt. The character of this Pharaoh finds its parallel among the Assyrians rather than the Egyptians. The impiety of the oppressor and that of Sennacherib are remarkably similar, though Sennacherib seems to have been more resolute in his resistance than Pharaoh. This resemblance is not to be overlooked, especially as it seems to indicate an idiosyncrasy of the Assyrians and kin-

dred nations, for national character was more marked in antiquity than it is now in most peoples, doubtless because isolation was then general and is now special. Thus, the Egyptian monuments show us a people highly reverencing their gods, and even those of other nations, the most powerful kings appearing as suppliants in the representations of the temples and tombs. In the Assyrian sculptures, on the contrary, the kings are seen rather as protected by the gods than as worshipping them; so that we understand how in such a country the famous decree of Darius, which Daniel disobeyed, could be enacted. Again, the Egyptians do not seem to have supposed that their enemies were supported by gods hostile to those of Egypt, whereas the Assyrians considered their gods as more powerful than those of the nations they subdued. This is important in connection with the idea that at least one of the Pharaohs of the oppression was an Assyrian.

The idolatry of Egypt appears to have arrived at its height in the time of this monarch. We see evidences of a great difference between the religious system of this period and of the time of Joseph's Pharaoh. At both periods indeed we read of the "magician and wise men of Egypt," but it by no means follows that because the names are the same the part discharged by them was identical in the two periods. Besides, we read in the later period (Exod. vii, 11) of an order of men (sorcerers, מְכַשְּׁפִים) apparently unknown in the earlier. These men supported their authority and doctrine by claims to miraculous power (ver. 11), whether we suppose them to have executed their feats merely by a skilful system of jugglery and sleight of hand, or, as many think, by diabolical aid. The authority of the God of Israel, acknowledged by the earlier Pharaoh, is by this king scornfully renounced, and a vast system of polytheism, embracing the famous worship of sacred animals, is firmly established as the religion of Egypt (v, 2; xii, 12; viii, 26). This was the suitable time chosen by God, when a great monarch ruled over the greatest empire of its time, which had brought to full development the idolatry by it widely propagated, to read a lesson to the Gentile world on the feebleness of idols as compared to him.

Before speaking of the later Pharaohs we may mention a point of weight in reference to the identification of these earlier ones. The accounts of the campaigns of the Pharaohs of the eighteenth, nineteenth, and twentieth dynasties have not been found to contain any reference to the Israelites. Hence it might be supposed that in their days, or at least during the greater part of the time, the Israelites were not yet in the Promised Land. There is, however, an almost equal silence as to the Canaanitish nations. The land itself, *Kanana* or *Kanaan*, is indeed mentioned as invaded, as well as those of *Kheta* and *Amar*, referring to the Hittites and Amorites; but the latter two must have been branches of those nations seated in the valley of the Orontes. A recently discovered record of Thothmes III, published by M. de Rougé in the *Revue Archéologique* (Nov. 1861, p. 344 sq.), contains many names of Canaanitish towns conquered by that king, but not one recognised as Israelitish. These Canaanitish names are, moreover, on the Israelitish borders, not in the heart of the country. It is interesting that a great battle is shown to have been won by this king at Megiddo. It seems probable that the Egyptians either abstained from attacking the Israelites from a recollection of the calamities of the exodus, or that they were on friendly terms. It is very remarkable that the Egyptians were granted privileges in the law (Deut. xxiii, 7), and that Shishak, the first king of Egypt after the exodus whom we know to have invaded the Hebrew territories, was of foreign extraction, if not actually a foreigner.

6. *Pharaoh, the Father-in-law of Mered.*—In the genealogies of the tribe of Judah, mention is made of the daughter of a Pharaoh married to an Israelite: "Bithiah, the daughter of Pharaoh, which Mered took" (1 Chron. iv, 18). That the name Pharaoh here probably designates an Egyptian king we have already shown, and observed that the date of Mered is doubtful, although it is likely that he lived before, or not much after, the exodus. See BITHIAH. It may be added that the name, Miriam, of one of the family of Mered (ver. 17), apparently his sister, or perhaps a daughter by Bithiah, suggests that this part of the genealogies may refer to about the time of the exodus. This marriage may tend to aid us in determining the age of the sojourn in Egypt. It is perhaps less probable that an Egyptian Pharaoh would have given his daughter in marriage to an Israelite, than that a Shepherd king would have done so, before the oppression. But Bithiah may have been taken in war after the exodus, by the surprise of a caravan, or in a foray. Others, however, bring down this event to the times of or near those of David. It was then the policy of the Pharaohs to ally themselves with the great families whose power lay between Egypt and Assyria, as we know from the intermarriages of Hadad and Solomon with the Egyptian dynasty. The most interesting feature connected with this transaction is the name, Bithiah (daughter of Jehovah), given to the daughter of Pharaoh. It exhibits the true faith of Israel as exerting its influence abroad, and gaining proselytes even in the royal house of idolatrous Egypt. See MERED.

7. *Pharaoh, the Protector of Hadad.*—With the exception of the preceding Pharaoh, whose date is doubtful, there is a long silence in Jewish history as to the kings of Egypt. During the period of the judges, and throughout the reigns of Saul and David, they had apparently neither entered into alliance nor made war with the Israelites. If such an event had happened, it is probable that some mention would have been made of it. It does not follow from this that during this period they had made no wars nor effected any conquests to the east of Egypt, for the seaboard of Canaan, which Israel did not during this time occupy, seems to have been a usual passage for the Egyptian armies in their eastern wars. But the silence of Scripture points to the probability that for this long period Egypt did not occupy the commanding position of the earlier or the later Pharaohs. Intestine divisions and dynastic quarrels may during a great portion of it have retained the Egyptians within their proper borders, satisfied if they were not assailed by foreign nations. In the reign of David we incidentally find notice of a Pharaoh who received with distinction Hadad the Edomite fleeing from Joab, and gave him his sister-in-law for wife (1 Kings xi, 15–22). We find this Pharaoh ruling from about the twentieth year of David's reign to its close, i. e. from about B.C. 1033 to B.C. 1013. His reign perhaps came to an end soon after David's death, as Solomon's father-in-law is thought to have been another Pharaoh. His treatment of Hadad, a bitter enemy of David, and with strong reason so, was certainly an unfriendly act towards the latter, but it does not seem to have been attended by any ulterior consequences. No war ensued between Egypt and Israel, and Pharaoh made no attempt to restore Hadad to the throne of Edom. When this latter, upon David's death, sought to return home, evidently with the intention of disturbing the reign of Solomon in its commencement, Pharaoh was apparently opposed to his return, very probably from a disinclination to favor any step which might involve him in unpleasant relations with the powerful kingdom of Israel, then at the height of its greatness. Probably in the first part of this account the fugitives took refuge in an Egyptian mining-station in the peninsula of Sinai, and so obtained guides to conduct them into Egypt. There they were received in accordance with the Egyptian policy, but with the especial favor that seems to have been shown

about this time towards the eastern neighbors of the Pharaohs, which may reasonably be supposed to have led to the establishment of the twenty-second dynasty of foreign extraction. For the identification of this Pharaoh we have chronological indications, and the name of his wife. Unfortunately, however, the history of Egypt at this time is extremely obscure, neither the monuments nor Manetho giving us clear information as to the kings. It appears that towards the latter part of the twentieth dynasty the high-priests of Amen, the god of Thebes, gained great power, and at last supplanted the Rameses family, at least in Upper Egypt. At the same time a line of Tanitic kings, Manetho's twenty-first dynasty, seems to have ruled in Lower Egypt. The feeble twentieth dynasty was probably soon extinguished, but the priest-rulers and the Tanites appear to have reigned contemporaneously, until they were both succeeded by the Bubastites of the twenty-second dynasty, of whom Sheshonk I, the Shiskak of the Bible, was the first. The monuments have preserved the names of several of the high-priests, perhaps all, and probably of some of the Tanites; but it is a question whether Manetho's Tanitic line does not include some of the former, and we have no means of testing the accuracy of its numbers. It may be reasonably supposed that the Pharaoh or Pharaohs spoken of in the Bible as ruling in the time of David and Solomon were Tanites, as Tanis was nearest to the Israelitish territory. We have therefore to compare the chronological indications of Scripture with the list of this dynasty. Shishak must have begun to reign in the twenty-fifth year of Solomon (B.C. 989). The conquest of Edom probably took place some fifty years earlier. It may therefore be inferred that Hadad fled to a king of Egypt who may have ruled at least twenty-five years, probably ceasing to govern before Solomon married the daughter of a Pharaoh early in his reign; for it seems unlikely that the protector of David's enemy would have given his daughter to Solomon, unless he were a powerless king, which it appears was not the case with Solomon's father-in-law. This would give a reign of twenty-five years, or $25+x$ separated from the close of the dynasty by a period of twenty-four or twenty-five years. According to Africanus, the list of the twenty-first dynasty is as follows: Smendes, 26 years; Psusennes, 46; Nephelcheres, 4; Amenothis, 9; Osochor, 6; Psinaches, 9; Psusennes, 14; but Eusebius gives the second king 41, and the last 35 years, and his numbers make up the sum of 130 years, which Africanus and he agree in assigning to the dynasty, although the true sum seems to be 109 years. If we take the numbers of Eusebius, Osochor would probably be the Pharaoh to whom Hadad fled, and Psusennes II the father-in-law of Solomon; but the numbers of Africanus would substitute Psusennes I, and probably Psinaches. We cannot, however, be sure that the reigns did not overlap, or were not separated by intervals, and the numbers are not to be considered trustworthy until tested by the monuments. The royal names of the period have been searched in vain for any one resembling Tahpenes. If the Egyptian equivalent to the similar geographical name Tahpanhes, etc., were known, we might have some clew to that of this queen. See Tahpanhes; Tahpenes.

8. *Pharaoh, the Father-in-law of Solomon.*—In the narrative of the beginning of Solomon's reign, after the account of the deaths of Adonijah, Joab, and Shimei, and the deprivation of Abiathar, we read: "And the kingdom was established in the hand of Solomon. And Solomon made affinity with Pharaoh king of Egypt, and took Pharaoh's daughter, and brought her into the city of David, until he had made an end of building his own house, and the house of the Lord, and the wall of Jerusalem round about" (1 Kings ii, 46; iii, 1). The events mentioned before the marriage belong altogether to the very commencement of Solomon's reign, excepting the matter of Shimei, which, extending through three years, is carried on to its completion. The mention that the queen was brought into the city of David while Solomon's house, and the Temple, and the city-wall were building, shows that the marriage took place not later than the eleventh year of the king, when the Temple was finished, having been commenced in the fourth year (vi, 1, 37, 38). It is also evident that this alliance was before Solomon's falling away into idolatry (iii, 3), of which the Egyptian queen does not seem to have been one of the causes. From this chronological indication it appears that the marriage must have taken place between about twenty-four and eleven years before Shishak's accession. It must be recollected that it seems certain that Solomon's father-in-law was not the Pharaoh who was reigning when Hadad left Egypt. Both Pharaohs, as already shown, cannot yet be identified in Manetho's list. See Pharaoh's Daughter.

This Pharaoh led an expedition into Palestine, which is thus incidentally mentioned, where the building of Gezer by Solomon is recorded: "Pharaoh king of Egypt had gone up, and taken Gezer, and burnt it with fire, and slain the Canaanites that dwelt in the city, and given it [for] a present unto his daughter, Solomon's wife" (ix, 16). This is a very curious historical circumstance, for it shows that in the reign of David or Solomon, more probably the latter, an Egyptian king, apparently on terms of friendship with the Israelitish monarch, conducted an expedition into Palestine, and besieged and captured a Canaanitish city. This occurrence warns us against the supposition that similar expeditions could not have occurred in earlier times without a war with the Israelites. Its incidental mention also shows the danger of inferring, from the silence of Scripture as to any such earlier expedition, that nothing of the kind took place.

This Pharaoh we suppose to have reigned over all Egypt, but he does not appear to have had any possessions in Asia. The kingdom of Israel, we are told, stretched to the land of the Philistines and the border of Egypt (1 Kings iv, 21), so that Egypt seems to have been strictly confined on the eastward by Philistia and Canaan. His expedition to and capture of Gezer was the capture of a city hitherto independent both of him and Solomon, and over which he retained no authority (1 Kings ix, 15, 16). The kingdom of Israel was at this time of greater extent and power than that of Egypt, so that the alliance with Solomon would be courted by Pharaoh, and seems to have been productive of great commercial advantages both to Egypt and Israel (1 Kings x, 28, 29; 2 Chron. i, 16, 17). It is the first direct intercourse of which we are with certainty informed between these two kingdoms since the time of the exodus. It is most likely that Pharaoh's daughter, married to Solomon in the opening of his reign, and when his zeal for Jehovah and his worship was at its height, was herself a convert to the faith of Solomon (1 Kings iii, 1–3). He would scarcely at this period of his life have married an idolatress, and in the Bithiah of an uncertain date we have already seen some evidence of the influence of true religion on the royal house of Pharaoh. Nor can we readily suppose that the Song of Solomon, emblematic of the union of Christ and his Church, was founded on any other than the marriage of Solomon with a daughter of the true faith. To what extent this good influence may have spread in the family of Pharaoh can be only matter of conjecture. If it had prevailed to any great extent it may have partly led to the change of dynasty which we have reason to believe took place in Egypt during the reign of Solomon. Any tendency towards truth, if it existed in the royal house, was not shared by the priesthood or people of Egypt, who were firmly wedded to their debased system of idolatry.

This Egyptian alliance is the first indication, however, after the days of Moses, of that leaning to Egypt which was distinctly forbidden in the law, and produced

the most disastrous consequences in later times. The native kings of Egypt and the Ethiopians readily supported the Hebrews, and were unwilling to make war upon them, but they rendered them mere tributaries, and exposed them to the enmity of the kings of Assyria. If the Hebrews did not incur a direct punishment for their leaning to Egypt, still this act must have weakened their trust in the divine favor, and paralyzed their efforts to defend the country against the Assyrians and their party.

The next kings of Egypt mentioned in the Bible are Shishak, probably Zerah, and So. The first and second of these were of the twenty-second dynasty, if the identification of Zerah with Userken be accepted, and the third was doubtless one of the two Shebeks of the twenty-fifth dynasty, which was of Ethiopians. The twenty-second dynasty was a line of kings of foreign origin, who retained foreign names; and it is noticeable that Zerah is called a Cushite in the Bible (2 Chron. xiv, 9; comp. xvi, 8). Shebek was probably also a foreign name. The title "Pharaoh" is probably not once given to these kings in the Bible, because they were not Egyptians, and did not bear Egyptian names. The Shepherd kings, it must be remarked, adopted Egyptian names, and therefore some of the earlier sovereigns called Pharaohs in the Bible may be conjectured to have been Shepherds notwithstanding that they bear this title. See SHISHAK; SO; ZERAH.

9. *Pharaoh, the Opponent of Sennacherib.*—It is not at all certain that the name used for so many centuries for the supreme ruler of Egypt was ever again correctly used *by itself* to designate a particular king of Egypt. The Pharaoh of whom we read in the reign of Hezekiah as the rival of the Assyrian Sennacherib (2 Kings xviii, 21; Isa. xxxvi, 9), is, indeed, simply called Pharaoh, but this title is not given him by the sacred historian, but by the Assyrian general Rabshakeh. Pharaoh is still, indeed, used as the generic title of Egyptian royalty (Isa. xix, 11), when no individual king is intended, but when particular kings are meant the Scriptures join to Pharaoh a second title, as Pharaoh-Necho, Pharaoh-Hophra. This may have been Josephus's reason for his statement (*Ant.* viii, 6, 2) that after the father-in-law of Solomon no king of Egypt used this name. The Jewish historian was too well acquainted with Scripture not to have known of the title in connection with a second name, and he therefore meant probably that it was never again used by itself as the title of Egyptian royalty. The king of whom we are now speaking reigned in the fourteenth year of Hezekiah, i. e. about B.C. 713, and was the contemporary of Tirhakah king of Ethiopia, and of Sennacherib king of Assyria. This latter synchronism depends, however, on the correctness of the present Hebrew text, which some suppose to have been corrupted, and that it was Sargon and not Sennacherib who invaded Judæa in the fourteenth year of Hezekiah (*Journ. of Sacr. Lit.* Oct. 1858; Jan. 1863). The comparison of Pharaoh in the above passages to a broken reed is remarkable, as the common hieroglyphics for "king," restricted to Egyptian sovereigns, *Su-ten*, strictly a title of the ruler of Upper Egypt, commence with a bent reed, which is an ideographic symbolical sign proper to this word, and is sometimes used alone without any phonetic complement. This Pharaoh can only be the *Sethos* whom Herodotus mentions as the opponent of Sennacherib, and who may reasonably be supposed to be the *Zet* of Manetho, the last king of his twenty-third dynasty. Tirhakah, as an Ethiopian, whether then ruling in Egypt or not, is, like So, apparently not called Pharaoh. See TIRHAKAH.

10. *Pharaoh-Necho.*—He was king of Egypt during the reigns of Josiah, Jehoahaz, and Jehoiakim, kings of Judah (2 Kings xxiii, 29–34). We do not read of him in Scripture until the last year of Josiah's reign, B.C. 609. How long before this he may have been king of Egypt the Bible gives us no help in ascertaining. It mentions him as still reigning in the fourth year of king Jehoiakim, i. e. B.C. 606 (Jer. xlvi, 2), and from 2 Kings xxiv, 7 it seems probable that he continued to reign for a considerable time after this. In the Bible his name is written *Nekô*, נְכֹו, and *Nekóh*, נְכֹה, and in hieroglyphics *Neku*. This king was of the Saïtic twenty-sixth dynasty, of which Manetho makes him either the fifth ruler (Africanus) or the sixth (Eusebius). Herodotus calls him *Nekôs*, and assigns to him a reign of sixteen years, which is confirmed by the monuments. According to this historian, he was the son of Psammetichus I; this the monuments do not corroborate. Dr. Brugsch says that he married Nît-Akert, Nitocris, daughter of Psammetichus I and queen Shepuntepet, who appears, like her mother, to have been the heiress of an Egyptian royal line, and supposes that he was the son of Psammetichus by another wife (see *Hist. d'Égypte*, p. 252; comp. 248). If he married Nitocris, he may have been called by Herodotus by mistake the son of Psammetichus.

The father of Necho had already distinguished himself by the siege and capture from the Assyrians of the strong town of Ashdod, which had been taken from the Egyptians in the reign of Sargon (Herod. ii, 157; Isa. xx, 1). In the decline of the Assyrian empire Egypt ventured once more beyond her eastern confines, and indulged in the hope of universal domination. Necho in the commencement of his reign prepared to carry out to completion his father's ambitious designs, and it was in this endeavor that he came into contact with the kingdom of Judah, and so finds a place in Scripture history. Claiming an oracle from the true God, he advanced an Egyptian army against the town of Carchemish on the Euphrates, then apparently under the dominion of the king of Assyria (2 Chron. xxxv, 21; 2 Kings xxiii, 29). There seems to be no doubt that Necho's claim to this oracle was sincere, and that he really thought himself commissioned to go to war with Assyria. How far this may indicate a true knowledge of God on Necho's part it is difficult to determine. Yet it can scarcely be understood as more than a conviction that the war was predestined, for it ended in the destruction of Necho's army and the curtailment of his empire. Josiah, however, influenced perhaps by an alliance with Assyria, or dreading the rising ambition of Egypt, disputed the march of Pharaoh's army. In vain the latter, evidently most unwilling to come into collision with Josiah, entreated him not to oppose him, and pleaded the oracle of him whom he would appear, in common with Josiah, to have recognised as the true God. At Megiddo (now Lejjûn), a town not far from the coast-line of Palestine, so frequently the passage of great armies in the old wars of Asia, Josiah encountered the armies of Egypt, and his death on this occasion formed the subject of lamentations among his people long after it took place. Without pausing upon his march, or returning back to attack Jerusalem, Pharaoh seems to have passed on with all haste to accomplish his original design of capturing Carchemish, which commanded one of the ordinary fords of the Euphrates, and thus of meeting and conquering the king of Assyria in his own dominions. In this great expedition he was entirely successful. He took Carchemish, and retained possession of the countries between Egypt and the Euphrates until the rising power of Babylon under the great Nebuchadnezzar met and overthrew the Egyptian army four years afterwards at Carchemish, and forced them back into their own land. Returning from the Euphrates, he treated Judæa as a conquered country, and exercised over it the same absolute authority which the Babylonians did immediately after him. Sending for Jehoahaz to Riblah in the land of Hamath, on the Orontes, a favorite camping-ground for the great armies of that period (Robinson, *Bibl. Res.* iii, 545), he placed him there in bonds for a time after a brief reign of three months. This he seems to have done because he was not consulted in the choice of a king. On his farther march

homeward, Necho entered as a conqueror into Jerusalem, placed the brother of Jehoahaz on the throne, and put the land to tribute. He then seems to have returned to Egypt, carrying with him the dethroned king of Judah, who died in the land of his captivity. The expedition of Necho, which Scripture describes as having been made against the king of Assyria, Josephus says was directed against the Medes and Babylonians, who had at this time, according to him, captured Nineveh (*Ant.* x, 5; see Rawlinson's *Herod.* i, 418. Herodotus mentions this battle, relating that Necho made war against the Syrians, and defeated them at Magdolus, after which he took Cadytis, "a large city of Syria" (ii, 159). There can be no reasonable doubt that Magdolus is Megiddo, and not the Egyptian town of that name [see MIGDOL], but the identification of Cadytis is difficult. It has been conjectured to be Jerusalem, and its name has been supposed to correspond to the ancient title, "the Holy," הקדושה, but it is elsewhere mentioned by Herodotus as a great coast-town of Palestine near Egypt (iii, 5), and it has therefore been supposed to be Gaza. The difficulty that Gaza is not beyond Megiddo would perhaps be removed if Herodotus be thought to have confounded Megiddo with the Egyptian Magdolus, or we may understand the term "coast" here used in a wide sense. (See Sir Gardner Wilkinson's note to *Herod.* ii, 159, ed. Rawlinson.) It seems possible that Cadytis is the Hittite city Ketesh, on the Orontes, which was the chief stronghold in Syria of those captured by the kings of the eighteenth and nineteenth dynasties. The Greek historian adds that Necho dedicated the dress he wore on these occasions to Apollo at the temple of Branchidæ (*l. c.*).

The power of Egypt under Necho at this period of his reign was very great. From the composition of the army which he led to Carchemish and left there in garrison (Jer. xlvi, 9), we gather that Ethiopia and Libya were at this time a part of his dominions. Eastward of Egypt his power extended to the Great River, and the Lydians, if not his subjects, were in strict league with him. This was the period of the fall of Assyria, and Egypt for a time succeeded to its rule on the west of the Euphrates (Wilkinson, i, 157). This was that time of boasting in its military successes which Jeremiah describes in ch. xlvi, and he takes occasion from it to predict the approaching overthrow of Egypt. When this land "rose up like a flood, and he said, I will go up, and will cover the earth," the prophet in plain words spoke of approaching defeat in battle and utter humiliation as a nation. The power of Necho to the east of Egypt only lasted about four years. In the fourth year of Jehoiakim, Nebuchadnezzar, having conquered Nineveh, had leisure to turn his arms against Egypt. At Carchemish, which Necho had wrested from the Assyrians, the Babylonian army conquered that of Egypt. Whether Necho was present at this contest does not appear. Its issue was that he was driven out of Asia and came into it no more (2 Kings xxiv, 7). It would seem to have been at a later period, however, that the utter humiliation of Egypt described by Jeremiah took place, though the battle of Carchemish was one of those decisive conflicts which changed for a period the history of the world. The strength of Necho's armies seems not to have lain in the native Egyptians, but in foreigners, whether subjects, allies, or mercenaries. They were Ethiopians, Libyans, and Lydians who fought with Nebuchadnezzar. Wilkinson places the death of Necho shortly before the captivity of Jehoiakim (i, 167). It is not certain, however, that Jehoiakim was carried away captive by Nebuchadnezzar. The book of Kings makes no mention of such an occurrence. Josephus states that he was put to death at Jerusalem (*Ant.* x, 6, 3). The second book of Chronicles only says (xxxvi, 6) that he was put into fetters for the purpose of being brought to Babylon. If Josephus's account is true, this purpose was not put into execution. Necho is famous in history for other besides his military exploits. The celebrated canal of Suez, according to Herodotus (ii, 158; see Wilkinson, i, 70), was completed by this king. He is also stated by this historian to have circumnavigated Africa, a performance the credibility of which is disputed by him for the very reason that makes it to modern readers all but certainly true (Herod. iv, 62; see Wilkinson, i, 160; Sir C. Lewis, *Astronomy of the Ancients*, p. 317). See NECHO.

11. *Pharaoh-Hophra.*—This is the last of the Pharaohs of whom mention is made in the Bible. He is introduced to our notice in connection with the closing period of the Jewish monarchy, as attempting to ward off from God's people the judgments brought upon them for their sins at the hand of Nebuchadnezzar (Jer. xxxvii, 7). He was on the throne of Egypt in the ninth year of the reign of Zedekiah (2 Kings xxv, 1), i. e. about B.C. 590, continued to reign when Jerusalem had been taken by the Babylonians, B.C. 588, and was to continue reigning until a signal destruction should fall upon him, and he was to suffer the loss of life at the hand of his enemies (Jer. xliv, 30), a prediction fulfilled about five years subsequently in the invasion of Egypt by Nebuchadnezzar, about B.C. 582 (Josephus, *Ant.* x, 9, 7). He ascended the throne about B.C. 589, and reigned for a period of nineteen years; but Eusebius, according to Syncellus, makes his reign to have lasted twenty-five years (Bunsen, *Egypt*, i, 640).

This Pharaoh is generally considered to have been the *Apries* or *Vaphres* (in hieroglyphic *Wah-[p]ra-hah*) of whom an account is given in Herodotus and Diodorus (Wilkinson, i, 168; Lewis, *Astronomy of the Ancients*, p. 317). He was, according to the former historian, the son of Psammis, and the grandson of Pharaoh-Necho, and enjoyed a fortunate reign of twenty-five years (ii, clxi). Wilkinson (i, 179) is doubtful whether he is the same person as Psammetichus III. Bunsen considers him to have been the fourth king of the twenty-sixth dynasty (*Egypt*, i, 164). Of Pharaoh-Necho we are told that after his defeat by Nebuchadnezzar he came forth out of Egypt no more; but Pharaoh-Hophra had recovered strength sufficient to enable him to meet the armies of Babylon out of his own country. At the time we read of him in Scripture he was in intimate alliance with Zedekiah, and it was doubtless in great part owing to his reliance upon Egypt that the infatuated king of Judah ventured to enter upon that contest with Nebuchadnezzar which terminated in the famous captivity of seventy years in Babylon. The pride of this Pharaoh was excessive. Ezekiel (xxix, 3) compares him to a great dragon lying in the midst of his rivers, and saying, "My river is mine own, and I have made it for myself," much as his successful antagonist Nebuchadnezzar gloried in the contemplation of Babylon. Influenced by an opinion of Pharaoh's power, and stimulated in all likelihood by promises of aid, Zedekiah rebelled against the Babylonians, and drew on that siege of Jerusalem which after two years resulted in its capture (2 Kings xxv, 1–3). The narrative of this event in Kings is very concise, but the fuller accounts in Jeremiah bring before us a temporary suspension of the siege caused by the advance of Pharaoh-Hophra with an Egyptian army to relieve Zedekiah (Jer. xxxvii, 5–12). It is quite plain from Jeremiah that the siege was abandoned for a time and the Babylonian army withdrawn from Jerusalem, so as to allow free intercourse between the city and the surrounding country; but whether the Chaldæan army withdrew before the advancing army of Egypt or advanced against it is not agreed on. Josephus (*Ant.* x, 7, 3) expressly states that Nebuchadnezzar on hearing of the march of the Egyptians broke up from before Jerusalem, met the Egyptians on their advance, conquered them in battle, drove them out of Syria, and then returned to the siege of Jerusalem. Some, however, think that the Babylonians retreated from before the Egyptians, who on this occasion took Gaza, Sidon, and Tyre (Trevor,

Egypt, p. 321). Looking simply to the scriptural account, the case appears to stand thus: On hearing of the rebellion of Zedekiah, Nebuchadnezzar despatched a force against Jerusalem, but without accompanying it himself. This force was sufficient to shut up Zedekiah within the city, but was not able to meet the Egyptian army in the field. This is the partial siege which is spoken of in Jer. xxxvii, 5–11, in which nothing is said of Nebuchadnezzar's presence. On the approach of Pharaoh-Hophra the Chaldæan army, unequal to the conflict, retired before him, and he advanced unopposed. This was probably in the eighth year of Zedekiah. That Pharaoh came to Jerusalem we are not told. Probably on hearing of the raising of the siege he judged it unnecessary, and took the easier coast-line towards Syria (Jer. xlvii, 1). Nebuchadnezzar, made aware of the retreat of his army, now advanced with his entire force (Jer. xxxix, 1), laid siege to Jerusalem in the ninth year of Zedekiah, and took it in the eleventh year. That the Egyptians and Babylonians met on this occasion in battle is not stated in the Bible. We think it probable from Jer. xxxvii, 7, that on hearing of Nebuchadnezzar's approach with the entire army of Babylon, the Egyptians retired without a contest and left Jerusalem to its fate (see Rawlinson's *Herodotus*, i, 423). Pharaoh-Hophra continued to be king of Egypt after the overthrow of Zedekiah (Jer. xliv, 30), and he and his land were the refuge of those Jews who, contrary to God's command to remain in their own land after the general captivity, preferred a course of their own. They expected peace beneath the shadow of Egypt, trusting in the power of Pharaoh, who seems till then to have enjoyed great prosperity. But in this they were to be disappointed. Pharaoh was himself to be delivered "into the hands of those who sought his life," of which Herodotus gives an account (ii, 169); at the very entry of Pharaoh's palace in Taphanes the Babylonian Nebuchadnezzar was to set his throne and spread his pavilion (Jer. xliii, 10); and henceforth Egypt was to descend in the scale of nations, and to become the meanest among kingdoms. Herodotus relates how he attacked Sidon, and fought a battle at sea with the king of Tyre, until at length an army which he had despatched to conquer Cyrene was routed, and the Egyptians, thinking he had purposely caused its overthrow to gain entire power, no doubt by substituting mercenaries for native troops, revolted, and set up Amasis as king. Apries, only supported by the Carian and Ionian mercenaries, was routed in a pitched battle. Herodotus remarks in narrating this, "It is said that Apries believed that there was not a god who could cast him down from his eminence, so firmly did he think that he had established himself in his kingdom." He was taken prisoner, and Amasis for a while treated him with kindness, but when the Egyptians blamed him, "he gave Apries over into the hands of his former subjects, to deal with as they chose. Then the Egyptians took him and strangled him" (Herod. ii, 161–169). The Scripture passages, which entirely agree with the account Herodotus gives of the death of Apries, make it not improbable that the invasion of Nebuchadnezzar was the cause of that disaffection of his subjects which ended in the overthrow and death of this Pharaoh. The invasion is not spoken of by any trustworthy profane historian excepting Berosus (Cory, *Anc. Frag.* 2d ed. p. 37, 38), but the silence of Herodotus and others can no longer be a matter of surprise, as we now know from the Assyrian records in cuneiform of conquests of Egypt either unrecorded elsewhere or only mentioned by second-rate annalists. See Hophra.

Pharaoh-Hophra was succeeded by two independent monarchs, the first of whom, Amasis, had a very prosperous reign; but in the reign of his son, Psammetichus, or Psammenitus, according to the Greeks, the Persian invasion took place, when Egypt was reduced to insignificance, and the ancient title of Pharaoh was transferred from the kings of Egypt to their conquerors (Trevor, *Egypt*, p. 331; Wilkinson, *Egypt*. i, 169–198). No subsequent Pharaoh is mentioned in Scripture, but there are predictions doubtless referring to the misfortunes of later princes until the second Persian conquest, when the prophecy "There shall be no more a prince of the land of Egypt" (Ezek. xxx, 13) was fulfilled. See Egypt.

Pharaoh's Daughter. Three Egyptian princesses, daughters of Pharaohs, are mentioned in the Bible. Our account of them includes whatever notices are extant in other writers.

1. The preserver of Moses, daughter of the Pharaoh who first oppressed the Israelites. She appears from her conduct towards Moses to have been heiress to the throne, something more than ordinary adoption seeming to be expressed in the passage in Hebrews respecting the faith of Moses (xi, 23–26), and the designation "Pharaoh's daughter" perhaps here indicating that she was the only daughter. She probably lived for at least forty years after she saved Moses, for it seems to be implied in the above passage of Hebrews that she was living when he fled to Midian. Artapanus, or Artabanus, a historian of uncertain date, who appears to have preserved traditions current among the Egyptian Jews, calls this princess *Merrhis*, and her father, the oppressor, Palmanothes, and relates that she was married to Chenephres, who ruled in the country above Memphis, for that at that time there were many kings of Egypt, but that this one, as it seems, became sovereign of the whole country (*Frag. Hist. Græc.* iii, 220 sq.). Palmanothes may be supposed to be a corruption of Amenophis, the equivalent of Amen-hept, the Egyptian name of four kings of the eighteenth dynasty, and also, but incorrectly, applied to one of the nineteenth, whose Egyptian name, Meneptah, is wholly different from that of the others. No one of these, however, had, as far as we know, a daughter with a name resembling Merrhis, nor is there any king with a name like Chenephres of this time. These kings Amenophis, moreover, do not belong to the period of contemporary dynasties. The tradition is apparently of little value, excepting as showing that one quite different from that given by Manetho and others was anciently current. See Pharaoh, 4.

2. *Bithiah*, wife of Mered, an Israelite, daughter of a Pharaoh of an uncertain age, probably about the time of the exodus. See Bithiah; Pharaoh, 6.

3. A wife of Solomon, most probably daughter of a king of the twenty-first dynasty. She was married to Solomon early in his reign, and apparently treated with distinction. It has been supposed that the Song of Solomon was written on the occasion of this marriage; and the idea is, we think, sustained by sound criticism. She was at first brought into the city of David (1 Kings iii, 1), and afterwards a house was built for her (vii, 8; ix, 24), because Solomon would not have her dwell in the house of David, which had been rendered holy by the ark having been there (2 Chron. vii, 11). See Pharaoh, 8.

Pharaoh's Wife. The wife of one Pharaoh, the king who received Hadad the Edomite, is mentioned in Scripture. She is called "queen," and her name, Tahpenes, is given. Her husband was most probably of the twenty-first dynasty. See Pharaoh, 7, Tahpenes.

Pharatho'ni (*Φαραθωνί* v. r. *Φαραθών*; Josephus, *Φαραθώ*, Peshito, *Pherath*; Vulg. *Phara*), one of the cities of Judæa fortified by Bacchides during his contests with Jonathan Maccabæus (1 Macc. ix, 50). In both MSS. of the Sept. the name is joined to the preceding—Thamnatha-Pharathon; but in Josephus, the Syriac, and Vulgate, the two are separated. Ewald (*Geschichte*, iv, 373) adheres to the former. Pharathon doubtless represents an ancient *Pirathon*, though hardly that of the Judges, since that was in Mount Ephraim, probably at Ferata, a few miles west of Nablus, too far north to be included in Judæa properly so called.

Pha'rès (Φαρές), a Græcized form (Matt. i, 3; Luke iii, 33) of the name of PHAREZ (q. v.), the son of Judah.

Pha'rez, the name of two persons.

1. (Heb. *Pe'retz*, פֶּרֶץ, a *breach*, as explained Gen. xxxviii, 29; Sept. and N. T. Φαρές; A. V. "Perez," 1 Chron. xxvii, 3; "Phares," Matt. i, 3; Luke iii, 33; 1 Esdr. v, 5), twin son with Zarah, or Zerah, of Judah by Tamar his daughter-in-law. B.C. cir. 1890. The circumstances of his birth are detailed in Gen. xxxviii. Pharez seems to have kept the right of primogeniture over his brother, as, in the genealogical lists, his name comes first. The house also which he founded was far more numerous and illustrious than that of the Zarhites. Its remarkable fertility is alluded to in Ruth iv, 12: "Let thy house be like the house of Pharez, whom Tamar bare unto Judah." Of Pharez's personal history or character nothing is known. We can only speak of him therefore as a demarch, and exhibit his genealogical relations. At the time of the sojourn in the wilderness "the families of the tribe of Judah were: of Shelah, the family of the Shelanites, or Shilonites; of Pharez, the family of the Pharzites; of Zerah, the family of the Zarhites. And the sons of Pharez were, of Hezron, the family of the Hezronites, of Hamul, the family of the Hamulites" (Numb. xxvi, 20, 21). After the death, therefore, of Er and Onan without children, Pharez occupied the rank of Judah's second son, and, moreover, from two of his sons sprang two new chief houses, those of the Hezronites and Hamulites. From Hezron's second son Ram, or Aram, sprang David and the kings of Judah, and eventually Jesus Christ. See GENEALOGY OF JESUS CHRIST. The house of Caleb was also incorporated into the house of Hezron [see CALEB], and so were reckoned among the descendants of Pharez. Another line of Pharez's descendants were reckoned as sons of Manasseh by the second marriage of Hezron with the daughter of Machir (1 Chron. ii, 21, 22). In the census of the house of Judah contained in 1 Chron. iv, drawn up apparently in the reign of Hezekiah (iv, 41), the houses enumerated in ver. 1 are Pharez, Hezron, Carmi, Hur, and Shobal. Of these all but Carmi (who was a Zarhite, Josh. vii, 1) were descendants of Pharez. Hence it is not unlikely that, as is suggested in the margin of the A. V., "Carmi" is an error for "Chelubai." Some of the sons of Shelah are mentioned separately at ver. 21, 22. See PAHATH-MOAB. In the reign of David the house of Pharez seems to have been eminently distinguished. The chief of all the captains of the host for the first month, Jashobeam, the son of Zabdiel (1 Chron. xxvii, 2, 3), so famous for his prowess (xi, 11), and called "the chief among the captains" (ibid. and 2 Sam. xxiii, 8), was of the sons of Perez, or Pharez. A considerable number of the other mighty men seem also, from their patronymic or gentile names, to have been of the same house, those, namely, who are called Bethlehemites, Paltites (1 Chron. ii, 33, 47), Tekoites, Netophathites, and Ithrites (ii, 53; iv, 7). Zabad, the son of Ahlai, and Joab and his brothers, Abishai and Asahel, we know were Pharzites (ii, 31, 36, 54; xi, 41). The royal house itself was the head of the family. We have no means of assigning to their respective families those members of the tribe of Judah who are incidentally mentioned after David's reign, as Adnah, the chief captain of Judah in Jehoshaphat's reign, and Jehohanan and Amasiah, his companions (2 Chron. xvii, 14–16); but that the family of Pharez continued to thrive and multiply we may conclude from the numbers who returned from captivity. At Jerusalem alone 468 of the sons of Perez, with Athaiah, or Uthai, at their head, were dwelling in the days of Zerubbabel (1 Chron. ix, 4; Neh. xi, 4–6), Zerubbabel himself of course being of the family (1 Esdr. v, 5). Of the lists of returned captives in Ezra ii, Neh. vii, in Nehemiah's time, the following seem to have been of the sons of Pharez, judging as before from the names of their ancestors, or the towns to which they belonged: the children of Bani (Ezra ii, 10; comp. 1 Chron. ix, 4); of Bigvai (ii, 14; comp. Ezra viii, 14); of Ater (ii, 16; comp. 1 Chron. ii, 26, 54); of Jorah, or Hariph (ii, 18; Neh. vii, 24; comp. 1 Chron. ii, 51); of Bethlehem and Netophah (ii, 21, 22; comp. 1 Chron. ii, 54); of Kirjath-arim (ii, 25; comp. 1 Chron. ii, 50, 53); of Harim (ii, 32; comp. 1 Chron. iv, 8); and, judging from their position, many of the intermediate ones also (comp. also the lists in Ezra x, 25–43; Neh. x, 14–27). Of the builders of the wall named in Neh. iii the following were of the house of Pharez: Zaccur, the son of Imri (ver. 2, by comparison with 1 Chron. ix, 4, and Ezra viii, 14, where we ought, with many MSS., to read "Zaccur" for "Zabbud"); Zadok, the son of Baana (ver. 4, by comparison with 2 Sam. xxiii, 29, where we find that Baanah was a Netophathite, which agrees with Zadok's place here next to the Tekoites, since Bethlehem, Netophah, and Tekoa are often in close juxtaposition, comp. 1 Chron. ii, 54; iv, 4, 5; Ezra ii, 21, 22; Neh. vii, 26, and the situation of the Netophathites close to Jerusalem, among the Benjamites, Neh. xii, 28, 29, compared with the mixture of Benjamites with Pharzites and Zarhites in Neh. iii, 2–7); the Tekoites (ver. 5 and 27, comp. with 1 Chron. ii, 24; iv, 5); Jehoiada, the son of Paseah (ver. 6, comp. with 1 Chron. iv, 12, where Paseah, a Chelubite, is apparently descended from Ashur, the father of Tekoa); Rephaiah, the son of Hur (ver. 9, comp. with 1 Chron. ii, 20, 50; iv, 4, 12, Beth-Raphah); Hanun (ver. 13 and 30), with the inhabitants of Zanoah (comp. with 1 Chron. iv, 18); perhaps Malchiah, the son of Rechab (ver. 14. comp. with 1 Chron. ii, 55); Nehemiah, son of Azbuk, ruler of Beth-zur (ver. 16, comp. with 1 Chron. ii, 45); and perh. Baruch, son of Zabba, or Zaccai (ver. 20), if for Zaccai we read Zaccur as the mention of "the *other*, or second, *piece*," makes probable, as well as his proximity to Meremoth in this second piece, as Zaccur was to Meremoth in their first pieces (ver. 2, 4).

2. (Sept. Φαρές v. r. Φόρος.) A Græcized form (1 Esdr. viii, 30) for the PAROSH (q. v.) of the Heb. text (Ezra viii, 3).

Phari'ra (Φαριρά v. r. Φαριδά), a corrupt form (1 Esdr. v, 33) of the name PERIDA (q. v.) of the Heb. text (Neh. vii, 57).

Phar'isee, a designation (in the N. T. and Josephus) of one of the three sects or orders of Judaism in the time of Christ, the other two being the *Essenes* and the *Sadducees*. The following account of them is from Scriptural and Talmudical notices, with whatever light the comparison affords.

I. *Name of the Sect, and its Signification.*—The name Φαρισαῖος=*Pharisee* is the Greek form of the Hebrew פָּרוּשׁ (*parûsh*, passive participle of פָּרַשׁ, *to separate*, plur. פְּרוּשִׁים, Aramaic פְּרוּשָׁיִן), and properly denotes *one who is separated*, i. e. by special practices; or, as the dictionary called *Aruch* (s. v.) defines it, "one who separated himself from Levitical impurity and Levitically impure food" (comp. also Talmud, *Chagigah*, 18 *b*; *Sabbath*, 13 *a*). The derivation of it from פָּרַשׁ, in the sense of *unfolding*, *explaining*, and the assertion that the followers of this sect were called *Pharisees=interpreters of the Bible*, in contradistinction to the Sadducees, who adhered to the letter of the Scriptures, as well as the more generally received notion that they were so called because *they separated from the rest of the people*, believing themselves to be more holy, are at variance with the most ancient and most trustworthy authorities upon this subject. Besides, to take פָּרוּשׁ as meaning *interpreter* is contrary to its grammatical form, which, if *transitive*, ought to be מְפָרֵשׁ. Of course the separation from that which was Levitically impure necessarily implied separation from those who were defiled by Levitically impure objects. It must be observed that the name *Pharisees* is given to them in the Mishna (*Jebamoth*, iv, 6, etc.) by their opponents the *Sadducees*.

and that the names by which they were designated among themselves are חֲכָמִים, *sages*, or, more modestly תַּלְמִידֵי חֲכָמִים, *disciples of the sages*, but more generally חֲבֵרִים, *associates*. By the term *Pharisees*, פְּרוּשִׁים, or its equivalent *Chaberim*, חֲבֵרִים, i. e. *associates*, is therefore meant all those Jews who separated themselves from every kind of Levitical impurity, and united together to keep the Mosaic laws of purity. As it was natural that all the students of the law would, as a matter of course, be the first to join this association, the appellation *Chaber*, חָבֵר, *member, associate*, or פָּרוּשׁ, *Pharisee*, became synonymous with *student, disciple, lawyer, scribe*, while those who refused to unite to keep the laws were regarded as עַם הָאָרֶץ, *country people, common people, illiterates, irreligious*.

II. *The Qualifications for Membership of the Pharisaic Association.*—The most essential conditions which were enacted from every one who wished to become a *Chaber* or member of the Pharisaic association were two. Each candidate was required to promise in the presence of three members that—(*i*) He would set apart all the sacred tithes on the produce of the land, and refrain from eating anything which had not been tithed, or about the tithing of which there was any doubt; and (*ii*) He would scrupulously observe the most essential laws of purity which so materially affected the eating of food and all family affairs.

To understand these laws, which may seem trivial and arbitrary, as well as to see the extraordinary influence which they exercised upon the whole religious and social life of the Jewish nation in all its ramifications, the following facts must be borne in mind: The Mosaic law enjoins that besides the priestly heave-offering (תְּרוּמָה) every Israelite is annually to give to the Levites a tithe of all the produce (Numb. xviii, 21–24), which the Jewish canons call *the first tithe* (מַעֲשֵׂר רִאשׁוֹן); that *a second tithe* (מַעֲשֵׂר שֵׁנִי), as it is termed in the same canons, is to be taken annually from the produce to Jerusalem, either in kind or specie, and consumed by the owner in the metropolis in festive celebration (Deut. xii, 5–18), and that *every third year* this second tithe is to be given to the poor (Deut. xiv, 28, 29), whence it is denominated *the poor tithe* (מַעֲשֵׂר עָנִי) in the ancient canons. Moreover, as each seventh year was a Sabbatic or fallow year, which yielded no harvest, it was fixed that in the first, second, fourth, and fifth years of the septennial cycle *the second tithe* is to be eaten by the owner in Jerusalem, while in the third and sixth years it is to be distributed among the poor, and be *the poor tithe*. When it is remembered that these tithal laws, which were originally enacted for Palestine, were in the post-exilian period extended to Egypt, Ammon, Moab, and to every land in which the Jews had possessions, that they had more of a *religious* than civil import, that the portion of produce reserved as tithes was *holy*, that *the eating of holy things* was a deadly sin, and that the non-separation of the tithes rendered the whole produce unlawful, thus affecting every article of food, the paramount importance of the first condition which the Pharisees, who were the conservators of the divine law, exacted from the candidates for fellowship will readily be understood (comp. Mishna, *Bekoroth*, 30 *b*).

Of equal importance, and equally affecting the whole fabric of social and religious life, are the Mosaic laws upon the strength of which the second condition was exacted. These laws, which so rigidly enforce the eschewing of unclean food and defiling objects, even without the amplifications and expansion which obtained in the course of time, extend to and affect almost every action in public life and every movement in family intercourse. Thus not only are numbers of animals proscribed as food, but their very carcasses are branded as unclean, and he who touches them is temporarily defiled, and pollutes every one and everything wherewith he comes in contact (Lev. v, 2; xi). A man that has an issue not only defiles everything upon which he lies, sits, or which he touches, but his very spittle is polluting (xv, 1–13). The same is the case with a man who comes in contact with a corpse (Numb. xix, 14–22), with a woman in menstruum and childbirth (Lev. xii, 1–8; xv, 19–31), and with a husband after conjugal intercourse (xv, 18). Individuals thus defiled were forbidden to come into the sanctuary (Numb. xix, 20), and were visited with the severe punishment of excision if they ate the flesh of peace-offering (Lev. vii, 20, 21). Now the slightest reflection upon the workings of these laws will show that thousands upon thousands were daily unclean according to the Mosaic institutions, that these thousands of unclean men and women legally defiled myriads of people and things by contact with them, either wittingly or unwittingly, and that it therefore became absolutely necessary for those who were conscientiously desirous of discharging their religious duties in a state of legal purity to adopt such precautionary measures as would preclude the possibility of violating these laws. Hence the Jewish canons ordained that since one does not know whether he has been defiled by contact with any unclean person or thing, every *Chaber* or member of the Pharisaic association is "to wash his hands before eating his ordinary food, second tithes, or the heave-offering; to immerse his whole body before he eats the portions of holy sacrifices; and to bathe his whole body before touching the water absolving from sin, even if it is only his hands which are unclean. If one immersed himself for ordinary food, and designed it only for ordinary food, he could not eat second tithes; if he immersed for second tithes, and meant it only for second tithes, he could not eat of the heave-offering; if he immersed for the heave-offering, and meant by it the heave-offering, he was not allowed to eat the portions of the holy sacrifice; if he immersed for the holy sacrifice, and meant it for the holy sacrifice, he could not as yet touch the water absolving from sin; but he who immersed for the more important could share in the less important" (Mishna, *Chagigah*, ii, 5, 6). This gave rise to four degrees of purity, and to four divisions in the Pharisaic associations, so that every *Chaber* or member belonged to that rank whose prescriptions of purity he practiced. Each degree of purity required a greater separation from the above-named Mosaic defilements. The impure subjects themselves were termed *the fathers of impurity*, that which was touched by them was designated *the first generation of impurity*, what was touched by this again was called *the second generation of impurity*, and so on. Now ordinary food, the first degree of holiness, became impure when touched by the second generation; heave-offering, the second degree of holiness, became defiled when touched by the third generation; the flesh of sacrifices, the third degree of holiness, when coming in contact with the fourth generation, and so on. These degrees of purity had even to be separated from each other, as the lower degree was impure in respect to the higher one. The same removal, both from defilement without and the different gradations within, was required of each member of the Pharisaic order corresponding to the degree to which he belonged. Hence "the garments of an עַם הָאָרֶץ, *Am ha-Aretz* ['man of earth,' or *a publican, a sinner*, as he is termed in the N. T., who neglected to pay the tithes and observe the laws of Mosaic purity], defile the Pharisee [i. e. him who lived according to the first degree of purity], the garments of a Pharisee defile those who eat of the heave-offering [i. e. the second degree], the garments of those who eat the heave-offering defile those who eat the sacred sacrifices [i. e. the third degree], and the garments of those who eat the sacred sacrifices defile those who touch the water absolving from sin [i. e. the fourth de-

gree]" (comp. Mishna, *Chagigah*, ii, 7, with *Taharoth*, vii, 5).

The above-mentioned two conditions exacted from candidates for membership of the Pharisaic association are thus expressed in the Mishna: "He who takes upon himself to be conscientious, tithes whatever he eats, and whatever he sells, and whatever he buys, and does not become the guest of an *Am ha-Aretz* [i. e. a non-Pharisee]; . . . and he who takes upon himself to become a member of the Pharisaic association must neither sell to an *Am ha-Aretz* moist or dry fruit, nor buy of him moist fruit, nor become the guest of an *Am ha-Aretz*, nor receive him as guest, in his garments, into his house" (*Demai*, ii, 2, 3; comp. Matt. xxiii, 23; Luke xvii, 12). It is in accordance with this regulation that Christ enjoins that an offender is to be regarded "as a heathen man and publican" (Matt. xviii, 17), that the apostle Paul commands "not to eat" with a sinner (1 Cor. v, 11), and it is for this reason that Christ was upbraided by the Pharisees for associating and eating with publicans and sinners (Matt. ix, 9–11; xi, 19; Mark ii, 16; Luke v, 30; vii, 34), with the neglecters of tithes and the transgressors of the laws of purity, which was not only in violation of the then prevailing Pharisaic and national law, but contrary to the Mosaic enactments. But he came to teach that "not that which goeth into the mouth [i. e. untithed food or edibles handled by Levitically unclean persons] defileth a man, but that which cometh out of the mouth, this defileth a man" (Matt. xv, 11); and that it is not outward washing but inward purity which is acceptable. For this reason "he sat down to meat with a Pharisee, and did not first wash before dinner" (Luke xi, 37–40); which, as we have seen, was in contravention of the very first degree of purity among the association. It must, however, be remarked that the Jews were not peculiar in their laws of purity and defilement. Other nations of antiquity had similar statutes. Thus, among the ancient Indians, one who had an issue was obliged to bathe and pray to the sun (*Manu*, ii, 181); among the Hierapolytans in Syria every inmate of the house in which a death took place was thirty days unclean, and could not go to the temple during that time (Lucian, *De Syr. dea*, 53); the Greeks, too, were defiled by contact with a corpse, and could not resort to the temple (Theophrast. *Charact.* 16; Eurip. *Iphig. Taur.* 367; Diog. Laer. viii, 33); both the Parsees and the Greeks regarded a woman in childbirth as unclean (Kleuker, *Zend-Avesta*, iii, 222, 223; Eurip. *Iphig. Taur.* 367); and "no Egyptian would salute a Greek with a kiss, nor use a Greek knife, spits, caldrons, nor taste the meat of an ox which had been cut by a Greek knife. They drank out of bronze vessels, rinsing them perpetually. And if any one accidentally touched a pig he would plunge into the Nile without stopping to undress" (Herodot. ii, 37, 41, 47).

III. *The Tenets and Practices of the Pharisees.*—To state the doctrines and statutes of the Pharisees is to give a history of orthodox Judaism; since Pharisaism was after the return from the Babylonian captivity, and is to the present day, the national faith of the orthodox Jews, developing itself with and adapting itself to the ever-shifting circumstances of the nation. See Rabbinism. Of the other two sects, viz. the Essenes and the Sadducees, the former represented simply an intensified form of Pharisaism [see Essenes], while the latter were a very small minority. See Sadducees. The Pharisees, as the erudite Geiger has conclusively shown, were the democratic party, the true representatives of the people, whose high vocation they endeavored to develop by making them realize, both in their practices and lives, that "God has given to all alike the kingdom, priesthood, and holiness" (2 Macc. ii, 17); in opposition to the small caste of the priestly aristocracy of Sadducees, who set the highest value upon their spiritual office, and who, by virtue of their hereditary rights, tried to arrogate everything to themselves, and manifested little sympathy with the people at large. Hence the Pharisaic enactments were such as to make the people realize that they were *a people of priests, a holy nation;* that by becoming a diligent student of the law, and by preparing one's self for the office of a rabbi or teacher, every such person, though not literally of the priestly caste, may be a priest in spirit, and occupy quite as important and useful a position as if he were actually of the Aaronic order, and even arrange his mode of life according to the example of those who minister in holy things. Thus the very name חֶבֶר, *ἑταιρία*, which in olden times denotes *a priestly fraternity* (Hos. iv, 17; vi, 9), and was so used by the Jews on the Maccabæan coins (חבר היהודים), was adopted by the Pharisees for their lay association. Their social meals were invested with a solemn character to resemble the social meals of the priests, made up from the sacrifices in the Temple. If the priests took care that the sacrifices which they offered up, and portions of which constituted their social meal, especially on the Sabbath and festivals, should be clean and without blemish, the Pharisees also took the utmost precaution that their meals should be free from the different degrees of defilement: they washed before partaking thereof, recited prayers before and after the repast, had a cup of blessing, and offered incense. It is only from this point of view that some of the differences between the Pharisees and the Sadducees can be explained; as, for instance, *the ideal connection of places* for Sabbatic purposes, called עֵירוּב, *mixture*, adopted by the former and rejected by the latter. In consequence of the rigorous laws about the observance of the Sabbath (Exod. xvi, 29; Jer. xvii, 21, with Neh. xiii, 15, etc.), it was enacted that no Israelite is to walk on the Sabbath beyond a certain distance, called a Sabbath-day's journey, nor carry anything from one house to another. The Sadducees, or priestly party, who celebrated their meals on the Sabbath in different places, could go from one place to another, and carry to and fro anything they liked, because they regarded these meals as constituting part of their priestly and sacrificial service, which set aside the sanctity of the Sabbath. But the Pharisees, who made their Sabbatic repast resemble the priestly social meals, had to encounter difficulties arising from the rigorous Sabbatic laws. The distance which they had sometimes to walk to join a company in the social meal was more than a Sabbath-day's journey; the carrying from one place to another of the things requisite for the solemnities was contrary to the enactments about the sanctity of the day. Hence they contrived the ideal connection of places (עֵירוּב), which was effected as follows: Before the Sabbath commenced (i. e. Friday afternoon), an article of food was deposited by each member in the court selected for the social gathering, so that it might thereby become the common place for all; the streets were made to form one large dwelling-place with different gates, by means of beams laid across on the tops of the houses, and doors or gates put in the front; and meals were put in a house at the end of the distance permitted to walk, in order to constitute it a domicile, and thus another Sabbath-day's journey could be undertaken from the first terminus. By this means the Pharisees could evade the law, and, like the priests, meet together in any place to celebrate their social meals on the Sabbath, and carry anything that was wanted for its sacred festival, as they had three common meals on the Sabbath (שלוש סעודות). On the Friday eve the entrance of the Sabbath was greeted with a cup of wine, or the cup of blessing, over which every member recited benedictions (קידוש), expressing the holiness of the day as well as the holiness of Israel, whom God sanctified to himself and made a people of priests, a royal nation; and then the sacred and social meal was eaten. The second meal was eaten on noon of the Sabbath, and the third began with the setting sun, and in the middle of it the Sabbath departed.

When lights were kindled a blessing was again pronounced over a cup of wine (חבדלה), and burning incense was offered up to accompany the exit of the holy day, which was regarded as a departing friend. The paschal meal was the model for these social and sacred repasts. But the light in which this very model sacrifice is to be viewed was a point of dispute between the priestly party or the Sadducees and the Pharisees. Because the paschal lamb formed the social meal of the laity, the priestly party maintained that it is not to be regarded as a sacrifice for the congregation, urging in support of their notion the fact that the lambs were not numerically fixed like the other sacrifices in the Temple, but were regulated according to the number of families, and that they must therefore be viewed simply as family sacrifices, to be eaten by the respective owners, and must not set aside the sanctity of the Sabbath, i. e. ought not to be offered on the 14th of Nisan, if the first day of the Passover falls on the Sabbath. Hillel, however, or the Pharisaic party whom he represented, succeeded in carrying their point, and in putting the sacred but private offerings of the Passover on an equality with the Temple sacrifices, and it was ordained, in opposition to the priestly party, that they are to set aside the sanctity of the Sabbath; thus making the social family meal of the laity, which the Passover constituted, as sacred as the fraternal meal of the priests, consisting of the sacred sacrifices offered in the Temple (*Jerusalem Pesachim*, cap. vi; *Babylon Pesachim*, 66 *a*; Geiger, *Jüdische Zeitschrift* [Breslau, 1863], ii, 42 sq.). Having carried this point, the Pharisees also gave to their meals of the Sabbath and other holy days a sacrificial character after the model of the Passover.

As a people of priests and kings, the Pharisees considered themselves the guardians of the divine law and the ancestral customs, trusting implicitly that he who selected them to be his peculiar people would protect and shield them and theirs from all outward dangers which threatened the state. They were firmly penetrated by the conviction that as long as they were faithful to their God no power on earth, however formidable, would be permitted successfully to ravish his holy heritage. Hence they repudiated the time-serving policy of the aristocratic Sadducees, who maintained that a man's destiny was in his own hands, and that human ingenuity and state-craft ought to be resorted to in political matters.

Practically, Josephus represents the Pharisees as leading a temperate life, renouncing both excessive riches and immoderate pleasure, and striving above all to acquire a knowledge of that law and to practice those precepts which would fit them for the life to come (*Ant.* xviii, 1, 3); the same may be seen from the following declaration of the Talmud: "The more flesh on the body the more worms [when it is dead], the more riches the more cares, the more wives the more witches, the more handmaids the more unchastity, the more manservants the more robbery; but the more meditation in the divine law the better the life, the more schooling the more knowledge, the more counsel the more intelligence, the more benevolence the more satisfaction; he who acquires a good name acquires it for himself in this world, but he who acquires a knowledge of the divine law acquires for himself life in the world to come" (*Aboth*, ii, 17). In aiding the people to realize their high vocation, and to prepare themselves for the kingdom of heaven by obedience to the divine law, the Pharisees endeavored to facilitate that obedience by putting a mild interpretation upon some of the rigorous Mosaic enactments, and to adapt them to ever-changing circumstances. Thus they explain the expression נְבֵלָה, *carcass*, in Lev. vii, 24, literally, and maintain that the statute in the verse in question only declares *the flesh* of an animal which was torn and died a natural death to be defiling by contact, but not the skin, bones, etc.; and that, except the human corpse and the dead bodies of a few reptiles in which the skin and flesh are to a certain extent identical, the skin and bones of all animals, whether clean and legally slaughtered for meat, or unclean and dying accidentally, do not defile, but may be made up into parchment, different utensils, etc. The haughty and aristocratic Sadducees, on the other hand, who stood on their priestly dignity, and cared little for the comforts of the people, took the term נְבֵלָה in the unnatural sense of *an animal approaching the condition of becoming a carcass*, i. e. being so weak that it must soon expire, and maintained that an animal in such a condition may be slaughtered before it breathes its last; that its flesh must then be considered as a carcass, and is defiling, while the fat, skin, bones, etc., may be used for divers purposes (*Jerusalem Megilla*, i, 9; *Babylon Sabbath*, 108 *a*). It requires but little reflection to perceive how materially and divergently these different views must have affected the whole state of society, when it is remembered that according to the Sadducees the touching of any book written upon the parchment made from the skin of an unclean animal, or contact with one of the numerous utensils made from the leather, bones, veins, etc., of animals not Levitically clean and not legally slaughtered, imparted defilement. Again, the Pharisees, with a due regard for the interests of the people, and following the requirements of the time, explained *the right of retaliation*, "eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, foot for foot," etc. (Exod. xxi, 23, etc.), as requiring pecuniary compensation, while the Sadducees took it literally (*Baba Kama*, 83 *b*; 84 *a*, *b*; *Megillath Taanith*, cap. iv, Tosephta). The same consideration for the spiritual and temporal well-being of the people led the Pharisees to enact that in cases of danger, when the prescribed prayers cannot be offered, they are to offer a short prayer as follows: "Do thy will in heaven above, and give peace of mind to those who fear thee on earth, and whatsoever pleaseth thee do. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who hearest prayer!" (*Berakoth*, 29 *b*). What a striking resemblance between this and some parts of the Lord's prayer! It was this humane and pious care for the interests of the people that made the Pharisees so popular and beloved, and accounts for the remark of Josephus that they had such influence with the multitude that if they said anything against a king or a high-priest they were at once believed (*Ant.* xiii, 10, 5).

On a few leading theological points the Pharisees were decidedly pronounced, and to these we particularly call attention, as they were largely influential under the Christian economy.

a. In regard to *a future state*, Josephus presents the ideas of the Pharisees in such a light to his Greek readers that, whatever interpretation his ambiguous language might possibly admit, he obviously would have produced the impression on Greeks that the Pharisees believed in the transmigration of souls. Thus his statement respecting them is, "They say that every soul is imperishable, but that the souls of good men only pass over (or transmigrate) into another body—μεταβαίνειν εἰς ἕτερον σῶμα—while the souls of bad men are chastised by eternal punishment" (*War*, ii, 8, 14; comp. iii, 8, 5; *Ant.* xviii, 1, 3; and Böttcher, *De Inferis*, p. 519, 552). There are two passages in the Gospels which might countenance this idea: one in Matt. xiv, 2, where Herod the tetrarch is represented as thinking that Jesus was John the Baptist risen from the dead (though a different color is given to Herod's thoughts in the corresponding passage, Luke ix, 7–9); and another in John ix, 2, where the question is put to Jesus whether the blind man himself had sinned, or his parents, that he was born blind? Notwithstanding these passages, however, there does not appear to be sufficient reason for doubting that the Pharisees believed in a resurrection of the dead very much in the same sense as the early Christians. This is most in accordance with Paul's statement to the chief priests and council (Acts xxiii,

6) that he was a Pharisee, the son of a Pharisee, and that he was called in question for the hope and resurrection of the dead — a statement which would have been peculiarly disingenuous if the Pharisees had merely believed in the transmigration of souls; and it is likewise almost implied in Christ's teaching, which does not insist on the doctrine of a future life as anything new, but assumes it as already adopted by his hearers, except by the Sadducees, although he condemns some unspiritual conceptions of its nature as erroneous (Matt. xxii, 30; Mark xii, 25; Luke xx, 34–36). On this head the Mishna is an illustration of the ideas in the Gospels, as distinguished from any mere transmigration of souls; and the peculiar phrase "the world to come," of which ὁ αἰὼν ὁ ἐρχόμενος was undoubtedly only the translation, frequently occurs in it (הָעוֹלָם הַבָּא; *Aboth*, ii, 7; iv, 16; comp. Mark x, 30; Luke xviii, 30). This phrase of Christians, which is anterior to Christianity, but which does not occur in the O. T., though fully justified by certain passages to be found in some of its latest books, is essentially different from Greek conceptions on the same subject; and generally, in contradistinction to the purely temporal blessings of the Mosaic legislation, the Christian ideas that this world is a state of probation, and that every one after death will have to render a strict account of his actions, were expressed by Pharisees in language which it is impossible to misunderstand: "This world may be likened to a court-yard in comparison of the world to come; therefore prepare thyself in the antechamber that thou mayest enter into the dining-room" (*Aboth*, iv, 16). "Everything is given to man on security, and a net is spread over every living creature; the shop is open, and the merchant credits; the book is open, and the hand records; and whosoever chooses to borrow may come and borrow: for the collectors are continually going around daily, and obtain payment of man, whether with his consent or without it; and the judgment is true justice; and all are prepared for the feast" (iii, 16). "Those who are born are doomed to die, the dead to live, and the quick to be judged; to make us know, understand, and be informed that he is God; he is the Former, Creator, Intelligent Being, Judge, Witness, and suing party, and will judge thee hereafter. Blessed be he; for in his presence there is no unrighteousness, forgetfulness, respect of persons, nor acceptance of a bribe; for everything is his. Know also that everything is done according to the account, and let not thine evil imagination persuade thee that the grave is a place of refuge for thee: for against thy will wast thou formed, and against thy will wast thou born; and against thy will dost thou live, and against thy will wilt thou die; and against thy will must thou hereafter render an account, and receive judgment in the presence of the Supreme King of kings, the Holy God, blessed is he" (iv, 22). Still it must be borne in mind that the actions of which such a strict account was to be rendered were not merely those referred to by the spiritual prophets Isaiah and Micah (Isa. i, 16, 17; Mic. vi, 8), nor even those enjoined in the Pentateuch, but included those fabulously supposed to have been orally transmitted by Moses on Mount Sinai, and the whole body of the traditions of the elders. They included, in fact, all those ceremonial "works," against the efficacy of which, in the deliverance of the human soul, Paul so emphatically protested. See RESURRECTION.

b. In reference to the opinions of the Pharisees concerning *the freedom of the will*, a difficulty arises from the very prominent position which they occupy in the accounts of Josephus, whereas nothing vitally essential to the peculiar doctrines of the Pharisees seems to depend on those opinions, and some of his expressions are Greek, rather than Hebrew. "There were three sects of the Jews," he says, "which had different conceptions respecting human affairs, of which one was called Pharisees, the second Sadducees, and the third Essenes. The Pharisees say that some things, and not all things, are the work of fate; but that some things are in our own power to be and not to be. But the Essenes declare that fate rules all things, and that nothing happens to man except by its decree. The Sadducees, on the other hand, take away fate, holding that it is a thing of naught, and that human affairs do not depend upon it; but in their estimate all things are in the power of ourselves, as being ourselves the causes of our good things, and meeting with evils through our own inconsiderateness" (*Ant.* xviii, 1, 3; comp. *War*, ii, 8, 14). On reading this passage, and the others which bear on the same subject in Josephus's works, the suspicion naturally arises that he was biassed by a desire to make the Greeks believe that, like the Greeks, the Jews had philosophical sects among themselves. At any rate his words do not represent the opinions as they were really held by the three religious parties. We may feel certain that the influence of *fate* was not the point on which discussions respecting free-will turned, though there may have been differences as to the way in which the interposition of *God* in human affairs was to be regarded. Thus the ideas of the Essenes are likely to have been expressed in language approaching the words of Christ (Matt. x, 29, 30; vi, 25, 34), and it is very difficult to believe that the Sadducees, who accepted the authority of the Pentateuch and other books of the O. T., excluded God, in their conception, from all influence on human actions. On the whole, in reference to this point, the opinion of Grätz (*Geschichte der Juden*, iii, 509) seems not improbable, that the real difference between the Pharisees and Sadducees was at first practical and political. He conjectures that the wealthy and aristocratical Sadducees in their wars and negotiations with the Syrians entered into matters of policy and calculations of prudence, while the zealous Pharisees, disdaining worldly wisdom, laid stress on doing what seemed right, and on leaving the event to God; and that this led to differences in formal theories and metaphysical statements. The precise nature of those differences we do not certainly know, as no writing of a Sadducee on the subject has been preserved by the Jews, and on matters of this kind it is unsafe to trust unreservedly the statements of an adversary.

c. In reference to the spirit of *proselytism* among the Pharisees, there is indisputable authority for the statement that it prevailed to a very great extent at the time of Christ (Matt. xxiii, 15); and attention is now called to it on account of its probable importance in having paved the way for the early diffusion of Christianity. The district of Palestine, which was long in proportion to its breadth, and which yet, from Dan to Beersheba, was only 160 Roman miles, or not quite 148 English miles long, and which is represented as having been civilized, wealthy, and populous 1000 years before Christ, would under any circumstances have been too small to continue maintaining the whole growing population of its children. But, through kidnapping (Joel iii, 6), through leading into captivity by military incursions and victorious enemies (2 Kings xvii, 6; xviii, 11; xxiv, 15; Amos i, 6, 9), through flight (Jer. xliii, 4–7), through commerce (Josephus, *Ant.* xx, 2, 3), and probably through ordinary emigration, Jews at the time of Christ had become scattered over the fairest portions of the civilized world. On the day of Pentecost, that great festival on which the Jews suppose Moses to have brought the perfect law down from heaven (*Festival Prayers for Pentecost*, p. 6), Jews are said to have been assembled with one accord in one place in Jerusalem, "from every region under heaven." Admitting that this was an Oriental hyperbole (comp. John xxi, 25), there must have been some foundation for it in fact; and the enumeration of the various countries from which Jews are said to have been present gives a vivid idea of the widely-spread existence of Jewish communities. Now it is not unlikely, though it cannot be *proved* from Josephus (*Ant.* xx, 2, 3), that missions and organized

attempts to produce conversions, although unknown to Greek philosophers, existed among the Pharisees (De Wette, *Exegetisches Handbuch*, Matt. xxiii, 15). But, at any rate, the then existing regulations or customs of synagogues afforded facilities which do not exist now either in synagogues or Christian churches for presenting new views to a congregation (Acts xvii, 2; Luke iv, 16). Under such auspices the proselytizing spirit of the Pharisees inevitably stimulated a thirst for inquiry, and accustomed the Jews to theological controversies. Thus there existed precedents and favoring circumstances for efforts to make proselytes, when the greatest of all missionaries, a Jew by race, a Pharisee by education, a Greek by language, and a Roman citizen by birth, preaching the resurrection of Jesus to those who for the most part already believed in the resurrection of the dead, confronted the elaborate ritual-system of the written and oral law by a pure spiritual religion; and thus obtained the co-operation of many Jews themselves in breaking down every barrier between Jew, Pharisee, Greek, and Roman, and in endeavoring to unite all mankind by the brotherhood of a common Christianity. See PROSELYTE.

IV. *Origin, Development, Classes, and general Character of the Pharisees.*—The name does not occur either in the O. T. or in the Apocrypha; but it is usually considered that the Pharisees were essentially the same with the Assidæans (i. e. *chasidim* = godly men, saints) mentioned in 1 Macc. ii, 42; vii, 13–17; and in 2 Macc. xiv, 6. Those who admit the existence of Maccabæan Psalms find allusion to the Assidæans in Psa. lxxix, 2; xcvii, 10; cxxxii, 9, 16; cxlix, 9, where *chasidim* is translated "saints" in the A. V. (see Fürst, *Handwörterbuch*, i, 420 *b*). After the return from the Babylonian captivity the priesthood formed the centre of the new religious life, and the pious in Israel who were anxious to practice the commandments of the Lord naturally attached themselves to the divinely-appointed and time-honored tribe of Levi. Besides the keeping pure from intermarriage with heathen, great and vital importance was attached to the setting aside of the soil and Temple taxes (Neh. x, 33, 36, etc.; Ecclus. vii, 31; xlv, 20; Tobit i, 6; v, 13; Judith xi, 13; 1 Macc. iii, 49), to the due observance of the Sabbath (Neh. x, 31; xiii, 19), the three pilgrim festivals, viz. the Passover (2 Chron. xxx; xxxv; Ezra vi, 19–22), Pentecost (Tobit ii, 1), and Tabernacles (Neh. viii, 14), as well as the Sabbatic year (Neh. x, 31; 1 Macc. vi, 49, 53), and to the abstinence from unclean food. He who allied himself to the national party with the solemn resolve to keep those ancestral laws divinely given to the nation was called "one who had separated himself unto them from the impurity of the country people" (Ezra vi, 21), or "one who had separated himself for the law of the Lord from the country people" (ix, 1; x, 11; Neh. ix, 2; x, 28). Hence the phrase נִבְדַּל מִן, "separated from," obtained during this period *a party* signification. This name became the standing appellation for those who had thus separated themselves for the service of God, and continued to be the conservators of their ancestral religion, as may be seen from the taunt of the anti-national party, who warned them to join the Greek party, telling them in the days of the Maccabees that "since we have separated from them (ἐχωρίσθημεν ἀπ' αὐτῶν, the translation of נִבְדַּל) many evils have come upon us" (1 Macc. i, 11). Those who yielded to the temptation, and, relinquishing the national party, joined the antinational portion, were denominated (הִתְעָרֵב) *the mixed* (Ezra ix, 1), or (עֵרֶב) *the mixture* (Neh. xiii, 3). Hence the period before Alcimus was afterwards regarded as the *non-mixture* (ἀμιξία), while his own was looked upon as *the mixture* (ἐπιμιξ, 2 Macc. xiv, 3, 38). Afterwards, when the priestly party, or the Sadducees, who were at first the centre of the national movement, assumed a haughty position, stood upon their sacerdotal dignity, cared little for the real spiritual and temporal wants of the people, but only sought their own aggrandizement and preservation, allying themselves for this purpose with foreign nations, and espousing antinational sentiments, the real national portion of the people united themselves more firmly than ever, independently of the priests, to keep the law, and to practice their ancestral customs; and it is this party whom the opposite section called by the Aramaic name פְּרִישִׁין = Φαρισαῖοι, instead of its original Hebrew equivalent נִבְדָּלִים, *the separated* (Ezra vi, 21; ix, 1; x, 11; Neh. ix, 2; x, 28).

In the time of queen Alexandra (q. v.) the Pharisees attained almost supreme power. By the appearance of piety and thorough knowledge of the law, which they well knew how to affect (so as even to pass for prophets, Josephus, *Ant.* xvii, 2, 4), the Pharisees at an early day secured the popular favor (Josephus, *Ant.* xiii, 10, 5; xiii, 15, 5; xviii, 1, 3; *War*, i, 5, 2; comp. Luke xi, 43), and that of the women (Josephus, *Ant.* xvii, 2, 4, where, however, only the wives of king Herod are spoken of; but comp. Lightfoot, *Hor. Hebr.* p. 230 sq.), and thereby acquired considerable political influence, which became very manifest even during the history of the Jewish dynasty (Josephus, *Ant.* xiii, 10, 6; xiii, 16, 2; *War*, i, 5, 2). This influence became greatly increased by the extension of the Pharisees over the whole land (Luke v, 17), and the majority which they composed in the Sanhedrim (comp. Acts v, 34; xxiii, 6 sq.). In political conflicts they generally followed democratic principles, and sometimes carried them to an extreme, trusting to their combined influence for success. (Their number reached more than six thousand under the Herods, Josephus, *Ant.* xvii, 2, 4.) Many of them must have suffered death for political agitation (Josephus, *Ant.* xvii, 2, 4). In the time of Christ they were divided doctrinally into several schools, among which those of Hillel and Shammai were most noted, the former being more moderate, the latter more strict, in their observances. Of the history of the Pharisees after the resurrection of Christ and the foundation of the Christian Church little need be said. Their opposition to the Gospel continued as eager as before, and, though they are seldom mentioned by name in the Acts of the Apostles, that opposition is frequently brought before us when "the council" is spoken of (Acts iv, 15; v, 27; vi, 12; xxii, 30; comp. xxiii, 6). That "council" is the Sanhedrim, and of the seventy-two doctors of which it was composed, the more influential part appears to have consisted of Pharisees. We see then the same spirit of enmity to Christian truth manifested by it as had been displayed during the life of the Redeemer; and the history of Paul before his conversion is only a more marked illustration than ordinary of the manner in which the whole body would have "persecuted the Church of God and wasted it." It is not to be imagined that this enmity would abate as the infant Church grew stronger. Everything that we know of human nature and religious bigotry leads to the opposite conclusion; and in the terrible fanaticism with which, when Titus besieged Jerusalem, the Jewish people rushed upon their fate, in the unflinching zeal which they displayed, in the desperate efforts which they made to avert the destruction which was "the wrath come upon them to the uttermost," and in the awful frenzy with which they sacrificed themselves amid their falling palaces and burning Temple, it is impossible not to recognise the last convulsive outburst of Pharisaic heroism and despair.

With the definitions and explanations of such an extensive and gorgeous ritual as that of the Mosaic law, with the application and adaptation thereof to all the vicissitudes of the commonwealth, with the different degrees of holiness and uncleanness attached to the performance or neglect of each precept and rite, with the diverse dispositions and idiosyncrasies of the multitude about the respective merits of outward observances and a corresponding inward feeling, the Pharisees would

have been superhuman if they had escaped the extravagances which in the course of time have more or less developed themselves in the established religions based upon a more spiritual code and a less formal ritual. Thus the enactment that "the flesh of quadrupeds must not be cooked or in any way mixed with milk for food," deduced from injunctions in Exod. xxiii, 19; xxxiv, 26; Deut. xiv, 21; or the enactment about "the compulsory recitation of the *Shema* twice a day," i. e. the declaration about the unity of the Deity (Deut. vi, 4–9), at a stated time; or the discussion on "the lighting of candles on the eve of the Sabbath," which is the duty of every Jew; or "the interdict to eat an egg which had been laid on any feast-day, whether such day was or was not the day after the Sabbath," has its parallel in other and later systems. The Christian Church, without any basis for it in the N. T., has at times employed a casuistry which may fairly compete with that of the Pharisees, who had to define an inspired code of minute rites and ceremonies. From Peter Lombard to Gabriel Biel the question was warmly discussed among all the Christian casuists, What is to be done with a mouse which has eaten of the consecrated wafer? The Established Church of England has deduced from the words "Let all things be done decently and according to order" (1 Cor. xv, 40) the petty regulation that "no man shall cover his head in the church or chapel in the time of divine service, except he have some infirmity, in which case let him wear a nightcap or coif" (*Constitutions and Canons Ecclesiastical*, xviii); has enacted that "no minister, when he celebrateth the communion, shall wittingly administer the same to any but to such as kneel, under pain of suspension" (*ibid.* xxvii); that "upon Wednesdays and Fridays weekly, though they be not holy-days, the minister, at the accustomed hours of service, shall resort to the church or chapel, and, warning being given to the people by tolling of a bell, shall say the litany prescribed in the Book of Common Prayer: *whereunto we wish every householder dwelling within half a mile of the church to come or send one at the least of his household* fit to join with the minister in prayers" (xv); and that "no ecclesiastical person shall wear any coif or wrought nightcap, but only plain nightcaps of black silk, satin, or velvet; . . . in private houses and in their studies the said persons ecclesiastical may use any comely and scholar-like apparel, provided that it be not cut or pinkt; and that in public they go not in their doublet and hose, without coats or cassocks; and that they wear not any light-colored stockings" (lxxiv). This, however, only shows the tendency of all ritualism to degrade the human intellect by minute requisitions. That the multitudinous and detailed rites and ceremonies imposed by the Mosaic law, and amplified by the requirements of time, should have given rise among many Pharisees to formalism, outward religiousness, self-complacency, ostentation, superstition, and hypocrisy, was to be expected, judging from the general tendency of gorgeous ritualism in more modern days. A learned Jew charges against them rather the holiness of works than hypocritical holiness ("Werkheiligkeit, nicht Scheinheiligkeit," Herzfeld, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, iii, 359). At any rate they must be regarded as having been some of the most intense *formalists* whom the world has ever seen; and, looking at the average standard of excellence among mankind, it is nearly certain that men whose lives were spent in the ceremonial observances of the Mishna would cherish feelings of self-complacency and spiritual pride not justified by intrinsic moral excellence. The supercilious contempt towards the poor publican, and towards the tender penitential love that bathed Christ's feet with tears, would be the natural result of such a system of life. We are therefore not surprised that our Saviour saw these pernicious features in the ranks of Pharisaism, and that he found occasion to expose and to reprove most unsparingly their externalism (Matt. xxiii, 27; Luke vii, 39) and hypocrisy (Matt. xxiii, 13). But to conclude from this that all the Pharisees were either self-righteous and superstitious, or a set of hypocrites, is as unjust as it would be to brand every section in modern churches with the infirmities and extravagances of which individual members are guilty, and which are either denounced by their own more enlightened and spiritually-minded brethren, or exposed by the opposing sections. The language which the Pharisees themselves employed to denounce the proud, the formalists, the self-righteous, and the hypocrites in their own sect, is, to say the least, quite as strong as that which our Saviour used. In confirmation of this, we need only give the poignant Talmudic classification of the Pharisees. "There are seven kinds of Pharisees," says the Talmud: "1. *The Shechemite Pharisee* (פרוש שכמי), who simply keeps the law for what he can profit thereby, just as Shechem submitted to the rite of circumcision that he might thereby obtain Dinah, the daughter of Jacob (Gen. xxxiv, 19); 2. *The Tumbling Pharisee* (פרוש נקפי), who, in order to appear humble before men, always hangs down his head, and scarcely lifts up his feet when he walks, so that he constantly tumbles; 3. *The Bleeding Pharisee* (פרוש קיזאי), who, in order not to look at a woman, walks about with his eyes closed, and hence injures his head frequently, so that he has bleeding wounds; 4. *The Mortar Pharisee* (פרוש מדוכיא), who wears a cap in the form of a mortar to cover his eyes, that he may not see any impurities and indecencies; 5. *The What-am-I-yet-to-do Pharisee* (פרוש אדמה מה חובתי), who, not knowing much about the law, as soon as he has done one thing, asks, 'What is my duty now? and I will do it' (comp. Mark x, 17–22); 6. *The Pharisee from Fear* (פרוש מיראה), who keeps the law because he is afraid of a future judgment; and 7. *The Pharisee from Love* (פרוש מאהבה), who obeys the Lord because he loves him with all his heart" (*Babylon Sota*, 22 *b*; comp. *Jerusalem Berachoth*, cap. ix). It must also be admitted that it was among the Pharisees the glorious ideas were developed about the Messiah, the kingdom of heaven, the immortality of the soul, the world to come, etc. It was the Pharisees who, to some extent at least, trained such men as the immortal Hillel, "the just and devout Simeon, who waited for the consolation of Israel," and who, taking up the infant Saviour into his arms, offered up thanks to God (Luke ii, 25–35); Zacharias, "who was righteous before God" (i, 6); Gamaliel, the teacher of Saul of Tarsus; Paul, the great apostle of the Gentiles, etc. Our Saviour himself occupied Pharisaic ground, and used the arguments of the Pharisees in vindication of his conduct and doctrines. Thus, when Jesus was charged by the Pharisees with allowing his disciples to break the Sabbath by plucking ears of corn in the field on this holy day, he quoted the very maxim of the Pharisees that "the Sabbath is made for man, and not man for the Sabbath" (Mark ii, 27; comp. *Joma*, 85 *b*); and his proof is deduced according to the Pharisaic exegetical rule denominated גזרה שוה, *analogy*. When David was hungry, he ate of the priestly bread, and also gave some to those who were with him. Accordingly one who is hungry may satisfy his hunger with that which is otherwise only allowed to the priests. Now the priests perform all manner of work on the Sabbath without incurring the guilt of transgression; why, then, should one who is hungry not be allowed to do the same? (Matt. xii, 1–7). We only add that the apostle Paul, who must have known all the denunciations of Christ against the Pharisees, never uttered a disrespectful word against this sect, but, on the contrary, made it a matter of boast that he belonged to them (Acts xxiii, 6; xxvi, 5; Phil. iii, 5). Yet candor must acknowledge that great moral derelictions in practice often coexist with much that is beautiful in theory:

and the uncontradicted rebukes of our Saviour against the Pharisees of his time prove an enormous depravity on their part. He denounced them in the bitterest language; and in the sweeping charges of hypocrisy which he made against them as a class, he might even, at first sight, seem to have departed from that spirit of meekness, of gentleness in judging others, and of abstinence from the imputation of improper motives, which is one of the most characteristic and original charms of his own precepts. See Matt. xv, 7, 8; xxiii, 5, 13–15, 23; Mark vii, 6; Luke xi, 42–44; and comp. Matt. vii, 1–5; xi, 29; xii, 19, 20; Luke vi, 28, 37–42. Indeed, it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that his repeated denunciations of the Pharisees mainly exasperated them into taking measures for causing his death; so that in one sense he may be said to have shed his blood, and to have laid down his life in protesting against their practice and spirit. (See especially verses 53 and 54 in the 11th chapter of Luke, which follow immediately upon the narration of what he said while dining with a Pharisee.) Hence to understand the Pharisees is, by contrast, an aid towards understanding the spirit of uncorrupted Christianity. This divergence is so wide and fundamental that we shall best apprehend the genius of *Phariseeism* by developing the contrast somewhat in detail (see Delitzsch, *Jesus und Hillel* [Erlangen, 1866]).

(1.) In relation to the O.-T. dispensation, it was the Saviour's great effort to unfold the principles which had lain at the bottom of that dispensation, and, carrying them out to their legitimate conclusions, to "fulfil the law" (πληρῶσαι, Matt. v, 17, to "fulfil," not, as too often supposed to mean, to "confirm"). But, in contrast to this, the Pharisees taught such a servile adherence to the letter of the law, that its remarkable character as a pointing forward to something higher than its letter was completely overlooked, and that its moral precepts, intended to elevate men, and to lead them on to the thought of a moral stage more glorious than that at which they then stood, were made rather the instruments of contracting and debasing their ideas of morality. Thus, strictly adhering to the letter, "Thou shalt not kill," they regarded anger and all hasty passion as legitimate (Matt. v, 21, 22). Adhering with equal strictness to the words "Thou shalt not commit adultery," all impure thoughts and deeds which fell short of this were considered by them to be allowable (Matt. v, 27, 28). And, once more, acquiescing in the letter, "Whosoever shall put away his wife, let him give her a letter of divorcement," they so interpreted the precept that, if only a letter of divorcement were given, a wife might be put away for any cause however trifling (Matt. v, 31, 32). Thus, the whole spirit of the O.-T. dispensation was misunderstood by them. They did not see that it was adapted to a particular stage in the history of man; that its merit consisted, not in being perfect, but in being better than what would have existed without it; and that it contained in itself the pledge that it must one day yield, as a system, to the full evolution of those principles at which it aimed, and to which, from time to time, it gave expression. When accordingly He came, whose great effort it was to break through the letter, in order that he might set free the spirit, which the circumstances of men had rendered it necessary to enclose and confine for a season, their hearts were steeled from the first against him, and they attacked him as a blasphemer against the God of Israel and his law.

(2.) While it was the aim of Jesus to call men to the law of God itself as the supreme guide of life, the Pharisees multiplied minute precepts and distinctions to such an extent, upon the pretence of maintaining it intact, that the whole life of the Israelite was hemmed in and burdened on every side by instructions so numerous and trifling that the law was almost, if not wholly, lost sight of. These "traditions," as they were called, had long been gradually accumulating. Their object may in the first instance have been a good one. The law had been given under circumstances very different from those in which the Jewish people found themselves more and more placed as the Christian æra approached. The relations of life had been far simpler; the influence exerted over Israel by neighboring nations less refined; while the national authorities, except in times when the worship of the true God was altogether thrown aside, had united in keeping all admixture of foreign elements at a distance. That was no longer possible; and it became almost necessary therefore to explain the application of the law to the changed and ever-changing condition of the people (comp. Döllinger, *Christenthum und Judenthum*, p. 750). Commenting upon the law therefore was unavoidable; and many of the comments given were no doubt really what they were designed to be, "a fence to the law." But these "fences" too soon assumed, as indeed it was natural that they should, an importance superior to that of the law itself, while at the same time they were continually increasing in number, till at last a complete system of casuistry was formed, in which the most minute incidents of life were embraced, and which rendered the very conception of broad and general principles of duty an impossibility. Of the trifling character of these regulations innumerable instances are to be found in the Mishna, but, as it is not quite clear that the Talmudical was the same as the Pharisaic theology, we omit these, and remind our readers only of some of those mentioned in the N. T. Such, then, were their washings before they would eat bread, and the special minuteness with which the forms of this washing were prescribed; their bathing when they returned from the market, their washing of cups and pots, brazen vessels, and couches (Mark vii, 2–4); such were their fastings not only at the seasons which the law prescribed, but twice in the week (Luke xviii, 12)—on Thursday, when, according to their tradition, Moses had ascended Mount Sinai, and on Monday, when he had come down from it (Eisenmenger, *Entdecktes Judenthum*, i, 311); such were their tithings, not only of the property which the law provided should be tithed, but even of the most insignificant herbs—mint and anise and cummin (Matt. xxiii, 23; comp. Luke xviii, 12); and such, finally, were those minute and vexatious extensions of the law of the Sabbath, which must have converted God's gracious ordinance of the Sabbath's rest into a burden and a pain (Matt. xii, 1–13, Mark iii, 1–6; Luke xiii, 10–17, etc.).

(3.) It was a leading aim of the Redeemer to teach men that true piety consisted not in forms, but in substance; not in outward observances, but in an inward spirit; not in small details, but in great rules of life. The whole system of Pharisaic piety led to exactly opposite conclusions. Under its influence "the weightier matters of the law, judgment, mercy, and faith," were undervalued and neglected (Matt. xxiii, 23; Luke xi, 42); the idea of religion as that which should have its seat in the heart disappeared (Luke xi, 38–41); the most sacred obligations were evaded (Mark vii, 11); vain and trifling questions took the place of serious inquiry into the great principles of duty (Matt. xix, 3, etc.); and even the most solemn truths were handled as mere matters of curious speculation or means to entrap an adversary (Matt. xxii, 35, etc.; Luke xvii, 20, etc.).

(4.) The lowliness of piety was, according to the teaching of Jesus, an inseparable concomitant of its reality, but the Pharisees sought mainly to attract the attention and to excite the admiration of men. They gave alms in the most ostentatious manner; they often prayed standing at the corners of the streets; they disfigured their faces when they fasted (Matt. vi, 2, 6, 16) To draw attention to their religious zeal they made broad their phylacteries and enlarged the borders of their garments (Matt. xxiii, 5). Blind to the true glory of ministering to others rather than being ministered to, they sought their glory in obtaining the chief seats in the synagogues, the first places at the tables to

which they were invited, greetings of honor in the markets, and the title of Rabbi, Rabbi (Matt. xxiii, 6; Luke xiv, 7). Indeed, the whole spirit of their religion was summed up, not in confession of sin and humility, but in a proud self-righteousness at variance with any true conception of man's relation either to God or his fellow-creatures—"God, I thank thee that I am not as other men are, extortioners, unjust, adulterers, or even as this publican" (Luke xviii, 11).

(5.) It was a natural consequence of all this, that with such views of the principles and spirit of religion its practical graces should be overthrown, and it was so. Christ inculcated compassion for the degraded, helpfulness to the friendless, liberality to the poor, holiness of heart, universal love, a mind open to the truth. The Pharisees regarded the degraded classes of society as classes to be shunned, not to be won over to the right (Luke vii, 39; xv, 2; xviii, 11), and frowned from them such as the Redeemer would fain have gathered within his fold (John vii, 49). Instead of having compassion on the friendless, they made them a prey (Matt. xxiii, 13). With all their pretences to piety, they were in reality avaricious, sensual, and dissolute (Matt. xxiii, 25; John viii, 7). They looked with contempt upon every nation but their own (Luke x, 29). Finally, instead of endeavoring to fulfil the great end of the dispensation whose truths they professed to teach, and thus bringing men to the Hope of Israel, they devoted their energies to making converts to their own narrow views, who, with all the zeal of proselytes, were more exclusive and more bitterly opposed to the truth than they were themselves (Matt. xxii, 15).

In view of these facts, while acknowledging much that was just and commendable in their doctrines (Matt. xxiii, 2, 3), we are compelled to acquiesce in that general judgment which has made the name of "Pharisee" a proverb of ecclesiastical reproach—a character too often reproduced under Christianity itself.

V. *Literature.*—Besides the Mishna, the Talmud, and the Midrashim, which embody the sentiments of the Pharisees, we refer to Brucker, *Hist. Crit. Philosophiæ*, ii, 744–759; Milman, *Hist. of the Jews*, ii, 71; Ewald, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, iv, 415–419; Biedermann, *Pharisäer und Sadducäer* (Zur. 1854); Wellhausen, *Die Pharisäer und die Sadducäer* (Greifsw. 1874); and the *Jahrhundert des Heils*, p. 5, etc., of Gfrörer, who has insisted strongly on the importance of the Mishna, and has made great use of the Talmud generally. Grossmann has endeavored to present a harmony of the Jewish-Alexandrine doctrines with those of the Palestine Pharisees in his work, *De Pharis. Jud. Alexand.* (Hal. 1846), ii, 4; but it is very improbable that the Pharisees of Palestine agreed with the Jewish philosophers of Alexandria in their principles, when the latter were adherents of Plato, and diligent students of Homer and Hesiod (Grossmann, *De Philos. Sadduc.* iii, 8). See also the following works by modern learned Jews: Herzfeld, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel* (Nordhausen, 1857), ii, 258, etc.; Jost, *Geschichte des Judenthums und seiner Secten* (Leipsic, 1857), i, 197, etc.; Grätz, *Geschichte der Juden* (2d ed. ibid. 1863), iii, 72, etc., 454, etc.; and, above all, Geiger, *Urschrift und Uebersetzungen der Bibel* (Breslau, 1857), p. 103, etc.; also in the *Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft* (Leipsic, 1862), xvi, 714, etc.; and in his *Jüdische Zeitschrift für Wissenschaft und Leben* (Breslau, 1863), ii, 11, etc.; and reprinted separately (Breslau, 1863). See SECTS, JEWISH.

Pharmacy, a name applied to the arts of the magician and enchanter in the early ages of the Christian Church. The Council of Ancyra forbade pharmacy, that is, the magical art of inventing and preparing medicaments to do mischief; and appointed five years' penance for any one that receives a magician into his house for that purpose. Basil's canons condemn such arts under the same character of pharmacy and witchcraft, and assigns thirty years' penance to them. Tertullian plainly asserts that never did a magician or enchanter escape unpunished in the Church. Those who practiced the magical art were sometimes termed *pharmaci*, and their magical potions *pharmacæ*.

Pha'rosh (Ezra viii, 3). See PAROSH.

Phar'par (Heb. *Parpar'*, פַּרְפַּר, *swift;* Sept. Φαρφάρ v. r. Φαρφαρά, Ἀφαρφά; Vulg. *Pharpar*), one of the two rivers of Damascus mentioned in the well-known exclamation of Naaman, "Are not Abana and Pharpar, rivers of Damascus, better than all the waters of Israel?" (2 Kings v, 12). The name does not occur elsewhere in Scripture, nor is it found in ancient classic authors. Eusebius and Jerome merely state that it is a river of Damascus (*Onomast.* s. v. Farfar). Pliny says that "Damascus was a place fertilized by the river Chrysorrhoas, which is drawn off into its meadows and eagerly imbibed" (v, 16); and Strabo says of this river that "it commences from the city and territory of Damascus, and is almost entirely drained by watercourses; for it supplies with water a large tract of country" (xvi, 755). But none of these writers speak of any second river. Various opinions have been entertained regarding the Pharpar. Benjamin of Tudela states that, while the Abana runs through the city, the Pharpar runs between the gardens and the orchards in the outskirts (*Early Travels*, Bohn, p. 90). He evidently refers to the two branches of the same river. The river *Barada* takes its rise in the upland plain of Zebdâny, at the base of the loftiest peak of Anti-Lebanon. Its principal source is a fountain called Ain Barada. It cuts through the central chain in a sublime gorge, and flows in a deep wild glen down the eastern declivities. Its volume is more than doubled by a large fountain called Fijeh, which gushes from a cave in the side of the glen. The river leaves the mountains and enters the great plain of Damascus about three miles west of the city. The main stream flows though the city; but no fewer than seven large canals are taken from it at different elevations to irrigate the surrounding orchards and gardens. The largest of these is called *Nahr Taura*, "the river Taura," and is probably that which Benjamin of Tudela identified with the Pharpar (*l. c.*). The Arabic version of the Bible reads *Taura* for *Pharpar* in 2 Kings v, 12; but the words of Naaman manifestly imply the existence of two distinct rivers. Some have supposed that because the Barada has two great fountains, Naaman alluded to these; and Dr. Wilson would identify the Barada with the Pharpar, and Ain Fijeh with the Abana (*Lands of the Bible*, ii, 371, 373); but in reply we say that Naaman speaks of two "rivers," and not "fountains." See ABANA.

A short distance south of the city of Damascus flows the river *Awaj*. It has two principal sources—one high up on the eastern side of Hermon, just beneath the central peak; the other in a wild glen a few miles southward, near the romantic village of Beit Jann. The streams unite near Sasa, and the river flows eastward in a deep rocky channel, and falls into a lake, or rather large marsh, called Bahret Hijâneh, about four miles south of the lake into which the Barada falls. Although the Awaj is eight miles distant from the city, yet it flows across the whole plain of Damascus; and large ancient canals drawn from it irrigate the fields and gardens almost up to the walls. The total length of the Awaj is nearly forty miles; and in volume it is about one fourth that of the Barada. The Barada and Awaj are the only rivers of any importance in the district of Damascus; and there can be little doubt that the former is the Abana, and the latter the Pharpar. The identity of the Awaj and Pharpar was suggested by Munro in 1833 (*Summer Ramble*, ii, 54), and confirmed by Dr. Robinson (*Bibliotheca Sacra*, May, 1849, p. 371); but its sources, course, and the lake into which it falls, were first explored by Dr. Porter in the year 1852 (*ibid.* Jan. 1854, and April, 1854, p. 329). He then heard, for

the first time, the name *Barbar* applied to a glen on the east side of Hermon, which sends a small tributary to the Awaj; and it seems highly probable that we have in this name a relic of the ancient Pharpar. The Arabic may be regarded as equivalent to the Hebrew (see *Five Years in Damascus*, i, 299; *Biblioth. Sac.* l. c. p. 54). The mountain region round the sources of the river was occupied in a remote age by the warlike Maachathites (1 Chron. xix, 6, 7; Josh. xii, 5). Subsequently it formed part of the tetrarchy of Abilene (Luke iii, 1; Josephus, *Ant.* xix, 5, 1). Farther down, the river Pharpar divided the territory of Damascus from Ituræa (q. v.). The whole district through which the river flows is now called Wady el-Ajam, "the valley of the Persians;" the scenery is bare and mountainous, but some parts of it are extremely fertile, and it contains upwards of fifty villages, with a population of 18,000 souls (see *Jour. of Sac. Lit.* 1853; Ritter, *Pal. und Syr.* iv, 132 sq.). See DAMASCUS.

The tradition of the Jews of Damascus, as reported by Schwarz (*Palest.* p. 54, also p. 20, 27), is curiously subversive of our ordinary ideas regarding these streams. They call the river *Fijeh* (that is, the Barada) the Pharpar, and give the name Amana or Karmion (an old Talmudic name) to a stream which Schwarz describes as running from a fountain called *el-Barady*, a mile and a half from Beth Djana (Beit Jenn), in a north-east direction, to Damascus (see also the reference to the Nubian geographer by Gesenius, *Thesaur.* p. 1132 *a*).

Pharr, WALTER SMILEY, a Presbyterian minister, was born in Cabarras County, N. C., April 28, 1790. He was educated at Hampden Sidney College, Prince Edward Co., Va.; studied theology under the care of Moses Hoge, D.D.; was licensed by Hanover Presbytery, and ordained by Concord Presbytery Nov. 18, 1820. His first charge was Waxhaw Church, S. C., and he subsequently preached for Prospect, Rama, and Mallard Creek churches, in North Carolina, all within the bounds of Concord Presbytery. He died Dec. 27, 1866. Mr. Pharr was a sound theologian, a plain and successful preacher and pastor, much beloved and confided in by all who knew him. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1867, p. 450. (J. L. S.)

Phar'zite (Heb. with the art. *hap-Partsi'*, הַפַּרְצִי; Sept. ὁ Φαρεσί v. r. Φαρὲς), the patronymic of a family among the Hebrews (Numb. xxvi, 20), the descendants of Pharez (q. v.).

Phasaëlis (Φασαηλίς, Josephus; Φασηλίς, Ptolemy, v, 16, 7; *Phaselis*, Pliny, xiii, 4, 19; xxi, 5, 11), a city in the plain of the Jordan, built by Herod the Great in honor of his brother Phasaëlus (Josephus, *Ant.* xvi, 5, 2; xvii, 8, 1; xviii, 3, 2; *War*, ii, 9, 1). It is now Tell *Fusail*, a small hill with ruins at its base. The site is inhabited by a few people who cultivate their gardens. These are irrigated by a brook, the fountain of which is an hour more to the west, hidden as it were under the high cliffs below Daumeh, and under the shade of a dense jungle (see Robinson, *Researches*, ii, 305). Brocardus and Mar. Samedo (*Secr. Fidel. Cruc.* III, xiv, 3) identify this little stream, now called Ain Fusail, with the brook Cherith (see Reland, *Palæst.* p. 953; Bachiene, *Heil. Geogr.* I, i, 126–130).—Van de Velde, *Memoir*, p. 339.

Phase'ah [some *Pha'seah*] (Neh. vii, 51). See PASEAH.

Phase'lis (Φασηλίς), a town on the coast of Asia Minor, on the confines of Lycia and Pamphylia, and consequently ascribed by the ancient writers sometimes to one and sometimes to the other. It was one of the towns to which the Romans wrote commanding all Jewish exiles who had taken refuge there to be given up to Simon the high-priest (1 Macc. xv, 23). Its commerce was considerable in the 6th century B.C., for in the reign of Amasis it was one of a number of Greek towns which carried on trade somewhat in the manner of the Hanseatic confederacy in the Middle Ages. They had a common temple, the Hellenium, at Naucratis, in Egypt, and nominated προστάται for the regulation of commercial questions and the decision of disputes arising out of contracts, like the *preud'hommes* of the Middle Ages, who presided over the courts of *piepoudre* (*pieds poudrés*, pedlers) at the different staples. In later times Phaselis was distinguished as a resort of the Pamphylian and Cilician pirates. Its port was a convenient one to make, for the lofty mountain of Solyma (now Takhtalu), which backed it at a distance of only five miles, is nearly eight thousand feet in height, and constitutes an admirable landmark for a great distance. Phaselis itself stood on a rock of fifty or one hundred feet elevation above the sea, and was joined to the mainland by a low isthmus, in the middle of which was a lake, now a pestiferous marsh. On the eastern side of this were a closed port and a roadstead, and on the western a larger artificial harbor, formed by a mole run out into the sea. The remains of this may still be traced to a considerable extent below the surface of the water. The masonry of the pier which protected the small eastern port is nearly perfect. In this sheltered position the pirates could lie safely while they sold their booty, and also refit, the whole region having been anciently so thickly covered with wood as to give the name of *Pityusa* to the town. For a time the Phaselites confined their relations with the Pamphylians to the purposes just mentioned; but they subsequently joined the piratical league, and suffered in consequence the loss of their independence and their town lands in the war which was waged by the Roman consul Publius Servilius Isauricus in the years B.C. 77–75. But at the outset the Romans had to a great extent fostered the pirates, by the demand which sprang up for domestic slaves upon the change of manners brought about by the spoliation of Carthage and Corinth. It is said that at this time many thousand slaves were passed through Delos—which was the mart between Asia and Europe—in a single day; and the proverb grew up there, Ἔμπορε, κατάπλευσον· ἐξέλοῦ· πάντα πέπρατα. But when the Cilicians had acquired such power and audacity as to sweep the seas as far as the Italian coast, and interrupt the supplies of corn, it became time to interfere, and the expedition of Servilius commenced the work which was afterwards completed by Pompey the Great (see Smith, *Dict. of Class. Geog.* s. v.).

It is in the interval between the growth of the Cilician piracy and the Servilian expedition that the incidents related in the First Book of Maccabees occurred. After naming Ptolemy, Demetrius (king of Syria), Attalus (king of Pergamus), Ariarathes (of Pontus), and Arsaces (of Parthia) as recipients of these missives, the author adds that the consul also wrote: εἰς πάσας τὰς χώρας καὶ Σαμψάμῃ (Grotius conjectures Λαμψάκῳ, and one MS. has Μεσανίσσῃ) καὶ Σπαρτιάταις καὶ εἰς Δῆλον καὶ εἰς Μύνδον καὶ εἰς Σικυῶνα καὶ εἰς τὴν Καρίαν καὶ εἰς Σάμον καὶ εἰς τὴν Παμφυλίαν καὶ εἰς τὴν Λυκίαν καὶ εἰς Ἁλικαρνασσόν, καὶ εἰς Ῥόδον καὶ εἰς Φασηλίδα καὶ εἰς Κῶ καὶ εἰς Σίδην καὶ εἰς Ἄραδον καὶ εἰς Γόρτυναν καὶ Κνίδον, καὶ Κύπρον καὶ Κυρήνην (1 Macc. xv, 23). It will be observed that all the places named, with the exception of Cyprus and Cyrene, lie on the highway of marine traffic between Syria and Italy. The Jewish slaves, whether kidnapped by their own countrymen (Exod. xxi, 16), or obtained by raids (2 Kings v, 2), appear in early times to have been transmitted to the west coast of Asia Minor by this route (see Ezek. xxvii, 13; Joel iii, 6).

The existence of the mountain Solyma, and a town of the same name, in the immediate neighborhood of Phaselis, renders it probable that the descendants of some of these Israelites formed a population of some importance in the time of Strabo (Herod. ii, 178; Strab. xiv, c. 3; Livy, xxxvii, 23; Mela, i, 14; see Beaufort, *Karamania*, p. 53–56).

Phas'iron (Φασιρών; Vulg. *Phaseron* v. r. *Pasi-*

ron), the name of the head of an Arab tribe, "the children of Phasiron" (1 Macc. ix, 66). defeated by Jonathan, but of whom nothing more is known.

Phas'saron (Φασσαρών, v. r. Φασσοῦρος and Φάσσορος; Vulg. *Phasurius*), a Græcized form (1 Esdr. v, 25) of the Heb. name PASHUR (q. v.).

Phe'bè. See PHŒBE.

Phelan, WILLIAM, D.D., a somewhat noted Irish divine of the Protestant establishment, was born at Clonmel in 1789, and was educated at Trinity College, Dublin, where he was admitted sizar in 1806. In 1814 he was made second master of the endowed school of Derry; in 1817 he was elected fellow of his college, and in 1819 Donellan lecturer. In 1824 he became rector of Killyman, Armagh, and in 1825 of Ardtrea. He died in 1830. His *Remains* were published, with a biographical memoir, by the bishop of Limerick (2d ed. Lond. 1832, 2 vols. 8vo). See Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliogr.* s. v.

Phelet. See BETH-PHELET.

Phelipeaux, JEAN, a French theologian, was born at Angiers in the 17th century. He studied in Paris, and there took his degrees in theology even to the doctorship. Bossuet, having heard him dispute in the Sorbonne, formed so favorable an opinion of him that he placed him in the position of preceptor to his nephew, the abbé Bossuet, the future bishop of Troyes. Both were in Rome in 1697, when the affair of Quietism was agitated; they followed it with singular ardor, and with a kind of passion the expression of which Bossuet was more than once obliged to moderate. Phelipeaux wrote, June 24, 1698, "No better and more persuasive piece of news can be sent us than that of the disgrace of the relatives and friends of M. de Cambray." His pupil showed no less animosity. "He is a wild beast," said he, Nov. 25, in speaking of Fénelon—"he is a wild beast, that must be pursued until he is overthrown and unable to do any harm." Phelipeaux, entirely occupied with this affair, wrote numerous memoirs, and besieged the court of Rome with solicitations, at the same time carrying on a secret correspondence with M. de Noailles, archbishop of Paris. On his return to France (1699) he became canon, official, and grand-vicar of Meaux. He died at Meaux July 3, 1708. After his death was published the *Relation de l'origine du progrès et de la condamnation du Quiétisme répandu en France, avec plusieurs anecdotes curieuses* (s. l. 1732–1733, 2 pt. 12mo). All that is said in it against the manners of Madame Guyon is corroborated by no proof, and was refuted in 1733 by the abbé of La Bletterie. As for Fénelon, one cannot doubt that the design of the author was to injure his reputation; "his work," says De Bausset, "reveals the most marked partiality and the most odious rage." Besides, it was suppressed by a decree of the council. See Moréri, *Grand Dict. Hist.*; De Bausset, *Hist. de Fénelon*; Barbier, *Dict. des Anonymes*, 2d edit., No. 16,089.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxxix, 821.

Phelonium (φελόνιον), a *cloak*, which in the Greek Church corresponds to the *chasuble* in the Latin Church. This ecclesiastical vestment is worn by the priests, and that worn by the patriarch is embellished with triangles and crosses. This is supposed to have been the sort of garment which Paul left at Troas, and his anxiety for its restoration is to be attributed, we are told, to its sanctity as an ecclesiastical robe.

Phelps, Elizabeth Stuart, an American lady, noted as the author of a number of moral and religious story-books, was born at Andover, Mass., in 1815. She was the daughter of Dr. Moses Stuart, the celebrated professor of O.-T. exegesis at the Andover divinity school, and wife of Dr. Austen Phelps. She died at Boston Nov. 30, 1852. We have not space here for a list of her writings, but those interested will find it in Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s. v.

Phelps, Joseph T., a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Anne Arundel County, Md., Sept. 21, 1818; was converted at sixteen, and in 1840 became a member of the Baltimore Conference, and for eighteen years travelled in Maryland, Virginia, and Pennsylvania. His last appointment in the Baltimore Conference was Harper's Ferry. In 1858 he took a supernumerary relation, and moved to Ohio. At the ensuing Conference he was, at his own request, located. In 1860–61 he was employed by the presiding elder on Clarksfield Circuit, and in 1863 he was admitted into the North Ohio Conference, and travelled the following circuits: Sullivan, one year; Republic, two years; Perkins, two years; and Centerton, one year. His last appointment was Republic. "He was a man of general intelligence, of goodly presence, and unassuming manners. He was a very good and acceptable preacher, a true Christian gentleman, and success attended his ministerial labors." He died near Republic, Seneca County, Ohio, April 23, 1870. See *General Minutes of the Ann. Conferences.*

Phelps, Servis W., a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in 1846. After completing his studies at Lowville Academy, where he was converted, he joined the New York Conference in 1868. He was first appointed to New Bremen, and then to Barnes's Corners, where, under his ministrations, more than fifty persons were added to the Church. His health suddenly failed him, and at the Conference of 1870 he was compelled to take a supernumerary relation. He died in Martinsburgh, N. Y., Feb. 28, 1871. Phelps was naturally kind and benevolent, and possessed many excellent qualities as a minister. He had high opinions of the ministerial office, and aimed to exemplify them in his entire life and influence. See *Minutes of the Ann. Conferences.*

Phelps, Thomas, a Wesleyan preacher and missionary, was born at Rudford, Gloucestershire, England, in 1817. He was of humble parentage, and did not enjoy more than the usual advantages of a common-school education. In 1849 he was selected as a laborer in the Jamaica mission. He promptly accepted the work, and though more or less disabled by severe attacks of tropical fever, he yet continued faithful in the discharge of his duties. He died peacefully at Port Morant, Aug. 13, 1852. "Phelps's amiable disposition, and his habits of industry and punctuality, secured for him the love and esteem of the brethren with whom he was associated, and his brief ministry was not without fruit. His pulpit labors were acceptable; and his diligent attention to other pastoral duties obtained for him the love of the people among whom he was stationed." See *Wesleyan Magazine* (Sept. 1853), p. 869.

Phelypeaux, GEORGES-LOUIS, a French prelate, was born in 1729 in the château d'Herbaut, diocese of Orleans. He entered holy orders, became commendatory abbé of the royal abbey of Thouronel, and was appointed in 1757 archbishop of Bourges, and in 1770 chancellor of the Order of the Holy Ghost. He distinguished himself as much by the activity of his pastoral zeal as by his inexhaustible beneficence. He founded several colleges in the principal cities of his diocese, instituted bureaus of charity, and succeeded in considerably diminishing mendicity. See Blin de Sainmore, *Éloge Hist. de G.-L. Phelypeaux* (1778, 8vo); Fauchet, *Oraison Funèbre de G.-L. Phelypeaux.*—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxxix, 824.

Pheni'cè [some *Phe'nice*]: *a.* (Acts xxvii, 12). See PHŒNIX. *b.* (Acts xi, 19; xv, 3). See PHŒNICIA.

Pheni'cia. See PHŒNICIA.

Phenolion. See PHÆNOLIUM.

Phenomenon. See PHÆNOMENON.

Pherecȳdes (Φερεκύδης), an ancient Greek philosopher, was a native of the island of Syros, one of the Cyclades, and flourished in the 6th century B.C. He is said by Diogenes Laertius to have been a rival of

Thales, and to have learned his wisdom from the sacred books of the Phœnicians, or from the Egyptians and Chaldæans. He is also reputed to have been a disciple of Pittacus, and to have taught Pythagoras. He wrote a cosmogony in a kind of prose much resembling poetry, under the title Ἑπτάμυχος, the meaning of which is doubtful. In a manner rather poetic than philosophic, he endeavored in this work to show the origin of all things from three eternal principles: *Time*, or *Kronos*; *Earth*, as the formless and passive mass; and *Æther*, or *Zeus*, as the formative principle. He taught the doctrine of the existence of the human soul after death; but it is uncertain whether he held the doctrine of the transmigration of souls, afterwards promulgated by his disciple Pythagoras. Of his work only fragments are extant, which have been collected and elucidated by Sturtz (Gera, 1798; 2d ed. Leips. 1824). See Smith, *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. and Mythol.* s. v.; Butler, *Hist. of Anc. Phil.* vol. ii; Cudworth, *Intell. System of the Universe* (see Index in vol. iii).

Pher'esite (1 Esdr. viii, 69) or **Pher'ezite** (Judith v, 19; 2 Esdr. i, 21), different modes of rendering (Φερεζαῖος) the name PERIZITE (q. v.).

Phiăla (Φιάλη), LAKE, a small body of water described by Josephus, and believed by him to supply the fountain at Banias (*War*, iii, 10, 7). It is the present *Birket er-Râm*, east of Banias; first examined by Irby and Mangles (1818, *Travels*, p. 287); identified by Thomson (*Biblioth. Sacra*, iii, 189–192). See also Ritter, *Erdkunde*, xv, 154 sq., 174 sq.; Wilson, *Lands of the Bible*, ii, 180; Lynch, *Official Report*, p. 110; Robinson, *Later Bibl. Res.* p. 399.—Van de Velde, *Memoir*, p. 340.

Phibionitæ is a local name of the Gnostics (q. v.), and is probably a corruption of *Phrebionitæ*, which was acquired from Valentinus, the founder of the sect, who was a native of Phrebonitis, on the coast of Egypt (see Epiphanius, *Hæres.* xxvi, 3; xxxi, 2).

Phi'chol (Heb. *Pikol'*, פִּיכֹל, of doubtful meaning [see below]; Sept. Φιχώλ v. r. Φικόλ; Josephus Φίκωλος), the proper, or, more probably, the titular name of the commander of the troops of Abimelech, the Philistine king of Gerar in the patriarchal period. See ABIMELECH. If the Abimelech of the time of Isaac was the son of the Abimelech of the time of Abraham, we may conclude that the Phichol who attended on the second Abimelech (Gen. xxi, 22) was the successor of the one who was present with the first at the interview with Abraham (Gen. xxvi, 26). Josephus mentions him on the second occasion only. On the other hand the Sept. introduces Ahuzzath, Abimelech's other companion, on the first also. By Gesenius the name is treated as Hebrew, and as meaning the "mouth of all." By Fürst (*Heb. Lex.* s. v.) it is derived from a root פָּכַל, *to be strong*. But Hitzig (*Philistäer*, § 57) refers it to the Sanscrit *pitshula*, a *tamarisk*, pointing out that Abraham had planted a tamarisk in Beersheba, and comparing the name with Elah, Berosus, Tappuach, and other names of persons and places signifying different kinds of trees; and with the name Φίγαλος, a village of Palestine (Josephus, *Ant.* xii, 4, 2), and Φιγαλία in Greece. Stark (*Gaza*, etc. p. 96) more cautiously avoids such speculations. The natural conclusion from these mere conjectures is that Phichol is a Philistine name, the derivation and meaning of which are lost to us.

Philadel'phia [strictly *Philadelphi'a*] (Φιλαδέλφεια, *brotherly love*), one of the seven cities of Asia Minor to which the admonitions in the Apocalypse were addressed (Rev. i, 11; ii, 7). The town stood about twenty-five miles south-east from Sardis, in N. lat. 32° 28′, E. long. 28° 30′, in the plain of Hermus, about midway between the river of that name and the termination of Mount Tmolus. It was the second in Lydia (Ptolemy, v, 2; Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* v, 30), and was built by king Attalus Philadelphus, from whom it took its name. In B.C. 133 the place passed, with the dominion in which it lay, to the Romans. The soil was extremely favorable to the growth of vines, celebrated by Virgil (*Georg.* ii, 98) for the soundness of the wine they produced; and in all probability Philadelphia was built by Attalus as a mart for the great wine-producing region, extending for 500 stadia in length by 400 in breadth. Its coins have on them the head of Bacchus or a female Bacchant. Strabo compares the soil with that in the neighborhood of Catana, in Sicily; and modern travellers describe the appearance of the country as resembling a billowy sea of disintegrated lava, with here and there vast trap-dikes protruding. The original population of Philadelphia seems to have been Macedonian, and the national character to have been retained even in the time of Pliny. There was, however, as appears from Rev. iii, 9, a synagogue of Hellenizing Jews there, as well as a Christian Church—a circumstance to be expected when we recollect that Antiochus the Great introduced into Phrygia 2000 families of Jews, removing them from Babylon and Mesopotamia, for the purpose of counteracting the seditious temper of the Phrygians; and that he gave them lands and provisions, and exempted them from taxes (Josephus, *Ant.* xii, 3, 4). The locality continued to be subject to constant earthquakes, which in the time of Strabo (xiii, 628) rendered even the town-walls of Philadelphia unsafe; but its inhabitants held pertinaciously to the spot, perhaps from the profit which naturally accrued to them from their city being the staple of the great wine-district. But the expense of reparation was constant, and hence perhaps the poverty of the members of the Christian Church (οἶδα . . . ὅτι μικρὰν ἔχεις δύναμιν, Rev. iii, 8), who no doubt were a portion of the urban population, and heavily taxed for public purposes, as well as subject to private loss by the destruction of their own property. Philadelphia was not of sufficient importance in the Roman times to have law-courts of its own, but belonged to a jurisdiction of which Sardis was the centre. It continued to be a place of importance and of strength down to the Byzantine age; and of all the towns in Asia Minor it withstood the Turks the longest. It was taken by Bajazet I in A.D. 1392. Furious at the resistance which he had met with, Bajazet put to death the defenders of the city, and many of the inhabitants besides (see G. Pachym. p. 290; Mich. Duc. p. 70; Chalcond. p. 33).

Philadelphia still exists as a Turkish town, under the name of *Allah-shehr*, "city of God," i. e. Hightown. The region around is highly volcanic, and, geologically speaking, belongs to the district of Phrygia Catacecaumene, on the western edge of which it lies. The situation of Philadelphia is highly picturesque, especially when viewed from the north-east, for it is principally built on four or five hills, extremely regular in figure, and having the appearance of truncated pyramids. At the back of these, which are all of nearly the same height, rise the lofty ridges of Tmolus; and though the country around is barren and desolate, the city itself is wanting neither in wood nor verdure. The climate of Philadelphia is pleasant and healthy. It is elevated 952 feet above the level of the sea, and is open to the salutary breezes from the Catacecaumene—a wild desert tract of highly volcanic country extending as far to the east as Peltæ. This district is even yet famous for the growth of the vine, which delights in a light sandy soil; and, though incapable of extensive cultivation, has a few fertile oases. Close to Philadelphia the soil is rich, and fruits as well as corn are abundant. The Cogamos abounds in fresh-water turtle, which are considered delicacies, and highly prized accordingly. The revenues of the city depend on its corn, cotton, and tobacco. The cotton grows in small pods about the size of a medlar, and not unlike it in form. The town itself, although spacious, is miserably built and kept, the dwellings being remarkably mean, and the streets exceedingly filthy. Across the summits



Philadelphia.

of the hill behind the town and the small valleys between them runs the town-wall, strengthened by circular and square towers, and forming also an extensive and long quadrangle in the plain below. The ancient walls are partly standing and partly in ruins; but it is easy to trace the circuit which they once enclosed, and within which are to be found innumerable fragments of pillars and other remains of antiquity. The missionaries Fisk and Parsons, in 1822, were informed by the Greek bishop that the town contained 3000 houses, of which he assigned 250 to the Greeks, and the rest to the Turks. On the same authority it is stated that there are five churches in the town, besides twenty others which were too old or too small for use. Six minarets, indicating as many mosques, are seen in the town; and one of these mosques is believed by the native Christians to have been the church in which assembled the primitive Christians addressed in the Apocalypse. There are few ruins; but in one part there are still found four strong marble pillars, which supported the dome of a church. The dome itself has fallen down, but its remains may be observed, and it is seen that the arch was of brick. On the sides of the pillars are inscriptions, and some architectural ornaments in the form of the figures of saints. One solitary pillar of high antiquity has often been noticed as reminding beholders of the remarkable words in the Apocalyptic message to the Philadelphia Church: "Him that overcometh will I make a pillar in the temple of my God; and he shall go no more out" (Rev. iii, 12). It is believed that the Christian inhabitants of Philadelphia are on the increase. The city is the seat of a Greek bishop, and the last incumbent of the see did much to spread among his clergy a desire for theological learning; but education is in a very low state, and Mr. Arundell states that the children had been allowed to tear up some ancient copies of the Gospels. See Smith, *Sept. Ecclesiarum Asiæ*, p. 138; Arundell, *Seven Churches;* Richter, *Wahlfahrten*, p. 513; Schubert, *Morgenland*, i, 353–357; *Missionary Herald*, 1821, p. 253; 1839, p. 210–212; Chandler, *Travels*, p. 310.

It has been supposed by some that Philadelphia occupied the site of another town named Callatebus, of which Herodotus speaks, in his account of Xerxes's march; but the position and fertility of that spot do not correspond. At the same time the Persian king, in his two days' march from Cydrara to Sardis, must have passed very near the site of the future Philadelphia (Strabo, xii, c. 8; Herod. vii, 31). See Asia Minor.

Philadelphians, or "*the Philadelphian Society*," is the name of a sect which was founded in 1695, and claimed to have for its object "the advancement of piety and divine philosophy." It originated with Jane Leade (q. v.) and John Pordage (q. v.). Another of the Philadelphians was the learned physician Francis Lee, who edited the "Theosophical Transactions" of the society. Another eminent member was Dr. Lot Fisher, who caused all the works of Jane Leade and her associates to be translated into Dutch. A fourth principal coadjutor was Thomas Bromley, author of *The Sabbath of Rest*, and of some works on Biblical subjects. The Philadelphian Society contributed largely to the spread of that mystical piety which is so conspicuous in the works of the good and learned William Law, and which affected in no small degree the early stages of Methodism. Mrs. Leade herself, however, combined much fanaticism with her pietism, professing (like Swedenborg in a later generation) to hold intercourse with spirits. This fanaticism imparted itself to many members of the Philadelphian Society, and imaginary apparitions of good and evil angels became for a time a prominent feature of their religious life. In other respects their mysticism was that of the ordinary character, making the contemplative life the basis of religious knowledge and practice. A small work entitled *The Principles of the Philadelphians*, published in 1697, gives a curious exposition of their mysticism. See Ebrard, *Kirchen- u. Dogmengesch.* iv, 163; Mosheim, *Eccles. Hist.* vol. iii; *Meth. Rev.* April, 1865, p. 305; Illgen, *Zeitsch. für hist. Theol.* 1865, ii, 171; *Amer. Presb. Rev.* Jan. 1866, p. 191. (J. H. W.)

Philalethes, or *lovers of truth*, as their name implies, were a sect of infidels which arose at Kiel, in Germany, about 1847, and who wished to ignore Christianity altogether, and to use only the general forms of piety. See Rationalists.

Philanthropy (φιλανθρωπία, a term compounded of φίλος, *loving*, and ἄνθρωπος, *man*), signifies *the love of mankind*. It differs from benevolence only in this—that benevolence extends to every being that has life and sense, and is of course susceptible of pain and pleasure; whereas philanthropy cannot comprehend more than the human race. It differs from friendship, as this affection subsists only between a few individuals, while philanthropy comprehends the whole human species. It is a calm sentiment, which perhaps hardly ever rises to the warmth of affection, and certainly not to the heat of passion.

Christian philanthropy is universally admitted to be superior to that of any other ethical or religious system; and if we inquire what are the causes of this superior prominence given to active benevolence in the Christian scheme of ethics, we shall find, as in other instances, that the peculiar character of the ethical fruit depends on the root of religion by which the plant is nourished, and the theological soil in which it was planted. For surely it requires very little thought to perceive that the root of all that surpassing love of the human brotherhood lies in the well-known opening words of the most catholic of prayers—"Our Father, which art in heaven;" the aspect also of sin as a contumacy, and a rebellion, and a guilt, drawing down a curse, necessarily leads to a more aggressive philanthropy, with the view of achieving deliverance from that curse; but, above all, the doctrine of the immortality of the soul, and the terrible consequences necessarily involved in the idea

of an eternal banishment from the sunshine of the divine presence, has created an amount of social benevolence and missionary zeal which under any less potent stimulus would have been impossible. The miseries of the more neglected and outcast part of humanity present an entirely different aspect to the calm Epicurean and to the zealous Christian. To the Christian the soul of the meanest savage and of the most degraded criminal is still an immortal soul. Christian ethics requires us to love our enemies without betraying our rights, and this will become more and more practicable in the degree that international recognition becomes more common, and a large Christian philanthropy more diffused.

In the history of education philanthropy has acquired a special meaning. The influence exercised by Rousseau was not less great on education than on politics, and was as visible in the pedagogues of Germany and Switzerland as in the men of the French Revolution. It is to the brilliant and one-sided advocacy, by the author of *Émile*, of a return to nature in social life and in the training of the young, that Basedow owed his novel and enthusiastic educationalism, which he put to the practical test in the institution which was opened under his auspices at Dessau in 1774, and which was called *Philanthropina*. Other establishments of the same kind were founded in different parts of Germany, but the only one which still survives is Salzmann's Institute at Schnepfenthal, near Gotha, opened in 1784. These philanthropina are of interest to us because they sought the religious and moral training of the young on an entirely original plan. Until the days of these Philanthropists the Church had had the sole educational care of the rising generation, but these came forward to assume this responsibility, and to treat the child in a peculiar and altogether novel manner. The religious fervor was to be developed like love for any given study, and, instead of influencing the heart, religion became an intellectual acquisition. As philanthropism agreed no less with the absolutism of Russia than with the liberty of Switzerland, so, in the general private devotional exercises, nothing should be done which would not be approved of by every worshipper of God, whether he were a Christian, Jew, Mohammedan, or a deist. "In the temple of the Father of all, crowds of dissenting fellow-citizens will worship as brethren, and afterwards they will, with the same fraternal disposition, go, one to hear the holy mass, the other to pray with real brethren, 'Our Father,' the third to pray with real brethren, 'Father of us.' While the former education had viewed the minds of children as vessels into which a certain amount of knowledge and faith was to be infused, whether it was easy or difficult, philanthropism viewed these vessels as the chief thing, and the amount of knowledge as only secondary. In other words, knowledge was regarded merely as a means of training the human mind; and the aim was the natural development of all man's powers and faculties" (Kahnis, *Hist. of Germ. Prot.* p. 47). See the *Quart. Rev.* Jan. 1875, art. vi; Blackie, *Hist. of Europ. Morals*, p. 236, 263; Wuttke, *Christian Ethics* (see Index in vol. vii).

Philar'chès. This word occurs as a proper name in the A. V. at 2 Macc. viii, 32, where it is really the name of an office, *phylarch* (ὁ φυλάρχης=ὁ φύλαρχος, "the commander of the cavalry"). The Greek text seems to be decisive as to the true rendering; but the Latin version ("et Philarchen qui cum Timotheo erat . . .") might easily give rise to the error, which is very strangely supported by Grimm, ad loc.

Philaret OF MOSCOW, a modern Russian prelate of much celebrity, was born of pious parentage at Kolouma in 1782. His lay name was *Vasilj Drosdow*. He received his education in the Theological Seminary of Moscow. He commenced his public career as tutor of the Greek and Latin languages. His oratorical gifts being soon observed, he was appointed preacher in 1806 at the Sergian monastery of Troizka, and after having removed to St. Petersburg, entered the monastic life, in order to open to himself the higher avenues of the Church, which only the white clergy can enter. In 1810 he was translated to the Academy of Alexander Newskj as bachelor of theological science; in 1811 he was made archimandrite, and in 1812 became rector of the St. Petersburg Theological Academy. In 1817 he was raised to the bishopric, and was appointed successively bishop of Twer, Iaroslaw, and Moscow. In the episcopal see of Moscow, to which he was appointed in 1821, he remained until his death, Nov. 19, 1867. As the senior Russian prelate, the eminent orator and professor, the theologian justly renowned in the Christian world, the strict supporter of the Church, and the true statesman, Philaret, from his tenderest youth until the last day of his prolonged life, was animated by a burning and constant love for Russia. In the fulfilment of the mission which fell to his lot, he elevated himself by his spirit above the time, and did not allow himself to be captivated by any narrowness of mind. All that knew him know likewise that in the height of his intelligence he considered the relative importance of all the manifestations in the Christian world, whether within or without the orthodox Church. He would not permit the appellation of heretics to such of the Christian dissenters as had come into existence since the œcumenical councils, and consequently had not been condemned by them. He was exempt from fanaticism in his administrations, and yet he knew the limits and measures of that which stood below. His inexhaustible intellect, sound counsels, and thorough acquaintance with the religious and social life of the people made him the friend of the crowned heads of Russia; and he was by them selected as confidential adviser in all important questions concerning the good of the empire. Alexander I even told him who was to be the successor to his throne before the future emperor knew of it. In the late Crimean war his words and sacrificing example revived a patriotic feeling throughout the land; and to him is ascribed the manifesto which led to the abolishment of the anti-Christian serfdom. For over twenty-five years he was not present at the Holy Synod, yet all important documents concerning spiritual affairs were submitted to him; and his vivid words called out sympathy with the poor co-religionists in the island of Crete. In 1813 Philaret received a decoration from the emperor Alexander I for his oratory. Sermons, lectures, etc., of his have been printed in large numbers and translated into foreign languages. The synodial printing establishment at Moscow alone printed 360 of his compositions to the number of 2,000,223 copies. Metropolitan Philaret was really one of the greatest scholars of his Church. Almost all the now living communicants of the orthodox Russo-Greek Church have learned its doctrines from the Catechism arranged by him. His greatest work is his *History of the Russian Church*, of which a German translation was brought out in 1872. This history was really the first work of importance in Russian ecclesiastical annals. It was published from 1850 to 1859, and, by order of the Holy Synod, was introduced into the ecclesiastical seminaries (institutions ranking between the ecclesiastical schools and ecclesiastical academies). Within ten years four editions were published. The author divides the history of the Russian Church into five periods: the first closes with the inroads of the Mongolians in 1237; the second embraces the time of the subjection of Russia by the Mongolians, 1238 to 1409; the third extends to the establishment of a patriarchate, 1587; the fourth to the abolition of the patriarchate in 1719; the fifth comprises the administration of the Church of the Holy Synod. (The value of the German translation is considerably enhanced by an appendix containing Philaret's treatise on the *Liturgy of the Oriental Greek Church* and the *Catechism of the Orthodox Christian Doctrine*.)

Philaret published, besides this history of the Russian Church, the following works: *A System of Christian Doctrines* (2 vols.):—*A Work on the Saints of Russia:—Cyril and Methodius, the Apostles of the Slavi:—The Liturgy of the Russian Church before the Invasion of the Mongolians:—A Work on the Church Fathers* (3 vols., and an extract from it as a text-book):—*A Commentary to the Epistle to the Galatians:—An Outline of the Theological Literature of Russia* (2 vols.):—*Sermons, Homilies, and Addresses* (4 vols.), of which a detailed account is given by Otto in his *Russian Literature*. Of his personal appearance and kindness of heart dean Stanley makes mention in his *East. Ch. Lectures*, p. 525. As a preacher, the dean describes Philaret as one of the first of the present Church of Russia, "whose striking manner renders his sermons impressive even to those who cannot follow the language." See *Meth. Qu. Rev.* July, 1873, p. 498 sq.; *Union Rev.* March, 1869; Appleton's *Annual Cyclop.* 1867, art. Moscow; *Theologisches Literaturblatt* (Bonn, 1873, Jan. and April); *Zion's Herald* (Boston), April 2, 1868; Otto, *Russian Literature*, p. 324 sq.; Dixon, *Free Russia*, p. 29 sq. (J. H. W.)

Philaret, THEODORUS ROMANOFF, third patriarch of Russia, a near relative by his mother of the last czar of the blood of Rurik, was born in the 16th century. This relationship caused him, in 1599, to be made a monk by Boris Godounof. Elevated in 1605 to the episcopal chair of Rostof by Dmitri, he was in 1610 sent on an embassy to Poland, where he was retained, against the law of nations, a prisoner for nine years. On his return to Moscow, in 1619, he found his son czar, who appointed him, June 24, of this year, patriarch, and shared with him his sovereignty, so that all the ukases were given in their name, and in all solemnities each had a throne, one as high as the other. This interference of the patriarch in political affairs was fatal to Russia. Michael Romanoff had been called to the throne on the express condition of reigning with the concurrence of the chamber of the *boyards* and of the states-general, which, from 1613 to 1619, had come to be regarded as a legislative assembly. Philaret exiled the most distinguished boyards, and reduced the states-general to a merely consultative relation. Into spiritual affairs he carried the same retrograde spirit. Without caring for the advice of Oriental patriarchs, he ordained, in 1620, that every member of a Christian confession who should embrace the Russian religion must be baptized again, a regulation which is still in force. He died at Moscow Oct. 1, 1633. His pastoral epistles have been collected in the *Ancienne Bibliotheque Russe*, vol. xvi. See *Chronique de Nikon; Hist. of the Patriarch Philarète* (in Russian) (Moscow, 1802, 8vo); Satiehtchef et Solovief, *History of Russia;* Eugène, *Dict. Hist.* s. v.; Philarète, archb. of Kharkof, *Hist. de l'Eglise Russe;* Dolgoroukow, *La Vérité sur la Russie*, ch. vi.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxxix, 838.

Philaster (PHILASTRIUS), a noted hæresiologist of the ancient Latin Church, flourished in the first quarter of the 4th century. He was probably a native of Italy, and came on the stage of theological activity when the Arian controversy was waxing hot, and he was soon interested in it as a most ardent orthodox presbyter seeking the conversion of strayed sheep of the flock. He travelled far and near, seeking everywhere the conversion of the Arians, both high and low. Thus, e. g., he went to Milan to convince bishop Auxentius of the error of his ways. He was so well liked by the clergy that he was finally elected bishop of Brescia (Brixia), and as such took part in the Council of Aquileia in 361. He died July 18, 387. Philaster's greatest work is his *Liber de hæresibus* (in 156 chapters) (edited by Fabricius, Hamb. 1728; by Galland, *Bibliotheca*, vii, 475–521; and by Ehler in vol. i of his *Corpus hæreseolog.* p. 5–185). There is an affinity of Philaster with Epiphanius, but it is usually accounted for on the ground of the dependence of the former on the latter. This seems to have been the opinion of Augustine (*Epistola* 222 *ad Quodvultdeum*). But Lipsius derives both from a common older source, viz. the work of Hippolytus against thirty-two heresies, and explains the silence of Epiphanius (who mentions Hippolytus only once) by the unscrupulousness of the authorship of the age, which had no hesitation in decking itself with borrowed plumes. Philaster was very liberal with the name of heresy, extending it to 156 systems, 28 before Christ, and 128 after. He includes peculiar opinions on all sorts of subjects: "Hæresis de stellis cœlo affixis, hæresis de peccato Cain, hæresis de Psalterii inequalitate, hæresis de animalibus quatuor in prophetis, hæresis de Septuaginta interpretibus, hæresis de Melchisedech sacerdote, hæresis de uxoribus et concubinis Salomonis!" Philaster's writings first appeared in print at Basle in 1528, edited by Sichardus; they were reprinted in 1539 at Basle, and at other places. In 1677 they were inserted in the *Bibliotheca Patrum Maxima*, v. 701 sq. But the best edition is by Fabricius (Hamb. 1721), with a *Vita Philastri*. See Schröckh, *Kirchengesch.* ix, 363–382; Schaff, *Ch. Hist.* iii, 931 sq.; Alzog, *Patrologie*, § 63. (J. H. W.)

Philĕas OF THUMITÆ, an Eastern prelate, flourished in the 3d century as bishop of Thumitæ, in Egypt. He was of noble family, and in his native place filled the highest offices, and was distinguished for his piety and learning. On account of his faith, he was persecuted at Alexandria, and died as a martyr about 307 or 311. He left a work in praise of martyrdom. See Fabricius, *Bibl. Græca*, vii, 306; Möhler, *Patrologie*, i, 678 sq.; Routh, *Rel. Sac.* iii, 381 sq.

Phile'mon (Φιλήμων, *affectionate*), a Christian to whom Paul addressed his epistle in behalf of Onesimus. A.D. 57. He was a native probably of Colossæ, or at all events lived in that city when the apostle wrote to him; first, because Onesimus was a Colossian (Col. iv, 9); and, secondly, because Archippus was a Colossian (ver. 17), whom Paul associates with Philemon at the beginning of his letter (Philem. 1, 2). Wieseler (*Chronologie*, p. 452) argues, indeed, from Col. iv, 17, that Archippus was a Laodicean; but the εἴπατε in that passage on which the point turns refers evidently to the Colossians (of whom Archippus was one therefore), and not to the Church at Laodicea spoken of in the previous verse, as Wieseler inadvertently supposes. Theodoret (*Procem. in Epist. ad Phil.*) states the ancient opinion in saying that Philemon was a citizen of Colossæ, and that his house was pointed out there as late as the 5th century. The legendary history supplies nothing on which we can rely. It is related that Philemon became bishop of Colossæ (*Constit. Apost.* vii, 46), and died as a martyr under Nero. From the title of "fellow-workman" (συνεργός) given him in the first verse, some (Michaelis, *Einleit.* ii, 1274) make him a deacon, but without proof. But, according to Pseudo-Dorotheus, he had been bishop in Gaza (see Witsius, *Miscel. Leidens.* p. 193 sq.). The Apphia mentioned in the epistle was nearly connected with Philemon, but whether or not she was his wife there are no means of determining (comp. esp. Hofmann, *Introd. in Epist. ad Colos.* p. 52 sq.; Bertholdt, *Einleit.* vi, 3631 sq.). It is apparent from the letter to him that Philemon was a man of property and influence, since he is represented as the head of a numerous household, and as exercising an expensive liberality towards his friends and the poor in general. He was indebted to the apostle Paul as the medium of his personal participation in the Gospel. All interpreters agree in assigning that significance to σεαυτόν μοι προσοφείλεις in Philem. 19. It is not certain under what circumstances they became known to each other. If Paul visited Colossæ when he passed through Phrygia on his second missionary journey (Acts xvi, 6), it was undoubtedly there, and at that time, that Philemon heard the Gospel and attached himself to the Christian party. On the contrary, if Paul never visited that city in per-

son, as many critics infer from Col. ii, 1, then the best view is that he was converted during Paul's protracted stay at Ephesus (Acts xix, 10), A.D. 51–54. That city was the religious and commercial capital of Western Asia Minor. The apostle labored there with such success that "all they who dwelt in Asia heard the word of the Lord Jesus." Phrygia was a neighboring province, and among the strangers who repaired to Ephesus, and had an opportunity to hear the preaching of Paul, may have been the Colossian Philemon. It is evident that on becoming a disciple, he gave no common proof of the sincerity and power of his faith. His character, as shadowed forth in the epistle to him, is one of the noblest which the sacred record makes known to us. He was full of faith and good works, was docile, confiding, grateful, was forgiving, sympathizing, charitable, and a man who on a question of simple justice needed only a hint of his duty to prompt him to go even beyond it (*ὑπὲρ ὃ λέγω ποιήσεις*). Any one who studies the epistle will perceive that it ascribes to him these varied qualities; it bestows on him a measure of commendation which forms a striking contrast with the ordinary reserve of the sacred writers. It was through such believers that the primitive Christianity evinced its divine origin, and spread so rapidly among the nations. See PAUL.

PHILEMON, EPISTLE TO. This is the shortest and (with the exception of Hebrews) the last of Paul's letters as arranged in most editions of the N. T. In the following treatment of it we combine the Scriptural statements with modern researches.

I. *Authorship.*—That this epistle was written by the apostle Paul is the constant tradition of the ancient Church. It is expressly cited as such by Origen (*Homil.* 19 *in Jerem.* i, 185, ed. Huet.); it is referred to as such by Tertullian (*Nov. Marc.* v, 21); and both Eusebius (*Hist. Eccles.* iii, 25) and Jerome (*Procem. in Ep. ad Philem.* iv, 442) attest its universal reception as such in the Christian world. The latter, indeed, informs us that some in his day deemed it unworthy of a place in the canon, in consequence of its being occupied with subjects which, in their estimation, it did not become an apostle to write about, save as a mere private individual; but this he, at the same time, shows to be a mistake, and repudiates the legitimacy of such a standard for estimating the genuineness or authority of any book. That this epistle should not have been quoted by several of the fathers who have quoted largely from the other Pauline epistles (e. g. Irenæus, Clement of Alexandria, and Cyprian), may be accounted for partly by the brevity of the epistle, and partly by their not having occasion to refer to the subjects of which it treats. We need not urge the expressions in Ignatius, cited as evidence of that apostolic father's knowledge and use of the epistle; though it is difficult to regard the similarity between them and the language in v, 20 as altogether accidental (see Kirchhofer, *Quellensammlung*, p. 205). The Canon of Muratori, which comes to us from the 2d century (Credner, *Geschichte des Kanons*, p. 66), enumerates this as one of Paul's epistles. Tertullian says that Marcion admitted it into his collection. Sinope, in Pontus, the birthplace of Marcion, was not far from Colossæ where Philemon lived, and the letter would find its way to the neighboring churches at an early period. It is so well attested historically, that, as De Wette says (*Einleitung ins Neue Testament*), its genuineness on that ground is beyond doubt.

Nor does the epistle itself offer anything to conflict with this decision. It is impossible to conceive of a composition more strongly marked within the same limits by those unstudied assonances of thought, sentiment, and expression, which indicate an author's hand, than this short epistle as compared with Paul's other productions. Paley has adduced the undesigned coincidences between this epistle and that to the Colossians with great force, as evincing the authenticity of both (*Horæ Paulinæ*, c. 14); and Eichhorn has ingeniously shown how a person attempting, with the Epistle to the Colossians before him, to forge such an epistle as this in the name of Paul, would have been naturally led to a very different arrangement of the historical circumstances and persons from what we find in the epistle which is extant (*Einleit. ins N. T.* iii, 302).

Baur (*Paulus*, p. 475) would divest the epistle of its historical character, and make it the personified illustration from some later writer of the idea that Christianity unites and equalizes in a higher sense those whom outward circumstances have separated. He does not impugn the external evidence. But, not to leave his theory wholly unsupported, he suggests some linguistic objections to Paul's authorship of the letter, which must be pronounced unfounded and frivolous. He finds, for example, certain words in the epistle which are alleged to be not Pauline; but, to justify that assertion, he must deny the genuineness of such other letters of Paul as happen to contain these words. He admits that the apostle could have said *σπλάγχνα* twice, but thinks it suspicious that he should say it three times. A few terms he adduces which are not used elsewhere in the epistles; but to argue from these that they disprove the apostolic origin of the epistle is to assume the absurd principle that a writer, after having produced two or three compositions, must for the future confine himself to an unvarying circle of words, whatever may be the subject he discusses, or whatever the interval of time between his different writings. The arbitrary and purely subjective character of such criticisms can have no weight against the varied testimony admitted as decisive by Christian scholars for so many ages, upon which the canonical authority of the Epistle to Philemon is founded. They are worth repeating only as illustrating Baur's own remark that modern criticism in assailing this particular book runs a greater risk of exposing itself to the imputation of an excessive distrust, a morbid sensibility to doubt and denial, than in questioning the claims of any other epistle ascribed to Paul. See PAUL.

II. *Person Addressed.* — The epistle is inscribed to Philemon; and with him are joined Apphia (probably his wife), Archippus (his son or brother), and the Church which is in their house, though throughout the epistle it is Philemon alone who is addressed. Philemon was a personal friend and apparently a convert of the apostle (ver. 13, 19); one who had exerted himself for the cause of the Gospel and the comfort of those who had embraced it (ver. 2–7). His residence was probably at Colossæ (comp. Col. iv, 9, 17); but whether he held any office in the Church there remains uncertain. In the *Apostolical Constitutions* (vii, 46) he is said to have been ordained bishop of the Church, but this is not sustained by any other testimony, and is expressly denied by the author of the commentary on St. Paul's epistles ascribed to Hilary. See PHILEMON.

Wieseler is of opinion that Philemon was a Laodicean; and that this epistle is that mentioned (Col. iv, 16) as sent by the apostle to the Church in Laodicea. His ground for this is that the epistle is addressed to Archippus as well as Philemon, and he assumes that Archippus was bishop of the Church at Laodicea; partly on the authority of Theodoret, who says he resided at Laodicea; partly on that of the *Apostolical Constitutions* (vii, 46), which say he was bishop of the Church there; and partly on the connection in which the reference to him in Col. iv, 17 stands with the reference to the Church at Laodicea, and the injunction given to the Colossians to convey a message to him concerning fidelity to his office, which it is argued would have been sent to himself had he been at Colossæ. But the authorities cited have no weight in a matter of this sort; nor can the mere juxtaposition of the reference to Archippus with the reference to the Church at Laodicea prove anything as to the residence of the former; and as for the injunction to counsel Archippus, it is more likely that it would be given by the apostle in a letter to the Church to

which he belonged than to another Church. On the other hand, supposing Philemon to have been at Laodicea, it is not credible that the apostle would have requested the Colossians to send to Laodicea for a letter addressed so exclusively to him personally, and relating to matters in which they had no immediate interest, without at least giving Philemon some hint that he intended the letter to be so used. The letter to the Church at Laodicea was doubtless one of more general character and interest than this. See LAODICEANS, EPISTLE TO.

III. *Time and Place of Writing.*—This is generally held to be one of the letters (the others are Ephesians, Colossians, Philippians, and Hebrews) which the apostle wrote during his first captivity at Rome. The arguments which show that he wrote the Epistle to the Colossians in *that city* and at *that period* involve the same conclusion in regard to this; for it is evident from Col. iv, 7, 9, as compared with the contents of this epistle, that Paul wrote the two letters at the same time, and forwarded them to their destination by the hands of Tychicus and Onesimus, who accompanied each other to Colossæ. A few modern critics, as Schulz, Schott, Böttger, Meyer, maintain that this letter and the others assigned usually to the first Roman captivity were written during the two years that Paul was imprisoned at Cæsarea (Acts xxiii, 35; xxiv, 27). But this opinion, though supported by some plausible arguments, can be demonstrated with reasonable certainty to be incorrect. See COLOSSIANS, EPISTLE TO THE.

The *time* when Paul wrote may be fixed with much precision. The apostle at the close of the letter expresses a hope of his speedy liberation. He speaks in like manner of his approaching deliverance in his Epistle to the Philippians (ii, 23, 24), which was written during the same imprisonment. Presuming, therefore, that he had good reasons for such an expectation, and that he was not disappointed in the result, we may conclude that this letter was written by him early in the year A.D. 58.

IV. *Design and Effect.*—Our knowledge respecting the occasion and object of the letter we must derive from declarations or inferences furnished by the letter itself. For the relation of Philemon and Onesimus to each other, the reader will see the articles on those names. Paul, so intimately connected with the master and the servant, was anxious naturally to effect a reconciliation between them. He wished also (waiving the *ἀνῆκον*, the matter of duty or right) to give Philemon an opportunity of manifesting his Christian love in the treatment of Onesimus, and his regard, at the same time, for the personal convenience and wishes, not to say official authority, of his spiritual teacher and guide. Paul used his influence with Onesimus (*ἀνέπεμψα*, in ver. 12) to induce him to return to Colossæ, and place himself again at the disposal of his master. Whether Onesimus assented merely to the proposal of the apostle, or had a desire at the same time to revisit his former home, the epistle does not enable us to determine. On his departure Paul put into his hand this letter as evidence that Onesimus was a true and approved disciple of Christ, and entitled as such to be received, not as a servant, but above a servant, as a brother in the faith, as the representative and equal in that respect of the apostle himself, and worthy of the same consideration and love. It is instructive to observe how entirely Paul identifies himself with Onesimus, and pleads his cause as if it were his own. He intercedes for him as his own child, promises reparation if he had done any wrong, demands for him not only a remission of all penalties, but the reception of sympathy, affection, Christian brotherhood; and, while he solicits these favors for another, consents to receive them with the same gratitude and sense of obligation as if they were bestowed on himself. See ONESIMUS.

The result of the appeal cannot be doubted. It may be assumed from the character of Philemon that the apostle's intercession for Onesimus was not unavailing. There can be no doubt that, agreeably to the express instructions of the letter, the past was forgiven; the master and the servant were reconciled to each other; and if the liberty which Onesimus had asserted in a spirit of independence was not conceded as a boon or right, it was enjoyed at all events under a form of servitude which henceforth was such in name only. So much must be regarded as certain; or it follows that the apostle was mistaken in his opinion of Philemon's character, and his efforts for the welfare of Onesimus were frustrated. Chrysostom declares, in his impassioned style, that Philemon must have been less than a man, must have been alike destitute of sensibility and reason (*ποῖος λίθος, ποῖον θήριον*), not to be moved by the arguments and spirit of such a letter to fulfil every wish and intimation of the apostle. Surely no fitting response to his pleadings for Onesimus could involve less than a cessation of everything oppressive and harsh in his civil condition, as far as it depended on Philemon to mitigate or neutralize the evils of a legalized system of bondage, as well as a cessation of everything violative of his rights as a Christian. How much farther than this an impartial explanation of the epistle obliges us or authorizes us to go has not yet been settled by any very general consent of interpreters. Many of the best critics construe certain expressions (*τὸ ἀγαθόν* in ver. 14, and *ὑπὲρ ὃ λέγω* in ver. 21) as conveying a distinct expectation on the part of Paul that Philemon would liberate Onesimus. Nearly all agree that he could hardly have failed to confer on him that favor, even if it was not requested in so many words, after such an appeal to his sentiments of humanity and justice. Thus it was, as Dr. Wordsworth remarks (*St. Paul's Epistles*, p. 328), "by Christianizing the master that the Gospel enfranchised the slave. It did not legislate about mere names and forms, but it went to the root of the evil, it spoke to the heart of man. When the heart of the master was filled with divine grace, and was warmed with the love of Christ, the rest would soon follow. The lips would speak kind words, the hands would do liberal things. Every Onesimus would be treated by every Philemon as a beloved brother in Christ." See SLAVERY.

V. *Contents.*—The epistle commences with the apostle's usual salutation to those to whom he wrote; after which he affectionately alludes to the good reputation which Philemon, as a Christian, enjoyed, and to the joy which the knowledge of this afforded him (ver. 1–7). He then gently and gracefully introduces the main subject of his epistle by a reference to the spiritual obligations under which Philemon lay to him, and on the ground of which he might utter as a command what he preferred urging as a request. Onesimus is then introduced; the change of mind and character he had experienced is stated; his offence in deserting his master is not palliated; his increased worth and usefulness are dwelt upon, and his former master is entreated to receive him back, not only without severity, but with the feeling due from one Christian to another (ver. 8–16). The apostle then delicately refers to the matter of compensation for any loss which Philemon might have sustained, either through the dishonesty of Onesimus or simply through the want of his service; and though he reminds his friend that he might justly hold the latter his debtor for a much larger amount (seeing he owed to the apostle his own self), he pledges himself, under his own hand, to make good that loss (ver. 17–19). The epistle concludes with some additional expressions of friendly solicitude; a request that Philemon would prepare the apostle a lodging, as he trusted soon to visit him; and the salutations of the apostle and some of the Christians by whom he was surrounded at the time (ver. 20–25).

VI. *Character.*—The Epistle to Philemon has one peculiar feature—its *æsthetical character* it may be termed—which distinguishes it from all the other epistles, and demands a special notice at our hands. It has been de-

servedly admired as a model of delicacy and skill in the department of composition to which it belongs. The writer had peculiar difficulties to overcome. He was the common friend of the parties at variance. He must conciliate a man who supposed that he had good reason to be offended. He must commend the offender, and yet neither deny nor aggravate the imputed fault. He must assert the new ideas of Christian equality in the face of a system which hardly recognised the humanity of the enslaved. He could have placed the question on the ground of his own personal rights, and yet must waive them in order to secure an act of spontaneous kindness. His success must be a triumph of love, and nothing be demanded for the sake of the justice which could have claimed everything. He limits his request to a forgiveness of the alleged wrong, and a restoration to favor and the enjoyment of future sympathy and affection, and yet would so guard his words as to leave scope for all the generosity which benevolence might prompt towards one whose condition admitted of so much alleviation. These are contrarieties not easy to harmonize; but Paul, it is confessed, has shown a degree of self-denial and a tact in dealing with them which, in being equal to the occasion, could hardly be greater. This letter, says Eichhorn, is a voucher for the apostle's urbanity, politeness, and knowledge of the world. His advocacy of Onesimus is of the most insinuating and persuasive character, and yet without the slightest perversion or concealment of any fact. The errors of Onesimus are admitted, as was necessary, lest the just indignation of his master against him should be roused anew; but they are alluded to in the most admirable manner: the good side of Onesimus is brought to view, but in such a way as to facilitate the friendly reception of him by his master, as a consequence of Christianity, to which he had, during his absence, been converted; and his future fidelity is vouched for by the noble principles of Christianity to which he had been converted. The apostle addresses Philemon on the softest side: who would wilfully refuse to an aged, a suffering, and an unjustly imprisoned friend a request? And such was he who thus pleaded for Onesimus. The person recommended is a Christian, a dear friend of the apostle's, and one who had personally served him: if Philemon will receive him kindly, it will afford the apostle a proof of his love, and yield him joy. What need, then, for long urgency? The apostle is certain that Philemon will, of his own accord, do even more than he is asked. More cogently and more courteously no man could plead (*Einleit. ins N. T.* iii, 300).

There is a letter extant of the younger Pliny (*Epist.* ix, 21) which he wrote to a friend whose servant had deserted him, in which he intercedes for the fugitive, who was anxious to return to his master, but dreaded the effects of his anger. Thus the occasion of the correspondence was similar to that between the apostle and Philemon. It has occurred to scholars to compare this celebrated letter with that of Paul in behalf of Onesimus; and as the result they hesitate not to say that, not only in the spirit of Christian love, of which Pliny was ignorant, but in dignity of thought, argument, pathos, beauty of style, eloquence, the communication of the apostle is vastly superior to that of the polished Roman writer.

VII. *Commentaries.*—The following are the special exegetical helps on this epistle: Jerome, *Commentarii* (in *Opp.* vii, 741); also Pseudo-Hieron. *id.* (ibid. xi); Chrysostom, *Homiliæ* (in *Opp.* xi, 838; also ed. Raphelius, in the latter's *Annotationes*, ii); Alcuin, *Explanatio* (in *Opp.* I, ii); Calvin, *Commentarius* (in *Opp.*; also in English, by Pringle, in the latter's *Comment. on Tim.*; and by Edwards, in the *Bib. Repos.* 1836); Brentz, *Commentarii* (in *Opp.* vii); Pamelius, *Commentariolus* (Rabani Mauri, *Opp.* v); Major, *Enarratio* (Vitemb. 1565, 8vo); Danæus, *Commentarius* (Genev. 1579, 8vo); Hyperius, *Commentarius* [includ. Tim. and Tit.] (Tigur. 1582, fol.); Feuardent (R. C.), *Commentarius* (Paris, 1588, 8vo); Rollock, *Commentarius* (Genev. 1602, 8vo); Attersoll, *Commentary* (Lond. 1612, 1633, fol.); Gentilis, *Commentarius* (Norib. 1618, 4to); Dyke, *Exposition* (Lond. 1618, 4to; also in Dutch, in his *Wercke*, Amst. 1670, p. 793); Rapine (R. C.), *Exposition* [French] (Par. 1632, 8vo); Jones, *Commentary* [includ. Heb.] (Lond. 1635, fol.); Himmel, *Commentarius* (Jen. 1641, 4to); Vincent (R. C.), *Explicatio* (Par. 1647, 8vo); Crucius, *Verklaaring* (Harlem, 1649, 8vo); Habert (R. C.), *Expositio* [includ. Tim. and Tit.] (Par. 1656, 8vo); Franckenstein, *Observationes* (Hal. 1657, 4to; Lips. 1665, 12mo); Taylor, *Commentarius* (Lond. 1659, fol.); Hummel, *Explanatio* (Tigur. 1670, fol.); Fecht, *Expositio* (Rost. 1696, 4to); Schmid, *Paraphrasis* (Hamb. 1704, 4to, and later); Smalridge, *Sermon* (in *Sermons*, Oxf. 1724, fol.); Lavater, *Predigt.* (St. Gall, 1785 sq., 2 vols. 8vo); Klotzsch, *De occasione*, etc. (Viteb. 1792, 4to); Niemeyer, *Program.* (Hal. 1802, 4to); Wildschut, *De dictione*, etc. (Tr. ad Rh. 1809, 8vo); Buckminster, *Sermon* (in *Sermons*, Bost. 1815); Hagenbach, *Interpretatio* (Basil. 1829, 4to); Parry, *Exposition* (Lond. 1834, 12mo); Rothe, *Interpretatio* (Brem. 1844, 8vo); Koch, *Commentar* (Zür. 1846, 8vo); Kühne, *Auslegung* (Leips. 1856, 8vo); Ellicott, *Commentary* (Lond. 1857, 8vo); Hackett, *Revised Translation* (Amer. Bible Union, 1860, 12mo); Bleek, *Vorlesungen* [includ. Ephes. and Coloss.] (Berl. 1865, 8vo); Lightfoot, *Notes* [includ. Coloss.] (Lond. 1875, 8vo). See EPISTLE.

Phile'tus (Φίλητος, *beloved*), an apostate Christian, possibly a disciple of Hymenæus, with whom he is associated in 2 Tim. ii, 17, and who is named without him in an earlier epistle (1 Tim. i, 20). A.D. 58–64. Waterland (*Importance of the Doctrine of the Holy Trinity*, ch. iv, in his *Works*, iii, 459) condenses in a few lines the substance of many dissertations which have been written concerning their opinions, and the sentence which was inflicted upon at least one of them. "They appear to have been persons who believed the Scriptures of the O. T., but misinterpreted them, allegorizing away the doctrine of the resurrection, and resolving it all into figure and metaphor. The delivering over unto Satan seems to have been a form of excommunication declaring the person reduced to the state of a heathen; and in the apostolical age it was accompanied with supernatural or miraculous effects upon the bodies of the persons so delivered." Walch is of opinion that they were of Jewish origin; Hammond connects them with the Gnostics; Vitringa (with less probability) with the Sadducees. They understood the resurrection to signify the knowledge and profession of the Christian religion, or regeneration and conversion, according to Walch, whose dissertation, *De Hymenæo et Phileto*, in his *Miscellanea Sacra*, 1744, p. 81–121, seems to exhaust the subject. Among writers who preceded him may be named Vitringa, *Observ. Sacr.* iv, 9, p. 922–930; Buddæus, *Ecclesia Apostolica*, v, 297–305. See also, on the heresy, Burton, *Bampton Lectures*, and dean Ellicott's notes on the pastoral epistles; and Potter on *Church Government*, ch. v, with reference to the sentence. The names of Philetus and Hymenæus occur separately among those of Cæsar's household whose relics have been found in the Columbaria at Rome. See HYMENÆUS.

Phil'ip (Φίλιππος, *lover of horses*), the name of several men mentioned in the Apocrypha and Josephus. Those named in the N. T. will be noticed separately below.

1. The father of Alexander the Great (1 Macc. i, 1; vi, 2), king of Macedonia, B.C. 359–336. See ALEXANDER (*the Great*).

2. A Phrygian, left by Antiochus Epiphanes as governor at Jerusalem (B.C. cir. 170), where he behaved with great cruelty (2 Macc. v, 22), burning the fugitive Jews in caves (vi, 11), and taking the earliest measures to check the growing power of Judas Maccabæus (viii, 8). He is commonly (but it would seem incorrectly) identified with,

3. The foster-brother (*σύντροφος*, ix, 29) of Antiochus Epiphanes, whom the king upon his death-bed appointed regent of Syria and guardian of his son Antiochus V, to the exclusion of Lysias (B.C. 164; 1 Macc. vi, 14, 15, 55). He returned with the royal forces from Persia (vi, 56) to assume the government, and occupied Antioch. But Lysias, who was at the time besieging "the Sanctuary" at Jerusalem, hastily made terms with Judas, and marched against him. Lysias stormed Antioch, and, according to Josephus (*Ant.* xii, 9, 7), put Philip to death. In 2 Macc. Philip is said to have fled to Ptol. Philometor on the death of Antiochus (2 Macc. ix, 29), though the book contains traces of the other account (xiii, 23). See ANTIOCHUS (*Epiphanes*).

4. Philip V, king of Macedonia, B.C. 220–179. His wide and successful endeavors to strengthen and enlarge the Macedonian dominion brought him into conflict with the Romans when they were engaged in the critical war with Carthage. Desultory warfare followed by hollow peace lasted till the victory of Zama left the Romans free for more vigorous measures. Meanwhile Philip had consolidated his power, though he had degenerated into an unscrupulous tyrant. The first campaigns of the Romans on the declaration of war (B.C. 200) were not attended by any decisive result, but the arrival of Flamininus (B.C. 198) changed the aspect of affairs. Philip was driven from his commanding position, and made unsuccessful overtures for peace. In the next year he lost the fatal battle of Cynoscephalæ, and was obliged to accede to the terms dictated by his conquerors. The remainder of his life was spent in vain endeavors to regain something of his former power, and was imbittered by cruelty and remorse. In 1 Macc. viii, 5 the defeat of Philip is coupled with that of Perseus as one of the noblest triumphs of the Romans.

Philip V of Macedon.

Didrachm of Philip V (Attic talent). *Obv.:* Head of king, bound with fillet. *Rev.:* ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΦΙΛΙΠΠΟΥ; club of Hercules: all within wreath.

Philip (M. JULIUS PHILIPPUS), emperor of Rome, a native of Bostra, in Trachonitis, according to some authorities, after serving with distinction in the Roman armies, was promoted by the later Gordian to the command of the imperial guards after the death of Misitheus, A.D. 243. In the following year he accompanied Gordian in his expedition into Persia, where he contrived to excite a mutiny among the soldiers by complaining that the emperor was too young to lead an army in such a difficult undertaking. The mutineers obliged Gordian to acknowledge Philip as his colleague; and in a short time Philip, wishing to reign alone, caused Gordian to be murdered. In a letter to the senate he ascribed the death of Gordian to illness, and the senate acknowledged him as emperor. Having made peace with the Persians, he led the army back into Syria, and arrived at Antioch for the Easter solemnities. Eusebius, who with other Christian writers maintains that Philip was a Christian, states as a report that he went with his wife to attend the Christian worship at Antioch, but that Babila, bishop of that city, refused to permit him to enter the church, as being guilty of murder, upon which Philip acknowledged his guilt, and placed himself in the ranks of the penitents. This circumstance is also stated by John Chrysostom. From Antioch Philip came to Rome, and the following year, 245, assumed the consulship with T. F. Titianus, and marched against the Carpi, who had invaded Mœsia, and defeated them. In 247 Philip was again consul, with his son of the same name as himself, and their consulship was continued to the following year, when Philip celebrated with great splendor the thousandth anniversary of the building of Rome. An immense number of wild beasts were brought forth and slaughtered in the amphitheatre and circus. In the next year, under the consulship of Æmilianus and Aquilinus, a revolt broke out among the legions on the Danube, who proclaimed emperor a centurion named Carvilius Marinus, whom, however, the soldiers killed shortly after. Philip, alarmed at the state of these provinces, sent thither Decius as commander, but Decius had no sooner arrived at his post than the soldiers proclaimed him emperor. Philip marched against Decius, leaving his son at Rome. The two armies met near Verona, where Philip was defeated and killed, as some say by his own troops. On the news reaching Rome, the prætorians killed his son also, and Decius was acknowledged emperor in 249. Eutropius states that both Philips, father and son, were numbered among the gods. It is doubtful whether Philip was really a Christian, but it seems certain, as stated by Eusebius and Dionysius of Alexandria, that under his reign the Christians enjoyed full toleration, and were allowed to preach publicly. Gregory of Nyssa states that during that period all the inhabitants of Neo-Cæsarea, in Pontus, embraced Christianity, overthrew the idols, and raised temples to the God of the Christians. It appears that Philip during his five years' reign governed with mildness and justice, and was generally popular.

Coin of Philip.

Phil'ip THE APOSTLE (*Φίλιππος ὁ ἀπόστολος*), one of the twelve originally appointed by Jesus. See APOSTLE.

1. *Authentic History.*—The Gospels contain comparatively scanty notices of this disciple. A.D. 25–28. He is mentioned as being of Bethsaida, the city of Andrew and Peter (John i, 44), and apparently was among the Galilæan peasants of that district who flocked to hear the preaching of the Baptist. The manner in which John speaks of him, the repetition by him of the self-same words with which Andrew had brought to Peter the good news that the Christ had at last appeared, all indicate a previous friendship with the sons of Jonah and of Zebedee, and a consequent participation in their Messianic hopes. The close union of the two in John vi and xii suggests that he may have owed to Andrew the first tidings that the hope had been fulfilled. The statement that Jesus *found* him (John i, 43) implies a previous seeking. To him first in the whole circle of the disciples were spoken the words so full of meaning, "Follow me" (*ibid.*). Philip was thus the fourth of the apostles who attached themselves to the person of Jesus—of those who "left all and followed him." As soon as he has learned to know his Master, he is eager to communicate his discovery to another who had also shared the same expectations. He speaks to Nathanael, probably on his arrival in Cana (see John xxi, 2; comp. Ewald, *Gesch.* v, 251), as if they had not seldom communed together of the intimations of a better time, of a divine kingdom, which they found in their sacred books. We may well believe that he, like his friend, was an "Israelite indeed in whom there was no guile." In the lists of the twelve apostles in the sy-

noptic Gospels, his name is as uniformly at the head of the second group of four as the name of Peter is at that of the first (Matt. x, 3; Mark iii, 18; Luke vi, 14); and the facts recorded by John give the reason of this priority. In those lists again we find his name uniformly coupled with that of Bartholomew, and this has led to the hypothesis that the latter is identical with the Nathanael of John i, 45, the one being the personal name, the other, like Barjonah or Bartimæus, a patronymic. Donaldson (*Jashar*, p. 9) looks on the two as brothers, but the precise mention of τὸν ἴδιον ἄδελφον in v, 41, and its omission here, is, as Alford remarks (on Matt. x, 3), against this hypothesis.

Philip apparently was among the first company of disciples who were with the Lord at the commencement of his ministry, at the marriage of Cana, on his first appearance as a prophet in Jerusalem (John ii). When John was cast into prison, and the work of declaring the glad tidings of the kingdom required a new company of preachers, we may believe that he, like his companions and friends, received a new call to a more constant discipleship (Matt. iv, 18–22). When the Twelve were specially set apart to their office, he was numbered among them. The first three Gospels tell us nothing more of him individually. John, with his characteristic fulness of personal reminiscences, records a few significant utterances. The earnest, simple-hearted faith which showed itself in his first conversion, required, it would seem, an education; one stage of this may be traced, according to Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* iii, 25), in the history of Matt. viii, 21. That Church father assumes that Philip was the disciple who urged the plea, "Suffer me first to go and bury my father," and who was reminded of a higher duty by the command, "Let the dead bury their dead; follow thou me." When the Galilæan crowds had halted on their way to Jerusalem to hear the preaching of Jesus (John vi, 5–9), and were faint with hunger, it was to Philip that the question was put, "Whence shall we buy bread that these may eat?" "And this he said," John adds, "to prove him, for he himself knew what he would do." The answer, "Two hundred pennyworth of bread is not sufficient for them that every one may take a little," shows how little he was prepared for the work of divine power that followed. It is noticeable that here, as in John i, he appears in close connection with Andrew. Bengel and others suppose that this was because the charge of providing food had been committed to Philip, while Chrysostom and Theodore of Mopsuestia rather suppose it was because this apostle was weak in faith.

Another incident is brought before us in John xii, 20–22. Among the pilgrims who had come to keep the Passover at Jerusalem were some Gentile proselytes (Hellenes) who had heard of Jesus, and desired to see him. The Greek name of Philip may have attracted them. The zealous love which he had shown in the case of Nathanael may have made him prompt to offer himself as their guide. But it is characteristic of him that he does not take them at once to the presence of his Master. "Philip cometh and telleth Andrew, and again Andrew and Philip tell Jesus." The friend and fellow-townsman to whom probably he owed his own introduction to Jesus of Nazareth is to introduce these strangers also.

There is a connection not difficult to be traced between this fact and that which follows on the last recurrence of Philip's name in the history of the Gospels. The desire to see Jesus gave occasion to the utterance of words in which the Lord spoke more distinctly than ever of the presence of his Father with him, in the voice from heaven which manifested the Father's will (ver. 28). The words appear to have sunk into the heart of at least one of the disciples, and he brooded over them. The strong cravings of a passionate but unenlightened faith led him to feel that one thing was yet wanting. They heard their Lord speak of his Father and their Father. He was going to his Father's house. They were to follow him there. But why should they not have even now a vision of the divine glory? It was part of the childlike simplicity of his nature that no reserve should hinder the expression of the craving, "Lord, show us the Father, and it sufficeth us" (xiv, 8). And the answer to that desire belonged also specially to him. He had all along been eager to lead others to *see* Jesus. He had been with him, looking on him from the very commencement of his ministry, and yet he had not known him. He had thought of the glory of the Father as consisting in something else than the Truth, Righteousness, Love that he had witnessed in the Son. "Have I been so long time with you, and yet hast thou not known me, Philip? He that hath seen me hath seen the Father; and how sayest thou, then, Show us the Father?" (John xiv, 9). No other fact connected with the name of Philip is recorded in the Gospels. The close relation in which we have seen him standing to the sons of Zebedee and Nathanael might lead us to think of him as one of the two unnamed disciples in the list of fishermen on the Sea of Tiberias who meet us in John xxi. He is among the company of disciples at Jerusalem after the ascension (Acts i, 13) and on the day of Pentecost.

2. *Traditionary Notices.* — Besides the above all is uncertain and apocryphal. Philip is mentioned by Clement of Alexandria as having had a wife and children, and as having sanctioned the marriage of his daughters instead of binding them to vows of chastity (*Strom.* iii, 52; Euseb. *H. E.* iii, 30); and he is included in the list of those who had borne witness of Christ in their lives, but had not died what was commonly looked on as a martyr's death (*Strom.* iv, 73). There is nothing improbable in the statement that he preached the Gospel in Phrygia (Theodoret, *in Psa.* cxvi; Niceph. *H. E.* ii, 36). Polycrates (in Euseb. *H. E.* iii, 31), bishop of Ephesus, speaks of him as having fallen asleep in the Phrygian Hierapolis, as having had two daughters who had grown old unmarried, and a third, with special gifts of inspiration (ἐν Ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι πολιτευσαμένη), who had died at Ephesus. There seems, however, in this mention of the daughters of Philip, to be some confusion between the apostle and the evangelist. Eusebius in the same chapter quotes a passage from Caius, in which the four daughters of Philip, prophetesses, are mentioned as living with their father at Hierapolis, and as buried there with him, and himself connects this fact with Acts xxi, 8, as if they referred to one and the same person. Polycrates in like manner refers to him in the Easter Controversy, as an authority for the Quartodeciman practice (Euseb. *H. E.* v, 24). It is noticeable that even Augustine (*Serm.* 266) speaks with some uncertainty as to the distinctness of the two Philips.

Epiphanius (xxvi, 13) mentions a Gospel of Philip as in use among the Gnostics. See GOSPELS, SPURIOUS. The apocryphal "*Acta Philippi*" are utterly wild and fantastic, and if there is any grain of truth in them, it is probably the bare fact that the apostle or the evangelist labored in Phrygia, and died at Hierapolis. He arrives in that city with his sister Mariamne and his friend Bartholomew. The wife of the proconsul is converted. The people are drawn away from the worship of a great serpent. The priests and the proconsul seize on the apostles and put them to the torture. John suddenly appears with words of counsel and encouragement. Philip, in spite of the warning of the Apostle of Love reminding him that he should return good for evil, curses the city, and the earth opens and swallows it up. Then his Lord appears and reproves him for his vindictive anger, and those who had descended to the abyss are raised out of it again. The tortures which Philip had suffered end in his death, but, as a punishment for his offence, he is to remain for forty days excluded from Paradise. After his death a vine springs up on the spot where his blood had fallen, and the juice of the grapes is used for the Eucharistic cup (Tischendorf, *Acta Apocrypha*, p. 75–94). The book which con-

tains this narrative is apparently only the last chapter of a larger history, and it fixes the journey and the death as after the eighth year of Trajan. It is uncertain whether the other apocryphal fragment professing to give an account of his labors in Greece is part of the same work, but it is at least equally legendary. He arrives in Athens clothed, like the other apostles, as Christ had commanded, in an outer cloak and a linen tunic. Three hundred philosophers dispute with him. They find themselves baffled, and send for assistance to Ananias, the high-priest at Jerusalem. He puts on his pontifical robes, and goes to Athens at the head of five hundred warriors. They attempt to seize on the apostle, and are all smitten with blindness. The heavens open; the form of the Son of Man appears, and all the idols of Athens fall to the ground; and so on through a succession of marvels, ending with his remaining two years in the city, establishing a Church there, and then going to preach the Gospel in Parthia (*ibid.* p. 95–104).

Another tradition represents Scythia as the scene of his labors (Abdias, *Hist. Apost.* in Fabricius, *Cod. Apoc. N. T.* i, 739), and throws the guilt of his death upon the Ebionites (*Acta Sanctorum*, May 1).

In pictorial art Philip is represented as a man of middle age, scanty beard, and benevolent face. His attribute is a cross which varies in form—sometimes a small cross in his hand; again, a high cross in the form of a T, or a staff with a small cross at the top. It has three significations: it may represent the power of the cross which he held before the dragon; or his martyrdom; or his mission as preacher of the cross of Christ. He is the patron-saint of Brabant and Luxembourg. His anniversary is May 1.

Phil'ip THE EVANGELIST (Φίλιππος ὁ εὐαγγελιστής), one of the original seven deacons in the Christian Church. A.D. 29. The first mention of this name occurs in the account of the dispute between the Hebrew and Hellenistic disciples in Acts vi. He was one of the seven appointed to superintend the daily distribution of food and alms, and so to remove all suspicion of partiality. The fact that all the seven names are Greek, makes it at least very probable that they were chosen as belonging to the Hellenistic section of the Church, representatives of the class which had appeared before the apostles in the attitude of complaint. The name of Philip stands next to that of Stephen; and this, together with the fact that these are the only two names (unless Nicolas be an exception; comp. NICOLAS) of which we hear again, tends to the conclusion that he was among the most prominent of those so chosen. He was, at any rate, well reported of as "full of the Holy Ghost, and wisdom," and had so won the affections of the great body of believers as to be among the objects of their free election, possibly (assuming the votes of the congregation to have been taken for the different candidates) gaining all but the highest number of suffrages. Whether the office to which he was thus appointed gave him the position and the title of a deacon of the Church, or was special and extraordinary in its character, must remain uncertain (Goulburn, *Acts of the Deacons*, Lond. 1866). See DEACON.

The after-history of Philip warrants the belief, in any case, that his office was not simply that of the later Diaconate. It is no great presumption to think of him as contributing hardly less than Stephen to the great increase of disciples which followed on this fresh organization, as sharing in that wider, more expansive teaching which shows itself for the first time in the oration of the protomartyr, and in which he was the forerunner of Paul. We should expect the man who had been his companion and fellow-worker to go on with the work which he had left unfinished, and to break through the barriers of a simply national Judaism. So accordingly we find him in the next stage of his history. The persecution of which Saul was the leader must have stopped the "daily ministrations" of the Church. The teachers who had been most prominent were compelled to take to flight, and Philip was among them. The cessation of one form of activity, however, only threw him forward into another. It is noticeable that the city of Samaria is the first scene of his activity (Acts viii). He is the precursor of Paul in his work, as Stephen had been in his teaching. It falls to his lot, rather than to that of an apostle, to take that first step in the victory over Jewish prejudice and the expansion of the Church, according to its Lord's command. As a preparation for that work there may have been the Messianic hopes which were cherished by the Samaritans no less than by the Jews (John iv, 25), the recollection of the two days which had witnessed the presence there of Christ and his disciples (ver. 40), even perhaps the craving for spiritual powers which had been roused by the strange influence of Simon the Sorcerer. The scene which brings the two into contact with each other, in which the magician has to acknowledge a power over nature greater than his own, is interesting rather as belonging to the life of the heresiarch than to that of the evangelist. See SIMON MAGUS. It suggests the inquiry whether we can trace through the distortions and perversions of the "hero of the romance of heresy," the influence of that phase of Christian truth which was likely to be presented by the preaching of the Hellenistic evangelist.

This step is followed by another. He is directed by an angel of the Lord to take the road that led down from Jerusalem to Gaza on the way to Egypt. See GAZA. A chariot passes by in which there is a man of another race, whose complexion or whose dress showed him to be a native of Ethiopia. From the time of Psammetichus there had been a large body of Jews settled in that region, and the eunuch or chamberlain at the court of Candace might easily have come across them and their sacred books, might have embraced their faith, and become by circumcision a proselyte of righteousness. He had been on a pilgrimage to Jerusalem. He may have heard there of the new sect. The history that follows is interesting as one of the few records in the N. T. of the process of individual conversion, and one which we may believe Luke obtained, during his residence at Cæsarea, from the evangelist himself. The devout proselyte reciting the prophecy which he does not understand—the evangelist-preacher running at full speed till he overtakes the chariot—the abrupt question—the simple-hearted answer—the unfolding, from the starting-point of the prophecy, of the glad tidings of Jesus—the craving for the means of admission to the blessing of fellowship with the new society—the simple baptism in the first stream or spring—the instantaneous, abrupt departure of the missionary-preacher, as of one carried away by a divine impulse—these help us to represent to ourselves much of the life and work of that remote past. On the hypothesis which has just been suggested, we may think of it as being the incident to which the mind of Philip himself recurred with most satisfaction. A brief sentence tells us that he continued his work as a preacher at Azotus (Ashdod), and among the other cities which had formerly belonged to the Philistines, and, following the coast-line, came to Cæsarea.

Here for a long period we lose sight of him. He may have been there when the new convert Saul passed through on his way to Tarsus (Acts ix, 30). He may have contributed by his labors to the eager desire to be guided farther into the Truth which led to the conversion of Cornelius. We can hardly think of him as giving up all at once the missionary habits of his life. Cæsarea, however, appears to have been the centre of his activity. The last glimpse of him in the N. T. is in the account of Paul's journey to Jerusalem. It is to his house, as to one well known to them, that Paul and his companions turn for shelter. He is still known as "one of the Seven." His work has gained for him the yet higher title of Evangelist. See EVANGELIST. He has four daughters, who possess the gift of prophetic utterance, and who apparently give themselves to the

work of teaching instead of entering on the life of home (xxi, 8, 9). He is visited by the prophets and elders of Jerusalem. At such a place as Cæsarea the work of such a man must have helped to bridge over the ever-widening gap which threatened to separate the Jewish and the Gentile churches. One who had preached Christ to the hated Samaritan, the swarthy African, the despised Philistine, the men of all nations who passed through the seaport of Palestine, might well welcome the arrival of the apostle of the Gentiles. A.D. 55.

The traditions in which the evangelist and the apostle who bore the same name are more or less confounded have been given under PHILIP THE APOSTLE. According to another, relating more distinctly to him, he died bishop of Tralles (*Acta Sanct.* June 6). The house in which he and his daughters had lived was pointed out to travellers in the time of Jerome (*Epit. Paulæ*, § 8). (Comp. Ewald, *Geschichte*, vi, 175, 208–214; Baumgarten, *Apostelgeschichte*, § 15, 16.) The later martyrologies, on the contrary, make him end his days in Cæsarea (*Acta Sanct.* June 6).

Phil'ip HEROD (Φίλιππος Ἡρῴδης), a son of Herod the Great by Mariamne, the daughter of Simon the high-priest. He was the first husband of Herodias, who was taken from him by his brother Herod Antipas (Matt. xiv, 3; Mark, vi, 17; Luke iii, 19). A.D. ante 25. Having been disinherited by his father, Philip appears to have lived a private life. He is called *Herod* by Josephus (*Ant.* xvii, 1, 2; 4, 2; xviii, 5, 1; *War*, i, 28, 4; 30, 7). See HEROD.

Phil'ip THE TETRARCH (Φίλιππος ὁ τετράρχης), tetrarch of Batanæa, Trachonitis, and Auranitis (Luke iii, 1); the two latter appear to have been regarded by Luke as included in Ituræa. Philip was the son of Herod the Great by his wife Cleopatra, and own brother of Herod Antipas; at his death his tetrarchy was annexed to Syria. From him the city Cæsarea Philippi took its name (Josephus, *Ant.* xvii, 1, 3; xi, 4; xviii, 4, 6; *War*, i, 28, 4; ii, 6, 3). Philip ruled from B.C. 4 to A.D. 34. See HEROD.



Coin of Herod Philip the Tetrarch.

Philip (*St.*) BENOZZI (*San Filippo Beniti*, or *Benizzi*) stands at the head of the Order of the Servi, or Serviti, at Florence. He was not the founder of the order, having joined it fifteen years after its establishment, but he is their principal saint. See SERVITI.

Philip OF CÆSAREA is a pseudo-name of one Theophilus of Cæsarea, who flourished in the second half of the 2d century, and kept the account of the council held in the city after which he is named in A.D. 196. See THEOPHILUS.

Philip OF GORTYNA, a Christian writer of the 2d century, flourished as bishop of the Church at Gortyna, in Crete, and was spoken of in the highest terms by Dionysius of Corinth in a letter to the Church at Gortyna and the other churches in Crete (apud Euseb. *Hist. Eccles.* iv, 23), as having inspired his flock with manly courage, apparently during the persecutions of Marcus Aurelius. Philip wrote a book against Marcion (q. v.), which was highly esteemed by the ancients, but is now lost; Trithemius speaks of it as extant in his day, but his exactness as to whether books were in existence or not is not great. He also states that Philip wrote *Ad Diversos Epistolæ* and *Varii Tractatus*, but these are not mentioned by the ancients. See Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* iv, 21, 23, 25; Jerome, *De Viris Illustr.* c. 30; Trithemius, *De Scriptor. Eccles.* c. 19; Cave, *Hist. Litt.* ad ann. 172 (ed. Oxford, 1740–1743), i, 74; Lardner, *Works* (see Index).—Smith, *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog.* s. v.

Philip OF MOSCOW, a Russian prelate of much distinction, flourished in the second half of the 16th century. Of his early history we know scarcely anything. He held several of the most important ecclesiastical trusts of Russia to the satisfaction of both clergy and government, and was finally, during the reign of Ivan the Terrible, made primate of the Russo-Greek Church. Philip soon came into collision with his royal master because of the personal cruelties in which the czar indulged, and for his honesty of purpose and frankness of declaration, Philip suffered martyrdom. "It is a true glory of the Russian Church, and an example to the hierarchy of all churches, that its one martyred prelate should have suffered, not for any high ecclesiastical pretensions, but in the simple cause of justice and mercy. 'Silence,' he said, as he rebuked the czar, 'lays sin upon the soul, and brings death to the whole people. . . . I am a stranger and a pilgrim upon earth, as all my fathers were, and *I am ready to suffer for the truth.* Where would my faith be if I kept silence? . . . Here we are offering up the bloodless sacrifice to the Lord; while behind the altar flows the innocent blood of Christian men.' As he was dragged away from the cathedral, his one word was 'Pray.' As he received his executioner in the narrow cell of his prison in the convent of Luer, he only said, 'Perform thy mission.'" See Stanley, *Hist. of the Eastern Church*, p. 437. (J. H. W.)

Philip (*St.*) OF NERI. See NERI, FILIPPO.

Philip OF OPUS. Suidas (s. v. Φιλόσοφος) has this remarkable passage: "——, a philosopher who divided the *Leges* (s. *De Legibus*) of Plato into twelve books (for he is said to have added the thirteenth himself), and was a hearer of Socrates and of Plato himself; devoting himself to the contemplation of the heavens (σχολάσας τοῖς μετεώροις). He lived in the days of Philip of Macedon." Suidas then gives a long list of works written by Philip. It is evident that the passage as it stands in Suidas is imperfect, and that the name of the author of the numerous works which he mentions has been lost from the commencement of the passage. It appears, however, from the extract occupying its proper place in the Lexicon according to its present heading, that the defect existed in the source from which Suidas borrowed. Kuster, the editor of Suidas (*not. in loc.*), after long investigation, was enabled to supply the omission by comparing a passage in Diogenes Laertius (iii, 37), and to identify "the philosopher" of Suidas with Philip of the Locrian town of Opus, near the channel which separates Eubœa from the mainland. The passage in Laertius is as follows: "Some say that Philip the Opuntian transcribed his (Plato's) work, *De Legibus*, which was written in wax (i. e. on wooden tablets covered with a coat of wax). They say also that the Ἐπινόμις (the thirteenth book of the *De Legibus*) is his," i. e. Philip's. The *Epinomis*, whether written by Philip or by Plato, is usually included among the works of the latter. Diogenes Laertius elsewhere (iii, 46) enumerates Philip among the disciples of Plato. See Fabricius, *Bibl. Græc.* iii, 104.

Philip THE PRESBYTER, an Eastern ecclesiastic of the 5th century, was, according to Gennadius (*De Viris Illustr.* c. 62), a disciple of Jerome, and died in the reign of Marcian and Avitus over the Eastern and Western empires respectively, i. e. A.D. 456. Philip wrote, 1. *Commentarius in Jobum;* 2. *Familiares Epistolæ*, of which Gennadius, who had read them, speaks highly. These *Epistolæ* have perished; but a *Commentarius in Jobum* addressed to Nectarius has been several times printed, sometimes separately under the name of Philip (Basle, 1527, two edit. fol. and 4to), and sometimes under the name and among the works of the Venerable Bede and of Jerome. Vallarsi and the Benedictine editors of Jerome give the *Commentarius* in their editions of that father (v, 678, etc., ed. Benedict.; vol. xi,

col. 565, etc., ed. Vallarsi), but not as his. The *Prologus* or *Præfatio ad Nectarium* are omitted, and the text differs very widely from that given in the Cologne edition of Bede (1612, fol. iv, 447, etc.), in which the work is given as Bede's, without any intimation of its doubtful authorship. Cave, Oudin, and Vallarsi agree in ascribing the work to Philip, though Vallarsi is not so decided in his opinion as the other two. See Gennadius, *l. c.*; Cave, *Hist. Litt.* ad ann. 440, i, 434; Oudin, *De Scriptor. Eccles.* vol. i, col. 1165; Vallarsi, *Opera Hieron.* vol. iii, col. 825, etc.; vol. xi, col. 565, 566; Fabricius, *Biblioth. Med. et Infim. Latin.* v, 295, ed. Mansi.

Philip OF SIDE (ὁ Σιδίτης, or ὁ Σιδέτης, or ὁ ἀπο Σίδης), a Christian writer of the first half of the 5th century, was born probably in the latter part of the 4th century. He was a native of Side, in Pamphylia, and according to his own account in the fragment published by Dodwell (see below), when Rhodon, who succeeded Didymus in charge of the catechetical school of Alexandria, transferred that school to Side, Philip became one of his pupils. If we suppose Didymus to have retained the charge of the school till his death, A.D. 396, at the advanced age of eighty-six, the removal of the school cannot have taken place long before the close of the century, and we may infer that Philip's birth could scarcely have been earlier than A.D. 380. He was a kinsman of Troilus of Side, the rhetorician, who was tutor to Socrates the ecclesiastical historian, and was indeed so eminent that Philip regarded his relationship to him as a subject of exultation (Socrates, *Hist. Eccles.* vii, 27). Having entered the Church, he was ordained deacon, and had much intercourse with Chrysostom; in the titles of some MSS. he is styled his Syncellus, or personal attendant, which makes it probable that he was, from the early part of his ecclesiastical career, connected with the Church at Constantinople. Liberatus (*Breviar.* c. 7) says he was ordained deacon by Chrysostom; but Socrates, when speaking of his intimacy with that eminent man, does not say he was ordained by him. Philip devoted himself to literary pursuits, and collected a large library. He cultivated the Asiatic or diffuse style of composition, and became a voluminous writer. At what period of his life his different works were produced is not known. His Ecclesiastical History was, as we shall see, written after his disappointment in obtaining the patriarchate; but as his being a candidate for that high office seems to imply some previous celebrity, it may be inferred that his work or works in reply to the emperor Julian's attacks on Christianity were written at an earlier period. On the death of Atticus, patriarch of Constantinople, A.D. 425, Philip, then a presbyter, apparently of the great Church of Constantinople, and Proclus, another presbyter, were proposed, each by his own partisans, as candidates for the vacant see; but the whole people were bent upon the election of Sisinnius, also a presbyter, though not of Constantinople, but of a Church in Elæa, one of the suburbs (Socrates, *Hist. Eccles.* vii, 26). The statement of Socrates as to the unanimity of the popular wish leads to the inference that the supporters of Philip and Proclus were among the clergy. Sisinnius was the successful candidate; and Philip, mortified at his defeat, made in his Ecclesiastical History such severe strictures on the election of his more fortunate rival that Socrates could not venture to transcribe his remarks; and has expressed his strong disapproval of his headstrong temper. On the death of Sisinnius (A.D. 428) the supporters of Philip were again desirous of his appointment, but the emperor, to prevent disturbances, determined that no ecclesiastic of Constantinople should succeed to the vacancy; and the ill-fated heresiarch Nestorius, from Antioch, was consequently chosen. After the deposition of Nestorius at the Council of Ephesus (A.D. 431), Philip was a third time candidate for the patriarchate, but was again unsuccessful. Nothing is known of him after this. It has been conjectured that he was dead before the next vacancy in the patriarchate, A.D. 434, when his old competitor Proclus was chosen. Certainly there is no notice that Philip was again a candidate; but the prompt decision of the emperor Theodosius in Proclus's favor prevented all competition, so that no inference can be drawn from Philip's quiescence.

Philip wrote, *Multa volumina contra Imperatorem Julianum Apostatam* (Liberatus, *Breviar.* c. 7; comp. Socrat. *H. E.* vii, 27). It is not clear from the expression of Liberatus, which we have given as the title, whether Philip wrote many works, or, as is more likely, one work in many parts, in reply to Julian:—Ἱστορία Χριστιανική, *Historia Christiana.* The work was very large, consisting of thirty-six Βίβλοι or Βιβλία, *Libri*, each subdivided into twenty-four τόμοι or λόγοι, i. e. sections. This voluminous work seems to have comprehended both sacred and ecclesiastical history, beginning from the creation, and coming down to Philip's own day, as appears by his record of the election of Sisinnius, already noticed. It appears to have been finished not very long after that event. Theophanes places its completion in A.M. 5922, Alex. æra = A.D. 430; which, according to him, was the year before the death of Sisinnius. That the work was completed before the death of Sisinnius is probable from the apparent silence of Philip as to his subsequent disappointments in obtaining the patriarchate; but as Sisinnius, according to a more exact chronology, died A.D. 428, we may conclude that the work was finished in or before that year, and, consequently, that the date assigned by Theophanes is rather too late. The style was verbose and wearisome, neither polished nor agreeable; and the matter such as to display ostentatiously the knowledge of the writer rather than to conduce to the improvement of the reader. It was, in fact, crammed with matter of every kind, relevant and irrelevant: questions of geometry, astronomy, arithmetic, and music; descriptions of islands, mountains, and trees, rendered it cumbersome and unreadable. Chronological arrangement was disregarded. The work is lost, with the exception of three fragments. One of these, *De Scholæ Catecheticæ Alexandrinæ Successione*, on the succession of teachers in the catechetical school of Alexandria, was published from a MS. in the Bodleian Library at Oxford, by Dodwell, with his *Dissertationes in Irenæum* (Oxf. 1689, 8vo), and has been repeatedly reprinted. It is given in the ninth volume of the *Bibliotheca Patrum* of Galland, p. 401. Another fragment in the same MS., *De Constantino Maximiano, et Licinio Augustis*, was prepared for publication by Crusius, but has never, we believe, been actually published. The third fragment, Τὰ γενόμενα ἐν Περσίδι μεταξὺ Χριστιανῶν Ἑλλήνων τε καὶ Ἰουδαίων, *Acta Disputationis de Christo, in Perside, inter Christianos, Gentiles, et Judæos habitæ*, is (or was) in the Imperial Library at Vienna. Philip was present at the disputation. See Socrates, *H. E.* vii, 26, 27, 29, 35; Liberatus, *l. c.*; Phot. *Bibl.* cod. 35; Theophan. *Chronog.* p. 75, ed. Paris; p. 60, ed. Venice; i, 135, ed. Bonn; Tillemont, *Hist. des Empereurs*, vi, 130; Cave, *Hist. Litt.* ad ann. 418, i, 395; Oudin, *De Scriptoribus Eccles.* vol. i, col. 997; Fabricius, *Bibl. Græc.* vi, 739, 747, 749; vii, 418; x, 691; Galland, *Biblioth. Patrum*, vol. ix, *Prol.* c. 11; Lambecius, *Commentar. de Biblioth. Cæsaræa*, lib. s. vol. v, col. 289; vol. vi, pars ii, col. 406, ed. Kollar.

Philip THE SOLITARY, a Greek monk, flourished in the time of the emperor Alexius I. Comnenus. Nothing further seems to be known than what may be gleaned from the titles and introductions of his extant works. He wrote, Διόπτρα, *Dioptra*, s. *Amussis Fidei et Vitæ Christianæ*, written in the kind of measure called "versus politici," and in the form of a dialogue between the soul and the body. It is addressed to another monk, Callinicus, and begins with these two lines:

Πῶς κάξῃ; πῶς ἀμεριμνεῖς; πῶς ἀμελεῖς, ψυχή μου;
Ὁ χρόνος σου πεπλήρωται· ἔξελθε τοῦ σαρκίου.

The work, in its complete state, consisted of five books; but most of the MSS. are mutilated or otherwise defective, and want the first book. Some of them have been interpolated by a later hand. Michael Psellus, not the older writer of that name, who died about A.D. 1078, but one of later date, wrote a preface and notes to the *Dioptra* of Philip. A Latin prose translation of the *Dioptra* by the Jesuit Jacobus Pontanus, with notes by another Jesuit, Jacobus Gretserus, was published (Ingolstadt, 1604, 4to); but it was made from a mutilated copy, and consisted of only four books, and these, as the translator admits in his *Præfatio ad Lectorem*, interpolated and transposed ad libitum. Philip wrote also, Τῷ κατὰ πνεῦμα υἱῷ καὶ ἱερεῖ Κωνσταντίνῳ περὶ πρεσβείας καὶ προστασίας ἀπόλογος, *Epistola Apologetica ad Constantinum Filium Spiritualem et Sacerdotem, de Differentia inter Intercessionem et Auxilium Sanctorum:—Versus Politici*, in the beginning of which he states with great exactness the time of his finishing the *Dioptra*, 12th May, A.M. 6603, æra Constantinop. in the third indiction. in the tenth year of the lunar cycle = A.D. 1095, not 1105, as has been incorrectly stated. Cave has, without sufficient authority, ascribed to our Philip two other works, which are indeed given in a Vienna MS. (Codex 213, apud Lambec.) as *Appendices* to the *Dioptra*. One of these works (*Appendix secunda*), Ὅτι οὐκ ἔφαγε τὸ νομικὸν πάσχα ὁ Χριστὸς ἐν τῷ δείπνῳ, ἀλλὰ τὸ ἀληθινόν, *Demonstratio quod Christus in Sacra Cœna non legale sed verum comederit Pascha*, may have been written by Philip. Its arguments are derived from Scripture and Epiphanius. The other work, consisting of five chapters, *De Fide et Cœremoniis Armeniorum, Jacobitarum, Chatzitzariorum et Romanorum seu Francorum*, was published, with a Latin version, but without an author's name, in the *Auctarium Novum* of Combefis (Par. 1648, vol. ii, col. 261, etc.), but was, on the authority of MSS., assigned by Combefis, in a note, to Demetrius of Cyzicus, to whom it appears rightly to belong (comp. Cave, *Hist. Litt.* Dissertatio I, p. 6; Fabricius, *Bibl. Græc.* xi, 414). The Chatzitzarii (Χατζιτζάριοι) were a sect who paid religious homage to the image of the cross, but employed no other images in their worship. The work of Demetrius appears under the name of Philip in the fourteenth (posthumous) volume of the *Bibliotheca Patrum* of Galland; but the editors, in their *Prolegomena* to the volume, c. 15, observe that they knew not on what authority Galland had assigned it to Philip. Among the pieces given as *Appendices* to the *Dioptra*, are some verses in praise of the work and its author, by one Constantine, perhaps the person addressed in No. 2, and by Bestus, or Vestus, a grammarian, Στίχοι κυρίου Κωνσταντίνου καὶ Βέστου τοῦ γραμματικοῦ, *Versus Domini Constantini et Vesti Grammatici*. See Lambecius, *Commentar. de Biblioth. Cæsaræa*, lib. s. vol. v. col. 76–97, and 141, codd. 213, 214, 215, and 232, ed. Kollar; Cave, *Hist. Litt.* ad ann. 1095, ii, 163; Oudin, *De Scriptor. Eccles.* vol. ii, col. 851.

Philip OF THE (MOST HOLY) TRINITY, a famous missionary to Persia and the Indies, was born at Avignon in 1603, and died in 1671.

Philip, John, D.D., a missionary to Africa, was born at Kirkcaldy, Fifeshire, Scotland, April 14, 1775. His father, who was teacher of an English school, gave him his elementary education; and his mother, who is described as "a woman of earnest and devoted piety," endeavored, with all the powerful insinuating influence of maternal persuasion, to imbue his infant mind with the fear of God and a reverence for his Word. Circumstances occasioned his removal while yet a boy to reside in the house of an uncle at Leven; and there his character rapidly developed itself in the leading features of intellectual and moral individuality that distinguished him through life. In his nineteenth year he removed to Dundee, where, having completed his term of apprenticeship to a linen-manufacturer, he relinquished that trade for the office of clerk in a factory, an office which, without regard to salary, he preferred, from the greater opportunities it afforded him for mental improvement. The Congregational minister with whose Church he connected himself conceived a strong attachment for him, and through his influence Philip was introduced to the theological college at Hoxton. After having completed the regular term of three years' study, he was licensed as a preacher and ordained in 1804. In the course of Providence he was led to visit Aberdeen, where his pulpit ministrations proved so useful that he received an invitation, which he accepted, to undertake the pastoral charge of a Congregational Church recently formed in that town. His heart had for many years been strongly set on the missionary work, when the London Missionary Society proposed to him to undertake the superintendence of their numerous missions in South Africa. The proposal, though at first strenuously opposed by his attached congregation, to whom he had then ministered for fourteen years, was at length accepted by both as the will of God, and in 1820 Dr. Philip sailed for Africa. He there assumed charge of the Church in Union Chapel, Cape Town, and for thirty years besides held the office of superintendent of the society's missions. By his labors in this field he is principally known. But besides these direct evangelical labors, Dr. Philip made most persevering and successful efforts on behalf of the down-trodden tribes of South Africa. By his intercourse with the natives he obtained evidence of the disastrous effects of the prevailing system, and ere long the strong arm of British power was stretched out for the defence of those who had so long been the white man's prey. These labors gained for him the title of "Liberator of Africa." Dr. Philip died in 1850, as became a missionary, amid the people to whose spiritual and temporal welfare the energies of his life had been devoted. He published a work entitled *Researches in Africa*, which was received with great interest by the English government.

Philip, Robert, D.D., an English dissenting divine, was born in 1791, and was educated at Owen College, Manchester, and after ordination preached to several Independent congregations, until at last he was called to the pastorate of Maberley Chapel, London, where he died in 1858. He wrote, *Christian Experience, Guide to the Perplexed:—Communion with God, Guide to the Devotional:—Eternity Realized, Guide to the Thoughtful:—The God of Glory, Guide to the Doubting:—On Pleasing God, Guide to the Conscientious:—Redemption, or the New Song in Heaven.* Rev. Albert Barnes wrote an introduction to these six works, and they were published under the title of *Devotional Guides* (N. Y. 1867, 2 vols. 12mo). Dr. Philip also published, *Sacramental Experience, a Guide to Communicants* (new ed. Lond. 1844, 18mo):—*The Marys, or Beauty of Female Holiness* (1840, roy. 18mo):—*The Marthas, or Varieties of Female Piety* (1840, sm. 18mo):—*The Lydias, or Development of Female Character* (1841, roy. 18mo):—*The Hannahs, or Maternal Influence on Sons* (1841, 12mo). These were published collectively as the "Lady's Closet Library" (4 vols. 18mo):—*Manly Piety in its Principles* (1837, 18mo):—*Manly Piety in its Realizations* (1837, 18mo), were published in 1 vol. 12mo, under the title of the "Young Man's Closet Library:"—*The Comforter, or the Love of the Spirit* (Lond. 1836, 18mo):—*The Eternal, or the Attributes of Jehovah, etc.* (1846, fcp. 8vo):—*The Elijah of South Africa* (1852, fcp. 8vo):—*Life, Times, etc., of John Bunyan* (1838, 12mo):—*Bunyan's Pilgrim's Progress* (Lond. 1843, roy. 18mo):—*Life and Times of the Rev. Samuel Whitefield* (1838, 8vo):—*Life and Opinions of the Rev. William Milne* (1839, post 8vo):—*Life and Times of the Rev. John Campbell* (Lond. 1841, 8vo):—*Introductory Essay to the Practical Works of the Rev. Richard Baxter* (1838, 4 vols.). (J. H. W.)

Philipoftschins or **Philiponians.** See PHILIPPINS.

Philip'pi (Φίλιπποι, plur. of *Philip*), a celebrated city of Macedonia, visited by the apostle Paul, and the seat of the earliest Christian Church formally established in Europe. The double miracle wrought there, and the fact that "to the saints in Philippi" the great apostle of the Gentiles addressed one of his epistles, must ever make this city holy ground. The following account of it combines the ancient notices with modern investigations.

1. *Apostolic Associations.*—St. Paul, when, on his first visit to Macedonia in company with Silas, he embarked at Troas, made a straight run to Samothrace, and from thence to Neapolis, which he reached on the second day (Acts xvi, 11). The Philippi of Paul's day was situated in a plain, on the banks of a deep and rapid stream called Gangites (now Angista). The ancient walls followed the course of the stream for some distance; and in this section of the wall the site of a gate is seen, with the ruins of a bridge nearly opposite. In the narrative of Paul's visit it is said: "On the Sabbath *we went out of the gate by the river* (ἐξήλθομεν τῆς πύλης παρὰ ποταμόν), where a meeting for prayer was accustomed to be" (ver. 13). It was doubtless by this gate they went out, and by the side of this river the prayer-meeting was held. As Philippi was a military colony, it is probable that the Jews had no synagogue, and were not permitted to hold their worship within the walls. Behind the city, on the north-east, rose lofty mountains; but on the opposite side a vast and rich plain stretched out, reaching on the south-west to the sea, and on the north-west far away among the ranges of Macedonia. On the south-east a rocky ridge, some sixteen hundred feet in height, separated the plain from the bay and town of Neapolis. Over it ran a paved road connecting Philippi with Neapolis. Though the distance between the two was nine miles, yet Neapolis was to Philippi what the Piræus was to Athens; and hence Paul is said, when journeying from Greece to Syria, to have "sailed away from Philippi;" that is, from Neapolis, its port (xx, 6).

Philippi was in the province of Macedonia, while Neapolis was in Thrace. Paul, on his first journey, landed at the latter, and proceeded across the mountain-road to the former, which Luke calls "the first city of the division of Macedonia" (*πρώτη τῆς μερίδος τῆς Μακεδονίας πόλις*, Acts xvi, 12). The word *πρώτη* does not, as represented in the A. V., signify "chief." Thessalonica was the chief city of all Macedonia, and Amphipolis of that division (*μερίς*) of it in which Philippi was situated (see Wieseler, *Chron. des Apost. Zeit.* p. 37). Πρώτη simply means that Philippi was the "first" city of Macedonia to which Paul came (Alford, *ad loc.*; Conybeare and Howson, *Life of St. Paul*, i, 311, note). In descending the mountain-path towards Philippi the apostle had before him a vast and beautiful panorama. The whole plain, with its green meadows, and clumps of trees, and wide reaches of marsh, and winding streams, lay at his feet; and away beyond it the dark ridges of Macedonia.

The missionary visit of Paul and Silas to Philippi was successful. They found an eager audience in the few Jews and proselytes who frequented the prayer-place on the banks of the Gangites. Lydia, a trader from Thyatira, was the first convert. Her whole house followed her example. It was when going and returning from Lydia's house that "the damsel possessed with a spirit of divination" met the apostles. Paul cast out the spirit, and then those who had made a trade of the poor girl's misfortune rose against them, and took them before the magistrates, who, with all the haste and roughness of martial law, ordered them to be scourged and thrown into prison. Even this gross act of injustice redounded in the end to the glory of God; for the jailer and his whole house were converted, and the very magistrates were compelled to make a public apology to the apostles, and to set them at liberty, thus declaring their innocence. The scene in the prison of Philippi was one of the most cheering, as it was one of the most remarkable incidents in the history of the apostolic Church.

Paul visited Philippi twice more, once immediately after the disturbances which arose at Ephesus out of the jealousy of the manufacturers of silver shrines for Artemis. By this time the hostile relation in which the Christian doctrine necessarily stood to all purely ceremonial religions was perfectly manifest; and wherever its teachers appeared, popular tumults were to be expected, and the jealousy of the Roman authorities, who dreaded civil disorder above everything else, to be feared. It seems not unlikely that the second visit of the apostle to Philippi was made specially with the view of counteracting this particular danger. He appears to have remained in the city and surrounding country a considerable time (Acts xx, i, 2).

When Paul passed through Philippi a third time he does not appear to have made any considerable stay there (ver. 6). He and his companion are somewhat loosely spoken of as sailing from Philippi; but this is because in the common apprehension of travellers the city and its port were regarded as one. Whoever embarked at the Piræus might in the same way be said to set out on a voyage from Athens. On this occasion the voyage to Troas took the apostle five days, the vessel being probably obliged to coast in order to avoid the contrary wind, until coming off the headland of Sarpedon, whence she would be able to stand across to Troas with an E. or E.N.E. breeze, which at that time of year (after Easter) might be looked for.

The Christian community at Philippi distinguished itself in liberality. On the apostle's first visit he was hospitably entertained by Lydia, and when he afterwards went to Thessalonica, where his reception appears to have been of a very mixed character, the Philippians sent him supplies more than once, and were the only Christian community that did so (Phil. iv, 15). They also contributed readily to the collection made for the relief of the poor at Jerusalem, which Paul conveyed to them at his last visit (2 Cor. viii, 1–6). It would seem as if they sent further supplies to the apostle after his arrival at Rome. The necessity for these appears to have been urgent, and some delay to have taken place in collecting the requisite funds; so that Epaphroditus, who carried them, risked his life in the endeavor to make up for lost time (*μέχρι θανάτου ἤγγισεν παραβουλευσάμενος τῇ ψυχῇ, ἵνα ἀναπληρώσῃ τὸ ὑμῶν ὑστέρημα τῆς πρὸς μὲ λειτουργίας*, Phil. ii, 30). The delay, however, seems to have somewhat stung the apostle at the time, who fancied his beloved flock had forgotten him (see iv, 10–17). Epaphroditus fell ill with fever from his efforts, and nearly died. On recovering he became homesick, and wandering in mind (*ἀδημονῶν*) from the weakness which is the sequel of fever; and Paul, although intending soon to send Timothy to the Philippian Church, thought it desirable to let Epaphroditus go without delay to them, who had already heard of his sickness, and carry with him the letter which is included in the canon—one which was written after the apostle's imprisonment at Rome had lasted a considerable time. Some domestic troubles connected with religion had already broken out in the community. Euodias and Syntyche, who appear to be husband and wife, are exhorted to agree with one another in the matter of their common faith; and the former is implored to extend his sympathy to certain females (obviously familiar both to Paul and to him) who did good service to the apostle in his trials at Philippi, and who in some way or other appear to be the occasion of the disagreement between the pair. Possibly a claim on the part of these females to superior insight in spiritual matters may have caused some irritation; for the apostle immediately goes on to remind his readers that the peace of God is something superior to the highest intelligence (*ὑπερέχουσα πάντα νοῦν*).

It would seem, as Alford says, that the cruel treatment of the apostle at Philippi had combined with the charm of his personal fervor of affection to knit up a bond of more than ordinary love between him and the Philippian Church. They alone, of all churches, sent subsidies to relieve his temporal necessities" (Phil. iv, 10, 15, 18; 2 Cor. xi, 9; 1 Thess. ii, 2; Alford, Greek Test., *Prol.* iii, 29). The apostle felt their kindness; and during his imprisonment at Rome wrote to them that epistle which is still in our canon. This epistle indicates that at that time some of the Christians there were in the custody of the military authorities as seditious persons, through some proceedings or other connected with their faith (*ὑμῖν ἐχαρίσθη τὸ ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ, οὐ μόνον τὸ εἰς αὐτὸν πιστεύειν ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ πάσχειν· τὸν αὐτὸν ἀγῶνα ἔχοντες οἷον εἴδετε ἐν ἐμοὶ καὶ νῦν ἀκούετε ἐν ἐμοί*, Phil. i, 29). The reports of the provincial magistrates to Rome would of course describe Paul's first visit to Philippi as the origin of the troubles there; and if this were believed, it would be put together with the charge against him by the Jews at Jerusalem which induced him to appeal to Cæsar, and with the disturbances at Ephesus and elsewhere; and the general conclusion at which the government would arrive might not improbably be that he was a dangerous person and should be got rid of. This will explain the strong exhortation of the first eighteen verses of chapter ii, and the peculiar way in which it winds up. The Philippian Christians, who are at the same time suffering for their profession, are exhorted in the most earnest manner, not to firmness (as one might have expected), but to moderation, to abstinence from all provocation and ostentation of their own sentiments (*μηδὲν κατὰ ἐριθείαν μηδὲ κενοδοξίαν*, ver. 3), to humility, and consideration for the interests of others. They are to achieve their salvation with fear and trembling, and without quarrelling and disputing, in order to escape all blame—from such charges, that is, as the Roman colonists would bring against them. If with all this prudence and temperance in the profession of their faith, their religion is still made a penal offence, the apostle is well content to take the consequence—to precede them in martyrdom for it—to be the libation poured out upon them the victims (*εἰ καὶ σπένδομαι ἐπὶ τῇ θυσίᾳ καὶ λειτουργίᾳ τῆς πίστεως ὑμῶν, χαίρω καὶ συγχαίρω πᾶσιν ὑμῖν*, ver. 17). Of course the Jewish formalists in Philippi were the parties most likely to misrepresent the conduct of the new converts; and hence (after a digression on the subject of Epaphroditus) the apostle reverts to cautions against *them*, such precisely as he had given before—consequently by word of mouth: "Beware of those dogs"—(for they will not be children at the table, but eat the crumbs underneath)—"those doers (and bad doers too) of the law—those flesh-manglers (for *circumcised* I won't call them, we being the true circumcision, etc.") (iii, 2, 3). Some of these enemies Paul found at Rome, who "*told the story* of Christ insincerely" (*κατήγγειλαν οὐχ ἁγνῶς*, i, 17) in the hope of increasing the severity of his imprisonment by exciting the jealousy of the court. These he opposes to such as "*preached* Christ" (*ἐκήρυξαν*) loyally, and consoles himself with the reflection that, at all events, the story circulated, whatever the motives of those who circulated it. See Walch, *Acta Pauli Philippensia* (Jen. 1726); Todd, *The Church at Philippi* (Lond. 1864). See PHILIPPIANS, EPISTLE TO.

2. *Ancient History.*—Strabo tells us that the old name of Philippi was *Krenides* (vii, 331); and Appian adds that it was so called from the number of "little fountains" (*κρηνίδες*) around the site. He also says that it had another name, *Datus;* but that Philip of Macedon, having taken it from the Thracians, made it a frontier fortress, and gave it his own name (*De Bell. Civ.* iv, 105). Philip's city stood upon a hill, probably that seen a little to the south of the present ruins, which may have always formed the citadel, but was in all probability in its origin a factory of the Phœnicians, who were the first that worked the gold-mines in the mountains here, as in the neighboring Thasos. Appian says that those were in a hill (*λόφος*) not far from Philippi, that the hill was sacred to Dionysus, and that the mines went by the name of "the sanctuary" (*τὰ ἄσυλα*). But he shows himself quite ignorant of the locality, to the extent of believing the plain of Philippi to be open to the river Strymon, whereas the massive wall of Pangæus is really interposed between them. In all probability the "hill of Dionysus" and the "sanctuary" are the temple of Dionysus high up the mountains among the Satræ, who preserved their independence against all invaders down to the time of Herodotus at least. It is more likely that the gold-mines coveted by Philip were the same as those at *Scapte Hyle*, which was certainly in this immediate neighborhood. Before the great expedition of Xerxes, the Thasians had a number of settlements on the main, and this among the number, which produced them eighty talents a year as rent to the state. In the year B.C. 463 they ceded their possessions on the continent to the Athenians; but the colonists, 10,000 in number, who had settled on the Strymon and pushed their encroachments eastward as far as this point, were crushed by a simultaneous effort of the Thracian tribes (Thucydides, i, 100; iv, 102; Herodotus, ix, 75; Pausanias, i, 29, 4). From that time until the rise of the Macedonian power, the mines seem to have remained in the hands of native chiefs; but when the affairs of Southern Greece became thoroughly embroiled by the policy of Philip, the Thasians made an attempt to repossess themselves of this valuable territory, and sent a colony to the site, then going by the name of "the Springs" (Κρηνίδες). Philip, however, aware of the importance of the position, expelled them and founded Philippi, the last of all his creations. The mines at that time, as was not wonderful under the circumstances, had become almost insignificant in their produce; but their new owner contrived to extract more than a thousand talents a year from them, with which he minted the gold coinage called by his name. The proximity of the gold-mines was of course the origin of so large a city as Philippi, but the plain in which it lies is one of extraordinary fertility. The position too was on the main road from Rome to Asia, the Via Egnatia, which from Thessalonica to Constantinople followed the same course as the existing post-road. The usual course was to take ship at Brundisium and land at Dyrrachium, from whence a route led across Epirus to Thessalonica. Ignatius was carried to Italy by this route, when sent to Rome to be cast to wild beasts. See Strabo, *Fragment.* lib. vii; Thucyd. i, 100; iv, 102; Herod. ix, 75; Diod. Sic. xvi, 3 sq.; Appian, *Bell. Civ.* iv, 101 sq.; Pausan. i, 28, 4.

The famous battle of Philippi, in which the Roman republic was overthrown, was fought on this plain in the year B.C. 42 (Dio. Cass. xlvi; Appian, *l. c.*). In honor, and as a memorial of his great victory, Augustus made Philippi a Roman "colony," and its coins bear the legend *Colonia Augusta Jul. Philippensis* (Conybeare and Howson, i, 312). The emperor appears to have founded the new quarter in the plain along the banks of the Gangites. As a colony (*κολωνία*, Acts xvi, 12) it enjoyed peculiar privileges. Its inhabitants were



Coin of Philippi.

Obverse: Head of Augustus, with the legend "Cæs. Aug. P. M. Tr. P." [i. e. Cæsar Augustus, Pontifex Maximus, Tribunitia Potestas]. *Reverse:* Figures of Julius Cæsar and Augustus, with the legend "Col. Aug. [Jul.] Philip."

Roman citizens, most of them being the families and descendants of veteran soldiers, who had originally settled in the place to guard the city and province. They were governed by their own magistrates, called Duumviri or Prætors (in Greek στρατηγοί; ver. 20), who exercised a kind of military authority, and were independent of the provincial governor.

3. *Present Site.*—Philippi (now called by the Turks *Felibejik*) is cut off from the interior by a steep line of hills, anciently called Symbolum, connected towards the N.E. with the western extremity of Hæmus, and towards the S.W., less continuously, with the eastern extremity of Pangæus. Between the foot of Symbolum and the site of Philippi two Turkish cemeteries are passed, the gravestones of which are all derived from the ruins of the ancient city, and in the immediate neighborhood of the one first reached is the modern Turkish village *Bereketli*. This is the nearest village to the ancient ruins. Near the second cemetery are some ruins on a slight eminence, and also a khan, kept by a Greek family. Here is a large monumental block of marble, twelve feet high and seven feet square, apparently the pedestal of a statue, as on the top a hole exists which was obviously intended for its reception. This hole is pointed out by local tradition as the crib out of which Alexander's horse, Bucephalus, was accustomed to eat his oats. On two sides of the block is a mutilated Latin inscription, in which the names of Caius Vibius and Cornelius Quartus may be deciphered. A stream employed in turning a mill bursts out from a sedgy pool in the neighborhood, and probably finds its way to the marshy ground mentioned as existing in the S.W. portion of the plain. After about twenty minutes' ride from the khan, over ground thickly strewed with fragments of marble columns, and slabs that have been employed in building, a river-bed sixty-six feet wide is crossed, through which the stream rushes with great force, and immediately on the other side the walls of the ancient Philippi may be traced. Their direction is adjusted to the course of the stream; and at only three hundred and fifty feet from its margin there appears a gap in their circuit, indicating the former existence of a gate. This is, no doubt, as above seen, the gate out of which the apostle and his companion passed to the "prayer-meeting" on the banks of a river, where they made the acquaintance of Lydia, the Thyatiran seller of purple. The locality, just outside the walls, and with a plentiful supply of water for their animals, is exactly the one which would be appropriated as a market for itinerant traders, "quorum cophinus fœnumque supellex," as will appear from the parallel case of the Egerian fountain near Rome, of whose desecration Juvenal complains (*Sat.* iii, 13). Lydia had an establishment in Philippi for the reception of the dyed goods which were imported from Thyatira and the neighboring towns of Asia, and were dispersed by means of pack-animals among the mountain clans of the Hæmus and Pangæus, the agents being doubtless in many instances her own coreligionists. High up in Hæmus lay the tribe of the Satræ, where was the oracle of Dionysus—not the rustic deity of the Attic vinedressers, but the prophet-god of the Thracians (ὁ Θρῃξὶ μάντις, Eurip. *Hecub.* 1267). The "damsel with the spirit of divination" (παιδίσκη ἔχουσα πνεῦμα πύθωνα) may probably be regarded as one of the hierodules of this establishment, hired by Philippian citizens, and frequenting the country-market to practice her art upon the villagers who brought produce for the consumption of the town. The fierce character of the mountaineers would render it imprudent to admit them within the walls of the city; just as in some of the towns of North Africa the Kabyles are not allowed to enter, but have a market allotted to them outside the walls for the sale of the produce they bring. Over such an assemblage only a summary jurisdiction can be exercised; and hence the proprietors of the slave, when they considered themselves injured, and hurried Paul and Silas into the town, to the *agora*—the civic market where the magistrates (ἄρχοντες) sat—were at once turned over to the military authorities (στρατηγοί), and these, naturally assuming that a stranger frequenting the extra-mural market must be a Thracian mountaineer or an itinerant trader, proceeded to inflict upon the ostensible cause of a riot (the merits of which they would not attempt to understand) the usual treatment in such cases. The idea of the apostle possessing the Roman franchise, and consequently an exemption from corporal outrage, never occurred to the rough soldier who ordered him to be scourged; and the whole transaction seems to have passed so rapidly that he had no time to plead his citizenship, of which the military authorities first heard the next day. But the illegal treatment (ὕβρις) obviously made a deep impression on the mind of its victim, as is evident not only from his refusal to take his discharge from prison the next morning (Acts xvi, 37), but from a passage in the Epistle to the Church at Thessa-

Plan of Philippi and its Vicinity.

lonica (1 Thess. ii, 2), in which he reminds them of the circumstances under which he first preached the Gospel to them (προπαθόντες καὶ ὑβρισθέντες, καθὼς οἴδατε, ἐν Φιλίπποις). Subsequently at Jerusalem, under parallel circumstances of tumult, he warns the officer (to the great surprise of the latter) of his privilege (Acts xxii, 55).

Philippi is now an uninhabited ruin. The remains are very extensive, but present no striking feature except two gateways, which are considered to belong to the time of Claudius. The foundations of a theatre can be traced; also the walls, gates, some tombs, and numerous broken columns and heaps of rubbish. The ruins of private dwellings are visible on every part of the site; and at one place is a mound covered with columns and broken fragments of white marble, where a palace, temple, or perhaps a forum once stood. Inscriptions both in the Latin and Greek languages, but more generally in the former, are found. See Clarke, *Travels*, vol. iii; Leake, *Northern Greece*, vol. iii; Cousinéry, *Voyage dans la Macéd.*; and especially Hacket, *Journey to Philippi* in the *Bible Union Quarterly*, August, 1860; Smith, *Dict. of Class. Geog.* s. v.; Lewin, *St. Paul*, i, 206 sq. See MACEDONIA.

Philip'pian (Φιλιππήσιος), the patrial title of an inhabitant of PHILIPPI (Phil. iv, 15).

PHILIPPIANS, EPISTLE TO THE, the sixth in order of the Pauline letters in the N. T. The following article treats the subject from the Scriptural as well as the modern point of view.

I. The canonical *authority*, Pauline *authorship*, and *integrity* of this epistle were unanimously acknowledged up to the end of the 18th century. Marcion (A.D. 140), in the earliest known canon, held common ground with the Church touching the authority of this epistle (Tertullian, *Adv. Marcion*, iv, 5; v, 20): it appears in the Muratorian Fragment (Routh, *Reliquiæ Sacræ*, i, 395); among the "acknowledged" books in Eusebius (*H. E.* iii, 25); in the lists of the Council of Laodicea, A.D. 365, and the Synod of Hippo, 393; and in all subsequent lists, as well as in the Peshito and later versions. Even contemporary evidence may be claimed for it. Philippian Christians who had contributed to the collections for Paul's support at Rome, who had been eye and ear witnesses of the return of Epaphroditus and the first reading of Paul's epistle, may have been still alive at Philippi when Polycarp wrote (A.D. 107) his letter to them, in which (ch. ii, iii) he refers to Paul's epistle as a well-known distinction belonging to the Philippian Church. It is quoted as Paul's by several of the early Church fathers (Irenæus, iv, 18, § 4; Clem. Alex. *Pædag.* i, 6, § 52, and elsewhere; Tertullian, *Adv. Mar.* v, 20, *De Res. Carn.* ch. xxiii). A quotation from it (Phil. ii, 6) is found in the Epistle of the Churches of Lyons and Vienne, A.D. 177 (Eusebius, *H. E.* v, 2). The testimonies of later writers are innumerable. See CANON.

It is only in very recent times that any doubt has been suggested as to the genuineness of this epistle. Schrader (*Der Ap. Paulus*, v, 233) first insinuated that the passage iii, 1–iv, 9 is an interpolation; but he adduces no reason for this but the purely gratuitous one that the connection between ii, 30 and iv, 10 is disturbed by this intervening section, and that by the excision of this the epistle becomes "more rounded off, and more a genuine occasional letter"—as if any sound critic would reject a passage from an ancient author because in his opinion the author's composition would be improved thereby! Baur goes farther than this, and would reject the whole epistle as a Gnostic composition of a later age (*Paulus*, p. 458 sq.). But when he comes to point out "the Gnostic ideas and expressions" by which the epistle is marked, they will be found to exist only in his own imagination, and can only by a perverse ingenuity be forced upon the words of the apostle. Thus, in the statement that Christ ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων οὐχ ἁρπαγμὸν ἡγήσατο τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ (ii, 5, 6), Baur finds an allusion to the Gnostic æon Sophia, in which "existed the outgoing desire with all power to penetrate into the essence of the supreme Father." But not only is this to give the apostle's words a meaning which they do not bear (for however we translate ἁρπαγμὸν ἡγήσατο, it evidently expresses an act in the past, not an aim for the future), but it is manifest that the entire drift of the passage is not to set forth any speculative doctrine, but to adduce a moral inference. This is so manifest that even Baur himself admits it, and by so doing overturns his own position; for it is only on the supposition that what the apostle refers to is a *fact*, and not a mere speculative fancy, that any moral conclusion can be drawn from it. Equally futile is the attempt to find Docetism in the use of the term μορφή—a term used by the apostle in reference to the divine nature—or of the terms ὁμοίωμα, σχῆμα, and εὑρεθῆναι, all of which occur elsewhere in Paul's writings, and are here used to denote simply that Jesus Christ presented himself to the view of men actually as one of themselves (Lünemann, *Pauli ad Phil. Ep. cont. Baurium defensa*, Gött. 1847; Brückner, *Ep. ad Phil. Paulo auctori vindicata cont. Baur.* Lips. 1848). Baur was followed by Schwegler (1846), who argued from the phraseology of the epistle and other internal marks that it is the work not of Paul, but of some Gnostic forger in the 2d century. He too has been answered by Lünemann (1847), Brückner (1848), and Resch (1850). Even if his inference were a fair consequence from Baur's premises, it would still be neutralized by the strong evidence in favor of Pauline authorship, which Paley (*Horæ Paulinæ*, ch. vii) has drawn from the epistle as it stands. The arguments of the Tübingen school are briefly stated in Reuss (*Gesch. d. N. T.* § 130–133), and at greater length in Wiesinger's *Commentary*. Most persons who read them will be disposed to concur in the opinion of dean Alford (*N. T.* iii, 27, ed. 1856), who regards them as an instance of the insanity of hypercriticism. The canonical authority and the authorship of the epistle may be considered as unshaken.

A question has been raised as to whether the extant Epistle to the Philippians is the only one addressed by Paul to that Church. What has given rise to this question is the expression used by the apostle (iii, 1), τὰ αὐτὰ γράφειν ὑμῖν, κ.τ.λ., where the writing of the *same* things to them is supposed to refer to the identity of what he is now writing with what he had written in a previous letter. It has also been supposed that Polycarp knew of more than one epistle addressed by the apostle to the Philippians, from his using the plural (ὃς ἀπὼν ὑμῖν ἔγραψεν ἐπιστολάς) in reference to what he had written to them. To this, however, much weight cannot be attached, for there can be no doubt that the Greeks used ἐπιστολαί for a single letter, as the Latins used *literæ* (see a multitude of examples in Stephans's *Thesaurus*, s. v.). That Polycarp knew of only one epistle of Paul to the Philippians has been supposed by some to be proved by the passage in the 11th chapter of his letter, preserved in the Latin version, where he says, "Ego autem nihil tale sensi in vobis vel audivi, in quibus laboravit beatus Paulus qui estis in principio epistolæ ejus," etc. But, as Meyer points out, "epistolæ" here is not the genitive singular, but the nominative plural; and the meaning is not "who are in the beginning of his epistle," which is hardly sense, but (with allusion to 2 Cor. iii, 1) "who are in the beginning [i. e. from the beginning of his preaching the Gospel among you—a common use of ἐν ἀρχῇ, which was the expression probably used by Polycarp] his epistle." It is going too far, however, to say that this passage has no bearing on this question; for if Meyer's construction be correct, it shows that Polycarp did use ἐπιστολαί for a single epistle. Meyer, indeed, translates "who are his epistles;" but if the allusion is to 2 Cor. iii, 1, we must translate in the singular, the whole Church collectively being the epistle, and not each member an epistle. But though the testimony of Poly-

carp for a plurality of epistles may be set aside, it is less easy to set aside the testimony of the extant epistle itself in the passage cited. To refer *τὰ αὐτά* to the preceding *χαίρετε ἐν κυρίῳ* seems somewhat difficult, for nowhere previously in this epistle has the apostle expressly enjoined on his readers *χαίρειν ἐν κυρίῳ*, and one does not see what on this hypothesis is the propriety of such expressions as *ὀκνηρόν* and *ἀσφαλές*; and to lay the stress on the *γράφειν*, as Wieseler proposes (*Chronologie des Ap. Zeit.* p. 458), so as to make the apostle refer to some *verbal* message previously sent to the Philippians, the substance of which he was now about to put into *writing*, seems no less so; for not only does the epistle contain no allusion to any oral message, but in this case the writer would have said *καὶ γράφειν*. A large number of critics follow Pelagius in the explanation, "eadem repetere *quæ præsens dixeram*;" but it may be doubted if so important a clause may be legitimately dragged in to complete the apostle's meaning, without any authority from the context. Hence many have concluded that the apostle alludes to some written communication previously sent by him to the Philippians (so Hähnlein, Flatt, Meyer, Bleek, Schenkel, etc.). But, besides the lack of all evidence of such lost epistles in general, the assumption here must be pronounced in a high degree doubtful and precarious. Hence we conclude that *τὰ αὐτά* refers to the *χαίρειν*, which is the pervading thought of the epistle (i, 4, 18; ii, 17, etc.), and which seems to have been the more dwelt upon as the actual circumstances of the case might very naturally have suggested the contrary feeling (hence *ὀκνηρόν*). See Ellicott, *ad loc.* Ewald (*Sendschreiben des Ap. Paulus*, p. 431) is of opinion that Paul sent several epistles to the Philippians; and he refers to the texts ii, 12 and iii, 18 as partly proving this. But some additional confirmation or explanation of this conjecture is requisite before it can be admitted as either probable or necessary.

There is a break in the sense at the end of the second chapter of the epistle, which every careful reader must have observed. It is indeed quite natural that an epistle written amid exciting circumstances, personal dangers, and various distractions should bear in one place at least a mark of interruption. Le Moyne (1685) thought it was anciently divided into two parts. Heinrichs (1810), followed by Paulus (1817), has conjectured from this abrupt recommencement that the two parts are two distinct epistles, of which the first, together with the conclusion of the epistle (iv, 21–23), was intended for public use in the Church, and the second exclusively for the apostle's special friends in Philippi. It is not easy to see what sufficient foundation exists for this theory, or what illustration of the meaning of the epistle could be derived from it. It has met with a distinct reply from Krause (1811 and 1818); and the integrity of the epistle has not been questioned by recent critics.

II. *Time and Place of Writing.*—The constant tradition that this epistle was written at Rome by Paul in his captivity was impugned first by Oeder (1732), who, disregarding the fact that the apostle was in prison (i, 7, 13, 14) when he wrote, imagined that he was at Corinth (see Wolf's *Curæ Philologicæ*, iv, 168, 270); and then by Paulus (1799), Schulz (1829), Böttger (1837), and Rilliet (1841), in whose opinion the epistle was written during the apostle's confinement at Cæsarea (Acts xxiv, 23). But the references to the "palace" (prætorium, i, 13), and to "Cæsar's household" (iv, 22), seem to point to Rome rather than to Cæsarea; and there is no reason whatever for supposing that the apostle felt in Cæsarea that extreme uncertainty of life connected with the approaching decision of his cause which he must have felt towards the end of his captivity at Rome, and which he expresses in this epistle (i, 19, 20; ii, 17; iii, 10); and, further, the dissemination of the Gospel described in Phil. i, 12–18 is not even hinted at in Luke's account of the Cæsarean captivity, but is described by him as taking place at Rome (comp. Acts xxiv, 23 with xxviii, 30, 31). Even Reuss (*Gesch. d. N. T.* 1860), who assigns to Cæsarea three of Paul's epistles, which are generally considered to have been written at Rome, is decided in his conviction that the Epistle to the Philippians was written at Rome.

Assuming then that the epistle was written at Rome during the imprisonment mentioned in the last chapter of the Acts, it may be shown from a single fact that it could not have been written long before the end of the two years. The distress of the Philippians on account of Epaphroditus's sickness was known at Rome when the epistle was written; this implies four journeys, separated by some indefinite intervals, to or from Philippi and Rome, between the commencement of Paul's captivity and the writing of the epistle. The Philippians were informed of his imprisonment, and sent Epaphroditus; they were informed of their messenger's sickness, and sent their message of condolence. Further, the absence of Luke's name from the salutations to a Church where he was well known implies that he was absent from Rome when the epistle was written: so does Paul's declaration (ii, 20) that no one who remained with him felt an equal interest with Timothy in the welfare of the Philippians. By comparing the mention of Luke in Col. iv, 14 and Philem. 24 with the abrupt conclusion of his narrative in the Acts, we are led to the inference that he left Rome after those two epistles were written and before the end of the two years' captivity. Lastly, it is obvious from Phil. i, 20 that Paul, when he wrote, felt his position to be very critical, and we know that it became more precarious as the two years drew to a close. Assuming that Paul's acquittal and release took place in 58, we may date the Epistle to the Philippians early in that year.

III. *Personal Circumstances of the Writer at the Time.*—1. *Paul's connection with Philippi* was of a peculiar character, which gave rise to the writing of this epistle. That city, important as a mart for the produce of the neighboring gold-mines, and as a Roman stronghold to check the rude Thracian mountaineers, was distinguished as the scene of the great battle fatal to Brutus and Cassius, B.C. 42. More than ninety years afterwards Paul entered its walls, accompanied by Silas, who had been with him since he started from Antioch, and by Timothy and Luke, whom he afterwards attached to himself; the former at Derbe, the latter quite recently at Troas. It may well be imagined that the patience of the zealous apostle had been tried by his mysterious repulse, first from Asia, then from Bithynia and Mysia, and that his expectations had been stirred up by the vision which hastened his departure with his new-found associate, Luke, from Troas. A swift passage brought him to the European shore at Neapolis, whence he took the road, about ten miles long, across the mountain ridge called Symbolum to Philippi (Acts xvi, 12). There, at a greater distance from Jerusalem than any apostle had yet penetrated, the long-restrained energy of Paul was again employed in laying the foundation of a Christian Church. Seeking first the lost sheep of the house of Israel, he went on a Sabbath-day with the few Jews who resided in Philippi to their small Proseucha on the bank of the river Gangites. The missionaries sat down and spoke to the assembled women. One of them, Lydia, not born of the seed of Abraham, but a proselyte, whose name and occupation, as well as her birth, connect her with Asia, gave heed unto Paul, and she and her household were baptized, perhaps on the same Sabbath-day. Her house became the residence of the missionaries. Many days they resorted to the Proseucha, and the result of their short sojourn in Philippi was the conversion of many persons (xvi, 40), including at last their jailer and his household. Philippi was endeared to Paul, not only by the hospitality of Lydia, the deep sympathy of the converts, and the remarkable miracle which set a seal on his preaching, but also by the successful exercise of his missionary activity after a long suspense, and by the

happy consequences of his undaunted endurance of ignominies which remained in his memory (Phil. i, 30) after a long interval. Leaving Timothy and Luke to watch over the infant Church, Paul and Silas went to Thessalonica (1 Thess. ii, 2), whither they were followed by the alms of the Philippians (Phil. iv, 16), and thence southwards. Timothy, having probably carried out similar directions to those which were given to Titus (i, 5) in Crete, soon rejoined Paul. We know not whether Luke remained at Philippi. The next six years of his life are a blank in our records. At the end of that period he is found again (Acts xx, 6) at Philippi.

After the lapse of five years, spent chiefly at Corinth and Ephesus, Paul, escaping from the incensed worshippers of the Ephesian Diana, passed through Macedonia, A.D. 54, on his way to Greece, accompanied by the Ephesians Tychicus and Trophimus, and probably visited Philippi for the second time, and was there joined by Timothy. His beloved Philippians, free, it seems, from the controversies which agitated other Christian churches, became still dearer to Paul on account of the solace which they afforded him when, emerging from a season of dejection (2 Cor. vii, 5), oppressed by weak bodily health, and anxious for the steadfastness of the churches which he had planted in Asia and Achaia, he wrote at Philippi his second Epistle to the Corinthians.

On returning from Greece, unable to take ship there on account of the Jewish plots against his life, he went through Macedonia, seeking a favorable port for embarking. After parting from his companions (Acts xx, 4), he again found a refuge among his faithful Philippians, where he spent some days at Easter, A.D. 55, with Luke, who accompanied him when he sailed from Neapolis.

Finally, in his Roman captivity (A.D. 57), their care of him revived again. They sent Epaphroditus, bearing their alms for the apostle's support, and ready also to tender his personal service (Phil. ii, 25). He stayed some time at Rome, and while employed as the organ of communication between the imprisoned apostle and the Christians, and inquirers in and about Rome, he fell dangerously ill. When he was sufficiently recovered, Paul sent him back to the Philippians, to whom he was very dear, and with him our epistle. See PHILIPPI.

2. *The state of the Church at Rome* should be considered before entering on the study of the Epistle to the Philippians. Something is to be learned of its condition about A.D. 55 from the Epistle to the Romans, and more about A.D. 58 from Acts xxviii. Possibly the Gospel was planted there by some who themselves received the seed on the day of Pentecost (Acts ii, 10). The converts were drawn chiefly from Gentile proselytes to Judaism, partly also from Jews who were such by birth, with possibly a few converts direct from heathenism. In A.D. 55 this Church was already eminent for its faith and obedience: it was exposed to the machinations of schismatical teachers; and it included two conflicting parties, the one insisting more or less on observing the Jewish law in addition to faith in Christ as necessary to salvation, the other repudiating outward observances even to the extent of depriving their weak brethren of such as to them might be really edifying. We cannot gather from the Acts whether the whole Church of Rome had then accepted the teaching of Paul as conveyed in his epistle to them. But it is certain that when he had been two years in Rome, his oral teaching was partly rejected by a party which perhaps may have been connected with the former of those above mentioned. Paul's presence in Rome, the freedom of speech allowed to him, and the personal freedom of his fellow-laborers were the means of infusing fresh missionary activity into the Church (Phil. i, 12–14). It was in the work of Christ that Epaphroditus was worn out (ii, 30). Messages and letters passed between the apostle and distant churches; and doubtless churches near to Rome, and both members of the Church and inquirers into the new faith at Rome addressed themselves to the apostle, and to those who were known to be in constant personal communication with him. Thus in his bondage he was a cause of the advancement of the Gospel. From his prison, as from a centre, light streamed into Cæsar's household and far beyond (iv, 22; i, 12–19). See ROME.

IV. *Effect of the Epistle.*—We have no account of the reception of this epistle by the Philippians. Except doubtful traditions that Erastus was their first bishop, and that he with Lydia and Parmenas was martyred in their city, nothing is recorded of them for the next forty-nine years. But about A.D. 107 Philippi was visited by Ignatius, who was conducted through Neapolis and Philippi, and across Macedonia, on his way to martyrdom at Rome. His visit was speedily followed by the arrival of a letter from Polycarp of Smyrna, which accompanied, in compliance with a characteristic request of the warm-hearted Philippians, a copy of all the letters of Ignatius that were in the possession of the Church of Smyrna. It is interesting to compare the Philippians of A.D. 58, as drawn by Paul, with their successors in A.D. 107 as drawn by the disciple of John. Steadfastness in the faith, and a joyful sympathy with sufferers for Christ's sake, seem to have distinguished them at both periods (Phil. i, 5, and Polyc. *Ep.* i). The character of their religion was the same throughout, practical and emotional rather than speculative: in both epistles there are many practical suggestions, much interchange of feeling, and an absence of doctrinal discussion. The Old Testament is scarcely, if at all, quoted; as if the Philippian Christians had been gathered for the most part directly from the heathen. At each period false teachers were seeking, apparently in vain, an entrance into the Philippian Church, first Judaizing Christians, seemingly putting out of sight the resurrection and the judgment which afterwards the Gnosticizing Christians openly denied (Phil. iii, and Polyc. vi, vii). At both periods the same tendency to petty internal quarrels seems to prevail (Phil. i, 27; ii, 14; iv, 2; and Polyc. ii, iv, v, xii). The student of ecclesiastical history will observe the faintly marked organization of bishops, deacons, and female coadjutors to which Paul refers (Phil. i, 1; iv, 3), developed afterwards into broadly distinguished priests, deacons, widows, and virgins (Polyc. iv, v, vi). Though the Macedonian churches in general were poor, at least as compared with commercial Corinth (2 Cor. viii, 2), yet their gold-mines probably exempted the Philippians from the common lot of their neighbors, and at first enabled them to be conspicuously liberal in alms-giving, and afterwards laid them open to strong warnings against the love of money (Phil. iv, 15; 2 Cor. viii, 3; and Polyc. iv, vi, xi).

Now though we cannot trace the immediate effect of Paul's epistle on the Philippians, yet no one can doubt that it contributed to form the character of their Church, as it was in the time of Polycarp. It is evident from Polycarp's epistle that the Church, by the grace of God and the guidance of the apostle, had passed through those trials of which Paul warned it, and had not gone back from the high degree of Christian attainments which it reached under Paul's oral and written teaching (Polyc. i, iii, ix, xi). If it had made no great advance in knowledge, still unsound teachers were kept at a distance from its members. Their sympathy with martyrs and confessors glowed with as warm a flame as ever, whether it was claimed by Ignatius or by Paul. They maintained their ground with meek firmness among the heathen, and still held forth the light of an exemplary though not a perfect Christian life.

V. *Scope and Contents of the Epistle.*—Paul's aim in writing is plainly this: while acknowledging the alms of the Philippians and the personal services of their messenger, to give them some information respecting his own condition, and some advice respecting theirs. Perhaps the intensity of his feelings and the distraction of his prison prevented the following out his plan with

undeviating closeness. For the preparations for the departure of Epaphroditus, and the thought that he would soon arrive among the warm-hearted Philippians, filled Paul with recollections of them, and revived his old feelings towards those fellow-heirs of his hope of glory who were so deep in his heart (i, 7) and so often in his prayers (i, 4).

Full of gratitude for this work of friendly remembrance and regard, Paul addressed to the Church in Philippi this epistle, in which, besides expressing his thanks for their kindness, he pours out a flood of eloquence and pathetic exhortation, suggested partly by his own circumstances, and partly by what he had learned of their state as a Church. That state appears to have been on the whole very prosperous, as there is much commendation of the Philippians in the epistle, and no censure is expressed in any part of it either of the Church as a whole, or of any individuals connected with it. At the same time the apostle deemed it necessary to put them on their guard against the evil influences to which they were exposed from Judaizing teachers and false professors of Christianity. These cautions he interposes between the exhortations suggested by his own state, and by the news he had received concerning the Philippians, with which his epistle commences and with which it closes. We may thus divide the epistle into *three* parts. In the *first* of these (i, ii), after the usual salutation and an outpouring of warm-hearted affection towards the Philippian Church (i, 1–11), the apostle refers to his own condition as a prisoner at Rome; and, lest they should be cast down at the thought of the unmerited indignities he had been called upon to suffer, he assures them that these had turned out rather to the furtherance of that great cause on which his heart was set, and for which he was willing to live and labor, though, as respected his personal feelings, he would rather depart and be with Christ, which he deemed to be "far better" (12–24). He then passes by an easy transition to a hortatory address to the Philippians, calling upon them to maintain steadfastly their profession, to cultivate humanity and brotherly love; to work out their own salvation with fear and trembling, and concluding by an appeal to their regard for his reputation as an apostle, which could not but be affected by their conduct, and a reference to his reason for sending to them Epaphroditus instead of Timothy, as he had originally designed (i, 25; ii, 30). In part *second* he strenuously cautions them, as already observed, against Judaizing teachers, whom he stigmatizes as "dogs" (in reference, probably, to their impudent, snarling, and quarrelsome habits), "evil-workers," and "the concision;" by which latter term he means to intimate, as Theophylact remarks (ad loc.), that the circumcision in which the Jews so much gloried had now ceased to possess any spiritual significance, and was therefore no better than a useless mutilation of the person. On this theme he enlarges, making reference to his own standing as a Jew, and intimating that, if under the Christian dispensation Jewish descent and Jewish privileges were to go for anything, no one could have stronger claims on this ground than he; but at the same time declaring that however he had once valued these, he now counted them "all but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ" (iii, 1–12). A reference to his own sanctified ambition to advance in the service of Christ leads him to exhort the Philippians to a similar spirit; from this he passes to caution them against unnecessary contention, and against those who walk disorderly, concluding by reminding them of the glorious hopes which, as Christians, they entertained (ver. 13–21). In the *third* part we have a series of admonitions to individual members of the Church at Philippi (iv, 1–3), followed by some general exhortations to cheerfulness, moderation, prayer, and good conduct (ver. 4–9); after which come a series of allusions to the apostle's circumstances and feelings, his thanks to the Philippians for their seasonable aid, and his concluding benedictions and salutations (ver. 10–23).

VI. *Characteristic Features of the Epistle.*—Strangely full of joy and thanksgiving amid adversity, like the apostle's midnight hymn from the depth of his Philippian dungeon, this epistle went forth from his prison at Rome. In most other epistles he writes with a sustained effort to instruct, or with sorrow, or with indignation; he is striving to supply imperfect, or to correct erroneous teaching, to put down scandalous impurity, or to heal schism in the Church which he addresses. But in this epistle, though he knew the Philippians intimately, and was not blind to the faults and tendencies to fault of some of them, yet he mentions no evil so characteristic of the whole Church as to call for general censure on his part or amendment on theirs. Of all his epistles to churches, none has so little of an official character as this. He withholds his title of "apostle" in the inscription. We lose sight of his high authority, and of the subordinate position of the worshippers by the river-side; and we are admitted to see the free action of a heart glowing with inspired Christian love, and to hear the utterance of the highest friendship addressed to equal friends conscious of a connection which is not earthly and temporal, but in Christ, for eternity. Who that bears in mind the condition of Paul in his Roman prison can read unmoved of his continual prayers for his distant friends, his constant sense of their fellowship with him, his joyful remembrance of their past Christian course, his confidence in their future, his tender yearning after them all in Christ, his eagerness to communicate to them his own circumstances and feelings, his carefulness to prepare them to repel any evil from within or from without which might dim the brightness of their spiritual graces? Love, at once tender and watchful—that love which "is of God"—is the key-note of this epistle; and in this epistle only we hear no undertone of any different feeling. Just enough, and no more, is shown of his own harassing trials to let us see how deep in his heart was the spring of that feeling, and how he was refreshed by its sweet and soothing flow.

VII. *Commentaries.*—The following are the exegetical helps specially on this entire epistle; a few of the most important are indicated by an asterisk (*) prefixed: Victorinus, *In Ep. ad Ph.* (in Mai, *Script. Vet.* III, i, 51; Pseudo-Hieronymus, *Commentarii* (in *Opp.* [*Suppos.*], xi, 1011); Chrysostom, *Homiliæ* (Gr. et Lat. in *Opp.* xi, 208; also in Erasmi *Opp.* viii, 319; in Engl. [including other epistles] in *Lib. of Fathers*, xiv, Oxf. 1843, 8vo); Zwingli, *Annotationes* (Tigur. 1531, 4to; also in *Opp.* iv, 504); Hoffmann, *Commentarius* (Basil. 1541, 8vo); Brenz, *Explicatio* (Franc. 1548, 8vo; also in *Opp.* vii); Calvin, *Commentarii* (in *Opp.* often; separately in Engl. by Becket, Lond. 1584, fol.; by Johnston [includ. Col.], Edinb. 1842, 12mo; by Pringle [includ. Col. and Thess.], Edinb. 1851, 8vo); Major, *Enarratio* [includ. Col. and Thess.] (Vitemb. 1554, 1561, 8vo); Ridley, *Exposition* (in Richmond's *Fathers*, ii); Weller, *Commentarius* [includ. Thess.] (Norib. 1561, 8vo); Salbont, *Commentarii* [includ. other epistles] (Antw. 1561, 8vo; also in *Opp.* Col. Agr. 1568, fol.); Musculus, *Commentarius* [includ. Col., Thess., and 1 Tim.] (Basil. 1565, 1578, 1595, fol.); Aretius, *Commentarii* [includ. Col. and Thess.] (Morg. 1580, 8vo); Olevian, *Notæ* [includ. Col.] (Gen. 1580, 8vo); Steuart (Roman Cath.), *Commentarius* (Ingolst. 1595, 4to); Zanchius, *Commentarius* [includ. Col. and Thess.] (Neost. 1595, fol.; also in *Opp.* vi); Weinrich, *Explicatio* (Lips. 1615, 4to); Airay, *Lectures* (Lond. 1618, 4to); Battus, *Commentarius* (Rost. 1627, 4to); Velasquez (Rom. Cath.), *Commentarii* (Lugd. 1628–32; Antw. 1637, 1651; Ven. 1646, 2 vols. fol.); Schotan, *Commentaria* (Franeck. 1637, 4to); Crell, *Commentarius* (in *Opp.* i, 501); Meelfuhr, *Commentationes* (Altorf, 1641, 4to); Cocceius, *Commentarius* (in *Opp.* v); Daillé, *Exposition* (2d ed. Gen. 1659–60, 2 vols. 8vo; in English by Sherman, Lond. 1841, 8vo); Scheid, *Disputationes* (Argent. 1668, 4to); Breithaupt, *Animadversiones* (Hol. 1693, 1703, 4to); Hazevoet, *Verklaaring* (Leyd. 1718, 4to); Van Til, *Ver-*

klaaring ([includ. Rom.] Harlem, 1721, 4to; in Lat. [includ. 1 Cor., Eph., and Col.] Amst. 1726, 4to); Busching, *Introductio* (Hal. 1746, 4to); Storr, *Diss. exegetica* (Tüb. 1783, 4to; also in *Opusc.* i, 301–67); Am Ende, *Annotationes* (fasc. i, ii, Torg. 1789–92; Viteb. 1798–1803, 8vo); Paulus, *De tempore*, etc. (Jen. 1799, 4to); Lang, *Bearbeit.* (Nuremb. and Alt. 1800, 8vo); Krause, *An diversis hom. script.*, etc. (Regiom. 1811, 4to; also in *Opusc.* p. 1–22); Hoog, *De Philip. conditione* (L. B. 1825, 8vo); *Rheinwald, *Commentar* (Berl. 1827, 8vo); Acaster, *Lectures* (Lond. 1827, 8vo); Rettig, *Quæstiones* (Giess. 1831, 8vo); Schinz, *D. Christl. Gemeine zu Phil.* (Zur. 1833, 8vo); Eastburn, *Lectures* (N. Y. 1833, 8vo); Passavant, *Auslegung* (Basle, 1834, 8vo); Baynes, *Commentary* (Lond. 1834, 12mo); Matthies, *Erklär.* (Greifsw. 1835, 8vo); *Steiger, *Exégèse* [includ. Col.] (Par. 1837, 8vo); *Van Hengel, *Commentarius* (L. B. 1838, 8vo); Hölemann, *Commentarii* (Lips. 1839, 8vo); Anon., *Erklär.* (Hanov. 1839, 8vo); Neat, *Discourses* (Lond. 1841, 8vo); Rilliet, *Commentaire* (Gen. and Par. 1841, 8vo); Hall, *Exposition* (Lond. 1843, 8vo); Neander, *Erläut.* (Berl. 1849, 8vo; in Engl. by Mrs. Conant, N. Y. 1851, 12mo); Robertson, *Lectures* (Lond. 1849, 12mo); B. Crusius, *Commentar* (Jen. 1849, 8vo); Köhler, *Auslegung* (Kiel, 1855, 8vo); Toller, *Discourses* (Lond. 1855, 12mo); *Weiss, *Auslegung* (Berl. 1858, 8vo); *Ellicott, *Commentary* [includ. Col. and Philem.] (Lond. 1858, 8vo); Jatho, *Erklär.* (Hildesh. 1858, 8vo); *Eadie, *Commentary* (Lond. 1858, 1861, 8vo); Shulte, *Commentary* (Lond. 1861, 8vo); Schenkel, *Erläut.* [includ. Eph. and Col.] (Leipz. 1862, 8vo); Newland, *Catena* (Lond. 1862, 8vo); Vaughan, *Lectures* (2d ed. Lond. 1864, 8vo); Todd, *Exposition* (Lond. 1864, 8vo); *Lightfoot, *Commentary* (Lond. 1868, 1870, 8vo); Johnstone, *Lectures* (Lond. 1875, 8vo). See EPISTLE.

Philippine Islands, situated in 5° 30′–19° 42′ N. lat., and 117° 14′–126° 4′ E. long., in the great Indian Archipelago, to the north of Borneo and Celebes, are more than twelve hundred in number, and have an area of about 150,000 square miles. The population is over 6,000,000, three fourths of whom are subject to Spain. The remainder are governed, according to their own laws and customs, by independent native princes. Luzon, in the north, has an area of 51,300 square miles, and Mindanao, or Magindanao, in the south, fully 25,000. The islands lying between Luzon and Mindanao are called the Bisayas, the largest of which are: Samar, area 13,020 square miles; Mindoro, 12,600; Panay, 11,340; Leyte, 10,080; Negros, 6300; Masbate, 4200; and Zebu, 2352. There are upwards of a thousand lesser islands of which little is known. To the south-west of the Bisayas lies the long, narrow island of Paragoa or Palawan, formed of a mountain-chain with low coast-lines, cut with numerous streams, and exceedingly fertile. The forests abound in ebony, logwood, gum-trees, and bamboos. To the north of Luzon lie the Batanen, Bashee, and Babuyan islands, the first two groups having about 8000 inhabitants, the last unpeopled. The Sooloo Islands form a long chain from Mindanao to Borneo, having the same mountainous and volcanic structure as the Philippine Islands, and all are probably fragments of a submerged continent. Many active volcanoes are scattered through the islands; Mayon, in Luzon, and Buhayan, in Mindanao, often causing great devastation. The mountain-chains run north and south, and never attain a greater elevation than 7000 feet. The islands have many rivers, the coasts are indented with deep bays, and there are many lakes in the interior. Earthquakes are frequent and destructive. The soil is extremely fertile, except where extensive marshes occur. In Mindanao are numerous lakes, which expand during the rainy season into inland seas. Rain may be expected from May to December, and from June to November the land is flooded. Violent hurricanes are experienced in the north of Luzon and west coast of Mindanao. Especially during the changes of the monsoons, storms of wind, rain, thunder and lightning prevail. The weather is very fine, and heat moderate, from December to May, when the temperature rapidly rises and becomes oppressive, except for a short time after a fall of rain. The fertility of the soil and the humid atmosphere produce a richness of vegetation which is nowhere surpassed. Blossoms and fruit hang together on the trees, and the cultivated fields yield a constant succession of crops. Immense forests spread over the Philippine Islands, clothing the mountains to their summits; ebony, iron-wood, cedar, sapanwood, gum-trees, etc., being laced together and garlanded by the bush-rope or palasan, which attains a length of several hundred feet. The variety of fruit-trees is great, including the orange, citron, bread-fruit, mango, cocoa-nut, guava, tamarind, rose-apple, etc.; other important products of the vegetable kingdom being the banana, plantain, pine-apple, sugar-cane, cotton, tobacco, indigo, coffee, cocoa, cinnamon, vanilla, cassia, the areca-nut, ginger, pepper, etc., with rice, wheat, maize, and various other cereals. Gold is found in river-beds and detrital deposits, being used, in the form of dust, as the medium of exchange in Mindanao. Iron is plentiful, and fine coal-beds, from one to four feet thick, have been found, Copper has long been worked in Luzon. There are also limestone, a fine variegated marble, sulphur in unlimited quantity, quicksilver, vermilion, and saltpetre—the sulphur being found both native and in combination with copper, arsenic, and iron. Except the wild-cat, beasts of prey are unknown. There are oxen, buffaloes, sheep, goats, swine, harts, squirrels, and a great variety of monkeys. The jungles swarm with lizards, snakes, and other reptiles; the rivers and lakes with crocodiles. Huge spiders, tarantulas, white ants, mosquitoes, and locusts are plagues which form a set-off to the beautiful fireflies, the brilliant queen-beetle (*Elater noctilucus*), the melody of myriads of birds, the turtle-doves, pheasants, birds-of-paradise, and many lovely species of paroquets, with which the forests are alive. "Hives of wild bees hang from the branches, and alongside of them are the nests of humming-birds dangling in the wind." The caverns along the shores are frequented by the swallow, whose edible nest is esteemed by the Chinese a rich delicacy. Some of them are also tenanted by multitudes of bats of immense size. Buffaloes are used for tillage and draught; a small horse for riding. Fowls are plentiful, and incredible numbers of ducks are artificially hatched. Fish is in great abundance and variety. Mother-of-pearl, coral, amber, and tortoise-shell are important articles of commerce. The principal exports are sugar, tobacco, cigars, indigo, Manilla hemp, coffee, rice, dye-woods, hides, gold-dust, and beeswax.

Native Population.—The Tagals and Bisayans are the most numerous native races. They dwell in the cities and cultivated lowlands; 2,500,000 being converts to Roman Catholicism, and a considerable number, especially of the Bisayans, Mohammedan. The mountain districts are inhabited by a negro race, who, in features, stature, and savage mode of living, closely resemble the Alfoors of the interior of Papua, and are probably the aborigines driven back before the inroads of the Malays. A few of the negroes are Christian, but they are chiefly idolaters, or without any manifest form of religion, and roaming about in families, without fixed dwelling. The Mestizos form an influential part of the population; by their activity engrossing the greatest share of the trade. These are mostly of Chinese fathers and native mothers.

The leading mercantile houses are English and American. British and American merchants enjoy the largest share of the business, the exports to Great Britain being upwards of £1,500,000 sterling yearly, and the imports thence nearly of the same value. There are seven British houses established at Manilla, and one at Iloilo, in the populous and productive island of Panay, which is the centre of an increasing trade. The total exports and imports of the Philippine Islands have a

value of about £6,000,000 yearly. The Chinese exercise various trades and callings, remaining only for a time, and never bringing their wives with them. The principal languages are the Tagalese and Bisayan. Rice, sweet potatoes, fish, flesh, and fruits form the food of the Tagals and Bisayans, who usually drink only water, though sometimes indulging in cocoa-wine. Tobacco is used by all. They are gentle, hospitable, fond of dancing and cock-fighting. Education is far behind; it is similar to what it was in Europe during the Middle Ages. It is entirely under the control of the Romish priesthood, who are governed by an archbishop (of Manilla), and the bishops of New Segovia, Nueva Caceres, and Zebu. Religious processions are the pride of the people, and are formed with great parade, thousands of persons carrying wax-candles, etc.

The Sooloo Islands have a population of 150,000; are governed by a sultan, whose capital is Sung, in 6° 1′ N. lat., and 120° 55′ 51″ E. long., who also rules over the greatest part of Paragoa, the northern corner only being subject to Spain. Luzon has a population of 2,500,000, one fifth part being independent; the Bisaya Islands, 2,000,000, of whom three fourths are under Spanish rule. The population of Panay amounts to 750,000, and that of Zebu to 150,000. Of the numbers in Mindanao nothing is known; the districts of Zamboanga, Misamis, and Caragan, with 100,000 inhabitants, being all that is subject to Spain. The greater part of the island is under the sultan of Mindanao, resident at Selanga, in 7° 9′ N. lat., and 124° 38′ E. long., who, with his feudatory chiefs, can bring together an army of 100,000 men. He is on friendly terms with the Spaniards. Besides Manilla, there are very many large and important cities, especially in Luzon, Panay, and Zebu. The great centres of trade are Manilla, in Luzon, and Iloilo, in Panay. The Philippine Islands were discovered in 1521 by Magellan, who, after visiting Mindanao, sailed to Zebu, where, taking part with the king in a war, he was wounded, and died at Mactan April 26, 1521. Some years later the Spanish court sent an expedition under Villabos, who named the islands in honor of the prince of Asturias, afterwards Philip II. For some time the chief Spanish settlement was on Zebu; but in 1581 Manilla was built, and has since continued to be the seat of government. See Semper, *Die Philippinen u. ihre Bewohner* (Würzb. 1869); and his *Reisen im Archipel der Philippinen* (Leips. 1867–73, 8 vols. 8vo); Earl, *Papuans*, ch. vii; *Academy*, Aug. 15, 1873, p. 311.

Philippins, a small Russian sect, so called from the founder, Philip Pustoswiät, under whose leadership they emigrated from Russia to Livonia near the beginning of the 18th century, are a branch of the Raskolniks (q. v.). They call themselves *Starowerski*, or "Old-Faith Men," because they cling with the utmost tenacity to the old service-books, the old version of the Bible, and the old hymn and prayer books of the Russo-Greek Church, in the exact form in which those books stood before the revision which they underwent at the hands of the patriarch Nikon (q. v.) near the middle of the 17th century. There are two classes of the Raskolniks—one which recognises popes (or priests); the other, which admits no priest or other clerical functionary. The Philippins are of the latter class; and they not only themselves refuse all priestly ministrations, but they regard all such ministrations—baptism, marriage, sacraments—as invalid; and they rebaptize all who join their sect from other Russian communities. All their own ministerial offices are discharged by the Starik, or parish elder, who for the time takes the title of pope, and is required to observe celibacy. But the preaching is permitted to any one who feels himself "called by the Spirit" to undertake it. Among the Philippins the spirit of fanaticism at times has run to the wildest excesses. They refuse oaths, and decline to enter military service; and it was on this account and like incompatibilities that they were forced to emigrate, under the leadership of Philip Pustoswiät, "the saint of the Desert." They are now settled partly in Polish Lithuania, partly in East Prussia, where they have several small settlements with churches of their own rite. They are reported to be a peaceable and orderly race. Their principal pursuit is agriculture; and their thrifty and industrious habits have secured for them the good-will of the land-proprietors as well as of the government.

They are sometimes called *Brûleurs*, or *Tueurs*, from their tendency to suicide, which they consider meritorious, and which they accordingly court, sometimes burying themselves alive, sometimes starving themselves to death. Accusations of laxity of morals have been brought against them, of renouncing marriage, and living in spiritual brotherhood and sisterhood, the truth of which has never been clearly established; for when the empress Anne (A.D. 1730–1740) sent commissioners to inquire into the state of their monasteries, they shut themselves up, and burned themselves alive within their own walls, rather than give any evidence on the subject. See Platon, *Greek Church* (see Index). (J. H. W.)

Philippists is the name of that sect or party among the Lutherans who were the followers of Philip Melancthon. He had strenuously opposed the Ubiquists, who arose in his time; and the dispute growing still hotter after his death, the University of Wittenberg, who espoused Melancthon's opinion, were called by the Flacians, who attacked it, *Philippists*. They were strongest in that university, the opposite party controlling the University of Jena. The Philippists were in the end accused of being Calvinists at heart, and were much persecuted by the ultra-Lutheran party. See the different works on the *Reformation* (q. v.), and the long treatise in Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, xi, 537–546. See also Adiaphoristic Controversy; Melancthon.

Philipps, Dirk, one of the most eminent co-laborers of Simon Menno (q. v.), was born in 1504 at Lenwarden, the capital of Friesland, of Romish parentage. He was carefully and piously reared, and had unusual educational facilities in his time. When the Anabaptists came to Friesland, Philipps, who was then a devoted Romanist, soon became interested in the new doctrines; and after his brother Ubbo, a common mechanic, had embraced the modern teachings and become a preacher, Dirk also found pleasure in them; forsook the Church of Rome, and was rebaptized. As a preacher of the new doctrines he was stationed at Appingadam (Groningen), and contented himself in that position until the Anabaptists advocated the extreme socialistic views. About the year 1534 or 1535 these two brothers came out boldly against the Münster ideas of the Anabaptists, and thus prepared the way for the revolution which Menno shortly after effected. After 1536 the brothers Philipps disappear, and are but little heard of. At the conference of the different Anabaptists held at Buckholt, in Westphalia, they do not seem to have been present. In 1543 we find them at Emden. After that we only meet Dirk now and then, but always in closest intimacy with Menno. Ubbo finally separated from both Dirk and Menno, and took a conciliatory position between the Protestants and Romanists. But Dirk remained true to Menno, and ever after is warmly commended by the great Dutch Reformer and founder of the Quakers of Holland. After the death of Simon Menno, Dirk was more or less involved, and that unhappily, in the controversies which agitated the Dutch Anabaptists. In 1568 he was at Dantzic, but was so much sought after at home that the sixty-four-years-old man consented to return to Emden. He died there in 1568 or 1570. His many pamphleteering publications have been collected in his *Enchiridion*, or "Hand-book," among which there is an *Apology* or *Defence of the Anabaptists;* a treatise on *Christian Marriage*, etc. It is the universal testimony of Protestants and Romanists that Dirk Philipps was a very learned man, well versed in the classical languages, and a pulpit orator of the very highest order.

See Gent, *Anfang u. Fortgang der Streitigkeiten unter den Taufgesinnten;* Blaup. Ten Cate, *Gesch. der Taufgesinnten.* See also MENNONITES, and the literature thereto appended. (J. H. W.)

Philipps, Ubbo. See PHILIPPS, DIRK.

Philippsohn, MOSES, a noted Hebraist, was born May 9, 1775, in Sandersleben, a small town on the Wipper, and was destined for a rabbinate by his parents, who began to initiate him into Hebrew when he was scarcely four years of age. In 1787 he was sent to a rabbinic school at Halberstadt, where he was instructed in the Talmud and other branches of rabbinic literature. He then went to Brunswick, where he devoted himself to the study of the sciences generally, and in particular Hebrew philology, acquiring a most classical and charming style in Hebrew composition. In 1799, when only four-and-twenty, he was appointed master of the noted Jewish school at Dessau, where the celebrated historian Jost and the philosopher Mendelssohn, were educated. Here Philippsohn prosecuted more zealously than ever the study of Hebrew and the Hebrew Scriptures, and determined to continue, with the aid of his three colleagues, the great Bible work commenced by Mendelssohn (q. v.), selecting the minor prophets for their conjoint labor. Philippsohn undertook to translate and expound Hosea and Joel, being the two most difficult books of the twelve minor prophets; his colleague Wolf the translation and exposition of Obadiah, Micah, Habakkuk, and Zephaniah; his colleague Solomon undertook Haggai and Zechariah; while Neuman undertook Amos, Nahum, and Malachi; Jonah having already been published by Löwe (q. v.); and the whole was published under the title מנחה טהורה, *a Pure Offering*, at Dessau, in 1805. Three years later Philippsohn published a Hebrew Grammar and Chrestomathy, entitled מורה לבני ברוח, *Friend of Students* (Dessau, 1808; 2d improved ed. ibid. 1823); and a *Hebrew Commentary on the Book of Daniel*, with a translation by Wolf (ibid. 1808). He also wrote essays on various subjects connected with Hebrew literature in the Hebrew periodical called המאסף, *The Gatherer*, and died April 20, 1814. See Steinschneider, *Catalogus Libr. Hebr. in Bibliotheca Bodleiana*, col. 2099, and the interesting biographical sketch by Dr. Ph. Philippson, in his *Biographische Skizzen* (Leips. 1864); Jost, *Geschichte des Juden. und seiner Sekten* (see Index in vol. iii).

Philips, Edward, M.A., an English divine, was born near the middle of the 16th century. He was entered a student in Broadgate's Hall, now Pembroke College, in 1574; became preacher at St. Saviour's, Southwark, London, and died about 1603. He was a Calvinist, and esteemed "a person zealous of the truth of God, earnest in his calling, faithful in his message, powerful in his speech, careful of his flock, peaceable and blameless in his life, and comfortable and constant in his death." His published sermons are entitled, *Certaine Godly and Learned Sermons, Preached by that worthy Servant of Christ in St. Saviour's, in Southwark; and were taken by the pen of H. Yelverton, of Gray's Inn, Gentleman* (Lond. 1607, 4to).

Philips, Thomas, a Roman Catholic divine, was born of Protestant parentage at Ickford, in Buckinghamshire; received his education at St. Omer's, and there became a zealous Romanist. He entered into orders, and became a Jesuit, but quitted that society, and obtained a prebend in the collegiate church of Tongres, with a dispensation to reside in England. He was the author of *The Study of Sacred Literature Stated and Considered* (Lond. 1758, 8vo); and *The Life of Cardinal Pole* (Oxf. 1764–67, 2 vols.). He died at Liege in 1774. Philips was a man of eminent piety, and a writer of considerable ability.

Philip's (*St.*) AND JAMES'S (*St.*) **Day,** a festival observed in memory of the apostles Philip and James the Less, on the 1st of May. In the Greek Church the festival of St. Philip is kept on the 14th of November.

Philis'tia (Heb. *Pele'sheth*, פְּלֶשֶׁת, signif. doubtful [see below]; Sept. ἀλλόφυλοι), the land of the Philistines, as it is usually styled in prose (Gen. xxi, 32, 33; Exod. xiii, 17; 1 Sam. xxvii, 1, 7; xxix, 11; 1 Kings iv, 21; 2 Kings viii, 2, 3). This term is rendered in our version sometimes "Palestina," as in Exod. xv, 14, and Isa. xiv, 29, 31; and "Palestine" in Joel iii, 4; but "Philistia" in Psa. lx, 8; lxxxvii, 4; and cviii, 9; and "Philistines" in Psa. lxxxiii, 7. "Palestine" originally meant nothing but the district inhabited by the "Philistines," who are called by Josephus Παλαιστῖνοι, "Palæstines" (*Ant.* v, 1, 8). In fact the two words are the same, and the difference in their present form is but the result of gradual corruption. The form Philistia does not occur anywhere in the Sept. or Vulgate. In Exod. xv, 14 this word (*Pelésheth*) is used along with Canaan, and as distinct from it; in Joel iii, 4 its "coasts" are referred to (for it was a littoral territory), and are coupled with Tyre and Sidon as having sold into slavery the children of Judah and Jerusalem, and carried off silver and gold from the Temple; and in Isa. xiv, 29–31 it is told not to congratulate itself on the death of Ahaz, who had smitten it. In Psa. lx, 8; lxxxiii, 7; lxxxvii, 4; cviii, 9, it is classed among countries hostile to Israel. The word therefore uniformly in Scripture denotes the territory of the Philistines—though it came at length to signify in common speech the entire country—the Holy Land. Philistia is probably the country vaguely referred to by Herodotus as Συρίη Παλαιστίνη—for he describes it as lying on the sea-coast (vii, 89). The name is specially attached to Southern Syria by Strabo (xvi), Pomp. Mela (i, 11), and Pliny (*Hist. Nat.* v, 12). The broader signification of the term arose by degrees. Josephus apparently uses it in both meanings (*Ant.* i, 6, 2, 4; viii, 10, 3). Philo says of Palestine, ἡ τότε προσηγορεύετο Χαναναίων, and Jerome says, "Terra Judæa quæ nunc appellatur Palæstina" (see Reland, *Palæst.* chap. i, vii, viii). In the Talmud and the Arabic it likewise denotes the whole land of the Jews. See PALESTINE.

The name itself has given rise to various conjectures. Hitzig identifies the Philistines with Πελασγοί, and supposes the word, after the Sanscrit *Valaksha*, to denote the white races, as opposed to the Phœnician or dusky races (see Kenrick, *Phœn.* p. 50, 52). Redslob makes it a transposition of the name of their country, שְׁפֵלָה, *Shephelah*, the low country (A. V. "valley" or "plain"). Knobel, Gesenius, Movers, and Roth take it from the root פָּלַשׁ, "to emigrate"—of which Ἀλλόφυλοι is supposed to be a translation. Fürst substantially agrees with this etymology, from the same Heb. root, in the sense of *breaking through*, i. e. "wandering." Stark regards this Greek term as opposed to ὁμόφυλος, "of the same race" (*Gaza*, p. 67); and Von Lengerke looks upon it as a playful transposition of Φυλιστιείμ. Ἀλλόφυλοι seems, in later Greek, to denote a foreign race living in a country among its natives. Thus Polybius gives the name to the forces of Hannibal located in Gaul and Italy (iii, 61). The Sept. has in this way given it to a race that lived in a country which God had conferred in promise on the Hebrew people. The same name is for a like reason given to the population of Galilee (1 Macc. v, 15).

Philistia proper was a long and somewhat broad strip of land lying on the sea-coast, west of the hills of Ephraim and Judah, and stretching generally from Egypt to Phœnicia. The northern portion of this territory, from Joppa nearly as far as Ashkelon, was allotted to Dan; and the southern portion, from Ashkelon to the wilderness of Tîh, and extending east to Beersheba, was assigned to Judah. In short, it comprised the southern coast and plain of Canaan, along the Mediterranean, hence called "the sea of the Philistines" (Exod. xxiii, 31), from Ekron to the border of Egypt; though

at certain times the Philistines had also in possession large portions of the interior (Psa. lx, 7; lxxxvii, 4; cviii, 10; 1 Sam. xxxi, 8; 1 Kings xv, 27; Psa. lxxxiii, 7). The land of the Philistines partakes of the general desolation common to it with Judæa and other neighboring states. According to Volney, except the immediate environs of a few villages, the whole country is a desert abandoned to the Bedawîn Arabs, who feed their flocks on it (Zeph. ii, 4–7). See PHILISTINE.

Philis'tim (Gen. x, 14). See PHILISTINE.

Philis'tine (Heb. *Pelishti'*, פְּלִשְׁתִּי, gentile from פְּלֶשֶׁת, *Philistia;* Sept. ἀλλόφυλος, but sometimes Φυλιστιείμ for the plur., which is the usual form; A. V. once "Philistim," Gen. x, 14; Josephus, Παλαίστινοι, *Ant.* v, 1, 18), a race of aboriginal Canaanites inhabiting the land of Philistia (q. v.). The following article combines the Scripture information with that from other sources.

I. *Early History.*—1. *The origin* of the Philistines is nowhere expressly stated in the Bible; but since the prophets describe them as "the Philistines from Caphtor" (Amos ix, 7), and "the remnant of the maritime district of Caphtor" (Jer. xlvii, 4), it is *primâ facie* probable that they were the "Caphtorims which came out of Caphtor" who expelled the Avim from their territory and occupied it in their place (Deut. ii, 23), and that these again were the Caphtorim mentioned in the Mosaic genealogical table among the descendants of Mizraim (Gen. x, 14). But in establishing this conclusion certain difficulties present themselves: in the first place, it is observable that in Gen. x, 14 the Philistines are connected with the Casluhim rather than the Caphtorim. It has generally been assumed that the text has suffered a transposition, and that the parenthetical clause "out of whom came Philistim" ought to follow the words "and Caphtorim." This explanation is, however, inadmissible; for (1) there is no external evidence whatever of any variation in the text, either here or in the parallel passage in 1 Chron. i, 12; and (2) if the transposition were effected, the desired sense would not be gained; for the words rendered in the A. V. "out of whom" (אֲשֶׁר מִשָּׁם) really mean "whence," and denote a local movement rather than a genealogical descent, so that, as applied to the Caphtorim, they would merely indicate a sojourn of the Philistines in their land, and not the identity of the two races. The clause seems to have an appropriate meaning in its present position: it looks like an interpolation into the original document with the view of explaining when and where the name Philistine was first applied to the people whose proper appellation was Caphtorim. It is an etymological as well as a historical memorandum; for it is based on the meaning of the name Philistine (from the root פָּלַשׁ = the Æthiopic *fulasa*, "to migrate;" a term which is said to be still current in Abyssinia [Knobel, *Völkert.* p. 281], and which on the Egyptian monuments appears under the form of *Pulost* [Brugsch, *Hist. d'Egypt.* p. 187]), viz. "emigrant," and is designed to account for the application of that name. But a second and more serious difficulty arises out of the language of the Philistines; for while the Caphtorim were Hamitic, the Philistine language is held to have been Shemitic. (Hitzig, in his *Urgeschichte d. Phil.*, however, maintains that the language is Indo-European, with a view to prove the Philistines to be Pelasgi. He is, we believe, singular in his view.) It has hence been inferred that the Philistines were in reality a Shemitic race, and that they derived the title of Caphtorim simply from a residence in Caphtor (Ewald, i, 331; Movers, *Phöniz.* iii, 258), and it has been noticed in confirmation of this that their land is termed Canaan (Zeph. ii, 5). But this seems to be inconsistent with the express assertion of the Bible that they were Caphtorim (Deut. ii, 23), and not simply that they came from Caphtor; and the term Canaan is applied to their country, not ethnologically but etymologically, to describe the trading habits of the Philistines. The difficulty arising out of the question of language has been met by assuming either that the Caphtorim adopted the language of the conquered Avim (a not unusual circumstance where the conquered form the bulk of the population), or that they diverged from the Hamitic stock at a period when the distinctive features of Hamitism and Shemitism were yet in embryo. (See below.) A third objection to their Egyptian origin is raised from the application of the term "uncircumcised" to them (1 Sam. xvii, 26; 2 Sam. i, 20), whereas the Egyptians were circumcised (Herod. ii, 36). But this objection is answered by Jer. ix, 25, 26, where the same term is in some sense applied to the Egyptians, however it may be reconciled with the statement of Herodotus. See CAPHTOR.

There is additional evidence to the above that the Philistines belonged to the Shemitic family. The names of their cities and their proper names are of Shemitic origin. In their intercourse with the Israelites there are many intimations that the two used a common language. How is this, if they were immigrants in Palestine? This difficulty is removed by supposing that originally they were in Palestine, being a part of the great Shemitic family, went westward, under pressure from the wave of population which came down from the higher country to the sea-coast, but afterwards returned eastward, back from Crete to Palestine; so that in Amos ix, 7 it is to be understood that God brought them up to Palestine, as he brought the Israelites out of Egypt—back to their home. This view the passage undoubtedly admits; but we cannot agree with Movers in holding that it gives direct evidence in its favor, though his general position is probably correct, that the Philistines first quitted the mainland for the neighboring islands of the Mediterranean sea, and then, after a time, returned to their original home (Movers, p. 19, 29, 35). Greek writers, however, give evidence of a wide diffusion of the Shemitic race over the islands of the Mediterranean. Thucydides says (i, 8) that most of the islands were inhabited by Carians and Phœnicians. Of Crete, Herodotus (i, 173) declares that barbarians had, before Minos, formed the population of the island. There is evidence in Homer to the same effect (*Od.* ix, 174; comp. Strabo, p. 475). Many proofs offer themselves that, before the spread of the Hellenes, these islands were inhabited by Shemitic races. The worship observed in them at this time shows a Shemitic origin. The Shemitics gave place to the Hellenics—a change which dates from the time of Minos, who drove them out of the islands, giving the dominion to his son. The expelled population settled on the Asiatic coast. This evidence, derived from heathen sources, gives a representation which agrees with the scriptural account of the origin, the westerly wandering, and eastward return of the Philistines. But chronology creates a difficulty. Minos probably lived about the year B.C. 1300. According to the O. T. the Philistines were found in Palestine at an earlier period. In Gen. xx, 2; xxvi, 1, we find a Philistine king of Gerar. But this king (and others) may have been so termed, not because he was of Philistine blood, but because he dwelt in the land which was afterwards called Philistia. There are other considerations which seem to show that Philistines did not occupy this country in the days of Abraham (consult Bertheau, p. 196). It is, however, certain that the Philistines existed in Palestine in the time of Moses as a brave and warlike people (Exod. xiii, 17)—a fact which places them on the Asiatic continent long before Minos. This difficulty does not appear considerable to us. There may have been a return eastwards before the time of Minos, as well as one in his time; or he may have merely put the finishing stroke to a return commenced, from some cause or other—war, over-population, etc.—at a much earlier period. The information found in the Bible is easily understood on the showing that in the earliest ages tribes of the Shemitic race spread themselves over the West, and, becoming

inhabitants of the islands, gave themselves to navigation. To these tribes the Philistines appear to have belonged, who, for what reason we know not, left Crete, and settled on the coast of Palestine.

2. The next question therefore that arises relates to *the early movements* of the Philistines. It has been very generally assumed of late years that Caphtor represents Crete, and that the Philistines migrated from that island, either directly or through Egypt, into Palestine. This hypothesis presupposes the Shemitic origin of the Philistines; for we believe that there are no traces of Hamitic settlements in Crete, and consequently the Biblical statement that Caphtorim was descended from Mizraim forms an *à priori* objection to the view. Moreover, the name Caphtor can only be identified with the Egyptian Coptos. But the Cretan origin of the Philistines has been deduced, not so much from the name Caphtor, as from that of the Cherethites. This name in its Hebrew form (כְּרֵתִי) bears a close resemblance to Crete, and is rendered Cretans in the Sept. A further link between the two terms has apparently been discovered in the term כָּרִי, *karî*, which is applied to the royal guard (2 Kings xi, 4, 19), and which sounds like Carians. The latter of these arguments assumes that the Cherethites of David's guard were identical with the Cherethites of the Philistine plain, which appears in the highest degree improbable. See CHERETHITE. With regard to the former argument, the mere coincidence of the names cannot pass for much without some corroborative testimony. The Bible furnishes none, for the name occurs but thrice (1 Sam. xxx, 14; Ezek. xxv, 16; Zeph. ii, 5), and apparently applies to the occupants of the southern district; the testimony of the Sept. is invalidated by the fact that it is based upon the mere sound of the word (see Zeph. ii, 6, where *kerôth* is also rendered Crete); and, lastly, we have to account for the introduction of the classical name of the island side by side with the Hebrew term Caphtor. A certain amount of testimony is indeed adduced in favor of a connection between Crete and Philistia; but, with the exception of the vague rumor, recorded but not adopted by Tacitus (*Hist.* v, 3), the evidence is confined to the town of Gaza, and even in this case is not wholly satisfactory. The town, according to Stephanus Byzantinus (s. v. Γάζα), was termed Minoa, as having been founded by Minos, and this tradition may be traced back to, and was perhaps founded on, an inscription on the coins of that city, containing the letters MEINΩ; but these coins are of no higher date than the 1st century B.C., and belong to a period when Gaza had attained a decided Greek character (Josephus, *War*, ii, 6, 3). Again, the worship of the god Marna, and its identity with the Cretan Jove, are frequently mentioned by early writers (Movers, *Phönic.* i, 662); but the name is Phœnician, being the *maran*, "lord," of 1 Cor. xvi, 22, and it seems more probable that Gaza and Crete derived the worship from a common source, Phœnicia. Without therefore asserting that migrations may not have taken place from Crete to Philistia, we hold that the evidence adduced to prove that they did is not altogether sufficient. What is remarkable, and as if two distinct and unallied peoples bore the same appellation, on a tablet of Rameses III at Medinet Habû is sculptured a naval victory over the Sharutana, perhaps the Cherethites of Crete; while another nation of the same name, perhaps the Cherethites of the mainland, form a portion of the Egyptian army. We find also the name *Pulusata* in close connection with this Sharutana. See CRETE.

Philistine Ship attacked by Egyptians.

On the other hand, it has been held by Ewald (i, 330) and others that the Cherethites and Pelethites (2 Sam. xx, 23) were Cherethites and Philistines. The objections to this view are: (1) that it is highly improbable that David would select his officers from the hereditary foes of his country, particularly so immediately after he had enforced their submission; (2) that there appears no reason why an undue prominence should have been given to the Cherethites by placing that name first, and altering Philistines into Pelethites, so as to produce a paronomasia; (3) that the names subsequently applied to the same body (2 Kings xi, 19) are appellatives; and



Philistine Wagons attacked by Egyptians.

(4) that the terms admit of a probable explanation from Hebrew roots. See PELETHITE.

3. A still more important point to be decided in connection with the early history of the Philistines is *the time when they settled in the land of Canaan.* If we were to restrict ourselves to the statements of the Bible, we should conclude that this took place before the time of Abraham; for they are noticed in his day as a pastoral tribe in the neighborhood of Gerar (Gen. xxi, 32, 34; xxvi, 1, 8); and this position accords well with the statement in Deut. ii, 23 that the Avim dwelt in Hazerim, i. e. in nomad encampments; for Gerar lay in the south country, which was just adapted to such a life. At the time of the exodus they were still in the same neighborhood, but grown sufficiently powerful to inspire the Israelites with fear (Exod. xiii, 17; xv, 14). When the Israelites arrived, they were in full possession of the Shephelah from the "river of Egypt" (el-Arish) in the south to Ekron in the north (Josh. xv, 4, 47), and had formed a confederacy of five powerful cities—Gaza, Ashdod, Ashkelon, Gath, and Ekron (Josh. xiii, 3). At what period these cities were originally founded we know not, but there are good grounds for believing that they were of Canaanitish origin, and had previously been occupied by the Avim. The name Gath is certainly Canaanitish; so most probably are Gaza, Ashdod, and Ekron. Ashkelon is doubtful; and the terminations both of this and Ekron may be Philistine. Gaza is mentioned as early as in Gen. x, 19 as a city of the Canaanites; and this as well as Ashdod and Ekron was in Joshua's time the asylum of the Canaanitish Anakim (Josh. xi, 22). The interval that elapsed between Abraham and the exodus seems sufficient to allow for the alteration that took place in the position of the Philistines, and their transformation from a pastoral tribe to a settled and powerful nation. But such a view has not met with acceptance among modern critics, partly because it leaves the migrations of the Philistines wholly unconnected with any known historical event, and partly because it does not serve to explain the great increase of their power in the time of the Judges. To meet these two requirements a double migration on the part of the Philistines, or of the two branches of that nation, has been suggested. Knobel, for instance, regards the Philistines proper as a branch of the same stock as that to which the Hyksos belonged, and he discovers the name Philistine in the opprobrious name *Philition* or *Philitis*, bestowed on the Shepherd kings (Herod. ii, 128); their first entrance into Canaan from the Casluhim would thus be subsequent to the patriarchal age, and coincident with the expulsion of the Hyksos. The Cherethites he identifies with the Caphtorim who displaced the Avim; and these he regards as Cretans, who did not enter Canaan before the period of the Judges. The former part of his theory is inconsistent with the notices of the Philistines in the book of Genesis; these, therefore, he regards as additions of a later date (*Völkert.* p. 218 sq.). The view adopted by Movers is, that the Philistines were carried westward from Palestine into Lower Egypt by the stream of the Hyksos movement at a period subsequent to Abraham; from Egypt they passed to Crete, and returned to Palestine in the early period of the Judges (*Phöniz.* iii, 258). This is inconsistent with the notices in Joshua. Ewald, in the second edition of his *Geschichte*, propounds the hypothesis of a double immigration from Crete, the first of which took place in the ante-patriarchal period, as a consequence either of the Canaanitish settlement or of the Hyksos movement, the second in the time of the Judges (*Gesch.* i, 329–331). We cannot regard the above views in any other light than as speculations, built up on very slight data, and unsatisfactory, inasmuch as they fail to reconcile the statements of Scripture. For they all imply (1) that the notice of the Caphtorim in Gen. x, 14 applies to an entirely distinct tribe from the Philistines, as Ewald (i, 331, note) himself allows; (2) that either the notices in Gen. xx, xxvi, or those in Josh. xv, 45–47, or perchance both, are interpolations; and (3) that the notice in Deut. ii, 23, which certainly bears marks of high antiquity, belongs to a late date, and refers solely to the Cherethites. But, beyond these inconsistencies, there are two points which appear to militate against the theory of the second immigration in the time of the Judges: (1) that the national title of the nation always remained Philistine, whereas, according to these theories, it was the Cretan or Cherethite element which led to the great development of power in the time of the Judges; and (2) that it remains to be shown why a seafaring race like the Cretans, coming direct from Caphtor in their ships (as Knobel, p. 224, understands "Caphtorim from Caphtor" to imply), would seek to occupy the quarters of a nomad race living in encampments, in the wilderness region of the south. We hesitate, therefore, to endorse any of the proffered explanations, and, while we allow that the Biblical statements are remarkable for their fragmentary and parenthetical nature, we are not prepared to fill up the gaps. If those statements cannot be received as they stand, it is questionable whether any amount of criticism will supply the connecting links. One point can, we think, be satisfactorily shown, viz. that the hypothesis of a second immigration is not needed in order to account for the growth of the Philistine power. Their geographical position and their relations to neighboring nations will account for it. Between the times of Abraham and Joshua the Philistines had changed their quarters, and had advanced northwards into the Shephelah or plain of Philistia. This plain has been in all ages remarkable for the extreme richness of its soil; its fields of standing corn, its vineyards and olive-yards, are incidentally mentioned in Scripture (Judg. xv, 5); and in time of famine the land of the Philistines was the hope of Palestine (2 Kings viii, 2). We should, however, fail to form a just idea of its capacities from the scanty notices in the Bible. The crops which it yielded were alone sufficient to insure national wealth. It was also adapted to the growth of military power; for while the plain itself permitted the use of war-chariots, which were the chief arm of offence, the occasional elevations which rise out of it offered secure sites for towns and strongholds. It was, moreover, a commercial country; from its position it must have been at all times the great thoroughfare between Phœnicia and Syria in the north, and Egypt and Arabia in the south. Ashdod and Gaza were the keys of Egypt, and commanded the transit trade; and the stores of frankincense and myrrh which Alexander captured in the latter place prove it to have been a depot of Arabian produce (Plutarch, *Alex.* cap. 25). We have evidence in the Bible that the Philistines traded in slaves with Edom and Southern Arabia (Amos i, 6; Joel iii, 3, 5), and their commercial character is indicated by the application of the name Canaan to their land (Zeph. ii, 5). They probably possessed a navy; for they had ports attached to Gaza and Ashkelon; the Sept. speaks of their ships in its version of Isa. xi, 14, and they are represented as attacking the Egyptians out of ships. The Philistines had at an early period attained proficiency in the arts of peace; they were skilful as smiths (1 Sam. xiii, 20), as armorers (xvii, 5, 6), and as builders, if we may judge from the prolonged sieges which several of their towns sustained. Their images and the golden mice and emerods (vi, 11) imply an acquaintance with the founder's and goldsmith's arts. Their wealth was abundant (Judg. xvi, 5, 18), and they appear in all respects to have been a prosperous people.

4. *Subsequent Extension.*—Possessed of such elements of power, the Philistines had attained in the time of the Judges an important position among Eastern nations. Their history is, indeed, almost a blank; yet the few particulars preserved to us are suggestive. About B.C. 1209 we find them engaged in successful war with the Sidonians, the effect of which was so serious to the latter power that it involved the transference of the capital of Phœnicia to a more secure position on the island of

Tyre (Justin. xviii, 3). About the same period, or a little after, they were engaged in a naval war with Rameses III of Egypt, in conjunction with other Mediterranean nations; in these wars they were unsuccessful (Brugsch, *Hist. d'Egypte*, p. 185, 187), but the notice of them proves their importance, and we cannot therefore be surprised that they were able to extend their authority over the Israelites, devoid as these were of internal union, and harassed by external foes. With regard to their tactics and the objects that they had in view in their attacks on the Israelites, we may form a fair idea from the scattered notices in the books of Judges and Samuel. The warfare was of a guerilla character, and consisted of a series of *raids* into the enemy's country. Sometimes these extended only just over the border, with the view of plundering the threshing-floors of the agricultural produce (1 Sam. xxiii, 1); but more generally they penetrated into the heart of the country and seized a commanding position on the edge of the Jordan valley, whence they could secure themselves against a combination of the trans- and cis-Jordanic divisions of the Israelites, or prevent a return of the fugitives who had hurried across the river on the alarm of their approach. Thus at one time we find them crossing the central district of Benjamin and posting themselves on Michmash (xiii, 16), at another time following the coast-road to the plain of Esdraelon and reaching the edge of the Jordan valley by Jezreel (xxix, 11). From such posts as their headquarters they sent out detached bands to plunder the surrounding country (xiii, 17), and, having obtained all they could, they established some military mark (נְצִיב, A. V. "garrison," but perhaps meaning only a *column*, as in Gen. xix, 26) as a token of their supremacy (1 Sam. x, 5; xiii, 3), and retreated to their own country. This system of incursions kept the Israelites in a state of perpetual disquietude: all commerce was suspended, from the insecurity of the roads (Judg. v, 6); and at the approach of the foe the people either betook themselves to the natural hiding-places of the country, or fled across the Jordan (1 Sam. xiii, 6, 7). By degrees the ascendency became complete, and a virtual disarmament of the population was effected by the suppression of the smiths (xiii, 19). The profits of the Philistines were not confined to the goods and chattels they carried off with them. They seized the persons of the Israelites and sold them for slaves; the earliest notice of this occurs in 1 Sam. xiv, 21, where, according to the probably correct reading (עִבְרִים, and not עִבְרִים) followed by the Sept., we find that there were numerous slaves in the camp at Michmash: at a later period the prophets inveigh against them for their traffic in human flesh (Joel iii, 6; Amos i, 6): at a still later period we hear that "the merchants of the country" followed the army of Gorgias into Judæa for the purpose of buying the children of Israel for slaves (1 Macc. iii, 41), and that these merchants were Philistines is a fair inference from the subsequent notice that Nicanor sold the captive Jews to the "cities upon the sea-coast" (2 Macc. viii, 11). There can be little doubt, too, that tribute was exacted from the Israelites, but the notices of it are confined to passages of questionable authority, such as the rendering of 1 Sam. xiii, 21 in the Sept., which represents the Philistines as making a charge of three shekels a tool for sharpening them; and again the expression "Metheg-ammah" in 2 Sam. viii, 1, which is rendered in the Vulg. *frenum tributi*, and by Symmachus τὴν ἐξουσίαν τοῦ φόρου (the true text may have been הַמִּדָּה, instead of הָאַמָּה). In each of the passages quoted the versions presuppose a text which yields a better sense than the existing one.



Heads of Philistine Prisoners. (From the Egyptian Monuments.)

II. *Connection of the Philistines with Israelitish History.*—Here we recur to the Biblical narrative.

1. *Under Joshua and the Judges.*—The territory of the Philistines, having been once occupied by the Canaanites, formed a portion of the Promised Land, and was assigned to the tribe of Judah (Josh. xv, 2, 12, 45–47). No part, however, of it was conquered in the lifetime of Joshua (xiii, 2), and even after his death no permanent conquest was effected (Judg. iii, 3), though, on the authority of a somewhat doubtful passage, we are informed that the three cities of Gaza, Ashkelon, and Ekron were taken (Judg. i, 18). The Philistines, at all events, soon recovered these, and commenced an aggressive policy against the Israelites, by which they gained a complete ascendency over them. We are unable to say at what intervals their incursions took place, as nothing is recorded of them in the early period of the Judges. But they must have been frequent, inasmuch as the national spirit of the Israelites was so entirely broken that they even reprobated any attempt at deliverance (xv, 12). Individual heroes were raised up from time to time whose achievements might well kindle patriotism, such as Shamgar the son of Anath (iii, 31), and still more Samson (xiii–xvi); but neither of these men succeeded in permanently throwing off the yoke. Of the former only a single daring feat is recorded, the effect of which appears, from Judg. v, 6, 7, to have been very shortlived. The true series of deliverances commenced with the latter, of whom it was predicted that "he shall begin to deliver" (xiii. 5), and were carried on by Samuel, Saul, and David. A brief notice occurs in Judg. x, 7 of invasions by the Philistines and Ammonites, followed by particulars which apply exclusively to the latter people. It has hence been supposed that the brief reference to the Philistines is in anticipation of Samson's history.

The history of Samson furnishes us with some idea of the relations which existed between the two nations. As a "borderer" of the tribe of Dan, he was thrown into frequent contact with the Philistines, whose supremacy was so established that no bar appears to have been placed to free intercourse with their country. His early life was spent on the verge of the Shephelah between Zorah and Eshtaol, but when his actions had aroused the active hostility of the Philistines he withdrew into the central district, and found a secure post on the rock of Etam, to the south-west of Bethlehem. Thither the Philistines followed him without opposition from the inhabitants. His achievements belong to his personal history: it is clear that they were the isolated acts of an individual, and altogether unconnected with any national movement; for the revenge of the Philistines was throughout directed against Samson personally. Under Eli there was an organized but unsuccessful resistance to the encroachments of the Philistines, who had penetrated into the central district and were met at Aphek (1 Sam. iv, 1). The production of the ark on this occasion demonstrates the greatness of the emergency, and its loss marked the lowest depth of Israel's degradation.

The next action took place under Samuel's leadership, and the tide of success turned in Israel's favor: the Philistines had again penetrated into the mountainous country near Jerusalem; at Mizpeh they met the cowed host of the Israelites, who, encouraged by the signs of divine favor, and availing themselves of the panic produced by a thunderstorm, inflicted on them a total defeat. For the first time the Israelites erected their pillar or *stele* at Eben-ezer as the token of victory. The re-

sults were the recovery of the border-towns and their territories "from Ekron even unto Gath," i. e. in the northern district. The success of Israel may be partly ascribed to their peaceful relations at this time with the Amorites (1 Sam. vii, 9–14).

2. *Under the Hebrew Monarchy.*—The Israelites now attributed their past weakness to their want of unity, and they desired a king, with the special object of leading them against the foe (1 Sam. viii, 20). It is a significant fact that Saul first felt inspiration in the presence of a pillar (A. V. "garrison") erected by the Philistines in commemoration of a victory (x, 5, 10). As soon as he was prepared to throw off the yoke he occupied with his army a position at Michmash, commanding the defiles leading to the Jordan valley, and his heroic general Jonathan gave the signal for a rising by overthrowing the pillar which the Philistines had placed there. The challenge was accepted; the Philistines invaded the central district with an immense force (a copyist's clerical exaggeration [see NUMBER]), and, having dislodged Saul from Michmash, occupied it themselves, and sent forth predatory bands into the surrounding country. The Israelites shortly after took up a position on the other side of the ravine at Geba, and availing themselves of the confusion consequent upon Jonathan's daring feat, inflicted a tremendous slaughter upon the enemy (ch. xiii, xiv). No attempt was made by the Philistines to regain their supremacy for about twenty-five years, and the scene of the next contest shows the altered strength of the two parties: it was no longer in the central country, but in a ravine leading down to the Philistine plain, the valley of Elah, the position of which is about fourteen miles south-west of Jerusalem; on this occasion the prowess of young David secured success to Israel, and the foe was pursued to the gates of Gath and Ekron (ch. xvii). The power of the Philistines was, however, still intact on their own territory, as is proved by the flight of David to the court of Achish (xxi, 10–15), and his subsequent abode at Ziklag (ch. xxvii), where he was secured from the attacks of Saul. The border warfare was continued; captures and reprisals, such as are described as occurring at Keilah (xxiii, 1–5), being probably frequent. The scene of the next conflict was far to the north, in the valley of Esdraelon, whither the Philistines may have made a plundering incursion similar to that of the Midianites in the days of Gideon. The battle on this occasion proved disastrous to the Israelites: Saul himself perished, and the Philistines penetrated across the Jordan, and occupied the forsaken cities (xxxi, 1–7). The dissensions which followed the death of Saul were naturally favorable to the Philistines; and no sooner were these brought to a close by the appointment of David to be king over the united tribes than the Philistines attempted to counterbalance the advantage by an attack on the person of the king; they therefore penetrated into the valley of Rephaim, south-west of Jerusalem, and even pushed forward an advanced post as far as Bethlehem (1 Chron. xi, 16). David twice attacked them at the former spot, and on each occasion with signal success, in the first case capturing their images, in the second pursuing them "from Geba until thou come to Gazer" (2 Sam. v, 17–25; 1 Chron. xiv, 8–16). About seven years after the defeat at Rephaim, David, who had now consolidated his power, attacked them on their own soil, and took Gath, with its dependencies (1 Chron. xviii, 1), and thus (according to one interpretation of the obscure expression "Metheg-ammah" in 2 Sam. viii, 1) "he took the arm-bridle out of the hand of the Philistines" (Bertheau, *Comm.* on 1 Chron.), or (according to another) "he took the bridle of the metropolis out of the hand of the Philistines" (Gesenius, *Thesaur.* p. 113)—meaning in either case that their ascendency was utterly broken. This indeed was the case; for the minor engagements in David's lifetime probably all took place within the borders of Philistia; Gob, which is given as the scene of the second and third combats, being probably identical with Gath, where the fourth took place (2 Sam. xxi, 15–22; comp. the Sept., some of the copies of which read Γέθ instead of Γόβ).

The whole of Philistia was included in Solomon's empire, the extent of which is described as being "from the river unto the land of the Philistines, unto the border of Egypt" (1 Kings iv, 21; 2 Chron. ix, 26), and again, "from Tiphsah unto Gaza" (1 Kings iv, 24; A. V. "Azzah"). The several towns probably remained under their former governors, as in the case of Gath (1 Kings ii, 39), and the sovereignty of Solomon was acknowledged by the payment of tribute (iv, 21). There are indications, however, that his hold on the Philistine country was by no means established; for we find him securing the passes that led up from the plain to the central district by the fortification of Gezer and Bethhoron (ix, 17), while no mention is made either of Gaza or Ashdod, which fully commanded the coast-road. Indeed the expedition of Pharaoh against Gezer, which stood at the head of the Philistine plain, and which was quite independent of Solomon until the time of his marriage with Pharaoh's daughter, would lead to the inference that Egyptian influence was paramount in Philistia at this period (ver. 16).

Under the later Jewish kings these signs of aggression on the part of the Philistines increase. The division of the empire at Solomon's death was favorable to the Philistine cause: Rehoboam secured himself against them by fortifying Gath and other cities bordering on the plain (2 Chron. xi, 8): the Israelitish monarchs were either not so prudent or not so powerful, for they allowed the Philistines to get hold of Gibbethon, commanding one of the defiles leading up from the plain of Sharon to Samaria, the recovery of which involved them in a protracted struggle in the reigns of Nadab and Zimri (1 Kings xv, 27; xvi, 1). Judah meanwhile had lost the tribute; for it is recorded, as an occurrence that marked Jehoshaphat's success, that "*some* of the Philistines brought presents" (2 Chron. xvii, 11). But this subjection was of brief duration: in the reign of his son Jehoram they avenged themselves by invading Judah in conjunction with the Arabians, and sacking the royal palace (xxi, 16, 17). The increasing weakness of the Jewish monarchy under the attacks of Hazael led to the recovery of Gath, which had been captured by that monarch in his advance on Jerusalem from the western plain in the reign of Jehoash (2 Kings xii, 17), and was probably occupied by the Philistines after his departure as an advanced post against Judah: at all events it was in their hands in the time of Uzziah, who dismantled (2 Chron. xxvi, 6) and probably destroyed it; for it is adduced by Amos as an example of divine vengeance (Amos vi, 2), and then disappears from history. Uzziah at the same time dismantled Jabneh (Jamnia), in the northern part of the plain, and Ashdod, and further erected forts in different parts of the country to intimidate the inhabitants (2 Chron. xxvi, 6). The prophecies of Joel and Amos prove that these measures were provoked by the aggressions of the Philistines, who appear to have formed leagues both with the Edomites and Phœnicians, and had reduced many of the Jews to slavery (Joel iii, 4–6; Amos i, 6–10). How far the means adopted by Uzziah were effectual we are not informed; but we have reason to suppose that the Philistines were kept in subjection until the time of Ahaz, when, relying upon the difficulties produced by the Syrian invasions, they attacked the border-cities in the Shephelah, and "the south" of Judah (2 Chron. xviii, 18).

From this time the notices of the Philistines are largely involved in the movements of the great powers surrounding Palestine. Isaiah's declarations (xiv, 29–32) throw light upon these subsequent events: from them we learn that the Assyrians, whom Ahaz summoned to his aid, proved themselves to be the "cockatrice that should come out of the serpent's (Judah's)

root," by ravaging the Philistine plain. A few years later the Philistines, in conjunction with the Syrians and Assyrians ("the adversaries of Rezin"), and perhaps as the subject-allies of the latter, carried on a series of attacks on the kingdom of Israel (Isa. ix, 11, 12). Hezekiah's reign inaugurated a new policy, in which the Philistines were deeply interested: that monarch formed an alliance with the Egyptians, as a counterpoise to the Assyrians, and the possession of Philistia became henceforth the turning-point of the struggle between the two great empires of the East. Hezekiah, in the early part of his reign, re-established his authority over the whole of it, "even unto Gaza" (2 Kings xviii, 8). This movement was evidently connected with his rebellion against the king of Assyria, and was undertaken in conjunction with the Egyptians; for we find the latter people shortly after in possession of the five Philistine cities, to which alone are we able to refer the prediction in Isa. xix, 18, when coupled with the fact that both Gaza and Ashkelon are termed Egyptian cities in the annals of Sargon (Bunsen, *Egypt*, iv, 603). The Assyrians under Tartan, the general of Sargon, made an expedition against Egypt, and took Ashdod, as the key of that country (Isa. xx, 1, 4, 5). Under Sennacherib Philistia was again the scene of important operations: in his first campaign against Egypt Ashkelon was taken and its dependencies were plundered; Ashdod, Ekron, and Gaza submitted, and received as a reward a portion of Hezekiah's territory (Rawlinson, *Herod.* i, 477): in his second campaign (on the view that the two were different) other towns on the verge of the plain, such as Libnah and Lachish, were also taken (2 Kings xviii, 14; xix, 8). The Assyrian supremacy, though shaken by the failure of this latter expedition, was restored by Esar-haddon, who claims to have conquered Egypt (Rawlinson, i, 481); and it seems probable that the Assyrians retained their hold on Ashdod until its capture, after a long siege, by the Egyptian monarch Psammetichus (Herod. ii, 157), the effect of which was to reduce the population of that important place to a mere "remnant" (Jer. xxv, 20). It was about this time, and possibly while Psammetichus was engaged in the siege of Ashdod, that Philistia was traversed by a vast Scythian horde on their way to Egypt: they were, however, diverted from their purpose by the king, and retraced their steps, plundering on their retreat the rich temple of Venus at Ashkelon (Herod. i, 105). The description of Zephaniah (ii, 4–7), who was contemporary with this event, may well apply to this terrible scourge, though more generally referred to a Chaldæan invasion. The Egyptian ascendency was not as yet re-established, for we find the next king, Necho, compelled to besiege Gaza (if the Cadytis of Herodotus, ii, 159) on his return from the battle of Megiddo. After the death of Necho, the contest was renewed between the Egyptians and the Chaldæans under Nebuchadnezzar, and the result was specially disastrous to the Philistines: Gaza was again taken by the former, and the population of the whole plain was reduced to a mere "remnant" by the invading armies (Jer. xlvii). The "old hatred" that the Philistines bore to the Jews was exhibited in acts of hostility at the time of the Babylonian captivity (Ezek. xxv, 15–17); but on the return this was somewhat abated, for some of the Jews married Philistine women, to the great scandal of their rulers (Neh. xiii, 23, 24).

3. *Post-exilian History.*—From this time the history of Philistia is absorbed in the struggles of the neighboring kingdoms. In B.C. 332, Alexander the Great traversed it on his way to Egypt, and captured Gaza, then held by the Persians under Betis, after a two month's siege. In 312 the armies of Demetrius Poliorcetes and Ptolemy fought in the neighborhood of Gaza. In 198 Antiochus the Great, in his war against Ptolemy Epiphanes, invaded Philistia and took Gaza. In 166 the Philistines joined the Syrian army under Gorgias in its attack on Judæa (1 Macc. iii, 41). In 148 the adherents of the rival kings Demetrius II and Alexander Balas, under Apollonius and Jonathan respectively, contended in the Philistine plain: Jonathan took Ashdod, triumphantly entered Ashkelon, and received Ekron as his reward (1 Macc. x, 69–89). A few years later Jonathan again descended into the plain in the interests of Antiochus VI, and captured Gaza (1 Macc. xi, 60–62). No further notice of the country occurs until the capture of Gaza in 97 by the Jewish king Alexander Jannæus, in his contest with Lathyrus (Joseph. *Ant.* xiii, 13, 3; *War*, i, 4, 2). In 63 Pompey annexed Philistia to the province of Syria (*Ant.* xiv, 4, 4), with the exception of Gaza, which was assigned to Herod (xv, 7, 3), together with Jamnia, Ashdod, and Ashkelon, as appears from xvii, 11, 5. The last three fell to Salome after Herod's death, but Gaza was re-annexed to Syria (xvii, 11, 4, 5). The latest notices of the Philistines as a nation, under their title of ἀλλόφυλοι, occur in 1 Macc. iii–v. The extension of the name from the district occupied by them to the whole country, under the familiar form of PALESTINE, has already been noticed under that head.

III. *Usages, etc.*—With regard to the institutions of the Philistines our information is very scanty. Their military tactics have been noticed above. The country in which they settled is remarkably productive (2 Kings viii, 2). Thomson exclaims on entering it, "Beautiful but monotonous—wheat, wheat, a very ocean of wheat" (*Land and Book*, ii, 32 sq.). The country, he adds, greatly resembles some of the prairies in Western America. "Isaac sowed in that land, and received in the same year a hundredfold" (Gen. xxvi, 12). Not only was agriculture most remunerative, but Philistia was the highway for caravans between Egypt and the north, and commerce must have added to its wealth. Harbors were attached to Gaza and Ashkelon, and a lucrative navigation may have been carried on. The greatness of the cities was mainly owing to commerce, for the coast of Palestine was in the earliest ages exclusively in possession of the traffic which was carried on between Europe and Asia. Besides a great transit trade, they had internal sources of wealth, being given to agriculture (Judg. xv, 5). In the time of Saul they were evidently superior in the arts of life to the Israelites; for we read (1 Sam. xiii, 20) that the latter were indebted to the former for the utensils of ordinary life.

The five chief cities had, as early as the days of Joshua, constituted themselves into a confederacy, restricted, however, in all probability, to matters of offence and defence. Each was under the government of a prince whose official title was *séren*, סֶרֶן (Josh. xiii, 3; Judg. iii, 3, etc.), and occasionally *sâr*, שַׂר (1 Sam. xviii, 30; xxix, 6). Gaza may be regarded as having exercised a hegemony over the others, for in the list of the towns it is mentioned the first (Josh. xiii, 3; Amos i, 7, 8), except where there is an especial ground for giving prominence to another, as in the case of Ashdod (1 Sam. vi, 17). Ekron always stands last, while Ashdod, Ashkelon, and Gath interchange places. Each town possessed its own territory, as instanced in the case of Gath (1 Chron. xviii, 1), Ashdod (1 Sam. v, 6), and others, and each possessed its dependent towns or "daughters" (Josh. xv, 45–47; 1 Chron. xviii, 1; 2 Sam. i, 20; Ezek. xvi, 27, 57), and its villages (Josh. *l. c.*). In later times Gaza had a senate of five hundred (Joseph. *Ant.* xiii, 13, 3).

The Philistines appear to have been deeply imbued with superstition: they carried their idols with them on their campaigns (2 Sam. v, 21), and proclaimed their victories in their presence (1 Sam. xxxi, 9). They also carried about their persons charms of some kind that had been presented before the idols (2 Macc. xii, 40). The gods whom they chiefly worshipped were Dagon, who possessed temples both at Gaza (Judg. xvi, 23) and at Ashdod (1 Sam. v, 3–5; 1 Chron. x, 10; 1 Macc. x, 83); Ashtoreth, whose temple at Ashkelon was far-famed (1 Sam. xxxi, 10; Herod. i, 105); Baal-zebub, whose fane

at Ekron was consulted by Ahaziah (2 Kings i, 2–6); and Derceto, who was honored at Ashkelon (Diod. Sic. ii, 4), though unnoticed in the Bible. Priests and diviners (1 Sam. vi, 2) were attached to the various seats of worship; and the Philistine magicians were in repute (Isa. ii, 6).

The special authorities for the history of the Philistines are Stark, *Gaza und die philistäische Küste* (Jena, 1852); Knobel, *Völkertafel der Genesis* (Giess. 1850); Movers, *Phönizien* (Bonn, 1841); Hitzig, *Urgesch. und Mythologie der Philistäer* (Leips. 1845); and Kneucker, in Schenkel's *Bibel-Lex.* s. v. Philistäer. See also *Jour. Sac. Lit.* July, 1852, p. 323 sq.; Jan. 1856, p. 299 sq.; Frisch, *De Origine, diis et terra Palæstinorum* (Tubing. 1696); Wolf, *Apparatus Philistœorum bellicorum* (Viteb. 1711); Hannecker, *Die Philistäer* (Eichstädt, 1872).

Phillipps, George, a Congregational minister, was born at Rondham, in the county of Norfolk, England, near the opening of the 17th century. Having given early indications of a remarkably vigorous mind, a strong love of knowledge, and a deep sense of religion, he was sent to the University of Cambridge, where he received his education, and distinguished himself as a scholar. Theology was his favorite study; and, while yet a young man, he had made himself familiar with the most celebrated of the fathers of the Christian Church. Not long after his ordination he began to entertain scruples with regard to certain requirements of the Established Church. This dissatisfaction became so strong that at last he determined to emigrate to this country with a company of Puritans, among whom was John Winthrop. He arrived at Salem in 1630. Having founded with a number of others the settlement of Watertown, Mass., Phillipps became the first pastor of the Church, and as such he continued his labors till near the time of his death, which occurred July 1, 1644. Phillipps possessed no small degree of intellectual acumen, and was an able controversial writer. He was a man of great independence of mind, and adhered with unyielding tenacity to his conscientious convictions. He seems to have been in advance of nearly all his contemporaries in regard to the principles of strict Congregationalism; insomuch that his views were, for a time, regarded as novel and extreme. His ministry was marked by great diligence and fervor, and attended with rich blessings. His publications are, *Reply to the Confutation of some Grounds of Infant Baptism; as also Concerning the Form of a Church, put forth against me by one Thomas Lamb* (Lond. 1645, 4to). See Mather, *Magnalia*, iii, 82–84, 162; Winthrop, *Journal;* Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, i, 15–17. (J. H. W.)

Phillips, James, D.D., an eminent Presbyterian divine, was born at Newendon, Essex County, England, April 22, 1792. His father was a minister of the Established Church of England, and attached to the Evangelical party in that Church. His early education was acquired mostly while he was engaged in private study and teaching in the service of the English navy. His tastes and habits seem to have been fixed early, and to the impressions which he there received, and the scenes he witnessed at the great military and naval stations, may be traced many of his later habits and interests. He came to America in 1818, and engaged in the business of teaching at Harlem, N. Y., where he soon had a flourishing school. There were at that time in New York and the neighborhood a number of American and British mathematicians who had organized a mathematical club, of which he became a member. To the mathematical journals published at that time he was a regular contributor, or at least to two of them—the *Mathematical Repository* and *Nash's Diary*. In 1826 he was elected to the vacant mathematical chair in the University of North Carolina, and entered upon the duties of his professorship in July of the same year. In this position he continued to labor for forty-one years, devoting himself with unremitting care and attention to his duties. The amount of work he went through with is amazing. He projected a complete course of mathematical works, and published in 1828 a work on conic sections, which was afterwards adopted as a text-book in Columbia College, New York. He prepared also treatises on algebra, geometry, trigonometry, differential and integral calculus, and natural philosophy, besides making for his own use translations of many of the French mathematicians—which works, however, he never made any attempt to publish. He also joined the other members of the faculty in contributing his quota to the *Harbinger*, a newspaper published at Chapel Hill, in 1832, under the direction of Dr. Caldwell. Up to the time of his coming to North Carolina, and for many years after, he seems to have devoted himself exclusively to scientific studies. Although he had been for years a consistent member of the Church, yet now he began to experience a change, which he regarded as the true beginning of his Christian life. Henceforth he ceased to be the mere teacher of science; he added to his other duties the diligent study of theology and unwearied activity in all Christian duties, and in September, 1833, was licensed by the Presbytery of Orange, at New Hope, and in April, 1835, was ordained to the full work of the ministry. He was never installed as pastor, but he preached as a supply for some time at Pittsboro', and afterwards, for the greater part of his ministerial life, at New Hope Church. He was in the full discharge of his professional duties when he died suddenly March 14, 1867. Dr. Phillips was a man of remarkable literary, theological, and professional attainments. He was an inexorable mathematician, but well and thoroughly read in all departments. Many books in his library had this simple comment, "Perlegi." His chief religious reading was among the old Nonconformist divines; his favorite authors were the old English classics; the book that was oftenest in his hand was the Bible. He was a great preacher; his sermons were complete structures; there was nothing oratorical about him—it was the pure "weight of metal." As a man he was uncompromisingly conscientious, remarkably modest, free from all arrogance and presumption, and yet most genial as a companion and friend. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1868, p. 349. (J. L. S.)

Phillips, John, LL.D., an American philanthropist of some note, was born in Andover, Mass., Dec. 27, 1719; was educated at Harvard College (class of 1735); and having preached for some time, at length engaged in mercantile pursuits, and was for several years a member of the Council of New Hampshire. In 1778 he and his brother, Samuel Phillips, of Andover, founded and liberally endowed the academy in that town, which was incorporated in 1780. In 1789 he further gave to this institution $20,000. The academy called Phillips Exeter Academy, of which he was the sole founder, was incorporated in 1781, with a fund which was eventually increased to $134,000. He endowed a professorship in Dartmouth College, and he contributed liberally to Princeton College. He died in April, 1795, bequeathing to his academy two thirds of all his estate, and one third of the residue to the seminary at Andover, particularly for the benefit of pious youth.

Phillips, Morgan, sometimes called *Phillip Morgan*, a Roman Catholic divine, was born probably during the latter part of the 15th century. He received his education at Oxford, graduating in the class of 1537. He was made principal of St. Mary's Hall in 1546, and was one of the founders of the English College at Douay, where he died in 1570. His powers as a disputant were so great that he was called "Morgan the Sophister," and he was one of the three selected to dispute with Peter Martyr on the Eucharist, and published on that occasion *Disputatio de Sacramento Eucharistiæ in Univ. Oxon. habita contra D. Peter Martyr*, 13 *Mai*, 1549. He also published *A Treatise showing the Regiment of Women is conformable to the Law of God and Nature* (Liege, 1571,

8vo), written in answer to John Knox's work, *The First Blast of the Trumpet*, etc. See Wood, *Athen. Oxon.*; Dodd, *Ch. Hist.* vol. iii; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth.* s. v.

Phillips, Richard, an English Wesleyan preacher, was born in 1777. In early life he was brought to Christ through Methodist influence, and, feeling called of God to the work of the ministry, entered the itinerant ranks in 1804, and continued in the active labors of the ministry until 1844, when debility constrained him to accept an assistant, and to preach only occasionally. "Blessed with a good understanding and a retentive memory, patient and prudent, enjoying the life of God in his soul, and warmly attached to the doctrines and discipline of Methodism, he preached those doctrines and administered that discipline to the profit of the Wesleyan body." See *Wesleyan Magazine*, 1846, p. 916.

Phillips, Samuel (1), a Congregational minister, was born Feb. 17, 1690 (O. S.), at Salem, Mass. He graduated at Harvard College in 1708, and was ordained, Oct. 17, 1711, pastor of the South Parish, Andover, where he remained until his death, June 5, 1771. Samuel Phillips was a devoted orthodox preacher, and not only refused to be affected by the heretical tendencies of his times, but combated all Arian influences, and became a most decided opponent of the Unitarians. "As a preacher, he was highly respectable, was zealous, and endeavored not only to indoctrinate his people in sentiments which he deemed correct and important, but to lead them to the practice of all Christian duties." He published, *Elegy upon the Death of Nicholas Noyes and George Curwen* (1718):—*A Word in Season, or Duty of a People to take the Oath of Allegiance to a Glorious God* (1727):—*Advice to a Child* (1729):—*The History of the Saviour* (1738):—*The Orthodox Christian, or a Child well Instructed* (1738):—*A Minister's Address to his People* (1739):—*A Sermon on Living Water to be had for Asking* (1750):—*A Sermon on the Sinner's Refusal to Come to Christ* (1753):—*A Sermon on the Necessity of God's Drawing in Order to Men's Coming unto Christ* (1753):—*Seasonable Advice to a Neighbor, in a Dialogue* (1761):—*Address to Young People, in a Dialogue* (1763); and several occasional sermons. See Sprague, *Annals*, i, 273.

Phillips, Samuel (2), LL.D., an American philanthropist, noted for his service to the state, deserves a place here for the interest which he took in educational matters. He was born at Andover in 1751, and graduated at Harvard College in 1771. He was a member of the Provincial Congress in 1775, and of the House of Representatives till the year 1780, when he assisted in framing the constitution of Massachusetts. On its adoption he was elected a member of the Senate, and was its president from 1785 to 1802. Being appointed justice of the Court of Common Pleas for Essex in 1781, he held his office till 1797, when his declining health induced his resignation. He was commissioner of the state in Scharp's insurrection, and in 1801 was chosen lieutenant-governor. He died Feb. 10, 1802. Although so greatly honored with public eminence, he remained a faithful son of the Church of Christ, and was not only regular in his own observances, but ministered frequently to those unable to go to church. He appeared to be continually governed by love to the Supreme Being, and by the desire of imitating his benevolence and doing good. Phillips's deep views of evangelical doctrine and duty, of human depravity and mediatorial mercy, formed his heart to humility, condescension, and kindness, and led him continually to depend on the grace of God through the atonement of his Son. He was one of the projectors of the academy at Andover, and was much concerned in establishing that, as well as the academy at Exeter, which were founded by his father and uncle. To these institutions he was a distinguished benefactor. He was also a founder of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences of Boston. At his death he left to the town of Andover $5000, the income to be applied to the cause of education. After his death his widow, Phœbe Phillips, and his son, John Phillips, of Andover, evinced the same attachment to the interests of learning and religion, by uniting with Samuel Abbot, and three others of a most liberal and benevolent spirit, in founding the theological seminary at Andover, which was opened in September, 1808. See Allen, *Dict. of Amer. Biog.* s. v.; Brown, *Rel. Cyclop.* s. v.; Drake, *Dict. of Amer. Biog.* s. v.

Phillips, Thomas, an English Roman Catholic priest, was born in Buckinghamshire in 1708. He received his education at St. Omer's College, and became a most zealous worker in the Church. He obtained a prebend in the collegiate church of Tongres, and resided for many years in the family of the earl of Shrewsbury. Towards the end of his life he retired to the English college at Liege, where he died in 1774. He published, *The Study of Sacred Literature fully Stated and Considered* (Lond. 1756, 8vo; 2d ed. 1758; 3d ed. 1765):—*Philemon* (1761, 8vo). This autobiographical pamphlet was privately printed, and suppressed:—*The History of the Life of Reginald Pole* (Oxford, 1764–1767, 2 pts. in 1 vol. 4to; Lond. 1767, 2 vols. 8vo). This work elicited six answers, by Richard Lillard, T. Ridley, T. Neve, E. Stone, B. Pye, and J. Jones (see Chalmers, *Biog. Dict.* xxvi, 460–461), and Phillips responded in an appendix to the *Life* (1767, 4to); see also end of his 3d ed. of *Study of Sacred Literature*:—*Reasons for the Repeal of the Law against the Papists*:—*Translation in Metre of the Hymn Lauda Sion Salvatorem*:—*Censura Commentariorum Cornelii à Lapide*, in Latin, on a single sheet. He also addressed some poetry to his sister Elizabeth, abbess of the Benedictine nuns at Ghent. See Cole's *MS. Athen.* in the British Museum; *European Magazine*, for September, 1796; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth.* s. v.

Phillips, William (1), a Christian philanthropist, was born in Boston April 10, 1750. Owing to feeble health, he was prevented from receiving many educational advantages. He entered upon mercantile pursuits with his father, from whom he received a large fortune at his death. In 1772 he made a profession of religion; in 1794 he was made a deacon of Old South Church, Boston, where he officiated until his death, May 26, 1817. He was highly respected by the community at large, and was influential in all the affairs of State and Church. He was at one time the lieutenant-governor of his native state. He was also actively engaged in philanthropic labors, and was at his death president of the Massachusetts Bible Society. His charities were very extensive, and during a series of years amounted to from $8000 to $11,000. He bequeathed $15,000 to Phillips Academy; $10,000 to the theological institution at Andover; to the Society for Propagating the Gospel among the Indians, the Massachusetts Bible Society, the Foreign Mission Board, the Congregational Society, the Educational Society, and the Massachusetts General Hospital, each $5000; to the Medical Dispensary $3000; to the Female Asylum, and the Asylum for Boys, each $2000.

Phillips, William (2), a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Jessamine County, Ky., May 7, 1797. Even as a youth he exhibited talents of a superior order. He received a careful and pious training, but he did not as a young man make any outward profession of religion; and after entering political life, and while engaged for several years as a successful teacher, he became even less considerate of his higher and immortal interests, and sought refuge from the accusations of conscience in the dark and cheerless regions of infidelity. His early impressions of religious truth were, however, strong and abiding, and he was finally converted, and deeply impressed with the idea that he was called of God to enter the Christian ministry. Dec. 27, 1828, he was licensed as a local

preacher. In the fall of 1831 he was received into the Kentucky Conference. He was appointed consecutively to the Winchester Circuit, Lexington Circuit, and Newport and Covington stations. He was also assistant editor of the *Western Christian Advocate*, serving for one year by appointment of the Book Committee, and then by vote of the General Conference of 1836. Among his numerous contributions to that journal was a series of articles on the peculiar tenets of Alexander Campbell, which excited very considerable attention. These were republished, by request of the Ohio Conference, after Mr. Phillips's death, which occurred June 22, 1836, only a few weeks after his election by the General Conference.

Phillips, William Wirt, D.D., a Presbyterian divine, was born in Montgomery County, N. Y., Sept. 23, 1796. He graduated at Union College, Schenectady, N. Y., in 1812; completed a three years' course in the Associate Reformed Theological Seminary, New York, and afterwards spent a year in the theological seminary at New Brunswick, N. J., under the instruction of Rev. Dr. Livingston; was licensed by the New Brunswick Classis of the Reformed Dutch Church, and in April, 1818, was ordained and installed pastor of Pearl Street Presbyterian Church, New York City. From this church he was called to the First Presbyterian Church, New York. The congregation having disposed of their building and ground in Wall Street, in May, 1844, the corner-stone of the building on Fifth Avenue, near Twelfth Street, was laid in the following autumn, and soon after completed. Dr. Phillips was their beloved pastor for a period of nearly forty years; he was actively engaged in the discharge of his ministerial duties until about four weeks before his death, which occurred March 20, 1865. Dr. Phillips was a man of the utmost simplicity of character; a sound and able preacher of the Gospel, whose aim in the pulpit was to hold forth the Word of Life in all its purity, and to impress it with solemnity upon the hearts of all his hearers. He was moderator of the General Assembly which met at Pittsburgh in 1835, and for many years previous to his death he was the presiding officer of the Board of Foreign Missions. He was also president of the Board of Publication; a trustee of Princeton College and Seminary; a director of the Sailors' Snug Harbor, and several other benevolent institutions. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1866, p. 160; *Congreg. Quar.* 1859, p. 133. (J. L. S.)

Phil(l)potts, Henry, D.D., an English prelate of much note, was the son of a respectable hotel-keeper of Gloucester, and was born in that city in 1777. At the age of fifteen he was elected to a scholarship at Corpus Christi College, Oxford, and having taken the degree of B.A., gained the chancellor's prize for an English essay in 1795. He was elected in the following year to a fellowship at Magdalen College, which he vacated on his marriage in 1804 with Miss Surtees, a niece of the late lord chancellor Eldon. In 1806 he became chaplain to Dr. Barrington, bishop of Durham, and in that capacity distinguished himself by a controversy which he maintained against the learned Roman Catholic historian of England, Dr. Lingard (q. v.), and subsequently by the publication of some pamphlets, vindicating the established clergy in the North from the attacks of lords Grey and Durham. For these services he was rewarded with the rich living of Stanhope. In 1825 he again entered the lists of controversy as the opponent of Mr. Charles Butler's *Book of the Catholic Church*. In 1827 he published his celebrated *Letter on Catholic Emancipation* addressed to Mr. Canning, soon after which he was promoted (in 1828) to the deanery of Chester, which he exchanged in October, 1830, for the bishopric of Exeter. As a member of the House of Lords, bishop Phillpotts proved the zealous champion of Tory principles, and consequently opposed the Reform Bill, the Irish Church Temporalities Bill, the Poor-law Bill, the Ecclesiastical Commission, the National Education Bill, and every measure of a liberal tendency. Dr. Phillpotts was for many years in that assembly the recognised episcopal head and representative of the extreme High-Church party, and by his writings and speeches warmly advocated the revival of convocation, and of other innovations on the established system of ecclesiastical affairs. In 1849 he rejected Mr. Gorham, who was nominated by the crown to a living in Devonshire, on the ground that he held erroneous opinions as to the effects of infant baptism; and though he was supported by the ecclesiastical courts, their judgment was set aside on appeal by a decision of the judicial committee of the privy council in 1850. On this Dr. Phillpotts published a *Letter* in which he formally excommunicated the archbishop of Canterbury, who had been a party to the decision (see *Edinb. Rev.* xcv, 59–65). See Gorham Case. In the following year he held a synod of his clergy at Exeter, which was pronounced illegal by the officers of the crown, and has never since been summoned. He died in 1869. The list of Dr. Phillpotts's controversial pamphlets occupies no less than twelve pages in the new catalogue of the British Museum. His best-known publications are given in Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s. v. See *English Cyclop.* s. v.; *Men of the Time*, s. v.; *Blackwood's Mag.* xxiv, 1; xxix, 157; *Dublin University Mag.* xx, 223; *Fraser's Mag.* ii, 687; *Lond. Athen.* 1861, i, 151.

Philo (surnamed in Latin Judæus, i. e. the Jew; in Hebrew, פִּילוֹן הַיְּהוּדִי; in Greek, Φίλων [ὁ] Ἰουδαῖος), the greatest of ancient Jewish philosophers, flourished in the 1st century of the Christian æra. We give a somewhat lengthy exposition of his philosophic and religious opinions.

Life.—Philo was a native and throughout life a resident of Alexandria. The precise time of his birth is unknown, but he represents himself as of advanced age about A.D. 40, when he was sent as chief of an embassy from the Jews of Alexandria to the emperor Caligula, for the purpose of pleading their cause against Apion, who charged them with refusing to pay due honors to Cæsar (Josephus, *Ant.* xviii, 8, 1; comp. *De Legat. ad Caium*, xxviii). He was probably about sixty years old; if so, he was born about B.C. 20, and was contemporary with all the important events of the New Testament. He went again to Rome in the reign of Claudius, but after this nothing is known with certainty of his whereabouts. Philo had a brother employed in the affairs of government at Alexandria, named Alexander Lysimachus, who is supposed to be the Alexander mentioned in Acts iv, 6 as a man "of the kindred of the high-priest." That Philo was a member of the sacerdotal family is asserted by Josephus (*Ant.* xviii, 8, 1), and also by Eusebius, Jerome, and others, and his own writings indirectly testify that such was the fact. There is also reason to believe that he belonged to the sect of the Pharisees. Philo was eminent for his learning and eloquence. To the attainments usually secured by Jews of his social condition (Eusebius, *Præp. Evang.* viii, 13) he added an extensive knowledge of the Greek philosophy, especially the Platonic, for the acquisition of which the most favorable opportunities would occur in Alexandria, at that time the very metropolis of the learned world and the home of revived Hellenism. He has been represented by Scaliger and Cudworth as ignorant of Jewish literature and customs, but Fabricius and Mangey have clearly shown that such a view is entirely groundless. The supposition of his ignorance of Hebrew must have arisen from the fact that the Jews of Alexandria at that time were so little acquainted with the original of the Old-Test. Scriptures that they had to be supplied with the Sept. and other Greek versions. But even Geiger, who says that Philo had but a schoolboy knowledge of the Hebrew language, concedes that when the translation of the Bible was undertaken for the Alexandrian Jews, "they had not yet been altogether estranged from the Hebrew language;" but that

"they were no longer so much at home and versed in it that they could have fully mastered the Book which was to offer them the bread and water of life; it was the Grecian language that must bring it home to them" (p. 146; comp. also p. 148). As absurd as is this charge of Philo's ignorance of Hebrew is the charge that Philo's Greek is unclassical, and this because he was a Jew. As well might we say of the Jewish literati of Germany that their style is Jewish-German, and not the pure tongue of Lessing and Gervinus. Philo's Greek was of course not that of Plato, nor the pure Attic of Demosthenes. No one at Alexandria wrote so purely, but Philo wrote as did his contemporaries, and as wrote the best of them. In his treatise *De Congressu*, xiv, Philo refers himself to his own attainments in grammar, philosophy, geometry, music, and poetry; and his accomplished character was thus gracefully attested by his wife, who, when once asked why she alone of all her sex did not wear any golden ornaments, replied: "The virtue of a husband is a sufficient ornament for his wife" (*Fragments*, ed. Richter, vi, 236).

The circumstance that Philo was contemporary with New-Test. events, coupled with his high intelligence and interest in sacred learning, as well as with the fact that he once visited Jerusalem "to offer up prayers and sacrifices in the Temple" (although only one such visit is referred to by him [Richter's ed. of *Fragments*, vi, 200], his piety and devotion probably led to occasional repetitions of this pilgrimage, which were less likely to be mentioned because of his modesty and reserve in personal matters), led ancient writers to connect Philo intimately with Christianity. Photius (*Bibl.* Cod. 15) makes him a friend of the apostle Peter; as do also Eusebius (*Hist. Eccles.* ii, 17), Jerome (*Catal. Scriptor. Eccles.*), and Suidas. Photius goes so far as to say that Philo was admitted into the Christian Church, from which he afterwards fell. But while we have no direct means of testing the truth of such statements, they certainly do not bear the evidence on their face. A man of such decided characteristics as Philo could no more have remained quiet after conversion than did Saul of Tarsus, and, because we have no utterances from him as a Christian, we have reason to reject the story as fabulous from first to last. Besides, Philo's own extant writings do not give the slightest reference to any such important step, and this fact tells even more strongly, if possible, against the report.

His Theology and Philosophy.—In the article NEO-PLATONISM (q. v.) it has been shown that this eclectic philosophy, though it developed in the 3d century after Christ, is not only to be regarded in its origin as coeval with Christianity, but must acknowledge as its father and founder Philo the Jew (see Kingsley, *Alexandria and her Schools*, p. 79). Alexandria, from its very foundation by Alexander the Great in B.C. 332, had sought to establish Greek civilization within its borders, and to produce an intellect that might be the rival of Athens in her proudest day. Mind was the secret of Greek power, and for that the great conqueror would work in this African city, which he designed to be the point of union of two, or, rather, of three worlds. For in this place, named after himself, Europe, Asia, and Africa were to meet and to hold communion. Under the Ptolemies this desire was strengthened still more, and yet the outcome of all the Ptolemæan appliances was of little or no account if we except the great collection of MSS. and art treasures. The wisest men, though gathered from the most learned centres of the world, failed to produce anything that was really worth preserving. In physics they did little. In art nothing. In metaphysics less than nothing. Says Kingsley, "You must not suppose that the philosophers whom the Ptolemies collected (as they would any other marketable article) by liberal offers of pay and patronage, were such men as the old Seven Sages of Greece, or as Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle. In these three last indeed, Greek thought reached not merely its greatest height, but the edge of a precipice, down which it rolled headlong after their decease. . . . When the Romans destroyed Greece, God was just and merciful. The eagles were gathered together only because the carrion needed to be removed from the face of God's earth. And at the time of which I now speak the signs of approaching death were fearfully apparent. Hapless and hopeless enough were the clique of men out of whom the first two Ptolemies hoped to form a school of philosophy; men certainly clever enough, and amusing withal, who might give the kings of Egypt many a shrewd lesson in kingcraft and the crafts of this world, and the art of profiting by the folly of fools and the selfishness of the selfish; or who might amuse them, in default of fighting-cocks, by puns and repartees, and battles of logic; 'how one thing cannot be predicated of another,' or 'how the wise man is not only to overcome every misfortune, but not even to feel it,' and other such weighty questions, which in those days hid that deep unbelief in any truth whatsoever which was spreading fast over the minds of men . . . during those frightful centuries which immediately preceded the Christian æra, when was fast approaching that dark chaos of unbelief and unrighteousness which Saul of Tarsus so analyzes and describes in the first chapter of his Epistle to the Romans; when the old light was lost, the old faiths extinct, the old reverence for the laws of family and national life destroyed, yea, even the natural instincts themselves perverted; that chaos whose darkness Juvenal and Petronius and Tacitus have proved in their fearful pages not to have been exaggerated by the more compassionate though more righteous Jew" (p. 55–63).

Fortunately for the Macedonians, another Eastern nation had closely intermingled with them, and from this mixture of two races came that superior product which gave to Alexandrian thought not only a new impulse, but a superior life. When Hellenism was transferred to Alexandria, the Grecian spirit, as we have seen, was in an exhausted and faded condition. But together with Hellenism had come Judaism also. True, the latter was not sought for and imported at the bidding of the mighty conqueror of three worlds, but he had suffered the Jews to find a home in Alexandria, and thus Judaism found its establishment then and there. The Ptolemies also pursued the same conciliatory policy; and Judaism gained strength and developed so much at Alexandria that it became a centre of Jewish thought and learning for several centuries, and its rabbins were called "the light of Israel."

Now it is to be expected that whenever two spiritual powers meet, such as Hellenism and Judaism, such as Grecian culture and Jewish religion—when two such spiritual world-reforming powers come into conflict with each other—that conflict must necessarily result in new formations; something new will always grow out of it, be it by their antagonism or by their spiritual interpenetration; new creations will be evolved, either bearing the character of both, or pre-eminently that of one of them, yet impregnated, in a certain measure, by that of the other. The conflict between Hellenism and Judaism was principally a spiritual struggle, and its result a radical change in the thought and belief of both Jew and Macedonian, which led to the formation of what came to be known as *Neo-Platonism*, a philosophy of syncretism, whose elements are partly Oriental (Alexandrian-Jewish in particular) and partly Hellenic; but whose form is strictly Hellenic, and whose peculiarity of doctrine is that it is distinguished from Plato's own by the *principle of revelation* contained in the new philosophy.

The great representative of this syncretism, which also reappeared afterwards in manifold shapes in Gnosticism, is our spirited and prolific theologian, Philo of Alexandria. He held to the divine character of the Old Test., had very strict views of inspiration, and thought that the Mosaic law and the Temple worship were destined to be perpetual. He ascribed to the Jews

a mission for all nations, boasted of their cosmopolitism, and called them priests and prophets, who offered sacrifice and invoked the blessing of God for all mankind. With him the expounding of the books of the Old Test. is synonymous with the philosophy of his nation; but in his own exposition he allegorically introduces into those documents philosophical ideas, partly derived from the natural internal development of Jewish notions, and partly obtained from Hellenic philosophy, and thus the theology of Philo has been aptly called a blending of Platonism and Judaism.

The allegorical method of interpreting the sacred Scriptures, which had long prevailed among the more cultivated of the Alexandrian Jews, was adopted by Philo without restriction. His principle that the prophets were only involuntary instruments of the Spirit which spoke through them was favorable to the freest use of this mode of exegesis. He pronounced those who would merely tolerate a literal interpretation of the Scriptures as low, unworthy, and superstitious; and while he was thus led astray frequently to the introduction of foreign heathen elements into the store of divine revelation, and to the refusal of all elements which, like the anthropomorphisms for instance, seemed offensive to the culture of the time, Philo, like Origen (q. v.) in later times, far from rejecting the literal sense in every case, often, especially in the case of historical events in the Old Test., assumed both this and the allegorical sense as equally true. But Philo, besides this, regarded as higher that conception of Scripture which penetrated beneath the shell of the letter to what he thought to be the kernel of philosophical truth; beneath the anthropomorphic and anthropopathic representations of God, to that idealistic view of God which, in fact, divests him in the end of all concrete attributes. In this way, in spite of his opposition to *Hellenic* mysteries, Philo set up a radical distinction of initiated and uninitiated, a mode of interpretation which leads very easily to the contempt of the letter, and thus to an unhistorical, abstractly spiritualistic tendency. See INTERPRETATION. As a devoted, believing Jew, Philo accepted Judaism as a truth requiring no proof. But in him, as probably in others of the Alexandro-Jewish school of philosophers before him, the desire was awakened to blend the Jewish inheritance with the newly acquired Grecian knowledge; to heighten the truths of Judaism by the addition of Hellenic culture; to reconcile both treasures with each other, so that each should make the lustre of the other shine the more clearly and brightly. Directly antagonistic as they were to each other, a compromise must needs be effected between them. Judaism is the fruit of self-evidence, inner experience of a vivid conviction, for which no proof is required. Hellenism, on the contrary, proceeded from investigation, from human research, starting from the physical, to reach, by combination and analysis, the higher idea. These are two processes not only diverging in their progress, but even in their whole conception, and these two directly antagonistic views clashed against each other. But there was also in Hellenism a tendency which, although grown from the Grecian spirit, nevertheless endeavored to conceive, by a certain prophetic flight of poesy, the higher, thence to descend to the lower, and thus to make the former descend into lower degrees. It desired likewise directly to conceive the divine, the ideal, by intuition, by higher perception. With such a bold flight Plato conceived the everlasting Good, the everlasting Beautiful, whence individual ideals evolve themselves, which as archetypes—we are not told whether they have a distinct existence, or must be regarded as mere fictions of the spirit—are expressed in real objects, perfect in themselves, while the several visible objects represent them in a limited degree. This was a system which especially suited the philosophizing Jews; it afforded them a bridge between the purely spiritual and the physical objects. How does the Highest Spirit, the eternally Perfect One, enter into the finite world? He creates ideals from himself, says Plato. He introspects himself, and thus perfection is produced; but this perfection impresses itself upon more subordinate existences, and thus it descends from immediate causes to intermediate causes, until the real objects spring into existence, and creation becomes manifest to us; God, the eternal existence, the eternally perfect, is the highest cause, but the eternally Pure One does not immediately come into contact with the impure—only by means of manifold emanations and concatenations, the earthly grows into existence. Such views afforded the philosophic Jews a happy means of preserving the theory of the infallibility and inconceivableness of God, and yet of accepting the different figurative expressions concerning God in the Bible, because they could refer to the subordinate beings. Hellenism of that time, stiff and sober as it was, was unfit to conceive naive, poetical imageries, and to admit poetical expression without fearing that thereby the sublimity of thought might be violated. The latter was tenaciously adhered to, and whenever it expressed entities too directly, it had to yield to forced interpretations. To such also the Bible was frequently subjected. Narratives and commands were forcibly driven from their natural simplicity into artificial philosophemes, in the belief that their value would thus be enhanced. The figurative expressions and events in connection with God were referred to such subordinate spirits as had evolved themselves from God. In the writings of Philo that intermediate agency is comprised in the *Logos*.

As with Plato and the elder Greeks, so with Philo, *theology* was the ultimate object of all metaphysical science. But there arose a puzzle in the mind of the Jewish philosopher, as in reality it had already arisen in the minds of Socrates and Plato. How could he reconcile the idea of that absolute and eternal one Being, that Zeus, Father of gods and men, self-perfect, self-contained, without change or motion, in whom, as a Jew, he believed even more firmly than the Platonists, with the Dæmon of Socrates, the divine teacher whom both Plato and Solomon confessed? Or how, again, could he reconcile the idea of him with the creative and providential energy, working in space and time, working in matter, and apparently affected and limited, if not baffled, by the imperfection of the matter which he moulded? Philo offered a solution in that idea of a Logos, or Word of God, divinity articulate, speaking and acting in time and space, and therefore by successive acts, and so doing in time and space the will of the timeless and spaceless Father, the abysmal and eternal Being, of whom he was the perfect likeness. In calling this person the Logos, and making him the source of all human reason, and knowledge of eternal laws, he only translated from Hebrew into Greek the name which he found in his sacred books, "The Word of God." Of God himself, Philo teaches that he is incorporeal, invisible, and cognizable only through the reason; that he is the most universal of beings, the Being to whom alone being, as such, truly pertains; that he is more excellent than virtue, than science, or even than the good *per se* and the beautiful *per se*. He is one and simple, imperishable and eternal; his existence is absolute and separate from the world; the world is his work. Thus while Philo contends that God is to be worshipped as a personal being, he yet conceives him at the same time as the most general of existences: τὸ γενικώτατόν ἐστιν ὁ θεός (*Legis Alleg.* ii). God is the only truly existent *being*, τὸ ὄν (*De Somn.* i, 655, ed. Mang.). But Philo, similarly to the Neo-Platonists of a later epoch, advances upon the Platonic doctrine by representing God as exalted not only above all human knowledge and virtue—as Plato had done—but as above the idea of the Good—κρείττων τε ἡ ἀρετή, καὶ κρείττων ἡ ἐπιστήμη, καὶ κρείττων ἡ αὐτὸ τάγαθὸν καὶ αὐτὸ τὸ καλόν (*De Mundi Officio*, i, 2, ed. Mang.)—with which Plato identifies him—and by teaching that we do not arrive at the absolute by scientific demon-

stration (λόγων ἀποδείξει), but by an intermediate subjective certainty (ἐναργεία, *De post Caini*, 48, p. 258, ed. Mang.). Still a certain kind of knowledge of God, which, however, is only second in rank, results from the æsthetic and teleological view of the world, as founded on the Socratic principle that "no work of skill makes itself" (οὐδὲν τῶν τεχνικῶν ἔργων ἀπαυτοματίζεται). God is one and simple: ὁ Θεὸς μόνος ἐστὶ καὶ ἕν, οὐ σύγκριμα, φύσις ἁπλῆ . . . τέτακται οὖν ὁ Θεὸς κατὰ τὸ ἓν καὶ τὴν μονάδα, μᾶλλον δὲ καὶ ἡ μονὰς κατὰ τὸν ἕνα Θεόν (*Legis Alleg.* ii, i, 66 sq. ed. Mang.). God is the only free nature (ἡ μόνη ἐλευθέρα φύσις, *De Somn.* ii), full of himself and sufficient to himself (αὐτὸ ἑαυτοῦ πλῆρες καὶ ἑαυτῷ ἱκανόν, *De Nom. Mutat.* i, 582); everything finite is involved in necessity. God is not in contact with matter; if he were he would be defiled. He who holds the world itself to be God the Lord has fallen into error and sacrilege. In his essence God is incomprehensible; we can only know that he is, not what he is. All names which are intended to express the separate attributes of God are appropriate only in a figurative sense, since God is in truth an unqualified and pure being. Notwithstanding the pantheistically sounding neuters which Plato applies to God, Philo ascribes to him the purest blessedness: "He is without grief or fear, not subject to evils, unyielding, painless, never wearied, filled with unmixed happiness" (*De Cherubim*, i, 154). God is everywhere by his power (τὰς δυνάμεις αὐτοῦ διὰ γῆς καὶ ὕδατος, ἀέρος τε καὶ οὐρανοῦ τείνας), but in no place with his essence, since space and place were first given to the material world by him (*De Linguarum Conf.* i, 425). Speaking figuratively, Philo describes God as enthroned on the outermost border of the heavens, in an extramundane place (τόπος μετακόσμιος), as in a sacred citadel (*Genes.* 28, 15; *De Vit. Mos.* ii, 164, etc.). God is the place of the world, for it is he that contains and encompasses all things (*De Somniis*, i). In creating the world, God employed as instruments incorporeal potencies or ideas, since he could not come in contact with polluting matter (ἐξ ἐκείνης [τῆς οὐσίας] πάντ' ἐγέννησεν ὁ Θεός, οὐκ ἐφαπτόμενος αὐτός· οὐ γὰρ ἦν θέμις ἀπειρης καὶ πεφυρμένης ὕλης ψαύειν τὸν ἴδμονα καὶ μακάριον· ἀλλὰ ταῖς ἀσωμάτοις δυνάμεσιν, ὧν ἔτυμον ὄνομα αἱ ἰδέαι κατεχρήσατο πρὸς τὸ γένος ἕκαστον τὴν ἀρμόττουσαν λαβεῖν μορφήν, *De Sacrificantibus*, ii, 261). These potencies surround God as ministering spirits, just as a monarch is surrounded by the members of his court. The highest of the divine potencies, the creative (ποιητική), bears also, according to Philo, in Scripture the name of God (Θεός); the second or ruling (βασιλική) potency is called the Lord (κύριος) (*De Vita Mosis*, ii, 150, et al.). These are followed by the foreseeing potency, the law-giving, and many others. They are all conceived by Philo, not only in the nature of divine qualities, but also as relatively independent, personal beings, who can appear to men, and who have favored some of them with their most intimate intercourse (*De Vita Abrah.* ii, 17 sq.).

From all that has been said of the Philonic doctrine of the *Logos*, it is clearly apparent that Philo recognised it as the highest of all the divine forces; and yet many of his descriptions of it were in no essential like those of the apostle John, but rather belonged to Jewish ideas which he found already existing. The distinction of a concealed God and a revelation of him was connected with the Old-Test. idea of theophany. But by tracing back all theophanies to the one principle of revelation lying at their basis, and by making it their objective, the idea of the Logos was attained. The apocryphal book of *The Wisdom of Solomon* had already interposed *wisdom* between God and the world as the reflection of the eternal light; the fountain of all knowledge, virtue, and skill; the moulder of all things; the medium of all the Old-Test. revelations (ch. vii–x). This idea Philo also conceived, but he modified it according as the Platonic influence was more or less strongly felt. Says Neander, "In proportion as he occupied the standpoint which divested the Divine Being of human qualities, or that which favored anthropomorphism, the ideal or the symbolical, might not the λόγος appear as a power of God or as a hypostatic being?" Philo describes the λόγος, therefore, as the first-born before all existence, the πρωτόγονος υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ, as the perfect reflection of God, as the ἀρχάγγελος among the angels, as the original power of the divine powers. Alluding to the νοητὸν παράδειγμα of Plato, he describes him as the world-constructing reason; he compares the world to the ζῶον of Plato, and the λόγος to the soul of the world; he calls him God's vicegerent in the world (ὕπαρχος); he gives him the office of mediator between God and the universe, since the connection of phenomena with God is effected through the reason revealed in the world. Hence he is the high-priest of the world, the advocate (παράκλητος) for the defects of men with God, and generally the revealer of the divine nature to the universe. The Logos is the archetype of the reason, which is formed not after the Absolute himself, the Ὄν, but after the Logos. He, as the revelation of the Absolute in the reason, is the image of God, after which man, according to Genesis, was created. In this connection he calls the Logos the ideal man; and alluding to a Jewish mystical idea, the original man. In the Logos is the unity of the collected revelations of the Divine Being which is individualized in man. In general, everything is traced back to the distinction between the Divine Being as he is in himself and his revelation in the Logos, or the εἶναι and the λέγεσθαι. The revelation of God in creation—in all positive revelation—in the communication of separate ideas by peculiar dogmas—all this forms part of the knowledge of the revealed God in the phenomenal world, and of the symbolical knowledge from the standpoint of the *vioi* τοῦ λόγου, over which the standpoint of the *vioi* τοῦ Ὄντος is raised. But this Logos by Philo is only a sort of intermediate being between *God*, who is in his nature hidden, simple, without attributes, and the eternal, shapeless, chaotic *matter* (the Platonic ὕλη). It is the *reflection*, the first-born Son of God; the second God; the sum of the ideas, which are the original types of all existence; the ideal world itself (κόσμος νοητός); the medium through which the actual, sensible world (κόσμος αἰσθητός) is created and upheld; the interpreter and revealer of God; the archangel, who destroyed Sodom and Gomorrah, spoke to Jacob and to Moses in the burning bush, and led the people of Israel through the wilderness; the high-priest (ἀρχιερεύς), and advocate (παράκλητος), who pleads the cause of sinful humanity before God, and procures for it the pardon of its guilt. We see an apparent affinity of this view with the christology of St. Paul and St. John, and thus it probably came to exert no small influence with the early Church fathers in the evolution of their doctrine of the Logos. But at the same time we must not overlook the very essential difference. Philo's doctrine would not itself suggest the application of the idea of the Logos to any historical appearance whatever; for the revelation of the Logos refers not exclusively to any single fact, but to everything relating to the revelation of God in nature and history. If, according to John's Gospel, the appearance of the Logos is the highest and only medium of communication with God, then communion with the Logos in Philo's sense can only be a subordinate standpoint; for not even the highest man immediately apprehends the Absolute. Yet out of this religious idealism a preparation and a medium might be formed for Christian realism, when what was here taken in a merely ideal sense showed itself as realized in humanity. Christianity refers the Logos to the perfect revelation of God in human nature, to the one revelation in Christ; and substitutes for the immediate apprehension of the Absolute the historically founded communion with God revealed in Christ. The symbolical meaning of Philo's Paraclete was elevated by the reference to the

historical Christ as the only high-priest. Thus the Alexandrian ideas formed a bridge to Christianity. But we cannot regard the doctrine of a union of the Logos with humanity, in all the forms under which it appeared, as a reflection in the first place of Christianity, but must doubtless presuppose a tendency of this kind before the Christian æra. A yearning of the spirit goes before great events—an unconscious longing for that which is to come. This must especially have been the case in that greatest revolution which the religious development of humanity experienced. It was preceded by an unconscious feeling of a revelation of the spiritual world to humanity—a longing which hastened to meet the new communications from God. It was not difficult for those who regarded the Logos as the medium of revelation, by which God made himself cognizable to pious souls, and, on the other hand, who held the Messiah to be the highest of God's messengers, to suppose a particular connection between him and the Logos. But, after all, this Jewish idea of the Logos is quite eclipsed by the Christian idea of the Messiah: with the Jews it is simply the hope of their miraculous restoration from all parts of the world to Palestine, through the agency of a superhuman appearance (ὄψις); and even this supernatural phenomenon has no legitimate place in Philo's system; it means nothing. But again, his dualistic and idealistic view of the world absolutely excludes an incarnation, which is the central truth of Christianity (comp. Dorner, *Person of Christ*). His Christ, if he needed any, could have been at best but a gnostic, docetistic, fantastic Christ; his redemption, but ideal and intellectual. He attained only an artificial harmony between God and the world, between Judaism and heathenism; which hovered, like a "spectral illusion," an "evanescent fata morgana," on the horizon of dawning Christianity. Says Schaff, "It is a question not yet entirely settled whether Philo's Logos was a personal hypostasis or merely a personification, a divine attribute. While Gfrörer, Grossmann, Dähne, Lücke, Ritter, and Semisch maintain the former view, Dorner (*Entwicklungsgeschichte der Lehre von der Person Christi*, 2d ed. i, 23 sq.) has latterly attempted to re-establish the other. To me, Philo himself seems to vibrate between the two views; and this obscurity accounts for the difference among so distinguished scholars on this point" (*Hist. of the Apostolic Church*, p. 180). The eternal atonement, which Philo imagined already *made* and *eternally being made* by his ideal Logos, could be effected only by a creative act of the condescending love of God; and it is a remarkable instance of divine wisdom in history that this redeeming act was really performed about the same time that the greatest Jewish philosopher and theologian of his age was dreaming of and announcing to the world a ghostlike shadow of it.

Of his other philosophic speculations we have space only to refer to some of his ethical views. With him knowledge and virtue are gifts of God, to be obtained only by self-abnegation on the part of man. A life of contemplation is superior to one of practical, political occupation. In other words, the business of man is to follow and imitate God (*De Caritate*, ii. 404, et pass.). The soul must strive to become the dwelling-place of God, his holy temple, and so to become strong, whereas it was before weak, and wise, whereas before it was foolish (*De Somn.* i, 23). The highest blessedness is to abide in God (*πέρας εὐδαιμονίας τὸ ἀκλινῶς καὶ ἀῤῥεπῶς ἐν μόνῳ στῆναι*). The various minor sciences serve as a preparatory training for the knowledge of God. Of the philosophical disciplines, logic and physics are of little worth. The highest step in philosophy is the intuition of God, to which the sage attains through divine illumination when, completely renouncing himself and leaving behind his finite self-consciousness, he resigns himself unresistingly to the divine influence.

It remains for us to notice the use that has been made of Philo's writings within the domain of New-Test. interpretation. There are some Christian exegetists who in their rationalistic tendency have gone so far as to account for the character and style of some of the New-Test. Scriptures by referring their origin to Philo's writings. (We here quote largely from Kitto's *Biblical Cyclopædia*.) Mr. Grinfield, in his *Hellenistic Greek Testament*, and the accompanying *Scholia*, has derived many of his notes from the works of Philo; in the application, however, of such illustrations, it must be borne in mind that Philo's style was hardly a *natural* one; it is very elaborate, and avoids Alexandrian provincialisms, and on that account often fails to elucidate the simple diction of the New Test., even where there is similarity in the subject-matter (comp. Carpzovii *Exer. Sacr.* in *Ep. ad Hebr.* p. 140). But recent critics of the rationalistic school are not content with finding in Philo such illustration of the New Test. as might be expected to occur in a contemporary, and in some respects kindred, Greek writer; they go so far as to assert that some of the prominent doctrines of the sacred writers are little else than accommodations from the opinions of Philo, mediate or immediate. Thus Grossmann (*Quæst. Philon.* sub init.) does not scruple to say that Christianity is the product of the allegories of the Jewish synagogue and of Philo. Other writers, more measured in their terms, trace isolated truths to a like source. For instance, the well-disposed Ernesti (*Institutes*), and after him Lücke, who says, "It is impossible to mistake as to the immediate historical connection of John's doctrine of the *Logos* with the Alexandrian in its more perfect form, as it occurs in Philo." Similarly, Strauss, De Wette, and others; while others again apply the like criticism to St. Paul. Among these we must especially notice Gfrörer, whose work, *Philo und die jüdisch-alexandrinische Theologie*, has been made accessible to English readers, in an abridged form, by Prof. Jowett, in his dissertation *St. Paul and Philo*, contained in his commentary on St. Paul's *Epp.* i, 363–417. No criticism, however, is to be tolerated by the believer in Revelation which does not start from the principle that the characteristic truths of Christianity are self-evolved, i. e. (to use Dorner's words) "have not emerged from without Christianity, but wholly from within it" (*Person of Christ* [Clark], vol. i, Introduction, p. 45). Instead of making Philo, in any sense, a fountain-head of Christian doctrine, it would be more correct to regard him as the unconscious source of antichristian opinion —*unconscious*, we say, for with all his knowledge and skill in style, Philo possessed not those energetic qualities which characterize founders of schools of opinion. To say nothing of Philo's influence upon the theosophizing fathers of the Church, Clement of Alexandria and Origen, who borrowed largely from their Jewish predecessor and fellow-citizen, some of the salient heresies of the early centuries had almost their spring in the Philonian writings (for the affinity of the opposite opinions of Arius and Sabellius to certain opinions of Philo, see Mosheim's Notes on Cudworth cited below); while that pagan philosophy, the Neo-Platonism of Alexandria, which derived much of its strength and obtained its ultimate defeat from the Christianity which it both aped and hated, is mainly traceable to our Philo. For a popular but sufficiently exact statement of (1) Philo's relation to Neo-Platonism, and (2) of the antagonism of this Neo-Platonism to Christianity, the reader is referred to Lewes's *Hist. of Philosophy*, p. 260–278. Although we cannot therefore allow that the inspired volume of the Christian religion owes in its origin anything to Philo, we do not deny to his writings a certain utility in the interpretation of the New Test. See PHILOSOPHY, GREEK. Besides the explanation of words and phrases above referred to (a service which is the more valuable because of Philo's profound acquaintance with the Septuagint version, in which the writers of the New Test. show themselves to have been well versed also), the works of Philo sometimes contribute interesting elucidation of scriptural facts and statements. We may

instance his delineation of the character of Pontius Pilate (*De Legat. ad Caium*, xxxviii, Richter, vi, 134; Bohn, iv, 164). This well-drawn sketch of such a man, from the masterly hand of a contemporary, throws considerable light on more than one point, such as the relations of Herod and Pilate, which are but lightly touched in the Gospels (comp. Hale's *Analysis*, iii, 216–218). As a second instance, may we not regard the remarkable passage of St. Paul as receiving light from Philo's view of the twofold creation, first of the heavenly (*οὐράνιος*) or ideal man, and then of the earthly (*γήϊνος*) man? (Comp. 1 Cor. xv, 46, 47, with Philo, *De Allegor. Legis*, i, 12, 13 [Richter, i, 68; Bohn, i, 60], and *De Mundi Opific.* p. 46 [Richter, i, 43; Bohn, i, 39]; and see Stanley *on Corinthians*, i, 331.) But then such illustration is rather an example of how Philo is corrected by St. Paul, than of how St. Paul borrowed from Philo. Respecting the allegorical method of interpreting the Old Test., of which the apostle is alleged to have derived the idea from our author, it should be remembered that St. Paul, guided by the Divine Spirit, who had indited the ancient Scriptures, was directed to apply Old-Test. facts to New-Test. doctrines, as correlative portions of one great scheme of providential dispensation; whereas Philo's adaptations of the same facts were only the product of an arbitrary and extremely fanciful imagination; so that in the case of the former we have an authoritative and sure method of interpreting ancient events without ever impairing their historical and original truth, whereas the latter affords us nothing besides the conjectures of a mind of great vivacity indeed, but often capricious and inconsistent, which always postpones the truth of history to its allegorical sense, and oftentimes wholly reduces it to a simple myth. Readers of Philo are well aware of the extravagance and weakness of many of his allegories; of these some are inoffensive, no doubt, and some others are even neat and interesting, but none carry with them the simple dignity and expressiveness of the allegorical types of the New Test. St. Paul and Philo, it is well known, have both treated the history of Hagar and Sarah allegorically (comp. Gal. iv, 22–31 with Philo, *De Congressu*, p. 1–5 [Richter, iii, 71–76; Bohn, ii, 157–162]; and see Lightfoot, *Epist. to Gal.* p. 189–191; and Howson's *Hagar and Arabia*, p. 20, 36, 37); but although we have here one of the best specimens of Philo's favorite method, how infinitely does it fall short of St. Paul's! To say nothing of authority, it fails in terseness and point, and all the features of proper allegory. The reader will at once perceive this who examines both.

Literature.—For an account of Philo's philosophical and theological system in general, the reader is referred to Mosheim's notes on Cudworth, p. 640–649 [transl. by Harrison, ii, 320–333], where Philo's influence on Patristic divinity and early heresy, especially the Sabellian, is clearly traced; to Ritter, *Hist. of Phil.* [transl. by Morrison], iv, 407–478; and to Döllinger, *The Gentile and the Jew* [transl. by Darnell], ii, 398–408; Neander, *Hist. of Christ. Dogmas*, xi, 135 sq.; id. *Ch. Hist.* p. 58 sq.; Ueberweg. *Hist. of Philos.* i, 222 sq.; Schaff, *Hist. of the Apost. Ch.* p. 176 sq.; Tennemann, *Hist. of Phil.* p. 170 sq.; Fabricius, *Dis. de Platonismo Philonis* (Leips. 1693, 4to); id. *Sylloge Dissertat.* (Hamb. 1738, 4to); Stahl, *Attempt at a Systematic Statement of the Doctrines of Philo of Alexandria*, in the *Allgem. Bibl. der Bibl. Literatur* of Eichhorn, tom. iv, fasc. v; Schreiter, *Ideas of Philo respecting the Immortality of the Soul, the Resurrection, and Future Retribution*, in the *Analecten* of Keil and Tzchirner, vol. i, sec. 2; see also vol. iii, sec. 2; Scheffer, *Quæstiones*, pt. i, ii, 1829–31; Grossmann, *Quæstiones Philonianæ*, pt. i, *De theologiæ Philonis fontibus et auctoritate* (1829); Gfrörer, *Philo und die Alexandrinische Theosophie* (1831, 1835, 2 vols.); Dähne, *Geschichtliche Darstellung der jüdisch-alexandrinischen Religionsphilosophie* (1831), pt. i; id. in the *Theol. Studien und Kritiken*, 1833, p. 984; Bucher, *Philonische Studien* (1848); Creuzer, *Kritik der Schriften des Juden Philon*, in *Theol. Studien und Kritiken*, January, 1832. Philo's opinions about the divine *Logos* have been warmly discussed. The ancients, as we have seen, were fond of identifying them with Christian doctrine; Mangey, in the middle of the last century, accompanied his splendid edition of Philo's works (2 vols. fol.) with a dissertation, in which he made our author attribute, in the Christian sense, a distinct personality to the Logos; bishop Bull had stated a similar opinion (*Def. Fid. Nic.* [transl. by the Rev. Peter Holmes for the Anglo. Cath. Lib.], i, 31–33); and, more recently, Bryant (*Sentiments of Philo Jud. concerning the λόγος*); and, very lately, Pye Smith (*Messiah*, i, 573–600). But the conclusions of these writers, however learnedly asserted, have been abundantly refuted in many works; the chief of which are Carpzovii *Disput. de λόγῳ Philonis, non Johannis*, adversus Mangey (1749); Cæsar Morgan's *Investigation of the Trinity of Plato and of Philo Jud.*; Burton's *Bampton Lectures*, note 93, p. 550–560; and Dorner's *Person of Christ* [Clarke], i, 22–41. (See also the able articles of professors H. B. Smith and Moses Stuart, in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, vi, 156–185, and vii, 696–732.) An interesting review of Philo's writings and their relation to Judaism, from the Jewish point of view, occurs in Jost's *Geschichte des Judenthums*, i, 379–393 (the chapter is designated *Die Gnosis in Judenthume*); Grätz, *Gesch. der. Juden*, iii, 298 sq.; Schultz, *Die jüdische Religionsphilosophie* in Gelzer's *Prot. Monatsblatt*, vol. xxiv, No. 4 (Oct. 1864); Clemens, *Die Therapeuten* (Königsb. 1809); Georgius, *Ueber die neuesten Gegensätze in Auffassung der Alexandrin. Religionsphilosophie* in Illgen's *Zeitschr. f. hist. Theol.* (1839), Nos. 3 and 4; Keferstein, *Philo's Lehre v. d. Mittelwesen* (Leips. 1846); Wolff, *Die Philonische Philosophie* (ibid. 1849; 2d ed. Gothenb. 1858); Frankel, *Zur Ethik des Philo*, in *Monatschrift f. Gesch. u. Wissensch. d. Judenthums*, July, 1867; Delaney, *Philon d'Alexandrie* (Paris, 1867).

We ought not to close this article without noticing the old opinion which made Philo the author of the beautiful *Book of Wisdom* in the Apocrypha. This opinion, which was at one time very prevalent, has not stood its ground before recent critical examination. For the literature of the question we can only refer our readers to Prof. C. L. W. Grimm's *Das Buch der Weisheit*, Einleitung, sec. 6, where the authorities on both sides are given. Corn. à Lapide, in *Librum Sapientiæ*, also discusses Philo's claims to the distinguished honor which tradition had conferred on him, but decides against him [new edition by Vives. viii, 264].

Besides Mangey's edition of Philo, above referred to, we mention Turnebus's edition (Paris, 1552, fol.), emended by Hoeschelius (Colon. Allobrog. 1613; Paris, 1640; Francof. 1691); Pfeiffer's edition, incomplete (Erlangen, 1785–92, 5 vols. 8vo), and the convenient edition by Richter (Leips. 1828–30, 8 vols. 12mo). This last contains not only a reprint of Mangey, in the first six volumes, but two supplementary volumes of Philo's writings, discovered by Angelo Mai in a Florentine MS., and by Bapt. Aucher in an Armenian version, and translated by him into Latin. What an edition of Philo ought to be to deserve the approbation of the critical student has been pointed out by different German theologians, most recently by Creuzer, in *Theol. Studien u. Kritiken*, 1832, p. 1–43. A popular and cheap edition was published at Leipsic (1851–53); also *Philonea*, ed. Tischendorf (Leips. 1868). A fuller account of these editions, with a list of the various versions of Philo's writings, which have been made from time to time into Latin, Hebrew, German, French, Italian, Spanish, and English, is contained in Fürst's *Bibl. Jud.* Fürst adds a catalogue of all the leading works in which Philo and his writings have been treated. To his list of versions we must here add the useful one published by Mr. Bohn, in four vols. of his *Eccl. Library*, by Mr. Yonge.

For a complete, and withal succinct examination of

the entire field of Philo's opinions, we refer to Herzog's *Real-Encyklop.* xi, 578–603. Shorter and more accessible, but inevitably imperfect, notices occur in Smith's *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. and Mythol.* iii, 309 sq.; Schaff's *Apostolic Church* [Clarke], p. 211–214; Horne's *Introduction* [by Eyre], p. 277, 278; [by Davidson], p. 363–365; Davidson's *Hermeneutics* [Clarke, 1843], p. 63–65; Fairbairn's *Hermeneut. Man.* p. 47. A temperate review of Jowett's *Dissertation on Philo and St. Paul* may be found, written by Dr. J. B. Lightfoot, in the *Journal of Philology*, iii, 119–121; and for sound views respecting Philo's doctrine of the λόγος, as bearing upon the writings of the New Test., see Neander's *Planting of the Christian Church* [Bohn], ii, 13–15; Westcott's *Introduction*, p. 138–143, and Tholuck's *St. John* [Clarke], p. 62–67. The interest of Jews in the writings of their philosophic countryman is curiously exhibited in the Hebrew version of certain of them. These are enumerated by Fürst, *Bibl. Judaica*, ii, 90. As. de' Rossi, one of the translators, has revived Philo's synonym *Jedidiah*, by which he was anciently designated in Rabbinical literature (see Bartolocci, *ut sup.*, and Steinschneider's *Bodl. Catal.* s. v. Philon).

Philo Carpathius (from Carpathus, an island north-east of Crete), or, rather, Carpasius (from Carpasia, a town in the north of Cyprus), an Eastern ecclesiastic, flourished about the opening of the 5th century. His birthplace is unknown, but he derived this cognomen from his having been ordained bishop of Carpasia by Epiphanius, the well-known bishop of Constantia. According to the statements of Joannes and Polybius, bishop of Rhinoscuri, in their life of Epiphanius (*Vita Epiphan.* ch. xlix), Philo, at that time a deacon, was sent, along with some others, by the sister of the emperors Arcadius and Honorius, to bring Epiphanius to Rome, that through his prayers and the laying on of hands she might be saved from a dangerous disease under which she was laboring. Pleased with Philo, Epiphanius not only ordained him bishop of Carpasia, but gave him charge of his own diocese during his absence. This was about the beginning of the 5th century (Cave, *Hist. Litt.* p. 240, ed. Genev.). Philo Carpasius is principally known from his commentary on the Canticles, which he treats allegorically. A Latin translation, or, rather, paraphrase of this commentary, with ill-assorted interpolations from the commentary of Gregorius I, by Salutatus, was published (Paris, 1537, and reprinted in the *Biblioth. Pat. Lugdun.* vol. v). Fragments of Philo's commentary are inserted in that on the Canticles, which is falsely ascribed to Eusebius, edited by Meursius (Lugd. Batav. 1617). In these he is simply named Philo, without the surname. Bandurius, a Benedictine monk, promised in 1705 a genuine edition, which he never fulfilled. An edition, however, was published from a Vatican MS. in 1750, under the name of Epiphanius, and edited by Fogginius. The most important edition, however, is that of Giacomellus (Rome, 1772), from two MSS. This has the original Greek, a Latin translation, with notes, and is accompanied by the entire Greek text of the Canticles, principally from the Alexandrian recension. This is reprinted in Galland, *N. Bibl. PP.* ix, 713: Ernesti (*Neueste Theolog. Bibl.* vol. iii, pt. vi), in a review of this edition, of which he thinks highly, is of opinion that the commentary, as we now have it, is but an abridgment of the original. Besides this commentary, Philo wrote on various parts both of the Old and New Test., fragments of which are contained in the various *Catenæ*. See Suidas, s. v.; Cave, *l. c.*; Fabricius, *Bibl. Græc.* vii, 398, 611; viii, 645; x, 479; Smith, *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog.* s. v.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, s. v.

Philo the Dialectician. See Philo the Megarian.

Philo of Larissa, an academic philosopher of Athens, flourished in the century preceding the Christian æra. He quitted the Greek capital on the success of the army of Mithridates, and went to Rome, where he had Cicero for a disciple. He gained renown by his services to philosophic science. He furnished a more complete and systematic division of the different branches of philosophy, and was more methodic in his terms. He is also often spoken of as the founder of the third academy. See Tennemann, *Manual of Hist. of Philosophy*; Ueberweg, *Hist. of Philosophy* (see Index in vol. ii).

Philo the Megarian, or Dialectician, was a disciple of Diodorus Cronus, and a friend of Zeno, though older than the latter, if the reading in Diogenes Laertius (vii, 16) is correct. In his *Menexenus* he mentioned the five daughters of his teacher (Clem. Alex. *Strom.* iv, 528, ed. Potter), and disputed with him respecting the idea of the possible, and the criteria of the truth of hypothetical propositions. With reference to the first point, Philo approximated to Aristotle, as he recognised that not only what is, or will be, is possible (as Diodorus maintained), but also what is in itself conformable to the particular purpose of the object in question, as of chaff to burn (κατὰ ψιλὴν λεγόμενον ἐπιτηδειότητα; Alex. Aphrod. *Nat. Qual.* i, 14; comp. on the whole question Harris, in Upton's *Arriani Dissertat. Epict.* ii, 19, ap. Schweighäuser, ii, 515, etc.). Diodorus had allowed the validity of hypothetical propositions only when the antecedent clause could never lead to an untrue conclusion, whereas Philo regarded those only as false which with a correct antecedent had an incorrect conclusion (Sext. Empir. *Adv. Math.* viii, 113, etc.; *Hypotyp.* ii, 110; comp. Cicero, *Acad.* ii, 47; *De Fato*, 6). Both accordingly had sought for criteria for correct sequence in the members of hypothetical propositions, and each of them in a manner corresponding to what he maintained respecting the idea of the possible. Chrysippus attacked the assumption of each of them.

The Philo who is spoken of as an Athenian and a disciple of Pyrrhon, though ridiculed by Timon as a sophist, can hardly be different from Philo the dialectician (Diog. Laert. ix, 67, 69). Jerome (*Jov.* 1) speaks of Philo the dialectician and the author of the *Menexenus* as the instructor of Carneades, in contradiction to chronology, perhaps in order to indicate the sceptical direction of his doctrines.

Philo the Monk. An ascetic treatise, bearing the name of Philo Monachus, whom Cave (*Hist. Litt.* p. 176) deems to be much later than the other ecclesiastical writers of the same name, is preserved in the library of Vienna (*Cod. Theol.* 325, No. 15). It is entitled *Contra Pulchritudinem Feminarum.*

Philo the Pythagorean. Clemens Alexandrinus (*Strom.* i, 305) and Sozomen (i, 12) mention Philo ὁ Πυθαγόρειος. It is probable from their language that they both mean by the person so designated Philo Judæus. Jonsius (*ibid.* iii, c. iv, p. 17) is strongly of opinion that Philo the elder and this Philo mentioned by Clemens are the same. Fabricius, who once held this opinion, was led to change his views (*Bibl.* i, 862), and tacitly assumes (iv, 738) that Sozomen indicates Philo Judæus by this epithet.

Philo the Rhetorician and Philosopher. Cave, Giacomellus, and Ernesti are of opinion that this is no other than Philo Carpathius (q. v.). His æra agrees with this, for the philosopher is quoted by Athanasius Sinaita, who flourished about A.D. 561. We need not be startled at the term *philosopher* as applied to an ecclesiastic. This was not uncommon. Michael Psellus was termed the prince of philosophers, and Nicetas was surnamed, in the same way as Philo, ῥήτωρ καὶ φιλόσοφος. Besides, Polybius, in the life of Epiphanius, expressly calls Philo of Carpathia κληρικὸν ἀπὸ ῥητόρων, which Tillemont and others erroneously understand to mean a man who has changed from the profession of the law to that of the Church. Cave shows that the ῥήτωρ held

an office in the Church itself, somewhat analogous to our professorship of ecclesiastical history. Our only knowledge of Philo, under this name, whether it be Philo Carpathius or not, is from an inedited work of Anastasius Sinaita, preserved in the library of Vienna and the Bodleian. Glycas (*Annal.* p. 283, etc.), it is true, quotes as if from Philo, but he has only borrowed *verbatim*, and without acknowledgment, from Anastasius. The work of Anastasius referred to is entitled by Cave *Demonstratio Historica de Magna et Angelica summi Sacerdotis Dignitate.* Philo's work therein quoted is styled a Church history, but, if we may judge from the only specimen of it we have, we need hardly regret its loss. It consists of a tale regarding a monk, that, being excommunicated by his bishop, and having afterwards suffered martyrdom, he was brought in his coffin to the church, but could not rest till the bishop, warned in a dream, had formally absolved him. See Cave, *Hist. Litt.* p. 176 (ed. Geneva, 1720); Fabricius, *Bibl. Græc.* vii, 420.

Philo Senior. Josephus (*Apion*, i, 23), when enumerating the heathen writers who had treated of Jewish history, mentions together Demetrius Phalereus, *Philo*, and Eupolemon. Philo he calls *the elder* (ὁ πρεσβύτερος), probably to distinguish him from Philo Judæus, and he cannot mean Herennius Philo, who lived after his time. Clemens Alexandrinus (*Stromat.* i, 146) also couples together the names of Philo the elder and Demetrius, stating that their lists of Jewish kings differed. Hence Vossius thinks that both authors refer to the same person (*De Hist. Græc.* p. 486, ed. Westermann). In this Jonsius agrees with him, while he notices the error of Josephus, in giving Demetrius the surname of Phalereus (*De Script. Hist. Phil.* iii, 4, p. 17). As Huetius (*Demonstrat. Evangel.* p. 62) was of opinion that the apocryphal Book of Wisdom was written by this Philo, he was necessitated to consider him as a Hellenistic Jew, who, unskilled in the original Hebrew, had it translated, and then expanded it, in language peculiar to his class (*ibid.* p. 62, 246, etc.). Fabricius thinks that the Philo mentioned by Josephus may have been a Gentile, and that a Philo different from either Philo Judæus or senior was the author of the Book of Wisdom. Eusebius (*Præp. Evangel.* ix, 20, 24) quotes fifteen obscure hexameters from Philo, without giving hint of who he is, and merely citing them as from Alexander Polyhistor. These evidently form part of a history of the Jews in verse, and were written either by a Jew, in the character of a heathen, as Fabricius hints is possible, or by a heathen acquainted with the Jewish Scriptures. This is, in all probability, the work referred to by Josephus and Clemens Alexandrinus. Of course the author must have lived before the time of Alexander Polyhistor, who came to Rome B.C. 83. It is doubtful whether he is the same as the geographer of the same name.

Philo of Tarsus, a deacon. He was a companion of Ignatius of Antioch, and accompanied the martyr from the East to Rome, A.D. 107. He is twice mentioned in the epistles of Ignatius (*Ad Philadelph.* c. xi; *Ad Smyrnæos*, c. xiii). He is supposed to have written, along with Rheus Agathopus, the *Martyrium Ignatii*, for which see Ignatius. See Cave, *Hist. Litt.* p. 28 (ed. Geneva, 1720).

Philolaus, a Pythagorean philosopher, was born at Crotona, or Tarentum, towards the close of the 5th century B.C. Aresas, a probable disciple of Pythagoras, was his master; so that we receive the Pythagorean doctrine from Philolaus, only as it appeared to the third generation, and an account of it is therefore more properly in place in a general examination of the philosophy of Pythagoras (q. v.). It has been repeated once and again that Philolaus divined the true theory of the universe, and was the virtual predecessor of Copernicus. Nothing can be more false. In his scheme indeed, not the earth, but *fire*, is placed in the centre of the universe; that fire, however, is not the *sun*, which, on the contrary, he makes revolve around the central πῦρ. The scheme, in so far as it can be understood, is altogether fantastic, based on no observation or comparison of phenomena, but on vague and now unintelligible metaphysical considerations. The only predecessor of Copernicus in antiquity was Aristarchus of Samos, whose remarkable conjectures appeared first in the editio princeps of Archimedes—published after Copernicus wrote. Of Philolaus's three works, written in the Doric dialect, only fragments now remain. See Böckh, *Leben, nebst den Bruchstücken seiner Werke* (Berl. 1819); Smith, *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. and Mythol.* s. v.; Ueberweg, *Hist. of Philos.* (see Index in vol. ii); Butler, *Hist. of Ancient Philos.* vol ii. (J. H. W.)

Philol'ogus (φιλόλογος, *fond of talk*), one of the Christians at Rome to whom Paul sent his salutations (Rom. xvi, 15). A.D. 55. Origen conjectures that he was the head of a Christian household which included the other persons named with him. Dorotheus makes him one of the seventy disciples, and alleges that he was placed by the apostle Andrew as bishop of Sinope, in Pontus (see Epiphanius, *Mon.* p. 68, ed. Dressel). Pseudo-Hippolytus (*De LXX Apostolis*) substantially repeats the same improbable tradition. His name is found in the Columbarium "of the freedmen of Livia Augusta" at Rome; which shows that there was a Philologus connected with the imperial household at the time when it included many Julias. The name Philologus was a common one at Rome (Lewin, *Life and Epistles of St. Paul*, ii, 71).

Philology, Comparative. The importance which this subject has assumed in modern science as a key to the history of national origin justifies its admission and brief discussion here, with special reference to the two Biblical tongues.

The ethnographical table contained in the tenth chapter of Genesis has derived no little corroboration and illustration from the researches of modern philology. It has thus been clearly established that all the languages which have furnished a polished literature are reducible to two great families, corresponding, with a few sporadic variations, to the lineage of the two older sons of Noah respectively, namely, Shem and Japheth. The former of these, which is in fact usually designated as the *Shemitic*, is emphatically Oriental, and embraces the Hebrew and Arabic, with their cognates, the Samaritan, the eastern and western Aramæan, or Chaldee and Syriac, and the Ethiopic. The latter, which is conveniently styled the *Indo-Germanic* group, includes the Sanscrit, with its sister the Zend, and their offshoots, the Greek, the Latin, the Gallic, the Saxon—in a word, the stock of the Occidental or European languages. The analogies and coincidences subsisting between the members of the Shemitic family have been pretty fully exhibited by Castell, Gesenius, and Fürst in their lexicons, and by Ewald and Nordheimer in their grammars; while the relationship existing among the Indo-Germanic group has been extensively traced by Bopp in his *Comparative Grammar*, by Pott in his *Etymologische Forschungen*, and by Benfey in his *Wurzel-Lexicon*. Other philologists, among whom De Sacy, Bournouf, Max Müller, and Rénan may be especially mentioned, have somewhat extended the range of these comparisons, and occasional resemblances have been pointed out in particular forms between the Shemitic and Indo-Germanic branches; but no systematic collation of these latter coincidences, so far as we are aware, has been instituted, unless we accept such fanciful attempts as those of Parkhurst, who derives most of the Greek primitives from Hebrew roots! Yet notwithstanding the confusion at Babel and many a later linguistic misadventure, the common Noachian parentage ought to be capable of vindication by some distinct traces, at least of analogy if not of identity, in early forms of

speech existing among both these great branches of the human family as represented by their written records. We propose in this article briefly to exhibit a few of these resemblances which have presented themselves in our own investigations as arguing a common origin, although a remote one, between the Shemitic and the Indo-Germanic tongues; the most of them are certainly too striking to have been accidental. Lest we should venture beyond our own or our readers' depth, and make our pages bristle with an unnecessary display of foreign characters, we shall confine our illustrations to the Hebrew, on the one hand, and to the Greek, Latin, French, German, and English, on the other, as sufficient representatives of the two lingual families which we are comparing.

I. *Identity of Roots.*—The following is a table, compiled from notes made in the course of our own reading, of such Hebrew roots as recur among the European dialects so strikingly similar in form and significance as to leave little doubt in most cases of their original identity. We have carefully excluded all those that betray evidences of later or artificial introduction from one language to the other, such as commercial, mechanical, or scientific terms, mere technicals, obvious onomatopoetics, names of animals, plants, minerals, official titles, etc., and we have selected words representing families as far divergent as possible, rather than those exhibiting the most striking resemblance. It will be interesting to observe how a root has sometimes slipped out of one or more of the cognate dialects, in the line of descent, and reappears in another representative; a few only are found in all the columns. In some of them again the signification or form has become disguised in one or another of the affiliated languages, but becomes clear again in a later representative. We have restored the digamma wherever it was necessary in order to bring out the relationship in the Greek roots. Those marked with an asterisk are Chaldee. A few out of their proper column are included in brackets.

HEBREW.	GREEK.	LATIN.	FRENCH.	GERMAN.	ENGLISH.
אָב	*father*	avus	....	....	....
אָבָה	*to desire* ? αὔω	aveo	....	....	....
אָבַל	*to mourn*	balo	piailler	[bawl]	wail
אָבַק	*to pound*	....	bouc	Bängel	beak
אָגַר	*to gather* ἀγείρω	....	....	....	....
אוֹל	*to roll* Fέλλω	volvo	....	walzen	wheel
אַיִן	*naught* νή	non	ne	nein	no, un-
אַל	*this*	ille	il	er	....
אָנֹכִי	*I* ἔγω	ego	je	ich	I
אָנַק	*to squeeze* ἄγχι	ango	angoisse	enge	anger
אָנַשׁ	*to ail* νόσος	....	....	....	....
אָצַר	*to lay up*	....	....	....	store
אָרַח	*to travel* ἔρχομαι	....	....	....	....
אֶרֶץ	*the earth*	....	....	Erde	earth
אָרַר	*to curse* ἀράομαι	? ara	....	....	....
אָתָא	*to come*	ad	à	....	at
אַתָּה	*thou* σύ	tu	tu	du	thou
בְּ	*in*	....	....	bei	by
בָּאַר	*to dig* πείρω	foro	perçer	bohren	bore
בָּאַשׁ	*to stink*	....	....	? böse	....
בּוֹא	*to go* βαίνω	vado	venir	waten	wend
בּוּס	*to tread* πάτος	pes	patte	Pfad	path
בּוֹשׁ	*to be ashamed*	pudeo	....	....	bash

HEBREW.	GREEK.	LATIN.	FRENCH.	GERMAN.	ENGLISH.
בָּטַח	*to trust* πείθω	fides	foi	....	faith
בָּמָה	*a mound* βουνός	mons	mont	Bühne	mount
בָּעַר	*to consume* βορά	voro	....	....	browse
בָּקַק	*to empty*	bacuo	....	....	puke
בַּר	*corn* πυρός	far	....	....	bar-ley
בָּרָא	*to create*	paro	parer	....	pare
בָּרַח	*to bolt*	....	barre	....	bar
בָּרַךְ	*to bless*	precor	prier	fragen	pray
בָּרַר	*to cleanse*	purus	pur	....	pure
גַּב	*the back* κυφός	cumbo	gibbeux	Giebel	gaff
גָּבִיעַ	*a cup* κεφαλή	caput	chapeau	Haupt	goblet
גָּדַד	*to hew* σχίζω	cædo	couteau	schneiden	cut
גְּדִי	*a kid*	hædus	....	....	kid
גָּדַר	*to enclose* χόρτος	portus	cour	Gitter	yard
גּוֹרָל	*a lot* ? κλῆρος	? glarea	....	....	? gravel
גִּיד	*to tie*	catena	....	gatten	....
גָּלַח	*to be smooth* χαλκός	gelu	[gleich]	kahl	callow
גָּלַם	*to fold*	glomus	....	....	ag-glom-erate
*גָּלַת	*to sculpture* γλύφω	sculpo	....	....	scalp
גַּם	*also* κοινός	cum	....	....	....
גָּעַר	*to low* γοάω	ceva	....	Kuh	cow
גָּרָב	*a scab*	....	scorbut	Schorf	scurvy
גָּרַד	*to scrape* χαράττω	rado	gratter	kratzen	grate
גָּרוֹן	*the throat* γαργαρίζω	guttur	goulet	Gurgel	gulp
גָּרַס	*to crush*	....	écraser	Gries	groats
גָּרַע	*to shave* κείρω	? careo	....	scheeren	score
גָּרַם	*to pluck* ἁρπάζω ? Fερέπτομαι	carpo rapio	gripper ? crever	Griff raffen	crop rob
גָּרַר	*to sweep* σαίρω	sarrio	écurer	scheuern	scour
דָּאַב / דָּאַג	*to melt* τήκω	tabeo	....	....	....
דָּמַם	*to be silent* δαμάω	domo	dompter	dumm	dumb
דָּקַק	*to crush* δάκνω	....	....	....	....
דָּקַר	*to stab*	....	dague	? Deich	? dig
דָּרַךְ	*to tread* τρέχω	....	....	treten	thresh
הַ־	*the* ὁ	hic	....	....	he
הוּא	*he*	is	....	je-	it
הָיָה	*to be*	fio	fut	werden	was
הֵן	*lo!* ἦν	en	....	....	....
וְ־	*and* καί τε	ve que	ou et	und	and ? too
זָבַח	*to slay* ? φάζω	....	....	....	....
זֶה	*this* τό	(is) te	....	der	the
זוּד	*to boil* ζέω	....	....	sieden	seethe
זוּעַ	*to quake* σείω	....	....	....	? shake
זָלַל	*to swing* σάλος	? salix	? saillir	....	? sally
זָנַח	*to stink* ταγγός	....	....	....	tang
זָעַם	*to foam*	....	écume	Schaum	skim
זָקַק	*to filter* σάκκος	sagum	sac	seihen	sack
זָרָה	*to strew* σπείρω	sero	a-sperger	streuen	sow

HEBREW.	GREEK.	LATIN.	FRENCH.	GERMAN.	ENGLISH.
חָבַט	*to beat* πατάσσω	batuo	battre	[abate]	pat
חָבַל	*to bind*	....	cable	Kabel	cable
חָבַר	*to join* ? παρά	par	pair	Paar	peer
חוּל	*to twist* κυλίω	....	? cueillir	....	? coil
חוּשׁ	*to hasten*	....	hâte	hetzen	haste
חָזָה	*to look* ? ἀγάζομαι	....	....	....	gaze
חָזַק	*to seize* Ἰσχύς	vis	....	....	vigor
חָיָה	*to live* ζάω	? vivo	....	....	? save
חָלַב	*fat* ἀλείφω	lippus	glisser	schlüpfen	glib
חָלַל	*to pierce* χαλάω	cœlum	? creux	hohl	hole
חָלַץ	*to pull* λύω	laxus	[lose]	los	loose
חָלַק	*to smooth* γλυκύς	glaber	glace	gläuzen	sleek
חָם	*father-in-law* γάμος	geminus	....	....	? groom
חָמַל	*to spare* ἁμαλός	? mel	a-mollir	mild	mellow
חָנַק	*to throttle* πνίγω	....	....	....	....
חָסַס	*to peel* σκάπτω	scabo	....	schaben	scrape
חָסַף	*to hew* ? ὀξύς	? acies	hacher	hacken	hash
חָקַר	*to search* [בָּקַר]	quæro	ac-quérir	[question]	query
חָרַב	*to waste* κάρφω	....	....	....	....
חָרַד	*to tremble* κραδάω	....	....	....	cradle
חָרַק	*to quash* κριζω	....	....	....	creak
חָרַר	*to glow*	areo	été	Herd	ardent
חָרַשׁ	*to carve* γράφω	scribo	graver	graben	scratch
חָשַׁת	*to be silent*	[hist !]	....	husch	hush
טָבַל	*to plunge* / *to sink* δύπτω	[dive]	[dabble]	taufen	dip
טוּר	*to encircle* τιάρα	[עָטַר]	tour	[turn]	tier
טוּשׁ	*to pounce*	tundo	....	Stoss	toss
טָפַף	*to trip* στείβω	stipes	étamper	tappen	step
טָרַד	*to drive*	trudo	....	....	thrust
טָרַף	*to rend* ῥήπτω	....	....	streifen	strip
יָאַל	*to please* βούλομαι	volo	vouloir	wollen	will
יָבַב	*to cry* βοάω	bos	....	....	....
יָבַל	*to flow*	....	....	wallen	well
יָדַע	*to know* Ϝοἶδα	video	voir	weissen	wit
יָהַב	*to give* ? ἔἆω	....	....	geben	if
יַיִן	*wine* Ϝοῖνος	vinum	vin	Wein	vine
יָכֹל	*to be able*	? calleo	....	....	could
יָלַד	*to bring forth*	[? lewd]	....	Leute	lad
יָלַךְ	*to go*	....	....	....	walk
יָלַל	*to wail* ὐλάω	ululo	hurler	heulen	yell
יָסַד	*to found* Ϝέζομαι	sedeo	as-seoir	setzen	sit
יָרַשׁ	*to possess*	heres	hériter	? Herr	heir
יָצָא	*to go forth*	....	issue	....	? ooze
יֵשׁ	*there is* ἐστί	est	est	ist	is
כַּד	*a bucket* κάδος	cadus	....	....	? caddy
כִּי	*a brand* καίω	? siccus	? sèche	....	....
כִּי	*because* Ϝός	qui	que	wie	how
כֹּל	*all* Ϝόλος	ullus	seul	alle	whole

HEBREW.	GREEK.	LATIN.	FRENCH.	GERMAN.	ENGLISH.
כָּמַהּ	*to long* κάμνω	....	....	....	....
כָּן	*a gnat* κνάω	cinifes	? canif	kneipen	nip
כָּנַע	*to bend* γόνυ / γωνία	genu cuneus	genou coin	Knie knicken	knee coign
כָּפַל	*to double* [fold]	? copula	couple	Koppel	couple
כָּפַף	*to bow* κάμπτω	cavus	caverne	kippen	cup
כָּפַר	*to hide*	....	? couvrir	....	? cover
כָּרָה	*to dig*	....	carrer	..	quarry
*כָּרַז	*to proclaim* κράζω	crocio	....	kreischen	shriek
כָּרַר	*to leap* σκαίρω	curro	char	karren	carry
כָּתַת	*to beat* ? κυδοιμός	cudo	....	....	....
לָהָה	*to faint*	laxus	languir	....	lag
לוּחַ	*a tablet* λευκός	lux	....	leuchten	light
לוּט	*to muffle* λανθάνω	lateo	[? claudo]	....	lid
לוּץ	*to deride*	ludo	é-luder	....	il-lusion
לָעַג	*to mock* γελάω	....	....	lachen	laugh
לָעַט	*to devour*	glutio	glouton	....	glut
לַפִּיד	*a flame* λάμπω	lampas	lampe	....	lamp
לָקַק	*to lap* λείχω	ligurio	langue	lecken	lick
לָשׁוֹן	*the tongue* ? γλῶσσα	....	....	....	....
מֵאָה	*a hundred* ? μέγας	? magnus	....	? Menge	? much
מָדַד	*to measure* μέτρον	meta	mesure	messen	mete
מוּג	*to melt* ὀμίχω	mingo	[? muck]	[? mucus]	? meek
מוּט	*to waver* [mutiny]	moveo	mouvoir	[muto]	mow
מוּק	*to jeer* μῶκος	....	moquer	....	mock
מוּת	*to die* μορτός	mors	mort	Mord	murder
מָחָא	*to clap* μάχομαι	macto	....	....	smack
מָחָה	*to wipe* ἀπο-μύσσω	e-mungo	....	....	....
מִי	*who ?* τίς ;	quis ?	qui ?	wer ?	why ?
מָלֵא	*to fill* μάλα / πλοῖον	multus plus	mille plouvoir	viel voll	mile flow
מָלַל	*to talk* λαλάω	lallo	[loll]	lallen	lull
מָלַץ	*to be smooth* μαλακός	mulceo	? mêler	Milch	melt
מָנָה	*to allot* νέμω	numerus	....	....	....
מָסַךְ	*to mix* μίγνυμι	misceo	mixer	mischen	mingle
מָצָא	*to find* μετά	[*מָטָא]	....	mit	meet
מָצַץ	*to suck* μύζω	musso	....	....	mutter
מָקַק	*to melt* ? μικρός	maceo	maigre	mager	meagre
מָרַר	*to be bitter* [mœro]	amarus	morne	mürrisch	mourn
מָשַׁל	*to rule* βασιλεύς	....	....	....	....
מָשַׁשׁ	*to touch* μάσσω	....	....	....	....
נָבַל	*to wilt* φαῦλος	....	....	faul	foul
נָהַג	*to lead* ἡγέομαι	ago	agir	....	act
נוּד	*to wander*	nuto	....	....	nod
נוּחַ	*to rest* ναιω	....	....	....	....
נוּעַ	*to reel* νεύω	....	....	nicken	....
נָטַל	*to raise* τέλλω	tuli	tolerer	[סָלַל]	tall
נָטַר	*to keep* τηρέω	tueri	....	....	....
נָכָה	*to smite*	neco	nuire	....	an-noy
נַעַר	*a lad* ἀνήρ	....	....	....	....

HEBREW.	GREEK.	LATIN.	FRENCH.	GERMAN.	ENGLISH.
נָפַל	*to fall* σφάλλω	fallo	falloir	fallen	fail
נָקַהּ	*to fell* κόπτω	[chop]	couper	....	cuff
נָתַן	*to give* δίδωμι	donum	donner	....	en-dow
נָתַר	*to palpitate* τρέω	terreo	trembler	....	tremble
*סָכָה	*to view*	? sequor	....	? suchen	sight
סֶלַע	*a rock*	silex	....	....	....
עָבַר	*to pass* ὑπέρ	super	....	über	over
עָגַב	*to love* ἀγαπάω	....	....	....	....
עָוֶל	*evil*	....	....	übel	? ill
עָלָה	*to ascend* ? ἄλλομαι	? alo	? ad-oles-cence	....	ad-ult
עָלַהּ	*to cover* καλύπτω	clepo	....	....	....
עִם	*with* ἅμα	simul	en-semble	sammt { same ? seem	
עָמַל	*to toil* μῶλος	moles	....	....	moil
עָנָק	*a collar*	....	....	Nacken	neck
עָרַךְ	*to arrange*	rectus	rang	Reihe	row
עֹרֶף	*the back* ? ἐρέφω	....	....	....	? roof
עָרַף, רָעַף	*to distil*	[נָטַר]	....	triefen, tropfen	drip, drop
עָשַׁן	*to smoke* ἀτμός	....	....	Athem	....
פָּאַר	*to be beautiful*	....	....	....	? fair
פָּגַע	*to strike* πήγνυμι	figo	[pack]	pochen	peck
פָּגַר	*to faint*	piger	....	....	....
פֶּדֶר	*fat* πατήρ	vitricus	paître	Futter	feed
פּוּג	*to be torpid*	....	....	....	fag
פּוּחַ	*to blow*	? bufo	? bouffer	? puffen	? puff
פּוּךְ	*to waver* [fickle]	vagus	vaciller	schwanken	wag
פּוֹל	*a bean*	? bulla	[? pulse]	....	? boll
פּוֹר	*a lot* φᾶρος	....	....	....	pall
פִּרְיָה	*fat* πίων	pinguis	....	....	....
פַּר	*bullock* πόρτις	porto	....	Farre	....
פָּרַד	*to scatter*	pars	part	[brittle]	party
פָּרָה	*to bear* φέρω βαρύς	fero pario	fertile fruit	fahren Börde	burden born
פָּרַהּ	*to break* Ϝρήγνυμι	frico	? froisser	brechen	wreck
פָּרַץ	*to rend*	....	....	....	? burst
פָּרַק	*to tear off* [fringe]	[fray]	franchir	frank	free
פָּתָה	*to persuade* πείθω	fides	foi	[? בָּטַח]	faith
פָּתַח	*to open* πετάννυμι	pateo	é-pandre	? spreiten	? span
צָחַק	*to laugh* καχιζω	cachin-nor	....	gackeln	giggle
צָעַד	*to step*	scando	....	....	? climb
צָפָה	*to watch* σκέπτομαι	specio	[שָׁקַף]	spähen	spy
קוֹל	*the voice* καλέω	calo	....	....	call
קָטַל	*to kill* κτείνω	[kill]	....	quälen	quell
קָטָן	*little* στενός	tendo	[תָּן]	dünn	thin
קַל	*light* κέλης	celer	ac-célérer	....	ex-cel
קָנָה	*to get*	....	gagner	....	gain
קַר	*cold* κρύος	cruor	ichor	gähren	gore
קָרָא	*to call* γηρύω	? garrio	crier	krähen	cry
קָרָה	*to meet* κυρέω	....	....	....	....
קֶרֶן	*a horn* κέρας	cornu	corne	Horn	corner

HEBREW.	GREEK.	LATIN.	FRENCH.	GERMAN.	ENGLISH.
רָאָה	*to see* Ϝοράω	verus	garder	wehren	wary
רָגַז	*to be angry* ὀργή	rego	rage	recken	reach
רָדַם	*to snore* δαρθάνω	dormio	dormir	träumen	dream
רוּחַ	*to shake* ? τρίβω	....	....	reiben	rub
רוּק	*to empty* ἐρευγομαι	....	....	....	....
רִיב	*to contend*	? rivalis	[strive]	streben	? raffle
רָמָה	*to hurl*	ramus	....	....	ram
רָנַן	*to shout*	....	....	....	rant
רָפָא	*to mend* ῥάπτω	[reeve]	....	Reef	raft
שָׂאַב	*to bale*	....	? écope	? schöpfen	scoop
שָׁאַל	*to ask*	con-sulo	conseil	....	counsel
שָׁאַף	*to pant* [snap]	....	....	schnauben	snuff
שְׂאֹר	*leaven*	....	....	sauer	sour
שֵׁבֶט	*a rod* σκῆπτρον	scipio	....	Schaft	shaft
שֶׁבַע	*seven* Ϝεπτά	septem	sept	sieben	seven
שָׁבַר	*to break*	....	....	? Schiefer	? shiver
שַׁד	*the breast* τίτθη	....	téton	Zitzen	teat
שׁוֹר	*an ox* ταῦρος	taurus	....	Stier	steer
שְׁחֶלֶת	*onycha* σκύλλω	[skull]	écaille	Schale	shell
שִׂים	*to put* ? τίθημι	? pono	....	? thun	? do
שָׁרַת	*to place* ἵστημι	sto	....	stehen	stand
שָׁקָה	*to drink* [succus]	sugo	such	saugen	soak
שָׂכַל	*to be wise*	....	....	....	? skill
שָׁלַל	*to strip* συλάω	vello	spolier	Fell	peel
שָׁם	*there* τῆμος	tum	....	dann	then
שֵׁם	*a name* ? σῆμα	....	....	....	....
שָׁמַט	*to cast*	mitto	mettre	schmeis-sen	smite
שֶׁמֶשׁ	*the sun* Ϝήλιος	sol	soleil	Sonne	summer
שֵׁן	*a tooth* ὀδούς	dens	dent	Zahn	dent
שָׂעַר	*to shiver* χήρ	hirsutus	[hair]	Schauer	shaggy
שַׁעַר	*a gate* θύρα	....	....	Thür	door
שָׂפָה	*the lip* [sip]	sapor	ab-sorber	schlappen	lap
שָׁפַט	*to judge*	....	....	Schöppe	....
שֵׁשׁ	*six* Ϝέξ	sex	six	sechs	six
תָּלָה	*to hang* τλάω	tollo	....	[הָוַל*]	[See נָשָׂא]
תַּנִּין	*a dragon* τείνω	tenuis	tenir	dehnen	tender
תָּפֵל	*insipid*	....	....	....	? fool
תָּפַח	*to beat* τύπτω	tympa-num	taper	zapfen	tabor
*תָּרַע	*to rend* τείρω	tero	....	zehren	tear

This list is sufficiently copious, after deducting those which further researches may show to be merely fortuitous, to prove a more than accidental agreement in words of frequent use. Many of the roots are evidently related to each other, and most of them are found in several kindred forms. Among these the selection has here been made not so much for the purpose of exhibiting the most palpable similarity, as to include the greatest variety of distinct etymons in each line of descent. We have not room to express the numerous cognates and derivatives of each, to trace the connection of their meanings with the common or generic import, nor to note the various orthographical changes that they have undergone. If the reader will take the trouble to investigate these points at his leisure, as he may readily do

with the help of good lexicons of the respective languages, he will soon satisfy himself how widely these radices have ramified and how intimately they are connected. A comparison with their Arabic and Sanscrit parallels would still further verify the foregoing results.

II. *Monosyllabic Roots.*—It is well settled that the so-called *weak radicals* in Hebrew verbs, technically denominated Pe-Aleph, Pe-Nun, Pe-Yod, Lamed-He, etc., which drop away in the course of inflection, were not in reality originally triliteral at all, but that these letters were only *added* in those forms in which they appear for the sake of uniformity with regular verbs. But these constitute in the aggregate a very large part, we apprehend a decided majority, of all the verbs most frequently employed in the language. Besides these, there is another very large class of roots of kindred or analogous signification with each other, and having two radicals in common. All these, as Gesenius has ingeniously shown in his *Lexicon*, are likewise to be regarded as essentially identical, the idea clinging in the two letters possessed by them in common. Thus we have reduced nearly the other moiety of Hebrew verbs, and these it must be remembered are the ground or stock of the entire vocabulary, to biliterals. The presumption is not an unwarrantable one that *all* the roots might etymologically be similarly retrenched. The few quadriliterals that occur are unceremoniously treated in this manner, being regarded as formed from ordinary roots by reduplication or interpolation.

Now it is a remarkable coincidence that the ultimate theme of the primitive Greek verb has been ascertained, in like manner, by modern philologists to be a monosyllable, consisting of two consonants vocalized, in precise conformity with the Hebrew system of vowel points, by a single mutable vowel. Thus the basis of such protracted forms even as λανθάνω, μανθάνω, διδάσχω, becomes λαθ, μαθ, δαχ. Indeed, Noah Webster has applied the same principle to all the roots of English words; and in his *Dictionary* (we speak of the quarto edition, originally published at New Haven in two volumes) he has indicated them as "class Dg, No. 28," etc., although he seems never to have published the key or list of this classification.

III. *Primitive Tenses.*—In nothing perhaps does the disparity between the Greek and the Hebrew verb strike the student at first more obviously than the multiplicity and variety of tense-forms in the former, compared with the meagre and vague array of tenses in the latter. A little further examination, however, shows that by means of the various so-called *conjugations* (Niphal, Hiphil, etc.) the Hebrews managed to extend their paradigm to pretty considerable dimensions. Here the Heb. Piel and other dageshed conjugations evidently correspond with the *reduplication* of the Greek perfect and pluperfect tenses, while the prefixed syllable of Hiphil, etc., affords a clew to the device of the simple *augment* in Greek. These, however, are comparatively unimportant, although interesting analogies.

The root of the Hebrew verb is found in its least disguised form in the *præter Kal.* The future is but a modification of this, as is especially evident from the facility with which it resumes the preterit import with "vav conversive." The past is naturally the first and most frequent tense in use, because it is historical. In all these respects the præter answers to the Greek *second aorist.* The augment of this tense was a secondary or subsequent invention, and, accordingly, Homer habitually disregards it. The "Attic reduplication" (for example, ἤγαγον) had a still later origin. The second aorist gives the root in its simplest if not purest form. It is further remarkable that *none but primitive verbs have this tense, and no Greek verbs are primitive but those which exhibit a monosyllabic root* as found in the stem of the second aorist. We invite the attention of scholars especially to these last enunciated principles. They show that this tense was originally the ground-form of the verb.

No tense in Greek exhibits greater modifications of the root than the present. This argues that the tense itself was of comparatively late date. Accordingly the derivative verbs most usually have it, although defective in many other parts; and the variety of forms under which it appears occasions most of the so-called irregularities set down in tables of Greek verbs. Now the Hebrew has properly no present tense. Present time can only be expressed by means of the participle, with the substantive verb (regularly understood) like our "periphrastic present" ("I am doing," etc.). True to the analogy which we have indicated, the junior members of the Hebraistic family, especially the Chaldee and Syriac, have constructed a present tense out of the participle by annexing the inflective terminations appropriate to the different numbers and persons. This process illustrates the formation of

IV. *Verb Inflections.*—In Greek, as in Hebrew, the personal endings are obviously but fragments of the personal *pronouns*, appended to the verbal root or tense-stem. This is so generally recognised to be the fact with respect to both these languages that we need dwell upon it only for the purpose of explaining, by its means, some of the peculiarities of the Greek verbs in -μι. This termination, which reappears in the optative of other verbs, was doubtless the original and proper sign of the first person, rather than the ending in -ω. The former is the basis of the oblique cases of the pronoun of the first person, μέ, *me;* as the latter is the last, but non-radical, syllable of the nominative, ἐγώ, *I.* It is in keeping with this that the verbs in -μι are some of the oldest in the language, for example, the substantive verb, εἰμί. The passive terminal -μαι is doubtless but a modification of the same. Now the principle or fact to which we wish to call particular attention in this connection is this: *Every primitive "pure" verb in Greek is a verb in -μι.* By this rule the student may always know them, as there are no others, except the few factitious verbs in -υμι, and very rare exceptions like ῥέω, τίω, πίνω, which are attributable to disguises of the true root. Let it now be further noted, in confirmation of what we have stated above concerning the Greek primal tense, that *verbs in -μι have substantially the same inflection as the second aorist*, and *they have only those tenses with which these inflections are compatible.* Neither of these last-named principles, it is true, is carried out with exactness, for the aorists passive of other verbs seem to have usurped these active terminations; but we are persuaded they are in general the real clew to the defectiveness and peculiar inflection of the forms in -μι. We therefore look upon the verbs in question as interesting links in the descent from the older Hebrew type.

V. *Declensional Endings.*—In the absence of any real declensions whatever in the Hebrew, or any proper cases — unless the "construct state" be entitled to be regarded as a genitive—there is little ground of comparison with the copious series of modifications of the Greek noun and adjective. Yet Webster has noted the resemblance of the plural ים and Chaldee ין to the English ox*en* (archaic hous*en*, etc.). The ν "ephelcustic" has its analogue in the "paragogic" ן, and is strikingly generalized in the "nunnation" of the Arabic.

VI. *Vowel Changes.*—To the learner the Hebrew language seems very complicated in this respect: but the whole process of vocalization is wrought out under the following simple law: that "without the tone, a long vowel cannot stand in a closed syllable, nor a short vowel in an open syllable." From this results practically the alternative of *a long vowel or an additional consonant* (or dagesh forte) in every unaccented syllable. In the Greek the following fundamental principle prevails: that *a long vowel* (or diphthong) *indicates the omission of a consonant*, except where it represents two short vowels; and this latter is tantamount to the other, for there is one *letter* less. Thus the systems of sylla-

bication in both languages essentially coincide in this: that *length in the vowel is equivalent to another consonant.* We might take room to exemplify these rules, but the modern scholar will readily see their truth. In none of the later cognate languages is this principle regarded with much uniformity, although from the nature of the vocal organs themselves, it follows, even in so arbitrary a tongue (or rather so *historical* a spelling) as the English, that a vowel is naturally long when it ends the syllable, and short when a consonant closes the sound. But in the Greek and Hebrew the law we have propounded is consistently carried out in a complete system of euphonic changes which lie at the very threshold of either language.

Accordingly, in exactness of *phonetic* representation these two languages have no rival, not even in the German, Italian, or Spanish. Though the original sounds are now somewhat uncertain, yet it is evident (unless we take the degenerate modern Greek, and the discrepant modern Rabbinical pronunciations as perfect guides) that each letter and vowel in both had its own peculiar power. The two alphabets, we know, were identical in origin; for if we distrust the story of the importation of the Phœnician characters by Cadmus into Greece, we have but to compare the names, order, and forms of the written signs (reversing them, as the two languages were read in opposite directions), in order to satisfy ourselves that they are essentially the same. Even the unappreciable א has its equivalent in the *spiritus lenis* (as the ע may be visually represented by the *spiritus asper*), and the old *digamma* (*Faῦ*) reappears in the consonantal ו. Perhaps the reason why *υ* initial always has the rough breathing is owing to its affinity to both these last named. See Alphabet.

We trust we have said enough to illustrate our proposition that these two lingual families, and especially their two chiefly interesting representatives — which, widely variant as they are in age, culture, flexibility, and genius, yet by a remarkable Providence have been brought together in the only revelation written for man —have no ordinary or casual points of resemblance. We would be glad to see the subject extended by some competent hand, especially by a comparison of the venerable and rich Sanscrit and Arabic. See Shemitic Languages.

Philome'tor (*Φιλομήτωρ, mother-loving*), the surname of Ptolemæus VI of Egypt (2 Macc. iv, 21). See Ptolemy.

Philon. See Philo.

Philopatris is the name of a dialogue found among the writings of Lucian (q. v.). It is quoted in Church history as a contribution to the heathen satires against Christianity. It is a frivolous derision of the character and doctrines of the Christians in the form of a dialogue between Critias, a professed heathen, and Triephon, an Epicurean, personating a Christian. It represents the Christians as disaffected to the government, dangerous to civil society, and delighting in public calamities. It calls St. Paul a half-bald, long-nosed Galilæan, who travelled through the air to the third heaven (2 Cor. xii, 1–4). It combats the Church doctrine of the Trinity, and of the procession of the Spirit from the Father, though not by argument, but only by ridicule. Not its intrinsic value, but its historic references, make it a valuable production. The authenticity of the work has been called in question by Gessner, in his *De ætate et auctore dialogi Lucianei, qui Philop. inscribitur* (Jen. 1714; Leips. 1730; Götting. 1741; et in tom. ix, ed. Bip.), who ascribes to it a post-Nicæan age. Of like opinion are Neander (*Church Hist.* ii, 90) and Tzschirner (*Fall des Heidenthums*, p. 312). Niebuhr (*Kleine histor. u. philolog. Schriften*, ii, 73) dates it from the reign of Nicephorus Phocas (963–969), but this date is generally regarded as too recent. Compare Bernhardy, *Berl. Jahrb.* 1832, ii, 131; Ehrmann, in Stein's *Studien der evangel. Geistlichkeit Würtembergs*, 1839, p. 47; Schmid, *De Philopatride Lucianeo dialogo nova dissert.* (Leips. 1830); Wetzlar, *De ætate, vita scriptisque Luciani Samos* (Marb. 1834); Schaff, *Ch. Hist.* ii, 79. (J. H. W.)

Philoponists, a sect of Tritheists in the 6th century, named after a famous Alexandrian grammarian. Nature and hypostasis, he affirmed, were identical, unity not being something real, but only a generic term, according to the Aristotelian logic. See Philoponus.

Philopŏnus, Joannes (*Ἰωάννης ὁ Φιλόπονος*), or Joannes Grammaticus (*ὁ Γραμματικός*), an Alexandrian theologian and philosopher of great renown, but which he little deserved on account of his extreme dulness and want of good-sense, was called *Φιλόπονος* because he was one of the most laborious and studious men of his age. He lived in the 7th century of our æra; one of his writings, *Physica*, is dated May 10, 617. He calls himself *γραμματικός*, undoubtedly because he taught grammar in his native town, Alexandria, and would in earlier times have been called rhetor. He was a disciple of the philosopher Ammonius. Although his celebrity is more based upon the number of his varied productions and the estimation in which they were held by his contemporaries than upon the intrinsic value of those works, he is yet so strangely connected with one of the most important events of his time (though only through subsequent tradition) that his name is sure to be handed down to future generations. We refer to the capture of Alexandria by Amru in A.D. 639, and the pretended conflagration of the famous Alexandrian library. It is in the first instance said that Philoponus adopted the Mohammedan religion on the city being taken by Amru, whence he may justly be called the last of the pure Alexandrian grammarians. Upon this, so the story goes, he requested Amru to grant him the possession of the celebrated library of Alexandria. Having informed the absent caliph Omar of the philosopher's wishes, Amru received for answer that if the books were in conformity with the Koran, they were useless, and if they did not agree with it, they were to be condemned, and ought in both cases to be destroyed. Thus the library was burned. But we now know that this story is most likely only an invention of Abulfaraj, the great Arabic writer of the 13th century, who was, however, a Christian, and who, at any rate, was the first that ever mentioned such a thing as the burning of the Alexandrian library. We consequently dismiss the matter, referring the reader to the 51st chapter of Gibbon's *Decline and Fall.* It is extremely doubtful that Philoponus became a Mohammedan. His favorite authors were Plato and Aristotle, whence his tendency to heresy; and he was one of the first and principal promoters of the sect of the Tritheists, which was condemned by the Council of Constantinople of 681. Starting with Monophysite principles, taking *φύσις* in a concrete instead of an abstract sense, and identifying it with *ὑπόστασις*, Philoponus distinguished in God three individuals, and so became involved in Tritheism. This view he sought to justify by the Aristotelian categories of *genus, species,* and *individuum.* His followers were called Philoponiaci and Tritheistæ. Philoponus, it may be remarked, was not the first promulgator of this error; but (as appears from Assem. *Bibl. Orient.* ii, 327; comp. Hefele, ii, 555) the Monophysite John Ascusnages, who ascribed to Christ only *one* nature, but to each person in the Godhead a separate nature, and on this account was banished by the emperor and excommunicated by the patriarch of Constantinople. The time of the death of Philoponus is not known. The following is a list of his works: *Τῶν εἰς τὴν Μωυσέως κοσμογονίαν ἐξηγητικῶν λόγοι ζ', Commentarii in Mosaicam Cosmogoniam,* lib. viii, dedicated to Sergius, patriarch of Constantinople, who held that see from 610 to 639, and perhaps 641. Edit. Græce et Latine by Balthasar Corderius (Vienna, 1630, 4to). The editor was deficient in scholarship, and Lambecius promised a better edition, which,

however, never appeared. Photius (*Biblioth.* cod. 75) compares the *Cosmogonia* with its author, and forms no good opinion of either:—*Disputatio de Paschale*, "ad calcem Cosmogoniæ," by the same editor:—*Κατὰ Πρόκλου περὶ ἀϊδιότητος κόσμου λύσεις, λόγοι ιή, Adversus Procli de Æternitate Mundi Argumenta XVIII Solutiones*, commonly called *De Æternitate Mundi*. The end is mutilated. Edit.: the text by Victor Trincavellus (Venice, 1535, fol.); Latin versions, by Joannes Mahotius (Lyons, 1557, fol.), and by Casparus Marcellus (Venice, 1551, fol.):—*De quinque Dialectis Græcæ Linguæ Liber.* Edit. Græce, together with the writings of some other grammarians, and the *Thesaurus* of Varinus Camertes (Venice, 1476, fol.; 1504, fol.; ad calcem Lexici Græco-Latini, Venice, 1524, fol.; another, ibid. 1524, fol.; Basle, 1532, fol.; Paris, 1521, fol.):—*Συναγωγὴ τῶν πρὸς διάφορον σημασίαν διαφόρως τονουμένων λέξεων, Collectio Vocum quæ pro diversa significatione Accentum diversum accipiunt*, in alphabetical order. It has often been published at the end of Greek dictionaries. The only separate edition is by Erasmus Schmid (Wittenb. 1615, 8vo), under the title of *Cyrilli, vel, ut alii volunt, Joanni Philoponi Opusculum utilissimum de Differentiis Vocum Græcarum, quod Tonum, Spiritum, Genus*, etc., to which is added the editor's *Dissertatio de Pronunciatione Græca Antiqua.* Schmid appended to the dictionary of Philoponus about five times as much of his own, but he separated his additions from the text:—*Commentarii in Aristotelem*, viz. (1) *In Analytica Priora.* Edit.: the text, Venice, 1536, fol.; Latin versions, by Gulielmus Dorotheus (Venice, 1541, fol.), Lucillus Philaltheus (ibid. 1544, 1548, 1553, 1555, fol.), Alexander Justinianus (ibid. 1560, fol.). (2) *In Analytica Posteriora.* Edit.: Venice, 1504, fol., together with Anonymi Græci Commentarii on the same work (ibid. 1534, fol.), revised and with additions, together with Eustratii, episcopi Nicæani (who lived about 1117) *Commentarii* on the same work. A Greek edition of 1534 is said to exist. Latin versions by Andreas Grateolus (Venice, 1542, fol.; Paris, 1543, fol.) and by Martianus Rota (Venice, 1559, 1568, fol.). (3) *In quatuor priores Libros Physicorum.* Edit.: the text, cum Præfatione Victoris Trincavelli ad Casparum Contarenum Cardinalem (Venice, 1535, fol.); Latin version, by Gulielmus Dorotheus (ibid. 1539 and 1541, fol.); a better one by Baptista Rasarius (ibid. 1558, 1569, 1581, fol.). Philoponus speaks of his *Scholia* to the sixth book, whence we may infer that he commented upon the last four books also. (4) *In Librum unicum Meteorum.* The text ad calcem Olympiodori *In Meteora* (Venice, 1551, fol.); Latine, by Joannes Baptistus Camotius (ibid. 1551, 1567, fol.). (5) *In Libros III de Anima.* Edit. Græce, cum Trincavelli Epistola ad Nicolaum Rudolphum Cardinalem (Venice, 1553, fol.); Latine, by Gentianus Hervetus (Lyons, 1544, 1548; Venice, 1554, 1568) and by Matthæus à Bove (Venice, 1544, 1581), all in folio. (6) *In Libros V De Generatione et Interitu.* Græce, cum Præfatione Asalani (Venice, 1527, fol.), together with Alexander Aphrodiseus's *Meteorologia.* (7) *In Libros V De Generatione Animalium*, probably by Philoponus. Edit. Græce cum Petri Corcyræi Epistola Græca ad Andream Matthæum Aquavivam (Venice, 1526, fol.); Latine, by the same, ibid. eodem anno. Black letter. (8) *In Libros XIV Metaphysicorum.* Latine by Franciscus Patricius (Ferrara, 1583, fol.). The text was never published. Philoponus wrote many other works, some of which are lost, and others have never been published. Fabricius gives an "Index Scriptorum in Philop. De Mundi Æternitate memoratorum," and an "Index Scriptorum in universis Philoponi ad Aristotelem Commentariis memoratorum," both of great length. See Fabricius, *Bibl. Græc.* x, 639, etc.; Cave, *Hist. Litt.* vol. i; Smith, *Dict. of Class. Biography*, s. v.; Schaff, *Church History*, iii, 674, 767; Hilgenfeld, *Patristik*, p. 288; Ueberweg, *History of Philosophy*, i, 255, 259, 347–9, 402; Alzog, *Kirchengeschichte*, i, 313; Stillingfleet, *Works*, vol. i; Gieseler, *Ecclesiastical History* (see Index); Hagenbach, *History of Doctrines;* Cudworth, *Intellectual System of the Universe* (see Index).

Philosarcæ (Gr. *φιλέω, to love*, and *σάρξ, flesh*), a term of reproach used by the Origenists in reference to the orthodox as believers in the resurrection of the body.

Philosopher (*φιλόσοφος*). Of the Greek sects of philosophers existing in the time of the apostles, the Stoics and Epicureans are mentioned in Acts xvii, 18, some of whom disputed with Paul at Athens. In Col. ii, 8 a warning is given against philosophy itself, as a departure from the knowledge of Christ; and it has been noticed that Paul, who had been a Pharisee, acted in this respect in harmony with the sect in which he had been educated (Grossmann, *De Pharisaismo Judæor. Alex.* i, 8). At least the rabbins set the divine law above all human wisdom; yet they do not appear to have given the name of philosophy to their expositions of the law (see Josephus, *Ap.* ii, 4; 1 Macc. i and v). Paul is speaking in the passage alluded to of theosophic speculations, which had found an entrance among Christians (v, 16 sq.), and on which Rheinwald (*De pseudo doctor. Colos.* Bonn, 1834), Neander (*Gesch. d. Pflanz.* i, 438 sq.), and others have made investigations (see, in brief, De Wette, *Br. a. d. Kolos.* p. 1 sq.). It is plain from Paul's letters that he denied all worth to human wisdom and philosophy in comparison with that eternal salvation which is only to be obtained through the divine revelation in the Gospel; but it is not necessary to suppose that he was a despiser of sober philosophic investigation, either on the ground of his pharisaic training or of his apostolic principles. For monographs, see Volbeding, *Index Programmatum*, p. 89 sq. See PHILOSOPHY.

Philosophists, a name given to a class of French writers who entered into a combination to overturn the religion of Jesus, and eradicate from the human heart every religious sentiment. The man more particularly to whom this idea first occurred was Voltaire, who, being weary (as he said himself) of hearing people repeat that twelve men were sufficient to establish Christianity, resolved to prove that one might be sufficient to overturn it. Full of this project, he swore, before the year 1730, to dedicate his life to its accomplishment; and for some time he flattered himself that he should enjoy alone the glory of destroying the Christian religion. He found, however, that associates would be necessary; and, from the numerous tribe of his admirers and disciples, he chose D'Alembert and Diderot as the most proper persons to co-operate with him in his designs. But Voltaire was not satisfied with their aid alone. He contrived to embark in the same cause Frederick II, king of Prussia. This royal adept was one of the most zealous of Voltaire's coadjutors, till he discovered that the philosophists were waging war with the throne as well as with the altar. This, indeed, was not originally Voltaire's intention. He was vain; he loved to be caressed by the great; and, in one word, he was from natural disposition an aristocrat, and an admirer of royalty. But when he found that almost every sovereign but Frederick disapproved of his impious projects because they perceived the issue, he determined to oppose all the governments on earth rather than forfeit the glory, with which he had flattered himself, of vanquishing Christ and his apostles in the field of controversy. He now set himself, with D'Alembert and Diderot, to excite universal discontent with the established order of things. For this purpose they formed secret societies, assumed new names, and employed an enigmatical language. Thus Frederick was called *Luc;* D'Alembert, *Protagoras*, and sometimes *Bertrand;* Voltaire, *Raton;* and Diderot, *Platon*, or its anagram, *Tonpla;* while the general term for the conspirators was *Cacoucc.* In their secret meetings they professed to celebrate the mysteries of *Mythra;* and their great object, as they professed to one another, was to confound

the wretch, meaning Jesus Christ. Hence their secret watchword was *Écrasez l'Infâme*, "Crush the Wretch." If we look into some of the books expressly written for general circulation, we shall there find the following doctrines; some of them standing alone in all their naked horrors, others surrounded by sophistry and meretricious ornaments, to entice the mind into their net before it perceives their nature: "The Universal Cause, that God of the philosophers, of the Jews, and of the Christians, is but a chimera and a phantom. The phenomena of nature only prove the existence of God to a few prepossessed men: so far from bespeaking a God, they are but the necessary effects of matter prodigiously diversified. It is more reasonable to admit, with Manes, a twofold God, than the God of Christianity. We cannot know whether a God really exists, or whether there is the smallest difference between good and evil, or vice and virtue. Nothing can be more absurd than to believe the soul a spiritual being. The immortality of the soul, so far from stimulating man to the practice of virtue, is nothing but a barbarous, desperate, fatal tenet, and contrary to all legislation. All ideas of justice and injustice, of virtue and vice, of glory and infamy, are purely arbitrary, and dependent on custom. Conscience and remorse are nothing but the foresight of those physical penalties to which crimes expose us. The man who is above the law can commit without remorse the dishonest act that may serve his purpose. The fear of God, so far from being the beginning of wisdom, should be the beginning of folly. The command to love one's parents is more the work of education than of nature. Modesty is only an invention of refined voluptuousness. The law which condemns married people to live together becomes barbarous and cruel on the day they cease to love one another." These extracts from the secret correspondence and the public writings of these men will suffice to show us the nature and tendency of the dreadful system they had formed. The philosophists were diligently employed in attempting to propagate their sentiments. Their grand *Encyclopædia* was converted into an engine to serve this purpose. See ENCYCLOPÆDISTS. Voltaire proposed to establish a colony of philosophists at Cleves, who, protected by the king of Prussia, might publish their opinions without dread or danger; and Frederick was disposed to take them under his protection, till he discovered that their opinions were anarchical as well as impious, when he threw them off, and even wrote against them. They contrived, however, to engage the ministers of the court of France in their favor, by pretending to have nothing in view but the enlargement of science, in works which spoke, indeed, respectfully of revelation, while every discovery which they brought forward was meant to undermine its very foundation. When the throne was to be attacked, and even when barefaced atheism was to be promulgated, a number of impious and licentious pamphlets were dispersed (for some time none knew how) from a secret society formed at the Hôtel d'Holbach, at Paris, of which Voltaire was elected honorary and perpetual president. To conceal their design, which was the diffusion of their infidel sentiments, they called themselves Encyclopedists. See HOLBACH. The books, however, that were issued from this club were calculated to impair and overturn religion, morals, and government; and these, indeed, spreading over all Europe, imperceptibly took possession of public opinion. As soon as the sale was sufficient to pay the expenses, inferior editions were printed and given away, or sold at a very low price; circulating libraries of them were formed, and reading societies instituted. While they constantly disowned these productions before the world, they contrived to give them a false celebrity through their confidential agents and correspondents, who were not themselves always trusted with the entire secret. By degrees they got possession of most of the reviews and periodical publications; established a general intercourse, by means of hawkers and pedlers, with the distant provinces, and instituted an office to supply all schools with teachers; and thus did they acquire unprecedented dominion over every species of literature, over the minds of all ranks of people, and over the education of youth, without giving any alarm to the world. The lovers of wit and polite literature were caught by Voltaire; the men of science were perverted, and children corrupted in the first rudiments of learning, by D'Alembert and Diderot; stronger appetites were fed by the secret club of baron Holbach; the imaginations of the higher orders were set dangerously afloat by Montesquieu; and the multitude of all ranks were surprised, confounded, and hurried away by Rousseau. Thus was the public mind in France completely corrupted, and this, no doubt, greatly accelerated those dreadful events which afterwards transpired in that country.

Philosophoumena. See HIPPOLYTUS.

Philosophy is the highest department of human speculation, the most abstract knowledge of which the human mind is capable.

Importance of the Subject.—The character of the investigations with which philosophy is concerned, and still more the superabundance during the last century of what has professed itself to be philosophy, render it excessively difficult either to define this branch of inquiry, or to determine what may be legitimately included under the wide designation. Sir William Hamilton devoted seven lectures of his course of metaphysics to the discussion of this single topic. The vagueness of the term, the instability and indistinctness of the boundaries of this department of knowledge, and the dissensions in regard to all its details, have led many quick and ingenious minds to repudiate the study altogether, and to deny to it any valid existence. Nevertheless it is necessary to recognise its reality, in spite of the uncertainty of its nature, of the confusion thus produced, and of the pretensions sheltered under its honorable name. It was a profound and keen reply, which was said to have been made by Aristotle to the assailants and abnegators of philosophy, that "whether we ought to philosophize or ought not to philosophize, we are compelled to philosophize" (εἴτε φιλοσοφητέον φιλοσοφητέον, εἴτε μὴ φιλοσοφητέον φιλοσοφητέον, πάντως δὲ φιλοσοφητέον, David. *Prolegom. Phil.*, ap. *Schol. Aristot.* p. 13, ed. Acad. Berol.), for philosophy is required to demonstrate the inanity and nugatoriness of philosophy: "But the mother of demonstrations is philosophy." The same deep sense of the irrecusable obligation is manifested by Plotinus, when, in a rare access of humor, he utters the paradoxical declaration that all things, rational and irrational—animals, plants, and even minerals, air and water too—alike yearn for theoretical perfection (or the philosophical completion of their nature, *Ennead.* iii, viii, 1); and that nature, albeit devoid of imagination and reason, has its philosophy within itself, and achieves whatever it effects by theory, or the philosophy which it does not itself possess. "There is reason in roasting eggs," and philosophy in all things, if we can only get at it:

> "the meanest flower that blows can give
> Thoughts that do often lie too deep for tears."

Philosophy is, like death, one of the few things that we can by no means avoid, whether we welcome or reject it; whether we regard the irresistible tendencies of our intellectual constitution to speculative inquiry, or the latent regularity, order, and law controlling all things that fall under our notice, when they develop themselves in accordance with their intrinsic nature (see Sir W. Hamilton, *Metaphysics*, lect. iv, p. 46; Ueberweg, *Hist. of Philosophy*, vol. i, § 1, p. 5).

There is no longer reason to dread the rarity of philosophy; there has been no occasion for such alarm for more than two thousand years; the terror has been produced by the redundance of what claims this name. There are philosophers of all sorts, who deal with all

varieties of subjects. There is mental, moral, political, economical, and natural philosophy; there is the philosophy of religion, the philosophy of enthusiasm, and the philosophy of insanity; the philosophy of logic, the philosophy of rhetoric, the philosophy of language, and the philosophy of grammar; there is the philosophy of history, the philosophy of law, the philosophy of the inductive sciences; there is the philosophy of colors, the philosophy of music, the philosophy of dress, the philosophy of manners, the philosophy of cookery, the philosophy of building, etc. All imaginable topics reveal an aptitude for philosophic treatment, and pretend to furnish a basis for some special philosophy. It would occasion no surprise to encounter a philosophy of jack-straws, and other infantile amusements. There must be some legitimacy, however slight, in these numerous pretensions, some semblance of truth in such easy assumption, or such professions would not continue to be repeated and tolerated. There must be some common element, some cord of similitude, uniting together under one category these multitudinous forms of inquiry, and the unnumbered inquiries which are left unnamed.

Scope of the Term.—The word *philosophy* first appears in the Father of History. It is applied by Crœsus to Solon, in his travels in search of knowledge and information, and is used as almost equivalent to *theory*, which in the context means scarcely anything more than sight-seeing or observation (Herodot. i, 30). It next appears in Thucydides. Pericles speaks of the Athenians as "philosophizing without effeminacy," where the term seems to denote the acquisition of information and culture (Thuc. ii, 40). The origination of the word is ascribed to Pythagoras in a familiar anecdote, which reports that, being asked by Leon, the chief of Phlius, "What were philosophers?" he replied, with a happy allusion to the concourse at the Olympic Games, that "they were those who diligently observed the nature of things," calling themselves "students, or lovers of wisdom," and occupied with "the contemplation and knowledge of things" (Cicero, *Tusc. Qu.* v, 3, 9). He is supposed to have thus repudiated the designation of "wise man," or "sophister," previously in vogue, and to have modestly proposed in its stead the appellation of "philosopher," a lover of wisdom. The authenticity of the anecdote has been gravely questioned; and the designation, alleged to have been rejected in this manner, continued in habitual use, with no invidious sense, and was applied to Socrates and the chiefs of the Socratic schools (Grote, *Hist. of Greece*, pt. ii, vol. viii, ch. lxvii, p. 350). To the numerous passages cited by Grote may be added Androtion, *Fr.* 39; Phan. Eretrius, *Fr.* 21; and Synesii *Dio*, apud Dion Chrysostom, ii, 329, ed. Teubner). The censures of the Sophists by Plato and Aristotle, the character of the Socratic teaching, and the almost exclusively inquisitive and indeterminate complexion of the Platonic speculation, appear to have given currency to the designation of philosophy, as a more modest and inconclusive appellative than "sophia," or wisdom.

Originally, then, philosophy imported only the loving pursuit of knowledge, without any implication of actual attainment; but it soon acquired a more positive and distinct acceptation. In the *Republic* Plato defines philosophy as "the circuit, or beating about of the soul in its ascending progress towards real existence;" and declares those to be philosophers "who embrace the really existent," and "who are able to apprehend the eternal and unchanging." In the *Euthydemus* he goes farther, and describes philosophy as "the acquisition of true knowledge." In the definitions ascribed to Plato, which, though not his, may preserve the tradition of his teaching, it is only "the desire of the knowledge of eternal existences." Xenophon rarely employs the term, but applies "sophia" to the Socratic knowledge. In one passage where he uses it it signifies the knowledge and practice of the duties of life (*Mem.* iv, 2, p. 23).

A great step towards the definite restriction of the meaning of philosophy was made by the Platonic writings, though the name continued, and has always continued, to be employed with great latitude. Aristotle, who gave a sharp, scientific character to nearly everything which he touched, first confined the term to special significations, and gave to it a limited and, in some cases, a purely technical meaning. He calls philosophy "the knowledge of truth;" and he endeavored to discover a "first philosophy," or body of principles common to all departments of speculative inquiry, and dealing solely with the primary elements and affections of being (*Met.* i, 1, p. 993; *Phys.* i, 9, p. 5; Simplicii *Schol.* p. 345). This first philosophy, or "knowledge of the philosopher," corresponds to metaphysics in its stricter sense—a division of speculative science receiving its name from the remains of Aristotle, and, in great measure, constituted by his labors. It is the science of being as being (τὸ ὂν ᾗ ὄν, *Met.* vi, 1, p. 1026; xi, 3, p. 1060; iv, p. 1061). Thus, with the Peripatetics, philosophy included all science, but especially theoretical science, and was peculiarly attached to metaphysical science. With this accords the definition of Cicero, which is evidently derived from Peripatetic sources (*De Off.* ii, 2, 5).

This historical deduction is not unnecessary. Many words grow in meaning with the growth of civilization. Many gradually lose with the advancement of knowledge their original vague amplitude, and acquire a definite and precise significance. The real import of either class of words can be ascertained only by tracing their development through their successive changes. The history of the term philosophy enables us to understand the still subsisting vacillation in its employment, and to detect the common principle which runs through all its various and apparently incongruous applications. It brings us, at the same time, to the recognition of the mode and measure of its most rigorous employment.

Philosophy is the earnest investigation of the principles of knowledge, and most appropriately of the first principles, or principles of abstract being. It is not science, but search (Kant, *Program.* 1765–66; Sir William Hamilton, *Metaph.* lect. i, iii; *Discussions*, p. 787). It is distinctively *zetetic*, or inquisitive, rather than dogmatic. Its chief value consists in the zeal, perspicacity, simplicity, and unselfishness of the persevering desire for the highest truth, not in its attainment; for the highest truth is, in its nature, unattainable by the finite intelligence of man. It has not, or ought not to have, the pretension or confident assurance of knowledge, though this claim has frequently been made (ἡ φιλοσοφία γνῶσίς ἐστι πάντων τῶν ὄντων, David. *Interpr. x. Categ. Schol. Aristot.* p. 29, ed. Acad. Berol.). It is only a systematic craving and continuous effort to reach the highest knowledge.

> "For man loves knowledge, and the beams of truth
> More welcome touch his understanding's eye
> Than all the blandishments of sound his ear,
> Than all of taste his tongue" (Akenside).

Philosophy was called by the schoolmen "the science of sciences;" and wherever the recondite principles of knowledge are sought, there is philosophy, in a faint and rudimentary, or in a clear and instructive form. Hence it admits of being predicated of investigations far remote from those higher exercises of abstract contemplation to which it is most properly applied.

What is man? What are his faculties and powers? Whence is he? Whither is he going? How shall he guide himself? What is this vast and varied universe around him? How did it arise? How is it ordered and sustained? What is man's relation to it, and to the great Power behind the veil, manifested by its wondrous movements and changes? What is the nature of this power? What are man's duties to it, to himself, and to his fellow-men? What knowledge of these things can he acquire? What are his destinies, and his aids for their achievement? These questions, and questions like these, constitute the province of philosophy

proper. They present themselves dimly or distinctly to every reflecting mind; and they will not be gainsaid. Our intellectual constitution compels us to think of them; and to think of them, however weakly and spasmodically, is the beginning of philosophy. They all admit of partial solution—of an answer at least, which stimulates further investigation. None of them can receive a full and complete reply from the human reason—they stretch beyond its compass. All of them, in every age, have met with some response, either in the poetic and bewildering fancies of the prevalent mythology, or in the wild guesses of popular credulity; either in the aphorisms of the prudent, or in the conclusions of those who have sedulously devoted themselves to the unravelling of these enigmas. This latter class have been the philosophers of each generation, from the commencement of rational inquiry to the current day, as they will continue to be till the closing of the great roll of time; for of philosophy there is no end.

This constant disappointment and continual renewal of effort are strange phenomena, and have often proved utterly disheartening. Hence has proceeded the objection so frequently urged that philosophy is ever in restless and fretful activity, but does not advance. The allegation of an entire failure of progress is unjust; but the same questions constantly reappear with changed aspects, and the same solutions are offered under altered forms. But the change in the aspects and the alteration in the forms are themselves an advancement. The true source of encouragement is, however, to be derived less from the progress which can never pass the boundaries imposed by the same old questions than from the knowledge that the pursuit is more than the impracticable attainment—the race more important than the arrival at the goal could be—at least in this finite life, with our finite powers. From this habitual disappointment, and the apparent failures which bring the disappointment, have arisen, too, this variety of solutions which have been proposed for the numerous riddles that philosophy propounds to man. Varro enumerated two hundred and eighty-eight possible sects, apparently on the basis of ethics alone (August. *De Civ. Dei*, xix, 1); and the number of distinguishable schemes of philosophy, to say nothing of diversities of opinion in regard to details, is countless. Yet each of these has contributed something to our knowledge: in the more precise statement of the problems to be solved, in the clearer determination of their conditions, in the refutation of former errors, in the exposure of previous misapprehensions, in presenting the inquiries under new and brighter lights, or in adding to our positive information in regard to these dark and difficult subjects. The gratitude which Aristotle expresses, in a remarkable passage (*Met.* i), towards his predecessors, who had gone astray, or who had failed to see the truth, is due to all philosophical inquirers. They have contributed something towards the result, however incomplete that result may remain (*καὶ γὰρ οὗτοι συνεβάλοντο τι· τὴν γὰρ ἕξιν προήσκησαν ἡμῶν*; and see Alexander Aphrodis. *Schol. Aristot.* ad loc. *ἡ γὰρ τῶν καταβεβλημένων δοξῶν εὐπορία εὑρετικωτέρους ἡμᾶς τῆς ἀληθείας παρασκευάσει*).

History of the Subject.—The hopelessness of satisfactory attainment, with the inevitable persistency of the search, and the gradual approximation, or appearance of approximation, to a goal which is never reached, but is ever receding, eventuate in changes, expansions, fluctuations, and revolutions in opinion, which are recorded and appreciated in the history of philosophy. This history chronicles the origins and original phases of philosophical inquiry, its mutations, progresses, and recessions, and the causes of them; it notes the introduction of new doctrines, new methods of procedure, new modes of exposition; the dissensions and controversies which spring up and minister to new developments; the reduction of kindred views to a coherent body, and the constitution of sects and schools; the fortunes of such schools, the development or perversion of the several successive or contemporaneous schemes of speculation in the bosom of the schools themselves, either in consequence of their own internal activity, or of the necessities suggested or enforced by external attack. In this manner, and from these motives of change, philosophy exhibits unceasing activity and frequent novelty of form, notwithstanding the substantial identity of the questions debated, and the sameness of the ground surveyed. In these vicissitudes of opinion there is, however, an element which ought never to be overlooked, and which gives an immediate and urgent interest to all the variations. The philosophy of an age or sect is largely influenced by recent experiences, and by the present demands of the society or circle to which it is addressed; and, in turn, it exercises a most potent influence in determining the views of the rising and succeeding generations, not only within the range of theoretical inquiry, but also in government, social organization, manners, habits of thought, arts, and in everything which concerns the daily life of the people. The condition of Athenian politics and morals directly engendered the Socratic inquiries and the Socratic schools. The personal degradation and servility of the Romans under the empire provoked the revival and ardent advocacy of stoicism. The repugnance to Islamism, and the dialectical needs of Christendom, gave birth to mediæval scholasticism. The antagonism which issued in the English commonwealth furnished the hotbed in which germinated the philosophy of Hobbes. Locke and the encyclopædists were the prophets and guides of the French revolutionary spirit; and the materialism of the current years has received form as well as vitality from the predominance and achievements of the physical sciences, and the enormous fascinations of material interests and gratifications. Thus the alternations of philosophy explain and are explained by the concurrent modifications of society.

The history of philosophy admits of two distinct principles of division, both of which are simultaneously employed. It may be divided either with reference to its special subject-matter, as a part of the general domain of philosophy, or with reference to its chronological successions. Each of these distributions of course permits further subdivision.

Plato practically, though not expressly, divided philosophy into dialectics, physics, and ethics, including theology and much of metaphysics, along with natural philosophy, under the head of physics. See PLATONIC PHILOSOPHY. The division of Aristotle is indistinct and apparently variable. But he did not complete his system. His metaphysics, which corresponds nearly with his first philosophy, or with philosophy in its strictest sense, was an incomplete collection of unfinished papers, gathered and arranged after his death. Science, or knowledge, he distributes between practice, production, and theory (*Metaph.* vi, 1, *Frag.* 137, p. 94, ed. Didot). Ueberweg mistakes this for a formal division of philosophy, but the third head is the only one to which Aristotle would have assigned the name of philosophy. He elsewhere distinguishes theory into physical, mathematical, and theological—the last corresponding with philosophy proper (*Metaph.* xi, 7). In one of his fragments, philosophical problems are declared to be of five kinds: political, dialectical, physical, ethical, and rhetorical (Aristot. *Frag.* 137, p. 108). This division excludes the greater part of philosophy. The uncertainty and confusion which these several divisions are calculated to produce may be accounted for and excused by the loose acceptation of the term physics in the Socratic schools; and by the fact that metaphysics, or philosophy, in Aristotle's estimation, lay beyond the domain of physics. Dividing philosophy into metaphysics, physics, and ethics, we now habitually exclude physics, or natural philosophy, and set it apart as the realm of exact science. The other two are assigned to philosophy. But metaphysics and ethics may be united as together

constituting philosophy, or they may be kept distinct and variously subdivided. Sir William Hamilton, who, in deference to the narrowness of the Scotch school, at times almost identifies psychology with philosophy, enumerates, by a strained construction, five branches of the former: logic, ethics, politics, æsthetics, and theology (*Metaph.* lect. iii, p. 44). Rémusat incidentally distributes philosophy under the five heads of psychology, logic, metaphysics, theodicy (or the philosophy of religion = theology), and morals (*Vie d'Abélard*, liv. ii, ch. iii, vol. i, p. 351 sq.). Ampère, in his ingenious and fantastic classification of human knowledge, by a septuple series of violent dichotomies, manufactures eighty-four distinct departments of philosophical inquiry. For the present purpose, the sufficiency or the insufficiency, the validity or the invalidity, of these various divisions and subdivisions is unimportant. The history of philosophy includes them all, either as definite members or as subordinate parts. Each may be treated separately, or all may be embraced in one treatment, or a distinct discussion may be bestowed upon several of them combined in one view. Thus there may be a history of mental philosophy, and a history of ethics, like the supplements of Dugald Stewart and Sir James Mackintosh to the *Encyclopædia Britannica;* or a history of logic, like Mr. Blakey's very feeble treatise on that subject; or a history of heretical opinions, like those so common in the earlier ages of the Christian Church; or a general history of philosophy, like Brucken's or Tennemann's or Ueberweg's. This is the mode in which the history of philosophy may be divided.

The other process of division regards primarily the succession of philosophical systems, or of philosophical schools, where the systems are identified with particular schools. A very loose and general distribution of this kind is into ancient, mediæval, and modern, each of which has often been handled separately. The distinction between these divisions is mainly the difference of time. They frequently run into each other. In many characteristics, both of doctrine and method, they repeat each other. The scholastic procedure is discernible in Plotinus and Joannes Damascenus, while John Scotus Erigena approached more nearly to the Neo-Platonists than to the schoolmen. Occam and Gerson exhibit many modern features; and among the moderns there are many wide differences, not only in doctrine, but in character. Hence other divisions, more precise than are attainable by these indistinct chronological periods, have latterly won more favor. The following may be offered as an example of such distribution:

I. The commencements of philosophy, chiefly among the Orientals, with whom philosophy, mythology, and theology were inseparably intertwined.
II. The philosophy of the Greeks, which comprehends of course the philosophy of the Romans, as it was essentially Greek from Cicero to Boëthius.
III. The philosophy of the Schoolmen, which in part overlaps modern systems. To this the philosophy of the Jews and Saracens may be joined as an appendix, since it affords the transition to it from the Greeks.
IV. The philosophy of the Renaissance, or Transition Age, commencing with Gemistus Pletho and the Medicean Academy, and ending with Pascal and Gassendi.
V. The philosophy of Modern Times—from Francis Bacon and Descartes.

Each of these periods has many subdivisions, which have been variously constituted by different historians, and necessarily vary with the variation of the aspects under which philosophy is contemplated by the several chroniclers of its fluctuations.

Literature.—The fullest repertory of works on the several schemes of philosophy, on its general and special history, and on the history of the philosophers themselves, and of particular doctrines, may be found in Ueberweg, *History of Philosophy*, translated by George S. Morris (N. Y. 1875, 2 vols. 8vo). Up to the date of that work the fullest treatise on the subject was H. Ritter's *Geschichte der Philosophie* (Gotha, 1854, 12 vols. 8vo). A convenient summary is Maurice's *Moral and Metaphysical Philosophy* (Lond. 1850–56, and later, 4 vols. 8vo), which gives a historical review of the whole subject. (G. F. H.)

Philosophy, Chaldæan. See Magi; Philosophy, Hebrew.

Philosophy, Greek. It is not in accordance with the scope of this *Cyclopædia* to give a full account of the various philosophical systems of the ancient Greeks. These are sufficiently discussed under the names of their respective founders. Our purpose here is only to give so much as will serve to show their relations to Christianity. In doing this, as well as in the following article on Hebrew Philosophy, we combine the Scriptural statements with the results of modern investigations.

I. *The Development of Greek Philosophy.*—The complete fitness of Greek philosophy to perform a propædeutic office for Christianity, as an exhaustive effort of reason to solve the great problems of being, must be apparent after a detailed study of its progress and consummation; and even the simplest outline of its history cannot fail to preserve the leading traits of the natural (or even necessary) law by which its development was governed.

The various attempts which have been made to derive Western philosophy from Eastern sources have signally failed. The external evidence in favor of this opinion is wholly insufficient to establish it (Ritter, *Gesch. d. Phil.* i, 159, etc.; Thirlwall, *Hist. of Gr.* ii, 130; Zeller, *Gesch. d. Phil. d. Griechen*, i, 18–34; Max Müller, *On Language*, 84 note), and on internal grounds it is most improbable. It is true that in some degree the character of Greek speculation may have been influenced, at least in its earliest stages, by religious ideas which were originally introduced from the East; but this indirect influence does not affect the real originality of the great Greek teachers. The spirit of pure philosophy, distinct from theology, is wholly alien from Eastern thought; and it was comparatively late when even a Greek ventured to separate philosophy from religion. But in Greece the separation, when it was once effected, remained essentially complete. The opinions of the ancient philosophers might or might not be outwardly reconcilable with the popular faith; but philosophy and faith were independent. The very value of Greek teaching lies in the fact that it was, as far as is possible, a result of simple reason, or, if faith asserts its prerogative, the distinction is sharply marked. In this we have a record of the power and weakness of the human mind written at once on the grandest scale and in the fairest characters.

Of the various classifications of the Greek schools which have been proposed, the simplest and truest seems to be that which divides the history of philosophy into three great periods, the first reaching to the æra of the Sophists, the next to the death of Aristotle, the third to the Christian æra. In the first period the world objectively is the great centre of inquiry; in the second, the "ideas" of things, truth, and being; in the third, the chief interest of philosophy falls back upon the practical conduct of life. Successive systems overlap each other, both in time and subjects of speculation, but broadly the sequence which has been indicated will hold good (Zeller, *Die Philosophie der Griechen*, i, 111, etc.). After the Christian æra philosophy ceased to have any true vitality in Greece, but it made fresh efforts to meet the changed conditions of life at Alexandria and Rome. At Alexandria Platonism was vivified by the spirit of Oriental mysticism, and afterwards of Christianity; at Rome Stoicism was united with the vigorous virtues of active life. Each of these great divisions must be passed in rapid review.

1. *The pre-Socratic Schools.*—The first Greek philosophy was little more than an attempt to follow out in thought the mythic cosmogonies of earlier poets. Gradually the depth and variety of the problems included in

the idea of a cosmogony became apparent, and, after each clew had been followed out, the period ended in the negative teaching of the Sophists. The questions of creation, of the immediate relation of mind and matter, were pronounced in fact, if not in word, insoluble, and speculation was turned into a new direction.

What is the one permanent element which underlies the changing forms of things?—this was the primary inquiry to which the *Ionic* school endeavored to find an answer. Thales (B.C. cir. 625–610), following, as it seems, the genealogy of Hesiod, pointed to moisture (water) as the one source and supporter of life. Anaximenes (B.C. cir. 520–480) substituted air for water, as the more subtle and all-pervading element; but equally with Thales he neglected all consideration of the force which might be supposed to modify the one primal substance. At a much later date (B.C. cir. 450) Diogenes of Apollonia, to meet this difficulty, represented this elementary "air" as endowed with intelligence (*νόησις*), but even he makes no distinction between the material and the intelligent. The atomic theory of Democritus (B.C. cir. 460–357), which stands in close connection with this form of Ionic teaching, offered another and more plausible solution. The motion of his atoms included the action of force, but he wholly omitted to account for its source. Meanwhile another mode of speculation had arisen in the same school. In place of one definite element, Anaximander (B.C. 610–547) suggested the unlimited (*τὸ ἄπειρον*) as the adequate origin of all special existences. Somewhat more than a century later Anaxagoras summed up the result of such a line of speculation: "All things were together; then mind (*νοῦς*) came and disposed them in order" (Diog. Laert. ii, 6). Thus we are left face to face with an ultimate dualism.

The *Eleatic* school started from an opposite point of view. Thales saw moisture present in material things, and pronounced this to be their fundamental principle; Xenophanes (B.C. cir. 550–530) "looked up to the whole heaven, and said that the One is God" (Arist. *Met.* i, 5, *τὸ ἓν εἶναί φησι τὸν θεόν*). "Thales saw gods in all things; Xenophanes saw all things in God" (Thirlwall, *Hist. of Gr.* ii, 136). That which *is*, according to Xenophanes, must be one, eternal, infinite, immovable, unchangeable. Parmenides of Elea (B.C. 500) substituted abstract "being" for "God" in the system of Xenophanes, and distinguished with precision the functions of sense and reason. Sense teaches us of "the many," the false (phenomena); Reason of "the one," the true (the absolute). Zeno of Elea (B.C. cir. 450) developed with logical ingenuity the contradictions involved in our perceptions of things (in the idea of *motion*, for instance), and thus formally prepared the way for scepticism. If the One alone *is*, the phenomenal world is an illusion. The sublime aspiration of Xenophanes, when followed out legitimately to its consequences, ended in blank negation.

The teaching of Heraclitus (B.C. 500) offers a complete contrast to that of the Eleatics, and stands far in advance of the earlier Ionic school, with which he is historically connected. So far from contrasting the existent and the phenomenal, he boldly identified being with change. "There ever was, and is, and shall be, an ever-living fire, unceasingly kindled and extinguished in due measure" (*ἁπτόμενον μέτρα καὶ ἀποσβεννύμενον μέτρα*, Clem. Alex. *Strom.* v, 14, § 105). Rest and continuance is death. That which *is* is the instantaneous balance of contending powers (Diog. Laert. ix, 7, *διὰ τῆς ἐναντιοτροπῆς ἡρμόσθαι τὰ ὄντα*). Creation is the *play* of the Creator. Everywhere, as far as his opinions can be grasped, Heraclitus makes noble "guesses at truth;" yet he leaves "fate" (*εἱμαρμένη*) as the supreme creator (Stob. *Ecl.* i, p. 59, ap. Ritter and Preller, § 42). The cycles of life and death run on by its law. It may have been by a natural reaction that from these wider speculations he turned his thoughts inwards. "I investigated myself," he says, with conscious pride (Plutarch, *adv. Col.* 1118, *c*); and in this respect he foreshadows the teaching of Socrates, as Zeno did that of the Sophists.

The philosophy of Pythagoras (B.C. cir. 540–510) is subordinate in interest to his social and political theories, though it supplies a link in the course of speculation: others had labored to trace a unity in the world in the presence of one underlying element or in the idea of a whole; he sought to combine the separate harmony of parts with total unity. Numerical unity includes the finite and the infinite; and in the relations of number there is a perfect symmetry, as all spring out of the fundamental unit. Thus numbers seemed to Pythagoras to be not only "patterns" of things (*τῶν ὄντων*), but causes of their being (*τῆς οὐσίας*). How he connected numbers with concrete being it is impossible to determine; but it may not be wholly fanciful to see in the doctrine of the transmigration of souls an attempt to trace in the successive forms of life an outward expression of a harmonious law in the moral as well as in the physical world. (The remains of the pre-Socratic philosophers have been collected in a very convenient form by F. Mullach in Didot's *Biblioth. Gr.* Paris, 1860.)

The first cycle of philosophy was thus completed. All the great primary problems of thought had been stated, and typical answers rendered. The relation of spirit and matter was still unsolved. Speculation issued in dualism (Anaxagoras), materialism (Democritus), or pantheism (Xenophanes). On one side reason was made the sole criterion of truth (Parmenides); on the other, experience (Heraclitus). As yet there was no rest, and the Sophists prepared the way for a new method. Whatever may be the moral estimate which is formed of the Sophists, there can be little doubt as to the importance of their teaching as preparatory to that of Socrates. All attempts to arrive at certainty by a study of the world had failed: might it not seem, then, that truth is subjective? "Man is the measure of all things." Sensations are modified by the individual; and may not this hold good universally? The conclusion was applied to morals and politics with fearless skill. The belief in absolute truth and right was well-nigh banished; but meanwhile the Sophists were perfecting the instrument which was to be turned against them. Language, in their hands, acquired a precision unknown before, when words assumed the place of things. Plato might ridicule the pedantry of Protagoras, but Socrates reaped a rich harvest from it.

2. *The Socratic Schools.*—In the second period of Greek philosophy the scene and subject were both changed. Athens became the centre of speculations which had hitherto chiefly found a home among the more mixed populations of the colonies. At the same time inquiry was turned from the outward world to the inward, from theories of the origin and relation of things to theories of our knowledge of them. A philosophy of ideas, using the term in its widest sense, succeeded a philosophy of nature. In three generations Greek speculation reached its greatest glory in the teaching of Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle. When the sovereignty of Greece ceased, all higher philosophy ceased with it. In the hopeless turmoil of civil disturbances which followed, men's thoughts were chiefly directed to questions of personal duty.

The famous sentence in which Aristotle (*Met.* xiii, 4) characterizes the teaching of Socrates (B.C. 468–399) places his scientific position in the clearest light. There are two things, he says, which we may rightly attribute to Socrates, inductive reasoning and general definition (*τούς τ' ἐπακτικοὺς λόγους καὶ τὸ ὁρίζεσθαι καθόλου*). By the first he endeavored to discover the permanent element which underlies the changing forms of appearances and the varieties of opinion: by the second he fixed the truth which he had thus gained. But, besides this, Socrates rendered another service to truth. He changed not only the method, but also the subject

of philosophy (Cicero, *Acad. Post.* i, 4). Ethics occupied in his investigations the primary place which had hitherto been held by physics. The great aim of his induction was to establish the sovereignty of virtue; and, before entering on other speculations, he determined to obey the Delphian maxim and "know himself" (Plato, *Phædr.* p. 229). It was a necessary consequence of a first effort in this direction that Socrates regarded all the results which he derived as like in kind. Knowledge (ἐπιστήμη) was equally absolute and authoritative, whether it referred to the laws of intellectual operations or to questions of morality. A conclusion in geometry and a conclusion on conduct were set forth as true in the same sense. Thus vice was only another name for ignorance (Xenoph. *Mem.* iii, 9, 4; Arist. *Etn. Eud.* i, 5). Every one was supposed to have within him a faculty absolutely leading to right action, just as the mind necessarily decides rightly as to relations of space and number, when each step in the proposition is clearly stated. Socrates practically neglected the determinative power of the will. His great glory was, however, clearly connected with this fundamental error in his system. He affirmed the existence of a universal law of right and wrong. He connected philosophy with action, both in detail and in general. On the one side he upheld the supremacy of conscience, on the other the working of Providence. Not the least fruitful characteristic of his teaching was what may be called its desultoriness. He formed no complete system. He wrote nothing. He attracted and impressed his followers by his many-sided nature. He helped others to give birth to thoughts, to use his favorite image, but he was barren himself (Plato, *Theæt.* p. 150). As a result of this, the most conflicting opinions were maintained by some of his professed followers, who carried out isolated fragments of his teaching to extreme conclusions. Some adopted his method (Euclides, B.C. cir. 400, the *Megarians*), others his subject. Of the latter, one section, following out his proposition of the identity of self-command (ἐγκράτεια) with virtue, professed an utter disregard of everything material (Antisthenes, B.C. cir. 366, the *Cynics*), while the other (Aristippus, B.C. cir. 366, the *Cyrenaics*), inverting the maxim that virtue is necessarily accompanied by pleasure, took immediate pleasure as the rule of action.

These "minor Socratic schools" were, however, premature and imperfect developments. The truths which they distorted were embodied at a later time in more reasonable forms. Plato alone (B.C. 430-347), by the breadth and nobleness of his teaching, was the true successor of Socrates; with fuller detail and greater elaborateness of parts, his philosophy was as many-sided as that of his master. Thus it is impossible to construct a consistent Platonic system, though many Platonic doctrines are sufficiently marked. Plato, indeed, possessed two commanding powers, which, though apparently incompatible, are in the highest sense complementary: a matchless destructive dialectic, and a creative imagination. By the first he refuted the great fallacies of the Sophists on the uncertainty of knowledge and right, carrying out in this the attacks of Socrates; by the other he endeavored to bridge over the interval between appearance and reality, and gain an approach to the eternal. His famous doctrines of Ideas and Recollection (ἀνάμνησις) are a solution by imagination of a logical difficulty. Socrates had shown the existence of general notions; Plato felt constrained to attribute to them a substantive existence (Arist. *Met.* xiii, 4). A glorious vision gave completeness to his view. The unembodied spirits were exhibited in immediate presence of the "ideas" of things (*Phædr.* p. 247); the law of their embodiment was sensibly portrayed; and the more or less vivid remembrance of supramundane realities in this life was traced to antecedent facts. All men were thus supposed to have been face to face with truth: the object of teaching was to bring back impressions latent but uneffaced.

The "myths" of Plato, to one of the most famous of which reference has just been made, play a most important part in his system. They answer in the philosopher to faith in the Christian. In dealing with immortality and judgment he leaves the way of reason, and ventures, as he says, on a rude raft to brave the dangers of the ocean (*Phædr.* p. 85, D; *Gorg.* p. 523, A). "The peril and the prize are noble and the hope is great" (*Phædr.* p. 114, C, D). Such tales, he admits, may seem puerile and ridiculous; and if there were other surer and clearer means of gaining the desired end, the judgment would be just (*Gorg.* p. 527, A). But, as it is, thus only can he connect the seen and the unseen. The myths, then, mark the limit of his dialectics. They are not merely a poetical picture of truth already gained, or a popular illustration of his teaching, but real efforts to penetrate beyond the depths of argument. They show that his method was not commensurate with his instinctive desires; and point out in intelligible outlines the subjects on which man looks for revelation. Such are the relations of the human mind to truth (*Phædr.* p. 246-49); the pre-existence and immortality of the soul (*Meno*, p. 81-3; *Phædr.* p. 110-12; *Tim.* p. 41); the state of future retribution (*Gorg.* p. 523-25; *Rep.* p. 614-16); the revolutions of the world (*Polit.* p. 269. Comp. also *Sympos.* p. 189-91, 203-5; Zeller, *Philos. d. Griech.* p. 361-63, who gives the literature of the subject).

The great difference between Plato and Aristotle (B.C. 384-322) lies in the use which Plato thus made of imagination as the exponent of instinct. The dialectics of Plato is not inferior to that of Aristotle, and Aristotle exhibits traces of poetic power not unworthy of Plato; but Aristotle never allows imagination to influence his final decision. He elaborated a perfect method, and he used it with perfect fairness. His writings contain the highest utterance of pure reason. Looking back on all the earlier efforts of philosophy, he pronounced a calm and final judgment. For him many of the conclusions which others had maintained were valueless, because he showed that they rested on feeling, and not on argument. This stern severity of logic gives an indescribable pathos to those passages in which he touches on the highest hopes of men; and perhaps there is no more truly affecting chapter in ancient literature than that in which he states in a few unimpassioned sentences the issue of his inquiry into the immortality of the soul. Part of it may be immortal, but that part is impersonal (*De An.* iii, 5). This was the sentence of reason, and he gives expression to it without a word of protest, and yet as one who knew the extent of the sacrifice which it involved. The conclusion is, as it were, the epitaph of free speculation. Laws of observation and argument, rules of action, principles of government remain, but there is no hope beyond the grave.

It follows necessarily that the Platonic doctrine of ideas was emphatically rejected by Aristotle, who gave, however, the final development to the original conception of Socrates. With Socrates "ideas" (general definitions) were mere abstractions; with Plato they had an absolute existence; with Aristotle they had no existence separate from things in which they were realized, though the form (μορφή), which answers to the Platonic idea, was held to be the essence of the thing itself (comp. Zeller, *Philos. d. Griech.* i, 119, 120).

There is one feature common in essence to the systems of Plato and Aristotle which has not yet been noticed. In both, ethics is a part of politics. The citizen is prior to the man. In Plato this doctrine finds its most extravagant development in theory, though his life, and, in some places, his teaching, were directly opposed to it (e. g. *Gorg.* p. 527, D). This practical inconsequence was due, it may be supposed, to the condition of Athens at the time, for the idea was in complete harmony with the national feeling; and, in fact, the absolute subordination of the individual to the body includes one of the chief lessons of the ancient world. In Aristotle the "political" character of man is defined

with greater precision, and brought within narrower limits. The breaking up of the small Greek states had prepared the way for more comprehensive views of human fellowship, without destroying the fundamental truth of the necessity of social union for perfect life. But in the next generation this was lost. The wars of the succession obliterated the idea of society, and philosophy was content with aiming at individual happiness.

The coming change was indicated by the rise of a school of sceptics. The scepticism of the Sophists marked the close of the first period, and in like manner the scepticism of the Pyrrhonists marks the close of the second (Stilpo, B.C. cir. 290; Pyrrho, B.C. cir. 290). But the Pyrrhonists rendered no positive service to the cause of philosophy, as the Sophists did by the refinement of language. Their immediate influence was limited in its range, and it is only as a symptom that the rise of the school is important. But in this respect it foreshows the character of after-philosophy by denying the foundation of all higher speculations. Thus all interest was turned to questions of practical morality. Hitherto morality had been based as a science upon mental analysis, but by the Pyrrhonists it was made subservient to law and custom. Immediate experience was held to be the rule of life (comp. Ritter and Preller, § 350).

3. *The post-Socratic Schools.*—After Aristotle, philosophy, as has already been noticed, took a new direction. The Socratic schools were, as has been shown, connected by a common pursuit of the permanent element which underlies phenomena. Socrates placed virtue in action, truth in a knowledge of the ideas of things. Plato went farther, and maintained that these ideas are alone truly existent. Aristotle, though differing in terms, yet only followed in the same direction when he attributed to form, not an independent existence, but a fashioning, vivifying power in all individual objects. But from this point speculation took a mainly personal direction. Philosophy, in the strict sense of the word, ceased to exist. This was due both to the circumstances of the time and to the exhaustion consequent on the failure of the Socratic method to solve the deep mysteries of being. Aristotle had, indeed, laid the wide foundations of an inductive system of physics, but few were inclined to continue his work. The physical theories which were brought forward were merely adaptations from earlier philosophers.

In dealing with moral questions two opposite systems are possible, and have found advocates in all ages. On the one side it may be said that the character of actions is to be judged by their results; on the other, that it is to be sought only in the actions themselves. Pleasure is the test of right in one case; an assumed or discovered law of our nature in the other. If the world were perfect and the balance of human faculties undisturbed, it is evident that both systems would give identical results. As it is, there is a tendency to error on each side, which is clearly seen in the rival schools of the Epicureans and Stoics, who practically divided the suffrages of the mass of educated men in the centuries before and after the Christian æra.

Epicurus (B.C. 352–270) defined the object of philosophy to be the attainment of a happy life. The pursuit of truth for its own sake he regarded as superfluous. He rejected dialects as a useless study, and accepted the senses, in the widest acceptation of the term, as the criterion of truth. Physics he subordinated entirely to ethics (Cicero, *De Fin.* i, 7). But he differed widely from the Cyrenaics in his view of happiness. The happiness at which the wise man aims is to be found, he said, not in momentary gratification, but in lifelong pleasure. It does not consist necessarily in excitement or motion, but often in absolute tranquillity (*ἀταραξία*). "The wise man is happy even on the rack" (Diog. Laert. x, 118), for "virtue alone is inseparable from pleasure" (id. p. 138). To live happily and to live wisely, nobly, and justly, are convertible phrases (id. p. 140). But it followed as a corollary from his view of happiness that the gods, who were assumed to be supremely happy and eternal, were absolutely free from the distractions and emotions consequent on any care for the world or man (id. p. 139; comp. Lucr. ii, 645–47). All things were supposed to come into being by chance, and so pass away; and the study of nature was chiefly useful as dispelling the superstitious fears of the gods and death by which the multitude are tormented. It is obvious how such teaching would degenerate in practice. The individual was left master of his own life, free from all regard to any higher law than a refined selfishness.

While Epicurus asserted in this manner the claims of one part of man's nature in the conduct of life, Zeno of Citium (B.C. cir. 280), with equal partiality, advocated a purely spiritual (intellectual) morality. The opposition between the two was complete. The infinite, chance-formed worlds of the one stand over against the one harmonious world of the other. On the one side are gods regardless of material things, on the other a Being permeating and vivifying all creation. This difference necessarily found its chief expression in ethics. For when the Stoics taught that there were only two principles of things, matter (*τὸ πάσχον*), and God, fate, reason—for the names were many by which it was fashioned and quickened (*τὸ ποιοῦν*)—it followed that the active principle in man is of divine origin, and that his duty is to live conformably to nature (*τὸ ὁμολογουμένως [τῇ φύσει] ζῆν*). By "nature" some understood the nature of man, others the nature of the universe; but both agreed in regarding it as a general law of the whole, and not particular passions or impulses. Good, therefore, was but one. All external things were indifferent. Reason was the absolute sovereign of man. Thus the doctrine of the Stoics, like that of Epicurus, practically left man to himself. But it was worse in its final results than Epicurism, for it made him his own god.

In one point the Epicureans and Stoics were agreed. They both regarded the happiness and culture of the individual as the highest good. Both systems belonged to a period of corruption and decay. They were the efforts of the man to support himself in the ruin of the state. But at the same time this assertion of individual independence and breaking down of local connections performed an important work in preparation for Christianity. It was for the Gentile world an influence corresponding to the Dispersion for the Jews. Men, as men, owned their fellowship as they had not done before. Isolating superstitions were shattered by the arguments of the Epicureans. The unity of the human conscience was vigorously affirmed by the Stoics (comp. *Antoninus*, iv, 4, 33, with Gataker's notes).

Meanwhile in the New Academy Platonism degenerated into scepticism. Epicurus found an authoritative rule in the senses. The Stoics took refuge in what seems to answer to the modern doctrine of "common-sense," and maintained that the senses give a direct knowledge of the object. Carneades (B.C. 213–129) combated these views, and showed that sensation cannot be proved to declare the real nature, but only some of the effects, of things. Thus the slight philosophical basis of the later schools was undermined. Scepticism remained as the last issue of speculation; and, if we may believe the declaration of Seneca (*Quæst. Nat.* vii, 32), scepticism itself soon ceased to be taught as a system. The great teachers had sought rest, and in the end they found unrest. No *science* of life could be established. The reason of the few failed to create an esoteric rule of virtue and happiness. For in this they all agreed, that the blessings of philosophy were not for the mass. A "gospel preached to the poor" was as yet unknown.

But though the Greek philosophers fell short of their highest aim, it needs no words to show the work which they did as pioneers of a universal Church. They re-

vealed the wants and the instincts of men with a clearness and vigor elsewhere unattainable, for their sight was dazzled by no reflections from a purer faith. Step by step great questions were proposed — fate, providence — conscience, law — the state, the man; and answers were given which are the more instructive because they are generally one-sided. The discussions which were primarily restricted to a few, in time influenced the opinions of the many. The preacher who spoke of "an unknown God" had an audience who could understand him, not at Athens only or Rome, but throughout the civilized world.

The complete course of philosophy was run before the Christian æra, but there were yet two mixed systems afterwards which offered some novel features. At Alexandria Platonism was united with various elements of Eastern speculation, and for several centuries exercised an important influence on Christian doctrine. At Rome Stoicism was vivified by the spirit of the old republic, and exhibited the extreme Western type of philosophy. Of the first nothing can be said here. It arose only when Christianity was a recognised spiritual power, and was influenced both positively and negatively by the Gospel. The same remark applies to the efforts to quicken afresh the forms of paganism, which found their climax in the reign of Julian. These have no independent value as an expression of original thought; but the Roman Stoicism calls for brief notice from its supposed connection with Christian morality (Seneca, † A.D. 65; Epictetus, † A.D. cir. 115; M. Aurelius Antoninus, 121–180). The belief in this connection found a singular expression in the apocryphal correspondence of Paul and Seneca, which was widely received in the early Church (Jerome, *De Vir. Ill.* xii). And lately a distinguished writer (Mill, *On Liberty*, p. 58, quoted by Stanley, *Eastern Ch.* lect. vi, apparently with approbation) has speculated on the "tragical fact" that Constantine, and not Marcus Aurelius, was the first Christian emperor. The superficial coincidences of Stoicism with the New Test. are certainly numerous. Coincidences of thought, and even of language, might easily be multiplied (Gataker, *Antoninus*, Præf. p. xi, etc.), and in considering these it is impossible not to remember that Shemitic thought and phraseology must have exercised great influence on Stoic teaching (Grant, *Oxford Essays*, 1858, p. 82). But beneath this external resemblance of Stoicism to Christianity, the later Stoics were fundamentally opposed to it. For good and for evil they were the Pharisees of the Gentile world. Their highest aspirations are mixed with the thanksgiving "that they were not as other men are" (comp. *Anton.* i). Their worship was a sublime egotism. The conduct of life was regarded as an art, guided in individual actions by a conscious reference to reason (*Anton.* iv, 2, 3; v, 32). and not a spontaneous process rising naturally out of one vital principle. The wise man, "wrapt in himself" (vii, 28), was supposed to look with perfect indifference on the changes of time (iv, 49); and yet beneath this show of independence he was a prey to a hopeless sadness. In words he appealed to the great law of fate, which rapidly sweeps all things into oblivion, as a source of consolation (iv, 2, 14; vi, 15); but there is no confidence in any future retribution. In a certain sense the elements of which we are composed are eternal (v, 13), for they are incorporated in other parts of the universe, but *we* shall cease to exist (iv, 14, 21; vi, 24; vii, 10). Not only is there no recognition of communion between an immortal man and a personal God, but the idea is excluded. Man is but an atom in a vast universe, and his actions and sufferings are measured solely by their relation to the whole (*Anton.* x, 5, 6, 20; xii, 26; vi, 45; v, 22; vii, 9). God is but another name for "the mind of the universe" (ὁ τοῦ ὅλου νοῦς, v, 30), "the soul of the world" (iv, 40), "the reason that ordereth matter" (vi, 1), "universal nature" (ἡ τῶν ὅλων φύσις, vii, 33; ix, 1; comp. x, 1), and is even identified with the world itself (τοῦ γεννήσαντος κόσμου, xii, 1; comp. Gataker on iv, 23). Thus the stoicism of M. Aurelius gives many of the moral precepts of the Gospel (Gataker, p. xviii), but without their foundation, which can find no place in his system. It is impossible to read his reflections without emotion, but they have no creative energy. They are the last strain of a dying creed, and in themselves have no special affinity to the new faith. Christianity necessarily includes whatever is noblest in them, but they affect to supply the place of Christianity, and do not lead to it. The real elements of greatness in M. Aurelius are many, and truly Roman; but the study of his *Meditations* by the side of the New Test. can leave little doubt that he could not have helped to give a national standing-place to a catholic Church.

The history of ancient philosophy in its religious aspect has been strangely neglected. Nothing, so far as we are aware, has been written on the pre-Christian æra answering to the clear and elegant essay of Matter on post-Christian philosophy (*Histoire de la Philosophie dans ses rapports avec la Religion depuis l'ère Chrétienne*, Paris, 1854). There are useful hints in Carové's *Vorhalle des Christenthums* (Jena, 1851), and Ackermann's *Das Christliche in Plato* (Hamb. 1835). The treatise of Denis, *Histoire des Théories et des Idées morales dans l'Antiquité* (Paris, 1856), is limited in range and hardly satisfactory. Döllinger's *Vorhalle zur Gesch. d. Christenthums* (Regensb. 1857; transl. Lond. 1862) is comprehensive, but covers too large a field. The brief surveys in De Pressensé's *Hist. des Trois Premiers Siècles de l'Église Chrétienne* (Paris, 1858; transl. Edinb. 1862), and in Cocker, *Christianity and Greek Philosophy* (N. Y. 1870), are much more vigorous, and on the whole just. But no one seems to have apprehended the real character and growth of Greek philosophy so well as Zeller (though with no special attention to its relations to religion) in his history (*Die Philosophie der Griechen*, 2d ed. Tüb. 1856), which for subtlety and completeness is unrivalled. See (in addition to works named in the adjoining articles) Brandis, *Handb. d. gr.-röm. Philosophie* (Berl. 1835 sq.); Maury, *Hist. de la Religion de la Grèce* (Paris, 1857 sq., 3 vols.); Butler, *Hist. of Anc. Philos.* (Lond. 1866, 2 vols.).

II. *Connection of Greek with Hebrew Philosophy.*— The literature of Greece and Judæa came in contact at Alexandria; and the first known attempt to accomplish their fusion is that ascribed to the Jewish Peripatetic Aristobulus, in the reign of Ptolemy Philometor (B.C. 180–146); but the principal extant specimens are to be found in the writings of the Jewish Platonist Philo, the date of whose birth may be placed about B.C. 20. (Aristobulus is said to have been a Peripatetic; but of his exact relations to this philosophy nothing is known. From the few fragments which remain of his writings, he seems to have anticipated Philo in the employment of an allegorical interpretation of Scripture. His name, however, is more known in connection with forgeries of the Greek poets in support of his theory that the wisdom of the Greeks was borrowed from Moses. See Valckenær, *Diatribe de Aristobulo*, Lugd. Bat. 1806, reprinted in Gaisford's edition of Eusebii *Præp. Evang.*; Dähne, ii, 73; Vacherot, *Histoire de l'École d'Alexandrie*, i, 140.) Philo's system may be described as the result of a contact between the Hellenic theory of the absolute and the Jewish belief in God as represented in the Old Test. (See Dorner, *Person of Christ*, vol. i, note A [p. 330, Eng. transl.]. For some of the details of this contact, see Dähne, i, 31 sq.) In his religion Philo was a Jew, with all a Jew's reverence for the oracles of God committed to the charge of his people; but his philosophical studies attached themselves to those doctrines of the Platonic philosophy which, while dealing with the same great question, approached it from an opposite point of view. (For Philo's testimony to the divine authority of the Scriptures, see *Vit. Mos.* lib. iii, c. 23 [p. 163, Mangey]; *Quis rer. div. hær.* c. 52, 53, p. 510, 511. Other passages to the same effect

are cited by Gfrörer, i, 54. Philo even maintains the divine inspiration of the Septuagint version, *Vit. Mos.* ii, c. 6, 7, p. 139, 140.) The result in his writings was an attempted combination of the two—the Greek philosophy supplying the fundamental idea, while the Jewish Scriptures, through the Septuagint translation, contributed, by means of an extravagant license of allegorical interpretation, much of the language and illustration of the system, besides imparting to it the apparent sanction of a divine authority. The leading idea of Philo's teaching is the expansion of that thought of Plato's which forms the connecting link between the philosophy of Greece and the pantheism of the East—that thought which represents the supreme principle of things as absolutely one and simple, beyond personality and beyond definite existence, and as such immutable and incapable of relation to temporal things. (Comp. Plato, *Rep.* vi, 509; ii, 381. Gfrörer, i, 134, and Franck, *Dict. des Sciences Philosophiques*, art. Philon, regard this feature of Philo's theology as of Oriental origin. But his Greek studies might suggest the same idea, and much of his language seems to point to this origin. See Dähne, i, 31, 41.)

In place of the God of the Hebrew Scriptures, who, even in his most hidden and mysterious nature, is never regarded as other than a person, Philo is led to substitute the Greek abstraction of an ideal good or absolute unity, as the first principle of a system in which philosophy and theology are to be reconciled and united: and though he is unable entirely to abandon the language of personality which the Scriptures at every page force upon their readers, he is at the same time unable, consistently with his philosophical assumptions, to admit an immediate personal relation between the Supreme Being and the creature. (See *De Mut. Nom.* c. 4, p. 582; Gfrörer, i, 144; Dähne, ii, 154. The various passages inconsistent with this, in which Philo seems to speak of a direct action of God in the world, may perhaps be explained by supposing this action to be exerted through the medium of the Logos. Comp. *Quod Deus sit immut.* c. 12, p. 281; Gfrörer, i, 199, 293.) The medium of reconciliation is sought in a development of the scriptural manifestation of the Wisdom and the Word of God, which take the place of the soul of the world as it appears in the *Timæus*, being represented as a *second God*—the connecting link between the first principle and the world; in whom are concentrated those personal attributes which are indispensable to religious belief, and which are so conspicuously present in the Scripture theology (*Fragm.* p. 625, *ex Euseb. Præp. Evang.* vii, 13: Διὰ τί ὡς περὶ ἑτέρου Θεοῦ φησὶ τὸ ἐν εἰκόνι Θεοῦ ἐποίησε τὸν ἄνθρωτον, ἀλλ' οὐχὶ τῇ ἑαυτοῦ; Παγκαλῶς καὶ σοφῶς τουτὶ κεχρησμῴδηται. Θνητὸν γὰρ οὐδὲν ἀπεικονισθῆναι πρὸς τὸν ἀνωτάτω καὶ Πατέρα τῶν ὅλων ἐδύνατο, ἀλλὰ πρὸς τὸν δεύτερον Θεὸν ὅς ἐστιν ἐκείνου Λόγος). The following short summary of Philo's system will serve to exhibit those of its features which are most nearly related to our present inquiry (in this summary use has been made chiefly of that of Hegel, *Gesch. der Philos.* in his *Werke*, xv, 18–23, and of that of Zeller, *Philos. der Griechen*, iii, 594–665): The highest aim of philosophy, and the most perfect happiness, according to Philo, is the knowledge of God in his absolute nature (*De Vita Contempl.* c. 2, p. 473. Comp. *De Conf. Ling.* c. 20, p. 419; *De Vict. Offerent.* c. 16, p. 264; *De Monarch.* i, 3, 4, p. 216), in which he is exalted above all affinity to finite things, without qualities, and not to be expressed in speech (*Legis Alleg.* i, c. 13, p. 50: ἄποιος ὁ Θεός. *Ibid.* c. 15, p. 53: δεῖ γὰρ ἡγεῖσθαι καὶ ἄποιον αὐτὸν εἶναι, καὶ ἄφθαρτον καὶ ἄτρεπτον. *De Somn.* i, 39, p. 655: λέγεσθαι γὰρ οὐ πέφυκεν, ἀλλὰ μόνον εἶναι τὸ ὄν. Comp. *De Vit. Cont.* c. 1, p. 472; *Quod Deus immut.* c. 11, p. 281). Such knowledge, though not fully attainable by any man, is nevertheless to be earnestly sought after, that it may be attained at least in that second degree in which we apprehend directly the existence of God, though falling short of a comprehension of his essence (*De Præm. et Pœn.* c. 7, p. 415. Comp. Gfrörer, i, 135, 199. By this hypothesis of a primary and secondary knowledge, Gfrörer reconciles those passages in which the knowledge of God is spoken of as unattainable with others apparently of an opposite import: e. g. *De Post. Caini*, c. 48, p. 258; *De Monarch.* i, 6, p. 218). Even this amount, however, of direct knowledge is not to be gained by any effort of human thought, but only by God's revelation of himself; and such a revelation is only possible in the form of an ecstatic intuition, in which the seer, himself passive, is elevated by divine inspiration above the conditions of finite consciousness, and becomes one with the God whom he contemplates (*De Poster. Cain.* c. 5, p. 229; *Legis Alleg.* iii, 33, p. 107; *De Abr.* c. 24, p. 19; *De Migr. Abr.* c. 31, p. 463; *Fragm.* p. 654; *Quis rer. div. hær.* c. 13, 14, p. 482; comp. Neander, *Ch. Hist.* i, 79, ed. Bohn. This ecstatic intuition is insisted upon also by Plotinus and the later Platonists, as in modern times by Schelling). But this ecstatic vision is possible only to a chosen few; for the many, who are incapable of it, there remains only that inferior and improper apprehension of God which can be gained through the means of derived and created existences, especially of his Word or Wisdom, who is the medium by which God is related to the world, the God of imperfect men, as the Supreme Being is the God of the wise and perfect (*Legis Alleg.* iii, 32, p. 107; iii, 73, p. 128; *De Abr.* c. 24, p. 19; *De Migr. Abr.* c. 31, p. 463; *De Conf. Ling.* c. 28, p. 427). This Word, or Logos, is described in various ways, some more naturally denoting an impersonal, others a personal being. (Whether the Logos of Philo is to be regarded as a distinct person or not is matter of controversy. The negative is maintained by Burton [*Bampton Lectures*, note 93] and by Dorner [*Person of Christ*, i, 27, Engl. transl. and note A], against Gfrörer, Dähne, Lücke, and the majority of recent critics. An intermediate view is taken by Zeller, iii, 626, and to some extent by Prof. Jowett, *Epistles of St. Paul*, i, 484, 2d ed.) He is the intelligible world, the archetypal pattern, the idea of ideas (*De Mundi Opif.* c. 6, p. 5; elsewhere the Λόγος is distinguished from the παράδειγμα. See *De Conf. Ling.* c. 14, p. 414), the wisdom of God (*Legis Alleg.* i, 19, p. 56), the shadow of God, by which, as by an instrument, he made the world (*Legis. Alleg.* iii, 31, p. 106; comp. *De Monarch.* ii, 5, p. 225; *De Cherub.* c. 35, p. 162): he is the eternal image of God (*De Conf. Ling.* c. 28, p. 427. The contradiction between this representation and the concrete attributes ascribed to the Logos is pointed out by Hegel, *Werke*, xv, 20), the eldest and most general of created things (*Legis Alleg.* iii, 61, p. 121): he is the first-born of God, the eldest angel or archangel (*De Conf. Ling.* c. 28, p. 427; *Quis rer. div. hær.* c. 42, p. 501), the high-priest of the world (*De Somn.* i, 37, p. 653; comp. *De Gig.* c. 11, p. 269; *De Migr. Abr.* c. 18, p. 452), the interpreter of God (*Legis Alleg.* iii, 73, p. 128), the mediator between the Creator and his creatures, the suppliant in behalf of mortals, the ambassador from the ruler to his subjects (*Quis rer. div. hær.* c. 42, p. 501). He is moreover the God in whose likeness man was made; for the supreme God cannot have any likeness to a mortal nature (*Fragm.* p. 625): he is the angel who appeared to Hagar (*De Somn.* i, 41, p. 656; *De Prof.* c. i, p. 547), the God of Jacob's dream and the angel with whom he wrestled (*De Somn.* i, 39, p. 655; *De Mut. Nom.* c. 13, p. 591), the image of God who appeared to Moses at the bush (*Vit. Mos.* i, 12, p. 91; comp. Gfrörer, i, p. 283, 284), the guide of the Israelites in the wilderness (*De Migr. Abr.* c. 31, p. 463). This interposition of the Logos thus serves to combine the theology of contemplation with that of worship and obedience; it endeavors to provide one God for those whose philosophical meditations aspire to an intuition of the absolute, and another for those whose religious feelings demand a personal object; while at the same time it attempts to preserve the unity

of God by limiting the attribution of proper and supreme deity to the first principle only.

In addition to this, which may be regarded as the central point of Philo's system, some have endeavored to elicit from his writings a closer approximation to Christian doctrine, in the recognition of a third divine being, distinct both from the supreme God and from the Logos. (See Allix, *Judgment of the Jewish Church*, p. 118, ed. 1821; Kidder, *Demonstration of the Messias*, pt. iii, ch. 5.) A remarkable passage sometimes cited for this purpose occurs in his allegorizing commentary on the cherubim and the flaming sword placed in Eden. "With the one truly existent God," he says, "there are two first and highest powers, goodness and authority: by goodness he has produced everything, and by authority he rules over that which he has produced; and a third, which brings both together as a medium, is reason; for by reason God is both a ruler and good. Of these two powers — authority and goodness — the cherubim are the symbol; and of reason, the flaming sword" (*De Cherub.* c. 9, p. 143). In like manner he comments on the threefold appearance to Abraham in the plains of Mamre: "The middle appearance represents the Father of the universe, who in the sacred writings is called by his proper name, the Existent (ὁ Ὤν), and those on each side are the most ancient powers and nearest to the Existent; one of which is called the creative and the other the kingly power. The creative power is God, for by this power he made and arranged the universe; and the kingly power is Lord, for it is meet that the Creator should rule over and govern the creature" (*De Abr.* c. 24, p. 19; comp. *De Sacr. Ab. et Cain.* c. 15, p. 173). The inference, however, which has been drawn from these and similar passages rests on a very precarious foundation. There is no consistency in Philo's exposition, either as regards the number or the nature of these divine powers. Even granting the disputed opinion that the powers represent distinct personal beings, we find in one of the above passages the three beings all distinguished from the supreme God; while in the other he seems to be identified with one of them; and the confusion is increased if we compare other passages in which additional powers are mentioned with further distinctions. (Comp. *De Mut. Nom.* c. 4, p. 582, where a ἐυεργετικὴ δύναμις is mentioned as distinct from the βασιλικὴ and ποιητικὴ, and all three are distinguished from the supreme God.) The truth seems to be that Philo indulged his allegorizing fancy in the invention of divine powers *ad libitum*, in any number and with any signification which the text on which he was commenting for the moment might happen to suggest; and he has no more difficulty in finding six divine powers to be represented by the six cities of refuge (*De Prof.* c. 18, 19, p. 560, 561. In this passage, again, the three higher powers, represented by the three cities beyond Jordan, are clearly distinguished from the supreme God) than he has in finding three, to suit the two cherubim and the flaming sword. In this kind of desultory playing with the language of Scripture it is idle to look for any definite doctrine, philosophical or theological.

It must not be supposed that the doctrines here attributed to Philo are clearly and unambiguously enunciated in his writings. Many passages might be quoted apparently indicating different views; and probably no consecutive summary of doctrines could be drawn up against which similar objections might not be urged. This difficulty is unavoidable in the case of a writer like Philo, who attempts to combine together two antagonistic systems, of whose antagonism he is himself but imperfectly, if at all, conscious. Philo's system has been called an eclecticism; but it was not so much an eclecticism founded on definite principles of selection as an accumulation of speculations which he was unable to combine into a consistent whole, though persuaded of the existence of a common principle of truth concealed under them. There is a perpetual struggle between the Jewish and the heathen, the religious and the philosophical elements of his system, if system it can be called, which cannot be set at rest by all the latitude of interpretation which he so freely indulges in. Hence his religious convictions perpetually manifest themselves in language inconsistent with his philosophical theories; and the utmost that can be attempted in a short analysis of his teaching is to give an outline of the system as it probably would have been had it been logically carried out, not as it actually appears in his own very illogical attempt to carry it out.

In the language as well as in the doctrines of Philo we may trace the influence of Greek philosophy in conjunction with the literature of his own nation. The theory, indeed, which would trace the *term* Λόγος to the few and unimportant passages in which it is employed by Plato is too fanciful and far-fetched to be tenable; but the appearance in Philo of the Stoical distinction between λόγος ἐνδιάθετος and λόγος προφορικός, as well as his general use of the term, seems to indicate that in the employment of this word he was influenced by the language of the Greek philosophy, though perhaps in conjunction with that of the Sept. (On the λόγος of the Stoics and its relation to Philo, see Zeller, *Philos. der Griechen*, iii, 630. Comp. Wyttenbach *on Plutarch*, ii, 44, A. The distinction between ἐνδιάθετος and προφορικὸς λόγος, though acknowledged by Philo, is not applied by him directly to the divine reason [see Gfrörer, i, 177]. On other affinities between Philo and the Stoics, see Valckenär, *Diatr. de Aristobulo*, sec. xxxii.) In the use of the cognate term Σοφία, as nearly, if not quite equivalent to Λόγος, he was probably more directly influenced by writers of his own nation, by the Sept. version of the Proverbs, and by the books of Ecclesiasticus and Wisdom. (On the identity of Λόγος and Σοφία in Philo, see Gfrörer, i, 213 sq.) Thus his language, no less than his matter, indicates the compound character of his writings; the twofold origin of his opinions being paralleled by a similar twofold source of the terms in which they are expressed.

It is necessary to dwell to some extent upon the writings of Philo, because it is through them, if at all, that the influence of the Greek philosophy on the Christian Scriptures is to be traced. Whether we admit the conjecture that St. John, during his residence at Ephesus, might have become acquainted with Philo's writings; or whether we regard these writings as the extant representatives of a widely diffused doctrine, which might have reached the apostle through other channels (see, for the one supposition, dean Milman, in a note on Gibbon, ch. xxi; and for the other, Gfrörer, i, 307; ii, 4), it is to the asserted coincidences between this evangelist and the Alexandrian philosopher that we must look for the chief evidence for or against the theory which asserts an influence of Greek speculations on Christian doctrine. The amount of that influence, however, has been very differently estimated by different critics; one of whom, as has been before observed, ascribes to it nearly all the distinctive doctrines of the Christian Church; while another considers that the whole resemblance between St. John and Philo may be accounted for by their common use of certain passages of the O. T., especially those concerning the angel of the Lord, and the distinction between the hidden and the revealed God (see Tholuck on the *Gospel of St. John*, p. 65, Engl. transl.). The truth may perhaps be found in an intermediate view, if we distinguish between the Christian doctrine itself and the language in which it is expressed. Notwithstanding the verbal parallels which may be adduced between the language of Philo and that of some portions of the N. T., the relation between the Alexandrian and the Christian doctrine is one rather of contrast than of resemblance. The distinguishing doctrine of the Christian revelation—that of the Word made flesh—not only does not appear in Philo, but could not possibly appear, consistently with the lead-

ing principles of his philosophy, according to which the flesh, and matter in general, is condemned as the source of all evil. The development of Philo's doctrine, if applied to the person of Christ, will lead, as has been pointed out, not to Christianity, but to docetism (see Dorner on the *Person of Christ*, i, 17, Engl. transl.); and in the distinction, which he constantly makes, between the absolute God and the secondary deity, who alone is capable of relation to finite things, we may trace the germ of a theory which afterwards, in various forms, became conspicuous in the different developments of gnosticism.

In fact, the method of Philo, both in his philosophical theories and in his interpretations of Scripture, is so far from being, either in substance or in spirit, an anticipation of the Christian revelation, that it may rather be taken as a representative of the opposite spirit of rationalism, the tendency of which is to remove all distinction between natural and revealed religion, by striving to bring all religious doctrines alike within the compass of human reason. It is not the reception of divine truth as a fact, resting on the authority of an inspired teacher, telling us *that* these things are so; it is rather an inquiry into causes and grounds, framing theories to explain *how* they are so. The doctrine of the Logos, as it appears in Philo, is a hypothesis assumed in order to explain how it is possible that the God whom his philosophy taught him to regard as above all relation to finite existence, could nevertheless, as his religion taught him to believe, be actually manifested in relation to the world. To explain this difficulty, he has recourse to the supposition of an intermediate being between God and the world; standing, as it were, midway between the abstract and impersonal on the one side, and the definite and personal on the other; and described in language which wavers between the two conceptions, without succeeding in combining them. In this respect the theory reminds us not only of those forms of gnosticism which subsequently emanated from the Alexandrian philosophy under the influence of Christianity, as Philo's system emanated from the same philosophy under the influence of Judaism, but also, to some extent, of later speculations, which, in the endeavor to transfer the Catholic faith from a historical to a metaphysical foundation, have regarded the doctrine of the incarnation of the divine Word, not as the literal statement of a fact which took place at an appointed time, but as the figurative representation of an eternal process in the divine nature. (See Fichte, *Anweisung zum seligen Leben*, *Werke*, v, 482; Schelling, *Vorlesungen über Acad. Stud.* p. 192; Hegel, *Philosophie der Geschichte*, *Werke*, ix, 388; Baur, *Christliche Gnosis*, p. 715.)

On the other hand, the Christian revelation, while distinctly proclaiming as a fact the reconciliation of man to God by One who is both God and man, yet announces this great truth as a mystery to be received by faith, not as a theory to be comprehended by reason. The mystery of the union between God's nature and man's does not cease to be mysterious because we are assured that it is real. No intermediate hypothesis is advanced to facilitate the union of the two natures by removing the distinctive attributes of either; no attempt is made to overcome the philosophical difficulties of the doctrine by deifying the humanity of Christ or humanizing his divinity. His divine nature is not less divine than that of his Father; his human nature is not less human than that of his brethren. The intellectual difficulty of comprehending how this can be remains still; but the authority of a divine revelation is given to enable us to believe notwithstanding.

But while we acknowledge the wide and fundamental differences which exist between the doctrines of the Alexandrian Judaism and those of the Christian Scriptures, we must also acknowledge the existence of some striking similarities of language between the writings of Philo and some parts of the N. T. The following instances exhibit some of the most remarkable parallels of this kind:

N. T.	Philo.
John i, 1. Ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ Λόγος, καὶ ὁ Λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν Θεόν, καὶ Θεὸς ἦν ὁ Λόγος.	*De Conf. Ling.* 28, p. 427. τῆς ἀϊδίου εἰκόνος αὐτοῦ, λόγου τοῦ ἱερωτάτου. *De Somn.* i, 39, p. 655. καλεῖ δὲ Θεὸν τὸν πρεσβύτατον αὐτοῦ νυὶ λόγον. *Fragm.* p. 625. πρὸς τὸν δεύτερον Θεὸν ὃς ἐστιν ἐκείνου λόγος.
John i, 3. Πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο, καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδὲ ἕν ὃ γέγονεν.	*De Monarch.* ii, 5, p. 225. Λόγος δέ ἐστιν εἰκὼν Θεοῦ, δι' οὗ σύμπας ὁ κόσμος ἐδημιουργεῖτο.
John i, 4. Καὶ ἡ ζωὴ ἦν τὸ φῶς τῶν ἀνθρώπων. 9. ἦν τὸ φῶς τὸ ἀληθινὸν ὃ φωτίζει πάντα ἄνθρωπον.	*De Mundi Opif.* 8, p. 6. καὶ ταύτης εἰκόνα τὸ νοητὸν φῶς ἐκεῖνο, ὃ θείου λόγου γέγονεν ε.κὼν τοῦ διερμηνεύσαντος τὴν γένεσιν αὐτοῦ.
John i, 18. Θεὸν οὐδεὶς ἑώρακε πώποτε· ὁ μονογενὴς υἱὸς ὁ ὢν εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρός, ἐκεῖνος ἐξηγήσατο. (The parallels sometimes adduced from John iv, 10 and vi, 32, as compared with *De Prof.* 18, p. 560, and *Legis Alleg.* ii, 21; iii, 56, 59, are very questionable. In both cases the allusion seems to arise naturally from the conversation, and not from any reference to Philo.)	*Legis Alleg.* iii, 73, p. 128. οὐ περὶ τῆς φύσεως αὐτοῦ διαγωῶναι δύναται, ἀλλ' ἀγαπητόν, ἐὰν τοῦ ὀνόματος αὐτοῦ δυνηθῶμεν, ὅπερ ἦν, τοῦ ἑρμηνέως λόγου.
1 John i, 5. Ὅτι ὁ Θεὸς φῶς ἐστι, καὶ σκοτία ἐν αὐτῷ οὐκ ἔστιν οὐδεμία.	*De Somn.* i, 13, p. 632. ἐπειδὴ πρῶτον μὲν ὁ Θεὸς φῶς ἐστι.
1 John ii, 1. Καὶ ἐάν τις ἁμάρτῃ, παράκλητον ἔχομεν πρὸς τὸν πατέρα, Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν δίκαιον.	*De Vit. Mos.* iii, 14, p. 155. Ἀναγκαῖον γὰρ ἦν τὸν ἱερωμένον τῷ τοῦ κόσμου πατρὶ παρακλήτῳ χρῆσθαι τελειοτάτῳ τὴν ἀρετὴν ὑῷ πρός τε ἀμνηστείαν ἁμαρτημάτων, κ.τ.λ. [The Son of God here is the world, represented by the vestments of the high-priest.]
Rom. iv, 17. Θεοῦ τοῦ καλοῦντος τὰ μὴ ὄντα ὡς ὄντα.	*De Creat. Princ.* 7, p. 367. τὰ γὰρ μὴ ὄντα ἐκάλεσεν εἰς τὸ εἶναι.
1 Cor. iii, 1, 2. ὡς νηπίοις ἐν Χριστῷ· γάλα ὑμᾶς ἐπότισα, καὶ οὐ βρῶμα; comp. Heb. v, 12, 13.	*De Agricult.* 2, p. 301. Ἐπεὶ δὲ νηπίοις μέν ἐστι γάλα τροφὴ, τελείοις δὲ τὰ ἐκ πυρῶν πέμματα, καὶ ψυχῆς γαλακτώδεις μὲν ἂν εἴεν τροφαί, κ.τ.λ.
1 Cor. iv, 1. ὡς ὑπηρέτας Χριστοῦ καὶ οἰκονόμους μυστηρίων Θεοῦ.	*De Præm. et Pœn.* 20, p. 427. νοῦν καθαρέντα καὶ μύστην γεγονότα τῶν θείων τελετῶν.
1 Cor. x, 4. ἔπινον γὰρ ἐκ πνευματικῆς ἀκολουθούσης πέτρας· ἡ δὲ πέτρα ἦν ὁ Χριστός.	*Legis Alleg.* ii, 21, p. 82. ἡ γὰρ ἀκρότομος πέτρα ἡ σοφία τοῦ Θεοῦ . . . ἐξ ἧς ποτίζει τὰς φιλοφέους ψυχάς.
1 Cor. xiii, 12. βλέπομεν γὰρ ἄρτι δι' ἐσόπτρου ἐν αἰνίγματι. 2 Cor. iii, 18. ἡμεῖς δὲ πάντες ἀνακεκαλυμμένῳ προσώπῳ τὴν δόξαν Κυρίου κατοπτριζόμενοι.	*De Decal.* 21, p. 198. ὡς γὰρ διὰ κατόπτρου φαντασιοῦται ὁ νοῦς Θεοῦ, κ. τ. λ.
2 Cor. iii, 3. ἐπιστολὴ Χριστοῦ διακονηθεῖσα ὑφ' ἡμῶν, ἐγγεγραμμένη οὐ μέλανι, ἀλλὰ πνεύματι Θεοῦ ζῶντος, οὐκ ἐν πλαξὶ λιθίναις, ἀλλὰ ἐν πλαξὶ καρδίαις σαρκίναις.	*Quod Omn. prob.* lib. 7, p. 452. Νόμος δὲ ἀψευδὴς ὁ ὀρθὸς λόγος, οὐχ ὑπὸ τοῦ δεῖνος ἢ τοῦ δεῖνος ἐνηοῦ φθαρτὸς ἐν χαρτιδίοις ἢ στήλαις ἄψυχος ἀψύχοις, ἀλλ' ὑπ' ἀθανάτου φύσεως ἄφθαρτος ἐν ἀθανάτῳ διανοίᾳ τυπωθείς.
2 Cor. iv, 4. τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὅς ἐστιν εἰκὼν τοῦ Θεοῦ; comp. Col. i, 15.	*De Monarch.* ii, 5, p. 225. λόγος δέ ἐστιν εἰκὼν Θεοῦ. *De Conf. Ling.* 28, p. 427. Θεοῦ γὰρ εἰκὼν λόγος ὁ πρεσβύτατος.

Col. i, 15. πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως; comp. Heb. i, 6.

1 Tim. ii, 5. Εἷς γὰρ Θεός, εἷς καὶ μεσίτης Θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπων, ἄνθρωπος Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς.

Heb. i, 2. δι' οὗ καὶ ἐποίησεν τοὺς αἰῶνας.

Heb. i, 3. ὃς ὢν ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης καὶ χαρακτὴρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ.

Heb. iii, 1. Κατανοήσατε τὸν ἀπόστολον καὶ ἀρχιερέα τῆς ὁμολογίας ἡμῶν Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν.

Heb. iii, 4. πὰς γὰρ οἶκος κατασκευάζεται ὑπό τινος· ὁ δὲ τὰ πάντα κατασκευάσας Θεός.

Heb. iv, 12. ζῶν γὰρ ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ ἐνεργής, καὶ τομώτερος ὑπὲρ πᾶσαν μάχαιραν δίστομον, καὶ διικνούμενος ἄχρι μερισμοῦ ψυχῆς τε καὶ πνεύματος, ἁρμῶν τε καὶ μυελῶν.

Heb. iv, 14, 15. Ἔχοντες οὖν ἀρχιερέα μέγαν, διεληλυθότα τοὺς οὐρανούς, Ἰησοῦν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, κρατῶμεν τῆς ὁμολογίας. Οὐ γὰρ ἔχομεν ἀρχιερέα μὴ δυνάμενον συμπαθῆσαι ταῖς ἀσθενείαις ἡμῶν, πεπειραμένον δὲ κατὰ πάντα καθ' ὁμοιότητα χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας.

Heb. vi, 13. Τῷ γὰρ Ἀβραὰμ ἐπαγγειλάμενος ὁ Θεός, ἐπεὶ κατ' οὐδενὸς εἶχε μείζονος ὀμόσαι, ὤμοσε καθ' ἑαυτοῦ.

Heb. vii, 25. πάντοτε ζῶν εἰς τὸ ἐντυγχάνειν ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν. (It may be questioned whether the allegorical commentary on Melchisedek [*Leg. Alleg.* iii, 26, p. 103] is a fair parallel to Heb. vii. The latter seems more likely to have been taken directly from Psa. cx, without the intervention of Philo.)

Heb. xi, 4. Καὶ δι' αὐτῆς ἀποθανὼν ἔτι λαλεῖται.

Legis Alleg. iii, 61, p. 121. ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ . . . πρεσβύτατος καὶ γενικώτατος τῶν ὅσα γέγονε. *De Agricult.* 12, p. 308. τὸν ὀρθὸν αὐτοῦ λόγον, πρωτόγονον υἱόν. *De Prof.* 20, p. 562. ὁ μὲν πρεσβύτατος τοῦ ὄντος λόγος. *De Somn.* i, 37, p. 653. ἀρχιερεὺς ὁ πρωτόγονος αὐτοῦ θεῖος λόγος.

Quis rer. div. hær. 42, p. 501. Τῷ δὲ ἀρχαγγέλῳ καὶ πρεσβυτάτῳ λόγῳ δωρεὰν ἐξαίρετον ἔδωκεν ὁ τὰ ὑλα γέννησας πατήρ, ἵνα μεθόριος στὰς τὸ γενόμενον διακρίνῃ τοῦ πεποιηκότος, κ. τ. λ.

De Cherub. 35, p. 162. αἴτιον μὲν αὐτοῦ τὸν Θεὸν . . . ὄργανον δὲ λόγον Θεοῦ, δι' οὗ κατεσκευάσθη.

De Mundi Opif. 51, p. 35. πᾶς ἄνθρωπος κατὰ μὲν τὴν διάνοιαν ᾠκείωται θείῳ λόγῳ, τῆς μακαρίας (comp. *Sap. Sol.* vii, 26). *De Plant. Noe*, 5, p. 332. φύσεως ἐκμαγεῖον ἢ ἀπόσπασμα ἢ ἀπαύγασμα γεγονὼς σφραγὶδι Θεοῦ ἧς ὁ χαρακτὴρ ἐστιν ἀίδιος λόγος.

De Somn. i, 38, p. 654. ὁ μὲν δὴ μέγας ἀρχιερεὺς τῆς ὁμολογίας, κ. τ. λ.

De Cherub. 35, p. 162. οἰκία καὶ πόλις πᾶσα ἵνα κατασκευασθῇ, τίνα συνεισελθεῖν δεῖ; ἆρ' οὐ δημιουργόν, κ. τ. λ. . . . Μετελθὼν οὖν ἀπὸ τῶν ἐν μέρει κατασκευῶν, ἰδε τὴν μεγίστην οἰκίαν ἢ πόλιν, τόνδε τὸν κόσμον· εὑρήσεις γὰρ αἴτιον μὲν αὐτοῦ τὸν Θεόν, κ. τ. λ.

Quis rer. div. hær. 26, p. 491. τῷ τομεῖ τῶν συμπάντων αὐτοῦ λόγῳ, ὃς ἐς τὴν ὀξυτάτην ἀκοὴν θεὶς ἀκμὴν διαιρῶν οὐδέποτε λήγει τὰ α σθητὰ πάντα. 27, p. 492. Οὕτως ὁ Θεὸς ἀκονησάμενος τὸν τομέα τῶν συμπάντων αὐτοῦ λόγον, διαιρεῖ τήν τε ἄμορφον καὶ ἄποιον τῶν ὅλων οὐσίαν.

De Prof. 20, p. 562. Λέγομεν γὰρ τὸν ἀρχιερέα οὐκ ἄνθρωπον ἀλλὰ λόγον θεῖον εἶναι, πάντων οὐχ ἑκουσίων μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀκουσίων ἀδικημάτων ἀμέτοχον. *De Vict.* 10, p. 246. ὅτι ὁ πρὸς ἀλήθειαν ἀρχιερεὺς καὶ μὴ ψευδώνυμος ἀμέτοχος ἁμαρτημάτων ἐστίν.

Legis Alleg. iii, 72, p. 127. Ὁρᾷς γὰρ ὅτι οὐ καθ' ἕτερον ὀμνύει Θεός, οὐδὲν γὰρ αὐτοῦ κρεῖττον, ἀλλὰ καθ' ἑαυτοῦ, ὅς ἐστι πάντων ἄριστος.

Quis rer. div. hær. 42, p. 501. ὁ δ' αὐτὸς ἱκέτης μέν ἐστι τοῦ ὄντος κηραίνοντος ἀεὶ πρὸς τὸ ἄφθαρτον.

Quod deter. potiori insid. 14, p. 200. Μαρτυρήσει δὲ τὸ χρησθὲν λόγιον, ἐν ᾧ φωνῇ χρώμενος καὶ βοῶν ἃ πέπονθεν ὑπὸ κακοῦ συνθέτου τηλαυγῶς εὑρίσκεται. Πῶς γὰρ ὁ μηκέτ' ὢν διαλέγεσθαι δυνατός;

An examination of these passages will, we believe, confirm the view which has been above taken of the doctrinal differences between them; while, at the same time, it will enable us to discern a purpose to be served by the verbal resemblances which they undoubtedly exhibit. If we except instances of merely accidental similarity in language, without any affinity in thought; or quotations by way of illustration, such as St. Paul occasionally borrows from heathen writers; or thoughts and expressions derived from the O. T., and therefore common to Philo and the apostles, as alike acknowledging and making use of the Jewish Scriptures; they may be reduced, for the most part, to two heads: first, the use of the name ὁ Λόγος, by St. John, as a title of Christ, and the application to him, both by St. John and St. Paul, of various attributes and offices ascribed by Philo to the divine Word, and to the various philosophical representations with which the Word is identified; and, secondly, the recognition, chiefly in the acknowledged writings of St. Paul and in the Epistle to the Hebrews, of a spiritual sense, in parts of Scripture, distinct from the literal interpretation; though this is employed far more cautiously and sparingly than in Philo, and as an addition to, rather than, as Philo for the most part employs it, as a substitute for the literal sense. The apostles, it would appear from these passages, availed themselves, in some degree, of the language already established in the current speculations of their countrymen, in order to correct the errors with which that language was associated, and to lead men's minds to a recognition of the truth of which these errors were the counterfeit. This is only what might naturally be expected from men desirous of adapting the truths which they had to teach to the circumstances of those to whom they had to teach them. There was an earlier gnosticism founded in part on the perversion of the Law, as there was a later gnosticism founded in part on the perversion of the Gospel; and it is probable that, at least at the time when St. John wrote, the influence of both had begun to be felt in the Christian Church, and had modified to some extent the language of its theology (see Burton, *Bampton Lectures*, p. 218). If so, the adoption of that language, as a vehicle of Christian doctrine, would furnish the natural means both of correcting the errors which had actually crept into the Church, and of counteracting the influence of the source from which they sprang. If the philosophical Jews of Alexandria, striving, as speculative minds in every age have striven, to lay the foundations of their philosophy in an apprehension of the one and the absolute, were driven by the natural current of such speculations to think of the supreme God as a being remote and solitary, having no relation to finite things, and no attributes out of which such a relation can arise, it is natural that the inspired Christian teacher should have been directed to provide, by means of their own language, the antidote to their error; to point, in the revelation of God and man united in one Christ, to the truth, and to the manner of attaining the truth; to turn the mind of the wandering seeker from theory to fact, from speculation to belief; to bid him look, with the eye of faith, to that great mystery of godliness in which the union of the infinite and the finite is realized in fact, though remaining still incomprehensible in theory. If the same philosophers, again, seeking to bridge over the chasm which their speculations had interposed between God and man, distorted the partial revelation of the Angel of the Covenant, which their Scriptures supplied, into the likeness of the ideal universe of the Platonist, or of the half-personified world-reason of the Stoic, it was surely no unworthy object of the apostolic teaching to lead them, by means of the same language, to the true import of that revelation, as made known, in its later and fuller manifestation, by the advent of the Word made flesh. If the Platonizing expositor of the Jewish Scriptures, eager to find the foreign philosophy which he adopted in the oracles of God committed to his own people, explained away their literal import by a system of allegory and metaphor, it was natural that

the inspired writers of the New Covenant should point out the true meaning of those marks which the Jewish history and religion so clearly bear of a spiritual significance beyond themselves, by showing how the institutions of the Law and the record of God's dealings with his chosen people are not an allegory contrived for the teaching of a present philosophy, but an anticipation, designed by the divine Author of the whole as a preparation, directly and indirectly, by teaching and training, by ritual and prophecy, by type and symbol, to make ready the way for him that was to come.

The attempts made by Grossmann, Gfrörer, and others, to explain the origin of Christianity as an offshoot of the Jewish philosophy of Alexandria rest mainly on these occasional coincidences of language, while overlooking fundamental differences of doctrine. The ideal Logos, the distinguishing feature of the Alexandrian philosophy, has no place in the teaching of the N. T. The belief in one Christ, very God and very man, has not only no place in, but is diametrically opposed to the philosophical speculations of Philo. For his personal relations to Christianity, see PHILO. Christianity came into the world at a time when the Græco-Jewish modes of thought, of which Philo is the representative, were prevalent; and the earliest Christian teachers, so far as they had to deal with those to whom that philosophy was familiar, could do so most effectually by means of its language and associations. These considerations seem naturally to explain the resemblance and the difference between the two systems—resemblance as regards the language employed; difference as regards the doctrine which that language conveys.

See Keferstein, *Philo's Lehre v. d. göttl. Mittelwesen* (Leips. 1846); Niedner, *De λόγῳ apud Philonem* (in the *Zeitschr. f. hist. Theol.* 1849); Clarke's *Comm.* ad loc. Joh.; Bryant, *Philo Judæus* (Cambr. 1797, 8vo). See LOGOS.

III. *Christianity in Contact with Ancient Philosophy.*—The only direct trace of the contact of Christianity with Western philosophy in the N. T. is in the account of Paul's visit to Athens, where "certain philosophers of the Epicureans and of the Stoics" (Acts xvii, 18)—the representatives, that is, of the two great moral schools which divided the West—"encountered him;" and there is nothing in the apostolic writings to show that it exercised any important influence upon the early Church (comp. 1 Cor. i, 22–24). But it was otherwise with Eastern speculation, which, as it was less scientific in form, penetrated more deeply through the mass of the people. The "philosophy" against which the Colossians were warned (Col. ii, 8) seems undoubtedly to have been of Eastern origin, containing elements similar to those which were afterwards embodied in various shapes of gnosticism, as a selfish asceticism and a superstitious reverence for angels (ver. 16–23), and in the Epistles to Timothy, addressed to Ephesus, in which city Paul anticipated the rise of false teaching (Acts xx, 30), two distinct forms of error may be traced, in addition to Judaism, due more or less to the same influence. One of these was a vain spiritualism, insisting on ascetic observances, and interpreting the resurrection as a moral change (1 Tim. iv, 1–7; 2 Tim. ii, 16–18); the other a materialism allied to sorcery (2 Tim. iii, 13, γόητες). The former is that which is peculiarly "false-styled gnosis" (1 Tim. vi, 20), abounding in "profane and old wives' fables" (iv, 7) and empty discussions (i, 6, vi, 20); the latter has a close connection with earlier tendencies at Ephesus (Acts xix, 19), and with the traditional accounts of Simon Magus (comp. viii, 9), whose working on the early Church, however obscure, was unquestionably most important. These antagonistic and yet complementary forms of heresy found a wide development in later times; but it is remarkable that no trace of dualism, of the distinction of the Creator and the Redeemer, the Demiurge and the true God, which formed so essential a tenet of the Gnostic schools, occurs in the N. T. (comp. Thiersch, *Versuch zur Herstellung d. hist. Standpunktes*, etc., p. 231–304).

The writings of the sub-apostolic age, with the exception of the famous anecdote of Justin Martyr (*Dial.* 2–4), throw little light upon the relations of Christianity and philosophy. The heretical systems again are too obscure and complicated to illustrate more than the general admixture of foreign (especially Eastern) tenets with the apostolic teaching. One book, however, has been preserved in various shapes, which, though still unaccountably neglected in Church histories, contains a vivid delineation of the speculative struggle which Christianity had to maintain with Judaism and heathenism. The Clementine *Homilies* (ed. Dressel, 1853) and *Recognitions* (ed. Gersdorf, 1838) are a kind of philosophy of religion, and in subtlety and richness of thought yield to no early Christian writings. The picture which the supposed author draws of his early religious doubts is evidently taken from life (Clem. *Recogn.* i, 1–3; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* i, 43, Engl. transl.); and in the discussions which follow there are clear traces of Western as well as Eastern philosophy (Uhlhorn, *Die Hom. u. Recogn. d. Clem. Hom.* p. 404, etc.).

At the close of the 2d century, when the Church of Alexandria came into marked intellectual pre-eminence, the mutual influence of Christianity and Neo-Platonism opened a new field of speculation, or, rather, the two systems were presented in forms designed to meet the acknowledged wants of the time. According to the commonly received report, Origen was the scholar of Ammonius Saccas, who first gave consistency to the later Platonism, and for a long time he was the contemporary of Plotinus (A.D. 205–270), who was its noblest expositor. Neo-Platonism was, in fact, an attempt to seize the spirit of Christianity, apart from its historic basis and human elements. The separation between the two was absolute; and yet the splendor of the one-sided spiritualism of the Neo-Platonists attracted in some cases the admiration of the Christian fathers (Basil, Theodoret), and the wide circulation of the writings of the pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite served to propagate many of their doctrines under an orthodox name among the schoolmen and mystics of the Middle Ages (Vogt, *Neu-Platonismus u. Christenthum*, 1836; Herzog, *Encyklop.* s. v. Neu-Platonismus). See NEO-PLATONISM.

The want which the Alexandrian fathers endeavored to satisfy is in a great measure the want of our own time. If Christianity be truth, it must have points of special connection with all nations and all periods. The difference of character in the constituent writings of the N. T. are evidently typical, and present the Gospel in a form (if technical language may be used) now ethical, now logical, now mystical. The varieties of aspect thus indicated combine to give the idea of a harmonious whole. Clement rightly maintained that there is a "gnosis" in Christianity distinct from the errors of gnosticism. The latter was a premature attempt to connect the Gospel with earlier systems; the former a result of conflict grounded on faith (Möhler, *Patrologie*, p. 424, etc.). Christian philosophy may be in one sense a contradiction in terms, for Christianity confessedly derives its first principles from revelation, and not from simple reason; but there is no less a true philosophy of Christianity, which aims to show how completely these, by their form, their substance, and their consequences, meet the instincts and aspirations of all ages. The exposition of such a philosophy would be the work of a modern Origen.

See Haber, *Philosophie der Kirchenväter* (Münch. 1859); Stöckl, *Philos. d. patristischen Zeit* (Würzburg, 1859); Möller, *Kosmologie in d. griech. Kirche* (Halle, 1868).

IV. *Patristic Recognition of the Propædeutic Office of Greek Philosophy.*—The divine discipline of the Jews was in nature essentially moral. See PHILOSOPHY, HEBREW. The lessons which it was designed to teach were embodied in the family and the nation. Yet this was not in itself a complete discipline of our nature.

The reason, no less than the will and the affections, had an office to discharge in preparing man for the incarnation. The process and the issue in the two cases were widely different, but they were in some sense complementary. Even in time this relation holds good. The divine kingdom of the Jews was just overthrown when free speculation arose in the Ionian colonies of Asia. The teaching of the last prophet nearly synchronized with the death of Socrates. All other differences between the discipline of reason and that of revelation are implicitly included in their fundamental difference of method. In the one, man boldly aspired at once to God; in the other, God disclosed himself gradually to man. Philosophy failed as a religious teacher practically (Rom. i, 21, 22), but it bore noble witness to an inward law (ii, 14, 15). It laid open instinctive wants which it could not satisfy. It cleared away error, when it could not found truth. It swayed the foremost minds of a nation, when it left the mass without hope. In its purest and grandest forms it was "a schoolmaster to bring men to Christ" (Clem. Alex. *Strom.* i, § 28).

This function of ancient philosophy is distinctly recognised by many of the greatest of the fathers. The principle which is involved in the doctrine of Justin Martyr on "the Seminal Word" finds a clear and systematic expression in Clement of Alexandria (comp. Redepenning, *Origenes*, i, 437–439). "Every race of men participated in the Word. And they who lived with the Word were Christians, even if they were held to be godless (ἄθεοι), as, for example, among the Greeks, Socrates and Heraclitus, and those like them" (Just. Mart. *Ap.* i, 46; comp. i, 5, 28, and ii, 10, 13). "Philosophy," says Clement, "before the coming of the Lord, was necessary to Greeks for righteousness; and now it proves useful for godliness, being in some sort a preliminary discipline (προπαιδεία τις οὖσα) for those who reap the fruits of the faith through demonstration. . . . Perhaps we may say that it was given to the Greeks with this special object (προηγουμένως), for it brought (ἐπαιδαγώγει) the Greek nation to Christ, as the law brought the Hebrews" (Clem. Alex. *Strom.* i, 5, § 28; comp. 9, § 43, and 16, § 80). In this sense he does not scruple to say that "Philosophy was given as a peculiar testament (διαθήκην) to the Greeks, as forming the basis of the Christian philosophy" (*ibid.* vi, 8, § 67; comp. 5, § 41). Origen, himself a pupil of Ammonius Saccas, speaks with less precision as to the educational power of philosophy, but his whole works bear witness to its influence. The truths which the philosophers taught, he says, referring to the words of Paul, were from God, for "God manifested these to them, and all things that have been nobly said" (*c. Cels.* vi, 3; *Philoc.* 15). Augustine, while depreciating the claims of the great Gentile teachers, allows that "some of them made great discoveries, so far as they received help from heaven, while they erred so far as they were hindered by human frailty" (August. *De Civ.* ii, 7; comp. *De Doctr. Chr.* ii, 18). They had, as he elsewhere says, a distant vision of the truth, and learned from the teaching of nature what prophets learned from the Spirit (*Serm.* lxviii, 3; cxl, etc.).

But while many thus recognised in philosophy the free witness of the Word speaking among men, the same writers in other places sought to explain the partial harmony of philosophy and revelation by an original connection of the two. This attempt, which in the light of a clearer criticism is seen to be essentially fruitless and even suicidal, was at least more plausible in the first centuries. A multitude of writings were then current bearing the names of the Sibyl or Hystaspes, which were obviously based on the O.-T. Scriptures, and as long as they were received as genuine it was impossible to doubt that Jewish doctrines were spread in the West before the rise of philosophy. On the other hand, when the fathers ridicule with the bitterest scorn the contradictions and errors of philosophers, it must be remembered that they spoke often fresh from a conflict with degenerate professors of systems which had long lost all real life. Some indeed there were, chiefly among the Latins, who consistently inveighed against philosophy. But even Tertullian, who is among its fiercest adversaries, allows that at times the philosophers hit upon truth by a happy chance or blind goodfortune, and yet more by that "general feeling with which God was pleased to endow the soul" (Tertull. *De An.* 2). The use which was made of heathen speculation by heretical writers was one great cause of its disparagement by their catholic antagonists. Irenæus endeavors to reduce the Gnostic teachers to a dilemma: either the philosophers with whom they argued knew the truth or they did not; if they did, the incarnation was superfluous; if they did not, whence comes the agreement of the true and the false? (*Adv. Hær.* ii, 14, 7). Hippolytus follows out the connection of different sects with earlier teachers in elaborate detail. Tertullian, with characteristic energy, declares that "Philosophy furnishes the arms and the subjects of heresy. What (he asks) has Athens in common with Jerusalem? the Academy with the Church? heretics with Christians? Our training is from the Porch of Solomon. . . . Let those look to it who bring forward a Stoic, a Platonic, a dialectic Christianity. We have no need of curious inquiries after the coming of Christ Jesus, nor of investigation after the Gospel" (Tertull. *De Præscr. Hær.* 7).

This variety of judgment in the heat of controversy was inevitable. The full importance of the history of ancient philosophy was then first seen when all rivalry was over, and it became possible to contemplate it as a whole, animated by a great law, often trembling on the verge of truth, and sometimes by a "bold venture" claiming the heritage of faith. Yet even now the relations of the "two old covenants"—philosophy and the Hebrew Scriptures—to use the language of Clement—have been traced only imperfectly. What has been done may encourage labor, but it does not supersede it. In the porticos of Eastern churches Pythagoras and Plato are pictured among those who prepared the way for Christianity (Stanley, p. 41); but in the West, sibyls, and not philosophers, are the chosen representatives of the divine element in Gentile teaching.

Philosophy, Hebrew. The term philosophy, as seen above, may be properly used in a wider and in a more restricted sense. In the former it is nearly synonymous with *science*, and embraces all departments of human knowledge capable of being scientifically classified—that is, where the facts are presented in their causes, where phenomena are referred to principles, and arranged under laws. In the latter it is confined to speculative knowledge, that which the mind has of its own operations and laws, or which it acquires by reasoning from its own thoughts. We have no evidence that philosophy in the stricter sense was cultivated by the ancient Hebrews; nor have we much reason to believe that scientific study, even as regards external phenomena, was much followed by them. Forming our estimate from what of their literature has been preserved to us in the Bible, we must conclude that the ancient Hebrew mind was not specially characterized by those tendencies, nor largely endowed with those faculties which give birth to speculative research. The analytical and the logical are but slightly perceptible in their mental products, while the imaginative, the synthetic, and the historical largely predominate. We should be led to infer that they delighted rather in putting things together according to their analogies than in distributing them according to their differences. They were careful observers of phenomena, and their minds sought scope in bold flights of imagination, or reposed in calm, protracted, and profound reflection; but it was as historians and poets rather than as philosophers that they looked on the world both of being and event.

It thus appears that philosophy, if we limit the word strictly to describe the free pursuit of knowledge of

which truth is the one complete end, is essentially of Western growth. In the East the search after wisdom has always been connected with practice: it has remained there, what it was in Greece at first, a part of religion. The history of the Jews offers no exception to this remark: there is no Jewish philosophy properly so called. Yet on the other hand speculation and action meet in truth; and perhaps the most obvious lesson of the O. T. lies in the gradual construction of a divine philosophy by fact, and not by speculation. The method of Greece was to proceed from life to God; the method of Israel (so to speak) was to proceed from God to life. The axioms of one system are the conclusions of the other. The one led to the successive abandonment of the noblest domains of science which man had claimed originally as his own, till it left bare systems of morality; the other, in the fulness of time, prepared many to welcome the Christ—the Truth.

From what has been said, it follows that the philosophy of the Jews, using the word in a large sense, is to be sought for rather in the progress of the national life than in special books. These, indeed, furnish important illustrations of the growth of speculation, but the history is written more in acts than in thoughts. Step by step the idea of the family was raised into that of the people; and the kingdom furnished the basis of those wider promises which included all nations in one kingdom of heaven. The social, the political, the cosmical relations of man were traced out gradually in relation to God. See JEWS; JUDAISM.

I. *The Philosophy of Nature.*—1. *Primitive Period.*—With the Hebrews the original theory of the world was so simple that little occasion was given to them for speculation on the mysteries of existence. Their conception of it was essentially and wholly monotheistic. They held the existence of one God, besides whom there was no other; and as the world had come into being by his simple fiat, so it was kept in being by his will, governed by his immediate agency, and subordinated to the fulfilment of his designs. No trace is discoverable in the Bible of those pantheistic notions in which the thinkers and writers of other ancient nations seem so generally to have taken refuge from the perplexities arising out of the relations of the finite to the infinite, and which at a later period took such hold of the Jewish mind, as is attested by their cabalistic books (Freystadt, *Philosophia Cabbalistica et Pantheismus*, 1832). The world and the things in the world were regarded by them not as emanations from God, nor as in any sense God; they are all the work of his hands, proceeding from him, but as distinct from him as the work is distinct from the workman. By the word of Jehovah all things were created, and by his word they are upheld. They all belong to him as his property, and he does with them as he wills. They are his, but not in any sense he. As little do the Hebrews seem to have realized the idea of an order of nature distinct from the will and power of God. The phenomena of being and event they referred alike to the immediate agency of the Almighty. Causation was with them simply God acting. They thus removed the distinction between the natural and the supernatural, not, as some modern speculatists propose, by reducing all phenomena under natural laws, but by the reverse process, resolving all into the immediate operation of God. Man, as part of God's creation, is equally subject with the rest to his control. His times and ways are all in God's hand. By God's power and wisdom he has been fashioned; by God's goodness he is upheld and guided; by God's law his entire activity is to be regulated; at God's command he retires from this active sphere and passes into the unseen world, where his spirit returns to him who gave it.

But though this simple and childlike theory of the universe gave little scope for speculative thinking and inquiry, and though the Bible presents us with but little that indicates the existence of philosophic study among the ancient Hebrews, we are not entitled to conclude from these data that such pursuits had no existence among them. It is to be borne in mind that it was foreign to the design and pretensions of the sacred writers to discuss speculatively points on which they were commissioned to speak authoritatively in the name of God; nor must it be forgotten that we have not in the Bible the entire literature of the Hebrew people, and that, as philosophic writings would, because not addressed to the popular mind, be precisely those most likely to be allowed to perish, it is possible that much may have been lost which, had it been preserved, would have shown how and to what extent scientific research flourished among the Hebrews. This suggestion acquires force, not only from the fact that we know that certain utterances by Solomon of a scientific kind, probably committed to writing, have perished (1 Kings iv, 33), but also from the statement in Eccles. xii, 12, which, besides indicating that the literature of the Hebrews was more copious than what we now possess, leads, from its connection, to the conclusion that part of it at least was devoted to philosophic inquiry. The book of Ecclesiastes itself, as well as that of Job, may be held as proving that the Hebrew mind did not acquiesce wholly in simple faith, but had, like mind elsewhere, its seasons of doubt, question, and speculation on matters relating to man's condition and destiny. We may also point to Psa. xlix, lxxiii, and to many passages in the book of Proverbs, as indicating the same thing. Nor must we overlook the fact that the Hebrew is rich in terms which are appropriate to philosophic inquiry, and indicate habits of analytic research among those by whom they were used. Of these may be mentioned חָכְמָה, *wisdom*, often used as we use *philosophy* (comp. Eccles. i, 13, where תור בחכמה might almost be rendered *to philosophize*); בִּין, from בֵּין, *between, to separate, to discern, to understand*, i. e. to analyze perceptions into their component elements, so as to arrive at just notions of them, whence בִּינָה, *insight, intelligence, judgment*; דָּרַשׁ and חָקַר, *to investigate, to examine*; הָגָה, *to think, to reflect*; אָזַן, *to ponder*; יָדַע, *to know*, whence דַּעַת, *knowledge*. To these may be added their names for the mental part of man, רוּחַ, *πνεῦμα*; נֶפֶשׁ, *ψύχη*; נְשָׁמָה, *anima*; לֵב, *καρδία, φρήν*.

It is further to be observed that though the Bible does not present philosophic truth in a speculative form, it presents abundantly the materials out of which philosophies may be constructed. Philosophy thus exists in it as it exists in nature, not (to use the scholastic phraseology) in a manifest and evolute, but in a concrete and involute state; and it needs only a patient collection of its statements, and the arrangement of these according to their meaning and relations, to enable us to construct systematic developments of them. We may thus form not only a theology from the Bible, but an anthropology, including physiology and a system of ethics. See Roos, *Fundamenta Psychologiæ ex Sac. Script. Collecta* (1769); Beck, *Umriss d. biblischen Seelenlehre* (1843); Haussmann, *Die bibl. Lehre vom Menschen* (1848); Von Schubert, *Gesch. der Seele* (4th ed. 1850); Delitzsch, *System der bibl. Psychologie* (2d ed. 1861); Taylor, *Ductor Dubitantium* (1660); Buddæus, *Instit. Theolog. Moralis* (1715); Stäudlin, *Lehrbuch der Moral für Theologen* (2d ed. 1817); Schleiermacher, *Die Christliche Sitte* (1843); Harless, *Christliche Ethik* (4th ed. 1849); Wuttke, *Handb. der Christl. Sittenlehre* (2 vols.). See BIBLICAL THEOLOGY.

For the natural science of the Hebrews, see ASTRONOMY, BOTANY, MEDICINE, ZOOLOGY, and the articles on subjects of natural history in this work. For the exact sciences, see the articles CHRONOLOGY and NUMBER.

2. *Exilian Period.*—This is of great interest to the student of the Bible, in consequence of the influence which the Babylonian philosophy exerted on the opin-

ions and manner of thinking of the Israelites during their captivity in Babylon—an influence of a general and decided character, which the rabbins themselves admit, in alleging that the names of the angels and of the months were derived by the house of Israel from Babylon (*Rosh Hashanah*, p. 56). The system of opinion and manner of thinking which the captives met with in Babylon cannot be characterized exclusively as Chaldæan, but was made up of elements whose birthplace was in various parts of the East, and which appear to have found in Babylon a not uncongenial soil, where they grew and produced fruit which coalesced into one general system. Of these elements the two principal were the Chaldæan and the Medo-Persian or Zoroastrian. It is to the first that the reader's attention is invited in this article.

The Chaldæans, who lived in a climate where the rays of the sun are never darkened, and the night is always clear and bright by means of the light of the moon and stars, were led to believe that light was the soul of nature. Accordingly it was by the light of the sun and stars that the universal spirit brought forth all things; and therefore the Chaldæans offered their homage to the Supreme Being in the heavenly bodies, where he appeared to them in a special manner to dwell. As the stars form separate bodies, imagination represented them as distinct existences, which had each their peculiar functions, and exerted a separate influence in bringing forth the productions of nature. The idea of a universal spirit disappeared, as being too abstract for the people, and not without difficulty for cultivated minds; and worship was offered to the stars as so many powers that governed the world. It is easy to see how the Chaldæans passed from this early corruption of the primitive religion of the Bible to a low and degrading polytheism.

As light was regarded as the only moving power of nature, and every star had its own influence, so natural phenomena appeared the result of the particular influence of that heavenly body which at any given time was above the horizon; and the Chaldæan philosophers believed that they found the cause of events in its position, and the means of foretelling events in its movements. These views, and perhaps the extraordinary heat and the pestilential winds which in certain months prevail in the country, and against which there is no protection except in the hills, led the Chaldæans to the mountains which gird the land. On these observatories, which nature seems to have expressly formed for the purpose, they studied the positions and movements of the heavenly host. They thought they saw that similar phenomena were constantly accompanied by the same conjunction of the stars, which seemed to observe regular movements and a similar course. On this the Chaldæan priests came to the conviction that natural events are bound together, and that sacrifices do not interrupt their course; that they all have a common origin, which works according to unknown principles and laws, whose discovery is so important as to deserve their best attention. The heavenly bodies themselves are obedient to these laws; their formation, position, and influence are consequences of these universal laws, by which nature was controlled. This determined the Chaldæans to seek in the heavens the knowledge of the original cause which created the world, and of the laws which that cause followed in the formation of things and in the production of phenomena, since in the heavens dwelt the power which brings all things forth.

The stars were masses of light; the space which held them were filled with light; no other power appeared to operate therein: accordingly the Chaldæans held light to be the moving power which had produced the stars. It could not be doubted that this power possessed intelligence, and the operations of the mind appear to have so much resemblance to the subtlety and fleetness of light that men who had only imagination for their guide had no hesitation to represent intelligence as a property of light, and the universal spirit or highest intelligence as light itself. The observations of the Chaldæans had taught them that the distances of the stars from the earth are unequal, and that light decreases in its approach to the earth, on which they concluded that light streams forth from an endless fountain far removed from the earth, in doing which it fills space with its beams, and forms the heavenly bodies in different positions and of different magnitudes. The creative spirit was therefore set forth by them under the image of an eternal, inexhaustible fountain of light; they thought this fountain was to the universe what the sun is to the regions lighted and warmed by his beams.

As light becomes less in propagating itself, its fountain must be of an inconceivable subtlety and purity, and, accordingly, in its loftiest condition, intelligent. As its beams are removed from their source they lose their activity, and by the gradual waning of their influence sink from their original perfection; they therefore produced different existences and intelligences, in proportion as they became more distant from the fountain of light; at last, passing from one element into another, they lost their lightness, were pressed together, and made dense, till they became corporeal, and produced chaos. There accordingly was between the Supreme Being and the earth a chain of intermediate existences, whose perfections decreased as they were more remote from the First Great Cause. This Supreme Being had communicated in a distinguished degree his primary radiations, intelligence, power, productiveness; all other emanations had, in proportion to their distance from the highest intelligence, a less and less share in these perfections; and thus were the different regions of light, from the moon to the dwelling-place of the Supreme, filled with various orders of spirits.

The space which contained the First Cause, or Fountain of radiations, was filled with pure and happy intelligences. Immediately beneath this region began the corporeal world, or the empyreum, which was a boundless space, lighted by the pure light which flowed immediately from the Great Source; this empyreum was filled with an infinitely less pure fire than the original light, but immeasurably finer than all bodies. Below this was the ether, or grosser region, filled with still grosser fire. Next came the fixed stars, spread over a wide region where the thickest parts of the ethereal fire had come together and formed the stars. The world of planets succeeded, which contained the sun, moon, and the wandering stars. Then came the last order of beings—the rude elements which are deprived of all activity, and withstand the motions and influence of light. The different parts of the world are in contact, and the spirits of the upper regions can influence the lower, as well as descend and enter into them. As the chaotic elements were without shape and motion, the spirits of the higher regions must have formed the earth, and human souls are spirits sprung from them. To these spirits from above the system of the Chaldæans ascribed all the productions, appearances, and movements upon the earth. The formation of the human body, the growth of the fruits, all the gifts of nature, were attributed to beneficent spirits. In the space below the moon, in the midst of night, tempests arose, lightnings threaded the dark clouds, thunder broke forth and laid waste the earth; there were found spirits of darkness, corporeal dæmons spread through the air. Often, too, were flames of fire seen to rise out of the bosom of the earth, and the mountains were shaken. Earthly powers or dæmons were supposed to dwell in the centre of the earth; and since matter was held to be without activity, all movements were attributed to spirits. Storms, volcanoes, tempests, appeared to have no other object than to destroy human happiness; and these dæmons were held to be wicked spirits who produced these evils; to them every unfortunate event was ascribed, and a sort of hierarchy was formed of these evil beings, as had been

done in the case of the good spirits. But why did not the Supreme Mind put down, by an exertion of his power, this swarm of wicked spirits? Some thought it was beneath the dignity of the Primary Essence to contend with these dæmons; others were of opinion that these bad spirits were naturally indestructible, and as the Supreme could neither destroy nor improve them, he had banished them to the centre of the earth and to the region beneath the moon, where they indulged in their baseness and exercised their dominion: in order, however, to protect the human race against fiends so numerous and fearful, he commissioned good spirits, whose office it was to defend men against these corporeal dæmons. As the good and the bad spirits had various degrees of power and different offices, so they had names given to them which described their functions. As the good spirits were under an obligation to protect men and furnish succor in their need, they were compelled to learn human language; accordingly, it was believed that a guardian angel against every evil was possessed by every one who bore his mysterious name—a name which was to be pronounced only when succor was needed. All manner of names were therefore devised, by which the good spirits were conjured or informed of human necessities; and all the combinations of the alphabet were exhausted in order to bring about a commerce between men and angels. Here is the origin of the Cabala, which gave strange names to these spirits in order to bring them into connection with men, and by this means to do wonderful things (Matt. xii, 24–27). These names also sometimes served to drive bad spirits away: they were a kind of exorcism. For since it was believed that these dæmons had been banished to the centre of the earth, and that they could do evil only in consequence of having baffled the vigilance of the guardian spirits and escaped to the outer world, so, it was held, they were compelled to flee as soon as they heard the name of the good angels whose business it was to keep them shut up in subterranean caverns, and to punish them if they ventured from their prison-house. A power, too, was ascribed to the name of the spirit, or to the image which marked his office — a power which forced the spirit to come on being called; and, accordingly, it was held that this name carved on a stone kept the spirit near the person who wore the stone—a notion in which is probably found the origin of talismans, formed either by words or symbolical figures.

3. *Cabalistic Period.*—It is uncertain at what date the earliest Cabala (i. e. Tradition) received a definite form; but there can be no doubt that the two great divisions of which it is composed, "the Chariot" (*Mercabah*, Ezek. i), and "the Creation" (*Bereshith*, Gen. i), found a wide development before the Christian æra. The first dealt with the manifestation of God in himself; the second with his manifestation in Nature; and as the doctrine was handed down orally, it received naturally, both from its extent and form, great additions from foreign sources. On the one side it was open to the Persian doctrine of emanation, on the other to the Christian doctrine of the Incarnation; and the tradition was deeply impressed by both before it was first committed to writing in the 7th or 8th century. At present the original sources for the teaching of the Cabala are the *Sepher Jezirah*, or Book of Creation, and the *Sepher Hazohar*, or Book of Splendor. The former of these dates, in its present form, from the 8th, and the latter from the 13th century (Zunz, *Gottesd. Vortr. d. Juden*, p. 165; Jellinek, *Moses ben-Schemtob de Leon*, Leips. 1851). Both are based upon a system of pantheism. In the Book of Creation the cabalistic ideas are given in their simplest form, and offer some points of comparison with the system of the Pythagoreans. The book begins with an enumeration of the thirty-two ways of wisdom seen in the constitution of the world; and the analysis of this number is supposed to contain the key to the mysteries of Nature. The primary division is into 10+22. The number 10 represents the ten *Sephiroth* (figures) which answer to the ideal world; 22, on the other hand, the number of the Hebrew alphabet, answers to the world of objects; the object being related to the idea as a word, formed of letters, to a number. Twenty-two again is equal to 3+7+12; and each of these numbers, which constantly recur in the O.-T. Scriptures, is invested with a peculiar meaning. Generally the fundamental conceptions of the book may be thus represented: The ultimate Being is Divine Wisdom (*Chokmah*, σοφία). The universe is originally a harmonious thought of Wisdom (Number, *Sephirah*); and the thought is afterwards expressed in letters, which form, as words, the germ of things. Man, with his twofold nature, thus represents in some sense the whole universe. He is the microcosm in which the body clothes and veils the soul, as the phenomenal world veils the spirit of God. It is impossible to follow out here the details of this system, and its development in Zohar; but it is obvious how great an influence it must have exercised on the interpretation of Scripture. The calculation of the numerical worth of words (comp. Rev. xiii, 18; *Gematria*, Buxtorf, *Lex. Rabb.* p. 446), the resolution of words into initial letters of new words (*Notaricon*, Buxtorf, p. 1339), and the transposition or interchange of letters (*Temurah*), were used to obtain the inner meaning of the text; and these practices have continued to affect modern Jewish exegesis.

The fragments of Berosus, preserved by Eusebius and Josephus, and to be found in Scaliger (*De Emendat. Temp.*), and more fully in Fabricius (*Bibl. Gr.* xiv, 175), afford some information on the subject of Chaldæan philosophy. Berosus was a priest of the god Baal, at Babylon, in the time of Alexander the Great. On the naturalistic philosophy of the Jews in general, the Talmud and other works of the Jewish rabbins may also be advantageously consulted, together with the following authorities: Euseb. *Præp. Evang.* ix, 10; Philo, *De Mig. Mun.*; Selden, *De Diis Syris*, Proleg. 3; Stanley, *Hist. of Oriental Philosophy*; Kleuker, *Ueber die Natur und den Ursprung der Emanationslehre bei den Kabbalisten* (Riga, 1786); Molitor, *Philos. der Geschichte* (1827–28); Hartmann, *Die enge Verbindung des A. T. mit dem N.* (1831); Ketzer, *Lexicon von P. Fritz* (1838); Brucken, *Hist.-Crit. Phil.*; Ritter, *Geschichte der Phil.*; Nork, *Vergleichende Mythologie* (1836); Lutterbeck, *Neu-test. Lehrbegriff*, i, 223–254; Reuss, *Kabbala*, in Herzog's *Encyklop.*; Joel, *Die Religionsphilos. d. Zohar* (1849); Westcott, *Introd. to Gospels*, p. 131–134; Franck, *La Kabbale* (1843). See CABALA.

II. *The Philosophy of History.*—The philosophy of the Jews is, as has been seen from the above outline of its naturalistic relations, essentially a moral philosophy, resting on a definite connection with God. The doctrines of Creation and Providence, of an Infinite Divine Person and of a responsible human will, which elsewhere form the ultimate limits of speculation, are here assumed at the outset. The difficulties which they involve are but rarely noticed. Even when they are canvassed most deeply, a moral answer drawn from the great duties of life is that in which the questioner finds repose. The earlier chapters of Genesis contain an introduction to the direct training of the people which follows. Premature and partial developments, kingdoms based on godless might, stand in contrast with the slow foundation of the divine polity. To distinguish rightly the moral principles which were successively called out in this latter work would be to write a history of Israel; but the philosophical significance of the great crises through which the people passed lies upon the surface. The call of Abraham set forth at once the central lesson of faith in the Unseen, on which all others were raised. The father of the nation was first isolated from all natural ties before he received the promise; his heir was the son of his extreme age; his inheritance was to him "as a strange land." The history of the patriarchs brought out into yet clearer light the sovereignty of God; the younger was pre-

ferred before the elder; suffering prepared the way for safety and triumph. God was seen to make a covenant with man, and his action was written in the records of a chosen family. A new æra followed. A nation grew up in the presence of Egyptian culture. Persecution united elements which seem otherwise to have been on the point of being absorbed by foreign powers. God revealed himself now to the people in the wider relations of Lawgiver and Judge. The solitary discipline of the desert familiarized them with his majesty and his mercy. The wisdom of Egypt was hallowed to new uses. The promised land was gained by the open working of a divine Sovereign. The outlines of national faith were written in defeat and victory; and the work of the theocracy closed. Human passion then claimed a dominant influence. The people required a king. A fixed Temple was substituted for the shifting Tabernacle. Times of disruption and disaster followed; and the voice of prophets declared the spiritual meaning of the kingdom. In the midst of sorrow and defeat and desolation the horizon of hope was extended. The kingdom which man had prematurely founded was seen to be the image of a nobler "kingdom of God." The nation learned its connection with "all the kindred of the earth." The Captivity confirmed the lesson, and after it the Dispersion. The moral effects of these, and the influence which Persian, Greek, and Roman, the inheritors of all the wisdom of the East and West, exercised upon the Jews, have been elsewhere noticed. See CYRUS; DISPERSED. The divine discipline closed before the special human discipline began. The personal relations of God to the individual, the family, the nation, mankind, were established in ineffaceable history, and then other truths were brought into harmony with these in the long period of silence which separates the two Testaments. But the harmony was not always perfect. Two partial forms of religious philosophy arose. On the one side the predominance of the Chaldæan or Persian element gave rise to the Cabala; on the other the predominance of the Greek element issued in Alexandrian theosophy.

Before these one-sided developments of the truth were made the fundamental ideas of the divine government found expression in words as well as in life. The Psalms, which, among the other infinite lessons that they convey, give a deep insight into the need of a personal apprehension of truth, everywhere declare the absolute sovereignty of God over the material and moral worlds. The classical scholar cannot fail to be struck with the frequency of natural imagery, and with the close connection which is assumed to exist between man and nature as parts of one vast order. The control of all the elements by one All-wise Governor, standing out in clear contrast with the deification of isolated objects, is no less essentially characteristic of Hebrew as distinguished from Greek thought. In the world of action Providence stands over against fate, the universal kingdom against the individual state, the true and the right against the beautiful. Pure speculation may find little scope, but speculation guided by these great laws will never cease to affect most deeply the intellectual culture of men. (Comp. especially Psa. viii, xix, xxix, l, lxv, lxviii, lxxvii, lxxviii, lxxxix, xcv, xcvii, civ, cvi, cxxxvi, cxlvii, etc. It will be seen that the same character is found in Psalms of every date.) For a late and very remarkable development of this philosophy of Nature, see Dillmann, *Das B. Henoch*, xiv, xv.

One man above all is distinguished among the Jews as "the wise man." The description which is given of his writings serves as a commentary on the national view of philosophy. "And Solomon's wisdom excelled the wisdom of all the children of the east country, and all the wisdom of Egypt. . . . And he spake three thousand proverbs; and his songs were a thousand and five. And he spake of trees, from the cedar that is in Lebanon even unto the hyssop that springeth out of the wall: he spake also of beasts, and of fowl, and of creeping things, and of fishes" (1 Kings iv, 30–33). The lesson of practical duty, the full utterance of "a large heart" (ver. 29), the careful study of God's creatures—this is the sum of wisdom. Yet in fact the very practical aim of this philosophy leads to the revelation of the most sublime truth. Wisdom was gradually felt to be a person, throned by God, and holding converse with men (Prov. viii). She was seen to stand in open enmity with "the strange woman," who sought to draw them aside by sensuous attractions; and thus a new step was made towards the central doctrine of Christianity—the Incarnation of the Word.

Two books of the Bible—Job and Ecclesiastes—of which the latter, at any rate, belongs to the period of the close of the kingdom, approach more nearly than any others to the type of philosophical discussions. But in both the problem is moral and not metaphysical. The one deals with the evils which afflict "the perfect and upright;" the other with the vanity of all the pursuits and pleasures of earth. In the one we are led for an answer to a vision of "the enemy" to whom a partial and temporary power over man is conceded (Job i, 6–12); in the other to that great future when "God shall bring every work to judgment" (Eccl. xii, 14). The method of inquiry is in both cases abrupt and irregular. One clew after another is followed out, and at length abandoned; and the final solution is obtained, not by a consecutive process of reason, but by an authoritative utterance, welcomed by faith as the truth, towards which all partial efforts had tended. (Comp. Maurice, *Moral and Metaphysical Philosophy*, 1st ed.)

The Captivity necessarily exercised a profound influence upon Jewish thought. The teaching of Persia seems to have been designed to supply important elements in the education of the chosen people. But it did yet more than this. The imagery of Ezekiel (ch. i) gave an apparent sanction to a new form of mystical speculation. The contact of the Jews with Persia thus gave rise to a traditional mysticism. Their contact with Greece was marked by the rise of distinct sects. In the 3d century B.C. the great doctor Antigonus of Socho bears a Greek name, and popular belief pointed to him as the teacher of Sadoc and Boethus, the supposed founders of Jewish rationalism. At any rate, we may date from this time the twofold division of Jewish speculation which corresponds to the chief tendencies of practical philosophy. The Sadducees appear as the supporters of human freedom in its widest scope; the Pharisees of a religious Stoicism. At a later time the cycle of doctrine was completed, when by a natural reaction the Essenes established a mystic asceticism. The characteristics of these sects are noticed elsewhere. It is enough now to point out the position which they occupy in the history of Judaism (comp. Westcott, *Introd. to Gospels*, p. 60–66). At a later period the Fourth Book of Maccabees (q. v.) is a very interesting example of Jewish moral (Stoic) teaching. See SECTS, JEWISH.

The conception of wisdom which appears in the book of Proverbs was elaborated with greater detail afterwards [see WISDOM OF SOLOMON], both in Palestine [see ECCLESIASTICUS] and in Egypt; but the doctrine of *the Word* is of greater speculative interest. Both doctrines, indeed, sprang from the same cause, and indicate the desire to find some mediating power between God and the world, and to remove the direct appearance and action of God from a material sphere. The personification of Wisdom represents only a secondary power in relation to God; the Logos, in the double sense of Reason (λόγος ἐνδιάθετος) and Word (λόγος προφορικός), both in relation to God and in relation to the universe. The first use of the term Word (*Memra*), based upon the common formula of the prophets, is in the Targum of Onkelos (1st century B.C.), in which "the Word of God" is commonly substituted for God in his immediate, personal relations with man (Westcott, *Introd. to Gospels*, p. 137); and it is probable that round

this traditional rendering a fuller doctrine grew up. But there is a clear difference between the idea of the Word then prevalent in Palestine and that current at Alexandria. In Palestine the Word appears as the outward mediator between God and man, like the Angel of the Covenant; at Alexandria it appears as the spiritual connection which opens the way to revelation. The preface to John's Gospel includes the element of truth in both. In the Greek apocryphal books there is no mention of the Word (yet comp. Wisd. xviii, 15). For the Alexandrian teaching it is necessary to look alone to Philo (cir. B.C. 20–A.D. 50); and the ambiguity in the meaning of the Greek term, which has already been noticed, produces the greatest confusion in his treatment of the subject. In Philo language domineers over thought. He has no one clear and consistent view of the Logos. At times he assigns to it divine attributes and personal action; and then again he affirms decidedly the absolute indivisibility of the divine nature. The tendency of his teaching is to lead to the conception of a twofold personality in the Godhead, though he shrinks from the recognition of such a doctrine (*De Monarch.* § 5; *De Somn.* § 37; *Quod. det. pot. ins.* § 24; *De Somn.* § 39, etc.). Above all, his idea of the Logos was wholly disconnected from all Messianic hopes, and was rather the philosophic substitute for them. (See Westcott, *Introd. to Gospels*, p. 138–141; Dähne, *Jüd.-Alex. Religionsphilos.* [1834]; Gfrörer, *Philo*, etc. [1835]; Dorner, *Die Lehre v. d. Person Christi*, i, 23 sq.; Lücke, *Comm.* i, 207, who gives an account of the earlier literature.) See Philosophy, Greek.

On the general subject, see Buch, *Weisheitslehre der Hebräer* (Strasb. 1851); Nicolas, *Les doctrines religieuses des Juifs* (Par. 1860).

Philostorgius (Φιλοστόργιος), an Eastern ecclesiastical historian of some note, was a native of Borissus, in Cappadocia. He was the son of Carterius and Eulampia, and was born in the reign of Valentinian and Valens, in A.D. 358, according to Gothofredus (*Proleg. ad Philost.* p. 5, etc.), about A.D. 367, according to Vossius (*De Hist. Gr.* p. 314). He was twenty years old when Eunomius (q. v.) was expelled from Cæsarea. He was educated at Constantinople, and, together with his father, warmly embraced the doctrines of Eunomius. Philostorgius wrote an ecclesiastical history, from the heresy of Arius, in A.D. 300, to the period when Theodosius the Younger conferred the empire of the West on Valentinian the Younger (A.D. 425). The work, composed in twelve books, began respectively with the twelve letters of his name, so as to form a sort of acrostic. In this history he lost no opportunity of extolling the Arians and Eunomians, while he overwhelmed the orthodox party with abuse, with the single exception of Gregory of Nazianzum. Photius charges Philostorgius with introducing gross misrepresentations and unfounded statements, and says that the work is not a history, but a panegyric upon the heretics. Philostorgius, nevertheless, was a man of learning, and was possessed of considerable geographical and astronomical knowledge. Being a heretic, it is not to be wondered at that his work has not come down to us. An abstract of it, however, was made by Photius in a separate work, which has been preserved. Photius characterizes him as being elegant in his style, making use of figurative expressions, though not in excess. His figures were, however, sometimes harsh and far-fetched, and his narrative involved and indistinct (Phot. *Bibl.* cod. 40). Photius's abstract was published at Geneva in 1643 by Jac. Godefroi, or Gothofredus, entitled *Ecclesiasticæ historiæ, à Constantino M. Ariique initiis ad sua usque tempora, libri xii à Photio in epitomen contracti; nunc primum editi à Jacobo Gothofredo, Gr. et Lat. cum supplementis nonnullis, indiceque accurato, ex prolixioribus dissertationibus* (Lugd. 1643, 4to), and in a somewhat corrected form, with a new Latin translation, by H. Valesius (Paris, 1673), together with the ecclesiastical history of Theodoritus, Evagrius, and Theodorus; also by Reading, *Ex ecclesiasticis Philostorgii historiis epitome, et fragmenta* (Cantabr. 1720). There is also a French version: *Abrégé de l'Histoire de l'Église de Philostorge* (Paris, 1676). See Fabricius, *Bibl. Gr.* vii, 420, etc.; Vossius, *De Hist. Gr.* p. 313, etc.; Schöll, *Gesch. der Griech. Lit.* iii, 313.—Smith, *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog.* s. v. See Dowling, *Introd. to Church Hist.*; Hook, *Eccles. Biog.* viii, 72; Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrines*, i, 328; Jortin, *Remarks*, ii, 121; Stanley, *Hist. of East. Ch.* p. 168; Stäudlin, *Gesch. d. Kirchengesch.* p. 72.

Philostratus, Flavius, a famous Greek Sophist, was a native of the island of Lemnos, and was born in the second half of the 2d century of our æra. He taught rhetoric first at Athens, and Eusebius therefore calls him an Athenian, but Eunapius and Suidas always speak of him as a Lemnian, and he himself hints in his *Life of Apollonius* that he used to be at Lemnos when he was young. He frequented the schools of the Sophists, and mentions having heard Damianus of Ephesus, Proclus Naucratitas, and Hippodromus of Larissa. This shows that he lived in the reign of the emperor Severus (193–212). He also taught at Rome, where he became known and was patronized by the empress Julia, the wife of Septimius Severus, who was partial to the learned, and was surnamed "the philosophic," because she gathered about herself such a brilliant circle of scholars. She commissioned him to compile the biography of Apollonius of Tyana from some memoirs written by a certain Damis of Nineveh, who had accompanied Philostratus in his peregrinations, and which had come into her possession. Philostratus professes also to have used in his compilation a collection of letters of Apollonius, which were at one time in the possession of Hadrian, and were placed by that emperor in his palace at Antium, together with certain responses of the Oracle of Trophonius, which Apollonius had also collected. The biographer availed himself also, according to his own statement, of the narrative of a certain Maximus who had known Apollonius. The book of Philostratus displays great credulity in the compiler, and a great want of critical discrimination; it also contains many anachronisms and geographical errors. Huet and others have imagined that the object of Philostratus was to write a parody of the life of Christ, but this seems doubtful: the parody, if intended as such, is too gross; besides which, it appears from the testimony of Lampridius (*Life of Alex. Severus*), that Christ was really worshipped by some of the later heathen emperors, together with Abraham, Orpheus, and Apollonius, these being all looked upon as holy men and tutelary genii. That Apollonius of Tyana was a real character, a philosopher, and a traveller appears from various passages of ancient authors; but it is remarkable that no one mentions him until nearly a century after the time assigned for his death. The empress Julia, a Syrian by birth, was probably fond of the marvellous; and Philostratus, intending to entertain her, inserted in his book all the wonderful stories he could collect relative to his hero. It seems, however, that in the time of the great struggle between the heathen and Christian religions under Diocletian and his immediate successors, some of the heathen writers thought of availing themselves of the *Life of Apollonius* as a kind of counterpoise to the Gospel narrative. Hierocles, prefect of Alexandria, and an enemy of the Christians, wrote a book with that object, in the shape of a comparison between the life of Apollonius by Philostratus and that of Christ, of which book Eusebius wrote a refutation: *Eusebii Pamphili Animadversiones in Philostrati de Apollonio Tyanensi Commentarios ob institutam cum illo ab Hierocle Christi comparationem, adornatæ.* Lactantius (*Divin. Instit.* v, 3) also combats the same notion as absurd. Augustine (*Epist.* 4) refers to Apollonius as a magician whom the heathens compared with Christ. (See Tillemont, *Hist. des Empereurs Romains*, vol. ii, and Bayle's article *Apollonius de Tyane.*) The other works of Philostratus are, *The Lives of the Sophists*, in two books (ed. by Kayser, Heidelberg, 1838):—*Heroica*, or

comments on the lives of some of the heroes of Homer, in the shape of a dialogue (ed. by Boissonade, Paris, 1806, 8vo):—*Icones*, or descriptions of sixty-four paintings which were in a portico near Neapolis by the seashore (these descriptions contain valuable information concerning the state of ancient art) (ed. by F. Jacobs and F. G. Welcker, Leips. 1825, 8vo):—*Epistles*, mostly erotic, excepting a few on matters of literature; one, which is inscribed to Julia Augusta, is an apology for the Sophists. Philostratus wrote also many other works, such as a *Lexicon Rhetoricum*, orations, etc., but they are lost. Different editions of all the existing works of Philostratus have been published. Those by Morellius (Paris, 1608) and Olearius (Leips. 1709, fol.) are good, but a better one, far more critical and correct, is that by Kayser (Zurich, 1844, 4to), with a valuable body of notes on each work. There are separate editions of the lives of the Sophists. See Neander, *Christian Dogmas*, i, 192 sq.; Baur, *Apollonius v. Tyana u. Christus* (Tüb. 1832); Alzog, *Kirchengesch.* i, 149; Ritter, *Hist. of Philos.*; Smith, *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog.* s. v.; Butler, *Hist. of Ancient Philosophy*, vol. ii; Lardner, *Works* (see Index).

Philotheia (φιλοθεία, i. e. *the love of God*), is a term which was sometimes applied by ancient Christian writers to the monastic life, because those who embraced that life professed to renounce all for the love of God. Hence Theodoret entitles one of his books *Philotheus* (q. v.).

Philotheos Historia (φιλόθεος ἱστορία, *God-loving history*), the name given by Theodoret, the well-known commentator, bishop of Cyrus, to his lives of thirty ascetics or Eastern monks. "Their virtues," he confesses, "cannot be adequately described," and he relates the most astounding prodigies of them. The tract is in the third folio of Sirmond's edition of his works. See Philotheia.

Philotheus (Φιλόθεος) (1), an Eastern prelate, flourished as patriarch of Alexandria about A.D. 995. He was a man of luxurious habits and a most scandalous course of life. Philotheus wrote four works, the titles of which, as translated from the Arabic, are, *Declarator:—Rara Commentatorum, et Depravationes Hæreticorum: — Detectio Arcanorum: — Autobiographia.* All of these works are lost, and it does not appear whether the author wrote in Arabic or in Greek. A sermon, *De Mandatis Domini nostri Jesu Christi* (ed. Greek and Latin by P. Possinus in his *Ascetica*), is ascribed to one S. Pilotheus, perhaps the same person. See Cave, *Hist. Litt.* ad an. 995; Smith, *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog.* s. v.

Philotheus (2) Coccinus, also an Eastern ecclesiastic, flourished as patriarch of Constantinople. He was probably born in the beginning of the 14th century, and early took the monastic habit. After living for a considerable time as a monk in, and afterwards as superior of, the convent of St. Laura on Mount Sinai, he was appointed archbishop of Heracleia (before 1354). In 1355 he was employed by the emperor John Cantacuzenus in bringing about a reconciliation between Michael, the son, and John Palæologus, the son-in-law of the emperor; and in the same year he was chosen patriarch of Constantinople, in the place of Callistus, who, however, recovered his see after John Palæologus had taken possession of Constantinople. Callistus, however, died soon afterwards, and now Philotheus was once more placed in the patriarchal chair, which post he occupied with great dignity till his death, which occurred in 1371, according to Cave, or in 1376 according to the *Chronologia reformata* of J. B. Riccioli quoted by Fabricius. We append the titles of the most important of the numerous works of Philotheus, very few of which have been published: *Liturgia et Ordo instituendi Diaconum*, printed in Latin in the 26th vol. of *Bibl. Pat. Max.*:—*Libri xv Antirrhetici*, a defence of his friend the celebrated Palama, extant in different libraries:—*Sermo Encomiasticus in tres Hierarchas, Basilium, Gregorium Theologum, et Joannem Chrysostomum*, Latin, in the 26th vol. of *Bibl. Pat. Max.*, Gr. and Lat. by Jac. Pontanus, together with Philippi Solitarii Dioptra (Ingolstadt, 1604, 8vo); by Fronto Ducæus, in the 2d vol. of *Auctuar. Patr.* (Paris, 1624):—*Oratio de Cruce*, Gr. and Lat. apud Gretser. *De Cruce* (Ingolstadt, 1616, fol. vol. ii); there is another *Oratio de Cruce*, in the same volume, which is attributed by some to our Philotheus:—*Oratio in tertiam Jejuniorum Dominicam*, Gr. and Lat. (ibid.):—*Refutatio Anathematismorum ab Harmenopulo scriptorum*, Gr. and Lat. apud Leunclav. *Jus. Gr. Rom.* lib. iv:—*Confutatio Capitum xiv Acindymi et Barlaami*, extant in MS.:—*Homilia:—Compendium de Œconomia Christi*, etc. Wharton, in Cave, and Fabricius give a catalogue of the numerous works of Philotheus. See Fabricius, *Bibl. Græc.* xi, 513, etc.; Cave, *Hist. Litt.* ad an. 1362. See Smith, *Dict. Gr. and Rom. Biog.* s. v.; Neale, *Hist. of the East. Church* (Patriarchate of Constantinople).

Philotheus (3) Monachus or Sanctus, an unknown monk, wrote *De Mandatis Domini nostri Jesu Christi*, ed. Gr. and Lat. in P. Possinus's *Ascetica* (Paris, 1684). Although this work bears the same title as the one quoted above under the head Philotheus No. 1, the works are apparently by different authors. See Fabricius, *Bibl. Græc.* xi, 519; Cave. *Hist. Litt.* Dissert. i, p. 17, ed. Oxon.

Philotheus (4), archbishop of Selymbria, of unknown age, wrote *Oratio in T. Agothonicum*, which is still extant in MS.

Philoxenian Version. See Syriac Versions.

Philoxĕnus of Bagdad, an Eastern prelate of some distinction as an author, also known as *Lazarus Bar-Sapta*, flourished in the early part of the 9th century as bishop of Bagdad. This episcopate was founded in 762, but Philoxenus is the first incumbent of whom we have any notice. His character seems to have been a questionable one, for in the year 829 he was deposed, on which he appealed to Alaumeon, the caliph, by whom the sentence was confirmed. Philoxenus is the author of a Syro-Jacobite liturgy, which is in nowise remarkable. See Neale, *Hist. of the Eastern Church* (Introd.), i, 329.

Philoxĕnus of Mabug or Hierapolis, an Eastern prelate of some note, flourished in the second half of the 5th century. He was a devoted Jacobite, and for his zeal in the propagation of their doctrines is reckoned among the saints of that branch of the Syrian Church. He was bishop of Mabug, to which see he was consecrated by Peter the Fuller, after A.D. 485, though he is said not to have been baptized. He is the author of two Jacobite liturgies, of which only one is authenticated. The other is, according to Neale, "a sadly inflated specimen of mediæval taste in the East." He is also noted as the translator of certain portions of the sacred Scriptures into Syrian, and as the supervisor of a general and complete version. Besides, he was the head of the Monophysites about 500, when they fought with Nestorianism at the Council of Chalcedon. See Neale, *Hist. of the East. Ch.* (Introd.), i, 333; Assemani, *Bibl. Orient.* ii, 10; Le Quien, *Oriens Christianus*, ii, 928; Renaudot, *Lit. Orient.* ii, 300; Petavius, *De theol. dogmat.* lib. i, cap. xviii; Walch, *Gesch. der Ketzereien*, vi, 955 sq.; vii, 10 sq.; Dorner, *Entwickelungsgesch.* etc., ii, 23–46, 152, 168. (J. H. W.)

Philpot, John, an English divine of the Reformation period, noted for his learning and his devotion to the Protestant cause, for which he paid his life, was born near Winchester about the close of the 15th century. He was educated at New College, Oxford, which he entered in 1534, and of which he finally became a fellow. After leaving Oxford he travelled through Italy, where, on account of his religion, he was brought into danger. On returning to England he re-

ceived the preferment of the archdeaconry of Winchester. During the time of Edward his labors were abundant and successful. He was well furnished both by nature and grace for his calling, and he devoted himself with an uncompromising zeal to the advancement of pure and undefiled religion. After the accession of Mary, Philpot distinguished himself by his bold stand for the Protestant cause. In a convocation of bishops and dignitaries, held for the purpose of changing the established religion from Protestantism to popery, the learned archdeacon, and a few others, bore a noble testimony against the design. For his exertions, notwithstanding the promised freedom of debate, he was called before the bishop of Winchester (Stephen Gardiner), and was by his order imprisoned a year and a half. He was then sent to bishop Bonner, and other commissioners, who confined him in the bishop's coal-house. He here met with every insult: was once confined from morning till night in the stocks; was examined some fifteen or sixteen times; and, though he firmly and unanswerably defended his cause, was met only with taunts and abusive epithets. Yet in all this persecution the consolations of the Holy Spirit were abundantly administered to him; insomuch that on one occasion Bonner said to him, "I marvel that you are so merry in prison, singing in your naughtiness," etc. Philpot, proving a most uncompromising devotee to the new religion, and a most ingenious exponent of the law of the land, was regarded by the Papists as a dangerous man to be abroad, and he was therefore condemned as a heretic. After his condemnation he suffered many indignities in Newgate. But he was soon brought to the stake. He kissed the wood, and said, "Shall I disdain to suffer at this stake, when my Lord and Saviour refused not to suffer a most vile death on the cross for me?" When he was bound to it, he repeated the 106th, 107th, and 108th Psalms, and prayed most fervently; till at length, in the midst of the flames, with great meekness and joy, he gave up his spirit to God. This occurred at Smithfield, Dec. 18, 1555. For both learning and piety he was esteemed as only next to Ridley among the English Reformers. They had sound and clear views of that Gospel which they sealed with their blood. Philpot's writings have been collected and published under the title, *Examinations and Writings*, edited for the Parker Society by the Rev. R. Eden (Camb. 1842, 8vo). They contain besides a *Biographical Notice of Philpot; Notices of the Bishops and other Clergy, etc., who examined Philpot in* 1555; *the Process and History of Master John Philpot, examined, condemned, and martyred; Disputation in the Convocation House, October*, 1553; *Letters; Apology for Spitting upon an Arian; Defence of the True and Old Authority of Christ's Church*, by Cœlius Secundus Curio, translated by John Philpot. See also Richmond's *Fathers*, iv, 335; *British Reformers*, vol. iii; Fox, *Acts and Monuments*, anno 1555; Strype, *Memorials*, and his *Cranmer;* Fuller, *Abel Redivivus;* Wood, *Athenæ Oxon.;* Bickersteth, *Christian Student*, p. 328; Middleton, *Evangel. Biogr.* i, 428 sq.; Burnet, *Hist. of the English Ref.;* Soames, *Hist. of the Ref.;* Hardwick, *Hist. of the Ref.* p. 216; Froude, *Hist. of England* (see Index in vol. viii); Hook, *Eccles. Biog.* viii, 74. (J. H. W.)

Philpotts. See PHILLPOTTS.

Philter, Philtre (Gr. *φίλτρον*, *love-charm, love-potion*). A superstitious belief in the efficacy of certain artificial means of inspiring and securing love seems to have been generally prevalent from very early times; and among the Greeks and Romans (among the latter in the later days of the republic, and under the emperors) love-charms, and especially love-potions, were in continual use. It is not certainly known of what these love-potions were composed—nor can we rely entirely on the details given us on this subject by classic writers, and their commentators in later time—but there is no doubt that certain poisonous or deleterious herbs and drugs were among their chief ingredients, to which other substances, animal as well as vegetable, are said to have been added, coupled with the employment of magic rites. Thessaly had the credit of producing the most potent herbs, and her people were notorious as the most skilful practicers of magic arts, whence the well-known "Thessala philtra" of Juvenal (vi, 610). These potions were violent and dangerous in operation, and their use resulted often in the weakening of the mental powers, madness, and death, instead of the purpose for which they were intended. Lucretius is said to have been driven mad by a love-potion, and to have died by his own hand in consequence—though the story does not perhaps rest on sufficient authority; and the madness of the emperor Caligula was attributed by some persons to love-potions given him by his wife Cæsonia —by which also she is said to have preserved his attachment till the end of his life. In the corrupt and licentious days of the Roman empire the manufacture of love-charms of all kinds seem to have been carried on as a regular trade; the purchasers, if not the makers of them, being chiefly women. The use of philters seems to have been not unknown during the Middle Ages; and in the East, the nurse of superstition of all kinds, belief in the power of love-potions lingers probably down to the present day

Philumĕna, one of the youngest, and in Italy one of the most revered of saints, especially as the protectress of the imprisoned, deserves to be mentioned here as one of the most extravagant examples of Romish credulity and superstition. Her remains were reported to have been exhumed in 1802 from the catacomb of St. Priscilla (q. v.) at Rome. Her history is claimed to have been revealed at the time to three different persons, and according to this she was the descendant of a Greek prince, and in her thirteenth year was brought to Rome as a Christian devotee, and came under the notice of the emperor Diocletian, who desired her for wife—an honor which she refused on the ground that she had two years previously wedded herself to her Lord in her virginity. For this refusal the emperor condemned her to death by martyrdom. In 1805 her remains were removed to her supposed birthplace——Mugnano, twenty miles from Naples. The wonders wrought at her tomb were related far and near, and soon her resting-place became the object of many pilgrimages, and she is now known as the "wonder-worker of the 19th century." Pope Gregory XVI put her in the calendar of saints, and she is commemorated Aug. 11. See Sintzel, *Verehrung der heil. Philomena* (Munich, 1844); Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, xii, 984 sq.; Abel, *Die Legende vom heil. Johann v. Nepomuck* (Berl. 1855), p. 6. (J. H. W.)

Phin'eës (*Φινεές*), the Græcized form of the Heb. name PHINEHAS (q. v.): *a.* The son of Eleazar, son of Aaron, the great hero of the Jewish priesthood (1 Esdr. v, 5; viii, 2, 29; 2 Esdr. i, 2 *b;* Ecclus. xlv, 23; 1 Macc. ii, 26); *b.* The son of Eli (2 Esdr. i, 2 *a*): but the insertion of the name in the genealogy of Ezra (in this place only) is evidently an error, since Ezra belonged to the line of Eleazar, and Eli to that of Ithamar; *c.* A priest or Levite of the time of Ezra, father of Eleazar (1 Esdr. viii, 63).

(*Φινοέ.*) In 1 Esdr. v, 31 it stands for PASEAH (q. v.) of the Heb. text (Ezra ii, 49).

Phin'ehas (Heb. *Pinechas'*, פִּינְחָס, *mouth of brass* [Gesen.], or *of utterance* [Fürst]; Sept. *Φινεές* v. r. *Φεινεές*; Josephus, *Φινεέσης*), the name of two or three Hebrews.

1. Son of Eleazar and grandson of Aaron (Exod. vi, 25). His mother is recorded as one of the daughters of Putiel, an unknown person, who is identified by the rabbins with Jethro the Midianite (*Targ. Pseudojon.* on Exod. vi, 25; Wagenseil, *Sota*, viii, 6). Phinehas is memorable for having while quite a youth, by his zeal and energy at the critical moment of the licentious idol-

atry of Shittim, appeased the divine wrath and put a stop to the plague which was destroying the nation (Numb. xxv, 7). B.C. 1619. For this he was rewarded by the special approbation of Jehovah, and by a promise that the priesthood should remain in his family forever (ver. 10-13). This seems to have raised him at once to a very high position in the nation, and he was appointed to accompany as priest the expedition by which the Midianites were destroyed (xxxi, 6). Seven years later he also headed the party who were despatched from Shiloh to remonstrate against the altar which the transjordanic tribes were reported to have built near Jordan (Josh. xxii, 13-32). In the partition of the country he received an allotment of his own—a hill on Mount Ephraim which bore his name—Gibeath-Pinechas. Here his father was buried (xxiv, 32).

During the life of Phinehas he appears to have been the chief of the great family of the Korahites or Korhites who guarded the entrances to the sacred tent and the whole of the sacred camp (1 Chron. ix, 20). After Eleazar's death he became high-priest—the third of the series. B.C. cir. 1580-1523. In this capacity he is introduced as giving the oracle to the nation during the struggle with the Benjamites in the matter of Gibeah (Judg. xx, 28). Where the ark and tabernacle were stationed at that time is not clear. From ver. 1 we should infer that they were at Mizpeh, while from ver. 18, 26 it seems equally probable that they were at Bethel (which is also the statement of Josephus, *Ant.* v, 2, 11). Or the Hebrew words in these latter verses may mean, not Bethel the town, but, as they are rendered in the A. V., "house of God," and refer to the tabernacle at Shiloh. But wherever the ark may have been, there was the aged priest "standing before it," and the oracle which he delivered was one which must have been fully in accordance with his own vehement temper, "Shall we go out to battle . . . or shall we cease?" The answer was, "Go up: for to-morrow I will deliver them into your hand."

The memory of this champion of Jehovah was very dear to the Jews. The narrative of the Pentateuch presents him as the type of an ardent and devoted priest. The numerous references to him in the later literature all adopt the same tone. He is commemorated in one of the Psalms (cvi, 30, 31) in the identical phrase which is consecrated forever by its use in reference to the great act of faith of Abraham; a phrase which perhaps more than any other in the Bible binds together the old and new dispensations—"that was *counted to him for righteousness* unto all generations for evermore" (comp. Gen. xv, 6; Rom. iv, 3). The "covenant" made with him is put into the same rank for dignity and certainty with that by which the throne was assured to king David (Ecclus. xlv, 25). The zeal of Mattathias the Maccabee is sufficiently praised by a comparison with that of "Phinees against Zambri, the son of Salom" (1 Macc. ii, 26). The priests who returned from the captivity are enrolled in the official lists as the sons of Phinehas (Ezra viii, 2; 1 Esdr. v, 5). In the *Seder Olam* (ch. xx) he is identified with "the prophet" of Judg. vi, 8.

Josephus (*Ant.* iv, 6, 12), out of the traditions which he frequently introduces, adds to the narrative of the Pentateuch a statement that "so great was his courage and so remarkable his bodily strength that he would never relinquish any undertaking, however difficult and dangerous, without gaining a complete victory." The later Jews are fond of comparing him to Elijah, if indeed they do not regard them as one and the same individual (see the quotations in Meyer, *Chron. Hebr.* p. 845; Fabricius, *Codex Pseudepig.* p. 894, note). In the Targum Pseudojonathan of Numb. xxv the slaughter of Zimri and Cozbi is accompanied by twelve miracles, and the covenant made with Phinehas is expanded into a promise that he shall be "the angel of the covenant, shall live forever, and shall proclaim redemption at the end of the world." His Midianitish origin (already noticed) is brought forward as adding greater lustre to his zeal against Midian, and enhancing his glorious destiny. The verse which closes the book of Joshua is ascribed to Phinehas, as the description of the death of Moses at the end of Deuteronomy is to Joshua (*Baba Bathra*, in Fabricius, p. 893). He is also reported to be the author of a work on sacred names (*ibid.*), which, however, is so rare that Fabricius had never seen it.

The succession of the posterity of Phinehas in the high-priesthood was interrupted when Eli, of the race of Ithamar, was priest; but it was resumed in the person of Zadok, and continued in the same line to the destruction of Jerusalem. See HIGH-PRIEST. One of the members of the family—Manasseh, son of Johanan, and brother of Jaddua—went over to the Samaritans, and they still boast that they preserve the succession (see their letter to Scaliger, in Eichhorn's *Repertorium*, xiii, 262).

The tomb of Phinehas, a place of great resort to both Jews and Samaritans, is shown at Awertah, four miles south-east of Nablûs. It stands in the centre of the village, enclosed within a little area or compound, which is overshadowed by the thickly trellised foliage of an ancient vine. A small mosque joins the wall of the compound. Outside the village, on the next hill, is a larger enclosure, containing the tomb of Eleazar, and a cave ascribed to Elijah, overshadowed by two venerable terebinth-trees, surrounded by arcades, and forming a retired and truly charming spot. The local tradition asserts that Awertah and its neighborhood are the "Hill of Phinehas."

2. Second son of Eli (1 Sam. i, 3; ii, 34; iv, 4, 11, 17, 19; xiv, 3). He was not of the same line as his illustrious and devoted namesake, but of the family of Ithamar. See ELI. Phinehas was killed with his brother by the Philistines when the ark was captured. B.C. 1125. He had two sons, Ahitub, the eldest—whose sons Ahijah and Ahimelech were high-priests at Shiloh and Nob in the time of Saul (xiv, 3)—and Ichabod. He is introduced, apparently by mistake, in the genealogy of Ezra in 2 Esdr. i, 2 *a*.

3. A Levite, mentioned in Ezra viii, 33 as the father of the Eleazar who aided Meremoth to weigh the vessels of the sanctuary. B.C. ante 458. The meaning, however, may be that Eleazar was of the family of the great Phinehas.

Phinney, CLEMENT, an American Free-will Baptist preacher, noted especially as an evangelist, was born in Gorham, Me., Aug. 16, 1780. He possessed a good physical constitution, a large share of good-nature and cheerfulness, as well as strong common-sense. His love of music was remarkable. When a youth his talent of song made him a favorite with both old and young. In 1806 he was converted, and after his talents had been consecrated to God his gift of song became instrumental in awakening in the human heart responses to the calls of the divine Word. He sang with the Spirit and with power, which at times produced wonderful effect. He received ordination in 1816, and feeling called of God to labor as an evangelist, declined the work of the pastorate. He seemed to be specially qualified by nature and grace for the work of winning souls to Christ, and God gave him many as seals of his ministry—thousands were awakened by his earnest and affectionate ministrations. Though his advantages for an education were limited, yet college professors and other learned men were frequently found among his delighted auditors. He was a devoted friend of the slave, and, with the leaders of his denomination, early espoused the anti-slavery cause. His amiability, integrity, wisdom, and purity of character won for him universal confidence and esteem. He died at Portland, Me., where he had performed the most of his public labors, full of years and abounding in faith.

Phipps, JOSEPH, a noted member of the Society of Friends, flourished in the second half of last century.

He is distinguished as the writer of eight important theological treatises (Lond. 1767–96), of which we mention here, *Brief Remarks on the Common Arguments now used in Support of divers Ecclesiastical Impositions in this Nation* (1769, 8vo):—*The Original and Present State of Man briefly considered; wherein is shown the Nature of his Fall, and the Necessity, Means, and Manner of his Restoration; to which are added some Remarks on the Arguments of Samuel Newton, of Norwich* (1773, 8vo):—*A Reply to a late Publication of S. Newton, intituled An Appendix, etc.; in Answer to which it is plainly shown that the Quakers are not Calvinists, that the Gospel comprehends more than Words, and that the Spirit of Truth is to be experienced and sensibly felt in the Minds and Consciences of Men* (1774, 8vo):—*An Address to the Youth of Norwich* (1776, 12mo):—*Dissertations on the Nature and Effect of Christian Baptism, Christian Communion, and Religious Waiting upon God; to which are added a few Reflections on the Observance of Public Fasts and Festivals* (1781, 8vo).

Phi'son (Φισών), a Græcized form (Ecclus. xxiv, 25) of the name of the river PISON (q. v.).

Phlegĕthon, a river in the infernal regions, according to the system of ancient heathenism. It was one of the four rivers which the dead must cross before finding admission to the realms of Orcus. See Gardner, *Faiths of the World*, ii, 655.

Phle'gon (Φλεγων, *burning*), one of the Christians of Rome to whom Paul sent his salutations (Rom. xvi, 14). A.D. 55. The legend (apud Dorotheus) makes him to have been one of the seventy disciples, and bishop of Marathon. So likewise Pseudo-Hippolytus (*De LXX Apostolis*). He is said to have suffered martyrdom on April 8 (*Martyrologium Romanum*, apud Estium), on which day he is commemorated in the calendar of the Byzantine Church.

Phlegon (Φλέγων), surnamed TRALLIANUS, from Tralles, a city of Lydia, where he was born, flourished in the reign of the emperor Hadrian. Nothing is known of the events of his life, and the date of his death is uncertain; however, as one of his chronological works, which is no longer extant, carried the history down to Ol. 229.2 = A.D. 141 (Suidas), he probably lived to the middle of the 2d century A.D. Phlegon's name is familiar among the moderns because, though a heathen, he bore witness to the accomplishment of Christian prophecies (Origen, *Contra Cels.* lib. ii, § 14, p. 69, ed. Spencer, Cantab. 1677; but see Lardner's *Credibility*, pt. ii, *Heathen Testimonies*, ch. xiii, who concludes that "upon the whole this citation is of no great moment"). There is also in Phlegon's writings a passage which may be reckoned still more material, as it is supposed to relate to the miraculous darkness which prevailed at the time of Christ's crucifixion. In St. Jerome's Latin version of the *Chronicle* of Eusebius (p. 155, ed. Pont., Burdig. 1604), the passage occurs as follows: "And so writes Phlegon, an excellent compiler of the Olympiads, in his thirteenth book, saying, 'In the fourth year of the two hundred and second Olympiad there was a great and extraordinary eclipse of the sun, distinguished among all that had happened before. At the sixth hour the day was turned into dark night, so that the stars in the heavens were seen, and there was an earthquake in Bithynia which overthrew many houses in the city of Nice'" (comp. Origen, *Contra Cels.* lib. ii, § 33, p. 80; § 59, p. 96; and other authorities quoted by Lardner). This passage was the origin of a controversy in England in the early part of the last century between Mr. Whiston, Dr. Sykes, Mr. Chapman, and others, a long and complete account of which may be found in the English translation of Bayle's *Dictionnaire Historique*, s. v., and in Chauffepié's "Supplement" to it. The immediate cause of the controversy was the omission of the passage in the eighth edition of Dr. S. Clarke's *Boyle Lectures*, published soon after his death in 1732, although it had been inserted in the first edition, which came out in 1706. This was done at the persuasion of Dr. Sykes, who had suggested to Clarke that an undue stress had been laid upon the passage. Whiston, who informs us of this affair, expresses great displeasure against Sykes, and calls "the suggestion groundless." Upon this Sykes published *A Dissertation on the Eclipse mentioned by Phlegon, or an Inquiry whether that Eclipse had any Relation to the Darkness which happened at our Saviour's Passion* (1732, 8vo). Sykes concludes it to be most probable that Phlegon had in view a natural eclipse, which happened Nov. 24, in the first year of the two hundred and second Olympiad, and not in the fourth year of the Olympiad in which Christ was crucified. Many pieces were written against Sykes, who replied to some of them, but it may well be considered as a controversy still unsettled. The principal objections against the authority of the passage in question are thus briefly summed up by Dr. Adam Clarke (*Comment. on Matt. xxvii*, 45): 1. All the authors who quote Phlegon differ, and often very materially, in what they say was found in him. 2. He says nothing of "Judæa;" what he says is that in such an Olympiad (some say the one hundred and second, others the two hundred and second) there was "an eclipse in Bithynia," and "an earthquake at Nice." 3. He does not say that the earthquake happened at the time of the eclipse. 4. He does not intimate that this "darkness" was "extraordinary," or that the eclipse happened at the "full of the moon," or that it lasted "three hours;" all of which circumstances could not have been omitted by him if he had known them. 5. He speaks merely of an ordinary though perhaps total eclipse of the sun, and cannot mean the darkness mentioned by the evangelists. And, 6, he speaks of an eclipse that happened in some year of the one hundred and second or two hundred and second Olympiad, and therefore, upon the whole, little stress can be laid on what he says as applying to this event. Some fragments of his works are all that remain, the longest belongs to a treatise, Περὶ θαυμασίων, *De Mirabilibus*. It is a curious work, divided into thirty-five chapters (some of which are very short), and containing (as might be expected from the title) a great many absurd fables. The same may be said of a shorter fragment of four chapters, Περι μακροβίων, *De Longævis*. The third fragment that remains is a chapter, Περι τῶν Ὀλυμπίων, *De Olympiis*, which is supposed by Salmasius (*Ad Spartian.* p. 43) to be the preface to a lost work, *De Olympionicis*. These fragments were first published in 1568 (Basil. 8vo, Greek and Latin), by Xylander, together with Antonini Liberalis, *Transform. Conger.*; Apollonii *Hist. Mirab.*; Antigoni Carystii *Hist. Mirab.*; and M. Antoninus, *De Vitâ suâ*. An improved edition, with notes by Meursius, appeared in 1620 (Lugd. Bat. 4to, Greek and Latin), which is reprinted by Gronovius in his *Thesaur. Antiquit. Græc.* viii, 2690 sq., and 2727, and ix, 1289 sq.; and also inserted among the works of Meursius, vii, 77 sq. The best edition is by Westermann, in his *Scriptores Rerum Mirabilium Græci* (Bruns. 1839). See, besides the references already given, *Engl. Cyclop.* s. v.; *Gen. Biog. Dict.* s. v., Smith, *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. and Mythol.* s. v.

Phobĕtor (Φοβήτωρ, *frightener*), an attendant on Somnus, the god of sleep, in the ancient heathen mythology. It was his office to suggest to the mind images of animated beings, and in this capacity he is mentioned by Ovid in his *Metamorphoses*.

Phobus (Φόβος), the personification of *Fear* among the ancient Greeks. He is said to have been the son of Ares and Cythereia, and a constant attendant upon his father. He was worshipped by the Romans under the equivalent name of *Metus*.

Phŏbus is the name of a number of Jews who distinguished themselves in Hebrew literature. We mention the following as most important:

1. SAMUEL, of Warcislaw, flourished in the last quar-

ter of the 17th century, was rabbi at Fürth and Schidlow, and wrote, בְּרִית שְׁמוּאֵל, a commentary on the codex *Eben-Ezer*, making use of other commentaries on the same, as the טורי זהב of Chajim Kohen, etc. (Dyrhenfurt, 1689; corrected edition, Fürth, 1694; Wilna-Grodno, 1819):—a commentary on the codex *Orach Chajim*:—a commentary on *Jore Dea*:—*Discourses on the Pentateuch*, which have not been printed.

2. Samuel *ben-Joseph ha-Kohen Falk*, of Vienna, died in Palestine, where he went after the Jews had been expelled from Vienna in 1670. He wrote, לֶקֶט שְׁמוּאֵל, a kind of haggadistic dictionary of proper names, wherein he speaks in alphabetical order of אָדָם, אָבוֹת, אַהֲרֹן, etc., collected from different sources (Venice, 1694):—דְּרוּשׁ שְׁמוּאֵל, discourses on the Pentateuch (ibid. 1714). See Wolf, *Bibl. Hebr.* iii, 1122 sq.

3. Uri *ben-Aharon ha-Levi*, a typographer at Amsterdam, was born in 1623, and was still living in 1713. He published the Hebrew Old Testament, with many additions of Jacob Blitz, and a Preface in Judæo-German by the editor (Amsterd. 1679). He also published *Neuer Abendsegen*, a prayer-book, in Judæo-German (ibid. 1677). See Grätz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, x, 329 sq.

4. Uri *ben-David*, flourished in the middle of the 17th century, was rabbi at Polnow, in Lithuania, and wrote אור תּוֹרָה, an exegetical and allegorical commentary on the Pentateuch, with additions of Sam. El. Edeler (Lublin, 1672). See Wolf, *Bibl. Hebr.* i, 131, iii, 84.

5. Uri *ha-Kohen*, rabbi at Metz, wrote halachic discussions, haggadic dissertations, and discourses, under the title of הֲלָכָה בְּרוּרָה (Metz, 1793).

6. Uri *ben-A. Löw*, of Breslau, is the author of, מִדְרָשׁ מְלִים, a *Hebrew-German Dictionary* (Dyrhenfurt, 1773):—לִקּוּטֵי אוֹרוֹת, in two parts, the first gives the six hundred and thirteen precepts according to the Pentateuch, the second, under the title פִּתְגָם הַמֶּלֶךְ, contains these precepts in a metrical form (ibid. 1812).

7. Uri *ben-Simeon*, of Beelen, who lived in the middle of the 16th century, published רְחוֹב הָאָבוֹת, remarkable epitaphs of pious and distinguished Israelites in Palestine, written for pilgrims. After it had been published by an anonymous author in 1537, Uri Phœbus recast the whole, and published it in 1564 at Safed, after having visited and seen himself the different places. It was then published again in Venice in 1599, and often. It was translated into Latin by Hottinger, in his *Cippi Hebraici* (Heidelberg, 1659–1662); into French by Carmoly (in *Revue Orient.* [Brussels, 1843–1844] iii, 85–99):—לוּחַ, a *Calendarium*, which has been translated into Latin by Jac. Christmann, under the title *Calendarium Palestinorum et universorum Judæorum ad annos* 40 *supputatum, auctore Uri fil. Sim. Judæo Palästino, nunc primum ex sermone Hebræo in Latinum conversum, ac scholiis utilibus maximeque necessariis illustratum* (Frankf. a. M. 1594). See Wolf, *Bibl. Hebr.* i, 133 sq.; iii, 84 sq.; Fürst, *Bibl. Jud.* iii, 95 sq. (B. P.)

Phocas, a Christian martyr of the early Church, flourished as bishop of Pontus in the 3d century. He was condemned to death for his refusal to sacrifice to Neptune, and was put to death by being first cast into a hot limekiln, and afterwards thrown into a scalding bath (Fox, p. 16).

Another martyr of the same name flourished near the opening of the 4th century. He was put to death in A.D. 303. He was inserted in the list of martyrs in the days of the emperor Constantine. This Phocas is to the Greek Christians the Castor and Pollux of ancient Greece, and mariners revere his memory and pray for his intercession. He is commemorated by the Romanists July 14.

Phocas, John, a noted Eastern monastic, flourished at Crete near the middle of the 12th century. He is especially distinguished by his description of a visit to Palestine, which work is entitled Ἔχφρασις ἐν συνόψει τῶν ἀπ' Ἀντιοχείας μέχρι Ἱεροσολύμων κάστρων καὶ χωρῶν Συρίας, Φοινίκης καὶ τῶν κατὰ Παλαιστίνην ἁγίων τόπων (ed. Gr. et Lat. Leo Allatius, Colon. 1653). This is a most important contribution to the department of Biblical geography, and is prized even in our day. See Smith, *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog.* ii, 601.

Phœbadius, an eminent prelate of the 4th century, flourished as bishop of Agen, in Gaul. He was living in 392, when Jerome wrote his Catalogue, but was then in extreme old age. He is noted as the author of *Liber contra Arianos* (published in *Bibl. Max. Patr.* iv, 300; *Bibl. Patr. Gall.* v, 250; *Athanasii Dialogi*, v, 1570, 8vo).

Phœbè (Φοίβη, *radiant*), a deaconess of the Church at Cenchreæ, recommended to the kind attention of the Church of Rome by Paul, who had received hospitable treatment from her (Rom. xvi, 1). A.D. 55. Her name occurs first in the long list of Christian men and women of whom express mention is there made. For the most part these were persons who had been previously known to Paul, and had some connection with him in his apostolic labors, but were at the time residing in Rome. Phœbe, however, was in the neighborhood of the apostle, probably still in Cenchreæ, and was on the eve of setting out for Rome—on what business it is not said; but that she had something of importance in hand is evident from the request of the apostle, that the Christians at Rome would "receive her in the Lord, and assist her in whatever business she had need of them" (ver. 2). See Paul. It is probable that she was the bearer of the Epistle to the Romans. See Romans, Epistle to. "What is said of her is worthy of especial notice, because of its bearing on the question of the deaconesses of the Apostolic Church. On this point we have to observe, (1) that the term διάκονος, here applied to her, though not in itself necessarily an official term, is the term which would be applied to her if it were meant to be official; (2) that this term is applied in the *Apostolical Constitutions* to women who ministered officially, the deaconess being called ἡ διάκονος, as the deacon is called ὁ διάκονος; (3) that it is now generally admitted that in 1 Tim. iii, 11 Paul applies it so himself; (4) that in the passage before us Phœbe is called the διάκονος of a particular Church, which seems to imply a specific employment; (5) that the Church of Cenchreæ, to which she belonged, could only have been a small Church: whence we may draw a fair conclusion as to what was customary, in the matter of such female ministration, in the larger churches; (6) that, whatever her errand to Rome might be, the independent manner of her going there seems to imply (especially when we consider the secluded habits of Greek women) not only that she was a widow or a woman of mature age, but that she was acting officially; (7) that she had already been of great service to Paul and others (προστάτις πολλῶν, καὶ ἐμοῦ αὐτοῦ), either by her wealth or her energy, or both; a statement which closely corresponds with the description of the qualifications of the enrolled widows in 1 Tim. v, 10; (8) that the duty which we here see Phœbe discharging implies a personal character worthy of confidence and respect." See Deaconess.

Phœbus (Φοῖβος, *bright*), a title, and subsequently a name, of *Apollo*. It had reference both to the youthful beauty of the god, and to the radiance of the sun, when, latterly, Apollo became identified with *Helios*, the sun-god.

Phœbus, William, a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Somerset County, Md., August, 1754. In 1783 he was admitted to the Conference, and preached in various places until 1798, when he located in the city of New York, entering upon the practice of medicine. In 1806 he was readmitted into the New York

Conference, laboring effectively till 1821, after which time he was either supernumerary or superannuated. He died in New York Nov. 9, 1831. He was a sound preacher and an excellent man.—*Minutes of Conferences*, ii, 162; Sprague, *Ann. of the Amer. Pulpit*, vii, 87.

Phœni'cè [some *Phe'nice*], or, rather, PHŒNIX (*Φοίνιξ, a palm-tree* [q. v.], which Theophrastus says was indigenous there), a town and harbor in the island of Crete, which the vessel in which the apostle Paul sailed was attempting to reach when driven away by the euroclydon and wrecked (Acts xxvii, 12). The harbor or "haven" (*λιμήν*) is described by Luke as *βλέποντα κατὰ λίβα καὶ κατὰ χῶρον*, which the A. V. renders "lieth towards the south-west and north-west." But Mr. Smith contends that *κατά* in connection with winds means "in the same direction as." Thus *βλέποντα κατὰ λίβα* would not mean, as is generally supposed, that the haven looked to the point *from* which the libs blows, but to the point *towards* which it blows. Consequently the haven looked *towards the north-east and the south-east* (Smith, *Voyage and Shipwreck of St. Paul*, p. 86 sq., 2d ed.). In this rendering Mr. Smith is sustained by ancient authorities, and also by some of the best modern critics (Alford, ad loc.; Conybeare and Howson, *Life of St. Paul*, ii, 334, note; see, however, for the contrary opinion, Hacket *On Acts*, ad loc.). It is certain that one meaning of *κατά* with the accusative is "opposite," or "over against," as it is correctly translated in ver. 7 of this very chapter. Schweighäuser, in his *Lexicon Herodoteum*, has pointed out some very instructive instances of this in Herod. ix, 31, where *κατά* is used indiscriminately with *ἀντίον* and *ἀντία*. In this sense, *βλέποντα κατὰ Λίβα*, etc., would be equivalent to *βλέποντα πρὸς Λίβα*, etc.; a phrase as to the meaning of which there could be no doubt (Xenophon, *Mem.* iii, 8, 9). *Κατά* with an accusative also often signifies "down." But the objection to translating it so in this passage is that it would thus, with extreme awkwardness, *inferentially* mean the exact contrary of what it *directly* means in its other acknowledged sense, as marking the local relation between two objects.

Both Ptolemy and Strabo mention a town *Φοίνιξ*; while Ptolemy alone mentions a haven, of a similar name, which he calls in the accusative *Φοινικοῦντα*. Strabo locates it on the southern coast, at the narrowest part of the island (x, 4, p. 475). Hierocles identifies it with *Aradena*, and seems to place it opposite the island of Clauda (*Vet. Rom. Itin.* ed. Wessel. p. 650, 651); and Stephen of Byzantium identifies Aradena and Acropolis (s. v.). On the south coast of Crete, at the narrowest part of the island, and opposite the island of Clauda, is the harbor of *Lutro*. It is open to the east; but, as a little island lies almost in front of it, it has two entrances, one looking to the north-east, and the other to the south-east. It is thus described by captain Spratt: "Having in 1853 examined generally the south coast of Crete, I was fully convinced that Lutro was the Phenice of St. Paul, for it is the only bay to the westward of Fair Havens in which a vessel of any size could find any shelter during the winter months. By hauling inside the island, and securing to the south shore of the bay, a vessel is nearly land-locked. South-east and east winds only could endanger her; but with the former, where the fetch is greatest, the wind would not blow home against such a mountain as the White Mountains, so immediately over the bay, and rising to an elevation of 9000 feet" (Smith, p. 89). Mr. Brown, who since visited it, adds: "It is the only secure harbor, in all winds, on the south coast of Crete" (*Id.* p. 256). This identification is confirmed by the researches of Mr. Pashley (*Travels in Crete*, ii, 257), who discovered, a short distance above Lutro, a village called Acropolis ("upper city"), and another near it called Aradhena. Captain Speke also (*Researches in Crete*, ii, 249) asserts that the name *Phineka* is still currently applied to Lutro, and that a Latin inscription found there, dating from the emperor Nerva, shows that ships from Alexandria resorted to this harbor. Lechler, on the other hand (*Die Apostelgesch.* 1869, p. 400), maintaining the usual interpretation of *κατά* here (*towards*), suggests that Luke is only reporting a popular opinion as to the situation of Phœnix, which Paul's company did not reach; and that hence we are not to look for the usual accuracy of the writer. See SHIPWRECK (OF PAUL).

Phœni'cia (*Φοινίκη*), a country whose inhabitants necessarily held important and intimate relations, not only to the Hebrews, but to all antiquity. The latest and most complete authority on this subject is Rawlinson's *History of Phœnicia* (London, 1889).

I. *The Land.*—1. *Name.*—"Phœnicè" was not the name by which its native inhabitants called it, but was given to it by the Greeks, who called those merchants who came from that coast of the Mediterranean Sea which runs parallel with Mount Lebanon *Φοίνικες*. In Cicero (*De Fin.* iv, 20) there occurs the doubtful reading Phœnicia (comp. the Vulgate in Numb. xxxiii, 51). However, this latter form of the name has come into

Map of Coast near Lutro.

general use (comp. Gesenii *Monumenta Phœnicia* [Leips. 1837], p. 338; Forbiger, *Handbuch der alten Geographie* [ibid. 1842–1844], p. 659 sq.). This name has been variously derived. It is possibly from *Phœnix* the son of Agenor and the brother of Cadmus. It perhaps arose from the circumstance that the chief article of the commerce of these merchants was φοινός, *purple*. The word φοινός means *blood-red*, and is probably related to φόνος, *murder*. This derivation of the name is alluded to by Strabo (i, 42). Others imagine as naturally that the color does not give name to the people, but is named after them: as our damask, from Damascus; or our "calico," from Calicut. The term, as an epithet of color, may also apply, as Kenrick supposes, to the sun-burnt complexion of the people. But after all, in the opinion of others, a Greek derivation may not be admissible, for the name may be original or Shemitic—though it is ridiculous in Scaliger, Fuller, and Glassius to identify it with פנג, "to live luxuriously," in allusion to the results of Phœnician wealth and merchandise. Strabo, however, maintains that the Phœnicians were called Φοίνικες, because they resided originally on the coasts of the Red Sea. Bochart, in his *Canaan* (i, 1), derives the name from the Hebrew בני ענק, *sons of Anak*. Reland, in his *Palæstina ex Monumentis Veteribus Illustrata*, derives it from φοίνιξ, *palm-tree;* and this is the etymology now generally acquiesced in. The palm-tree is seen, as an emblem, on some coins of Aradus, Tyre, and Sidon; and there are now several palm-trees within the circuit of modern Tyre, and along the coast at various points; but the tree is not at the present day one of the characteristic features of the country. The native name of Phœnicia was *Kenáan* (Canaan) or Knâ, signifying Lowland, so named in contrast to the adjoining Aram, i. e. Highland, the Hebrew name of Syria. The name Kenáan is preserved on a coin of Laodicea of the time of Antiochus Epiphanes, whereon Laodicea is styled "a mother city in Canaan," ללאדרכא אם בכנען. *Knâ* or *Chnâ* (Χνᾶ) is mentioned distinctly by Herodian the grammarian as the old name of Phœnicia. Hence, as Phœnicians or Canaanites were the most powerful of all tribes in Palestine at the time of its invasion by Joshua, the Israelites, in speaking of their own territory as it was before the conquest, called it "the land of Canaan." See CANAAN.

In the O. T. the word Phœnicia does not occur, as might be expected from its being a Greek name. In the Apocrypha it is not defined, though spoken of as being, with Cœle-Syria, under one military commander (2 Macc. iii, 5, 8; viii, 8; x, 11; 3 Macc. iii, 15). In the N. T. the word occurs only in three passages, Acts xi, 19; xv, 3; xxi, 2; and not one of these affords a clew as to how far the writer deemed Phœnicia to extend. On the other hand, Josephus possibly agreed with Strabo; for he expressly says that Cæsarea is situated in Phœnicia (*Ant.* xv, 9, 6); and although he never makes a similar statement respecting Joppa, yet he speaks, in one passage, of the coast of Syria, Phœnicia, and Egypt, as if Syria and Phœnicia exhausted the line of coast on the Mediterranean Sea to the north of Egypt (*War*, iii, 9, 2).

The Phœnicians in general are sometimes called *Sidonians* (comp. Gesenii *Monumenta Phœnicia*, ii, 267 sq.; *Thesaurus Linguæ Hebraicæ*, under the word צירון). Justinus (xviii, 3) alludes to the etymology of this name: "A city being built which they called *Sidon*, from the abundance of fishes; for the Phœnicians call a fish *sidon*." This statement is not quite correct. But the root צוד, which in Hebrew means only to catch beasts and birds, can also be employed in Arabic when the catching of fishes is spoken of. This root occurs also in the Aramaic, in the signification of both hunting and fishing (comp. the art. ZIDON).

2. *Extent.*—Phœnicia in general is the name applied to a country on the coast of Syria, bounded by the Mediterranean Sea on the west and Lebanon on the east; Syria and Judæa forming its northern and southern limits respectively, situated between about 34° to 36° N. lat., and 45° to 36° E. long. Yet the extent of its territory varied so considerably at different times that the geographical definitions of the ancient writers differ in a very remarkable manner. Thus, while in Gen. x, 19 Canaan does not reach northwards beyond Sidon—a place which in early times gave the name to the whole people (ריושבי צירדון, צירנים, Deut., Judg.)—and Byblus and Berytus are considered as lying beyond it (Gen. x, 15 sq.; Josh. xiii, 5), it comprised in the Persian period (Herod. iii, 91) Posidium, as high as 35° 52′. Later still (Pliny, Strabo, Ptolemy) the Eleutherus (34° 60′), and subsequently (Mela, Stephanus) the island of Aradus (34° 70′), were considered its utmost northern limits. To the south it was at times Gaza (Gen. x, 19; Zeph. ii, 5; Herod., Philo, Eustath.), at others Egypt (Numb. xxiv, 5; Josh. xv, 4, 47; Strabo, Procop., etc.); and, from the Macedonian period chiefly, Cæsarea is mentioned as its extreme point. Eastward the country sometimes comprised parts of Syria and Palestine, beyond the mountain-ridges of the former and the hill-chains of the latter.

It will thus be seen that the length of coast to which the name Phœnicia was applied varied at different times, and may be regarded under different aspects before and after the loss of its independence. (1.) What may be termed Phœnicia proper was a narrow undulating plain, extending from the pass of Râs el-Beyâd or Abyad, the "Promontorium Album" of the ancients, about six miles south of Tyre, to the Nahr el-Auly, the ancient Bostrenus, two miles north of Sidon (Robinson, *Bib. Res.* ii, 473). The plain is only twenty-eight miles in length, and, considering the great importance of Phœnicia in the world's history, this may well be added to other instances in Greece, Italy, and Palestine, which show how little the intellectual influence of a city or state has depended on the extent of its territory. Its average breadth is about a mile (Porter, *Handbook for Syria*, ii, 396); but near Sidon the mountains retreat to a distance of two miles, and near Tyre to a distance of five miles (Kenrick, *Phœnicia*, p. 19). The whole of Phœnicia, thus understood, is called by Josephus (*Ant.* v, 3, 1) the great plain of the city of Sidon (τὸ μέγα πεδίον Σιδῶνος πόλεως). In it, near its northern extremity, was situated Sidon, in the north latitude of 33° 34′ 05″; and scarcely more than seventeen geographical miles to the south was Tyre, in the latitude of 33° 17′ (admiral Smyth's *Mediterranean*, p. 469): so that in a straight line those two renowned cities were less than twenty English miles distant from each other. Zarephath, the Sarepta of the N. T., was situated between them, eight miles south of Sidon, to which it belonged (1 Kings xvii, 9; Obad. 20; Luke iv, 26). (2.) A still longer district, which afterwards became fairly entitled to the name of Phœnicia, extended up the coast to a point marked by the island of Aradus, and by Antaradus towards the north; the southern boundary remaining the same as in Phœnicia proper. Phœnicia, thus defined, is estimated by Mr. Grote (*Hist. of Greece*, iii, 354) to have been about one hundred and twenty miles in length; while its breadth, between Lebanon and the sea, never exceeded twenty miles, and was generally much less. This estimate is most reasonable, allowing for the bends of the coast; as the direct difference in latitude between Tyre and Antaradus (Tortosa) is equivalent to one hundred and six English miles; and six miles to the south of Tyre, as already mentioned, intervene before the beginning of the pass of Râs el-Abyâd. The claim of this entire district to the name of Phœnicia rests on the probable fact that the whole of it, to the north of the great plain of Sidon, was occupied by Phœnician colonists; not to mention that there seems to have been some kind of political connection, however loose, between all the inhabitants

(Diodorus, xvi, 41). Scarcely sixteen geographical miles farther north than Sidon was Berytus; with a roadstead so well suited for the purposes of modern navigation that, under the modern name of Beirût, it has eclipsed both Sidon and Tyre as an emporium for Syria. Whether this Berytus was identical with the Berôthah and Berothai of Ezek. xlvii, 16, and of 2 Sam. viii, 8, is a disputed point. Still farther north was Byblus, the Gebal of the Bible (Ezek. xxvii, 9), inhabited by seamen and calkers. Its inhabitants are supposed to be alluded to in the word *Giblim*, translated "stone-squarers" in the A. V. of 1 Kings v, 18 (32). It still retains in Arabic the kindred name of Jebeil. Then came Tripolis (now Tarâbulus), said to have been founded by colonists from Tyre, Sidon, and Aradus, with three distinct towns, each a furlong apart from one another, each with its own walls, and each named from the city which supplied its colonists. General meetings of the Phœnicians seem to have been held at Tripolis (Diod. xvi, 41), as if a certain local jealousy had prevented the selection for this purpose of Tyre, Sidon, or Aradus. Lastly, towards the extreme point north was Aradus itself, the Arvad of Gen. x, 18 and Ezek. xxvii, 8, situated, like Tyre, on a small island near the mainland, and founded by exiles from Sidon.

During the period of the conquest of Canaan by the Israelites, the Phœnicians possessed the following towns, which we will enumerate successively in the direction from south to north: Dora (דור, Josh. xi, 2; xvii, 11 sq.); Ptolemais (עכו, Judg. i, 33); Ecdippa (אכזיב, Josh. xix, 29); Tyre (צור, Josh. xix, 29); Sarepta (צרפת, 1 Kings xvii, 9 sq.; Luke iv, 26); Sidon (צידון, Gen. x, 15); Berytus (ברותה, Ezek. xlvii, 16; 2 Sam. viii, 8); Byblus (גבל, Josh. xiii, 5); Tripolis, Simyra (הצמרר, Gen. x, 18); Arka (הערקי, Gen. x, 17); Simna (הסיני, Gen. x, 16); Aradus (הארודי, Gen. x, 18). Comp. the respective articles on these towns. Sidon is the only Phœnician town mentioned in Homer (see *Iliad*, vi, 239; xxiii, 743; *Odyss.* xv, 415; xvii, 424).

3. *Geographical Features.*—The whole of Phœnicia proper is well watered by various streams from the adjoining hills; of these the two largest are the Khasimîyeh, a few miles north of Tyre—the ancient name of which, strange to say, is not certain, though it is conjectured to have been the Leontes—and the Bostrenus, already mentioned, north of Sidon. The soil is fertile, although now generally ill-cultivated; but in the neighborhood of Sidon there are rich gardens and orchards. The havens of Tyre and Sidon afforded water of sufficient depth for all the requirements of ancient navigation, and the neighboring range of the Lebanon, in its extensive forests, furnished what then seemed a nearly inexhaustible supply of timber for ship-building. To the north of Bostrenus, between that river and Beirût, lies the only desolate and barren part of Phœnicia. It is crossed by the ancient Tamyras or Damuras, the modern Nahr ed-Damûr. From Beirût the plains are again fertile. The principal streams are the Lycus, now the Nahr el-Kelb, not far north from Beirût; the Adonis, now the Nahr Ibrahim, about five miles south of Gebal; and the Eleutherus, now the Nahr el-Kebîr, in the bend between Tripolis and Antaradus.

The climate of Phœnicia—an item of immense moment in the history of a nation—varies very considerably. Near the coast, and in the lower plains, the heat in summer is at times tropical, while the more mountainous regions enjoy a moderate temperature, and in winter even heavy falls of snow are not uncommon. In the southern parts the early rains begin in October, and are, after an interval of dry weather, followed by the winter rains, which last till March, the time of the "latter" rains. From May till October the sky remains cloudless. The rare difference of temperature found in so small a compass is thus happily described by Volney: "If the heat of July is oppressive, a six hours' journey to the neighboring mountains transports you into the coolness of March; and if, on the contrary, the hoar-frost troubles you at Besharrai, a day's travel will bring you into the midst of blooming May;" or, as an Arabic poet has it, "Lebanon bears winter on its head, spring on its shoulders, autumn on its lap, and summer at its foot." The dense population assembled in the great mercantile towns greatly contributed to augment by artificial means the natural fertility of the soil. The population of the country is at present very much reduced, but there are still found aqueducts and artificial vineyards formed of mould carried up to the terraces of the native rock. Ammianus Marcellinus says (xiv, 8), "Phœnicia is a charming and beautiful country, adorned with large and elegant cities." Even now this country is among the most fertile in Western Asia. It produces wheat, rye, and barley, and, besides the more ordinary fruits, also apricots, peaches, pomegranates, almonds, citrons, oranges, figs, dates, sugar-cane, and grapes, which furnish an excellent wine. In addition to these products, it yields cotton, silk, and tobacco. The country is also adorned by the variegated flowers of oleander and cactus. The higher regions are distinguished from the bare mountains of Palestine by being covered with oaks, pines, cypress-trees, acacias, and tamarisks; and above all by majestic cedars, of which there are still a few very old trees, whose stems measure from thirty to forty feet in circumference. The inhabitants of Sur still carry on a profitable traffic with the produce of Mount Lebanon, namely, in wood and charcoal. Phœnicia produces also flocks of sheep and goats; and innumerable swarms of bees supply excellent honey. In the forests there are bears, wolves, panthers, and jackals. The sea furnishes great quantities of fish, so that Sidon, the most ancient among the Phœnician towns, derived its name from fishing.

II. *The People.*—1. Respecting the *ethnography* of the Phœnicians, we have only to observe that the opinions are as much divided on the subject as ever. According to Gen. x, 15, Canaan had eleven "sons" ("Canaan begat Sidon his first-born, and Heth, and the Jebusite, and the Amorite, and the Girgasite, and the Hivite, and the Arkite, and the Sinite, and the Arvadite, and the Zemarite, and the Hamathite; and afterwards were the families of the Canaanites spread abroad"), six of whom had settled in the north of Palestine; and although all his descendants are sometimes included, both by classical writers and the Sept. (e. g. in Josh. v, 1, 12), in the name of Φοίνικες, yet in general the term chiefly applies to the inhabitants of the north. Scripture speaks of them as descendants of primeval giants (Autochthons) who had inhabited Canaan since the flood—that is, from times immemorial. Considering the careful attention paid by the Biblical writers to the early history of Palestine, and the close contact between the Phœnicians and Israelites, it would appear as if all traditions of a time anterior to their sojourn in that land had been long lost. Gen. x, 6, on the other hand, calls Canaan a descendant of Ham—a statement which, unless explained to refer to their darker skins, would seem to war against their being indigenous inhabitants of Palestine, or a Shemitic population, an assumption much favored by their language. Herodotus, however, makes them, both on their own statements and by accounts preserved in Persian historians, immigrants from "the Erythræan Sea;" and Justin backs the notion of immigration by recording that the Tyrian nation was founded by the Phœnicians, and that these, being forced by an earthquake to leave their native land, first settled on the Assyrian lake (Dead Sea or lake of Gennesareth), and subsequently on a shore near the sea, where they founded a city called Sidon. The locality of the "Erythræan Sea," however, is a moot point still. It is taken by different investigators to stand either for the Arabian or Persian Gulf; the latter view being apparently favored by the occurrence of Phœnician names borne by some of its islands (Strabo)—though these may have been

given them by late Phœnician colonists. Some have seen in them the Hyksos driven to Syria. Without entering any further into these most difficult, and, in the absence of all trustworthy information, more than vague speculations, so much appears certain, that many immigrations of Shemitic branches into Phœnicia, at different periods and from different parts, must have taken place, and that these gradually settled into the highly civilized nationality which we find constituted as early as the time of Abraham (Gen. xii, 6, אָז=then, already; comp. Aben-Ezra, ad loc., and Spinoza, *Tract. Theol.-Pol.* ch. viii). It would be extremely vain to venture an opinion on the individuality of the different tribes that, wave-like, rushed into the country from various sides, at probably widely distant dates. The only apparently valuable tradition on the subject seems contained in the above-quoted passage of Gen. x, 15–18. But there is one point which can be proved to be in the highest degree probable, and which has peculiar interest as bearing on the Jews, viz. that the Phœnicians were of the same race as the Canaanites. This remarkable fact, which, taken in connection with the language of the Phœnicians, leads to some interesting results, is rendered probable by the following circumstances: 1st. The native name of Phœnicia, as already pointed out, was Canaan, a name signifying "lowland." This was well given to the narrow slip of plain between the Lebanon and the Mediterranean Sea, in contrast to the elevated mountain range adjoining; but it would have been inappropriate to that part of Palestine conquered by the Israelites, which was undoubtedly a hill-country (see Movers, *Das Phönizische Alterthum*, i, 5); so that, when it is known that the Israelites at the time of their invasion found in Palestine a powerful tribe called the Canaanites, and from them called Palestine, the land of Canaan, it is obviously suggested that the Canaanites came originally from the neighboring plain, called Canaan, along the sea-coast. 2d. This is further confirmed through the name in Africa whereby the Carthaginian Phœnicians called themselves, as attested by Augustine, who states that the peasants in his part of Africa, if asked of what race they were, would answer, in Punic or Phœnician, "Canaanites" (*Opera Omnia*, iv, 1235; *Exposit. Epist. ad Rom.* § 13). 3d. The conclusion thus suggested is strongly supported by the tradition that the names of persons and places in the land of Canaan —not only when the Israelites invaded it, but likewise previously, when "there were yet but a few of them," and Abraham is said to have visited it—were Phœnician or Hebrew: such, for example, as Abimelek, "father of the king" (Gen. xx, 2); Melchizedek, "king of righteousness" (xiv, 18); Kirjath-sepher, "city of the book" (Josh. xv, 15). As above observed, in Greek writers also occurs the name χνά for Phœnicia (comp. Gesenii *Thesaurus Linguæ Hebraicæ* [Leips. 1839], ii, 696, and Gesenii *Monumenta Phœnicia*, p. 570 sq.). The dialect of the Israelites perhaps resembled more the Aramæan, and that of the Phœnicians more the Arabic; but this difference was nearly effaced when both nations resided in the same country, and had frequent intercourse with each other. Concerning the original country of the Phœnicians and their immigration into Canaan, comp. especially Bertheau, *Zur Geschichte der Israeliten* (Göttingen, 1840), p. 152–186, and Lengerke, *Kanaan, Volks- und Religionsgeschichte Israels* (Königsberg, 1844), i, 182 sq.

2. *Government.*—Two principal divisions existed anciently among these Canaanites: these were those of the interior of Palestine, and the tribes inhabiting the sea-coast, Phœnicia proper. By degrees three special tribes, more powerful than the rest, formed, as it were, the nucleus around which the multitude of minor ones gathered and became one nationality, viz. the inhabitants of Sidon, of Tyre, and of Aradus. Three principal elements are to be distinguished, according to classical evidence (Cato, comp. *Serv. ad Æn.* iv, 682), in the constitution of Phœnician states: 1. The aristocracy, consisting of certain families of noble lineage, which were divided into tribes (שִׁבְטִים), families (מִשְׁפָּחוֹת, Phœn. חִבְרִין), and *gentes* (בֵּית אָבוֹת), the last generally of the number of 300 in each state or colony. Out of the "tribes" were elected thirty *principes* (Phœn. רַב), who formed a supreme senate; besides which there existed another larger representative assembly of 300 members, chosen from the *gentes*. 2. The lower estates of the people, or "plebs" itself, who do not seem to have had their recognised special representatives, but by constant opposition, which sometimes broke out in open violence, held the nobles in check. 3. The kingdom, at first hereditary, afterwards became elective. Nor must the priesthood be forgotten; one of the most powerful elements in the Phœnician commonwealth, and which in some provinces even assumed, in the person of the high-priest, the supreme rule. There was a kind of federal union between the different states, which, according to their importance, sent either their kings or their judges, at the head of a large number of their senators, to the general councils of the nation, held at stated periods either at Sidon or Tyre. The colonies were governed much as the home-country, except that local affairs and the executive were intrusted to two (annual, as it would seem) judges (שׁוֹפְטִים, suffetes) elected by the senate —an institution which for some time also replaced the monarchical form in Tyre. When Tripolis was founded by Tyre, Sidon, and Aradus, as a place of joint meeting for their hegemony, every one of these cities sent 100 senators to watch her special interests at the common meeting; and the senate of Sidon seems, in the 4th century B.C., at least, to have consisted of 500 to 600 elders, some of whom were probably selected more for their wealth than for their noble lineage. The king sometimes combined in his person the office of high-priest. The turbulent seething mass of the people, consisting of the poorer families of Phœnician descent, the immigrants of neighboring tribes, the strangers, and the whole incongruous mass of workmen, tradespeople, sailors, that must have abounded in a commercial and maritime nation like the Phœnicians, and out of whose midst must have arisen at times influential men enough—was governed, as far as we can learn, as "constitutionally" as possible. The unruly spirits were got rid of in Roman fashion somehow in the colonies, or were made silent by important places being intrusted to their care, under strict supervision from home. Only once or twice do we hear of violent popular outbreaks, in consequence of one of which it was mockingly said that Phœnicia had lost all her aristocracy, and what existed of Phœnicians was of the lowest birth, the offspring of slaves. As the wealth of all the world accumulated more and more in the Phœnician ports, luxury, and too great a desire to rest and enjoy their wealth in peace, induced the dauntless old pirates to intrust the guard of their cities to the mariners and mercenary soldiers, to Libyans and Lydians—"they of Persia and of Lud and of Phut," as Ezekiel has it; although the wild resistance which this small territory offered in her single towns to the enormous armies of Assyria, Babylonia and Greece shows that the old spirit had not died out. The smaller states were sometimes so much oppressed by Tyre that they preferred rather to submit to external enemies (comp. Heeren, *Ideen*, etc., p. 15 sq.; Beck, *Anleitung zur genaueren Kenntniss der Welt- und Völkergeschichte*, p. 252 sq., and 581 sq.).

3. *History.*—One of the most powerful and important nations of antiquity, Phœnicia has yet left but poor information regarding her history. According to Josephus, every city in Phœnicia had its collection of registers and public documents (comp. Targum to Kirjath-Jearim, Judg. i, 11, 15). Out of these, Menander of Ephesus, and Dias, a Phœnician, compiled two histories of Tyre, a few fragments of which have survived (comp.

Josephus, *Contra Ap.* i, 17, 18; *Ant.* viii, 5, 3; xiii, 1 sq.; ix, 14, 2; Theophil. *Ad Autol.* iii, 22; Syncellus, *Chron.* p. 182). Sanchoniatho is said to have written a history of Phœnicia and Egypt, which was recast by Philo of Byblus, under the reign of Hadrian, and from his work Porphyrius (4th century A.D.) took some cosmogonical quotations, which found their way into Eusebius (*Præp. Evang.* i, 10). Later Phœnician historians' works (Theodotus, Hesycrates, Moschos, mentioned as authors on Phœnicia by Tatianus, *Contra Græcos*, § 37) are likewise lost. Gesenius mentions, in his *Monumenta Phœnicia* (p. 363 sq.), some later Phœnician authors, who do not touch upon historical subjects. Thus nothing remains but a few casual notices in the Bible, some of the Church fathers, and classical writers (Josephus, Syncellus, Herodotus, Diodōrus, Justin), which happen to throw some light upon the history of that long-lost commonwealth. A great part of this history, however, being identical with that of the cities mentioned, in which by turns the hegemony was vested, fuller information will be found under their special headings. The names of the kings from Hiram to Pygmalion are preserved by Josephus (*Apion*, i, 18) in a fragment from the history of Tyre by Menander of Ephesus. We give them, with the computations of the reigns by Movers (*ut sup.* II, i, 140, 143, 149), Duncker (*Gesch. des Alterthums* [3d ed. Berl. 1863–7], i, 526 sq.), and Hitzig (*Urgesch. und Mythol. der Philistäer*, p. 191). See also Herzog, *Encyklop.* xi, 620 sq.

Name.	Menander.	Movers.	Duncker.	Hitzig.
		B.C.	B.C.	B.C.
Hiram I....	34 years	980–947	1021–991	1031–997
Balcazar....	7 (17) years	946–940	991–974	997–990
Abdastartus	9 years	939–931	974–965	990–981
Unknown ..	12 years	930–919	965–953	981–969
Astartus....	12 years	918–907	953–941	969–957
Astarymus .	9 years	906–898	941–932	957–948
Pheles.....	8 months			
Ithobal.....	32 (12) years	897–866	931–898	948–916
Balezorus ..	6 (8, 18) years	865–858	898–890	916–910
Myttonus...	9 (25, 29) years	857–833	890–861	910–901
Pygmalion .	47 (40, 48) years	832–785	861–813	900–853

Broadly speaking, we may begin to date Phœnician history from the time when Sidon first assumed the rule, or about B.C. 1500. Up to that time it was chiefly the development of the immense internal resources, and the commencement of that gigantic trade that was destined soon to overspread the whole of the then known world, which seem to have occupied the attention of the early and peaceful settlers. The symbolical representative of their political history during that period is El, or Belitan, builder of cities, supreme and happy ruler of men. The conquest of Canaan by the Israelites marks a new epoch, of which lists of kings were still extant in late Greek times. We now hear first of Sidonian colonies, while the manufactures and commerce of the country seem to have reached a high renown throughout the neighboring lands. The Israelites drove out Sidonian settlers from Laish, near the sources of the Jordan. Somewhat later (beginning of 13th century), Sidonian colonization spread farther west, founding the (island-) city of Tyre, and Citium and Hippo on the coast of Africa. About 1209, however, Sidon was defeated by the king of Askalon, and Tyre, assuming the ascendency, ushered in a third period, during which Phœnicia reached the summit of her greatness. At this time, chiefly under the brilliant reign of Hiram, we hear also of a close alliance with the Israelites, which eventually led to common commercial enterprises at sea. After Hiram's death, however, political dissensions began to undermine the unparalleled peace and power of the country. His four sons ruled, with certain interruptions, for short periods, and the crown was then assumed by Ethbaal, the father of Jezebel. His grandson, Mattan, left the throne to his two children, Pygmalion and Dido (Elissa). The latter, having been excluded from power by her brother, left the country, together with some of the aristocratic families, and founded Carthage (New-Town), about B.C. 813. Of the century that followed, little further is known save occasional allusions in Joel and Amos, which tell of the piratical commerce of Tyrians and Sidonians. Assyrian, Chaldæan, Egyptian invasions followed each other in turns during the last phase of Phœnician history, dating from the 8th century, and soon reduced the flourishing country to insignificance. Deeds of prowess, such as the thirteen years' siege sustained by Tyre against overwhelming forces, could not save the doomed country. Her fleet destroyed, her colonies wrested from her or in a state of open rebellion, torn by inner factions, Phœnicia was ultimately (together with what had been once Nebuchadnezzar's empire) embodied with Persia B.C. 538. Once more, however, exasperated by the enormous taxes imposed upon them, chiefly during the Greek war, together with other galling measures issued by the successive satraps, the Phœnicians, under the leadership of Sidon, took part in the revolution of Egypt against Artaxerxes Mnemon and Ochus, about the middle of the 4th century B.C., which ended very unhappily for them. Sidon, the only city that refused to submit at once at the approach of the Persian army, was conquered, the citizens themselves setting fire to it, and more than 40,000 people perished in the flames. Although rebuilt and repeopled shortly afterwards, it yet never again reached its ancient grandeur, and to Tyre belonged the hegemony, until she, too, had to submit, after a seven years' siege, to Alexander, who through the battle on the Issus (B.C. 333) had made all Phœnicia his as part and parcel of the gigantic Persian empire. Under Antiochus the Great, all except Sidon became subject to Seleucidian sway. Pompey, incorporating Phœnicia with Syria (B.C. 65), made it a Roman province. During the civil wars of Rome, when Cassius divided Syria into small provinces, and sold them separately, Tyre again became for a short period a principality, with a king of its own. Cleopatra in her turn received Phœnicia as a present from Antony. What shadow of independence was still left to the two ancient cities was taken from them by Augustus (A.D. 20). Tyre, however, retained much of her previous importance as an emporium and a manufacturing place through the various vicissitudes of Syrian history during the sixteen centuries that followed, until the Ottoman Turks conquered the country, and the opening up of the New World on the one hand, and of a new route to Asia on the other, destroyed the last remnant of the primitive grandeur of one of the most mighty empires of the ancient world, and one which has contributed one of the largest shares to the civilization of all mankind.

4. *Occupations.*—Commerce and colonization were the elements by which this grandeur was chiefly accomplished. Regarding the former, we have already hinted at the overflowing wealth and almost unparalleled variety of home products which this small country furnished forth, and which, far too abundant for their own consumption, easily suggested the idea of exportation and traffic of exchange. Their happy maritime position further enabled them to do that which Egypt and Assyria, with all their perfection of industry and art, were debarred from doing; partly, it is true, through their isolated habits and narrow laws, but chiefly by the natural limits of their countries. To Phœnicia alone it was given to supply the link that was to connect the East with the West, or at least with Europe and Western Africa. Communicating by means of Arabia and the Persian Gulf with India and the coast of Africa towards the equator; and on the north, along the Euxine, with the borders of Scythia, beyond the Strait of Gibraltar, with Britannia, if not with the Baltic, their commerce divides itself into different great branches according to those natural highways. From the countries on the Persian Gulf and the Red Sea, the coasts of Arabia, Africa, and India, they exported spice, precious stones, myrrh, frankincense, gold, ivory, ebony, steel, and iron, and from Egypt embroidered linen and corn. In ex-

change they brought not only their own raw produce and manufactures, but gums and resins for embalming, also wine and spices. From Mesopotamia and Syria came the emeralds and corals of the Red Sea; from Babylon the manifold embroideries; wine and fine wool from Aleppo and the Mesopotamian plains; from Judæa the finest wheat, grape-honey, oil, and balm. Another remote region, Armenia, furnished troops of riding and chariot horses and mules; and this same country, or, rather, the south-eastern coast of the Euxine, further furnished the Phœnician emporiums with slaves of a superior market-value—for pirating and slave-dealing went hand in hand with their maritime calling—with copper, lead, brass (or ichalcum), and tunnies, which they also fetched, together with conger-eels, from the Atlantic coast. Their extensive early commerce with Greece is frequently alluded to in Homer, and is further shown by the remarkable fact of the abundance of Shemitic or Phœnician words in Greek for such things as precious stones, fine garments, vessels, spices, and Eastern plants in general, musical instruments, weights and measures, etc. (comp. *μύῤῥα*, מר; *κίνναμον*, קנמון; *κάννα*, קנה; *λίβανος*, לבנה; *χαλβάνη*, galbanum, חלבנה; *νάρδος*, נרד; *σάμφειρος*, שפיר; *ἴασπις*, ישפה; *βύσσος*, בוץ; *κάρπασος*, כרפס; *νάβλα*, נבל; *τύμπανον*, תף; *σαμβύκη*, סבכא; *κύπρος*, כפר; *ὕσσωπος*, אזוב; *κιβώρυον*, כפור; *σάκκος*, שק; *χάρτης*, חרט; *δέλτος*, דלת; *ἀῤῥαβών*, ערבון; *μνᾶ*, מנה; *κάβος*, קב; *δραχμή*, דרכמון; *κόρος*, כר, etc.). Beyond the Strait, along the north and west coast of Africa, they received skins of deer, lions, panthers, domestic cattle, elephants' skins and teeth, Egyptian alabaster, castrated swine, Attic pottery and cups, probably also gold. Yet the most fabulously rich mines of metals—such as silver, iron, lead, tin—they found in Tartessus. So extensive and proverbial was this commerce that we enumerate its elements in detail.

The position of Phœnicia, as we have seen, was most favorable for the exchange of the produce of the East and West. Persians, Lydians, and Lycians frequently served as mercenaries in the Phœnician armies (Ezek. xxvii, 10, 11). Phœnicia exported wine to Egypt (Herod. iii, 5, 6). Purple garments were best manufactured in Tyre (Amati, *De Restitutione Purpurarum*, 3d ed. Casenæ, 1784). Glass was made in Sidon and Sarepta (comp. Heeren, p. 86 sq.; Beck, p. 593 sq.). In Phœnicia was exchanged the produce of all known countries. After David had vanquished the Edomites and conquered the coasts of the Red Sea, king Hiram of Tyre entered into a confederacy with Solomon, by which he insured for his people the right of navigation to India. The combined fleet of the Israelites and Phœnicians sailed from the seaports of Ezion-geber and Elath. These ports were situated on the eastern branch of the Red Sea, the Sinus Elaniticus, or Gulf of Akabah. Israelitish-Phœnician mercantile expeditions proceeded to Ophir, perhaps Abhira, situated at the mouth of the Indus (comp. Lassen, *Indische Alterthumskunde* [Bonn, 1844], i, 537 sq.). It seems, however, that the Indian coasts in general were also called Ophir. Three years were required in order to accomplish a mercantile expedition to Ophir and to return with cargoes of gold, algum-wood, ivory, silver, monkeys, peacocks, and other Indian produce. Some names of these products are Indian transferred into Hebrew, as אלמגים, *almuggim*, Sanscr. *valgu*, or, according to the Decanic pronunciation, *valgum*; שן־חבים, *shen-habbim* (ivory), Sanscr. *ibha*; קוף *koph* (ape), Sanscr. *kapi*; תוכיים, *tukkiyim* (peacock), Sanscr. *cikhi*, according to the Decanic pronunciation (comp. 1 Kings ix, 27; x, 11, 22). See Ophir. It seems, however, that these mercantile expeditions to India were soon given up, probably on account of the great difficulty of navigating the Red Sea. King Jehoshaphat endeavored to recommence these expeditions, but his fleet was wrecked at Ezion-geber (1 Kings xxii, 48). The names of mercantile establishments on the coasts of Arabia along the Persian Gulf have partly been preserved to the present day. In these places the Phœnicians exchanged the produce of the West for that of India, Arabia, and Ethiopia. Arabia especially furnished incense, gold, and precious stones. The Midianites (Gen. xxxvii, 28) and the Edomites (Ezek. xxvii, 16) effected the transit by their caravans. The fortified Idumæan town Petra probably contained the storehouses in which the produce of southern countries was collected. From Egypt the Phœnicians exported especially byssus (ver. 7) for wine. According to an ancient tradition, the tyrant of Thebes, Busiris, having soiled his hands with the blood of all foreigners, was killed by the Tyrian Hercules. This indicates that Phœnician colonists established themselves and their civilization successfully in Upper Egypt, where all strangers had usually been persecuted. At a later period Memphis was the place where most of the Phœnicians in Egypt were established. Phœnician inscriptions found in Egypt prove that even under the Ptolemies the intimate connection between Phœnicia and Egypt still existed (comp. Gesenii *Monumenta Phœnicia*, xiii, 224 sq.). From Palestine the Phœnicians imported, besides wheat, especially from Judæa, ivory, oil, and balm; also wool, principally from the neighboring nomadic Arabs. Damascus furnished wine (Ezek. xxvii, 5, 6, 17, 18, 21), and the mountains of Syria wood. The tribes about the shores of the Caspian Sea furnished slaves and iron; for instance, the Tibaræans (תובל, Tubal) and Moschi (משך, Meshech). Horsemen, horses, and mules came from the Armenians (תגרמה, Togarmah) (see Heeren, p. 86–130). The treasures of the East were exported from Phœnicia by ships which sailed first to Cyprus, the mountains of which are visible from the Phœnician coast. Citium was a Phœnician colony in Cyprus, the name of which was transferred to the whole of Cyprus, and even to some neighboring islands and coasts called כתים (Gen. x, 4; Isa. xxiii, 1, 12). Hence also חתים, the name of a Canaanitish or Phœnician tribe (Gesenii *Monumenta Phœnicia*, p. 153). Cyprus was subject to Tyre up to the time of Alexander the Great. There are still found Phœnician inscriptions which prove the connection of Cyprus with Tyre. At Rhodes (רדנים) also are found vestiges of Phœnician influence. From Rhodes the mountains of Crete are visible. This was of great importance for the direction of navigators, before the discovery of the compass. In Crete, and also in the Cycladic and Sporadic Isles, are the vestiges of Phœnician settlements. On the Isle of Thasos, on the southern coast of Thrace, the Phœnicians had gold-mines; and even on the southern shores of the Black Sea they had factories. However, when the Greeks became more powerful, the Phœnicians sailed more in other directions. They occupied also Sicily and the neighboring islands, but were, after the Greek colonization, confined to a few towns, Motya, Soloes, Panormus (Thucydides, vi, 2). The Phœnician mercantile establishments in Sardinia and the Balearic Isles could scarcely be called colonies. Carthage was a Phœnician colony, which probably soon became important by commerce with the interior of Africa, and remained connected with Tyre by means of a common sanctuary. After Phœnicia had been vanquished by the Assyrians, Babylonians, and Persians, the settlements in Sicily, Sardinia, and Spain came into the power of Carthage. The Phœnicians had for a long period exported from Spain gold, silver, tin, iron, lead (Ezek. xxxviii, 13), fruit, wine, oil, wax, fish, and wool. Their chief settlement was Tarshish, תרשיש, *subjection*, from the root רשש, *he vanquished, subjected*. The Aramæans pronounced it תרתיש; hence the Greek *Tartessos*. This was probably the name of a town situated to the west of the Pillars of Hercules (Calpe

and Abyla, now Gibraltar and Ceuta), and even more west than Gades, at the mouth of the Bætis (Herod. iv, 62; Scymnus Chius, v, 161 sq.). This river was also called Tartessus (Arist. *Meteor.* i, 13; Pausan. vi, 19, 3; Strabo, iii, p. 148). At a later period the town of Tartessus obtained likewise the Phœnician name Carteja, from קרת, *town* (Strabo, iii, p. 151). There are other names of towns in Spain which have a Phœnician derivation: Gades, גדר, *septum, fence* (comp. Gesenii *Monumenta Phœnicia*, p. 304 sq., 349); Malaga (מלח), on account of much salt fish thence exported; or, according to Gesenius (*id.* p. 312 sq., and 353), from מלאכה-מלכה, *officina fabrorum*, iron-works, or manufactory of other metals, on account of the mines to be found there; Belon, בעלה, *civitas*, city (*id.* p. 311 sq., and 348). The voyage to Tarshish was the most important of those undertaken by the Phœnicians. Hence it was that their largest vessels were all called *ships of Tarshish*, although they sailed in other directions (1 Kings x, 22). It appears also that the Phœnicians exported tin from the British Isles, and amber from the coasts of Prussia. Their voyages on the western coasts of Africa seem to have been merely voyages of discovery, without permanent results. The Spanish colonies were probably the principal sources of Phœnician wealth, and were founded at a very remote period. The migration of the Phœnician, Cadmus, into Bœotia likewise belongs to the earlier period of Phœnician colonization. Homer seems to know little of the Sidonian commerce; which fact may be explained by supposing that the Phœnicians avoided all collision and competition with the increasing power of the Greeks, and preferred to direct their voyages into countries where such competition seemed to be improbable.

Herodotus describes the Phœnicians as beginning soon after their settlement to occupy themselves in distant voyages (i, 1). From the construction of rude rafts, they must speedily have reached to a style of substantial ship-building. Their commercial vessels are represented either as long in shape, and fitted both for sailing and being rowed with fifty oars—"ships of Tarshish;" or as rounder in form, and more capacious in stowage, but slower in speed—tubs or coasting-vessels—bearers of cargo on short voyages. Xenophon (*Economics*, viii) passes a high eulogy on a Phœnician ship—"the greatest quantity of tackling was disposed separately in the smallest stowage." Their merchantmen also carried arms for defence, and had figures on their prows, which the Greeks named *πάταικοι*. They steered by the Cynosure, or the last star in Ursa Minor; and they could cast reckonings, from the combined application of astronomy and arithmetic (Strabo, xvi, 2, 24). This nautical application of astronomy is ascribed by Callimachus to Thales, a Phœnician by descent (*Frag.* ed. Blomfield, p. 213; Diog. Laert. Thales). Lebanon supplied them with abundance of timber, and Cyprus gave them all necessary equipments, from the keel to the topsails—"a fundamento ipso carinæ ad supremos ipsos carbasos" (Amm. Marcell. xiv, 8-14). These daring Phœnician navigators in the reign of Pharaoh-Necho circumnavigated Africa—departing from the Red Sea and returning by the Strait of Gibraltar. They reported that in sailing round Libya they had the sun on their right hand—a story of which Herodotus says, "I, for my part, do not believe them," and yet it is the positive proof that they had gone round the Cape (Herod. iv, 42). Diodorus speaks also of Phœnician mariners being driven westwards beyond the Pillars of Hercules into the ocean, and reaching at length a very fertile and beautiful island—"a dwelling of gods rather than of men"—one probably of the Azores or Canary Islands. The Phœnicians furnished to Xerxes 300 ships, but they were defeated at Salamis. It is said that of all the nations employed in digging the famous canal across the isthmus of Athos, they alone had sufficient engineering skill to begin its banks on their section at a slope, and thus prevent caving in (vii, 23). The remote periods of Phœnician commerce and colonization are wrapped in myths. Phœnician ships may have first carried the produce of Assyria and Egypt—but their own wares and manufactures were soon largely exported by them (Ezek. xxviii). The commerce of Tyre reached through the world (Strabo, iii, 5, 11). There was also a great trade in the tunny fisheries, and the Tyrians sold fish in Jerusalem (Neh. xiii, 16). Phœnicia excelled in the manufacture of the purple dye extracted from the shell-fish murex, so abundant on parts of its coasts. This color in its richest hue was at length appropriated to imperial use, and the silk so dyed was of extraordinary value. The glass of Sidon was no less famous than the Tyrian dye—the fine white sand used for the process being very abundant near Mount Carmel. Glass has been found in Nineveh, and glass-blowing is figured at Beni-Hassan in Egypt. The art might have come from Egypt, but the discovery in Phœnicia is represented as accidental. The pillar of emerald shining brightly in the night, which Herodotus speaks of as being in the temple of Hercules, was probably a hollow cylinder of glass with a lamp within it (Kenrick, *Phœnicia*, p. 249). Phœnicia produced also drinking-cups of silver and gold. Homer describes Sidon as abounding in works of brass. Its building-stone was not of very good quality, but cedar-wood was largely employed. When stone was used the joints were bevelled—a practice which also characterizes Hebrew architecture, and gives it a panelled appearance. The mining operations of the Phœnicians were also celebrated. Herodotus says they turned a mountain over *ἐν τῇ ζητήσει*—in the search for gold. Mines were wrought in the various colonies—in the Grecian islands and in Spain—by processes much the same as those employed in more modern times. The marine knowledge and experience of Phœnicia led to the plantation of numerous colonies in Cyprus, Rhodes, Cilicia, and the islands of the Ægean—the Cyclades and Sporades (Thucyd. i, 8)—in Sicily, in Sardinia, the Balearic Islands, and in Spain. Strabo says that the Phœnicians possessed the best parts of Iberia before the days of Homer (iii, 22, 14). One principal colony was in Northern Africa, and Strabo asserts that they occupied the middle part of Africa soon after the Trojan war. The story of Dido and the foundation of Carthage is well known, the event being placed by some in B.C. 813. Byrsa, the name of the hill on which the city was built, denotes a fortress, being בָּצְרָה (Bozrah), the name also of the Idumæan capital; though its Greek form, Βύρσα, gave rise to the story about the purchase of as much land as a hide would measure. Carthage means "new town" (קרת חדשה), and *Punici* is only another spelling of *Phœnici*. Intercourse with many strange and untutored races led the Phœnicians to indulge in fictions, and love of gain taught them mercantile deceits and stratagems. "Phœnician figment"—*ψεῦσμα φοινικικόν*—or a traveller's tale, was proverbial in former times, like *fides Punica* at a later period (Strabo, xii, p. 55). The *Etymologium Magnum* bluntly defines *φοινικικόν* by *τὸ ψεῦδος*, the lie. In the *Odyssey* they are described as "crafty" *ναυσίκλυτοι* (*Odyss.* xiii, 415), or as "crafty and wicked." As a trading nation they were ready sometimes to take advantage of the ignorant and savage tribes with which they bartered, and they cared nothing for law or right on the high seas, where no power could control or punish; so that Ulysses uses the phrase *Φοίνικ᾽ ἀνὴρ ἀπατήλια εἰδὼς τρώκτης*, "a Phœnician man knowing deceitful things—crafty" (*id.* xiv, 285). The term "Canaan," "Canaanite," or "man of Canaan," the native name of the Phœnician, is sometimes rendered "merchant" in the English version (Isa. xxiii, 8; Zeph. i, 11; Job xli, 6; Prov. xxxi, 24; Zech. xiv, 21; Hos. xii, 7; Ezek. xvii, 4). "Phœnician" and "merchant" were thus interchangeable terms; so that *Φοίνικ᾽ γίνο-*

μαι means, "I become a trader." But the phrase seems to have sunk in moral meaning, and trader was but another name for a hucksterer, or a pedler going from house to house, as in Prov. xxxi, 24. Nay, the prophet Hosea (xii, 7) says, "He is a Canaanite," or "Phœnician," or "as for Canaan, the balances of deceit are in his hand: he loveth to oppress. And Ephraim said, Yet am I become rich, I have found me out substance." A common proverb expressive of fraud matching fraud was Σύροι πρὸς Φοίνικας. No coined money of Phœnicia is extant prior to its subjugation by the Greeks. The standard seems to have been the same as the Jewish; the shekel being equal to the Attic tetradrachm; and the *zuz*, which occurs on the tablet of Marseilles, being of the value of a denarius. On the same tablet *keseph* (silver) occurs, with the probable ellipse of "shekel," as in Hebrew. Foreign silver money (זר) is also there referred to. Among the antiquities dug up in Nineveh are several bronze weights in the form of lions; having both cuneiform legends with the name of Sennacherib, and also Phœnician or cursive Shemitic inscriptions (Layard, *Nin. and Bab.* p. 601). The *cor* was a Phœnician measure, the same as the Hebrew chomer, and holding ten Attic metretæ, each metretes being equal to about ten and a half gallons. The arithmetical notation was carried out by making simple strokes for the units; 10 was a horizontal stroke or a semicircle, and 100 was a special sign, the unit strokes added to it denoting additional hundreds (Gesenii *Monumenta Phœnicia*, p. 85).

Coin of Tyre, Antiochus IV.

It appears almost incredible how, with the comparatively small knowledge of natural science which we must attribute to them, the Phœnicians could thus on their frail rafts traverse the wide seas almost from one end of the globe to the other, with apparently no more difficulty than their inland caravans, their chapmen and dealers, found in traversing the neighboring countries. Yet it must not, on the other hand, be forgotten that theirs appears to have been an uncommon knowledge of astronomy and physical geography—witness their almost scientifically planned voyage of discovery under Hiram—and that, above all, an extraordinary amount of practical sense, of boldness, shrewdness, unscrupulousness, untiring energy, and happy genius, went far to replace some of the safe contrivances with which modern discoveries have made our mariners familiar. These qualities also made and kept them the unrivalled masters of ancient commerce and navigation. They were, moreover, known rather to destroy their own ships and endanger their lives than let others see their secret way and enterprise; and it would be very surprising if theirs had not been also the greatest discoveries, the greatest riches and splendor and power for many a long century, though they owned but a small strip of country at home. Well might Tyre once say, "I am of perfect beauty" (Ezek. xxvii, 3), and the prophet address Sidon, "Behold, thou art wiser than Daniel, there is no secret they can hide from thee: with thy wisdom and thine understanding thou hast gotten thee riches, and hast gotten gold and silver into thy treasures: by thy great wisdom and by thy traffic hast thou increased thy riches, and thine heart is lifted up because of thy riches" (xxviii, 3-5). There can, indeed, not be fancied a fuller and more graphic account of the state of Phœnicia, especially as regards her commercial relations, than the two chapters of Ezekiel (xxvii and xxviii) containing the lamentation on Tyre: which, indeed, form our chief information on this point.

In regard to Phœnician trade, as connected with the Israelites, the following points are worthy of notice.

(1.) Up to the time of David, not one of the twelve tribes seems to have possessed a single harbor on the sea-coast: it was impossible, therefore, that they could become a commercial people. It is true that according to Judg. i, 31, combined with Josh. xix. 26, Accho or Acre, with its excellent harbor, had been assigned to the tribe of Asher: but from the same passage in Judges it seems certain that the tribe of Asher did not really obtain the possession of Acre, which continued to be held by the Canaanites. However wistfully, therefore, the Israelites might regard the wealth accruing to their neighbors the Phœnicians from trade, to vie with them in this respect was out of the question. But from the time that David had conquered Edom, an opening for trade was afforded to the Israelites. The command of Ezion-geber, near Elath, in the land of Edom, enabled them to engage in the navigation of the Red Sea. As they were novices, however, at sailing, as the navigation of the Red Sea, owing to its currents, winds, and rocks, is dangerous even to modern sailors, and as the Phœnicians, during the period of the independence of Edom, were probably allowed to trade from Ezion-geber, it was politic in Solomon to permit the Phœnicians of Tyre to have docks and build ships at Ezion-geber on condition that his sailors and vessels might have the benefit of their experience. The results seem to have been strikingly successful. The Jews and Phœnicians made profitable voyages to Ophir in Arabia or India, whence gold was imported into Judæa in large quantities; and once in three years still longer voyages were made, by vessels which may possibly have touched at Ophir, though their imports were not only gold, but likewise silver, ivory, apes, and peacocks (1 Kings x, 22). See TARSHISH. There seems at the same time to have been a great direct trade with the Phœnicians for cedar-wood (ver. 27), and generally the wealth of the kingdom reached an unprecedented point. If the union of the tribes had been maintained, the whole sea-coast of Palestine would have afforded additional sources of revenue through trade; and perhaps even ultimately the "great plain of Sidon" itself might have formed part of the united empire. But if any possibilities of this kind existed, they were destroyed by the disastrous secession of the ten tribes; a heavy blow from which the Hebrew race has never yet recovered during a period of nearly 3000 years.

(2.) After the division into two kingdoms, the curtain falls on any commercial relation between the Israelites and Phœnicians until a relation is brought to notice, by no means brotherly, as in the fleets which navigated the Red Sea, nor friendly, as between buyers and sellers, but humiliating and exasperating, as between the buyers and the bought. The relation is meant which existed between the two nations when Israelites were sold as slaves by Phœnicians. It was a custom in antiquity, when one nation went to war against another, for merchants to be present in one or other of the hostile camps, in order to purchase prisoners of war as slaves. Thus at the time of the Maccabees, when a large army was sent by Lysias to invade and subdue the land of Judah, it is related that "the merchants of the country, hearing the fame of them, took silver and gold very much with servants, and came into the camp to buy the children of Israel for slaves" (1 Macc. iii, 41); and when it is related that at the capture of Jerusalem by Antiochus Epiphanes, the enormous number of 40,000 men were slain in battle, it is added that there were "no fewer sold than slain" (2 Macc. v, 14; Credner's *Joel*, p. 240). Now this practice, which is thus illustrated by details at a much later period, undoubtedly prevailed in earlier times (*Odyssey*, xv, 427; Herod. i, 1), and is alluded to in a threatening manner against the Phœnicians by the prophets (Joel iii, 4, and Amos i, 9, 10), about B.C. 800. The circumstances which led to this state of things may be thus explained. After the division of the two kingdoms there is no trace of any friendly relations between the kingdom of Judah and the Phœnicians: the interest of the latter rather led them to cultivate the

friendship of the kingdom of Israel; and the Israelitish king, Ahab, had a Sidonian princess as his wife (1 Kings xvi, 31). Now, not improbably in consequence of these relations, when Jehoshaphat, king of Judah, endeavored to restore the trade of the Jews in the Red Sea, and for this purpose built large ships at Ezion-geber to go to Ophir for gold, he did not admit the Phœnicians to any participation in the venture, and when king Ahaziah, Ahab's son, asked to have a share in it, his request was distinctly refused (xxii, 48, 49). That attempt to renew the trade of the Jews in the Red Sea failed, and in the reign of Jehoram, Jehoshaphat's son, Edom revolted from Judah and established its independence; so that if the Phœnicians wished to despatch trading-vessels from Ezion-geber, Edom was the power which it was mainly their interest to conciliate, and not Judah. Under these circumstances the Phœnicians seem, not only to have purchased and to have sold again as slaves, and probably in some instances to have kidnapped inhabitants of Judah, but even to have sold them to their enemies the Edomites (Joel, Amos, as above). This was regarded with reason as a departure from the old brotherly covenant, when Hiram was a great lover of David, and subsequently had the most friendly commercial relations with David's son; and this may be considered as the original foundation of the hostility of the Hebrew prophets towards Phœnician Tyre (Isa. xxiii; Ezek. xxviii).

(3.) The only other notice in the Old Testament of trade between the Phœnicians and the Israelites is in the account given by the prophet Ezekiel of the trade of Tyre (xxvii, 17). While this account supplies valuable information respecting the various commercial dealings of that most illustrious of Phœnician cities [see TYRE], it likewise makes direct mention of the exports to it from Palestine. These were wheat, honey (i. e. sirup of grapes), oil, and balm. The export of wheat deserves attention [concerning the other exports, see BALM; HONEY; OIL], because it shows how important it must have been to the Phœnicians to maintain friendly relations with their Hebrew neighbors, and especially with the adjoining kingdom of Israel. The wheat is called wheat of Minnith (q. v.), which was a town of the Ammonites, on the other side of the Jordan, only once mentioned elsewhere in the Bible: and it is not certain whether Minnith was a great inland emporium, where large purchases of corn were made, or whether the wheat in its neighborhood was peculiarly good, and gave its name to all wheat of a certain fineness in quality. Still, whatever may be the correct explanation respecting Minnith, the only countries specified for exports of wheat are Judah and Israel, and it was through the territory of Israel that the wheat would be imported into Phœnicia. It is suggested by Heeren (in his *Historical Researches*, ii, 117) that the fact of Palestine being thus, as it were, the granary of Phœnicia, explains in the clearest manner the lasting peace that prevailed between the two countries. He observes that with many of the other adjoining nations the Jews lived in a state of almost continual warfare; but that they never once engaged in hostilities with their nearest neighbors the Phœnicians. The fact itself is certainly worthy of special notice; and is the more remarkable, as there were not wanting tempting occasions for the interference of the Phœnicians in Palestine if they desired it. When Elijah at the brook Kishon, at the distance of not more than thirty miles in a straight line from Tyre, put to death 450 prophets of Baal (1 Kings xviii, 40), we can well conceive the agitation and anger which such a deed must have produced at Tyre. At Sidon, more especially, which was only twenty miles farther distant from the scene of slaughter, the first impulse of the inhabitants must have been to march forth at once in battle array to strengthen the hands of Jezebel, their own princess, in behalf of Baal, their Phœnician god. When again afterwards, by means of falsehood and treachery, Jehu was enabled to massacre the worshippers of Baal in the land of Israel, we cannot doubt that the intelligence was received in Tyre, Sidon, and the other cities of Phœnicia, with a similar burst of horror and indignation to that with which the news of the massacre on St. Bartholomew's day was received in all Protestant countries; and there must have been an intense desire in the Phœnicians, if they had the power, to invade the territories of Israel without delay and inflict signal chastisement on Jehu (2 Kings x, 18–28). The fact that Israel was their granary would undoubtedly have been an element in restraining the Phœnicians, even on occasions such as these; but probably still deeper motives were likewise at work. It seems to have been part of the settled policy of the Phœnician cities to avoid attempts to make conquests on the continent of Asia. For this there were excellent reasons in the position of their small territory, which, with the range of Lebanon on one side as a barrier, and the sea on the other, was easily defensible by a wealthy power having command of the sea, against second or third rate powers, but for the same reason was not well situated for offensive war on the land side. It may be added that a pacific policy was their manifest interest as a commercial nation, unless by war they were morally certain to obtain an important accession of territory, or unless a warlike policy was an absolute necessity to prevent the formidable preponderance of any one great neighbor. At last, indeed, they even carried their system of non-intervention in continental wars too far, if it would have been possible for them by any alliances in Syria and Cœle-Syria to prevent the establishment on the other side of the Lebanon of one great empire. For from that moment their ultimate doom was certain, and it was merely a question of *time* as to the arrival of the fatal hour when they would lose their independence. But too little is known of the details of their history to warrant an opinion as to whether they might at any time by any course of policy have raised up a barrier against the empire of the Assyrians or Chaldees. See COMMERCE.

The impulse given to industry and the arts by this almost unparalleled extension of the commercial sphere of the Phœnicians was enormous. Originally exporters or traders only for the wares of Egypt and Assyria, they soon began to manufacture these wares themselves, and drew the whole world into their circle of commerce. As to the early and most extensive commercial intercourse between Phœnicia and Greece and her colonies, nothing can be more striking than the circumstance of nearly all the Greek names for the principal objects of Oriental commerce being Phœnician, or rather Shemitic; identical, almost, with the terms found in the Old Testament. The descriptions of the abundance of precious metals verge on the fabulous. Thus, the Phœnicians are supposed to have made even their anchors of silver, when they first discovered the mines, not knowing how to stow away all the silver in their vessel. What must have been the state of these mines is clear from the fact that even in the Roman time 40,000 men were constantly employed as miners, and the state received a clear revenue of 20,500 drachms daily. The "Fortunate Islands," which, according to Diodorus, they discovered after many days' sailing along the coast of Africa, beyond the Pillars of Hercules, and which, to judge from the name Purpurariæ given to some islands off the coast of Mauritania, would seem to have been the Canaries, yielded them the shell-fish purpura, so useful for their dyeing manufactories. Besides their wholesale commerce carried on by fleets and caravans, they also appear to have gone about the interior of Syria and Palestine, retailing their home or foreign produce. What degree of perfection they had reached in metallurgy may be seen in the minute description of the mining process contained in Job (xxviii, 1–11), probably derived from mines which they worked in the Lebanon, Cyprus, Thasos, Iberia, Tartessus, and wherever a trace of metal was found. That they had acquired a high standing

in what we should call the fine arts may be gathered from the fact that not only architects, but skilful workers of all kinds, for the adornment and embellishment of the Temple, were sent for by Solomon when he intended to fulfil the task his father David had set himself, in all the magnificence and splendor worthy of his golden reign. Their sculptures—what there has been found of them—do not, it is true, give us a very high notion of their artistic perfection; but, for all we know, these may be only the archaic beginnings, or the remnants of a corrupt age or unskilful hands. Better things may come to light any day. There certainly exist some exceedingly skilful engravings of theirs on gems among the Assyrian remnants. We further know (comp. the gold-edged silver bowl, for instance, given to Telemachus by Menelaos, which had been previously given to Hephæstos by the king of the Sidonians; the silver vase offered by Achilles as a prize at the funeral games for Patroclus; the columns and the magnificent vessels cast for the Temple of Jerusalem by Tyrian artists, and the like) that they manufactured all kinds of beautiful vessels and ornaments in gold, silver, and ivory, and knew how to extract perfumes from the lily and cypress; but, as in every other respect, they must in this province also be declared to have been only the skilful appropriators of the knowledge of others, of which, however, they made use with a diligence and perseverance entirely unparalleled.

In broadly recapitulating the routes their vessels took around the earth, we have indicated the line of their colonization. We cannot do more in this place than hint at the wanderings of Baal (q. v.), Astarte (q. v.), and Melkarth (q. v.), as the principal allegories in which the myth couched the primitive traditions of their settlements abroad. The whole of the Mediterranean, with its islands and coast, had been made theirs by rapid strides. Commencing with neighboring Cyprus, they proceeded to Cythium, to Rhodes, Crete, the Cycladic and Sporadic Isles, Cilicia, Lycia, and Caria, Chios, Samos, Tenedos, Bithynia, the Euxine, Samothrace, Lemnos, Thasos (whither they had come "in search of Europa"), Bœotia, and Eubœa. More difficult was the occupation of Sicily and the neighboring islands, where Motya, Machanetti, Panormus, and other cities, testify to their successful settlements. Thence also, by way of Malta, they sailed to Africa, and founded Carthage, which afterwards possessed herself of all the colonies in Sicily, Sardinia, and Spain. In Sardinia and the Balearic Islands they had commercial establishments at Caralis (Cagliari), Minorca, Iviza, Elba. Spain was one of their earliest and principal settlements, where they founded Cadiz, Malago, Belon, Abdarach, and other cities. It is also more than probable, although we have no distinct evidence on the point, that they had colonies in the tin districts of Cornwall and the Scilly Isles, as also on the Baltic. They settled, further, both on the north-west coast of Africa (Mauritania, Cerne), and on its north coast (Hippo, Utica, Leptis, Hadrumetum). How far Phœnicians may have had a more than temporary sojourn in India (Ophir = ? Abhira), whither they went by way of the Red Sea, we are unable to determine at present.

5. *Religion.*—The same lack of genuine and authentic information, of which we have spoken before, baffles our endeavors to arrive at anything like a proper understanding of the real character of the religion of the Phœnicians. The mutilated scraps contained in classical writers can be of as little use for its full reconstruction as the uncertain allusions of the Bible. As to Sanchoniatho, extracts of whose Phœnician writings (in Philo of Byblus's Greek version) are, as has been mentioned above, supposed to have survived in Eusebius, all that can be said regarding them is that we have more than ample reasons to suspect both the author, the translator, and the Church father, not of wilful misinterpretation, but of a certain want of candor in doing that full and fair justice to both sides which we expect from a historian of our day. A few broken votive and sacrificial stones, a few coins and unshapely images, make up the rest of our sources of information for the present. A few years hence, however, we may, if our excavations are carried on with unflagging zeal, and are as successful as they have been of late years, have as ample a supply to work upon as we have now respecting the once—hardly fifteen years ago—much more unknown land of Nebuchadnezzar and Sennacherib, if not with respect even to Greece and Rome. It will be sufficient here to indicate that Phœnician, like Canaanitic religion, in general consisted in a worship of the powers of nature under their favorable or creative (=female), and unfavorable or destroying, yet also begetting (=male) aspects. Still more concretely were these represented in the different phases of life, as child (Adonis), youth (Esmun), man (Baal-Hercules), or old man (Belitan); again, as kings (Moloch) or queens (Astarte), and other characters most fitting to the idea symbolized in them. Their chief (visible) representatives — the sun, the moon, the planets, and the elements—were revered as supreme deities, who, at the same time, were also the special Numina of particular tribes, places, and seasons, and some of their general designations, such as King (מלך), Lord (אדון), Almighty (אל), etc., are also found in the Bible. To the supreme class of deities (עליונים ועליונות) belong Baal and Astarte, with their different attributes and ramifications, e. g. Baal-samim, בעל שמים = Ζεὺς Ὀλύμπιος, Optimus Maximus, Baalitan, Baal Ram, Baal Mon; Baal Melkarth, מלך קרתא, king of the city (Tyre); Astarte = Tanith, תנת, generally with the epithet רבת, the great one, who appears identical with the Egypto-Persian war- and moon-goddess Tanaith. Corresponding to this triad in the Syro-Sidonian worship, we meet in Northern Phœnicia with the two Sidonian tribes: El (אל) or Kronos, the founder of Byblus and Berytus; Baaltis (בעלתי, my lady) = Aphrodite (Astronoe, Beruth); and Adonis (Gauas, Eljun, Esmun, etc.). Besides other well-known deities, such as Moloch and Dagon (Derketo, Atergatis)—for all of which we refer to the special articles treating of them—we find a certain mysterious number of minor gods, variously denominated the strong ones (Kabiri), or the children of the Just One (Zadik, צדיק, כביר), the principal patrons of the seafarers, worshipped alike by all the Phœnician tribes (Dioscuri, Pætaci: Chusor-Phtha [Chusartis], Astarte, Cadmus [קדם] or Taaut, Adod, and principally Esmun [אשמן = Æsculapius]). These, together with the infernal or Chthonic deities, Muth (מות = death), further a goddess known only to us as "Persephone" (daughter of Jephta with the Samaritan Sichemites), or Dido (נדידה = the wandering one), or generally Elothi = my lady, my goddess, etc., are, as far as we know at present, the chief representatives of the Phœnician Pantheon, which, be it observed by the way, appears to have been almost as catholic in the reception of foreign deities as that of imperial Rome. Like the Greeks, and after them the Romans, the Phœnicians also deified certain natural phenomena and "elements" (sun, moon, stars, water, fire, earth, air), personal attributes, abstract ideas, allegories, the seasons of life, of the year, of the day, trades and professions, and even animals; probably as symbols only at first. The serpent (Agathodæmon, Esmun, Typhon), the bull (Ashteroth-Karnaim), the lion, the ass (symbol of Shemitic Baal-worship), the dog, fishes, doves, goats, etc., are found either representing divinities, or merely sacred to them. Anything like an investigation into the various phases of Phœnician mythology, which, stretching from the remotest prehistoric days far into the first Christian centuries, must needs contain the most contradictory, apparently irreconcilable, elements and data, lies beyond the scope

of this article. We shall only mention that Sanchoniatho distinguishes—a sure sign of the consciousness on the part of native writers of the hopeless confusion in the religious notions and traditions of their time—three periods or æras, with distinct circles of deities of special classes and families. The first period contains twelve families of gods. In the second three dynasties follow each other, and there are twenty-two supreme deities (according to the letters of the Phœnician alphabet), at the head of whom stands El or Kronos, etc., as follows:

א, El, Kronos.

ב, Baityl.	ט, Astarte.	ע, Apollo.
ג, Dagon.	י, Rhea.	פ, Pontos.
ד, Atlas.	כ, Baaltis.	צ, Typhon.
ה, Persephone.	ל, Heimarmene.	ק, Nereus.
ו, Athene.	מ, Hora.	ר, Sido.
ז, Zeus Demarus.	נ, Kronos.	ש, Poseidon.
ח, Sadid.	ס, Zeus Belus.	ת, Hadod.

Of the third period only fragments of Sanchoniatho have come down, but it would appear as if Zeus Belus had in this assumed the chief rank, equal to Kronos of the second period. These gods and goddesses were propitiated in various ways, but chiefly by sacrifices, which consisted on certain occasions of first-born male children (העבור למולך). Prostitution (קדש) in honor of Astarte was considered another praiseworthy act. Among the rites of sacrifice and expiation must also be enumerated circumcision, which was not practiced with all the Phœnician tribes, but seems to have been a ceremony peculiar to the worshippers of El, the special deity of Berytus and Byblus. Whether, however, as has been held, it is to be considered analogous to this prostitution of virgins in the service of Astarte, we shall not here investigate. The country abounded with places of worship, for every grove and every height, every river and every well, were adapted for the purpose, if it could be fancied a dwelling-place for some deity. See Idolatry. Nor were special buildings (sanctuaries, temples), with all their accessories of arks and priests, wells and fires, wanting; as indeed the Phœnicians are supposed to have been the first who erected such permanent sanctuaries. Their construction was in accordance with their destination, which was not to be houses of prayer, but the seat of honor of the special deity. They were divided into two parts, the first of which contained the statues and symbols which were the objects of public worship. The second, the Adyton, on the other hand, contained such symbols which were not to be seen constantly, but were reserved for certain special festive occasions; besides the holy arks with their mystical contents, and the holy vehicles upon which these sacred objects were carried about. The walls were covered with the symbolical representations of the deities; and in this place also the priests kept their archives. Something of the abhorrence of all visible representations of the Deity which seems in the first stages of their existence to have filled the minds of all Shemitic nations — an abhorrence erroneously taken of late to indicate their monotheistic propensity (comp. Rénan's and Munk's *Inaugural Lectures*) — is also noticeable with the Phœnicians, whose gods were legion. No paintings, statues, or other likenesses of deities are recorded as found in the ancient temples of Gades, Tyre, Samaria, Paphos, etc. There were, however, certain symbolical columns of wood, אשרים (for the female Numen, Astarte), of stone, מצבות (for Baal), of gold or emerald (חמנים), together with phallic representations, found in and before the Phœnician sanctuaries. Another kind of divine mementos, as it were, were the Betylia (בית אל), probably meteors, for which a fetich-like reverence was shown, and which were called by the names of Father, Mighty Father (אב אב אדיר), and at the time of Augustine there were still a number of priests engaged in Punic Africa to wait upon these idols and to elicit oracles from them (Eucaddirs). Among the principal festivals, with some of which, as with those of the Hebrews, were connected pilgrimages —from the farthest colonies even—are the "awakening" and the "self-destruction by fire" of Hercules, a certain festival of "staves," a vintage-feast in honor of the Tyrian Bacchus, and certain others in honor of Astarte, celebrating her disappearance, flight, and wanderings, the Adonia, etc. An account of the different Phœnician gods named in the Bible will be found elsewhere (see Asherah; Ashtaroth; Baal, etc.), but it will be proper here to point out certain effects which the circumstance of their being worshipped in Phœnicia produced upon the Hebrews.

(1.) In the first place, their worship was a constant temptation to polytheism and idolatry. It is the general tendency of trade, by making merchants acquainted with different countries and various modes of thought, to enlarge the mind, to promote the increase of knowledge, and, in addition, by the wealth which it diffuses, to afford opportunities in various ways for intellectual culture. It can scarcely be doubted that, owing to these circumstances, the Phœnicians, as a great commercial people, were more generally intelligent, and as we should now say civilized, than the inland agricultural population of Palestine. When the simple-minded Jews, therefore, came in contact with a people more versatile and, apparently, more enlightened than themselves, but who nevertheless, either in a philosophical or in a popular form, admitted a system of polytheism, an influence would be exerted on Jewish minds, tending to make them regard their exclusive devotion to their own one God, Jehovah, however transcendent his attributes, as unsocial and morose. It is in some such way that we must account for the astonishing fact that Solomon himself, the wisest of the Hebrew race, to whom Jehovah is expressly stated to have appeared twice—once, not long after his marriage with an Egyptian princess, on the night after his sacrificing 1000 burnt-offerings on the high place of Gibeon, and the second time after the consecration of the Temple—should have been so far beguiled by his wives in his old age as to become a Polytheist, worshipping, among other deities, the Phœnician or Sidonian goddess Ashtoreth (1 Kings iii, 1-5; ix, 2; xi, 1-5). This is not for a moment to be so interpreted as if he ever ceased to worship Jehovah, to whom he had erected the magnificent Temple, which in history is so generally connected with Solomon's name. Probably, according to his own erroneous conceptions, he never ceased to regard himself as a loyal worshipper of Jehovah, but he at the same time deemed this not incompatible with sacrificing at the altars of other gods likewise. Still the fact remains that Solomon, who by his Temple in its ultimate results did so much for establishing the doctrine of one only God, became himself a practical Polytheist. If this was the case with him, polytheism in other sovereigns of inferior excellence can excite no surprise. With such an example before him, it is no wonder that Ahab, an essentially bad man, should after his marriage with a Sidonian princess not only openly tolerate, but encourage the worship of Baal; though it is to be remembered even in him that he did not disavow the authority of Jehovah, but, when rebuked by his great antagonist Elijah, he rent his clothes and put sackcloth on his flesh, and showed other signs of contrition evidently deemed sincere (1 Kings xvi, 31; xxi, 27-29). Finally, it is to be observed generally that although, before the reformation of Josiah (2 Kings xxiii), polytheism prevailed in Judah as well as Israel, yet it seems to have been more intense and universal in Israel, as might have been expected from its greater proximity to Phœnicia; and Israel is sometimes spoken of as if it had set the bad

example to Judah (2 Kings xvii, 19; Jer. iii, 8); though, considering the example of Solomon, this cannot be accepted as a strict historical statement.

(2.) The Phœnician religion was likewise in other respects deleterious to the inhabitants of Palestine, being in some points essentially demoralizing. For example, it sanctioned the dreadful superstition of burning children as sacrifices to a Phœnician god. "They have built also," says Jeremiah, in the name of Jehovah (xix, 5), "the high places of Baal, to burn their sons with fire for burnt-offerings unto Baal, which I commanded not, nor spake it, neither came it into my mind" (comp. Jer. xxxii, 35). This horrible custom was probably in its origin founded on the idea of sacrificing to a god what was most valuable in the eyes of the suppliant; but it could not exist without having a tendency to stifle natural feelings of affection, and to harden the heart. It could scarcely have been first adopted otherwise than in the infancy of the Phœnician race; but grown-up men and grown-up nations, with their moral feelings in other respects cultivated, are often the slaves in particular points of an early implanted superstition, and it is worthy of note that, more than two hundred and fifty years after the death of Jeremiah, the Carthaginians, when their city was besieged by Agathocles, offered as burnt-sacrifices to the planet Saturn, at the public expense, two hundred boys of the highest aristocracy; and, subsequently, when they had obtained a victory, sacrificed the most beautiful captives in the like manner (Diod. xx, 14, 65). If such things were possible among the Carthaginians at a period so much later, it is easily conceivable how common the practice of sacrificing children may have been at the time of Jeremiah among the Phœnicians generally; and if this were so, it would have been certain to prevail among the Israelites who worshipped the same Phœnician gods; especially as, owing to the intermarriages of their forefathers with Canaanites, there were probably few Israelites who may not have had some Phœnician blood in their veins (Judg. iii, 5). Again, parts of the Phœnician religion, especially the worship of Astarte, tended to encourage dissoluteness in the relations of the sexes, and even to sanctify impurities of the most abominable description. Connected with her temples and images there were male and female prostitutes, whose polluted gains formed part of the sacred fund appropriated to the service of the goddess; and, to complete the deification of immorality, they were even known by the name of the "consecrated." Nothing can show more clearly how deeply this baneful example had eaten into the hearts and habits of the people, notwithstanding positive prohibitions and the repeated denunciations of the Hebrew prophets, than the almost incredible fact that, previous to the reformation of Josiah, this class of persons was allowed to have houses or tents close to the temple of Jehovah, whose treasury was perhaps even replenished by their gains (2 Kings xxiii, 7; Deut. xxiii, 17, 18; 1 Kings xiv, 24; xv, 12; xxii, 46; Hos. iv, 14; Job xxxvi, 14; comp. Lucian, *Lucius*, c. 35; *De Deâ Syrâ*, c. 27, 51; Gesenius, *Thesaurus*, s. v. קָדֵשׁ, p. 1196; Movers, *Phön.* i, 678, etc.; Spencer, *De Legibus Hebræorum*, i, 561).

A few words may be added here on Phœnician theogony and cosmogony, which, as far as they are known to us, give evidence of the enormous amount of thought bestowed by the thinkers of that people on the enigma of creation. The Deity was, in accordance with the antique mind, presupposed. Speculation never questioned its eternal existence, the original quality of each of its two principal—male and female—sides, and the way in which, out of their union, sprang the universe. According to the system of Eudemus, Time, Desire, and Mist formed the first triad of existence; and from the embrace of the last two sprang air and "motion of air," out of which again was produced the mundane egg. The cosmogony, according to Sanchoniatho on the other hand, assumes, in the beginning of all things, a gloomy and agitated air, and a turbid chaos of thickest darkness, which for a long course of ages was without limits. The wind becoming enamoured with its own essence, Mot sprang into being, as a kind of thick, putrid fluid, which contained all germs. The first beings created from this were without intellect; and from them, again, came intellectual beings, Zopha-Semin (צופי שמים), watchmen, or beholders of the heavens. "And it began to shine Mot, also the sun and the moon, the stars and the great planets. The glowing sun, heating sea and earth, raised vapors, which produced clouds and winds, lightning and thunder, and at their crash the beings began to awake in terror, and male and female moved on land and sea." The wind Kolpia further produced with Baau (בֹּהוּ of Genesis) Aion and Protogonos, the first mortals. Aion first discovered the art of nutriment from fruit-trees; and their children, Genos and Genea, who dwelt in Phœnicia, first worshipped Baalsamin, or the sun. Genos begat Light, Fire, and Flame, out of whom came giants, Cassius, Libanus, Antilibanus, and Brathys. Their sons invented the art of constructing huts of reeds and meshes and the papyrus, and the art of making coverings for the body out of the skins of wild beasts. After them came the inventors of hunting and fishing, the discoverers of iron, of the art of navigation, etc. One of their descendants was Elyon (probably the God whose priest was Melchisedec, Gen. xiv, 18, etc.; Abraham, in his reply to the king of Sodom, emphatically adds "Jehovah" to El-Elyon), who with his wife Beruth begat an Autochthon, afterwards called Uranos (heaven), and his sister Ge (earth). They had issue four sons, Ibis, Betylus, Dagon, and Atlas; and three daughters, Astarte, Rhea, and Dione. Chronos deposed his father, subsequently killed him, and travelled about in the world. He then assigned the whole of Phœnicia to Astarte, to Athene he gave Attica, and to Taut Egypt. The country being involved in war, he offered up his two sons, Jeud and Muth (מוֹת, Pluto), in expiation. He afterwards bestowed the city of Byblus upon the goddess Baaltis (Dione), and Berytus upon Poseidon and the Kabiri. Taut made the first images of the countenances of the gods Chronos and Dagon, and formed the sacred characters of the other elements; and the Kabiri, the seven sons of Sydyc, and their eighth brother Asklepios, first set them down in memory. "Thabion," Eusebius (*Pr. Ev.* i, 10) continues, "the first hierophant, allegorized these things subsequently, and, mixing the facts with physical and mundane phenomena, he delivered them down to those that celebrated orgia, and to the prophets who presided over the mysteries, and to their successors, one of whom was Isiris, the inventor of three letters, the brother of Chna, the first Phœnician."

6. *Language.*—The most important intellectual invention of man, that of letters, was universally asserted by the Greeks and Romans to have been communicated by the Phœnicians to the Greeks. The earliest written statement on the subject is in Herodotus (v, 57, 58), who incidentally, in giving an account of Harmodius and Aristogeiton, says that they were by race Gephyræans; and that he had ascertained by inquiry that the Gephyræans were Phœnicians, among those Phœnicians who came over with Cadmus into Bœotia, and instructing the Greeks in many other arts and sciences, taught them likewise letters. It was an easy step from this to believe, as many of the ancients believed, that the Phœnicians *invented* letters (Lucan, *Pharsal.* iii, 220, 221). This belief, however, was not universal; and Pliny the Elder expresses his own opinion that they were of Assyrian origin, while he relates the opinion of Gellius that they were invented by the Egyptians, and of others that they were invented by the Syrians (*Nat. Hist.* vii, 57). Now, as Phœnician has been shown to be nearly the same language as Hebrew, the question arises whether Hebrew throws any light on the time or the mode of the invention of letters, on the question

of who invented them, or on the universal belief of antiquity that the knowledge of them was communicated to the Greeks by the Phœnicians. The answer is as follows: Hebrew literature is as silent as Greek literature respecting the precise date of the invention of letters, and the name of the inventor or inventors; but the names of the letters in the Hebrew alphabet are in accordance with the belief that the Phœnicians communicated the knowledge of letters to the Greeks: for many of the names of letters in the Greek alphabet, though without meaning in the Greek, have a meaning in the corresponding letters of Hebrew. For example: the first four letters of the Greek alphabet, Alpha, Beta, Gamma, Delta, are not to be explained through the Greek language; but the corresponding first four letters of the Hebrew alphabet, viz. Aleph, Beth, Gimel, Daleth, being essentially the same words, are to be explained in Hebrew. Thus in Hebrew Aleph or Eleph means an ox; Beth or Bayith a house; Gamal, a camel; and Deleth a door. The same is essentially, though not always so clearly, the case with almost all the sixteen earliest Greek letters said to have been brought over from Phœnicia by Cadmus, Α Β Γ Δ Ε Ϝ Ι Κ Λ Μ Ν Ο Π Ρ Σ Τ; and called on this account Phœnician or Cadmeian letters (Herodot. *l. c.;* Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* vii, 57; Jelf, *Greek Gram.* i, p. 2). The sixth letter, afterwards disused, and now generally known by the name of Digamma (from Dionysius, i, 20), was unquestionably the same as the Hebrew letter Vav (a hook). Moreover, as to writing, the ancient Hebrew letters, substantially the same as Phœnician, agree closely with ancient Greek letters—a fact which, taken by itself, would not prove that the Greeks received them from the Phœnicians, as the Phœnicians might possibly have received them from the Greeks; but which, viewed in connection with Greek traditions on the subject, and with the significance of the letters in Hebrew, seems reasonably conclusive that the letters were transported from Phœnicia into Greece. It is true that modern Hebrew writing and the later Greek writing of antiquity have not much resemblance to each other; but this is owing partly to gradual changes in the writing of Greek letters, and partly to the fact that the character in which Hebrew Bibles are now printed, called the Assyrian or square character, was not the one originally in use among the Jews, but seems to have been learned in the Babylonian captivity, and afterwards gradually adopted by them on their return to Palestine (Gesenius, *Gesch. der Hebräischen Sprache und Schrift*, p. 156). See ALPHABET.

As to the mode in which letters were invented, some clew is afforded by some of the early Hebrew and the Phœnician characters, which evidently aimed, although very rudely, like the drawing of very young children, to represent the object which the name of the letter signified. Thus the earliest Alpha has some vague resemblance to an ox's head, Gimel to a camel's back, Daleth to the door of a tent, Vav to a hook or peg. Again, the written letters, called respectively, Lamed (an ox-goad), Ayin (an eye), Qoph (the back of the head), Resh or Rosh (the head), and Tav (a cross), are all efforts, more or less successful, to portray the things signified by the names. It is said that this is equally true of Egyptian phonetic hieroglyphics; but, however this may be, there is no difficulty in understanding in this way the formation of an alphabet; when the idea of representing the component sounds or half-sounds of a word by figures was once conceived. But the original idea of thus representing sounds, though peculiarly felicitous, was by no means obvious, and millions of men have lived and died without its occurring to any one of them.

It may not be unimportant to observe that, although so many letters of the Greek alphabet have a meaning in Hebrew or Phœnician, yet their Greek names are not in the Hebrew or Phœnician, but in the Aramaic form. There is a peculiar form of the noun in Aramaic called by grammarians the *status emphaticus*, in which the termination *â* (א) is added to a noun, modifying it according to certain laws. Originally this termination was probably identical with the definite article "ha;" which, instead of being prefixed, was subjoined to the noun, as is the case now with the definite article in the Scandinavian languages. This form in â is found to exist in the oldest specimen of Aramaic in the Bible, *Yegar sahadûthâ*, in Gen. xxxi, 47, where *sahadûth*, testimony, is used by Laban in the *status emphaticus*. Now it is worthy of note that the names of a considerable proportion of the "Cadmeian letters" in the Greek alphabet are in this Aramaic form, such as Alpha, Beta, Gamma, Delta, Eta, Theta, Iota, Kappa, Lambda; and although this fact by itself is not sufficient to support an elaborate theory on the subject, it seems in favor, as far as it goes, of the conjecture that when the Greeks originally received the knowledge of letters, the names by which the several letters were taught to them were Aramaic. It has been suggested, indeed, by Gesenius, that the Greeks themselves made the addition in all these cases, in order to give the words a Greek termination, as "they did with other Phœnician words, as *melet*, *μάλθα*, *nebel*, *νάβλα*." If, however, a list is examined of Phœnician words naturalized in Greek, it will not be found that the ending in *α* has been the favorite mode of accommodating them to the Greek language. For example, of the words specified by Bleek (*Einleitung in das A. T.* p. 69) as having been communicated through the Phœnicians to the Greeks (see above), it is remarkable that only four end in *α* in Greek which have not a similar termination in Hebrew; and of these four one is a late Alexandrian translation, and two are names of musical instruments, which, very probably, may first have been communicated to Greeks, through Syrians, in Asia Minor. Under any circumstances, the proportion of the Phœnician words which end in *α* in Greek is too small to warrant the inference that any common practice of the Greeks in this respect will account for the seeming fact that nine out of the sixteen Cadmeian letters are in the Aramaic *status emphaticus*. The inference, therefore, from their endings in *α* remains unshaken. Still this must not be regarded in any way as proving that the alphabet was invented by those who spoke the Aramaic language. This is a wholly distinct question, and far more obscure; though much deference on the point is due to the opinion of Gesenius, who, from the internal evidence of the names of the Shemitic letters, has arrived at the conclusion that they were invented by the Phœnicians (*Palæographie*, p. 294). The strongest argument of Gesenius against the Aramaic invention of the letters is that, although doubtless many of the names are both Aramaic and Hebrew, some of them are not Aramaic—at least not in the Hebrew signification; while the Syrians use other words to express the same ideas. Thus אלף in Aramaic means only 1000, and not an ox; the word for "door" in Aramaic is not דלת, but תרע; while the six following names of Cadmeian letters are not Aramaic: פא, עין, יוד, רו, קוף, (Syr. פוּם), תו.

As this obviously leads to the conclusion that the Hebrews *adopted* Phœnician as their own language, or, in other words, that what is called the Hebrew language was in fact "the language of Canaan," as a prophet called it (Isa. xix, 18), and this not merely poetically, but literally and in philological truth; and as this is repugnant to some preconceived notions respecting the peculiar people, the question arises whether the Israelites might not have translated Canaanitish names into Hebrew. On this hypothesis the names now existing in the Bible for persons and places in the land of Canaan would not be the original names, but merely the translations of those names. The answer to this question is, 1. That there is not the slightest direct mention, nor any indirect trace, in the Bible, of any

such translation. 2. That it is contrary to the analogy of the ordinary Hebrew practice in other cases: as, for example, in reference to the names of the Assyrian monarchs (perhaps of a foreign dynasty) Pul, Tiglath-Pileser, Sennacherib, or of the Persian monarchs Darius, Ahasuerus, Artaxerxes, which remain unintelligible in Hebrew, and can only be understood through other Oriental languages. 3. That there is an absolute silence in the Bible as to there having been any difference whatever in language between the Israelites and the Canaanites, although in other cases where a difference existed that difference is somewhere alluded to, as in the case of the Egyptians (Psa. lxxxi, 5; cxiv, 1), the Assyrians (Isa. xxxvi, 11), and the Chaldees (Jer. v, 15). Yet in the case of the Canaanites there was stronger reason for alluding to it; and without some allusion to it, if it had existed, the narration of the conquest of Canaan under the leadership of Joshua would have been singularly imperfect.

The Phœnician language, however, certainly belonged to that family of languages which, by a name not altogether free from objection, but now generally adopted, is called "Shemitic." Under this name are included three distinct branches: *a.* Arabic, to which belongs Æthiopic as an offshoot of the Southern Arabic or Himyaritic. *b.* Aramaic, the vernacular language of Palestine at the time of Christ, in which the few original words of Christ which have been preserved in writing appear to have been spoken (Matt. xxvii, 46; Mark v, 41; and mark especially Matt. xvi, 18, which is not fully significant either in Greek or Hebrew). Aramaic, as used in Christian literature, is called Syriac, and as used in the writings of the Jews has been very generally called Chaldee. *c.* Hebrew, in which by far the greater part of the Old Testament was composed. Now one of the most interesting points to the Biblical student connected with Phœnician, is, that it does not belong to either of the first two branches, but to the third; and that it is in fact so closely allied to Hebrew that Phœnician and Hebrew, though different dialects, may practically be regarded as the same language. This may be shown in the following way: (1.) In passages which have been frequently quoted (see especially Gesenii *Monumenta Scripturæ Linguæque Phœniciæ*, p. 231), testimony is borne to the kinship of the two languages by Augustine and Jerome, in whose time Phœnician or Carthaginian was still a living language. Jerome, who was a good Hebrew scholar, after mentioning, in his Commentaries on Jeremiah (lib. v, c. 25) that Carthage was a Phœnician colony, proceeds to state, "Unde et Pœni sermone corrupto quasi Phœni appellantur, quorum lingua Hebrææ linguæ magnâ ex parte confinis est." Augustine, who was a native of Africa, and a bishop there of Hippo, a Tyrian colony, has left on record a similar statement several times. In one passage he says of the two languages, "Istæ linguæ non multum inter se differunt" (*Quæstiones in Heptateuchum*, vii, 16). In another passage he says, "Cognatæ sunt istæ linguæ et vicinæ, Hebræa, et Punica, et Syra" (*In Joann. Tract.* 15). Again, on Gen. xviii, 9, he says of a certain mode of speaking (Gen. viii, 9), "Locutio est, quam propterea Hebræam puto, quia et Punicæ linguæ familiarissima est, in quâ multa invenimus Hebræis verbis consonantia" (lib. i, cap. 24). On another occasion, remarking on the word Messias, he says, "Quod verbum Punicæ linguæ consonum est, *sicut alia Hebræa multa et pœne omnia*" (*Contra literas Petiliani*, ii, c. 104). (2.) These statements are fully confirmed by a passage of Carthaginian preserved in the *Pœnulus* of Plautus (act v, scene 1), and accompanied by a Latin translation as part of the play. There is no doubt that the Carthaginians and the Phœnicians were the same race; and the Carthaginian extract is undeniably intelligible through Hebrew to Hebrew scholars (see Bochart's *Canaan;* and especially Gesenii *Monumenta Phœniciæ*, p. 357–382, where the passage is translated with notes, and full justice is done to the previous translation of Bochart). (3.) The close kinship of the two languages is, moreover, strikingly confirmed by very many Phœnician and Carthaginian names of places and persons, which, destitute of meaning in Greek and Latin, through which languages they have become widely known, and having sometimes in those languages occasioned false etymologies, become really significant in Hebrew. Thus through Hebrew it is known that Tyre, as *Tsôr*, signifies "a rock," referring doubtless to the rocky island on which the city was situated: that Sidon, as *Tsidôn*, means "Fishing" or "Fishery," which was probably the occupation of its first settlers: that Carthage, or, as it was originally called, "Cartha-da," means "New Town," or "Newton:" and that Byrsa, which, as a Greek name, suggested the mythological mythus of the Bull's Hide (*Æneid*, i, 366, 367), was simply the citadel of Carthage—"Carthaginis arcem," as Virgil accurately termed it: the Carthaginian name of it, softened by the Greeks into Βύρσα, being merely the Hebrew word Botsrah, "citadel;" identical with the word called Bozrah in the English Version of Isa. lxiii, 1. Again, through Hebrew, the names of celebrated Carthaginians, though sometimes disfigured by Greek and Roman writers, acquire a meaning. Thus Dido is found to belong to the same root as David, "beloved;" meaning "his love" or "delight;" i. e. the love or delight either of Baal or of her husband: Hasdrubal is the man "whose help Baal is:" Hamilcar the man whom the god "Milcar graciously granted" (comp. Hananeel; Θεόδωρος): and, with the substitution of Baal for El or God, the name of the renowned Hannibal is found to be identical in form and meaning with the name of Hanniel, who is mentioned in Numb. xxxiv, 23 as the prince of the tribe of Manasseh: Hanniel meaning the grace of God, and Hannibal the grace of Baal. (4.) The same conclusion arises from the examination of Phœnician inscriptions, preserved to the present day; all of which can be interpreted, with more or less certainty, through Hebrew. Some of these will be more particularly noticed below.

III. *Literature.*—1. *Original Remains.*—With the exception of Greek and Latin, no language was so widely known and spoken throughout antiquity as the Phœnician; and monuments of it have been found, and continue to be found, almost all over the ancient world. We can only vaguely speculate on its early history and its various phases, so long as our materials yield so little information on that point. Its decline seems to date from the 8th century B.C., when Aramaisms crept in in overwhelming numbers. Finally, the close contact with, and the everywhere preponderating influence of the Greeks, superseded—chiefly after Alexander's time—the ancient language almost completely; and even coins with Phœnician legends occur not later than the 2d century B.C.

An important Phœnician literature seems to have been extant as late as the 1st century A.D., but it has disappeared from the face of the earth. After the second half of the 3d century the language had vanished entirely in the country itself, and Jerome, who lived in Palestine, mentions the Punic, but never the Phœnician. In the West it survived to a much later period. In Mauritania and Numidia it remained, in a corrupted form, the reigning tongue as late as the 4th century A.D.; and Augustine draws his explanations of Scripture from the Punic current in the 5th century. There was a translation of the whole Bible into Punic made for the use of the Punic churches; and in and near Tripolis it was the language of the common people up to a late period. From the 6th century, however, it rapidly died out, chiefly in consequence of the Vandals, Goths, Moors, and other foreign tribes overrunning the country, and ingrafting their own idioms upon it.

The literature of Phœnicia, in its original form, has, as we have said, perished entirely. What traces and fragments we have of it have survived in Greek translations. But from even these small remnants we can

easily imagine the extreme antiquity, and the high importance and vast extent of these productions, which, at first, seem to have been chiefly of a theological or theogonical nature. Their authors are the gods themselves, and the writings are only accessible to the priests, and to those initiated in the mysteries. From the allegorical explanations of these exalted personages sprang a new branch of sacred literature, of which those fragments of cosmogony mentioned above are derived. To the literary age of Taaut, Cadmus, Ophion, Esmun, etc., succeeded Thabion, Isiris, Sanchoniatho, and Mochus, who founded the schools of priests and prophets. These cultivated the sciences, chiefly the occult ones, magic, and the like. Nearest to the sacred literature stands didactic poetry, somewhat related to the Orphic, whose chief representatives are Sido, Jopas, etc. The erotic poetry is characterized as of a very sensuous nature, both in Phœnicia and the colonies. Of historians are mentioned Mochus, Hypsikrates (Sanchoniatho?) Theodotus, Philostratus, Menander, and others; but these are mere Greek versions of their Phœnician names, and absolutely nothing has been preserved of their writings. Punic literature is also frequently mentioned by Greek and Roman writers. Geography, history, agriculture, were the fields chiefly cultivated by the colonists of Carthage and the West generally.

The monuments that have come down to us, and which not only have enabled us to judge for ourselves of the religion, the language, and the manners of the Phœnicians, are either original, as legends on coins and lapidary inscriptions, or at second hand, as Phœnician proper nouns and texts imbedded in the works of ancient classical or sacred writers. The principal and ever-growing source for our information, however, is the monumental inscriptions, of whose existence, till the middle of the 18th century, nothing was known. The most numerous Phœnician remnants have been discovered in the colonies. Richard Pococke first found, on the site of ancient Citium (Larnaka of to-day), thirty-one (not thirty-three, as generally stated) Phœnician inscriptions, which he deposited at Oxford (published by Swinton, 1750). Malta, Sardinia, Carthage, Algiers, Tripolis, Athens, Marseilles, have each yielded a considerable number, so that altogether we are now in the possession of about one hundred and twenty monuments, either votive tablets or tomb inscriptions. The latest and most remarkable are those now in the British Museum, discovered at Carthage a few years ago by N. Davis, consisting of votive tablets, a (doubtful) tombstone, and a sacrificial tariff, which completes another stone found some years ago at Marseilles of the same nature; both setting forth the amount of taxes, or rather the proportionate share the priest was entitled to receive for each sacrifice. Another exceedingly valuable (trilingual) inscription, referring to the gift of an altar vowed to Eshmun-Asklepios, has lately been discovered in Sardinia (see below). One of the most important historical monuments is the sarcophagus of Eshmanasar II, king of Sidon (son of Tennes?), found at Tyre in 1855, the age of which has variously been conjectured between the 11th century B.C. (Ewald)—a most incongruous guess indeed—the 7th (Hitzig), the 6th (duc De Luynes), and the 4th (Levy), of which we shall add the commencement, literally translated:

Lid of Phœnician Sarcophagus.

"In the month of Bul, in the fourteenth year that I reigned, king Eshmanasar, king of the Sidonians, son of king Tebnith, king of the Sidonians—spake king Eshmanasar, king of the Sidonians, saying: Carried away before my time, in the flood of days—in dumbness ceases the son of gods. Dead do I lie in this tomb, in the grave, on the place which I have built. I myself ordain that all the nobles and all the people shall not open this place of rest; they shall not seek for treasures and not carry away the sarcophagus of my resting-place, and not disturb me by mounting the couch of my slumbers. If people should speak to thee [and persuade thee to the contrary], do not listen to them. For all the nobles and all the people who shall open this sarcophagus of the place of rest, or carry away the sarcophagus of my couch, or disturb me upon this resting-place, may they find no rest with the departed; may they not be buried in a tomb, and may no son and successor live after them in their place," etc. (see Thomson, *Land and Book*, i, 198 sq.).

The votive tablets bear the same character throughout, differing only with respect to the name of the man or woman who placed it in a certain sanctuary in accordance with his or her vow. Their material is mostly limestone or fine sandstone, rarely marble, and they vary from 5 to 15 inches in height, from 4 to 7 in width, and from 1½ to 4 in thickness. Beginning in most cases with the dedication to the god or goddess, or both, thus: "[Sacred] To the god . . . [this tablet] which vowed N. son (daughter) of N. When he (she) heard my voice and blessed," or "hear my voice and bless;" etc. The sepulchral tablets generally run somewhat in this manner: "Stone erected to . . . , who lived . . . years." Much yet remains to be done. Even the palæographical side has, notwithstanding all the ready material, not been settled satisfactorily yet. One point, however, is indisputable even now. There are at least two kinds of Phœnician writing to be distinguished most clearly. The older, purer, more orthographical, and more neatly executed, is found in the inscriptions of Phœnicia herself, of Malta, Athens, Citium, and Carthage; the younger, corrupted not only with respect to the grammar and language, but also with respect to the form of the letters, which are less carefully executed, and even exhibit some strange, probably degenerate characters, is found chiefly on the monuments of Cyprus, Cilicia, Sardinia, Africa, Spain, Numidia, and the adjacent parts.

i. e.—
Lerabbath Letanith Pen-Baal
Uleaddan Lebaâl Ch[ammon A]
[Sh] Nadar Chanbaâl [Ben Âbd]
Ashmun . . . [Shema]
[Ko]l[a Barcha . . .
"To the Lady Tanith, the Face of Baal, and to the Lord Baal Chammon [is dedicated this] which has vowed Hanbaâl [the son of Âbd] Ashmun . . . [When he (or she) hears his voice, may he (or she) bless."]

Besides these monumental sources for the language, there are a few remnants of it embedded, as we said, in ancient non-Phœnician writings. The Old Testament alone, however, has preserved its words—proper nouns chiefly—unmutilated. Later eastern writers even, not to mention the Greeks and Romans, have corrupted the spelling to such a degree that it is often most puzzling to trace the original Shemitic words. Phœnician names occur in Suidas, Dioscorides, Apuleius, in martyrologies, calendariums, Acts of Councils, in Church fathers (Augustine, Priscianus, Servus), etc. The only really important remnant, however, is found preserved—albeit fearfully mutilated and Latinized—in Plautus's *Pœnulus*, act v, scene 1 of which contains, in sixteen lines, the Phœnician translation of the Latin text, with more than one hundred Phœnician words. Several other phrases and words are embodied in act v, scenes 2 and 3 of the same play. Yet, although there is very little

doubt among scholars about the greater portion of these texts, the corruption and mutilation which they had to undergo, first at the hands of Plautus, who probably only wrote them by the ear, then at the hands of generations of ignorant scribes, have made more than one word or passage an insoluble puzzle. The first of the two specimens of Phœnician [Punic] writing subjoined is taken from one of those Carthaginian votive tablets


CLEON · SALARI · SOC · S · AESCOLAPIO · MERRE · DONVM · DEDIT · LVBENS
MERITO · MERENTE
ΑΣΚΛΗΠΙΩ ΜΙΡΡΗΑΝΑΘΕΜΑΡ ΜΟΝΕΣΘ
ΣΕΚΛΕ ΝΟΕΠΙΤ ΝΑΛ ΝΚΑΤΑΠΟΣΤΑΓΜΑ

The first (Latin) division, consisting of 14 lines, reads: "Cleon . Salari[orum] . Soc[ietatis] . S[ocius, odalis] . Æscolapio . Merre . Donum . Dedit . Merito . Merente."
The second (Greek) division (two half lines) reads: "Ἀσκλήπιῳ Μίρρη Ἀνάθεμα Βωμὸν Ἔστησε Κλέων Ὁ Ἐπὶ Τῶν Ἀλῶν Κατὰ Πρόσταγμα."
The third (Phœnician) division (14 lines) reads: "Leidan Leeshmun Maarach Misbuch Nechosheth Mishkal Litram Meath [100] Ash Nadar Aklin Shachsag Measher Mimelach Tishm[a Kjola Rephia Beshat Suphetim Chamilkat Veabd Ashmun Ben Chamilk[at]."

with which the British Museum (now the wealthiest in Phœnician monuments) has lately been enriched, as mentioned before. The emblems on it are symbolical, and refer to the deities invoked. The lower part is mutilated, but easily supplied. The date is uncertain, perhaps the 2d or 3d century B.C. The second is a trilingual inscription from a base of an altar recently found at Pauli Gerrei, in Sardinia, and has been fully explained by Deutsch (see *Transactions* of the Royal Society of Literature, 1864). Its contents are briefly this: A certain Cleon, Phœnician by religion, Greek by name, Roman by nationality, a salt-farmer, vows an altar—material and weight of which are only given in Phœnician: viz. copper, a hundred pounds in weight—to Eshmun-Asklepios "the Healer" (the Phœnician *Mearrach*, clumsily transcribed *Merre* in Latin, and *Mirre* in Greek), in consideration for a cure to be performed. The date, given in Phœnician, viz. the year of two, apparently annual, entirely unknown judges, gives no clew to the time. Palæographical reasons, however, would place it in about the 1st century B.C.

2. *Modern Authorities.*—Among those who have more or less successfully occupied themselves with Phœnician antiquities, language, and literature, and who have also, in some instances, deciphered inscriptions, we mention Scaliger, Bochart, Pococke, Barthélemy, Swinton, Bayer, Dutens, Hamaker, Gesenius, Movers, Munck, Judas, Bargès, De Saulcy, Ewald, Levy, Vaux, Rénan, De Luynes, De Vogué, Deutsch, and others; to whose writings, contained either in special works or scattered in Transactions of learned societies, we refer for further information on the subject of our article.

In English, see Kenrick's *Phœnicia* (Lond. 1855); in Latin, the second part of Bochart's *Geographia Sacra*, under the title "Canaan," and Gesenius's work, *Scripturæ Linguæque Phœniciæ Monumenta quotquot supersunt* (Leips. 1837); in German, the exhaustive work of Movers, *Die Phönizier und das Phönizische Alterthum* (Berlin, 1841–1856, 5 vols.); Gerhard, *Kunst der Phönizier* (ibid. 1848); an article on the same subject by Movers, in Ersch and Gruber's *Encyclopädie*, and an article in the same work by Gesenius on *Paläographie*. See likewise Gesenius, *Gesch. der Hebräischen Sprache und Schrift* (Leips. 1815); Bleek, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament* (Berl. 1860). Phœnician inscriptions discovered since the time of Gesenius have been published by Judas, *Étude démonstrative de la langue Phénicienne et de la langue Libyque* (Paris, 1847), and forty-five other inscriptions have been published by the abbé Bourgade (ibid. 1852, fol.). In 1845 a votive tablet was discovered at Marseilles, respecting which see Movers, *Phönizische Texte* (1847), and Judas, *Analyse* (Par. 1857), and *Études* (ibid. 1857). On the sarcophagus of Eshmanasar, see Dietrich, *Zwei Sidonische Inschriften, und eine alte Phönizische Königsinschrift* (Marburg, 1855), and Ewald, *Erklärung der grossen Phönizischen Inschrift von Sidon* (Göttingen, 1856, 4to; from the seventh volume of the *Abhandlungen der Königl. geograph. Gesellschaft zu Göttingen*). Information respecting these works, and others on Phœnician inscriptions, is given by Bleek, p. 64, 65. See also Barthélemy, *Monumens Phœniciens* (Paris, 1795); Hamaker, *De Monumentis Punicis* (Leips. 1822); Raoul-Rochette, *Monumenta Phœnicia* (Paris, 1828); Davis, *Carthage* (Lond. 1861); Wilkins, *Phœnicia and Israel* (Lond. 1871); Rénan, *Mission de Phénicie* (Paris, 1864).

Phœnix, the name of a mythical Egyptian bird, supposed by some to be a kind of plover, like the *kibitz*, often depicted with human arms, and called in hieroglyphs *rekh*. Others consider it to be the *bennu*, or nycticorax, a bird sacred to Osiris, and represented watching in the tamarisk over his coffin. The first of these representations has sometimes a star upon the head, supposed to indicate the astronomical period of its appearance. It visited Egypt after the death of its father, and entered the shrine particularly dedicated to it at Heliopolis, and there buried its parent, putting the

Antique Representations of the Phœnix.

1, Sitting on a wood-pile; 2, striding; 3, false phœnix, destitute of tuft; 4, the planet Mercury as messenger of the gods, with his travelling-staff, and a phœnix; 5, a gold denarius of Trajan, representing a phœnix as surmounting its nest and bearing the sun's disc.

body into an egg or case made of myrrh, and then closing up the egg. Another account is that the Phœnix, when about to die, made a nest for itself in Arabia, from which a new Phœnix sprang of itself. This bird proceeded to Heliopolis, and there burned and buried its father. But the more popularly known version is that the Phœnix burned itself, and a new and young Phœnix sprang from the ashes. A less received version is that a worm crawled out of the body of the dead Phœnix, and became the future one. The Phœnix was, according to the most authentic accounts, supposed to visit Egypt every five hundred years; the precise period, however, was not known at Heliopolis, and was a subject of contention till its appearance. The connection of the Phœnix period with that of the Sothiac cycle, appears to be generally received by chronologists, as well as the statement of Horapollo, that it designated the soul and the inundation of the Nile. A great difference of opinion has prevailed about the Phœnix period: according to Ælian, it was a cycle of 500 years; Tacitus seems to make it one of 250 years; Lepsius, a cycle of 1500 years. The Phœnix was fabled to have four times appeared in Egypt: 1, under Sesostris; 2, under Amasis, 569–525 B.C.; 3, under Ptolemy Philadelphus, 284–246 B.C.; and lastly, 34 or 36 A.D., just prior to the death of Tiberius. The Phœnix also appears upon the coins of Constantine, 334 A.D, viz. 300 years after the death of Christ, who was considered the Phœnix by the monastic writers. It is supposed by the rabbins to be mentioned in the Bible (Job xxix, 18; Psa. ciii, 5). See Herodotus, ii, 73; Achilles Tatius, iii, 25; Tacitus, *An.* vi, 28; Tselzes, *Chil.* v, 397; Lepsius, *Einleit.* p. 183; *Archæologia*, xxx, 256. The East is full of fables resembling the phœnix. Thus the *Simorg* of the ancient Persians is said to have witnessed twelve catastrophes, and may yet see many more. It has built its nest on Mount *Kaf*, and perched upon the branches of the *Yogard*, or tree of life; it predicts good or evil to mortals. Similar legends are to be found connected with the *Rokh* of the Arabians and *Semenda* of the Hindûs. The Jews also have their sacred bird *Tsits*. See Gardner, *Faiths of the World*, ii, 655, 656.

Phonascus (*φωνασκός*, *a singing-master*), a name given in the ancient Christian Church to the individual who acted as *precentor* (q. v.), or led the psalmody in divine service. This appellation seems to have been used first in the 4th century, and is still employed in the Greek Church.

Phorcus or **Phorcys**, a Homeric sea-god, to whom a harbor in Ithaca was dedicated. He is said to have been the son of Pontus and Ge, and to have been the father, by his sister Ceto, of the Gorgons, the Hesperian dragon, and the Hesperides. By Hecate he was the father of Scylla.

Pho'ros (*Φόρος*), an incorrect Greek form (1 Esdr. v, 19; ix, 26) of the Heb. name (Ezra ii, 3; viii, 3) Parosh (q. v.).

Phos (*φῶς*, *light*), and its allied term **Photisma** (*illumination*), are generally applied in the ancient Christian Church to baptism, from the great blessings supposed to arise from it. Hence baptized Christians were sometimes called *φωτιζόμενοι*, *the enlightened*, and the baptistery *φωτιστήριον*, *place of enlightenment*. The same terms were also applied to the Lord's Supper.—Riddle, *Christian Antiquities*, p. 484, 485, 551. See also Baptism (*Names of*, 5.).

Phosphŏrus (*φωσφόρος*, *light-bringer*), a surname of *Artemis*, *Eos*, and *Hecate*. This was also the name given by the Greek poets to the planet *Venus* when it appeared in the morning before sunrise.

Phota *Hagia* (*φῶτα ἅγια*, *holy lights*), a term anciently used to denote the festival of Epiphany, as being commemorative of Christ's baptism. See Epiphany.

Photinians is the name of those Christian heretics who denied Christ's divinity. They derived their views from *Photinus of Sirmium* (q. v.). They flourished in the 4th and part of the 5th century.

Photīnus of Sirmium, an Eastern ecclesiastic, noted as the founder of a heretical body, flourished near the middle of the 4th century. Of his origin and earliest history we know nothing. He was a pupil of Marcellus of Ancyra, and was for a time deacon under him. Later Photinus was made bishop of Sirmium, in Pannonia. He was a person of unusual accomplishments, and was generally respected for his learning. Even while yet connected with Marcellus, heretical tendencies were manifest in Photinus. Once advanced to the bishopric, he soon fell away from all restraint, gradually abandoned orthodox associations, and suddenly changed, after having taught the people the knowledge of the true God, to those pernicious Sabellian notions for which his teacher had been condemned. According to Vincentius Xirinensis, he went even further than Macarius, and added to the impieties of Sabellius, Paulus Samosatenus, Cerinthus, and Ebion, this distinctive formula, that "Christ was not only mere man, but began to be the Christ when the Holy Ghost descended upon him in Jordan." In other words, "that Jesus Christ was born of the Holy Ghost and the Virgin Mary; that a certain divine emanation, which he called the Word, descended upon him; and that, because of the union of the divine Word with his human nature, he was called the Son of God, and even God himself; and that the Holy Ghost was not a person, but merely a celestial virtue proceeding from the Deity." Hence, while the Oriental Church could suffer Marcellus to remain within the fold, it could not tolerate the man who would teach such extreme heresy. At a synod held at Milan in 345, the doctrine was also rejected and condemned; and while thus discarded by both the East and the West, he yet managed to retain his episcopal office until A.D. 351, when a Semi-Arian council at Sirmium removed him. For a time restored under the emperor Julian, he was soon again deposed, and died in exile, probably near the close of the 4th century. His writings are lost. His doctrines we learn from the anathemas of those synods which sat in judgment over them. See, besides the literature quoted in the article Marcellus, Hefele, *Conciliengesch.* vol. i. (J. H. W.)

Photisma. See Phos.

Photisterion (*φωτιστήριον*), a place of illumination, being a term frequently used in the ancient Christian Church to denote the *baptistery*, or the place of baptism, that ordinance being supposed to be attended with a divine illumination of the soul. See Phos. This name might also be used for another reason, namely, because baptisteries were the places in which instruction

was communicated previous to baptism, the catechumens being there taught the creed and instructed in the first rudiments of the Christian faith.

Photius OF CONSTANTINOPLE (1), an Eastern ecclesiastic, flourished in the 4th century. In the *Acta Sanctorum, Junii*, i, 274, etc., is given an account of the martyrdom of St. Lucillianus, and several others who are said to have suffered at Byzantium, in the persecution under Aurelian. The account bears this title: *Φωτίου τοῦ μακαριωτάτου σκευοφύλακος τῶν Ἁγίων Ἀποστόλων καὶ λογοθέτου ἐγκώμιον εἰς τὸν ἅγιον ἱερομάρτυρα Λουκιλλιανόν*; *Sancti Martyris Lucilliani Encomium, auctore beatissimo Photio, Sanctorum Apostolorum Sceuophylace ac Logotheta.* Of the writer Photius, nothing further appears to be known than is contained in the title, namely, that he was keeper of the sacred vessels in the great church of the Apostles at Constantinople, which was second in importance only to that of St. Sophia; and that he must be placed after the time of Constantine, by whom the church was built. The *Encomium* is given in the *Acta Sanctorum* in the original Greek, with a *Commentarius prævius*, a Latin version, and notes by Conradus Janningus. See Fabricius, *Bibl. Græc.* x, 271, 678; Smith, *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog.* s. v.

Photius OF CONSTANTINOPLE (2), also an Eastern ecclesiastic, flourished in the 5th century as presbyter of the Church at Constantinople, and was one of the most decided and active supporters of the unfortunate heresiarch Nestorius (q. v.). When Antonius and Jacobus were sent, some time before the Council of Ephesus, A.D. 431, to convert, by persecution, the Quartadecimans and Novatians of Asia Minor, they presented to some of their converts at Philadelphia, not the Nicene Creed, but one that contained a passage deemed heretical on the subject of the Incarnation, which excited against them Charisius, who was œconomus of the Church at Philadelphia. In these proceedings Antonius and Jacobus were supported by Photius, who not only gave them letters at the commencement of their mission, attesting their orthodoxy, but procured the deposition of their opponent Charisius, who thereupon presented a complaint to the Council of Ephesus (*Concilia*, vol. iii, col. 673, etc., ed. Labbé). Tillemont is disposed to ascribe to Photius the answer which was drawn up to the *Epistola ad Solitarios* of Cyril of Alexandria. A certain Photius, a supporter of Nestorius, was banished to Petra, about A.D. 436 (Lupus, *Ad Ephesin Concil. varior. PP. Epistolæ*, cap. clxxxviii), whom, notwithstanding the objections of Lupus (not. in loc.), we agree with Tillemont in identifying with the presbyter of Constantinople (Tillemont, *Mémoires*, xiv, 300, 332, 494, 607, 787).

Photius OF CONSTANTINOPLE (3), one of the most eminent men whose names occur in the long series of the Byzantine annals, flourished in the 9th century. In the preparation of this article we depend very largely upon Smith, *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog.* s. v.

Life.—The year and place of his birth, and the name of his father, appear to be unknown. His mother's name was Irene: her brother married one of the sisters of Theodora, wife of the emperor Theophilus (Theoph. Continuat. lib. iv, 22); so that Photius was connected by affinity with the imperial family. We have the testimony of Nicetas David, the Paphlagonian, that his lineage was illustrious. He had at least four brothers (Mountagu, *Not. ad Epistol. Photii*, p. 138), one of whom, the eldest, enjoyed the dignity of patrician. Photius himself, in speaking of his father and mother, celebrates their crown of martyrdom, and the patient spirit by which they were adorned, during the reign of Theophilus or some other of the iconoclastic emperors. This is the more likely, as Photius elsewhere (*Epistol.* 2, *Encycl.* § 42, and *Epistol. ad Nicol. Papam*) claims as his relative Tarasius (probably great-uncle), partriarch of Constantinople, who was one of the great champions of image worship, which shows the side taken by his family in the controversy. The ability of Photius would have adorned any lineage, and his capacious mind was cultivated, as the testimony even of his opponents and his extant works show, with great diligence. "He was accounted," says Nicetas David, the biographer and panegyrist of his competitor Ignatius, "to be of all men most eminent for his secular acquirements, and his understanding of political affairs. For so superior were his attainments in grammar and poetry, in rhetoric and philosophy, yea, even in medicine, and in almost all the branches of knowledge beyond the limits of theology, that he not only appeared to excel all the men of his own day, but even to bear comparison with the ancients. For all things combined in his favor: natural adaptation, diligence, wealth, which enabled him to form a comprehensive library; and more than all these, the love of glory, which induced him to pass whole nights without sleep, that he might have time for reading. And when the time came (which ought never to have arrived) for him to intrude himself into the Church, he became a most diligent reader of theological works" (*Vita Ignatii* apud *Concil.* vol. viii, ed. Labbé). It must not, however, be supposed that Photius had wholly neglected the study of theology before his entrance on an ecclesiastical life: so far was this from being the case, that he had read and carefully analyzed, as his *Bibliotheca* attests, the chief works of the Greek ecclesiastical writers of all ages, so that his attainments in sacred literature might have shamed many a professional divine. Thus highly connected, and with a mind so richly endowed and highly cultivated, Photius obtained high advancement at the Byzantine court. He held the dignity of a *proto-a-secretis*, or chief-justice (Codin. *De Officiis CP.* p. 36. ed. Bonn); and, if we trust the statement of Nicetas David (*l. c.*), of *protospatharius*, a name originally denoting the chief sword-bearer or captain of the guards, but which became, in later times, a merely nominal office (Codin. *ibid.* p. 33). To these dignities may be added, on the authority of Anastasius Bibliothecarius (*Concil. Octavi Hist.* apud *Concil.* vol. viii, col. 962, ed. Labbé), that of senator; but this is, perhaps, only another title for the office of *proto-a-secretis* (Gretser. et Goar. *Not. in Codin.* p. 242). Besides these official duties at the capital, he was also occasionally employed on missions abroad; and it was during an embassy "to the Assyrians" (a vague and unsuitable term, denoting apparently the court of the caliphs, or of some of the other powers of Upper Asia) that he read the works enumerated in his *Bibliotheca*, and wrote the critical notices of them which that work contains—a striking instance of the energy and diligence with which he continued to cultivate literature in the midst of his secular duties and when away from home. Of the date of this embassy, while engaged in which he must have resided several years at the Assyrian court, as well of the other incidents of his life before his elevation to the patriarchate of Constantinople, we have no knowledge. He could hardly have been a young man at the time he became patriarch.

The patriarchal throne of Constantinople was occupied in the middle of the 9th century by Ignatius (s. v.), who had the misfortune to incur the enmity of some few bishops and monks, and also of Bardas, who was all-powerful at the court of his nephew Michael, then a minor. Ignatius had excommunicated Bardas on a charge of incest, and Bardas, in retaliation, caused the patriarch's deposition, and the election of Photius in his place. Though a layman, and, according to some statements, under excommunication for supporting Gregory, less than a week sufficed, according to Nicetas David (*ibid.*), for the rapid passage of Photius through all the needful subordinate gradations: the first day witnessed his conversion from a layman to a monk; the second day he was made reader; the third day subdeacon; the fourth, deacon; the fifth, presbyter; and the sixth (Christmas-day, A.D. 858) beheld his promotion to the

patriarchate, the highest ecclesiastical dignity in the empire. Nicetas (*ibid.*) states that his office was irregularly committed to him by secular hands. Photius himself, however, in his apologetic epistle to pope Nicholas I (apud Baron. *Annal.* ad ann. 859, § lxi, etc.), states that the patriarchate was pressed upon his acceptance by a numerous assembly of the metropolitans, and of the other clergy of his patriarchate; nor is it likely that the Byzantine court would fail to secure a sufficient number of subservient bishops to give to the appointment every possible appearance of regularity. A consciousness that the whole transaction was violent and indefensible, whatever care might be taken to give it the appearance of regularity, made it desirable for the victorious party to obtain from the deposed patriarch a resignation of his office; but Ignatius was a man of too lofty a spirit to consent to his own degradation. Photius, however, retained his high dignity; the secular power was on his side; the clergy of the patriarchate, in successive councils (A.D. 858, 859), confirmed his appointment, though we are told by Nicetas David that the metropolitans exacted from him a written engagement that he would treat his deposed rival with filial reverence, and follow his advice; and even the legates of the Holy See were induced to side with him, a subserviency for which they were afterwards deposed by pope Nicholas I. The engagement to treat Ignatius with kindness was not kept; in such a struggle its observance could hardly be expected; but how far the severities inflicted on him are to be ascribed to Photius cannot now be determined. The critical position of the latter would be likely to aggravate any disposition which he might feel to treat his rival harshly; for Nicholas, in a council at Rome (A.D. 862), embraced the side of Ignatius, and anathematized Photius and his adherents; various enemies rose up against him among the civil officers as well as the clergy of the empire; and the minds of many, including, if we may trust Nicetas (*ibid.*), the kindred and friends of Photius himself, were shocked by the treatment of the unhappy Ignatius. To add to Photius's troubles, the Cæsar Bardas appears to have had disputes with him, either influenced by the natural jealousy between the secular and ecclesiastical powers, or, perhaps, disappointed at not finding in Photius the subserviency he had anticipated. The letters of Photius addressed to Bardas (*Epistolæ*, 3, 6, 8) contain abundant complaints of the diminution of his authority, of the ill-treatment of those for whom he was interested, and of the inefficacy of his own intercessions and complaints. However, the opposition among his own clergy was gradually weakened, until only five bishops remained who supported the cause of Ignatius. Yet, notwithstanding these defections from the deposed patriarch, Photius labored zealously for a restoration of friendly feelings between himself and the Western patriarch. Nicholas, however, spurned all advances, and in A.D. 863 anathematized and deposed Photius anew. Of course the Roman patriarchate, failing to secure the aid of the Eastern emperor, could not give practical effect to the deposition, and Photius remained in his place. In order to retaliate on Rome, he now assembled a council of the Eastern clergy at Constantinople (A.D. 867), in which the question was removed from the region of a personal dispute between the bishops to a controversy of doctrine and discipline between the churches of the East and West themselves. In this council Photius first brought forward distinctly certain grounds of difference between the churches, which, although considerably modified, afterwards led to their final separation. In all these doctrinal differences, the council condemned the Western Church, excommunicated Nicholas and his abettors, and withdrew from the communion of the see of Rome. The charge of heresy against the Church of Rome in general was embraced in the following articles: 1. That the Church of Rome kept the Sabbath as a fast; 2. That it permitted milk and cheese in the first week of Lent; 3. That it prohibited the marriage of priests; 4. That it confined the rite of anointing persons baptized to the bishops alone; 5. That it had corrupted the Nicene Creed by the addition of the words *filioque*. As neither party had the secular power wherewith to carry its sentence into effect, the separation of the Eastern and Western churches became simply a schism, and as such lasted until the actual deposition of Photius, A.D. 869.

Of the conduct which controlled Photius as patriarch, in matters not connected with the struggle to maintain his position, it is not easy to judge. That he aided Bardas, who was elevated to the dignity of Cæsar, in his efforts for the revival of learning, perhaps suggested those efforts to him, is highly probable from his indisputable love of literature (Theoph. Contin. *De Mich. Theophili Filio*, c. 26). That he possessed many kindly dispositions is indicated by his letters. The charges of the forgery of letters, and of cruelty in his struggles with the party of Ignatius, are, there is reason to believe, too true; but as almost all the original sources of information respecting his character and conduct are from parties hostile to his claims, we cannot confidently receive their charges as true in all their extent. The murder of Cæsar Bardas (A.D. 866 or 867), by the emperor's order, was speedily followed by the assassination of Michael himself (A.D. 867), and the accession of his colleague and murderer, Basil I (the Macedonian). Photius had consecrated Basil as the colleague of Michael; but after the murder of the latter he refused to admit him to the communion, reproaching him as a robber and a murderer, and unworthy to partake of the sacred elements. Photius was for this offence immediately banished to a monastery, and Ignatius restored: various papers which the servants of Photius were about to conceal in a neighboring reed-bed were seized, and afterwards produced against Photius, first in the senate of Constantinople, and afterwards at the council held against him. This hasty change in the occupants of the patriarchate had been too obviously the result of the change of the imperial dynasty to be sufficient of itself. But the imperial power had now the same interest as the Western Church in the deposition of Photius. A council (recognised by the Romish Church as the eighth œcumenical or fourth Constantinopolitan) was therefore summoned, A.D. 869, at which the deposition of Photius and the restoration of Ignatius were confirmed. The cause was in fact prejudged by the circumstance that Ignatius took his place as patriarch at the commencement of the council. Photius, who appeared before the council, and his partisans were anathematized and stigmatized with the most opprobrious epithets. He subsequently acquired the favor of Basil, but by what means is uncertain; for we can hardly give credence to the strange tale related by Nicetas (*ibid.*), who ascribes it to the forgery and interpretation by Photius of a certain genealogical document containing a prophecy of Basil's exaltation. It is certain, however, not only that he gained the favor of the emperor, but that he soon acquired a complete ascendency over him; he was appointed tutor to the sons of Basil, had apartments in the palace assigned to him; and on the death of Ignatius, about A.D. 877, was immediately restored to the patriarchal throne. With writers of the Ignatian party and of the Romish Church this restoration is, of course, nothing less than a new irruption of the wolf into the sheepfold. According to Nicetas, he commenced his patriarchate by beating, banishing, and in various ways afflicting the servants and household of his defunct rival, and by using ten thousand arts against those who objected to his restoration as uncanonical and irregular. Some he bribed by gifts and honors, and by translation to wealthier or more eligible sees than those they occupied; others he terrified by reproaches and accusations, which, on their embracing his party, were speedily and altogether dropped. That, in the corrupt state of the Byzantine empire and Church, something of this must

have happened at such a crisis, there can be little doubt; though there can be as little doubt that these statements are much exaggerated. It is probable that one great purpose of Basil in restoring Photius to the patriarchate was to do away with divisions in the Church, for it is not to be supposed that Photius was without his partisans. But to effect this purpose he had to gain over the Western Church. Nicholas had been succeeded by Hadrian II, and he by John VIII (some reckon him to be John IX), who now occupied the papal chair. John was more pliant than Nicholas, and Basil was a more energetic prince than the dissolute Michael; the pope therefore yielded to the urgent entreaties of a prince whom it would have been dangerous to disoblige; recognised Photius as lawful patriarch, and excommunicated those who refused to hold communion with him. Pope John's yielding attitude in this case betrayed so much womanly weakness that it is, in the opinion of some, thought to have been the origin of that fable about popess Joan (q. v.), in that it obtained for him *the feminine sobriquet Joanna*. But the recognition was on condition that he should resign his claim to the ecclesiastical superiority of the Bulgarians, whose archbishops and bishops were claimed as subordinates by both Rome and Constantinople; and is said to have been accompanied by strong assertions of the superiority of the Roman see. The copy of the letter in which John's consent was given is a re-translation from the Greek, and is asserted by Romish writers to have been falsified by Photius and his party. It is obvious, however, that this charge remains to be proved; and that we have no more security that the truth lies on the side of Rome than on that of Constantinople. The ecclesiastical jurisdiction of Bulgaria was no new cause of dissension: it had been asserted as strongly by the pious Ignatius as by his successor (comp. Joan. VIII Papæ *Epistol.* 78, apud *Concil.* p. 63, etc.). Letters from the pope to the clergy of Constantinople and to Photius himself were also sent, but the extant copies of these are said to have been equally corrupted by Photius. Legates were sent by the pope, and even the copies of their *Commonitorium*, or letter of instruction, are also said to be falsified; but these charges need to be carefully sifted. Among the asserted additions is one in which the legates are instructed to declare the council of A.D. 869 (reputed by the Romish Church to be the eighth œcumenical or fourth Constantinopolitan), at which Photius had been deposed, to be null and void. Another council, which the Greeks assert to be the eighth œcumenical one, but which the Romanists reject, was held at Constantinople A.D. 879. The papal legates were present, but Photius presided, and had everything his own way. The restoration of Photius and the nullity of the council of A.D. 869 were affirmed: the words "filioque" (q. v.), which formed one of the standing subjects of contention between the two churches, were ordered to be omitted from the creed, and the jurisdiction of the Bulgarian Church was referred to the emperor as a question affecting the boundaries of the empire. The pope refused to recognise the acts of the council, with the exception of the restoration of Photius, though they had been assented to by his legates, whom on their return he condemned, and then anathematized Photius afresh (Baron. *Annal. Eccles.* ad ann. 880, vols. xi, xiii). The schism and rivalry of the churches became greater than ever, and has never since been really healed. See Greek Church. Photius, according to Nicetas (*ibid.*), had been assisted in regaining the favor of Basil by the monk Theodore or Santabaren; but other writers reverse the process, and ascribe to Photius the introduction of Santabaren to Basil. Photius certainly made him archbishop of Euchaïta, in Pontus; and he enjoyed, during Photius's patriarchate, considerable influence with Basil. By an accusation, true or false, made by this man against Leo, the emperor's eldest surviving son and destined successor, of conspiring his father's death, Basil had been excited to imprison his son. So far, however, was Photius from joining in the designs of Santabaren, that it was chiefly upon his urgent entreaties the emperor spared the eyes of Leo, which he had intended to put out. Basil died A.D. 886, and Leo VI succeeded to the throne. He immediately set about the ruin of Santabaren; and, forgetful of Photius's intercession, scrupled not to involve the patriarch in his fall. Andrew and Stephen, two officers of the court, whom Santabaren had formerly accused of some offence, now charged Photius and Santabaren with conspiring to depose the emperor, and to place a kinsman of Photius on the throne. The charge appears to have been utterly unfounded, but it answered the purpose. An officer of the court was sent to the church of St. Sophia, who ascended the ambo, or pulpit, and read to the assembled people articles of accusation against the patriarch. Photius was immediately led into confinement, first in a monastery, afterwards in the palace of Pegæ; and Santabaren was brought in custody from Euchaïta and confronted with him; the two accusers, with three other persons, were appointed to conduct the examination, a circumstance sufficient to show the nature and spirit of the whole transaction. The firmness of the prisoners, and the impossibility of proving the charge against them, provoked the emperor's rage. Santabaren was cruelly beaten, deprived of his eyes, and banished; but was afterwards recalled, and survived till the reign of Constantine Porphyrogenitus, the successor of Leo. Photius was banished to the monastery of Bordi, in Armenia (or rather in the Thema Armeniacum), where he seems to have remained till his death. He was buried in the church of a nunnery at Merdosagares. The year in which his death occurred is not ascertained. Pagi, Fabricius, and Mosheim fix it in A.D. 891; but the evidence on which their statement rests is not conclusive. He must have been an aged man when he died, for he must have been in middle age when first chosen patriarch, and he lived after that event thirty years, and probably more. He was succeeded in the patriarchate by the emperor's brother Stephen, first his pupil, then his syncellus, and one of his clergy. (Theoph. Continuat. lib. v, c. 100; lib. vi, c. 1–5; Symeon Magister, *De Basil. Maced.* c. 21; *De Leone Basil. fil.* c. 1; Georg. Monach. *De Basil.* c. 24; *De Leone*, c. 1–7.)

The character of Photius is by no means worthy of much respect. He was an able man of the world, but not influenced by the high principles which befitted his sacred office. Yet he was probably not below the average of the statesmen and prelates of his day; and certainly was not the monster that the historians and other writers of the Romish Church, whose representations have been too readily adopted by some moderns, would make him. A writer in the *Edinburgh Review*, xxi, 329, says, "He seems to have been very learned and very wicked—a great scholar and a consummate hypocrite—not only neglecting occasions of doing good, but perverting the finest talents to the worst purposes." This is unjust; he lived in a corrupt age, and was placed in a trying position; and, without hiding or extenuating his crimes, it must be remembered that his private character remains unimpeached; the very story of his being a eunuch, which, though not having the appearance of truth, shows at least that he was not open to the charge of licentiousness; his firmness is attested by his repulse of Basil from the communion of the Church, and his mercifulness by his intercession for the ungrateful Leo. It must be borne in mind also that his history has come down to us chiefly in the representations of his enemies. The principal ancient authorities have been referred to in the course of this narrative, though we have by no means cited all the places. We may add, Leo Grammaticus, *Chronographia*, p. 463–476, ed. Paris; Zonar. xvi, 4, 8, 11, 12; Cedren. *Compend.* p. 551, 569, 573, 593, ed. Paris; ii, 172, 205, 213, 248, ed. Bonn; Glycas, *Annal.* pars iv, p. 293, 294, 297, etc., ed. Paris; p. 226, 228, 230, etc., ed. Venice; p. 544, 547, 552, ed. Bonn; Genesius, *Reges*, lib. iv, p. 48, ed. Venice; p. 100,

ed. Bonn; Constantin. Manass. *Compend. Chron.* vers. 5133–5163, 5233, etc., 5309, etc.; Joel, *Chronog. Compend.* p. 179, ed. Paris; p. 55, 56, ed. Bonn; Ephraem. *De Patriarchis CP.* ver. 10,012–10,025, ed. Bonn.

Various notices and documents relating to his history generally, but especially to his conduct in reference to the schism of the churches, may be found in the *Concilia*, vols. viii, ix, ed. Labbé; vols. v, vi, ed. Hardouin; vols. xv, xvi, xvii, ed. Mansi. Of modern writers, Baronius (*Annal. Eccles.* A.D. 858–886) is probably the fullest, but at the same time one of the most unjust. Hankius (*De Byzantin. Rerum Scriptoribus*, pars i, c. 18) has a very ample memoir of Photius, which may be advantageously compared with that of Baronius, as its bias is in the opposite direction. See also Dupin, *Nouvelle Bibliothèque des Auteurs Ecclésiastiques, Siècle ix*, p. 270, 2d ed. 1698. An essay by Francesco Fontani, *De Photio Novæ Romæ Episcopo ejusque Scriptis Dissertatio*, prefixed to the first volume of his *Novæ Eruditorum Deliciæ* (Florence, 1785, 12mo), is far more candid than most of the other works by members of the Romish Church; and is in this respect far beyond the *Mémoire sur le Patriarche Photius*, by M. Weguelin, in the *Mémoires de l'Academie Royale* (de Prusse) *des Sciences et Belles-Lettres*, année 1777 (Berlin, 1779, 4to), p. 440, etc. Shorter accounts may be found in Mosheim (*Eccles. Hist.* by Murdock, bk. iii, cent. ix, pt. ii, c. iii, § 27–32), and in the works cited at the close of this article. Fabricius has given a list of the councils held to determine questions arising out of the struggle of Ignatius and Photius for the patriarchate, or out of the contests of the Eastern and Western churches with regard to Photius. He has also given a list of writers respecting Photius, divided into—1. Those hostile to Photius; and 2. Those more favorable to him. Of the historians of the lower empire, Le Beau (*Bas Empire*, liv, lxx, 38, etc.; lxxi, lxxii, 1–3) is outrageously partial, inflaming the crimes of Photius, and rejecting as untrue, or passing over without notice, the record of those incidents which are honorable to him. Gibbon (*Decline and Fall*, c. 53, 60), more favorable, has two separate, but brief and unsatisfactory, notices of the patriarch.

Writings.—The published works of Photius are the following: 1. Μυριόβιβλον ἢ Βιβλιοθήκη, *Myriobiblon seu Bibliotheca.* This is the most important and valuable of the works of Photius. It may be described as an extensive review of ancient Greek literature by a scholar of immense erudition and sound judgment. It is an extraordinary monument of literary energy, for it was written while the author was engaged in his embassy to Assyria, at the request of Photius's brother Tarasius, who was much grieved at the separation, and desired an account of the books which Photius had read in his absence. It thus conveys a pleasing impression, not only of the literary acquirements and extraordinary industry, but of the fraternal affection of the writer. It opens with a prefatory address to Tarasius, recapitulating the circumstances in which it was composed, and stating that it contained a notice of two hundred and seventy-nine volumes. The extant copies contain a notice of two hundred and eighty: the discrepancy, which is of little moment, may have originated either in the mistake of Photius himself, or in some alteration of the divisions by some transcriber. It has been doubted whether we have the work entire. An extant analysis, by Photius, of the *Historia Ecclesiastica* of Philostorgius (q. v.), by which alone some knowledge of the contents of that important work has been preserved to us, is so much fuller than the brief analysis of that work contained in the present text of the *Bibliotheca*, as to lead to the supposition that the latter is imperfect. "It is to be lamented," says Valesius (*De Critica*, i, 29), "that many such abridgments and collections of extracts are now lost. If these were extant in the state in which they were completed by Photius, we should grieve less at the loss of so many ancient writers." But Leiche has shown (*Diatribe in Phot. Biblioth.*) that we have no just reason for suspecting that the *Bibliotheca* is imperfect; and that the fuller analysis of Philostorgius probably never formed part of it, but was made at a later period. The two hundred and eighty divisions of the *Bibliotheca* must be understood to express the number of volumes (codices) or manuscripts, and not of writers or of works: the works of some writers, e. g. of Philo Judæus (codd. 103–105), occupy several divisions; and, on the other hand, one division (e. g. cod. 125, *Justini Martyris Scripta Varia*), sometimes comprehends a notice of several different works written in one codex. The writers examined are of all classes: the greater number, however, are theologians, writers of ecclesiastical history, and of the biography of eminent churchmen; but several are secular historians, philosophers, and orators, heathen or Christian, of remote or recent times, lexicographers, and medical writers; only one or two are poets, and those on religious subjects, and there are also one or two writers of romances or love tales. There is no formal classification of these various writers; though a series of writers or writings of the same class frequently occurs, e. g. the *Acta* of various councils (codd. 15–20); the writers on the *Resurrection* (codd. 21–23); and the secular historians of the Byzantine empire (codd. 62–67). In fact, the works appear to be arranged in the order in which they were read. The notices of the writers vary much in length: those in the earlier part are very briefly noticed, the later ones more fully; their recent perusal apparently enabling the writer to give a fuller account of them; so that this circumstance confirms our observation as to the arrangement of the work. Several valuable works, now lost, are known to us chiefly by the analyses or extracts which Photius has given of them; among them are the *Persica* and *Indica* of Ctesias (q. v.), in cod. 72; the *De Rebus post Alexandrum Magnum gestis*, and the *Parthica* and the *Bithynica* of Arrian, in codd. 53, 92, and 93; the *Historiæ* of Olympiodorus (q. v.), in cod. 80; the *Narrationes* of Conon, in cod. 186; the *Nova Historia* of Ptolemy Hephæstion, in cod. 190; the *De Heracleæ Ponticæ Rebus* of Memnon, in cod. 224; the *Vita Isidori* by Damascius, in cod. 242; the lost *Declamationes* of Himerius, in cod. 243; the lost books of the *Bibliotheca* of Diodorus Siculus, in cod. 244; the *De Erythræo* (s. *Rubro*) *Mari* of Agatharchides, in cod. 250; the anonymous *Vita Pauli CPolitani* and *Vita Athanasii*, in codd. 257 and 258; the lost *Orationes*, genuine or spurious, of Antiphon, Isocrates, Lysias, Isæus, Demosthenes, Hyperides, Deinarchus, and Lycurgus, in codd. 259–268; and of the *Chrestomatheia* of Helladius of Antinoopolis, in cod. 279; besides several theological and ecclesiastical and some medical works. The above enumeration will suffice to show the inestimable value of the *Bibliotheca* of Photius, especially when we reflect how much the value of his notices is enhanced by the soundness of his judgment. The first edition of the *Bibliotheca* was published by David Hœschelius, under the title of Βιβλιοθήκη τοῦ Φωτίου, *Librorum quos legit Photius Patriarcha Excerpta et Censuræ* (Augsburg, 1601, fol.). Some of the *Epistolæ* of Photius were subjoined. The text of the *Bibliotheca* was formed on a collation of four MSS., and was accompanied with notes by the editor; but there was no Latin version. A Latin version and scholia, by Andreas Schottus of Antwerp, were published (ibid. 1606, fol.); but the version is inaccurate, and has been severely criticised. It was, however, reprinted, with the Greek text, under the title of Φωτίου Μυριόβιβλον ἢ Βιβλιοθήκη, *Photii Myriobiblon sive Bibliotheca* (Geneva, 1612, fol., and Rouen, 1653, fol.). This last edition is a splendid one, but inconvenient from its size. An edition, with a revised text, formed on a collation of four MSS. (whether any of them were the same as those employed by Hœschelius is not mentioned), was published by Immanuel Bekker (Berlin, 1824–25, 2 thin vols. 4to): it is convenient from its size and the copiousness of its index, but has neither version nor notes.

2. Ἐπιτομὴ ἐκ τῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν ἱστοριῶν Φιλοστοργίου ἀπὸ φωνῆς Φωτίου πατριάρχου, *Compendium Historiæ Ecclesiasticæ Philostorgii quod dictavit Photius patriarcha.* Cave regards this as a fragment of another work similar to the *Bibliotheca*, but his conjecture rests on no solid foundation. The *Compendium* is of great importance as preserving to us, though very imperfectly, an Arian statement of the ecclesiastical transactions of the busy period of the Arian controversy in the 4th century. It was first published, with a Latin version and copious notes, by Jacobus Gothofredus (Godefroi) (Geneva, 1643, 4to); and was reprinted with the other ancient Greek ecclesiastical historians by Henricus Valesius (Henri Valois) (Paris, 1673, fol.) and by Reading (Cambridge, 1720, fol.).

3. Νομοκανών or Νομοκάνονον, *Nomocanon*, s. *Nomocanonon*, s. *Nomocanonus*, s. *Canonum Ecclesiasticorum et Legum Imperialium de Ecclesiastica Disciplina Conciliatio* s. *Harmonia.* This work, which bears ample testimony to the extraordinary legal attainments of its author, is arranged under fourteen τίτλοι, *Tituli*, and was prefixed to a Σύνταγμα τῶν κανόνων, *Canonum Syntagma*, or collection of the *Canones* of the apostles and of the ecclesiastical councils recognised by the Greek Church, compiled by Photius; from which circumstance it is sometimes called Προκάνων, *Procanon.* It has been repeatedly published, with the commentaries of Theodore Balsamon, who strongly recommended it, in preference to similar works of an earlier date: it appeared in the Latin version of Gentianus Hervetus (Paris, 1561, fol.), and in another Latin version of Henricus Agylæus (Basle, 1561, fol.), and in the original Greek text with the version of Agylæus, edited by Christophorus Justellus (Paris, 1615, 4to). It was reprinted, with the version of Agylæus, in the *Bibliotheca Juris Canonici*, published by Guillelmus Vœllus and Henricus Justellus (Paris, 1661, fol.), ii, 785, etc. The *Nomocanon* of Photius was epitomized in the kind of verses called politici by Michael Psellus, whose work was published, with one or two other of his pieces, by Franciscus Bosquetus (Paris, 1632, 8vo).

4. Περὶ τῶν ζ' οἰκουμενικῶν συνόδων, *De Septem Conciliis Œcumenicis.* This piece subjoined, with a Latin version, to the *Nomocanon* in the Paris editions of 1615 and 1661, and often published elsewhere, is really part of one of the *Epistolæ* of Photius, and is noticed in our account of them.

5. Ἐπιστολαί, *Epistolæ.* There are extant a considerable number of the letters of Photius. The MSS. containing them are enumerated by Fabricius (*Bibl. Græc.* xi, 11). It is much to be regretted that no complete collection of them has been published. David Hœschelius subjoined to his edition of the *Bibliotheca* (Augsburg, 1601, fol.), mentioned above, thirty-five letters selected from a MS. collection which had belonged to Maximus Margunius, bishop of Cerigo, who lived about the end of the 16th century. One consolatory letter to the nun Eusebia on her sister's death was published by Conrad Rittershausius, with a Latin version, with some other pieces (Nürnberg, 1601, 8vo). But the largest collection is that prepared with a Latin version and notes by Richard Mountagu (Latinized Montacutius), bishop of Norwich, and published after his death (Lond. 1651, fol.). The Greek text was from a MS. in the Bodleian Library. The collection comprehends two hundred and forty-eight letters translated by the bishop, and a supplement of five letters brought from the East by Christianus Ravius, of which also a Latin version by another person is given. The first letter in Mountagu's collection is addressed to Michael, prince of the Bulgarians, on the question Τί ἐστιν ἔργον ἄρχοντος, *De Officio Principis:* it is very long, and contains the account of the seven general councils already mentioned (No. 4), as subjoined to the printed editions of the *Nomocanon.* This letter to prince Michael was translated into French verse by Bernard, a Theatin monk, dedicated to Louis XV, and published (Paris, 1718, 4to). The second letter, also of considerable length, is an encyclical letter on various disputed topics, especially on that of the procession of the Holy Spirit, the leading theological question in dispute between the Eastern and Western churches. Mountagu's version has been severely criticised by Combefis (Fabricius, *Bibl. Græc.* i, 701, note f f f). Several important letters are not included in the collection, especially two to pope Nicholas I, and one to the archbishop or patriarch of Aquileia, on the procession of the Holy Spirit, of all of which Baronius had given a Latin version in his *Annales Ecclesiastici* (ad ann. 859, lxi, etc.; 861, xxxiv, etc.; and 883, v, etc.). Fragments of the Greek text of the letters to pope Nicholas were cited by Allatius in different parts of his works; the original of the letter to the archbishop of Aquileia was published in the *Auctarium Novissimum* of Combefis, pt. i, p. 527, etc. (Paris, 1672, fol.), with a new Latin version and notes by the editor; and the original of all the three letters, together with a previously unpublished letter, *Ad Œconomum Ecclesiæ Antiochiæ*, and the encyclical letter on the procession of the Holy Spirit (included in Mountagu's collection), the *Acta* of the eighth œcumenical council (that held in 879, at which the second appointment of Photius to the patriarchate was ratified), and some other pieces, with notes by Dositheus, patriarch of Jerusalem, were published by Anthimus "Episcopus Remnicus," i. e. bishop of Rimnik, in Wallachia, in his Τόμος χαρᾶς (Rimnik, 1705, fol.). A letter, *Ad Theophanem Monachum*, i. e. to Theophanes Cerameus, with a Latin version by Sirmond, was published by the Jesuit Franciscus Scorsus, in his *Proœmium Secundum*, § 3, to the *Homiliæ* of Cerameus (Paris, 1644, fol.), and another letter, *Stauracio Spatharo-candidato, Præfecto insulæ Cypri*, was included in the *Ecclesiæ Græcæ Monumenta* of Cotelerius (ii, 104), together with a short piece, Περὶ τοῦ μὴ δεῖν πρὸς τὰ ἐν τῷ βίῳ λυπηρὰ ἐπιστρέφεσθαι, *Quod non oporteat ad præsentis vitæ molestias attendere*, which, though not bearing the form of a letter (perhaps it is a fragment of one), is in the MS. classed with the *Epistolæ.* A Latin version, from the Armenian, of some fragments of an *Epistola Photii ad Zachariam Armeniæ Patriarcham*, in support of the doctrine of the Council of Chalcedon, is given in the *Conciliatio Ecclesiæ Armeniæ cum Romana* of Galanus (Rom. 1650, fol.). To all these we may add the *Epistola Tarasio Fratri*, usually subjoined to the *Bibliotheca.* The *Epistola ad Zachariam*, just mentioned, and another letter, *Ad Principem Armenium Asutium*, are extant in MS. in an Armenian version (comp. Mai, *Scriptor. Veterum Nov. Collectio*, Proleg. in vol. i, Rom. 1825, 4to).

6. Λέξεων συναγωγή s. Λεξικόν, *Lexicon.* Marquardus Gudius, of Hamburg, had an anonymous MS. lexicon, which he believed and asserted to be that of Photius; but the correctness of his opinion was first doubted by some, and is now given up by most scholars; and another lexicon, much shorter, and which is in the MSS. ascribed to Photius, is now admitted to be the genuine work of that eminent man. Of this *Lexicon* there exist several MSS., but that known as the Codex Galeanus, because given by Thomas Gale to the library of Trinity College, Cambridge, is considered to be the archetype from which the others have been transcribed; but this MS. is in itself very imperfect, containing in fact not much more than half the original work. Nearly the whole of the lexicon known as the *Lexicon Sangermanense*, a portion of which was published in the *Anecdota Græca* of Immanuel Bekker (Berlin, 1814, 8vo), i, 319, etc., appears to have been incorporated in the *Lexicon* of Photius, of which, when entire, it is estimated to have formed a third part (*Præfat.* to Porson's edition). The *Lexicon* of Photius was first published, from Continental MSS., by Gothofredus Hermannus (Leips. 1808, 4to). It formed the third volume of a set, of which the first two volumes contained the *Lexicon* ascribed to Joannes Zonaras. The publication of the *Lex-*

icon was followed by that of a *Libellus Animadversionum ad Photii Lexicon* (Leips. 1810, 4to), and *Curæ Novissimæ sive Appendix Notarum et Emendationum in Photii Lexicon* (Leips. 1812, 4to), both by Jo. Fried. Schleusner. But the edition of Hermann having failed to satisfy the wants of the learned, an edition from a transcript of the Codex Galeanus, made by Porson, was published after the death of that eminent scholar (Lond. 1822, 4to and 8vo). (Comp. *Edinb. Rev.* xxi, 329, etc., No. 42, July, 1813, and *Class. Journ.* l. c.)

7. Ἀμφιλόχια, *Amphilochia.* This work, which Allatius, not a friendly censor, declared to be "a work filled with vast and varied learning, and very needful for theologians and expositors of Scripture," is in the form of answers to certain questions, and is addressed to Amphilochius, archbishop of Cyzicus. The answers are said in one MS. (apud Fabricius, *Bibl. Græc.* xi, 26) to be two hundred and ninety-seven in number; but Montfaucon (*l. c.*) published an index of three hundred and eight, and a Vatican MS., according to Mai (*Script. Vet. Nova Collectio*, vol. i, Proleg. p. xxxix), contains three hundred and thirteen. Of these more than two hundred and twenty have been published, but in various fragmentary portions (Mai, *l. c.*). The first portion which appeared in print was in the *Lectiones Antiquæ* of Canisius (Ingolstadt, 1604, etc., 4to), v, 188, etc., who gave a Latin version, by Franciscus Turrianus, of six of the *Quæstiones;* but the work to which they belonged was not mentioned. In the subsequent edition of the *Lectiones* by Basnage (Amsterd. 1725, 4to, vol. ii, pt. ii, p. 240, etc.), the Greek text of five of the six was added (the original of the sixth seems never to have been discovered), as well as the Greek text of a seventh *Quæstio*, "*De Christi Voluntatibus Gnomicis*," of which a Latin version by Turrianus had been published in the *Auctarium Antiquarum Canisii Lectionum* of the Jesuit Petrus Stewartius (Ingolstadt, 1616, 4to); also without notice that it was from the *Amphilochia.* Further additions were made by Combefis, in his *SS. Patrum Amphilochii, etc., Opera* (Paris, 1644, 2 vols. fol.) (by a strange error he ascribed the work not to Photius, but to Amphilochius of Iconium, a much older writer, from whose works he supposed Photius had made a selection), and in his *Novum Auctarium* (Paris, 1648), 2 vols. fol.; by Montfaucon, in his *Bibliotheca Coisliniana* (Paris, 1715, fol.); and by Jo. Justus Spier, in *Wittenbergische Anmerkungen über theologische, philosophische, historische, philologische, und kritische Materien* (Wittenberg, 1738, 8vo), pt. i (Harles, *Introd. in Historiam Linguæ Græc. Supplem.* ii, 47). But the principal addition was made by Jo. Chr. Wolff, of forty-six *Quæstiones,* published, with a Latin version, in his *Curæ Philologicæ* (Hamb. 1735, 4to), vol. v ad fin.; these were reprinted in the *Bibliotheca Patrum* of Galland (Venice, 1779, fol.), vol. xiii. A further portion of eighteen *Quæstiones,* under the title Ἐκ τῶν Φωτίου Ἀμφιλοχίων τινα, *Ex Photii Amphilochiis quædam,* was published, with a Latin version, by Angelus Antonius Schottus (Naples, 1817, 4to); and some further portions, one of twenty *Quæstiones,* with a Latin version by Mai, in his *Scriptorum Veterum Nova Collectio*, i, 193, etc., and another of a hundred and thirty *Quæstiones,* in ix, 1, etc. As many of the *Quæstiones* were mere extracts from the *Epistolæ* and other published works of Photius, Mai considers that with these and with the portions published by him, the whole of the *Amphilochia* has now been published. He thinks (*Scriptor. Vet. Nova Collect.* vol. i, Proleg. p. xl) that the patriarch, towards the close of his life, compiled the work from his own letters, homilies, commentaries, etc., and addressed it to his friend Amphilochius, as a mark of respect, and not because the questions which were solved had actually been proposed to him by that prelate; and he thus accounts for the identity of many passages with those in the author's other works.

8. *Adversus Manichæos* s. *Paulicianos Libri Quatuor.* No Greek title of the whole work occurs, but the four books are respectively thus described: 1. Διήγησις περὶ τῆς Μανιχαίων ἀναβλαστήσεως, *Narratio de Manichæis recens repullulantibus.* 2. Ἀπορίαι καὶ λύσεις τῶν Μανιχαίων, *Dubia et Solutiones Manichæorum.* 3. Τοῦ Φωτίου λόγος Γ, *Photii Sermo III.* 4. Κατὰ τῆς τῶν Μανιχαίων ἀρτιφυοῦς πλανῆς, Ἀρσενίῳ τῷ ἁγιωτάτῳ μοναχῷ πρεσβυτέρῳ καὶ ἡγουμένῳ τῶν ἱερῶν, *Contra repullulantem Manichæorum Errorem ad Arsenium Monachum Sanctissimum Presbyterum et Præfectum Sacrorum.* The title of the second book is considered by Wolff to apply to the second, third, and fourth books, which formed the argumentative part of the work, and to which the first book formed a historical introduction. The second book is intended to show that the same God who created spiritual intelligences also created the bodies with which they are united, and the material world generally; the third vindicates the divine origin of the Old Testament; and the fourth reiterates some points of the second and third books, and answers the objections of the Paulicians. The first book has several points in common with the historical work of Petrus Siculus on the same subject, so as to make it probable that one writer used the work of the other, and it is most likely Photius availed himself of that of Petrus. This important work of Photius was designed for publication by several scholars (see Wolff, *Præfat. in Anecdot. Græc.* vol. i; and Fabricius, *Bibl. Græc.* vii, 329; xi, 18), but they were prevented by death from fulfilling their purpose. Montfaucon published the first book, with a Latin version, in his *Bibliotheca Coisliniana* (p. 349, etc.); and the whole work was given by Jo. Christoph. Wolff, with a Latin version and notes, in his *Anecdota Græca* (Hamb. 1722, 12mo), vols. i, ii, from which it was reprinted in vol. xiii of the *Bibliotheca Patrum* of Galland (Venice, 1779, fol.). A sort of epitome of this work of Photius is found in the *Panoplia* of Euthymius Zigabenus. Oudin contended that the work of Metrophanes of Smyrna, on the Manichæans and on the Holy Spirit, was identical with this work of Photius; but this opinion is erroneous.

9. Κατὰ τῶν τῆς παλαίας Ῥώμης ὅτι ἐκ Πατρὸς μόνου ἐκπορεύεται τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἀλλ' οὐχὶ καὶ ἐκ τοῦ Υἱοῦ, *Adversus Latinos de Processione Spiritus Sancti.* This work is incorporated in the Greek text of the *Panoplia* of Euthymius Zigabenus (Tergovist. 1710, fol., p. 112, 113), of which it constitutes the thirteenth τίτλος or section. It is omitted in the Latin versions of Euthymius. The work of Photius contains several syllogistic propositions, which are quoted and answered seriatim in the *De Unione Ecclesiarum Oratio I,* of Joannes Veccus, published in the *Græcia Orthodoxa* of Allatius (Rome, 1652, 4to), i, 154, etc. It is apparently the work entitled by Cave *Disputatio Compendiaria de Processione Spiritus Sancti a solo Patre.*

10. Ὁμιλίαι, *Homiliæ.* Several of these have been published: (1.) Ἔκφρασις τῆς ἐν τοῖς βασιλείοις νέας ἐκκλησίας τῆς ὑπεραγίας Θεοτόκου ὑπὸ Βασιλείου τοῦ Μακεδόνος οἰκοδομηθείσης, *Descriptio Novæ Sanctissimæ Dei Genitricis Ecclesiæ, in Palatio a Basilio Macedone exstructæ;* a discourse delivered on the day of the dedication of the church described. It was first printed by Lambecius, in his notes to the work of Georgius Codinus, *De Originibus CPolitanis* (Paris, 1655, fol.), p. 187, and is contained, with a Latin version, in the Bonn reprint of Codinus (1839, 8vo). It is also contained in the *Originum CPolitanarum Manipulus* of Combefis (Paris, 1664, 4to), p. 296, with a Latin version and notes; and in the *Imperium Orientale* of Bandurius (Paris, 1711, fol.), pars iii, p. 117. (2.) Εἰς τὸ γενέσιον τῆς ὑπεραγίας Θεοτόκου, *Homilia in Sanctissimæ Dei Genitricis Natalem Diem,* published by Combefis in his *Auctarium Novum* (Paris, 1648, fol.), vol. i, col. 1583, and in a Latin version, in his *Bibliotheca Patrum concionatoria* (Paris, 1662, fol. etc.). Both text and version are reprinted in the *Bibliotheca Patrum* of Galland. (3.) *In Sepulturam Domini;* a fragment, probably from this, is given by Mai (*Scriptor. Vet. Nova Collect.* Pro-

leg. in vol. i, p. xli). (4.) Περὶ τοῦ μὴ δεῖν πρὸς τὰ ἐν τῷ βίῳ λυπηρὰ ἐπιστρέφεσθαι, *Quod non oporteat ad præsentis Vitæ Molestias attendere.* This piece, which is perhaps not a homily, but the fragment of a letter, was published in the *Ecclesiæ Græcæ Monumenta* of Cotelerius, and has already been noticed in speaking of the *Epistolæ* of Photius.

11. Ἐρωτήματα δέκα σὺν ἴσαις ταῖς ἀποκρίσεσι, *Interrogationes decem cum totidem Responsionibus*, s. Συναγωγαὶ καὶ ἀποδείξεις ἀκριβεῖς συνειλεγμέναι ἐκ τῶν συνοδικῶν καὶ ἱστορικῶν γραφῶν περὶ ἐπισκόπων καὶ μητροπολιτῶν καὶ λοιπῶν ἑτέρων ἀναγκαίων ζητημάτων, *Collectiones accuratæque Demonstrationes de Episcopis et Metropolitis et reliquis aliis necessariis Quæstionibus ex Synodicis et Historicis Monumentis excerptæ.* This piece was published, with a Latin version and notes, by Francesco Fontani, in the first volume of his *Novæ Eruditorum Deliciæ* (Florence, 1785, 12mo). The notes were such as to give considerable offence to the stricter Romanists. (Mai, *Scriptor. Veter. Nov. Collect.* Proleg. ad vol. i, p. xliv.)

12. Εἰς τὸν Λουκᾶν ἑρμηνείαι, *In Lucam Expositiones.* Some brief *Scholia* on the Gospel of Luke from MSS. *Catenæ*, are given, with a Latin version, in vol. i of the *Scriptorum Veterum Nova Collectio* of Mai, p. 189, etc., but from which of Photius's works they are taken does not appear.

13. *Canonica Responsa*, addressed to Leo, archbishop of Calabria; also published, with a Latin version, by Mai (*ibid.* p. 362), from a Palimpsest in the Vatican Library.

Many works of this great writer still remain in MS.: 1. *Commentarius in D. Pauli Epistolas*, a mutilated copy of which is (or was, according to Cave) in the public library at Cambridge. It is largely cited by Œcumenius. 2. *Catena in Psalmos*, formerly in the Coislinian library, of which, according to Montfaucon (*Bibl. Coislin.* p. 58, 59), Photius appears to have been the compiler. But the Commentary on the Prophets, *Prophetarum Liber*, ascribed to him by Cave, Fabricius, and others, appears to have no real existence; the supposition of its existence was founded on the misapprehension of a passage in Possevino's *Apparatus Sacer* (Mai, *Proleg.* ut sup. p. l). 3. *Homiliæ XIV*, extant in MS. at Moscow, of the subjects of which a list is given in the *Auctarium Novissimum* (ad calc. vol. i) of Combefis, in the *De Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis* of Oudin (col. 210, etc.), and in the *Bibl. Græca* (xi, 30, etc.) of Fabricius. To these may be added two other homilies, *De Ascensione*, and *In Festo Epiphaniæ*, and an *Encomium Protomartyris Theclæ* (Fabricius, *ibid.*). 4. *Odæ.* Nine are or were extant in a MS. formerly belonging to the college of Clermont, at Paris; and three in an ancient Barberini MS. at Rome. The latter are described by Mai (*Proleg.* p. xliv) as of moderate length, and written in pleasing verse. Some *Epigrammata* of Photius are said to be extant (Montfaucon, *Bibl. Coislin.* p. 520); but the Στιχηρόν, *In Methodium CPol.*, said to be given in the *Acta Sanctorum, Junii*, ii, 969, is not to be found there. 5. Ἐπιτομὴ τῶν πρακτικῶν τῶν ἑπτὰ οἰκουμενικῶν συνόδων, *Epitome Actorum Conciliorum septem Generalium.* This is described by Cave and Fabricius as a different work from the published piece (No. 4, above). Some critics have doubted whether it is different from the similar work ascribed to Photius of Tyre; but as this prelate lived in the time of the third or fourth councils, he could not have epitomized the *Acta* of the fifth, sixth, and seventh. Thus the *Epitome* cannot be by Photius of Tyre, whatever doubt there may be as to its being the work of our Photius. 6. The *Syntagma Canonum* has already been mentioned in speaking of the *Nomocanon.* 7. Περὶ τῆς τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος μυσταγωγίας, *De Spiritus Sancti Disciplina Arcana*, s. Περὶ τοῦ ἁγίου καὶ ζωοποιοῦ καὶ προσκυνητοῦ Πνεύματος, *Liber de Spiritu Sancto*, addressed to a bishop Bedas, and different from the published work (No. 9). It is described by Mai, who has given some extracts (*Proleg.* p. xlv), as "liber luculentus, varius, atque prolixus." It is ascribed in one MS., but by an obvious error, to Metrophanes of Smyrna. 8. Τὰ παρὰ τῆς ἐκκλησίας τῶν Λατίνων αἰτιώματα μερικά, *Adversus Latinorum Ecclesiam Criminationes Particulares.* 9. *Contra Francos et Latinos* (*ibid.* p. xlviii); a very short piece. Various other pieces are mentioned by Cave, Lambecius, Fabricius, and Mai, as extant in MS.; but some of these are only fragments of the published writings (*ibid.* p. l) enumerated by mistake as separate works. The work *In Categorias Aristotelis*, now or formerly extant in Vienna and Paris, is apparently a part of the *Amphilochia* (*ibid.* p. xxxvi). The works *De Episcopis et Metropolitis*, and the *Annotatio de Patriarchis sede sua injuste pulsis*, mentioned by Cave and Fabricius, appear to be either the *Interrogationes decem* published by Fontani, or a part of that work. (See No. 11 of the published works.) The *Symbolum Fidei* mentioned by Lambecius, Cave, and Harles (Fabricius, *Bibl. Græc.* xi, 30), is part of one of the letters to pope Nicholas; and the *Liber de Pulsione Ignatii ac Restitutione* mentioned by Montfaucon (*Bibl. Bibliothecarum*, p. 123), is also part of a letter of pope Nicholas; and the fragment *De decem Oratoribus*, mentioned by Vossius and others, and extant in MS. in the King's Library at Paris, is probably from the *Bibliotheca* (Mai, *Proleg.* p. l). Some works have perished, as that against the heretic Leontius of Antioch, mentioned by Suidas (s. v. Λεόντιος). Photius wrote also against the emperor Julian (Phot. *Epist.* 187, ed. Montac.), and in defence of the use of images. Some writings, or fragments of writings, of his on this subject (*Adversus Iconomachos et Paulicianos*, and *De Differentia inter sacras Imagines atque Idola*) are extant in the Imperial Library at Vienna, but whether in distinct works, or under what title, does not appear to be known.

In the *Synodicon* of bishop Beveridge (vol. ii, ad fin. pt. i) a short piece is given, of which the running title is *Balsamon in Photii Interrogationes quorumdam Monachorum;* but the insertion of the name of Photius is altogether incorrect; the work belongs to the time of the emperor Alexius I Comnenus. The *Exegesis*, or Commentary of Elias Cretensis on the *Scala Paradisi* of Joannes Climacus, is, in a MS. of the Coislinian library (Montfaucon, *Bibl. Coislin.* p. 141), improperly ascribed to Photius.

Two learned Romanists, Joannes Andresius and Jacobus Morellius, have in recent times contemplated the publication of a complete edition of the works of Photius; the latter proceeded so far as to draw up a *Conspectus* of his proposed edition (Mai, *Proleg.* p. xliv). But unfortunately the design has never been completed. Migne has published an edition in 4 vols. roy. 8vo, which he claims to be complete, but it is hardly as critical as the works of the greatest genius of his age deserves. This edition is entitled *Photii, Constantinopolitani patriarchæ, opera omnia in classes quinque distributa:* exegetica, dogmatica, parænetica, historica canonica, etc., accurante J. P. Migne (tomes i et iv, in grand-8 à deux colonnes, 1416 p., Paris, impr. et libr. J. P. Migne, 1860. Veneunt 4 vol. 42 francis gallicis). See Cave, *Hist. Litt.* ii, 47, etc. (ed. Oxford, 1740–1743); Fabricius, *Biblioth. Græc.* i, 701; vi, 603; vii, 803; x, 670 to xi, 37; xii, 185, 210, 216, 348; Oudin, *Comment. de Scriptorib. et Scriptis Eccles.* vol. ii, col. 200, etc.; Hankius, *De Rerum Byzantin. Scriptorib.* pars i, c. 18; Dupin, *Nouvelle Bibliothèque des Auteurs Ecclés. IXme Siècle*, p. 346 (2me ed. 1698); Ceillier, *Auteurs Sacrés*, xix, 426, etc.; Ittigius, *De Bibliothecis Patrum*, passim; Gallandius, *Biblioth. Patrum*, Proleg. in vol. xiii; Fontani, *De Photio Novæ Romæ Episcopo ejusque Scriptis Dissertatio*, prefixed to vol. i of the *Novæ Eruditorum Deliciæ;* Mai, *Scriptor. Vet. Nova Collectio*, Proleg. in vol. i; Assemani, *Bibliotheca Juris Orientalis*, lib. i, c. 2, 7, 8, 9; Vossius, *De Historicis Græcis*, lib. ii, c. 25; Donaldson's *Literature* (see Index in vol. ii); Lea, *Sacerdotal Celibacy* (see Index); Ffoulkes, *Divisions of Christendom*, vol. ii, ch. i; Fleury,

Hist. Ecclésiastique; Maimbourg, *Schisme des Grecs*; Döllinger, *Lehrbuch der Kirchengesch.* vol. i; Jager, *Hist. de Photius, d'après les monuments origineaux* (Paris, 1845).

Photius of Tyre, another Eastern ecclesiastic, flourished near the middle of the 5th century. On the deposition of Irenæus, bishop of Tyre, in A.D. 448, Photius was appointed his successor. Evagrius (*Hist. Eccles.* i, 10) makes the deposition of Irenæus one of the acts of the notorious Council of Ephesus, held in A.D. 449, and known as the "Concilium Latrocinale;" but Tillemont more correctly considers that the council only confirmed the previous deposition (*Mémoires*, xv, 268). Photius of Tyre was one of the judges appointed by the emperor Theodosius II, in conjunction with Eustathius, bishop of Berytus, and Uranius, bishop of Himeræ in Osrhoëne, to hear the charges against Ibas, bishop of Edessa. Photius, Eustathius, and Uranias met at Berytus, and Photius and Eustathius again met at Tyre, in the year 448 or 449, heard the charges, acquitted Ibas, and brought about a reconciliation between him and his accusers, who were presbyters of his own Church at Edessa (*Concil.* vol. iv, col. 627, etc., ed. Labbé; vol. ii, col. 503, etc., ed. Hardouin). There is a considerable difficulty as to the chronology of these meetings, which is discussed by Tillemont in two of his careful notes (*Mém.* xv, 897, etc.). Photius was present at the Council of Ephesus, known as the "Concilium Latrocinale," where he joined in acquitting the archimandrite Eutyches, and restoring him to his ecclesiastical rank from which he had been deposed (*Concil.* vol. iv, col. 260, ed. Labbé; vol. ii, col. 220, ed. Hardouin). About the same time Photius had a contest with Eustathius, bishop of Berytus, who had obtained an edict of the emperor Theodosius II, erecting Berytus into a metropolitan see, as to the extent of their respective jurisdictions. Tillemont judges that the dignity accorded to the see of Berytus was designed to be merely titular, and that the struggle was occasioned by the attempt of Eustathius to assume metropolitan jurisdiction over some bishoprics previously under the jurisdiction of Tyre. In this attempt, being supported by the patriarchs Anatolius of Constantinople and Maximus of Antioch, he effected his purpose; and Photius, after a struggle, was constrained, not so much by an excommunication, which was speedily recalled, as by a threat of deposition, to submit. The jurisdiction of the dioceses abstracted was, however, restored to Photius by the Council of Chalcedon, A.D. 451 (*Concil.* vol. iv, col. 539, ed. Labbé; vol. ii, col. 435, etc., ed. Hardouin). Photius was among those who at the same council voted that Theodoret was orthodox, and should be restored to his see (*Concil.* col. 619, ed. Labbé; col. 495, ed. Hardouin). He also took part in some of the other transactions of the assembly. Nothing further is known of him. There is extant one piece of Photius, entitled Δεήσεις, *Preces* s. *Supplex Libellus*, addressed to the emperors Valentinian III and Marcian, respecting the dispute with Eustathius of Berytus. It is given in the *Actio Quarta* of the Council of Chalcedon (*Concil.* vol. iv, col. 542, etc., ed. Labbé; vol. ii, col. 436, etc., ed. Hardouin).

A Synopsis de Conciliis, extant in MS., is ascribed to Photius of Tyre: this cannot be, as some have supposed, the same work as the *Epitome Actorum Conciliorum*, also extant in MS., and ascribed to the more celebrated Photius, patriarch of Constantinople. See Tillemont, *Mém.* l. c.; Cave, *Hist. Litt.* ad ann. 451, i, 443; Fabricius, *Biblioth. Græc.* x, 678; xii, 358; Smith, *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. and Mythol.* s. v.

Photizoměnoi (φωτιζόμενοι, *enlightened*), a term frequently used among the early Christians to denote the baptized as being instructed in the mysteries of the Christian religion. See Phos.

Phrat. See Euphrates.

Phrenology (from φρήν, *the mind*, and λόγος, *a discourse*), an empirical science, which claims to read the mental peculiarities of individuals by means of the exterior developments of the skull. It had its origin with Franz Joseph Gall, a physician of Germany, and was greatly extended by Dr. Spurzheim, of the same country, and by George and Andrew Combe, of Scotland. In this country it has been chiefly popularized by the late L. N. and O. S. Fowler. There is a sprightly periodical, called the *Phrenological Journal*, published in New York, devoted to its advocacy. In accordance with its theory of the special functions of particular portions of the brain, it has mapped out the cranium into various "organs," as amativeness, philoprogenitiveness, etc., in the animal order; ideality, veneration, etc., in the æsthetic and moral; figure, time, tune, etc., in the perceptive, and so on. It has largely been used by itinerant lecturers as a method of indicating the character of unknown persons, somewhat after the fashion of fortune-telling. Its claims to scientific value are not generally admitted by sound physiologists and mental philosophers, as neither its craniological nor its psychological theory and analysis agree with the best settled principles of either of those departments of self-knowledge. Its theological bearings are decidedly materialistic. For a fuller exposition the reader is referred to the works of the writers above cited. See also Psychology.

Phrontisterion (φροντιστήριον, *a place of meditation*), a name anciently applied to denote *monasteries* as being places of education and schools of learning. Baptisteries were also occasionally called by this name, the catechumens being there educated in religious truth.

Phryg'ia (Φρυγία, perhaps from φρύγω, hence *parched*), an inland province of Asia Minor, bounded on the north by Bithynia and Galatia, on the east by Cappadocia and Lycaonia, on the south by Lycia, Pisidia, and Isauria, and on the west by Caria, Lydia, and Mysia. Perhaps there is no geographical term in the New Testament which is less capable of an exact definition. Many maps convey the impression that it was co-ordinate with such terms as Bithynia, Cilicia, or Galatia. But in fact there was no Roman province of Phrygia till considerably after the first establishment of Christianity in the peninsula of Asia Minor. The word was rather ethnological than political, and denoted, in a vague manner, the western part of the central region of that peninsula. Accordingly, in two of the three places where it is used, it is mentioned in a manner not intended to be precise (διελθόντες τὴν Φρυγίαν καὶ τὴν Γαλατικὴν χώραν, Acts xvi, 6; διερχόμενος καθεξῆς τὴν Γαλατικὴν χώραν καὶ Φρυγίαν, Acts xviii, 23), the former having reference to the second missionary journey of St. Paul, the latter to the third. Nor is the remaining passage (Acts ii, 10) inconsistent with this view, the enumeration of those foreign Jews who came to Jerusalem at Pentecost (though it does follow, in some degree, a geographical order) having no reference to political boundaries. By Phrygia we must understand an extensive district, which contributed portions to several Roman provinces, and varying portions at different times. In early times Phrygia seems to have comprehended the greater part of the peninsula of Asia Minor. It was subsequently divided into Phrygia Major on the south, and Phrygia Minor or Epictetus (*acquired*) on the north-west. The Romans divided the province into three districts: Phrygia Salutaris on the east, Phrygia Pacatiana on the west, and Phrygia Katakekaumene (*the burnt*) in the middle. The country, as defined by the specified limits, is for the most part level, and very abundant in corn, fruit, and wine. It had a peculiar and celebrated breed of cattle, and the fine raven-black wool of the sheep around Laodicea on the Lycus was in high repute. The Mæander and the Hermus were its chief rivers. The Phrygians were a very ancient people, and are supposed to have formed, along with the Pelasgi, the aborigines of Asia Minor. Jews from Phrygia were present in Jerusalem at the

Feast of Pentecost (Acts ii, 10). All over this district the Jews were probably numerous. They were first introduced there by Antiochus the Great (Josephus, *Ant.* xii, 3, 4); and we have abundant proof of their presence there from Acts xiii, 14; xiv, 1, 19, as well as from Acts ii, 10. The cities of Laodicea, Hierapolis, and Colossæ, mentioned in the New Testament, belonged to Phrygia, and Antioch in Pisidia was also within its limits (see the names). See Rosenmüller, *Bibl. Geog.* iii, 43–45; Leake, *Geog. of Asia Minor;* Smith, *Dict. of Class. Geog.* s. v. See Asia Minor.

Phrygians or **Cataphrygians** (q. v.), a sect in the 2d century, so called as being of the country of Phrygia. They were orthodox in everything, setting aside this, that they took Montanus for a prophet, and Priscilla and Maximilla for true prophetesses, to be consulted in everything relating to religion; as supposing that the Holy Spirit had abandoned the Church. See Montanists.

Phtha or **Ptah**, the supreme god of the ancient Egyptians, in the first four dynasties or successions of kings, extending about 321 years. This god seems, however, in later times to have been degraded from his high position and become a secondary god. No image of this, nor indeed of any other god or goddess, is found upon the most ancient Egyptian monuments. The worship of Phtha passed from Egypt into Greece, and was altered into *Hephæstus*. "When, in later times," says Mr. Osburn, in his *Religions of the World*, "pictures and images of the gods made their appearance on the ruins of ancient Egypt, Ptah was represented as a tall youth, with handsome features, and a green complexion, denoting the swarthy, sallow hue which the burning sun of Africa had already impressed upon the skins of Phut and his descendants. He was swathed in white linen like a mummy to denote that he had been dead, but his hands had burst through the cerements, and grasped many symbols, to denote that he has risen again. This god is made the son of many divine parents, according to the later fables, both of the monuments and of the Greek authors, most of them prompted by political motives; but not on the monuments of all epochs. The image of Ptah of Memphis is enclosed in a shrine, to denote that he claimed affinity with no other god, and that his real parentage was unknown or forgotten."

Phthartodocētæ (from *φθαρτός, destructible,* and *δοκέω, to seem*). One of the numerous Monophysite sects. They were so called because they maintained that the body of Christ was truly corruptible before his resurrection. They were opposed to another sect which affirmed that the body of Jesus was rendered incorruptible in consequence of the divine nature blended with it: these were called Aphthartodocetæ, Phantasiasts, etc., and were likewise divided into parties, some of which debated whether the body of Christ was created or uncreated. See Aphthartodocetæ; Monophysites.

Phthartolatræ (*φταρτός, destructible,* and *λατρεύω, to worship*), a term of reproach applied to the Severians (q. v.) in the 6th century, who maintained that Christ's body was corruptible of itself, but by reason of the Godhead dwelling in it was never corrupted.

Phud (*Φούδ*), an incorrect Greek form (Jud. ii, 23) of the Heb. name (Ezek. xxvii, 10) Phut (q. v.).

Phu'rah (Heb. *Purah'*, פֻּרָה, *bough;* Sept. *Φαρά*), the servant of Gideon, who went with him by night to spy the camp of the Midianites (Judg. vii, 10, 11). B.C. 1362.

Phu'rim (Esth. xi, 1). See Purim.

Phut (Heb. *Pût*, פּוּט; Sept. *Φούδ* or *Φούτ*, but usually *Λίβυες*, and so Josephus, *Ant.* i, 6, 2), the name of a people mentioned in connection with Mizraim and Cush as third among the descendants of Ham (Gen. x, 6; "Put," 1 Chron. i, 8), elsewhere applied to an African country or people (Jer. xlvi, 9; Ezek. xxvii, 40; xxx, 5; xxxviii, 5; "Put," Nah. iii, 9. Comp. also Jud. ii, 23, in the Greek and Syriac). In all of these passages Phut or Put is named with Cush, Ludim, and Lubim. Putites served in the Egyptian army (Jer. *l. c.;* comp. Ezek. xxx, 5), and the Tyrian navy (Ezek. xxvii, 20), and are numbered in the army of Gog (Ezek. xxxviii, 5). Josephus (*Ant.* i, 6, 2) understands here the Mauritanians. He also mentions a river bearing the same name, in the territory of the Mauri, which is called *Fut* by Pliny (p. 242, ed. Hard.), and flows into the Atlantic. Ptolemy (iv, 1, 3) calls it *Phthouth* (long. 7½°, lat. 30½°), in Mauritania Tingitana (comp. Michael. *Spicil.* i, 160 sq.). These traces of the name, however, are not needed. That it is a name of Libya is sufficiently obvious from the Sept. in Jeremiah and Ezekiel, and from the fact that *Faiat* is a Coptic name for Libya in Egypt—that is, for that part of Lower Egypt which lies west of the Canopic mouth of the Nile, so called (see Gesen. *Thesaur.* ii, 1093). More recently Hitzig would identify with Put the tribe of *Putiyâ*, mentioned in the inscriptions at the tomb of Darius, and refers to Putea (*Πούτεα*), a city on the west bank of the river Triton in Northern Africa (Ptol. iv, 3, 39). But no weight can be given to his remark that a people which served in the Egyptian army in foreign expeditions must not be sought in Western Africa.—Winer, ii, 229. See Libya.

"In the above genealogical lists Phut follows Cush and Mizraim, and precedes Canaan. The settlements of Cush extended from Babylonia to Ethiopia above Egypt, those of Mizraim stretched from the Philistine territory through Egypt and along the northern coast of Africa to the west; and the Canaanites were established at first in the land of Canaan, but afterwards were spread abroad. The order seems to be ascending towards the north: the Cushite chain of settlements being the most southern, the Mizraite chain extending above them, though perhaps through a smaller region, at least at the first, and the Canaanites holding the most northern position. We cannot place the tract of Phut out of Africa, and it would seem that it was almost parallel to that of the Mizraites, as it could not be farther to the north: this position would well agree with Libya. But it must be recollected that the order of the nations or tribes of the stocks of Cush, Mizraim, and Canaan is not the same as that we have inferred to be that of the principal names, and that it is also possible that Phut may be mentioned in a supplementary manner, perhaps as a nation or country dependent on Egypt. The few mentions of Phut in the Bible clearly indicate, as already remarked, a country or people of Africa, and, it must be added, probably not far from Egypt. It is noticeable that they occur only in the list of Noah's descendants and in the prophetical Scriptures. Isaiah probably makes mention of Phut as a remote nation or country, where the A. V. has *Pul*, as in the Masoretic text (Isa. lxvi, 19). Nahum, warning Nineveh by the fall of No-Amon, speaks of Cush and Mizraim as the strength of the Egyptian city, and Phut and Lubim as its helpers (iii, 9). Jeremiah tells of Phut in Necho's army with Cush and the Ludim (xlvi, 9). Ezekiel speaks of Phut with Persia and Lud as supplying mercenaries to Tyre (xxvii, 10), and as sharing with Cush, Lud, and other helpers of Egypt, in her fall (xxx, 5); and again, with Persia, and Cush, perhaps in the sense of mercenaries, as warriors of the army of Gog (xxxviii, 5). From these passages we cannot infer anything as to the exact position of this country or people; unless indeed in Nahum, Cush and Phut, Mizraim and Lubim, are respectively connected, which might indicate a position south of Egypt. The serving in the Egyptian army, and importance of Phut to Egypt, make it reasonable to suppose that its position was very near.

"In the ancient Egyptian inscriptions we find two names that may be compared to the Biblical Phut. The tribes or peoples called the Nine Bows, *IX Petu* or

IX Na-Petu, might partly or wholly represent Phut. Their situation is doubtful, and they are never found in a geographical list, but only in the general statements of the power and prowess of the kings. If one people be indicated by them, we may compare the Naphtuhim of the Bible. See NAPHTUHIM. It seems unlikely that the Nine Bows should correspond to Phut, as their name does not occur as a geographical term in use in the directly historical inscriptions, though it may be supposed that several well-known names there take its place as those of individual tribes; but this is an improbable explanation. The second name is that of Nubia, *To-pet*, "the region of the Bow," also called *To-meru-pet*, "the region, the island of the Bow," whence we conjecture the name of Meroë to come. In the geographical lists the latter form occurs in that of a people, *Anu-meru-pet*, found, unlike all others, in the lists of the southern peoples and countries as well as the northern. The character we read *Pet* is an unstrung bow, which until lately was read *Kens*, as a strung bow is found following, as if a determinative, the latter word, which is a name of Nubia, perhaps, however, not including so large a territory as the names before mentioned. The reading *Kens* is extremely doubtful, because the word does not signify bow in Egyptian, so far as we are aware, and still more because the bow is used as the determinative of its name *Pet*, which from the Egyptian usage as to determinatives makes it almost impossible that it should be employed as a determinative of *Kens*. The name *Kens* would therefore be followed by the bow to indicate that it was a part of Nubia. This subject may be illustrated by a passage of Herodotus, explained by Mr. Harris, of Alexandria, if we may premise that the unstrung bow is the common sign, and, like the strung bow, is so used as to be the symbol of Nubia. The historian relates that the king of the Ethiopians unstrung a bow, and gave it to the messengers of Cambyses, telling them to say that when the king of the Persians could pull so strong a bow so easily he might come against the Ethiopians with an army stronger than their forces (iii, 21, 22, ed. Rawlinson: Sir G. Wilkinson's note). For the hieroglyphic names, see Brugsch, *Geogr. Inschr.*

"The Coptic *Piphaiat* must also be compared with Phut. The first syllable being the article, the word nearly resembles the Hebrew name. It is applied to the western part of Lower Egypt beyond the Delta; and Champollion conjectures it to mean the Libyan part of Egypt, so called by the Greeks, comparing the Coptic name of the similar eastern portion, *Phapabia* or *Tapabia*, the older Arabian part of Egypt and Arabian Nome (*L'Égypte sous les Pharaons*, ii, 28–31, 243). Be this as it may, the name seems nearer to Naphtuhim than to Phut. To take a broad view of the question, all the names which we have mentioned may reasonably be connected with the Hebrew Phut; and it may be supposed that the Naphtuhim were Mizraites in the territory of Phut, perhaps intermixed with peoples of the latter stock. It is, however, reasonable to suppose that the *Pet* of the ancient Egyptians, as a geographical designation, corresponds to the Phut of the Bible, which would therefore denote Nubia or the Nubians, the former, if we are strictly to follow the Egyptian usage. This identification would account for the position of Phut after Mizraim in the list in Genesis, notwithstanding the order of the other names; for Nubia has been from remote times a dependency of Egypt, excepting in the short period of Ethiopian supremacy, and the longer time of Ethiopian independence. The Egyptian name of Cush, *Kesh*, is applied to a wider region well corresponding to Ethiopia. The governor of Nubia in the time of the Pharaohs was called Prince of *Kesh*, perhaps because his authority extended beyond Nubia. The identification of Phut with Nubia is not repugnant to the mention in the prophets; on the contrary, the great importance of Nubia in their time, which comprehended that of the Ethiopian supremacy, would account for their speaking of Phut as a support of Egypt, and as furnishing it with warriors. The identification with Libya has given rise to attempts to find the name in African geography, which we shall not here examine, as such mere similarity of sound is a most unsafe guide."

The name of *Phtha*, the chief deity of Memphis, has been considered by some Egyptologists to be the hieroglyphic transcription of Phut, the son of Ham, whose descendants settled in the oases of the Libyan desert, as is demonstrated by the circumstance that the country named after Phut, in the Hebrew, is translated Libya by the Sept. (see Gesenius, *Lexicon*, s. v. פּוּט). "The name Phut, in its change to *Phtha*," says Osburn, "has undergone an extraordinary process, highly characteristic of the modes of thought that prevailed in very ancient times. Written with the final *h*, which may be added to a Hebrew word without altering the sense, it represents the consonants of the verb 'to reveal,' which in the Coptic sense is 'to write hieroglyphics.' A still stranger use has been made of this pun upon the name of Phut. His animal representative has been named after the action in direct antagonism with that of the human original. The hieroglyphic name of the bull Apis, *hp*, is the Coptic verb *pet*, 'to hide,' which is a mere transcription of the ancient verb חפה, חוּפ, with the same meaning. The comparison of the two groups renders this contrast very apparent. It will be seen that one group is as nearly as possible an inversion of the other. The meanings are in like manner in antithesis. In the bull Apis, therefore, were concealed the attributes which were revealed in Phtha" (*Mon. Hist. of Egypt*, ch. v).

Some late Egyptologists, however, regard *Put* as a merely Egyptian pronunciation for *Punt* (Bunsen, *Egypt*, ii, 304), which was the name of an Arabian tribe east of Egypt (Brugsch, *Geogr. Inschr.* ii, 15). See ETHNOGRAPHY.

Phu'vah (Heb. *Puvvah'*, פֻּוָּה, *mouth;* Sept. Φουά), the second named of four sons of Issachar (Gen. xlvi, 13). B.C. 1900. This name is also written "Pua" in the A. V. (Numb. xxvi, 23), and "Puah," margin "Phuvah" (1 Chron. vii, 1). His descendants are called "Punites" (Numb. xxvi, 23).

Phygel'lus (Gr. Φύγελλος, perh. *a fugitive*), a Christian of Asia, who being at Rome during Paul's imprisonment, deserted him in his necessity (2 Tim. i, 15). A.D. 64. "It is open to question whether this repudiation of the apostle was joined with a declension from the faith (see Buddæus, *Eccl. Apostol.* ii, 310), and whether the open display of the feeling of Asia took place—at least so far as Phygellus and Hermogenes were concerned—at Rome. It was at Rome that Onesiphorus, named in the next verse, showed the kindness for which the apostle invokes a blessing on his household in Asia: so perhaps it was at Rome that Phygellus displayed that change of feeling towards Paul which the apostle's former followers in Asia avowed. It seems unlikely that Paul would write so forcibly if Phygellus had merely neglected to visit him in his captivity at Rome. He may have forsaken (see 2 Tim. iv, 16) the apostle at some critical time when his support was expected; or he may have been a leader of some party of nominal Christians at Rome, such as the apostle describes at an earlier period (Phil. i, 15, 16) opposing him there. Dean Ellicott, on 2 Tim. i, 15, who is at variance with the ancient Greek commentators as to the exact force of the phrase 'they which are in Asia,' states various opinions concerning their aversion to Paul. The apostle himself seems to have foreseen it (Acts xx, 30); and there is nothing in the fact inconsistent with the general picture of the state of Asia at a later period which we have in the first three chapters of the Revelation."

Phylactery (φυλακτήριον, a receptacle for safe-

keeping), a small square box, made either of parchment or black calf-skin, in which are enclosed slips of parchment or vellum with Exod. xiii, 2–20, 11–17; Deut. vi, 4–9, 13–22, written on them, and which are worn on the head and left arm by every strict Jew on week-day mornings during the time of prayer.

1. *Name and its Signification.*—The Greek term *φυλακτήριον=phylactery*, is a later expression used in the N. T. for the O. T. word טוֹטָפֹת, plur. טוֹטָפֶת, *"frontlets,"* which is rendered תְּפִלִּין, *prayer-fillets*, by the Chaldee paraphrases of Onkelos and Jonathan b.-Uzziel, as well as by the unanimous voice of Jewish tradition. It is now generally agreed by lexicographers that, according to the analogy of בָּבֶל, which stands for בַּלְבֶּל, and כּוֹכָב, which stands for כַּכְכָּב, and which are formed by the reduplication of the chief two radical letters, טוֹטָפֶת stands for טָפַף, from טוּף, *to bind round* (Ewald, *Lehrbuch der Hebräischen Sprache*, § 158, *c*), and that it denotes *a tie, a band, a frontlet*. The Sept. in all the three instances in which לְטוֹטָפֹת בֵּין עֵינֶיךָ occurs (Exod. xiii, 16; Deut. vi, 8; xi, 18), renders it by *ἀσάλευτον πρὸ ὀφθαλμῶν σου, a fixture before thine eyes*, with which Symmachus and Theodotion agree. The rendering of Aquila, *εἰς ἀτίνακτα, for an immovable* (comp. Montfaucon, *Hexapla*, nota ad vers.), is to the same effect. Philo (ii, 358), however, translates it *σειόμενα πρὸ ὀφθαλμῶν*, and afterwards adds that it is to be a constant pendulum (*σάλον ἐχέτω ταῦτα κινούμενον*) to summon the sight by its motion to a very clear inspection. Herzfeld (*Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, ii, 224) infers from this that Philo must either have read *σάλευτον* in the Sept., or taken the *ἀ* before it as *intensitive*, and assigns to טוּף the sense of *to move backwards and forwards*, vindicating for טוטפות the meaning of *pendulum, pendent ornament*. Herzfeld, moreover, maintains that this rendering is more in harmony with *the little houses*, or *square boxes*, constituting the phylacteries, and that it escapes the following objections to the current rendering of it by *binding round:* (1) In the phylacteries *the box* in the front is the principal part, and not the strap round the head which holds it; and (2) the טוטפת is to be *"between the eyes,"* which does not tally with forehead tie (*Stirnbinde*). The name תפילין, *prayer-fillets*, by which the Chaldee paraphrases and the Syriac version render טוטפות, and which is the common appellation for the phylacteries among the Jews to the present day, owes its origin to the fact that the phylacteries are worn during prayer-time. Hence the plural תפילין has the masculine termination to distinguish it from the feminine תפילות, which denotes *prayers*, just as the plural masculine תהלים denotes *psalms*, in contradistinction to the feminine plural תהלות, *praise*.

2. *The Manner in which the Phylacteries are Made and Used.*—As the Mosaic law (Exod. xiii, 16; Deut. vi, 8; xi, 18) gives no specific directions how the phylacteries are to be made, but simply says that they are to be of a double nature, viz. for the hand and between the eyes, the Jewish canons have enacted minute regulations about the arrangement and use of them. A piece of leather is soaked, stretched on a square block cut for the purpose, sewed together with gut-strings while wet, and left on the block till it is dried and stiffened, so that when it is taken off it forms a (בית) square leather box (*Jerusalem Megilla*, iv, 9). As the Mosaic code enjoins one for the hand and another for the head, two such boxes (בתים) are requisite for making the phylacteries. The box of which the phylactery for the hand (תפלה של יד) is made has no inscription outside, and only one cell inside, wherein is deposited a parchment strip with the four following sections written thereon in four columns, each column having seven lines. On column i is written Exod. xiii, 1–10, treating on the sanctification of the first-born, and containing the injunction about the phylacteries; on col. ii, Exod. xiii, 11–16, which also treats on the sanctification of the first-born, and repeats the injunction about the phylacteries; on col. iii, Deut. vi, 4–9, enjoining that the law and the command about the phylacteries should be inculcated into the minds of the rising generation; and on col. iv is written Deut. xi, 13–21, describing the blessing attached to the keeping of the law, and to the observance of the command about the phylacteries. The order, therefore, of the passages of Scripture is as follows:

iv.	iii.	ii.	i.
Deut. xi, 13–21	Deut. vi, 4–9	Exod. xiii, 11–16	Exod. xiii, 1–10

The slip is rolled up, put inside, tied with white and well-washed hairs of a calf or cow, generally obtained from the tail, and put into the box; a flap connected with the brim is then drawn over the open part and sewed firmly down to the thick leather brim, in such a manner as to form a loop on one side, through which passes a very long leather strap (רצועה), wherewith



Phylactery for the Arm.

the phylactery is fastened to the arm. The box of which the phylactery for the head (תפלה של ראש) is made has on the outside to the right the regular three-pronged letter *Shin*, being an abbreviation for שדי, *the Almighty*, and on the left side *a four-pronged* letter *Shin* (*Sabbath*, 28 *b*). In the inside are four cells, in which are deposited four slips of parchment, whereon are written the same four passages of Scripture as on the one slip in the phylactery for the hand. The box is closed in the same manner, and a thong passes through the loop with which it is fastened to the head.

The phylacteries, like the *Mezuzah*, i. e. the scrolls on the door-posts, must be written in Hebrew characters, while the law may be written in Greek (Mishna, *Megilla*, i, 8). Every Jew, from the time that he is thirteen years of age, when he is considered a member



Phylactery for the Head.

of the congregation (בר מצוה), is obliged to wear the phylacteries during the time of morning prayer, every day except on Sabbath and festivals. Before commencing his devotions he first puts on one on the left arm through the sling formed by the long strap. Having fastened it just above the elbow, on the inner part of the naked arm, in such a manner that when the arm is bent the phylactery may touch the flesh and be near the heart, to fulfil the precept, "Ye shall lay up these words in your heart," he first twists the long strap three times close to the phylactery, forming a *Shin*, which stands for שדי, *the Almighty*, pronouncing the following benediction: "Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, King of the universe, who hast sanctified us with thy commandments and enjoined us to put on the phylacteries." He then twists the long leather strap seven times around the arm (in the form of two *Shins*, one with three prongs and the other with four), and puts on the phylactery on the head, placing it exactly in the centre between the eyes, so as to touch the spot where the hair begins to grow, and before he secures it pronounces the following benediction: "Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, King of the universe, who hast sanctified us with thy commandments, and enjoined upon us the command about the phylacteries;" and immediately after adjusting it says, "Blessed be the name of the glory of his kingdom forever and ever" (Maimonides, *Iad Ha-Chezaka*, *Hilchoth Tephillin*, iv, 5). He then winds the end



Phylactery on the Arm.

of the long leather strap three times around his middle finger, and the remainder around the hand, saying, "I will betroth thee unto me forever, yea, I will betroth thee unto me in righteousness and in judgment, and in loving-kindness, and in mercy, and thou shalt know the Lord" (Hos. ii, 19).

There is no special canon about the size of the boxes (בתים) which contain the slips, and thus constitute the phylacteries. They are generally made an inch and a half square, and are worn during morning prayer, except on Sabbath and festivals, because these days being themselves a sign (אות) require no other sign or pledge (Maimonides, *ibid.* iv, 10). The pious Jews who are engaged in the study of the law, and in meditations, also wear them during these hallowed engagements; they make the phylacteries a little larger than the ordinary ones to give more space, and hence more distinctness to every letter and word composing the writing inside, and walk with the phylacteries on from one place to another. The hypocrites among the Pharisees imitated this, and made their phylacteries more than ordinarily large, so as to make them conspicuous and visible to any one at a distance, thereby to indicate that they were praying or in holy meditation, which our Saviour rebuked (Matt. xxiii, 5). If the phylacteries are written by an infidel they must be burned; and if written by a Samaritan, an informer, a slave, a woman, or a minor, they are unlawful and must be shut up (Maimonides, *ibid.* i, 13). The Sadducees wore the phylacteries on the forehead or brow, and on the palm of the hand (Maimonides, *ibid.* iv, 3).

3. *Origin and Design of the Phylacteries.*—It is the unanimous voice of Jewish tradition that the phylacteries are enjoined in Exod. xiii, 9, 16; Deut. vi, 8; xi, 18. It is true that Rashbam and Aben-Ezra (on Exod. xiii, 9), who are followed by De Lyra, Calvin, bishop Patrick, H. Michaelis, Keil, etc., take the passages in question in a figurative sense. But against this the advocates of the usage urge that—(1.) It is inconceivable that the same declaration should be used four times figuratively, there being no parallel for such a usage throughout the whole Pentateuch. (2.) In two cases out of the four (Deut. vi, 9; xi, 20), the injunction is immediately followed by the command about *the Mezuzah*, which is generally admitted to be literal [see MEZUZAH], and it is against all sound rules of exegesis to take one command in a figurative and the other in a literal sense. (3.) In every one of the four instances wherein the injunction is given, the expression אות is used, which in all other passages of Scripture invariably denotes *a visible sign*, given either to attest an event or doctrine stated in the foregoing passage, or to serve as a remembrance. Now, on the supposition that the whole commandment is to be taken figuratively, it would be no sign whatever, and the term לזכרון could not have been substituted for the technical expression לטוטפת, as it is in Exod. xiii, 9. (4.) The *end* of the external action enjoined in the first clause of Exod. xiii, 9 is immediately introduced in the second clause by למען, "*that* the law of the Lord may be in thy mouth;" whereas, as Philippsohn rightly remarks, the simple conjunction ו would be required if the preceding words had the same internal figurative meaning. (5.) It was a common custom in ancient days for those who engaged in military service, or devoted themselves to the worship of a special deity, to be marked either on the forehead or on the hand, or on both (Veget. *de Milit.* ii, 5; Herod. ii, 113; Lucian, *De Syr. Dea*, 59; *Asiat. Res.* vii, 281 sq.). Thus the high-priest, as being especially consecrated to the service of Jehovah, had inscribed in the plate on the front of his head "Holiness to the Lord" (Exod. xxviii, 36), the ordinary servants of Jehovah were commanded to have a mark (Ezek. ix, 4, 6); and at the ingathering of Israel we are told that even the horses shall have written upon their bells "Holiness to the

Lord" (Zech. xiv, 20); while the worshippers of the beast are represented as bearing his inscription on their foreheads and arms (Rev. vii, 3; xiii, 16–18; xiv, 9–11; xvi, 2; xix, 20; xx, 4). The Moslems, Nusairieh and Bedawin Arabs, to the present day, either tie, or have tattooed, on their hands and foreheads select passages of the Koran. It was therefore natural that the Mosaic law, which forbids tattooing (Lev. xix, 28), should appropriate, for the service of the Most High, the innocent and generally prevailing custom, which the lawgiver could not eradicate, of wearing ornaments and tokens, with inscriptions declaring that they belonged to Jehovah, and that the Lord is their Redeemer. This universal custom would of itself be sufficient argument for taking the injunction in its literal sense, even if we had not the support of the ancient versions and the undeviating practice of the synagogue; and be it remembered that even the Sadducees, who rejected tradition and adhered to the simple meaning of the law, also wore phylacteries. As to the phrase כתבם על לוח לבך (Prov. iii, 3, etc.), which is frequently quoted in support of the spiritual meaning, it must be observed that it too is to be taken literally, inasmuch as לוח does not denote *the external front of the breast*, but the *tablet* which the ancients wore on their hearts. It is the same as פנקס, which so frequently occurs in the Mishna (comp. *Kelim*, xxiv, 7), and which the Greeks called Πίνακ, and the Romans *Pugillares*. This *tablet*, when made of wood, was called לוח (Isa. xxx, 8; Habak. ii, 2); when of metal, it was termed גליון (Isa. viii, 1), and when it was of stone it was denominated אבנים. The argument of Spencer, that because the Sept. renders טוטפות by *ἀσάλευτα*, and not *φυλακτήρια*, therefore this version did not understand it literally, "inter eos (qui legem illam sensu tantum metaphorico exponendam censuerunt) LXX cum primis notandi veniunt, qui quod in Moisi est טוטפות ipsi non *φιλακτήρια* sed *ἀσάλευτα* transtulerunt" (*De Leg. Hebræor. ritual.* lib. iv, c. 2), ignores the fact that *φυλακτήρια* is a term which obtained at a much later period as an equivalent for תפלין. Josephus, too, who like all the ancient and modern Jews takes the injunction literally, does not render טוטפות by *φυλακτήρια* (*Ant.* iv, 8, 13). The fact is, that in very early days there was no fixed and technical term for those frontlets. Hence Herzfeld (*Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, ii, 223) has pointed out that the phylacteries are meant in 2 Kings xi, 12, where the high-priest is said to have put upon Joash "the crown and the עדות;" and Duschak (*Josephus und die Tradition*, p. 85) supposes that the *Tephillin* are meant by צור תעודה (Isa. viii, 16). The injunction about the phylacteries was so generally observed among the Jews after the Babylonian captivity, that the writers of them found it a most lucrative business. Hence we are told that "twenty-four fast days were ordained by the Great Synagogue, in order that the writers of the scrolls of the law, the phylacteries, and the mezuzahs, might not grow rich, inasmuch as they were not allowed to write them on these days" (*Pesachim*, 50 *b*). In harmony with the design of the phylacteries, Maimonides propounds their utility, when he remarks: "The sacred influence of the phylacteries is very great; for as long as one wears them on his head and arm he is obliged to be meek, God-fearing, must not suffer himself to be carried away by laughter or idle talk, nor indulge in evil thoughts; but must turn his attention to the words of truth and uprightness" (Kitto). Nevertheless, the fact that these appendages, being regarded more or less in the light of amulets, engender superstition, has led interpreters generally to view the sacred injunction as a spiritual or figurative precept. This is the opinion of the Karaites, Grotius, Schöttgen (*Her. Heb.* i, 194), Rosenmüller, Hengstenberg (*Pent.* i. 458 sq.), and most others. In Matt. xxiii, 5 only they are called *φυλακτήρια*, either because they tended to promote observance of the law (*ἀεὶ μνημὴν ἔχειν τοῦ Θεοῦ*, Just. Mart. *Dial. c. Tryph.* p. 205, for which reason Luther happily renders the word by *Denkzettel*), or from the use of them as amulets (Lat. *præbia*, Gr. *περιαπτά*, Grotius ad Matt. xxiii, 5). *Φυλακτήριον* is the ordinary Greek word for an amulet (Plutarch, ii, 378, B, where *φυλ.* = the Roman *bulla*), and is used *apparently* with this meaning by a Greek translator (Ezek. xiii, 18) for כְּסָתוֹת, cushions (Rosenmüller, *Schol.* ad loc. i; Schleusner, *Lex. in N. T.*). Jerome (on Matt. xxiii, 5) says they were thus used in his day by the Babylonians, Persians, and Indians, and condemns certain Christian "mulierculæ" for similarly using the Gospels ("parvula evangelia," *βιβλια μικρά*, Chrys.) as *περιάμματα*, especially the Prœm. to St. John (comp. Chrysost. *Hom. in Matt.* 73). The Koran and other sacred books are applied to the same purpose to this day (Hottinger, *Hist. Orient.* i, 8, p. 301; *De numinis Orient.* xvii sq.; "The most esteemed of all Chegabs is a Mûshaf, or copy of the Koran," Lane, *Mod. Egypt.* i, 338). Scaliger even supposes that phylacteries were designed to supersede those amulets, the use of which had been already learned by the Israelites in Egypt. See AMULET. There was a spurious book called *Phylact. Angelorum*, where pope Gelasius evidently understood the word to mean "amulets," for he remarks that Phylacteria ought rather to be ascribed to devils. In this sense they were expressly forbidden by pope Gregory ("Si quis . . . phylacteriis usus fuerit, anathema sit," Sixt. Senensis, *Bibl. Sanct.* p. 92; comp. Can. 36, Concil. Laod.).

The expression "they make broad their phylacteries" (*πλατύνουσι τὰ φυλ. αὐτῶν*, Matt. xxiii, 5) refers not so much to the phylactery itself, which seems to have been of a prescribed breadth, as to the case (קציצה) in which the parchment was kept, which the Pharisees (among their other pretentious customs, Mark vii, 3, 4; Luke v, 33, etc.) made as conspicuous as they could (Reland, *Antiq.* ii, 9, 15). Misled probably by the term *πλατύνουσι*, and by the mention of the ציצת, or fringe (Numb. xv, 38, Sept. *κλῶσμα ὑακίνθινον ἐπὶ τὰ κράσπεδα τῶν πτερυγίων*) in connection with them, Epiphanius says that they were *πλάτεα σήματα πορφύρας*, like the Roman *laticlave*, or the stripes on a Dalmatic cloak (*τὰ δὲ σήματα τῆς πορφύρας φυλακτήρια εἰώθασιν οἱ ἠκριβωμένοι μετονομάζειν*, *c. Hær.* i, 33; Sixt. Sen. *l. c.*). He says that these purple stripes were worn by the Pharisees with fringes, and four pomegranates, that no one might touch them, and hence he derives their name (Reland, *Antiq.* ii, 9, 15). But that this is an error is clearly shown by Scaliger (*Elench. Trihær.* viii, 66 sq.). It is said that the Pharisees wore them always, whereas the common people only used them at prayers, because they were considered to be even holier than the ציץ, or golden plate, on the priest's tiara (Exod. xxviii, 36), since that had the sacred name once engraved, but in each of the Tephillin the tetragrammaton recurred twenty-three times (Carpzov, *App. Critic.* 196). Again, the Pharisees wore the *tephillah* above the elbow, but the Sadducees on the palm of the hand (Goodwyn, *l. c.*). The modern Jews only wear them at morning prayers, and sometimes at noon (Leo of Modena, *l. c.*). In our Lord's time they were worn by all Jews, except the Karaites, women, and slaves. Boys, when (at the age of thirteen years and a day) they become בני מצות (sons of the commandments), were bound to wear them (*Baba Berac.* fol. 22, 1, in Glossâ), and therefore they may have been used even by our Lord, as he merely discountenanced their *abuse*. The suggestion was made by Scaliger (*l. c.*), and led to a somewhat idle controversy. Lightfoot (*Hor. Hebr. ad Matt.* xxiii, 5) and Otho (*Lex. Rab.* p. 656) agree with Scaliger, but Carpzov (*l. c.*) and others strongly deny it, from a belief that the entire use of phylacteries arose from an error.

The rabbins even declared that God wore them, arguing from Isa. lxii, 8; Deut. xxxiii, 2; Isa. xlix, 16. Perhaps this was a pious fraud to inculcate their use; or it may have had some mystic meaning (*Zohar*, pt. ii, fol. 2; Carpzov, *l. c.*), but the rabbins disapproved the application of them to charm wounds or to lull children to sleep (*Id. Leg.* 253; Maimonides, *De Idol.* ii). He who wore them was supposed to prolong his days (Isa. xxxviii, 16), but he who did not was doomed to perdition, since he thereby broke eight affirmative precepts (Maimonides, *Tephil.* iv, 26). We have a specimen of this style of interpretation in the curious literalism of Kimchi's comment on Psa. i, 2. Starting the objection that it is impossible to meditate in God's law day and night, because of sleep, domestic cares, etc., he answers that for the fulfilment of the text it is sufficient to wear *tephillin!* In spite of these considerations, Justin (*Dial. c. Tryph.* l. c.), Chrysostom, Euthymius, Theophylact, and many moderns (Baumgarten, *Comm.* i, 479; Winer, s. v. Phylact.), prefer the literal meaning. It rests, therefore, with them to account for the entire absence of all allusion to phylacteries in the O. T. The passages in Proverbs (ut sup.) contain no such reference, and in Ezek. xxiv, 17, פְּאֵר means not a phylactery (as Jarchi says), but a turban (Gesen. *Thesaur.* p. 1089).

4. *Literature.*—Besides the authors already quoted (Sixt. Senensis, Reland, Lightfoot, Schöttgen, Carpzov, Hottinger, Goodwyn, Rosenmüller, etc.), see the following, to whom they refer: Surenhusius, *Mishna ad Tract. Berachoth*, p. 8, 9; Beck, *De Judæorum ligamentis precativis*, and *De usu Phylact.* (1679); Basnage, *Hist. des Juifs*, V, xii, 12 sq.; Braunius, *De Vest. Sacerd.* p. 7 sq.; Buxtorf, *Synag. Jud.* p. 170 sq.; Maimonides, *Yad Hacash.* p. 2, 3; Ugolino, *De Phylacter. Hebræor.* in *Thesaur.* tom. xxi; Townley, *Reasons for the Laws of Moses*, p. 350; Bodenschatz, *Gottesdienstl. Verfassung d. Juden*, iv, 15 sq.; Gropp, *De Phylact.* (Leips. 1708); Otho, *Lex. Rabbin.* p. 756; Wagenseil, *Sota*, c. ii, p. 397 sq.; Spencer, *De Leg. Hebr.* IV, i–vii; Herzfeld, *Gesch. d. Jud.* ii, 223 sq.; the *Derech ha-Chayim* (Vienna, 1859), p. 24 sq.; Hochmuth, in *Ben Chananya*, p. 215; and the monographs cited by Volbeding, *Index Programmatum*, p. 130. See FRONTLET.

Phyllobolia (from *φύλλον*, a *leaf*, and *βάλλω*, *to throw*), a custom which existed among the ancient heathen nations of throwing flowers and leaves on the tombs of the dead. The Greek was placed on his funeral bed as if asleep, wearing a white robe and garland, the purple pall half hidden by numerous chaplets, and so was carried out to his burial before the dawn of day. The Romans, deriving the custom from the Greeks, covered the bier and the funeral pile with leaves and flowers. It is not an unfrequent custom in different parts of England in our day to spread flowers on and around the body when committing it to the coffin. In Wales also, when the body is interred, females hasten with their aprons full of flowers to plant them on the grave. The practice of connecting flowers with the dead seems to have been of great antiquity, for an Egyptian of high rank was wont to be carried to his sepulchre in a sarcophagus adorned with lotus, had his tomb decked with wreaths, and his mummy-case painted with acacia leaves and flowers. The use of the flowers on such occasions was no doubt connected with the idea of life after death.

Physician (רֹפֵא, *rophê, a curer*; *ἰατρός*). Among the Hebrews, as among the ancients generally, medical remedies (Exod. xxi, 19) were early (comp. Pliny, xxix, 5) dispensed by a special class, who probably derived their skill from the Egyptians (Gen. l, 1; comp. Herod. ii, 84; iii, 1, 129; Diod. Sic. i, 82; Diog. Laert. iii, 8; Pliny, xxvi, 3; xxix, 30; see Sprengel, *Geschichte*, i, 62; Wilkinson, iii, 390), who were famous for their medicines (*Odyss.* iv, 229). Their aid was at first made use of, as among common people at all times, for surgery and in extraordinary cases, and medicines (Exod. i, 15: the "stools," אָבְנַיִם, there spoken of were, according to Gesenius, *Thes. Heb.* p. 17, benches or seats on which the parturient females were seated; but the word, see *Studien u. Krit.* 1834, p. 81, 626, 641; 1842, p. 1048, will scarcely bear this signification, see Ewald, *Gesch. Isr.* i, 481, and Lengerke, *Kenan*, p. 387) were regularly employed (see Kall, *De obstetricib. matrum Hebr. in Æg.* Hamb. 1746). In later times Hebrew prescriptions obtained, which the prophets sometimes applied (2 Kings iv, 21; v, 10; viii, 7; xx, 7; Isa. xxxviii; which cases, although miraculous, evince the custom of seeking relief from that class of persons); mostly for *external* injuries or complaints (Isa. i, 6; Ezek. xxx, 21; 2 Kings viii, 29; ix, 15), but sometimes for internal maladies (2 Chron. xvi, 12), and even for mental diseases (1 Sam. xvi, 16; comp. Josephus, *Ant.* viii, 2, 5); but these never reached any extensive degree of science (see Buxtorf, *Lex. Chald.* s. v. רפא). The resort to physicians was very general before and especially after the exile (2 Chron. xvi, 12; Jer. viii, 22; Sir. xxxviii, 1; Mark v, 26; comp. Luke iv, 23; v, 31; viii, 43; see Josephus, *War*, ii, 8, 6; Doughtæi *Analect.* ii, 35), and eventually medical practitioners could be found even in the smaller cities of the land (Josephus, *Life*, 72; comp. *Ant.* xiv, 13, 10). Their remedies consisted mostly in salves (especially *balsam*, Jer. viii, 22; xlvi, 11; li, 8; comp. Prosp. Alpin. *Med. Æg.* 118 sq.; or *oil*, Luke x, 34; Mishna, *Sabb.* xiv, 4; including the oil-bath, Josephus, *War*, i, 33, 5; Mishna, *Berachoth*, i, 2), leaves (Ezek. xlvii, 12), plasters (e. g. of *figs*, 2 Kings xx, 7; comp. Pliny, xxiii, 63; Strabo, xv, 713), and bathing in mineral springs (Josephus, *Ant.* xvii, 6, 5; *Life*, 16; *War*, i, 33, 5; ii, 21, 6; comp. John v, 2), or in flowing streams (2 Kings v, 10). *Internal* nostrums are again and again recommended in the Talmud (see the Mishna, *Sabb.* xiv, 3; xxii, 6; *Joma*, viii, 6); in the Old Test. honey only is mentioned (Prov. xvi, 24), which still holds a conspicuous place among medical compounds in the East. Specimens of the Jewish prescriptions may be seen in Lightfoot on Mark v, 26 (the formula or "*Recipe*" is לריתי). Surgical operations are mentioned in the Mishna (*Sabb.* xxii, 6; *Chelim*, xii, 4; comp. *Sabb.* vi, 5). Great curative virtue was attributed to amulets (Mishna, *Sabb.* vi, 2, 10), incantations, charms, the touch of certain individuals, and other superstitions of a like character (2 Kings v, 11 [comp. Rosenmüller, *Morgenl.* iii, 227]; Josephus, *Ant.* viii, 5); especially in cases of hypochondria or supposed dæmoniacal possession. See AMULET; DÆMONIAC. The priests (Luke xvii, 14) were appointed by the law (Lev. xii–xv) the civil health-wardens, not so much for the cure as for the inspection of the sick, or of persons suspected of certain maladies, and the instructions given to them, especially respecting endemic diseases, exhibit



Ancient Egyptian Doctors (or Barbers?) and Patients.

a very careful observation, and afford apt and accurate symptoms. See LEPROSY; PLAGUE. For the priests themselves, who, in consequence of being obliged to perform their services barefoot, were often liable to catch cold (see Kall, *De morbis sacerdotum V. T.* Hafn. 1745), a special physician (*medicus viscerum*) was (in later times) appointed at the Temple (Lightfoot, p. 781). The priests must have obtained considerable anatomical knowledge (comp. the Talmudic abstract on osteology in the Mishna, *Oholoth*, i, 8) from the daily slaughter of the animal sacrifices. On the subject generally, see Börner, *Diss. de statu medicinæ ap. vet. Ebr.* (Viteb. 1755); Lindlinger, *De Hebr. vet. arte medica* (1774); Sprengel, *De medicina Ebræor. diss.* (Hal. 1789); comp. Schmidt's *Bibl. Medicus* (Tüll. 1743); also Norberg, *De medicina Arabum* (in his *Opusc. acad.* iii, 404 sq.); Wunderbar, *Biblisch-talmudische Medicin* (Riga, 1859). See MEDICINE.

The superstitious credulity of modern Orientals as to curative means is proverbial, and has been noticed by all travellers. The Arabs are ready to put faith in almost any Frank as a professional "medicine man" or *hakim* (literally "wise man"), as they term all physicians. Prescriptions of all sorts are at once taken by them, however absurd; but they are generally unwilling to exercise the patience, care, self-restraint, and especially the cleanliness necessary to a real cure. They expect sudden and immediate restoration, and invariably prefer extraordinary to simple remedies. All this is in keeping with the supernatural character of the nostrums ordinarily employed by them. Indeed, fatalism being the basis of Mohammedanism, a resort to direct divine power might naturally be expected. See SUPERSTITION.

"It is a very prevalent notion among the Christians of Europe that the Muslims are enemies to almost every branch of knowledge. This is an erroneous idea; but it is true that their studies, in the present age, are confined within very narrow limits. Very few of them study medicine, chemistry (for our first knowledge of which we are indebted to the Arabs), the mathematics, or astronomy. The Egyptian medical and surgical practitioners are mostly barbers, miserably ignorant of the sciences which they profess, and unskilful in their practice; partly in consequence of their being prohibited by their religion from availing themselves of the advantage of dissecting human bodies. But a number of young men, natives of Egypt, are now receiving European instruction in medicine, anatomy, surgery, and other sciences, for the service of the government. Many of the Egyptians, in illness, neglect medical aid, placing their whole reliance on Providence or charms. Alchemy is more studied in this country than pure chemistry, and astrology more than astronomy" (Lane, *Mod. Egypt.* i, 239).

Physiognomy (from *φύσις*, *nature*, and *γνῶμον*, *an index*), a method, rather than a science, of discovering the human character by means of the features, especially of the countenance. To some extent this is instinctively practiced, as all have learned to read the natural language of the tones, expression, gesture, etc., which spontaneously accompany our emotions. There can be no doubt also that passions or states of mind habitually indulged imprint themselves upon the lineaments of the face, and so become an indication of character. But when it is claimed that this is invariably the case, and that it may be reduced to fixed rules of interpretation which will serve as an unerring guide, the principle becomes proverbially deceptive. Lavater is especially famous for his fanciful scheme on this basis; and by Campe the so-called "facial angle" was relied on for determining the comparative intellectual capacity of individuals; but experience has demonstrated the fallacy of all such arbitrary systems of physiognomy.

Physiology (from *φύσις*, *nature*, and *λόγος*, *a discourse*), the science of the animal constitution, especially in man. This branch of self-knowledge is evidently of the highest temporal importance, and lies at the basis of the practice of medicine. Modern education has recognised its claims by incorporating it among the common-school studies; and few of the coming generation, it is hoped, will be so ignorant as to labor under the popular delusions and superstitions to which its neglect in former ages has led.

Piaggia, TERAMO or ERASMO (also called *Teramo di Zoagli*), an Italian painter, was born at Zoagli, in the Genoese state, near the beginning of the 16th century. He was a pupil of Lodovico Brea, and painted at Genoa in 1547. In conjunction with Antonio Semini he painted several pictures for the churches at Genoa, the most esteemed of which is an altar-piece of the *Martyrdom of St. Andrea*, in the church of that saint. Lanzi highly commends this work, and says, "None can witness this very beautiful altar-piece without seeing traces of Brae's style, already enlarged and changed into one more modern." He also painted several pieces by himself, at Genoa and at Chiavari.

Piales, JEAN JACQUES, a French canonist, was born in 1720 at Mur-de-Barrez (Aveyron). Being received as a lawyer in the Parliament of Paris (1747), he formed a connection with Claude Mey, one of the supporters of Jansenism, and both gave a great number of consultations and took a very active part in the affairs of the appellants. While one treated of the great questions of public law and jurisdiction, the other gave himself entirely to practice relating to benefices. Although Piales lost his sight in 1763, he lost nothing of his zeal for the cause which he maintained, and M. Dupin says, "There is no counsellor in the world who dictated more consultations." He died in Paris Aug. 4, 1789. Unforeseen changes in ecclesiastical matters have rendered his works useless; they are, *Traité de la Collation des Bénéfices* (Par. 1754 and 1755, 5 vols. 12mo):—*De la Provision de la Cour de Rome à litre de Prévention* (2 vols. 12mo):—*De la Dévolution, du Dévolu et des Vacances de plein Droit* (3 vols. 12mo):—*De l'Expectative des Gradués* (1758, 6 vols. 12mo):—*Des Commendes et des Réserves* (3 vols. 12mo):—*Des Réparations et Reconstructions des Églises* (Par. 1762, 4 vols. 12mo; 1788, 5 vols. 12mo, ed. given by Camus). The first volume (the only one which appeared) of the *Histoire de la Fête de la Conception* is attributed to Piales. See *Journal Chrétien* (1758 and 1759); Camus et Dupin, *Biblioth. choisie des Livres de Droit;* Picot, *Mémoires Ecclés.* tom. iv; Feller, *Dict. Hist.*—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xl, 32.

Piane, GIOVANNI MARIA DELLE (called *Il Molinaretto*), a Genoese painter, was born at Genoa in the year 1660. According to Ratti, he studied under Gio. Battisti Gaulli, whose style he adopted, and distinguished himself by some excellent works which he executed for the churches at Genoa, but more by the excellence of his portraits. Lanzi highly extols his *Decollation of St. John the Baptist*, at Sestri di Ponente. He also says that he was particularly excellent in portraits, and that Genoa is full of his works in this branch. He was also invited to Parma and Piacenza, where he furnished the court with portraits, and executed some works for the churches. He was afterwards invited to Naples by king Charles of Bourbon, who appointed him his painter, with a liberal pension, and he continued in this service till his death in 1745.

Piarists is the name of a Roman Catholic order which was founded by St. Joseph Calasanza or Calasantius, a Spanish nobleman and priest, at Rome in 1607, and was approved by pope Gregory XV in 1622 as a congregation of regulated clergy, under the name *Patres scholarum piarum* (*Fathers of the pious schools*). Paul V was the first pontiff to give encouragement to the work of this now celebrated order. Until that time

Calasanza labored at Rome only, and was so remarkably successful in getting children for instruction under himself and his associates that his work was gladly accepted as that of a religious order by 1622. Calasanza was the first general of the congregation, and under his management it spread through Poland, Germany, Italy, and other countries. In 1860 the Piarists had 33 houses in Germany, 28 in Italy, 32 in Hungary, 14 in Poland, and at least 30 in Spain. In Italy they have since been suppressed; and the only country in which the Piarists conduct, at present, educational institutions of note is the Austro-Hungarian monarchy. In Cis-Lithuanian Austria, in 1870, they had 29 houses with 297 members; included in which were 4 under-gymnasia. The Piarists take besides the three usual monastic vows, a fourth—that of free instruction of youth. Pope Innocent XII granted them the privileges of the Begging Monks. Their dress is a long, black coat, like the overcoat of the Jesuits, and a mantle like theirs. At the head of the congregation stands the general, who is elected for six years, and to whom are subject the generals of the different societies or countries in which the order prevails. (J. H. W.)

Piastrini, Giovanni Domenico, a painter, was born at Pistoja about 1700. He studied under Cav. Benedetto Luti at Florence, and afterwards went to Rome, where he distinguished himself by paintings in the church of St. Maria in Via Lata; in which, according to Lanzi, he rivalled the best followers of Carlo Maratti. He also painted some works for the churches in his native city, particularly in La Madonna della Umilta, where he filled two large spaces with pictures illustrating the history of that church.

Piatti, Francesco, an Italian painter, was, according to Fuessli, born at Teglio, in the Valteline, in 1650. He executed many works for the churches in the neighborhood, and painted much for the collections.

Piattoli, Gaetano, a Florentine painter, was born in 1703. He studied under Francesco Riviera at Leghorn. Lanzi says he is particularly extolled for the excellence of his portraits. He found abundant employment at Florence in that branch of the art, and was not only patronized by the inhabitants, but was employed to paint the portraits of the foreign nobility who visited that city. He died in 1770.

Piazza, *Cav.* **Andrea**, an Italian painter of the Venetian school, was born at Castelfranco about 1600. He was the nephew and pupil of Paolo Piazza (q. v.), whom he accompanied to Rome, and whose style he adopted, though somewhat modified by an attentive study of the works of the great masters. He acquired distinction, and was patronized by the duke of Lorraine, in whose service he continued many years, and received from him the honor of knighthood. He afterwards returned to Venice, where he executed some works for the churches, the best of which is the *Marriage at Cana*, in the church of S. Maria, a grand composition of many figures, which Lanzi says is one of the best works in the place. He died there in 1670.

Piazza, Carlo Bartoloméo, an Italian monk, deserves to be mentioned here. He was abbé and counsellor of the Congregation of the Index, and published *Diarium Vaticanum* (Rome, 1687, 4to), and *La Gerarchia cardinalizia* (ibid. 1703, fol.).—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xl, 35.

Piazza, Francesco, an Italian theologian, was born in Bologna near the beginning of the 15th century. In 1424 he took the dress of the Dominicans, and distinguished himself by his skill in the science of canon law. He died at Bologna Dec. 17, 1460. His treatise *De restitutionibus, usuris et excommunicationibus* (Cremona, 1472, fol.) has been several times reprinted. Another, composed by him, *De actu matrimoniali*, which contains singular opinions, is preserved in manuscript at Leipsic.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xl, 35.

Piazza, Girolamo Bartoloméo, an Italian Dominican friar, flourished in the first half of the 18th century. He was highly esteemed by his coreligionists, and was at one time judge of the Inquisition. But the cruelty and injustice of the Roman Ultramontanists caused him to withdraw from the Church of Rome. He went over to England, and was admitted into the Church of England. He taught Italian and French for many years at Cambridge, and died there about 1745. He is the author of *A Short and True Account of the Inquisition and its Proceedings, as it is Practiced in Italy, set forth in some Particular Cases* (Engl. and Fr., Lond. 1722). See Quétif and Échard, *Scriptores ordinis Prædicationum*, s. v.

Piazza, Paolo (commonly called *Padre Cosimo*), was born at Castelfranco, in the Venetian territory, in 1557. He studied under the younger Palma, and Baglioni commends him as one of his best pupils. He did not follow the style of his master, but adopted one of his own, which, though not distinguished by great vigor or energy, was graceful and pleasing, and gained him so much reputation that he was successively employed by pope Paul V, the emperor Rudolph II, and the doge Priuli. He executed many works, both in oil and fresco, for the churches and public edifices at Rome, Vienna, Venice, and other places. He was employed several years by the emperor Rudolph. Among his best works are the *Descent from the Cross* in the Campidoglio, and the *History of Antony and Cleopatra* in the Palazzo Borghese at Rome. After Piazza had acquired distinction, he joined the Capuchin friars, and took the name *Padre Cosimo*, by which appellation he is usually known. He died at Venice in 1621.

Piazzetta, Giovanni Battista, one of the most celebrated of the later Venetian painters, was born in 1682. According to Zanetti, he was instructed in the rudiments of the art by his father, a reputable sculptor in wood, and afterwards became the pupil of Antonio Molinari. His first style was distinguished for a clear and brilliant tone of coloring, but on visiting Bologna he employed himself with Spagnoletto; and by diligently studying the works of Guercino, he imitated his strong contrasts of lights and shadows, and boldness of relief, with considerable success. Lanzi says it is supposed that he had long observed the effects of lights applied to statues of wood and images of wax, and by this means he was enabled to draw with considerable judgment and exact precision the several parts that are comprehended in the shadowing; owing to which art his designs were eagerly sought after, and his works repeatedly engraved by Pitteri, by Pelli, and by Monaco, besides many other masters in Germany and elsewhere. His method of coloring, however, diminished in a great measure the chief merit of his pictures. His shades have increased and changed, his lights sunk, and his tints become yellow; so that there remains an inharmonious and unformed mass. There are a few of his pictures still in good preservation: as the *Decollation of St. John the Baptist*, in the church of that saint at Padua, placed in competition with those of the first artists in the state, and at that period esteemed best of all. "Yet if we follow him closely he will not fail to displease us by that monotonous coloring of lakes and yellows, and by that rapidity of hand called, by some, spirit, though to the judicious it often appears neglect, as if the artist were desirous of abandoning his task before it was completed." He executed many chalk-drawings which were greatly valued. He also etched a few plates from his own designs. He died at Venice in 1754. See Spooner, *Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts*, ii, 690.

Piazzi, Callisto, an Italian painter, was born at Lodi, and flourished from 1524 to 1556, as appears from

the dates on his pictures. According to Orlandi, he was one of the most successful imitators of Titian. Lanzi says that his picture of the *Assumption of the Virgin*, in the collegiate church of Codogno, is worthy of any of the disciples of Titian. It is a grand composition, containing figures of the apostles, and two portraits of the Marchesi Trivulzi. In the church of the Incoronata, at Lodi, he painted three chapels in fresco, each ornamented with four beautiful histories. One contains the *Mysteries of the Passion*, another the *Acts of St. John the Baptist*, and the third the *Life of the Virgin*. "It is currently believed," says Lanzi, "that Titian, in passing through Lodi, painted several of the heads—a story probably originating from the exceeding beauty that may be observed in them." He sometimes imitated the style of Giorgione, as may be seen in his altar-piece in the church of St. Francesco at Brescia, representing the Virgin among several saints, which is esteemed one of the most beautiful productions in that city. He executed many works for the churches in other cities, particularly at Crema and Alessandria. In the cathedral of the latter city are several of his best works. Lanzi rebukes Ridolfi, who commends him for nothing except his coloring, whereas "he boasts a very noble design, is tolerably select in his forms, and rich and harmonious in his coloring. His *Wedding at Cana*, in the refectory of the Padri Cisterciensi, at Milan, is truly a surprising production, no less for its boldness of hand than for the number of its figures, which seem to live and breathe, though the whole of them are not equally well studied, and a few are really careless and incorrect." Lomazzo also, speaking of his *Choir of the Muses*—in which he introduced the portraits of the president Sacco and his wife, for whom it was painted—says, "I may, without fear of temerity, observe that it is impossible to produce anything more perfectly graceful and pleasing, and more beautiful in point of coloring, among works in fresco."

Pi-be'seth (Heb. *id.* פִּי־בֶסֶת; Sept. Βούβαστος; Vulg. *Bubastus*), a town of Lower Egypt, mentioned but once in the Bible (Ezek. xxx, 17). In hieroglyphics its name is written *Bahest*, *Bast*, and *Ha-Bahest*, followed by the determinative sign for an Egyptian city, which was probably not pronounced. The Coptic forms are *Bast*, with the article *pi* prefixed, or *Poubaste*, *Poubast*, *Phoubasthi*, *Bouasti*, *Pouast*; and the Greek, Βούβαστις, Βούβαστος. The first and second hieroglyphic names are the same as those of the goddess of the place, and the third signifies the abode of *Bahest*, that goddess. It is probable that *Bahest* is an archaic mode of writing, and that the word was always pronounced, as it was sometimes written, *Bast*. It seems as if the civil name was *Bahest*, and the sacred *Ha-Bahest*. It is difficult to trace the first syllable of the Hebrew and of the Coptic and Greek forms in the hieroglyphic equivalents. There is a similar case in the names *Ha-Hesar*, *Bousiri*, *Pousiri*, Βούσιρις, *Busiris*. Dr. Brugsch and M. Devéria read *Pe* or *Pa*, instead of *Ha*; but this is not proved. It may be conjectured that in pronunciation the masculine definite article *pepa* or *pi* was prefixed to *Ha*, as could be done in Coptic: in the ancient language the word appears to be common, whereas it is masculine in the later. Or it may be suggested that the first syllable or first letter was a prefix of the vulgar dialect, for it is frequent in Coptic. The name of Philæ may perhaps afford a third explanation, for it is written *Eelek-t*, *Eelek*, and *P-Eelek* (Brugsch, *Geogr. Inschr.* i, 156, Nos. 626, 627); whence it would seem that the sign city (not abode) was common, as in the first form the feminine article, and in the last the masculine one, is used, and this would admit of the reading *Pa-Bast*, "the [city] of Bubastis [the goddess]." The goddess *Bast*, who was here the chief object of worship, was the same as *Pesht*, the goddess of fire. Both names accompany a lion-headed figure, and the cat was sacred to her. Herodotus considers the goddess Bubastis to be the same as Artemis (ii, 137), and that this was the current opinion in Egypt in the Greek period is evident from the name Speos Artemidos of a rock temple dedicated to *Pesht*, and probably of a neighboring town or village. The historian speaks of the annual festival of the goddess held at Bubastis as the chief and most largely attended of the Egyptian festivals. It was evidently the most popular, and a scene of great license, like the great Moslem festival of the Seyid el-Bedawi celebrated at Tanteh in the Delta (ii, 59, 60).

There are scarcely any historical notices of Bubastis in the Egyptian annals. In Manetho's list it is related that in the time of Boethos, or Bochos, first king of the 2d dynasty (B.C. cir. 2231), a chasm of the earth opened at Bubastis, and many perished (Cory's *Ancient Fragments*, 2d ed. p. 98, 99). This is remarkable, since, though shocks of earthquakes are frequent in Egypt, the actual earthquake is of very rare occurrence. The next event in the list connected with Bubastis is the accession of the 22d dynasty (B.C. cir. 990), a line of Bubastite kings (*ibid.* p. 124, 125). These were either foreigners or partly of foreign extraction, and it is probable that they chose Bubastis as their capital, or as an occasional residence, on account of its nearness to the military settlements. See MIGDOL. Thus it must have been a city of great importance when Ezekiel foretold its doom: "The young men of Aven and of Pi-beseth shall fall by the sword: and these [cities] shall go into captivity" (xxx, 17). Heliopolis and Bubastis are near together, and both in the route of an invader from the East marching against Memphis. Bubastis was situated on the west bank of the Pelusiac or Bubastite branch of the Nile, about forty miles from the central part of Memphis, and was the principal town of the Bubastite nome (Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* v, 9; Ptolemy, iv, 5). Herodotus speaks of its site as having been raised by those who dug the canals for Sesostris, and afterwards by the labor of criminals under Sabacôs the Ethiopian, or, rather, under the Ethiopian dominion. He mentions the temple of the goddess Bubastis as well worthy of description, being more beautiful than any other known to him. It lay in the midst of the city, which, having been raised on mounds, overlooked it on every side. An artificial canal encompassed it with the waters of the Nile, and was beautified by trees on its bank. There was only a narrow approach leading to a lofty gateway. The enclosure thus formed was surrounded by a low wall, bearing sculptures; within was the temple, surrounded by a grove of fine trees (ii, 137, 138). Sir Gardner Wilkinson observes that the ruins of the city and temple confirm this account. The height of the mounds and the site of the temple are very remarkable, as well as the beauty of the latter, which was "of the finest red granite." It "was surrounded by a sacred enclosure, about 600 feet square, . . . beyond which was a larger circuit, measuring 940 feet by 1200, containing the minor one and the canal." The temple is entirely ruined, but the names of Rameses II of the 19th dynasty, Userken I (Osorchon I) of the 22d, and Nekht-har-heb (Nectanebo I) of the 30th, have been found here, as well as that of the eponymous goddess *Bast*. There are also remains of the ancient houses of the town, and, "amidst the houses on the N.W. side are the thick walls of a fort, which protected the temple below" (Notes by Sir G. Wilkinson in Rawlinson's *Herodotus*, ii, 186, plan). Bubastis thus had a fort, besides being strong from its height. The city was taken by the Persians, who destroyed the walls (Diod. Sic. xvi, 51); but it was still a place of some consideration under the Romans. It was near Bubastis that the canal leading to Arsinoe (Suez) opened to the Nile (Strabo, xvii, 805; Mela, i, 9, 9; Herod. ii, 138); and although the mouth was afterwards often changed and taken more southward, it has now returned to its first locality, as the present canal of Tel el-Wadi commences in the vicinity of Tel Basta. This Tel

has recently been explored (Naville, *Bubastis*, "Eg. Explor. Fund," Lond. 1891. 4to). See Wilkinson, *Modern Egypt*, i, 300, 427-429; Ritter, *Erdkunde*, i, 825; Rosellini, *Monum. Storichi*, ii, 76 sq.; Mannert, *Geog.* x, i, 588 sq.; Malus, in the *Descr. de l'Egypte*, iii, 307.

Pic, JEAN, a young French Christian, suffered martyrdom for his devotion to the Protestant cause. He was born in 1546, and flourished at Tournay. Together with his friend, Hugo Destailleur, accused of heresy, they were proven to have circulated the Genevese tracts, and refusing to recant, were imprisoned; and March 22, 1565, were sentenced to be burned to death. They died faithful to the Lord they had decided to serve. See Hurst, *Martyrs to the Tract Cause*, p. 154–164.

Picard, Jean (1), a French priest, is noted especially as an astronomer. He was born at La Flêche, in the present department of the Sarthe, and after taking holy orders became prior of Rille, in the same department. He gave himself largely to astronomic studies, and many are his publications in this department of natural science. Picard died at Paris July 12, 1682. For a list of his publications, which are not of special interest to us, we refer to Condorcet, *Éloge de Picard;* Fontenelle, *Éloge de Picard;* and the *Biographie Universelle*, s. v.

Picard, Jean (2), a French humanist, was born in Beauvais in the 16th century. He was regular canon of St. Victor, in Paris. He died in 1617. We owe to him the edition of the chronicle of Guillaume de Neubourg (*De rebus Anglicis* [Paris, 1610, 8vo], lib. v), accompanied by the life of the author and historical notes, and that of the *Œuvres de St. Bernard* (Paris, 1615, fol.). See Moréri, *Dict. Hist.* s. v.; Papillon, *Bibl. de Burgogne*, s. v.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xl, 47.

Picard, John. See PICARDS.

Picard, Mathurin, a French ecclesiastic who flourished in the early part of the 17th century, was curate of Mesnil-Jourdain, in the diocese of Evreux. Picard is the author of a quaint book, which has become very rare, *Le Fouet des Paillards, ou juste Punition des Voluptueux et Charnels* (Rouen, 1623, 12mo). He incurred the same accusations as Urbain Grandier, and was doomed to the same penalty. His alleged crime was bewitching the nuns of Saint-Louis of Louviers, and sundry acts of profanation and debauchery. As he was tried after his death, his body was exhumed and burned at Rouen, in execution of a judgment rendered Aug. 21, 1647. See Frère, *Bibliogr. Normande.*—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xl, 48.

Picardet, CHARLES N., a French priest, was born at Dijon near the beginning of the 18th century. Before the Revolution he was canon of Saint-Jean-Baptiste of Dijon, and prior of Neuilly, near that city. He died about 1794. We have of his works, *Essai sur l'Education des petits Enfants* (Dijon, 1756, 12mo):—*Les deux Abdolonymes* (ibid. 1779, 8vo):—and *Histoire météorologique, nosologique, et économique pour l'Année* 1785. He had undertaken a considerable work, which, under the title of *Grande Apologétique*, was to contain the refutation of all heresies since the establishment of Christianity. See *Biog. Nouv. des Contemp.*—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xl, 53.

Picards, a Christian sect of heretics which arose in Bohemia in the 15th century. John Picard, the founder of the sect, whence their name, drew after him men and women to whom he promised that he would restore them to the primitive state of innocence wherein man was created. With this pretence he taught them to give themselves up to all impurity, saying that therein consisted the liberty of the sons of God, and all those not of their sect were in bondage. He first published his notions in Germany and the Low Countries, and persuaded many people to go naked, and gave them the name of *Adamites* (q. v.); and accordingly he assumed the title of *New Adam.* After this he seized on an island in the river Lausnecz, some leagues from Tabor, the headquarters of Zisca, where he established himself and his followers. His women were common, but none were allowed to enjoy them without his permission; so that when any man desired a particular woman he carried her to Picard, who gave him leave in these words: "Go, increase, multiply, and fill the earth." At length, however, Zisca, general of the Hussites (famous for his victories over the emperor Sigismond), incensed at their abominations, marched against them, made himself master of their island, and put them all to death except two, whom he spared that he might learn their doctrine.

Such is the account which various writers, relying on the authorities of Æneas Silvius and Varillas, have given of the Picards. Some, however, doubt whether a sect of this denomination, chargeable with such wild principles and such wild conduct, ever existed. It appears probable that the reproachful representations of the writers just mentioned were calumnies invented and propagated in order to disgrace the Picards, merely because they deserted the communion and protested against the errors of the Church of Rome. Lasitius informs us that Picard, together with forty other persons, besides women and children, settled in Bohemia in the year 1418. Balbinus, the Jesuit, in his *Epitome Rerum Bohemicarum*, lib. ii, gives a similar account, and charges on the Picards none of the extravagances or crimes ascribed to them by Sylvius. Schlecta, secretary of Ladislaus, king of Bohemia, in his letters to Erasmus, in which he gives a particular account of the Picards, says that they considered the pope, cardinals, and bishops of Rome as the true antichrists; and the adorers of the consecrated elements in the eucharist as downright idol worshippers. According to this author, the Picards are Vaudois, who fled from persecution in their own country and sought refuge in Bohemia. Beausobre held the same opinion, on the ground that the Vaudois were settled in Bohemia in the year 1178, where some of them adopted the rites of the Greek, and others those of the Latin Church. The former were pretty generally adhered to till the middle of the 14th century, when the establishment of the Latin rites caused great disturbance. At the commencement of the national troubles in Bohemia, on account of the opposition of the papal power, the Picards more publicly avowed and defended their religious opinions; and they formed a considerable body in an island by the river Launitz, or Lausnecz, in the district of Bechin, and, resorting to arms, were defeated by Zisca. See Hardwick, *Hist. of the M. A. Church*, p. 436; *Ref.* p. 95; Mosheim, *Church Hist.* vol. ii; and the references under ADAMITES. (J. H. W.)

Picart, Bernard, a famous French engraver, was born at Paris in 1673. He was the pupil of Le Clerc. His best works are those executed in France. Having embraced the Reformed religion, he took up his residence in Holland. In Amsterdam, to which place he accompanied his father in 1710, he worked exclusively for the booksellers, and became mannered, metallic, and merely ornamental. A great many of his prints are from his own designs, in which he imitated the style of composition of Antoine Coypel. He had a facility in imitating the styles of other earlier engravers, and he published many prints of this class which are said to have deceived collectors; Picart used to call them *Impostures innocentes*, and they were published under this title, to the number of seventy-eight, with a list of his works (Amsterdam, 1738), after his death. His prints altogether amount to about 1300, and one of the best of them is a *Slaughter of the Innocents*, after a design of his own: there are various impressions of it. He died in 1733. The French text which Picart's copper-plates were intended to illustrate was written by J. F. Bernard and Bruzen de la Martinière. The first and best edition of the work in the original French is that of 1723–37; to which should be added *Supplément* (1743, 2 vols.), and *Superstitions, Anciennes et Modernes*

(1733–36, 2 vols.). Picart is the author of a work on *The Religious Ceremonies and Customs of the several Nations of the known World*, represented in more than a hundred copper-plates, which he designed, and accompanied with historical explanations and several curious dissertations (Lond. 1731–39, 7 vols. fol.). See Duplessis, *Hist. de la Gravure en France;* Haag Frères, *La France Protestante*, s. v.; Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliogr.* s. v.; *English Cyclop.* s. v.

Picart, Étienne, called *Le Romain*, father of the preceding, also a celebrated French engraver, was born at Paris in 1631. His prints, chiefly portraits and history, are very numerous: they are finely executed, but want harmony. He worked with the graver and the etching-needle, much in the style of Poilly. He is supposed to have been called Le Romain from his long sojourn in Rome, or he assumed the name that he might not be confounded with another engraver of the name of Picart. He was engraver to the king, and a member of the French Academy of Painting, etc. He left his country because he was persecuted for his religious belief, and died at Amsterdam in 1721. He engraved many sacred subjects of the great masters, among them the *Birth of the Virgin*, after Guido; the *Marriage of St. Catharine*, after Correggio; the *Holy Family*, after Palma, etc.

Piccadori, Jean Baptiste, an Italian ascetic of some note, was born at Rieti in 1766. He entered the congregation of the regular Minorites, and professed philosophy and theology. In 1791 he obtained the professorship of morals, and kept it while he lived. He was at the same time curate of the parish of Saint-Vincent-et-Saint-Anastase, consultor of the Index, etc. In September, 1826, Leo XI appointed him superior-general of his order, in which he had occupied different minor charges. Piccadori published *Institutions éthique, ou de la Philosophie morale*, and was prevented by death from finishing *Institutions du Droit des Gens*. He died at Rome Dec. 29, 1829.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xl, 55.

Picchiani, Francesco (also called *Picchetti*), an Italian architect, was born at Ferrara in the latter part of the 17th century. He was the son, and probably the pupil, of Bartoloméo Picchiani, who erected the church del Monte della Misericordia at Naples. Francesco settled in that city, where he gained a high reputation for his talents. He was employed by the viceroy Don Pedro Arragona to assist in the construction of a basin for the royal galleys, and other vessels. He also constructed the beautiful avenue leading from the basin to the piazza of the palace, adorning it with elegant fountains. Among his other works were the church and monastery of S. Giovanni della Monache, without the Porta Alba; S. Agostino; La Divino Amore; the church and monastery de' Miracoli; and the Monte de' Poveri, in the Strada di Toledo. He died in 1690.

Picchianti, Giovanni Domenico, an Italian designer and engraver, was born at Florence about 1670. He was instructed in the rudiments of drawing by Giovanni Battista Foggini, and afterwards learned engraving. Picchianti, with Lorenzini, Mogalli, and other artists, was employed in engraving a set of plates from pictures in the Florentine Gallery. Among other works of his are the following: *The Madonna della Seggiola*, after Raffaelle; *The Virgin and Infant Jesus, with St. John*, after Anthony Caracci; *The Tribute-Money*, after Titian; *The Virgin and Infant*, after Titian; *Abraham Sending away Hagar*, after P. da Cortona.

Piccinardi, Serafino, an Italian theologian of some note, was born at Padua in 1634. He embraced the rule of St. Dominic; professed theology at Bologna, Verona, Genoa, and Milan; and was called upon, in 1669, to occupy the chair of metaphysics at the university of his native place. According to Papadopoli, he died in 1686 at Brescia; according to Échard, in 1695. He published, *Philosophiæ dogmaticæ peripateticæ Christianæ lib. ix* (Padua, 1671–1676, 2 vols. 4to):—*De approbatione doctrinæ St. Thomæ lib. vii* (ibid. 1683, 3 vols. fol.):—and *Prædestinatus* (ibid. 1686, 4to). — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xl, 55.

Piccini, Giacomo, an Italian engraver, was born at Venice in 1617. It is not known by whom he was instructed. He engraved a set of thirty portraits of the principal painters of the Venetian school, for the account of their lives by Ridolfi, published in 1648. He also engraved a few plates after the Italian masters, among which are *The Holy Family*, after P. Liberi; *Judith with the Head of Holofernes at her Feet*, and *The Holy Family*, after Titian. His plates are executed in a stiff, disagreeable style. He was living in 1669.

Piccioni, Mattéo, a painter and engraver, was born at Ancona, according to Nagler, in 1615. Little is known of him as a painter, save that he flourished at Rome, and was elected a member of the Academy of St. Luke in 1655. Lanzi says he was a fellow-student of Giovanni Antonio Galli. Bartsch gives a list of twenty-three prints by him, among which are the following: *St. Luke painting the Virgin*, after Raffaelle; *The Adoration of the Shepherds*, after P. Veronese; *The Holy Family*, after P. Veronese; *The Virgin and Infant Jesus, with St. John*, after A. Camassei; *The Exposing of Moses in the Waters of the Nile*, after A. Camassei.

Piccola, Niccola (or Niccola Lapiccola), a Sicilian painter, was born at Crotona, in Calabria Ultra, in 1730. He studied under Francesco Mancini at Rome, and acquired considerable reputation. He executed several works for the churches in that city, and decorated the cupola of a chapel in the Vatican, which was so much esteemed that it was afterwards copied in mosaic. Many paintings by Piccola are at Veletri, but none of his works are specified. He died in 1790.

Piccolomini, Alessandro, one of the most distinguished of Italian prelates of the 16th century, was born at Siena in 1508. He sprang from the same family as pope Pius II (q. v.), and by his piety, modesty, and scholarship gained great renown; but no events of his life are particularly worth recording. He deserves to be remembered for the wide extent of his writings, and the esteem in which they were held by his contemporaries and immediate followers. He died in 1578. He was of an original turn of mind, and his writings are almost all in Italian, so that he is among the earliest of those who endeavored to raise the character of vernacular literature by treating all branches of knowledge in modern tongues. His commentaries on Aristotle were prized for their good-sense, and for their abandonment of most of the scholasticisms by which that philosophy was disfigured by commentators. He advocated in 1578 the reformation of the calendar, which was afterwards adopted. In his book on the fixed stars and the sphere he adopts the mode of designating the stars by letters—a small matter, but one which makes the greater part of the immortality of Bayer, and to which the diagrams of Piccolomini establish his prior claim. His works are of a most miscellaneous character—astronomy, physics, comedies, sonnets, morals, divinity, and commentaries on Aristotle. De Thou speaks in strong terms of the rare union of diversity and depth which his acquirements presented. For a list of his most important works, and an estimate of them, see Fabiani, *Vita d' Aless. Piccolomini* (Vienna, 1749, 1759, 8vo); Ughelli, *Italia Sacra*, s. v.; Tiraboschi, *Storia della letter. ital.* vol. vii, pt. i, p. 506; Nicéron, *Mémoires*, vol. xxiii, s. v.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gén.* s. v.

Piccolomini, Francesco, an Italian philosopher, father of the preceding, was born in 1520 at Siena. At

Padua, where he pursued his studies, he was condisciple of Felix Peretti, who became pope under the name of Sixtus V, and who boasted of having worsted him in public disputation. He professed philosophy at Siena, Macerata, Perugia (1550), and finally at Padua (1560). His advanced age compelled him, in 1601, to leave the latter city and retire to Siena. He strove both by his lessons and by his writings to restore the philosophy of Plato, and to show that it is compatible after all with the principles of Aristotle. He died at Siena in 1604. He left, *Universa philosophia de moribus* (Venice, 1583, fol.); the editions of Frankfort (1601, 1611, 8vo) contain besides, under the title of *Comes politicus*, an answer to the attacks of Zabarella:—*Libri de scientiæ natura V partibus* (Frankf. 1597, 1627, 4to), which is a treatise on natural philosophy:—*De arte definiendi et eleganter discurrendi* (ibid. 1600, 4to):—*Commentaria in Aristotelem De Ortu et Interitu, De anima et De Cœlo* (Mentz, 1608, 8vo); each of these commentaries was also published separately.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xl, 67.

Picenardi, Carlo (1) (called *The Elder*), an Italian painter, who, according to Zaist, flourished at Cremona about 1600. He was of a patrician family, and a favorite pupil of Lodovico Caracci. He executed some works for the churches of his native city, and painted some burlesque histories which gained him considerable reputation. He died young.

Picenardi, Carlo (2) (called *The Younger*), son of the preceding, was born about 1610. It is not known by whom he was instructed; but, after studying at Rome, he went to Venice, and formed a style of his own, Roman in design and Venetian in coloring. On his return to Cremona he executed some works for the churches and public edifices, but painted most for the collections. Lanzi says he was very successful in burlesque histories, in imitation of the elder Picenardi. He died about the year 1680.

Pichler, Aloys, *Dr.*, one of the most prominent Roman Catholic theologians of Germany, was born in 1833 at Burgkirchen, in the diocese of Passau. He studied at the Passau Lyceum and at Munich, and in 1857 he received the prize for an essay on Polybius. Two years later he was made a priest; in 1861 he was honored with the theological doctorate, and in the following year he commenced his lectures on Church history. In 1869 he was appointed librarian at St. Petersburg; but two years later he was found to be guilty of kleptomaniac propensities in his official capacity, and as he had robbed the library of many valuable possessions, he was brought to trial, found guilty, and condemned to banishment to Siberia, where he remained till 1874, when he was pardoned through the intervention of the Bavarian prince Leopold. Pichler then returned to his native country. He died June 3, 1874, at Siegdorf, near Trauenstein. He wrote, *Geschichte des Protestantismus in der orientalischen Kirche im* 17 *Jahrhund., oder der Patriarch Cyrillus Lucaris u. seine Zeit* (Munich, 1861):—*Die orientalische Kirchenfrage nach ihrem gegenwärtigen Stande* (ibid. 1861):—*Geschichte der kirchlichen Trennung zwischen Orient und Occident* (1864–65, 2 vols.); which had the distinction of being placed on the Romish Index:—*Die Theologie des Leibnitz* (1869 sq., 2 vols.):—*Die wahren Hindernisse und die Grundbedingungen einer durchgreifenden Reform der Kirche* (1870). Towards the last he became more estranged from his Church. See Zuchhold, *Bibliotheca Theologica*, ii, 995; *Literarischer Handweiser fürs katholische Deutschland*, 1874, p. 335 sq.; Kurtz, *Lehrbuch der Kirchengesch.* 7th ed., ii, 357. (B. P.)

Pichler, Veit, a German Roman Catholic theologian and member of the Society of Jesus, was born at Berchtofen, Bavaria, in the second half of the 17th century. He entered the Jesuitic order, and was a professor of canonical law at Dillingen; became in 1716 professor of jurisprudence at Ingoldstadt, and in 1731 he obtained a professorship of jurisprudence at Munich. He died in 1736. We have of him, *Iter polemicum ad Ecclesiæ catholicæ veritatem* (Augsb. 1708, 8vo):—*Examen polemicum super Augustana confessione* (ibid. 1708, 8vo):—*Papatus numquam errans in proponendis fidei articulis* (ibid. 1709, 8vo):—*Lutheranismus constantor errans in fidei articulis* (ibid. 1709, 8vo):—*Theologia polemica* (ibid. 1719, 4to, and often):—*Summa jurisprudentiæ sacræ* (ibid. 1723, 5 vols. 8vo):—*Jus canonicum practice explicatum* (ibid. 1728, 4to; 1735, 1746, fol.).—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xl, 77.

Pichon, Jean, a French Jesuit, noted as a revivalist, was born at Lyons in 1683. He early became a preacher, but after entering the Society of Jesus in 1697, and obtaining orders, preached in missions at Rheims, Langres, and Metz. Stanislas, duke of Lorraine and Bar, gave him the direction of the missions which he founded in this country with truly royal liberality. To refute some Jansenists, who dissuaded the people from frequent communion by asserting that man must be perfect before approaching the holy table, he published *Esprit de Jésus Christ et de l'Église sur la Communion fréquente* (1745, 12mo). His book caused a great stir. It was attacked by the authors of the *Nouvelles Ecclésiastiques*, condemned by an ordinance of M. de Caylus, bishop of Auxerre (Sept. 27, 1747), and soon afterwards by other prelates, zealous partisans of the "Unigenitus bull." Jesuits and Jansenists being united against his book, Pichon retracted his obnoxious opinions in a letter to M. de Beaumont, archbishop of Paris, Jan. 24, 1748. He then went to preach at Colmar; but as it soon appeared that he was endeavoring secretly to instigate a number of German prelates against the proscription of his work in France, he was banished to Maariac (1748), and soon after compelled to leave France. Having found an asylum in the house of the bishop of Lyons (Valais), he became grand-vicar and general visitor of his bishopric. He died at Lyons May 3, 1751.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xl, 78.

Pichon, Thomas-Jean, a French littérateur, was born in 1731 at Le Mans. Having been ordained a priest, he attached himself to M. d'Avrincourt, bishop of Perpignan, by whose protection he became canon and chorister of the Sainte-Chapelle of Le Mans. He was historiographer of the king's brother, whose estate was in that part of France. At the time of the Revolution the constitutional bishopric of Sarthe was offered to Pichon; but he would accept only the situation of administrator of the hospital of Le Mans. He died at that place Nov. 18, 1812. His principal writings are, *La Raison triomphante des Nouveautés* (Paris, 1756, 12mo); it is an essay upon manners and incredulity:—*Traité historique et critique de la Nature de Dieu* (ibid. 1758, 12mo):—*Cartel aux Philosophes à quatre Pattes* (Brussels, 1763, 8vo), in which he exposes materialism:—*Mémoire sur les Abus du Célibat dans l'Ordre politique* (Amsterdam, 1763, 8vo); this memoir, quite singular and inaccurate, excited some complaints against the author:—*La Physique de l'Histoire* (La Haye, 1765, 12mo); general considerations upon the temperament and character of people:—*Les Droits respectifs de l'État et de l'Église rappelés à leurs Principes* (Paris, 1766, 12mo):—*Mémoires sur les Abus dans les Mariages* (Amsterdam, 1766, 12mo):—*Des Études théologiques* (Avignon, 1767, 12mo); researches upon the abuses which opposed the progress of theology in the public schools:—*Les Arguments de la Raison en Faveur de la Religion et du Sacerdoce* (Paris, 1776, 12mo); an examination of the treatise *De l'Homme* of Helvetius. Abbé Pichon also published the *Principes de la Religion et de la Morale* of Saurin (Amsterdam, 1768, 2 vols. 12mo), the same work as the *Esprit de Saurin* of J. F. Duranel:—*La France agricole et marchande* of Goyen (Paris, 1768, 8vo):—and *Le Sacre et le Couronnement de Louis XVI* of Gobet (Paris, 1775, 8vo and 4to), to which was added a *Journal historique* of this ceremony. See Desportes,

Bibliogr. du Maine; Quérard, *France Litter.* s. v.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xl, 79.

Pick, a name common to several Hebrew literati, of whom we mention the following:

1. Aaron.—When and where he was born, and when he became a Christian, we do not know. From his publications we see, what he states himself, that he was formerly professor of Hebrew and Chaldee at the University of Prague. He afterwards resided at London, where he published *A Literal Translation from the Hebrew of the Twelve Minor Prophets, with Notes and Critical Remarks* (Lond. 1833; 2d ed., without notes, ibid. 1835; 3d ed. 1838):—*A Treatise on the Hebrew Accents* (ibid. 1837):—*The Bible Student's Concordance, by which the English Reader may be enabled readily to ascertain the Literal Meaning of any Word in the Sacred Original* (ibid. 1840, 1850, 4to); a work of little account to scholars:—*The Gathering of Israel* (ibid. 1845). When Pick died we do not know. See Steinschneider, *Bibliographisches Handbuch* (Berl. 1859), p. 111; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s. v.

2. Israel, the founder of the Amenian Congregation, was born at Seuftenberg, Bohemia, about the year 1825. After attaining maturity, he obtained his livelihood by writing for periodicals at Vienna till the year 1852, when he received an appointment to act as rabbi for the Jewish synagogue in Bucharest, the chief city of the present Roumania. In the latter part of 1853, having been impressed in favor of the Christian religion, he boldly confessed his faith in Christ crucified; was baptized at Breslau, Silesia, Jan. 1, 1854, on which occasion Pick delivered an address to the Jews assembled at the Hofkirche. Viewing the promises given to the Jewish people in the Old Testament from a Hebraic standpoint, Pick intended to constitute in the Holy Land a congregation of the people of God, consisting of Jewish Christians. The whole Mosaic law, including the Jewish Sabbath and circumcision, alongside of baptism and the Lord's Supper, he intended to make the basis of ecclesiastical and civil organization. Here and there he was successful in winning some believers, whom he called the *Amenian* Congregation, because in Christ (the אלהי אמן, Isa. lxv, 16) all promises of the Old Covenant are yea and amen. The nucleus of this congregation was in München-Stadbach. In the year 1857 Pick went to Palestine, in order to reconnoitre the field for a settlement of his adherents, where, however, he disappeared without leaving any traces. He wrote, *Israel hat eine Idee zu tragen: ein Wort an mein Volk* (Breslau, 1854; Engl. translation, "A Word to my People," Edinburgh, 1854):—*Der Gott der Synagoge und der Gott der Judenchristen* (ibid.):—*Briefe an meine Stammesgenossen* (Hamburg, 1854):—*Der Stern aus Jacob* (ibid. 1855–56):—*Wider Stahl und Bunsen* (Barmen, 1856). See Kurtz, *Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte* (7th ed. Mitau, 1874), ii, 445; Niedner, *Lehrbuch der christlichen Kirchengeschichte* (Berlin, 1866), p. 950; *Jewish Intelligencer* (Lond. 1854), p. 302 sq.; Pick, *In Saat auf Hoffnung* (Leips.), 1857; Zuchhold, *Bibliotheca Theologica*, ii, 995. (B. P.)

Pickard, Edward, an English dissenting minister, inclined to Arianism, was born at Alcester, Warwickshire, in 1714. After studying theology, he became minister at Bermondsey in 1740, and at Carter Lane, London, in 1746. He died in 1778. He is the author of *National Praise to God for the glorious Revolution, the Protestant Succession, and the signal Successes and Blessings with which Providence has crowned us*, a sermon on Psa. cxlvii, 1 (Lond. 1761, 8vo):—*The Religious Government of a Family, particularly the Obligation and Importance of Family Worship*, in three discourses (ibid. 1762, 8vo).

Pickard, John H., a Presbyterian minister, was born in Orange County, N. C., in March, 1783. He received a limited education, and was not a graduate of any college. In 1816 he was licensed, and installed over Stony Creek and Bethesda churches, in N. C., where he continued to labor devotedly for upwards of thirty years. During the later years of his life he preached occasionally in the destitute portions of his neighborhood. He died Sept. 11, 1858. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1860, p. 77.

Pickering, George, one of the great pioneers of New England Methodism, was born in Talbot County, Md., in 1769, converted in St. George's Church, Philadelphia, when eighteen years old, and almost immediately began his public labors. In 1790 he was received on probation by the Conference, and for fifty-six years continued to receive its appointments, and lived to be the oldest active preacher in the itinerancy. He died Dec. 8, 1846, retaining his mental faculties to the last hour; and as he laid aside his armor to give up the ghost, could use such language as "All my affairs for time and eternity are settled, glory be to God." George Pickering was a rare man in all respects. Any just delineation of him must comprehend the whole man, for it was not his distinction to be marked by a few extraordinary traits, but by general excellence. In person he was tall, slight, and perfectly erect. His countenance was expressive of energy, shrewdness, self-command, and benignity; and in advanced life his silvered locks, combed carefully behind his ears, gave him a striking appearance. The exactitude of his mind extended to all his physical habits. In pastoral labors, exercise, diet, sleep, and dress, he followed a fixed course, which scarcely admitted of deviation. Almost unerring prudence marked his life. If not sagacious at seizing new opportunities, he was almost infallibly perfect in that negative prudence which secures safety and confidence. No man who knew him would have apprehended surprise or defeat in any measure undertaken by him after his usual deliberation. His character was full of energy, but it was the energy of the highest order of minds, never varying, never impulsive. He continued to the last to wear the plain, Quakerlike dress of the first Methodist ministry. His voice was clear and powerful, and his step firm to the end. His intellectual traits were not of the highest, but of the most useful order. Method was perhaps his strongest mental habit, and it comprehended nearly every detail of his daily life. His sermons were thoroughly "skeletonized." He pretended to no subtlety, and was seldom if ever known to preach a metaphysical discourse. The literal import of the Scriptures, and its obvious applications to experimental and practical religion, formed the substance of his sermons. Perspicuity of style resulted from this perspicacity of thought. The most unlettered listener could have no difficulty in comprehending his meaning, and the children of his audience generally shared the interest of his adult hearers. See Stevens, *Hist. of the Meth. Episc. Church; N. Y. Methodist*, vol. vii, No. 6; Sherman, *New England Sketches*, p. 399; Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, vii, 196–200. (J. H. W.)

Pickering, Robert, a noted Wesleyan preacher, was born at Sancton, Yorkshire, in 1786; was early converted to God, and called to the duties of the Christian ministry. Having for some time labored as a local preacher in the Hull Circuit, he offered to accompany Dr. Coke as a missionary to the East. But as Coke had obtained his complement of young men, Pickering regarded this as a providential indication that he was not intended for the mission field. Soon after he passed the required examinations, and at the Conference of 1811 was placed on the president's list of reserves. In November of the same year he was sent as temporary supply to Partington Circuit, and in the following January to Spilsby. At the Conference of 1812 he was appointed to Horncastle; and in 1813 to the Spilsby mission. His next appointment was to Louth, where he spent two years. Subsequently he travelled at Todmorden, Barnsley, and Doncaster, and in 1822 was appointed to Colne, where he remained three years. Here

his exertions, both of mind and body, in the erection of a new chapel and two preachers' houses, seriously impaired his health. In 1827 he was stationed at Kettering; next at Norwich; in 1831 at West Bromwich, and there he labored faithfully, although rapidly declining in health. While at Conference in London in 1834 he was taken very ill, and he died August 18. Pickering was a man of genuine piety. As a preacher he was a workman who needed not to be ashamed. He was well and extensively read in theology and general literature. As a man he was fearless and honorable. What he considered to be his duty he unhesitatingly discharged. See *Wesleyan Meth. Mag.* 1836, p. 889–895; 1835, p. 719. (J. H. W.)

Pickett, John R., a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born April 2, 1814, in Fairfield District, S. C., of godly parentage; was converted in 1831; called of God to the ministry, he began to preach October, 1834, and in the following spring entered South Carolina Conference. He labored faithfully and acceptably for the Church until 1862, when an attack of paralysis obliged him to take a superannuate's relation. He died March 15, 1870. He was quick in perception, patient in study, strong in will, possessed great powers of analysis, and a lively imagination. In temper he was genial, hearty, self-possessed, and confident. He had the simplicity of a child, both in and out of the pulpit. His manner in the pulpit was self-possessed and deliberate; but as he proceeded in his sermon, he generally warmed with his subject, and his voice assumed a depth and fulness of volume which was wonderful. See *Annual Minutes of the Conferences of the Meth. Episc. Church, South*, p. 420, 421.

Pico. See Mirandula.

Picot, François Edouard, a French painter, was born at Paris in 1786. He was a disciple of Vincent, and in 1811 obtained the second grand prize for paintings in France from the Academy. After studying for some time at Rome, he was intrusted with the execution of a picture representing *The Death of Sapphira* (1819) for the church of St. Séverin. In the same year he exhibited the tableau of Amor and Psyche, the figures of which, expressive of graceful naiveté, obtained great favor, and which was bought by the duke of Orleans. M. Picot was rewarded at that exhibition by a first-class medal. After this auspicious beginning he executed freely and successfully. Among his works are *Raphael and the Fornarina; The Deliverance of St. Peter; The Annunciation;* two ceilings in the Louvre, in the Musée des Antiques. Picot had a share in the work of restoration of the paintings of the Fontainebleau palace. He executed *The Crowning of the Virgin* (Notre Dame de Loretto); the paintings of the ship and choir of St. Vincent de Paul, with M. Flandrin; and some pictures in the church of St. Clotilde. M. Picot was received a member of the Académie des Beaux Arts in 1836, in the place of Charles Vernet. He was created an officer of the Legion of Honor in 1832. He died in 1870.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xl, 86.

Picot, Michel Joseph Pierre, a French writer of some note, was born March 24, 1770, at Neuville-aux-Boix, near Orleans. He was early destined for the Church, and was received at the age of thirteen in the house of the bishop of Bayeux. He studied theology at the seminary of Orleans. While professor of humanities at Meung-sur-Loire, he refused the oath required by the civil constitution of the clergy. A warrant being issued against him for his share in the evasion of a royalist, he absconded to Paris; then, submitting to the duties of the requisition which he had shirked till then, he offered to enter the marine (1793), and, after two campaigns, was employed in the equipment office at Brest. In 1797 he was released, and devoted himself to the study of the history of the Church during the 18th century. The *Mémoires* which he published in 1806 obtained the eulogies of religious societies, especially of the abbé Boulogne, who intrusted him with the redaction of the *Mémorial Catholique*, a monthly paper founded by him. In the month of April, 1814, he was called upon to manage *L'Ami de la Religion et du Roi*, which soon became the official journal of the clergy. He died Nov. 15, 1841, at Paris. He left, *Mémoire pour servir à l'Histoire ecclésiastique pendant le dix-huitième Siècle* (Paris, 1806, 1815–1816, 4 vols. 8vo; 3d edit. 6 vols. 8vo); this valuable publication is less polemical than the *Mémoires* of father d'Avrigny, of which it is a kind of continuation; but the historical part of it is weak, and the bibliography is incomplete:—*Essai historique sur l'Influence de la Religion en France pendant le dix-septième Siècle* (ibid. 1824, 2 vols. 8vo). He is the chief contributor to the collection of the *Mélanges* (9 vols. 8vo), commenced by the abbé Boulogne; and he edited in 1827 the works of that prelate, adding to the same a *Tableau religieux de la France sous le Directoire*, and a *Précis historique sur l'Église constitutionnelle*. He wrote a number of articles in the *Journal des Curés*, in the *Supplément au Dict. historique* of Feller, the *Biographie Universelle* of Michaud, etc. He bequeathed part of his rich library to the seminary of Saint-Sulpice.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xl, 85.

Picot, Pierre, a Swiss preacher, was born in 1746 at Geneva. He descended from Nicolas Picot, who left Noyon in company with Calvin, his friend, to settle in Geneva. His studies being finished, he visited France, Holland, and England, and connected himself with Franklin, who vainly urged him to accompany Cook in his second voyage around the world. After having served for ten years the Church of Sattigny, he was attached to that of Geneva (1783), and there received in 1787 the title of honorary professor of theology. He died in Geneva March 28, 1822. We have of his works, *De multiplici montium utilitate* (Geneva, 1790, 8vo):—the *Éloge historique de J. A. Mallet-Favre*, in the *Guide astronomique* of Lalande (1771):—and some *Sermons* (ibid. 1823, 8vo), remarkable for their harmony of style. See Rabbe, etc., *Biog. univ. et portat. des Contemp.*; Haag Frères, *La France Protestante*, s. v.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xl, 83.

Picot, Victor Maria, a French engraver, was born at Abbeville in 1744. About the year 1770 he went to London, where he engaged in business. He died in 1805. Nagler gives a list of thirty-six prints by him, among which is *The Four Evangelists*, after Rubens.

Picquet, François (1), a French prelate, was born at Lyons April 12, 1626. The son of a banker, he was destined to a commercial career, and travelled in France, Italy, and England. As he had thus become associated with several influential Parisians, he was in 1652 appointed to the consulship of France at Aleppo; and, although he was only twenty-six years of age, he was so successful in the discharge of his duties that the Dutch republic intrusted him with her own representation in the same city. Although a layman, he displayed extraordinary zeal for the promotion of the missionary work. He received the tonsure in 1660 at the hands of André, archbishop of Syria, who was indebted to him for his elevation. Two years afterwards he resigned the consulship and went to Rome, to give to pope Alexander VII an account of the state of religion in Syria. When he returned to France he received orders, was appointed prior of Grimand (Provence), and (1663) apostolic protonotarius. He was proposed in 1674 for the apostolic vicarate of Babylon, and became in 1675 bishop in partibus of Cæsaropolis, in Macedonia. In 1679 he embarked for Aleppo with the chevalier d'Arvieux, the new French consul, endeavored with unrelenting zeal to revive the faith of the Catholics, and started in May, 1681, as ambassador of the courts of France and Rome in Persia, with a view of working for the restoration and expansion of the Catholic faith. He arrived at Ispahan July 12, 1682, and soon after-

wards witnessed the celebrations in that city in honor of the passage of the khan of the Tartars, Usbeck, who was on his way to Mecca. He was granted an audience, harangued the khan in Italian, and obtained a promise of protection for the Roman Catholics of his lands. Towards the close of 1683 he took the same prince rich presents from the king of France, and transmitted to his sovereign the answer and presents of the Persian sovereign. That same year he was appointed bishop of Babylon, and he had arrived at Hamadan, when his impaired health compelled him to stop several months in that city, where he died, Aug. 26, 1685, after writing to the Congregation of the Propaganda for a coadjutor. A special honor was conferred on him by his burial in the church of the Armenians. Picquet furnished to Nicole several important documents for his work on the perpetuity of the faith of the Church in regard to the Eucharist.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gén.* xl, 87.

Picquet, François (2), a French missionary, was born at Bourg (in Bresse) Dec. 6, 1708. He took holy orders, and for a time preached in the diocese of Lyons, but finally entered the Congregation of St. Sulpice, and in 1735 was by it sent to Montreal, to share in the work of the North American missions. Towards 1740 he settled north of that city, near the lake of Two Mountains, where he constructed a fort with the money sent for that purpose by Louis XV, and by requisitions. With the aid of this fort he succeeded in keeping sedentary two roaming tribes, the Algonquins and Nipissings, who took to agriculture. He induced them, as well as the Trokas and Hurons, to submit to France; and during the war of 1742 to 1748, Picquet's measures for the safety of his colony were so effective that it remained untouched by English invasion. Peace being restored, he founded in 1749 a new mission near Lake Ontario, and called it La Présentation; the point occupied by it is the same where the English afterwards founded Kingston. In 1753 he arrived at Paris, and reported to the minister of the marine as to the flourishing state of the colony, which counted already no less than five hundred families. In the war that broke out soon afterwards, he put himself at the head of the Indians which he had trained, destroyed all English forts south of Ontario, and contributed to the defeat of general Braddock. After the defeat of Quebec (1759), Picquet determined to return to France by way of Louisiana. He started with twenty-five Frenchmen and two small troops of savages, which were successively relieved by others in the tribes he met; traversed Upper Canada, reached Michilimakinac, crossed Michigan, and by the Illinois and the Mississippi rivers went to New Orleans, where he spent twenty-two months. The English had offered a reward for his head. Picquet had never received any reward, except a bounty of a thousand dollars and some books in 1751. The books he had to sell to enable him to return to France, and he was compelled to live on his scanty inheritance until the assembly of the clergy of France in 1765 presented him a bounty of twelve hundred pounds, which they gave him a second time in 1770. In 1777 he undertook a journey to Rome, where Pius VI, to honor his merits, paid all his expenses, and made him a present of five thousand pounds. Picquet came home to die at Verjou, near Bourg, the house of his sister, a poor peasant-woman, July 15, 1781.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xl, 87.

Pictet, Benedict, a learned Swiss divine, was born at Geneva in 1655. He studied there under Francis Turretin, whom he succeeded as professor of theology in 1687, and obtained great celebrity. In 1690 he was made rector of the academy; in 1700 pastor of the Italian Church. He died in 1724. Pictet joined to vast erudition a vivid and natural eloquence. A list of his numerous works is given by Nicéron. Among these the following are the most important: *La Théologie Chrétienne, et la Science du Salut* (new ed. Gen. 1721, 3 vols. 4to); originally *Theologia Christiana* (ibid. 1616, 2 vols. 12mo); *Christian Theology* (translated from the Latin by the Rev. Frederick Reyroux, B.A., Lond. 1847, sm. 8vo): —*La Morale Chrétienne, ou l'Art de bien vivre* (nouv. éd. augmentée, Gen. 1709, 8 vols. 12mo); the first volume of this work appeared anonymously. It was reprinted at Lyons, in France, with a dedication to the bishop of Belley:—*Dissertation sur les Temples, leur Dédicace, et plusieurs Choses qu'on y voit, avec un Sermon* (ibid. 1716, 12mo):—*Huit Sermons sur l'Examen des Religions* (1 Thess. v, 21) (ibid. 1716, 8vo):—*Dix Sermons sur divers Sujets* (ibid. 1718, 8vo):—*L'Histoire du douzième Siècle* (Amst. 1732, 4to):—*Quatorze Sermons sur divers Sujets* (Gen. 1721, 8vo). See *Biblioth. Germanique*, s. v.; Nicéron, *Mémoires*, vol. i; Senebier, *Hist. littér. de Genève*, ii, 249 sq.; Darling, *Cyclop. Bibl.* s. v.; Mosheim, *Eccles. Hist.* vol. iii; Hook, *Eccles. Biog.* viii, 92. (J. H. W.)

Picture, the rendering in the A. V. in three passages of two Hebrew words which are from the same root (שָׂכָה, *to look at*).

1. *Maskîth*, מַשְׂכִּית, *an image;* used alone, either literally (plur. "pictures," Prov. xxv, 11) or in the sense of *imagination* ("conceit," Prov. xviii, 11; plur. "wish," Psa. lxxiii, 7); with אֶבֶן, *a stone* ("image of stone," Lev. xxvi, 1; plur. "pictures," Numb. xxxiii, 52); with חֶדֶר, *an apartment* (plur. "chambers of imagery" [q. v.], Ezek. viii, 12), "it denotes idolatrous representations, either independent images, or more usually stones 'portrayed,' i. e. sculptured in low relief, or engraved and colored (Ezek. xxiii, 14; Layard, *Nin. and Bab.* ii, 306, 308). Movable pictures, in the modern sense, were doubtless unknown to the Jews; but colored sculptures and drawings on walls or on wood, as mummy-cases, must have been familiar to them in Egypt (see Wilkinson, *Anc. Egyptians*, ii, 277). In later times we read of portraits (εἰκόνας), perhaps busts or intagli, sent by Alexandra to Antony (Josephus, *Ant.* xv, 2, 6). The 'pictures of silver' of Prov. xxv, 11, were probably wall-surfaces or cornices with carvings, and the 'apples of gold' representations of fruit or foliage, like Solomon's flowers and pomegranates (1 Kings vi, vii). The walls of Babylon were ornamented with pictures on enamelled brick."

2. *Sekiyâh*, שְׂכִיָּה, the *flag* of a ship, as seen from afar (plur. "picture," Isa. ii, 16). The Phœnician and Egyptian vessels had their flags and sails of purple and other splendid colors (see Ezek. xxvii, 7; comp. Diod. Sic. i, 51; Wilkinson, *Anc. Egypt.* iii, 211). See Standard.

Pictures, Worship of, in Churches. The use of paintings and images in churches was introduced as early as the commencement of the 4th century, but was speedily condemned by a council held at Illiberis, in Spain, A.D. 305. Individual writers also during this century bore their testimony against the practice in question. Eusebius of Cæsarea, at the beginning of the century, and Epiphanius of Salamis, towards the close of it, denounced the practice as heathenish and unscriptural (see Milner's *Hist. of the Church*, vol. iv, ch. xiii, p. 423). Nevertheless the practice of hanging up pictures of saints and martyrs, as well as symbolical representations of Scripture histories, prevailed in the 5th century. No images of God or representations of the Holy Trinity were tolerated in churches till after the second Nicene council. Pictures of Scripture scenes were hung on the walls of churches at first to aid those who could not read. The idolatrous devotion with which the Papists bow down before the images and paintings of the dead is a consequence of this practice. See Image-worship. Besides, the pictures are used by the Romanists for working upon the superstitious belief of the masses. Thus Seymour tells us the following in his *Pilgrimage:* "There is scarcely an incident in the life of our Lord that has not its rival incident or parallel in the legendary life of Mary. For example, a picture represents an angel announcing to Mary the miraculous conception of the Messiah; it is rivalled by another rep-

resenting an angel announcing to Anna, the legendary mother of Mary, the miraculous and immaculate conception of Mary in the womb. A picture represents the birth of our Lord; it is paralleled by another representing the nativity or birth of the Virgin Mary. If there is one representing our Lord sitting on the throne and bearing the crown as King of kings, there is a rival picture representing Mary sitting on the same throne, bearing the sceptre, and wearing the crown as Queen of heaven. There are two classes of miraculous pictures. One class comprehends those which are said to have had a miraculous origin; that is, to have been painted in part or in whole by no human hands, but by an angel, or some mysterious visitant from the world of spirits. The second class of miraculous pictures is far more numerous, and comprehends all those which have performed miracles. At the church of St. Giovanni e Paolo, near Rome, is a small picture of the Virgin Mary, which is said to have shed tears on the French invasion of Italy. At Arezzo we were shown a picture in the cathedral church, which wept many tears at the language of some drunkards. It was a Madonna, and the bishop made it the means of collecting sufficient funds to build a new chapel to commemorate it. In the church of St. Pietro de Montorio is a singularly ugly representation of Mary and our Lord. Indeed, it is positively hideous; but an inscription on a marble slab announces that 'this sacred likeness of the mother of God, holding her son and a book, is illustrious for miracles more and more every day.' In St. Peter's, however, is a very important one, not only for the miracle, but for its authentication. It is in the subterranean chapel, usually called the Grotto. It is a picture of the Virgin with a mark under the left eye, and the following is the inscription: 'This picture of the Most Holy Virgin Mary, which stood between the pillars of the porch of the ancient Basilica, having been struck by an impious hand, poured forth blood (sanguinem fudit) on the stone, which is now protected by a grating.' On one side is a large stone, on the other are two small stones. All three are covered with a strong iron grating, to preserve them, as on them the blood of this miraculous picture is said to have fallen." See Riddle, *Christian Antiquities;* Coleman, *Christian Antiquities.*

Pie is a table or rule which was used in the old Roman offices previous to the Reformation, showing in a technical way how to find out the service which is to be read upon each day, and corresponds to what the Greeks called *πίναξ*, or the index (literally a *plank*, by metonymy a painted table or picture); and because indexes or tables of books were formed into square figures resembling pictures or painters' tables hung up in a frame, these likewise were called *πίνακες*, or, being marked only with the first letters of the word, *πι*'s, or pies. *Pie* is the familiar English name for the Romish *pica* (*ordinal*, or service-book), which perhaps came from the ignorance of the friars, who have thrust in many barbarous words into the liturgies. Some say that the word *pye* is derived from *littera picata*, a great black letter in the beginning of some new order in the prayer, and among printers that term is still used, the pica type. See Procter. *Book of Common Prayer;* Eadie, *Eccles. Cyclop.* s. v.

Piece OF GOLD. The A. V., in rendering the elliptical expression "six thousand of gold," in a passage respecting Naaman, relating that he "took with him ten talents of silver, and six thousand of gold, and ten changes of raiment" (2 Kings v, 5), supplies "pieces" as the word understood. The similar passage respecting silver, in which the word understood appears to be shekels, probably justifies the insertion of that definite word. See PIECE OF SILVER. The same expression, if a weight of gold be here meant, is also found in the following passage: "And king Solomon made two hundred targets [of] beaten gold: six hundred of gold went to one target" (1 Kings x, 16). Here the A. V. supplies the word "shekels," and there seems no doubt that it is right, considering the number mentioned, and that a common weight must be intended. That a weight of gold is meant in Naaman's case may be inferred, because it is extremely unlikely that coined money was already invented at the time referred to, or indeed that it was known in Palestine before the Persian period. See DARIC; MONEY. Rings or ingots of gold may have been in use, but we are scarcely warranted in supposing that any of them bore the name of shekels, since the practice was to weigh money. The rendering "pieces of gold" is therefore very doubtful; and "shekels of gold," as designating the value of the whole quantity, not individual pieces, is preferable. See GOLD.

Piece OF MONEY. See KESITAH; STATER.

Piece OF SILVER. The passages in the O. T. and those in the N. T. in which the A. V. uses this term must be separately considered. See MONEY.

I. In the O. T. the word "pieces" is used in the A. V. for a word understood in the Hebrew, if we except one or two cases to be afterwards noticed. The phrase is always "a thousand" or the like "of silver" (Gen. xx, 16; xxxvii, 28; xlv, 22; Judg. ix, 4; xvi, 5; 2 Kings vi, 25; Hos. iii, 2; Zech. xi, 12, 13). In similar passages the word "shekels" occurs in the Hebrew, and it must be observed that these are either in the law, or relate to purchases, some of an important legal character, as that of the cave and field of Machpelah, that of the threshing-floor and oxen of Araunah, or to taxes, and the like (Gen. xxiii, 15, 16; Exod. xxi, 32; Lev. xxvii, 3, 6, 16; Josh. vii, 21; 2 Sam. xxiv, 24; 1 Chron. xxi, 25, where, however, shekels of gold are spoken of; 2 Kings xv, 20; Neh. v, 15; Jer. xxxii, 9). There are other passages in which the A. V. supplies the word "shekels" instead of "pieces" (Deut. xxii, 19, 29; Judg. xvii, 2, 3, 4, 10; 2 Sam. xviii, 11, 12), and of these the first two require this to be done. It becomes then a question whether there is any ground for the adoption of the word "pieces," which is vague if actual coins be meant, and inaccurate if weights. The shekel, be it remembered, was the common weight for money, and therefore most likely to be understood in an elliptical phrase. When we find good reason for concluding that in two passages (Deut. xxii, 19, 20) this is the word understood, it seems incredible that any other should be in the other places. See SHEKEL.

One of the exceptional cases in which a word corresponding to "pieces" is found in the Hebrew is in the Psalms, where presents of submission are prophesied to be made of "pieces of silver," רַצֵּי־כָסֶף (lxviii, 30, Heb. 31). The word רֵץ, which occurs nowhere else, if it preserve its radical meaning, from רָצַץ, must signify a piece broken off, or a fragment: there is no reason to suppose that a coin is meant.—Smith. Another exceptional passage is 1 Sam. ii, 26, where the Heb. word rendered "piece [of silver]" is אֲגוֹרָה, *agorâh*, which seems to signify a small piece of money, as *wages*, from the idea of *collecting* (root אגר, to gather). See SILVER. For the "pieces of silver" in Josh. xxiv, 32, see KESITAH.

II. In the N. T. two words are rendered by the phrase "piece of silver," drachma, *δραχμή*, and *ἀργύριον*. (1.) The first (Luke xv, 8, 9) should be represented by *drachm*. It was a Greek silver coin, equivalent, at the time of Luke, to the Roman denarius, which is probably intended by the evangelist, as it had then wholly or almost superseded the former. See DRACHMA. (2.) The second word is very properly thus rendered. It occurs in the account of the betrayal of our Lord for "thirty pieces of silver" (Matt. xxvi, 15; xxvii, 3, 5, 6, 9). It is difficult to ascertain what coins are here intended. If the most common silver pieces be meant, they would be denarii. The parallel passage in Zechariah (xi, 12, 13) must, however, be taken into consid-

eration, where, if our view be correct, shekels must be understood. It may, however, be suggested that the two thirties may correspond, not as of exactly the same coin, but of the chief current coin. Some light may be thrown on our difficulty by the number of pieces. It can scarcely be a coincidence that thirty shekels of silver was the price of blood in the case of a slave accidentally killed (Exod. xxi, 32). It may be objected that there is no reason to suppose that shekels were current in our Lord's time; but it must be replied that the tetradrachms of depreciated Attic weight of the Greek cities of Syria of that time were of the same weight as the shekels which we believe to be of Simon the Maccabee [see MONEY], so that Josephus speaks of the shekel as equal to four Attic drachmæ (*Ant.* iii, 8, 2). These tetradrachms were common at the time of our Lord, and the piece of money found by Peter in the fish must, from its name, have been of this kind. See STATER. It is therefore more probable that the thirty pieces of silver were tetradrachms than that they were denarii. There is no difficulty in the use of two terms, a name designating the denomination and "piece of silver," whether the latter mean the tetradrachm or the denarius, as it is a vague appellation that implies a more distinctive name. In the received text of Matthew the prophecy as to the thirty pieces of silver is ascribed to Jeremiah, and not to Zechariah, and much controversy has thus been occasioned. The true explanation seems to be suggested by the absence of any prophet's name in the Syriac version, and the likelihood that similarity of style would have caused a copyist inadvertently to insert the name of Jeremiah instead of that of Zechariah. See SILVERLING.

Pierce, Edward, an English painter who flourished in the reigns of Charles I and II, was eminent both in history and landscapes. He also drew architecture, perspective, etc., and was much esteemed in his time. But there is little of his work now remaining, the far greater part being destroyed in the fire of London, 1666. It chiefly consisted of altar-pieces, ceilings of churches, and the like; of these there is one yet remaining, done by him, in Covent Garden Church, where are to be found many admirable parts of a good pencil. He worked some time for Vandyck, and several good pieces by Pierce are to be seen at Belvoir Castle, in Leicestershire. He died in London about the close of the 17th century.

Pierce, George Edmond, D.D., an American Congregational divine, noted especially as an educator, was born at Southbury, Conn., Sept. 9, 1794. He was educated at Yale College, class of 1816; then studied theology at Andover Theological Seminary, class of 1821, teaching at the same time at the Fairfield Academy. In July, 1822, he was ordained pastor of the Congregational Church at Harwinton, where he remained until called to the presidency of the Western Reserve College in 1834. He remained at the head of this high school until 1855, and gave to it an excellent reputation. He died at Hudson, Ohio, May 27, 1871.

Pierce, Gershom, a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in the closing quarter of the last century. He was converted about 1800, and called of God to the work of the sacred ministry; joined the Methodist Episcopal Church, and entered in 1803 the New York Conference. His first appointment was at Plattsburgh. In 1804 he preached at Fletcher; 1805, Niagara; 1806, Oswegatchie; 1807, Dunham; 1808, Saratoga; 1809–10, Granville; 1811, Thurman; 1812, Grand Isle; 1813–14, Cambridge; 1815–16, Montgomery; 1817–18, Sharon; 1819, Albany; 1820, Coeymans; 1821–22, Chatham; 1823–24, Granville; 1825–26, Pittsfield; 1827, Burlington; 1828–29, Redding; 1830–31, Hempstead and Huntington. At the Conference of 1832 he became superannuated, and continued in that relation to the period of his death. Mr. Pierce was a man of much more than ordinary ability. His intellect, in force and habit, is best described by the expression "long-headed." He was a devout man, at times a most powerful preacher. His sermons, weighty with thought, fervid with feeling, and in power of the Holy Spirit, made a deep and abiding impression. He died in much peace at Milan, Ohio, March 23, 1865. See Smith, *Sacred Memories*, p. 288 sq.

Pierce, James Edwin, an American divine of note, was born at West Townsend, Vt., in 1839. He graduated at Middlebury College in 1861, and at Auburn Theological Seminary in 1865. On his graduation he was elected to a professorship (of the Hebrew language and literature) in the last-named institution, which position he retained till his death (at Auburn, July 13, 1870). He was a close student, a thorough and able teacher, and an impressive and popular preacher.—Appleton's *Amer. Cyclop.* x, 570.

Pierce, John, D.D., a noted American Congregational minister, was born at Dorchester, Mass., July 14, 1773. He was educated at Harvard University, class of 1793, and then became a tutor in his alma mater. Descended of very humble parentage, he had made his way to college by his own exertions, and maintained his position by the force of his own industry. Feeling persuaded that his work was that of the Christian ministry, he took up the study of theology, and March 15, 1797, was ordained over the First Congregational Church, Brookline, Mass., of which he was sole pastor for half a century. He died in this place Aug. 24, 1849, respected by all who knew him, and greatly mourned by the ecclesiastic body to which he belonged. Dr. Pierce was member of the Academy of Arts and Sciences, and of the Massachusetts Historical Society. For several years he was president of the Massachusetts Bible Society. In all matters appertaining to family and literary statistics he was a prodigy. He had 18 quarto vols. of 600 pages each, of his own MS., containing memoirs and memorabilia. He published *Half-century Discourse at Brookline* (Mar. 1847):—*Sketch of Brookline*, in "Mass. Hist. Collections," 2d ser. vol. ii:—*Sermon at Ordination of S. Clark* (1817):—*Dudleian Lect.* (1821); also occasional *Sermons*, etc. See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, viii, 331; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s. v. (J. H. W.)

Pierce, John J., a Presbyterian minister, was born in Vermont in 1791. He secured his early education principally by his own exertions; graduated at Princeton College in 1820, and at the theological seminary in the same place in 1823. He was licensed by the New Brunswick Presbytery, and began preaching at Portsmouth, Va., where he remained until 1824, when he left for Clarksville, Tenn. In 1825 he was elected president of an academy in Elkton, Ky., which position he held until 1837. Soon after he occupied temporarily the place of one of the professors in Centre College, Danville, Ky.; then returned again to Elkton; but subsequently left, and spent two years in teaching in Illinois and Missouri. On his return he took charge of Ridgewood Church, Ky., where he continued to labor until his death, March 18, 1861. Mr. Pierce was a pure-hearted, simple-minded man; never attaining any very eminent success in the ministry, but ever contented and happy. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1862, p. 116. (J. L. S.)

Pierce, Thomas, D.D., an English divine of note, flourished near the middle of the 17th century. He was educated at Magdalen College, Oxford, and after graduation was presented with a fellowship. In 1648 he was ejected for nonconformity, but was restored under the Protectorate, and became prebend of Canterbury and Lincoln; in 1661 president of Magdalen College; in 1671 dean of Salisbury. He died in 1691. Dean Pierce was a man of more than ordinary talent and acquisition. In theology he was decidedly Arminian, and published a number of occasional sermons, theolog-

ical treatises, and controversial tracts. Among these we mention, *The Sinner Impleaded in his own Court, wherein are represented the Great Discouragements from Sinning which the Sinner receiveth from Sin itself* (Lond. 1656, 8vo):—*The Divine Philanthropie defended against the Declamatory Attempts of certain late printed Papers, entitled, A Correptory Correction. In Vindication of some Notes concerning God's Decrees, especially of Reprobation* [against Barlee] (Lond. 1657, 4to):—*A Collection of Sermons upon Several Occasions* (Oxf. 1671, 4to):—*A Correct Copy of some Notes concerning God's Decrees, especially of Reprobation* (Oxf. 1671, 4to):—*Pacificatorium Orthodoxæ Theologiæ Corpusculum. Secundæ huic editioni accesserunt, De perfectissimo Dei cultu ad normam divinam exigendo* [Anon.] (Lond. 1685, sm. 8vo). Dean Pierce also greatly assisted bishop Walton in the publication of the Polyglot Bible. He was the decided antagonist of Baxter, and, according to Watson, "compelled that great controversialist to quail before him" (*Works*, i, 469). See Wood, *Athenæ Oxonienses;* Lowndes, *Brit. Librarian*, p. 1080; Watts, *Bibl. Brit.* s. v. (J. H. W.)

Pierce, Thomas A., a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born in Fauquier Co., Va., Oct. 25, 1819; was converted at the age of twenty; and feeling called of God to the work of the sacred ministry, joined the Virginia Conference at Charlottesville in the fall of 1847, and was appointed to the Stafford Circuit. In 1848 he was sent to Rappahannock and Culpepper; in 1849 he went to King William, where he travelled two years; in 1852 and 1853 he labored on the James City and New Kent Circuit; in 1854, in King George; 1855, in New Hampshire; 1856 and 1857, in Hanover. In 1858 he was again in King William; in 1859 he was sent to Greensville; in 1860 and 1861 he had his pastoral charge in Mecklenburg; in 1862 and 1863, in Campbell; 1864 and 1865, in Appomattox. In all of these appointments he labored like a man of God, and was instrumental in doing much good. Failing health obliged him in 1866 to take a superannuated relation. He died Feb. 26, 1867. See *Minutes of Ann. Conf. of the M. E. Church. South*, 1868.

Pieri, Stefano, a Florentine painter, born in 1513, and a pupil of Battista Naldini. He passed much of his life at Rome, where he was patronized by cardinal Alessandro Medici, by whom he was employed in the church of S. Prassede, where he painted the *Annunciation* and some pictures of the apostles. He executed other works for the churches at Rome and Florence, in which latter city he assisted Vasari in the cupola of S. Maria del Fiore. Lanzi says one of his best works is the *Sacrifice of Isaac*, in the Palazzo Pitti. Another fine picture is the *Assumption of the Virgin*, in the church of S. Maria in Via, at Rome. His works are well designed, but Baglioni censures them as being dry and hard. He died at Rome in the year 1600.

Pieritz, Joseph Abraham, a noted Anglican divine, was born of Jewish parentage in the year 1815 at Kletzko, in Prussia. At the age of twenty-three Pieritz became a Christian by being baptized at London. Four years later "the London Society for Propagating the Gospel among the Jews" appointed him a missionary among his brethren, and for about eight years he faithfully discharged his duty in that relation, residing in different places in the west of England. In the year 1851 he accepted an appointment to a pastoral charge in British Guiana. For about twenty years he labored as rector of the parish of St. Patrick, in the town of New Amsterdam, in the colony of British Guiana, where he died, Oct. 16, 1870. See *Jewish Intelligencer* (London), 1838, p. 292; 1870, p. 20; *Report of the London Society*, 1851, p. 34; Kalkar, *Israel und die Kirche*, p. 172. (B. P.)

Pierius, surnamed *the younger Origen*, a disciple of Origen, was distinguished in the Church of the 3d century as a scholar and author of high repute. We know nothing of his personal history, and his writings are no longer extant, or at least are inaccessible.

Pierpont, Hezekiah B., an American Presbyterian minister, was a native of Connecticut, and was born about 1791. In 1821 he came to New York state and settled at Rochester, and soon after was ordained a Presbyterian minister. He became the pastor of a Church in Hopewell, Ontario Co., for several years. He was then called to the pastorate at Avon, and there he lived until about 1861, when he moved to Rochester, N. Y., where he died in 1871, beloved by all his acquaintances for his many social and genial qualities. Indeed, none knew him but to honor him, both as a Christian and as a gentleman. "He lived a long life of usefulness as a pastor of the Presbyterian Church, and died full of years, in the blessed consciousness of a blameless life as an honored servant of God's ministry."

Pierpont, James, a noted New England Congregational minister of colonial days, was born at Roxbury, Conn., in 1661. He was educated at Harvard College, where he graduated in 1681; was ordained fourth minister in New Haven, Conn., in 1685, and retained that connection until his death in 1714. In the year 1698 Mr. Pierpont was one of three ministers who concerted the plan of founding a college—a plan which took effect in the establishment of Yale College in 1700. As one of the original trustees of the institution he was untiringly active; and it was through his influence, in no small degree, that the distinguished individual from whom it received its name was induced to make it the object of his liberal benefactions. Dwight, in his life of Edwards, states that Mr. Pierpont read lectures to the students in Yale College as professor of moral philosophy. This, however, Dr. Bacon considers doubtful, as the college was not removed from Saybrook till after Mr. Pierpont's death. Of the famous synod held at Saybrook in 1708, for the purpose of forming a system that should better secure the ends of Church discipline and the benefits of communion among the churches, Mr. Pierpont was a prominent member. The "Articles" which were adopted as the result of the synod, and which constitute the well-known "Saybrook Platform," are said to have been drawn up by him. The only publication of Mr. Pierpont was a sermon preached at Boston, in Cotton Mather's pulpit, in 1712, entitled *Sundry false Hopes of Heaven discovered and decryed.* Mather introduces the sermon with a short preface, in which he says of the author, "He has been a rich blessing to the Church of God." New Haven values him, all Connecticut honors him—they have cause to do so. Dr. Bacon writes thus concerning him:

> "That we are not able to form so lively an idea of him as of Davenport is partly because his life was shorter, and was less involved in scenes of conflict, and partly, no doubt, because his nature and the early discipline of Divine Providence had less fitted him to make himself conspicuous by the originality and energy of his character, and to leave his image stamped with ineffaceable distinctness on the records of his times. In the pulpit Mr. Pierpont was distinguished among his contemporaries. His personal appearance was altogether prepossessing. He was eminent in the gift of prayer. His doctrine was sound and discriminating, and his style was clear, lively, and impressive, without anything of the affected quaintness which characterized some of the most eminent men of that day."

See Sprague, *Annals of the American Pulpit*, i, 205, 206; Bacon, *Historical Discourses*, p. 171 sq.; id. *Genesis of the New England Churches.* (J. H. W.)

Pierpont, John, an eminent American Unitarian divine, noted especially for his part in temperance and antislavery movements, was born in 1785 at Litchfield, Conn., and graduated at Yale College in 1804. The years immediately after his leaving college were occupied in teaching, a part of the time at the South and afterwards in New England, and he then studied law and settled at Newburyport. The war of 1812 interfered with his professional prospects, and he forsook the law for business, but met with indifferent success,

both at Boston and Baltimore, and in 1818 he entered the Cambridge Divinity School. Less than a year after this time he was installed as pastor of the Hollis Street Unitarian Church at Boston, succeeding the Rev. Dr. Holley, and for twenty-five years he held the pastorate of that church. At first he was successful, popular, and strongly beloved by his people, but the latter part of his ministry was clouded with troubles and dissensions between himself and prominent men of his society on the temperance question, which were never amicably adjusted. While settled at Boston he visited Europe and Palestine. In 1845 he became the first pastor of the Unitarian Church at Troy, N. Y. After a four years' pastorate there he received a call to Medford, where was his last ministerial experience. After this he identified himself with the Spiritualists, having become an enthusiastic believer in animal magnetism. The breaking out of the rebellion found Mr. Pierpont at his home in Medford, but the wear and tear of over seventy-five years of life had not been sufficient to keep him quietly at his fireside while parishioners and friends were hastening to the front to uphold the government which he loved and honored. He sought a post of duty at once, and governor Andrew yielded to his request, and appointed him chaplain of the Twenty-second Regiment. The exposure of camp-life and duties on the field proved beyond his strength, and he was soon compelled to resign his place, much to his regret. Secretary Chase then appointed him to a clerkship in the treasury department, and his clerical duties were always faithfully performed, and he proved a valuable and efficient officer. He died in 1866, while yet in the employ of the government. Mr. Pierpont was a thorough scholar, a graceful and facile speaker, a poet of rare power and pathos, a most earnest advocate of the temperance and antislavery movements, and a man whose convictions, purposes, and impulses were always sincerely expressed. His strong desire for securing advancement and reform may have led him sometimes into injudicious steps, and diminished his influence for the causes he sought to advance, but his heart was always right; and temperance, freedom, and Christianity had no firmer and more consistent friend or advocate. He leaves an enviable reputation as a poet, and his pathetic "Passing Away" will live as long as our language is spoken or written. In addition to his poetical works, he published at Boston several popular school-readers, and some twenty occasional sermons and discourses. See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s. v.; *Christian Examiner*, Nov. 1866, art. v; *Atlantic Monthly*, Dec. 1866; Appleton's *Annual Cyclopædia*, 1866, p. 617. (J. H. W.)

Pierquin, Jean, a French ecclesiastic, noted especially as a writer, was born Feb. 15, 1672, at Charleville. After taking holy orders, he was in 1699 appointed curate of Châtel, in the Ardennes, where he spent his whole life, dividing his time between works of charity and literary pursuits. He died March 10, 1742. He published, *Vie de St. Tuvin, Hermite* (Nancy, 1732, 8vo):—*Dissertations physico-théologiques sur la Conception de Jésus dans le Sein de la Vierge Marie, sa mère* (Paris, 1742, 12mo), in which work he gives some physical account of the manner in which the divine act of generation took place, etc.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xl, 128.

Pierre, St. See Peter.

Pierre, Jean Baptiste Maria, a French painter, was born at Paris in 1715. It is not known by whom he was instructed; but he went, when quite young, to Rome, where he remained several years. On his return to Paris he distinguished himself as a historical painter; and executed several works for the churches and public edifices, which gained him great reputation. He was appointed painter to the king, and elected member of the academy at Paris. One of his greatest works was the ceiling of the chapel of the Virgin, in the church of St. Sulpice, which has been engraved by Nicholas Dupuis. He also etched a few plates from his own designs and those of others. He died in 1789.

Pierson, Abraham, an American Congregational divine and educator, was born at Lynn, Mass., in 1641. Abraham, his father, first minister of Southampton, L. I. (born in Yorkshire, England, in 1608, died Aug. 9, 1678), was one of the first settlers of Newark in 1677, and was the first minister of that town. He preached to the Indians of Long Island in their own language, and contributed *Some Helps for the Indians in New Haven Colony to a further Account of the Progress of the Gospel in New England* (1659). His son, Abraham, Jun., was educated at Harvard University, where he graduated in 1668. After studying theology, he was ordained colleague with his father at Newark, N. J., March 4, 1672, and was minister at Killingworth, Conn., from 1694 until his death, March 5, 1707. Mr. Pierson was identified with the founding of Yale College, was anxiously desired for its first principal, and did instruct for a time at Killingworth, though he never moved to Saybrook, where the commencements of Yale were held in its earliest days, because his parishioners would not suffer him to leave them. He was taken ill in the midst of the agitation regarding his college duties, and died before he could settle the case. President Clapp, in his *History of Yale College*, says of rector Pierson that he was "a hard student, a good scholar, a great divine, and a wise, steady, and judicious gentleman in all his conduct." See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, i, 116 sq.; Bacon, *Genesis of the New England Churches*. (J. H. W.)

Piĕtas, a virtue which denotes veneration for the Deity, and love and tenderness to our friends, and especially dutifulness to parents. It received divine honors among the Romans, and was made one of their gods. Acilius Glabrio first erected a temple to this new divinity, on the spot where a woman had fed with her own milk her aged father, who had been imprisoned by order of the senate, and deprived of all aliment. The goddess is seen represented on Roman coins as a matron, throwing incense upon an altar, and her attributes are a stork and children. See Cicero, *De Div.* 1; Val. Maximus, v, 4; Pliny, vii, 36; Zumpt, in the *Class. Museum*, iii, 452.

Pietism is the specific appellation of a phase of religious thought which developed itself especially within the pale of the German Lutheran Church in the 18th century. Like English Methodism, it originated in a period of indifference to religion, and, like it also, aimed to supersede dead faith, knowledge without life, form without spirit, worldliness under the cloak of religion, by *life*—a spiritual and living faith. Like Methodism, it laid great stress on the necessity of the new birth; it prohibited certain amusements and modes of life until then considered as at least harmless; and it encouraged private assemblies of Christian persons for purposes of edification, such as the study of the Scriptures or the interchange of spiritual experiences. Like Methodism, too, it encountered at first no little ridicule, and even persecution. It was accused of being an attempt to found a new sect, and was vehemently opposed on this ground; but, unlike Methodism, though it did here and there give rise to some insignificant bodies of separatists, it never broke off from the national Church of the country, but remained as a movement within its pale.

The development of German Lutheranism, which really means German Protestantism, repeats in a most peculiar manner the course of the general Church previous to it. As in the first four centuries the productive spirit of the Church proposed to itself the view of Christianity as a whole, so also was the time from the beginning of the Reformation to the *Augsburg Confession* (q. v.) one pre-eminently creative, and it laid the foundation of the Lutheran Church as regards its confession of faith. With the endeavor pervading the 5th, 6th, and

7th centuries more distinctly to work out the single doctrines corresponds the work of the Lutheran Church up to the time of the *Formula Concordiæ* (q. v.), by which the various differences of doctrines were to be settled. As the Church of the Middle Ages had handed down to it, as a firm foundation, the doctrinal matter produced by the fathers and sanctioned by the Church, which scholasticism then undertook to work out and digest in a systematic manner, so there arose in the 17th century —the Protestant Middle Ages—a scholasticism which put into a regular form the Lutheran confession of faith embodied in the *Formula Concordiæ*. As in the Middle Ages mysticism stands side by side with the strict representatives of scholasticism, so the Protestant mystics, Jacob Böhme (q. v.), Arndt, and others, stand by the side of an effete orthodoxy. This mystical tendency acquired an importance about the end of the 17th and the beginning of the 18th centuries. A parallel again between this period and that of the 14th century is obvious. In the 14th century the romantic spirit had become extinct; scholasticism had outdone itself; from France there flowed over Europe a worldly spirit; the Roman spirit had decayed; everything was in dissolution. Then from the reaction against the externalized scholasticism and secularized life there broke forth on all sides and in the most varied forms mysticism, which had in itself a Reformatory feature. In like manner after the Thirty-years' War the blossom of Germany had withered; the religious spirit, which since the period of the Reformation had been the first power in Germany, had stepped into the background; while, on the other hand, the secular spirit had been let loose, along with a powerful retinue of immorality, especially by the preponderance of France under Louis XIV. It was a dreary period in German history.

Politically the empire had fallen asunder into a number of separate despotic little states; and the sentiment of national unity had become so nearly extinct that the loss of the fertile and beautiful Alsace to France seems to have been viewed with wonderful indifference. Socially the life of the people had greatly deteriorated. The rural population was terribly diminished in numbers and wealth; their means of communication were restricted by the destruction of their horses and the neglect of the roads; their schools had disappeared, and were but very slowly replaced; their new houses and churches were bare and barn-like compared to the old ones; their periodical gatherings for certain purposes of local self-government or for festivities had fallen into disuse. It was a vegetating sort of existence, and the writers of the following age bear testimony to the illiteracy and coarseness of manners which prevailed towards the end of the 17th century even among the gentry of the country districts. In the towns things were but little better. The commerce of Germany had received a serious check; her merchant-princes had sunk to the level of petty traders, and adopted the manners and culture of the latter class. Her old free cities were decaying; only a few of the newer ones were growing, and what intellectual life then existed centred in them, as at Hamburg or Berlin, or at the court of any sovereign who specially protected letters, or still more at the universities. Throughout this period Germany contributed only one really great name to literature—that of Leibnitz; while in France it was the age of military glory and social brilliancy—of Racine and Molière, of Fénelon and Bossuet, of Bayle and Voltaire. German men and women therefore found their own life mean and tiresome, and were carried away by admiration of their splendid neighbor, till it became the fashion to imitate whatever was French in manners, dress, or tone of thought, and the very language was wretchedly corrupted by the intermixture of French phrases. Of course there was a class, of which king Frederick William I of Prussia may be taken as the type, who hated foreign ways, and upheld whatever was most antiquated and unrefined as peculiarly German; but in general the tide set in favor of the foreigners. The French were now the great models, and very unfortunate ones for a people whose natural genius was so totally different. German literature reached its lowest ebb under these influences. One of the earliest signs, if not the first sign, of its revival was a rebellion against French classicism, and an admiration for the master writers of English—Shakespeare and Milton.

Religion suffered under the same depression. On the one hand was a rigid Lutheranism which had petrified what had once been living convictions into dead dogmas, and which gave its whole attention to controversies about definitions of doctrines in which the people had ceased to feel a genuine interest. On the other hand was a genteel indifference which idolized "enlightenment" (the favorite watchword of that period), and indemnified itself for its compliance with certain outward observances by laughing at the whole affair in private. Rabener, a satirist of this period, when characterizing the earlier part of the 18th century, says: "There was a time in Germany when no satire could be witty at the expense of anything but the Bible, and there were lively heads which had, so to speak, a complete satirical concordance in readiness, that their wit might never run dry. . . . If a groom is conscious of possessing a more cultivated mind than the dairymaid, he startles her by a jest on some text or hymn; all the servants scream with laughter, all admire him, down to the very cowboy, and the poor dairymaid, who is not so witty, stands there abashed." When the danger seemed imminent that the great work of the Reformation would prove in vain, and that it would soon come to ruin, providential supply and guidance came in the pietistic spirit which arose. Indeed, the learned Dorner holds, with a large number of others, that this new tendency was a necessary stage in the development of Protestantism—a supplement of the Reformation—and that Spener, the father of pietism, was the veritable successor of Melanchthon.

But we must first learn what pietism proposed to do before we can properly appreciate its historical importance. Pietism commenced upon the principle that the Church was corrupt; that the ministry were generally guilty of gross neglect; and that the people were cursed with spiritual death. It therefore proposed, as a theological means of improvement: 1. That the scholastic theology, which reigned in the academies, and was composed of intricate and disputable doctrines, and obscure and unusual forms of expression, should be totally abolished. 2. That polemical divinity, which comprehended the controversies subsisting between Christians of different communions, should be less eagerly studied and less frequently treated, though not entirely neglected. 3. That all mixture of philosophy and human science with divine wisdom was to be most carefully avoided; that is, that pagan philosophy and classical learning should be kept distinct from, and by no means surpersede Biblical theology; but, 4, that, on the contrary, all those students who were designed for the ministry should be accustomed from their early youth to the perusal and study of the Holy Scriptures, and be taught a plain system of theology, drawn from these unerring sources of truth. 5. That the whole course of their education was to be so directed as to render them useful in life, by the practical power of their doctrine and the commanding influence of their example. But it was not intended to confine these reforms to students and the clergy. Religious persons of every class and rank were encouraged to meet in what were called Biblical colleges, or colleges of piety (we might call them prayer-meetings), where some exercised in reading the Scriptures, singing, and prayer, and others engaged in the exposition of the Scriptures; not in a dry and critical way, but in a strain of practical and experimental piety, whereby they were mutually edified. This practice, which always more or less obtains where religion flourishes (as, for instance, at the Reformation), raised the same sort of outcry as at

the rise of Methodism; and those who entered not into the spirit of the design were eager to catch at every instance of weakness or imprudence, to bring disgrace on that, which, in fact, brought disgrace upon themselves, as lukewarm and formal Christians. "In so saying, Master, thou reproachest us also."

The person who began this religious movement was John Arndt (1555–1621), who wrote *The True Christian*, a work as useful religiously as Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress* or Doddridge's *Religion in the Soul*. Spener followed (1635–1705). The private religious meetings which he established about 1675, *Collegia Pietatis*, were the origin of the application of the name pietism to the movement. One of his pupils was the saintly A. H. Francke (q. v.). Paul Gerhard, the well-known author of the German hymns, also belonged to the same party. The revival feeling spread rapidly through Germany, where the institution of the "Collegia," being in complete accord with the national instinct, soon attained great popularity. Up to 1686 pietism had spread without exciting commotion, no persecution having yet been attempted. But when in this year Spener removed to Dresden, and several of his students made bold to lecture at the University of Leipsic, in imitation of their leader's practice, giving in their lectures particular prominence to the correction of the errors contained in Luther's translation of the Bible, the great body of Lutherans, who had been accustomed to regard this translation as little short of inspired, took umbrage at such freedom of criticism, and at the practice of these Pietists who lectured in the popular tongue. All kinds of adverse rumors were circulated, they were maligned in many ways, and complaints were made to the university authorities. When these popular agitations were ignored, there followed tumults of so violent a character as to spread throughout Leipsic the seeds and principles of mutiny and sedition, and finally the matter was forced to public trial. Of course the pious and learned men above mentioned were, indeed, declared free from the errors and heresies that had been laid to their charge, but were, at the same time, prohibited from carrying on the plan of religious instruction they had undertaken with such zeal. It was during these troubles and divisions that the invidious designation *Pietists* was first invented; it may at least be affirmed that it was not commonly known before this period. It was at first applied by some giddy and inconsiderate persons to those who frequented the Biblical colleges, and lived in a manner suitable to the instructions and exhortations that were addressed to them in these seminaries of piety. It was afterwards made use of to characterize all those who were either distinguished by the excessive austerity of their manners, or who, regardless of truth and opinion, were only intent upon practice, and turned the whole vigor of their efforts towards the attainment of religious feelings and habits. But as it is the fate of all those denominations by which peculiar sects are distinguished to be variously and often very improperly applied, so the title "Pietist" was frequently given in common conversation to persons of eminent wisdom and sanctity, who were equally remarkable for their adherence to truth and their love of piety; and not seldom to persons whose motley characters exhibited an enormous mixture of profligacy and enthusiasm, and who deserved the title of delirious fanatics better than any other denomination. This contest was by no means confined to Leipsic, but spread with incredible celerity through all the Lutheran churches in the different states and kingdoms of Europe. For from this time, in all the cities, towns, and villages where Lutheranism was professed, there started up, all of a sudden, persons of various ranks and professions, of both sexes, who declared that they were called by a divine impulse to pull up iniquity by the root; to restore to its primitive lustre and propagate through the world the declining cause of piety and virtue; to govern the Church of Christ by wiser rules than those by which it was at present directed; and who, partly in their writings and partly in their private and public discourses, pointed out the means and measures that were necessary to bring about this important revolution. Several religious societies were formed in various places, which, though they differed in some circumstances, and were not all conducted and composed with equal wisdom, piety, and prudence, were, however, designed to promote the same general purpose. In the mean time these unusual proceedings filled with uneasy and alarming apprehensions both those who were intrusted with the government of the Church and those who sat at the helm of the state. These apprehensions were justified by this important consideration, that the pious and well-meaning persons who composed these assemblies had indiscreetly admitted into their community a number of extravagant and hot-headed fanatics, who foretold the approaching destruction of Babel (by which they meant the Lutheran Church), terrified the populace with fictitious visions, assumed the authority of prophets honored with a divine commission, obscured the divine truths of religion by a gloomy kind of jargon of their own invention, and revived doctrines that had long before been condemned by the Church. The most violent debates arose in all the Lutheran churches; and persons whose differences were occasioned rather by mere words and questions of little consequence than by any doctrines or institutions of considerable importance, attacked one another with the bitterest animosity; and in many countries severe laws were at length enacted against the Pietists. These revivers of piety proposed to carry on their plan without introducing any change into the doctrine, discipline, or form of government that were established in the Lutheran Church.

At the head of this movement stood, in Germany, the learned and pious Spener, whose sentiments were adopted by the professors of the new Academy of Halle; and particularly by Francke and Paulus Antonius, who had been invited thither from Leipsic, where they began to be suspected of pietism. Though few pretended to treat either with indignation or contempt the intentions and purposes of these good men (which, indeed, none could despise without affecting to appear the enemy of practical religion and virtue), yet many eminent Lutheran divines, and more especially the professors and pastors of Wittenberg, being of opinion that, in the execution of this laudable purpose, several unorthodox maxims were adopted and certain unwarrantable measures employed, proceeded publicly against Spener in the year 1695, and afterwards against his disciples and adherents, as the inventors and promoters of erroneous and dangerous opinions. These debates turned upon a variety of points, and therefore the matter of them cannot be comprehended under any one general head. If we consider them indeed in relation to their origin, and the circumstances that gave rise to them, we may be able to reduce them to some fixed principles. We have already said that those who had the advancement of piety most zealously at heart were possessed of a notion that no order of men contributed more to retard its progress than the clergy, whose peculiar vocation it was to inculcate and promote it. Looking upon this as the root of the evil, it was but natural that their plans of reformation should begin here; and accordingly they laid it down as an essential principle that none should be admitted into the ministry but such as had received a proper education, were distinguished by their wisdom and sanctity of manners, and had hearts filled with divine love. Hence they proposed, in the first place, a thorough reformation of the schools of divinity; and they explained clearly enough what they meant by this reformation, as we have seen above. As these maxims were propagated with the greatest industry and zeal, and were explained inadvertently by some without those restrictions which prudence seemed to require, these professed patrons and revivers of piety were suspected of designs that could not

but render them obnoxious to censure. They were supposed to despise philosophy and learning; to treat with indifference, and even to renounce, all inquiries into the nature and foundations of religious truths; to disapprove of the zeal and labors of those who defended it against such as either corrupted or opposed it; and to place the whole of their theology in certain vague and incoherent declamations concerning the duties of morality. Hence arose those famous disputes concerning the use of philosophy and the value of human learning, considered in connection with the interests of religion; the dignity and usefulness of systematic theology; the necessity of polemic divinity; the excellence of the mystic system; and also concerning the true method of instructing the people. The second great object that employed the zeal and attention of the persons now under consideration was that the candidates for the ministry should not only for the future receive such an academical education as would tend rather to solid utility than to mere speculation, but also that they should dedicate themselves to God in a peculiar manner, and exhibit the most striking examples of piety and virtue. This maxim, which, when considered in itself, must be considered to be highly laudable, not only gave occasion to several new regulations, designed to restrain the passions of the studious youth, to inspire them with pious sentiments, and to excite in them holy resolutions, but also produced another maxim, which was a lasting source of controversy and debate, viz.: "That no person who was not himself a model of piety and divine love was qualified to be a public teacher of piety, or a guide to others in the way of salvation." This opinion was considered by many as derogatory to the power and efficacy of the Word of God, which cannot be deprived of its divine influence by the vices of its ministers, and as a sort of revival of the long-exploded errors of the Donatists; and what rendered it peculiarly liable to an interpretation of this nature was the imprudence of some Pietists, who inculcated and explained it without those restrictions that were necessary to render it unexceptionable. Hence arose endless and intricate debates concerning the following questions: "Whether the religious knowledge acquired by a wicked man can be termed theology?" "Whether a vicious person can, in effect, attain a true knowledge of religion?" "How far the office and ministry of an impious ecclesiastic can be pronounced salutary and efficacious?" "Whether a licentious and ungodly man cannot be susceptible of illumination?" and other questions of a like nature. These revivers of declining piety went still farther. In order to render the ministry of their pastors as successful as possible in rousing men from their indolence, and in stemming the torrent of corruption and immorality, they judged two things indispensably necessary. The first was to suppress entirely, in the course of public instruction, and more especially in that delivered from the pulpit, certain maxims and phrases which the corruption of men leads them frequently to interpret in a manner favorable to the indulgence of their passions. Such, in the judgment of the Pietists, were the following propositions: No man is able to attain to that perfection which the divine law requires; good works are not necessary to salvation; in the act of justification, on the part of man faith alone is concerned, without good works. The second step which they took in order to give efficacy to their plans of reformation was to form new rules of life and manners, much more rigorous and austere than those that had formerly been practiced; and to place in the class of sinful and unlawful gratifications several kinds of pleasure and amusement which had hitherto been looked upon as innocent in themselves, and which could only become good or evil in consequence of the respective characters of those who used them with prudence or abused them with intemperance. Thus dancing, pantomimes, public sports, theatrical diversions, the reading of humorous and comical books, with several other kinds of pleasure and entertainment, were prohibited by the Pietists as unlawful and unseemly, and therefore by no means of an indifferent nature. The third thing on which the Pietists insisted was that, besides the stated meetings for public worship, private assemblies should be held for prayer and other religious exercises. The University of Halle, which had been founded for the avowed purpose of promoting the pietistic movement, finally became its home and centre; and the Orphan-house established in that town by A. H. Francke, and renowned all over Europe, one of its most effective agencies. Besides, it became a living proof that pietism was not only able to combat the religious errors of the times, but also to grapple with the grave wants of common life. Is not that a good and safe theology which, in addition to teaching truth, can also clothe the naked and feed the hungry? It has been charged against the Pietists that they wrote but little. Writing was not their mission. It was theirs to act, to reform the practical life and faith of the people, not to waste their strength in a war of books. They wrote what they needed to carry out their lofty aim; and this was perhaps sufficient. They did lack profundity of thought; but let it be remembered that their work was restorative, not initial. Yet we would not leave the impression that pietism did not exert any influence as a literary light. The theological instruction of Francke and his coadjutors in the University of Halle was very influential. During the first thirty years of its history six thousand and thirty-four theologians were trained within its walls, not to speak of the multitudes who received a thorough academic and religious instruction in the Orphan-house. The Oriental Theological College, established in connection with the university, promoted the study of Biblical languages, and originated the first critical edition of the Hebrew Bible. Moreover, it founded missions to the Jews and Mohammedans. From Halle streams of the new life flowed out until there were traces of reawakening throughout Europe. First, the larger cities gave signs of returning faith; and the universities which were most bitter against Spener were influenced by the power of the teachings of his immediate successors. Pietism propagated its influence by means of Bengel in Würtemberg and the University of Tübingen, and in Moravia through Zinzendorf. Arnold and Thomasius belonged to this party at the beginning of the 18th century. Oettinger at Tübingen, Crusius at Leipsic, and, to a certain extent, Buddeus also, partook of the spirit of pietism. The opposition of the old Lutheran party of other parts of Germany produced controversies which continued till about 1720 (for an account, see Weismann, *Mem. Eccl. Hist. Sacr.* [1745], p. 1018 sq.). Zurich, Basle, Berne, and all the larger towns received it with gladness. It penetrated as far east as the provinces bordering on the Baltic Sea, and as far north as Denmark, Norway, and Sweden. Many of the continental courts welcomed it, and orphan-houses, after the model of Francke's, became the fashion of the day. The Reformed Church was influenced and impelled by it, and even England and the Netherlands indicated a strong sympathy for its practical and evangelical features. No higher tribute can be paid it than that of Tholuck, who avers "that the Protestant Church of Germany has never possessed so many zealous Christian ministers and laymen as in the first forty years of the 18th century."

With a new generation of professors at Halle—among them C. B. Michaelis, the younger Francke, Freilinghausen, the elder Knapp, Callenberg, and Baumgarten—taking the place of their more vigorous predecessors, pietism began to lose its first power and earnest spirit. The persistent inquiry into scriptural truth passed over into a tacit acquiescence of the understanding. Reliance was placed on the convictions, more than on the fruits of study. Spener had blended the emotions of the mind and heart, reason and faith, harmoniously; but

the later Pietists cast off the former and blindly followed the latter. Hence they soon found themselves indulging in superstition, and repeating many of the errors of some of the most deluded Mystics. Science was frowned upon, because of its supposed conflict with the letter of Scripture. The language of Spener and Francke, which was full of practical earnestness, came into disuse. Definitions became loose and vague. The "Collegia," which had done so much good, now grew formal, cold, and disputatious. The missions, which had begun very auspiciously, dwindled from want of means and men. External life became pharisaical. Great weight was attached to long prayers. The duke of Coburg required the masters of schools to utter a long prayer in his presence, as a test of fitness for advancement. Pietism grew mystical, ascetic, and superstitious. Some of its advocates and votaries made great pretensions to holiness and unusual gifts. This had a tendency to bring the system into disrepute in certain quarters, though the good influences that it had exerted still existed and increased. It might disappear, but the good achieved by it would live after it. Pietism, though it ceased its aggressive power after Francke and Thomasius, was destined to exert a reproductive power long afterwards. From their day to the present, whenever there has arisen a great religious want, the heart of the people has been directed towards this same agency as a ground of hope. Whatever be said against it, it cannot be denied that it has succeeded in finding a safe lodgment in the affections of the evangelical portion of the German Church. Even in our own century the Church has had recourse to pietism as its only relief from a devastating rationalism; not the pietism of Spener and Francke, we acknowledge, but the same general current belonging to both. Its organ was the *Evangelical Church Gazette*, in 1827, and among the celebrities who attached themselves to it we find the names of Heinroth, Von Meyer, Schubert, Von Raumer, Steffens, Schnorr, and Olivier. Pietism lacked a homogeneous race of teachers. Here lay the secret of its overthrow. Had the founders been succeeded by men of much the same spirit, and equally strong intellect, its existence would have been guaranteed, so far as anything religious can be promised in a country where there is a state Church to control the individual conscience. The great mistake of Lutheranism was in its failure to adopt it as its child. The sceptical germ which soon afterwards took root, gave evidence that it could cause its overthrow for a time, at least; but the evils of rationalism were partially anticipated by the practical teachings of the Pietists.

The inference has frequently been drawn that the two tendencies — the dogmatic and the pietistic — which marked the religious life of Germany at the opening of the 18th century, ministered indirectly to the production of scepticism; the dogmatic strictness stimulating a reaction towards latitude of opinion, and the unchurchlike and isolating character of pietism fostering individuality of belief. This inference is, however, hardly correct. Dogmatic truth in the corporate Church, and piety in the individual members, are ordinarily the safeguards of Christian faith and life. The danger arose in this case from the circumstance that the dogmas were emptied of life, and so became unreal; and that the piety, being separated from theological science, became insincere. Rationalism in Germany, without pietism as its forerunner, would have been fatal for centuries. But the relation of these tendencies, so plainly seen in the ecclesiastical history of Germany, is one of long standing. From the days of Neo-Platonism to the present they have existed, the good to balance the evil, faith to limit reason. They have been called by different names; but Christianity could little afford to do without it or its equivalent in the past, and the Church of the future will still cling as tenaciously and fondly to it or to its representative. A recent author who has shown a singular facility in grouping historical periods and discovering their great significance, says: "Pietism went back from the cold faith of the 17th century to the living faith of the Reformation. But just because this return was vital and produced by the agency of the Holy Spirit, it could not be termed a literal return. We must not forget that the orthodoxy of the 17th century was only the extreme elaboration of an error, the beginning of which we find as far back as Luther's time, and which became more and more a power in the Church through the influence of Melancthon. It was this: Mistaking the faith *by which we believe* for the faith *which is believed*. The principle of the Reformation was justification by faith, not the doctrine of faith *and* justification. In reply to the Catholics it was deemed sufficient to show that this was the true doctrine which points out the way of salvation to man. The great danger lay in mistaking faith itself for the doctrine of faith. Therefore, in the controversies concerning justifying faith, we find that faith gradually came to be considered in relation to its doctrinal aspects more than in connection with the personal, practical, and experimental knowledge of men. In this view pietism is an *elaboration* of the faith of the 16th century. . . . So far from being heterodox, Spener even expressed himself in the most decided manner in favor of the doctrines of the Church. He would make faith consist less in the dogmatism of the head than in the motions of the heart; he would bring the doctrine away from the angry disputes of the schools and incorporate it into practical life. He was thoroughly united with the Reformers as to the real signification of justifying faith, but these contraries which were sought to be re-established he rejected. . . . From Spener's view a new phase of spiritual life began to pervade the heart. The orthodoxy of the state Church had been accustomed to consider all baptized persons as true believers if only they had been educated in wholesome doctrines. There was a general denial of that living, conscious, self faith which was vital in Luther, and had transformed the world. The land, because it was furnished with the Gospel and the sacraments, was considered an evangelical country. The contrast between mere worldly and spiritual life, between the living and dead members of the Church, was practically abolished, though there still remained a theoretical distinction between the visible and invisible Church. As to the world outside the pale of the Church, the Jews and heathen, there was no thought whatever. Men believed they had done their whole duty when they had roundly combated the other Christian churches. Thus lived the state Church in quiet confidence of its own safety and pure doctrine at the time when the nation was recovering from the devastations of the Thirty-years' War. 'In the times succeeding the Reformation,' says a Würtemberg pastor of the past century, 'the greater portion of the common people trusted that they would certainly be saved if they believed correct doctrines; if one is neither a Roman Catholic nor a Calvinist, and confesses his opposition, he cannot possibly miss heaven; holiness is not so necessary after all'" (Auberlen, *Die göttliche Offenbarung*, i, 278–281).

The enemies of pietism have confounded it with mysticism. There are undoubted points in common, but pietism was aggressive instead of contemplative; it was practical rather than theoretical. Both systems made purity of life essential, but mysticism could not guard against mental disease, while pietism enjoyed a long season of healthful life. The latter was far too much engaged in relieving immediate and pressing wants to fall into the gross errors which mark almost the entire career of the former. Pietism was mystical in so far as it made purity of heart essential to salvation; but it was the very antipodes of mysticism when organized and operating against a languid and torpid Church with such weapons as Spener and his coadjutors employed. Böhme and Spener were world-wide apart in many respects, but in purity of heart they were beautifully in unison.

A brief account of pietism is given in Hase's *Church Hist.* § 409; and for a fuller account, see Schröckh, *Kirchengesch. seit der Ref.* viii, 255–291; Pusey, *On German Theology*, pt. i (p. 67–113); pt. ii, ch. x; Amand Saintes, *Crit. Hist. of Rationalism*, ch. vii. Spener's character and life may be seen in Canstein's memoir of him; and in Weismann, p. 966–972. A philosophical view of pietism, as a necessary stage in the development of German religious life, is given by Dorner in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1840, pt. ii, p. 137, "Ueber den Pietismus." Kahnis, who himself quotes from it (*Hist. of Germ. Prot.* p. 102), regards pietism as ministering indirectly to rationalism; much in the same way as bishop Fitzgerald criticised the similar evangelical movement of England (*Aids to Faith*, p. 49, etc.). The best account of pietism is to be found in Horsbach, *Spener u. seine Zeit.*; Bretschneider, *Die Grundlage des evangelischen Pietismus*; Marklin, *Darstellung u. Kritik des modernen Pietismus.* See also Hurst, *Hist. of Rationalism*, ch. ii and iii; Hurst's Hagenbach, *Church Hist. of the 18th and 19th Centuries*; Winkworth, *Christian Singers of Germany*, p. 257 sq.; *Meth. Qu. Rev.* April, 1865, p. 316; *Bibliotheca Sacra*, July, 1865, p. 522; 1864, p. 224; Gass, *Dogmengesch.*; Haag, *Hist. des Dogmes.*

Pietosi is the name of a celebrated Jewish family, called in Hebrew בן הענוים, which, like the families בן התפוחים and בן הנצרים, traced their origin to those Jews who were led into captivity after the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus and Vespasian. To this family belong the following:

1. Benjamin de, *ben-Abr.*, *b.-Jech.*, *b.-Abr. Rofe*, of Rome, who flourished in the middle of the 13th century, is the author of שער עץ חיים, a didactic poem (Prague, 1598):—פיוטים ושיירים, religious hymns. See Zunz, *Synagogale Poesie*, p. 313–315; id. *Literaturgeschichte der synagog. Poesie*, p. 362 sq.; Steinschneider, *Catalogus Libr. Hebr. in Bibl. Bodl.* p. 2767 sq.; Dukes, *Ozar Nachmad*, ii, 199.

2. Jacob de, of Italy, wrote ברית יעקב, a great collectaneum of diverse matters (Livorno, 1800):—רנו ליעקב, novellas on the treatises *Chullin* and *Temura* (ibid. 1810):—מזבח כפרה, another collectaneum (ibid.).

3. Zidkia de, a brother of Benjamin, wrote שבלי חלקט, on Jewish rites and precepts (Venice, 1546; Sulzbach, 1699; Dubno, 1794). See Wolf, *Bibl. Hebr.* i, 1001; iii, 961; iv, 962; Schorr, *Kritische Untersuchung über das Werk Schibbale ha-Leketh in Zijjon* (Frankfort-on-the-Main, 1841), i, 147 sq.; Fürst, *Bibl. Jud.* iii, 100. (B. P.)

Pietro, Michéle di, an Italian prelate of note, was born Jan. 18, 1747, at Albano. After defending in public disputation at Rome with great success some theological propositions, he was appointed professor of ecclesiastical history in the Gregorian university, and of canonical law at the Roman archi-gymnasium. He took an important share in the work of the congregation which examined the decisions of the Synod of Pistoja favorable to Jansenism, and contributed with the learned Gerdil to the redaction of the bull *Auctorem fidei* (1794). Pius VI, when he left Rome (1798), made him apostolical legate, and he had to give his advice in many a delicate question; for instance, in that of the oath of hatred against royalty which was exacted from French clergymen. Pius VII appointed him successively patriarch of Jerusalem, cardinal (Feb. 23, 1801), and prefect of the Propaganda. When this pontiff was forced to leave Rome (1809), Pietro was chosen to occupy his place; but he was soon compelled to betake himself to Paris, and upon his refusal to attend the religious celebration of Napoleon's marriage with Maria Louisa, he was punished with banishment, loss of the ensigns of his dignities, and confiscation of his income. Relegated to Saumur with cardinals Gabrielli and Oprizzoni, confined in 1810 in the dungeon of Vincennes, he joined the pope in 1813 at Fontainebleau, and was again separated from him in January, 1814. The political situation finally allowed him to return to Rome, and he became grand penitentiary, prefect of the Index, bishop of Albano (1816), and of Porto and Santa-Ruffine (1820). He died at Rome July 2, 1821. This prelate, remarkable for his circumspection and flexibility, was considered one of the luminaries of the Sacred College, for his theological lore and administrative abilities.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xl, 205.

Piety occurs but once in the A. V.: "Let them learn first to show *piety* at home" (τὸν ἴδιον οἶκον εὐσεβεῖν, better, "towards their own household," 1 Tim. v, 4). The choice of this word here instead of the more usual equivalents of "godliness," "reverence," and the like, was probably determined by the special sense of *pietas*, as "erga parentes" (Cicero, *Partit.* 22; *Rep.* vi, 15; *Inv.* ii, 22). It does not appear in the earlier English versions, and we may recognise in its application in this passage a special felicity. A word was wanted for εὐσεβεῖν which, unlike "showing godliness," would admit of a human as well as a divine object, and this *piety* supplied.—Smith.

Piety, or godliness, only another name for personal religion, consists in a firm belief, and in right conceptions of the being, perfections, and providence of God; with suitable affections to him, resemblance of his moral perfections, and a constant obedience to his will. The different articles included in this definition, such as knowledge, veneration, love, resignation, etc., are explained in their proper places in this work. For *Perverted Piety*, see Ethics.

Piga, Meletius, an Eastern prelate, flourished in the second half of the 16th century. He was in 1591 exarch of the Church of Constantinople, and shortly after that time was chosen to fill the chair of St. Mark's. As patriarch of Alexandria, Piga distinguished himself by great devotion to ecclesiastical studies, and as the author of one or two controversial writings for the Slavonic Church, which was exposed to the intrusion of Romanism.

Pigenat, François, a French preacher of the Jesuitic order, was born at Autun near the close of the 15th century. He early became a member of the Society of Jesus, and at Paris was one of the most zealous preachers of the League. In September, 1588, he was, in a somewhat quaint manner, elected curate of St. Nicolas des Champs, Legeay having been expelled by his parishioners as suspected of Huguenotism. Henry III said on that occasion that "Parisians were kings and popes, and if you only let them have their own way, they will soon dispose of the whole spiritual and temporal power of the realm." In January, 1589, Pigenat preached at Paris the funeral sermon of the duke and cardinal of Guise, assassinated at Blois by order of the king, and gave them the title of martyrs. Pigenat took a conspicuous part in all the absurd and obscene processions of the time. He organized one in his own parish, where over a thousand persons, of both sexes and every age, were marched half naked, the curate himself having only a white robe to cover him. He was one of the first to sign the deposition of Henry III, and became a member of the council of Quarante. He was by his friends claimed to be inspired, but royalist writers call him "a troublesome liar, false prophet, promoter of every kind of crime, who receives from the Spanish court numbers of doubloons for his vociferating in the chair and in the public thoroughfares." After the murder of Henry III, Pigenat transferred his animosity to Henry IV, declaring that "it was not in the power of God that the Bearnais should be converted, that the pope could not absolve him and put him on the throne, and that if he did he would be excommunicated himself." Pigenat did not live to see Henry IV make his entrance into Paris. He died in 1590. Ac-

cording to L'Estoile, he was not destitute of talent and imagination.

His brother, ODON PIGENAT, provincial of the Jesuits and one of the Seize, was also a chief of the League. He died at Bourges of an attack of frenzy.

A third member of the same family, JEAN PIGENAT, lived at the same time. He left *Aveuglement des Politiques, Hérétiques, et Maheustres*, etc. (Paris, 1592, 8vo). —Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xl, 205.

Pigeon is the rendering—but only in connection with the epithet "young"—of two very different Heb. and one Gr. word: יוֹנָה, *yonâh*, *περιστερά*, a general name for any member of the dove family ("dove" everywhere, except in the Mosaic enactment, Lev. i, 14; v, 7, 11; xii, 6, 8; xiv, 22, 30; xv, 14, 29; Numb. vi, 10; Luke ii, 24); but in Gen. xv, 9, גּוֹזָל, *gozâl*, the *young* of any bird, perhaps there correctly of the dove, although in Deut. xxxii the "young" of the eagle is meant. The Biblical passages in which the pigeon is mentioned may be classified as follows:

1. Pigeons or doves were the only birds used for sacrifices (comp. already Gen. xv, 9), in particular young pigeons (בְּנֵי הַיּוֹנָה, *pulli columbini*) and turtle-doves, which were sacrificed, sometimes with other offerings (Lev. xii, 6, in purifying women after childbed), sometimes alone as free-will offerings made by fire (Lev. i, 14); or were prescribed in the purifications from leprosy (Lev. xiv, 22), from personal uncleanness (Lev. xv, 14); that of Nazarites (Numb. vi, 10), and of women after menstruation (Lev. xv, 29). But in two cases, where poverty interfered with more costly sacrifices, these were substituted (Lev. v, 7 sq.; xii, 8. Comp. Luke ii, 24). Such offerings of birds were also made by the poor in Egypt. (See Pausan. x, 32, 9. Comp. Engel, *Cyprus*, ii, 184 sq.) For the purpose of providing these sacrifices, dealers in pigeons used to sit in the neighborhood of the Temple (Matt. xxi, 12; Mark xi, 15; John ii, 14, 16); and the raising of doves was from an early day a pursuit peculiar to the Jews (Isa. lx, 8. Comp. Rosenmüller, *Morgenl.* vi, 283), although there were also many wild pigeons in Palestine (Ezek. vii, 16. Comp. Schubert, iii, 250), which built their nests in clefts of the rocks (Jer. xlviii, 28; Cant. ii, 14; Robinson, ii, 433), or at least sought a refuge there when chased (Psa. xi, 1. Comp. *Iliad*, xxi, 493 sq.; Quint. *Smyrn.* xii, 12 sq.). See Schwebel, *De columbarum cultu* (Onold. 1767); Wernsdorf, *De columb. sacra Syrorum* (Helmst. 1761).

2. The flight of the pigeon was employed by the poet as a figure for swiftness (Psa. lv, 7; Hosea xi, 11. Comp. Soph. *Œd. Col.* 1081; Eurip. *Bacch.* 1090; Robinson, ii, 484), and is so understood by many interpreters in several passages of the New Testament (Matt. iii, 16; Mark i, 10; John i, 32) in which the Holy Spirit's descent is spoken of, but this may be doubted. The figure is carried out still further by Isaiah (lx, 8), and it is true that the pigeon surpasses in swiftness and directness of flight many birds of its size, without, however, being remarkable in this respect (Virg. *Æn.* v, 213 sq.; Plin. x, 52). The cause of this may be found in its long wings (Rechstein, *Naturgesch.* iv, 2), by means of which it often escapes the birds which would prey upon it (Plin. x, 52; Phædr. i, 323; Ælian, *Animal.* iii, 45). In songs of love, the eyes of the beloved, as expressive of attachment and of innocence, are compared with those of the dove, or, as some say, with little doves (Cant. i, 15; iv, 1). And in Cant. v, 12 it is said, "*His eyes are like doves over brooks of water, bathed in milk, resting in fulness*;" a very beautiful description of the swimming apple of the eye. (The explanation of these words by Umbreit and Döpke is in better taste than that of Rosenmüller.) The voice of the dove is represented by the poets as a *sigh*, an expression of sorrow (הגה, Isa. xxviii, 14; lix, 11; Nah. ii, 8. Comp. Ezek. vii, 16; Theocr. vii, 141; Virg. *Eclog.* i, 59; Martial, iii, 59, 19; and quotations from the Oriental poets in Jones, *Poes. Asiat.* p. 346 sq.; Gesen. *Comment. on Isa.* i, 992). To the white and glimmering plumage reference is made in Psa. lxviii, 14; on which we remark that, according to Hasselquist (*Travels*, p. 553), the pigeons of Palestine have usually whitish-gray feathers on the neck, head, breast, and shoulders. In the comparison used by Jesus (Matt. x, 16), the dove is the image of innocence. (Comp. Schöttgen and Wetstein, ad loc.)

3. Psa. lv, 7 was understood by the Hebrew interpreters as affording a trace of the use of carrier-pigeons among the ancient Jews; their use being common now in the East. (See Arvieux, *Nachr.* v, 422; Troilo, *Trav.* p. 610 sq.; Russell, *N. H. of Aleppo*, ii, 90; and especially Bochart, *Hieroz.* ii, 542; J. De Sacy, *La Colombe messagère*, from the Arabic of Michael Sabbagh [Par. 1805]; and on the use of them in ancient times, especially in sieges, see Ælian, *V. H.* ix, 2; Plin. x, 53; *Front. Strateg.* iii, 13, 8.) But the words of this passage contain no such reference. Some would also refer to the same birds the words in Psa. lvi, 1 (Lengerke, *Ken.* p. 166), but without reason. (See Gesen. *Thes.* i, 104.) See DOVE; TURTLE-DOVE.

Piggott, JOHN, an English Baptist divine, flourished in the second half of the 17th century, and was very popular in his day, especially in his own religious denomination. As a religious instructor, he taught with clearness and argued with strength, exhorted with vehemence and reproved with becoming authority. He published, *Account of J. Pilkington's Recantation of Romanism* (Lond. 1669, 4to):—*Eight Separate Sermons* (1700–1709, all 8vo):—*Eleven Sermons* (1714, 8vo); with the last is the sermon preached at Piggott's grave by the Rev. J. Stenneth. See Skeats, *Hist. of the Free Churches of England*, p. 261; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s. v.

Pighius, ALBERT, whose family name was *Van Campen*, was born about the year 1490 at Campen, in the Netherlands. He studied first philosophy and mathematics at Louvain, then theology, on which he lectured at the latter place and at Cologne, where he had also been honored with the doctorate of divinity. He accompanied pope Adrian VI (q. v.) to Spain and Italy, and after the death of Adrian he resided at Rome, and acted on several important missions as the representative of Rome, as at Worms and Regensburg. Under pope Paul III (q. v.) he was made provost of the church of St. John at Utrecht, where he died, Dec. 24, 1543. Although Pighius was very fierce against Protestants, yet among his own coreligionists his orthodoxy to the Catholic faith was doubted very much. Of his works we mention, *Adversus Prognosticatorum vulgus, qui animas prædictiones edunt et se astrologos mentiuntur, astrologiæ defensio*:—*De æquinoctiorum solstitiorumque inventione, nec non de ratione paschalis celebrationis et de restitutione ecclesiastici calendarii*:—*Adversus novam Marci Beneventani astronomiam apologia*:—*Assertio hierarchiæ ecclesiasticæ lib. vi* (Cologne, 1538, and often):—and *De libero hominis arbitrio et divina gratia libri x adversus Lutherum, Calvinum, et alios*, to which Calvin replied in his *Defensio sanæ et orthodoxiæ doctrinæ de Servitute et Liberatione humani Arbitrii advers. Calumnias Alb. Pighii Campensis* (Geneva, 1545), published in his tractatus. See Dupin, *Nouvelle Bibliothèque des Auteurs ecclésiastiques*, etc., t. xvi; Bayle, *Dict.* s. v.; Schweizer, *Centraldogmen*, i, 180; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* s. v.; *Theologisches Universal-Lexikon*, s. v.; Jöcher, *Gelehrten-Lexikon*, s. v.; Hagenbach, *History of Doctrines*, ii, 197 sq. (B. P.)

Pigneau de Béhaine, PIERRE-JOSEPH, a French missionary, was born Dec., 1741, at Origny (Thiérache). He was brought up in the College of Laon, and studied theology at the Séminaire des Trente-Trois at Paris. After taking holy orders, he embarked at Cadiz, in the beginning of 1756, for the Oriental missions, unknown

to his parents, who were opposed to his design. In 1767 he arrived at the island of Hon-Dat, near the coast of Cochin-China. The apostolic vicar of that mission, M. Piguel, bishop of Champa in partibus, gave him the direction of his college, which he was then transferring to that place. In 1768 the governor of the province Kan-Rao, to which the island of Hon-Dat belonged, ordered him to be arrested, and sentenced him to the cangue, with another French missionary and a Chinese priest. They endured the torment with patience, and after three months' captivity were set at large. Pigneau resumed the direction of his college, and transferred it to Pondicherry. In 1770 he was appointed bishop of Adran in partibus, and coadjutor of the apostolic vicar of Cochin-China, whom he soon after succeeded in his office. In 1774 he entered Cochin-China by the Cambodia. He found the whole country in the power of rebels, who had put to death the king and his nephew. The brother of the latter, Nguyén-Auts, who had been imprisoned, escaped and fled to the house of the bishop of Adran, where he was concealed for a month. He succeeded afterwards in bringing together a small force, took possession of Lower Cochin-China, and called to his side his benefactor, and was, in all he did, directed by his advice. In 1783 he was beaten by the rebels, and had to flee the country. Pigneau then, taking along the pupils of his college, went to the Cambodia, and thence to Siam. Having embarked for Pondicherry, he heard, while sailing along the coast of Cambodia, that Nguyén-Auts was at a short distance on the coast; he joined him, who, with about six hundred soldiers, was reduced to the last extremity of starvation. He relieved them with his own provisions, and after spending a fortnight with them, he gained Pulo-Way, a small deserted island, situated sixty leagues from the continent. He stayed there nine months, during which time he wrote, in company with a Cochin-Chinese priest, instructions for the religious worship, and corrected several works translated from the French. In December, 1784, he joined again the king of Cochin-China, and soon after went in person to solicit the assistance of Louis XVI for his friend, taking along with him the six-year-old son of the Asiatic prince. He arrived at Lorient February, 1787. His embassy was a successful one. France engaged to send four frigates and nearly two thousand soldiers to Cochin-China, and obtained in compensation the principal harbor of that country, Touron. Louis XVI appointed Pigneau his plenipotentiary, and had his prebend presented by him to Nguyén-Auts. The bishop, who had received rich presents himself, embarked for Pondicherry with the young prince, carrying to count Thomas Conway, governor-general of the French settlements, the blue cordon he had obtained for him, with the direction to prepare and command in person the projected expedition; but various obstacles, among others the Revolution, prevented it, and the bishop could only equip two little ships, which he loaded with ammunition, guns, etc. Count Conway put also at his disposition a frigate, on board of which he sailed to Cochin-China, where he joined the king in December, 1789. The arrival of these subsidies, the clever exertions of the French officers, who in a short time equipped a powerful fleet, and organized an army of six thousand soldiers after the European fashion, gave the victory to the king. The bishop was hopeful of turning to the advantage of religion the influence he had won, when he died of dysentery, Oct. 9, 1799. In August, 1861, the French government restored the tomb of Pigneau de Béhaine, and proclaimed it French property.—Hoefer, *Nour. Biog. Générale*, xl, 224.

Pignone, Simone, an Italian painter, who, according to Orctti, was born at Florence in the year 1614, studied with Fabrizio Boschi, afterwards with Passignano, and lastly with Francesco Furini, whose manner he adopted, though he improved his coloring by visiting Venice, and studying the works of the great masters, particularly those of Titian and Tintoretto. After his return to Florence he distinguished himself by several works which he executed for the churches, and which were greatly admired for the delicacy and beauty of the coloring. The most esteemed of these are, *St. Michael discomfiting the Rebel Angels*, in the Nunziata; *St. Louis, King of France, Distributing his Wealth to the Poor*, in S. Felicita; and an altar-piece, Monte Oliveto. His most admired works, however, are to be found in the collections of the nobility. These are of small size, and from sacred subjects. There are also some of his pictures in the Florentine Gallery. He was fond of painting mythological subjects, the peculiar character of which afforded a fine opportunity of displaying his marvellous skill in flesh tints. Lanzi and Carlo Maratti agree as to his being among the best of the Florentine painters of his time. His death occurred in 1698. See Spooner, *Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts*, ii, 695.

Pignorius, Laurentius, a noted Italian ecclesiastic, celebrated especially as an antiquary, was born at Padua in 1571, and flourished at Treviso, where he held a canonry. He died of the plague in 1631. He collected a cabinet of medals and other curiosities of rare extent and value. His principal work is an attempt to explain the famous Isiac Table, a relic of Egyptian antiquity, covered with figures of divinities, symbols, and hieroglyphs. The table is supposed by Warburton to belong to the latest period of ancient Egypt. Pignorius also wrote a treatise, *De Servis et eorum apud veteres Ministeriis:—Antiquities of Padua*, etc.

Pi-hahi'roth (Heb. *Pi-hachiroth'*, פִּי הַחִירֹת, understood by some to be of Hebrew etymology, and rendered *mouth of the gorges*; Sept. ἡ ἔπαυλις, τὸ στόμα Εἰρώθ, Εἰρώθ; Vulg. *Phihahiroth*), a place before or at which the Israelites encamped, at the close of the third march from Rameses, when they went out of Egypt. Pi-hahiroth was before Migdol, and on either hand were Baal-zephon and the sea (Exod. xiv, 2, 9; Numb. xxxiii, 7, 8). The name is probably that of a natural locality, from the unlikelihood that there should have been a town or village in both parts of the country where it is placed in addition to Migdol and Baal-zephon, which seem to have been, if not towns, at least military stations, and its name is susceptible of an Egyptian etymology giving a sense apposite to this idea. The first part of the word is apparently treated by its punctuation as a separate prefix (Numb. xxxiii, 8), and it would therefore appear to be the masculine definite article *Pe*, *Pa*, or *Pi*. Jablonsky proposed the Coptic *pi-Achirot*, "the place where sedge grows," and this, or a similar name, the late M. Fulgence Fresnel recognised in the modern *Ghuweybet el-bûs*, "the bed of reeds," near Ras Atakah. There is another *Ghuweybet el-bûs* near Suez, and such a name would of course depend for its permanence upon the continuance of a vegetation subject to change. Migdol appears to have been a common name for a frontier watch-tower. See Migdol. Baal-zephon we take to have had a similar meaning to that of Migdol. See Baal-zephon. We should expect, therefore, that the encampment would have been in a depression, partly marshy, having on either hand an elevation marked by a watch-tower (Smith). It is evident that so vague a circumstance as the presence of reeds, which are common in any moist place near Suez, cannot serve to determine the locality. This must be fixed by the more definite notices of the narrative, which appear to us to point to the opening of the plain *el-Badeah*, between Jebel Atakah and Jebel Abu-Deraj. See Exode; Red Sea, Crossing of.

Pik, also called Jesaiah Berlin, a somewhat noted Jewish rabbi, flourished at Breslau, in Silesia, where he died, May 13, 1799, after having occupied the rabbiship for about sixteen years. He wrote הגהות, or notes and corrections to the Talmud, which are generally printed in

the modern editions of the Talmud:—חפלאה שבערכין, elucidations and corrections to Nathan ben-Jechiel's (q. v.) dictionary, called *Aruch*, but only on the letters כ–א, which were edited by R. W. Günsburg (Breslau, 1830), while the second part, comprising the letters ת–ל, which was prepared by Luzzatto and Hurwitz, was edited by Rosenkranz (Vienna, 1859):—מיני תרגימא, i. e. glossaries on the Targum of Onkelos (q. v.), edited by D. Sklower (Breslau, 1827, and Vienna, 1836):—ראשון לציון, glossaries on the Mishna, printed in the editions of the Mishna (Vienna, 1793; Prague, 1825–30; and with many additions edited by W. Eger, Altona, 1841–46). See Beer, *Jüdische Literaturbriefe* (Leips. 1857, p. 45; reprinted from Frankel's *Monatsschrift*, 1853–1854); Fürst, *Bibliotheca Judaica*, i, 110; Zunz, *Die Monatstage des Kalenderjahres* (Berlin, 1872), p. 27; Engl. transl. by Rev. B. Pick, in the *Jewish Messenger* (N. Y. 1874); Cassel, *Leitfaden zur jüdischen Geschichte u. Literatur* (Berlin, 1872), p. 107; Jost, *Gesch. d. Judenth. u. s. Sekten*, iii, 245; Steinschneider, *Bibliograph. Handb.* p. 22; *Catalogus Libr. Hebr. in Biblioth. Bodl.* p. 1385. (B. P.)

Pike, Samuel, an English Dissenting minister, was born at Ramsey, Wiltshire, about 1717. He became minister of a congregation at Henley-on-Thames, and in 1747 succeeded John Hill at the Three Cranes, London. He died in 1773. Pike was quite a voluminous writer. Among his many productions we mention, *Thoughts on such Passages of Scripture as ascribe Affections and Passions to the Deity* (Lond. 1750, 12mo):—*Philosophia Sacra, or the Principles of Natural Philosophy extracted from Divine Revelation* (Lond. 1753, 8vo); a scarce work, written on Hutchinsonian principles:—*The Nature and Evidences of Saving Faith; being the substance of Four Sermons on Heb. xi*, 1; *Two of which were Preached at the Merchants' Lecture, Pinner's Hall. With a Preface* (Lond. 1764, 8vo):—*Religious Cases of Conscience answered in an Evangelical Manner, or the Inquiring Christian Instructed; to which are added Replies to Thirty-two Questions, or the Professing Christian Tried at the Bar of God's Word. To which is subjoined the Character of the Happy, Honest, and Faithful Man.* By Samuel Pike and Samuel Hayward (new ed. Romsey, 1819, 8vo; last Amer. ed. with an *Introd.* by Dr. H. A. Boardman, Phila. 1859, 12mo):—*Compendious Hebrew Lexicon* (1766, 8vo; new ed. 1816, 8vo). See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s. v.; Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliog.* s. v. (J. H. W.)

Pikollos, a deity among the ancient Wends of Slavonia, who was believed to preside over the infernal regions and the realms of the dead. He was represented as an old man with a pale countenance, and having before him three death's heads. He corresponded to *Pluto* of the ancient Romans, and to *Siva* of the Hindûs. Like the latter, he desires human blood, and reigns at once over the manes or souls of the dead, and over the metals in the bowels of the earth.

Pilarik, Stephen, a Hungarian ecclesiastic of some distinction, was born at Otschova in 1615. He was the son of a Protestant clergyman, and also devoted himself to the ministry, and his talent as a preacher soon got him a widespread reputation. In the year 1663, while travelling, he was captured by Tartars, who reduced him to slavery. He died Feb. 8, 1693, at Neusalza. His principal writings are, *Currus Jehovæ mirabilis* (Wittenberg, 1678, 4to); and *Turcico-Tartarica crudelitas* (Buda, 1684, 4to), a touching account of his captivity. His son, also called Stephen, who died in 1710, left some works, now forgotten.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xl, 229.

Pi'late, Pontius (Πόντιος Πιλᾶτος, Græcized from the Latin *Pontius Pilatus*), the Roman procurator or resident as governor of Judæa during the period of our Lord's public ministry and passion, and chiefly known in history from his connection with the Crucifixion. In the following account we combine Scriptural notices with information from other ancient resources and modern examination.

I. *His Name.*—His *prænomen* or first name is unknown. His *nomen* or family-name indicates that he was connected, by descent or adoption, with the *gens* of the Pontii, first conspicuous in Roman history in the person of C. Pontius Telesinus, the great Samnite general. The *cognomen* Pilatus has received two explanations. (1.) As armed with the *pilum* or javelin (comp. "pilata agmina," Virg. *Æn.* xii, 121); (2.) As contracted from *pileatus*. The fact that the *pileus* or cap was the badge of manumitted slaves (comp. Suetonius, *Nero*, c. 57; *Tiber.* c. 4), makes it probable that the epithet marked him out as a *libertus*, or as descended from one.

II. *His Office.*—Pilate was the sixth Roman procurator of Judæa (Matt. xxvii, 2; Mark xv, 1; Luke iii, 1; John xviii, xix). under whom our Lord taught, suffered, and died (Acts iii, 13; iv, 27; xiii, 28; 1 Tim. vi, 13). The testimony of Tacitus on this point is no less clear than it is important; for it fixes beyond a doubt the time when the foundations of our religion were laid. "The author of that name (Christian) or sect was Christ, who was capitally punished in the reign of Tiberius by Pontius Pilate" (Auctor nominis ejus Christus, Tiberio imperitante, per Procuratorem Pontium Pilatum supplicio affectus est).

A *procurator* (ἐπίτροπος, Philo, *Leg. ad Caium*, and Josephus, *War*, ii, 9, 2; but less correctly ἡγεμών, Matt. xxvii, 2; and Josephus, *Ant.* xviii, 3, 1) was generally a Roman knight, appointed to act under the governor of a province as collector of the revenue, and judge in causes connected with it. Strictly speaking, *procuratores Cæsaris* were only required in the imperial provinces, i. e. those which, according to the constitution of Augustus, were reserved for the special administration of the emperor, without the intervention of the senate and people, and governed by his legate. In the senatorial provinces, governed by proconsuls, the corresponding duties were discharged by quæstors. Yet it appears that sometimes *procuratores* were appointed in those provinces also, to collect certain dues of the *fiscus* (the emperor's special revenue), as distinguished from those of the *ærarium* (the revenue administered by the senate). Sometimes in a small territory, especially in one contiguous to a larger province, and dependent upon it, the procurator was head of the administration, and had full military and judicial authority, though he was responsible to the governor of the neighboring province. Thus Judæa was attached to Syria upon the deposition of Archelaus (A.D. 6), and a procurator appointed to govern it, with Cæsarea for its capital. Already, during a temporary absence of Archelaus, it had been in charge of the procurator Sabinus; then, after the ethnarch's banishment, came Coponius; the third procurator was M. Ambivius; the fourth Annius Rufus; the fifth Valerius Gratus; and the sixth Pontius Pilate (Josephus, *Ant.* xviii, 2, 2), who was appointed A.D. 25–6, in the twelfth year of Tiberius. He held his office for a period of ten years (Josephus, *Ant.* xviii, 10, 2). The agreement on this point between the accounts in the New Testament and those supplied by Josephus is entire and satisfactory. It has been exhibited in detail by the learned, accurate, and candid Lardner (i, 150–389, Lond. 1827). These procurators had their headquarters at Cæsarea, which is called by Tacitus *Judææ caput;* but they took up their temporary abode at Jerusalem on occasion of the great feasts, as a measure of precaution against any popular outbreak. See Procurator.

III. *His Life.*—1. Of the *early history* of Pilate we know nothing; but a German legend fills up the gap strangely enough. Pilate is the bastard son of Tyrus, king of Mayence. His father sends him to Rome as a hostage. There he is guilty of a murder; but being sent to Pontus, rises into notice as subduing the barbarous tribes there, receives in consequence the new name of Pontius, and is sent to Judæa. It has been suggested

that the twenty-second legion, which was in Palestine at the time of the destruction of Jerusalem, and was afterwards stationed at Mayence, may have been in this case either the bearers of the tradition or the inventors of the fable (comp. Vilmar, *Deutsche Nationalliteratur*, i, 217).

2. *His Official Career.*—(1.) *His Administration in General.*—One of Pilate's first acts was to remove the headquarters of the army from Cæsarea to Jerusalem. The soldiers of course took with them their standards, bearing the image of the emperor, into the Holy City. Pilate had been obliged to send them in by night, and there were no bounds to the rage of the people on discovering what had thus been done. They poured down in crowds to Cæsarea, where the procurator was then residing, and besought him to remove the images. After five days of discussion he gave the signal to some concealed soldiers to surround the petitioners and put them to death unless they ceased to trouble him; but this only strengthened their determination, and they declared themselves ready rather to submit to death than forego their resistance to an idolatrous innovation. Pilate then yielded, and the standards were by his orders brought down to Cæsarea (Josephus, *Ant.* xviii, 3, 12; *War*, ii, 9, 2–4). No previous governor had ventured on such an outrage. Herod the Great, it is true, had placed the Roman eagle on one of his new buildings; but this had been followed by a violent outbreak, and the attempt had not been repeated (Ewald, *Geschichte*, iv, 509). The extent to which the scruples of the Jews on this point were respected by the Roman governors is shown by the fact that no effigy of either god or emperor is found on the money coined by them in Judæa before the war under Nero (*ibid.* v, 33, referring to De Saulcy, *Recherches sur la Numismatique judaïque*, pt. viii, ix). Assuming this, the denarius with Cæsar's image and superscription of Matt. xxiii must have been a coin from the Roman mint, or that of some other province. The latter was probably current for the common purposes of life. The shekel alone was received as a Temple-offering. See Abomination of Desolation.



Coin of Judæa struck under Pontius Pilate.

Obverse: Τιβερίου Καίσαρος ("Of Tiberius Cæsar"), with the legend ιϛ 16, i. e. A.D. 29, the year of our Lord's crucifixion. *Reverse:* Ἰουλία Καίσαρος ("Julia [mother] of Cæsar"), with three ears of corn tied together. Probably a *quadrans*, equivalent to two "mites" (Matt. xi, 29).

On two other occasions Pilate nearly drove the Jews to insurrection; the first when, in spite of this warning about the images, he hung up in his palace at Jerusalem some gilt shields inscribed with the names of deities, which were only removed by an order from Tiberius (Philo, *Ad Caium*, § 38, ii, 589); the second when he appropriated the revenue arising from the redemption of vows (Corban; comp. Mark vii, 11) to the construction of an aqueduct. This order led to a riot, which he suppressed by sending among the crowd soldiers with concealed daggers, who massacred a great number, not only of rioters, but of casual spectators (Josephus, *War*, ii, 9, 4). Ewald suggests that the Tower of Siloam (Luke xiii, 4) may have been part of the same works, and that this was the reason why its fall was looked upon as a judgment (*Gesch.* vi, 40). The Pharisaic reverence for whatever was set apart for the Corban (Mark vii, 11), and their scruples as to admitting into it anything that had an impure origin (Matt. xxvii, 6), may be regarded, perhaps, as outgrowths of the same feeling. See Corban.

To these specimens of his administration, which rest on the testimony of profane authors, we must add the slaughter of certain Galilæans, which was told to our Lord as a piece of news (ἀπαγγέλλοντες, Luke xiii, 1), and on which he founded some remarks on the connection between sin and calamity. It must have occurred at some feast at Jerusalem, in the outer court of the Temple, since the blood of the worshippers was *mingled with their sacrifices;* but the silence of Josephus about it seems to show that riots and massacres on such occasions were so frequent that it was needless to recount them all. Ewald suggests that the insurrection of which Mark speaks (xv, 7) must have been that connected with the appropriation of the Corban (*supra*), and that this explains the eagerness with which the people demanded Barabbas's release. He infers further, from Barabbas's name, that he was the son of a rabbi (Abba was a rabbinic title of honor), and thus accounts for the part taken in his favor by the members of the Sanhedrim. See Barabbas.

(2.) *His special Connection with Jesus.*—It was the custom for the procurators to reside at Jerusalem during the great feasts, to preserve order, and accordingly, at the time of our Lord's last Passover, Pilate was occupying his official residence in Herod's palace; and to the gates of this palace Jesus, condemned on the charge of blasphemy, was brought early in the morning by the chief priests and officers of the Sanhedrim, who were unable to enter the residence of a Gentile, lest they should be defiled, and unfit to eat the Passover (John xviii, 28). Pilate therefore came out to learn their purpose, and demanded the nature of the charge. At first they seem to have expected that he would have carried out their wishes without further inquiry, and therefore merely described our Lord as a κακοποιός (disturber of the public peace); but as a Roman procurator had too much respect for justice, or at least understood his business too well to consent to such a condemnation, and as they knew that he would not enter into theological questions, any more than Gallio afterwards did on a somewhat similar occasion (Acts xviii, 14), they were obliged to devise a new charge, and therefore interpreted our Lord's claims in a political sense, accusing him of assuming the royal title, perverting the nation, and forbidding the payment of tribute to Rome (Luke xxiii, 3; an account plainly presupposed in John xviii, 33). It is evident that from this moment Pilate was distracted between two conflicting feelings: a fear of offending the Jews, who had already grounds of accusation against him, which would be greatly strengthened by any show of lukewarmness in punishing an offence against the imperial government, and a conscious conviction that Jesus was innocent, since it was absurd to suppose that a desire to free the nation from Roman authority was criminal in the eyes of the Sanhedrim. Moreover, this last feeling was strengthened by his own hatred of the Jews, whose religious scruples had caused him frequent trouble, and by a growing respect for the calm dignity and meekness of the sufferer. First he examined our Lord privately, and asked him whether he were a king. The question which he in return put to his judge, "*Sayest thou this of thyself, or did others tell it thee of me?*" seems to imply that there was in Pilate's own mind a suspicion that the prisoner really was what he was charged with being; a suspicion which shows itself again in the later question, "*Whence art thou?*" (John xix, 8), in the increasing desire to release him (ver. 12), and in the refusal to alter the inscription on the cross (ver. 22). In any case Pilate accepted as satisfactory Christ's assurance that his *kingdom was not of this world*, that is, not worldly in its nature or objects, and therefore not to be founded by this world's weapons, though he could not understand the assertion that it was to be established by bearing witness to the truth. His famous reply, "*What is truth?*" was the question of a worldly-minded politician, sceptical because he was indifferent, one who thought truth an empty name, or at least could not see "any connection between ἀλήθεια and βασιλεία, truth and policy" (Dr. C. Wordsworth, *Comm.* ad loc.). With this question he

brought the interview to a close, and came out to the Jews and declared the prisoner innocent. To this they replied that his teaching had stirred up all the people from Galilee to Jerusalem. The mention of Galilee suggested to Pilate a new way of escaping from his dilemma, by sending on the case to Herod Antipas, tetrarch of that country, who had come up to Jerusalem to the feast, while at the same time this gave him an opportunity for making overtures of reconciliation to Herod, with whose jurisdiction he had probably in some recent instance interfered. But Herod, though propitiated by this act of courtesy, declined to enter into the matter, and merely sent Jesus back to Pilate dressed in a shining kingly robe (ἐσθῆτα λαμπράν, Luke xxiii, 11), to express his ridicule of such pretensions, and contempt for the whole business. So Pilate was compelled to come to a decision, and first, having assembled the chief priests and also the people, whom he probably summoned in the expectation that they would be favorable to Jesus, he announced to them that the accused had done nothing worthy of death, but at the same time, in hopes of pacifying the Sanhedrim, he proposed to scourge him before he released him. But as the accusers were resolved to have his blood, they rejected this concession, and therefore Pilate had recourse to a fresh expedient. It was the custom for the Roman governor to grant every year, in honor of the Passover, pardon to one condemned criminal. The origin of the practice is unknown, though we may connect it with the fact mentioned by Livy (v, 13) that at a Lectisternium "vinctis quoque dempta vincula." Pilate therefore offered the people their choice between two, the murderer Barabbas, and the prophet whom a few days before they had hailed as the Messiah. To receive their decision he ascended the βῆμα, a portable tribunal which was carried about with a Roman magistrate to be placed wherever he might direct, and which in the present case was erected on a tessellated pavement (λιθόστρωτον) in front of the palace, and called in Hebrew *Gabbatha*, probably from being laid down on a slight elevation (גַּבָּתָא, "to be high"). As soon as Pilate had taken his seat, he received a mysterious message from his wife, according to tradition a proselyte of the gate (θεοσεβής), named Procla or Claudia Procula (*Evang. Nicod.* ii), who had "suffered many things in a dream," which impelled her to entreat her husband not to condemn the Just One. But he had no longer any choice in the matter, for the rabble, instigated of course by the priests, chose Barabbas for pardon, and clamored for the death of Jesus; insurrection seemed imminent, and Pilate reluctantly yielded. But before issuing the fatal order he washed his hands before the multitude, as a sign that he was innocent of the crime, in imitation probably of the ceremony enjoined in Deut. xxi, where it is ordered that when the perpetrator of a murder is not discovered, the elders of the city in which it occurs shall wash their hands, with the declaration, "Our hands have not shed this blood, neither have our eyes seen it." Such a practice might naturally be adopted even by a Roman, as intelligible to the Jewish multitude around him. As in the present case it produced no effect, Pilate ordered his soldiers to inflict the scourging preparatory to execution; but the sight of unjust suffering so patiently borne seems again to have troubled his conscience, and prompted a new effort in favor of the victim. He brought him out bleeding from the savage punishment, and decked in the scarlet robe and crown of thorns which the soldiers had put on him in derision, and said to the people, "Behold the man!" hoping that such a spectacle would rouse them to shame and compassion. But the priests only renewed their clamors for his death, and, fearing that the political charge of treason might be considered insufficient, returned to their first accusation of blasphemy, and quoting the law of Moses (Lev. xxiv, 16), which punished blasphemy with stoning, declared that he must die "because he made himself the Son of God." But this title υἱὸς θεοῦ augmented Pilate's superstitious fears, already aroused by his wife's dream (μᾶλλον ἐφοβήθη, John xix, 7); he feared that Jesus might be one of the heroes or demigods of his own mythology; he took him again into the palace, and inquired anxiously into his descent ("Whence art thou?") and his claims, but, as the question was only prompted by fear or curiosity, Jesus made no reply. When Pilate reminded him of his own absolute power over him, he closed this last conversation with the irresolute governor by the mournful remark: "Thou couldst have no power at all against me, except it were given thee from above; therefore he that delivered me unto thee hath the greater sin." God had given to Pilate power over him, and power only, but to those who delivered him up God had given the means of judging of his claims; and therefore Pilate's sin, in merely exercising this power, was less than theirs who, being God's own priests, with the Scriptures before them, and the word of prophecy still alive among them (John xi, 50; xviii, 14), had deliberately conspired for his death. The result of this interview was one last effort to save Jesus by a fresh appeal to the multitude; but now arose the formidable cry, "If thou let this man go, thou art not Cæsar's friend," and Pilate, to whom political success was as the breath of life, again ascended the tribunal, and finally pronounced the desired condemnation.

The proceedings of Pilate in our Lord's trial supply many interesting illustrations of the accuracy of the evangelists, from the accordance of their narrative with the known customs of the time. Thus Pilate, being only a procurator, had no quæstor to conduct the trial, and therefore examined the prisoner himself. Again, in early times Roman magistrates had not been allowed to take their wives with them into the provinces, but this prohibition had fallen into neglect, and latterly a proposal made by Cæcina to enforce it had been rejected (Tacit. *Ann.* iii, 33, 34). Grotius points out that the word ἀνέπεμψεν, used when Pilate sends our Lord to Herod (Luke xxiii, 7), is "propria Romani juris vox: nam *remittitur* reus qui alicubi comprehensus mittitur ad judicem aut originis aut habitationis" (see Alford, *ad loc.*). The tessellated pavement (λιθόστρωτον) was so necessary to the forms of justice, as well as the βῆμα, that Julius Cæsar carried one about with him on his expeditions (Sueton. *Jul.* c. 46). The power of life and death was taken from the Jews when Judæa became a province (Josephus, *Ant.* xx, 9, 1). Scourging before execution was a well-known Roman practice.

So ended Pilate's share in the greatest crime which has been committed since the world began. That he did not immediately lose his feelings of anger against the Jews who had thus compelled his acquiescence, and of compassion and awe for the Sufferer whom he had unrighteously sentenced, is plain from his curt and angry refusal to alter the inscription which he had prepared for the cross (ὃ γέγραφα, γέγραφα), his ready acquiescence in the request made by Joseph of Arimathæa that the Lord's body might be given up to him rather than consigned to the common sepulchre reserved for those who had suffered capital punishment, and his sullen answer to the demand of the Sanhedrim that the sepulchre should be guarded. (Matt. xxvii, 65, ἔχετε κουστωδίαν· ὑπάγετε, ἀσφαλίσασθε ὡς οἴδατε. Ellicott would translate this, "Take a guard," on the ground that the watchers were Roman soldiers, who were not under the command of the priests. But some might have been placed at their disposal during the feast, and we should rather expect λάβετε if the sentence were imperative.)

(3.) *His Eventual Fate.*—Here, as far as Scripture is concerned, our knowledge of Pilate's life ends. But we learn from Josephus (*Ant.* xviii, 4, 1) that his anxiety to avoid giving offence to Cæsar did not save him from political disaster. The Samaritans were unquiet and rebellious. A leader of their own race had promised to

disclose to them the sacred treasures which Moses was reported to have concealed in Mount Gerizim. Pilate led his troops against them, and defeated them easily enough. The Samaritans complained to Vitellius, now president of Syria, and he sent Pilate to Rome to answer their accusations before the emperor (*ibid.* 2). When he reached Rome he found Tiberius dead and Caius (Caligula) on the throne, A.D. 36. Eusebius adds (*Hist. Eccl.* ii, 7) that soon afterwards, "wearied with misfortunes," he killed himself. As to the scene of his death there are various traditions. One is that he was banished to Vienna Allobrogum (Vienne on the Rhone), where a singular monument, a pyramid on a quadrangular base, fifty-two feet high, is called Pontius Pilate's tomb (Smith, *Dict. of Class. Geog.* art. Vienna). Another is that he sought to hide his sorrows on the mountain by the lake of Lucerne, now called Mount Pilatus; and there, after spending years in its recesses, in remorse and despair rather than penitence, plunged into the dismal lake which occupies its summit. According to the popular belief, "a form is often seen to emerge from the gloomy waters, and go through the action of one washing his hands; and when he does so dark clouds of mist gather first round the bosom of the Infernal Lake (such it has been styled of old), and then, wrapping the whole upper part of the mountain in darkness, presage a tempest or hurricane, which is sure to follow in a short space" (Scott, *Anne of Geierstein*, ch. i). (See below.)

Pilate's wife is also, as might be expected, prominent in these traditions. Her name is given as Claudia Procula (Niceph. *Hist. Eccl.* i, 30). She had been a proselyte to Judaism before the crucifixion (*Evang. Nicod.* c. 2). Nothing certain is known as to her history, but the tradition that she became a Christian is as old as the time of Origen (*Hom. in Matt. xxxv*). The Greek Church has canonized her. The dream has been interpreted by some as a divine interposition; by others as a suggestion of the devil, who wished to prevent the Saviour's death; by others as the unconscious reflection of her interest in the reports which had reached her regarding Jesus. The description of Jesus as "that just man" (τῷ δικαίῳ ἐκείνῳ), it is remarked by Schaff, recalls the celebrated unconscious prophecy of Plato, in his *Republic*, as to the δίκαιος who was, after enduring all possible sufferings, to restore righteousness. In the earlier periods, and indeed so long as the commonwealth subsisted, it was very unusual for the governors of provinces to take their wives with them (Senec. *De Controv.* 25), and in the strict regulations which Augustus introduced he did not allow the favor, except in peculiar and specified circumstances (Seuton. *Aug.* 24). The practice, however, grew to be more and more prevalent, and was customary in Pilate's time. It is evident from Tacitus that at the time of the death of Augustus, Germanicus had his wife Agrippina with him in Germany (*Annal.* i, 40, 41; comp. iii, 33–59; Josephus, *Ant.* xx, 10, 1; Ulpian, iv, 2). Indeed, in the beginning of the reign of Tiberius, Germanicus took his wife with him into the East. Piso, the præfect of Syria, took his wife also along with him at the same time (Tacit. *Annal.* ii, 54, 55). "But," says Lardner (i, 152), "nothing can render this (the practice in question) more apparent than a motion made in the Roman senate by Severus Cæsina, in the fourth consulship of Tiberius, and second of Drusus Cæsar (A.D. 21), that no magistrate to whom any province was assigned should be accompanied by his wife, except the senate's rejecting it, and that with some indignation" (Tacit. *Annal.* iii, 33, 34). The fact mentioned incidentally, or rather implied, in Matthew, being thus confirmed by full and unquestionable evidence, cannot fail to serve as a corroboration of the evangelical history. (Comp. Paulus, *Comm.* iii, 723; Kuinöl, *In loc. Mat.*; Gotter, *De Conjugis Pilati Somnio*, Jena, 1704; Kluge, *De Somnio Uxoris Pil.* Hal. 1720; Herbart, *Examen Somnii Uxoris Pil.* Oldenb. 1735.)

IV. *His Character.*—The character of Pilate may be sufficiently inferred from the sketch given above of his conduct at our Lord's trial. By some he has been depicted as one of the worst of tyrants; by others, who have passed to the opposite extreme, his faults have been unduly palliated or denied. Tertullian speaks of him as virtually a Christian at heart ("jam pro suâ conscientiâ Christianum," *Apol.* c. 21); and the Ethiopian Church has even made him a saint. We have no reason to suppose that, so far as his general administration went, it differed greatly from that of the other Roman governors of Judæa. He was a type of the rich and corrupt Romans of his age; a worldly-minded statesman, conscious of no higher wants than those of this life, yet by no means unmoved by feelings of justice and mercy. His conduct to the Jews, in the instances quoted from Josephus, though severe, was not thoughtlessly cruel or tyrannical, considering the general practice of Roman governors, and the difficulties of dealing with a nation so arrogant and perverse. Certainly there is nothing in the facts recorded by profane authors inconsistent with his desire, obvious from the Gospel narrative, to save our Lord. But all his better feelings were overpowered by a selfish regard for his own security. He would not encounter the least hazard of personal annoyance in behalf of innocence and justice; the unrighteous condemnation of a good man was a trifle in comparison with the fear of the emperor's frown and the loss of place and power. While we do not differ from Chrysostom's opinion that he was παράνομος (Chrysost. i, 802, *Adv. Judæos*, vi), or that recorded in the Apostolical Constitutions (v, 14), that he was ἀναρδρος, we yet see abundant reason for our Lord's merciful judgment, "He that delivered me unto thee hath the greater sin." At the same time his history furnishes a proof that worldliness and want of principle are sources of crimes no less awful than those which spring from deliberate and reckless wickedness. The unhappy notoriety given to his name by its place in the two universal creeds of Christendom is due, not to any desire of singling him out for shame, but to the need of fixing the date of our Lord's death, and so bearing witness to the claims of Christianity as resting on a historical basis (August. *De Fide et Symb.* c. v, vol. vi, p. 156; Pearson, *On the Creed*, p. 239, 240, ed. Burt, and the authorities quoted in note *c*).

That the conduct of Pilate was highly criminal cannot be denied. But his guilt was light in comparison with the atrocious depravity of the Jews, especially the priests. His was the guilt of weakness and fear, theirs the guilt of settled and deliberate malice. His state of mind prompted him to attempt the release of an accused person in opposition to the clamors of a misguided mob; theirs urged them to compass the ruin of an acquitted person by instigating the populace, calumniating the prisoner, and terrifying the judge. If Pilate yielded against his judgment under the fear of personal danger, and so took part in an act of unparalleled injustice, the priests and their ready tools originated the false accusation, sustained it by subornation of perjury, and when it was declared invalid enforced their own unfounded sentence by appealing to the lowest passions. Pilate, it is clear, was utterly destitute of principle. He was willing, indeed, to do right, if he could do right without personal disadvantage. Of gratuitous wickedness he was perhaps incapable, certainly in the condemnation of Jesus he has the merit of being for a time on the side of innocence. But he yielded to violence, and so committed an awful crime. In his hands was the life of the prisoner. Convinced of his innocence, he ought to have set him at liberty, thus doing right regardless of consequences. But this is an act of high virtue which we hardly require at the hands of a Roman governor of Judæa; and though Pilate must bear the reproach of acting contrary to his own declared convictions, yet he may equally claim some credit for the apparently sincere efforts which he made in order to de-

feat the malice of the Jews and procure the liberation of Jesus.

If now we wish to sum up the judgment of Pilate's character, we easily see that he was one of that large class of men who aspire to public offices, not from a pure and lofty desire of benefiting the public and advancing the good of the world, but from selfish and personal considerations, from a love of distinction, from a love of power, from a love of self-indulgence; being destitute of any fixed principles, and having no aim but office and influence, they act right only by chance and when convenient, and are wholly incapable of pursuing a consistent course, or of acting with firmness and self-denial in cases in which the preservation of integrity requires the exercise of these qualities. Pilate was obviously a man of weak, and therefore, with his temptations, of corrupt character. The view given in the Apostolical Constitutions (v, 14), where unmanliness (*ἀνανδρία*) is ascribed to him, we take to be correct. This want of strength will readily account for his failing to rescue Jesus from the rage of his enemies, and also for the acts of injustice and cruelty which he practiced in his government—acts which, considered in themselves, wear a deeper dye than does the conduct which he observed in surrendering Jesus to the malice of the Jews. This same weakness may serve to explain to the reader how much influence would be exerted on this unjust judge, not only by the stern bigotry and persecuting wrath of the Jewish priesthood, but especially by the not concealed intimations which they threw out against Pilate that, if he liberated Jesus, he was no friend of Tiberius, and must expect to have to give an account of his conduct at Rome. That this was no idle threat, nothing beyond the limits of probability, Pilate's subsequent deposition by Vitellius shows very plainly; nor could the procurator have been ignorant either of the stern determination of the Jewish character, or of the offence he had by his acts given to the heads of the nation, or of the insecurity, at that very hour, when the contest between him and the priests was proceeding regarding the innocent victim whom they lusted to destroy, of his own position in the office which he held, and which, of course, he desired to retain. On the whole, then, viewing the entire conduct of Pilate, his previous iniquities as well as his bearing on the condemnation of Jesus—viewing his own actual position and the malignity of the Jews—we cannot, we confess, give our vote with those who have passed the severest condemnation on this weak and guilty governor.

The number of dissertations on Pilate's character and all the circumstances connected with him, his "facinora," his "Christum servandi studium," his wife's dream, his supposed letters to Tiberius, which have been published during the last and present centuries, is quite overwhelming. On this point the student may consult with advantage dean Alford's *Commentary;* Ellicott, *Historical Lectures on the Life of our Lord*, sect. vii; Neander's *Life of Christ*, § 285 (Bohn); Ewald, *Geschichte*, v, 30, etc. See also Müller, *De enixiss. Pil. Christ. servand. stud.* (Hamb. 1751); Tobler, in Pfenniger, *Samml. z. christl. Mag.* III, ii, (Zurich, 1782); Niemeyer, *Charakt.* i, 129 sq.; Paulus, *Comment.* iii, 697 sq.; Lücke, *on John xix.* Comp. Schuster, in Eichhorn's *Biblioth. d. bibl. Lit.* x, 823; Olshausen, in answer to Tholuck's low valuation of Pilate, *Comment.* ii, 504 sq. The reader will find a discriminating analysis in Stier, *Reden Jesu*, vi, 318–382 (ii, 619 sq. of the American translation), and in Dr. Hanna's *Last Day of Our Lord's Passion*, p. 77–148. See also the *Zeitschr. f. wissensch. Theol.* 1871, vol. iv.

V. *Apocryphal Accounts.*—We learn from Justin Martyr (*Apol.* i, 76, 84), Tertullian (*Apol.* c. 21), Eusebius (*Hist. Eccles.* ii, 2), and others, that Pilate made an official report to Tiberius of our Lord's trial and condemnation; and in a homily ascribed to Chrysostom, though marked as spurious by his Benedictine editors (*Hom.* viii, *in Pasch.* viii, 968, D), certain *ὑπομνήματα* (*Acta*, or *Commentarii Pilati*) are spoken of as well-known documents in common circulation. That he made such a report is highly probable, and it may have been in existence in Chrysostom's time; but the *Acta Pilati* now extant in Greek, and two Latin epistles from him to the emperor (Fabric. *Apocr.* i, 237, 298; iii, 111, 456), are certainly spurious. The number of extant "*Acta Pilati*," in various forms, is so large as to show that very early the demand created a supply of documents manifestly spurious, and we have no reason for looking on any one of those that remain as more authentic than the others. The taunt of Celsus that the Christians circulated spurious or distorted narratives under this title (Origen, *c. Cels.*), and the complaint of Eusebius (*Hist. Eccles.* ix, 5) that the heathens made them the vehicle of blasphemous calumnies, show how largely the machinery of falsification was used on either side. Such of these documents as are extant are found in the collections of Fabricius, Thilo, and Tischendorf. Some of them are but weak paraphrases of the Gospel history. The most extravagant are perhaps the most interesting, as indicating the existence of modes of thought at variance with the prevalent traditions. Of these anomalies the most striking is that known as the *Paradosis Pilati* (Tischendorf, *Evang. Apoc.* p. 426). The emperor Tiberius, startled at the universal darkness that had fallen on the Roman empire on the day of the crucifixion, summons Pilate to answer for having caused it. He is condemned to death, but before his execution he prays to the Lord Jesus that he may not be destroyed with the wicked Hebrews, and pleads his ignorance as an excuse. The prayer is answered by a voice from heaven, assuring him that all generations shall call him blessed, and that he shall be a witness for Christ at his second coming to judge the twelve tribes of Israel. An angel receives his head, and his wife dies filled with joy, and is buried with him. Startling as this imaginary history may be, it has its counterpart in the traditional customs of the Abyssinian Church, in which Pilate is recognised as a saint and martyr, and takes his place in the calendar on the 25th of June (Stanley, *Eastern Church*, p. 13; Neale, *Eastern Church*, i, 806). The words of Tertullian, describing him as "jam pro suâ conscientiâ Christianus" (*Apol.* c. 21), indicate a like feeling, and we find traces of it also in the Apocryphal Gospel, which speaks of him as "uncircumcised in flesh, but circumcised in heart" (*Evang. Nicod.* i, 12, in Tischendorf, *Evang. Apoc.* p. 236).

According to another legend (*Mors Pilati*, in Tischendorf's *Evang. Apoc.* p. 432), Tiberius, hearing of the wonderful works of healing that had been wrought in Judæa, writes to Pilate, bidding him to send to Rome the man that had this divine power. Pilate has to confess that he has crucified him; but the messenger meets Veronica, who gives him the cloth which had received the impress of the divine features, and by this the emperor is healed. Pilate is summoned to take his trial, and presents himself wearing the holy and seamless tunic. This acts as a spell upon the emperor, and he forgets his wonted severity. After a time Pilate is thrown into prison, and there commits suicide. His body is cast into the Tiber, but as storms and tempests followed, the Romans take it up and send it to Vienne. It is thrown into the Rhone; but the same disasters follow, and it is sent on to Losania (Lucerne or Lausanne?). There it is sunk in a pool, fenced round by mountains, and even there the waters boil or bubble strangely. The interest of this story obviously lies in its presenting an early form (the existing text is of the 14th century) of the local traditions which connect the name of the procurator of Judæa with the Mount Pilatus that overlooks the lake of Lucerne. The received explanation (Ruskin, *Modern Painters*, v, 128) of the legend, as originating in a distortion of the descriptive name Mons Pileatus (the "cloud-capped"), supplies a curious instance of the *genesis* of a myth from a false etymology; but it may be questioned whether it rests on suffi-

cient grounds, and is not rather the product of a pseudo-criticism, finding in a name the starting-point, not the embodiment of a legend. Have we any evidence that the mountain was known as "Pileatus" before the legend? Have we not, in the apocryphal story just cited, the legend independently of the name? (comp. Vilmar, *Deutsche Nationalliteratur*, i, 217). The extent to which the terror connected with the belief formerly prevailed is somewhat startling. If a stone were thrown into the lake, a violent storm would follow. No one was allowed to visit it without a special permission from the authorities of Lucerne. The neighboring shepherds were bound by a solemn oath, renewed annually, never to guide a stranger to it (Gessner, *Descript. Mont. Pilat.* [Zurich, 1555], p. 40). The spell was broken in 1584 by Johannes Müller, curé of Lucerne, who was bold enough to throw stones and abide the consequences (Golbery, *Univers pittoresque de la Suisse*, p. 327). It is striking that traditions of Pilate attach themselves to several localities in the south of France (comp. Murray's *Hand-book for France*, Route 125).

But whatever we may think of these legends, or even of the apocryphal works that have come down to our own times, there can be little doubt that the original documents referred to by the early Church fathers were genuine (Hencke, *Opusc. Acad.* p. 201 sq.). Such is the opinion of Winer (*Realwörterb.*). Lardner, who has fully discussed the subject, decides that "it must be allowed by all that Pontius Pilate composed some memoirs concerning our Saviour, and sent them to the emperor" (vi. 610). Winer adds, "What we now have in Greek under this title (*Pilate's Report;* see Fabricii *Apocr.* i, 237, 239; iii, 456), as well as the two letters of Pilate to Tiberius, are fabrications of a later age." So Lardner: "The *Acts* of Pontius Pilate, and his letter to Tiberius, which we now have, are not genuine, but manifestly spurious." We have not space here to review the arguments which have been adduced in favor of and against these documents; but we must add that we attach some importance to them, thinking it by no means unlikely that, if they are fabrications, they are fabricated in some keeping with the genuine pieces, which were in some way lost, and the loss of which the composers of our actual pieces sought as well as they could to repair. If this view can be sustained, then the documents we have may serve to help us in the use of discretion to the substance of the original *Acts*. At all events, it seems certain that an official report was made by Pilate; and thus we gain another proof that "these things were not done in a corner." Those who wish to enter into this subject should first consult Lardner (*ut sup.*), and the valuable references he gives. See also Altman, *De Epist. Pil. ad Tiber.* (Bern. 1755); Van Dale, *De Orac.* p. 609 sq.; Schmidt, *Einleitung ins N. T.* ii, 249 sq. Of especial value is Hermansson, *De Pontio Pilat.* (Upsala, 1624); also Burger, *De Pontio Pilat.* (Misen. 1782). The latest work on the subject is that of Lipsius, *Die Pilatus-Acten, kritisch untersucht* (Kiel, 1871). See Acts of Pilate.

On the general subject of this article, the reader may refer to Germar, *Docetur ad loca P. Pilati facinora cæt.* (Thorun, 1785); Lengheimich, *De Pilati patriæ* (s. l. 1677); Gotter, *De Conjugis Pilati Somnio* (Jen. 1704); Kluge, *De Somnio Uxoris Pilati* (Hal. 1720); Herbart, *Examen Somnii Ux. Pil.* (Oldenb. 1735); Distell, *De Solute Uxoris Pilati* (Alt. 1772); Mounier, *De Pilati in Causa Servat. agendi ratione* (1825); Warneck, *Pont. Pil. ein Gemälde* (Gotha, 1867); *Theol. and Lit. Journal*, April, 1861. Hase, in his *Leben Jesu*, p. 203, 205 (third ed.), affords valuable literary references on this, as on so many other N.-T. subjects. See also the monographs referred to by Volbeding, *Index Programmatum*, p. 58, 59. See Jesus Christ.

Pilate's Staircase. This celebrated staircase is contained within a little chapel near the church of St. John Lateran, at Rome. It consists of twenty-eight white marble steps, and it is alleged by Romanists that this is the holy staircase which Christ several times ascended and descended when he appeared before Pilate, and that it was carried by angels from Jerusalem to Rome. Multitudes of pilgrims at certain periods crawl up the steps of this staircase on their knees, with rosaries in their hands, and kissing each step as they ascend. On reaching the top, the pilgrim must repeat a short prayer. The performance of this ceremony is regarded as peculiarly meritorious, and entitling the devout pilgrim to a plenary indulgence. It was during this act of devotion that Martin Luther, then a monk, was startled by the remembrance of the text, "The just shall live by faith." He instantly saw the folly of such performances; and fleeing in shame from the place, became from that time a zealous reformer. By the Romanists this staircase is called *Scala Santa*, or *holy staircase*.

Pil'dash (Heb. *Pildash'*, פִּלְדָּשׁ, according to Fürst, for פֶּלֶד אֵשׁ, *flame of fire;* Sept. Φαλδές), the sixth named of the eight sons of Nahor, Abraham's brother, by his niece and wife, Milcah (Gen. xxii, 22). B.C. cir. 2046. "The settlement of his descendants has not been identified with any degree of probability. Bunsen (*Bibelwerk*, Gen. xxii, 22) compares *Ripalthas*, a place in the north-east of Mesopotamia; but the resemblance of the two names is probably accidental" (Smith).

Pil'eha (Heb. *Pilcha'*, פִּלְחָא, *the slice*, or *worship;* Sept. Φαλασύ), the head of one of the Jewish families who sealed the covenant with Nehemiah (Neh. x, 24 [Heb. 25]). B.C. 445.

Piles. See Hæmorrhoids.

Pile'ser. See Tiglath-Pileser.

Pile-tower, or *Pele-tower*, an architectural term, seems to have signified a small fortress, dwelling, or tower, capable of being defended against any sudden marauding expedition. Church towers appear to have been sometimes used for the same purpose. Some of these towers, which were used for habitations, have had additions made to them subsequent to their erection. Heifer-haw tower, near Alnwick, and a tower in Corbridge churchyard, were probably pele-towers only. *Pile*, a fortress, occurs only in names of places in the Isle of Man, Lancashire, and the neighboring parts, but it is an archaic term not exclusively northern.

Pilgrim is used in the A. V. only in the old sense of sojourner, for παρεπίδημος (Heb. xi, 13; 1 Pet. ii, 11; "stranger," 1 Pet. i, 1). Similarly in the O. T. "pilgrimage" occurs as a rendering of מָגוּר, *magûr*, which signifies a *stay*, or an abode in a foreign country, travels (Gen. xvii, 8). Metaphorically, it is applied to the sojourning on earth; thus the patriarch Jacob says to Pharaoh, "The days of the years of my pilgrimage are a hundred and thirty years (Gen. xlvii, 9). The Psalmist likewise says, "Thy statutes have been my songs in the house of my pilgrimage" (Psa. cxix, 54).

Pilgrim Fathers, a name often given to the early settlers of New England. The ship "Mayflower," that bore the first of them, left Plymouth Sept. 6, 1620, and on Dec. 6 the passengers landed on a rock in Cape Cod harbor. The men engaged in the formation of the New England colonies have seldom been surpassed in sagacity and prowess, in piety and benevolent exertion. Many of them were men of education and rank; they were eminently free from the low and degrading vices of the statesmen of that age. The political trust committed to them was felt to be an awful deposit. It was their constant aim, one which they carried with them to the council-chamber, and bore back with them to the closet in their religious exercises, that each colonist should exhibit the lofty mien of a freeman, and wear the dignity of an heir to heaven; that he should bow the knee to none but God, and bear no yoke but his who is meek and lowly in heart. The grief of bidding farewell to friends, country, and home

did not produce in them a sentimental lethargy, but was borne with manly courage and Christian heroism. In the long and tedious voyage their hearts sank not. Their spirit did not fail them in the midst of those difficulties and dangers with which foreign adventure abounds. The sultry climate, the swamp and the forest, the solitary encampment, and the whoop of the savage, were calmly and successfully encountered. Like their leaders, the majority of them were men of God. The men that landed from the "Mayflower" on the rock of Plymouth felt themselves to be "chosen vessels," and the consciousness of their solemn consecration was the deepest sensation of their religious experience. The preservation of the ordinances of religion was a principal endeavor with them. The first trees of the virgin forest were felled for the sanctuary—"a man was famous according as he had lifted up axes upon the thick trees." Truly did they vow, "If I forget thee, O Jerusalem, let my hand forget her cunning." Their inner life nourished itself by frequent days of fasting and prayer. These were seasons of coveted enjoyment. Their firmness might be somewhat stern, their rigidness of observance might generate formality, yet their heart was with God, his law their guide, his glory their aim. In every crisis they inquired at the oracle of Jehovah; in seasons of deliverance they entered his courts with praise—"a multitude that kept holiday;" in times of impending danger they placed themselves under the protection of him to whom the shields of the earth belong. They were a people worthy of those high-souled patriots who were their leaders, both in civil polity and religion. Few statesmen of that day had the purity of Winthrop, few ministers the learning of Cotton, the endowments of Hooker, or the self-sacrificing spirit of Roger Williams. See PURITANS.

Pilgrim, RELIGIOUS. See PILGRIMAGES.

Pilgrim, a German prelate of mediæval times, flourished from 970 to 991. He was first engaged in missionary work among the Hungarians. He held different ecclesiastical positions, and at last was made bishop of Passau. In 974 he drew up for pope Benedict VI a remarkable report concerning the spread of Christianity in Hungary, but the paper was somewhat exaggerated, and probably prepared by Pilgrim to further some particular interest of his own. The truth is that, like his predecessors, he was striving to assert his independence of the archbishopric of Salzburg; and he defended the dignity and rights of that ancient metropolis, the long since dilapidated city of Lorch (Laureacum), whose diocese stretched onward to Pannonia. "And so we may suppose," says Neander, "that in his efforts to convince the pope (from whom, in fact, he obtained the fulfilment of his wishes) how necessary the restoration of this metropolis was to Pannonia and to its subordinate bishoprics, he allowed himself to be betrayed into a somewhat exaggerated representation of this new sphere of labor in Hungary." See Neander, *History of the Christian Church*, iii, 331 sq.; Kurtz, *Lehrbuch d. Kirchengesch.* (7th ed.) i, 294; *Theolog. Univ.-Lex.* s. v. (B. P.)

Pilgrim, JOHANN ULRICH, an engraver on wood, and the supposed inventor of engraving in chiaro-oscuro. Little is known of him or of his works, except a few prints, which are marked with two pilgrims' staves crossed between the initials Jo. V. Among the ten prints mentioned by Bartsch are these: *Christ on the Cross*, with the Magdalen kneeling at its foot, and the Virgin and St. John standing one on either side; *The Virgin*, seated in a garden, with the Infant on her knee; *The Virgin*, half-length, with the Infant in her arms; *St. Jerome in the Desert*, with a book in one hand and a stone in the other; and *St. Sebastian*, tied to a tree.

Pilgrimage of Grace, THE. In the time of Henry VIII, it is said that by the dissolution of the lesser monasteries about ten thousand persons became (rather from choice than necessity, for they had the option of being transferred to the larger houses) applicants for public bounty. These persons, traversing the kingdom, by the detail of their sufferings created extensive dissatisfaction, and popular feeling was with them. Many of the people also sympathized with the inmates of nunneries, some of whom they were taught to regard as ladies of gentle lives and kind deeds, whose monastic charities were necessarily suspended when their communities were dispersed. An attempt was made to suppress the growing disturbance by restoring thirty of the less disorderly of the suppressed houses. But the storm broke out first in Lincolnshire, and subsequently in Yorkshire, where forty thousand men marched with crucifixes and banners before them, calling their expedition *the Pilgrimage of Grace*, and avowing their object to be the removal of low-born counsellors (Cromwell, the chancellor, was the son of a blacksmith at Putney), the suppression of heresy, and the restitution of the Church. These rebel forces, however, melted away without any action; and their leader Aske, upon a repetition of the outbreak, was beheaded for treason. Many of the abbots and friars were supposed to be implicated in the pilgrimage.

Pilgrimages are exercises of religious discipline, which consist in journeying to some place of reputed sanctity, frequently in discharge of a vow.

Christian Pilgrimages.—The idea of any peculiar sacredness being attached to special localities under the Christian dispensation was very strikingly rebuked by Christ in his conversation with the woman of Samaria, as recorded in John iv; and nowhere is the principle on this subject more plainly laid down than in the Lord's statement on that occasion: "The hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth: for the Father seeketh such to worship him." In proportion, however, as Christianity receded from the apostolic age, it gradually lost sight of the simplicity and spirituality which marked its primitive character, and availed itself of carnal expedients for the purpose of elevating the imagination and kindling the devotion of its votaries. Hence, in the 4th century, many, encouraged by the example of the emperor Constantine, whose superstitious tendencies were strong, resorted to the scenes of the Saviour's life and ministry for the nourishing and invigoration of their religious feelings and desires. Helena, the mother of Constantine, set the first example of a pilgrimage to Palestine, which was soon extensively imitated; partly, as in the case of Constantine, with a desire to be baptized in the Jordan, but still more from a veneration for the spots which were associated with the events of the history of Christ and his apostles. Thus a superstitious attachment to the Holy Land increased so extensively that some of the most eminent teachers of the Church, as Jerome and Gregory of Nyssa, openly disapproved these pilgrimages. The most frequent resort of pilgrims was Jerusalem, but to this were afterwards added Rome, Tours, and Compostella. As to the last-named place, we find that in the year 1428, under the reign of Henry VI, abundance of licenses were granted by the crown of England to captains of English ships for carrying numbers of devout persons to the shrine of St. James; provided, however, that those pilgrims should first make oath not to take anything prejudicial to England, nor to reveal any of its secrets, nor to carry out with them any more gold or silver than would be sufficient for their reasonable expenses. In that year 926 persons went from England on the said pilgrimage. In our own times the greatest numbers have resorted to Loretto (q. v.), in order to visit the chamber of the Blessed Virgin, in which she was born, and brought up her son Jesus till he was twelve years of age! or to *Paray le Monial* (q. v.), to pay homage to the Virgin Marie à la Coque (q. v.).

In the Middle Ages pilgrimages were regarded as a mark of piety, but, as might have been expected, they gave rise to the most flagrant abuses. We find ac-

cordingly pope Boniface, in a letter to Cuthbert, archbishop of Canterbury, in the 8th century, desiring that women and nuns might be restrained from their frequent pilgrimages to Rome. The second Council of Chalons also, which was held in A.D. 813, denounces in no measured terms the false trust reposed in pilgrimages to Rome, and also to the church of St. Martin at Tours. "There are clergymen," complains this ecclesiastical synod, "who lead an idle life, and trust thereby to be purified from sin, and to fulfil the duties of their calling; and there are laymen who believe that they may sin or have sinned with impunity because they undertook such pilgrimages; there are great men who, under this pretext, practice the grossest extortion among their people; and there are poor men who employ the same excuse to render begging a more profitable employment. Such are those who wander round about, and falsely declare that they are on a pilgrimage; while there are others whose folly is so great that they believe that they become purified from their sins by the mere sight of the holy places, forgetting the words of St. Jerome, who says that there is nothing meritorious in seeing Jerusalem, but in leading a good life there." It was between the 11th and the 13th centuries, however, that the rage for pilgrimages came to its height. About the commencement of the period now referred to the idea extensively prevailed throughout Europe that the thousand years mentioned in the Apocalypse were near their close, and the end of the world was at hand. A general consternation spread among all classes, and many individuals, parting with their property and abandoning their friends and families, set out for the Holy Land, where they imagined that Christ would appear to judge the world. While Palestine had been in the hands of the caliphs, pilgrimages to Jerusalem had been encouraged as offering them an ample source of revenue; but no sooner had Syria been conquered by the Turks, in the middle of the 11th century, than pilgrims to the Holy Land began to be exposed to every species of insult. The minds of men in every part of Christendom were now inflamed with indignation at the cruelties and impositions of the Mohammedan possessors of the holy places; and in such circumstances the Church enthusiasts found little difficulty in originating the *Crusades* (q. v.), and for two centuries vast armies of pilgrims poured into the Holy Land. It was easier for the Crusaders, however, to make their conquests than to preserve them; and accordingly, before the 13th century had passed away, the Christians were driven out of all their Asiatic possessions, and the holy places fell anew into the hands of the infidels.

In almost every country where Romanism prevails pilgrimages have been and still are common. In England, at one time, the shrine of Thomas à Becket, and in Scotland that of St. Andrew, was the favorite resort of devout pilgrims. But even down to the present day there are various places in Ireland where stations and holy wells attract crowds of devout worshippers every year; and many parts of that country are sacred to extraordinary worship and pilgrimage. From the beginning of May till the middle of August every year crowds of popish penitents resort to an island near the centre of Lough Fin, or White Lake, in the county of Donegal, to the amount of three or four thousand. These are mostly of the poorer sort, and many of them are proxies for those who are richer; some of whom, however, together with some of the priests and bishops, on occasion make their appearance there. When the pilgrim comes within sight of the holy lake he must uncover his hands and feet, and thus walk to the water-side, and is taken to the island for sixpence. Here are two chapels and fifteen other houses, to which are added confessionals, so contrived that the priest cannot see the person confessing. The penance varies according to the circumstances of the penitent, during the continuance of which (sometimes three, six, or nine days) he subsists on oatmeal, sometimes made into bread. He traverses sharp stones on his bare knees or feet, and goes through a variety of other forms, paying sixpence at every different confession. When all is over the priest bores a gimlet-hole through the top of the pilgrim's staff, in which he fastens a cross peg; gives him as many holy pebbles out of the lake as he cares to carry away, for amulets to be presented to his friends, and so dismisses him, an object of veneration to all other papists not thus initiated, who no sooner see the pilgrim's cross in his hands than they kneel down to get his blessing. But France, even in modern times, remains the special patron of Roman-Catholic devotees. Thus the *N.-Y. Tribune* correspondent writes under Aug. 27, 1875, from Paris: "If half a million was a correct estimate—the faithful will tell you that it was too low—of the number of those who had already this year, at the date of my 10th of July letter, gone on foot or wheels to pay their devotions at this, that, and the other French shrine, by this it should be near a million and a half. We are now in the height of the pilgrimage season. Never in modern times, if in any time, was there another like it for brisk and multitudinous pious peregrination. One day it is 100,000 devotees about *Notre Dame de la Garde;* on another 20,000 at *Cambrai*, 10,000 at *Notre Dame de Liesse*, at *La Salette*, and *Lourdes*, besides great days and extraordinary occasions. The affluence is constant, with a sprinkling of miraculous cures from the thaumaturgic springs of the last-named places. There is hardly a diocese whose bishop does not exalt the merits of some local shrine for convenience of tender-footed or short-winded devotees of his flock." In Belgium also the same priestly management prevails. The chief object is, of course, the attraction of immense flocks of pilgrims from all parts of the world to enrich from their offerings the depleted coffers of the papacy, and to incite the popular mind to renewed ardor in the promotion of all the objects at which Romanism has been wont to aim. See ROMANISM.

Peculiar usages have prevailed from time to time among the pilgrims of Christianity. Thus the English pilgrim's weeds consisted of a hood with a cape, a low-crowned hat with two strings, a staff or bourdon four or five feet long, made originally of two sticks swathed together, a bottle strung at their waist-belt, and scrip. Those whose pilgrimage was self-imposed walked barefooted, and begged their daily bread, let their beards grow, and wore no linen. The palmer was distinguished by two leaflets of palm; the pilgrim to Mount Sinai wore the St. Catharine's wheel; he who went to Rome came back with a medal, graven with the cross-keys, or vernicle; the pilgrim to Compostella brought home the scallop-shell of Galicia; those who went to Walsingham were distinguished by a badge; and from Canterbury the pilgrim carried, as a memorial, an ampulla full of Canterbury water, which was mingled with one tiny drop of à Becket's blood. Latimer mentions "the piping, playing, and curious singing, to solace the travail and weariness of pilgrims." At Gloucester the pilgrims' door, with its colossal warders, remains in the south arm of the transept. In the holy wars the French Crusaders were distinguished by a red, English by a white, and Flemings by a green cross. Penitents paid Peter's pence as a composition for a pilgrimage to Rome, or commuted it by a visit to Peterborough, St. Alban's, or St. David's. In 1064, persons going to visit a saint had the protection of the Church. At Hereford, a canon might be absent on a pilgrimage in England for three weeks; and once in his life for seven weeks to visit St. Denis; ten weeks, Rome and Compostella; eight, Pontegnes; and one year, Jerusalem. In some Continental countries pilgrims and priests sometimes inscribed their names on the altars which they visited. These were called inscripta, or literata, but must not be confounded with those bearing the donor's name; the first instance of the latter custom occurred in the case of Pulcherius at Constantinople, as Sozomen relates. The pilgrim's tomb sometimes bore the print of two bare feet, as em-

blematical of his safe return. The pilgrims, having been first shriven, prostrated themselves before the altar while prayers were said over them, and stood up to receive the priest's benediction on their scrips and staves, which he sprinkled with holy water and delivered into their hands. If they were going to Jerusalem, a cross was marked upon their garment; the ceremonial terminated with a solemn mass. In 1322 a priest who betrayed a confession had to go on a pilgrimage as a penance. In 1200 monks were forbidden to become pilgrims. "Divers men and women," said W. Thorpe in the 15th century, "have with them both men and women that can well sing wanton songs, some other have bagpipes, so that in every town, what with the noise of their singing and with the sound of their piping, and with the jingli..g of their Canterbury bells, and with the barking out of dogs after them, they make more noise than if the king came there away with all his clarions and many other minstrels." The staff had sometimes a bronze socket, inscribed with these words in Latin, "May this cross direct thy journey in safety."

Jewish Pilgrimages.—Among the Jews pilgrimages to Jerusalem are made by the most devoted only. The Polish and Russian Jews, greatly oppressed in their homes, occasionally seek relief by a journey to the city of Zion, there to pray for the speedy coming of the Messiah. That sect of Judaism known as the Chasidim have their yearly processions to Sandez, the nursery of the most absurd superstition. The time for this pilgrimage is generally on the first days of the month of Elul. As soon as the sound of the cornet proclaims the approach of the new year the Chasidim of Galicia and Russian Poland hasten in large numbers to Sandez, to manifest their adoration and veneration by rich presents to the rabbi working miracles, who presides at Sandez. About that time the city authorities and the rabbi assume a very friendly relation, and the quiet life of the place changes into activity by the increase of strangers. The streets are filled with Chasidim, who come from afar off to open their heart and confide their secret wishes to the wonder-working man.

Mohammedan Pilgrimages.—In Mohammedan countries, pilgrimages are much in vogue. The pilgrimage to Mecca (q. v.) is not only expressly commanded in the Koran, but is regarded by the Arabian prophet as indispensable to all his followers. In his view, a believer neglecting this duty, if it were in his power to perform it, might as well die a Christian or a Jew. The Persians, however, instead of subjecting themselves to a toilsome pilgrimage to Mecca, look upon the country of which Babylon formerly, and now Bagdad, is the chief city, as the holy land in which are deposited the ashes of Ali and the rest of the holy martyrs. Not only do the living resort thither, but many bring along with them the dead bodies of their relatives, to lay them in the sacred earth. Pilgrimage is a duty binding upon all Moslems, both men and women. Inability is the only admitted ground of exemption, and Mohammedan casuists have determined that those who are incapable must perform it by deputy, and bear the expense of these substitutes. What is principally reverenced in Mecca, and gives sanctity to the whole, is a square stone building, called the Kaaba (q. v.). Before the time of Mohammed this temple was a place of worship for the idolatrous Arabs, and is said to have contained no less than three hundred and sixty different images, equalling in number the days of the Arabian year. They were all destroyed by Mohammed, who sanctified the Kaaba, and appointed it to be the chief place of worship for all true believers. The Mussulmans pay so great a veneration to it that they believe a single sight of its sacred walls, without any particular act of devotion, is as meritorious in the sight of God as the most careful discharge of one's duty for the space of a whole year in any other temple. To this temple every Mohammedan who has health and means sufficient ought once, at least, in his life to go on a pilgrimage; nor are women excused from the performance of this duty. The pilgrims meet at different places near Mecca, according to the different parts from whence they come during the months of Shawal and Dhu'lhaja, being obliged to be there by the beginning of the latter; which month, as its name imports, is peculiarly set apart for the celebration of this solemnity. The men put on the ibram or sacred habit, which consists only of two woollen wrappers, one wrapped about the middle, and the other thrown over their shoulders, having their heads bare, and a kind of slippers which cover neither the heel nor the instep, and so enter the sacred territory on their way to Mecca. While they have this habit on they must neither hunt nor fowl (though they are allowed to fish), which precept is so punctually observed that they will not kill vermin if they find them on their bodies: there are some noxious animals, however, which they have permission to kill during the pilgrimage, as kites, ravens, scorpions, mice, and dogs given to bite. During the pilgrimage it behooves a man to have a constant guard over his words and actions; to avoid all quarrelling or ill language, all converse with women, and all obscene discourse; and to apply his whole attention to the good work he is engaged in. The pilgrims being arrived at Mecca, immediately visit the temple, and then enter on the performance of the prescribed ceremonies, which consist chiefly in going in procession round the Kaaba, in running between the Mounts Safa and Meriva, in making the station on Mount Arafat, and slaying the victims and shaving their heads in the valley of Mina. In compassing the Kaaba, which they do seven times, beginning at the corner where the black stone is fixed, they use a short, quick pace the first three times they go round it, and a grave, ordinary pace the last four; which, it is said, was ordered by Mohammed, that his followers might show themselves strong and active, to cut off the hopes of the infidels, who gave out that the immoderate heats of Medina had rendered them weak. The aforesaid quick pace, however, they are not obliged to use every time they perform this piece of devotion, but only at some particular times. As often as they pass by the black stone they either kiss it, or touch it with their hand, and kiss that. The running between Safa and Meriva is also performed seven times, partly with a slow pace and partly running; for they walk gravely till they come to a place between two pillars; and there they run, and afterwards walk again, sometimes looking back, and sometimes stopping, like one who had lost something, to represent Hagar seeking water for her son; for the ceremony is said to be as ancient as her time. On the 9th of Dhu'lhaja, after morning prayer, the pilgrims leave the valley of Mina, whither they come the day before, and proceed in a tumultuous and rushing manner to Mount Arafat and Mina, and there spend the night in prayer and reading the Koran. The next morning by daybreak they visit el-Mashar el-Karam, or the sacred monument; and, departing thence before sunrise, haste by Batn-Mohasser to the valley of Mina, where they throw seven stones at three marks or pillars, in imitation of Abraham, who, meeting the devil in that place, and being by him disturbed in his devotions, or tempted to disobedience when he was going to sacrifice his son, was commanded by God to drive him away by throwing stones at him; though others pretend that this rite is as old as Adam, who also put the devil to flight in the same place and by the same means. The ceremony being over, on the same day, the 10th of Dhu'lhaja, the pilgrims slay their victims in the said valley of Mina, of which they and their friends eat part, and the rest is given to the poor. These victims must be either sheep, goats, kine, or camels; males, if either of the two former kinds, and females if either of the latter, and of a fit age. The sacrifices being over, they shave their heads and cut their nails, burying them in the same place; after which the pilgrimage is looked upon as completed, though they again visit the Kaaba to take their leave of that sacred building. The

pilgrimage to Mecca was interrupted for a quarter of a century by the Carmathians, and in our own day it has been again interrupted by the Wahabîs, and these in turn were defeated by Mohammed Ali, who revived the pilgrimage and attended with his court. In the year 1873, 200,000 pilgrims visited the holy places. But in the present year (1877) pilgrimages to Mecca have been revived in marvellous force, owing to the contest of Turkey with Russia, and it is expected that nearly one half million people, if not more, will bring tribute to the Kaaba, the treasures of which, amounting to over 200,000,000 piasters, or $50,000,000, have been placed at the disposal of the sultan of Turkey, and are to be used in the defence of the Mussulman's faith.

Heathen Pilgrimages.—Among heathen nations, also, pilgrimages are practiced. In Japan, more especially, all the different sects have their regular places of resort. The pilgrimage which is esteemed by the Sintuists as the most meritorious is that of Istje, which all are bound to make once a year, or at least once in their life. Another class of pilgrims are the Siunse, who go to visit in pilgrimage the thirty-three principal temples of Canon, which are scattered over the empire. Besides these regular pilgrimages, the Japanese also undertake occasional religious journeys to visit certain temples in fulfilment of certain vows. These pilgrims travel alone, almost always running, and, though generally very poor, refuse to receive charity from others (comp. McFarland, *Japan*, p. 211).

Hindûism has its pilgrimages on a grand scale. Thousands and tens of thousands annually repair to the temple of Jaggernaut (q. v.). Equally famed as the resort of multitudes of Hindû pilgrims is the island of Ganga Sagor, where the holiest branch of the Ganges (q. v.) is lost in the waters of the Indian Ocean. To visit this sacred river hundreds of thousands annually abandon their homes, and travel for months amid many hardships and dangers, and should they reach the scene of their pilgrimage, it is only in many cases that they may plunge themselves and their unconscious babies into the troubled but, in their view, purifying waters, offering themselves and their little ones as voluntary victims to the holy river. Among the numberless sacred spots in Hindostan may be mentioned Jumnontri, a village on the banks of the Jumna, which is so famed as a place of pilgrimage that those who resort thither are considered as thereby almost entitled to divine honors. The holy town of Hurdwar may also be noticed, to which pilgrims resort from every corner of the East where Hindûism is known; and of such efficacy is the water of the Ganges at this point that even the guiltiest may be cleansed from sin by a single ablution. The Hindûs also attach great importance to pilgrimages to the holy temples at Benares and other sacred shrines. Sometimes these are performed on sandals with small spikes inserted, every step causing pain to the pilgrim. In other cases, the whole distance of hundreds of miles is travelled by the infatuated fakir tumbling over and over, like a wagon-wheel, without ever standing on his feet; for the greater the pain and suffering with which the pilgrimage is accomplished, the greater is the merit attached to its performance. It often happens that poor pilgrims perish on the road for want of food, or in consequence of sufferings arising from the severe penalty which they inflict upon themselves. But instead of this being a warning to others, it is considered highly meritorious to fall in the effort to fulfil a vow made in honor of their idol gods. The Buddhists, though not so devoted to pilgrimages as the Hindûs, are not without their places of sacred resort. One of the most noted is Adam's Peak, in Ceylon, where Gotama Buddha is supposed to have left the impression of his foot. The summit of the peak is annually visited by great numbers of pilgrims. The Lamaists of Thibet also make an annual pilgrimage to Lha-Ssa for devotional purposes.

Dr. Johnson gives us some observations on pilgrimage, which are so much to the purpose that we shall here present them to the reader: "Pilgrimage, like many other acts of piety, may be reasonable or superstitious, according to the principles upon which it is performed. Long journeys in search of truth are not commanded; truth, such as is necessary to the regulation of life, is always found where it is honestly sought; change of place is no natural cause of the increase of piety, for it inevitably produces dissipation of mind. Yet since men go every day to view the fields where great actions have been performed, and return with stronger impressions of the event, curiosity of the same kind may naturally dispose us to view that country whence our religion had its beginning. That the Supreme Being may be more easily propitiated in one place than another is the dream of idle superstition; but that some places may operate upon our own minds in an uncommon manner is an opinion which hourly experience will justify. He who supposes that his vices may be more successfully combated in Palestine, will, perhaps, find himself mistaken; yet he may go thither without folly: he who thinks they will be more freely pardoned dishonors at once his reason and his religion" (Johnson's *Rasselas*). See *Encyclop. Brit.* s. v.; Gardner, *Faiths of the World*, s. v.; *British Quar. Rev.* July, 1875, art. v; *Mediæval and Modern Saints*, p. 112, 159; *Baptist Quar.* April, 1875, art. vii; Cutts, *Scenes and Characters of the Middle Ages* (Lond. 1873), essay iii; Lea, *Sacerdotal Celibacy;* Butler, *Church History*, i, 410, 447; Riddle, *Hist. of the Papacy;* Gieseler, *Ecclesiastical History;* Mosheim, *Ecclesiastical History*, vol. ii; Walcott, *Sacred Archæol.* s. v.

Pilgrims and Strangers. See Sionites.

Pilkington, James, a noted Anglican prelate, who flourished in the great Reformation period of the 16th century, was born of an ancient gentleman's family at Rivington, in Lancashire, in 1520. He was educated at St. John's College, Cambridge, and after graduation took holy orders. Under the reign of king Edward he distinguished himself as one of the disputants against transubstantiation, but under the reign of bloody Mary he was obliged to leave the country, as he was very decided in his Protestant proclivities. He lived for a while at Zurich, and then at Basle. When suffered to return, in 1558, after the accession of Elizabeth, he was made master of his alma mater. He interested himself in educational affairs generally throughout the kingdom, and in his native place established a free-school, which he himself endowed. In 1561 he was elevated to the bishopric of Durham, and became noted for his tolerant views. Thus, in 1564, he advocated indulgence to Nonconformists, and to all who scrupled to observe practices or assume obligations having any appearance of popish tendency. Bishop Pilkington died in 1575. He published, *Exposition of the Prophet Haggeus* (Lond. 1560, 8vo):—and *on Obadiah* (1560), *Nehemiah* (Camb. 1585, 4to), *Ecclesiastes, Epistle of Peter, and of Paul to the Galatians:—Def. of the Engl. Service;* and, besides, many sermons. His *Works* were edited, with biographical notices, for the Parker Society, by the Rev. James Scholefield, regius professor of Greek, Cambridge (Camb. 1842, 8vo). See Strype's *Cranmer, Parker,* and *Grindal;* Hardwick, *Hist. of the Ref.* p. 219 et al.; Soames, *Elizabethan Ch. History*, p. 22, 49, 605; Burnet, *Hist. of the Ref.;* Hook, *Eccles. Biog.* viii, 92. (J. H. W.)

Pilkington, Matthew, an English divine, flourished near the middle of the last century as prebend of Lichfield. He is especially noted as a secular writer. He is also the author of *Evangelical History and Harmony* (Lond. 1747, fol.), which is executed with great care, and is of some value:—*A Rational Concordance* (Nottingh. 1749, 4to), which is now extremely scarce:—and *Remarks upon several Passages of Scripture* (Camb. and Lond. 1759, 8vo), which, according to Orme (*Bibl. Bibl.* s. v.), "contains a considerable portion of valuable matter." Pilkington also published several of his sermons (1733, 4to; 1755, 8vo), etc.

Pillar is a term frequently occurring in the Scriptures, especially of the O. T., where it is used in different senses, and as the rendering of several Heb. and Gr. words, which need to be distinguished both in their meaning and application.

I. *Original Words so Translated.*—1. From the root נָצַב, *natsáb, to station*, come the following: מַצֵּבָה, *matstsebâh* (rendered "pillar" everywhere in Genesis, and in Exod. xxiv, 4; Deut. xii, 3; Isa. xix, 19; elsewhere "image"), a *column* or *image* of stone; מַצֶּבֶת, *matstsébeth*, a monumental "pillar" (Gen. xxxv, 14, 20; 2 Sam. xviii, 18), once the *trunk* or stump of a tree ("substance," Isa. vi, 13); מָצָב, *mutstsâb*, according to some a military *post* (as in Isa. xxix, 3, "mount"), or garrison, according to others a terminal *mark* (Judg. ix, 6); נְצִיב, *netsíb*, a *statue* (only Gen. xix, 26, "pillar"), or military *officer* or *garrison* (as elsewhere rendered).

2. From other roots: עַמּוּד, *ammûd*, lit. something *upright* (from עָמַד, *to stand*), a *column* (the usual word for "pillar," and invariably so rendered in the A. V., but meaning an elevated stand or *platform* in 2 Kings xi, 14; xxiii, 3); מִסְעָד, *mis'âd, a support* (from סָעַד, *to prop*), a *balustrade* (only 1 Kings x, 12); מָצוּק, *matsúk, a column* (from צוּק, *to set up*) as a support (fig. 1 Sam. ii, 8), or tropically *a crag* ("situate," 1 Sam. xiv, 5); אֹמְנָה, *omenâh* (from אָמַן, *to stay up*), *a column* (only 2 Kings xviii, 16); and תִּימָרָה, *timerâh*, a *column*, in the form of an artificial palm-tree (Cant. iii, 6; Joel ii, 30 [Heb. iii, 3]).

3. In the N. T.: only στύλος, a column or support (Gal. ii, 9; 1 Tim. iii, 15; Rev. iii, 12; x, 1).

II. *Uses.*—The essential notion of a pillar is that of a shaft or isolated pile, either supporting or not supporting a roof.

1. *Monumental.*—Perhaps the votive object was the earliest application of the pillar. This in primitive times consisted of nothing but a single stone or pile of stones. Instances are seen in Jacob's pillars (Gen. xxviii, 18; xxxi, 46, 51, 52; xxxv, 14); in the twelve pillars set up by Moses at Mount Sinai (Exod. xxiv, 4); the twenty-four stones erected by Joshua (Josh. iv, 8, 9; see also Isa. xix, 19, and Josh. xxiv, 27). See STONE. The trace of a similar notion may probably be found in the holy stone of Mecca (Burckhardt, *Trav.* i, 297). The erection of columns or heaps of stone to commemorate any remarkable event was universal before the introduction of writing or inscription, and it is still employed for that purpose by many savage nations. See GALEED. Monumental pillars have thus been common in many countries and in various styles of architecture. Such were perhaps the obelisks of Egypt (Fergusson, p. 6, 8, 115, 246, 340; Ibn-Batuta, *Trav.* p. 111; Strabo, iii, 171, 172; Herod. ii, 106; Amm. Marc. xvii, 4; Josephus, *Ant.* i, 2, 3, the pillars of Seth). See PYRAMID.

The stone Ezel (1 Sam. xx, 19) was probably a terminal stone or a waymark. See EBENEZER.

The "place" set up by Saul (1 Sam. xv, 12) is explained by St. Jerome to be a trophy, Vulg. *fornicem triumphalem* (Jerome, *Quæst. Hebr. in lib. i, Reg.* iii, 1339). The word used is the same as that for Absalom's pillar, יָד, *yâd* (lit. *a hand*), called by Josephus χεῖρα (*Ant.* vii, 10, 3), which was clearly of a monumental or memorial character, but not necessarily carrying any representation of a hand in its structure, as has been supposed to be the case. So also Jacob set up a pillar over Rachel's grave (Gen. xxxv, 20; and Robinson, i, 218). The monolithic tombs and obelisks of Petra are instances of similar usage (Burckhardt, *Syria*, p. 422; Roberts, *Sketches*, p. 105; Irby and Mangles, *Travels*, p. 125). See ABSALOM'S TOMB.

2. *Architectural.*—Pillars form an important feature in Oriental architecture, partly perhaps as a reminiscence of the tent with its supporting poles, and partly also from the use of flat roofs, in consequence of which the chambers were either narrower or divided into portions by columns (Judg. xvi, 25). The tent-principle is exemplified in the open halls of Persian and other Eastern buildings, of which the fronts, supported by pillars, are shaded by curtains or awnings fastened to the ground outside by pegs, or to trees in the garden-court (Esth. i, 6; Chardin, *Voy.* vii, 387; ix, 469, 470, and plates 39, 81; Layard, *Nin. and Bab.* p. 530, 648; Burckhardt, *Notes on Bed.* i, 37). Thus Moses was commanded to spread the veil of the tabernacle on four pillars (Exod. xxvi, 32, etc.). Thus also a figurative mode of describing heaven is as a tent or canopy supported by pillars (Psa. civ, 2; Isa. xl, 22), and the earth as a flat surface resting on pillars (1 Sam. ii, 8; Psa. lxxv, 3). See TENT.



Solitary Pillar in the Wilderness.

It has already been remarked that the word "place," in 1 Sam. xv, 12, is in Hebrew "hand." In the Arab tent two of the posts are called *yed* or "hand" (Burckhardt, *Bed.* i, 37). See HAND.

The general practice in Oriental buildings of supporting flat roofs by pillars, or of covering open spaces by awnings stretched from pillars, led to an extensive use of them in construction. In Indian architecture an enormous number of pillars, sometimes amounting to 1000, is found. A similar principle appears to have been carried out at Persepolis. At Nineveh the pillars were probably of wood [see CEDAR], and it is very likely that the same construction prevailed in the "house of the forest of Lebanon," with its hall and porch of pillars (1 Kings vii, 2, 6). The "chapiters" of the two pillars Jachin (q.v.) and Boaz resembled the tall capitals of the Persepolitan columns (Layard, *Nin. and Bab.* p. 252, 650; *Nineveh*, ii, 274; Fergusson, *Handb.* p. 8, 174, 178, 188, 190, 196, 198, 231–233; Roberts,

Sketches, No. 182, 184, 190, 198; Euseb. *Vit. Const.* iii, 34, 38; Burckhardt, *Trav. in Arabia*, i, 244, 245). See HOUSE.

3. *Idolatrous.*—The word *Matstsebâh*, "pillar," is generally rendered "statue" or "image" (e. g. Deut. vii, 5; xii, 3; xvi, 22; Lev. xxvi, 1; Exod. xxiii, 24; xxxiv, 13; 2 Chron. xiv, 3; xxxi, 1; Jer. xliii, 13; Hos. iii, 4; x, 1; Mic. v, 13). This agrees with the usage of heathen nations, practiced, as we have seen, by the patriarch Jacob, of erecting blocks or piles of wood or stone, which in later times grew into ornamental pillars in honor of the deity (Clem. Alex. *Coh. ad Gent.* c. iv; *Strom.* i, 24). Instances of this are seen in the Attic Hermæ (Pausan. iv, 33, 4), seven pillars significant of the planets (iii, 21, 9; also vii, 17, 4, and 22, 2; viii, 37); and Arnobius mentions the practice of pouring libations of oil upon them, which again recalls the case of Jacob (*Adv. Gent.* i, 335, ed. Gauthier). See ASHERAH; PHALLUS.

The termini or boundary-marks were originally, perhaps always, rough stones or posts of wood, which received divine honors (Ovid, *Fast.* ii, 641, 684). See IDOL.

But other circumstances contributed to make stones an object of worship. Such phenomena as the rocking stones worshipped by the British Druids would naturally excite the astonishment of an ignorant people, and many commentators are of opinion that the אֶבֶן מַשְׂכִּית, *ében mashkîth*, image of stone, which the Jews were forbidden to erect (Lev. xxvi, 1), was one of those bowing or rocking stones, especially as the phrase is used in opposition to מַצֵּבָה, *matstsebâh*, which signifies "a standing pillar." Those rare phenomena, aëroliths, still more easily became objects of idolatry; they were generally of a similar kind to that mentioned by Herodian, as being consecrated to the sun under his name of *Elaiagabalos*, and preserved in his magnificent temple in Syria; "in which," says the historian, "there stands not any image made with hands, as among the Greeks and Romans, to represent the god, but there is a very large stone, round at the bottom, and terminating in a point of a conical form, and a black color, which they say fell down from Jupiter." See DIOPETES. Sacred pillars or stones were indeed frequently worshipped instead of statues by idolatrous nations, and traces of this preposterous veneration may still be found in various countries. See DIANA. The erection of monoliths or monumental pillars was forbidden to the Israelites, but it appears that they were permitted to erect cairns or piles of stone to preserve the recollection of great events, as Joshua did at Gilgal (q. v.), that it might be a memorial of his miraculous passage over the Jordan. See CROMLECH.

4. Lastly, the *figurative* use of the term "pillar," in reference to the cloud and fire accompanying the Israelites on their march (Exod. xxxiii, 9, 10; Neh. ix, 12; Psa. xcix, 7), or as in Cant. iii, 6 and Rev. x, 1, is plainly derived from the notion of an isolated column not supporting a roof. See PILLAR OF CLOUD AND FIRE. A pillar is also an emblem of firmness and steadfastness (Jer. i, 18; Rev. iii, 12), and of that which sustains or supports (Gal. ii, 9; 1 Tim. iii, 15). In the Apocrypha we find a similar metaphor (Ecclus. xxxvi, 24): "He that getteth a wife beginneth a possession, a help like unto himself, and a pillar of rest." See ARCHITECTURE.

PILLAR is in architectural language the column supporting the arch. In the *Norman* style the pillars are generally massive, and are frequently circular, with



St. Peter's, Northampton, c. 1160.



Sections of Pillars.

capitals either of the same form or square; they are sometimes ornamented with channels, or *flutes*, in vari-

Druidical Pillars.

ous forms, spiral, zigzag, reticulated, etc. In plain buildings a square or rectangular pillar, or pier, is occasionally found; a polygonal, usually octagonal, pillar is also used, especially towards the end of the style, and is generally of lighter proportions than most of the other kinds. But, besides these, clustered or compound pillars are extremely numerous and much varied; the simplest of them consists of a square with one or more rectangular recesses at each corner, but a more common form is one resembling these, with a small circular shaft in each of the recesses, and a larger one, semicircular, on two (or on each) of the faces: most of the compound pillars partake of this arrangement, though other varieties are by no means rare.

In the *Early English* style plain circular or octagonal shafts are frequently used, especially in plain buildings, but many other and more complicated kinds of pillars are employed; the commonest of these consists of a large central shaft, which is generally circular, with smaller shafts (usually four) round it; these are frequently made of a finer material than the rest, and polished, but they are often worked in courses with the central part of the pillar, and are sometimes filleted; in this style the pillars are very constantly banded.



Welford, c. 1220.

In the *Decorated* style the general form of clustered pillars changes from a circular to a lozenge-shaped arrangement, or to a square placed diagonally, but many other varieties are also to be met with. They sometimes consist of small shafts surrounding a larger one, and are sometimes moulded; the small shafts and some of the mouldings are often filleted; plain octagonal pillars are also very frequently employed in village churches: towards the end of this style a pillar consisting of four small shafts separated by a deep hollow and two fillets is common, as it is also in the Perpendicular style, but the hollows are usually shallower, and the disposition of the fillets is different.

A plain octagonal pillar continues in use throughout the *Perpendicular* style, though it is not so frequent as at earlier periods, and its sides are occasionally slightly hollowed. In Decorated work a few of the mouldings of the piers occasionally run up into the arches and form part of the archivolt, as at Bristol Cathedral, but in Perpendicular buildings this arrangement is much more common, and in some cases the whole of the mouldings of the pillars are continued in the arches without any capital or impost between them: the forms are various, but in general arrangement they usually partake of a square placed diagonally; sometimes, however, they are contracted in breadth so as to become narrower between the archways (from east to west) than in the opposite direction: the small shafts attached to the pillars in this style are usually plain circles, but are occasionally filleted, and in some instances are hollow-sided polygons.



Orton-on-the-Hill, c. 1300.



Stogumber, c. 1450.

Pillar of Cloud and Fire. According to Exod. xiii, 21 sq. (comp. xiv, 24; Numb. xiv, 14; Neh. ix, 12, 19), the Israelites during their journey from Egypt through the desert were accompanied in the day by a pillar of cloud, and at night by a pillar of fire (Heb. עַמּוּד עָנָן, עַמּוּד אֵשׁ, Sept. στύλος νεφέλης, πυρός), as a guide (comp. esp. Exod. xl, 36 sq.) and protection (comp. Psa. cv, 89; Wisd. x, 17), and this waited over the tabernacle while the people rested (Exod. xl, 34 sq.; Numb. ix, 15 sq.). The narrative represents Jehovah himself as in this cloud (comp. also Numb. xiv, 14), and as speaking from it to Moses (Exod. xxxiii, 9 sq.; Numb. xii, 5; Deut. xxxi, 15). Later writers explain this of the "wisdom" of God (σοφία, Wisd. x, 17), or the divine *Logos* (q. v.; comp. Philo, *Opera*, i, 501). Toland, again, and after him many others, explained this appearance naturally, and referred it to the fire carried in a vessel before the host, which in the day served as a guide and signal by its smoke, and at night by its brightness. Von der Hart carried this opinion so far as to hold that this fire carried before the Israelites was the sacred fire preserved upon the altar from the time of Abraham (*Ephemerid. Philol. Discurs.* vi, 109 sq.; and *Philol. Vindic.* Helmst. 1696. For the controversy on this view, see Rosenmüller on Exod. xiii, 21; comp. Förster, in Eichhorn's *Repert.* x, 132 sq.). This custom is actually observed by caravans in the East at the present day (Harmer, *Observ.* i, 438 sq.; *Descript. de l'Égypte*, viii, 128), and it became at an early day customary with armies

in the East, especially in traversing an unknown region (Curt. iii, 3, 9; v, 2, 7; but the passages sometimes quoted, Veget. *Mil.* iii, 5; Frontin. *Strateg.* ii, 25, do not refer to this. Comp. esp. on the custom, Faber, *Archäol.* p. 244 sq.; *Wolfenb. Fragm.* p. 103 sq.; Bauer, *Hebr. Mythol.* i, 281 sq.). Meanwhile we must not forget that it is the evident intention of the historian to narrate a miracle (comp. also Psa. lxxviii, 14; cv, 39; comp. Diod. Sic. xvi, 66; Clem. Alex. *Strom.* i, 150). The following monographs on this subject are unimportant: Krause, *De columna ignis ac nubis* (Viteb. 1707); Friderici, *De col. ign. et nub.* (Leips. 1689); Sahm, *De column. ign. ac nub.* (Gedan. 1702); Münden, *De column. nub. et igne* (Goslar, 1712), and many others. Following this national recollection, Isaiah (iv, 5) has employed the figure of a cloud of smoke and fire hovering over Zion and the Temple as a symbol of the presence of Jehovah, in his picture of the blessedness of the theocracy (comp. Ewald, *Isr. Gesch*, ii, 167 sq.). See SHEKINAH.

Pillar, PLAIN OF THE (אֵלוֹן מְצֻבֶה; Sept. τῆ βαλανῳ τῆ εὐρετῆ τῆς στάσεως; Alex. omits τῆ εὐρετῆ; Vulg. *quercum quæ stabat*), or rather "*oak of the pillar*" —that being the real signification of the Hebrew word *elôn;* a tree which stood near Shechem, and at which the men of Shechem and the house of Millo assembled, to crown Abimelech, son of Gideon (Judg. ix, 6). There is nothing said by which its position can be ascertained. It possibly derived its name of *Mutstsâh* from a stone or pillar set up under it; and reasons have already been adduced for believing that this tree may have been the same with that under which Jacob buried the idols and idolatrous trinkets of his household, and under which Joshua erected a stone as a testimony of the covenant there re-executed between the people and Jehovah. See MEONENIM. There was both time and opportunity during the period of commotion which followed the death of Joshua for this sanctuary to return into the hands of the Canaanites, and the stone left standing there by Joshua to become appropriated to idolatrous purposes as one of the *matstsebâhs* in which the religion of the aborigines of the Holy Land delighted. See IDOLATRY. The terms in which Joshua speaks of this very stone (Josh. xxiv, 27) almost seem to overstep the bounds of mere imagery, and would suggest and warrant its being afterwards regarded as endowed with miraculous qualities, and therefore a fit object for veneration. Especially would this be the case if the singular expression, "It hath heard all the words of Jehovah our God *which he spake to us*," were intended to indicate that this stone had been brought from Sinai, Jordan, or some other scene of the communications of Jehovah with the people. The Samaritans still show a range of stones on the summit of Gerizim as those brought from the bed of Jordan by the twelve tribes. See OAK.

Pillar OF SALT. See LOT.

Pillar Saints, devotees who stood on the tops of lofty pillars for many years in fulfilment of religious vows. The first who originated this practice was Simeon, a native of Syria, who was born about A.D. 390. In early youth he entered a monastery near Antioch, where he devoted himself to the most rigid exercises of mortification and abstinence. Having been expelled from the monastery for his excessive austerities, he retired to the adjacent mountain, where he took up his residence first in a cave, and then in a little cell, where he immured himself for three years. Next he removed to the top of a mountain, where he chained himself to a rock for several years. His fame had now become so great that crowds of visitors thronged to see him. "Incommoded by the pressure of the crowd," we are told, "he erected a pillar on which he might stand, elevated at first six cubits, and ending with forty. The top of the pillar was three feet in diameter, and surrounded with a balustrade. Here he stood day and night in all weathers. Through the night, till 9 A.M., he was constantly in prayer, often spreading forth his hands and bowing so low that his forehead touched his toes. A bystander once attempted to count the number of these successive prostrations, and he counted till they amounted to 1244. At 9 o'clock A.M. he began to address the admiring crowd below, to hear and answer their questions, to send messages and write letters, etc., for he took concern in the welfare of the churches, and corresponded with bishops, and even emperors. Towards evening he suspended his intercourse with this world, and betook himself again to converse with God till the following day. He generally ate but once a week, never slept, wore a long sheepskin robe, and a cap of the same. His beard was very long, and his frame extremely emaciated. In this manner he is reported to have spent thirty-seven years, and at last, in his sixty-ninth year, to have expired unobserved in a praying attitude, in which no one ventured to disturb him till after three days, when Anthony, his disciple and biographer, mounting the pillar, found that his spirit had departed, and his holy body was emitting a delightful odor. His remains were borne in pomp to Antioch, in order to be the safeguard of that unwalled town, and innumerable miracles were performed at his shrine. His pillar also was so venerated that it was literally enclosed with chapels and monasteries for some ages. Simeon was so averse to women that he never allowed one to come within the sacred precincts of his pillar. Even his own mother was debarred this privilege till after her death, when her corpse was brought to him, and he now restored her to life for a short time that she might see him, and converse with him a little before she ascended to heaven." Another Simeon Stylites is mentioned by Evagrius as having lived in the 6th century. In his childhood he mounted his pillar near Antioch, and is said to have occupied it sixty-eight years. The example of Simeon was afterwards followed, to a certain extent at least, by many persons in Syria and Palestine, and *pillar saints* were found in the East even in the 12th century, when the *Stylites*, as they were termed by the Greeks, were abolished. This order of saints never found a footing the West, and when one Wulfilaieus attempted to commence the practice in the German territory of Treves, the neighboring bishops destroyed his pillar, and prevented him from carrying his purpose into effect.

Pilled (Gen. xxx, 37, 38) is a rendering of פָּצַל, *patsál*, to *strip off* the bark, being the same as "strakes," i. e. *streaks*, in the same connection (ver. 57). PEELED (Isa. xviii, 2; Ezek. xxix, 18), however, is a different word in the original, מָרַט, *marát*, signifying to *polish*. The verb "to pil!" appears in Old English as identical in meaning with "to peel=to strip," and in this sense is used in the above passages from Genesis. Of the next stage in its meaning as=plunder, we have traces in the word "pillage," pilfer. If the difference between the two forms be more than accidental, it would seem as if, in the English of the 17th century, "peel" was used for the latter signification. The "people scattered and peeled" are generally interpreted to mean those that have been plundered of all they have. Comp.

> "Peeling their prisoners."—Milton, *P. R.* iv.
> "To peel the chiefs, the people to devour."
> —Dryden, *Homer, Iliad* (Richardson).

The soldiers of Nebuchadnezzar's army (Ezek. xxix, 18), however, have their shoulder *peeled* in the literal sense. The skin is worn off with carrying earth to pile up the mounds during the protracted siege of Tyre. See TYRE.

Pil(l)more (also spelled *Pilmoor*), JOSEPH, D.D., an early Episcopal minister in America, was born at Tadmouth, Yorkshire, England, about 1734, and was educated at Kingswood, the school of John Wesley, under whom he had been previously converted. On com-

pleting his studies, Pilmore became a lay helper in the Methodist itinerant ministry, and labored in this way for many years through England, Scotland, and Wales. His ministerial certificate from Mr. Wesley represents him as "having grace, gifts, and success or fruit in the work." His word was blessed everywhere. His appearance and preaching were impressive. Mr. Pilmore's manly form, tall and erect, his sympathizing spirit, earnest zeal and prayers, all united to make strong and lasting impressions. In 1769 he came to America, and preached throughout the colonies. Stevens says Pilmore had many hair-breadth escapes of life and limb in his wide journeys. At Charleston, S. C., he could find no place to use for preaching except the theatre, and while earnestly delivering a sermon, suddenly the table used for a pulpit, with the chair he occupied, all at once disappeared through a trap-door to the cellar. This was a wicked contrivance of the "baser sort." Nothing discouraged, however, the preacher, springing upon the stage, with the table, invited the audience to the adjoining yard, adding pleasantly, "Come on, my friends, we will, by the grace of God, defeat the devil this time, and not be beat by him from our work," and then quietly finished his discourse. The fruits of his Christian labors appeared in the conversion of many souls. Wherever he appeared large crowds attended his ministry, and listened to his Master's message. With the Wesleyan preachers generally, Pilmore retired from his ministerial work during the troublesome times of the American Revolution. In 1783 he joined the Protestant Episcopal Church, and was soon after ordained. He now became rector of Trinity (Oxford), All Saints (Lower Dublin), and St. Thomas (Whitemarsh). After the establishment of peace in this year he returned to America, and next served St. Paul's, Philadelphia, and thence removed to Christ Church, New York, of which he was chosen rector in 1804. Notwithstanding the interdiction of "Old Trinity," he preached with great acceptance and usefulness during ten years, and then was chosen rector of St. Paul's, Philadelphia, in 1814. Mr. Pilmore's congregation in New York became well known for its evangelical piety, and some of its communicants were on terms of intimate friendship with the members of the old John Street Methodist Episcopal Church. During the year 1821 this faithful and aged minister's mental powers exhibited evidences of failure, and this, with bodily indisposition, made it necessary for him to have an assistant. The Rev. Mr. Benjamin was chosen. Continuing gradually to fail, Pilmore departed this life July 24, 1825. Dr. Pilmore was a faithful minister of God, and wherever he preached gathered a large body of communicants. He left many bequests for charitable purposes. He is the author of a *Narrative of Labors in South Wales* (1825), and of a *Description of Travels and Trials and Preaching in the Colonies of New York, New Jersey, Delaware, Pennsylvania, Maryland, and Virginia*, which was never published. See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, v, 266; Disosway, in the *N. Y. Methodist*, No. 178; *Lives of Eminent Philadelphians* (1859), p. 801. (J. H. W.)

Pillow is the rendering in the A. V. of three very different Hebrew and one Greek word. The proper term is in the plur. מְרַאֲשֹׁת, *meraashôth* (Gen. xxviii, 11, 18, elsewhere "bolster"), which denotes simply a place for laying the head. In that passage we read that "Jacob took of the stones of that place [Haran], and put them for his pillows, and lay down in that place to sleep." The Hebrew word would be more properly rendered "towards the head." Similarly our Lord employed either the bench or possibly some cushion or rug upon it, when asleep upon the boat (προσκεφάλαιον, Mark iv, 38). See Bed. The כֶּסֶת, *ke'seth* (also in the plur.), of Ezek. xiii, 18, 20, however, designates a cushion or soft pad used in some way for magical enticement, perhaps one of the meretricious luxuries of the females alluded to. See Armhole. In 1 Sam. xix, 13, 16, the Heb. word is כְּבִיר, *kebîr*, something *braided* or plaited, hence usually thought to be a *quilt* or mattress. See Bolster.

What kind of pillows the Hebrews used we have no means of knowing, but the ancient Egyptians had pillows of wood formed to receive the head when resting on their couches, and these no doubt had a cushion stuffed with feathers, or other soft material. Specimens of these wooden pillows may be seen in the British Museum (Wilkinson, *Anc. Egyptians*, i, 71). "Hardy travellers, like Jacob (Gen. xxviii, 11, 18) and Elijah (1 Kings xix, 6), sleeping on the bare ground, would make use of a stone for this purpose; and soldiers on the march had probably no softer resting-place (1 Sam. xxvi, 7, 11, 12, 16). Possibly both Saul and Elijah may have used the water-bottle which they carried as a bolster, and if this were the case, David's midnight adventure becomes more conspicuously daring. The 'pillow' of goats' hair which Michal's cunning put in the place of the bolster in her husband's bed (xix, 13, 16) was probably, as Ewald suggests, a net or curtain of goats' hair, to protect the sleeper from the mosquitoes (*Gesch.* iii, 101, note), like the 'canopy' of Holofernes." See Sleep.



Ancient Egyptian Wooden Pillow.

Pillsbury, Ithamar, an American Presbyterian evangelist and missionary, was born in Dracutt, Mass., Aug. 22, 1794. His parents being both very pious, his early discipline and religious training were very strict and thorough. He prosecuted his academic course under many difficulties and discouragements, being obliged to interrupt his studies from time to time and to engage in teaching, in order to raise funds. He entered Union Academy, in Plainfield, N. H., in 1815; graduated at Yale College in October, 1822; studied theology in New York under the direction of Rev. Drs. Gardiner Spring and E. W. Baldwin; was licensed in October, 1824, and on June 19, 1825, was at his own request and by the unanimous vote of the Presbytery ordained as an evangelist. For several months after he labored as city missionary in and around the cities of New York and Boston. The character and results of his labors in those two cities laid the foundation for that extensive system of religious effort which aims at the spiritual good of the poor and destitute, known as City Missions. Desirous of a pastoral charge, in September, 1827, he accepted an invitation to supply the Church at Smithtown, Long Island, for one year, but continued to labor in that capacity until April, 1830, when he was installed their regular pastor. At his own request, in 1833 this relation was dissolved, and until May, 1834, he spent the time in travelling as an agent of the American Sunday-School Union. In 1835 he was appointed a commissioner to the General Assembly at Pittsburgh, Pa., after which he started on a tour of exploration to the state of Illinois, with a view to the founding of a colony. In September of the same year he returned to New York, and succeeded in organizing a company with a capital of some $40,000, to be invested "in the purchase of land, and the establishment of a colony for promoting the cause of education and piety in the state of Illinois." From this time onward

to the end of his life he was identified with the West, especially in all that pertained to the growth and prosperity of the Presbyterian Church. To the scheme of Christian colonization he gave much thought, time, labor, and prayer. From the spring of 1836 his labors as a missionary and an evangelist fairly set in; and with untiring energy and devotion he addressed himself to his work. He organized fourteen churches, and assisted at the organization of several others. In 1837 was organized the Church at Andover, in the Andover colony, and in 1841 he was installed its pastor, and continued to minister unto it until September, 1849. In May, 1850, he was installed pastor at Princeton, Bureau Co., where he had previously organized a Church; in 1853 he was chosen president of McDonough College, at Macomb; in 1855 he began to labor as stated supply in the Presbyterian Church at Macomb; in 1860 he returned to Andover, and took charge of the Church which he founded there. He died April 20, 1862. Mr. Pillsbury was a prudent and wise counsellor, a sincere and constant friend, and an able and faithful minister of the Gospel. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1863, p. 195. (J. L. S.)

Pilot (חֹבֵל, *chobél*, Ezek. xxvii, 8, 27–29), literally a *steersman*, a mariner, is also rendered in our version (Jonah i, 6) "ship-master;" but in the passage in Ezekiel it is used in a figurative sense for the chief rulers or counsellors of the Tyrians. See SHIP.

Pilsbury, PHINEAS, *Elder*, a famous early American Baptist minister, flourished in Maine in 1804. He was uneducated, in the ordinary acceptation of the term, but was called "a son of thunder" on account of his boldness and ability. He was extremely eccentric, and many curious incidents in his personal history are told, but nothing can be related here of any interest to the general inquirer.

Pilsen, FRANCIS, a Flemish painter and engraver who flourished at Ghent about the middle of the 18th century. He studied under Robert van Audenarde. Little is known of his painting; but there are a few prints by him, among which are the following: *Virgin and Infant Jesus; Conversion of St. Bavon;* a *St. Francis*, after Rubens; *The Martyrdom of St. Blaize*, after G. de Crayer.

Pil'tai (Heb. *Piltay'*, פִּלְטַי, *my deliverances;* Sept. Φελετι), the representative of the priestly house of Moadiah, or Maadiah, in the time of Joiakim, the son of Jeshua; apparently one of the priests who returned to Jerusalem with Nehemiah (Neh. xii, 17). B.C. 445.

Pilzarro, ABRAHAM ISRAEL, of Amsterdam, a Jewish littérateur, was of Portuguese origin, and flourished in Italy near the opening of this century. He wrote *Discursos y exposiciones sobre la vara de Jeuda*, an exposition of Jacob's prophecy, entitled "the Sceptre of Judah," in which he complains of the unfair manner in which Christians expound the Scriptures, of their unfitness for such a task, and the danger of confuting their interpretations. On account of its odious contents it was suppressed by the leaders of the congregation (a MS. copy of this work is to be found in the Saracin Library). See De Rossi, *Dizionario storico degli autori Ebrei*, p. 264; id. *Bibl. Jud. Antichrist.* (Parma, 1800), p. 92; Wolf, *Bibl. Hebr.* iii, 42; De Long, *Bibl. Sacra*, ii, 594 (where the author is called *Bizaro*); Lindo, *Hist. of the Jews in Spain and Portugal*, p. 369. (B. P.)

Pimentel, ABRAHAM HA-KOHEN, a Jewish rabbi, flourished about the middle of the 17th century. He was a pupil of Saul Mortera, and afterwards rabbi at the academy Keter Tora of Amsterdam, and lastly rabbi of the congregation of the Sephardim at Hamburg. He wrote מנחת כהן on Jewish rites, in three parts (Amsterd. 1668):—academic treatises in the Portuguese language, under the title *Questoens et discursos academicos, que compoz et recitan na illustre Academia* בתר תורה *et juntamente alguns sermons compostos por o ditto* (Hamb. 1688). See Wolf, *Bibl. Hebr.* i, 97; iii, 58 sq.; De Rossi, *Dizionario storico degli autori Ebrei*, p. 264 (Germ. transl. by Hamberger); Fürst, *Bibl. Jud.* iii, 101. (B. P.)

Pin (יָתֵד, *yathêd*), a *tent-pin*, spoken of the copper pegs driven into the ground to hold the cords of the court (Exod. xxvii, 19; xxxv, 18; xxxviii, 20, 31; xxxix, 40; Numb. iii, 37; iv, 32), or for any other purpose (Judg. xvi, 14; Ezek. xv, 3), being the same word elsewhere usually rendered "nail" (Judg. iv, 21, 22; v, 26; Ezra ix, 8; Isa. xxii, 22, 25; Zech. x, 4), occasionally "stake" (Isa. xxxiii, 20; liv, 2), once "paddle" (Deut. xxiii, 13). See NAIL.

Pins, in the modern sense of the word, used for fastening the dress, were no doubt in use among the Hebrews, as we know they were among the Egyptians, but they were frequently made of bone or wood, and bore a considerable resemblance to skewers, as did those used even in England till a comparatively recent period. The forms of the Egyptian pins may be seen in the British Museum. "Pins and needles were among the articles of the toilet which have occasionally been found in the tombs. The former are frequently of considerable length, with large gold heads; and some, of a different form, tapering gradually to a point, merely bound with gold at the upper end, without any projecting head (seven or eight inches in length), appear to have been intended for arranging the plaits or curls of hair, like those used in England in the days of Elizabeth for nearly the same purpose" (Wilkinson, *Anc. Egypt.* ii, 344). See CRISPING-PIN.



Ancient Egyptian Toilet-pins.

Pinart, MICHEL, a French Orientalist, was born in July, 1659, at Sens. His parents died when he was very young, and left him penniless. Admitted by the protection of the abbé Boileau, grand-vicar at Sens, in the community of Germain Gillot, he learned there Latin, Greek, and the elements of Hebrew. He was sufficiently proficient in the latter language to be able to help father Thomassin in his *Glossoire*. He obtained a situation as tutor at the College Mazarin, and in 1712 was appointed theologist of the chapter of Sens. He had been a member of the Académie des Inscriptions since 1706. The "Collections" of this company and the "Journal des Savans" contain several memoirs of him. He died at Sens July 3, 1717.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xl, 248.

Pinault, PIERRE OLIVIER, a French writer who flourished in the second half of last century, was a member of the Parliament of Paris, and is the author of, *Jugement parté sur les Jésuites par les grands hommes de l'Église et de l'État* (1761, 12mo):—*La nouvelle philosophie dévoilée* (1770, 12mo):—and *Origine des maux de l'Église* (1787, 12mo). He published a new edition of Héricourt's *Lois ecclésiastiques de France* (1771, fol.), and some translations of Portuguese and Italian works. —Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xl, 248.

Pinchon, GUILLAUME, a French prelate of note, was born in the parish of St. Alban, near St. Brieuc, in 1184. He took holy orders in 1207, and was made canon of St. Brieuc; then of St. Gatien de Tours; and, in 1220, bishop of St. Brieuc. Pierre Mauclerc, duke of Brittany, made an attempt at that time to encroach upon the secular rights which the bishops of the province enjoyed in their bishoprics, and he issued ordinances by which the clergy were deprived of their most important privileges. Guillaume, acting in accord with the other prelates of the duchy, excommuni-

cated Mauclerc, who, having assembled a number of his barons at Redon, decided that the bishops should be banished. Guillaume retired to Poitiers, where he acted, for some time, as coadjutor of Philippe, bishop of that city, during a severe illness of this prelate (1229). His rights having been recognised by Pierre Mauclerc, he returned to his see in 1231, and kept busy during the rest of his life in reforming the abuses which had spread among the clergy during his absence, and continuing the reconstruction of his cathedral. Guillaume Pichon died at St. Brieuc July 29, 1234. He was canonized by Innocent III in 1247. His complete relics were discovered in 1847 in the cathedral. The Church of St. Brieuc and of Tréguier devotes to his memory the 29th of July.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xl, 248.

Pinckard, Patrick M., a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born near the opening of the present century. He was converted about 1840, and in 1844 entered the itinerant ranks of the Methodist ministry, and preached successfully until 1870 within the bounds of the Missouri Conference. During this long term of ministerial life he was employed in circuit, station, and district work; also in the agency of Central College, and, later, as the depositary in St. Louis of the Book-house of Missouri Methodism, in all of which places of trust and responsibility he gained the approval, confidence, and esteem of his brethren and the Church. He died Sept. 23, 1871. See *Minutes of Annual Conf. M. E. Church, South*, 1872, p. 738.

Pinckney Lectures are a series of sermons, for the foundation of which Charles Pinckney, chief-justice of South Carolina under the provincial government (father of the late general C. C. Pinckney), provided. He died in 1758, and by his last will directed that two sermons, in May and November, annually, being on the first Wednesday after the second Tuesday in each of these months, should be preached in St. Philip's Church, Charleston, on the "greatness of God, and his goodness to all creatures," with the view, as he states, "to encourage and promote religious and virtuous principles and practices among us, and to raise an ardent love of the Deity in us; and in order to excite an emulation in my wealthy countrymen, whose abilities and fortunes will better enable them thereto, for establishing lectures among us, in humble imitation of those founded by the Hon. Mr. Boyle in Great Britain." For effecting these pious purposes, the will states, "I do hereby charge my said mansion and land and buildings in Colleton Square, devised to my eldest son, with the payment of five guineas yearly, and every year forever, unto such lectures."

Pinczovians, a Socinian sect, so named after the town of Pinczow, Poland, where its leaders resided. The Pinczovians were usually called "Unitarian Brethren," but they deserved to be called Arians (q. v.) rather than Socinians (q. v.). It is true, some of the principal doctors among them were inclined towards those views of Jesus Christ which afterwards were the common views of the Socinian sect; but the greater part of them agreed with the Arians, and affirmed that the Saviour was produced by God the Father before the foundation of the world, but that he was greatly inferior to the Father, and so also the Holy Spirit was begotten, and is inferior to the Father. This is very clearly taught by George Schomann in his *Testamentum*, published by Sand (p. 194–5): "Sub id fere tempus (A.D. 1566) ex rhapsodiis *Lælii Socini* quidam fratres dicerunt, Dei filium non esse secundam Trinitatis personam patri coëssentialem et cœqualem, sed hominem Jesum Christum, ex Spiritu Sancto conceptum, ex virgine Maria natum, crucifixum et resuscitatum; a quibus nos commoniti, sacras litteras perscrutari, persuasi sumus." These words most clearly show that the *Pinczovians* (as they were called before they separated from the Reformed in 1565) professed to believe in a Trinity of some sort, and did not divest Jesus Christ of all divinity. Besides, Schomann was a doctor of great authority among them; and in the year 1565 (as he himself informs us), he contended at the convention of Petricow (pro uno Deo patri) *for one God the Father*, in opposition to the Reformed, who, he says (Deum trinum defendebant), *maintained a threefold God.* Yet in the following year he, with others, was induced by the papers of Lælius Socinus to so alter his sentiments that he denied Christ to be a divine person. He, therefore, with his Pinczovian flock, before this time must necessarily have been, not a Socinian, but an Arian. See Poland. (J. H. W.)

Pindar, John Hothersall, an English divine, was born in 1794. He graduated at Caius College, Cambridge, in 1816, and became principal of Codrington College, Barbadoes. He was afterwards canon residentiary and prebendary of Wells Cathedral, and principal of Wells Theological College, which latter office he resigned in 1865. He died at West Malvern, Eng., April 16, 1868. He published a volume of *Sermons on Common Prayer:—Sermons on the Ordination Service:—Sermons on the Holy Days of the Church:—Expository Discourses on the Epistle to Timothy;* and some *Lectures.* —Appleton's *Annual Cyclop.* viii, 592.

Pinder, Thomas, a Wesleyan preacher of some note, was born at West Stockwith, near Gainsborough, Eng., Sept. 22, 1774. He was converted through Methodist agency in 1795 at Sheffield. He felt called of God to the work of the holy ministry, and in 1799 was appointed to the Thetford Circuit. Thence for thirty-five years he labored on in a most exemplary discharge of his pastoral and ministerial functions. In all the circuits in which he travelled he was highly and deservedly esteemed, both in his public and private capacity. As a preacher, though not great, he was striking, faithful, and impressive. As a pastor, he was most tender and sympathizing. He died Aug. 27, 1835.—*Wesl. Meth. Mag.* 1836, p. 719; 1838, art. i.

Pineda, Juan de (1), a learned Franciscan monk, was born at Seville in 1557. After entering the order at the age of fourteen, he was carefully advanced in classical learning, and then instructed in theology. As a student, he bore the reputation of great erudition, especially in the Greek, Hebrew, and Oriental languages. He was placed at the head of the Inquisition in Andalusia, and was commissioned by cardinal Zapata to visit the principal libraries of Spain, in order to register those works which might be obnoxious to the Roman Catholic religion. The result of his inquiry was an *Index novus Librorum Prohibitorum* (Seville, 1631), published by order of cardinal Zapata, grand-inquisitor of Spain. Pineda published a version of Theodore Peltar's *Catena Græcorum Patrum in Proverbia Salomonis.* He also published *Commentarius in Job* (Madrid, 1597, 2 vols. fol.):—*Prælectio sacra in Canticum Canticorum* (Seville, 1602):—*Salomo Prævius, sive de Rebus Salomonis Regis* (Lyons, 1609, libri octo):—*Commentarius in Ecclesiasten* (Antwerp, 1620). He died at Seville Jan. 27, 1637.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xl, 261.

Pineda, Juan de (2), another Spanish divine, was born at Medina del Campo in the 16th century, and has frequently been confounded with the preceding. He belonged to the Order of the Jesuits, and published *Historia maravillosa de S. Juan-Baptista* (Salamanca, 1574, 4to):—*La Monarquia Ecclesiastica, o Historia Universal del Mundo* (ibid. 1588, 14 vols. fol.; Barcelona, 1594, 1620); *Agricultura Christiana que contiene xxxv, dialogos familiares* (ibid. 1589, 2 vols. fol.). Many other works of his remain unpublished.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xl, 262.

Pinedo, Thomas de (called in the synagogue *Isaac*), a noted Jewish littérateur of the 17th century, was born in 1614 in Spain, but was obliged to leave his native country and seek a refuge in Amsterdam from inquisitorial persecution. He was more famed for his

proficiency in Greek and the ancient classics than as a Jewish theologian. He was descended from the family of Pinheiro of Francoso, in Portugal. His education he received at Madrid, where he was indebted to the training of the Jesuits for his literary attainments, of whom he speaks in grateful remembrance. He had already reached a mature age when the suspicions of the Inquisition obliged him to quit the scene of his studies and the society of his learned friends in the capital of Spain, to live in safety in the United Provinces. He belonged to those few who were fortunate enough to evade in safety the clutches of the Inquisition. He differs from Orobio de Castro in this especially, that he never in any of his writings attacked the Christian religion, but, on the contrary, frequently took pleasure in acknowledging its beneficial influences upon society, though he did not spare the tribunal of the Inquisition, of which he says: "Me pudet pigetque prodidisse hoc de gente Christiana." At Amsterdam he finished and published, in 1678, his edition of Στέφανος περὶ πολέων: *Stephanus de Urbibus quem Primus Thomas de Pinedo Lusitanus Latii jure donabat et observationibus scrutinio variarum linguarum ac præcipue Hebraicæ, Phœniciæ, Græcæ, et Latinæ dialectis illustrabat*, and dedicated the work to the marquis of Mondejos, of the house of Mendoza, ever devoted to the encouragement of literature. Pinedo's work, which is very valuable for Jewish history and archæology, and was lately edited with a preface by Dindorf (Leips. 1825, 4 vols.), shows that the author was well acquainted with Jewish literature. Besides Josephus, which forms the basis of the whole, Pinedo quotes Benjamin de Tudela's *Itineraries;* David Zemach (p. 482, 584); R. Salomo Jarchi, s. v. Antiochia, "quem Hebræi per rosetheboth Rasi vocant, celeberrimus in S. S. commentator;" Kimchi's *Commentary on Genesis* (p. 497); Ibn-Ezra's *Commentary on Esther* (p. 583); Maimonides, *Moreh Nebuchim;* R. Azariah, *Min Haadomim* (p. 583). In two passages Pinedo mentions the name of Jesus, viz., when speaking of Bethlehem, he says, after having given the explanation of the text: "Sed multo magis urbem nobilitarunt *Davidis et Jesu Nazareni* natales;" and then, when speaking of Galilee, he adds: "Quia *Jesus Nazarenus* frequenter in hac regione versabatur, ideo Julianus, ὁ Παραβάτης, eum per contemptum *Galilæum* et Christianos *Galilæos* vocabat. Sic enim vocabantur prius Christiani, qui sub imperatore Claudio, relicto *Nazaræorum* et *Galilæorum* nomine, Christiani dicti sunt, ut testatur Suidas." Pinedo died Nov. 13, 1679, and the noble marquis whom we have mentioned above warmly expressed in a letter to the Judæo-Spanish poet, De Barrios, his regret at the death of Pinedo, and more especially at his dying in the profession of Judaism. Pinedo not only left in his Στέφανος a monument "aëre perennius," but also wrote his own epitaph in the following words:

Advertite Mortales.
Hic jacet
Thomas de Pinedo Lusitanus
Qui primum Orientem vidit
In Lusitaniæ oppido Francoso.
Ortus
Ex nobili illius regni familia
Paterna Pinheiro, materna Fonseca
Madriti penes patruum educatus
Literis apud Jesuitas operam dedit.
Domo profugus
Nullius criminis ac invidiæ reus
Has oras appulit.
Antequam abiret ad plures
In sui memoriam
Hoc cenotaphium per Stephanum sibi excitavit.
Id volebat vos scire.
Valete.

See Fürst, *Bibl. Jud.* iii, 102; De Rossi, *Dizionario storico degli autori Ebrei*, p. 264 sq. (Ger. transl. by Hamburger); Wolf, *Bibl. Hebr.* i, 397; iii, 278; Da Costa, *Israel and the Gentiles*, p. 433 sq.; Grätz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, x, 200; Kayserling, in Frankel's *Monatsschrift*, 1858, p. 191 sq.; id. *Geschichte der Juden in Portugal* (Leips. 1867), p. 301. (B. P.)

Pinelli, Luca, an Italian theologian, born at Melfi. His family, one of the twenty-four chief of Genoa, gave the republic two doges, Agostino, son of Filippo, elected 1555, and Agostino, son of Alessandro, elected 1609. He was admitted in 1562 into the Company of Jesus; was a professor of theology at Ingolstadt and Pont-à-Mousson, and rector at Florence, Perugia, and Palermo. Pinelli died at Naples Aug. 25, 1607. His theological writings enjoyed a favor which is not extinguished altogether even in our own day. They have been reprinted and translated a number of times. Some of them must be referred to here: *Meditazioni del Sacramento* (Brescia, 1599, 12mo; translated into French, *Pieux entretiens*, etc., Tournay, 1850, 18mo):—*Gersone, avvero della perfezione religiosa*, lib. iv; the most recent editions of this often republished work are, in Italian, Rome, 1839, 8vo; in Latin, 1710, 16mo; in French, 1847, 18mo, etc.:—*Meditazione della Vergine Maria* (Brescia, 1599, 12mo; translated into Portuguese by Antonio Vaz de Sousa):—*De Sacramento Pœnitentiæ* (Cologne, 1602, 12mo):—*Trattato dell' altra vita e dello stato delli anime in essa* (Venice, 1604, 8vo):—*Meditationes de IV hominis novissimis, quæ sunt mors, judicium, infernus, paradisus* (Cologne, 1605, 12mo):—*Trattato della Messa* (Naples, 1606, 12mo). The spiritual works of father Pinelli appeared first at Venice (1604, 12mo); but the Latin edition of Cologne (1604, 3 vols. 12mo) is the most complete.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xl, 265.

Pine-tree. The word "pine" occurs in our translation three times, but in neither case is the pine of our northern regions referred to in the original. The first instance is in Neh. viii, 15 (Sept. ξύλον κυπαρίσσινον, Vulg. *lignum pulcherrimum*), where the Hebrew words

Stone-Pine Cone and Nuts.

עֵץ שֶׁמֶן, *êts shémen*, are rendered "pine-branches," though the phrase is generally understood to denote the wild *olive-tree*. See Olive. The second and third instances are in Isa. xli, 19 (Sept. *πεύκη*, Vulg. *pinus*) and lx, 13 (Sept. *βραθυδαάρ*, Vulg. *ulmus*), where the Hebrew word is תִּדְהָר, *tidhâr*, which Gesenius conjectures to denote the *oak* (from its hardness and durability, root, דָּהַר); but the old translators waver between beech, pine, cypress, larch, etc., and by modern interpreters it has been variously explained to be the Indian plane, the larch, and the elm (Celsius, *Hierob.* ii, 271). See Ash-tree; Box-tree; Cedar-tree. The Sept. rendering in Isa. xli, 19, *βραθυδαάρ*, appears to have arisen from a confused amalgamation of the words *berôsh* and *tidhâr*, which follow each other in that passage. Of these *berôsh* is sometimes rendered "cypress," and might stand for "juniper." That species of juniper which is called savin is in Greek *βραθύ*. The word *δαάρ* is merely an expression in Greek letters for *tidhâr* (Pliny, xxiv, 11, 61; Schleusner, s. v.; Celsius, *Hierob.* i, 78). In the Chaldee paraphrase the word *murneyan*, commonly thought to mean the elm, is used as the synonym of *tidhâr*. But no similar name having been discovered in any of the cognate languages, no proofs can be adduced in favor of one more than another. The name *tidhara*, meaning "three-cornered," is applied in India to a species of Euphorbia (*E. antiquorum*); but this is not likely to be the plant alluded to in Scripture. But the rendering "pine" seems least probable of any, as the root implies either curvature or duration, of which the latter is not particularly applicable to the pine, and the former remarkably otherwise. On the other hand, Thomson (*Land and Book*, ii, 266 sq.) supposes that *berôsh* (בְּרוֹשׁ) ought to be rendered *pine* instead of *fir*, as usual in the A. V.; referring it to the "stone-pine," which still covers the sandy ridges of Lebanon and Hermon, and is called *snubar* by the Arabs. See Fir.

Pinnacle. In the account of our Lord's temptation (Matt. iv, 5), it is stated that the devil took him to Jerusalem, "and set him on a [rather *the*] pinnacle of the Temple" (*ἐπὶ τὸ πτερύγιον τοῦ ἱεροῦ*). The part of the Temple denoted by this term has been much questioned by different commentators, and the only certain conclusion seems to be that it cannot be understood in the sense usually attached to the word (i. e. the point of a spiral ornament), as in that case the article would not have been prefixed. Grotius, Hammond, Doddridge, and others take it in the sense of balustrade or pinnated battlement. But it is now more generally supposed to denote what was called the king's portico, which is mentioned by Josephus (*Ant.* xv, 11, 5), and is the same which is called in Scripture "Solomon's porch." Of this opinion are Wetstein, Kuinöl, Parkhurst, Rosenmüller, and others. Krebs, Schleusner, and some others, however, fancy that the word signifies the ridge of the roof of the Temple; and Josephus (*Ant.* xv, 11, 5) is cited in proof of this notion. But we know that iron spikes were fixed all over the roof of the Temple to prevent the holy edifice from being defiled by birds (Joseph. *War*, v, 5, 6), and the presence of these spikes creates an objection, although the difficulty is perhaps not insuperable, as we are told that the priests sometimes went to the top of the Temple (*Middoth*, ch. iv; *T. Bab.* tit. *Taanith*, fol. 29). Dr. Bloomfield asks: "May it not have been a lofty spiral turret, placed somewhere about the centre of the building, like the spire in some cathedrals, to the topmost lookout of which the devil might take Jesus?" (*Recens. Synopt.* in Matt. iv, 5). We answer, no: steeples do not belong to ancient or to Oriental architecture, and it is somewhat hazardous to provide one for the sole purpose of meeting the supposed occasion of this text. Lightfoot, whose opinion on this point is entitled to much respect, declares his inability to judge whether the part denoted should be considered as belonging to the holy fabric itself or to some building within the holy circuit. If the former, he can find no place so fitting as the top of the אוּלָם, or porch of the Temple; but if the latter, the royal porch or gallery (*στοὰ βασιλική*) is the part he would prefer. He adds that, above all other parts of the Temple, the porch thereof, and indeed the whole pronaos, might not unfitly be called *τὸ πτερύγιον τοῦ ἱεροῦ*, *the wing* (for that is the literal meaning) *of the Temple*, "because like wings it extended itself in breadth on each side, far beyond the breadth of the Temple." If therefore the devil had placed Christ on the very precipice of this part of the Temple, he may well be said to have placed him "upon the wing of the Temple; both because this part was like a wing to the Temple itself, and because that precipice was the wing of this part" (*Hor. Hebr.* ad Matt. iv, 5). Against this interpretation, however, it seems decisive that Jesus, not being a priest, could not have gained admittance to the Temple proper; unless, indeed, we understand that he was transported thither and back again miraculously. With regard to the other alternative, it is only necessary to cite the description of Josephus to show that the situation was at least not inappropriate to Satan's object: "On the south part (of the court of the Gentiles) was *στοὰ βασιλική*, 'the royal gallery,' that may be mentioned among the most magnificent things under the sun; for above the profoundest depth of the valley, Herod constructed a gallery of a vast height, from the top of which, if any one looked down, he would become dizzy, his eyes being unable to reach so vast a depth." The same Greek word is used in the Sept. version to render, 1. כָּנָף, *kanâph*, a wing or border, e. g. of a garment (Numb. xv, 38; 1 Sam. xv, 27; xxiv, 4); 2. סְנַפִּיר, *senappîr*, the fin of a fish (Lev. xi, 9. So Arist. *Anim.* i, 5, 14); 3. קָצָה, *katsâh*, an edge; A. V. end (Exod. xxviii, 26). Hesychius explains *πτερύγιον* as *ἀκρωτήριον*. Perhaps in any case *τὸ πτερύγιον* means the *battlement* ordered by law to be added to every roof. It is in favor of this that the word *kanâph* is used to indicate the top of the Temple (Dan. ix, 27; Hammond, Grotius, Calmet, De Wette, Lightfoot, *Hor. Hebr.* ad Matt. iv). Eusebius tells us that it was from "the pinnacle" (*τὸ πτερύγιον*) that St. James was precipitated, and it is said to have remained until the 4th century (Euseb. *Hist. Eccles.* ii, 23; Williams, *Holy City*, ii, 338). See Temple.

PINNACLE is an architectural term used to designate a small turret or tall ornament, usually tapering towards the top, and much used in Gothic architecture as a termination to buttresses, etc. Pinnacles are not used in the *Norman* style, though there exist a few small turrets, of late date, with pointed terminations, which appear to be their prototypes, as at the west end of Rochester Cathedral, and the north transept of the church of St. Stephen at Caen.


Battle Church, cir. 1250

In the *Early English* style they are not very abundant; they are found circular, octagonal, or square; some are perfectly plain, as at the east end of Battle Church, Sussex; others are surrounded with small shafts, as at Peterborough and Wells; and in some instances the tops are crocketed. Towards the latter part of this style the system of surmounting each face of the shaft with a small pediment was introduced, and about the same period the shafts began to be occasionally made of

Peterborough Cathedral, A.D.1238.

open-work, so as to form niches for statues.

Decorated pinnacles are very numerous; they have the shafts sometimes formed into niches, and sometimes panelled or quite plain, and each of the sides almost invariably terminates in a pediment; the tops are generally crocketed, and always have finials on the points: in form they are most usually square, but are sometimes octagonal, and in a few instances hexagonal and pentagonal; occasionally, in this style, square pinnacles are placed diagonally.

Lincoln.

In the *Perpendicular* style they do not in general differ much from those of the Decorated; polygonal forms are not very frequently found, and square pinnacles are very much oftener placed diagonally on buttresses, etc.; they are also in rich buildings abundantly used on the offsets of buttresses, as well as at the tops: instead of the small pediments over the sides of the shaft, it is sometimes finished with a complete moulded cornice or capping, out of which the top of the pinnacle rises, and sometimes in the place of a top of this kind the figure of an animal holding a vane, or some other device, is used: there are a few examples of pinnacles in this style with ogee-shaped tops. In the fine Perpendicular towers the pinnacles are often the most striking feature. Examples are seen on Merton and Magdalen towers in Oxford, and many of the towers in Somersetshire.

Pi'non (Heb. *Pinon'*, פִּינֹן, prob. i. q. *Punon;* Sept. Φεινών; Vulg. *Phinon*), one of the "dukes" of Edom; that is, head or founder of a tribe of that nation (Gen. xxxvi, 41; 1 Chron. i, 52). By Eusebius and Jerome (*Onomasticon*, Φινών, and Fenon) the seat of the tribe is said to have been at Punon, one of the stations of the Israelites in the Wilderness; which again they identify with Phaeno, "between Petra and Zoar," the site of the famous Roman copper-mines. No name answering to Pinon appears to have been yet discovered in Arabic literature or among the existing tribes. See PUNON.

Pins, JEAN DE, a French prelate noted for his diplomatic career, was born at Toulouse towards 1470. He was the third son of Gaillard de Pins, and studied under the guidance of his eldest brother at Toulouse, Poitiers, Paris, and in Italy, where he became proficient in Greek and Latin letters through the lessons of Philippo Bersaldo the elder. In 1497 he embraced the clerical profession; returned to Italy, where he spent five years, and was in 1511 appointed clerk-counsellor at the parliament of his native city. Antoine Duprat, with whom he was closely acquainted, took him to Italy, and had him appointed counsellor at the parliament founded by Francis I at Milan. He there managed some very intricate matters with so much prudence and dexterity that the king sent him on an embassy to Venice in 1516, and to Rome in 1520. On both occasions he showed extraordinary aptitude for political negotiations, and displayed great zeal for the interests of religion and the glory of his country. A pontifical brief of Dec. 27, 1520, shows that Jean de Pins was made bishop of Pamiers. But he never governed that bishopric, and was in 1523 appointed bishop of Rieux. In 1527 he founded and endowed the chapter of Saint-Ybars. The most learned men of his time spoke in praise of his erudition; and cardinal Sadolet submitted to him his own works before giving them to the printer. In 1673 his bust was placed in the Salle des Toulousains Illustres, at the capitol of Toulouse. Jean de Pins wrote in most elegant Latin, and deserved the following eulogy at the hands of Erasmus, who was such a competent judge in the matter: "Potest inter Tullianæ dictionis competitores numerari Johannes Pinus." We have of him, *Vita Philippi Bersaldi majoris* (Bologna, 1505, 4to):—*Vita Sanctæ Catharinæ Senensis* (ibid. 1505, 4to):—*Divi Rochi Narbonensis Vita* (Ven. and Par. 1516, 8vo):—*Allobrogicæ narrationis libellus* (ibid. 1516, 4to); this is a kind of novel composed for the instruction of the children of the chancellor Antoine Duprat:—*De vita aulica* (Toulouse, 4to); this work is held in great esteem:—*De claris fœminis* (Par. 1521, fol.); remarkable for the elegance of the composition. Pins died at Toulouse Nov. 1, 1537.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xl, 277.

Pinsker, SIMCHA, a noted recent Hebraist, was born at Tarnopol, Austrian Poland (Galicia), in 1801. He was the son of a rabbi [see SHEBACH], and was well trained in Hebrew lore. Becoming interested in the doctrines of the *Chasidim* (q. v.), he joined the ranks of the so-called Kotzker-Chasidim, who, in the theory of mystic views, as well as in the practice, favored worldly gayety coupled with cynical elements. At the same time he suffered himself to be drawn into the whirlpool of a noisy commercial life, which induced him to enter upon several large speculations; his genius could not long remain imprisoned in these strange spheres, and, with the loss of his entire fortune, he finally abandoned these schemes. He took up his abode in Odessa, which was then a flourishing town, and filled the situation of Rabbinical secretary, and although the pittance of a salary which was paid him was barely enough for his existence, he was always in good spirits. But it was not to be expected that a man of Pinsker's talents should long rest content in such a limited sphere. Perceiving how miserable was the condition, in regard to culture, of the South-Russian Jews, which he had no doubt was due to a faulty, antiquated education, he determined to exert himself for the establishment of Jewish elementary schools, in which the children could receive a proper religious and secular training, suitable to those times. Odessa, being the commercial centre of Southern Russia, seemed to him just adapted for such an institution, and Simcha Pinsker lost no time in communicating this important matter to his friend Isaac Horowitz, a native of Brody, who at once took great interest in the proposition. The two young men made known the object they had in view to several influential parties, and soon succeeded in gaining for their plan the conjunction of eminent men, who made all necessary arrangements with the congregation and the government, and thus readily accomplished the object. Pinsker was placed at the head of the newly founded school, and in that capacity he labored until 1840, when he removed to Vienna on a pension for the remainder of his life. Pinsker is noted, however, not simply as the founder and propagator of a high educational status among his coreligionists at Odessa, but rather as one of the best Hebraists of our day. When in 1839 Abraham Firkowitch brought from the Crimea a mass of curious and unknown manuscripts, and, among others, a codex of the later prophets, which had, like several Pentateuch fragments, with Haphtaroth and Targum, a peculiar punctuation—the vowel and accent points deviating in form, placed not under, but above the consonants—and which he presented to the Odessa Society for history and antiquities, Pinsker gave himself to the deciphering of this newly discovered system of punctuation, and never rested till, in 1842–43, he became thoroughly acquainted with the materials before him. He showed the patience of a monk of the Middle Ages, continually making researches

in bibliography, biography, and literary history, and did not even shrink from commencing to study the Arabic, the language in which some of the manuscripts were composed. To acquire the latter was in those days no mean task, especially in a town like Odessa, yet Pinsker overcame all difficulties, and by his indefatigable diligence he mastered that language also. But none of these researches and their result were communicated to the world. Pinsker was too modest a man to presume that he had anything at command worth knowing by the rest of the world until Osias Schorr applied to him for a contribution to his critical *Ha-Chaluz*. For this purpose, Pinsker began his labors with a communication concerning the accomplishments of two Karaites, Mose Darai and Radba (David ben-Abraham), natives of Fez, who lived during the Middle Ages, and stood in great repute for their learning. The result of these labors grew to a great work of comprehensive contents, which he published under the name *Likkute Kadmonioth* ("Collections from Times of Yore"), and also under the title, *The History of Karaism and the Karaite Literature*. In it he describes the development of Karaism, and notes four consecutive periods: a pre-Ananitic, one of Anan himself, another of the reformer Nohawendi, and last the Karaites proper. The latter period brought about the breach concerning the Talmudic tradition, and missionaries were sent to Jewish congregations in order to call the people together to enlist them for the new doctrine. From this calling together (Hebrew, *kara*), the word Karaite, according to Pinsker, was derived. They were the people who laid the foundation-stone for completing the edifice of Biblical orthography, grammar, lexicography, and modern Hebrew poesy; and although Gaon Saadia may be considered in Rabbinical circles as the first who wrote a Hebrew grammar and a lexicon, and Dunash ben-Labrat is looked upon as the first who wrote poetry according to Arabic rules, yet there were already among the Karaites many grammarians, lexicographers, and poets, who made use of the Arabic metre, and of this we find ample proofs in the *Likkute*. Important Karaite writings are quoted, among which the *Lexicon* by Radba and the *Divan* by Mose Darai are largely treated of. Pinsker maintains that the latter lived during the 9th century; and, if so, Darai must be considered the leader of a great poetic period, the value of whose poetical productions was highly appreciated, inasmuch as Gebirol Mose ibn-Ezra, Jehuda ha-Levi, and Abraham ibn-Ezra employed many successful similes, expressions, and even whole strophes, which accord in sound and manner with those of Darai. The *Likkute* found a reception which surpassed the highest expectations of the author. Hardly known previously in the republic of letters, Pinsker became all at once a celebrated name. The extraordinary compilation, the imposing erudition, the superabundance of rich material, the conscientiousness and geniality of combinations, were all calculated to cause admiration. Before the work was all published, those, as it were, official representatives of Jewish history, Jost and Grätz, hastened to declare their acknowledgment. The former, with full admiration, in the "Ben-Chananja" (1860), and the latter in the preface of the fifth volume of his history of the Jews. Also Dr. Schmiedl (Frankel's *Monatsschrift*, 1861) signified his appreciation of Pinsker. In the year 1863 Pinsker published in Vienna his *Mebo ha-Nikkud*, or, as entitled in German, "Introduction to the Babylonic-Hebraic punctuation system, executed according to the manuscripts for history and antiquities in the Odessa Museum." This work is a masterpiece of critical penetration into the historic developments of the vowel and accentuation points. Every line of the *Likkute* and *Mebo* sufficiently proves Pinsker's inquiring mind as a grammarian, and it was one of his favorite ideas to publish a system of Hebrew grammar, which he was on the point of carrying out when his health began to fail him; and the more he tried to bid defiance to nature, the more inexorably the overtasked mind took revenge on him. He died Oct. 29, 1864. He left in MS. more than eighty works, the most of them having reference to Rabbinical or Karaite authors, such as Jephet ben-Ali, Aron the First, Abraham ibn-Ezra, Maimonides—the books Abodah and Corbanoth—Kalonymos ben-Kalonyms, Mordecai Contini, Delmedigo, and many others. They treat of punctuation, accentuation, the Masorah, theoretic and practical grammar, lexicography, concordances, comparisons in philology, exegesis, bibliography, Biblical geography, and numerous other subjects. His loss is greatly mourned among Hebraists, for had he lived he would probably have given a completeness to his works which no one else is able to supply. (J. H. W.)

Pintelli, Baccio, a noted Italian architect, is supposed to have been a Florentine. He was very active in Rome in the pontificate of Sixtus IV (1471–1484), for whom he built, in 1473, the Capella Sistina, which contains some of the greatest works of modern painting. It is a simple rectangular oblong, with a vaulted roof: 132 feet 8 inches long, 43 feet wide, and 57 feet 10 inches high. The fresco of the *Last Judgment*, by Michael Angelo, painted in 1533–1541, for pope Paul III, on the altar-wall, is 47 feet 1 inch in height, and 43 feet wide. It is the especial chapel of the pope, and the Church ceremonies of the first Sunday in Advent and of the Holy Week are always performed in it; the scrutiny also of the votes for the popedom takes place in this chapel, when the Conclave is held in the Vatican. Before the execution of the *Last Judgment*, two horizontal series of paintings went around the chapel below the windows, of which there are six on each side; the upper is a series from the Old and New Testaments, illustrating the acts of Moses and of Christ; the second, or lower, consists of imitations of hangings, with the arms of Sixtus IV. The side walls remain as they were originally painted, and on great festivals of the Church the painted hangings used to be formerly covered by the tapestries made for the purpose from the celebrated cartoons of Raffaelle which are now preserved in the corridor in the museum of the Vatican, built for them by Leo XII; they were placed in the museum by Pius VII in 1814, in the apartments of Pius V. There are twenty-two tapestries in all, but only ten are in the style and of the size of the cartoons at Hampton Court; the rest were not ordered or purchased for the Sistine Chapel. The subject of these ten is the history of the apostles; and besides the seven at Hampton Court there are the following three: the *Martyrdom of St. Stephen; St. Paul in Prison at Philippi during the Earthquake;* and the *Conversion of St. Paul.* The ten cartoons of these tapestries were executed in 1515 and 1516 by the order of Leo X, and Raffaelle received for them *about fifteen pounds each.* The second set of tapestries of the *Life of Christ*, which are larger than the others, are supposed, from their style and their bad drawing, to have been executed from cartoons made by Flemish masters, probably Van Orlay and Michael Coxis, from small sketches by Raffaelle, and certainly not from cartoons from Raffaelle's own hands. The two sets are called *Della Scuola Nuova* and *Della Scuola Vecchia*, those ordered by Leo X being of the "Scuola Vecchia." The ceiling of the Sistine Chapel is decorated with the frescos executed in 1512 by Michael Angelo, illustrating the creation of man, the fall, and the early history of the world. Michael Angelo intended to paint the *Fall of Lucifer* on the wall opposite the *Last Judgment*, but this design was never carried into execution. The whole series of illustrations would have represented the complete cycle of the creation and fall of man, and his final salvation, if this last design had been executed: it would have offered one vast "speculum humanæ salvationis," as such a series was termed by the early artists of the Roman Catholic Church: it repeatedly occurs in early manuscripts. Pintelli was the principal architect of Sixtus, and he executed several other important works for this pope. Between the years 1472 and 1477 Pintelli erect-

ed the church and convent of Santa Maria del Popolo, in the church of which he built a beautiful chapel for Domenico della Rovere, cardinal of San Clemente, and, according to Vasari, nephew of Sixtus IV: he built a palace for the same cardinal at the Borgo Vecchio. About 1473–1475 he built the old Library of the Vatican: Platina was installed by Sixtus as librarian in 1475. Pintelli restored also the hospital of Santo Spirito in Sassia, which was burned down in 1741. He built also the Ponte Sisto over the Tiber; the churches San Pietro in Vinculis, Sant' Agostino, Santa Maria della Pace, and Sant' Apostolo (since rebuilt); and probably San Pietro in Montorio and San Jacopo were built from his designs. In 1480 Pintelli strengthened the celebrated church and convent of San Francisco at Assisi by raising enormous buttresses against the northern walls. Dr. Gaye (*Kunstblatt*, 1836) attributes some other works in Rome to Pintelli, and he has shown that after the death of Sixtus, in 1484, he went to Urbino to continue the ducal palace of Urbino, which Lucianus Lauranna of Slavonia had been engaged upon from 1468 until 1483, for Federico II, duke of Urbino. Pintelli may have remained at Urbino until 1491, when he built the church of Santa Maria delle Grazie at Sinigaglia, for the duke Giovanni della Rovere. He probably died at Urbino, where he was apparently naturalized, as he took the surname of *Urbinas*. He appears to have been influenced by the style of Brunelleschi in his designs, in which there are still characteristics of the previously prevailing pointed architecture. His works are said to be well constructed, as appears from the cupola of Sant' Agostino and the Ponte Sisto, still in a perfect state of preservation.

Pinto, Isaac, a Portuguese moralist of Jewish descent, was born in 1715. He first settled at Bordeaux, then went to Holland. He was a learned man, but commenced to write only at the age of about fifty, when he gained some reputation by defending against Voltaire his Jewish brethren, or at least, among them, the Portuguese and Spanish Jews. He wrote in French. We select among his writings, *Essai sur le luxe* (Amster. 1762, 12mo). He thus defines his subject: "Luxury consists in this, that the houses we dwell in, the clothes we put on, the victuals we live on, the equipages we use, are so expensive in proportion of our means, that we can no longer discharge our duties towards our families, friends, the country, and the poor" (*Apologie pour la nation Juive; Réflexions critiques*, etc. [ibid. 1762, 12mo]). Pereire, the instructor of the deaf-mutes, was the editor of this work. The author sent a copy of it to Voltaire, who thanked him, and promised to notice it in the next edition of his works, which, however, he failed to do. Guénée reprinted the "Apology" as a kind of introduction to his *Lettres de quelques Juifs Portugais:—Du jeu de Cartes* (1768, 8vo), a letter to Diderot:—*Traité de la Circulation et du Crédit* (ibid. 1771, 1773, 1781, 8vo), translated into English and German:—*Précis des arguments contre les matérialistes* (La Haye, 1774, 1776, 8vo). The complete works of Pinto were published in French (Amster. 1771, 8vo), and in German (Leipsic, 1777, 8vo). Pinto died Aug. 14, 1787, at La Haye.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gén.* xl, 282.

Pinto, Josias, BEN-JOSEPH, a Jewish rabbi, was born at the beginning of the 17th century at Lisbon, and settled at Damascus. He is also called ריף, i. e. *Rabbi Josias Pinto*, and wrote מאור עינים, "Light of the Eyes," annotations on the *Fountain of Jacob*, עין יעקב, by R. Jakob ibn-Chabib (Venice, 1643, and often since):—כסף מזקק, "Purified Silver," a diffuse exposition on the Pentateuch (ibid. 1628):—כסף נבחר, "Choice Silver," a succinct exposition on Genesis and Exodus:—כסף צרוף, "Proved Silver," a commentary on Proverbs (Amsterd. 1714–35):—שו"ת, legal decisions (Venice, 1694; Smyrna, 1756). See Fürst, *Bibl. Jud.* iii, 104; De Rossi, *Dizionario storico degli autori Ebrei* (Germ. transl. by Hamburger), p. 265; Wolf, *Bibl. Hebr.* i, 399 sq.; iii, 281 sq.; Lindo, *Hist. of the Jews in Spain and Portugal*, p. 336; Etheridge, *Introduction to Hebrew Lit.* p. 437; Finn, *Sephardim*, p. 462; Steinschneider, *Catalogus Libr. Hebr. in Bibl. Bodl.* p. 1547. (B. P.)

Pinto de Fonseca, EMMANUEL, grand-master of the Order of Malta, born May 24, 1681, belonged to one of the first families of Portugal. Elected grand-master Jan. 18, 1741, after discharging the functions of vice-chancellor and bailli de grâce, he won by his firmness of conduct the esteem of the sovereigns of Europe, to whom he had been useful. It was during his mastery that a widespread conspiracy against the order was discovered, June 25, 1742. A number of Turkish prisoners, among them Osman Pasha, governor of Rhodes, were to destroy the knights by the sword and by poison, and take possession of Malta with the aid of the Turkish fleet, with which they were in secret correspondence. In September, 1760, a number of Christian slaves forming the crew of a first-rate ship carrying a valuable freight, and on board of which Mehemet Pasha was going to Stanchio to collect the taxes, made themselves masters of the ship, brought it to Malta, and shared the spoils with the knights. The sultan prepared to wreak terrible vengeance on the order, when Louis XV, king of France, had the vessel redeemed at his own cost and restored to the padishah, Dec. 10, 1761. Pinto suppressed (1769) the Jesuits in all the dominions of the order, but granted them an indemnity in the form of life-rents. In 1772 he obtained from king Stanislaus-August of Poland the restitution of considerable donations which had been taken from the order. He died Jan. 24, 1773.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xl, 281.

Pinturicchio, BERNARDINO, an Italian painter of much celebrity, was born at Perugia in 1454. His real name was *Betti Biagi*, but he was often called *Sordicchio*, from his deafness and insignificant appearance, but *Pinturicchio* was his usual name. He was a disciple of Pietro Perugino (q. v.). His earlier works no longer exist. He never perfected himself in the use of oil mediums, but was confined almost entirely to tempera. He went to Rome, and probably labored with Perugino in the Sistine Chapel. He afterwards executed almost numberless frescos in the churches and palaces of that city. He was first patronized by the Roveri, and then by the Piccolomini. For Alexander VI he decorated the Apartamento Borgia in the Vatican; five of these rooms still remain in their original state. His pictures in the Castle of S. Angelo have been completely destroyed. During his engagements in Rome he went twice to Orvieto, for the execution of commissions there. The amount of his labors was surprising, but is explained by his great facility of execution and the employment of many assistants. He was not original in his compositions; he loved landscapes, but he cumbered them with too much detail; his figures of virgins, infants, and angels have a certain coarseness; he used too much gilt and ornamentation; his draperies were full, but often badly cast; his works are either too gaudy or very sombre, no pleasing medium seeming to suggest itself to him; his flesh has the red outlines of the earliest tempera; and yet with all these faults he painted at a time when the great precepts of art were well known, and his works are good exponents of skilled labor in art without any striking or exceptional power in the artist. It is scarcely possible here to give more than a list of the churches in which he painted: in Rome they were the Araceli, S. Cecilia in Trastevere, Santa Croce in Gerusalemme, and S. Onofrio. In 1496 he returned to Perugia, and undertook an altar-piece for S. Maria de' Fossi (now S. Anna), to be completed in two years. This is the most finished of his works, and more full of feeling than any other. He next adorned the collegiate church of Spello; but his works there are fast disappearing from the effects of dampness.

He was next called to Siena by cardinal Francesco Piccolomini, to decorate the library of the Duomo. Here he painted the ceiling in a variety of designs, with the shield and arms of the Piccolomini in the centre; and the walls with ten scenes from the life of Æneas Sylvius, or Pius II. This work was commenced in 1503, but was interrupted by deaths in the family of his patron, and was not completed until 1507, he having filled various other commissions in the mean time. It is said with great probability that he was assisted in the library by the then youthful Raffaelle, and some critics have been wont to attribute the best features of all Pinturicchio's pictures to aid from the same source. But this can hardly have been the case. They were associated more or less, without doubt, and it is not improbable that Raffaelle was one of the many assistants whom the master hired in Perugia for his work in Siena; but there are many reasons why the credit of the best of Pinturicchio should not be given to Sanzio, who certainly does not need any such praise. There are many circumstances connected with certain cartoons, many similarities of figures in the works of the two masters, which make us feel sure of their association, but these Siena frescos are conceived in the system of Pinturicchio. This library is one of the few Italian halls that retain their original character. The frescos are discolored and injured in parts, but are, on the whole, fairly preserved. It is probable that after the completion of these works the master went to Rome, and returned to Siena in 1509 with Signorelli, who stood as godfather to the son born to Pinturicchio in the beginning of that year. He then probably entered the service of Pandolfo Petrucci. His last authentic picture is now in the Palazzo Borromeo at Milan, and is a cabinet size of *Christ bearing his Cross*. It was painted in 1513, the year of his death. Dreadful stories have been told of the manner in which his wife Grania treated him. It is said that when very sick she left him to die of starvation, but this lacks confirmation. His works are seen in all large, and in some smaller collections of Europe. See Clement, *Handbook of Sculptors, Painters*, etc., s. v.; Spooner, *Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts*, s. v.

Piny, Alexandre, a French ascetic writer of much celebrity, was born at Barcelonnette in 1640. He joined the Dominican Order, and then taught theology at Aix; was called to Paris in 1676, and there was the director of the novitiate in the houses of his order. He was more distinguished for the holiness of his life than for his writings. He died at Paris Jan. 28, 1709. Of these we mention *Cursus philosophicus* (Lyons, 1670, 5 vols. 12mo):—*Summæ S. Thomæ Compendium* (ibid. 1680, 4 vols. 12mo):—*La Clef du par amour* (ibid. 1682, 12mo):—*La Vie cachée* (Paris, 1685, 12mo), etc.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xl, 285.

Pinytus is mentioned by Eusebius (*Hist. Eccles.* iv, 29, 31) as bishop of Cnossus, in the isle of Crete, and as a contemporary of Dionysius of Corinth (q. v.). According to the notices given by Eusebius, Dionysius addressed an epistle to Pinytus, exhorting him that, concerning abstinence (*ἀγνεία*), not to lay too heavy a yoke on the brethren (*τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς*), but rather pay regard to the weakness of the majority. It seems that Pinytus tried to promote in his congregation a Montanistic or Gnostico-ascetic tendency. Pinytus, however, persevered in his course, and replied to Dionysius that it was time to offer to his congregation a stronger meat than milk. Some have thought that the point of difference between Dionysius and Pinytus was rather concerning celibacy, which the latter intended to introduce among his clergy; but this is a mistake. In other respects, Eusebius speaks of this rejoinder of Pinytus as containing the best proof of the latter's orthodoxy, his care for the salvation of the souls committed to his charge, his rhetoric, and understanding of divine things. See Herzog, *Real-Encykl.* s. v.; *Theol. Univ.-Lex.* s. v.; Jöcher, *Gelehrt.-Lex.* s. v.; Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* iv, 29, 31. (B. P.)

Piombo, *Fra* Sebastiano del, an eminent Italian painter, noted in the history of sacred art, was born in 1485 at Venice, whence he was called also "Veneziano." His surname, according to Lanzi, was *Luciano*, though it does not appear that he was known by it in his own time, or that he ever marked his pictures with it. On his principal performance in oil, the *Raising of Lazarus*, the words "Sebastianus Venetus faciebat" appear in characters no doubt traced by himself. He was a skilful musician, particularly on the lute, but abandoned that science for painting, the rudiments of which he acquired under Bellini, but afterwards became the disciple of Giorgione, whose style of coloring he carefully studied and successfully imitated. He first distinguished himself as a portrait-painter, to which his powers were peculiarly adapted. His portraits are boldly designed and full of character; the heads and hands are admirably drawn, with an exquisite tone of color and extraordinary relief. The first historical picture which established his reputation was the altar-piece in the church of San Gio. Crisostomo at Venice, which, from its richness and harmony of coloring, has frequently been mistaken for a work by his master Giorgione. Sebastiano was invited to Rome by Agostino Chigi, a rich merchant who traded at Venice, by whom he was employed in ornamenting his palace of the Farnesina, in conjunction with Baldassare Peruzzi, where Raffaelle had painted his celebrated *Galatea*. Thus painting in competition, he found his own deficiency of invention, to remedy which he studied the antique, and obtained the instruction and assistance of Michael Angelo. Indeed it is said that that illustrious painter, growing jealous of the fame of Raffaelle, availed himself of the powers of Sebastiano as a colorist, in the hope that, assisted by his composition, Piombo might become a successful rival. Michael Angelo accordingly furnished the designs for the *Pietà* in the church of the Conventuali at Viterbo, and the *Transfiguration* and the *Flagellation* in San Pietro in Montorio at Rome, the execution of which, however, in consequence of Piombo's tedious mode of proceeding, occupied six years. The extraordinary beauty of the coloring, and the grandeur of Michael Angelo's composition and design in these celebrated productions, were the objects of universal surprise and applause. At this time cardinal Julian de' Medici commissioned Raffaelle to paint his picture of the *Transfiguration*, and being desirous of presenting an altar-piece to the cathedral of Narbonne, of which he was archbishop, he engaged Sebastiano to paint a picture of the *Raising of Lazarus*, of the same dimensions. Vasari states that in the composition of this work he was assisted by Michael Angelo; and in the magnificent collection of drawings belonging to Sir Thomas Lawrence there were two careful sketches of the *Lazarus*, made by Michael Angelo, and several slighter ones of other parts of the design. On its completion the picture was publicly exhibited at Rome, in competition with the *Transfiguration*, and it excited general admiration, although thus brought into direct competition with the crowning glory of Raffaelle's pencil. It was sent to the cathedral of Narbonne, for which it was painted, and remained till the middle of the 18th century, when it was removed by the regent of France into the Orleans collection. Having been brought to England with the rest of that collection in 1792, it was purchased for two thousand guineas, and is now deposited in the National Gallery at London. It was painted on wood, but has been transferred to canvas; its size is twelve feet six inches high, and nine feet six inches wide. After the death of Raffaelle, Piombo was called the first painter in Rome. He was greatly patronized by pope Clement VII, who conferred upon him the office of keeper of the papal signet, which was the cause of his name, *Del Piombo*, in allusion to the lead of the seal. This position rendering it necessary that he should assume a religious habit, he abandoned the profession of a painter, and was thenceforth called *Fra Sebastiano del Piombo*. His

works were numerous; some fine ones are in Madrid and St. Petersburg; many are in Venice, and they are seen in several Continental galleries. The last work was the chapel of the Chigi family, in Santa Maria del Popolo, which he left imperfect, and it was afterwards finished by Francisco Salviati. He died of a fever, at Rome, in 1547. He is said to have been the inventor of painting upon walls with oil-color, and of preventing the colors from becoming dark by applying, in the first instance, a mixture of mastic and Grecian pitch, or, according to some authorities, a plaster composed of quick-lime, pitch, and mastic. See Spooner, *Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts*, s. v.; Clement, *Painters, Sculptors, Architects*, etc., s. v.

Pious Workers, a Roman Catholic congregation, founded in 1621 by Caraffa, an Italian nobleman, who was for a time a Jesuit, was approved by pope Gregory XV, and confirmed in 1634 by pope Urban VIII. This congregation is governed by a superior tribunal, and vows are taken, and they serve in missions and other ecclesiastical functions useful to the Church. Their dress is black cloth, like that of other ecclesiastics.

Pious Worker.

Pipe, Musical (חָלִיל, *chalil*). The Hebrew word invariably so rendered (1 Sam. x, 5; 1 Kings i, 40; Isa. v, 12; xxx, 29; Jer. xlviii, 36; so also αὐλός, 1 Cor. xiv, 7) is derived from a root signifying "to bore, perforate," and is represented with sufficient correctness by the English "pipe" (or "flute," as in the margin of 1 Kings i, 40). It is one of the simplest, and therefore probably one of the oldest of musical instruments; and in consequence of its simplicity of form there is reason to suppose that the "pipe" of the Hebrews did not differ materially from that of the ancient Egyptians and Greeks. It is associated with the tabret (*tôph*) as an instrument of a peaceful and social character, just as in Shakespeare (*Much Ado*, ii, 3), "I have known when there was no music with him but the drum and fife, and now had he rather hear the *tabor and the pipe*"—the constant accompaniment of merriment and festivity (Luke vii, 32), and especially characteristic of "the *piping* time of peace." The pipe and tabret were used at the banquets of the Hebrews (Isa. v, 12), and their bridal processions (Mishna, *Baba metsia*, vi, 1), and accompanied the simpler religious services, when the young prophets, returning from the high-place, caught their inspiration from the harmony (1 Sam. x, 5); or the pilgrims, on their way to the great festivals of their ritual, beguiled the weariness of the march with psalms sung to the simple music of the pipe (Isa. xxx, 29). When Solomon was proclaimed king the whole people went up after him to Gihon, piping with pipes (1 Kings i, 40). The sound of the pipe was apparently a soft wailing note, which made it appropriate to be used in mourning and at funerals (Matt. ix, 23), and in the lament of the prophet over the destruction of Moab (Jer. xlviii, 36). The pipe was the type of perforated wind-instruments, as the harp was of stringed instruments (1 Macc. iii, 45), and was even used in the Temple-choir, as appears from Psa. lxxxvii, 7, where "the players on instruments" are properly "pipers." Twelve days in the year, according to the Mishna (*Arach.* ii, 3), the pipes sounded before the altar: at the slaying of the First Passover, the slaying of the Second Passover, the first feast-day of the Passover, the first feast-day of the Feast of Weeks, and the eight days of the Feast of Tabernacles. On the last-mentioned occasion the playing on pipes accompanied the drawing of water from the fountain of Siloah (*Succah*, iv, 1; v, 1) for five and six days. The pipes which were played before the altar were of reed, and not of copper or bronze, because the former gave a softer sound. Of these there were not less than two nor more than twelve. In later times the office of mourning at funerals became a profession, and the funeral and death-bed were never without the professional pipers or flute-players (αὐλητάς, Matt. ix, 23), a custom which still exists (comp. Ovid, *Fast.* vi, 660, "cantabat mœstis tibia funeribus"). It was incumbent on even the poorest Israelite, at the death of his wife, to provide at least two pipers and one woman to make lamentation. See Musical Instruments.

In the social and festive life of the Egyptians the pipe played as prominent a part as among the Hebrews. "While dinner was preparing, the party was enlivened by the sound of music; and a band, consisting of the harp, lyre, guitar, tambourine, double and single pipe, flute, and other instruments, played the favorite airs and songs of the country" (Wilkinson, *Anc. Egypt.* ii, 222). In the different combinations of instruments used in Egyptian bands, we generally find either the double pipe or the flute, and sometimes both; the former being played both by men and women, the latter exclusively by women. The Egyptian single pipe, as described by Wilkinson (*Anc. Egypt.* ii, 308), was "a straight tube, without any increase at the mouth, and when played was held with both hands. It was of moderate length, apparently not exceeding a foot and a half, and many have been found much smaller; but these may have belonged to the peasants, without mer-



Ancient Egyptian Pipes: Figs. 1, 2, 3, single pipes; 4, double pipe.



Ancient Egyptian Reed-pipes. (Now in the British Museum. One is 9 in. long, the other 15.)

iting a place among the instruments of the Egyptian band. . . . Some have three, others four holes . . . and some were furnished with a small mouthpiece" of reed or thick straw. This instrument must have been something like the *náy*, or dervish's flute, which is described by Mr. Lane (*Mod. Egypt.* vol. ii, ch. v) as "a simple reed, about eighteen inches in length, seven eighths of an inch in diameter at the upper extremity, and three

The Oriental *Nâŷ* or Flute, with Case.

quarters of an inch at the lower. It is pierced with six holes in front, and generally with another hole at the back. . . . In the hands of a good performer the *náy* yields fine, mellow tones; but it requires much practice to sound it well." The double pipe, which is found as frequently in Egyptian paintings as the single one, "consisted of two pipes, perhaps occasionally united together by a common mouthpiece, and played each with the corresponding hand. It was common to the Greeks and other people, and, from the mode of holding it, received the name of right and left pipe, the *tibia dextra* and *sinistra* of the Romans; the latter had but few holes, and, emitting a deep sound, served as a bass. The other had more holes, and gave a sharp tone" (Wilkinson, *Anc. Egypt.* ii, 309, 310). It was played on chiefly by women, who danced as they played, and is imitated by the modern Egyptians in their *zummára*, or double reed, a rude instrument, used principally by peasants and camel-drivers out of doors (*ibid.* p. 311, 312). In addition to these is also found in the earliest sculptures a kind of flute, held with both hands, and sometimes so long that the player was obliged to stretch his arms to their full length while playing. Any of the instruments above described would have been called by the Hebrews by the general term *châlîl*, and it is not improbable that they might have derived their knowledge of them from Egypt. The single pipe is said to have been the invention of the Egyptians alone, who attribute it to Osiris (Jul. Poll. *Onomast.* iv, 10); and as the material of which it was made was the lotus-wood (Ovid, *Fast.* iv, 190, "horrendo lotos adunca sono"), there may be some foundation for the conjecture. Other materials mentioned by Julius Pollux are reed, brass, boxwood, and horn. Pliny (xvi, 66) adds silver and the bones of asses. Bartenora, in his note on *Arachin*, ii, 3, above quoted, identifies the *chalîl* with the French *chalumeau*, which is the German *schalmeie* and our *shawm* or *shalm*, of which the clarionet is a modern improvement. The shawm, says Mr. Chappell (*Pop. Mus.* i, 35, note *b*), "was played with a reed like the wayte, or hautboy, but being a bass instrument, with about the compass of an octave, had probably more the tone of a bassoon." This can scarcely be correct, or Drayton's expression, "the *shrillest* shawm" (*Polyol.* iv, 366), would be inappropriate.—Smith, s. v. As among the Greeks, Romans, and the modern Arabs (see Niebuhr, *Reis.* i, 180, where cuts are given), so probably among the ancient Jews, there were several kinds of pipe, distinguished chiefly by the number of holes. (See Joseph. *War*, iii, 9, 5; Pliny, x, 60; Doughtæi *Anal.* ii, 12; Altmann, in *Tempe Helv.* ii, 509 sq.) Yet we must not call to mind the completeness of modern pipes and flutes, obtained by keys, etc. See esp. Meursius, *De tibiis collectand.* in Ugolino, *Thesaur.* vol. xxxii; Bartholin, *De tibiis vet. Bib.* 3 (Amsterd. 1679). See FLUTE.



Modern Egyptian Pipes: Figs. 3, 4, the *Zummára* (14 in. long); 5, mouthpiece of the latter; 6, the *Arghûl* (3 ft. 2½ in. long); each in sections, A–B, etc.

Pipe, HYDRAULIC. There are three Hebrew words so rendered: מוּצָקָה (*mutsakâh*, Zech. iv, 2, something *cast*, as rendered 2 Chron. iv, 3); נֶקֶב (*ne'keb*, prob. a *bezel* or cavity, Ezek. xxviii, 13); and צַנְתֵּר (*tsantâr*, a *tube*, Zech. iv, 12; whence κάνθαρος, *cantharus*).

Pipe, JOHN S., a Wesleyan minister, was born in the last half of the 18th century. He was converted when but a boy. He entered the itinerant ministry in 1790, and for thirty-five years labored most successfully for the Gospel cause. He was generally employed in the most populous parts of the British kingdom, and was much beloved by the people to whom he preached. He died July 21, 1835. "His ministry was faithful, lively, and zealous, and his spirit affectionate, cheerful, and devout."—*Wesleyan Meth. Mag.* 1835, p. 723.

Piper (Rev. xviii, 22). See MINSTREL; PIPE.

Pipher, WILLIAM G., a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born August 23, 1817, in Hopkinston, N. H. In 1837 he removed to Illinois, and entered a school in the town of Ebenezer, near Jacksonville. He was converted Aug. 6, 1838, and believing that he was moved by the Holy Ghost to preach the Gospel, obtained license Aug. 14, 1841. In September of the same year he joined the Illinois Conference, and was appointed to the Rushville Circuit; in 1842 was sent to Carthage; in 1843 he was appointed to Pulaski; in 1844 was reappointed to Rushville; in 1845 to Mount Sterling; in 1846 to Lawrenceville; in 1847 to Hillsborough; in 1848 was ordained elder; and from 1848 to 1850 held a local relation. In 1851 he was readmitted to the Conference, and reappointed to Pulaski; in 1852 to Havanna; in 1853 to Athens; in 1854 to Edgar; in 1855, his health not being very good, he took a transfer to Kansas, which at that time was just opening for settlement. His first appointment was Topeka Circuit, where he labored with great acceptability, and laid foundations upon which others have since largely built. In 1857 he was sent to Big Springs Circuit, where he did a good work, organized classes and Sunday-schools, attending to all the duties of a Methodist preacher. In 1858 he was appointed to the Auburn and Tecumseh Circuit, where he labored the earlier half of the year with some success; but the long rides between appointments, the many exposures to storms, swimming swollen streams, with only such accommoda-

tions as new settlements often afford, and sometimes wandering over the wide prairies until morning, broke him down completely, and at the Conference in 1859 he took a superannuated relation, after which he resided at Baldwin City, Kansas, highly respected and most beloved by those who knew him best. He died there May 15, 1869. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 1870, p. 94.

Piphiles, a name given to the Flemish Albigenses (see Ekhert, *Adv. Cathar.* in *Bibl. Max. Lugd.* xxiii, 601). See ALBIGENSES.

Pipping, HENRI, a German theologian and biographer, was born at Leipsic in 1670. He discharged, from the year 1693, several ecclesiastical functions at the church of San Thomas at Leipsic, and became in 1708 preacher at the court of Dresden. Pipping died in 1722. He wrote *Arcanæ Bibliothecæ Thomæ Lipsiensis sacra* (Leipsic, 1780, 8vo):—*Sacer decadum septenarius memoriam theologorum nostra ætate clarissimorum exhibens* (ibid. 1705, 2 vols. 8vo), followed by a *Trias decadum* (ibid. 1707, 8vo):—*Semicenturia Biographica selecta* (ibid. 1709, 8vo):—*Syntagma dissertationum* (ibid. 1708 and 1723, 8vo).

Piquepuz is the name of a French reformed order of Franciscans, which was organized by father Vincent Massart, a Parisian, in 1593. They built their first convent between Paris and Pontoise, and the second at the place called Piquepuz, where they finally made their headquarters, and obtained the name by which they are generally known. The strength of the order confined to France is remarkable. They have a house at Rome, but it is the only one sanctioned outside of France, as pope Paul V, who gave authority for the order in 1620, so conditioned. Their dress is a black coat, and a round hood with scapulary. They wear sandals, and shave like the Capuchin monks.

Monk of the Piquepuz Order.

Piquet (or **Picquet**), CLAUDE, a French monastic, was born at Dijon in the second half of the 16th century. He joined the Franciscan Order, and became the abbot of this order at Châlons-sur-Saône and at Romenay. He was also professor of philosophy. He died after 1621. He left *Commentaria super evangelicam fratrum Minorum regulam ac sancti Francisci testamentum* (Lyons, 1597, 8vo). It contains a life of the founder, and a catalogue of the distinguished men of his order:—*Provinciæ S. Bonaventuræ, seu Burgundiæ, fratrum Minorum regularis observantiæ*, etc., *descriptio* (Tournon, 1610 and 1612, 8vo). Claude Piquet left, among other manuscripts, a life of pope Clement IV.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xl, 298.

Pi'ra (Πειρά), a name found in the apocryphal account of the family-heads who returned from the Captivity with Zerubbabel (1 Esdr. v, 19); but not contained in the parallel Heb. texts (Ezra ii, 25; Neh. vii 29), and evidently originating from a repetition of the name Caphira preceding.

Pi'ram (Heb. *Piram'*, פִּרְאָם, *like a wild ass*, i. e. fleet; Sept. Φιδών, v. r. Alex. Φιραάμ, Vulg. *Pharam*), the Amoritish king of Jarmuth at the time of Joshua's conquest of Canaan (Josh. x, 3). B.C. cir. 1618. With his four confederates he was defeated in the great battle before Gibeon, and fled for refuge to the cave at Makkedah, the entrance to which was closed by Joshua's command. At the close of the long day's slaughter and pursuit, the five kings were brought from their hiding-place, and hanged upon five trees till sunset, when their bodies were taken down and cast into the cave "wherein they had been hid" (Josh. x, 27).—Smith. See JARMUTH.

Pir'athon (Heb. *Pirathon'*, פִּרְעָתוֹן, Gesen. *princely*; Fürst, a *cleft* or *creek*; Sept. Φαραθών, v. r. Φαραθώμ and Φραθών), the name of one or two places in Palestine. We read in the book of Judges that "Abdon the son of Hillel, *a Pirathonite*, judged Israel, . . . and was buried in *Pirathon*, in the land of Ephraim, in the mount of the Amalekites" (xii, 13, 15). The city is not again mentioned in the Bible; but among David's mighty men was "Benaiah *the Pirathonite*, of the children of Ephraim" (1 Chron. xxvii, 14; xi, 31; 2 Sam. xxiii, 30). The city of Pirathon was therefore situated in the territory of Ephraim, and among the mountains, apparently where a colony of the wandering Amalekites had settled. Jerome mentions it (*Onomast.* s. v. Fraaton), but does not appear to have known anything of it. It is mentioned, however, by the accurate old traveller hap-Parchi as lying about two hours west of Shechem, and called *Fer'ata* (Asher's *Benjamin of Tud.* ii, 426). About six miles W.S.W. of Nâbulus, upon the summit of a tell among low hills, still stands the little village of *Fer'ata*, which is doubtless identical with the ancient Pirathon (Robinson, *Bib. Res.* iii, 134). According to Schwarz (*Palest.* p. 151), it is identified by Astori with the modern village *Pretha*, on the mountain of Amalek, five English miles west of Shechem, doubtless referring to the same place.

Josephus mentions a *Pharathon* (Φαραθών), grouping it between Timnah and Tekoa (*Ant.* xiii, 1, 3); and the same name occurs in 1 Macc. ix, 50 (Φαραθωνί), among the towns whose ruined fortifications were restored by Bacchides, in his campaign against the Jews; but it could scarcely have been identical with the Pirathon of Ephraim, though the names are the same. This city was probably situated somewhere in the wilderness of Judah; but the site has not been discovered. See PIRATHONITE.

Pir'athonite (Heb. *Pirathoni'*, פִּרְעָתוֹנִי and פִּרְעָתֹנִי, from *Pirathon*; Sept. Φαραθωνίτης, Φαραθωνει, or ἐκ Φαραθών), a native or inhabitant of Pirathon (q. v.); the epithet of the judge Abdon (Judg. xii, 13, 15), and of two of David's officers, namely, Benaiah, captain of the eleventh army contingent (1 Chron. xxiii, 14), and a member of the royal guard (1 Chron. xi, 31).

Pirie, ALEXANDER, a Scotch divine, flourished near the opening of the present century. His ecclesiastical connection was first with the Antiburghers, then with the Relief Synod, and finally he joined the Independents. He died at Newburgh, in Fife, in 1804. His

works, collected and published after his death (Edinb. 1805–6, 6 vols. 12mo), contain various treatises, relating to the Jews, to the primitive condition of man, on difficult passages of Scripture, on baptism and the covenant of Sinai, and a dissertation on Hebrew roots. On all these topics he has many fanciful and visionary speculations, and it is to be regretted that a mind so capable and a life so industrious was spent so largely on trifles, or things of a fanciful nature. His controversial pamphlets are prized because they exhibit his religious modifications.

Pirit, a ceremony among the Buddhists of Ceylon, which consists in reading certain portions of the Bana, for the purpose of appeasing the dæmons called *Yakas*, from whom all the afflictions of men are supposed to proceed. This ceremony, which is the only one that professes to be sanctioned by Gotama Buddha, is thus described by Mr. Spence Hardy in his *Eastern Monachism:*

"About sunset numbers of persons arrived from different quarters, the greater proportion of whom were women, bringing with them cocoanut-shells and oil, to be presented as offerings. As darkness came on the shells were placed in niches in the wall of the court by which the wihára is surrounded; and by the aid of the oil and a little cotton they were soon converted into lamps. The wall around the bó-tree was similarly illuminated: as many of the people had brought torches, composed of cotton and resinous substances, the whole of the sacred enclosure was in a blaze of light. The gay attire and merry countenances of the various groups that were seen in every direction gave evidence that, however solemn the professed object for which they were assembled together, it was regarded by all as a time of relaxation and festivity. Indeed, the grand cause of the popularity of this and similar gatherings is that they are the only occasion, marriage festivals excepted, upon which the young people can see and be seen, or upon which they can throw off the reserve and restraint it is their custom to observe in the ordinary routine of society intercourse. The service continues during the seven days, a preparatory ceremony being held on the evening of the second day. The edifice in which it is conducted is the same as that in which the Bana is read upon other occasions. A relic of Buaba, enclosed in a casket, is placed upon the platform erected for the purpose; and the presence of this relic is supposed to give the same efficacy to the proceedings as if the great sage were personally there. For the priests who are to officiate another platform is prepared; and at the conclusion of the preparatory service a sacred thread, called the pirit núla, is fastened round the interior of the building, the end of which, after being fastened to the reading-platform, is placed near the relic. At such times as the whole of the priests who are present are engaged in chanting the chorus the cord is untwined, and each priest takes hold of it, thus making the communication complete between each of the officiating priests, the relic, and the interior walls of the building. From the commencement of the service on the morning of the second day, until its conclusion on the evening of the seventh day, the reading-platform is never to be vacated day or night. For this reason, when the two officiating priests are to be relieved by others, one continues sitting and reading while the other gives his seat to his successor, and the second priest does not effect his exchange until the new one has commenced reading. In the same way, from the morning of the second day till the morning of the seventh day, the reading is continued day and night, without intermission. Not fewer than twelve, and in general twenty-four, priests are in attendance, two of whom are constantly officiating. As they are relieved every two hours, each priest has to officiate two hours out of the twenty-four. In addition to this, all the priests engaged in the ceremony are collected three times in each day: viz. at sunrise, at mid-day, and at sunset, when they chant in chorus the three principal discourses of the pirit, called respectively Mangala, Ratana, and Karaniya, with a short selection of verses from other sources. After this the reading is continued till the series of discourses have been read through, when they are begun again, no other than those in the first series being read until the sixth day, when a new series is commenced. On the morning of the seventh day a grand procession is formed of armed and unarmed men, and a person is appointed to officiate as the déwad-utayá, or messenger of the gods. This company, with a few of the priests, proceeds to some place where the gods are supposed to reside, inviting them to attend prior to the conclusion of the service, that they may partake of its benefits. Until the messenger and his associates return the officiating priests remain seated, but the reading is suspended. At the festival I attended the messenger was introduced with great state, and sulphur was burned before him to make his appearance the more supernatural. One of the priests having proclaimed that the various orders of gods and dæmons were invited to be present, the messenger replied that he had been deputed by such and such deities, repeating their names, to say that they would attend. The threefold protective formulary, which forms parts of the recitation, was spoken by all present in grand chorus. In the midst of much that is superstitious in practice or utterly erroneous in doctrine, there is some advice repeated of an excellent tendency; but the whole ceremony being conducted in a language that the people do not understand, no beneficial result can be produced by its performance."

Such is the ceremony attending the reading of the ritual of priestly exorcism. This ritual is called *Piruwana pota*. It is written in the Pali language, and consists of extracts from the sacred books, the recital of which, accompanied with certain attendant ceremonies, is intended to ward off evil and to bring prosperity.

Pirke Aboth, i. e. *capita patrum* (פִּרְקֵי, *a chapter*), or sayings of the fathers, is the name of a tract of the *Mishna* (q. v.), and consists of five chapters of chronologically regulated gnomes from the teachers of Israel who flourished within 450 years. They were in all ages highly esteemed for their moral character, but in modern times, when a greater interest in Jewish history awoke, they also experienced greater attention on account of their historical value. The *Pirke Aboth* was especially used by Frankel for solving some historical problems, and several after him found in them sources for chronological suggestions. A very ingenious speculation about the first chapter of the *Pirke Aboth* is brought forward by rabbi Bloch. He asserts that its sentences and rules of life were pronounced on the occasion of the solemn dispensing of the *Semicha*, "the ordination and authorization to the office of rabbi and judge," given to the disciples as rules of life in office. With such sentence the teacher discharged his disciple, who was prepared to enter an independent calling. The first chapter gives us the chain of tradition, how the law was delivered from generation to generation. When the men of the great synagogue said, "Be deliberate in judgment, train up many disciples, and make a fence for the law," they could not have intended for every man and for every opportunity, but just for such disciples to whom they dispensed *Semicha*. When Judah ibn-Tabia taught (ver. 8), "Consider not thyself like a chief-justice, and when parties are before thee in judgment, consider both as guilty; but when they are departed from thee, consider them both as innocent, if they acquiesced in the sentence;" or if Abtalyon impressed the sages to be cautious of their words (ver. 11), etc., it appears clearly that they merely addressed persons who have charge of judgments and of the chair. Verse 13, which is taught in the name of Hillel, expresses genuine Shamaic rigor, and only the suppositions that these precepts are directed to disciples will somewhat explain their rigidness. Especially verse 3 gains clearness, which reports the sentence of Antigonos of Socho: "Be not like servants who serve their master for the sake of receiving reward, but be like servants who serve without the condition to receive reward, and let the fear of heaven be upon you." According to the common conception, the last sentence could not be brought into close connection with the foregoing. Clearly Antigonos intended to say something else than what his expounders impute to him. By פרס he decidedly understood earthly reward, and addressed his disciples to exercise their offices as teacher and judge not with a view to reward, but for the office' sake, and "The fear of heaven be upon you" completes the advice. The chapters following contain rules of life for "every man" (שיבור לו האדם).

When the extemporaneous discourses were suspended in the synagogue by the reading of the *Haggadah* (q. v.), etc., it became the custom to read in the Sabbath afternoon service a chapter of the *Aboth* (Zunz, *Gottesdienstl. Vorträge der Juden*, p. 424), and this still continues the practice in many countries (Bodenschatz, *Kirchl. Verfassung der Juden*, ii, 151 sq.). The Spanish Jews read

the *Aboth* only on the six Sabbaths between Passover and Pentecost. The Prayer-books have the *Aboth* always as an appendix. A separate critical edition, with German translation, was prepared by rabbi Caro, under the title *Minchath Schabbath* (Krotoshin, 1847). See Talmud. (J. H. W.)

Pirkheimer, Wilibald, a celebrated German humanist, was born at Eichstädt, Dec. 5, 1470, of an old patrician Nuremberg family. He enjoyed a most refined education; he was at the age of eighteen introduced to the court of the bishop of Eichstädt, where he soon became proficient in every kind of knightly pursuit, and carefully cultivated his fine native talent for music. Though interrupted by several military expeditions, his literary studies, in which he was guided by Georges von Tegen and the canon Adelmann, were not neglected. In 1490 he went to the University of Padua, where he studied jurisprudence, and got familiar with the Greek language, in which he was taught by Musurus. Three years afterwards he completed his study of jurisprudence at Pavia, under Maino, Lancelot, and Philip Decius. At his return to Nuremberg, 1497, he married Crescentia Rietter, whose influential family soon opened to him the doors of the senate. This assembly soon acknowledged his merit, and, in spite of his youth, intrusted him with several important negotiations. In 1499 he obtained the command of the contingent sent by the city to the emperor Maximilian I against the Swiss cantons, when his brilliant conduct during this campaign, of which he afterwards published an account, won him the favor of the sovereign, who made him his counsellor. Disgusted by the envious attacks of which the imperial favor was fruitful, he resigned in 1501 his functions as senator, but resumed them three years afterwards, when he was again intrusted with the most delicate negotiations, his amiable disposition and persuasive eloquence fitting him especially for this kind of affairs. In 1511 or 1512 he was sent as deputy to the diets of Trèves and Cologne. In 1522 Pirkheimer retired into private life, devoting himself to study, and encouraging with all his power throughout Germany the cultivation of literature and science. His library, rich in rare manuscripts, was at the disposition of the public; his opulent mansion became the favorite resort of a chosen phalanx of literati, artists, and other persons of merit. He helped many a poor savant with his purse and his influence. He entertained friendly relations with Erasmus, Conrad Cettes, Reuchlin, Trithème, Albert Dürer, Pico de la Mirandola, etc. Unfortunately the greater part of his correspondence is lost; but what remains of it proves the truth of the words of Cochlæus in a letter to Pirkheimer, "Eo enim hactenus in eruditos fuisti animo, ut communi studiosorum judicio habitus fueris et literarum decus et eruditionis variæ atque adeo omnigenæ princeps." After greatly improving the condition of the schools of Nuremberg, he made that city one of the most active centres of intellectual culture. Hutten likens his influence to that of Erasmus and Reuchlin. His predilection for the classical, especially for the Greek writers, some of which he translated into Latin and German, did not lessen his interest for the history of his own country. Some parts of it he treated with a judicious criticism remarkable for that time. He also endeavored to encourage the study of mathematics and of astronomy, and finally took a most lively interest in all attempts made to reform the Church and its discipline, writing against the degenerated scholastics, and taking the part of Reuchlin against his persecutors in an eloquent pamphlet. He at first enlisted among the partisans of Luther, but soon changed his mind, being, like Erasmus, fearful lest the success of reformation might prove obnoxious to his favorite pursuits. He died at Nuremberg Dec. 22, 1530. His works are *Eccius dedotatus* (1520, 4to), under the pseudonym of T. Fr. Cottalambergius:—*Apologia seu laus podagræ* (Nuremb. 1522, 4to; Strasb. 1529, 1570; Amberg, 1604, 1611, 4to); this humorous pamphlet was translated into German (Nuremb. 1831, 8vo):—*De vera Christi carne, ad Œcolampadium responsio* (ibid. 1526, 8vo); followed by a second answer, and a pamphlet with the title *De convitiis monachi illius qui Œcolampadius nuncupatur* (1527, 8vo):—*Germaniæ ex variis Scriptoribus perbrevis explicatio* (ibid. 1530, 1532, 8vo):—*Priscorum num morum æstimatio* (Tübing. 1533; Nuremb. 1541, 4to):—*Translations of several Opuscula of Plutarch, Lucian, St. Nilus, St. Gregory Nazianzenus*, etc. The complete works of Pirkheimer have been collected by Goldast (Frankf. 1610, fol.); among them we find printed for the first time his *Bellum Suitense seu Helveticum anno* 1490, translated into German by Munch, who added thereto a life of the author (Nuremb. 1826). Pirkheimer gave the first edition of Fulgentius (ibid. 1519, 8vo); he also wrote the text to the splendid woodcuts of Albert Dürer's *Triumphal Chariot of the Emperor Maximilian*. Some of his letters are to be found in Strobel's *Beiträge* and *Miscellanea*, in Waldau's *Beiträge*, and other collections.

His sister, *Charitas Pirkheimer*, born 1464, after enjoying a most liberal education, entered very young the monastery of Santa Clara at Nuremberg, of which she became abbess in 1504. She read Greek, and wrote in Latin with elegance. Some of her letters in that language to Erasmus and others have been preserved. She died in 1532.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xl, 304.

Pirking, Ehrenreich, a German canonist, was born at Sigarten, in Bavaria, in 1606. After studying philosophy and jurisprudence at Ingolstadt, he entered the Jesuitic order in 1628, and was a professor of morals, canon law, and exegesis in several colleges of his order. Pirking died after 1676. We have of him, *Apologia Cæsaris, principum Catholicorum et ordinum religiosorum adversus Balduini calumnios* (Ingolstadt, 1652, 8vo):—*De jurisdictione prælatorum et rectorum episcopis inferiorum* (Dillingen, 1663, 8vo):—*De jurisdictione judicis delegati* (ibid. 1664, 8vo):—*De constitutionibus et consuetudine* (ibid. 1666, 8vo):—*De renuntiatione beneficiorum* (ibid. 1667, 8vo):—*Commentaria in Decretales* (ibid. 1674, 3 vols. fol.):—*Jus canonicum explicatum* (ibid. 1674–1678, 5 vols. fol.; Venice, 1759).

Pirminius, St., a Frankish ecclesiastic and bishop of Melci (Metz, or Melo in St. Gallen, or Medelsheim, near Zweibrücken, or Meaux-on-the-Marne), carried the Gospel along the shores of the lake of Constance; and, protected in his labors by Charles Martel, he founded the monastery of Reichenau. Three years afterwards, however, he was expelled in consequence of a national rising of the Alemanni against the Frankish rule, and he now descended the Rhine and founded a number of monasteries (as Murbach, Schwarzenbach, Neuweiler, Schuttern, Gengenbach, etc.), among them Hornbach, in the diocese of Metz, where he died, Nov. 3, 753, after having met shortly before with St. Boniface. A great many legends surround the life of this servant of Christ, which, however, have no historical basis. Pirminius is said to be the author of *Libellus abbatis Pirminii, de singulis libris canonicis scarapsus* (the latter in mediæval Latin meaning "excerpt"), printed in Mabillon, *Vetera Analecta* (Paris, 1723, fol.), p. 65–73. See Rettberg, *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands*, ii, 50–58; Hefele, *Geschichte der Einführung des Christenthums im südwestlichen Deutschland* (Tübing. 1837); G. Th. Rudhard, *Älteste Geschichte Bayerns* (Hamburg, 1841), p. 346, 371, 372; M. Görringer, *Pirminius*, etc. (Zweibr. 1841), p. 384–407; Fink, in Piper's *Evangel. Kalender*, 1861, xii, 129–134; Kurtz, *Lehrbuch der Kirchengesch.* vol. i, § 78, p. 1; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* s. v.; Jöcher, *Gelehrten-Lexikon*, s. v.; *Theologisches Universal-Lexikon*, s. v. (B. P.)

Pirna, John. See Pirnensians.

Pirnensians, a mediæval sect, taking its name from John Pirna or Pirnensis, an anti-sacerdotal schismatic of Silesia, A.D. 1341. His principles were those common to the mediæval sects, and illustrated especial-

ly in the *Beghards* and the *Brethren of the Free Spirit*. It is thought probable that they were in some way connected with the *Strigolniks* of Russia, although the latter belong to a much more recent time. The Pirnensians regarded the pope as Antichrist, and were especially distinguished by great hatred of the clergy. They disappeared on the Continent by merging with the Hussites. See Krazinski, *Hist. of the Reformation in Poland*, i, 55; Hardwick, *Hist. of the Church in the Middle Ages*, p. 374.

Piromalli, Paolo, an Italian missionary, was born in 1591 or 1592 at Siderno (Ulterior Calabria). Having embraced the rule of St. Dominic, he devoted himself to preaching, and was in 1628 called to Rome to teach philosophy in the monastery of La Minerva. Appointed in 1631 director of the missions of Major Armenia, he succeeded in gaining for the Catholic faith a number of schismatics and Eutychians, among the latter the patriarchs Cyriac and Moyse III. In 1637 he travelled through Georgia, and was twice sent to pacify in Polonia the uneasiness caused by the disputes of the Armenians. In 1642 he went to Persia, remaining there ten years, and then preached the Gospel in several parts of India. In 1654 he passed over to Africa, with a view of converting infidels, but was captured by Algerian pirates, who kept him prisoner for fourteen months. Appointed archbishop of Naschivan (1655), he governed that Armenian Church to the close of 1664, when he was transferred to the episcopal see of Bisignano, in the kingdom of Naples. He died July 13, 1667, at Bisignano. He left *Theanthropologia* (Vienna, 1656, 8vo): —*Apologia de duplici natura Christi* (ibid. 1656, 8vo); and sixteen works never printed, among which we may mention a Vocabulary and a Grammar of the Armenian language.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xl, 308.

Pirot, Edmonde, a French theologian, was born Aug. 12, 1631, at Auxerre. He chose the clerical career, and having taken his degrees, the doctorate included, at the Sorbonne, he became a most successful professor of theology, a member of the chapter of Notre Dame de Paris, and at last chancellor. It was his regular business to examine the works and theses of theology. He interrogated Mme. Guyon, and undertook the censure of her doctrines. Fénelon gave him his *Explication de Maximes des Saints* to examine. He approved of it greatly, after some small changes, going even so far, it is said, as to call it a golden book; then, under the influence of Bossuet, he took back his first decision, and wrote against the *Explication* a censure which was signed by sixty other doctors. He died at Paris Aug. 4, 1713. With the exception of a Latin speech pronounced in 1669, nothing of his exists in print; but some manuscript pamphlets are mentioned by contemporaries.

A Jesuit of this name, *Pirot* (Georges), who was born in 1599 in the bishopric of Rennes, is the author of an *Apologie des Casuistes contre les Calomnies des Jansenistes* (1657), a work condemned by Alexander VII and several bishops. He died Oct. 6, 1659.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xl, 320.

Pisa, a city of Northern Italy, the recent capital of Tuscany, with a population of about 22,000, is noted in ecclesiastical history as the seat of several important Church councils.

I. The first council here (*Concilium Pisanum*) was convoked by pope Innocent II in 1134, who presided at the head of a large assembly of the bishops of France, Germany, and Italy. St. Bernard assisted at their deliberations. By this body the excommunication of the anti-pope Anacletus was renewed, together with his abettors. Several canons were published.

1. Directs that priests shall be separated from their wives, and nuns from their pretended husbands; and both parties put to penance.

6. Forbids, under pain of excommunication, to violate the sanctuary of a church or churchyard.

See Labbé, *Concil.* x, 989.

II. But far more important was the council convened here March 25, 1409. Its object was the conciliation of the pope and anti-pope, and the ending of so dangerous a schism as then existed. It was proposed to judge between the two competitors for the papacy, and elect one of them to the throne, or set both aside and choose a third party. The council was called under the protection of king Charles VI of France, and was attended by the cardinals of both rivals to the papal chair — Benedict XIII (q. v.) and Gregory XII (q. v.). Benedict, by the advice of several bishops, sent seven legates to the council; but Gregory, on the other hand, refused to appear either in person or by deputy, although summoned in due form. The assembly was one of the most august and numerous ever seen in the Church: there were present 22 cardinals; the Latin patriarchs of Alexandria (Simon), Antioch (Wenceslaus), Jerusalem (Hugo), and Grade (Francis Lando); 12 archbishops were present in person, and 14 by their proctors; 80 bishops, and the proctors of 102 absent; 87 abbots, and the proctors of 200 others; besides priors; generals of orders; the grand-master of Rhodes, with 16 commanders; the prior-general of the Knights of the Holy Sepulchre; the deputy of the grand-master and Knights of the Teutonic Order; the deputies of the universities of Oxford, Cambridge, Paris, Florence, Cracow, Vienna, Prague, and many others; more than 300 doctors in theology; and ambassadors from the kings of England, France, Portugal, Bohemia, Sicily, Poland, and Cyprus; from the dukes of Burgundy, Brabant, etc.

The following was the action of each session of this council:

Session 1. The order of precedency to be observed by the members of the council was laid down.

Sess. 2. After the usual prayer and sermon, the archbishop of Pisa read the decree of Gregory X upon the procession of the Holy Spirit, to which the Greeks had agreed in the Council of Lyons, A.D. 1274, and the canon of Toledo relating to the proper order of ecclesiastical councils. After this the necessary officers were appointed, the letter of convocation read, and the two rival popes summoned at the gates of the church; no one, however, appearing for them.

Sess. 3. A fresh citation was made, and no one having appeared, the two popes, Pedro of Luna and Angelo Corrario, were declared contumacious by a sentence which was affixed to the church door.

Sess. 4. Bishop Ulric, the ambassador of Robert, king of the Romans, addressed the assembly, endeavoring to frustrate the object of the council.

Sess. 5. The two contending parties were again declared contumacious, and the promoter of the council produced against them thirty-seven articles, containing the whole history of the schism, and showing the badness of their cause. Although the facts contained in this accusation were sufficiently notorious, commissioners were appointed to prove their truth.

Sess. 6. The bishop of Salisbury showed that it was necessary for the cause that there should be a *general*, and not merely a *partial*, withdrawal from the obedience of the popes, and declared that he had authority from the king of England to follow out the scheme for unity, and to consent to whatever the council should determine.

Sess. 7. The difficulties started by the ambassador of the king of the Romans were answered.

Sess. 8. The bishops of Salisbury and Evreux showed that the union of the two colleges of cardinals could not be effected while those of the party of Benedict continued to obey him, and that the withdrawal from obedience must be universal. Whereupon the council declared the union of the two colleges to be lawful, and the council itself duly convoked; and a decree was passed to the effect that each one might and ought to withdraw from the obedience both of Gregory and Benedict; since both of them had by their artifices eluded the solemn cession of office which they had promised upon oath to make.

Sess. 9. Was employed in the reading of the decree of the preceding session.

Sess. 10. The two contending parties were again cited at the door of the church, in order that they might hear the testimony of the witnesses. Then thirty-seven articles, containing their deposition, were read; and it was noted down by how many witnesses each article was proved.

Sess. 11. The reading of the depositions was continued.

Sess. 12. A decree was published declaring the council to be œcumenical, and all contained in the preceding depositions to be true, public, and notorious.

Sess. 13. One of the deputies from the University of Paris showed that Pedro of Luna was a heretic and schis-

matic, and that he had forfeited the papacy; and this he declared to be the opinion of the French universities. The bishop of Navarre also declared that all the doctors in the council, to the number of three hundred, agreed in this view.

Sess. 14. A declaration was made that the council represented the Roman Catholic Church, that the cognizance of the matter before it of right belonged to it, as being the highest authority on earth; also an act of general withdrawal from the obedience of the two contending parties was drawn up,

Sess. 15. The definitive sentence was pronounced in the presence of the whole council and of the people who were permitted to enter. The sentence was to the effect that the holy œcumenical synod, representing the Catholic Church, to which it appertained to take cognizance of and to decide the question, after having examined everything which had been done concerning the union of the Church, declared Pedro of Luna, called Benedict XIII, and Angelo Corrario, called Gregory XII, to be both of them schismatical, abettors of schism, heretics, and guilty of perjury; that they had given offence to the whole Church by their obstinacy, that they had forfeited every dignity, and were, *ipso facto*, separated from the Church. It forbade all the faithful, under pain of excommunication, to recognise them or support their cause. It annulled all that they had done against the promoters of unity, and declared the last promotion of cardinals made by them to be null and void.

Sess. 16. A paper was read, in which the cardinals present all promised that, in the event of any one of them being elected to the papal chair, he would continue the present council, until the Church should be reformed in its head and in its members; and if one of those then absent or any other not belonging to the college of cardinals, were elected, that they would compel him to make the same promise before publishing his election. Afterwards the council ratified the sentence against Angelo and Pedro.

Sess. 17. Certain preliminaries concerning the election were settled.

Sess. 18. A solemn procession was made to implore of the Almighty the grace necessary to guide their election.

Sess. 19. The cardinals, to the number of twenty-four, entered into conclave under the guard of the grand-master of Rhodes, and at the end of ten days' confinement, they unanimously elected Peter of Candia, cardinal of Milan, of the order of Franciscan friars, a man seventy years of age, who took the name of Alexander V. As soon as he was elected, John Gerson, chancellor of the University of Paris, delivered a discourse, exhorting him to the faithful discharge of his duty, etc.

Sess. 20. The new pope presided and delivered a discourse. The decree of his election was then read, and on the following Sunday he was crowned.

Sess. 21. A decree was read on the part of the pope, approving and ratifying all the dispensations of marriage, and those relating to the penitentiary, which had been granted by Benedict or Gregory.

Sess. 22. A decree was published on the part of the pope and council, confirming all collations, provisions, translations, etc., made canonically by the two rival popes.

Sess. 23. A decree was read, ordering metropolitans to convoke provincial councils, and the generals of orders to hold chapters, having presidents of the pope's appointment. Finally, Alexander ratified all that the cardinals had done since May 3, 1408, and especially what had passed at Pisa. With regard to Church reform, as many of the prelates had left the council, the pope declared that the subject should be deferred until the following council, which he appointed to be held in 1412; then he dismissed the assembly, giving plenary indulgence to all who had assisted at it, and to all who had adhered to it.

See Hardouin, *Acta*, vii, 1929 sq.; viii, 1 sq.; Mansi, *Concil.* xxvi, 1131 sq.; xxvii, 1–522; Labbé, *Concil.* xi, 2114; Lenfant, *Hist. du Conc. de Pisa* (Amsterd. 1724, 4to); Wessenberg, *Die Allgemeinen Concil. des* 15 *u.* 16 *Jahrh.* ii, 48 sq.; Hefele, *Conciliengesch.* vol. v. For the imbecile conduct of papal affairs under the newly chosen candidate we refer the reader to the art. ALEXANDER V, and the history of his successor, John XXIII (s. v.). In this place we may simply add that the schism, instead of being closed, continued, with three popes in the room of two. The effort also to reduce the rank of the pope to a constitutional instead of an absolute monarch, by giving to the councils of the Church the supreme tribunal, to which the pope himself is subordinate and amenable, failed. See INFALLIBILITY; PAPAL SUPREMACY.

III. Another council was convened at Pisa in 1511, at the instigation of the emperors Maximilian and Louis XII of France, who having just cause of complaint against pope Julius II (q. v.), persuaded the cardinals of St. Croix, Narbonne, and Cosenzi to convoke a council, whose object was set forth to be the reform of the Church in its head and in its members, and to punish various notorious crimes which for a long time had scandalized the whole Church. It was further stated that there was urgent need of such councils, that Julius had not only neglected to convoke one, but had done all in his power to hinder it; and, finally, the pope was in respectful terms cited to appear at the council. Besides this, in answer to the complaint made against them by Julius, they published an apology for their conduct, in which they justified the convocation of the Council of Pisa: first, by a decree passed in the thirty-ninth session of the council; secondly, by the pope's own vow, according to which he had promised to hold a council; thirdly, by the oath of the cardinals, and by the necessity of avoiding so great scandal. They further showed that the canons, which vest the power of convoking such councils in the pope, are to be understood as speaking of the ordinary state of things, but that cause may arise in which councils may be called and assembled by others than the sovereign pontiff. The pope, in order to parry the blow, convoked a rival council to Rome, and cited the three above-mentioned cardinals to appear there within a certain time, under pain of deprivation. The Council of Pisa, however, proceeded, and was opened Nov. 1, 1511. Four cardinals attended, and the proctors of three who were absent, also fourteen French bishops and two archbishops, together with a few abbots and doctors; deputies from the universities of France, and the ambassadors of Louis XII. The following is an account of each session's transactions:

Sess. 1. Cardinal St. Croix presided. The convocation of the Council of Pisa, having for its object the reformation of the Church, was pronounced to be just and lawful, and all that had been or might be done to its prejudice declared null and void.

Sess. 2. All that related to the order of the assembly was settled; the canon of Toledo read, and officers appointed. A decree was made to the effect that the present council could not be dissolved until the reformation of the Church should have been effected. The decrees of the Council of Constance, relating to the authority of œcumenical councils, were renewed.

Sess. 3. At this time, the pope having entered into a league with Ferdinand and the Venetians, began to attack the state of Florence, and the fathers judged it expedient to transfer the council to Milan; which accordingly was done; and on Jan. 4, 1512, the fourth session was held at Milan.

Sess. 4. The assembly was more numerous, the cardinals of St. Severin and St. Angelo joined themselves to the others. The proctor-general of the Order of Premonstrants made a long discourse upon the disorders which ravaged the Church; then certain decrees were read, by which thirty days were given to the pope, within which time to determine himself to reform abuses in the Church, or else to assemble an œcumenical council, or to unite with that already assembled.

Sess. 5. The decree of the Council of Constance was renewed against those who troubled and maltreated persons coming to the council.

Sess. 6. A deputy from the University of Paris delivered a discourse, after which the pope Julius was again cited in the usual form; and upon his non-appearance a demand was made that he should be declared contumacious. Several decrees were also published, among other subjects upon the exemplary life which ecclesiastics ought to lead; also upon the order to be observed in councils, with regard to sessions and congregations. The convocation of a council to Rome, made by Julius, was declared null and void.

Sess. 7. The promoters of the council required that Julius should be declared, through his contumacy, to have incurred, *ipso facto*, suspension from all administration of the pontifical office. Consequently he was called upon three times from the foot of the altar, and at the church door: the settlement of the question was then deferred till the next session.

Sess. 8. After mass, sung by the bishop of Maguelonne (now Montpellier), a decree was made suspending Julius, and the council, after reciting all that had been done in order to obtain his protection, exhorted all cardinals, bishops, princes, and people no longer to recognise Julius as pope, he having been declared contumacious, the author of schism, incorrigible and hardened, and having as such incurred the penalties denounced in the decrees of Constance and Basle.

Sess. 9. This was the last session of the council, for the French being obliged to abandon the Milanese, the bish-

eps were compelled to quit Milan; they made an attempt to continue the council at Lyons, but without effect.

See Landon, *Conc.* xiii, 1486; Dupin, *Comp. Hist.* iv, 4; Hefele, *Conciliengesch.*

Pisa, Bartholoméo de', an Italian theologian, was born at Pisa near the beginning of the 14th century. He belonged to the Dominican Order, and has often been confounded with a Franciscan monk of the same name, who rendered himself famous by his book on the resemblance of Jesus to St. Francis. He died about 1347. He wrote several works of piety and theology; but two only have been printed: *Summa de casibus conscientiæ* (Cologne, 1474, fol.), and *De documentis antiquorum opus morale* (Treviso, 1601, 8vo). See Échard, *De Script. Ord. Prædicat.*—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xl, 330.

Pisa, Samuel Cohen de', a native of Lisbon, was one of the most profound Talmudists of the 17th century. He wrote צפנת פענח, the "Revealer of Secrets" (Venice, 1661), a commentary on the most difficult passages of Ecclesiastes and Job, in fourteen chapters, which, besides the exposition of the passages, considers very important questions. Thus, for instance, in the first chapter he treats on the question "whether, in the third chapter of Ecclesiastes, the immortality of the soul is denied;" and in the ninth chapter, "whether Job did deny the immortality of the soul and the resurrection of the dead." See Fürst, *Bibl. Jud.* iii, 105; De Rossi, *Dizzionario storico degli autori Ebrei*, p. 265 (German transl. by Hamburger); Wolf, *Bibl. Hebr.* i, 1206; iii, 1111; Lindo, *History of the Jews in Spain and Portugal*, p. 369. (B. P.)

Pisano, Andrea, an early artist of Pisa, was a sculptor and architect, and the friend of Giotto, a few years his senior. Andrea was born about 1280. Of his several works still extant, the bronze gates of the Baptistery of St. John at Florence are the most important. These two gates are still perfect; the exact date of their execution is disputed—whether they were finished in 1330, or only commenced in that year. The reliefs are from the life of John the Baptist, and the general design of the gate is said to have been made by Giotto; but Giotto's share, if any, must have been more that of the architect than the sculptor, though even defining the panels and indicating the subjects; he can scarcely have had more to do with the design than this, or his name would have been more intimately associated with them. The work appears to have been modelled by Andrea and his son Nino, and the castings commenced by some Venetian artists in 1330, and the complete gates to have been finished and gilded in 1339, with the exception of some decorations of the architrave, which were added many years afterwards by Vittorio, the son of Lorenzo Ghiberti, in order to make them harmonize with the other two sets of gates executed by his father. The gates of Andrea were originally in the centre of the Baptistery, opposite to the cathedral, but were afterwards removed to the side, to give place to the more beautiful work of Ghiberti, in the year 1424. All three sets of gates have been well engraved in outline by Lasinio, *Le tre Porte del Battisterio di Firenze* (Florence, 1823). Andrea was made citizen of Florence, and died there in 1345; he was buried in the cathedral of Santa Maria del Fiore. See Vasari, *Vite de Pittori*, etc. (ed. Flor. 1846 sq.); Cicognara, *Storia della Scultura;* Rumohr, *Italienische Forschungen;* Rosini, *Storia della Pittura Italiana*, s. v.

Pisano, Giovanni, the son and assistant of Niccola, was born at Pisa about 1240. He seems to have inherited much of his father's genius, but had an entirely different taste. Gothic architecture was his choice, and he was fond of exaggeration and fantastic action and expression in sculpture. As early as the making of the Siena pulpit he was a master in his own right, and went in 1268 to Naples to fulfil a commission from the Franciscans there; he also designed the Episcopal Palace. After the death of Niccola the Pisans were anxious to have Giovanni remain in his native city, where he executed important works. The church of S. Maria della Spina was the first example in Italy of the pointed architecture, and is a most pleasing one. In 1278 he was chosen to build the Pisan Campo Santo; it was the first and the most beautiful church of all Italy. It is too well known to be described in our limited space, but it seems that nothing could have been more fitting for its purpose than the plan which he adopted. Many of the sculptures here were also by his hand. The representation of Pisa was the first attempt at making large statues in Italy since the days of Constantine. It is a strange, and in many respects an unlovely work; and yet it has great intensity of expression in its principal figure, and displays the originality of Giovanni. He gained much reputation from this, and in 1286 went to Siena, where he was commissioned to build the façade of the cathedral. The people of Siena were very desirous that he should fix his home there; the magistrates made him a citizen, and exempted him from taxes for life; but he remained only three years, and went next to Perugia. In that city he made a monument to Urban IV, which no longer exists. From this time he devoted himself almost wholly to sculpture. At Arezzo he made the shrine of S. Donato for the cathedral, which cost (including jewels for the Madonna, enamels, and silver bass-reliefs) 30,000 florins. It was a superb work of art. His next work was done as a rival to "Il Tedesco," a sculptor who had made a pulpit for the church of S. Giovanni at Pistoja, which was much praised. A new pulpit was also to be made for the church of S. Andrea, and there were those in Pistoja who had so admired Niccola Pisano that they desired to have Giovanni do it; he excelled his rival in every way, and fully supported the reputation he had gained. Our artist now went to Florence. This was a prosperous time there, and Giovanni remained two years. In 1305 he began the monument of pope Benedict XI, and somewhat later one for St. Margaret in S. Dominica at Perugia. In 1312 he undertook the rebuilding of the cathedral of Prato, and, though he did not live to see it completed, his designs were carried out with precision. He died in 1320. He had many pupils; among them Andrea Pisano (q. v.). See Spooner, *Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts*, s. v.; Vasari, *Lives of the Painters and Sculptors;* Cicognara, *Storia della Scultura*, s. v.

Pisano, Giunta (or GIUNTA DI GIUSTINO of Pisa), is the earliest known Tuscan painter, and flourished in the first half of the 13th century. A crucifixion painted by him in the church of Santa Maria degli Angeli at Assisi, about the year 1236, is still preserved; it is admirable in impasto and absolutely great as a work of art, compared with anything we know of this early period in Italy. Giunta was anterior to Cimabue. This shows how little reliance is to be placed on local and partial histories, especially where individuals are made heroes of. This picture, of which a fac-simile has been published by the Düsseldorf painter Ramboux, in his *Outlines from Tracings, illustrating the Old Christian Art in Italy*, shows that, so far from Cimabue being the father of Italian painting, he was scarcely equal to Giunta, certainly inferior in style of drawing. If an individual can have the credit of reviving painting in Italy, it must belong to Giunta Pisano, for anything we know, as yet, to the contrary; he is said to have worked with the Greeks about 1210. There was notoriously an influx of Greek artists into Italy after the Venetian capture of Constantinople in 1204, but we know of no Greek works equal to this crucifixion by Giunta. There are several other works of his preserved, and the progress of the art was evidently very slow, even down to the time of Masaccio, notwithstanding the great impulse given to it by the works of Giotto.

Pisano, Niccola, a noted Italian architect and

sculptor, was born at Pisa about 1206. At the age of fifteen he was appointed architect to Frederick II, with whom he went to Naples. In the service of this sovereign he passed ten years, and then went to Padua, where he made the design for the Basilica di S. Antonio. The first known attempt which he made as a sculptor resulted in his alto-rilievo of the *Deposition from the Cross* which now fills a lunette over a door of the cathedral of S. Martino at Lucca. This is most excellent as the work of an untutored artist, as he was at that time, and it shines by comparison with works of his contemporaries which are near it. The statuettes of the Misericordia Vecchia at Florence are of about the same merit as this bass-relief. In 1248 Niccola went to Florence to assist the Ghibellines in their work of destruction; he was commissioned to overturn the tower called Guardamorto in such a way as to destroy the Baptistery; he overturned the tower, but it did not fall in the anticipated direction, and we may believe that this was in accordance with his intention, although it was attributed to a special miracle by Villani. During the twelve succeeding years he was employed in making designs for the building and remodelling of many churches and palaces. The church of Santa Trinità at Florence is one of the best known of his works of this period. In 1260 Niccola established his fame as a sculptor by the magnificent pulpit which he executed for the Baptistery at Pisa. Of course marks of his comparative inexperience can be found in this work, but taken all in all it almost challenges criticism. His next work was the *Arca di S. Domenico* at Bologna, which is now surrounded with a maze of beautiful sculptures, of which the *Arca* is the centre, and is of great interest as illustrating the art of the 13th century. In 1266 Pisano went to Siena to make the pulpit for the Duomo. This is similar to that of Pisa in many ways, but not so effective, because surrounded by other objects of interest, and in a larger space, while at Pisa the pulpit seems almost the only thing to attract the attention. In 1269 he was commissioned to build the abbey and convent of La Scorgola, which are now in ruins. In 1274 he commenced the fountain of Perugia, which was his last work. The authorities of the city made severe laws for its preservation, and it was considered the most precious possession of the city. In 1278 Pisano died, after a life of great usefulness, for his influence had been felt through all Italy. His services could never be estimated. He had founded a new school of sculpture; had put behind him the standards of barbarism; in architecture, too, the same may be said, and in the words of Mr. Perkins, "He was truly a great man, one to whom the world owes an eternal debt of gratitude, and who looms up in gigantic proportions through the mist of five centuries, holding the same relation to Italian art which Dante holds to Italian literature." In his life he was respected and beloved by all who came in contact with him, be it as patron, friend, or servant.

Pisant, Louis, a French savant, was born in 1646 at Sassetot, near Fécamp. Admitted in 1667 into the Congregation of the Benedictines of Saint-Maur, he administered with the rank of superior several abbeys, and retired to that of Saint-Ouen. He died May 5, 1726, at Rouen. He wrote, *Sentiments d'une Ame pénitente* (1711, 12mo), and *Traité historique et dogmatique des Privileges et Exemptions ecclésiastiques* (Luxemb. 1715, 4to), a work which failed to meet the approbation of his congregation.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xl, 330.

Piscator, Johannes, a German theologian of the Reformation age, is noted for his learning and piety. He was born at Strasburg March 27, 1546. He was from his youth up a lover of study, and was soon distinguished for his learning. While engaged in the study of logic, he anxiously sought to reconcile and unite Aristotle and his commentator Peter Ramus (q. v.); and when, after the completion of his university studies at Strasburg and Tübingen, he became professor at the university of his native town, he made this the special subject of some of his lectures, though the department of divinity was his field. Suspected of Zwinglianism, he found his position uncomfortable, and accepted a professorship at Heidelberg in 1574. But here also the severely Lutheran tendency gave him disquiet, and after a short stay at Neustadt in 1578 he went to Nevers, France, where, however, he was not suffered to remain quietly, and in 1584 he finally removed to Herborn as conrector of the Academy, where he taught with so much success that many students flocked thither from Germany, France, Poland, and other northern countries. He was very diligent, and scarcely allowed himself sufficient time for sleep. He wrote extensively, translating the whole Bible with great faithfulness into the German, and making a logical and theological analysis of the greater part (Herborn, 1602–3, 3 vols. 4to; 2d ed. 1604–6; 3d ed. 1624; abridged ed. Berne, 1681; Dinsburg, 1684). He also published several valuable commentaries on the Old and New Testaments (1613–58), and many dogmatic and polemic writings, of which those on the *Lord's Supper*, *Predestination*, *Heidelberg Catechism*, *Justification*, and the reply to Hunnius, *De Sacramentos*, deserve mention. Most peculiar were the views of Piscator on the active obedience of Christ, which he held not to be imputed, but that which Christ for himself owed to God. See Satisfaction. Piscator died in 1625. See Steubing, in *Zeitschrift f. histor. Theol.* 1841, iv, 198 sq.; Schröckh, *Kirchengesch. s. d. Ref.* v, 358 sq.; Gass, *Prot. Dogmatik*, i, 163, 383, 422; Tholuck, *Das akademische Leben des 17ten Jahrh.* pt. ii, p. 304; Hagenbach, *Kirchengesch.* vol. v; Bossuet, *Variations*, vol. ii; Buchanan, *Justification* (see Index). (J. H. W.)

Pischon, Friedrich Augustus, a minister of the German Evangelical Church, and pastor in Berlin, died Dec. 31, 1857. He published, *Die hohe Wichtigkeit der Uebersetzung der heil. Schrift durch Martin Luther* (Berlin, 1834):—*Von der Hülfe, welche die Frauen der Aufnahme des göttlichen Wortes leisten können* (ibid. 1836):—*Predigten* (ibid. 1837):—*Vorträge über die deutsche und schweizerische Reformation* (ibid. 1846):—*Die Augsburgische Confession u. der Berliner Kirchentag* (ibid. 1853):—*Die Taufnamen. Eine Weihnachtsgabe* (ibid. 1857, etc.). He also edited the *Monatsschrift für die unirte evangelische Kirche*, in connection with Eltester, Jonas, and Sydow. See Zuchhold, *Bibliotheca Theologica*, ii, 899, 997 sq. (B. P.)

Piscina (Lat. = a reservoir of water), originally the reservoir and filter connected with the aqueducts of Rome, but applied in ecclesiastical language to a water-drain formerly placed near an altar in a church, is a small niche, or *fenestella*, containing the *piscina*, or *lavacrum*, basin. It consists of a shallow stone basin, or sink, with a hole in the bottom, to carry off whatever is poured into it. It is fixed at a convenient height above the floor, and was used to receive the water in which the priest washed his hands, as well as that with which the chalice was rinsed at the time of the celebration of the mass. It is usually annexed to the *consessus* or seats of the priests in the ancient churches, for the most part similarly decorated, and sometimes appearing as an additional compartment. It is sometimes also found alone in the southern walls of chancels and aisles, sometimes in the eastern walls on the right, and there are one or two instances in which it occurs on the left. When two channels occur in it, one was to receive the water in which the priest had washed his hands, the other that in which he had rinsed the chalice. Ducange limits the piscina, as it is restricted above, to the lavacrum. By Bingham it is received in a more enlarged meaning. "The font," says that author, "by the Greek writers is commonly called κολυμβήθρα, and by the Latins *piscina*, for which latter name Optatus affords

Crowmarsh, c. 1150.

Warmington, c. 1220.

a mystical reason. He says it was called piscina in allusion to our Saviour's technical name ἰχθύς, which was an acrostic composed of the initial letters of our Saviour's several titles, Jesus Christ, the Son of God, our Saviour." See Fish; Font. In many instances, particularly in those of Early English and early Decorated date, there are two basins and drains, and occasionally three; within the niche there is also often found a wooden or stone shelf, which served the purpose of a *credence-table*, to receive certain of the sacred vessels that were used in the service of the mass, previous to their being required at the altar; sometimes there is room at the bottom of the niche for these to stand at the side of the basin. In England the piscina is almost invariably on the south side of the altar, and usually in the south wall (though sometimes in the eastern), but in Normandy it is not uncommon to find it on the north side, when the situation of the altar is such as to render that more convenient than the south. No piscinas are known to exist in England of earlier date than the middle of the 12th century, and of that age they are extremely rare; of the 13th and succeeding centuries, down to the period of the Reformation, they are very abundant, and are to be found (or at least traces of them) in the chancel of most churches that have not been rebuilt, and very frequently at the eastern ends of the aisles of the nave also: their forms and decorations are very various, but the character of the architectural features will always decide their date.

Piscis, Pisciculi, and Vesica Piscis. The fish is a hieroglyphic of Jesus Christ, very common in the remains of Christian art, both primitive and mediæval. The origin of it is as follows: From the name and title of our blessed Lord, Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, Θεοῦ Υἱός, Σωτήρ—Jesus Christ, the Son of God, the Saviour—the early Christians, taking the first letter of each word, formed the name ΙΧΘΥΣ, *piscis*, a fish. See Inscriptions. Hence Christians came to be called *Pisciculi*, little fishes, with reference to their regeneration in the waters of baptism. The Vesica Piscis, which is the figure of an oval, generally pointed at either end, and which is much used as the form of the seals of religious houses, and to enclose figures of Jesus Christ or of the saints, also has its rise from this name of Christ, though some say that the mystical Vesica Piscis has no reference except in its name to a fish, but represents the almond, the symbol of virginity and self-production. Clement of Alexandria, in writing of the ornaments which a Christian may consistently wear, mentions the fish as a proper device for a ring, and says that it may serve to remind the Christian of the origin of his spiritual life. See Riddle, *Christian Antiquities*, p. 185; Siegel, *Christl. Alterthümer* (see Index in vol. iv). See Ichthus.

Pise, Charles Constantine, D.D., an American Roman Catholic divine of note, was born at Annapolis, Md., in 1802. He was the son of an Italian gentleman of ancient and noble family. His mother was an American lady, a native of Philadelphia. At an early age Charles was placed in the Georgetown College, that famous institution being then as now under the control of the Order of the Society of Jesus. Graduating there most creditably, he went to Rome to pursue his theological studies, but returned after two years, and completed his preparation for the ministry under the tutelage of the Rev. Dr. Bunti, the preceptor of the late archbishop Hughes. On his return to this country Pise taught rhetoric and poetry in the Seminary of Mount St. Mary's, Emmettsburg, Md. He was ordained priest in 1825, and commenced his labors in Frederick, Md., but subsequently removed to Baltimore, where he officiated at the cathedral. The labors of his position, together with the performance of a large amount of religious literary work which he attempted, impaired his health, and he again visited Rome for a respite. While there he was honored with the title of Knight of the Roman Empire. Upon his return to America he settled in Washington, and through the influence of Henry Clay and other warm personal friends he was elected chaplain to the senate of the United States. On the invitation of Dr. Dubois, then bishop of New York, he afterwards removed to New York City, and officiated at St. Peter's, in Barclay Street, till 1849, when he went over to Brooklyn, and purchased the church in Sydney Place, with which he was connected at the time of his death, in 1866. Dr. Pise was acknowledged to be one of the most eloquent and learned divines of his Church in America, as he was one of the most indus-



Cumnor, c. 1356.



Tackley, c. 1450.

trious and faithful laborers in it. Aside from his labors with his spiritual charge, he was eminent both as a preacher and a lecturer. He devoted much time to literary pursuits. He was the author of *Letters on the Truths of Catholic Doctrines; a History of the Church from its Establishment to the Reformation* (1830, 5 vols. 8vo):—*The Acts of the Apostles in Verse*:—*The Lives of St. Ignatius and his Companions;* and many other volumes in prose and verse. He also edited, many years ago, in company with the late father Felix Varella, D.D., an influential magazine published in New York City, and known as the *Catholic Expository*. In the volumes of this work will be found many of his happiest efforts both in verse and prose. Among the latter may be mentioned *Horæ Vagabundæ*, a series of deeply interesting letters descriptive of his travels in Europe. They were eagerly sought after at the time of their publication. (J. H. W.)

Pis'gah (Heb. *Pisgah'*, פִּסְגָה, always with the art.), the name of a mountain of Moab. It is in fact an ancient topographical name found, in the Pentateuch and Joshua only, in two connections: 1. The top, or head, of the Pisgah (רֹאשׁ הַפִּסְגָּה), from which Moses took his dying survey of Canaan (Numb. xxi, 20; xxiii, 14; Deut. iii, 27; xxxiv, 1); 2. Ashdoth hap-Pisgah, perhaps the springs, or roots, of the Pisgah (Deut. iii, 17; iv, 49; Josh. xii, 3; xiii, 20). See ASHDOTH-PISGAH. The word *hap-Pisgâh*, הַפִּסְגָּה, literally is *the section*, from פסג = פסק, *to divide*, and hence it may mean an isolated hill or peak. The rendering of the Sept. is not uniform. In Deut. iii, 17; xxxiv, 1; Josh. xii, 3; xiii, 20, it is Φασγά; but in Numb. xxi, 20; xxiii, 14; and Deut. iii, 27, the phrase ראש הפסגה is rendered *κορυφὴ τοῦ λελαξευμένου*, which is a translation of the Hebrew, *top of the cut mountain*. The Vulgate has everywhere *Phasga*. The reference to the scene of Moses's death by Josephus (*Ant.* iv, 8, 48) affords no additional light.

"The Pisgah" must have been in the mountain range or district, the same as or a part of that called the mountains of Abarim (comp. Deut. xxxii, 49 with xxxiv, 1). See ABARIM. Its situation is minutely described by the sacred writers. It is first mentioned in connection with the approach of the Israelites to Palestine. They marched "from Bamoth in the valley, that is in the country of Moab, *to the top of Pisgah, which looketh towards Jeshimon*" (Numb. xxi, 20). Pisgah was thus on the plateau of Moab, and commanded a view of the western desert. See JESHIMON. Another passage (xxiii, 13, 14) proves that it commanded a view of the Israelitish camp in the valley on the east bank of the Jordan; and from other incidental notices we learn that it was opposite to and in sight of (על פני) Jericho (Deut. xxxiv, 1), and overhanging the northeastern angle of the Dead Sea (iv, 49; Josh. xii, 3). The names Abarim, Nebo, and Pisgah are connected in such a way by the sacred writers as to create some difficulty to the geographer. In Deut. xxxii, 49 the Lord commands Moses, "Get thee up *into this mountain Abarim, Mount Nebo*," etc.; and in xxxiv, 1 we read that Moses, obeying, "went up from the plains of Moab *unto the mountain of Nebo, the top of Pisgah*" (אל-הר נבו ראש הפסגה). From these passages we may infer, (1) that Abarim was the name of a range or group of mountains; (2) that Nebo was one of its peaks; and (3) that the name Pisgah was either equivalent to Abarim, or that it is (as represented in some passages in the Sept., and in the margin of the A. V.) a common noun, signifying "an isolated hill or peak." If the latter view be taken, then Deut. xxxiv, 1 may be rendered, "*Moses went up to Mount Nebo, to the top of the hill.*" The construction rather favors the view that Pisgah, like Abarim, was the name of the range, and that Nebo was one of its peaks. Others have taken precisely the opposite view, namely, that Pisgah was a particular summit of Nebo as a range; but in that case Pisgah would not be so often mentioned (as a mountain at the foot of which the Israelitish host encamped, and as furnishing springs of water), while Nebo is but once named (as the peak on which Moses died). (See below.) Upon Pisgah Balaam built altars and offered sacrifices, so that it was probably one of the ancient "high places" of Moab (Numb. xxiii, 14). From its summit Moses obtained his panoramic view of the Holy Land, and there he died (Deut. xxxiv, 1–5). Beneath the mountains were celebrated "springs" or "torrents" (אַשְׁדוֹת), which are several times mentioned in defining the boundaries of Reuben, as *Ashdoth-Pisgah* (Deut. iii, 17; iv, 49 in the Hebrew; Josh. xii, 3; xiii, 20). Pisgah



View westward from the summit of Mt. Pisgah. (From a sketch taken on the spot.)

1. The Negeb, or "South Country."
2. Hebron.
3. Bethlehem.
4. Jerusalem and Mount of Olives.
5. Nebi Samwil.
6. Mounts. of Ephraim.
7. Gerizim.
8. Ebal.
9. Mounts. of Samaria.
10. Carmel.
11. Gilboa.
12. Mounts. of Galilee.
13. Massada.
14. Engedi.
15. Mouth of Jordan.
16. Jericho.
17. E. brow of Jordan Valley.
18. Kurn Surtabeh.
19. Jebel Osha.
20. Mounts. of Gilead.
21. Ayûn Mûsa.
22. Mounts. of Moab.
23. Jebel Sîâghah.
24. Wady Heabân.

therefore lay on the east of Jordan, contiguous to the field of Moab, and immediately opposite Jericho. The field of Zophim was situated on it, and its highest point or summit—its "head"—was the Mount Nebo. If it was a proper name, we can only conjecture that it denoted the whole or part of the range of the highlands on the east of the lower Jordan. In the late Targums of Jerusalem and Pseudo-Jonathan, Pisgah is invariably rendered by *ramatha*, a term in common use for a hill. It will be observed that the Sept. also does not treat it as a proper name. On the other hand, Eusebius and Jerome (*Onomast.* s. v. Abarim, Fasga) report the name as existing in their day in its ancient locality. Mount Abarim and Mount Nabau were pointed out on the road leading from Livias to Heshbon (i. e. the Wady Hesbân), still bearing their old names, and close to Mount Phogor (Peor), which also retained its name, *whence*, says Jerome (*à quo*), the contiguous region was even then called Phasgo. This connection between Phogor and Phasgo is puzzling, and suggests a possible error of copyists. See PEOR.

No traces of the name Pisgah have been met with in later times on the east of Jordan, but in the Arabic garb of *Ras el-Feshkah* (almost identical with the Hebrew Rosh hap-Pisgah) it is attached to a well-known headland on the north-*western* end of the Dead Sea, a mass of mountain bounded on the south by the Wady en-Nar, and on the north by the Wady Sidr, and on the northern part of which is situated the great Mussulman sanctuary of Neby Mûsa (Moses). This association of the names of Moses and Pisgah on the *west* side of the Dead Sea—where to suppose that Moses ever set foot would be to stultify the whole narrative of his decease—is extremely startling. No explanation of it has yet been offered. Certainly that of M. De Saulcy and of his translator (see De Saulcy's *Voyage*, etc., and the notes to ii, 58–66 of the American edition), that the Ras el-Feshkah is identical with Pisgah, cannot be entertained. Against this the words of Deut. iii, 27, "Thou shalt not go over this Jordan," are decisive. See DEAD SEA.

The mountain itself is chiefly memorable as the height from which Moses got his most distinct view of the Land of Promise; from thence "the Lord showed him all the land of Gilead unto Dan, and all Naphtali, and the land of Ephraim and Manasseh, and all the land of Judah unto the utmost sea; and the south, and the plain of the valley of Jericho, the city of palm-trees, unto Zoar" (Deut. xxxiv, 1–3). Mr. Tristam (*Land of Israel*, 1865, p. 535 sq.) describes a visit which he and his fellow-travellers paid to the range of Nebo or Abarim, and the magnificent prospect they had from the height which they supposed might possibly be the Pisgah of Moses. It was about three miles south-west of Heshbon, and one and a half miles due west of Main. The elevation was considered to be about 4500 feet; yet the ascent was not rugged, and for several hours they rode along the ridge. The day was clear, and to the north and east they saw the hills of Gilead, and "the vast expanse of the goodly Belka, one waving ocean of corn and grass." Southwards appeared Mounts Hor and Seir, with other granite peaks of Arabia, in the direction of Akabah. Then, turning westwards, there lay distinctly before them the Dead Sea and the whole valley of the Jordan, "all the familiar points in the neighborhood of Jerusalem." Looking over Jordan, "the eye rested on Gerizim's rounded top; and farther still opened the plain of Esdraelon, the shoulder of Carmel, or some other intervening height, just showing to the right of Gerizim, while the faint and distant bluish haze beyond it told us that *there* was 'the sea, the utmost sea.' It seemed as if but a whiff were needed to brush off the haze, and reveal it clearly. Northward, again, rose the distant outline of unmistakable Tabor, aided by which we could identify Gilboa and Jebel Dûhy (Little Hermon). Snowy Hermon's top was mantled with cloud, and Lebanon's highest range must have been exactly shut behind it; but in front, due north of us, stretched in long line the dark forests of Ajlun, bold and undulating, with the deep sides of mountains, here and there whitened by cliffs, terminating in Mount Gilead, behind Es-Salt (Ramoth-Gilead)." This seems to realize to the full what was anciently exhibited to the eye of Moses, and shows the representation given of his extensive prospect to have been no ideal picture.

The spot has more recently been the subject of a considerable discussion by Prof. Paine, of the American exploring party, in report No. 3 of these operations (N. Y. Jan. 1875). Prof. Paine contends that Jebel Neba, the highest point of the range, is Mount Nebo, that Jebel Siâghah, the extreme headland of the hill, is Mount



Map of Mount Pisgah.

Pisgah, and that "the mountains of Abarim" are the cliffs *west* of these points, and descending towards the Dead Sea. He maintains these positions by the following arguments:

1. There is still an old road leading down to the Jordan valley in this direction, which he thinks the Israelites pursued on their way from Almon-diblathaim to the plains of Moab (Numb. xxxiii, 47, 48). It has generally been supposed, however, that they took the route now usual with travellers, down Wady Hesbân. The position of the Israelites on Abarim is there said to have been "before" (לִפְנֵי) Nebo, a particle which generally signifies *east* and not west. The parallel account of the station in question (xxi, 29) places it on "the *top* of the Pisgah" (רֹאשׁ הַפִּסְגָּה); and this certainly discountenances Paine's location on a lower peak of the ridge. It is true the phrase is added, "which looketh towards Jeshimon," i. e. the Ghor or Jordan valley (see Keil, *Comment.* ad loc.); but this may possibly mean only pointing in that direction from the station last left. The preceding clause, "the valley that is in the field of Moab," is ambiguous; as it may qualify either the point of departure, i. e. Bamoth, or the destination, i. e. Pisgah. The A. V. adopts the former construction; but this is not favored by the syntax of the adjoining verses, and conflicts with the idea of a high place (Bamoth), which could hardly have been in a *valley*. The latter reference is therefore adopted by most interpreters, but (as Rosenmüller remarks) seems to disagree with the phraseology "top of Pisgah." We suggest as the only consistent translation, "And from Bamoth [to] the valley which [is] in the plateau of Moab (the summit of the Pisgah [range]), and overlooks the Ghor." This makes Pisgah but another name for the edge of the table-land of Moab overhanging the Jordan valley or Dead Sea. The particular "top" in question was apparently Nebo itself, which is in fact but a crest of the Moabitic table-land, that shows as a "mountain" only from the western point of view. The sole considerable "valley" (הַגַּיְא) answering to this description is Wady es-Sowânieh, which is the southern head-branch of Wady Hesbân, and intersects the plain up to the very crest of Nebo. Prof. Paine, however, appears to identify it with the valley in which the "Springs of Moses" are situated, a deep, wild glen hardly answering to the requirements of the case, except that it contains water and looks directly down upon the Dead Sea. At the encampment as we have located it, the Israelites would have been precisely on the route to Heshbon, which they next attacked (xxi, 21–26), and thence to the Ghor opposite Jericho (xxii, 1), by way of Wady Hesbân.

2. Paine's next argument is drawn from the history of Balaam and Balak immediately following the passages last cited. After lodging at Kirjath-huzoth (Numb. xxii, 39), which Paine regards as the site of Kufeir Abi-Bed, just east of the crest of Nebo, the two proceeded first to "the high places of Baal" (ver. 41), which the professor deems to be "the extremity of Jebel Siâghah, the first chief summit of Pisgah"—a description which, if we correctly understand the somewhat confused statements, designates the outer or westernmost peak, as from this "the whole of Israel" could be seen. Balaam next repaired to a point called "the top of Pisgah" (ver. 14), which Paine regards as "the third" or easternmost peak, because from it only a part of the Israelitish camp could be seen. Finally, the prophet ascended "the top of Peor" (ver. 28), which the professor thinks was the middle or ruin-crowned peak of Siâghah, as from it the various surrounding countries there enumerated can be seen to advantage. But this distribution of the several localities seems rather arbitrary. The first name is a very indefinite one, being identical with Bamoth-baal (Josh. xiii, 17), apparently nearer the Arnon (Numb. xxi, 28), if not identical with the Bamoth previously referred to (ver. 20); and surely there are many spots in the vicinity from which "the utmost part of the people" could be seen—a phrase that designates not the whole, but only the *rear*. In Numb. xxiii, 13, where the same expression is used, the same place is referred to, and the words must be rendered, "And Balak said to him, Come now with me to another place, whence thou mayest see him (only his extremity canst thou see [here], and not all of him canst thou see); and thou shalt curse him for me from there" (see Keil, ad loc.). The next locality accordingly was one commanding a view of the entire encampment, namely, "the top of the Pisgah" range, probably Jebel Neba itself. It seems to have been much farther than Paine makes it from Balak's previous station, for there the two adjoining eminences are spoken of in very different phraseology ("the high-places of Baal—to a high place," Numb. xxii, 41; xxiii, 3). As this second outlook of Balaam is called (xxiii, 14) "the field of Zophim," or *the watchers*, Paine holds that it was Wady Haisa, which he reports as being partly under cultivation; but this affords no good prospect of the "plains of Moab" eastward, such as Keil thinks the import of the name requires (*Comment.* ad loc.). The third of Balaam's posts of observation was "the top of Peor, that looketh towards Jeshimon," or *the desert* [of Judah] (Numb. xxiii, 28); and as the next to the last day's journey of the Israelites was "to the top of Pisgah, that looketh towards Jeshimon" (xxii, 28), and as, moreover, Moses died on the top of Pisgah, and was buried "in a valley in the land of Moab, over against Beth-peor" (Deut. xxxiv, 6), Paine concludes that all these were designations of the same or immediately adjoining spots, thus making the ruin-crowned summit of Siâghah the site of the sanctuary of Peor, and he adduces the character of the remains as evidence that they were an early temple. He thinks they are not sufficiently extensive for those of the town of Nebo (q. v.), which he inclines to identify with the more considerable ruins called Kharâb el-Mukheyat, a little more than a mile south of Jebel Neba.

Other collateral arguments of less moment adduced by Prof. Paine in support of his views are drawn from the name "Ashdoth-Pisgah" (Deut. ii, 17; iv, 49; Josh. xii, 3; xiii, 20), which he renders *springs of Pisgah*, and identifies with those of Ayûn Mûsa; and from the Bible accounts of Moses's death and burial. He also adduces the statements of later writers (Josephus, Eusebius, etc.) on these points. His attempt to trace the name Pisgah in the modern Siâghah is an obvious failure. His main conclusion that Pisgah is a special name for a particular part of Mount Nebo, and that the mountains of Abarim are likewise limited to the hills immediately overhanging the north-east end of the Dead Sea, can hardly be said to be sustained by his ingenious reasoning; and we therefore incline to the generally entertained view that the reverse is true. Dr. J. L. Porter has still more recently travelled over this locality, and he states, in his account of his journey in the *London Athenæum*, that *Jebel Nebbeh* is a common name for many of the eminences in this vicinity. He is inclined to regard *Siâghah* as a relic of the name Pisgah. See Nebo.

Pishtah. See Flax.

Pisid'ia (Πισιδία, etymology uncertain) was a district of Asia Minor, which cannot be very exactly defined. But it may be described sufficiently by saying that it was to the north of Pamphylia, and stretched along the range of Taurus. Northward it reached to and was partly included in Phrygia, which was similarly an indefinite district, though far more extensive. Thus Antioch in Pisidia was sometimes called a Phrygian town. In general terms it may be said that Pisidia was bounded on the north by Phrygia, on the west by Caria and Lycia, on the south by Pamphylia, and on the east by Cilicia and Isauria (Strabo, xii, 569; Ptolemy, v, 5). It was a mountainous region; but high up

among the peaks of Taurus were some fertile valleys and little upland plains. The province was subdivided into minute sections, and held by tribes of wild and warlike highlanders, who were the terror of the whole surrounding country (Strabo, *l. c.*; Xenoph. *Anab.* i, 1, 11; ii, 5, 13). It was probably among the defiles of Pisidia that the apostle Paul experienced some of those "perils of robbers" of which he speaks in 2 Cor. xi, 26; and perhaps fear of the bandits that inhabited them had something to do with John's abrupt departure from Paul and Barnabas just as they were about to enter Pisidia (Acts xiii, 13, 14). The Pisidian tribes had rulers of their own, and they maintained their independence in spite of the repeated attacks of more powerful neighbors, and of the conquests of the Greeks, and even of the Romans. The latter were content to receive from them a scanty tribute, allowing them to remain undisturbed amid their mountain fastnesses. See Smith, *Dict. of Class. Geog.* s. v. The scenery of Pisidia is wild and grand. The mountains are mostly limestone, and are partially clothed with forests of oak, pine, and juniper. The lower slopes are here and there planted with olives, vines, and pomegranates. Many of the ravines are singularly grand—bare cliffs rising up a thousand feet and more on each side of the bed of a foaming torrent. In other places fountains gush forth, and streams brawl along amid thickets of oleander. The passes from the sea-coast to the interior are difficult, and have always been dangerous. See Asia Minor. Paul paid two visits to Pisidia. In company with Barnabas he entered it from Pamphylia on the south, and crossed over the mountains to Antioch, which lay near the northern border (Acts xiii, 14). Their mission was successful; but the enemies of the truth soon caused them to be expelled from the province (ver. 50). After an adventurous journey through Lycaonia and Isauria, they again returned through Pisidia to Pamphylia, apparently by the same route (xiv, 21–24). See Arundell, *Asia Minor*, vol. ii; Fellows, *Asia Minor*; Spratt, *Travels in Lycia*; see also full extracts in Conybeare and Howson, *Life of St. Paul*, i, 164 sq., and article Antioch of Pisidia.



Coin of Antioch in Pisidia, with the head of Gordian, as an imperial "colony."

Pi'son (Heb. *Pishon'*, פִּישׁוֹן, *streaming*; Sept. Φισών), the second of the four great rivers which watered the garden of Eden, the identification of which has hitherto been attempted variously. It is described in the sacred text (Gen. ii, 11, 12) as "compassing (סוֹבֵב, rather, perhaps, *traversing*) the whole land of Havilah, where there is gold; and the gold of that land is good: there is bdellium (*bedo'lach*) and the onyx-stone (*sho'ham*)." With regard to this river, the most ancient and most universally received opinion identifies it with the Ganges. Josephus (*Ant.* i, 1, 3), Eusebius (*Onomast.* s. v.), Ambrosius (*De Parad.* c. 3), Epiphanius (*Ancor.* c. 58), Ephr. Syr. (*Op. Syr.* i, 23), Jerome (Ep. 4 *ad Rust.* and *Quæst. Heb. in Gen.*), and Augustine (*De Gen. ad lit.* viii, 7) held this. But Jarchi (on Gen. ii, 11), Saadiah Gaon, R. Moses ben-Nachman, and Abr. Peritsol (Ugolino, *Thesaur.* vol. vii) maintained that the Pison was the Nile. The first of these writers derives the word from a root which signifies "to increase," "to overflow" (comp. Hab. i, 8), but at the same time quotes an etymology given in *Bereshith Rabba*, § 16, in which it is asserted that the river is called Pison "because it makes the flax (פִּשְׁתָּן) to grow." Josephus explains it by πληθύς, Scaliger by πλήμμυρα. The theory that the Pison is the Ganges is thought to receive some confirmation from the author of the book of Ecclesiasticus, who mentions (xxiv, 25, 27) in order the Pison, the Tigris, the Euphrates, Jordan, and Gihon, and is supposed to have commenced his enumeration in the east and to have terminated it in the west. That the Pison was the Indus was an opinion current long before it was revived by Ewald (*Gesch. d. Volkes Isr.* i, 331, note 2) and adopted by Kalisch (*Genesis*, p. 96). Philostorgius, quoted by Huet (Ugolino, vol. vii), conjectured that it was the Hydaspes; and Wilford (*As. Res.* vol. vi), following the Hindû tradition with regard to the origin of mankind, discovers the Pison in the Landi-Sindh, the Ganges of Isidorus, called also Niláb from the color of its waters, and known to the Hindûs by the name of Nilá-Gangá, or Gangá simply. Severianus (*De Mundi Creat.*) and Ephraem Syrus (*Comm. on Gen.*) agree with Cæsarius in identifying the Pison with the Danube. The last-mentioned father seems to have held, in common with others, some singular notions with regard to the course of this river. He believed that it was also the Ganges and Indus, and that, after traversing Ethiopia and Elymais, which he identified with Havilah, it fell into the ocean near Cadiz. Such is also the opinion of Epiphanius with regard to the course of the Pison, which he says is the Ganges of the Ethiopians and Indians and the Indus of the Greeks (*Ancor.* c. 58). Some, as Hopkinson (Ugolino, vol. vii), have found the Pison in the Naharmalca, one of the artificial canals which formerly joined the Euphrates with the Tigris. This canal is the *flumen regium* of Amm. Marc. (xxiii, 6, § 25, and xxiv, 6, § 1), and the *Armalchar* of Pliny (*N. H.* vi, 30). Grotius, on the contrary, considered it to be the Gihon. Even those commentators who agree in placing the terrestrial Paradise on the *Shat el-Arab*, the stream formed by the junction of the Tigris and Euphrates, between Ctesiphon and Apamea, are by no means unanimous as to which of the branches, into which this stream is again divided, the names Pison and Gihon are to be applied. Calvin (*Comm. in Gen.*) was the first to conjecture that the Pison was the most easterly of these channels, and in this opinion he is followed by Scaliger and many others. Huet, on the other hand, conceived that he proved beyond doubt that Calvin was in error, and that the Pison was the westernmost of the two channels by which the united stream of the Euphrates and Tigris falls into the Persian Gulf. He was confirmed by the authority of Bochart (*Hieroz.* pt. ii, l. 5, c. 5). Junius (*Præl. in Gen.*) and Rask discovered a relic of the name Pison in the Pasitigris. The advocates of the theory that the true position of Eden is to be sought for in the mountains of Armenia have been induced, from a certain resemblance in the two names, to identify the Pison with the Phasis, which rises in the elevated plateau at the foot of Mount Ararat, near the sources of the Tigris and Euphrates. Reland (*de Situ parad. terr.* Ugolino, vol. vii), Calmet (*Dict.* s. v.), Link (*Urwelt*, i, 307), Rosenmüller (*Handb. der bibl. Alt.*), and Hartmann have given their suffrages in favor of this opinion. Raumer (quoted by Delitzsch, *Genesis*) endeavored to prove that the Pison was the Phasis of Xenophon (*Anab.* iv, 6), that is, the Aras or Araxes, which flows into the Caspian Sea. There remain yet to be noticed the theories of Leclerc (*Comm. in Gen.*) that the Pison was the Chrysorrhoas, the modern Barada, which takes its rise near Damascus; and that of Buttmann (*Aelt. Erdk.* p. 32), who identified it with the Besynga or Irabatti, a river of Ava. Mendelssohn (*Comm. on Gen.*) mentions that some affirm the Pison to be the Gozan of 2 Kings xvii, 6 and 1

Chron. v, 26, which is supposed to be a river, and the same with the Kizil-Uzen in Hyrcania. Colonel Chesney, from the results of extensive observations in Armenia, was "led to infer that the rivers known by the comparatively modern names of Halys and Araxes are those which, in the book of Genesis, have the names of Pison and Gihon; and that the country within the former is the land of Havilah, while that which borders upon the latter is the still more remarkable country of Cush" (*Exped. to Euphr. and Tigris*, i, 267). — Smith. Faber inclines to make it the Absarus of Pliny, or Batûm of modern geographers, which rises in Armenia and flows into the Black Sea; but Dr. Hales considers the Araxes to have a better claim; and this last speculation (for nothing better can any of the assigned positions be called) seems to derive support from the author of the apocryphal book of Ecclesiasticus, who, speaking of a wise man, says that "he filleth all things with his wisdom," or spreads it on every side, "as Phison and Tigris" spread their waters "in the time of the new fruits," that is, when they are swollen by the melting of the winter snows, thus seeming to indicate a river rising in a cold and mountainous region. The mention of *gold* as the special product of the vicinity inclines to the view which regards the Pishon as identical with the Phasis of antiquity; and the resemblance of names confirms this. See EDEN.

Pis'pah (Heb. *Pispah'*, פִּסְפָּה, perh. *expansion;* Sept. Φασφά), the second of the three sons of Jether, of the tribe of Asher (1 Chron. vii, 38). B.C. cir. 1017.

Pistachio. See NUT.

Pistis Sophia (i. e. *the Believing Wisdom*) is the name of a newly discovered Gnostic work, fully entitled *Pistis Sophia, Opus Gnosticum e codice manuscripta Coptico-Latine vertit M. G. Schwartze, edidit J. H. Petermann* (Berl. 1851). The date is doubtful; it evidently belongs to the period when Valentinian Gnosticism had reached its full development—about the close, therefore, of the 2d century. The general dogmas of the Valentinian system are found in it, though half buried in a luxurious and monotonous vegetation. The theme is always the same—a *gnosis*, or hidden doctrine, which brings salvation by simple illumination. Jesus Christ returns from the heavens into which he had reascended, and appears to his disciples on the Mount of Olives, to reveal to them the sublime mysteries of the truth. They form around him the inner and privileged circle of the spiritual ones, whose charge it is to transmit this hidden manna to the pneumatic men of future generations. All these revelations revolve around the destiny of Sophia, who here symbolizes, far more clearly than among the early Valentinians, the melancholy condition of the human soul, which, as the punishment for having sought to overpass the limits of its original sphere, is tormented by the cosmical powers, among which we recognise the Demiurgus. He produces, by emanation, a terrible power with a lion face, which, surrounded by other similar emanations, terrifies the noble and ardent exiled Sophia, even in the dark regions of matter, flashing before her eyes a false and misguiding brightness. Nevertheless she does not lose courage; she still hopes and believes. Hence she deserves the name of the Believing Wisdom. Twelve times she invokes the Deliverer in strains of passionate and truly sublime supplication; these are her twelve repentances ("Nunc cujus πνεῦμα alacre, progreditor, ut dicat solutionem duodecimæ μετάνοιας πίστεως σοφίας," *Pist. Soph.* p. 70). Her deliverance is accomplished by means of an equal number of interventions on the part of Jesus. As the fall, or sin, is nothing more than an obscuration produced by matter, so salvation is simply a return to the light. This division of the lamentations of Sophia and the interventions of Jesus produces a wearisome amount of repetition; the aspirations of the soul are, however, rendered with a force all the more poetic because so largely derived from the Old Testament. In particular, all the penitential Psalms are applied to Sophia, being wrested from their natural meaning.

"O Light of lights," she exclaims, "thou whom I have seen from the beginning, listen to the cry of my repenting" (Lumen luminum, cui ἐπίστευσα inde ab initio, audi igitur nunc, lumen, meam μετάνοιαν, *ibid.* p. 33). "Save me, O Light, from my own thoughts, which are evil. I have fallen into the infernal regions. False lights have led me astray, and now I am lost in these chaotic depths. I cannot spread my wings and return to my place, for the evil powers sent forth by my enemy, and most of all this lion-faced power, hold me captive. I have cried for help, but my voice dies in the night. I have lifted up my eyes to the heights, that thou mayest come to my aid, O Light. But I have found none but hostile powers, who rejoice in my affliction, and seek to increase it by putting out the spark of thine which is in me. Now, O Light of truth, in the simplicity of my heart I have followed the false brightness which I mistook for thine. My sin is wholly before thee. Leave me not to suffer longer, for I have cried to thee from the beginning. It is for thee that I am plunged into this affliction. Behold me in this place weeping, crying out again for the light which I have seen upon the heights. Hence the rage of those who keep the doors of my prison. If thou wilt come and save me, great is thy mercy; grant my supplication. Deliver me from this *dark matter*, lest I be, as it were, swallowed up in it" (Libera me e ὕλῃ hujus caliginis, *ibid.* p. 34). "O Light, cast upon me the flame of thy compassion, for I am in bitter anguish. Haste thee, hear me. I have waited for my spouse that he might come and fight for me, and he comes not. Instead of light, I have received darkness and matter. I will praise thee, I will glorify thy name; let my hymn rise with acceptance to thee at the gates of light. Let my whole soul be purified from matter, and dwell in the divine city. Let all souls which *receive the mystery* be admitted therein" (Ψυχαί horum qui suscipient mysterium, *ibid.* p. 36). The same cry rises twelve times to the Deliverer. "I am become," says Sophia again, "like the dæmon who dwells in matter, in whom all light is extinct. I am myself become matter. My strength is turned to stone in me" (Atque mea vis congelascuit in me, *ibid.* p. 43). "I have set my love in thee, O Light, leave me not in the chaos. Deliver me by thy knowledge" (Libera mea in tua cognitione, *ibid.* p. 56). "My trust is in thee; I will rejoice, I will sing praise to thy glory, because thou hast had pity on me. Give me thy baptism, and wash away my sins."

This mythology, full of poetic sadness, was skilfully spread as a veil over the abstractions of Gnosticism, and adapted them to the taste of subtle and unhealthy minds. The dialogue between Jesus and his disciples, in spite of its uniformity, pleased the readers of the apocryphal Gospels, and satisfied those feverish imaginations which had lost the sense of true beauty. Pride found its gratification in these new mysteries, which emulated in every respect those of Eleusis or of Mithra. See Cramer, *Beiträge zur Beförderung theolog. Kenntnisse* (1778), iii, 82 sq.; Köstlin, *Das gnostische System des B. Pistis Sophia*, in Zeller's *Theol. Jahrb.* (Tüb. 1854), vol. i and ii. See GNOSTICISM. (J. H. W.)

Pistoja, SYNOD OF, in 1786, marks one of the many reformatory movements in the Roman Catholic Church which remained without any effect. Leopold of Tuscany (q. v.), actuated by the same sense in which his brother Joseph II of Austria acted, tried to ameliorate the affairs of the Catholic Church in his country. For this purpose he issued Jan. 26, 1786, a circular-address to his bishops, containing fifty-seven articles of his reformatory plan, which he wished them to examine respectively, and carry out. The most important points for consideration were, 1. The necessity of holding annual synods in each diocese; 2. The restitution of the episcopal power; 3. A scientific training of the clergy, and a religious education of the people. This circular-address was prepared by the grand-duke himself, who was well versed in theological literature. He gave his bishops six months' time for consideration, but after this time he expected them to answer in a frank and categorical manner. Almost all the bishops opposed; among those who favored the plan was the bishop of Pistoja, Scipio Ricci, who, having high notions of religious purity, attempted other reforms. In September, 1786, Ricci assembled a diocesan council at Pistoja, which was opened Sept. 18 in the church of St. Leopold. Two hundred and thirty-four clergymen were present, among

whom was the greatest unanimity. Among the passed resolutions we find several that aimed to enlighten the people as to the proper limits of image-worship and the invocation of the saints; suppression of certain relics which gave occasion to superstitious practices; encouragement to spread religious works, especially the Gospel, among the flock. Besides advocating the use of the liturgy in the oral language of the country, and exposing the abuse of indulgences, the spiritual independence of the bishops was maintained, and the four propositions of the Gallican Church of 1682 (comp. the art. GALLICAN CHURCH, iii, 725, of this *Cyclop.*) were adopted. The synod also recommended that the ecclesiastical law of marriage should be subject to the law of the country. The minutest attention was paid to the reform of monachism—all orders should be united into one, and perpetual vows should be restricted or abolished — and Church discipline, and to carry this out the convocation of a national synod was expressed as very desirable. The grand-duke, who welcomed these resolutions with great joy, convoked a council at Florence of the bishops of Tuscany, April 23, 1787, and proposed to them fifty-seven articles concerning the reform of ecclesiastical discipline. The result was, that all articles were either laid aside or so modified as to lose their importance. The government did not abandon its reformatory plans, and allowed every bishop to do in his diocese what he pleased. Leopold's successor abandoned all these plans, and suffered a papal bull, *Auctorem fidei*, dated Aug. 28, 1794, to condemn the eighty-five propositions of the Synod of Pistoja. Comp. *Atti e decreti del concilio diœcesano di Pistoja a.* 1786, edited by Bracali and translated into Latin: *Acta et decreta synodi diœces. Pistoriensis* (1791, 2 vols.). The proceedings, published at the expense of the grand-duke, and prepared by C. Cambiagi in 7 vols., were also translated into Latin: *Acta congregationis archiepiscoporum et episcoporum Hetruriæ Florentiæ anno* 1787 *celebratæ*, Ex Italico translata a J. Schwarzel (Bamb. 1790–1794); *Vie de Scipion de Ricci*, par de Potter (Bruss. 1825, 3 vols.), German transl. 4 vols. (Stuttg. 1826); Wolf, *Geschichte der röm.-kathol. Kirche unter Pius VI* (Leips. 1796); Münch, *Leopold von Oesterreich*, in his *Denkwürdigkeiten*, p. 303 sq.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* s. v.; *Theologisches Universal-Lexikon*, s. v.; H. B. Smith, *History of the Church of Christ in Chronological Tables*, p. 619; Kurtz, *Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte*, § 164, p. 9; Niedner, *Lehrbuch der christl. Kirchengeschichte*, p. 846; Hagenbach-Hurst, *History of the Church in the* 18*th and* 19*th Centuries*, ii, 433; *Evangelische Kirchenzeitung* (1820), p. 270 sq.; Denzinger, *Enchiridion symbolorum et definitionum* (4th ed. 1865), p. 388 sq., "*Præpositiones* 85 *Synodi diœcesanæ Pistoriensis damnatæ a Pio VI per constitutionem 'Auctorem fidei'" Aug.* 28, 1794; Ranke, in *Zeitschrift für historische Theologie*, 1871, iii, art. ii. (B. P.)

Pistor, HENRICUS, is the author of a Latin hymn, "De S. Johanne Baptista," commencing, "Præcursoris et Baptistæ." The only notice we have of Pistor is that given by Clichtovlus in *Elucidator Eccles.* p. 198, where we read: "Auctor ejus (viz. of the hymn) fuisse traditur eximius pater Henricus Pistor, doctor theologus Parisiensis, et in religiosâ domo Sti. Victoris juxta Parisios monasticam vitam professus, qui etiam Concilio Constantinensi (1414–18) interfuit, eaque tempestate, doctrinâ et virtute mirifice floruit." This is about all. As to the hymn itself, the first verse runs thus:

Præcursoris et Baptistæ
Diem istum chorus iste
Veneretur laudibus.
Vero die jam diescat,
Ut in nostris elucescat
Verus dies mentibus.

See Daniel, *Thesaurus Hymnol.* ii, 169; Trench, *Sacred Latin Poetry*, p. 91 sq.; Rambach, *Anthologie christl. Gesänge*, p. 364. (B. P.)

Pistorius (Germ. *Becker*), a name common to many theologians in the first two centuries of the Reformation, of whom we mention the following:

1. CONRAD, a Brunswick theologian. Together with Paul Eitzen, of Hamburg, and Joachim Mörlin, of Brunswick, he took part in the proceedings of the Hardenberg controversy (comp. Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* v, 540 sq.). In 1562 he was superintendent in Güstrow; in 1572 the duke Ulric of Mecklenburg dismissed him from his estates. He then went to Rostock; thence to Antwerp and Vienna; was appointed superintendent at Hildesheim, and, when expelled, returned again to Brunswick, where he died in 1588. See Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* s. v.; *Theologisches Universal-Lexikon*, s. v.

2. JOHN (1), at first a Roman Catholic priest of St. John's in Nidda, a Hessian city, afterwards first Lutheran pastor and superintendent there, took part with Melancthon and Bucer as a representative of the Protestants in the colloquy at Ratisbon in 1541, and afterwards at Worms in 1557. In 1544 he was very active in aiding the prince Herman, count of Wied, to introduce the Reformation in the archbishopric of Cologne, but the battle at Mühlberg put an end to the whole movement. Pistorius died in 1583. See Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* s. v.; *Theolog. Universal-Lexikon*, s. v.; Smith, *Hist. of the Church of Christ in Chronological Tables*, p. 53; Kurtz, *Lehrbuch der Kirchengesch.* § 135, 3; Niedner, *Lehrbuch der christl. Kirchengesch.* p. 635.

3. JOHN (2) (also called *Niddanus*, from his native place), son of the former, was born Feb. 4, 1546. He studied first medicine, law, and history, and finally theology. Originally a Lutheran, he became next a zealous Calvinist, and induced the first son of the margrave Charles II of Baden, Ernest Frederick, to join him. Soon afterwards he joined the Roman Catholic Church, in which alone he could see the continuity of the Church of Christ, and induced the second son of the margrave Jacob to follow him. In behalf of his patron, he held in 1589 a colloquy at Baden with Andreä and Heerbrand, who represented Lutheranism, and Schyrius, who represented Calvinism. A second colloquy he held at Emmendingen in 1590, with Dr. Peppus, of Strasburg. After the death of his patron, Pistorius went to Freiburg and Constance; became doctor of theology, canon of Constance, cathedral-provost of Breslau, and imperial counsellor to the emperor Rudolph II. Pistorius died in 1608. In his *Theorema de fidei Christianæ definita mensura*, and in *Unser von Gottes Genaden Jakobs Markgrafen zu Baden . . . christl. erhebliche und wohlfundirte Motifen*, etc., he endeavored to justify his own and his patron's conversion to the Church of Rome. His polemics against Luther in his *Anatomia Lutheri, seu de septem spiritibus Lutheri*, called forth a number of rejoinders. Pistorius is also the author of some medical works, and some historical works on Poland, Germany, Hungary, and Spain. In the service of the Church of Rome, Pistorius also wrote a *Wegweiser für alle verführten Christen*, to which Dr. Mentzer replied in his *Anti-Pistorius.* See Fechti *Historia Colloquii Emmendingensis, cui subjicitur protocollum et conclusio* (Rostockii, 1709); Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* s. v.; *Theolog. Universal-Lexikon*, s. v.; Jöcher, *Gelehrten-Lexikon*, s. v.; Buchanan, *Justification* (see Index).

4. THEOPHILUS (1), succeeded the excellent John Mathesius (q. v.) in the ministry at Joachimsthal; and his son,

5. THEOPHILUS (2), a great Oriental scholar, lectured at Leipsic, Tübingen, Jena, and Copenhagen, and wrote *Enchiridion linguæ sanctæ grammaticam* (Leips. 1612), etc. See Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* s. v.; Jöcher, *Gelehrten-Lexikon*, s. v.; Fürst, *Bibl. Jud.* iii, 106; Steinschneider, *Bibliog. Handbuch*, p. 111, No. 1574. (B. P.)

Pit. In the A. V. this word appears with a figurative as well as a literal meaning. It passes from the facts that belong to the outward aspect of Palestine and its cities to states or regions of the spiritual world. With this power it is used to represent several Hebrew and Greek words, and the starting-point which the lit-

eral meaning presents for the spiritual is, in each case, a subject of some interest.

1. Of these *bôr*, בּוֹר (root בָּאַר, cognate בְּאֵר, *bêêr*, a well), occurs most frequently, and means a deep hole or pit, dug in the first instance for a well, or *a cistern* hewn or cut in stone, a reservoir, which the Orientals are in the habit of preparing in those regions where there are few or no springs, for the purpose of preserving rain-water for travellers and cattle. These cisterns and trenches are often without water, no supply being obtainable for them except from the rain. In old decayed cisterns the water leaks out, or becomes slimy (Jer. ii, 13). Such cisterns or pits, when without water, were often used in the East apparently for three purposes: (1) As a place of *sepulture* (Psa. xxviii, 1; xxx, 4; Isa. xxxviii, 18), hence יוֹרְדֵי בוֹר, "they that go down to the pit"—a phrase of frequent occurrence, employed sometimes to denote dying without hope, but commonly a simple going down to the place of the dead (see Gesen. *Lex.* s. v.); also, "the graves set in the sides of the pit" (Exod. xxxii, 23), the recesses cut out for purposes of burial; or they might be the natural fissures in the rocks, abounding in all limestone formations, of which the rocks of Syria and Palestine chiefly consist. (2) *A prison:* "they shall be gathered as prisoners are gathered in the pit, and shall be shut up" (Isa. xxiv, 22; also Jer. xxxvii, 16; Exod. xii, 29). The pit or dungeon was a common place of punishment in the East, and very dreadful it was, as the case of Jeremiah illustrates (Jer. xxxviii, 4, 9). To be doomed to the pit was often to be left to a slow death by starvation; and to be saved from such a doom was regarded as the greatest of all deliverances. Hence it was used (3) as a place of *destruction* (Zech. ix, 11). In the case of Joseph, Reuben suggested the pit as a device for saving his brother; the others hostile to Joseph adopted it as the most secret, and, they might think, the least guilty method of making away with him (Gen. xxxvii, 22–29).

As remarked above, in this word, as in the cognate בְּאֵר, *bêêr* (which is likewise rendered pit in Gen. xiv, 10; Psa. lv, 23; lxix, 15; Prov. xxiii, 27), the special thought is that of a pit or well dug for water (Gesen. *Thesaur.* s. v.). The process of desynonymizing which goes on in all languages seems to have confined the former to the state of the well or cistern, dug into the rock, but no longer filled with water. Thus, where the sense in both cases is figurative, and the same English word is used, we have pit (*beêr*) connected with the "deep water," "the water-flood," "the deep" (Psa. lxix, 16), while in pit (=בּוֹר) there is nothing but the "miry clay" (Psa. xl, 2). Its dreariest feature is that there is "no water" in it (Zech. ix, 11). So far the idea involved has been rather that of misery and despair than of death. But in the phrase "they that go down to the *pit*" (בּוֹר) it becomes even more constantly than the synonyms noticed below (*sheol*, *shachath*) the representative of the world of the dead (Ezek. xxxi, 14, 16; xxxii, 18, 24; Psa. xxviii, 1; cxliii, 7). There may have been two reasons for this transfer: 1. The wide, deep excavation became the place of burial. The "graves were set in the sides of the pit" (*bôr*) (Ezek. xxxii, 24). To one looking into it, it was visibly the home of the dead, while the vaguer, more mysterious Sheol carried the thoughts further to an invisible home. 2. The *pit*, however, in this sense, was never simply equivalent to burial-place. There is always implied in it a thought of scorn and condemnation. This, too, had its origin apparently in the use made of the excavations, which had either never been wells, or had lost the supply of water. The prisoner in the land of his enemies was left to perish in the pit (*bôr*) (Zech. ix, 11). The greatest of all deliverances is that the captive exile is released from the slow death of starvation in it (*shachath*, Isa. li, 14). The history of Jeremiah, cast into the dungeon or pit (*bôr*) (Jer. xxxviii, 6, 9), let down into its depths with cords, sinking into the filth at the bottom (here also there is no water), with death by hunger staring him in the face, shows how terrible an instrument of punishment was such a pit. The condition of the Athenian prisoners in the stone-quarries of Syracuse (Thuc. vii, 87), the Persian punishment of the σπόδος (Ctesias, *Pers.* 48), the oubliettes of mediæval prisons, present instances of cruelty more or less analogous. It is not strange that with these associations of material horror clustering round, it should have involved more of the idea of a place of punishment for the haughty or unjust than did the *sheol* or the grave. See Well.

2. *Shâchath*, שָׁחַת, of which, as well as in the cognate שׁוּחָה, *shuchâh* (rendered "pit" in Prov. xx, 14; Jer. ii, 6; xviii, 20, 22), שְׁחוּת, *shechûth* ("pit," Prov. xxviii, 10), שְׁחִית, *shechîth* ("pit," Lam. iv, 20; "destruction," Psa. cvii, 20), and שִׁיחָה, *shichâh* ("pit," Psa. lvii, 6; cxix, 85; Jer. xviii, 22), as the root שׁוּחַ shows, the sinking of the pit is the primary thought (Gesen. *Thesaur.* s. v.). It is dug into the earth (Psa. ix, 16; cxix, 85). A pit thus made and then covered lightly over, served as a trap by which animals or men might be ensnared (Psa. xxxv, 7). It thus became a type of sorrow and confusion, from which a man could not extricate himself, of the great doom which comes to all men, of the dreariness of death (Job xxxiii, 18, 24, 28, 30). To "go down to the pit" is to die without hope. It is the penalty of evil-doers, that from which the righteous are delivered by the hand of God. See Trap.

3. *Shĕôl*, שְׁאוֹל, in Numb. xvi, 30, 33; Job xvii, 16. Here the word is one which is used only of the hollow, shadowy world, the dwelling of the dead, and as such it has been treated of under Hell.

4. Other Hebrew words rendered pit in the A. V. are the following: גֵּב, *gêb*, something *cut* out, hence a *cistern* in the rock (Jer. xiv, 3); and the cognate גֶּבֶא, *gêbè* (Isa. xxx, 14; Jer. xiv, 3); גֻּמְּץ, *gumâts*, something *dug* (only Eccles. x, 8); and פַּחַת, *páchath*, an *excavation* (2 Sam. xvii, 9; xviii, 17; Isa. xxiv, 17, 18; Jer. xlviii, 43, 44; "hole," Jer. xlviii, 28; "snare," Sam. iii, 47). The term *mahamorôth*, מַהֲמֹרוֹת, rendered "deep pits" (Psa. cxl, 10), properly signifies *streams, whirlpools, abysses of water.* The rabbins, Symmachus, and Jerome understood *pits of water.*

5. The Greek terms are the following: in Rev. ix, 1, 2, and elsewhere, the "bottomless pit" is the translation of τὸ φρέαρ τῆς ἀβύσσου. The A. V. has rightly taken φρέαρ here as the equivalent of *bôr* rather than *beêr.* The pit of the abyss is as a dungeon. It is opened with a key (Rev. ix, 1; xx, 1). Satan is cast into it, as a prisoner (xx, 2). In Matt. xii, 11, "pit" is the rendering of βόθυνος, a deep *hole* or "ditch" (as rendered in Matt. xv, 14; Luke vi, 39). See Cistern.

Pitaka or **Pitakattayan** (Pali *pitakan*, a "basket," and *táyo*, "three"), the sacred books of the Buddhists. The text of the Pitaka is divided into three great classes. The instructions contained in the first class, called *Winaya*, were addressed to the priests; those in the second class, *Sútra*, to the laity; and those in the third class, *Abhidarma*, to the dêwas and brahmas of the celestial worlds. There is a commentary called the *Atthakatha*, which, until recently, was regarded as of equal authority with the text. The text, as we learn from Mr. Spence Hardy, was orally preserved until the reign of the Singhalese monarch Wattagamani, who reigned from B.C. 104 to B.C. 76, when it was committed to writing in the island of Ceylon. The commentary was written by Badhagosha in A.D. 420. To establish the text of the Pitakas three several convocations were held. The first met B.C. 543, when the whole was rehearsed, every syllable being repeated with

the utmost precision, and an authentic version established, though not committed to writing. The second convocation was held in B.C. 443, when the whole was again rehearsed, in consequence of certain usages having sprung up contrary to the teachings of Buddha. The third convocation took place B.C. 308, when the Pitakas were again rehearsed, without either retrenchment or addition. These sacred books are of immense size, containing, along with the commentary, nearly 2,000,000 lines. See BUDDHISTS.

Pitcairn, ALEXANDER, a Scottish divine who flourished in the second half of the 17th century, and appears to have been obliged to seek refuge in Holland, is known to us only as the author of, *Compendiaria Physiologiæ Aristoteliæ una cum Anatome Cartesianismi* (Lond. 1676, 12mo):—*Harmonia Evangelica Apostolorum Pauli et Jacobi in Doctrina de Justif.* etc. (Rotterd. 1685, 4to). In the last-named work, which is of a controversial nature, Pitcairn opposes Socinians, Papists, and Arminians in general, and Curcellæus, Morus, Bull, Sherlock, and Baxter in particular. There is a good deal of learning and acuteness displayed in the book, and he deserves the study of Calvinists.

Pitcairne, ALEXANDER, another Scottish divine, flourished about the same time as the preceding. He was minister at Oron. He published *The Spiritual Sacrifice*, a treatise concerning the saints' communion with God in prayer (Edinb. 1664, 2 vols. 4to).

Pitch is the rendering in the A. V. of two Hebrew words, *ze'pheth*, זֶפֶת, and *ko'pher*, כֹּפֶר. The former is from the root *zuph*, זוּף, *to flow*, or *be liquid* (like the German *Schmalz*, from the verb *schmelzen*) (Exod. ii, 3; Isa. xxxiv, 9; comp. Mishna, *Schab.* 2). The latter is from the root כָּפַר, *to cover* or *smear*, and is used in Gen. vi, 14, where the Sept. has ἄσφαλτον, the Vulg. *bitumen*. The word חֵמָר, *chemâr*, rendered "slime" (Gen. xi, 3; xiv, 10; Exod. ii, 3), likewise belongs here. The three Hebrew terms all represent the same object, viz. mineral pitch or asphalt, in its different aspects: *zépheth* (the *zift* of the modern Arabs, Wilkinson, *Anc. Egypt.* ii, 120) in its liquid state, *chemâr* in its solid state, from its red color, though also explained in reference to the manner in which it boils up (the former, however, being more consistent with the appearance of the two terms in juxtaposition in Exod. ii, 3; A. V. "pitch and slime"); and *kôpher*, in reference to its use in overlaying wood-work (Gen. vi, 14). Asphalt is an opaque, inflammable substance, which bubbles up from subterranean fountains in a liquid state, and hardens by exposure to the air, but readily melts under the influence of heat. In the latter state it is very tenacious, and was used as a cement in lieu of mortar in Babylonia (Gen. xi, 3; Strabo, xvi, 743; Herod. i, 179), as well as for coating the outsides of vessels (Gen. vi, 14; Josephus, *War*, iv, 8, 4), and particularly for making the papyrus boats of the Egyptians water-tight (Exod. ii, 3; Wilkinson, ii, 120). The Babylonians obtained their chief supply from springs at Is (the modern Hit), which are still in existence (Herod. i, 179). The Jews and Arabians got theirs in large quantities from the Dead Sea, which hence received its classical name of *Lacus Asphaltites*. The latter was particularly prized for its purple hue (Pliny, xxviii, 23). In the early ages of the Bible the slime-pits (Gen. xiv, 10), or springs of asphalt, were apparent in the vale of Siddim, at the southern end of the sea. They are now concealed through the submergence of the plain, and the asphalt probably forms itself into a crust on the bed of the lake, whence it is dislodged by earthquakes or other causes. Early writers describe the masses thus thrown up on the surface of the lake as of very considerable size (Josephus, *War*, iv, 8, 4; Tacit. *Hist.* v, 6; Diod. Sic. ii, 48). This is now a rare occurrence (Robinson, i, 517), though small pieces may constantly be picked up on the shore. The inflammable nature of pitch is noticed in Isa. xxxiv, 9. See ASPHALTUM; BITUMEN.

Pitcher in the A. V. represents the following words in the original: 1. כַּד, *kad*; Sept. ὑδρία; Vulg. *hydria*, *lagena*; akin to Sanscrit *kut* and κάδος; rendered "barrel" (1 Kings xvii, 12; xviii, 33). 2. נֵבֶל and נֵבֶל, *nébel*; Sept. ἀγγεῖον; Vulg. *vas*; A. V. "bottle," only once a "pitcher" (Lam. iv, 2), where it is joined with חֶרֶשׂ, an earthen vessel (Gesen. *Thesaur.* p. 522). 3. In the N. T. κεράμιον, twice only (Mark xiv, 13; Luke xxii, 10). It denotes the water-jars or pitchers with one or two handles, used chiefly by women for carrying water, as in the story of Rebecca (Gen. xxiv, 15–20; but see Mark xiv, 13; Luke xxii, 10). This practice has been and is still usual both in the East and elsewhere. The vessels used for the purpose are generally carried on the head or on the shoulder. The Bedawin women commonly use skin-bottles. Such was the "bottle" carried by Hagar (Gen. xxi, 14; Harmer, *Obs.* iv, 246; Layard, *Nin. and Bab.* p. 578; Roberts, *Sketches*, pl. 164; Arvieux, *Trav.* p. 203; Burckhardt, *Notes on Bed.* i, 351; Thomson, *Land and Book*, ii, 379). The same word *kad* is used of the pitchers employed by Gideon's 300 men (Judg. vii, 16), where the use made of them marks the material. Also the vessel (A. V. barrel) in which the meal of the Sareptan widow was contained (1 Kings xvii, 12), and the "barrels" of water used by Elijah at Mount Carmel (xviii, 33). It is also used figuratively of the life of man (Eccles. xii, 6). It is thus probable that earthen vessels were used by the Jews as they were by the Egyptians for containing both liquids and dry provisions (Birch, *Anc. Pottery*, i, 43). At the Fountain of Nazareth may be seen men and women with pitchers which scarcely differ from those in use in Egypt and Nubia (Roberts, *Sketches*, pl. 29, 164). The water-pot of the woman of Samaria was probably one of this kind, to be distinguished from the much larger amphoræ of the marriage-feast at Cana. See BOTTLE; CRUSE; EWER; FLAGON; POT.

Egyptian Pitchers.

Pitcher, EDWIN FRANK, a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born Feb. 14, 1846, near Fairmount, Marion County, West Virginia. He was the youngest of thirteen children. Very early in life he gave evidence of religious culture, and at the age of eleven was converted, and joined the Methodists. His school life was noted for its spiritual tone. At fourteen he entered Dickinson College. At sixteen he took the prize medal in the junior contest, and graduated the first in his class. The year following his graduation he became professor in Emory Female College, Carlisle, Pa., and while in this position was licensed to preach. Impressed with the value of a higher theological training, he went to Evanston; but the climate proving unfavorable to his health, he returned to his home. In the fall of 1865 he entered the theological school at Concord, N. H., where he remained until the spring of 1867, when he graduated. Joining the New England Conference, he was sent to Amherst, Mass., which was a new field

for Methodism. In 1868 he was called to Morgantown, West Virginia, where his labors were very successful. In 1870 he was stationed at Lawrence, Mass., but finding his wife's health failing, he entered the Philadelphia Conference, and in March, 1872, was stationed at Lebanon, Pa. In March, 1873, he was sent to Allentown, Pa., which proved to be his last appointment. In the spring of 1875, his own health failing, he sailed for Europe. Returning the middle of September, his pastoral work occupied his time until Feb. 23, when he was taken with hemorrhage from the lungs. He died May 18, 1876. His scholarship was thorough and elevated, his style classic and chaste. His manner was gentle and unpretentious, and his presentation of truth forceful and vivid. His favorite theme was the all-powerful Name. See *Zion's Herald*, Aug. 10, 1876.

Pi'thom (Heb. *Pithom'*, פִּתֹם, meaning, if of Heb. derivation, *mouth of Thom;* but the word is probably Egyptian, meaning *the* [city of] *Thomei* [justice]; Sept. Πιθώμ, v. r. Πιθώ), one of the store-cities built by the Israelites for the first oppressor, the Pharaoh "which knew not Joseph" (Exod. i, 11). In the Heb. these cities are two, Pithom and Raamses; the Sept. adds On as a third. It is probable that Pithom lay in the most eastern part of Lower Egypt, like Raamses, if, as is reasonable, we suppose the latter to be the Rameses mentioned elsewhere, and that the Israelites were occupied in public works within or near to the land of Goshen. See Raamses. Herodotus mentions a town called *Patumus*, Πάτουμος, which seems to be the same as the *Thoum* or *Thou* of the *Itinerary* of Antoninus, probably the military station *Thohu* of the *Notitia*. Whether or not Patumus be the Pithom of Scripture, there can be little doubt that the name is identical. The first part is the same as in Bu-bastis and Bu-siris, either the definite article masculine or a possessive pronoun, unless indeed, with Brugsch, we read the Egyptian word "abode" *pa*, and suppose that it commences these names. See Pi-beseth. The second part appears to be the name of *Atum* or *Tum*, a divinity worshipped at On, or Heliopolis, as well as Ra, both being forms of the sun [see On], and it is noticeable that Thoum or Thou was very near the Heliopolite nome, and perhaps more anciently within it, and that a monument at Abu-Kesheid shows that the worship of Heliopolis extended along the valley of the canal of the Red Sea. As we find Thoum and Patumus and Rameses in or near to the land of Goshen, there can be no reasonable doubt that we have here a correspondence to Pithom and Raamses, and the probable connection in both cases with Heliopolis confirms the conclusion. It is remarkable that the Coptic version of Gen. xlvi, 28 mentions Pithom for, or instead of, the Heroöpolis of the Sept. Whether Patumus and Thoum be the same, and the position of one or both, have yet to be determined, before we can speak positively as to the Pithom of Exodus. Herodotus places Patumus in the Arabian nome upon the canal of the Red Sea (ii, 48). The *Itinerary* of Antoninus puts Thou fifty Roman miles from Heliopolis, and forty-eight from Pelusium; but this seems too far north for Patumus, and also for Pithom, if that place were near Heliopolis, as its name and connection with Raamses seem to indicate. It was twelve miles from Vicus Judæorum, according to the *Itinerary*. It must therefore have been somewhere over against Wady Tûmilat, or the valley of Thôm, or near the mouth of that valley, and not far from Pi-beseth or Bubastis, now called Tell Basta. *Tell el-Kebir*, or "the Great Heap," which is a little to the south of it, may perhaps be the site of ancient Pithom. Heroöpolis, which had so long disappeared, and had almost become mythical, may, after all, be the same as Pithom. Heroöpolis, according to Ptolemy, lay at the extremity of Trajan's canal, i. e. its eastern extremity, where it joined or approached the more ancient canal of Pharaoh Necho, possibly at or within the mouth of this valley, and, according to Manetho, not far from the Bubastic branch of the Nile. Most writers, however, regard the ruins at *Abu-Kesheid* as marking the site of Heroöpolis. Accordingly the scholars who accompanied the French expedition place Pithom on the site of the present *Abhaseh*, at the entrance of the Wady Tûmilat, where there was at all times a strong military post. See Hengstenberg, *Die Bücher Moses und Aegypten;* Du Bois Aymé, in *Descript. de l'Égypte*, xi, 377; xviii, 1, 372; Champollion, *L'Égypte sous les Pharaons*, i, 172; ii, 58. See Goshen.

Pi'thon (Heb. *Pithon'*, פִּתוֹן, perh. *harmless* [Fürst]; Sept. Φιθών), the first named of four sons of Micah, the grandson of Jonathan, son of king Saul (1 Chron. viii, 35; ix, 41). B.C. post 1050.

Pithon, François and Pierre, twin-brothers, were born Nov. 1, 1539. Both became famous as canonists. François, who died as chancellor of the Parliament at Paris in 1607, published among other works the *Codex Dionysius Hadrianus* (i. e. the collection of canons of Dionysius Exiguus, as augmented by Adrian). Pierre occupied some of the highest official positions, which, however, he relinquished, in order to give himself entirely to his studies. After the massacre on Bartholomew's eve, he became a convert to the Roman Catholic Church, and again came before the public to defend the conversion of Henry IV, and to effect his reconciliation with Paris. He died at Noyen-sur-Seine in 1596. Pierre wrote *Les Libertes de l'Église Gallicane* (Par. 1594), in 83 articles, to which must be added Du Puy's *Preuves des Libertes de l'Église Gallicane, de Maistre Pierre Pithon* (ibid. 1652). Both brothers published an edition of the *Corpus juris canon.* See *Theolog. Universal-Lexikon*, s. v. (B. P.)

Pitiful. See Pity

Pitkin, Caleb, a Presbyterian minister, was born in New Hartford, Litchfield Co., Conn., Feb. 27, 1781. He graduated at Yale College, New Haven, Conn., in 1806; studied theology privately under Rev. Asahel Hooker, of Goshen, Conn.; was licensed June 10, 1807, by the North Congregational Association of Litchfield, Conn., and supplied for a time the churches of Derby and Oxford. In 1808 he became pastor of the Church in Milford, being ordained and installed by the West Consociation of New Haven, Conn.; in 1816 he acted as missionary in Ashtabula and Portage counties, Ohio; and in 1817 he was installed pastor of the Congregational Church of Charlestown, Portage Co., Ohio, where he remained about ten years. Previous to the close of this period measures had been taken by the presbyteries of Grand River and Portage towards the establishment of a college. Mr. Pitkin had been an active agent in this work, and henceforward it was the principal object of his attention. In 1828 he removed to Hudson, where the Western Reserve College was established, and remained there till his death, Feb. 5, 1864. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1865, p. 169. (J. L. S.)

Pitman, Charles, D.D., a pioneer preacher of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born near Cookstown, N. J., January, 1796. He early embraced religion, became a local preacher in 1817, and the next year joined the Philadelphia Conference. At once he obtained popularity with all hearers, occupying, from time to time, the most important stations and districts in the Philadelphia Conference. In the year 1841 he was elected corresponding secretary of the Missionary Society. His health failing in 1850, he resigned this office and retired to Trenton, passing serenely and faithfully from life, Jan. 14, 1854, and leaving a name for Christian purity, consistency, ministerial ability, and usefulness which thousands delight to remember. He possessed a strong memory, a quick perception, with discriminating judgment, and a holy evangelical fervor stamped his pulpit labors. Dr. Pitman had not many equals as a public speaker. His oratory was emphatically not scholastic, but, like the great Patrick Henry's, the true eloquence of nature. Although Dr. Pitman was an ex-

temporaneous preacher, he carefully used his pen in preparations for the pulpit. Many sermons he wrote in full, not to read or memorize them, but for the purpose of properly disciplining his thoughts and language, and for useful reference. Emphatically a preacher of Christ, the precious atonement became his favorite theme, and immense multitudes hung delighted upon his lips while he held up a crucified Saviour. All who heard believed him to be a man of God, preaching with divine unction, and they received in faith the words of truth which he uttered. Dr. Pitman had a fine, large head, moderately high forehead, and slightly sunken eyes, his likeness strongly resembling that of the celebrated Robert Hall of England. See *New Jersey Memorials of Methodism;* Sprague, *Annals of the American Pulpit*, vol. vii.

Pitman, John Rogers, an English divine, noted as a classical scholar and general littérateur, was born about 1782, and was educated at Pembroke College, Cambridge, in 1804. He became preacher at Berkeley and Belgrave chapels, and in the Foundling and Magdalen hospitals, and perpetual curate of St. Barnabas Church, Kensington. He died in 1870. Of his publications, we mention *Excerpta ex variis Romanis Poetis* (Lond. 1808, 8vo):—*Practical Lectures on St. John* (1821, 8vo; supplement, 1822, 8vo):—*Sermons for the Year* (1825, 2 vols. 8vo; 2d series, 1828):—*Practical Commentary on the Sermon on the Mount* (1852). Mr. Pitman also edited the works of Dr. Lightfoot (1822–25, 13 vols. 8vo), and Bingham's *Origines Ecclesiasticæ* (1840, 9 vols. 8vo).

Pitri (Sanscrit, i. e. *father*) is the name affixed in Hindû mythology to the deified progenitors of mankind, supposed to inhabit the orbit of the moon.

Pits (or **Pitseus**), John, D.D., an English divine, noted as a biographer, was born at Alton, in Hampshire, A.D. 1560. He received his early education at Winchester School, whence, at the age of eighteen, he was elected a probationer fellow of New College, Oxford; but in less than two years he left the kingdom as a voluntary Romish exile, and went to Douai. He went thence to Rheims, and a year afterwards to the English college at Rome, where he studied seven years, and was then ordained priest. He returned to hold the professorship of rhetoric and Greek at Rheims. Towards the end of 1590 he was appointed governor to a young nobleman, with whom he travelled into Lorraine, and afterwards went through Upper Germany and Italy. He subsequently returned to Lorraine, where he was preferred to a canonry of Verdun. When he had passed two years at his new residence, Antonia, daughter of the duke of Lorraine, who had married the duke of Cleves, invited him to Cleves to be her confessor. He continued in her service twelve years, till her death, when he returned a third time to Lorraine, and was promoted to the deanery of Liverdun, where he died in 1616. The leisure he enjoyed while confessor to the duchess of Cleves enabled him to compile a work which has given him great renown, *The Lives of the Kings, Bishops, Apostolical Men, and Writers of England* (four large volumes). The first contains the lives of the kings, the second of the bishops, the third of the apostolical men, and the fourth of the writers. The three first are preserved in the archives of the collegiate church of Verdun; the fourth only was published after his decease, under the title of *Joannis Pitsei Angli, S. Theologiæ Doctoris, Liverduni in Lotharingia Decani, Relationum Historicarum de Rebus Anglicis Tomus Primus* (Paris, 1619 and 1623, 4to), but the running title by which it is most frequently quoted is "De Illustribus Angliæ Scriptoribus." In this work Pits took much from Bale's book, *De Scriptoribus Majoris Britanniæ*, without acknowledgment, pretending at the same time to abhor both Bale and his work. He also quotes Leland's *Collectanea de Scriptoribus Angliæ*, which Wood asserts he never could have had the means of perusing, but must likewise have taken at second hand from Bale. His partiality is also great. He leaves Wickliffe and his followers, together with the Scotch and Irish writers, entirely out of his work, and in their room gives an account of the Roman Catholic writers, such especially as had left the kingdom after the Reformation in queen Elizabeth's time, and settled at Rome, Douai, Louvain, etc. This, however, is the best and most valuable part of Pits's work. He published three small treatises, which are less known: *De Legibus* (Trier, 1592):—*De Beatitudine* (Ingolstadt, 1595):—*De Peregrinatione* (Düsseldorf, 1604, 12mo). The last is dedicated to the duchess of Cleves. See *Biogr. Brit.* s. v.; Dodd, *Ch. Hist.;* Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth.* s. v.; *English Cyclop.* s. v.; Wood, *Athen. Oxon.* ii, 173.

Pitt, Christopher, an English divine, noted especially as a poet, was born in 1699 at Blandford, Dorsetshire; was educated at Winchester and at New College, Oxford; and, after taking holy orders, obtained the family living at Pimperne, where he passed his life, beloved and respected for his suavity of manners and general benevolence. He died in 1748. His works are of a secular character. See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth.* s. v.

Pittoni, Giambattista, an Italian canonist, was born at Venice in 1666. He took holy orders and was a priest, and resided in turns at Rome and Venice. He died Oct. 17, 1748. He compiled with great order a collection of the pontifical constitutions and of the decisions of the different Roman congregations (Viterbo, 1745 and ensuing years, 14 vols. 8vo), which is held in great esteem. He left also, *Vita di Benedetto XIII* (Venice, 1730, 4to):—*De commemoratione omnium fidelium defunctorum* (ibid. 1739, 8vo):—*De octavis festorum* (ibid. 1746, 2 vols. 8vo); etc.

Pittori, Lodovico Bigi (in Latin, *Pictorius*), a modern Latin poet, was born in 1454 at Ferrara. He cultivated with some success philosophy and theology, but his favorite study was Latin poetry. The only defect of his Latin poems is a kind of monotonous facility. We mention of his works, *Candida*, a poem (Modena, 1491, 4to):—*Tumultuariorum carminum lib. vii* (ibid. 1492, 4to):—*Christianorum opusculorum lib. iii* (ibid. 1496 or 1498, 4to):—*Epigrammata in Christi vitam* (Milan, 1513, 4to):—*In cœlestes proceres hymnorum epitaphiorumque liber* (Ferrara, 1514, 4to):—*Sacra et satyrica epigrammata* (ibid. 1514, 4to):—*Epigrammata moralia lib. iv* (Modena, 1516, 4to); a collection of sermons in Italian. All these works have become very rare. Freytag and David Clément have given a complete list of them.

Pity is usually defined to be the uneasiness we feel at the unhappiness of others, prompting us to compassionate them, with a desire for their relief. God is said to pity them that fear him, as a father pitieth his children (Psa. ciii, 13). Pity is thus a Christian grace, to the practice of which we are exhorted by the apostle: "Love as brethren, be pitiful, be courteous" (1 Pet. iii, 8).

The phrase נָשִׁים רַחֲמָנִיּוֹת, *nashim rachamaniyôth*, rendered "pitiful women" in our version (Lam. iv, 10), properly refers to the tenderness and affectionate love which is the distinguishing trait of the female character; and that such women should in the "siege and the straitness" be driven to and adopt the terrible expedient of feeding upon their own children, as in this passage they are stated to have done, is an awful instance of the literal fulfilment of the threatenings of the Lord in the event of the disobedience of the house of Israel (Deut. xxviii, 57). The same horrible expedient was resorted to also in the last siege of Jerusalem, as it had formerly been at the siege of Samaria, in the reign of Ahab (2 Kings vi, 28, 29).

Pitiful is a word whose derivations have by modern usage been almost limited to the sense of mean, contemptible, or insignificant. In the Bible and Prayer-book the old and primary meaning of full of mercy,

compassionate, or tender, is retained. The English Prayer-book gives us these examples: "... though we be tied and bound with the chain of our sins, yet let the *pitifulness* of thy great mercy loose us."—*Occasional Prayer.* Again: "Pitifully behold the sorrows of our hearts;" which petition in the Litany is thus altered in the American Prayer-book, "With pity behold the sorrows of our hearts." In these, the original and better sense of the word is alone intended. In the Primer of king Edward VI there is this expression: "O pitiful Physician, and Healer both of body and soul, Christ Jesu!" And Latimer, in his sermon on the birth of Christ, remarks: "Preachers exhort us to godliness, to do good works, to be pitiful and liberal unto the poor;" that is, to be compassionate, tender-hearted, and sympathizing to them.

Pius I, pope and saint of Rome, was a native of Aquileia, and succeeded Hyginus. Pius I is supposed to have commenced his pontificate, or rather bishopric, about 152 or 153, and to have died in 157. The date of his reign, however, as given by other authorities, is from 127 to 140. He was succeeded by Anicetus, but if by Hyginus, as some think, then the latter date of reign is correct. Several decretals have been attributed to Pius I by Gratian, but they are generally considered apocryphal. Hermes, the author of the *Shepherd*, is reputed to have been the brother of this pontiff. Pius is commemorated in the Western Church July 11. See *Acta SS.* vol. iii, July, p. 178; Pagi, *Brev. Pontif. Rom.* i, 27; Jaffé, *Regesta Pontificum Romanorum*, p. 3 and 920; Tillemont, *Mémoires pour servir à l'Histoire ecclésiastique* (ed. 1732, fol.), p. 130 and 263; Fontanini, *Historia Litteraria Aquilej.* lib. ii, cap. iii, p. 70. (J. H. W.)

Pius II, pope of Rome (from 1458 to 1464), whose original name was *Æneas Sylvius Piccolomini*, was a great theologian, diplomatist, canonist, historian, and orator, and in fact a pontiff universally accomplished. He is especially noted as the inspirer of a crusade against the Saracens. He was born at Corsignano, in Siena, Oct. 18, 1405. Early devoted to study, he soon became noted for his scholarship, and found no difficulty in securing within the Church all the honors and distinctions he might seek. In 1431 he went as secretary of cardinal Dominicus Capranica to the Council of Basle, that celebrated ecclesiastical assembly which attempted earnestly, though with little success, the reformation of the Church, and of which cardinal Piccolomini wrote a history: *Commentarius de Gestis Basil. Concilii*, in two books—a very important work for the history of the Church of that period, which, because of its advocacy of Gallican principles, was put in the *Index Librorum Prohibitorum.* At that time Piccolomini was a strong advocate for the supremacy of the council, and its right to judge and depose even the pope, "who," he argued, "ought to be considered as the vicar of the Church rather than as the vicar of Christ." These tenets, however, were condemned by pope Eugenius IV, though they caused the council to assert its authority by suspending the pope from his dignity. Then began a long struggle, which terminated in an open schism, the council deposing Eugenius and electing Felix V. Piccolomini was appointed secretary of the new pope or antipope, and was sent by him as his ambassador to the emperor Frederick III, who was so pleased with the envoy that he prevailed upon him to give up his precarious situation and accept the place of imperial secretary. Frederick afterwards sent him on several missions, and loaded him with favors. Piccolomini proved his gratitude to his imperial master, for he wrote several works in praise of his patron and in support of his imperial prerogative—*De Origine et Auctoritate Romani Imperii ad Fridericum III Imperatorem, Liber Unus:*—*Historia Rerum Friderici III:*—*De Itinere, Nuptiis, et Coronatione Friderici III Commentariolus:*—*De his. qui Friderico III Imperante, in Germaniam, et per totam Europam memorabiliter gesta sunt, usque ad annum* 1458, *Commentarius.* At last Frederick sent Piccolomini as his ambassador to pope Eugenius. This was a delicate errand for one who had been a most avowed antagonist of that pontiff; but Piccolomini managed so well by his dexterity, his captivating address, and, above all, his eloquence, that the pope not only forgave him, but became his friend; and Piccolomini had hardly returned to Germany from his mission when he received a papal brief appointing him apostolic secretary. He accepted an office congenial to his clerical profession, and also because it fixed his residence in Italy. From that time a marked change took place in the opinions, or at least in the professions, of Piccolomini, and he became a decided advocate for the claims of the see of Rome. Eugenius died in 1447, and his successor Nicholas V was recognised by the fathers of the Council of Basle, who, being forsaken by both the emperor and the French king, made their peace with Rome. Felix V also having abdicated in favor of Nicholas, the schism of the Church was healed. Nicholas made Piccolomini bishop of Trieste, and afterwards of Siena, and sent him as nuncio to Germany and Bohemia, where he had several conferences with the Hussites, which he relates in his Epistles (*Epistola* 130). He had, however, the merit—rare in that age—of recommending mild and conciliatory measures as the most likely to reclaim dissenters to the bosom of the Church. He wrote a work on the history of Bohemia and the Hussites, in which he states fairly and without any exaggeration the tenets of that sect, as well as those of the Waldenses, which he calls "impious," but which are mainly the same that have since been acknowledged by the Protestant and Reformed churches throughout Europe. He relates (in his *Historia Bœmica*) the burning of John Huss and Jerome of Prague, and speaks of their fortitude, "which," he says, "exceeded that of any of the philosophers of antiquity," and he recapitulates literally their charges against the corruption of the clergy. In the year 1452 Piccolomini, being then in Italy, was present at the solemn coronation of Frederick III at Rome, and delivered an oration to the pope in the name of that sovereign, whom he afterwards accompanied to Naples. On their return to Rome he delivered another oration before the pope, the emperor, and other German and Italian princes, and the ambassadors of other European courts, for the purpose of exhorting them to form an effectual league against the Turks, who were then on the point of taking Constantinople. Piccolomini felt the great danger to Christian Europe from the rapid advance of the Ottoman conquerors, and his paramount object through the remainder of his life was to form a strong bulwark to protect Italy and Germany; but at the same time he was too well acquainted with the politics of the various Christian courts, and their selfish and petty jealousies, to expect much union in their councils, and he expresses his views and his doubts in a masterly manner in several of his "Epistles." In December, 1456, Calixtus III, the successor of Nicholas V, made Piccolomini a cardinal; and in 1458, after the death of Calixtus, he was unanimously elected pope, and assumed the name of Pius II.

His pontificate lasted only six years, but during this period he distinguished himself by promoting learning, by inculcating peace and concord among the Christian princes, and exhorting them to unite their efforts against their common enemy, the barbarous Turks. The year after his election he convoked a congress of the ambassadors of all the Christian sovereigns to arrange the plan of a general war against the Ottomans. The pope himself repaired to Mantua, accompanied by the learned Philelphus, who spoke eloquently in favor of the proposed league. Most of the Italian states were willing to join in it, but Germany and France stood aloof, and nothing was decided. Pius also took the pains to write a long letter to sultan Mohammed II, to convince him of the errors of Islamism, and to induce him to turn

Christian. In the year 1464 an armament intended against the Turks was directed to assemble at Ancona, and soldiers began to repair thither from various parts. Matthias, king of Hungary, and Charles, duke of Burgundy, had promised to accompany the expedition. The Venetians also had promised the use of their fleet to forward the troops across the Adriatic into Albania. Pius II set off from Rome for Ancona, but on arriving there he found that the soldiers were in want of arms, clothes, and provisions; the foreign princes did not come; and instead of the Venetian fleet, only a few galleys made their appearance. The aged and disappointed pontiff fell ill, and on Aug. 14 he expired, after having taken leave of his cardinals, and begged forgiveness if he had erred in the government of the Church. He was generally regretted, especially throughout Italy. He was succeeded by Paul II. Pius II, before his death, raised his native town, Corsignano, to the rank of a bishop's see, and gave it the name of Pienza, by which it is now known. Pius assisted Ferdinand, king of Naples, in his war against the duke of Anjou, the pretender to that crown. At the same time he was obliged to make war in his own states against Sigismondo Malatesta, lord of Rimini, and against the Savelli and other feudal barons, in all of which undertakings he was successful. By a bull addressed to the universities of Paris and of Cologne, Pius condemned his own writings in defence of the Council of Basle, concluding with these words: "Believe what I, an old man, now say to you, and not what I wrote when I was young; believe the pontiff rather than the private individual; reject Æneas Sylvius, and accept Pius II." In several of his letters to his friends also, and especially to Pietro di Noceto, he expresses sorrow for his juvenile weaknesses, for he had once been too fond of the fair sex, and had even written accounts of some of his amorous adventures, and of those of other persons, which are found among his "Epistles." Some writers assert that Æneas Sylvius had refused the priestly office until his fortieth year because of his fondness for the fair sex; and they quote his own confessions in proof. But whatever his previous life, as pontiff he was devoted to the Church, and sought the accomplishment of great things.

A vacancy having occurred in the archiepiscopal see of Mentz, two candidates appeared for it—Adolph, count of Nassau, and Dietrich of Isenburg. The latter had the majority of votes, but Pius, who by the concordat had the right of deciding in cases of contested elections, refused to confirm the choice of Dietrich unless he engaged not to assert the supremacy of a general council, not to convoke of his own authority an imperial diet, and further to pay to Rome double the sum fixed for the annates, or first-fruits. Dietrich demurred to the first two conditions, and positively refused to accede to the last; and as proceedings were instituted against him in the apostolic court, he appealed to the next general council. Pius declared such appeals to be heretical, and excommunicated and deposed him, appointing Adolph of Nassau in his place. The emperor acknowledged Adolph, but Dietrich being supported by the count palatine and the elector of Bavaria, a war ensued, which, after much mischief, ended in the submission of Dietrich. Those who remembered the sentiments of Piccolomini when imperial secretary, and especially his letter (*Epistola* 25) to the papal nuncio, John Carvajal, concerning the supremacy of the council, were inclined to think that change of station had, in him as it but too often does in men, produced a corresponding change of opinions.

As a learned man and a writer, Pius II is best known under the name of *Æneas Sylvius*, the most important part of his career being passed before he was elected pope. He was one of the first historians of his age, a geographer, a scholar, a statesman, and a divine. He was also a great traveller by sea and by land; he lived many years in Germany; he repeatedly visited France, went to Great Britain and as far as Scotland, and to Hungary. His biographer Campanus, bishop of Arezzo, speaks at length of his peregrinations, and his diligence in informing himself of everything worth noticing in the countries which he visited. His principal works, besides those already mentioned, are, *Cosmographia, vel de Mundo Universo Historiarum*, libri i (a second book treats especially of Europe and its contemporary history):—*In Antonii Panormitæ de Dictis et Factis Alphonsi Arragonum Regis, libris quatuor, Commentaria:*—*Epitome supra Decades Flavii Blondi Forliviensis, ab inclinatione Imperii usque ad tempora Johannis XXIII, Pont. Max.* (in 10 books):—*Historia Gothica* (published first at Leipsic in 1730):—*A Treatise on the Education of Children, with Rules of Grammar and Rhetoric:*—lastly, his numerous *Epistles*, which contain much varied information. A collection of his works was published at Basle, *Æneæ Sylvii Piccolomini Senensis Opera quæ extant* (1551, fol.), but this edition does not include all. Domenico de Rosetti has published a catalogue of all his works and their various editions, and also of his biographers and commentators, *Serie di Edizioni delle Opere di Pio II, o da lui intitolate* (Trieste, 1830). Biographies of Pius II by Platina and Campanus are annexed to the Basle edition of his works, but a much more ample biography is found in the *Commentaries* published (Frankfort, 1614) under the name of John Gobellinus, his secretary, but which are known to have been written by himself or under his dictation, *Pii II, Pont. Max., Commentarii Rerum Memorabilium quæ Temporibus suis contigerunt*, libri xii, with a continuation by his intimate friend, James Ammanato, cardinal of Pavia, who had at his desire assumed the name of Piccolomini. See, besides these, Milman, *Hist. of Latin Christianity*, viii, 120–122; Riddle, *Hist. of the Papacy*, ii, 377 sq.; Bower, *Hist. of the Popes* (see Index); Hagenbach, *Rückerinnerungen an Aeneas Sylvius* (Basle, 1840); Verdière, *Sur Æneas Sylv. Piccolomini* (Paris, 1843); Pfizer, *Aeneas Sylv. Piccol.*, etc. (Stuttg. 1844); Helwing, *De Pii II Pontificis maximi Rebus gestis et moribus commentatio* (Berol. 1825); Voigt, *Aeneas Sylv. Piccol.* (Berlin, 1856–9); Düx, *Kardinal Nicolaus v. Cusa u. die Kirche seiner Zeit* (Regensburg, 1847, 2 vols. 8vo).

Pius III, pope of Rome in 1503, whose original name was *Francesco Todeschini Piccolomini*, was the child of pope Pius II's sister, and was born at Siena in 1439. He was made cardinal by pope Alexander VI, and succeeded him in 1503. His pontificate was of only a very short duration. Twenty-six days after his elevation he died, and Julius II (q. v.) became his successor. See Panvinius, *Vita Pii III.*

Pius IV, pope of Rome from 1560 to 1565, whose original name was *Giovanni Angelo Medici* or *Medichini*, was born at Milan, Italy, March 31, 1499. He was originally a student of law and devoted to the legal profession, but his brother won him over to the ecclesiastical ranks, and in 1549 he was made cardinal by pope Paul III. Pius IV was elected successor to pope Paul IV (q. v.) about the close of 1559, a very critical period in papal history, and was crowned Jan. 6, 1560. The most important act of his pontificate was, at Easter, 1561, the reassembling of the Council of Trent, which had been prorogued under Paul IV. Pius was particularly intent upon checking the spread of heresy, which had taken root in several parts of Italy, besides the valleys of Piedmont, and especially in some districts of Calabria. The Spanish viceroy of Naples sent his troops, assisted by an inquisitor and a number of monks, to exterminate by fire and sword the heretics of Calabria. Emmanuel Philibert, duke of Savoy, after attacking with an armed force the Waldenses, who made a gallant resistance, agreed to allow them the exercise of their religion within their own districts, subject to certain regulations. The quarrels between the Catholics and Protestants in France were more difficult to settle. Some of the French Catholic prelates, among others Monluc, bishop of Valence, and the cardinal of Lorraine, recommended large concessions

to be made to the Protestants with the hope of reconciling them to the Church, and queen Catharine di Medici wrote to the pope to that effect. The pope referred the matter to the council, and in the mean time Catharine published the edict of pacification, in January, 1562, which allowed the Protestants liberty of conscience, and leave to perform their worship in country places, but not within walled towns. The prelates sent by France to the Council of Trent, and several councillors of the Parliament of Paris who were also ordered to attend in the name of the king, spoke loudly of the necessity of an extensive reform in the Church, and seemed disposed to render the bishops more independent of the see of Rome. The cardinal of Lorraine was of opinion that the mass and other offices should be performed in the vulgar or popular language of each country; but the Italian prelates, and Lainez, general of the Jesuits, supported the maintenance of the established form of worship, as well as of the papal authority in all its existing plenitude. The discussions grew warm, and it was only in the following year, 1563, that the two parties came to an understanding. The council terminated its sittings in December of that year, and the pope confirmed its decrees by a bull. This was the principal event of the life of Pius IV. True, the Tridentine Council was not the most important that has ever met, but at all events it is the most important that has met in modern times. Its importance is comprised in two grand principles. By the one dogmatic theology, after divers fluctuations, separated itself from Protestant views forever, and the doctrine of justification as then established gave rise to the entire system of Roman Catholic dogmatics as maintained to our day. By the other the hierarchy became founded anew, theoretically by the decrees respecting ordination to the priesthood, practically by the resolutions on the subject of reform. The faithful were again subjected to an intolerant Church discipline, and in urgent cases to the sword of excommunication. As the pope held the exclusive right of interpreting the Tridentine decisions, it ever remains with him to prescribe the rules of faith and manners. All the threads of the restored discipline converged together in Rome. Such progress could only have been made by means of a community of sentiment and action with the leading Roman Catholic powers. In this union with the monarchies there lies one of the most important conditions for the whole subsequent development of Romanism, and were it for nothing else Pius IV would still be an important person in the history of the world, for he was the first pope that knowingly suffered or caused the claim of the hierarchy to place itself in opposition to monarchical government. After the council Pius IV relaxed all energy, neglected religion, ate and drank too eagerly, and took an excessive delight in the splendor of his court, in sumptuous festivities, and in costly buildings. He evidently had done his work. He died in December, 1565. His disposition was generous, and he embellished Rome; but he was guilty of the common fault of nepotism. He made his nephew, Charles Borromeo, a cardinal, who afterwards became celebrated as archbishop of Milan; and he instituted proceedings against the nephews of the late pope, cardinal Carlo Caraffa, and his brother the duke of Paliano, who were accused of various crimes, which were said to be proved against them, and both were executed. But in the succeeding pontificate of Pius V, the proceedings being revised, the two brothers Caraffa were declared to have been unjustly condemned. See Ranke, *Papacy*, i, 234 sq., et al.; Bower, *Hist. of the Popes* (see Index); Leonardi, *Oratio de laudibus Pii IV* (Padua, 1565); Panvinius, *Vita Pii IV;* Jervis, *Ch. Hist. of France*, p. 147, 159, 162; Ffoulkes, *Divisions of Christendom*, vol. i, § 68; Janus, *Pope and Council*, p. 418; Cramp, *Popery*, p. 264 sq.; Fisher, *Reformation*, p. 411; Montor, *Hist. des Souver. Pontifes*, iv, 183 sq.

PIUS IV, CREED OF. This document, which forms one of the authorized standards of the Church of Rome, was prepared by pope Pius IV immediately after the rising of the Council of Trent, and is understood to embody in substance the decisions of that Council. The creed bears date November, 1564, and was no sooner issued than it was immediately received throughout the Romish Church, and since that time it has continued to be accepted as an accurate summary of their faith. It is binding upon all clergymen, doctors, teachers, heads of universities, and of monastic institutions and military orders, and all reconciled converts. For this authoritative document, with the oath of promise appended, see PROFESSIO FIDEI.

Pius V, pope of Rome, succeeded Pius IV in 1566. His family name was *Michele Ghisleri;* he was born of low descent, Jan. 17, 1504, at Bosco, not far from Alessandria, in Piedmont, Italy. Early in life he entered the Dominican order, and devoted himself soul and body to the monkish piety which his order demanded. He sided with the strict party professing the old opinions, and especially distinguished himself by his zeal in support of the Inquisition, of which tribunal he, as pope, became one of the leading members. As the tendency to which he attached himself triumphed, he rose with the ascendency which it gained. Pope Paul IV spoke of friar Michele as "an eminent servant of God, and much to be honored." He made him bishop of Nepi, and in 1557 cardinal. In this new dignity Ghisleri continued as before, severe in his manner of life, poor and unpretending. He devoted himself to his religious exercises and to the Inquisition. He was austere in his morals, and wished to enforce a strict discipline among the clergy, and especially the monks and nuns, more than fifty thousand of whom are said to have been at that time living and strolling about Italy out of their respective convents, regardless of any of the obligations enjoined by their order (Botta, *Storia d' Italia*, bk. xii). There was also a monastic order in Lombardy called the "Umiliati," possessed of considerable wealth, the heads of which led openly a most dissolute life, and even kept bravoes or hired assassins to execute their mandates. Charles Borromeo, archbishop of Milan, who endeavored to check these atrocities, was shot at by one of the monks while at prayers in his oratory. The ball, however, only grazed the skin: the assassin was taken, and revealed his employers, and several preposti, or superiors of convents of the Umiliati, were executed. Pius V, having examined the whole affair, suppressed the order, and gave their property to the Jesuits and other orders. He also enforced the authority of the Inquisition over all Italy. There were at that time in several towns, especially in Tuscany, some scholars and other men of learning who advocated the doctrines of the Reformation. Some ladies, also, of high rank, who enjoyed a reputation for learning, such as Vittoria Colonna, Giulia Gonzaga, and Margaret, the wife of Emmanuel Philibert, duke of Savoy, were suspected of a similar bias. Pius demanded of Cosmo, duke of Florence, the person of Carnesecchi, a Florentine nobleman who made a public profession of opinions considered as heretical; being given up to the Inquisition, he was put to death at Rome. The same happened to Paleario, Bartocci, and Giulio Zanetti; the last, who was at Padua, being given up to the pope by the Venetian senate, on the plea that he was a native of Fano, and a subject of the Papal States. Numerous informers were kept by the Inquisition in every town of Italy; and such was the terror produced by these severities that the University of Pisa was almost deserted both by teachers and students. The pope also enforced the strict observance of the index of forbidden books, and enacted severe penalties against those who printed or introduced or kept such books. The printing-presses of Italy, those of Giunti of Florence, and others, declined greatly in consequence, and many printers emigrated to Switzerland or Germany. Pius V likewise enforced the canons against those priests who kept concubines; but instead of leav-

ing to the civil magistrates the repression of this abuse, he insisted upon the bishops acting both as magistrates and judges, attached armed men to their episcopal courts, and provided prisons for the punishment of offenders. Thus frequent collisions were occasioned between the secular and the ecclesiastical authorities, especially at Naples and Milan. Similar disputes took place also concerning the ecclesiastical inspectors and collectors sent by the pope to visit and demand accounts of all Church property throughout Italy. Pius proceeded on the principle asserted in the false decretals that the pope has the disposal of all the clerical benefices throughout the world. Hence he was also led to reintroduce the famous bull called "In cœna Domini," which excommunicates all princes, magistrates, and other men in authority who in any way favor heresy, or who attempt to circumscribe the ecclesiastical jurisdiction, spiritual and temporal, or to touch the property or revenues of the Church; and all those who appeal from the decision of the pope to the general council, as well as those who say that the pope is subject to the council. He ordered this bull, so ultramontane in spirit and tendency, to be read every Thursday before Easter in every parish church throughout the Christian world. France, Spain, and the emperor of Germany strenuously resisted the publication of this bull. In Italy the senate of Venice likewise forbade its publication. At Naples and Milan the Spanish governors did the same, but the bishops and monks refused absolution to those who in any way opposed the bull. After much altercation and some mischief, the civil power attained its object, and the bull was set aside. In Tuscany the bull was allowed to be published, but rather as a matter of form than as a measure upon which judicial proceedings could be grounded. The monks and some of the parochial clergy, however, pretended by virtue of the bull to be exempt from all taxes, and refused the sacrament to the collectors and other revenue officers and their families. The duke of Florence, Cosmo de Medici, threatened to put the monks in prison and prosecute them. The Tuscan bishops tried to conciliate matters, and to repress the arrogance of the clergy, but the disturbances continued till the death of Pius V. To conciliate the Tuscan house, Pius created Cosmo de Medici, duke of Florence, by a bull dated Aug., 1569, grand-duke, and his successors heirs to the title, and sent with the bull the model of a crown ornamented with a red lily, the former ensign of the Florentine republic. In the struggle with the Saracens, Pius was a great promoter of the Christian league; and after the glorious victory of Lepanto, won by the Christian combined fleet against the Turks in Sept., 1571, Pius caused Marc Antonio Colonna, commander of the papal galleys, who had distinguished himself in the battle, to make his triumphal entry into Rome on horseback, preceded by the Turkish captives and spoils, and accompanied by the magistrates, noblemen, and heads of trades of the city of Rome. Pius died in May, 1572, and was succeeded by Gregory XIII (q. v.). Pius V was canonized by pope Clement XI in 1713. Though a truly pious man, seeking only the good of the Church, he yet failed, because extremely obstinate in maintaining his opinions. There was no getting him to retract even for the strongest reasons. He was opinionated; and whatever estimate he made he was sure to adhere to inflexibly. Unfortunately he suspected most men, and was not, therefore, very charitable towards any who incurred his displeasure. Besides, he was often disappointed; for a character so stern was sure to make demands no one could meet, and hence he frequently alienated men, until his popedom proved nothing but an annoyance to its ruler, and he was led to declare that it was not propitious to his piety; that it contributed nothing to the salvation of his soul, or to his obtaining the glory of paradise (Ranke, i, 262). His religion was certainly of a strange composition. He was so exclusive and bigoted as to cherish a bitter hatred against all Christians who differed from him in matters of faith; and while he strove with indefatigable zeal to root out every vestige of dissenting agitation that yet survived in Roman Catholic countries, he persecuted with a still more savage inveteracy Protestants, whether such as had become free or those still struggling to be so. Thus he gave the papal troops who fought against the Huguenots the injunction "to take no prisoners, but to put all to death," and signified his approbation of Alva's sanguinary proceedings by sending him a consecrated hat and sword. Queen Elizabeth of England he put under ban, and Maximilian II he threatened with excommunication if he should grant toleration (religious) to the Protestants. Surely this was a medley of simplicity, nobleness, personal strictness, devoted religiousness, and morose exclusiveness, of bitter hate and bloody persecution. See Walch, *Entwurf einer vollst. Geschichte der röm. Päpste*, p. 392 sq.; Catena, *Vita del gloriosissimo papa Pio V;* Ranke, *Papacy*, i, 259–277; Agatio di Somma, *Vida de Pio Quinto;* Furillet, *Vie du Pape Pie V* (1674); Falloux, *Hist. de Saint Pie V* (1844, 2 vols.); Mendham, *Life and Pontificate of Saint Pius V* (Lond. 1832, 1844); Bower, *Hist. of the Popes* (see Index); Soames, *Elizabethean Hist.* (see Index); Collier, *Eccles. Hist.* (see Index); Fisher, *Hist. of the Reformation*, p. 302, 411.

Pius VI, pope of Rome, whose original name was *Giovanni Angelo di Braschi*, descended from a noble family, and was born at Cesena, Italy, Dec. 27, 1717. He made his reputation very early in life, and was elevated to important ecclesiastical dignities at an unusually early period. In 1766 he was made keeper of the papal exchequer, and in 1773 was honored with the cardinal's hat. In 1775, upon the death of pope Clement XIV, better known as Ganganelli, cardinal Braschi, who had then the reputation of being of a generous disposition, fond of learning and the arts, and had besides the advantages of a handsome person, a graceful demeanor, and easy and affable manners, was chosen successor to the vacant pontifical chair. In his previous office of treasurer he had managed the financial affairs of the country with prudence and disinterestedness. In the first five years of his pontificate he occupied himself largely with public improvements, and displayed the same care and independence. But in his political career pope Pius VI was rather unfortunate. Even at his elevation, feeling that he had not the qualifications of a politician, he predicted himself, to the conclave, an unhappy termination of his reign. Conciliatory in spirit, and determined upon the preservation of unity in the Church, he would frequently make concessions where stern opposition was more in place; then again he would hesitate, often where prompt measures alone would suffice. Thus in 1777 a serious dispute arose with Leopold I, grand-duke of Tuscany, and Ricci (q. v.), bishop of Pistoja, on the subject of some grave moral offences which had been discovered in several convents. The bishops, to be sure, had taken the liberty to act without papal consent, but the case warranted prompt proceedings, and these were not anticipated from Pius VI. Jealous of his authority in Church affairs, he endeavored to interfere, but without success, and saw himself at last passed by in the Council of Pistoja (q. v.), and when the question of jurisdiction was finally settled in a more satisfactory manner, it yet left a coldness between the courts of Rome and Tuscany. A more important disagreement took place in 1780 with emperor Joseph II. Leopold's brother, who, having control of the reins of power under the emperor's queen, Maria Theresa, was bent on separating the Church from all papal jurisdiction. His first step was to suppress superfluous convents without papal consent, and to emancipate the clergy of his dominions from all papal interference in matters of discipline. It was the same question previously raised in Tuscany by Leopold. Joseph even went further, and took upon himself the nomination of bishops—even of those in Italy, and the pope readily saw in these proposed reforms nothing short of a design to weaken the

influence of the see of Rome. Pius VI, not willing to leave unemployed any conciliatory offices at his command, believed that his duty lay in a visit to the emperor, and accordingly he set out for Vienna in 1782, to settle matters by personal arrangement. The step was in itself a novelty. For several centuries no pontiff had ever left Italy. Monti wrote a poem on the remarkable event, entitled *Il Pellegrino Apostolico*. At Vienna the pope was received with every honor; yet Pius failed to make any impression on the emperor, and the matter in discussion was referred to a ministry unfavorable to papal claims. It was the same struggle as that of France, Gallicanism against Ultramontanism, only this time the pope was himself inclined to be the peace-maker between the contending factions in the Church. Pius VI failed utterly in his mission, and returned to Rome disappointed and dejected, to be reproached for his good intentions, with having lowered the dignity of his office, and encouraged the Gallican tendencies in the Church at large. The troubles doubled upon the outbreak of the French Revolution, and rendered the remaining years of his pontificate gloomy and calamitous. In the early period of that fearful struggle Pius VI had solemnly condemned the abrupt changes made in France concerning the discipline and the property of the clergy, though in all secular matters he had wisely abstained from interference of any sort. But in January, 1793, a complication arose of a most serious nature. A young man, Hugo Basseville, an agent of the French republican party, while on his way to Naples, where he was to be secretary of embassy, stopped in the Eternal City, and made a foolish demonstration in the Corso, apparently to sound the opinions of the people. He appeared in a carriage with several tricolored flags, and distributed revolutionary tracts, vociferating something about liberty and against tyrants; but a mob collected; he was dragged out of his carriage, and mortally stabbed in several places by the populace. The military arrived too late, and though some of the murderers were arrested and tried, the French government charged the papal authorities with having been a party to the crime. The result was that the breach widened, and that finally the pope joined the league of the sovereigns against France. In 1796, when Bonaparte invaded Northern Italy, he took possession of the legations, but at the same time offered to the pope conditions of peace. These, however, it was impossible for Pius to accept, and the papal troops were marched against the French. The defeat of the papacy followed, and after the possession of Ancona and Loreto, peace was established at Campo Formio in Oct., 1797. The conditions of peace were very onerous, and added vexation to vexation against the unfortunate pope, who, old and infirm, was unequal to the difficulties which crowded upon him. Heavy contributions were imposed by the French Directory, and Ferrara, Romagna, and the Bolognese were incorporated with the newly founded Cisalpine republic; the price of peace, in fine, was the revocation of the papal edicts launched against the Jansenists, and the acknowledgment of the civil constitution of the French clergy. To make bad matters worse, some disorders in Rome between the French and Italians, in the course of which the French general Duphot was shot, gave a pretext to the French Directory for the expedition of Berthier, who arrived in Rome on February 10, and occupied the Vatican. Pius VI, forsaken by most of the cardinals, who had escaped, remained in the Vatican. On the 15th a tree of liberty was raised in the Campo Vaccino, and Rome was formally declared a republic. Berthier afterwards sent an officer to intimate to the pope that he must renounce his temporal sovereignty. Pius answered that he had received it from God and by the free election of men, and could not renounce it; that he was eighty years old, and his troubles could not be of long duration, but that he was determined to do nothing derogatory to his high office. Next came the commissary-general of the French army, who, after taking an inventory of all the valuables that still remained in the papal residence, ordered Pius to prepare to set out in two days. The pope said he could not oppose force, but protested against this new act of violence. On Feb. 20 Pius VI left the Vatican with a few attendants, and, escorted by a strong detachment of cavalry, took the road to Florence. He was lodged at first in a convent near Siena, and afterwards in the Carthusian convent near Florence, where he remained till the following year, when the French, having driven out of Tuscany the grand-duke Ferdinand, and being threatened by the Austro-Russians who were advancing to the Adige, ordered the pope to be transferred to France. He was taken to Grenoble, and afterwards to Valence, on the Rhône, where he died in August of that year (1799). Just before his death the Roman republic had ceased to exist, the French being driven out of Italy by the Austro-Russians, and Rome was occupied by Austrian and Neapolitan troops. In the year 1802, after the restoration of the papal government, the remains of Pius VI were transferred to Rome by leave of the first consul Bonaparte, at the request of his successor, Pius VII, and deposited with solemn pomp in the church of St. Peter. The bulls published by Pius VI are in *Bullar. Roman. contin. summor. Pontif. Clementis XIII, Clem. XIV, Pii VI constitutiones, etc., quas Coll. Barbieri, opp. et stud. R. Segredi* (Rom. 1835, f. t. vii–x); *cont. constit. Pii VI.* Pius VI greatly enlarged the museum of the Vatican, which he made one of the richest in Europe in works of sculpture, vases, precious marbles, and other remains of antiquity; and he caused a splendid set of engravings of the objects in this museum to be published, under the title of *Museo Pio Clementino*. He made additions to the church of St. Peter, and embellished Rome with new palaces, fountains, and other structures. His internal administration was liberal and mild, an unusual freedom of opinion and speech prevailed at Rome, and a number of learned men gathered thither from other parts of Italy. Many foreigners came to settle in that capital, the fine arts were encouraged by the pope and several of the cardinals, and modern Rome was reviving the brilliant period of Leo X when the struggle with the French Directory darkened the scene. See, besides the memoirs by Becattine (Venice, 1801, 4 vols.); Tavanti (Flor. 1804, 3 vols. 4to); *Gesch. des Papstes Pius VI* (Vienna, 1799); Bourgoing's *Mémoires de Pie VI* (Par. 1799); Ferrari, *Vita Pii VI* (Patav. 1802); Novaes, *Sommi Pontifici*, vol. xvi, xvii; Artaud, *Hist. des souv. Pontif. Rom.* (Par. 1849), vol. viii; Wolff, *Gesch. der kathol. Kirche unter Pius VI* (Zurich, 1797–1802, 7 vols. 8vo).

Pius VII, pope from 1800 to 1823, was successor of the preceding. He was originally called *Gregorio Barnaba Chiaramonti*, being also of noble descent, and was born in 1742 at Cesena. He first studied in the college of Ravenna, and subsequently entered the Order of Benedictines in 1758. He was appointed lecturer on philosophy, and afterwards on theology, to the novices of his order, first at Parma and then at Rome. Pius VI appointed him bishop of Tivoli, and in 1785 made him a cardinal and bishop of Imola. When Bonaparte took possession of the legations, and annexed them to the Cisalpine republic, cardinal Chiaramonti in a homily exhorted his flock to submit to the new institutions, and to be faithful to the state of which they had become a part. This conduct is said to have gained the approval of Bonaparte. When the news of the death of Pius VI, in his exile at Valence, in August, 1799, came to Italy, the conclave was summoned to assemble at Venice, then under the dominion of Austria, as Rome was in a state of anarchy. Thirty-five cardinals accordingly assembled in the Benedictine convent of St. Giorgio Maggiore, in order to elect one of their number to the papal office, a dignity apparently not very enviable in those troubled times. The deliberations of the conclave lasted several months, and at last, on March 14, 1800, cardinal Chiaramonti was chosen, and crowned

pope on the 21st of the same month, under the name of Pius VII. In the following July the pope made his entrance into Rome, and soon after appointed cardinal Consalvi his secretary of state, or prime minister. In the following year the peace of Luneville, between France and Austria, was made, and Bonaparte, first consul of France, ordered his troops to evacuate the papal territories, with the exception of the legations, which had been formally incorporated with the so-called "Italian Republic." Meantime the ecclesiastical affairs of France were in a state of the greatest confusion. France was still nominally Roman Catholic, but the clergy were no longer in communication with the see of Rome, and were divided into parties. In the midst of this confusion about one half of the population of France followed no mode of worship, and professed no religion whatever. A vast number of parish churches were shut up, and had been so for ten years. Bonaparte saw clearly that a nation could not subsist without a religion, and that the genius of the French demanded it rather as an institution than an internal life. He therefore resolved upon a concordat with Rome. The pope appointed the prelate Spina and the theologian Caselli, who proceeded to Paris, and Bonaparte named his brother Joseph, Cretet, councillor of state, and Bernier, a Vendéan priest, to treat with the pope's negotiators. But on an intimation from Bonaparte, who was above all things anxious that the matter should be promptly settled, the pope despatched to Paris cardinal Consalvi, who smoothed down all difficulties, and the concordat was signed at Paris, July 15, 1801, and was ratified by Pius at Rome, after some hesitation and consultation, on August 14th following. The principal scruples of the pope were concerning certain articles called "organic," which Bonaparte appended to the concordat, as if they had formed part of it, and which were proclaimed as laws of the state. Henceforth Romanism was the establishment of France; but, on the other hand, pope Pius VII was bound to recognise the independence of the French Church. See FRANCE.

From 1801 till 1804 Pius VII enjoyed tranquillity at Rome, which he employed in restoring order to the finances, in ameliorating the judicial administration, in promoting the agriculture of the Campagna, and in other similar cares. His personal establishment was moderate, his table frugal, his habits simple, and his conduct exemplary. In May, 1804, Napoleon was proclaimed emperor, and some time after he wrote to the pope requesting him to crown him solemnly at Paris. After considerable hesitation Pius consented, and set out from Rome at the beginning of November of that year. The ceremony of the coronation took place in the cathedral of Notre Dame, after which the pope spent several months in Paris, visiting the public establishments, and receiving the homage of men of all parties, who were won by his unassuming yet dignified behavior and his unaffected piety. In May, 1805, he returned to Rome; and his troubles began soon after. In October, 1805, a body of French troops suddenly took military possession of Ancona. Pius remonstrated in a letter which he wrote to Napoleon, who was at that time at the head of his army in Austria. It was only after the peace of Pressburg that he received an answer, in which Napoleon said that he considered himself as the protector of the Church against heretics and schismatics, like his predecessors from the time of Charlemagne, and that as such he had occupied Ancona to prevent it from falling into the hands of the English or the Russians. Soon after Napoleon officially required the pope, through his ambassador at Rome, to expel from his dominions all English, Russian, Swedish, and Sardinian subjects, and to close his ports to the vessels of those powers who were then at war with France. Pius replied at length in a letter to Napoleon, representing to him that his request was destructive of the independence of the Papal State, and of its political neutrality, which were necessary to the welfare of the Church, and for the security of the numerous members of it who were living in those very countries with which the emperor was then at war. He said that the head of the Church ought to be a minister of peace, and not to take part in a war which has not religion for its object; that if some of his predecessors had not always abided by this rule, he at least should not follow their example. Napoleon, however, insisted, and an angry correspondence was carried on between the two courts for about two years on this subject of contention, the neutrality of the Papal States being all the while merely nominal, as the French troops marching from and to Naples crossed and recrossed it at their pleasure, and the French also kept a garrison at Ancona, the only papal port of any importance. By degrees they extended their posts all along the Adriatic coast, and garrisoned the various ports. Some time after a body of French troops, coming from Naples, passed through Rome, ostensibly to proceed to Leghorn; but they suddenly turned out of the main road and surprised in the night the town of Civita Vecchia, of which they took military possession. In all these places they confiscated whatever English property they could find. The papal troops at Ancona, Civita Vecchia, and other places were ordered to place themselves under the direction of the French commanders, and some officers who refused to do so were arrested and kept in confinement. Napoleon in the mean time found fresh grounds of quarrel with the pope. He wished to declare the marriage of his brother Jerome with an American Protestant lady null; but Pius refused, saying that although the Church abhorred marriages between Catholics and heretics, yet if they were contracted in Protestant countries according to the laws of those countries they were binding and indissoluble. [*Letter of Pius VII* on this important subject in Artaud, *Vie du Pape Pie VII* (Paris, 1826).] He next accused the pope of dilatoriness in giving the canonical institution to the bishops elected to vacant sees in the kingdom of Italy. Eugene Beauharnais, viceroy of the kingdom of Italy, wrote an able and conciliatory letter to the pope, in order to bring about an arrangement; and the pope was induced to invite the bishops elect to Rome in order to receive the canonical institution, when a threatening letter came, written by Napoleon from Dresden after the peace of Tilsit in the summer of 1807, in which he said that "the pope must not take him for a Louis le Débonnaire; that his anathemas would never make his soldiers drop their muskets; that he, Napoleon, if provoked too far, could separate the greater part of Europe from the Roman Church, and establish a more rational form of worship than that of which the pope was the head; that such a thing was easy in the actual state of people's minds," etc.; and he forbade Eugene to correspond any longer with the pope, or send the bishops elect to Rome, for, he said, "they would only imbibe there principles of sedition against their sovereign."

Matters were now brought to an open rupture. A French force under general Miollis entered Rome in February, 1808, and took possession of the castle and the gates, leaving however the civil authorities undisturbed. The pope was prevailed upon to send cardinal de Bayanne as his legate to Paris, to make a last effort at reconciliation; but the cardinal had not arrived at his destination when a decree of Napoleon, dated April 2, 1808, united the provinces of Ancona, Macerata, Fermo, and Urbino to the kingdom of Italy. Fresh remonstrances on the part of Pius were answered by threats of further hostile measures on the part of Napoleon, unless the pope entered into an offensive and defensive league with the kingdoms of Naples and Italy, and by a declaration that "the pope would lose his temporal sovereignty and remain bishop of Rome as his predecessors were during the first eight centuries, and under the reign of Charlemagne" (*Note de M. de Champagny, Ministre des Affaires Étrangères à son Eminence le Cardinal Capara*, April 18, 1808). The

war which began soon after in Spain prevented Napoleon from occupying himself with the affairs of Rome, which remained in a state of uncertainty amid frequent clashing between the French military authorities and the papal civil officers. The papal territory, impoverished as it was by the loss of its finest provinces, was obliged to pay the French troops which garrisoned the towns that still nominally belonged to the pope. All the disaffected and the turbulent, trusting to French protection, openly insulted the papal government. The pope remained confined to his palace on the Quirinal, with his Swiss guard at the gates, not wishing to expose himself to violence by venturing out. On May 17, 1809, Napoleon, who was then making war against Austria, issued a decree from Vienna, in which he resumed the grant of his illustrious predecessor Charlemagne, and united the remainder of the Roman states to the French empire, leaving to the pope his palaces and an income of two millions of francs. On June 10, 1809, the pope issued a bull of excommunication against all the perpetrators and abettors of the invasion of Rome and of the territories of the Holy See. The bull was affixed to the gates of the principal churches of Rome and in other public places. The text of the bull is given by cardinal Pacca, in his *Memorie Storiche*, Appendix to pt. i, No. v. The French commander, Miollis, being afraid of an insurrection of the people of Rome, who had shown unequivocal signs of attachment to their sovereign, thought it expedient to remove Pius from the capital. The Swiss guards made no resistance, having orders to that effect from the pope; and, protesting that he "yielded to force," Pius took his breviary under his arm, accompanied the general to the gate, where his carriage was ready, and drove off under an escort. He was taken first to Grenoble, in Dauphiné, from whence he was removed, by order of Napoleon, to Savona, in the Riviera of Genoa, where he remained till June, 1812. While Pius was at Savona, Napoleon convoked a council at Paris of the bishops of his empire; but he found that assembly less docile than he expected, and he dissolved it without reaching any conclusion. The great question was how to fill up the vacant sees, when the pope refused the canonical institution. The pope at the same time would not recognise Napoleon's divorce from his first wife Josephine. In short, Napoleon found that unarmed priests were more difficult to conquer than the armies of one half of Europe (Thibaudeau, *Le Consulat et l'Empire*, ch. lxxvii; Botta, *Storia d'Italia*, bk. xxv). The plan of Napoleon was to have the pope settled at Avignon, or some other town of his empire, as his subject and his pensionary, and to control himself the nomination not only of the bishops, but of the cardinals also, by which means he would have added to his already overbearing temporal power the incalculable support of a spiritual authority which extends over a great part of the world. The resistance of Pius disconcerted his views. Napoleon at last imagined that by changing Pius to Fontainebleau he might succeed in overcoming his firmness. He therefore caused Pius to be removed with the greatest secrecy. He was brought to Fontainebleau in June, 1812, lodged in the imperial palace, and treated with marked respect. Napoleon had set out on his Russian expedition. After his return from that disastrous campaign, in December, 1812, he went to see the pope, embraced him, and treated him with studied attention; he also allowed several cardinals who were at Paris to repair to Fontainebleau, and at last, chiefly through their persuasions, he prevailed upon the pope to sign a new concordat, Jan. 25, 1813. It is not true, as some have stated, that Napoleon, in one of his conferences with Pius, lifted his hand against him and struck him. Pacca (*Memorie Storiche*, pt. iii, ch. i) denies this on the authority of Pius himself, but thinks it very probable that Napoleon spoke to his prisoner in an authoritative and threatening tone. Napoleon hastened to publish the articles of the concordat, and to give them the force of laws of the empire; after which he granted free access to the pope, to all cardinals, and others who chose to repair to Fontainebleau. Pius, who had scruples concerning some of the articles which he had signed, laid them before the cardinals and asked their opinion. Several of the cardinals, especially the Italian ones, such as Consalvi, Pacca, Litta, and Di Pietro, stated that some of the articles were contrary to the canon law and the legitimate jurisdiction of the Roman see, and pregnant with the most serious evils to the Church, and they urged the necessity of a prompt retraction. They quoted the example of Paschal II, who, in similar circumstances having ceded to the emperor Henry V the right of investiture, hastened to submit his conduct to the judgment of a council assembled in the Lateran, and the council revoked the cession. See PASCHAL II. Upon this Pius wrote to Napoleon, March 24, retracting his concessions, but proposing a new basis for a concordat; Napoleon, however, took no notice of the retractation, except to exile some of the cardinals who, he thought, had influenced it. Napoleon soon after set off for his army in Germany, and the affair with the pope remained in suspense. It was only after the defeat of the French armies and their expulsion from Germany that Napoleon proposed to restore to the pope the Papal States south of the Apennines, if the pope would agree to a concordat. Pius answered that he would not enter into any negotiations until he was restored to Rome. On Jan. 22, 1814, an order came for the pope to leave Fontainebleau the following day. None of the cardinals were allowed to accompany him. He set out, accompanied by an escort, and was taken to Italy. On arriving at the bridge on the river Nura, in the state of Parma, he met the advanced posts of the Neapolitan troops under Murat, who was then making common cause with the allied powers against Napoleon. Murat had taken military occupation of the Roman state, but he offered to give up Rome and the Campagna. Pius, however, preferred stopping at Cesena, his native town, until the political horizon was cleared up. After the abdication of Napoleon and the peace of Paris, Pius made his entrance into Rome, May 24, 1814, in the midst of rejoicings and acclamations. His faithful Consalvi soon after resumed his office of secretary of state. By the articles of the congress of Vienna the whole of the Papal States were restored, including the legations, which were not, however, evacuated by the Austrian troops until after the fall of Murat, in 1815.

The remaining years of the life of Pius VII were spent in comparative tranquillity, though not in idleness. He applied himself to adapt, as far as it was practicable, the civil institutions of his dominions to the great changes which had taken place in the social state. By a "motu proprio" of the year 1816 he confirmed the suppression of all feudal imposts, privileges, monopolies, and jurisdictions; he abolished every kind of torture, including that called the "corda," or "estrapade," which was formerly a frequent mode of punishment at Rome; he diminished the land-tax; retained the register of "hypothèques," or mortgages, instituted by the French; laid down the basis of a new code of public administration, and in November of the following year he published a new code of civil procedure, in which he regulated the costs of judicial proceedings. He maintained the commercial courts established by the French, as well as the new system of police, enforced by a regular corps of carabineers, instead of the old "sbirri," who were ineffective and corrupt (Tournon, *Études statistiques sur Rome*, bk. iv, ch. vi). Unfortunately, however, the old system of secret proceedings in criminal matters was restored, as well as that of the ecclesiastical courts, which have jurisdiction also over laymen. Pius, however, also made some important alterations in the form of proceeding of the Inquisition, abolishing torture as well as the punishment of death for offences concerning religion. He did perhaps all that he could do as a pope, and certainly more than any pope had done before him. Cardinal Consalvi

took vigorous measures to extirpate the banditti of the Campagna; and in July, 1819, he ordered the town of Sonnino, a nest of incorrigible robbers, to be razed to the ground. With regard to spiritual matters, Pius concluded a new concordat with France, Naples, Bavaria, and other states. He condemned by a bull the political society of Carbonari, as well as other secret societies. In the month of July, 1823, the aged pontiff had a fall in his apartments and broke his thigh. This accident brought on inflammation, and he died Aug. 20. He was succeeded by Leo XII (q. v.). Thorwaldsen was commissioned to make his monument, which has been placed in St. Peter's. Pius VII stands prominent among the long series of popes for his exemplary conduct under adversity, his Christian virtues, and his general benevolence and charity. Free from nepotism, virtuous, modest, unassuming, and personally disinterested, he was a stanch, though temperate, defender of the rights of his see; and his meek bearing and unblemished character engaged on his side the sympathies of the whole Christian world, without distinction of community or sect, during the long struggle with his gigantic and ungenerous adversary. A selection of his bulls, breves, etc., are found in Roskovany, *Monum. Cath. pro independentia potest. eccl. Quinque eccl.* (1847), ii, 1 sq. The *Bullarium Romanum continuat* contains in vol. xi and xii (Rom. 1846) all bulls and breves till 1806. See Cohen, *Précis histor. sur Pie VII* (Par. 1823); Simon, *La Vie politique et privée de Pie VII* (ibid. 1824); Jäger, *Lebensbeschreibung des Papstes Pius VII* (Frkf. 1824); Artaud de Montor, *Hist. de la Vie et du Pontificat du Pape Pie VII* (3d ed. Paris, 1839, 2 vols. 8vo); and Cardinal Pacca's *Historical Memoirs*, transl. into English by Sir George Head (Lond. 1850, 2 vols. post 8vo); the *London Review*, 1854, pt. ii, p. 77; Ranke, *History of the Papacy*, ii, 311 sq., et al.; Bower, *History of the Popes*, vol. viii; *Church Journal*, vol. vii; *Stud. und Krit.* 1867, No. i; *English Cyclopædia*, s. v.

Pius VIII, pope of Rome, was born at Cingoli, in the province of Ancona, Italy, Nov. 20, 1761. His original name was *Francis Xavier Castiglioni*. He was the friend of Pius VII, and was by him created bishop of Montalto in 1800, and elevated to the cardinalate in 1816. He was generally regarded as the most learned canonist of the papal court. He was desired for successor of pope Leo XII. During Pius VIII's short pontificate of one year and eight months (from March 31, 1829 till Nov. 30, 1830) nothing remarkable occurred. He warred against indifferentism, Bible societies, Freemasonry, and all secret associations, and successfully labored for the establishment of a patriarchate at Constantinople for the United Armenians. He deserves to be especially commended for his humane efforts with Dom Pedro of Brazil to suppress the slave traffic and system. His bulls, canons, etc., are in Roskovany, *Monument. Cath.* ii, 292–317. He was succeeded by pope Gregory XVI. See Artaud de Montor, *Hist. du Pape Pie VIII* (Par. 1843); Nodari, *Vitæ Pontificum Pii VI, VII, Leonis XII, et Pii VIII* (Padua, 1840). (J. H. W.)

Pius IX, the last of the Roman pontiffs who held both temporal and spiritual rule. His original name was *Giovanni Maria Mastai Ferretti*. He was of noble parentage, though there are writers claiming him to be of Jewish descent. He was born at Sinigaglia, May 13, 1792. As a youth he was distinguished for a mild disposition and for his works of charity. While still a child he was saved from drowning by a poor *contadino*, who lived to see him seated on what the historian Macaulay calls "the most ancient and venerable throne of Europe." At the age of eighteen he went to Rome for the purpose of entering the body-guard of the reigning pontiff, Pius VII. An epileptic attack, however, prevented the attainment of his wishes, and he entered a religious seminary, where his gentleness and devotion proved the foundation of his future distinction. While at Rome he lived under the protection of an uncle, an officer of the ecclesiastical establishment of the Vatican. In the troubled period which marked the closing days of Napoleon's reign, uncle and nephew removed to their estates at Sinigaglia. On a visit which pope Pius VII paid this place, Mastai was presented to his holiness, and when the pontiff was again able to return to Rome, after his long captivity in France, the young ecclesiastic of Sinigaglia was called to the holy city. In the meantime his health had improved, and he was able to prosecute his studies uninterruptedly. By invitation of cardinal Odescalchi, he took part in a mission to his native province, and when he returned was made deacon in 1818. He obtained a personal audience of the pontiff, and sought a dispensation which would allow him to be ordained without delay to the priesthood. The legend states that his holiness, laying his hands on the young aspirant, granted him the favor asked, together with the apostolic blessing, and thus forever cured him of his epilepsy. Secular writers less anxious to paint the miraculous manifestations in Pio Nono's youthful days declare that he was a libertine, and that, stretched upon a bed of sickness, he repented of his sins, and, by a life of abstinence and purity, gradually recovered.

In 1819 Mastai received priest's orders, and first exercised the sacerdotal functions in the hospital of San Giovanni at Rome—an institution founded for the education of poor orphans. He was assiduously devoted to his ministerial duties, and became noted for his charitable works also. In 1823 a wider field opened to him. A canon of the cathedral of Santiago, in Chili, had come to Rome to request of the pope the appointment of an apostolic delegate to that country, and when monsignore Muzi had been given this position, Mastai was selected to accompany him as auditor. Two years he spent in South America, and on his way home he also visited the North, and he is said to have been the only pope that ever saw America. Report will have it that he even visited a body of Freemasons in Philadelphia (see *Princeton Rev.* [March, 1878], p. 510). Nor need this surprise. "It is a fact," says Trollope, "which may be relied on, that—of course in the days before he became a priest, or had thought of ever becoming one—Pius IX had been a member of a lodge—or a vendetta, as the term was—of Carbonari." This was a secret society, originally of charcoal-burners (as the name signifies), who were opposed to the tyranny of the times. In the summer of 1825 Mastai was taken into the household of pope Leo XII as domestic prelate. He became a favorite with the pontiff, and in December was made superintendent of the hospital of St. Michael, founded two centuries ago by Innocent X, and comprising at this time not only a hospital for the sick, but a retreat for the aged, a refuge for boys, a house for magdalens, a home for virtuous girls, and a school of arts and industries. When he assumed the presidency of this vast and complicated institution it was on the decline. He reorganized every department of the hospital, repaired its dilapidated revenues, extended the range of its charities, and in less than two years brought order out of the confusion—by the sacrifice, however, of his own patrimony. He also preached much and obtained great distinction as a pulpit orator.

In 1829 Spoleto needed an archbishop. The political agitation was great throughout Italy. The approach of the disturbances which crowded the year 1830 was manifest in a thousand ways. The ecclesiastics, in order to be all-powerful and sufficient for the struggle, needed more than ordinary experience. A policy of anxious, irritated, and, at the same time, irritating repression had proved a failure. Mastai Ferretti was young enough to avoid falling into this error of his seniors, and as he had gained much political sagacity in his semipolitico-religious mission across the sea, he was selected for the vacant archiepiscopal chair. He quickly perceived that he must abandon the old receipts of the

prison and the executioner, and by a wise rule maintained perfect order in the midst of general disturbance. While all Italy was in arms, the little archbishopric of Spoleto remained peaceful. When suddenly 5000 insurgents came there to seek refuge from the pursuing Austrians, he dealt so kindly and judiciously with them that he induced them to lay down their arms and submit to authority; and when the civil authority of the city submitted to him the lists of these insurgents, he tossed them into the fire, instead of forwarding them to Rome. Gregory XVI and his court were displeased and indignant at such procedure. Mastai was summoned to Rome to give an account of his conduct; but he succeeded without much difficulty in persuading Gregory that if their enemies could be put down without punishments, which left a fresh store of hatreds behind, it was all the better. Mastai's enemies said that his conduct towards the persecuted liberal party was not altogether straightforward and consistent, and that he even in those early days showed a certain tendency to run with the hare at the same time that he was hunting with the hounds. The archbishop certainly succeeded finally in obtaining the approbation of his holiness, for on Dec. 17, 1832, he was translated to the see of Imola—a very important promotion, because it is understood that this bishopric is a stepping-stone to the cardinalate. Mastai had not only proved his political sagacity, but his religious fervor and purity of life gave a most dignified position to the churchmen of the diocese of Spoleto, as well as later to that of Imola. Particularly was he noted for his charity and readiness to aid all good works, both public and private. The disturbed times required such ecclesiastics. It gave authority to the sees and influence to the pontificate. How well the pope appreciated Mastai is made apparent in his selection, a short time after, as apostolic nuncio to Naples. He so ably discharged his mission that he was rewarded with the cardinalate by secret conclave in 1839, though he did not receive the purple robe until the year after. He was yet comparatively a young man. There were many far his seniors in the college of cardinals. Certainly no one dreamed that the bestowal of the red hat upon Mastai Ferretti was likely to bring him the tiara soon.

In 1846 Gregory XVI died. When the news from Rome came to the archbishop-cardinal of Imola, he delayed to celebrate first the obsequies of the dead pope. Apparently he was in no haste to get to Rome; yet those who were close observers and less friendly say that he had an eye to the papal throne from the moment of his elevation to the cardinalate, and that he prudently forbore ever after to identify himself with the court of Gregory. There were two parties in the conclave. Each of these sought in the new pontiff the representative of their ideas. The one party, confined to the Jesuits and headed by Lambruschini—himself an aspirant for the vacant chair—determined to maintain the papacy of mediæval times; the other party, moderately liberal, made up of better men than the Jesuits, yet also devoted to the fabric of mediæval times, but with some show of concession to modern ideas, were disposed to compromise on a moderate man, and selected the virtuous Bianchi, the Dominican who never doffed the dress of his order for the purple robe, though he accepted its honors and eschewed the Austrian policy of the late pontificate. Outside of the conclave, however, there was a small but enthusiastic faction, called "Young Italy," resolved to have a liberal pope, and they fastened upon the young cardinal who had espoused the Italian cause and had been a liberal in his past history. No one outside of the conclave imagined, when, on the 14th of June, it convened, that the party at whose simple mention the "holy" men were accustomed to cross themselves would be successful. The only hope was in the popular enthusiasm, which ran so high that there was hope the *vox populi* might possibly be turned into the *vox Dei*. On the very first vote Lambruschini received fifteen votes and Mastai thirteen. On the afternoon of the 16th Mastai received on the fourth ballot thirty-six votes—making, of the fifty-two present, more than the necessary two thirds—when the assembly rose as one man to confirm the choice by unanimous acclamation. Young Italy had conquered against all the Jesuit machinations. But it was well that it was done so soon; for as Mastai —now Pius IX—was bestowing his benediction (*Urbi et orbi*) from the balcony of St. Peter's, an Austrian cardinal drove into the Piazza with smoking post-horses and a "veto" from Vienna.

Various incidents in the reign of Pio Nono's predecessor had given rise to the wildest agitation in diplomatic circles. In 1845 there occurred the rising in the Romagna, which, when suppressed, revived in a far more effective shape in the famous pamphlet, *I Casi delle Romagne*, which circulated as the testament of a new political gospel throughout the peninsula. Then there came the memorable visit of the czar Nicholas to Rome, and those interviews in which the pope had dared to protest to the dreaded autocrat against the treatment to which he subjected the Romish Church in Russia. The interest excited in the political world was very great, for, on the one hand, the religious agitation in Poland had assumed serious proportions, while, on the other, speculation was stimulated by the mystery surrounding this interview, at which only two witnesses had been present (cardinal Acton and Mr. Boutevieff, the Russian minister at Rome). Finally, there came as French ambassador M. Rossi, a born subject of the pope—a fugitive professor from Bologna, and a notoriously compromised liberal—avowedly to obtain from the holy see its concurrence with the principles of free education, then advocated in France, and its compliance with the desire of the French government for the reduction within moderate limits of the establishments that had been opened in France, more or less clandestinely, by the Jesuits. All these circumstances had brought about a degree of agitation which was acknowledged by all who had not some special interest in speaking against the truth. Gregory XVI had lived in hourly dread of revolutionary upheaval, and in constant fear of absolute neglect by the European states. He had always kept in his drawer a document empowering the cardinals, on his demise, to proceed to immediate election, if they saw danger to the free action of the conclave. Such times needed a popular priest in the pontificate. But Mastai disappointed both his friends and his enemies—the former so sorely that they were weakened beyond the possibility of recovery; the latter, by his forming an alliance with them, and by the execution of schemes which they had never dreamed could be executed, even if Lambruschini himself had been in the papal chair. Pio Nono proved an impulsive, good-natured man, but ignorant and superstitious, vain and impetuous, weak and obstinate, without a mind of his own or settled policy. His reforms were, in reality, of little value. The best of them —those devoid of any political significance—projects to regulate the finances, to reform the administration of justice, to introduce railways, to ameliorate the condition of the Campagna—brought about merely a temporary improvement. The political measures were equally short-lived in their results, and, besides, were a burlesque on liberalism. Thus in March, 1847, an edict of the press was published with the intention of removing some of the restrictions under which it had labored till then; but strong hints were given as to the subjects which the government would allow to be discussed, and a censorship remained established in full force. The same year witnessed the institution of the *Consulta*, under the presidency of Gizzi. This seemed like concession to popular demands, but the whole thing was a farce; the members were chosen by the pope, and the functions of the council of the most limited nature. Its duty was to give an opinion when called upon, leaving it to the pope to act upon the proffered advice or to do otherwise. In 1848 appeared the famous *statuto* creating a high council and a chamber of deputies, as the

triumph of constitutionalism. But the chambers were forbidden to propose any law on ecclesiastical or mixed affairs, and every measure had to be submitted to the pope in a *secret* consistory, with the absolute right of veto. When the national crusade was inaugurated in 1847, under the leadership of prince Charles Albert, of the house of Savoy—the grandfather of the present king of Italy—the pope went with the multitude. The Ultramontanes, of course, broke out against this manifest liberalism of the pontiff, but it only needed a little strategy on their part, and he was at their bidding. When his trusted adviser, count Rossi, was assassinated at the door of the Council of State, Pius IX as rapidly retraced his steps as he had advanced, and now unreservedly gave himself over to those very Jesuits who had plotted the death of his minister, that the liberals might be charged with desperate motives. Accordingly, the pope, on the 29th of April, 1848—his ministry, who had counselled that the abandonment of the people "would most seriously compromise the temporal dominion of the holy see," having left him—issued, in the form of an allocution addressed to the cardinals, that celebrated paper which put an end at once and forever to the brief season of popularity and affection of his subjects in which he had basked. The first words of it declare the intentions of the Holy See "not to deviate from the institutions of our predecessors." Then it goes on to state that evil-minded men had made it believed that the pope had encouraged the Italians in their revolutionary aspirations, and had endeavored to make his conduct in this respect a means of stirring up schism in Germany. The paper finally warns all the Italians against any such designs or aspirations, enjoining them to remain docile subjects to their princes. This "allocution" fell like a bombshell in the midst of the liberal party. The dismay, the disappointment, the rage, were indescribable. Many had been led—some of the princes of Italy among the number—to compromise themselves in a way they would not have done had they not supposed that the pontiff was at the head of the liberal movement. This terrible announcement was made, too, when already the papal troops had passed the frontier of the States of the Church and joined the forces marching against the Austrians; so that these betrayed men were left to be treated by the Austrian soldiery as mere rebels and brigands. The king of Sardinia and the grand duke of Tuscany were equally placed in a most painful predicament by this sudden tergiversation of Pius IX. They acted, as is well known, differently in the difficulty. The king did not turn back from the plough to which he had put his hand. The weak grand duke made haste to follow the lead of the pontiff, and cast in his lot with him and with the Austrians. Such vacillation could not be other than destructive. When the hurricanes which swept over the political fabric of Europe reached the Italian shores, Rome's prince was the first to feel its severest touch. In France the citizen-king was forced to exile; in Rome the citizen-pope suffered a like fate, and with this hegira from the Quirinal to Gaeta terminates Pio Nono's comedy of liberalism. The story of Pio Nono's extraordinary hegira we cannot detail. Suffice it to say that Pio Nono's exit from Rome was made with the aid of the Bavarian minister, and at Gaeta he was received with great honor by the king of Naples, who persuaded the pope to abandon his original intention of going to the Balearic Islands. He now enjoyed the sympathy of the reactionists all over the world who had looked so coldly upon his early efforts at reform, but gained, of course, the execrations of the liberals, whose cause he had abandoned. Rome, left without a ruler, bloomed into a republic. The pope protested against all its acts, and summoned the Catholic world to put it down. It was France which, having disgraced herself by the election of a Bonaparte as president, was condemned to finish her story of crime and humiliation by throttling the Roman republic and restoring the temporal authority of the papacy. French troops landed at Civita Vecchia on the 25th of April, 1849, and besieged the capital, while the Austrians entered Italy from the north and the Spaniards from the south. The capital surrendered on the 1st of July; and pending the return of the pope—which did not take place until next year—the government was carried on by a papal commission, a council of state, a council of finances, and provincial councils. The pope returned in April, 1850, surrounded by the bayonets of a French army, "to a capital torn and ravaged by bombardment, and drenched in the blood of his own subjects, slain for the crime of taking up and carrying on the government which he had abdicated." His first act was the perfidy of destroying the constitution of chartered rights which he had guaranteed to his subjects. His second act was the granting of a mock amnesty, the exceptions to which were so framed as to put well-nigh the whole population under ban. The glutted prisons, which it had been his delight to empty at his first accession, filled up again as before. The Inquisition recommenced its sacred labors. Five hundred citizens were shot or decapitated and thirty thousand proscribed. Tribunals were established which condemned without trial, and without even open accusation. Speech was gagged, the press was muzzled, the Bible was prohibited. The stirring of resistance, provoked by excess of tyranny, was seized as the pretext of wanton barbarity; and the kind-hearted philanthropist of 1846 became an avenger at Perugia in 1859—a sad and black story, on which it is rather the province of the secular historian to dwell. In 1868, the Austrians broke the concordat and declared their spiritual emancipation. The year after, queen Isabella was driven out of Spain, and the government of the people refused to be bound by any previous treaties with the papacy. In 1870, finally, the war with Prussia destroyed the empire in France, and with the fall of Napoleon not only the French refused to be bound to Rome, but the gates of the Eternal City opened to all Italy. Previous to the entry of the Italian troops, Victor Emmanuel wrote to Pio Nono a most dutiful and submissive letter, offering terms of establishment in Rome which would guarantee his entire spiritual freedom and authority, to which his holiness made characteristic reply—the most extraordinary defiance ever uttered in such extremity. Though the king might after this have taken matters in his own hand, he yet accepted an obedient relation to the Church, and caused Parliament to guarantee the liberty of the Church and the independence of the sovereign pontiff on May 13, 1871. Notwithstanding all efforts of Victor Emmanuel for peace, the pope sternly persisted in his firm protest against the inevitable change of things. He steadily refused to receive the Sardinian princes, or to enter into any arrangement with them. He yielded merely to force, and evidently enjoyed his martyrdom much more than Emmanuel did his victory. For the first year after his dethronement, the pope talked of various changes of residence—of Malta, of Avignon, and even of St. Louis. But this was probably never serious. His great age prevented any such adventure, if there were no other reasons against it. He lived retired in the Vatican, and called himself a prisoner. On the 3d of June, 1877, the Romish Church celebrated the fiftieth anniversary of his episcopate, and on Feb. 7, 1878, he died, after a protracted dropsical illness.

Pio Nono's name will always be prominent among Roman pontiffs. His long reign proved a contradiction of the traditional words uttered at his coronation—*Non videbis annos Petri.* Besides, his interest in archæological pursuits, and the care he took in aiding in the preservation of the various monuments of Rome and in the embellishing of her churches, will hand his name down to remote generations. On the Forum, on the Coliseum, on fountains and in basilicas, the name of Pius IX is carved on large marble slabs, recording the part he has taken in preserving old structures from decay or in building new ones. In the tribune of the grand basilica of San

Paolo-fuori-le-mura there is a memorial of one of the proudest moments of Pio Nono's life. An expensive and elegant memorial is that placed in 1871 over the well-known bronze statue of St. Peter. Those who desire to study its details are referred to the pages of the *Civiltà Cattolica*.

In 1847 he began the reform of the great religious bodies. On June 17 he appointed a commission to inquire into the laxity of discipline in religious communities, and in the issue he so modified the constitutions of several as to make the period of probation more protracted, and to raise among all the standard of discipline and intellectual training. The missions of the Church were also strengthened, being carried forward *in partibus infidelium*, and great hierarchies, in lands formerly heathen or Protestant, were added to the vast clergy that owned "the Latin obedience." Thus he provided by brief of 1850 for the ecclesiastical government of England, dividing that country into one metropolitan and twelve episcopal sees; and this was followed by a pastoral letter of cardinal Wiseman, on his appointment as archbishop of Westminster, exulting in the supposed triumph of his Church in the land which had been the home of the Reformation for three centuries. Then he created in this country a vast Roman Catholic hierarchy by elevating to the cardinalate the archbishop of New York in 1875, and prepared the way for the re-establishment of the hierarchy in Scotland, which was effected in 1878. Finally, in 1854, without advice of a council, he ventured the utterance of a new dogma —the *immaculate conception* (q. v.) of the Virgin Mary —and the audacious promulgation, in 1864, of the bull *Quanta Cura*, which, with its accompanying "Syllabus" of damnable errors, was simply an attack on free governments and civilization itself, and rivalled the spirit and times of Hildebrand, the ecclesiastical absolutism of the 11th century. The consecration of these acts in the Vatican Council of 1870 by the decree of *Infallibility* (q. v.) was the logical completion of the Romish system and of the pontificate of Pius IX. The disturbances which have grown out of these steps are detailed in OLD CATHOLICISM, etc. One of the foulest blots on the pages of history regarding his reign is the forcible conversion of the Jew boy Mortara, and of a piece with this is the abject condition of the Hebrews at Rome, where the walls of the Ghetto were only removed with the establishment of the Italian power. The private life of the pope was marked by great simplicity of habits.

See Balleydier, *Histoire de la Révol. de Rome* (Lyons, 1851, 2 vols. 8vo); Maguire, *Rome, its Ruler and its Institutions* (Lond. 1859); Saint-Alvin, *Pie IX* (Paris, 1860); *Pius IX: the Story of his Life* (Lond. 1875, 2 vols. 8vo); Trollope, *Pope Pius IX* (ibid. 1877, 2 vols. 8vo); Legge, *Growth of the Temporal Power of the Papacy* (ibid. 1870); also, *Life of Pius IX* (ibid. 1875, 8vo); Hitchmann, *Biog. of Pius IX* (ibid. 1878, 12mo); *New York Tribune*, Feb. 8, 1878; *Christian Union*, vol. xvii, No. 7; *Christian Advocate*, Feb. 1878; Thompson, *The Papacy and the Civil Power* (N. Y. 1877, 12mo); *Princeton Review*, March, 1878.

Pius Societies The stormy years of 1848 and 1849 brought great hopes and great dangers to the Roman Catholic Church of Germany, especially the hope of entire emancipation from the State, and the danger of enslavement to the despotism of a liberalism hostile to the Church. But its representatives knew how to steer skilfully between the Scylla and Charybdis. In November, 1848, the German bishops of the Romish body assembled at Würzburg, to consult together concerning the best means to proceed in this critical period. Unvarying faithfulness to the papacy was the first point settled; voluntary co-operation with the "political regeneration" of the fatherland, the second; thankful acceptance of the promise of unconditional freedom of conscience (in the fundamental rights of the Frankfort Parliament), in order to accomplish the most complete independence of the Church and absolute control of national education, from the elementary to the high schools, the third. Shortly before this, however, an organization of far-reaching significance had been effected, in which also—and prominently—the laity were to co-operate, viz., the *Pius Society*, a Roman Catholic counterpart of the *Protestant Church Diet* (q. v.). Soon after the revolutionary struggles of March, unions were formed at several places in Germany having for their object the protection and advancement of Roman Catholic interests. At the anniversary of the building of the cathedral at Cologne, in August, 1848, the members of several of these unions met together and resolved upon a general convocation, in October, 1848, at Mayence, where the first union of this kind was formed, under the name of *Pius Society*. Here all the single unions were formed into a great collective union under the name of "Catholic Union of Germany;" although in practice the shorter name of *Pius Society* has been preferred. To direct the business of the collective union, one of the single unions was to be chosen every time from the annual general convention, which was called "Vorort." The object of the union was "the obtaining and maintenance of the freedom of the Church and control of the same over the schools; national culture in the Roman Catholic spirit and practice of Christian mercy; as fundamental law, obedience to the pope and to the episcopate; pacific posture towards the State and towards every existing form of government, so far as the rights of the Church were not thereby prejudiced; and defensive, not aggressive, posture towards the non-Catholic confessions. The Virgin Mary was chosen as patroness of the union, and every member bound himself to repeat a daily Paternoster and Ave Maria to further the objects of the union." The first general assembly, which was held at Mayence in 1848, was represented by eighty-three different societies; and a letter received from the pope (Feb., 1849), in which he gave his approbation and blessing to this union, only strengthened the movement, and gave not only authority, but also the name. A second assembly was held at Breslau, where the papal letter was received, and where the assembly openly expressed it that "a united Germany was only possible with a Catholic Christianity." Here a new society was also organized, the *Vincentius Society*, for missionary work at home. The third general assembly was held at Regensburg (October, 1849). Here, besides the organization of the *Bonifacius Society*, a paper was started, *Katholischer Vereinsbote für das deutsche Reich*, in the interest of all societies organized in the spirit of the Pius societies. Every year new societies of like tendency and spirit were organized, till in the year 1851 the number was so great that the original Pius societies, with the now-existing branch associations, were finally amalgamated into one, as all were only serving one purpose—the advancement of ultramontanism in Germany. Yet, in spite of all these efforts, the seventh general assembly, held at Vienna (Sept., 1853), was forced to acknowledge that it had not succeeded in attracting the masses, for only the same faces were present. The meeting at Cologne in 1854 became discordant, because the committee refused to give the Prussian government a guarantee of abstinence from political utterances and confessional polemics. The ninth general assembly, held at Salzburg in 1857, was a living "testimonium paupertatis," which the Roman Catholic world exhibited to the union. Little was felt here of important men, deeds, and speeches. The cathedral capitular Himioben of Mayence, the "real miles gloriosus of the meeting," uttered hectoring fanfaronades about the glorious victories of Roman Catholicism in Germany, and expressed the confident hope, in regard to the forty new Protestant churches built by the Gustavus Adolphus Union, that these would shortly again be cast out into the garden of rejected stones. "Harlequinades also were not wanting. Prof. Kreuzer, of Cologne, e. g., comforted those present in regard to

the charge of ultramontanism with the proverb, 'There stands the ox at the mountain;' from which it follows incontestably that the *oxen* are the real Cismontanes, because they are not able to pass over the mountain; and as regards the papacy, it is evident that Christ himself, who called upon his Father on the cross, was a papist; indeed, every man is a born papist, because the child lisps 'papa' already in the cradle; and other such comical things." As a change, it was also greatly lamented that two hundred and seven large and twelve hundred and thirty-four small journals were in the service of the Protestants of Germany, while, on the other hand, the Roman Catholics had only six large and eighty-one small ones.

The tenth general assembly was held at Cologne (September, 1858). All agreed that the results hitherto achieved were satisfactory. In general, the deportment of this conference was more dignified, the contents of its speeches more important, than those of the former years. "Still the jester Himioben was not wanting this time also. He exhorted the women to form Parament unions, and informed them that the first union of this kind was formed in the year 33 after Christ, in consequence of the first secularization, when the soldiers cast lots for the garment of the Saviour, which he had worn the evening previous as a chasuble at the first celebration of the mass. Indeed, we can even go farther back than this: Mary, who made swaddling-bands for the child Jesus, was the proper originator of the union. After being edified with such trifles, but also hearing many important truths, especially concerning the study of history and the musical culture of the young, the meeting was closed by consecrating the pillar of Mary built at Cologne in honor of the immaculate conception." The eleventh annual conference, which was held at Freiburg in 1859, expressed the hope that soon all Germany will be brought back within the pale of the Roman Catholic Church; while the twelfth, held at Prague in 1860, lamented over the wounds which were inflicted upon the papacy in that same year. The thirteenth general meeting, held at Munich in 1861, extolled the virtues of the holy father, and declared the robbing of the pope's territory to be a robbery of God. The seventeenth, which was held at Treves in 1865, praised the encyclica published in 1864 in the bull "Quanta cura" as the greatest deed of the 19th century; pronounced John Goerres (q. v.) as the greatest German, and the holy coat at Treves as the symbol of Catholic unity. In this tenor it went on. "Half childish, half spleenish remained the rest of the meetings, until the day at Breslau, in 1872, when humor gave place to rage, naivete to fanaticism, and the ostensible peace-policy to the ringing of the alarm-bell" (Kurtz).

The most prominent societies in connection with the original Pius societies are the *Bonifacius* unions for the support of needy Roman Catholic congregations in Protestant Germany (an imitation of the Gustavus Adolphus Union); the *Charles Borromeo* unions, to spread good Roman Catholic writings; the *Vincentius* and *Elizabeth* unions, for visiting the sick and taking care of the poor; the *Journeymen* unions (founded by Kolping, of Elberfeld, in 1846), for the spiritual and temporal sustenance of journeymen; the unions of *The Holy Childhood of Jesus*, composed chiefly of children, who contribute monthly five pennies for the salvation of exposed heathen children (especially in China), and daily pray an Ave Maria for them. These are the most prominent organizations in the service of the hierarchy, and are found all over the world. In the United States there is hardly a large town in which one or the other of these societies is not to be found. The tendency is the same, although the name may be different. The purpose of these organizations in the United States is to bring the state as much as possible under the influence and control of the hierarchy, and the political arena is the field of labor. Already they influence the legislatures, school-boards; yea, we may say they form a state within the state. The clergy commands a great ignorant mass, easily fanaticized, and ready to do anything "in majorem Dei gloriam et honorem papæ infallibilis." The doctrines of the Vatican are promulgated through numerous papers, and the utterances made at the annual gatherings of the different organizations are the best proof of the spirit which animates these societies. See Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* s. v. Piusvereine; *Theolog. Universal-Lexikon*, s. v.; Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, s. v.; more especially Kurtz, *Lehrbuch der Kirchengesch.* (Mitau, 1874), ii, 332 sq. See also ULTRAMONTANISM (in its conflict with Germany). (B. P.)

Pix. See PYX.

Pizzez. See APHSES.

Placæus. See PLACE, JOSUÉ DE LA.

Place, ABSALOM'S. See ABSALOM.

Place, FRUITFUL. See CARMEL.

Place, Conyers, an English divine of some note, flourished in the first half of last century, very near the opening of that æra. We know nothing of his personal history. He has left several valuable publications, among which we note, besides his *Sermons* (Lond. 1702, 4to; 1721, 8vo; 1705, 4to), *Adversaria* (1709):—*Remarks, with Queries put to Mr. Bolde, concerning his wild Pamphlet, or clouterly Invective, against the Christian Ministry and World, called Some Thoughts concerning Church Authority* (1724, 8vo):—*Space is Necessary Being*, etc. (1728):—*Essay towards the Vindication of the Visible Creation* (1729, 8vo):—*Reason an Insufficient Guide* (1735):—*Remarks on a Treatise entitled A Plain Account, etc., of the Lord's Supper*, in which all the texts in the New Testament which relate to it are produced and explained, and the whole doctrine about it is drawn from them alone (1735). See Blakey, *Hist. of the Philosophy of the Mind*, iii, 31; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s. v.; Hook, *Eccles. Biog.* s. v.

Place, Enoch, an American minister in the Free-will Baptist Church, was born in Rochester, N. H., July 13, 1786. He was converted in March, 1807, while engaged in teaching, and soon felt called of God to enter the work of the ministry. He preached his first sermon June 2, 1807, and was ordained Jan. 23, 1813. Forty-one years of his public life he passed in Strafford, N. H., laboring also much in adjoining towns. He had a thirst for knowledge, and from youth to manhood availed himself of the means within his reach to acquire an education, though his denomination at that period was not in favor of a learned ministry. By personal effort he advanced until he became eminent among his own people and a leader in his town. His gifts and position eminently qualified him for usefulness both as a minister and citizen. He was called to fill high positions in his denomination, such as moderator of General Conference, trustee of printing establishment, member of mission boards, etc. As a preacher, he was earnest and warm. At times he would have such a sense of the sinner's condition and obligation to God that he would speak as one having authority. Occasionally he would rise to such a height in feeling and eloquence as to be almost overwhelming and irresistible. His personal appearance was commanding, his voice sonorous and rich. He was also eloquent and mighty in prayer. Mr. Place, with many other Free-will Baptists, early espoused the antislavery cause. Abundant in labors and rich in faith, Father Place, as he came to be called, died March 23, 1865. See Barrett, *Mem. of Eminent Preachers*, p. 86 sq.

Place (*Placæus*), **Josué de la,** a celebrated French Protestant divine, was born in Bretagne about the close of the 16th century: some put the date at 1596, some as late as 1606. His parents died while he was in his infancy, and he was educated under the guidance of his elder brothers. When yet very young he was made teacher of philosophy at Saumur, where he had been a student. In 1625 he was made pastor of the Protestant Church at Nantes, and there remained

until 1632, when he was called, with Amyraldus and Capellus, to a professorship of theology at Saumur. He died in 1665. An excellent teacher and a pious Christian, he yet offended greatly, and provoked much strife and controversy by his tendency to Arminian theology in his views on the doctrine of *Imputation* (q. v.). The theory of original sin, as consisting only in native corruption, was condemned by the French synod of 1645, though Placæus himself was not named. Strictly speaking, his theory was only a modification of Jean Cameron's (q. v.), who had succeeded Gomarus (q. v.) at Saumur in 1618. Cameron himself taught, after Piscator, the imputation of Christ's passive obedience alone; and advocated the theory of the hypothetic universalism of divine grace, which was more fully developed by Amyraut. "The peculiarity of Amyraldism," says Schweizer, "is in the combination of a real particularism with a merely ideal universalism." Placæus accepted the statement of the synod of 1645, by distinguishing between immediate and mediate imputation, and advocated the mediate, instead of the immediate imputation of Adam's sin to his posterity. He was opposed by Anton Garissol (q. v.), professor in Montauban, and defended by Charles Drélincourt (q. v.), pastor at Charenton. His defence, *Disputationes academicæ, sub præsidio J. Placæi, de imputatione primi peccati Adami, de argumentis quibus efficitur, Christum prius fuisse, quam in utero B. V. conciperetur, et de testimoniis et argumentis quibus probatur Jesum Christum esse Deum*, was published at Salm (1649–51, 3 vols. 4to), and in an enlarged form the year of his death (1665), and since. His works (*Opera*) were published in collected form at Franeker in 1699, and again in 1702. See Schweizer, *Centraldogmen*, ii, 234 sq., 319; Haag, *Hist. des Dogmes;* Ebrard, *Dogmatik*, vol. i, § 43; Müller, *On Sin* (see Index); *Theological Essays from Princeton Review* (N. Y. 1846), p. 195 sq.; Cunningham, *Reformers*, p. 379 sq.; Dorner, *Gesch. der protestant. Theologie*, ii, 447; *Brit. and For. Ev. Rev.* July, 1860, p. 585; *New-Englander*, July, 1868. (J. H. W.)

Placēbo, an office in the Church of Rome, so called from its first word, has for its purpose the prayer for souls. It is the antiphon (q. v.) at vespers in the office of the dead, as the dirge is at matins. See Procter, *Book of Common Prayer;* Elliott, *Delineation of Romanism.*

Placentia, Councils of (*Concilium Placentinum*). Several important ecclesiastical gatherings were held there. The first of importance was convened March 1, 1095, and concluded March 5, by pope Urban II. Two hundred bishops attended, with nearly 4000 other ecclesiastics and 30,000 laymen. So innumerable were the multitude of persons who flocked to it that no church could be found in those parts capable of containing them, therefore the pope was compelled to hold the first and third sessions of this assembly in the open air. The empress Praxedis in person made complaint against her husband the emperor Henry, who divorced her and treated her infamously. Ambassadors from the emperor of Constantinople were present, who demanded help against the infidels, with the approbation of the pope. Fifteen canons were published, by which the heresy of Berenger was again condemned, and the truth of the real presence of the Lord Jesus Christ in the holy Eucharist clearly set forth. The sect of the New Nicolaitans (who favored incontinence in the clergy) was also condemned. The orders conferred by Guibert, the antipope, and others who had been excommunicated, were declared null. The Ember fasts were also fixed. After this Urban proceeded to France, and in the autumn of the same year held the celebrated Council of Clermont. See Labbé, *Concilia*, x, 500.

Another important council was held after Easter, 1132, by Innocent II, assisted by several bishops of Lombardy. It was forbidden to receive to penitence those who refused to renounce fornication, hatred, and every mortal sin. In this council the antipope Anacletus was excommunicated. See Labbé, *Concilia*, x, 988.

Places, Besieged. See Mazor.

Placet (*placi[e]tum regium, literæ parcatis seu exequatur*) is the sanction by a reigning prince to the promulgation and execution of an ecclesiastical ordinance. The placet is necessitated as soon as ecclesiastical ordinances transgress the purely religious boundaries, and come in contact with those of the state. As soon as the mutual boundaries had acquired a relative independence, which drew a line of demarcation between both the State and Church, the right of the *placet* was established, and the first traces of it we find in the quarrels of Philip le Bel of France with Boniface VIII (q. v.), and Louis of Bavaria with John XXII (q. v.). In the 15th century we find this right of assent fully established in different countries. Thus Louis XI, in 1495, appointed a commission at Amiens to examine all persons coming from Rome whether they had any papal briefs upon them "et icelles voir et visiter, pour sçavoir s'elles sont aucunement contraires ou prejudiciables à nous et à la dite église Gallicane. Et au cas qu'en trouverez aucunes qui y fussent contraires ou prejudiciables, prenez les et retenez par devers vous, et les porteurs arrestez et constituez prisonniers, si vous voyez que la matière y soit sujette; et du contenu esdites lettres nous advertissez, ou les nous envoyez à toute diligence, pour y donner la provision necessaire" (comp. Preuves, *Les Libertés de l'Eglise Gallicane*, ch. x). Martin V (q. v.), in a letter to the archbishops of Portugal, complains, anno 1427, of Portugal: "Dicitur enim nobis, quod statuto regio mandatum est, ne quis audeat sine ipsius regis licentia sub pœna mortis et perditionis bonorum in dictis regnis literas apostolicas publicare." When John II, king of Portugal, instigated by Innocent VIII, repealed the *Placetum Regium*, in 1486, the peers of the realm resisted, and declared that without the consent of the states such a repeal was void (Augustini Manuelis, *Hist. Joan. II*). Philip the Good, duke of Burgundy, decreed, Jan. 3, 1447: "Dat niemandt en brenghe, oft en exequere eenighe geestelycke monitien, inhibitien oft andere gheboden, op eenighe ondersaeten des Landts van Brabandt, uyt wat saecke dat het zy, hy eerst kome by onse Officiere ende Wethouderen, ende geoe hem klaerlyck te kennen de saecke waerom, ende verkryghe oorlof ende consent. Den gene die dat dede, sal daer an verbeurt hebben alle sine goederen, ende te dien aen syn lyf eenen wegh te S. Peter ende S. Pauls te Roomen te doen."

By 1594 the *placet* was already regarded as a customary right. Doctrine, usage, and legislature, however, developed more fully the cases in which the placet should be used, and thus in matters of conscience, according to a royal declaration of March 8, 1772, reissued Feb. 28, 1810, no placet was required. In Austria the necessity of the placet was emphasized as early as the 16th century. In addition to former ordinances, the decree of Leopold II, dated March 17, 1791, decreed that "papal bulls, briefs, and constitutions must have the sanction of the reigning prince before they can be promulgated and accepted. This ordinance also refers to all previous papal edicts, without exception, in such a manner that whenever use is made of an ancient bull the sanction is required, and even such bulls as have been sanctioned shall only be valid as long as new decrees of the state do not affect their validity." According to another decree, dated April 2 and 7, 1784, the placet was also required for all instructions, orders, etc., given to preachers and priests, no matter as to the form in which they are made known to them. The Austrian decree of 1791 was also adopted Jan. 30, 1830, for the province of the Upper Rhine. In Bavaria the same principles, which were still adhered to in the edict dated May 26, 1818, were already the same as in the edict dated April 3, 1770, that all ecclesiastical edicts are subject to the placet, with the

exception of summons issued by the ecclesiastical authorities, provided they only refer to the lower clergy, and are the natural issues of ordinances already sanctioned. These claims of the state had always been the subject of protest on the part of the Roman See. The bull "In cœna domini" (q. v.) excommunicates all those who prevent the promulgation and annunciation of papal bulls and briefs (comp. the bull *Pastoralis* of Urban VIII, anno 1627, § 7, 13, in the *Bullarium Romanum*, vi, 38, 40). When Leopold I, while governor of Belgium, would not allow the publication of the papal prohibition of Jansen's (q. v.) work *Augustinus* without the sanction of the government, appealing to privileges, liberties, and usages, Innocent X, in 1651, protested against it most decidedly: "Quod equidem audiri sine horrore animi non potest." "Never has such a privilege been granted either by a pope or a council, which must needs destroy the papal power. None, however, dare to refer to the privilege of a worldly prince, because it would be nothing else but a foolhardy arrogance to bind and loose the souls, which right the Lord Jesus Christ has granted to none else than to his vicar" (Roskovany, *Monumenta catholica pro independentia potestatis ecclesiasticæ ab imperio civili*, pt. i, p. 203, Quinque-Ecclesiis, 1847). In this sense the popes have continually protested against the placet, and the brief of Pius VIII (q. v.), "Pervenerat non ita pridem," dated June 30, 1830, is a bitter protest against the edict of Jan. 30, 1830. This persevering opposition was finally crowned with a result, but the hierarchy owes this result to an institution which is anything but desirable to the Church, viz. the liberty of the press. The Belgian Constitution of Feb. 25, 1831, art. xvi, decreed: "The state has no right to interfere with the appointment or election of ministers of any denomination, or to prevent them from having intercourse with their superiors and promulgating their records; in the latter case with the proviso of the usual responsibility concerning the press and promulgation." This example was followed in Holland and Prussia in 1848. in Austria in 1855, and in Würtemberg in 1857. In other countries the purely ecclesiastical edicts are freed from the placet; all that is required is that the civil authorities get an insight at their publication. Since the ascendency obtained by Prussia in the German empire at the close of the Franco-German war, the system of Church legislation has undergone a complete change, the details of Church government being largely taken into the control of the state, and obedience to the new code of Church laws being exacted from the clergy under penalty of forfeiture of income, of deprivation of office, and in some cases of exile. For the present *status quo* of Rome in the German empire, comp. Kurtz, *Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte* (Mitau, 1874), ii, 389 sq. See Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, s. v. Placet; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* s. v.; *Theologisches Universal-Lexikon*, s. v.; Aschbach, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, iv, 596-601; Gieseler, *Eccles. Hist.* (Smith's transl.), iii, 340, note 5; Van Espen, *Tractatus de promulgatione legum ecclesiasticarum ac speciatim Bullarum et rescriptorum Curiæ Romanæ* (Opera omnia, Lovanii, 1753, fol. iv, 123 sq.); Stockman, *Jus Belgarum circa Bullarum pontificum receptionem* (Opera, Brux. 1760); Besier, *Specimen de juris placeti historia in Belgio* (Trajecti ad Rh. 1848); Philipp, *Kirchenrecht*, ii, 557 sq.; iii, 556 sq.; Eichhorn, *Kirchenrecht*, i, 772, 782 sq.; Richter, *Kirchenrecht*, § 66, 177 (5th ed.).

Placette, Jean de la, a noted French Protestant divine, whose religious convictions caused his exile, was born at Pontac in 1639. His father was himself a minister, and trained Jean with great care for the preaching of the glad tidings. In 1660 he was ordained, and continued faithfully to discharge the obligations of his sacred ministry until after the revocation of the Edict of Nantes in 1685, when he was obliged to seek refuge from persecution in Denmark. He was there brought to the notice of the queen, who recognised in him great worth, and determined to enjoy his associations and teachings. After her death in 1711 he went over to Holland, residing for a while at the Hague, and then at Utrecht, where he died in 1718. He was the author of many works on practical religion and morals, which are highly esteemed. He also wrote several works in the department of Protestant polemics, and his influence was much dreaded by the Romanists. See Hook, *Eccles. Biog.* viii, 97. (J. H. W.)

Placeus. See Place, Josué de la.

Placĭdus, St., a Christian martyr of the 6th century, was of pious parentage, and was born probably in 515. When only seven years old he was intrusted by his father, the Roman patrician Tertullus, to the care of St. Benedict of Nursia. Placidus, thus religiously trained, grew up in the service of the Church, and in 541 became abbot of a newly founded monastery at Messina. In 546 he was killed, with his companions, by pirates. He is commemorated in the Church of Rome July 11. See Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, vol. xii, s. v.; Alzog, *Kirchengesch.* ii, 22.

Plague is used in the A. V. as the rendering of five Hebrew words: 1. *De'ber*, דֶּבֶר, which properly means *destruction, death* (as Hos. xiii, 14), and is hence applied to pestilence (as Lev. xxvi, 25; Deut. xxviii, 21; 2 Sam. xxiv, 13; 1 Kings viii, 37), and to a murrain among beasts (as Exod. iii, 9). The Sept. mostly has θάνατος. 2. *Maggephah'*, מַגֵּפָה, from the root נָגַף, *to smite;* hence a plague as actively considered, a pestilence sent from God (Exod. ix, 14; comp. Numb. xiv, 37; xvii, 13; xxv, 18, etc.). It is also used of *slaughter* in battle (1 Sam. iv, 17; 2 Sam. xvii, 9). 3. *Makkah'*, מַכָּה, from the root נָכָה, *to smite*, properly the act of smiting; hence *a blow, a stroke;* and so it should be rendered, rather than plague (Lev. xxvi, 21; Numb. xi, 33; Deut. xxviii, 59, 61; xxix, 22; 1 Sam. iv, 8; Jer. xix, 8; xlix, 17; l, 13). 4. *Ne'ga*, נֶגַע, from נָגַע, *to smite;* hence the meaning is like that of the foregoing. But it is often used to mean a *spot, mark, cut*, upon the skin, from the common effects of a blow. This is its meaning throughout the 13th and 14th chapters of Leviticus, where it is rendered *plague* in the A. V. 5. *Ne'geph*, נֶגֶף, from נָגַף, *to strike*, as above; hence a *plague*, as a divine judgment (Exod. xii, 13, and often). See Plagues of Egypt. To these should be added the following Greek words, which are usually translated "plague" in the A. V.: μάστιξ, properly a *scourge* or whip (Mark iii, 10; v, 29, 34; Luke vii, 21); and πλήγη, a *stroke* or wound, whether of natural or artificial infliction (Rev. ix, 20; xi, 6; xv, 1, 6, 8; xvi, 9, 21; xviii, 4, 8; xxi, 9; xxii, 18). It is evident that not one of these words can be considered as designating by its signification the plague. Whether the disease be mentioned must be judged from the sense of passages, not from the sense of words. The discrimination has already been pretty fully considered under the word Pestilence (q. v.). In the following treatment of the term we use it in its strict medical application.

In noticing the places in the Bible which might be supposed to refer to the plague, we must bear in mind that, unless some of its distinctive characteristics are mentioned, it is not safe to infer that this disease is intended. In the narrative of the Ten Plagues there is none corresponding to the modern plague. The plague of boils has indeed some resemblance, and it might be urged that as in other cases known scourges were sent (their miraculous nature being shown by their opportune occurrence and their intense character), so in this case a disease of the country, if indeed the plague anciently prevailed in Egypt, might have been employed. Yet the ordinary plague would rather exceed in severity this infliction than the contrary, which seems fatal to this supposition. Those pestilences which were sent as special judgments, and were either supernaturally rapid

in their effects, or in addition directed against particular culprits, are beyond the reach of human inquiry. But we also read of pestilences which, although sent as judgments, have the characteristics of modern epidemics, not being rapid beyond nature, nor directed against individuals. Thus in the remarkable threatenings in Leviticus and Deuteronomy, pestilence is spoken of as one of the enduring judgments that were gradually to destroy the disobedient. This passage in Leviticus evidently refers to pestilence in besieged cities: "And I will bring a sword upon you, that shall avenge the quarrel of [my] covenant: and when ye are gathered together in your cities, I will send the pestilence among you; and ye shall be delivered into the hand of the enemy" (xxvi, 25). Famine in a besieged city would occasion pestilence. A special disease may be indicated in the parallel portion of Deuteronomy (xxviii, 21): "The Lord shall make the pestilence cleave unto thee, until he [or "it"] have consumed thee from off the land whither thou goest to possess it." The word rendered "pestilence" may, however, have a general signification, and comprise calamities mentioned afterwards, for there follows an enumeration of several other diseases and similar scourges (xxviii, 21, 22). The first disease here mentioned has been supposed to be the plague (Bunsen, *Bibelwerk*). It is to be remembered that "the botch of Egypt" is afterwards spoken of (ver. 27), by which it is probable that ordinary boils are intended, which are especially severe in Egypt in the present day, and that later still "all the diseases of Egypt" are mentioned (ver. 60). It therefore seems unlikely that so grave a disease as the plague, if then known, should not be spoken of in either of these two passages. In neither place does it seem certain that the plague is specified, though in the one, if it were to be in the land, it would fasten upon the population of besieged cities, and in the other, if then known, it would probably be alluded to as a terrible judgment in an enumeration of diseases. The notices in the prophets present the same difficulty; for they do not seem to afford sufficiently positive evidence that the plague was known in those times. With the prophets, as in the Pentateuch, we must suppose that the diseases threatened or prophesied as judgments must have been known, or at least called by the names used for those that were known. Two passages might seem to be explicit. In Amos we read, "I have sent among you the pestilence after the manner of Egypt: your young men have I slain with the sword, and have taken your horses; and I have made the stink of your camps to come up into your nostrils" (iv, 10). Here the reference is perhaps to the death of the first-born, for the same phrase, "after the manner of Egypt," is used by Isaiah (x, 24, 26), with a reference to the Exodus, and perhaps to the oppression preceding it; and an allusion to past history seems probable, as a comparison with the overthrow of the cities of the plain immediately follows (Amos iv, 11). The prophet Zechariah also speaks of a plague with which the Egyptians, if refusing to serve God, should be smitten (xiv, 18); but the name and the description which appears to apply to this scourge seem to show that it cannot be the plague (ver. 12). Hezekiah's disease has been thought to have been the plague, and its fatal nature, as well as the mention of a boil, makes this not improbable. On the other hand, there is no mention of a pestilence among his people at the time, unless we so regard the sudden destruction of Sennacherib's army (2 Kings xx, 1–11). Severe epidemics are the common accompaniments of dense crowding in cities and of famine; and we accordingly often find them mentioned in connection (Lev. xxvi, 25; Jer. xiv, 12; xxix, 18; Matt. xxiv, 7; Luke xxi, 11). But there is no better argument for believing that "pestilence" in these instances means the glandular plague, than the fact of its being at present a prevalent epidemic of the East. It is also remarkable that the Mosaic law, which contains such strict rules for the seclusion of lepers, should have allowed a disease to pass unnoticed, which is above all others the most deadly, and at the same time the most easily checked by sanatory regulations of the same kind. Michaelis endeavors to explain why the Law contained no ordinances about the plague by arguing that, on account of the sudden appearance and brief duration of the disease, no permanent enactments could have been efficient in moderating its ravages, but only such preventive measures as varied according to the ever-varying circumstances of the origin and course of its visitations (*Mos. Recht*, iv, 290). The destruction of Sennacherib's army (2 Kings xix, 35) has also been ascribed to the plague. But—not to insist on the circumstance that this awfully sudden annihilation of 185,000 men is not ascribed to any disease, but to the agency of an angel (since such passages as 2 Sam. xxiv, 15, 16, weaken this objection, and even Josephus understood the cause to be a pestilence, *Ant.* x, 1, 5)—it is impossible that such a mortality could have been produced, in one night, by a disease which spread itself by contagion, like the Oriental plague; and the same remark applies, though in a less degree, to the three days' pestilence in the reign of David (2 Sam. xxiv, 13). There does not seem, therefore, to be any distinct notice of the plague in the Bible, and it is most probable that this can be accounted for by supposing either that no pestilence of antiquity in the East was as marked in character as the modern plague, or that the latter disease then frequently broke out there as an epidemic in crowded cities, instead of following a regular course. See DISEASE.

The disease now called the plague, which has ravaged Egypt and neighboring countries in modern times, is supposed to have prevailed there in former ages. Manetho, the Egyptian historian, speaks of "a very great plague" in the reign of Semempses, the seventh king of the first dynasty, B.C. cir. 2275. The difficulty of determining the character of the pestilences of ancient and mediæval times, even when carefully described, warns us not to conclude that every such mention refers to the plague, especially as the cholera has, since its modern appearance, been almost as severe a scourge to Egypt as the more famous disease, which, indeed, as an epidemic seems there to have been succeeded by it. Moreover, if we admit, as we must, that there have been anciently pestilences very nearly resembling the modern plague, we must still hesitate to pronounce any recorded pestilence to be of this class unless it be described with some distinguishing particulars. The plague in recent times has not extended far beyond the Turkish empire and the kingdom of Persia. It has been asserted that Egypt is its cradle, but this does not seem to be corroborated by the later history of the disease. It is there both sporadic and epidemic; in the first form it has appeared almost annually, in the second at rarer intervals. As an epidemic it takes the character of a pestilence, sometimes of the greatest severity. Our subsequent remarks apply to it in this form. It is a much-vexed question whether it is ever endemic: that such is the case is favored by its rareness since sanitary measures have been enforced. Respecting the causes and origin of plague nothing is known. There cannot be the slightest doubt that it is propagated by absolute contact with, or a very near approach to, the bodies or clothes of persons infected; but we are entirely at a loss to know how it is generated afresh. Extremes of temperature have a decided effect in putting a stop to it; but Dr. Russell observed that in the year 1761 the plague at Aleppo was mild, in 1762 it was severer, and in 1763 it was very fatal; and yet there was no appreciable difference in the respective seasons of these years. In Egypt, the plague commences in autumn, and is regularly put an end to by the heats of summer; and it is even asserted that contaminated goods are also disinfected at this time (see Russegger, *Reisen*, i, 236 sq.; Mariti, *Trav.* p. 199; Prosp. Alp. *Rer. Æg.* i, 19). In Europe the plague disappeared during the winter. This was remarked in all the epidemics except that from 1636 to 1648, called the Great

Plague, on account of its long duration; but even in this instance it abated considerably during the winter. It was a common superstition that the plague abated on St. John's day. The plague when most severe usually appears first on the northern coast of Egypt, having previously broken out in Turkey or North Africa west of Egypt. It ascends the river to Cairo, rarely going much farther. Thus Mr. Lane has observed that the great plague of 1835 "was certainly introduced from Turkey" (*Modern Egyptians*, 5th ed., p. 3, note 1). It was first noticed at Alexandria, ascended to Cairo, and farther to the southern part of Egypt, a few cases having occurred at Thebes; and it "extended throughout the whole of Egypt, though its ravages were not great in the southern parts" (*ibid.*). The mortality is often enormous, and Mr. Lane remarks of the plague just mentioned: "It destroyed not less than eighty thousand persons in Cairo, that is, one third of the population; and far more, I believe, than two hundred thousand in all Egypt" (*ibid.*). When this pestilence visited Egypt, in the summer of 1843, the deaths were not numerous, although, owing to the government's posting a sentry at each house in which any one had died of the disease, to enforce quarantine, there was much concealment, and the number was not accurately known (Mrs. Poole, *Englishwoman in Egypt*, ii, 32–35). Although since then Egypt has been free from this scourge, Bengházî (Hesperides), in the pashalic of Tripoli, was almost depopulated by it during part of the years 1860 and 1861. The most fatal, and at the same time the most general epidemic, was that which ravaged Asia, Africa, and the whole of Europe in the 14th century. It was called by the northern European nations "the Black Death," and by the Italians "la Mortilega Grande"—the great mortality. According to Dr. Hecker, not less than twenty-five millions perished by it in the short space of three years, from 1347 to 1350. Since the commencement of this century Europe has been free from the plague, with the exception of two or three instances. It occurred at Noja, in the kingdom of Naples, in 1815 and 1816; at the Lazaretto of Venice in 1818; in Greifenberg, in Silesia, in 1819. It has not been seen in Great Britain since the great epidemic of 1665, which is stated to have carried off eight thousand in one week. Quarantine was first performed in one of the islands near Venice in 1485. Persons who had been cured of plague in the Lazaretto on one of the adjoining islands were sent there, and all those with whom they had had intercourse, where they were detained forty days. This period was probably fixed upon on account of some medical hypothesis. The fortieth day was regarded as the last day of ardent diseases, and that which separated them from chronic. Forty days constituted the philosophical month of alchemists. Theological, and even legal derivations have also been given. The forty days of the flood; Moses's sojourn on Mount Sinai; our Lord's fast; and, lastly, what is called the "Saxon term" (Sächsische Frist), which also lasts forty days. Bills of health were probably first established in 1507, by a council of health established at Venice during a fatal plague that visited Italy for five years; but they were not generally used until 1665. It is to these great measures that Europe is indebted for its present immunity from this terrible scourge; and it cannot be doubted that but for the callous indifference of the Orientals (which proceeds from their fatalism, love of gain, and ignorance), the same measures would be adopted in the East with the same success (Hecker's *Hist. of the Epidemics of the Middle Ages;* Dr. Brown, art. Plague, in *Cyclop. of Pract. Med.*). See PESTILENCE.

The glandular plague, like the small-pox, is an eruptive fever, and is the most virulent and most contagious disease with which we are acquainted. The eruption consists of buboes, carbuncles, and petechiæ. Buboes are inflamed and swollen glands; and the glands so affected are generally those of the groin, axilla, neck, and the parotid glands. More frequently there are two, three, or even four such tumors. They sometimes subside of themselves; or, what is more commonly the case, they suppurate: and as this process seldom commences before the disease has taken a favorable turn, it is regarded as the cause, but more correctly as a sign, of approaching recovery. A carbuncle is an inflammation of the skin, giving rise to a hard tumor, with pustules or vesicles upon it. It resembles a common boil, but differs from it in this important respect. The carbuncle becomes gangrenous throughout its whole extent, so that when the eschar separates a large deep ulcer is left. Under the term petechiæ are included evanescent spots and streaks of various hues, from a pale blue to a deep purple, which give a marbled appearance to the skin. When such livid streaks occur in the face, they disfigure the countenance so much that a patient can hardly be recognised by his friends. The disease varies so considerably in its symptoms and course that it is impossible to give one description that will suit even the majority of cases. Sometimes the eruption does not appear at all, and even the general symptoms are not of such violence as to lead an ignorant person to suspect the least danger. The patient is suddenly attacked with a loss of strength, a sense of confusion, weight in the head, oppression at the heart, and extreme dejection of spirits. Such cases sometimes terminate fatally within twenty-four hours, and occasionally on the second or third day. Generally, however, the patient is attacked with shivering or coldness, which is soon followed by fever, giddiness, pain in the head, occasionally also by vomiting. Buboes and carbuncles in most cases make their appearance on the first day; and successive eruptions of them are not unusually observed during the course of the disease. There is a peculiar and characteristic muddiness of the eye, which has been described by Dr. Russell as a muddiness and lustre strangely blended together. The fever remits every morning, and increases during the day and night. The vomiting then increases; the tumors become painful; and the patient wanders, and is inclined to stupor. On the morning of the third day, in favorable cases, a sweat breaks out, which produces great relief, and sometimes even proves critical. The exacerbation on the fourth day is more severe than on the preceding ones, and continues intense until it is terminated by the sweat on the morning of the fifth day, which leaves the patient weak, but in every respect relieved. After this the exacerbations become slighter and slighter; and the buboes, advancing favorably to suppuration, little or no fever remains after the beginning of the second week. In other cases, again, the symptoms are far more urgent. Besides vomiting, giddiness, and headache, there is also diarrhœa at the outbreak of the fever. During the night the patient becomes delirious or comatose. The pulse is full and strong; and though the tongue is not dry, the thirst is excessive. The fever abates somewhat on the succeeding morning, but the pulse is frequent, the skin hot and dry, and the patient dejected. As the second day advances, the vomiting and diarrhœa become urgent, the eyes are muddy, the expression of countenance confused, the pulse quick, and sometimes low and fluttering, external heat moderately feverish, or occasionally intense in irregular flushings. There is pain at the heart, burning pain at the pit of the stomach, and incessant restlessness. When to these symptoms are joined faltering of the tongue or loss of speech, and the surface of the body becomes cold or covered with clammy sweats, death is inevitable, although it may still be at some distance. When the patient has been much weakened by the vomiting, diarrhœa, or hemorrhage, the third day proves fatal; but more commonly the disease is prolonged two or three days longer. In this form of plague buboes appear on the second or third day, and sometimes later; but whether they advance towards suppuration or not, they seem to have no effect in hastening or retarding the termination of the disease. Lastly, in some cases, the eruption of bu-

boes and carbuncles constitute the principal symptoms of the disease; and patients are so little indisposed that they are able to go about the streets, or attend to their usual avocations, if not prevented by the inflammation of inguinal tumors. The disease has never been successfully treated, except in isolated cases, or when the epidemic has seemed to have worn itself out. Depletion and stimulants have been tried, as with cholera, and stimulants with far better results.

See Lüdecke, *Beschreib. des türk. Reichs*, p. 62 sq.; Olivier, *Voyage*, vol. i, c. 18; Sonnini, *Reise nach Griechenland*, p. 358 sq.; *Descript. de l'Égypte*, xiii, 81 sq.; Bulard de Mern, *De la Peste Orient.* (Paris, 1839); L'Aubert, *De la Peste, ou Typhus* (ibid. 1840); Russell, *Nat. Hist. of Aleppo*; Clot-Bey, *De la Peste en Égypte* (1840), and *Aperçu général sur l'Égypte*, ii, 348-350. See MEDICINE.

Plagues OF EGYPT (for the use of the Hebrew word, see PLAGUE), the term usually applied to the series of divine visitations of wrath with which Jehovah punished the Egyptians, and especially their king, for their refusal to let Israel go. In considering the history of the Ten Plagues we have to notice the place where they occurred and the occasion on which they were sent, and to examine the narrative of each judgment, with a view to ascertain what it was and in what manner Pharaoh and the Egyptians were punished by it, as well as to see if we can trace any general connection between the several judgments; and we shall thus be prepared to estimate their providential character, as well as to determine how far they were miraculous events, and how far natural or simulated. In this discussion we combine the Scriptural information with that derived from modern investigations. See EGYPT; MOSES.

1. *The History of the Occurrences.*—1. *The Place.*—Although it is distinctly stated that the plagues prevailed throughout Egypt, save, in the case of some, the Israelitish territory, the land of Goshen, yet the descriptions seem principally to apply to that part of Egypt which lay nearest to Goshen, and more especially to "the field of Zoan," or the tract about that city, since it seems almost certain that Pharaoh dwelt in the Delta, and that territory is especially indicated in Psa. lxxviii, 43. That the capital at this time was not more distant is evident from the time in which a message could be sent from Pharaoh to Moses on the occasion of the Exodus. The descriptions of the first and second plagues seem especially to refer to a land abounding in streams and lakes, and so rather to the Lower than to the Upper country. We must therefore look especially to Lower Egypt for our illustrations, while bearing in mind the evident prevalence of the plagues throughout the land.

2. *The Occasion.*—When that Pharaoh who seems to have been the first oppressor was dead, God sent Moses to deliver Israel, commanding him to gather the elders of his people together, and to tell them his commission. It is added, "And they shall hearken to thy voice: and thou shalt come, thou and the elders of Israel, unto the king of Egypt, and ye shall say unto him, The Lord God of the Hebrews hath met with us: and now let us go, we beseech thee, three days' journey into the wilderness, that we may sacrifice to the Lord our God. And I am sure that the king of Egypt will not let you go, no, not by a mighty hand. And I will stretch out my hand, and smite Egypt with all my wonders which I will do in the midst thereof: and after that he will let you go" (Exod. iii, 18-20). From what follows, that the Israelites should borrow jewels and raiment, and "spoil Egypt" (ver. 21, 22), it seems evident that they were to leave as if only for the purpose of sacrificing; but it will be seen that if they did so, Pharaoh, by his armed pursuit and overtaking them when they had encamped at the close of the third day's journey, released Moses from his engagement.

When Moses went to Pharaoh, Aaron went with him, because Moses, not judging himself to be eloquent, was diffident of speaking to Pharaoh. "And Moses said before the Lord, Behold, I [am] of uncircumcised lips, and how shall Pharaoh hearken unto me? And the Lord said unto Moses, See, I have made thee a god to Pharaoh: and Aaron thy brother shall be thy prophet" (Exod. vi, 30; vii, 1; comp. iv, 10-16). We are therefore to understand that even when Moses speaks it is rather by Aaron than himself. It is perhaps worthy of note that in the tradition of the Exodus which Manetho gives, the calamities preceding the event are said to have been caused by the king's consulting an Egyptian prophet; for this suggests a course which Pharaoh is likely to have adopted, rendering it probable that the magicians were sent for as the priests of the gods of the country, so that Moses was exalted by contrast with these vain objects of worship.

It has been asked, What period of time was occupied in the infliction of these successive plagues? In answer to this, some contend for a year; but they have no better reason for this than that it enables them to compare the plagues with certain natural phenomena occurring at fixed seasons of the year in Egypt. This has been done with considerable ingenuity, though not without some rather violent straining in particular cases; but without some better reason than this we should not feel justified in accepting a hypothesis which the general tone of the narrative does not suggest. Each plague, according to the historian, lasted only for a short time; and unless we suppose an interval of several weeks between each, a few months or even weeks would afford sufficient time for the happening of the whole. We may now examine the narrative of each plague.

3. *The Plagues themselves.*—We here notice first a preliminary phenomenon of the same general character with the "plagues." When Moses and Aaron came before Pharaoh a miracle was required of them. Then Aaron's rod became a "serpent" (A. V.), or rather "a crocodile" (תַּנִּין). Its being changed into an animal reverenced by all the Egyptians, or by some of them, would have been an especial warning to Pharaoh. The Egyptian magicians called by the king produced what seemed to be the same wonder, yet Aaron's rod swallowed up the others (vii, 3-12). This passage, taken alone, would appear to indicate that the magicians succeeded in working wonders, but if it is compared with those others relating their opposition on the occasions of the first three plagues, a contrary inference seems more reasonable. In this case the expression "they also did in like manner with their enchantments" (ver. 11) is used, and it is repeated in the cases of their seeming success on the occasions of the first plague (ver. 22), and the second (viii. 7), as well as when they failed on the occasion of the third plague (ver. 18). A comparison with other passages strengthens us in the inference that the magicians succeeded merely by juggling. Yet, even if they were able to produce any real effects by magic, a broad distinction should be drawn between the general and powerful nature of the wonders wrought by the hand of Moses and Aaron and their partial and weak imitations. See MAGIC.

(1.) *The "Plague" of Blood.*—When Pharaoh had refused to let the Israelites go, Moses was sent again, and, on the second refusal, was commanded to smite upon the waters of the river, and to turn them and all the waters of Egypt into blood. The miracle was to be wrought when Pharaoh went forth in the morning to the river. Its general character is very remarkable, for not only was the water of the Nile smitten, but all the water, even that in vessels, throughout the country. The fish died, and the river stank. The Egyptians could not drink of it, and digged around it for water. This plague appears to have lasted seven days, for the account of it ends, "And seven days were fulfilled, after that the Lord had smitten the river" (vii, 13-25), and the narrative of the second plague immediately fol-

lows, as if the other had then ceased. Some difficulty has been occasioned by the mention that the Egyptians digged for water, but it is not stated that they so gained what they sought, although it may be conjectured that only the water that was seen was smitten, in order that the nation should not perish. It appears that the water, when filtered through the soil of the banks, regained its salubrity. This plague was doubly humiliating to the religion of the country, as the Nile was held sacred, as well as some kinds of its fish, not to speak of the crocodiles, which probably were destroyed. It may have been a marked reproof for the cruel edict that the Israelitish children should be drowned, and could scarcely have failed to strike guilty consciences as such, though Pharaoh does not seem to have been alarmed by it. He saw what was probably an imitation wrought by the magicians, who accompanied him, as if he were engaged in some sacred rites, perhaps connected with the worship of the Nile. Events having some resemblance to this are mentioned by ancient writers; the most remarkable is related by Manetho, according to whom it was said that, in the reign of Nephercheres, seventh king of the second dynasty, the Nile flowed mixed with honey for eleven days. Some of the historical notices of the earliest dynasties seem to be of very doubtful authenticity, and Manetho seems to treat this one as a fable, or perhaps as a tradition. Nephercheres, it must be remarked, reigned several hundred years before the Exodus. Those who have endeavored to explain this plague by natural causes have referred to the changes of color to which the Nile is subject, the appearance of the Red Sea, and the so-called rain and dew of blood of the Middle Ages; the last two occasioned by small fungi of very rapid growth. But such theories do not explain why the wonder happened at a time of year when the Nile is most clear, nor why it killed the fish and made the water unfit to be drunk. These are the really weighty points, rather than the change into blood, which seems to mean a change into the semblance of blood. The employment of natural means in effecting a miracle is equally seen in the passage of the Red Sea; but the divine power is proved by the intensifying or extending that means, and the opportune occurrence of the result, and its fitness for a great moral purpose. See NILE.

(2.) *The "Plague" of Frogs.*—When seven days had passed after the smiting of the river, Pharaoh was threatened with another judgment, and, on his refusing to let the Israelites go, the second plague was sent. The river and all the open waters of Egypt brought forth countless frogs, which not only covered the land, but filled the houses, even in their driest parts and vessels, for the ovens and kneading-troughs are specified. The magicians again had a seeming success in their opposition; yet Pharaoh, whose very palaces were filled by the reptiles, entreated Moses to pray that they might be removed, promising to let the Israelites go; but, on the removal of the plague, again hardened his heart (vii, 25; viii, 1–15). This must have been an especially trying judgment to the Egyptians, as frogs were included among the sacred animals, probably not among those which were reverenced throughout Egypt, like the cat, but in the second class of local objects of worship, like the crocodile. The frog was sacred to the goddess Hekt, who is represented with the head of this reptile. In hieroglyphics the frog signifies "very many," "millions," doubtless from its abundance. In the present day frogs abound in Egypt, and in the summer and autumn their loud and incessant croaking in all the waters of the country gives some idea of this plague. They are not, however, heard in the spring, nor is there any record, excepting the Biblical one, of their having been injurious to the inhabitants. It must be added that the supposed cases of the same kind elsewhere, quoted from ancient authors, are of very doubtful authenticity. The species of reptile which was made the instrument of this infliction was probably the small frog of Egypt called by the natives *dofda*, the *Rana Mosaica* of Seetzen (*Reisen*, ii, 245, 350 sq.). See FROG.

(3.) *The "Plague" of Lice.*—The account of the third plague is not preceded by the mention of any warning to Pharaoh. We read that Aaron was commanded to stretch out his rod and smite the dust, which became, as the A. V. reads the word, "lice" in man and beast. The magicians again attempted opposition; but, failing, confessed that the wonder was of God (viii, 16–19). There is much difficulty as to the animals meant by the term כִּנִּם. The Masoretic punctuation in ver. 13, 14 is כִּנָּם, *kinnâm*, which would probably make it a collective noun with ם formative; but the pointing כִּנִּם (ver. 12) and the more decided plural form כִּנִּים, *kinnîm*, also occur (ver. 13, 14; Psa. cv, 31), of which we once find the singular כִּנָּן in Isaiah (li, 6). It is therefore reasonable to conjecture that the first form should be punctuated כִּנָּם, as the defective writing of כִּנִּים; and it should also be observed that the Samaritan has בנים. The Sept. has σκνίφες, and the Vulg. *sciniphes*, mosquitoes, mentioned by Herodotus (ii, 95) and Philo (*De Vita Mosis*, i, 20, p. 97, ed. Mang.) as troublesome in Egypt. Josephus, however, makes the כנם lice (*Ant.* ii, 14, 3), with which Bochart agrees (*Hieroz.* ii, 572 sq.). The etymology is doubtful, and perhaps the word is Egyptian. The narrative does not enable us to decide which is the more probable of the two renderings, except, indeed, that if it be meant that exactly the same kind of animal attacked man and beast, mosquitoes would be the more likely translation. In this case the plague does not seem to be especially directed against the superstitions of the Egyptians; if, however, it were of lice, it would have been most distressing to their priests, who were very cleanly, apparently, like the Moslems, as a religious duty. In the present day both mosquitoes and lice are abundant in Egypt: the latter may be avoided, but there is no escape from the former, which are so distressing an annoyance that an increase of them would render life almost insupportable to beasts as well as men. It is therefore probable that some species of gnat or mosquito is meant. See LICE.

(4.) *The "Plague" of Flies.*—In the case of the fourth plague, as in that of the first, Moses was commanded to meet Pharaoh in the morning as he came forth to the water, and to threaten him with a judgment if he still refused to give the Israelites leave to go and worship. He was to be punished by עָרֹב, *arôb*, which the A. V. renders "swarms [of flies]," "a swarm [of flies]," or, in the margin, "a mixture [of noisome beasts]." These creatures were to cover the people, and fill both the houses and the ground. Here, for the first time, we read that the land of Goshen, where the Israelites dwelt, was to be exempt from the plague. So terrible was it that Pharaoh granted permission for the Israelites to sacrifice in the land, which Moses refused to do, as the Egyptians would stone his people for sacrificing their "abomination." Then Pharaoh gave them leave to sacrifice in the wilderness, provided they did not go far; but on the plague being removed broke his agreement (viii, 20–32). The proper meaning of the word עָרֹב is a question of extreme difficulty. The explanation of Josephus (*Ant.* ii, 14, 3), and almost all the Hebrew commentators, is that it means "a mixture," and here designates a mixture of wild animals, in accordance with the derivation from the root עָרַב, "he mixed." Similarly, Jerome renders it *omne genus muscarum*, and Aquila πάμμυια. The Sept., however, and Philo (*De Vita Mosis*, i, 23; ii, 101, ed. Mang.) suppose it to be a dog-fly, κυνόμυια. The second of these explanations seems to be a compromise between the first and the third. It is almost certain, from two passages (Exod. viii, 29, 31; Hebrew, 25, 27), that a single creature is intended. If so, what reason is there in favor of the

Sept. rendering? Oedmann (*Verm. Sammlungen*, ii, 150, ap. Gesen. *Thesaur.* s. v.) proposes the *blatta orientalis*, a kind of beetle, instead of a dog-fly; but Gesenius objects that this creature devours things rather than stings men, whereas it is evident that the animal of this plague attacked or at least annoyed men, besides apparently injuring the land. From Psa. lxxviii, 45, where we read, "He sent the עָרֹב, which devoured them," it must have been a creature of devouring habits, as is observed by Kalisch (*Comment. on Exod.* p. 138), who supports the theory that a beetle is intended. The Egyptian language might be hoped to give us a clew to the rendering of the Sept. and Philo. In hieroglyphics a fly is *af*, and a bee *sheb*, or *kheb*, *sh* and *kh* being interchangeable in different dialects; and in Coptic these two words are confounded in *aaf*, *af*, *ab*, *haf*, meaning *musca*, *apis*, *scarabæus*. We can therefore only judge from the description of the plague; and here Gesenius seems to have too hastily decided against the rendering "beetle," since the beetle sometimes attacks men. Yet modern experience does not bear out the idea that any kind of beetle is injurious to man in Egypt; but there is a kind of gadfly found in that country which sometimes stings men, though usually attacking beasts. The difficulty, however, in the way of the supposition that a stinging fly is meant is that all such flies are, like this one, plagues to beasts rather than men; and if we conjecture that a fly is intended, perhaps it is more reasonable to infer that it was the common fly, which in the present day is probably the most troublesome insect in Egypt. That this was a more severe plague than those preceding it appears from its effect on Pharaoh, rather than from the mention of the exemption of the Israelites, for it can scarcely be supposed that the earlier plagues affected them. As we do not know what creature is here intended, we cannot say if there were any reference in this case to the Egyptian religion. Those who suppose it to have been a beetle might draw attention to the great reverence in which that insect was held among the sacred animals, and the consequent distress that the Egyptians would have felt at destroying it, even if they did so unintentionally. As already noticed, no insect is now so troublesome in Egypt as the common fly, and this is not the case with any kind of beetle, which fact, from our general conclusions, will be seen to favor the evidence for the former. In the hot season the flies not only cover the food and drink, but they torment the people by settling on their faces, and especially round their eyes, thus promoting ophthalmia. See FLY.

(5.) *The "Plague" of the Murrain of Beasts.*—Pharaoh was next warned that, if he did not let the people go, there should be on the day following "a very grievous murrain," upon the horses, asses, camels, oxen, and sheep of Egypt, whereas those of the children of Israel should not die. This came to pass, and we read that "all the cattle of Egypt died: but of the cattle of the children of Israel died not one." Yet Pharaoh still continued obstinate (Exod. ix, 1–7). It is to be observed that the expression "all the cattle" cannot be understood to be universal, but only general, for the narrative of the plague of hail shows that there were still at a later time some cattle left, and that the want of universal terms in Hebrew explains this seeming difficulty. The mention of camels is important, since it appears to favor our opinion that the Pharaoh of the Exodus was a foreigner, camels apparently not having been kept by the Egyptians of the time of the Pharaohs. This plague would have been a heavy punishment to the Egyptians as falling upon their sacred animals of two of the kinds specified, the oxen and the sheep; but it would have been most felt in the destruction of the greatest part of their useful beasts. In modern times murrain is not an unfrequent visitation in Egypt, and is supposed to precede the plague. A very severe murrain occurred in that country in 1842, which lasted nine months, during the latter half of that year and the spring of the following one, and was succeeded by the plague, as had been anticipated (Mrs. Poole, *English-woman in Egypt*, ii, 32; i, 59, 114). "'A very grievous murrain,' forcibly reminding us of that which visited this same country in the days of Moses, has prevailed during the last three months"—the letter is dated Oct. 18, 1842—"and the already distressed peasants feel the calamity severely, or rather (I should say) the few who possess cattle. Among the rich men of the country the loss has been enormous. During our voyage up the Nile," in the July preceding, "we observed several dead cows and buffaloes lying in the river, as I mentioned in a former letter; and some friends who followed us, two months after, saw many on the banks; indeed up to this time great numbers of cattle are dying in every part of the country" (*ibid.* i, 114, 115). The similarity of the calamity in character is remarkably in contrast with its difference in duration: the miraculous murrain seems to have been as sudden and nearly as brief as the destruction of the first-born (though far less terrible), and to have therefore produced, on ceasing, less effect than other plagues upon Pharaoh, nothing remaining to be removed. See MURRAIN.

(6.) *The "Plague" of Boils.*—The next judgment appears to have been preceded by no warning, except, indeed, that when Moses publicly sent it abroad in Egypt, Pharaoh might no doubt have repented at the last moment. We read that Moses and Aaron were to take ashes of the furnace, and Moses was to "sprinkle it toward the heavens in the sight of Pharaoh." It was to become "small dust" throughout Egypt, and "be a boil breaking forth [with] blains upon man and upon beast." This accordingly came to pass. The magicians now once more seem to have attempted opposition, for it is related that they "could not stand before Moses because of the boil; for the boil was upon the magicians, and upon all the Egyptians." Notwithstanding, Pharaoh still refused to let the Israelites go (Exod. ix, 8–12). This plague may be supposed to have been either an infliction of boils, or a pestilence like the plague of modern times, which is an extremely severe kind of typhus fever, accompanied by swellings. See PLAGUE. The former is, however, the more likely explanation, since, if the plague had been of the latter nature, it probably would have been less severe than the ordinary pestilence of Egypt has been in this 19th century, whereas with other plagues which can be illustrated from the present phenomena of Egypt the reverse is the case. That this plague followed that of the murrain seems, however, an argument on the other side, and it may be asked whether it is not likely that the great pestilence of the country, probably known in antiquity, would have been one of the ten plagues; but to this it may be replied that it is more probable, and in accordance with the whole narrative, that extraordinary and unexpected wonders should be effected than what could be paralleled in the history of Egypt. The tenth plague, moreover, is so much like the great Egyptian disease in its suddenness, that it might rather be compared to it if it were not so wholly miraculous in every respect as to be beyond the reach of human inquiry. The position of the magicians must be noticed as indicative of the gradation of the plagues: at first they succeeded, as we suppose, by deception, in imitating what was wrought by Moses, then they failed, and acknowledged the finger of God in the wonders of the Hebrew prophet, and at last they could not even stand before him, being themselves smitten by the plague he was commissioned to send. The boil (שְׁחִין, *shechin*) was a scab or pustule, which might or might not break out into an ulcerous sore (Lev. xiii, 18 sq.). With this, in one of its worst forms, Job was afflicted (ii, 7), and by this Hezekiah was brought to the verge of the grave (2 Kings xx, 7; Isa. xxxviii, 21): it was an eruption of a very painful kind, accompanied with a burning itch, and

tending to produce a permanent state of foul and wasting disease. One species of it which seized upon the legs and knees, and was regarded as incurable, was peculiar to Egypt, and was hence called "the botch of Egypt" (Deut. xxviii, 27, 35). In the case before us, this eruption had a tendency to break out into larger swellings (אַנְעֻבַּעַת, from unused בּוּעַ, *to boil up, to swell*), and became probably the disease called elephantiasis, a disease said to be peculiar to Egypt, or the black leprosy, a disease which also affects cattle under the name of *melandria* (Jahn, *Archäol.* I, i, 381 sq.). It was something evidently more severe and deadly than the endemic Nile-fever, or eruption which visits Egypt periodically about the time of the overflowing of the Nile, and with which some writers would identify it. See Boil.

(7.) *The "Plague" of Hail.*—The account of the seventh plague is preceded by a warning, which Moses was commanded to deliver to Pharaoh, respecting the terrible nature of the plagues that were to ensue if he remained obstinate. First of all of the hail it is said, "Behold, to-morrow about this time I will cause it to rain a very grievous hail, such as hath not been in Egypt since the foundation thereof even until now." He was then told to collect his cattle and men into shelter, for everything hailed upon should die. Accordingly, such of Pharaoh's servants as "feared the Lord," brought in their servants and cattle from the field. We read that "Moses stretched forth his rod toward heaven: and the Lord sent thunder and hail, and the fire ran along upon the ground." Thus man and beast were smitten, and the herbs and every tree broken, save in the land of Goshen. Upon this Pharaoh acknowledged his wickedness and that of his people, and the righteousness of God, and promised if the plague were withdrawn to let the Israelites go. Then Moses went forth from the city, and spread out his hands, and the plague ceased, when Pharaoh, supported by his servants, again broke his promise (Exod. ix, 13–35). The character of this and the following plagues must be carefully examined, as the warning seems to indicate an important turning-point. The ruin caused by the hail was evidently far greater than that effected by any of the earlier plagues; it destroyed men, which those others seem not to have done, and not only men, but beasts and the produce of the earth. In this case Moses, while addressing Pharaoh, openly warns his servants how to save something from the calamity. Pharaoh for the first time acknowledges his wickedness. We also learn that his people joined with him in the oppression, and that at this time he dwelt in a city. Hail is now extremely rare, but not unknown, in Egypt, and it is interesting that the narrative seems to imply that it sometimes falls there. Thunder-storms occur, but, though very loud and accompanied by rain and wind, they rarely do serious injury. Those long resident in Egypt do not remember to have heard while there of a person struck by lightning, nor of any ruin excepting that of decayed buildings washed down by rain. See Hail.

(8.) *The "Plague" of Locusts.*—Pharaoh was now threatened with a plague of locusts, to begin the next day, by which everything the hail had left was to be devoured. This was to exceed any like visitations that had happened in the time of the king's ancestors. At last Pharaoh's own servants, who had before supported him, remonstrated, for we read, "And Pharaoh's servants said unto him, How long shall this man be a snare unto us? let the men go, that they may serve the Lord their God: knowest thou not yet that Egypt is destroyed?" They suggested a compromise with Moses, proposing that the *men* should be allowed to go with him to offer sacrifice to Jehovah in the wilderness, while by retaining the females they made sure of the men's returning to their servitude. Then Pharaoh sent for Moses and Aaron, and offered to let the people go, but refused when they required that all should go, even with their flocks and herds. "And Moses stretched forth his rod over the land of Egypt, and the Lord brought an east wind upon the land all that day, and all [that] night; [and] when it was morning the east wind brought the locusts. And the locusts went up over all the land of Egypt, and rested in all the coasts of Egypt: very grievous [were they]; before them there were no such locusts as they, neither after them shall be such. For they covered the face of the whole earth, so that the land was darkened; and they did eat every herb of the land, and all the fruit of the trees which the hail had left: and there remained not any green thing in the trees, or in the herbs of the field, through all the land of Eygpt." Then Pharaoh hastily sent for Moses and Aaron, and confessed his sin against God and the Israelites, and begged them to forgive him: "Now, therefore, forgive, I pray thee, my sin only this once, and entreat the Lord your God that he may take away from me this death only." Moses accordingly prayed. "And the Lord turned a mighty strong west wind, which took away the locusts, and cast them into the Red Sea; there remained not one locust in all the coasts of Egypt." The plague being removed, Pharaoh again would not let the people go (x, 1–20). This plague has not the unusual nature of the one that preceded it, but it even exceeds it in severity, and so occupies its place in the gradation of the more terrible judgments that form the later part of the series. Its severity can be well understood by those who have been in Egypt in a part of the country where a flight of locusts has alighted. In this case the plague was greater than an ordinary visitation, since it extended over a far wider space, rather than because it was more intense; for it is impossible to imagine any more complete destruction than that always caused by a swarm of locusts. So well did the people of Egypt know what these creatures effected, that when their coming was threatened Pharaoh's servants at once remonstrated. In the present day locusts suddenly appear in the cultivated land, coming from the desert in a column of great length. They fly rapidly across the country, darkening the air with their compact ranks, which are undisturbed by the constant attacks of kites, crows, and vultures, and making a strange whizzing sound like that of fire, or many distant wheels. Where they alight they devour every green thing, even stripping the trees of their leaves. Rewards are offered for their destruction, but no labor can seriously reduce their numbers. Soon they continue their course, and disappear gradually in a short time, leaving the place where they have been a desert. The following careful description of the effects of a flight of locusts is from Mr. Lane's manuscript notes. He writes of Nubia:

"Locusts not unfrequently commit dreadful havoc in this country. In my second voyage up the Nile, when before the village of Bustán, a little above Ibrîm, many locusts pitched upon the boat. They were beautifully variegated, yellow and blue. In the following night a southerly wind brought other locusts in immense swarms. Next morning the air was darkened by them, as by a heavy fall of snow; and the surface of the ground was thickly scattered over by those which had fallen and were unable to rise again. Great numbers came upon and within the boat, and alighted upon our persons. They were different from those of the preceding day, being of a bright yellow color, with brown marks. The desolation they made was dreadful. In four hours a field of young durrah [millet] was cropped to the ground. In another field of durrah more advanced only the stalks were left. Nowhere was there space on the ground to set the foot without treading on many. A field of cotton-plants was quite stripped. Even the acacias along the banks were made bare, and palm-trees were stripped of the fruit and leaves. Last night we heard the creaking of the sákiyehs [water-wheels], and the singing of women driving the cows which turned them: to-day not one sákiyeh was in motion, and the women were going about howling, and vainly attempting to frighten away the locusts. On the preceding day I had preserved two of the more beautiful kind of these creatures with a solution of arsenic: on the next day some of the other locusts *ate* them almost entirely, poisoned as they were, unseen by me till they had nearly finished their meal. On the third day they were less numerous, and gradually disappeared. Locusts are

eaten by most of the Bedawin of Arabia, and by some of the Nubians. We ate a few, dressed in the most approved manner, being stripped of the legs, wings, and head, and fried in butter. They had a flavor somewhat like that of the woodcock, owing to their food. The Arabs preserve them as a common article of provision by parboiling them in salt and water, and then drying them in the sun."

The parallel passages in the prophecy of Joel form a remarkable commentary on the description of the plague in Exodus, and a few must be here quoted, for they describe with wonderful exactness and vigor the devastations of a swarm of locusts: "Blow ye the trumpet in Zion, and sound an alarm in my holy mountain: let all the inhabitants of the land tremble: for the day of the Lord cometh, for [it is] nigh at hand; a day of darkness and of gloominess, a day of clouds and of thick darkness, as the morning spread upon the mountains: a great people and a strong; there hath not been ever the like, neither shall be any more after it, [even] to the years of many generations. A fire devoureth before them; and behind them a flame burneth: the land [is] as the garden of Eden before them, and behind them a desolate wilderness; yea, and nothing shall escape them. The appearance of them [is] as the appearance of horses; and as horsemen, so shall they run. Like the noise of chariots on the tops of mountains shall they leap, like the noise of a flame of fire that devoureth the stubble, as a strong people set in battle array. . . . They shall run like mighty men; they shall climb the wall like men of war; and they shall march every one on his ways, and they shall not break their ranks. . . . The earth shall quake before them; the heavens shall tremble: the sun and the moon shall be dark, and the stars shall withdraw their shining" (ii, 1–5, 7, 10; see also 6, 8, 9, 11–25; Rev. ix, 1–12). Here, and probably also in the parallel passage of Revelation, locusts are taken as a type of a destroying army or horde, since they are more terrible in the devastation they cause than any other creatures. See LOCUST.

(9.) *The "Plague" of Darkness.*—After the plague of locusts we read at once of a fresh judgment: "And the Lord said unto Moses, Stretch out thine hand toward heaven, that there may be darkness over the land of Egypt, that [one] may feel darkness. And Moses stretched forth his hand toward heaven; and there was a thick darkness in all the land of Egypt three days: they saw not one another, neither rose any from his place for three days: but all the children of Israel had light in their dwellings." Pharaoh then gave the Israelites leave to go if only they left their cattle; but when Moses required that they should take these also, he again refused (Exod. x, 21–29). The expression we have rendered "that [one] may feel darkness," according to the A. V. in the margin, where in the text the freer translation "darkness [which] may be felt" is given, has occasioned much difficulty. The Sept. and Vulg. give this rendering, and the moderns generally follow them. It has been proposed to read "and they shall grope in darkness," by a slight change of rendering, and the supposition that the particle בּ is understood (Kalisch, *Comment. on Exod.* p. 171). It is unreasonable to argue that the forcible words of the A. V. are too strong for Shemitic phraseology. The difficulty is, however, rather to be solved by a consideration of the nature of the plague. It has been illustrated by reference to the simûm and the hot wind of the khamsîn. The former is a sandstorm which occurs in the desert, seldom lasting, according to Mr. Lane, more than a quarter of an hour or twenty minutes (*Mod. Eg.* 5th ed. p. 2); but for the time often causing the darkness of twilight, and affecting man and beast. Mrs. Poole, on Mr. Lane's authority, has described the simûm as follows:

"The 'simûm,' which is a very violent, hot, and almost suffocating wind, is of more rare occurrence than the khamsîn winds, and of shorter duration; its continuance being more brief in proportion to the intensity of its parching heat and the impetuosity of its course. Its direction is generally from the south-east, or south-south-east. It is commonly preceded by a fearful calm. As it approaches, the atmosphere assumes a yellowish hue, tinged with red; the sun appears of a deep blood color, and gradually becomes quite concealed before the hot blast is felt in its full violence. The sand and dust raised by the wind add to the gloom, and increase the painful effects of the heat and rarity of the air. Respiration becomes uneasy, perspiration seems to be entirely stopped; the tongue is dry, the skin parched, and a pricking sensation is experienced, as if caused by electric sparks. It is sometimes impossible for a person to remain erect, on account of the force of the wind; and the sand and dust oblige all who are exposed to it to keep their eyes closed. It is, however, most distressing when it overtakes travellers in the desert. My brother encountered at Kûs, in Upper Egypt, a simûm which was said to be one of the most violent ever witnessed. It lasted less than half an hour, and a very violent simûm seldom continues longer. My brother is of opinion that, although it is extremely distressing, it can never prove fatal, unless to persons already brought almost to the point of death by disease, fatigue, thirst, or some other cause. The poor camel seems to suffer from it equally with his master; and will often lie down with his back to the wind, close his eyes, stretch out his long neck upon the ground, and so remain until the storm has passed over" (*Englishwoman in Egypt*, i, 96, 97).

The hot wind of the khamsîn usually blows for three days and nights, and carries so much sand with it that it produces the appearance of a yellow fog. It thus resembles the simûm, though far less powerful and far less distressing in its effects. It is not known to cause actual darkness; at least residents in Egypt mention no example either on experience or hearsay evidence. By a confusion of the simûm and the khamsîn wind it has even been supposed that a simûm in its utmost violence usually lasts three days (Kalisch, *Comment. on Exod.* p. 170), but this is an error. The plague may, however, have been an extremely severe sandstorm, miraculous in its violence and its duration, for the length of three days does not make it natural, since the severe storms are always very brief. Perhaps the three days was the limit, as about the longest period that the people could exist without leaving their houses. It has been supposed that this plague rather caused a supernatural terror than actual suffering and loss, but this is by no means certain. The impossibility of moving about, and the natural fear of darkness which affects beasts and birds as well as men, as in a total eclipse, would have caused suffering; and if the plague were a sandstorm of unequalled severity, it would have produced the conditions of fever by its parching heat, besides causing much distress of other kinds. An evidence in favor of the wholly supernatural character of this plague is its preceding the last judgment of all, the death of the first-born, as if it were a terrible foreshadowing of that great calamity. See SIMÛM.

(10.) *The Death of the First-born.*—Before the tenth plague Moses went to warn Pharaoh: "And Moses said, Thus saith the Lord, About midnight will I go out into the midst of Egypt: and all the first-born in the land of Egypt shall die, from the first-born of Pharaoh that sitteth upon his throne, even unto the first-born of the maidservant that [is] behind the mill; and all the first-born of beasts. And there shall be a great cry throughout all the land of Egypt, such as there was none like it, nor shall be like it any more." He then foretold that Pharaoh's servants would pray him to go forth. Positive as is this declaration, it seems to have been a conditional warning, for we read, "And he went out from Pharaoh in heat of anger," and it is added that God said that Pharaoh would not hearken to Moses, and that the king of Egypt still refused to let Israel go (Exod. xi, 4, 10). The Passover was then instituted, and the houses of the Israelites sprinkled with the blood of the victims. The first-born of the Egyptians were smitten at midnight, as Moses had forewarned Pharaoh. "And Pharaoh rose up in the night, he, and all his servants, and all the Egyptians; and there was a great cry in Egypt; for [there was] not a house where [there was] not one dead" (xii, 30). The clearly miraculous nature of this plague, in its severity, its falling upon man and beast, and the singling out of the first-born

puts it wholly beyond comparison with any natural pestilence, even the severest recorded in history, whether of the peculiar Egyptian plague, or other like epidemics. The Bible affords a parallel in the smiting of Sennacherib's army, and still more closely in some of the punishments of murmurers in the wilderness. The prevailing customs of Egypt furnish a curious illustration of the narrative of this plague. It is well known that many ancient Egyptian customs are yet observed. Among these one of the most prominent is the wailing for the dead by the women of the household, as well as those hired to mourn. It was thus in the great cholera of 1848 at Cairo. This pestilence, as we all know, frequently follows the course of rivers. Thus, on that occasion, it ascended the Nile, and showed itself in great strength at Bulák, the port of Cairo, distant from the city about a mile and a half to the westward. For some days it did not traverse this space. Every evening at sunset it is the custom to go up to the terrace on the roof of the house. There, in that calm, still time, might be heard each night the wail of the women of Bulák for their dead borne along in a great wave of sound a distance of two miles, the lamentation of a city stricken with pestilence. So, when the first-born were smitten, "there was a great cry in Egypt." See FIRST-BORN.

The history of the ten plagues strictly ends with the death of the first-born. The pursuit and the passage of the Red Sea are discussed elsewhere. See RED SEA, PASSAGE OF. Here it is only necessary to notice that with the event last mentioned the recital of the wonders wrought in Egypt concludes, and the history of Israel as a separate people begins. See EXODE.

II. *General Considerations.*—Having examined the narrative of the ten plagues in detail, we can now speak of their character and relations as a whole.

1. *Miraculous Nature of the Inflictions.*—In the above account we have constantly kept in view the arguments of those who hold that the plagues were not miraculous, and, while fully admitting all the illustration that the physical history of Egypt has afforded us, both in our own observation and the observation of others, we have found no reason for the naturalistic view in a single instance, while in many instances the illustrations from known phenomena have been so different as to bring out the miraculous element in the narrative with the greatest force, and in every case that element has been necessary, unless the narrative be deprived of its rights as historical evidence. Yet more, we have found that the advocates of a naturalistic explanation have been forced by their bias into a distortion and exaggeration of natural phenomena in their endeavor to find in them an explanation of the wonders recorded in the Bible. As miraculous the historian obviously intends us to regard them, and they are elsewhere spoken of as the "wonders" (מופתים) which God wrought in the land of Ham (Psa. cv, 27), as his miracles (נפלאותיו) in Egypt (cvi, 7), as his signs and prodigies (אתות ומפתים) which he sent into the midst of Egypt (cxxxv, 9), etc. It is only under this aspect that we can accept the narrative as historical. It is true that many of them appear to have been of the same kind with phenomena natural to the country; but this cannot be said of all of them; and in the case of those of which it can be said, the presence of the supernatural is seen not only in the unparalleled degree to which the infliction reached, but still more in the complete command which was exercised by Moses as the agent of Jehovah over the coming and going of the visitation. The exemption of the Israelites from the general calamity is also clearly assigned to the miraculous. The only alternative, therefore, allowed to us is to reject the whole narrative as mythic, or to accept it as miraculous. The attempts made by Eichhorn and the older rationalists to give natural explanations of these plagues, only exhibit the deplorable expedients to which an unsound hypothesis may compel able men to resort. They were evidently nearly all miraculous in time of occurrence and degree rather than essentially, in accordance with the theory that God generally employs natural means in producing miraculous effects. They seem to have been sent as a series of warnings, each being somewhat more severe than its predecessor, to which we see an analogy in the warnings which the providential government of the world often puts before the sinner. The first plague corrupted the sweet water of the Nile and slew the fish. The second filled the land with frogs, which corrupted the whole country. The third covered man and beast with vermin or other annoying insects. The fourth was of the same kind, and probably a yet severer judgment. With the fifth plague, the murrain of beasts, a loss of property began. The sixth, the plague of boils, was worse than the earlier plagues that had affected man and beast. The seventh plague, that of hail, exceeded those that went before it, since it destroyed everything in the field, man and beast and herb. The eighth plague was evidently still more grievous, since the devastation by locusts must have been far more thorough than that by the hail, and since at that time no greater calamity of the kind could have happened than the destruction of all remaining vegetable food. The ninth plague we do not sufficiently understand to be sure that it exceeded this in actual injury, but it is clear from the narrative that it must have caused great terror. The last plague is the only one that was general in the destruction of human life, for the effects of the hail cannot have been comparable to those it produced, and it completes the climax, unless indeed it be held that the passage of the Red Sea was the crowning point of the whole series of wonders, rather than a separate miracle. In this case its magnitude, as publicly destroying the king and his whole army, might even surpass that of the tenth plague.

2. *Their Historical Character.*—These events, though supernatural, all find a foundation in the natural phenomena of Egypt, and stand in close connection with ordinary occurrences. Hence the rationalist Bohlen says that "Moses, in order to avoid the suspicion of self-deception, was at least obliged to express himself in the mildest manner possible among his contemporaries, who were so well acquainted with Egypt, if he wished to make the commonly observed natural phenomena avail as miracles." To this remark Hengstenberg replies (*Egypt and the Books of Moses*, in English, Edinb. 1851):

"But it is perfectly clear that these occurrences, as they are related, notwithstanding their foundation in nature, always maintained their character as miracles, and consequently are sufficient to prove what they are intended to prove, and to accomplish what they did accomplish. Indeed, the unusual force in which the common exhibitions of nature here manifest themselves, and especially their rapid succession, while at other times only a single one exhibits itself with unusual intensity—if we at the same time consider these events in connection with the changing cause of them, and also take into account the exemption of the land of Goshen—bring us to the limits of the miraculous; for the transition to the miraculous is reached through the extraordinary in its highest gradation. But we are brought into the sphere of the miraculous itself, by the circumstance that these things are introduced and performed by Moses, that they cease at his request, and a part of them at a time fixed upon by Pharaoh himself (Exod. viii, 5 sq.). Hence the connection with natural phenomena can be made to avail against the Pentateuch only when, going beyond the present narrative, we limit what in it can be explained by the natural occurrences of Egypt, and establish the presumption that the remainder belongs to fiction. But this assumption wants all foundation. The supernatural presents generally, in the Scriptures, no violent opposition to the natural, but rather unites in a friendly alliance with it. This follows from the most intimate relation in which natural events also stand to God. The endeavor to isolate the miraculous can aid only impiety. But there was here a particular reason also for uniting the supernatural as closely as possible with the natural. The object to which all of these occurrences were directed, according to Exod. viii, 20, was to show that Jehovah is Lord in the midst of the land. Well-grounded proof of this could not have been produced by bringing suddenly upon Egypt a suc-

cession of strange terrors. From these it would only have followed that Jehovah had received a momentary and external power over Egypt. On the contrary, if their annual return were placed under the immediate control of Jehovah, it would be appropriately shown that he was God in the midst of the land, and the doom of the false gods which had been placed in his stead would go forth, and they would be entirely driven out of the jurisdiction which was considered as belonging to them."

Some objectors have affected to throw discredit upon the Mosaic narrative by remarking that no traces of any allusion to these plagues of the Egyptians are discoverable upon the monuments of that country. To this the reply is easy. The monuments in question were reared under the superintendence of the heathen priesthood, and miracles such as these were too humbling to their pride, and too destructive of their influence with the people, to render it likely that they would allow them to be recorded in any manner. Victories, triumphs, religious processions, and whatever was calculated to exalt the gods and kings in the minds of the people, were the only subjects permitted to be sculptured on the walls of the temples; and the usages of domestic life furnish the subjects of the paintings of the tombs. In the examination we have made it will have been seen that the Biblical narrative has been illustrated by reference to the phenomena of Egypt and the manners of the inhabitants, and that, throughout, its accuracy in minute particulars has been remarkably shown, to a degree that is sufficient of itself to prove its historical truth. This in a narrative of wonders is of no small importance. See Moses.

3. *The Egyptian Counterfeits.*—Of the deeds performed by Moses some were imitated by the magicians of the Pharaoh. To account for this, various hypotheses have been resorted to. 1. It has been supposed that they were enabled to do this by diabolic aid. But this assumes the position that men can enter into agreement or compact with evil spirits so as to receive their aid—a position which has never been proved, and consequently cannot be legitimately assumed to explain an actual phenomenon. This hypothesis assumes also that evil spirits can work miracles, a position no less gratuitous and improbable. 2. It has been maintained that the magicians were aided by God to do what they did; that they were instruments in his hand, as was the witch who raised Samuel, and were therefore as much surprised at their own success as she was; and that God thus employed them probably to show in the most decisive manner that the agency at work was his, and that it was just as he gave the power or withheld it that the miracle was performed. For this hypothesis there is much to be said. At the same time it is open to objection, for—(1) While Moses distinctly asserts that it was by divine power that he and Aaron wrought, he never hints, even in the most distant way, that it was by this that the magicians succeeded in their attempts; and (2) It is expressly said, on the contrary, that what they did they did by means of their "enchantments." The word here used (לָחַשׁ) means a secret art—hence magical arts, enchantments; and may be properly used to designate the covert tricks or juggling artifices by which practicers of legerdemain impose upon others. This leads to the 3d hypothesis, which is that the achievements of the magicians were merely clever tricks by which they imposed upon the people, and tended to confirm the Pharaoh in his obduracy. This hypothesis has in its favor the fact that the magicians of Egypt, and of the East generally, have always, down to our own day, possessed an unparalleled and almost incredible dexterity in artificial magic (see Lane, *Modern Egyptians*, p. 352 sq.). It is to be borne in mind, also, that in the cases before us these magicians were allowed time to *prepare* themselves, and to go through those introductory *processes* by means of which jugglers mainly succeed in cheating the beholders; and, moreover, it is important to keep in view that they performed before witnesses who were interested in believing in their success. Above all, in the three feats in which they succeeded, there was really nothing but what the jugglers of the present day could easily do. The jugglers of India will, for a few pence, do tricks with serpents far more wonderful than making them rigid so as to resemble staves; and any juggler could make water in a basin or a tank resemble blood, or, when the country was already swarming with frogs, could cover some place that had been cleared for the purpose with these reptiles, as if he had suddenly produced them. The performances of these magicians are really below par as compared with those which may be witnessed in the room of any travelling conjurer among ourselves. Let it be noted, also, that they failed as soon as they were required to perform the miracle on the instant, as in the case of the plague of lice, for their attempts to imitate which no time was allowed; and as a consequence of this it is emphatically said, "they could not." When to all this it is added that they were impotent not only to remove the infliction, but even to exempt themselves from it, there seems abundant reason for concluding that these magicians attained to nothing beyond the performance of a few successful tricks (Scot, *Congregational Lecture*, p. 210–226; Wardlaw, *On Miracles*, p. 231 sq.). See Jannes and Jambres.

4. *The Design of these Inflictions.*—This is a most important inquiry. That their ultimate object was the effecting of the liberation of the Israelites from their cruel bondage lies on the surface of the narrative; but with this there may have been, and probably were, other ends contemplated. We may suppose—1. That God designed to produce an effect on the mind of Moses himself, tending to educate and discipline him for the great work on which he was about to enter—the conduct and rule of the people during their passage through the wilderness. For such a task great fortitude and implicit confidence in the power and majesty of Jehovah were required; and as Moses, timid at first, and ready to retire on the first rebuff, gradually acquired courage and determination as the manifestations of God's power in the chastisements inflicted on the Pharaoh and his land proceeded, it is very probable that the series of inflictions of which he was the instrument were designed to confirm him in faith, obedience, and confidence, and so fit him for his great work. 2. We may suppose that a salutary effect was intended to be produced on the minds of the Israelites, the mass of whom had, under their long protracted debasement, sunk low in religious and intellectual life. The marvellous manner in which God interposed for their deliverance, and the mighty power by which he brought them forth, could not but arouse them to thought, and elevate and quicken their religious emotions. 3. It appears that a salutary religious effect was produced on many of the Egyptians themselves, as is evidenced by the multitudes who united themselves to the Israelites when they made their escape; and also on the surrounding nations, as is attested by Jethro, the father-in-law of Moses (Exod. xviii, 10, 11). We may presume, therefore, that this also was part of the design of these inflictions, especially as we find God expressly declaring to Moses that these judgments were intended to make the Egyptians know that he was God (vii, 5). 4. But these ends were included in the great end of demonstrating the vanity of those idols in which the Egyptians trusted. "Against all the gods of Egypt," said the Lord to Moses, "I will execute judgment: I am Jehovah" (xii, 12). On these idols God would pour contempt; and in connection with this it is noticeable that nearly every miracle performed by Moses had relation to some object of idolatrous worship among the Egyptians. The devouring of the serpents by the serpent into which the rod of Moses had been turned was directed against the serpent-worship of Egypt; the turning of the water into blood was an assault on their sacred river the Nile; the plague of the

frogs, the gnats, the flies or scarabei, all tended to bring objects of idolatrous worship among the Egyptians into contempt; the murrain on the cattle was directed against their Apis-worship; the plague of boils, brought on by the casting of ashes from the altar into the air, a rite which they followed to arrest evil, showed how God could reverse their omens, and make what they used for good to turn to evil; the hail and storm plague was directed against their worship of the elements, or of deities supposed to preside over them; the plague of locusts showed that this great scourge which they were accustomed to trace to the wrath of their deities was entirely in the power of Jehovah; the plague of darkness poured contempt on their worship of the sun-god; and the death of the first-born wound up this terrible series by showing that in the hand of Jehovah alone was the life of all his creatures. A mighty and memorable lesson was thus read out before both Egyptians and Israelites, which could not but have its effect in weakening among the former the attachment of many to their idols, and confirming the latter in their reverence for Jehovah as the only true God. 5. The gradual increase in severity and frequent remission of the plagues are perhaps the best key to their meaning as to the king of Egypt himself. They seem to have been sent as warnings to the oppressor, to afford him a means of seeing God's will and an opportunity of repenting before Egypt was ruined. It is true that the hardening of Pharaoh's heart is a mystery which St. Paul leaves unexplained, answering the objector, "Nay but, O man, who art thou that repliest against God?" (Rom. ix, 20). Yet the apostle is arguing that we have no right to question God's righteousness for not having mercy on all, and speaks of his long-suffering towards the wicked. The lesson that Pharaoh's career teaches us seems to be that there are men whom the most signal judgments do not affect so as to cause any lasting repentance. In this respect the after-history of the Jewish people is a commentary upon that of their oppressor. The "hardening" of Pharaoh's heart was evidently nothing more than that permissive act of providence by which a long-delayed punishment encourages to the persistence in sin (Eccles. viii, 11; Rom. ii, 5). God's design in so often releasing him (ἐξήγειρα, Rom. ix, 17) from the earlier stages of the inflictions was that the final blow might fall with full effect, both as to Pharaoh and the world at large. See JUDICIAL BLINDNESS.

See Stackhouse, *Hist. of the Bible;* Bryant, *Observations on the Plagues inflicted on the Egyptians* (Lond. 1794); Eichhorn, *De Egypti anno mirabili*, in the *Comment. Soc. Reg. Scient. Göttingen. Recentior.* iv, 45; Schwarz, *De plagis Pharonis* (Wittemb. 1724); Bonsdorf, *De plagis Ægypt.* (Aboæ, 1809–10); Hengstenberg, *Egypt and the Books of Moses;* Millington, *Signs and Wonders* (Lond. 1874); *British Quarterly Review*, July, 1874, p. 153 sq.; and the various commentaries, ad loc.

Plaifere (or **Playfere**), JOHN, D.D., an English divine of some note, flourished near the close of the 16th and the opening of the 17th century. He was educated at St. John's College, Cambridge, and was for some time fellow of his alma mater. About 1596 he was made Margaret professor of divinity in the same college. He died in 1608. He was an Arminian in theology, and his writings circulated extensively and had great renown. Thomas Baker, the antiquary, says that if Plaifere's sermons had never been printed, his name would yet have been honored in history, so decidedly marked was his influence on his time. Among his works we mention *Appello Evangelium for the True Doctrine of Divine Predestination*, etc. (Lond. 1652, 12mo); republished in *Cambridge Tracts* (1803, 8vo). See Cattermole, *Literature of the Ch. of England.* i, 334; *Churchman's Remembrancer*, vol. i.

Plain. I. This term, either in the sing. or plur., does duty in the A. V. for no less than seven distinct Hebrew words, each of which had its own independent and individual meaning, and could not be—at least *is not*—interchanged with any other. We frequently find two, three, and even more equivalents for the same Hebrew term; and, besides, some of the words are manifestly mistranslated, and some of them are proper names. See TOPOGRAPHICAL TERMS.

1. אָבֵל, *abél*, like the Arabic *abala*, signifies *moisture* and the *verdure* produced by it, as in a *meadow*, to which last term it chiefly corresponds. Hence it came to be applied to a low green plain. It occurs frequently as a proper name in Scripture; chiefly, however, in composition, as *Abel-beth-maachah* (2 Kings xv, 29; 1 Kings xv, 20), *Abel-meholah* (Judg. vii, 22), *Abel-maim* (2 Chron. xvi. 4), *Abel-shittim* (Numb. xxxiii, 49); also alone, as in 2 Sam. xx, 14, 18. In 1 Sam. vi, 18 the A. V. reads "unto the great *stone of* Abel;" but the Hebrew is עַד אבל הגדולה, "unto Abel the great." Several MSS. read אבן, "stone" (the Sept. has λίθου), and this is probably the true reading (De Rossi, *Var. Lect.* ad loc.). Judg. xi, 33 is the only passage in which it is rendered "plain," "and he smote them from Aroer, even till thou come to Minnith . . . and *unto the plain of the vineyards*" (עַד אבל כרמים; Sept. ἕως Ἐβελχαρμίμ, v. r. Ἀβὲλ ἀμπελώνων; *Abel quæ est vineis consita*). There can scarcely be a doubt that this is a proper name, and it should be rendered *Abel-keramim*. Eusebius and Jerome mention it as a village of the Ammonites still existing in their day, situated six miles from Philadelphia, in the midst of vineyards (*Onomast.* s. v. Abelavinearum). See ABEL.

2. אֵלוֹן, *elôn*. This word is derived from the root אול, *to be strong;* and hence it is used in Scripture to signify *a strong tree*, and most probably the *oak*, which grows to a great size in central and southern Palestine (Gesenius, *Thesaur.* p. 42, 50, 51). In the A. V. it is rendered "plain" (Gen. xii, 6; xiii, 18, etc.), or "plains" (xviii, 1; Deut. xi, 30), but in one place the margin has "oak" (Judg. ix, 6). It is difficult to account for this rendering. Probably it was adopted from the Vulgate, which translates *convallis* in four places, *vallis* in two, and *quercus* in three. The Sept. has δρῦς, except in Judg. ix, 9, where it has βάλανος; and ver. 37, Ἡλωνμαωνενίμ. The word should always be rendered "oak." It was considered a sacred tree. Under "the oak of Moreh," at Mamre, Abraham pitched his tent, and worshipped God (Stanley, *S. and P.* p. 508). See OAK.

3. בִּקְעָה, *bik'âh*, is from the root בָּקַע, *to cleave asunder*, and signifies literally *a cleft*, or place formed by dividing mountains, then a valley between mountains. It is equivalent to the Arabic *buk'ah*. It is generally used in the Bible to denote a low widely extended plain: as "the plain of Shinar" (Gen. xi, 2; Sept. πεδίον; *campus*); "the valley of Jericho" (Deut. xxxiv, 3); "the valley of Megiddo" (2 Chron. xxxv, 22; Zech. xii, 11); "the valley of Lebanon" (Josh. xi, 17, called in Amos i. 5 "the plain of Aven"), which is now called *el-Bukâa;* "the plain of Ono" (Neh. vi, 2), which appears to have been a portion of southern Sharon, where the town of Ono was situated. This word is rendered "plain" in the following passages: Gen. xi, 2; Neh. vi, 2; Isa. xl, 4; Ezek. iii, 22, 23; viii, 4; Amos i, 5; elsewhere it is translated "valley." It is generally rendered πεδίον in the Sept. and *campus* in the Vulgate. בִּקְעָא, *bik'â*, the Chaldee form of בקעה, found only in Dan. iii. Nebuchadnezzar set up "the golden image in *the plain* of Dura." See VALLEY.

4. כִּכָּר, *kikkâr*, seems to be equivalent to כִּרְכָּר, from the root כָּרַר, *to move in a circle;* ככר therefore signifies *a circuit*, or "the region round about any place" (allied to which are κύκλος, *circus*, and *circle;* Gesenius, *Thesaur.* p. 717). Hence, with the article הַכִּכָּר, *hakkikkar*, it was applied topographically to "the region of

the Jordan," especially the southern part of it, in which the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah once stood. It is so used seven times in Genesis (xiii, 10, 11, 12; xix, 17, 25, 28, 29); also in 2 Sam. xviii, 23; 1 Kings vii, 46; 2 Chron. iv, 17; and apparently in Neh. iii, 22; xii, 28. Reland suggests that the name may have been derived from the windings of the river (*Palæst.* p. 274; comp. Stanley, *S. and P.* p. 278). Though uniformly rendered *plain* in the A. V., and *περίχωρος* or *περίοικος* in the Sept., it appears to have all the definiteness of a proper name. It must be confessed that it is not easy to trace any connection between a "circular form" and the nature or aspect of the Jordan valley, and it is difficult not to suspect that *kikkar* is an archaic term which existed before the advent of the Hebrews, and was afterwards adopted into their language. See JORDAN.

The word is also very frequently used in Scripture to signify "a piece of money," generally "a talent" in the A. V. (Exod. xxv, 39; 1 Chron. xx, 2, etc.); also "a cake" or "loaf of bread" (1 Sam. x, 3; Prov. vi, 26). Their circular form doubtless suggested the name.

5. מִישׁוֹר, *mishôr*, with the article הַמִּישׁוֹר. This word comes from the root יָשַׁר, *to be straight* or *even*; hence *mishôr* signifies *a plain* or *level country*; thus in Psa. xxvi, 12, "My foot standeth in an even place," that is, "in a plain;" also, figuratively, *rectitude* or *justice*, as in Psa. lxvii, 4, "Thou shalt judge the people righteously" (*with justice*). With the article it has a topographical signification, and has usually the definiteness of a proper name. In the A. V. it is uniformly rendered *plain*. It occurs in the Bible in the following passages: Deut. iii, 10; iv, 43; Josh. xiii, 9, 16, 17, 21; xx, 8; 1 Kings xx, 23, 25; 2 Chron. xxvi, 10; Jer. xlviii, 8, 21. In each of these, with one exception, it is used for the district in the neighborhood of Heshbon and Dibon—the *Belka* of the modern Arabs, their most noted pasture-ground; a district which, from the scanty descriptions we possess of it, seems to resemble the "Downs" of England in the regularity of its undulations, the excellence of its turf, and its fitness for the growth of flocks. There is no difficulty in recognising the same district in the statement of 2 Chron. xxvi, 10. It is evident from several circumstances that Uzziah had been a great conqueror on the east of Jordan, as well as on the shore of the Mediterranean (see Ewald's remarks, *Geschichte*, iii, 588, note), and he kept his cattle on the rich pastures of Philistines on the one hand, and Ammonites on the other. Thus in all the passages quoted above the word *mishôr* seems to be restricted to one special district, and to belong to it as exclusively as *shephelah* did to the low land of Philistia, or *arabah* to the sunken district of the Jordan valley. It is therefore puzzling to find it used in one passage (1 Kings xx, 23, 25) apparently with the mere general sense of low land, or rather flat land, in which chariots could be manœuvred—as opposed to uneven mountainous ground. There is some reason to believe that the scene of the battle in question was on the east side of the Sea of Gennesareth, in the plain of Jaulan; but this is no explanation of the difficulty, because we are not warranted in extending the *mishôr* farther than the mountains which bounded it on the north, and where the districts began which bore, like it, their own distinctive names of Gilead, Bashan, Argob, Golan, Hauran, etc. Perhaps the most feasible explanation is that the word was used by the Syrians of Damascus without any knowledge of its strict signification, in the same manner indeed as it was employed in the later Syro-Chaldee dialect, in which *meshra* is the favorite term to express several natural features which in the older and stricter language were denominated each by its own special name. See MISHOR.

6. עֲרָבָה, *arabâh*, pl. עֲרָבוֹת (from the root עָרַב, *to be dry*), signifies *an arid region*. In poetry it is applied to any dry pasture-land, like Midbar; but with the article it means *the valley of the Jordan*, and has the force of a proper name. In the A. V. it is commonly rendered "plain" (Deut. i, 1, 7, etc.); but in Deut. xi, 30, "champaign;" in Ezek. xlvii, 8, "desert;" and in Josh. xv, 6; xviii, 18, "Arabah" (Gesen. *Thesaur.* p. 1066; Stanley, *S. and P.* p. 481). The Sept. usually has Ἀραβα, but sometimes *ὑσμή*. See ARABAH.

7. שְׁפֵלָה, *shephelâh*, *a low plain*, from the root שָׁפַל, *to be depressed*. In the A. V. it is rendered "plain" in Jer. xvii, 26; Obad. 19; Zech. vii, 7; "low plains" in 1 Chron. xxvii, 28; 2 Chron. ix, 27; but elsewhere "vale" or "valley." It has all the definiteness of a proper name, being the specific designation of the maritime plain of Philistia. To the Hebrews this, and this only, was the Shephelah. Shephelah has some claims of its own to notice. It was one of the most tenacious of these old Hebrew terms. It appears in the Greek text and in the A. V. of the book of Maccabees (1 Macc. xii, 38), and is preserved on each of its other occurrences, even in such corrupt dialects as the Samaritan version of the Pentateuch, and the Targums of Pseudo-Jonathan and of rabbi Joseph. And although it would appear to be no longer known in its original seat, it has transferred itself to other countries, and appears in Spain as *Seville*, and on the east coast of Africa as *Sofala*. See SHEPHELAH.

The plain of Esdraelon, which to the modern traveller in the Holy Land forms the third of its three most remarkable depressions, is designated in the original by neither of the above terms, but by עֵמֶק, *émek*, an appellative noun frequently employed in the Bible for the smaller valleys of the country—"the valley of Jezreel." Perhaps Esdraelon may anciently have been considered as consisting of two portions: the valley of Jezreel, the eastern and smaller; the plain of Megiddo, the western and more extensive of the two. See ESDRAELON.

II. The following are the principal plains of Palestine alluded to in the Bible, proceeding from north to south:

1. The great plain or valley of Cœle-Syria, the "hollow land" of the Greeks, which separates the two ranges of Lebanon and Antilebanon, is the most remarkable of them all. It is called in the Bible the Bika'ath Aven (Amos i, 5), and also probably the Bika'ath Lebanon (Josh. xi, 17; xii, 7) and Bika'ath Mizpeh (xi, 8), and is still known throughout Syria by its old name, as *el-Beka'a*, or *Ard el-Beka'a*. "A long valley, though broad," says Dr. Pusey (*Comment. on Amos i*, 5), "if seen from a height looks like a cleft;" and this is eminently the case with the "valley of Lebanon" when approached by the ordinary roads from north or south. It is of great extent, more than sixty miles long by about five in average breadth, and the two great ranges shut it in on either hand, Lebanon especially, with a very wall-like appearance. See CŒLE-SYRIA.

2. The plain (called עֵמֶק) of Jezreel or Esdraelon, which runs from the bay of Ptolemais to the Jordan, dividing the mountains of Galilee from those of Ephraim. It is well watered and grassy. See JEZREEL.

3. The flat along the Mediterranean from Carmel to the brook of Egypt (whose northern part near Joppa is called *Sharon*, שָׁרוֹן, the southern part *Shephelâh*, שְׁפֵלָה). The plain of the tribe of Judah stood in connection with the latter (1 Macc. iii, 24, 40; xiii, 13). See SHARON.

4. The meadow of Jordan, or the plain on both sides of that river, from the Sea of Gennesareth to the Dead Sea, usually called simply *The Plain* (הַכִּכָּר). In the neighborhood of Jericho this valley widens out into a great plain, thence called עַרְבוֹת יְרִיחוֹ, *The Plains of Jericho* (Josh. iv, 13; v, 10; 2 Kings xxv, 5; Jer. xxxix, 5), as the Dead Sea is called the "*Sea of the Plain*" (Deut. iii, 17; iv, 49). See JORDAN.

5. The elevated plain (הַמִּישׁוֹר) in the tribe of Reuben, in which lay Bezer and Medeba (Josh. xiii, 16; xx, 8; Deut. iv, 43). It belongs to the large but rather dry (Burckhardt, ii, 626) plateau of modern Belka (Ritter, ii, 368). See MOAB.

6. For "the plains of Jericho," see JERICHO.

Plain Song (*canto fermo*, *cantus planus*) is one of the terms applied to the monotonic recitative melody in ancient chants of the liturgy. In later times it became one of the parts in elaborate pieces, services, and anthems, originally the tenor, but afterwards assigned to the treble. The *Cantus Prophetarum Epistolarum et Evangelii* admitted certain inflections; the *Cantus Psalmorum* adopted inflections in the middle and end of the verse. An unrestricted melody was used in prefaces, anthems, and hymns, and the plain song is this *cantus collectarum*.—Staunton, *Eccles. Dict.* p. 536.

Plaister. See PLASTER.

Plaiting. See HAIR.

Plan of Salvation. See SALVATION.

Plancius, PIETER, a Dutch preacher of renown, was born at Drenoutre, Flanders, in 1552. Having imbibed the principles of the Calvinistic faith in the schools of Germany and England, he embraced the evangelical ministry in 1577, and discharged its duties in Brabant and Flanders, in the midst of the persecutions of the Spanish government. After the taking of Brussels (1585), where he was pastor, he fled to Holland, and was soon attached to the Church of Amsterdam. Being a zealous defender of orthodoxy, he displayed great animosity against the Lutherans and Arminians. He was in 1619 a member of the Synod of Dort, and was then one of the revisers of the version of the Old Testament. He is entitled to the gratitude of the Dutch people for the services which he rendered them by his geographical and nautical acquirements. He counselled the first expeditions sent by the Dutch to both Indies, and traced even the itineraries of those expeditions. He is much spoken of in Jeannin's negotiations, where he is called "a great cosmographer." He died May 25, 1622, at Amsterdam. — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xl, 403.

Planck, Gottlieb Jacob, a noted Protestant divine, was born at Nürtingen, in the kingdom of Würtemberg, Nov. 15, 1751. He was educated at the university in Tübingen, and in 1784 was made ordinary professor of theology in the University of Göttingen. In this capacity he exerted a remarkable influence throughout Germany, as he wielded a powerful pen, and wrote many essays upon the history of the Church and its doctrines. He is a leading representative of "pragmatic" historiography. His principal work is his *Geschichte des protestantischen Systems in seinem Ursprung, seiner Veränderung, u. seiner Fortbildung* (Leips. 1781–1800, 6 vols. 8vo), which was continued in a work published after a long interval under the title of *Geschichte des protestantischen Lehrbegriffes von der Concordienformel bis zur Mitte des 18ten Jahrhunderts* (Gött. 1831). Another great work of his is *Gesch. der christl.-kirchl. Gesellschaftsverfassung* (Hann. 1803–9, 5 vols. 8vo). Planck, though widely read and followed, does not deserve the great renown he has secured. He exhibits too much indifference to doctrine to be trusted implicitly in his judgments, and yet no one can withhold from him the tribute for application. But, like a too obtrusive cicerone, Planck, in these works, requires great judgment in the reader. He everywhere discovers purpose, preconcerted design, ambition, hatred, and other passions, as having been the motive forces in the process of doctrinal history. Thus the progressive and independent development of dogma is resolved into psychological dispositions and tendencies, while, at the same time, the author's own doctrinal indifference is unconsciously transferred to the agents of the dogma-forming process, by the axiomatic assumption that doctrine alone would have been incapable of exciting so much interest or contention. In his eyes doctrine is an antiquated matter, which is properly destined to oblivion. In this method, the view being restricted to efficient causes, and the inherent activity of final causes lost sight of, even the efficient causes are not comprehended in their entirety. Planck died in 1833. "With Planck the subjective, pragmatic method reaches its height. History is only the dreary theatre of human interests and passions. It is therefore truly amazing that, with his indifference to Church doctrine, he could bestow so much toilsome study and learned industry on such 'perfectly indifferent antiquations' as the theological contentions of the 16th and 17th centuries. Of course his work, with all its great and enduring merits, and the relative truth and necessity of its position, could not fail to have a bad effect, in completely sundering the doctrinal consciousness of its age from the basis of the older Church orthodoxy, and in justifying this rupture as a pretended advance. In his other large work, *The History of Church Government*, Planck likewise starts from that rationalistic conception of the Church, which dates from Locke, viz., that this divine establishment was originally a mere voluntary association, which formed its laws and institutions in accordance with the changing wants of the times, and under the influence of fortuitous, external circumstances; and that, in this way, it gradually assumed an aspect altogether different from what its founder and first members intended or foresaw. In this way he accounts for the gigantic hierarchy of the Middle Ages, which he looks upon in a simply political light, with the calmness of a learned but indifferent spectator; while the older Protestant orthodoxy had held it in pious abhorrence, as the broken bulwark of the veritable Antichrist" (Schaff, *Hist. of the Apostolic Church*, p. 73). A complete list of all his writings is given in Plütter, *Gesch. der Universität Göttingen*, ii, 121; iii, 283 sq.; iv, 270. See Lücke, *Gottlieb Jacob Planck, ein biographischer Versuch* (Gött. 1838, 8vo); Illgen, *Zeitschr. für histor. Theol.* 1843, iv, 75–88; Rheinwald, *Repert. of theol. Literatur*, 1839, xxv, 105 sq.; *Hallesche allgem. Zeit.* 1837, iii, 281 sq.; Dorner, *Hist. of Protestant Theology*, ii, 283; Kahnis, *Hist. of German Protestantism*, p. 176; Hurst's Hagenbach, *Church Hist. of the 18th and 19th Centuries;* Alzog, *Kirchengesch.* ii, 286, 731. (J. H. W.)

Planck, Heinrich Ludwig, another German Protestant divine, son of the preceding, was born at Göttingen July 19, 1785, and educated at the university of that place, where his father was then a professor. In 1809 young Planck appeared as author of a work entitled *Versuch einer neuen synoptischen Zusammenstellung der drei ersten Evangelien, nach Grundsätzen der höhern Kritik* (Götting. 1809, 8vo). In 1810 he was appointed extraordinary professor of theology at Göttingen; and his introductory programme, *De vera natura atque indole orationis Græcæ Novi Testamenti Commentatio* (Göttingen, 1810, 4to), added greatly to his reputation. The value of this essay can scarcely be overrated, and its influence has been equal to its worth. It has wrought an entire change of opinion respecting the N.-T. Greek, and upon the views which it enforced all subsequent investigations have been based. An English translation is published in the second volume of the *Edinburgh Biblical Cabinet*. It was Planck's intention, as stated in this essay, to exhibit his views in a more perfected form, in a work to be entitled *Isagoge Philologica in Novum Testamentum;* but from this he was diverted by an engagement into which he entered upon the strong recommendation of Gesenius, namely, to prepare a lexicon of the N. T. similar to that which the latter had published of the O. T. Unhappily the expectations awakened by his early promise were unfulfilled. His health was undermined by frequent attacks of epilepsy, and it was with difficulty that he could go through the duties of his office as ordinary professor of theology, to which he was appointed in 1823. Other works of his are, *New Revelation and Inspiration* (1817), and a *Short Scheme of the Philosophic Doctrines of Religion* (1821). He died Sept. 23, 1831. See Lücke's biography of Gottlieb Jacob Planck. (J. H. W.)

Plane (מַקְצֻעָה, *makstuâh*, a *chisel* for carpenter's work, Isa. xliv, 13). See HANDICRAFT.

Plane-tree (Ecclus. xxiv, 14). See CHESTNUT.

Planet. See MAZZAROTH.

Planet-worship is a prominent constructive feature in all mystic systems of antiquity. Thus the primitive worship of all objects like Osiris (q. v.) may be contemplated under two aspects, differing somewhat from each other, but incapable of any rigorous or formal separation. That worship seems to be in some localities directly *solar*. Fortunes of Osiris have been interwoven or identified with those of the great orb of the day. His votaries have an eye exclusively to periodic motions of the sun and the vicissitudes of the seasons; not so much in reference to the increase or the decrease of his luminous functions as to seeming changes in his fructifying, fertilizing power. In winter he appears to the imagination of the worshipper as languishing and dying; and all nature, ceasing to put forth her buds and blossoms, is believed to suffer with him; while at other seasons of the year the majesty of this great king of heaven is reasserted in the vivifying of creation and the gladdening of the human heart. There is an annual resurrection of all nature, for the sun-god is himself returning from the under-world—the region of the dead. Or, if we study the same representation in its more telluric aspect, what is there depicted as a mourning for Osiris is no longer emblematic merely of prostration in the sun-god: it imports more frequently the loss of vital forces in the vegetable kingdom as the consequence of the withdrawal of the solstitial heat. The earth herself becomes the principal sufferer; and the cause of all her passionate and despairing lamentations is the influence that dries up the fountains of her own vitality. Now, whichever be adjudged the primitive form or the correct interpretation of this old Osirian myth, we must remember that, historically speaking, the substance of the myth itself is not by any means peculiar to the valley of the Nile. It recurs in nearly all countries bordering on the Mediterranean. It can often be directly traced to Asia, and as often to the agency of those Phœnician colonists who, scattered thickly in the islands to the west of Syria, were importing to far distant havens not their amber only, but their civilization and religious knowledge. In the mother country of Phœnicia, the Osirian worship had its ancient counterpart in the mysteries of Adonis and the annual "weeping for Tammuz" (Ezek. viii, 14). There, again, the fate of the divinity was rigorously identified with periodic changes in the aspect of external nature. The idea of an Adonis in the prime of life was the most vivid image which the Syrian mind could fashion of all fertilizing and benignant powers. At length, however, the divinity sinks down oppressed and overwhelmed; his heart is pierced by some mysterious arrow: he dies, and in the sacred month, "the month of Tammuz," when the scorching blasts of summer are well-nigh exhausted, a large crowd of Syrian maids and matrons flock together from all quarters; they bemoan the loss of Tammuz; but their vehement ejaculations are all quickly followed by a series of impure and diabolic orgies; symptoms of returning life in nature are to them a signal for festivity as frantic as their former grief. Vitality is coming back to earth; and in its advent they perceive another "finding" of their lost Adonis, εὕρεσις Ἀδώνιδος. Nor is this the only instance of some close affinity between the old mythographers of Egypt and Phœnicia. Mingling with the other progeny of Ptah, or the Egyptian Vulcan, stand the great Cabirian brothers, whose repute and worship were extensively diffused in various provinces of the West. The word *Cabeiri* is itself immediately explainable, if we resort to the Shemitic languages; for there it means the "Great" or "Mighty Ones;" and thus is pointing in the same direction as the ancient dwarf-gods, which were also sacred images of Cabeiri, and were venerated with a kindred fervor by the rude Phœnician pilot and the polished priest of Memphis. The Cabeiri seem to have been eight in number, or, excluding Esmûn (literally the eighth), that one of the fraternity who was regarded as the chief or aggregate expression for the whole, we limit them to seven; which strongly indicates, in the opinion of some writers, an original identity of the Cabeiri with the more conspicuous of the heavenly bodies. In the sacred books of China the "seven brilliant ones" deemed worthy of peculiar homage are the sun, the moon, and the five planets; while the planets, when regarded singly, have been made to bear the corresponding title of the "five heavenly chiefs." The Greek had similarly his seven θεοὶ μεγάλοι, and the Persian his seven ministers of the highest; examples which appear to be suggestive of the early spread of planet-worship, if they do not absolutely prove that astronomical principles had entered largely into the construction of all mythic systems, that of Egypt not excepted. See Hardwick, *Christ and other Masters*, ii, 264–267; Uhlemann, *Aegypt. Alterthümer*, ii, 162 sq.; Movers, *Die Religion und die Gottheiten der Phönizier* (Bonn, 1841), p. 12 sq.; Lucian, *De Dea Syria*, c. vi sq.; Bunsen, *Egypt's Place*, i, 144; *Journal of Asiatic Society*, 1864, p. 53 sq.

Planeta. See CHASUBLE.

Plank (עֵץ, *êts*, Ezek. xli, 25, *a tree* [i. e. *beam*], as elsewhere usually rendered; צֶלַע, *tselâ*, a *rib* [or *side*], 1 Kings vi, 15, as elsewhere generally rendered; עֹב, *ôb* [probably the same as עָב, *âb*, a *threshold*, or "*thick beam*," 1 Kings vii, 6; "thick (plank)," Ezek. xli, 25], "thick plank," Ezek. xli, 26).

Plant. Under this general term we classify and explain the several plants mentioned in Scripture, as edible, flowering, or medicinal, in order.

I. *Edible Plants.*—Among these, with which we number also aromas and spices, may be noticed:

1. *Anise*, Gr. ἄνηθον, which means rather *dill;* an aromatic herb mentioned by Christ (Matt. xxiii, 23). See ANISE.

2. *Barley*, the frequent rendering of the Hebrew *seorah'*, שְׂעֹרָה, and of the Greek κριθή, as in Rev. vi, 6; John vi, 9, 13. See BARLEY.

3. *Bean*, Heb. *pôl*, פּוֹל, as in 2 Sam. xvii, 28; Ezek. iv, 9. See BEAN.

4. *Caper-berry*, Heb. *abiyonah'*, אֲבִיּוֹנָה, *desire* (Eccl. xii, 5). See CAPER-PLANT.

5. *Cinnamon* is the rendering of the Hebrew *kinnamon'*, קִנָּמוֹן (Exod. xxx, 23), and of the Greek κινάμωμον (Rev. xviii, 13). See CINNAMON.

6. *Coriander* represents the Hebrew *gad*, גַּד, in most ancient versions, as the Sept. and Vulg., in Exod. xvi, 31; Numb. xi, 7; but the Chaldee and Samaritan vary. See CORIANDER.

7. *Cucumber* translates the Hebrew *kisshû*, קִשֻּׁא (Numb. xi, 5); and *wild cucumbers* appear to be meant in 2 Kings iv, 39 by *pakkuoth'*, פַּקֻּעוֹת, where our version has *wild gourds*. See CUCUMBER; GOURD.

8. *Cummin* stands for the Hebrew *kammôn*, כַּמֹּן (Isa. xxviii, 25, 27); and in the New Test. for the Greek κύμινον, which is simply an adoption of the Hebrew. See CUMMIN.

9. *Doves' dung* our version gives for *charey yonim*, חַרֵי יוֹנִים, which is probably some kind of vegetable food, perhaps *kali*, though the rendering given is the literal translation (2 Kings vi, 25). See DOVES' DUNG.

10. *Fitches* is given by the A. V. in Isa. xxviii, 25, 27 for the Hebrew *kétsach*, קֶצַח, which, according to the Sept., Vulg., and rabbins, is a kind of fennel flower, as black cummin. In Ezek. iv, 9 the word *kusse'meth*, כֻּסֶּמֶת, is rendered *fitches*, but it seems to mean properly *spelt*. See FITCHES; RYE.

11. *Garlic* is the Hebrew שׁוּם, *shûm* (Numb. xi, 5). See GARLIC.

12. *Gourd.* See CUCUMBER; GOURD.

13. *Grape* is the rendering of several Hebrew words; some of them distinguishing particular kinds or qualities: (*a*) *beüshim*, בְּאֻשִׁים (Isa. v, 2, 4), *wild grapes*, i. e. *bad grapes*. Aquila has σαπρίαι, Symm. ἀτελῆ. (*b*) *Bô'ser*, בֹּסֶר (Isa. xviii, 5; Jer. xxxi, 24, 30; Ezek. xviii, 2), *sour* or *unripe grapes*; Sept. ὄμφαξ. (*c*) *Chartsán*, חַרְצָן, *sour grapes, kernels* (Numb. vi, 4), and of the Greek σταφυλή, *bunch of grapes* (Matt. vii, 16; Luke vi, 44; Rev. xiv, 18). See GRAPE.

14. *Leek* (in Numb. xi, 5) renders חָצִיר, *chatsir'*, which elsewhere is translated *grass*, i. e. *greens*. See GRASS; LEEKS.

15. *Lentil* renders Heb. *adash'*, עָדָשׁ (Gen. xxv, 34; 2 Sam. xvii, 28; xxiii, 11; Ezek. iv, 9). See LENTIL.

16. *Mallows* is for the Heb. *mallûach*, מַלּוּחַ, properly *sea purslain* (Job xxx, 4). See MALLOWS.

17. *Mandrake* is the Heb. *duduim*, דּוּדָאִים, *love-apples* (Gen. xxx, 14; Cant. vii, 13). See MANDRAKE.

18. *Manna*, Heb. *mân*, מָן, a sweet resin distilling from the leaves of tamarisk trees, of several species, especially the *tamarix Gallica mannifera*, from punctures made by an insect, the *coccus manniparus*. See MANNA.

19. *Melon* is found in Numb. xi, 5 as the rendering of the Hebrew *abattichim'*, אֲבַטִּחִים. See MELON.

20. *Millet* (in Ezek. iv, 9) represents the Hebrew *dochán*, דֹּחַן; it is the *holchus dochna* (Linn.). See MILLET.

21. *Mint* (in Matt. xxiii, 23; Luke xi, 42) is the Greek ἡδύοσμον, i. e. *sweet-scented*; the *mentha virides* of Linn. See MINT.

22. *Mustard* (in Matt. xiii, 31; xvii, 20; Mark iv, 31; Luke xiii, 19; xvii, 6) is the Greek σίναπι; the *sinapis orientalis*. See MUSTARD.

23. *Olive* universally is given in the A. V. where the Hebrew *za'yith*, זַיִת, is used. In 1 Kings vi, 23 the word *olive-tree* renders the Heb. *êts-shémen*, עֵץ שֶׁמֶן, lit. *the tree of fatness*. The same expression is rendered *oil-tree* (Isa. iv, 19) and *pine* (Neh. viii, 15). See OLIVE.

24. *Onion* is in Heb. *be'tsel*, בֶּצֶל, as Numb. xi, 5. See ONION.

25. *Parched-corn* is the Heb. *kali*, קָלִי or קָלְיָא; it is wheat or barley roasted in the ear and then rubbed out; perhaps occasionally some kind of pulse (1 Sam. xvii, 17). See PARCHED-CORN.

26. *Pistachio-nuts*, in Heb. *botnim'*, בָּטְנִים (Gen. xliii, 11), a kind of nut of oblong shape, and taking this name from *beten*, בֶּטֶן, *the belly*, in allusion to their form. See NUTS.

27. *Pomegranate* renders the Heb. *rimmôn*, רִמּוֹן, in many passages. See POMEGRANATE.

28. *Purslain* is the Heb. *challamuth'*, חַלְמוּת, according to the Syriac. Our version has *egg* (Job vi, 6), "*white of an egg*," which is certainly wrong. See Gesen. *Thesaur.* s. v., and PURSLAIN.

29. *Raisins, bunches of* (1 Sam. xxv, 18; xxx, 12; 2 Sam. xvi, 1; 1 Chron. xii, 40), translates the Heb. *tsimmûk*, צִמּוּק. See RAISINS.

30. *Rye* (in Exod. ix, 32; Isa. xxviii, 25) translates the Heb. *kusséməth*, כֻּסֶּמֶת, which means a smooth grain, *spelt*. See No. 10, above, and RYE.

31. *Vine*, Heb. *sôrek*, שֹׂרֵק, or *sorekâh*, שֹׂרֵקָה, is a peculiar kind of grape-vine. Thus, *choice vine* (Gen. xlix, 11); *choicest vine* (Isa. v, 2); *noble vine* (Jer. ii, 21. See VINE.

32. *Wheat* in general is the Heb. *chittâh*, חִטָּה, of which the plural in Chaldee is *chintim'*, חִנְטִים, as Ezra vi, 9; vii, 22; and in the New Test. is σῖτος, a general name for grain, which is also rendered "corn" (Mark iv, 28; Acts vii, 12).

II. Among *flowering plants* we notice the following:

1. *Lily* is the Heb. *shushan'*, שׁוּשַׁן (1 Kings vii, 19), and *shoshan*, שׁוֹשָׁן (Cant. ii, 16; iv, 5; v, 13; vi, 2, 3; vii, 3; 1 Kings vii, 22, 26). The word means a musical instrument shaped like a lily, as Psa. lx, 1; lxix, 1. Also Heb. *shoshannâh*, שׁוֹשַׁנָּה, but only in the first sense, as 2 Chron. iv, 5; Cant. ii, 1, 2; Hos. xiv, 6. See LILY; MUSICAL INSTRUMENTS.

2. *Myrtle* (in Neh. viii, 15; Isa. xli, 19; lv, 13; Zech. i, 8, 10, 11) represents the Heb. *hadás*, הֲדַס. See MYRTLE.

3. *Rose*, Heb. *chabatstséleth*, חֲבַצֶּלֶת, is properly *the meadow saffron* (*colchicum autumnale*, Linn.) (Cant. ii, 1; Isa. xxxv, 1). See ROSE.

4. *Saffron*, Heb. *karkôm*, כַּרְכֹּם; Sept. κρόκος (Cant. iv, 14), may refer to both kinds of saffron, the common and the Indian. See SAFFRON.

5. *Sedge*, Heb. *achu'*, אָחוּ, rendered *meadow* in Gen. xli, 2, 18, *flag* in Job viii, 11, is an Egyptian word, applied to all kinds of grassy growth in marshes. See REED.

6. *Tare* is the Greek ζιζάνιον, properly *darnel* (Matt. xiii, 25 sq.). See TARE.

7. *Thorn* is the translation of many Hebrew words, for the meanings of which see THORN.

III. Of *medicinal plants* we name the following:

1. *Balm*, "*balm of Gilead*," Heb. *tsori'*, צָרִי, *opobalsamum* (Gen. xliii, 11; xxxvii, 25; Jer. viii, 22; xlvi, 11; li, 8; Ezek. xxvii, 17). See BALM.

2. *Camphire*, Heb. *kôpher*, כֹּפֶר, rendered *pitch* (Gen. vi, 14); in Cant. i, 14; iv, 13, refers to the *el-henna* of the Arabs, a shrub with fragrant white flowers. See CAMPHIRE; PITCH.

3. *Hyssop*, Heb. *ezôb*, אֵזוֹב, and Greek ὕσωπος. See HYSSOP.

4. *Myrrh*, Heb. *lôt*, לֹט, a fragrant resinous gum from the leaves of a shrub, the *cistus ladanifera*. Sept. and Vulg. *stacte, myrrh* (Gen. xxxvii, 25; xliii, 11). Also Heb. *môr*, מֹר or מוֹר, a bitter aromatic resin distilling in tears from a tree, the *balsamodendron myrrha*. See MYRRH.

5. *Rue*, Greek πήγανον, the *ruta graveolens* of Linn. See RUE.

See, for the plants of Palestine in general, BOTANY.

Plantavitius, JOHN, *de la Pause*, or *Plantavitius Pausanus*, was born 1576 of a noble Protestant family in the diocese of Nismes, studied theology and Oriental literature, and became pastor at Beziers, where he embraced Roman Catholicism, 1604. He was made bishop of Lodève in 1625, retired from his ecclesiastical functions in 1648, on account of advanced age and great infirmities, and died in 1651, at the Palace Margon. Few literati, not Hebrews by birth, have devoted themselves more earnestly to, and labored more successfully in, the department of Hebrew literature than Plantavitius, and his works will continue to be a monument to his learning and industry as long as the sacred language of the O. T. continues to be studied. They are as follows: *Thesaurus synonymicus Hebræo-Chaldæo-Rabbinicus* (Lodovæ, 1643, fol.); very valuable to the student of the Hebrew Scriptures on account of its treatment of Hebrew synonyms:—*Florilegium Biblicum Hebraico-Latinum* (ibid. 1645):—and *Florilegium Rabbinicum, complectens præcipuas vet. Rabbinorum sententias, vers. Lat. et scholiis illustratas cum Bibliotheca Rabbinica* (ibid. 1645). See Wolf, *Bibliotheca Hebræa*, i, 5, etc.; Steinschneider, *Catalogus Libr. Hebr. in Biblio-*

theca Bodleiana, col. 2107; Geiger, in *Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, xvii, 330 (Leips. 1863).

Plantier, Claude Henri, one of the most prominent members of the French episcopate, was born of humble parentage at Ceyzerieux, in France, in 1813. In 1837 he was made a priest, and soon afterwards he was appointed professor of Hebrew at the theological school of Lyons. In 1855 he was elected bishop of Nismes, and died May 25, 1875. He was one of the fiercest opponents of Louis Napoleon. See *Literarischer Handweiser*, 1875, p. 252. (B. P.)

Plantin, Christophe, a celebrated printer, was born in 1514 at Mont-Louis, in the French province of Touraine, of poor parents. He went to Paris in his youth, and worked there some time in a bookbinder's shop; but afterwards went to Caen, in Normandy, where he learned the art of printing. After working in several of the printing-offices of France, and especially at Lyons, he returned to Paris; but the religious disturbances which commenced about that time induced him to remove to Flanders, and he is known to have been a master-printer at Antwerp in 1555. Besides his printing establishment at Antwerp, he had one at Paris and another at Leyden. The beauty as well as the correctness of the works which issued from his presses extended his reputation rapidly, and he soon acquired a considerable fortune. He employed as correctors of the press several men distinguished for their learning, and Plantin's house was resorted to by learned men from all countries. He died July 1, 1589. The work which has given most celebrity to Plantin's printing establishment at Antwerp is the edition which he printed of the great Polyglot Bible, which had previously been printed at Alcala, in Spain, under the direction of cardinal Ximenes. Plantin was engaged to perform the work by Philip II of Spain, who sent Arius Montanus to superintend it, and he was employed four years (1568 to 1572) in this occupation. See Arius Montanus. Guillaume Lebé was sent for from Paris to engrave the punches and superintend the casting of the type. The work, in addition to the contents of the Alcala Polyglot, gave a Chaldaic paraphrase and a Syriac version of the New Testament in Hebrew and Syriac characters. The proofs of the Antwerp Polyglot were all revised by Raphelengius, and the work was published in eight large folio volumes (1568-1572). Plantin was not so learned as the Aldi of Venice or the Estiennes of Paris, but his Latin prefaces to several of the works which he printed seem sufficiently to establish that he had acquired a considerable scholarship.

Plantsch, Martin, D.D., a German theologian, was born in 1460 at Dornstetten, in Würtemberg. He studied at the newly founded university at Tübingen, where in 1483 he was made magister, in 1484 professor of philosophy, and in 1494 doctor and professor of theology, at the same time preaching in the church of St. George. In 1523 he was present at the Zurich colloquium, and died July 18, 1533. In connection with Dr. Hartsesser, he founded the famous scholarship of St. George and St. Martin at Tübingen. He was also the author of *Tractatus de fagis maleficis*, which he wrote in 1506, on the occasion of the burning of a certain witch at Tübingen. See Jöcher, *Gelehrten-Lex.* s. v. (B. P.)

Planudes Maximus, a Byzantine monk noted as a literary character, flourished in the 14th century. He was born, as he says himself in one of his works, at Nicomedia. The time of his birth is unknown, and almost the only circumstance of his life which is beyond doubt is that in the year 1327 he was sent on an embassy to Venice by the emperor Andronicus the elder. At this time he must have been of a mature age. That he was yet alive in 1340 is evident from a letter still extant, which he wrote to the emperor Johannes Palæologus, who ascended the throne in that year. D'Orville places his death in 1353, for which, however, he adduces no testimony. Gerhard Vossius prolongs his life to the year 1370, and others place it still later. Towards the close of his life Planudes, it is said, was imprisoned on account of his partiality for the doctrines of the Church of Rome; and when afterwards compelled to write against that Church, to have done so in such a manner and with such feeble arguments that cardinal Bessarion declared that the heart of Planudes had no share in what he had written on that occasion. His works, of which several exist only in MS. form, are not of sufficient importance to be enumerated here. They consist of orations and homilies; translations from Latin into Greek of several works of such classics as Cicero, Cæsar, Ovid, etc.; also of Boethius's *De Consolatione;* St. Augustine, *De Trinitate* and *De Civitate Dei;* a collection of *Æsop's Fables;* commentaries on the *Rhetoric* of Hermogenes, and other Greek writings. See Fabricius, *Biblioth. Græca*, xi, 682 sq.; Hoffman, *Lexicon Bibliog. Script. Græc.* s. v.

Plassmann, Heinrich Ernst, D.D., a German Roman Catholic divine, was born in 1817 at Paderborn, where he also afterwards labored as professor of theology. He then went to Rome, where he was appointed rector of the German National Church. He was also honored with the degree of "Magister Sanitæ Theologiæ" by the Dominican college St. Thomæ de Urbe. He died at Tivoli, Italy, July 23, 1865. He wrote *Die Schule des heil. Thomas* (Soest, 1857), a great but unfinished work. See *Literarischer Handweiser für das katholische Deutschland*, 1865, p. 27 sq.; Zuchhold, *Bibliotheca Theologica*, ii, 1000. (B. P.)

Plaster, Mason's (גִּיר, *gir*, so called from its *effervescence, lime;* Sept. κονία; Dan. v, 5; "chalk," Isa. xxvii, 9; also שִׂיד, *sîd*, from its *boiling, lime*, Deut. xxvii, 2, 4; "lime," Isa. xxviii, 12; Amos ii, 1; as a verb, טוּחַ, *tûach, to smear*, Lev. xiv, 42, 43, 48; elsewhere "daub," etc.). The mode of making plaster-cement has been described elsewhere. See Mortar. Plaster is mentioned on three occasions in Scripture:

1. Where, when a house was infected with "leprosy" (Lev. xiv, 42, 48), the priest was ordered to take away the portion of infected wall and replaster it (Michaelis, *Laws of Moses*, § 211, iii, 297–305, ed. Smith). See House; Leprosy.

2. The words of the law were ordered to be engraved on Mount Ebal on stones which had been previously coated with plaster (Deut. xxvii, 2, 4; Josh. viii, 32), the pillars being covered with plaster, and the law written on this (see Thomson, *Land and Book*, ii, 204 sq.). Michaelis, however (vol. i, bk. iii), supposes that the words were cut in stone and plaster afterwards put upon it, that when the plaster should fall off the words might still be legible. Of this, however, no evidence appears. The process here mentioned was probably of a similar kind to that adopted in Egypt for receiving bass-reliefs. The wall was first made smooth, and its interstices, if necessary, filled up with plaster. When the figures had been drawn, and the stone adjacent cut away so as to leave them in relief, a coat of lime whitewash was laid on, and followed by one of varnish after the painting of the figures was complete. In the case of the natural rock the process was nearly the same. The ground was covered with a thick layer of fine plaster, consisting of lime and gypsum, carefully smoothed and polished. Upon this a coat of lime whitewash was laid, and on it the colors were painted, and set by means of glue or wax. The whitewash appears in most instances to have been made of shell-limestone not much burned, which of itself is tenacious enough without glue or other binding material (Long, quoting from Belzoni, *Eg. Ant.* ii, 49, 50). At Behistun, in Persia, the surface of the inscribed rock-tablet was covered with a varnish to preserve it from weather; but it seems likely that in the case of the Ebal tablets the inscription was cut while

the plaster was still moist (Layard, *Nineveh*, ii, 188; Vaux, *Nin. and Persep.* p. 172). See STONE.

3. It was probably a similar coating of cement on which the fatal letters were traced by the mystic hand "on the plaster of the wall" of Belshazzar's palace at Babylon (Dan. v, 5). We here obtain an incidental confirmation of the Biblical narrative. For while at Nineveh the walls are panelled with alabaster slabs, at Babylon, where no such material is found, the builders were content to cover their tiles or bricks with enamel or stucco, fitly termed plaster, fit for receiving ornamental designs (Layard, *Nin. and Bab.* p. 529; Diod. ii, 8). See BRICKS.

Plaster, MEDICINAL (מָרַח, *marách*, *to rub*, hence to anoint with a healing salve or similar substance, Isa. xxxviii, 21). See MEDICINE.

Plastic Nature, an absurd doctrine, which some have thus described: "It is an incorporeal created substance, endued with a vegetative life, but not with sensation or thought; penetrating the whole created universe, being co-extended with it; and, under God, moving matter, so as to produce the phenomena which cannot be solved by mechanical laws: active for ends unknown to itself, not being expressly conscious of its actions, and yet having an obscure idea of the action to be entered upon." To this it has been answered that, as the idea itself is most obscure, and, indeed, inconsistent, so the foundation of it is evidently weak. It is intended by this to avoid the inconvenience of subjecting God to the trouble of some changes in the created world, and the meanness of others. But it appears that, even upon this hypothesis, he would still be the author of them; besides, to Omnipotence nothing is troublesome, nor those things mean, when considered as part of a system, which alone might appear to be so. See Doddridge, *Lectures*, lect. 37; Cudworth, *Intellectual System*, p. 149, 172; More, *Immortality of the Soul*, lib. iii, c. 12; Ray, *Wisdom of God*, p. 51, 52; Lord Monboddo, *Ancient Metaphysics;* Young, *Essay on the Powers and Mechanism of Nature;* Cocker, *Theism;* Tulloch, *English Prot. Theol.* ii, 269, 273, 397.

Plat (חֶלְקָה, *chelkáh*, 2 Kings ix, 26, a *piece*, or *portion* of ground, as elsewhere rendered).

Plate (לוּחַ, *lûach*, 1 Kings vii, 36, a *board* [or "table"], as elsewhere rendered; פַּח, *pach*, a thin *lamina*, Exod. xxxix, 3; Numb. xvi, 38; צִיץ, *tsits*, a *burnished* plate of metal, Exod. xxviii, 36; xxxix, 30; Lev. viii, 9; סַרְן, *séren*, an *axle*, 1 Kings vii, 30).

Platel, JACQUES, a French theologian, was born at Bersée, a village of Artois, in the year 1608. He joined the Jesuits, and taught philosophy and theology at Douai. He was regarded as a man of some learning, and his writings were received favorably. He died Jan. 7, 1681, at Douai. His works are, *Synopsis cursûs theologici* (Douai, 1654, fol.; 6th ed. 1706):—*Auctoritas contra physicam prædeterminationem* (ibid. 1669–1673, 2 vols. 12mo).

Platina, BATTISTA BARTOLOMMEO DE SACCHI, a very learned Italian, is noted as the author of a *History of the Popes*. He was born in 1421 at Piadena, a village between Cremona and Mantua. He first embraced a military life, which he followed for a time, but afterwards devoted himself to literature. He went to Rome under Calixtus III, who was made pope in 1455; where, getting himself introduced to cardinal Bessarion, he obtained some small benefices of pope Pius II, who succeeded Calixtus in 1458, and afterwards was appointed apostolical abbreviator. When Paul II succeeded Pius in 1464, Platina's affairs took a very unfavorable turn. In the first place, Paul was much indisposed towards him, on account of his connections with his predecessor Pius; but this might possibly have been borne if Paul, in the next place, had not removed all the abbreviators from their employments by abolishing their places, notwithstanding they had purchased them with great sums of money. Upon this Platina complained to the pope, and most humbly besought him to order their cause to be judged by the auditors of the Rota. The pope was offended at the liberty, and gave him a very haughty repulse: "Is it thus," said he, looking at him sternly—"is it thus that you summon us before your judges, as if you knew not that all laws are centred in our breast? Such is our decree: they shall all go hence, whithersoever they please: I am pope, and have a right to ratify or cancel the acts of others at pleasure." These unhappy men, thus divested of their employments, used their utmost endeavors for some days to obtain audience of the pope, but were repulsed with contempt. Upon this Platina wrote to him in the following terms: "If you had a right to dispossess us, without permitting our cause to be heard, of the employments we had lawfully purchased, we, on the other side, ought to be permitted to complain of the injustice we suffer, and the ignominy with which we are branded. As you have repulsed us so contumeliously, we will go to all the courts of princes, and entreat them to call a council, whose principal business shall be to oblige you to show cause why you have divested us of all our lawful possessions." Nothing can better illustrate the temper and character of Platina than this letter, which was, however, considered as an act of rebellion, and caused him to be imprisoned, and to endure great hardships. At the end of four months he had his liberty, with orders not to leave Rome, and continued in quiet for some time; but afterwards, being suspected of a plot, he was again imprisoned, and, with many others, put to the rack. The plot being found imaginary, the charge was turned to heresy, which also came to nothing, and Platina was set at liberty some time after. The pope then flattered him with a prospect of preferment, and thus kept him in Rome; but, dying of apoplexy, left him to shift for himself as he could. This whole conflict is related by Platina himself in his *Lives of the Popes*, under the pontificate of Paul II. Sixtus IV succeeded Paul in 1467, and appointed Platina keeper of the Vatican Library, which was established by this pope. Platina here found himself in his own element, and lived very happily in that station till 1481, when he was snatched away by the plague. He bequeathed to Pomponius Lætus the house which he built on the Mons Quirinalis, with the laurel grove, out of which the poetical crowns were taken. He was the author of several works, the most considerable of which is *De Vitis ac Gestis Romanorum Pontificum*, or history of the popes from St. Peter to Sixtus IV, to whom he dedicated it. The Protestants have approved it, and ranked the author among the witnesses to truth. Some Roman Catholic writers charge him with want of sincerity and care; yet Panvinius did not scruple to publish this history, with notes of his own, and added to it the *Lives* of the popes from Sixtus IV to Pius IV. It was first printed at Venice in 1479 (fol.), and reprinted once or twice before 1500, since which time all the editions of it are said to have been castrated. His *Lives of the Popes* is written with elegance of style, and discovers powers of research and discrimination which were then rare. He writes with freedom of the popes. Some passages are omitted in late editions. In the edition of 1574, the passage in the life of St. Anacletus, "Uxorem habuit in Bithynia," is for the first time changed into "Uxorem non habens." Platina wrote also a *History of Mantua*, in Latin, which was first published by Lambecius, with notes, at Vienna (1675, 4to). The titles of some of his other works are, *De Naturis rerum:—Epistolæ ad diversos:—De honesta voluptate et valetudine:—De falso et vero bono:—Contra amores:—De vera nobilitate:—De optimo cive:—Panegyricus in Bessarionem:—Oratio ad Paulum II:—De pace Italiæ componenda et bello Turcico indicendo:—De flosculis linguæ Latinæ:—A Treatise on the Means of preserving Health, and the Science of the*

Kitchen (Bologna, 1498, 8vo), which provoked the following epigram by Sannazarius:

> Ingenia et mores, vitas, obitusque notasse
> Pontificum, argutæ lex fuit historiæ.
> Tu tamen hic lautæ tractas pulmenta culinæ,
> Hoc Platina, est ipsos pascere pontifices.

See Schröckh, *Kirchengesch.* vol. xxxii; Nicéron, *Mémoires*, vol. iii; Tiraboschi, *Storia della letter. Ital.* s. v.; *General Biog. Dict.* s. v.

Plato, one of the most eminent of the Greek philosophers. He was by far the most illustrious of the pupils of Socrates, completely eclipsing all his fellow-students, so that St. Augustine justly remarks, "Inter discipulos Socrates, non quidem immerito, excellentissima gloria claruit, qui omnes cæteros obscuraret, Plato" (*De Civ. Dei*, viii, 4). He was the earliest of the systematic scholarchs, or founders of permanent schools, in which the doctrines of the original master, with more or less of development and change, continued to be expounded through successive generations. His fame and influence on antiquity transcended the renown and authority of any other teacher, and may have suggested, in connection with the character of his doctrine and the mode of its exposition, the declaration of Labeo, that he was to be accounted a god rather than a man. "Hunc Platonem Labeo inter semideos commemorandum putavit, sicut Herculem, sicut Romulum; semideos autem heroibus anteponit, sed utrosque inter numina collocat" (Augustine, *ibid.* ii. 14). His influence was increased, rather than diminished, during the long and ardent struggle between rising Christianity and expiring Paganism—both combatants receiving his impulse, claiming his alliance, and submitting to his philosophical ascendency. Though the oblivion of the Greek language and the dogmatic character of mediæval speculation turned intellectual activity into widely divergent channels, yet the revival of letters was attended by the resurrection of Plato; and the Medicean Academy of Florence, under the direction of Marsilius Ficinus (q. v.), renewed the prominence of his name and of his philosophy. Since that period, the beginning of the 16th century, Plato has enjoyed an augmented authority in the domain of metaphysical inquiry; has animated successive schools of brilliant reputation and of extensive rule; and has been the late progenitor of the most famous systems which have given to modern Germany its marvellous predominance in transcendental metaphysics.

I. *Life and Times.*—The notices of Plato's life which have come down to us are few and scanty, and for the most part unauthenticated. Legend early fastened upon his name, and incrusted it over with myths as striking and as unreal as any employed by himself for the exemplification of his tenets. He transformed the rugged honesty of his teacher, Socrates: he was himself transfigurated by the wild fantasy of his own followers, and was *translated* in equal degree with Bully Bottom, though in dissimilar mode. But, if little is known of the real circumstances and incidents of the life of the philosopher, there is abundant information in regard to the troubled and motley times in which he lived. The ancient authorities for the life of Plato which have been transmitted to us are few, late, and untrustworthy. His biography by his pupil, companion, and successor, Xenocrates, was early lost. Of the numerous writers contemporaneous with him, or living in the next centuries, who treated his life, professedly or incidentally, scarcely any available memorials survive. Our fullest authorities are Diogenes Laertius, Apuleius, Olympiodorus, in the life prefixed to most editions of the *Opera Platonis*, and an anonymous biographer. These writers, Diogenes Laertius especially, may have had trustworthy materials at command, but they have commingled, or rather inundated them, with the legendary growth which sprang up after Plato's death—a growth which should not be entirely neglected, as it exhibits the manner in which Plato was regarded by his admiring disciples, arising out of his own imaginative expositions, and anticipating the fantastic reveries of the Neo-Platonic Thaumaturgists.

Plato was born a full Athenian citizen, of Athenian parents, but, apparently, not within the limits of Attica. His birthplace seems to have been the island of Ægina, where his father owned a cleruchy, or colonial estate. There are dissonances in regard to the year of his birth, but it fell within the first half of the Decennial War, or earlier portion of the Peloponnesian War. Grote assigns his nativity to May, B.C. 427, just before the surrender of Platæa; Clinton to May, B.C. 429, four or five months before the death of Pericles; and Diogenes Laertius to B.C. 428, the year in which Anaxagoras died. Taking Grote's date for convenience, as this is no place for the investigation of such chronological problems, the philosopher's birth was synchronous with the first exhibitions of the comedian Aristophanes, whom, throughout life he so greatly admired, and whose works he kept habitually under his pillow. Both the parents of Plato were of noble blood; a circumstance which affected equally his political inclinations and his speculative views. His father was Ariston, the son of Aristocles, and traced his descent from Codrus and the god Poseidon. His mother's name was Perictione. She was descended from a collateral branch of the family of Solon the Lawgiver; was nearly related to Critias, the chief of the Thirty Tyrants, and was the sister of Charmides, who was at the same time one of the ten governors of the Piræus. The genealogical table is given by Ueberweg. Legend, which is traced back to Speusippus, the nephew of Plato, ascribed the paternity of Plato to the god Apollo; and, in the form in which the story is told by Olympiodorus, closely imitates the record in regard to the nativity of Christ. A similar origin was assigned to Servius Tullius, to Pythagoras, to Alexander the Great, to Scipio Africanus, to Apollonius of Tyana, to the seventh ancestor of Genghiz-Kahn, to Buddha, and to many other notable personages. The story of Hercules is well known, and furnished occasion for the apt sarcasm of Tertullian: "Herculem de fabula facis Christum" (*Adv. Marc.* iv, 2). It was an old-world tale, often repeated in many ages and in many lands. As it was traced back to Speusippus, the translation of Plato into a supernatural being must have commenced immediately after his death. The transcendentalism of his doctrine may have suggested the fiction of his original divinity. The latter was recognised in the inscription on the tomb erected to his memory by the Athenians:

> Τοὺς δύ' Ἀπόλλων φῦσ', Ἀσκληπιὸν ἠδὲ Πλάτωνα·
> Τὸν μὲν ἵνα ψυχὴν, τὸν δ' ἵνα σῶμα, σόοι.

Soon after his birth he was carried to Mount Hymettus by his father and mother, that they might perform on his account the due sacrifices to the enchorial deities—Pan, the Nymphs, and the Nomian Apollo. As the infant lay sleeping on the flowers, the bees settled upon his lips, and filled his mouth with honey and the honeycomb, that Homer's verse might be accomplished, says Olympiodorus:

> Τοῦ καὶ ἀπὸ γλώσσης μέλιτος γλυκίων ῥέεν αὐδή (*Il.* ii, 249).

According to Greek usage, the child was called *Aristocles*, after his paternal grandfather. The name of *Plato* was imposed on him by Ariston of Argos, his instructor in gymnastics, on account of the breadth of his shoulders or of his forehead, or in consequence of the compass and fluency of his speech. He excelled so far in athletic sports as to gain the reputation of having contended in the Isthmian and other games. He began his education at an early age by studying grammar under Dionysius, and continued it by prosecuting the wide circle of knowledge then called music under Draco, a distinguished pupil of the more distinguished Damon. At some period of his youth he also gained an acquaintance with the philosophy of Heraclitus, under the guidance of Cratylus, after whom he has named one of his Dialogues. As a boy, he is said to have been quick in

apprehension, eager, diligent, grave, and modest. His first ambition, as with most young men of lively genius, seems to have been for literary renown. He wrote lyrics, dithyrambs, epigrams, and tragedies; and is even said to have composed a tetralogy for competition in the Dionysiac festival. In the estimation of antiquity he was universally accomplished, and his writings attest a wide range of acquirement. After he entered into intimate relations with Socrates, he burned up his juvenile poems; but throughout his career he was attended by the poetic afflatus. The acquaintance with Socrates seems to have begun about his twentieth year (B.C. 407), and was probably incited by the same causes which induced other wealthy, elegant, and ambitious Athenians to frequent the company of the ceaseless disputant—the desire of skill in debate, and dexterity in public harangues. Plato, or the author of the Seventh Epistle attributed to Plato, acknowledges that in youth "he was animated, like other young men, to devote himself, as soon as he was his own master, to the affairs of the commonwealth." Other attractions arose, and the association with Socrates became closer and closer with the passing years, till his venerable master was removed from him by the fatal cup of hemlock, after eight years of communion.

The twentieth year of Plato, according to Grote's chronology, coincides with the return of Alcibiades to Athens, the commission of Lysander as commander of the Peloponnesian fleet, and the appointment of Cyrus to the satrapy of Asia. Two years later came the decisive overthrow of the Athenians at Ægospotami—the siege—the starvation—the surrender—the dismantling and the humiliation of Athens. During these disastrous and sorrowing years the age of Plato would keep him employed, during the season of military operations, in the fleet, the infantry, or, more probably from his social station, in the cavalry. He is said to have participated in three engagements—at Tanagra, at Delium, and at Corinth. These exploits are wild imaginations, springing from the acknowledgment of Plato's service in the field, which an active, healthy youth could not have avoided, in such days of agony, without incurring the degradation of λειποταξία. Plato might have been present at Corinth, but Delium was fought when he was only three years old; Tanagra, when he was only one, or, if the principal action of that name be regarded, thirty years before his birth. There is no reason to doubt Plato's military service, but the scenes of that service are wholly conjectural. His intimate connection with Chabrias, in whose defence he once spoke, perhaps arose from old *camaraderie*.

The subjugation of Athens and the usurpation of the Thirty opened to Plato the public career which appeared barred against him during the reckless rule of the Demus. Critias, the leader of the Thirty, a man of splendid and various talent, of high culture, of daring energy, and of unscrupulous ambition, was a cousin; Charmides, one of the Ten at Piræus, who fell in the battle with Thrasybulus, was an uncle. The gates of the political stadium were thrown wide open to him, and the prospect of rapid advancement invited his eager activity. Accepting the Seventh Epistle as genuine, we have his own declaration that he promptly seized the opportunity afforded. His relatives, his friends, his party, so long excluded from office, were at length in power; and he entered as an aspirant along with those to whom he was united by blood, by traditional association, by hereditary interest, and by personal proclivities. He was a born aristocrat. These things should be remembered in the appreciation of Plato's political reveries, in the estimation of his censures of Pericles and the democracy, and even in the interpretation of his sarcasms on the rhetoricians and sophists. He was himself an exclusive, an oligarch, and he hated popular liberty even more than he hated a tyrant. His political prospects were, however, soon overclouded. The recent democracy had, doubtless, been lawless, savage, oppressive, and indiscreet; but his kinsmen, Critias, Charmides, and their colleagues, were more lawless, sanguinary, rapacious, and brutal. It is safe to reject the blind partisanship alike of Grote and of Mitford. Whether under the rule of the mob or under the rule of the few, the internal condition of Athens had become desperate. Our histories of Greece, with all their details of license and exaction, reveal but little of the consuming fever by which Athens and her sister states slowly perished. What outraged Plato more than anything else was the indignity and treacherous injustice shown towards his master, Socrates, himself affiliated with the dominant party. Socrates was ordered to arrest an innocent man, and to conduct him to punishment, in order that he might be involved in the crimes and odium of the chiefs. We are reminded of the nefarious counsels given by the historian and administrator Guicciardini for the repression of the prostrate and humiliated Florence. Socrates refused, and his life was endangered. At the same time his garrulous mouth was stopped, and his instructions in the streets and highways prohibited. Plato gave up the delusive visions of reform which he subsequently ascribed to his youth, and withdrew himself from political concerns. Critias was killed, the Thirty driven out, the usurpation overthrown, and a complete subversion of the recent polity was effected. Plato again sought an entrance into public life. He was dragged in this direction by a strong desire, as he confesses. His inclinations were decidedly political. He complains of the violence and vengeance which attended the political disturbances, but admits that much moderation was shown by the restored democracy. Still the party adverse to him acquired full ascendency, and he found himself excluded from influence. His final repulse from Athenian politics was due to the malicious indictment of Socrates, and his death under sentence of the criminal court. The peril and the condemnation of his teacher drew Plato closer to him. He attended and advised the sage in his trial. He offered to pay the fine that might be imposed upon him; and, if parted by sickness from his last serene hours, he fondly treasured up his memory and his aims, and consecrated his own life to the illustration of his virtues, and the perpetuation of the fame of his great guide and friend. Anxious and occupied with other cares as were the years of Plato's intercourse with Socrates, many of the learned German scholars who have occupied themselves with the Platonic writings have concluded that several of them were composed and published before or soon after the death of his illustrious instructor. It seems more reasonable to refer them all, or nearly all, to a much later period.

The tragic fate of Socrates dispersed the Socratic fraternity and drove Plato from Athens. He naturally feared to be involved in like odium and like danger with Socrates. It must be remembered that the real cause of enmity was mainly political—that Socrates and Plato were not merely adversaries of democratic ascendency, but had been identified with the tyranny of the Thirty. The looseness, too, and unregulated passion of Athenian procedure, civil and criminal, must also be borne in mind. Justice, innocence, and law were no assured protection before an Attic dicastery. This, doubtless, intensified Plato's hereditary opposition to the rule of the majority, and would increase his distrust after the judicial murder of Socrates. He might recall the remark made by Alcibiades at the time of his flight from Sicily, that he would not trust his life to the vote of his own mother, lest she should blunder and deposit a black pebble for a white one. Plato accordingly retired from Athens, and found refuge in the house of Euclid at Megara, a fellow-pupil, and the father of the Megaric school. He was now in his twenty-eighth year. How long he continued at Megara, and how far he imbibed the doctrines of Euclid, cannot be ascertained, though Megaric tendencies may readily be

recognised in his own teachings. After leaving Megara, Plato entered upon a round of distant voyages; but their extent, their order, and whether continuous or interspersed with visits to his native city, must remain undetermined. In the course of his travels he visited Cyrene, where he studied geometry under Theodorus; and thence proceeded to Egypt, where he admired the ancient monuments, and held intercourse with the priests. Some reports alleged that he extended his journeys to Palestine, Syria, Babylonia, and even to Persia. When he was about forty years of age he visited Tarentum—where he became acquainted with the Pythagoreans, Archytas, Timæus, Echecrates, etc.—and Syracuse, where his intimacy with Dion was formed. He is said to have been admitted at this time to the society of the elder Dionysius, and to have offended the tyrant, who sent him away in charge of Pollis, the Spartan, to be disposed of as a prisoner of war. The commission was executed, and Plato was sold as a slave in Ægina, but soon ransomed by Anniceris, who refused reimbursement. The story is questionable in all its parts.

Immediately after this supposed adventure Plato returned to Athens, and revived in a novel and more systematic form the career of Socrates, opening a school of philosophy in the grove of the hero Academus, which adjoined a small estate of his own, either inherited or purchased, lying a mile north of Athens, on the road to Eleusis. Here he remained for nearly forty years, in the exercise of his didactic vocation, with the exception of two absences in Sicily, each of considerable length. To this interval between the death of Socrates and the establishment of the Academy has been attributed the composition of many of the Platonic Dialogues. This has been done by German critics, who have been enabled by keen intuition to discover what was in the mind of Plato, though wholly unrevealed by himself. The object of their production in these years is not easily discernible. The leisure for their preparation would scarcely be afforded during the fatigues of his long journeys; nor is it likely that one so averse to the literary promulgation of his views would engage in such labors while occupied in storing his mind with multifarious knowledge, in examining the dogmas of other philosophers, and in maturing his own views. In the absence of all positive information, a decision is as absurd as it would be impossible. But the conclusion of Grote is most plausible—that the *Chartæ Platonicæ* are all subsequent to Plato's entrance upon his career as a teacher.

The history of the Academy under the rule and instruction of its founder is unknown. That it was thoroughly successful is evident from the high and wide reputation of its teacher, from the distinguished names of its pupils, from the duration of their academical course, and from its flourishing condition at his death. Among the more notable of the earlier academicians were Aristotle, who attended the instructions of the great teacher for twenty years; Speusippus, the nephew of Plato, and his immediate successor; Xenocrates, who succeeded Speusippus in the direction of the school; Eudoxus of Cnidus, the illustrious astronomer; the orators Demosthenes, Hyperides, and Lycurgus; the Syracusan Dion, and his comrade and murderer, Callippus. May we add "Timon of Athens" to the list, on the strength of the statement of Olympiodorus, that "with Plato alone did the misanthrope associate." Men and strong-minded women are said to have flocked to his lectures, as he renounced the pungent and mortifying irony of Socrates, abstained from disputations in the markets and workshops, and refrained from hunting up young men to persecute them with logomachies. He differed from the Pythagoreans in the abstinence from oaths, secrecy, and dogmatism; he differed from the Sophists, or those to whom the name in a later day attached, in requiring no fee from his hearers, though he accepted presents at times of large amounts. Honor, renown, and influence increased with advancing years. He was consulted, like that strange philosopher, Bentham, in recent times, by communities anxious to improve their organizations or jurisprudence. The Macedonian king Perdiccas sought his advice, and received Philip into his confidence upon his recommendation. The younger Dionysius twice tempted him to Syracuse, though from these visits he derived little advantage for himself, no improvement of condition for the Sicilians, and only discredit for philosophy. These two expeditions to Sicily constitute notable episodes in the life of Plato, and are reported and exculpated at length in the Seventh Epistle. On the accession of Dionysius the younger, who entertained some philosophical aspirations, and was still in the freshness of youth, his uncle Dion pursuaded Plato to accept an invitation to Syracuse, in the hope that his influence over a youthful mind might promote a renovation of good order and prosperity, by inducing the abandonment of the savage policy and cruel practices of the preceding tyranny. Plato yielded with hesitation and reluctance, as he afterwards declared, and sailed for Syracuse B.C. 367, twenty years after his first supposed visit. He was cordially welcomed, hospitably entertained, and for some time handsomely treated. But no conversion was effected. He found the young cub the whelp of the old beast. Dion was banished, and Plato discovered himself to be virtually a captive under surveillance. He was anxious to return to Athens, but the means of escape were unattainable. Dionysius made promises, and entreaties which were commands, and Plato prolonged his stay till the season of navigation in the ensuing year. Notwithstanding this unhappy experience, he was again (B.C. 361) persuaded to visit the tyrant of Syracuse, for the purpose of reconciling Dionysius to Dion, and securing the restoration of the latter to his country. The attempt failed utterly. Plato's life was imperilled, and he was enabled to return home only through the intervention of Archytas of Tarentum. On his return he met Dion at Olympia, and seems to have sanctioned his military expedition against Dionysius, though refusing any direct participation in the enterprise, on account of the technical hospitality received from the tyrant. Dion's bold adventure was successful. Dionysius was deposed and driven into exile. Dion acquired the control of Syracuse, declined into tyrannical procedures himself, was assassinated by his comrade Callippus, who was murdered in turn, and in the conflict of anarchy Dionysius was restored.

The intercourse of Plato with Dionysius, and even with Dion, was open to grave suspicion; and his visits to Sicily, with their calamitous issues, occasioned bitter reproach. The Seventh Epistle, addressed to the friends of Dion, is an elaborate exposition of the motives by which he professed to have been guided, and an anxious apology for his conduct. The disorder of the explanations; the subtle casuistry of the reasoning; the earnest palliation of his actions; the inconsequences and incongruities of his statements; the ruggedness and inequality of the expression; the absence of art, alike in the structure and in the details of the letter—are very divergent from the graces of Platonic composition, but are in perfect consonance with the situation of Plato, and with the painful solicitudes of a man compelled to justify what he was ashamed of, and, after the disaster of the mortifying events, to put the best possible interpretations upon unpleasant and damaging memories which could not be suppressed. The real facts may have been these: Plato, with the sanguine hope of a poet, the confidence of a philosopher, and the ambition of a reformer, believed that he could re-establish peace, good order, and happiness in Syracuse by his presence; but Dionysius and his subjects were equally intractable; and the Syracusans were so unfitted for civic and social tranquillity, by selfish and sensual luxury, chronic discord and general demoralization, as to be restless under any government, and refractory under any laws. The dissolution was universal throughout the Hellenic world,

though unrecognised; the total decay of the constitution was mistaken for an accidental, transitory, and curable disease. It was a time, in some respects, like the present: when the distemperature of society was universally experienced; when theories of all kinds—new constitutions on novel principles; socialistic, communistic, and other dreams—were in vogue, and sometimes put into practice, with only an aggravation of misery. This unhappy condition of society explains not merely Plato's failures in Sicily, but his disgust at Athenian politics, and the visionary, extravagant, and often immoral devices of his own political speculations.

The remainder of Plato's life, after his final return from Sicily, was devoted to his school. It was passed in great ease and honor, notwithstanding the troubles, domestic and foreign, in which Athens was involved, and the succession of wars which harassed, impoverished, and depopulated Greece. He died B.C. 347, in the year in which Olynthus was taken by Philip of Macedon, and, according to Seneca, on the same day of the same month in which he had been born ("Platoni diligentiæ suæ beneficio contigisse, quod natali suo decessit, et annum unum atque octogesimum implevit, sine ulla deductione," *Epist.* vi, 6 [58], § 31). He adds that hence the Magi, then at Athens, sacrificed to him, as being of a nature more than human ("amplioris fuisse sortis quam humanæ rati")—thus furnishing another evidence of his mythical divinity.

From this account of the life of Plato it will be seen that he had large and unsatisfactory acquaintance with the social ailments and political conditions of his time; that he held intimate intercourse with the most distinguished personages of the period; that he was brought into close connection with Socrates and the Socratic family, with the Heraclitean, Megaric, Pythagorean, and other schools; that his education was large and liberal; his studies, observation, and travels varied and extensive; his talents versatile and lofty; that he united the genius of the poet, the aptitudes of the rhetorician, the skill of the dialectician, the reason of the philosopher, with the diligence of a scholar, the training of a man of the world, and the propensities of a statesman. He was thus full-armed, and prepared to convert to his own use all former knowledge and speculation. How he employed his gifts and the materials at his command will be manifested by the consideration of his literary and philosophical career.

II. *Writings.*—The literary remains which pass under the name of Plato are among the most extensive monuments of the classic age of Athens, notwithstanding the disfavor with which he regarded writing as a mode of instruction, and his repeatedly expressed preference for oral communication in the treatment of philosophical problems (*Phædo*, p. 276; Grote, *Plato*, vol. i, ch. vi, p. 221–232). It would be pressing too far the remarkable declaration contained in the Seventh Epistle: "I have never myself written anything upon these subjects; there neither is, nor shall there ever be, a treatise of Plato"—it would be pressing this declaration too far to conclude from it that Plato had written nothing up to that late period of his life. It would be pressing it still further, and more unwarrantably, to receive it as evidence that he never wrote anything at all. The genuineness of the epistle is not above suspicion, and has often been denied. Moreover, Plato adds: "The opinions called by the name of Plato are those of Socrates, in his days of youthful vigor and glory." These opinions might have been published by writing, as well as by oral delivery, and still have been disclaimed; and there is a bold fiction, or Platonic myth, in ascribing them to Socrates at any period of his life; but it enabled Plato to disconnect himself from all personal responsibility for the doctrines set forth by him. It is certain that Plato discountenanced the written promulgation of philosophy, and that his writings were not designed for general circulation, or for the acquisition of literary or other fame, but as summaries for his school, and for the attestation of his views. This is confirmed by the story of Hermodorus selling the Platonic treatises in Sicily, and by the proverb founded thereon: Λόγοισιν Ἑρμόδωρος ἐμπορεύεται. Yet, in despite of this aversion, which rested on grounds of personal ease and security, as well as on the exclusiveness of sect and other philosophic reasons, the *Opera Platonis* constitute a very copious collection. They consist of thirty-six works, in fifty-six books, counting the thirteen epistles as one book. To these are appended, in many editions of Plato, seven treatises generally recognised to be spurious. Of the thirty-six works habitually ascribed to Plato, only two have wholly escaped challenge on the score of authenticity.

It is very important for the student of philosophy that the genuine treatises of Plato should be clearly separated from those that are doubtful or illegitimate. It is equally important that none should be repudiated from fanciful conjecture. The task of criticism seemed to have been adequately executed by the great scholars of the Museum at Alexandria, and the results which they reached were not seriously questioned till the close of the last century. Since that period a succession of acute and too ingenious philologians in Germany, commencing with Tennemann and Schleiermacher, have undertaken to determine the legitimacy, the order, and the approximate dates of the several Platonic treatises, in accordance with their own notion of his latent meaning; and have rejected such of the Dialogues as failed to harmonize in form, finish, or sentiment with their preconceived views of the Platonic scheme. These criticisms, arrangements, and rejections do not accord with each other: there are continual dissonances among these organizers and repudiators. If they are followed, everything becomes a quaking bog beneath the feet of the inquirer. It is safer and more satisfactory to acquiesce in the conclusions of the ancients, who had means of judging at their command denied to us, and to receive as Plato's what has been received as Plato's under their authority. To this conclusion Mr. Grote comes after a diligent and minute examination of the Platonic canon, and of all that has been alleged on the part of the opponents. He shows that the accepted canon rests upon the scheme of Thrasyllus, formed about the reign of Tiberius; that the canon of Thrasyllus rests upon the classification of Aristophanes of Byzantium, and the arrangements of the Alexandrian Library; that the Alexandrian critics probably derived their knowledge, mediately or immediately, from Xenocrates and the early Academy itself; and that the Platonic documents were attested by their careful preservation, transcription, and collation in the Academy itself—the house and manuscripts of Plato having been bequeathed by him to the school. The chain of evidence is as complete as possible for the determination of the authorship of ancient works. The direct positive evidence is valuable and irrefragable, but limited. It is almost entirely confined to references in Aristotle to treatises with which he connects the name of Plato; references to passages in Plato, but without mention of his name; and references which can scarcely be explained otherwise than as references to evident passages in Plato. The Dialogues thus accredited are, first, the Republic, Timæus, and Laws; second, the Phædon, Banquet, Phædrus, and Gorgias; third, the Meno, Hippias Minor, and Menexenus; fourth, the Theætetus, Philebus, and Sophistes; and lastly, the Politicus, Apology, Lysis, Laches, and perhaps the Protagoras, Euthydemus, and Cratylus.

The question of the canon is associated with several other difficult inquiries—the order of production and dates of the several works, their coherence and interdependence, their special aim, and their purpose as parts of a supposed Platonic system. There are no external testimonies or internal criteria by which the dates of production can be fixed. In some of the Dialogues events are mentioned which seem to determine the anterior limit of their composition, but reveal nothing as

to later years. Some critics have supposed that the order or approximate dates could be settled by the relative age assigned to Socrates in each. This is very arbitrary and fantastical, and leaves no guidance but bold conjecture. Some critics assume that certain pieces appeared during the lifetime of Socrates, others immediately after his death, others again during the period of Plato's foreign wanderings, and a large portion of the remainder in an indicated succession after the institution of the Academy. Some philological legislators decide that the Phædrus and such other Dialogues as may suit their fancy were the first fruits of his literary fecundity, in consequence of the joyous juvenility of their utterances, the uncastigated redundance of imagination, and the poetic richness of expression. But the latest productions of Edmund Burke were the richest, the most ornate, fervid, and poetical.

It is impossible to discover the chronological order of the Platonic treatises. The wide diversity of opinion on the subject, the ingenious arguments employed by discordant scholars to confirm their own theories and to refute those of others, attest this impossibility. There is as much divergence of view in regard to the sequence of the Platonic Dialogues as in regard to the dramas of Shakespeare. The hopeless uncertainty of all conclusions is assured by the similar characteristics of both authors. The productions of each were subject to continued revision and alteration; the first draft rarely, if ever, represented the ultimate form. Additions, suppressions, expansions, modifications, were from time to time introduced by both into their works, which were not published in permanent form, or thrown into circulation until after the death of their authors. Hence it is an utterly delusive procedure in either case to undertake to decide the date of production by tone, by style, by doctrine, or by historical statement or allusion. The writings of Plato are not bounded by the accidents of time. They bear the impress of his hand, his heart, his soul, not at particular moments of his life, but are the flower and sum of his whole intellectual existence. Except in a few instances, which do not affect the totality of his instructions, there is no ascertainable before and after, but all stand upon the same chronological plane. The attempt to determine the order in which the several works of Plato was produced derives its chief interest from the aid thence expected in tracing the evolution of the Platonic doctrines, and the relation of each treatise to the rest. The inquiry is tempting, but, even if capable of satisfactory solution, would be more fruitless in the case of Plato than of any other philosopher. There is so little in Plato of a dogmatic character, so much of tentative, sceptical, and undefined exploration, that the chief result of such an investigation, if it were practicable, would not be the discovery of the process of development and expansion, but only the settlement of the sequence of published doubts.

The question of the connection of the Platonic writings early engaged attention. It seems to have been raised in the years immediately following Plato's death. The great critic Aristophanes of Byzantium, librarian of the Museum at Alexandria, put forth an arrangement of the more notable tractates of Plato in a system of trilogies, the members of each trilogy being determined by community of subject or correspondence of form and treatment. The Platonic exposition is, for the most part, so thoroughly dramatic that it might naturally suggest an arrangement analogous to that observed in theatrical compositions. But the adaptation of the mould to the Platonic writings is altogether arbitrary, and proved to be inadequate in the hands of its inventors. The *Leges* and *Epinomis* were divorced from the *Republic;* the *Crito* and *Phædo* were placed in a different class from the *Euthyphron* and the *Apology*. Only fifteen of the treatises were *trilogized;* the rest were ungrouped, and followed in single file. Grote thinks the arrangement may have been earlier than Aristophanes. The imperfections of the scheme are manifold, and provoked other distributions. By some critics his works were arranged in three classes: 1. The Direct, or dramatic; 2. The Indirect, or narrative; 3. The Mixed. This disposition is awkward, insufficient, and indistinct. Only two, or at most three of the works of Plato are really narrative. All the rest are dialogues, and therefore dramatic; but these are composed of dialogues blended in varying proportions with narrative. Under the reign of the first emperors of Rome the Platonic remains were redistributed by Thrasyllus, to whom were due two distinct schemes. Imitating the example of Aristophanes, and guided by the same dramatic analogy, he disposed the whole recognised works of Plato in nine tetralogies, or groups of four each. The first tetralogy, in which a real community of subject and an orderly development are manifest, was formed of the *Euthyphron*, *Apology*, *Crito*, and *Phædo* — which still lead the procession of the *Corpus Platonicum* in nearly all editions of Plato's works. But the tetralogies of Thrasyllus had no more chronological truth, and rarely more logical coherence, than the trilogies of the Alexandrian school. They do not seem to have satisfied himself, for he proposed another and totally diverse classification of the Platonic memorials, founded upon their form and aim rather than on their subject or supposed succession. In this plan Thrasyllus distinguished the Platonic treatises into— I. Inquisitory; II. Expository. The Inquisitory productions were divided into, A. Gymnastic; B. Agonistic. The Gymnastic were subdivided into, 1. Obstetrical; 2. Peirastic, or Tentative; and the Agonistic into, 1. Confirmatory, or Monstratory; and 2. Refutatory. The Expository treatises were separated into, C. Theoretical, and D. Practical. Each of these contained two classes: the Theoretical—1. Physical; 2. Logical; and the Practical—1. Ethical, and 2. Political. The two schemes are exhibited by Grote in tabular form (*Plato*, vol. i, ch. iv, p. 161, 162).

The ancients thus renounced the effort to reduce into a connected series the writings of Plato, either by the evidence of the order of their production, or by hypothetical indications of their logical and philosophical interdependence. Such disappointment did not cool the ardor or repress the audacity of the German philologians. Schleiermacher bluntly assumed that the various productions of Plato constituted preconceived and well-ordered parts of a systematic doctrine, contemplated in its integrity from the beginning of his career. Starting from this point, he undertook to detect by internal signs the periods of production, the relation of the parts to each other, the purpose of each treatise, and the constitution of the whole philosophy. Whatever did not accord with this scheme was set aside as a disconnected or incidental labor, or was rejected as a fraudulent pretence. Schleiermacher's views raised up a host of opponents, but a host of imitators of his procedure also. It is not appropriate to examine here the theory of Schleiermacher, or the theories of his antagonists; or to point out what has been admitted and what rejected by each of the acute disputants. The theses of Schleiermacher, Ast, Socher, C. K. Hermann, Stallbaum, Steinhart, Süsemihl, Munk, and Ueberweg are carefully stated, weighed, and judged in Grote's laborious and tedious work. The discussion is noticed here because it involves the decision of two very important points in the appreciation of the doctrine of Plato: Was there any unity of design in the literary productions of this philosopher? Is there any unity of execution, any methodical scheme of philosophy in them? In other words, did Plato contemplate from the commencement of his career the elaboration of that scheme which may be deduced from his works? Does each separate work bear, from the intention of its author, a definite relation, and render a definite service to any complete doctrine? Are the works of Plato to be considered parts of a system? or as, in the main, occasional and fragmentary presentations of disconnected parts of philosophical inquiry? These questions probe the whole significance

of Plato's career and of the Platonic doctrine, and we assent substantially to the conclusions of Grote. The idea of a preconceived plan had been rejected by Ast, Socher, Hermann, Stallbaum, and others, before it was impugned by Grote. A system of philosophy is always a production of slow and gradual growth, requiring not merely long meditation and frequent re-examination, but favorable circumstances, so that it is rarely completed by its originator, except in method and broken outline. The philosophy of Comte is one of the few instances of complete organization by the author himself; the philosophy of Leibnitz an instance of the much commoner result of only fragmentary indication. The assumption of Schleiermacher is at variance with nearly all experience. Certain fundamental views in regard to principle or method, usually to both, for they are almost indissolubly connected, present themselves to the quick apprehension and creative imagination of the young philosopher. These long struggle to shape themselves into definite form. They are at first vague, though luminous; active, though indeterminate; indistinct in outline, though of penetrating radiance. As separate questions arise, they are discussed under the impulse and by the guidance of the new light: and each successive discussion renders this new force more distinct, more prominent, and more controlling. With the process of such expansion, new modifications and new applications are introduced, and it is only when an opportunity is afforded, after the performance of this course, for revising the chain of progression, that a philosopher is enabled to present his doctrine in harmonious integrity. Was this opportunity afforded to Plato, outside of the sphere of his acroamatic expositions? It may well be doubted, if not roundly denied. In his published works we find fragmentary revelations only, accompanied by incongruities and positive inconsistencies, which would surely have been absent from speculations complete in the mind of the philosopher, and not merely in various stages of development.

If there was no unity of purpose in the several productions, if they were never contemplated in their conception as parts of a general and concordant system, there could scarcely be any definite unity in their execution. The whole is composed of all its parts. The meditated whole may, indeed, be discerned "by the mind's eye" where several of the parts have been lost or never supplied, as any circle may be completed from a single arc, or from the broken segments of the same circumference. But that this may be done it is essential that all the members finished or preserved shall have the same curvature, shall have been described by the same radius revolving round the same centre. This cannot be said, and cannot be supposed without violent presumptions, of the Platonic treatises. All that we know, and all that we can positively discern, is adverse to such an hypothesis. The style of Plato is singularly various: its variety is one of the most salient indications of the wealth, freedom, and activity of his genius. The structure of the several dialogues is so ingeniously diversified as to render them incapable of classification, and to make them, like the plays of Shakespeare, each a distinct species in itself. Plato's mode of procedure is as elastic as his style. The Socratic method of disputation may be usually retained, but its spirit is curiously changed in different applications, and its prominence is varied. The points of view, the central stations, are constantly shifted in passing from one dialogue to another, and, as a necessary result, the aspects presented are changed—the tendencies are dissimilar and the doctrines are uncoalescing. But more than this: very few of the treatises of Plato are constructive or dogmatical. Nearly all of them are simply negative or inquisitorial. The latter do not seek to maintain any dependence on the former. They are separated by the whole diameter of the intellectual sphere. It is only in a few of his works—presumably the late and still crude products of his old age, the second fruitage that never ripens—that Plato enounces principles which are neither inductions nor deductions, and propounds dogmas which are rather germs of undeveloped speculation than the partial representation of the conclusions of a system already completed and formulated. However greatly he may have travestied and sublimated the character of his teacher and philosophical protagonist, his procedure was in the main and throughout honestly and earnestly Socratic, and his aim was Socratic also. His object was not the establishment of a doctrine, but the stimulation of candid investigation, in order to free his hearers from the stagnation of thought and the obsession of vulgar or treacherous errors. He was not a *doctrinaire*, but an inquirer; or, rather, he taught the need and practice of investigation, not a body of conclusions. Undoubtedly there is an intellectual unity, vague, unformed, and in great measure unconscious, in the constitution of every man; there is a mental identity, through innumerable and often wide changes of opinion, in the entire career of every thinker, and this unity and this identity, intuitively recognised by the pupil or student, will suggest purpose where no purpose was present, and furnish the elements of an imaginary system which never revealed itself to its parent. To this cause may be largely assigned the strange and divergent developments of the Platonic philosophy in the several schools which sheltered their reveries under the prestige of his great name. It would lead us too far from our proper subject to pursue further this line of reflection. We return, therefore, to the text that there was no conscious scheme, no unity of execution, in the writings of Plato, and approve of the spirit in which they have been regarded by Grote, who says, "I shall not affect to handle them as contributions to one positive doctrinal system, nor as occupying an intentional place in the gradual unfolding of one preconceived scheme, nor as successive manifestations of change, knowable and determinable, in the views of the author. For us they exist as distinct imaginary conversations, composed by the same author at unknown times and under unknown specialties of circumstance" (*Plato*, vol. i, ch. vi, p. 279).

The mode in which these questions may be decided regulates the interpretation to be given to the Platonic philosophy, both in the original conception of its author and in its subsequent developments. It explains the origin, the cause, and the filiation of the later divergencies, and their wide separation from each other. It determines our appreciation of the nature and extent of Plato's services to his own and future times, fixes his position in the history of philosophy and in the development of human intellect. It affects our estimate of his relation to his disciples, to his country, and to his times; and, indeed, penetrates and colors every part of the criticism which may be hazarded on his personal and speculative career.

III. *Relations to his Times.*—For the just and adequate conception of Plato it is indispensable to ascertain his actual position in the Hellenic world, and his attitude towards Attic thought, the thought both of the general public and of the cultivated intelligences in that period of mental activity which followed the death of Pericles. To do this it is necessary to consider the remarkable mission of Socrates; for, however Plato may have transmuted and glorified his master, he unquestionably continued his labors in a higher sphere, and both spoke in his name and contemplated the same public results. The extreme democracy of Athens, which was only the fullest and most pronounced exhibition of the general Hellenic tendency, threw all power—political, social, and, we may almost say, religious—into the hands of the multitude. The populace became more wilful, arrogant, and reckless after the demoralization produced by the Peloponnesian War and the plague. But the intractable Demus, described in burning lineaments by Aristophanes, is always under the guidance or at the mercy of demagogues, flatterers, and time-serving

politicians. The sense of power produced in the masses the feeling of right, for with mere numbers "might is right;" and the execrable maxim, "Stet pro ratione voluntas," is the motto of an ochlocracy even more than it is of an autocrat. The mob cannot be led by considerations of abstract morality; it may be wheedled by persuasion, by adroit catch-words, by dexterous appeals to its whims, passions, and immediate interests. At Athens it had lost all reverence for the cardinal principles of right; it had been greatly corrupted by the incidents and consequences of the war; it was habitually misguided for selfish purposes by its dissolute leaders; gentleness, mercy, justice, prudence, were all discredited; and everything was sacrificed to momentary caprice, to insane suspicion, and to blind fury (Plato, *De Rep.* viii, x–xiii; Xenoph. *De Rep. Ath.* Oratores Attici, passim). In these respects the Athenians were merely the highest exemplification of the contemporaneous spirit of the Greeks. The leaders, who debauched the people, could hope to gain or to retain their ascendency only by encouraging the debauched sentiments by which they throve. Under these circumstances professed teachers visited the Greek cities and thronged to Athens, undertaking to communicate for pay the corroding arts by which the populace might be swayed, and office, power, honor, and emolument acquired. By the union of these bad influences truth lost all respect; virtue all authority; the sense of right was destroyed; every ancient rule, custom, or institution was deprived of its sanction; every venerable principle was brought into contempt; morality was supplanted by passion or apparent expediency; nothing stable was suffered to remain; words became jugglers' tools, reason was degraded to chicanery, casuistry, and sonorous plausibility; and specious rhetoric or ambiguous commonplaces took the place of wisdom. No hope could be entertained for the renewed health of society, for the welfare of the community, for the restoration of order in the state, till this vicious circle of delusions had been broken and suppressed. But the delusions, and the pernicious practices which attended them, were fortified by the conceit of knowledge and of practical sagacity; and this conceit could not be overcome without exposing the ignorance which it concealed, and compelling the vain tribe of blind leaders of the blind to confess their ignorance with shame and remorse. The most effectual mode of reaching this result might well seem to be the examination of the nature, import, and ambiguities of words, habitually and loosely used without reference to their special significance or insignificance; the investigation of the shadowy and unsettled notions attached to current phrases and accepted aphorisms; the discovery of the characteristics and relations of propositions, both in particular employments and in their general constitution; and the detection of the conditions under which valid conclusions might be drawn. Lessons of this character could not be effectually communicated to persons confident in their own knowledge and perspicacity, and contemning all who were of a different communion, otherwise than by propounding a series of interrogations growing not out of each other, but out of the answers to each question, and thus leading the respondents into a labyrinth of perplexities, absurdities, inconsistencies, and impotent confusion. No escape would then be left from the recognition of previous ignorance and error. The better natures would be stimulated to further inquiry, and to persistent efforts to attain a knowledge of momentous truths, or, at least, to abstain from the preconization of manifest uncertainties, unmeaning verbiage, or interested misrepresentations, as unquestionable truth. Now this procedure was the Socratic *elenchus*, and it was mainly conducted by means of the Socratic *sorites*—a most fallacious form of reasoning, but most piercing in unveiling the hollow pretensions of arrogant sophistry. It was a keen "examination of conscience," intended to lay bare the habitual sins of ignorance, false knowledge, and fraudulent conceit. It was not designed to teach anything but the knowledge of self, and the accompanying knowledge of ignorance disguised as wisdom. This was the true *Nosce teipsum*, and the ground on which the Delphic Oracle pronounced Socrates the wisest of men—because he professed to know nothing. It was a contrivance for sweeping away error, as the indispensable preliminary for the discovery of truth. It was not the announcement of truth, but the preparation for its reception. It was the preaching of repentance, which must precede, and might induce, the restoration of individual, social, and political health, morality, and welfare. We see from the testimony of Plato, Xenophon, and even Aristophanes, to what cruel tortures, to what writhing reluctations, to what bitter reflections, to what irritating mortifications, the *catechumens* in this strange school were subjected. Some went away penitent, some sought fuller knowledge, and attached themselves to the master with reverent love and eager desire to learn, some followed him to acquire the secret of his art, that they might apply it to the nefarious practices which he proposed to frustrate. Hence from the Socratic school issued Alcibiades, and Critias, and Charmides, and Xenophon—the mercenary soldier and enemy of his country. But the most of the disciples departed in rage and confusion, to feed upon their husks, to repeat their old practices, and to nurse enmity against the man and the process by which they had been exposed and brought to shame.

The vocation of Socrates was exercised in the dockyards, the workshops, the markets, the streets, and all places of public gathering. He straggled about, seizing upon every chance idler whom he might; and whom he fascinated, or *button-holed*, so that "he could not choose but hear." Plato changed the audience and the venue; but he pursued the same dialectical method as his instructor, for the same purposes, with the same distant prospects; but with greater elegance, higher culture, and in a loftier range of thought, illustration, and expression. Like Socrates, he aimed at coercing his hearers into an examination of the meaning of their terms and the contents of their propositions, single or connected, in order to induce them to put aside the misguiding and corrupting influences of the empty pretence of knowledge, and of sophistical rules of action. When this was achieved, something more might be attempted: till this was done, nothing beneficial could be expected. The teachings of Socrates and Plato might train men in the legitimate employment of language and the instruments of thought, but was not calculated for the establishment of systematic doctrine; and they had direct relation to the positive needs of the Hellenic communities of their time, rather than to the intellectual aspirations of a few cultivated minds. If these views be correct, it is manifest that Plato could neither have contemplated nor executed any rounded scheme of philosophy in the writings that remain to us; and we know that we possess all his important works. The philosophy that may be ascribed to him must therefore be patiently, and in some degree at least conjecturally, developed from the hints that he has given, and from the scattered tenets that he has expressed.

There is another peculiarity which points in the same direction. Artistic considerations, and the desire to reproduce the life of the time and the familiar intercourse of Athenians, may have induced Plato to adopt the form of dialogue in nearly all his compositions. The truer representation both of Socrates and of the Socratic mode of procedure may also have concurred in recommending the dramatic presentation of his inquiries. But the dialogue had another and still higher advantage for him: it enabled him to conceal his opinions, and to dissociate himself from any doctrines calculated to give offence, or that might give offence, to the irritable people of Athens. The fate of Socrates was always before his eyes; and with much more sincerity, as well as art, than Descartes, he evaded responsibility for his opinions. He did not only adopt the form of dialogue, but he made

Socrates the principal speaker, illustrating the Socratic method under the mask of Socrates, and putting nearly everything of weight, moment, or originality into his mouth. He never appears *in propria persona*. There is nothing to connect him before the Athenian dicasteries with any tenet in his writings. There is a constant avoidance of definite doctrine, a frequent censure of written instruction, a continual reference to the obstetrical procedure, and a deliberate renunciation of all responsibility. Everything is thus adverse to systematic unity of any kind in the *Corpus Platonicum*.

IV. *Literary and Artistic Merits.*—The dramatic form of nearly all the Platonic writings has just been mentioned as one of the instrumentalities by which the philosopher shrouded his personality, and withdrew himself from the malice of his fellow-citizens; but it constitutes one of the distinguishing excellences of his composition. Whatever construction may be put upon Plato's philosophic career, whatever value may be assigned to his speculations, whatever censures of his doctrines may be hazarded, his varied literary merits and graces have always won the most enthusiastic admiration. In a beautiful epigram on his great comic contemporary attributed to him, Plato says that the Graces found in the soul of Aristophanes a temple which should never decay. The comedies of Aristophanes were Plato's constant companions. He caught from them many delicate turns of expression and attitudes of thought; and he offered in his own Protean mind an equally imperishable temple for the habitation of the Graces. Plato probably owes much more of his immortality to the beauties of his compositions than he does to his philosophic splendor and profundity; and perhaps it was chiefly through the fascination of his manner that his doctrines secured the attention necessary for their appreciation and acceptance. The literary attractions of the Platonic writings furnish their first and most easily recognised claim to permanent renown, and can scarcely be regarded as accidental or undesigned characteristics. Plato's earliest efforts were in the direction of poetry. He is believed to have produced attempts of high pretension in the popular forms of poetic art. No literary apprenticeship equals poetical composition. When he first associated himself with Socrates he was full of dreams of political distinction, and he may have expected to derive from the intercourse the same aids for a political career which were derived by other illustrious pupils of the school. When he renounced the temptations of a political career, he converted to philosophic purposes all the knowledge of literary art and all the faculties of effective expression which he had acquired by his previous discipline. The result was a style unrivalled for variety, fertility, vivacity, ease, flexibility, and almost every form of literary excellence. The great difficulty of expression—to say simple things simply, and ordinary things with propriety (*difficile est communia dicere*)—was never surmounted by any writer with such felicity as by Plato. None has approached him in the natural facility with which he changes the mood of expression with the changed mood of feeling, or with the requirements of the changing subject. He turns "from grave to gay, from lively to severe," with inimitable self-possession; rising without effort to the highest sublimities of imagination, descending without a fall to the playfulness of unchecked humor, and poising himself in the middle air without hazard and without uneasy fluttering of his pinions.

The exuberance of the Greek vocabulary can be estimated only by comparing Aristophanes with Plato—not that they exhaust its wealth, but that they have an ampler mastery of its treasures than any other writers of the tongue. In this comparison Plato will not appear inferior to Aristophanes in the extent of his possessions, in the happiness of their employment, or in the force of their combinations. Words, are, however, only the currency of thought and feeling. The preeminent merit of Plato is equally manifest in the plasticity of his phraseology; the appropriate turns of expression—the homeliness at times, at times the rare magnificence of his diction; the close adaptation of the utterance to the sentiment, so as to furnish a perfect cast of whatever is intended to be conveyed, no matter how convoluted and intricate. To these qualities must be added the balance and harmony of all the instrumentalities of communication, and—that which most delighted an Attic ear—the rhythm and melody which are almost as imperceptible to moderns as "the music of the spheres" to those who know not "divine philosophy."

These remarkable excellences are only aids for the fuller exhibition of higher characteristics of art. The drama was the favorite recreation of the Athenian people; their whole life was dramatic; their time was spent in the open air, "hearing or telling some new thing;" their political discussions were dramatic; their forensic controversies were thoroughly theatrical; their social gatherings and their street colloquies were all dramatic—and the dialogue was in consequence the natural representation of their daily existence, as well as of the customary procedure of Socrates. The Dialogues of Plato, at once artful and artistic, seemed wholly devoid of art, from their correspondence with the familiar usages of the people; and thus they won regard and ready acceptance, which might have been sturdily refused to a more demonstrative form of communication. Then, too, the dialogue enabled the author to turn and twist a question into every imaginable attitude and shape, and Plato revelled in the performance of such legerdemain. It furnished an opportunity of examining a thesis or a doubt on every possible side; of bringing forward and answering, modifying, appreciating, or evading, every conceivable objection; and of thus applying the Socratic elenchus in the most startling manner and with the best effect. It also enabled Plato to keep ever in the foreground his beloved teacher, who was elevated by his presentation, though dressed up so as to be incapable of recognition.

This prominence of Socrates points to another charm of the Platonic writings. We have little reason to believe that the Socrates of Plato was the man whom Xenophon described, whom Aristophanes ridiculed, whom the Athenians laughed at, whom Anytus and Melitus indicted, and who drank the hemlock in the public dungeon. The character presented was thoroughly unreal and wholly idealized; but it was a perfectly natural and consistent creation—as much so as Hamlet, Prospero, or Falstaff. It was a living portrait of one who had never appeared in that fashion in life. The same remarks may be extended to the other personages introduced into the magic mirror of Plato. The dramatic imagination is continually displayed by him with a power and a sagacity which might have been envied by Sophocles, by Aristophanes, or by Molière. These lifelike personages, moreover, are not employed by him as vain puppets, or as pageantry to excite surprise or to decorate the scene. They have a sufficient *ratio essendi*, and help forward all the graver purposes of the philosopher. How much more effective are the illustration and the pungency of the reasoning when they are the spontaneous outpouring of the thoughts and feelings of personages like ourselves and our acquaintances! Mr. Grote has shown the aim and the service of the endless questionings and inconclusive argumentation of Plato; and he has noted their partial correspondence with the unappreciated method of the schoolmen. Both procedures appear tedious, over-subtle, and absurd to modern apprehensions; yet they had their use, and might be revived with advantage. But the Platonic art renders the further service of bringing "home to men's business and bosoms" the grave perplexities which are discussed in so many forms and clothed in such chameleon hues; and also of making men take a lively interest in debates, which might otherwise be repelled as abstract refinements, devoid of

practical interest and significance. The total neglect into which the great schoolmen have fallen, when contrasted with the unfading fame of Plato, may prove how much of his influence in every age has been due to his literary skill and the marvellous subtlety and perfection of his dialogue.

If we frankly and admiringly confess the variety and splendor of the Platonic style, we must not close our eyes to its occasional defects. The copiousness of his expression and the joy of indulging his genius certainly encouraged loquacity and a needless languor of movement. The richness of his imagination, lavished upon reveries, also led to turgidity and inappropriate gorgeousness of rhetoric. These defects were noticed by the ancient critics, and can scarcely be overlooked by the sober modern student (Dionys. Halicarn. *De Vi Demosth.* p. 956; Longin. *De Sublim.* c. xxxii, xxix). There is the brilliancy, but there is also the extravagance of the Miltonic outbursts of fancy, and, as the language far outstrips the thought, it becomes obscure, like a cloud before the sun, whose darkness is deepened by the fringe of radiance on its borders.

It is not merely from this cause that Plato frequently lapses into obscurities and awkwardnesses. He is sometimes more concerned about his expression than about his thought. He dealt in reflections still vague to himself, and in mysteries not clear to his own mind. There was constant demand for the services of a Delian diver. The subjects which he handled were not only deep, but unfathomed by him; not only dark, but undefined. Their imperfect apprehension by himself was reflected by the indistinctness of his utterances. There was also a misguiding star by which he was often led astray, and tempted into pathless intricacies. The imagination of Plato was the commanding faculty of his intellect, and he followed its beams too far. He was a poet by congenital propensity. Aristotle has said that the philosopher is a devotee of fable (*φιλόμυθος ὁ φιλοσόφος πώς ἐστιν, Metaph.* i, ii, p. 982). Plato furnished the example and confirmed the *dictum*. He insisted upon the employment of philosophical fiction as the best means of popular education; and proposed to substitute it for the great poets—Homer, Pindar, and the Tragedians—whom he condemned and excluded from his commonwealth. He was constantly indulging his poetic appetencies, inventing fables for the illustration of his positions, and converting his fables into philosophical verities. Were the Platonic *Ideas* at first anything more than fantastic dreams—"tenues sine corpore vitas?" This tendency, which grew with years, eventuated in mysticism; and mysticism is at best a luminous cloud, unsubstantial, impalpable, inapprehensible, however bright it may be.

V. *Philosophy.*—From what has already been observed, it will be evident that we could not ascribe to Plato a definite, distinct, coherent, and complete body of doctrine. But philosophy, in its original application, and peculiarly in the Socratic school, imported the love and pursuit of truth and wisdom, without assuming their actual attainment. In the philosophy of every sect, the method of inquiry and the germs or fundamental principles constitute its distinctive characteristics and excellences, and determine its ulterior developments, whether wrought out by the founder of the school or by his successors. Thus, though we may deny to Plato the full creation of a philosophic system, we must admit that he laid the corner-stone and some of the foundations of a system; that he opened out new paths of inquiry and broadened old ones, that he stimulated investigation by characteristic modes, and communicated a potent impulse in a particular direction; and that he furnished new and pregnant germs of thought to be cherished into ample growth and production by those who should come after him. These germs are scattered through his writings without reciprocal connection; but they may be discovered, harmonized, and combined. Though their meaning may appear diverse to different minds, their combinations be variously established, and their developments be strangely divergent, yet a general accordance in the constitution of all the expositions will maintain the family likeness, and attest the presence of a distinctive and fruitful though undisclosed body of thought in the original founder of the sect. It is this body of thought, indicated, but unequally and imperfectly revealed, in the Platonic treatises—extracted from them, and co-ordinated by a succession of acolytes, who professed to find it in the authentic texts—which constitutes the philosophy of Plato. Partly in consequence of the length of this notice, partly in consequence of the impossibility of referring the connected scheme in its connected form to Plato, it will be presented in brief outline under the head of PLATONIC PHILOSOPHY.

VI. *Services and Influence.*—A few remarks may be added here on the character and tendency of the Platonic teachings, as no appropriate place will be found for them in the proposed examination of the Platonic doctrine. The aim of Plato was to bring his people to a knowledge of their intellectual sins, and to a confession of ignorance and guilt in their pretensions and practices, in order that a foundation for truth might be discovered, and the rules of correct action and upright conduct might be established and observed. His main object was to confute intellectual chicanery, to dispel delusion, and to lead men to an eager desire for justice, righteousness, and wisdom. For his greater pupil, Aristotle, was reserved the task of building on the ground which he cleared from wreck and ruin and poisonous weeds. But the vast and magnificent structures of the Stagirite are the best proof of the valuable service which Plato rendered. The domination of sophistry was ended by the career of Socrates and the institution of Plato's Academy. In various modes, earnest men addressed themselves to the search for truth, and ceased to wander after "sounding brass and tinkling cymbals." Healthy thought, eager purpose, and honest resolution were reawakened throughout the realm of Hellenic intellect; and, though devious paths were pursued, and dissimilar resting-places accepted as the goal, all prosecuted their investigations with a single eye to truth, and not as the means of fraudulently gaining personal advantage. As the Knights of the Round Table separated in the quest of the Holy Graal, which only one achieved, so the philosophers of Greece, after Socrates and Plato, travelled by different routes to reach the same end, though Aristotle alone accomplished the task which all contemplated. The pursuit of the *summum bonum*, or supreme good, became after Plato the special object of all philosophy (Cicero, *De Fin. Bon. et Mal.*). Divergent were the tracks of the inquirers, and dissimilar the forms of good which were contemplated, but with all the schools virtue and happiness, which was its promised fruit, were the aim. The utter rottenness of the communities of Greece, the irreparable disintegration of Hellenic society, prevented the new spirit from infusing health into the diseased political fabric; but the unexampled integrity of Lycurgus, and the exalted morality of Demosthenes in his Orations, both alleged pupils of Plato, may be taken as evidence of the wholesome reaction produced. To the lofty and pure sentiments of Plato, even more than to the beauty of his style, may be applied the observation of Quintilian: "Ut mihi non hominis ingenio sed quodam Delphico videatur oraculo instructus" (*Or. Inst.* x, i, 81).

The philosophy and the habitual sentiments of Greece were purified and elevated by the teachings of Plato, and the world never wholly lost the vantage-ground which had thus been gained. There is indeed nothing more remarkable in the history of Greek intellect than the purity of sentiment, the spirituality of aspiration, the adoration of virtue and holiness and justice and right, the fervid enthusiasm for a virtuous life, irrespective of consequences, and the intuitive apprehension of the highest precepts of morality, which shine

through all the writings of Plato. They are blended, occasionally, it is true, with coarse views contracted from the habitual practice of the pagan world around. Some of these views are too disgusting to be commemorated here. Others are aberrations unworthy of Plato. When he advocates the community of goods and the community of women, and the paternal abnegation of children, in the governing class of his ideal commonwealth, we see how far fantasy betrayed him into pernicious error (*De Rep.* v). There was no greater service rendered to humanity by Aristotle than his confutation of these dangerous and immoral extravagances. But when we contemplate the positions of Plato in regard to the perfections of God, to the nature of virtue and holiness; when we consider his declaration that man should assimilate himself to the Deity, that God is the source of good, but not of evil, that the regeneration of the spiritual nature is not to be attained by argumentative reasoning, and cannot be taught as a science or an art; when we regard his assertion of the immortality of the soul, his belief in future retribution, his allegation that the highest truth must be revealed, his delineation of the Son of God (*τοῦ θεοῦ ἔγγονος*)—it is impossible to overlook his vast superiority over all former schemes of morality, and his near approximation to the doctrines of Christianity—some of which he announces almost in the language of the apostles. We know no more terrible and sublime picture than the passage in which he depicts the dead presenting themselves for judgment in the other world, scarred and blotched and branded with the ineradicable marks of their earthly sins (*ψυχὴν . . . διαμεμαστιγωμένην καὶ οὐλῶν μεστὴν ὑπὸ ἐπιορκιῶν καὶ ἀδικίας, ἃ ἕκαστῳ ἡ πρᾶξις αὐτοῦ ἐξωμόρξατο εἰς τὴν ψυχήν*, κ. τ. λ. *Gorg.* c. lxxx). Yet this is but one of many analogous passages. This approximation to revealed truth is among the most insoluble problems bequeathed to us by antiquity. It has often been thought that Plato derived much of his theological and ethical doctrine from the Hebrew prophets, either circuitously or by direct acquisition during his supposed travels in Palestine. But his tenets are not to be found in those prophets in such a form as to be apprehended by a Gentile; nor can they be detected in them except through the illumination of the later revelation. It has been alleged that the spiritual interpretation of these utterances, which gives them their startling significance, is unwarrantably deduced from the Neo-Platonists, who were posterior to the evangelists. But the tenets are in Plato's text, were commented on by Cicero, and affected the speculation of Philo-Judæus, before Christianity had secured definite establishment, or Neo-Platonism was distinctly constituted. It has been suggested that these anticipations of the teachings of the Great Master are hesitating and only problematic—dreams thrown out as possibilities, the vague longings of the ecstatic fancy—but the mystery remains; how could such dreams and longings arise in the midst of paganism, and of Athenian degradation and corruption? We offer no solution of the enigma, which awaits its Œdipus. We only note the existence of the riddle. There are marvels in the life of men and of nations which no plummet in man's hands can fathom, but which justify the conviction that, as the spirit of God brooded over the face of the deep, and brought order and beauty and life out of chaos, so it incessantly broods over the dark confusion of earthly change, regulating all issues, and preparing the world, in the midst of manifold disorder, for the higher and purer phases of being for which it is designed, and towards which it is blindly striving.

We are not of the number of those who accept without inquiry the tenets of Plato, or approve the whole tendency of his teachings. We are of another school. We recognise, however, that his aims are always noble, and that an invigorating morality breathes through nearly all his writings. To him we are indebted for many glorious visions of supernal beauty, which beam upon us like the unattainable stars disclosed through rifts in the clouds which envelop the earth. But the philosophy of Plato is essentially mystical, and consequently unsubstantial; and, though mysticism may inflame, spiritualize, and refine natures already spiritual and refined, it is heady and intoxicating, and apt to justify wilful aberrations, and to place every fantastic conviction on the same level with confirmed truth. The Socratic elenchus, with its appropriate instrument, the Socratic sorites, is invaluable in certain rare conjunctures, but it is a dangerous procedure. It reveals the baselessness of error, but it weakens all convictions; and it was a natural consequence of its employment that Platonism so soon passed into the scepticism of the New Academy. The spirit of Plato's philosophy is throughout idealistic, though it is not pure idealism; and idealism, in all its forms, inevitably runs into pantheism, which resolves everything into phenomenal evolutions of divinity, and thus destroys the distinctions of right and wrong, and all moral responsibility. Hence, when the best of the Romans under the later republic and early empire experienced the necessity of corroborating the moral sense, and instituting a rigorous rule of conduct, it was not to the Platonists but to the Stoics that they recurred. Notwithstanding the purity of Plato's sentiments, his devotion to the abstract and ideal in preference to the actual, and his absolute submission to the tyranny of his rich imagination, tempted him into political and social heresies of the worst type of communism.

It is thus necessary to distinguish between the various tendencies of the Platonic doctrine, and, while admiring with reverent enthusiasm its rare excellences and elevating impulses, we must not overlook the germs of corruption which were also present, and which, like rust on iron or mould on bread, contaminated the wholesome body on which they preyed.

VII. *Literature.*—The literature of Platonism is endless. A complete collection of the works treating of this subject, directly or indirectly, would equal in extent the Library of Alexandria, and would include the writings of all subsequent philosophers. The professed historians of philosophy necessarily devote a large share of attention to Plato and his speculations; and in the treatment of the subsequent developments of metaphysical inquiry they are constantly compelled to refer to his system, in its original or derivative form, in consequence of the unceasing influence which it has exercised on the highest and most abstract departments of human thought. The special treatises which have been written on the general philosophy of Plato, or on particular Platonic theses, are practically innumerable. Under these circumstances it would be a cumbrous and inappropriate task to undertake to present here a Platonic bibliography. Such a labor would be inevitably incomplete, if fullness were contemplated. A selection of the best or most accessible authorities would be open to many objections, on the score of both omissions and admissions. It would be, moreover, a vain repetition of what has already been done in a sufficient manner by the historians of philosophy. It is consequently more advisable to direct attention to the copious enumeration of illustrative treatises found in the notice of Plato in Ueberweg's *History of Philosophy*, and to specify here only those recent works which are most useful or most accessible to the English student.

The basis of all intelligent study of the Platonic doctrine must, of course, be the writings of Plato. Of these there are three versions in the English language. Henry Rogers complained, nearly thirty years ago, that there was no translation creditable to English scholarship, the only complete attempt being that of Thomas Taylor, the Platonist, whose sins and imbecilities are severely castigated by him. This translation is, *The Works of Plato, viz. his Fifty-five Dialogues and Twelve Epistles, translated from the Greek. Nine of the Dialogues by the late Floyer Sydenham and the remainder by Thomas Taylor*

with occasional Annotations on the Nine Dialogues translated by Sydenham, and copious Notes by the latter Translator, etc. (Lond. 1804, 5 vols. 4to). At the very time of Rogers's complaint a new and respectable version was on the eve of appearance: *The Works of Plato, a New and Literal Version, chiefly from the Text of Stallbaum*, by Henry Cary and others (Bohn, Lond. 1848, 6 vols. sm. 8vo). A third and admirable version, recently produced, satisfies the desires and removes the grounds of censure expressed by Rogers: Jowett, *The Dialogues of Plato, translated into English, with Analyses and Introductions* (republished N. Y. 1874, 4 vols. 8vo). A new and revised edition of the work has recently appeared.

The other aids deserving of notice in this connection are, Day, *Summary and Analysis of the Dialogues of Plato* (1870, 8vo); Grote, *Plato and the other Companions of Sokrates* (2d ed. 1867, 3 vols. 8vo); Lewes, *Biographical Hist. of Philosophy*; Rogers, *Essays*, "*Plato and Socrates*" (in the *Edinb. Rev.* April, 1848, art. i); Zeller, *Plato and the Older Academy*, translated by Alleyne and Goodwin (Lond. 1876, 8vo). It may be added that indispensable assistance is still rendered by Cicero's *Quæstiones Academicæ*, etc., by Cudworth's *Intellectual System of the Universe*, and by Brucker's elaborate exposition of the Platonic tenets in his well-known *Historia Critica Philosophiæ*. (G. F. H.)



Antique Bust of Plato.

Platon, a celebrated Russian prelate of modern times, whose family name was *Beffschin*, was born June 29, 1737. He was the son of a village priest near Moscow, in the university of which capital he received his education, and, besides studying the classical tongues, made considerable proficiency in the sciences. His talents soon caused him to be noticed, and, while yet a student in theology, he was appointed, in 1757, teacher of poetry at the Moscow academy, and in the following year teacher of rhetoric at the seminary of the St. Sergius Lawra, or convent. He shortly afterwards entered the Church, became successively hieromonach, prefect of the seminary, and, in 1762, rector and professor of theology. That same year was marked by an event in his life which greatly contributed to his advancement, for on the visit of Catharine II to the St. Sergius Lawra, after her coronation, he addressed the empress in an eloquent discourse, and on another occasion preached before her. So favorable was the impression he made, that he was forthwith appointed court preacher and preceptor in matters of religion to the grand-duke (afterwards the emperor Paul), for whose instruction he drew up his *Orthodox Faith, or Outlines of Christian Theology*, which is esteemed one of his best and most useful productions, and has been reproduced in English by Pinkerton (Lond. 1814), by Coray (1857), and by Potissaco (1858). During the four years of his residence at St. Petersburg, Platon frequently preached before the court, and also delivered on various occasions many of the discourses and orations which are among his printed works. After being created member of the synod at Moscow, by an imperial order, he was made archbishop of Twer in 1770. His attention to the duties of his new office was assiduous and exemplary; for he not only set about improving the course of study pursued in the various seminaries throughout his diocese, but established a number of minor schools for religious instruction, and drew up two separate treatises, one for the use of the teachers, and the other for their pupils. He was also intrusted with the charge of instructing the princess of Würtemberg, Maria Feodorowna, the grand-duke's consort, in the tenets and doctrines of the Græco-Russian Church. At the beginning of 1775 he received the empress at Twer, and proceeded with her and the grand-duke to Moscow, where he was advanced to that see, with permission to retain the archimandriteship of the Sergius Lawra. With the exception of some intervals occasioned by his being summoned to St. Petersburg, where he preached before the court, it was in that convent that he chiefly resided, until he erected another in his vicinity at his own expense, in 1785, called the Bethania. Two years afterwards he was made metropolitan of the Russian Church, in which capacity he crowned the emperor Alexander, at Moscow, in 1801, delivering on that occasion a discourse that was translated into several modern languages, besides Latin and Greek. He died in his convent of Bethania, Nov. 11–23, 1812. His works, printed at different times, amount in all to twenty volumes, containing, besides various other pieces, 595 sermons, discourses, and orations, many of which are considered masterpieces of style and of eloquence. A selection from them, consisting of the finest passages and thoughts, was published in two volumes in 1805.—*English Cyclop.* s. v. See Mouravieff, *Hist. of the Church of Russia* (Oxf. 1842); Otto, *Hist. of Russian Literature*, p. 327–330; Hagenbach, *Hist. of Christian Doctrines*, ii, 459, 460; Schlegel, *Kirchengesch. des 18ten Jahrh.* i, 59 sq.

Platonic Philosophy, or the philosophy of Plato. The term is loosely and ambiguously applied. It is sometimes used to signify the collection of fragmentary views scattered through the writings of Plato; sometimes it is employed to denote the systematic coordination and development of those views by the later academicians; and, most frequently, it is extended to embrace the whole chain of opinion which may be deduced from, or which claims filiation with, the teachings of Plato. These diverse applications of the name are rarely discriminated in ordinary use, and its specific import is left vague and undetermined. This indistinctness cannot be wholly avoided, for it rises out of the disconnected utterances and unsystematic presentations of Plato himself, together with the concurrence of his successors in the arrangement and exposition of his doctrines. In attempting an outline of the Platonic philosophy, the effort will be made to adhere as closely as practicable to the authentic texts in the writings accredited to Plato, and to borrow as little as may be from the later luminaries of the school.

Numerous devices have been employed for the exhibition of the Platonic doctrine, and none of them are entirely satisfactory. It is necessary for a synoptical exposition that some thread should be discovered or invented for the support and connection of its several members, and that some definite commencement should be assumed to which the thread may be attached. The fixed point of departure has been variously chosen; and the tenets of Plato have been strung variously, and with various degrees of skill, on the thread adopted. The Germans, with their inner light and their divaricating assumptions, have been peculiarly ingenious, and often peculiarly unhappy, in the performance of their task. They abound in luminous views and in acute suggestions, but they generate such an intricate labyrinth of cross-lights that they dazzle, bewilder, and blind as much as they illuminate. They impose their own arbitrary opinions on Plato, as regards both the import and the coherence of his doctrines. They assert design where no design can be safely asserted. They imagine dependence where all is disconnected; and pretend system where system never existed. Other inquirers, feeling the difficulty and the hazard of the task, have been content, like the translators and many

of the editors of Plato, to give an abstract or analysis of the several pieces, with an appreciation of their contents. This leaves the doctrines in their original segregation, and affords little aid in bringing them into one harmonious picture. This process has been, in the main, followed by Grote, whose extensive work appears rather as a collection of preparatory studies, pursued with great diligence and redundant learning, than as a clear and full delineation of *Plato and other Companions of Socrates*. The danger is equally great of presenting the views of Plato without obvious links of connection, and of organizing them into a compact scheme, which could not have been contemplated by Plato. In avoiding Scylla on the one hand, and Charybdis on the other, we are thrown back upon the original record, with such assistance as may be derived from illustrative works, and especially from the historians of ancient philosophy. Among these expositors, the one who may still render the best service is Brucker. He is in many respects antiquated; he has morbid antipathies and scornful condescensions; he is very mechanical, and even wooden in his arrangements; but he is honest, earnest, discreet, and free from preoccupations. The very *methodism* of his procedure is serviceable, when we seek a summary but connected view of the doctrines which Plato taught, or was supposed in ancient times to have taught.

The leading object of Plato's life and philosophical activity was to teach the Greeks the correct use of reason, and to induce them to apply it, with a constant observance of the requisite conditions, to the practical concerns of private and public life. The human mind, alike from its constitution and from the defects of its instrument of communication, is ever exposed to the hazard of plausible delusions, and to the peril of accepting fallacies for irrefragable truth. These pernicious consequences were the daily diet of the Athenian people. Hence arose errors in morals, disregard of virtue, indifference to wrong-doing, unreflecting license of individual passion or caprice, disintegration of society, corruption, and anarchy. How were welfare, virtue, and happiness to be attained in this mass of disorder? What were justice, right, truth? How were they to be detected, appreciated, and appropriated? On truth everything else reposed; but other Greeks besides the Cretans were habitual liars (*Græcia mendax*). What is truth? The interrogation of Pilate was the fundamental question propounded by Plato to himself and to his age; and, in propounding it, he trod in the steps of Socrates. There is a truth of knowing and a truth of being, and they must agree with each other. How are they to be reached and reconciled? If the instruments of knowledge are broken, warped, or otherwise disordered, there can be no true knowledge, and no valid apprehension of the character and relation of the facts with which we have to deal. The purpose of Plato was, in some respects, similar to the purpose of Bacon. Bacon proposed to rectify the processes of reasoning in the investigation of nature, for the attainment of scientific knowledge, and for the practical benefits thence to be derived. Plato sought to do the same thing in a more general manner, for the intellectual and moral improvement of men, of societies, and of states. Coleridge has enlarged upon the correspondences of Plato and Bacon, and has exaggerated them. It was a fine and just instinct which suggested the parallelism. With Plato, as with Bacon, the first step was the exposure and expulsion of confident ignorance and presumptuous error; the refutation of the vast brood of sophisms which swarmed around every principle of speculation and conduct; the determination of the character, extent, and validity of human knowledge, and the requirements for the legitimate use of reasoning, and for the avoidance of its abuse. Only after this had been done would it be possible to arrive at trustworthy knowledge or safe opinion in regard to the universe of which we are members, and in regard to the relations in which we stand to it and to its parts. The truth of being, as a subject of knowledge, thus demanded and presupposed the truth of knowledge, not in its rounded fulness, but in its formulary of procedure. In the ultimate and unattainable result, the truth of knowledge would accord and be superficially coextensive with the truth of being, as the reflection in a perfect mirror corresponds with the object reflected. Not until such a recognition of the truth of being was gained as the competency of the weak, fallible, finite mind of man might permit, could the conduct of men find safe and authoritative regulation, and the truth of action, or right in all moral contingencies, be discovered. To reason accurately in order to know the essential character of the facts on which action should depend, and by which it must be controlled, and to use right reason and correct knowledge of facts for the determination of right action, may be said to be an abstract statement of the Platonic scheme, which thus embraces the whole duty of man. The intricate casuistry of Plato, and the breathless flights of his daring and playful fancy, withdraw attention from his solemn, earnest, direct, everyday aim. The determination and discipline of the reason, the appreciation of the universe, sensible and intelligible, and the application of these acquisitions to the permanent needs of individual, social, and political existence, constitute the sum of Plato's teachings; but how wonderfully are they diversified and adorned and enriched by his endless variety and poetic imagination!

In strict accordance with this interpretation of Plato's latent meaning, his philosophy is distributed under three heads: I. Dialectical Philosophy; II. Theoretical, Contemplative, or Physical; III. Practical (Cicero, *Acad. Quæst.* i, 5, § 19). The second and third divisions are subdivided. This distribution is not distinctly proposed in Plato's works, but it is implied in them. It is accredited by Sextus Empiricus to Xenocrates, Plato's second successor in the Academy. The terms employed are earlier than Plato, as are the inquiries also. It must not be forgotten that though Plato was in the main Socratic, he was also a votary of other doctrines — Eclectic, if not Syncretistic, and, in his later writings, largely Pythagorean.

I. *Dialectical Philosophy.* — The term "Dialectics" includes in Plato much more than it does in Aristotle (*Sophist.* p. 253; *De Rep.* vii, 532–535; Aristotle, *Topic.* i, 1, *Sophist. Elench.* xxxii; *Metaph.* ii, 1; iii, 2; *Rhet.* i, 2). It is not confined to the art of probable argumentation, but comprehends the whole theory of knowledge, the characteristics of correct and incorrect reasoning, the conduct of the understanding, and so much of psychology as is concerned with the operations of the mind in the acquisition, estimation, and communication of knowledge. This wide range may be illustrated by lord Bacon's inclusion under Logic of the *Artes Inveniendi, Judicandi, Retinendi, et Tradendi* (*De Augm. Sci.* v, 6).

There is a fundamental enigma which demands solution at the commencement of all inquiry, and which has been designated the problem of certitude. How can we know that we know what we think we know? How does knowledge arise? how is its credibility or validity ascertained? What degree of credibility belongs to it? These questions were never dogmatically answered by Plato, unless it were the last. A positive answer would have been a repudiation of the Socratic profession of ignorance and uncertainty (Aristot. *Soph. Elench.* xxxiii). But he labored assiduously in all his treatises to exemplify the conditions of true knowledge, and he contributed efficiently to their determination. Knowledge, in ordinary, according to Plato, is acquired through the senses, but it is not determined by sense: it is determined by the knowing mind. This is an approximation at once to Kant's forms of the understanding, and to Leibnitz's acute reply to the maxim, "Nihil in intellectu quod non prius in sensu," by the addition of

"nisi intellectus ipse." The mind is its own place. It is lord of itself, and of all the world beside. Sense is an affection of the mind through the intervention of the corporeal sensibilities. Permanent impressions made by the senses are retained by the faculty of memory. The collation of remembrances with sensible experiences constitutes opinion — true opinion when they agree, false opinion when they are discordant (*Phileb.* p. 34; *Theætet.* p. 186). The knowledge of things in time is uncertain, and amounts only to opinion. The human mind may be conceived to be a tablet of wax, ready to receive and to retain any impression. This is, however, merely an illustration (λόγου ἕνεκα). Thought is the communing of the mind with itself. Speech is the sensible utterance of thought. Words are not knowledge, but only the means and vehicle of knowledge (*Theætet.* p. 191, 202).

Intelligence, or real knowledge, is the action of the mind in the contemplation of the prime *Intelligibles*, or incorporeal types of being. It is twofold; the first is the perception of the soul, which beheld its appropriate *intelligibles*, before descending into the body; the second, or natural knowledge, is that which the mind receives while enveloped in its carnal integument. The latter, or mundane knowledge, is the restored but broken recollection of what had been known in a pre-existent state, and must be distinguished from the acquisitions of memory, being concerned with things intelligible, as the other is with things sensible (*Timæus*, p. 30; *Phædon*, p. 74–76; comp. Wordsworth, *Ode on Intimations of Immortality*, etc.). This doctrine of reminiscence is a peculiarly Platonic fancy, and fascinated the later Platonists to such an extent that Synesius declined a bishopric in the Christian Church rather than renounce the dream. It is implicated, as cause or consequence, with the doctrine of the Platonic ideal, as both are with the dialectic process by which Socrates and Plato strove to dissipate error and to evolve truth from the minds of their hearers. The midwifery of the mind which Socrates professed, and which Plato represented him as professing, necessitated the assumption that truth was present potentially in the mind, and that it only required to be drawn from its latent state by adroit handling. It could not be latent, nor could it be brought forth, unless it lay there like a chrysalis, and descended from an anterior condition of being. It was in a superterrestrial and antemundane existence that souls had acquired

"Ætherium sensum, atque auraï simplicis ignem;"

but before their demission, or return to earth, they had been steeped in oblivion,

"Scilicet immemores supera ut convexa revisant."

The acquisition of genuine knowledge was thus the restoration of the obliterated memories of supernal realities. Absurd and extravagant as this tenet appears in its Platonic form, it was a dreamy and ineffectual effort to give definite expression to the mysterious process of thought. The doctrine was modified and transformed by St. Augustine so as to deprive it of its wildness and irrationality. He conceived the human mind to be constituted in perfect harmony with the universe. The acquisition of knowledge was the evolution of this harmony, and it was accompanied with instinctive consciousness of the pre-adaptation. Many of the strangest reveries of Plato may be similarly reduced to prosaic probability.

The supernal realities which are the objects of the pure and of the purified intelligence are the *first Intelligibles*, presented to the contemplation of unembodied or disembodied spirits. These prime intelligibles are *Ideas*—eternal images, immaterial archetypes (*sine corpore formas*) — patterns or conceptions forever present to the Divine Mind, furnishing the models, and, indeed, the essence, of all the temporal creation. The term *ideas* was older than Plato; but its application to heavenly types, its metaphysical employment, and its substitution for the Pythagorean *Numbers*, were almost certainly Platonic inventions (*Parmenid.* p. 135; *De Rep.* vi, 509). It has justly been remarked by Ueberweg, as it had often been remarked before Ueberweg, that "the Platonic philosophy centres in the theory of ideas." In the Dialectics, Physics, Ethics, the rays all converge towards this point. But the *ideas* of Plato are not merely his central doctrine; they are usually conceived to be his distinctive doctrine. As such, they were assailed and refuted by Aristotle (*Metaph.* i, vi, ix), who, nevertheless, substituted a more rationalistic equivalent for them in *Forms*. As such, they were received and expanded by the New Platonists. As such, they have given life and name to all associated schemes of philosophy, included under the broad name of Idealism. As such, they furnished the battle-ground for the long, impassioned, and bitter controversy of the Realists and Nominalists. See Realism and Nominalism.

According to Plato, following the Eleatic school and Heraclitus, all sensible or concrete existence is perishable, fleeting, and imperfect; but this imperfection involves the existence of the perfect, the changeless, and the immortal (Aristot. *Metaph.* i, vi; Alex. Aphrod. Asclep. et Anon. Urbin. *Schol.* ad loc.). If some things are good, there must be an absolute goodness, in which all things good participate, and which they feebly reflect. If things are beautiful, they are so by the incorporation of the beautiful. If actions are just, beneficent, or holy, there must be an eternal justice, beneficence, and holiness, whence they derive their character (*Phædrus*, p. 246–256; *Hipp. Maj.* p. 294, 295; *Conviv.* p. 210–212; *Phædo*, p. 100–102). The passing things of sense acquire their essential character from the indwelling of these immutable existences, however these may be warped and deformed by being reduced to temporal conditions. As it is with abstract qualities, so it is with individual things. A dog, a horse, a man, are what they are (τὸ τί ἐστι) from the possession of the essential nature of those animals—*caninity*, *equinity*, *humanity*. Each differs from other members of its class, or is individualized, by union with matter, and consequent deflection from the perfect conception of the breed. Each, therefore, is an inadequate and, consequently, untrue representation of the true and perfect being of its kind, and approaches such perfection just in proportion as it approximates to the true, perfect, and eternal image. These intelligible and uncreated perfections are the *ideas*, present from the beginning, or before all beginning, in the contemplation of the Divinity, after which all things are made that were made. They are not merely the models of created things, but their essence. In the progress towards truth, all phenomenal being, all concrete existence, all temporal presentation, all earthly images, all sensible apprehensions, must be left behind, and, by an ascending process, the purified intelligence must pierce the veil and phantasmal appearances of time, and look upon the absolute, everlasting, unchanging, and divine *ideas* of things. These alone are true and real: all that is actual, sensible, or derived from sense is phenomenal, evanescent, and delusive. The doctrine of ideas will reappear, for, as Brücker notes, neither the metaphysics and theology of Plato, nor his physical and ethical philosophy, can preserve any consistency without them. Ideas form the first order of intelligibles, and are apprehended by the pure reason with the aid of the scientific understanding (νοήσει μετὰ λόγου περιληπτόν). The second order consists of species which are united with matter and cannot be separated from it—the inseparable species of the schoolmen. These are detected by the understanding with the concurrence of the intuitive faculty. Things sensible are, in like manner, primary and secondary, and are apprehended only conjecturally through irrational perception (δόξῃ μετ' αἰσθήσεως ἄλογου δοξαστόν). Intelligibles belong to the intelligible and eternal universe (τὸ νοητόν, τὸ ὄντως

ὄν). Sensibles are the shadows of the intelligible, and appertain to the visible, phenomenal, and shifting world (τὸ ὁρατόν, τὸ αἰσθητόν, τὸ ὄντως οὐδέποτε ὄν, τὸ γιγνόμενον). Knowledge attaches only to the former: from the latter nothing better than opinion can spring (*Timæus*, p. 28; *De Rep.* vi, 20, p. 509).

In contemplation, the mind regards truth and falsehood: in matters concerned with action, it judges of right and wrong. The moral or practical judgment proceeds from an ingenital sense of beauty and goodness, and decides, in particular instances, by comparison with the indwelling types of excellence. Truth, beauty, and goodness are thus nearly identified, and are exhibited as different aspects of the same perfect *ideas*. Beauty is conformity to the *idea*, and the *idea* is perfectly good and true.

In dialectical procedure, the first thing to be determined is the essential nature of the object under consideration. The essence is established by definition, division, and resolution. The accidents are separated by induction and ratiocination, or deduction from first principles. In detecting the essence we reduce *the many* to *the one;* in inferring consequences, we trace *the one* in *the many*. The Platonic scheme is presented in the *Republic* (vii). It is noticeable that hypotheses are admitted by Plato among the processes for discovering truth. The abstract theory thus sanctions the large use of imagination which presides over its whole development. It may be advantageous to compare the dialectics of Plato with the severe logic of Aristotle, and with the elaborate devices proposed in the second book of Bacon's *Organon*. Words are no criteria of the character of things. They are loosely imposed, in consonance with popular impressions, and do not agree with realities. Yet words and language are of grave importance, and require to be used with propriety and precision, to avoid indistinctness and ambiguity, and consequent delusion or deception. The art of effectual speech springs from a just knowledge of the intellectual powers and emotions, of the dispositions of men, and of the different forms of expression. The perfect orator is one who has these endowments, knows the arts of persuasion, and can apply them to his purposes (*Phædrus*, p. 259). The value which Plato attached to the graces of composition is attested by the skill and beauty of his own compositions. He has also strongly declared it (*ibid.* p. 258). Hence, when we find him ridiculing and denouncing rhetoric in the Gorgias, and comparing it to unwholesome cookery, we must accept the explanation of Quintilian that the Gorgias was eristic, and designed only for the refutation of the Sophists and sophistical teachers of rhetoric (*Inst. Or.* ii, 15). The dialectics of Plato thus embraced everything connected with the discovery, determination, and communication of truth, in its subjective aspect. But it will be remembered there was, in addition to the truth of knowing, the truth of being also; and this forms the second part of the Platonic philosophy.

II. *Theoretical, Contemplative, or Physical Philosophy.*—This grand division of Platonic speculation is distributed into three branches: Theology, Physics Proper, and Mathematics, which is a sort of appendix to the other two. It will be observed that the term Physics is employed in a very wide and unrestricted sense, to include not merely nature, but everything extrinsic to the intellectual operations and the ethical conduct of man. It is contradistinguished from dialectics by embracing the real constitution of things, while the latter is confined to their mental apprehension and exposition. It is contrasted with ethics, as it is concerned with essential being, while the latter deals only with human action. The division is made in the *Phædo* (li, p. 103; comp. *De Rep.* ii, 19, p. 381). It is further to be observed that the Platonic doctrines are rarely conveyed in explicit propositions, but must be gathered from fragmentary statements, from incidental expressions, from poetic fancies, and from the general tenor of discussion. In the *Phædo*, Plato explains the utter abnegation of physical inquiries by Socrates. In the opening of the *Timæus*, he announces the impossibility of giving anything more than a plausible account (εἰκότες λόγοι) of things *becoming*, and not permanent (vid. Ariston. ap. Stob. lxxx, § 7). Recognising, then, the difficulties and the uncertainties due to the character of the procedure and the presumed complexion of the subject, we continue to note the peculiarities of the Platonic philosophy.

1. *Theology.*—"In the beginning the world was without form." The universal chaos was reduced to order by the Supreme and Intelligent Cause, who framed the creation in accordance with the perfect and eternal patterns ever present to the divine mind. It is the best of all generated existences, the best of all possible worlds, because it was fashioned by the Highest Goodness and Wisdom working after the absolutely perfect models, or *ideas* (*Timæus*, p. 28). It was not made, however, out of nothing, but out of eternally existing matter. Being formed out of matter, it is not free from grave blemishes and defects, which are due to the inherent stubbornness and ineradicable perversity of matter. God and formless matter are thus the two concurring but antagonistic causes of the universe. By matter is understood something very different from the palpable substance or body which is habitually contemplated under that name—something totally different also from anything that we can conceive. It is that remnant or substratum of body which subsists after every cognizable property of body has been removed (*Timæus*, p. 51; comp. Porph. *Sentent.* xx; Plotin. *Enead.* ii, 4; Berkeley, *Siris*, § 317). By ascribing to God the creation of the Cosmos out of unformed matter, Plato avoids the heresy of pantheism. Still he indulges in fantasies which readily lead to it. From the nature of matter as co-eternal with the Divine Intelligence, and from its reluctation in yielding to the creative energy, originate the necessary existence and the inevitable presence of evil in all created things (*Theætet.* p. 176). The antagonism of matter suggested the presence of subtle aptitudes and occult qualities. We are thus brought within the range of hypotheses similar to those which underlie the recent theories of Darwin, Spencer, and Huxley.

Matter was the relatively passive ingredient in the process of creation. The active power was the Supreme Intelligence, or Highest Good, whom it is almost impossible to apprehend, and impossible to declare (*Timæus*, p. 29). He is the efficient cause of all things; the fountain of all pure, spiritual, perfect, and self-supporting existences; the founder and ultimate fabricator of everything. He is incorporeal reason, self-existent, eternally the same, without beginning, without end, having no affinity with things of sense, and apprehensible only by the pure intellect. He is all-wise, all-seeing, all-foreseeing, all-mighty, except so far as restricted by the intractability of matter. He has absolute freedom of will, is supremely good, and, being good, is void of envy and malevolence. Hence everything made by him is good, so far as the repugnance of matter will permit. He framed the world in all possible excellence after the eternal image in his own mind. This uncreated and unbeginning *idea* of the universe (λόγος or λογισμὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ) has been regarded as a third co-eternal principle. This exemplar included the patterns or *ideas* of all created things; everything in the sensible universe being fashioned according to its corresponding type in the intelligible universe, or world of *ideas*. The doctrine seems to have been deduced from Pythagoras, but was applied by Plato in his own manner; and never more beautifully nor more characteristically than in his celebrated fancy of a cave where all that men saw or heard consisted of shadows and echoes (*De Rep.* vii, p. 514–519). The imperfect things of earth were thus the obscure, fleeting images of the perfect forms of the divine contemplation. It is un-

certain whether Plato attributed to these *ideas* a substantive existence of their own, separate from and independent of the divine mind, or supposed them to be simply the immanent, changeless thoughts of the Godhead. Yet, though God is distinctly and habitually acknowledged as the father and creator of all things, all things were not directly framed and regulated by the Supreme Divinity. For the government of the sensible universe he created a subordinate deity, and placed it in the material creation (*Timæus*, p. 34). This guiding spirit, or Demiurgus, was a mixture of the ideal and of the material, of *the one* and of *the many*, that, being intermediate, it might communicate with both. This was the *Anima Mundi*, which assumed such prominence in the theological and physical speculations of the Stoics. It maintained the regular operations of the laws of temporal change, and by its plastic energy moulded into appropriate forms all the multitudinous manifestations of transitory being (*τὸ γιγνόμενον*) (*Cratylus*, p. 53).

The soul of the universe was not the sole created divinity. Divine spirits were apportioned to the earth, sun, moon, and stars, to govern their developments and to preside over their motions (*De Legg.* p. 899). Hosts of still inferior deities were assigned to other appropriate functions. Thus, with a fine and half-suppressed irony, provision was made for the national gods, and for the 30,000 unnamed divinities attested by Hesiod. To these deities, each in his due place in the vast hierarchy, was ascribed the duty of forming men, animals of lower order, plants, etc., and of watching over them. In the subordinate ranks of the celestial army were a countless multitude of sprites, who were cousin-german to the sylphs, gnomes, fairies, and other tribes of "little people," and to whom immortality was denied.

2. *Physics Proper.*—The second branch of contemplative philosophy is occupied with the consideration of the order of nature as the product of the acts of creation. Nothing exists or arises without cause. Hence proceeded the Aristotelian maxim *vere scire est scire per causas;* for the cause affords the *ratio essendi*, or explanation of the existence of the object investigated. As the universe, or orderly Cosmos, had a producing cause, it was created in time. It was generated or brought into being, and was therefore subject to sensible perception. It was consequently corporeal, visible, and tangible. It could not be visible except through the presence of fire, nor tangible without the presence of earth. An intermediate bond is needed to link two things together, and the fairest of bonds is a mean proportion. Thus, as fire is to air, so is air to water; and as air is to water, so is water to earth. Here are the four elements, corresponding to the mystical tetrad of the Pythagoreans. They were held together in their several combinations by the attraction of love. The whole theory is largely Pythagorean, and blends itself with the Pythagorean imaginations about the secret virtues of numbers. The universe is an animated whole, composed of perfect parts, and exempt from the infirmities of age and of disease (*Timæus*, p. 35). A spherical figure and orbicular motion are given to it and its chief components because a circle is the most perfect of figures, is least liable to injury and obstruction, returns upon itself, and thus promises the greatest duration to the vast living organism in which all things temporal are contained. As the universe had a spherical form and a circular motion conferred upon it, each of the elements had its own appropriate figure. Earth was cubical, fire pyramidal, air octahedral, and water eicosihedral, or twenty-sided. These were combined in apt proportions, and all things were ordered "by measure, by number, and by weight."

The details of the cosmogony must be omitted. It may be added that the earth and the seven moving lights of heaven were arranged in concentric spheres, at harmonic intervals, around a mighty spindle resting on the knees of Necessity; and that their revolutions propagated along the great axis "the music of the spheres" to the earth, which was the fixed and middle orb (*De Rep.* x, p. 617). The earth was occupied by animals and other things created by the subordinate demiurgi, to whom was also intrusted the creation of man. But man, as the noblest of animals, was not left wholly to their handiwork. Immortal souls, numerous as the stars, were supplied by the Supreme Intelligence, to be provided with terrestrial bodies. These souls were neither emanations nor spirations, but true creations. They were to guide and govern the material vessels in which they should be confined, as the superior spirits guided and governed the worlds which they controlled. The matter with which they were united exposed them to contamination, to failure, and to sin. From the struggle "within the union" results moral evil, or disobedience to the laws of ideal perfection, which are in conformity with the purposes of God. In their earthly condition, human souls were subjected to the general laws of the universe, but were endowed with an undefined freedom of will through their heavenly constitution. Happiness resulted from obedience to the impulses of the better nature, and to the order and economy of the intelligible world.

It would take too much space, and prove too tedious, to enter into the physiology propounded by Plato; and nothing could be gained from the presentation of his views but the exhibition of Platonic fantasy. We pass to the third part, or appendix, which was intended to serve at once as a discipline and as an instrument.

3. *Mathematics.*—The importance attached by Plato to mathematical science is familiar to every student, and is illustrated by the inscription supposed to have been placed over the entrance to the Academy:

Μηδεὶς ἀγεωμέτρητος εἰσίτω.

The commendations bestowed by him on this branch of learning (*De Rep.* vii, p. 522) may be compared with the similar eulogies of Roger Bacon (*Opus Majus*, pt. iv) in an age of somewhat analogous speculative development, and of Francis Bacon (*De Aug. Sci.* iii, vi; *Essays*, 1). They may also be contrasted with the views presented in the diatribe of Sir William Hamilton.

Under the head of mathematics were included, in accordance with the Pythagorean practice, and with the general conception of antiquity, arithmetic, geometry, astronomy, and music.

III. *Practical Philosophy.*—Plato's practical philosophy was in many respects consentaneous with his physics, or theory of nature. It would not be correct to say that it was founded upon it, for this would be inconsistent with the position that there was no orderly, consecutive, or concatenated development of the Platonic doctrine in the mind of its author. There is close correspondence in parts between Plato's physical and practical philosophy, but in others much separation and independence. The agreement must therefore be ascribed to the consonance of the developments of the same mind in different directions, rather than to intentional coherence between successive applications of doctrine. The practical philosophy of Plato falls under two heads, Ethics and Politics.

1. *Ethics.*—Moral questions occupy the largest part of the Platonic writings; but they are treated in the Socratic manner, by question and answer, and are thus proposed in diffuse and disconnected fragments. Plato's aims, his leading tenets, and his modes of explication are derived from Socrates; but his discussions, so far as may be conjectured, are conducted in a much broader spirit and loftier strain. He includes also within the domain of ethics much that would now be referred to theology.

As in the physics everything is traced back to the First Intelligence, the Divine Creator, so in the ethics everything is referred ultimately to the perfect and beneficent character of God. The good is the summit of all conceivable things. God is absolute goodness. The

supreme good of man (*summum bonum*) is the knowledge and imitation of God, and approximation thereby to the divine nature. "Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father is perfect." Everything is good and beautiful so far as it proceeds from God, retains the impress of its divine original, and possesses the characteristics of the pure archetypal *ideas* of moral perfection. "Every good gift and every perfect gift is from above, and cometh down from the Father of lights, in whom is no variableness, neither shadow of turning." Ordinary blessings or advantages in popular estimation, such as health, strength, high birth, riches, renown, honors, are good only in conjunction with virtue; otherwise they are evil (*Protag.* p. 351–353). The honorable (the right) alone is good (*Alcibiad.* i, 116). This is continually and strenuously asserted in opposition to the general practice and current sentiment among the contemporaneous Greeks. Virtue is lovely in itself, and to be loved irrespective of its rewards. Being of heavenly origin, the best reproduction of the divine *ideas*, and approximating to the divine nature, it is itself divine. Being divine, it is not an art that can be taught, but must be divinely communicated (*Euthydem.* p. 282). Goodness can be acquired only by the influx and inworking of the Good.

The object of all knowledge, and it should be the object of all effort, is assimilation to the highest good—that is, to God. This assimilation consists in the habit and practice of wisdom, fortitude, temperance, justice, and holiness (*Theætet.* p. 176; *De Legg.* iv, 716). The first stage of this approximation is *εὐδαιμονία*, usually translated happiness, but which implies good dispositions, and a conscience tranquil, innocent, and void of offence towards God and towards man (*Gorg.* p. 470; *Sympos.* p. 188). The Critias breaks off unfinished just at the opening of a full discussion of the conditions of a happy life. The word is also used for the future beatitude which it anticipates. The requirements for such bliss correspond, as nearly as a pagan dream can agree with revelation, to the Scripture rule "to do justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with God."

As has been observed, the body was regarded as a prison, because composed of malignant matter. Hence humanity was miserable by congenital constitution. The progress towards virtue and holiness was to be achieved by the subjugation of material antagonisms, by the renunciation of worldly aims and temptations, and by the purgation of mind and heart from sensual appetites and corporeal satisfactions (*De Rep.* vii, p. 515). There is here a pronounced tendency in the direction of Oriental asceticism. There is much also that inclines towards the pessimism of Schopenhauer, but it is wrought out to a very different issue. These tendencies readily explain the growth of the Neo-Platonic reveries which may always be detected in the egg in the writings of Plato himself. How far such results may be due to the difficulty of framing abstract conceptions at the commencement of ethical inquiry, and to the attendant difficulty of clothing such conceptions in precise terms before a philosophical language had been invented, it would be hazardous to say. Plato may have simply designed, in a blind, heathen, tentative way, to prescribe "the purification of the flesh," and "the overcoming of the world," and "the righteousness which is of God."

The morality of Plato was much higher in aim and sentiment than it was possible to be in its expression, yet in many single precepts it uses nearly the language of revealed truth. It habitually insists upon the charms of virtue and "the beauty of holiness;" and in the delineation of the several virtues, which he represents as indissolubly connected (*Charmides*, p. 161), and at times as united in one, he maintains an uncompromising elevation of view. His illustrations, indeed, are often tainted with the prevalent vices of his age and country. Thus, in treating of the passions, he is led by his rich and mythical fancy into hypothetical explanations, which have been very easily abused, and which are repulsive in their original proposition. We refer to his comments on friendship and love. Friendship, or attraction, is ascribed even to the particles of matter; and the like proclivities are bestowed upon primordial souls. Like is attracted to like, and hence arises friendship. Souls of similar nature are drawn towards each other by the instinct of resemblance resulting from preadaptation. The attraction proceeding from conformity in their pure state exercises its due influence only between spirits retaining in some measure their primordial purity. Hence true friendship can exist only between the good (*Lysis.* p. 214).

Love is a species of friendship, or friendship in its highest intensity. It is of three orders: sensual, animal, or bestial; honorable, having regard to psychical virtues; and mixed, which unites the characteristics of both (*Sympos.* p. 201). Love, in its two forms of heavenly and earthly, "half beast, half deity," appears in Plato in many ambiguous and Protean shapes, rising from the coarsest pagan sensualism to the purest aspirations for the beautiful and the good. But the dialogue in which its nature is chiefly discussed is so tantalizing, shifting, and bewildering—it is woven with threads of such changing and returning hues—that it furnishes treacherous foundation for any dogmatic conclusions.

2. *Political Philosophy.*—The two most extensive and elaborate of Plato's treatises are devoted to political questions. Of these, the *Republic* is the most complete and characteristic triumph of his genius. The *Laws* is in a rough and unfinished state, and has often been excluded from his works. In narrating the life of Plato, his predilections for political life, his early and unsuccessful intervention in Athenian affairs, his political expeditions to Sicily, and his consultation in matters of state by princes and states, were duly commemorated. The contemplative habits of his mind, his eager fancy, his tone, his temperament, his associations, his hereditary tastes, his party proclivities, all unfitted him for success in actual politics; and from every effort to engage in them he retired discomfited and disappointed. The more congenial domain of speculation was still open to him. He might organize a state, regulate its citizens, and determine their duties, in the vast realm of fancy, with none to make him afraid of either failure or obstruction. He might look forward to the ultimate adoption of his projects or his principles in some happier time, when philosophers had become rulers, or when rulers had become philosophers, and when later generations, instructed by his lessons, might give reality to his dreams (*De Legg.* v, 739). In strange modes, and in unrecognised forms, his visions have been partially accomplished.

The Republic and the Laws differ greatly in tone and dogma, as well as in execution, but they are intimately connected. They are diverse and consecutive presentations of the same general design. The Republic is the ideal state, the Laws the concrete state. The Republic is the dream of a Utopian constitution, the Laws the proposition of a frame of government adapted to the weaknesses and recalcitration of an Hellenic people. Everything in the one is suited to an impossible condition of things; everything in the other is reduced to the proportions and capacities of actual human society. In the one the state is conformed to the abstract idea of justice, as it was conceived by Plato; in the other, justice is put into action, weighted down with human prejudices and passions, and conformed to the nature of the Greeks. These distinctions must be regarded in order to prevent exaggeration of Plato's offences against morality and good-sense. We sympathize with the strong censure of the Republic expressed by Mitchell in his *Aristophanes*, but we see that what is most repugnant may be only an ingenious imagination to symbolize pure abstract doctrine. It is not surprising that much perplexity should exist in regard to the Republic. Its double title produces confusion. Its inscription, or su-

perscription, is, *Of Politics, or concerning the Just.* The second epigraph may have been formally the addition of Thrasyllus, but it is sanctioned by the text itself (*De Rep.* ii, p. 368; comp. iv, p. 434). Many critics of great name, and especially the ancients, have held it to be a theoretical constitution of the state. Others, of not inferior reputation, among the moderns, have considered it as simply an investigation into the nature of justice, illustrated by the state, because the state exhibits the characteristics of justice in a completer form and on a larger scale than the individual could do. Stallbaum, in his *Prolegomena*, arrays the arguments adduced in favor of either opinion, and concludes that Plato's design was to portray the image of a perfect and happy life, by prescribing the offices of man in his public and private relations (p. xviii, xix).

We are not disposed to deny this conclusion, which substantially reconciles the previous contradictions; but we think there is something more than this. The ideal, the absolute, the perfect, was always present to the mind of Plato: the whole tenor of his philosophy precluded him from resting in the actual. But his personal and philosophical career urged him also to regard with most earnestness the amelioration of the moral and political condition of his countrymen, and the improvement of their political through the rectification of their moral state. To a Greek the state was everything, the individual being merely a fragment or constituent atom of the state. The life of the citizen was absorbed in the state; the life of the state was reflected in the life of the citizen—was, indeed, imposed on him. According to Greek ideas, the just man could not develop his virtues except in a just state; and the just state could not subsist except through just citizens—just either by native constitution or by compulsion, or by both. Education and discipline would be demanded to produce just rulers and just subjects. The investigation of the nature of justice would accordingly require the determination of the form and conditions of a justly organized community (Jowett, *Plato*, iv, 5); the delineation of the just state would be blended with that of the just man—and the conclusions resulting from the whole inquiry would furnish an earthly image of the Greek City of God (*γῆς γε οὐδαμοῦ οἶμαι αὐτὴν εἶναι*, *De Rep.* ix, p. 592). Indistinct and fragmentary as is Plato's doctrine, it would have been left much more formless and unsatisfactory without the fancies and dreams and political precepts contained in the Statesman, Republic, and Laws. They furnish the unjointed outlines of the complete design for whose construction all the rest was intended.

According to Plato's notion, justice or righteousness is the object and essence of healthy political organization, and he consequently inquires in the Republic into its nature, and the best mode of its realization in the state. Of course he cannot free himself from Hellenic preoccupations. Of course his reactionary tendencies and his oligarchical proclivities produced a constant recoil from the democratic license of his Athenian contemporaries towards the spirit of antique usage and the imitation of Spartan institutions. Even in his wildest vagaries there appears a disposition to employ supposed traditionary practices. He insists upon the strict subordination of ranks; he even petrifies his classes of citizens into castes. He does not rigorously conjoin every one to his class, but accords advancement to those of eminent ability—*la carrière ouverte aux talens.* He restricts the government to the few (*καλοκαγαθοί*); the masses he converts almost into serfs—"hewers of wood and drawers of water," etc. There are two great classes of freemen, the guardians of the state and the craftsmen (*De Rep.* iii, p. 414, 415). The guardians are themselves divided into two orders, the rulers and the auxiliaries. The rulers are selected, by successive examinations till their thirtieth year, from the body of guardians, who are diligently trained and educated from their birth. The training and the selection have some agreement with the Chinese practices, with English competitive examinations, and still more with the regulation of the Ottoman Janizaries. There is also a considerable degree of correspondence between the Platonic organization and Comte's constitution of the Positive Society.

The body of the guardians or auxiliaries is employed as the military force to repress internal disorders and to repel external danger. The rulers are the supervisors of the community, and are to govern it with a view to the greatest happiness of all (*De Rep.* iv, p. 240). The auxiliaries are to live and to conduct themselves so as to cherish and protect the whole commonwealth. "None of them should have any property beyond what is absolutely necessary; neither should they have a private house, with bars and bolts, closed against any one who has a mind to enter; their provisions should be only such as are required by trained warriors, who are men of temperance and courage; their agreement is to receive from the citizens a fixed rate of pay, enough to meet the expenses of the year and no more, and they will have common meals and live together, like soldiers in a camp. . . . They alone of all the citizens may not touch or handle silver or gold, or be under the same roof with them, or wear them, or drink from them. And this will be their salvation and the salvation of the state" (*Rep.* Jowett's translation, ii, 242). There is here the union of Spartan institutions and Pythagorean organization with the theoretical devices of Plato. There is also an anticipation of the standing armies of modern states.

With the details of the education of the superior class, and with the appreciation of different branches of instruction, we cannot occupy ourselves further than to mention that it is in this connection he censures the poets, and excludes Homer and the Tragedians from the ideal state as blasphemers against the gods. We pass over the criticism of the various forms of government, important as this criticism is for political philosophy in general, and for the estimation of Plato's doctrine and its relation to Hellenic systems. We cannot, however, omit all notice of the measures by which he endeavors to maintain the unselfish devotion of the dominant order. He leaves the laboring masses almost entirely out of sight. They are to be protected in their persons, rights, and industry; and they are to be guided in the proper course. Further than this there is little concern for them. They work in their way for the state, as their superiors live and work also for the state, which is everything to the legislator. There was reason in the interruption of Adimantus that "the citizens were made miserable," if the temporal comfort of the citizen, and not the theoretical elevation of that hypothetical unit, the state, is taken into consideration.

To guard against jealousies, rivalries, discords, which might endanger or ruin the public welfare and the political constitution, the equality of the sexes, the community of women and the community of property are prescribed, and this community is still insisted on in the Laws. Plato seems to have held with the Persian impostor, Mezdah, in the reign of Khosru Kobad, that feuds, quarrels, and animosities arise mainly from the possession of wealth and women in severalty. The delusions of modern socialism and radicalism are anticipated. The shadowy character of Plato's proposed arrangements is some palliation for their entertainment. They are evidently devised as modes of discipline and preparation, or as means for the prevention of disorder. They are acknowledged to be unsuited to men as men now are, and may be taken as the prefiguration of what men might be under other conditions, in a blessed state in which there should be neither gold nor silver, nor marrying nor giving in marriage.

For the close correspondence in aim between the dreams of Plato and the revelations of Scripture, and between the devices of Plato and the projects of modern Communists and Socialists, we have no satisfactory explanation. The cultivated intelligence, the active im-

agination, the varied experience, the general immorality, and the painful disquietude of the Greeks in the 4th century before Christ may account for much, but it will not interpret all. We leave the enigma as one of the mysterious problems presented by the career of humanity. There is surely no more marvellous approximation to revealed truth than in the exposition of the Supreme Good, and of its child or offspring, which is described (*De Rep.* vi, p. 506) in terms that recall the delineation of wisdom in the Book of Wisdom.

"Vapor est enim virtutis Dei, et emanatio quædam est claritatis Dei sincera; et ideo nihil inquinatum in eam incurrit.

"Candor est enim lucis æternæ, et speculum sine macula Dei majestatis et imago bonitatis illius.

"Est enim hæc speciosior sole et super omnem dispositionem stellarum, luci comparata invenitur prior."

Do not such sublime anticipations consort well with the conclusion of the Republic, which increases our wonder, but at the same time justifies our reverential comparisons!

"And thus, Glaucon, the tale has been saved and has not perished, and may be our salvation if we are obedient to the word spoken; and we shall pass safely over the water of Forgetfulness, and our soul will not be defiled. Wherefore my counsel is that we hold fast to the heavenly way, and follow after justice and virtue always, considering that the soul is immortal, and able to endure every sort of good and every sort of evil. Thus shall we live dear to one another and to the gods, both while remaining here and when, like conquerors in the games who go round to gather gifts, we receive our reward. And it shall be well with us both in this life and in the pilgrimage of a thousand years which we have been reciting."

We have now at some length, yet all too briefly, reviewed the philosophy attributed to Plato and deducible from his writings. We have omitted nearly everything in the way of detail, and have attempted the survey from an elevated vantage-ground, where only the broad lines are apparent, and where the asperities and discords of the landscape disappear. It may now be manifest, we think, how and why Plato has always exercised such fascination on pure natures, and has so largely and so enduringly stimulated the speculation and ennobled the thought of the world.

Literature.—See the observations made and the works specified under the article PLATO. Comp. also Tulloch, *Rat. Theol. in England*, vols. i and ii (Lond. 1872, 8vo); Lecky, *Hist. of Rationalism*, and his *European Morals;* Nourisson, *Pensées Humaines*, p. 45 sq.; Stephen, *Hist. of Engl. Thought in the 18th Century* (Lond. 1876, 2 vols. 8vo); Ackerman, *The Christian Element in Plato and the Platonic Philos.* (transl. in Clark's *Edinburgh Philosophical Library*); Stein, *Sieben Bücher zur Geschichte d. Platonismus* (Leips. 1867); *Bapt. Quar.* April, 1874, art. v, "Plato's Relation to Christianity;" also *North Brit. Rev.* Nov. 1861, art. iii; *Presbyt. Rev.* April, 1864, art. i; *Brit. and For. Ev. Rev.* Oct. 1862, art. viii, on "Platonism of the Fathers. (G. F. H.)

Platonics, New. See NEOPLATONISM.

Platt, Adams W., a Presbyterian minister, was born in Weston, Conn., Oct. 28, 1790. After receiving an ordinary education, he commenced the study of medicine, when his brother, who was studying for the ministry, died, and he immediately turned his thoughts in that direction. He graduated with the second honor of his class at Union College, Schenectady, N. Y., in 1817, and at Princeton Theological Seminary in 1820; was licensed the same year, and entered upon his duties as a missionary in the then new states of Ohio and Indiana. In January, 1824, he accepted a call, and was ordained as pastor of the Presbyterian Church of Rutland, N. Y.; in July, 1829, he became pastor of the Church at West Galway, N. Y.; in 1833 he gave up the Church, and rested for a few months; in 1834 he became stated supply for the Church in West Fayette, N. Y., until 1836, when he became pastor of the Presbyterian Church in Hector, N. Y., where he continued to labor till, in 1848, his health becoming quite impaired, he ceased his pastoral labors. In 1856 he removed to Clinton, Iowa, and assisted in the organization of the Church there, and supplied the pulpit for one year. He died May 2, 1859. Mr. Platt was a humble, laborious, and self-denying minister — a man of marked prudence of character. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1860, p. 121. (J. L. S.)

Platte-Montagne, Nicolas de, a French painter and engraver, son of a celebrated Belgian portrait-painter, was born at Paris about 1631. He was a pupil of Philippe de Champagne, Charles le Brun, and of his uncle, Jean Morin. He painted the *Mary* which was presented in 1666 to the church of Notre Dame at Paris; a *St. Benedict*, a *St. Scholastica* (1676), and a ceiling for the church of the Benedictines du Saint-Sacrement of the Rue Cassette; and *The Holy Ghost alighting upon the Apostles*, for the church of Saint-Sulpice (1676). He also worked for the Tuileries in 1683 and 1684. He exhibited two paintings at the salon of 1673; five historical paintings and three portraits at the salon of 1699 —the first that took place in the galleries of the Louvre. He engraved from 1651 to 1694, in a fashion but little differing from that of Morin, seventeen different subjects, and eleven portraits after Porbus, Janet, Philippe de Champagne, B. de Champagne, and after his own paintings. He was received a member of the Academy April 21, 1779; appointed supplementary professor July 1, 1679, and regular professor Dec. 20, 1681. He signed his works Montagne, Montaigne, De Platte-Montaigne, N. D. P. Montaigne, N. de la Platte-Montagne, N. van Platten Berc, vulgo De Platte-Montagne, and N. de Platte-Montagne. He died Dec. 25, 1706. — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xl, 453.

Platter (παροψίς, properly a *side-dish*, consisting of dainties set on as a condiment, or sauce). Our Lord, in reproving the Pharisees, said, "Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye make clean the outside of the cup and of the platter, but within they are full of extortion and excess" (Matt. xxiii, 25). "Howbeit in vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men. For laying aside the commandment of God, ye hold the tradition of men, as the washing of pots and cups; and many other such like things ye do. And he said unto them, Full well ye reject the commandment of God, that ye may keep your own tradition" (Mark vii, 7–9). The Talmud contains many directions on the use of these utensils, which Jews are strictly required to observe. See DISH.

Play (צָחַק, *tsachák*, Exod. xxxii, 6). This word, in addition to the sense of joking or sporting (Gen. xix, 14), may also be understood of amusements, accompanied with music and singing, in which sense it may be understood in Judges xvi, 25. Though we have no particular mention in the Old Testament of such matters, we may reasonably suppose that some of the games practiced by the ancient Egyptians were likewise known to the Hebrews; these appear, from the monuments, to have been mock combats, races, gymnastic exercises, singing, dancing, and games of chance (Wilkinson, *Anc. Egyptians*, i, 189 sq.). In the declining period of Jewish history the athletic games of the Greeks were introduced, and there were gymnasia, or schools of exercise in Jerusalem, where they practiced wrestling, racing, quoits, etc. (1 Macc. v, 16; 2 Macc. iv, 13–15). For the



Ancient Egyptians playing at draughts and *mora* (guessing numbers).

Grecian games of strength and skill so often alluded to by Paul, see GAMES. Comp. SPORT.

Playfair, James, D.D., a Scotch divine of some note, was born about 1740, and was educated at the University of St. Andrew's. He then became minister of Liff and Benvie livings, which he held until his son succeeded him in the work of the ministry, to soon exchange, however, these fields of labor for the scientific work in which he became so greatly celebrated. Dr. James Playfair was also principal of the United College of St. Salvador and St. Leonard, in the University of St. Andrew's. He died in 1819. He published *A System of Chronology*, and other works. See *London Gentleman's Magazine*, 1819, pt. ii, p. 179.

Playfair, John, an eminent scientist, was born, in 1749, at Dundee; was educated at St. Andrew's; resigned a living, and became mathematical professor at Edinburgh, where he died July 20, 1819. Playfair was celebrated as a geologist, and a strenuous defender of the Huttonian system. Among his works are, *Elements of Geometry:—Outlines of Philosophy:—Illustrations of the Huttonian Theory:*—and *A System of Geography*.

Playfere, JOHN. See PLAIFERE.

Plays, Religious. See MYSTERIES.

Pleasure is the delight which arises in the mind from the contemplation or enjoyment of something agreeable, and is synonymous in expression with *happiness* (q. v.).

Pledge (usually some form of חָבַל, *chabál, to bind* as by a chattel mortgage; occasionally forms of עָבַט, *abát, to exchange*, and עָרַב, *aráb, to give security;* Talmud, מַשְׁכּוֹן), in a legal sense, an assurance given as security by a debtor to his creditor, which is alluded to in the Mosaic books in several instances. Thus—

1. The creditor was not permitted to go to the house of his debtor to take his pledge, but must receive it before the door (Deut. xxiv, 10 sq.). The reason of this requirement and its merciful object are obvious.

2. The articles which were forbidden to be taken in pledge were, (*a*) the *raiment* or outer garment (Exod. xxii, 26 sq.; Deut. xxiv, 10 sq., but see below), because this served the poor also as a covering by night for the bed; (*b*) the *handmill* (q. v.; xxiv, 6. Comp. Mishna, *Baba Mez.* ix, 13). But notwithstanding these merciful provisions of the law, hard-hearted creditors were found among the Israelites who oppressed their debtors by taking pledges (Prov. xx, 16; xxvii, 13; Ezek. xviii, 12; xxxiii, 15; Habak. ii, 6; comp. Job xxii, 6; xxiv, 3). See Delitzsch, *ad loc.*, and especially Michaelis, *Mos. Recht*, iii, 61 sq. The custom of giving pledges prevailed extensively in the ages succeeding the exile, from the fact that by the decisions of the scribes all Jews were prohibited from making any payments on the Sabbath; hence he who would make a purchase on that day left some pledge with the seller (see Mishna, *Shab.* xxiii, 1), as his outer garment, to be redeemed by payment the next day. The taking of pledges is still further restricted by the Talmud (*Baba Mez.* ix, 13). A pledging of land, mortgaging, appears first in the Talmud (Mishna, *Shebiith*, x, 6). However, the legal transfer of land under the Mosaic economy was properly but a pledging; for it could at any time be redeemed, and in the year of Jubilee it returned without repayment to the original owner. Pawning of personal property for debt, however, was a very ancient custom (Gen. xxxviii, 17 sq.). Personal guarantees of faith, pledges, or hostages, are mentioned (2 Kings xiv, 14, בְּנֵי תַעֲרֻבוֹת). The general abhorrence of the usurer, and of his taking pledges, among the Arabs of the present day, is often mentioned by travellers. Mohammed entirely forbids all lending on interest, and the Mosaic precepts (comp. Exod. xxii, 25–27) are generally so understood in the East. Yet nothing is more common there than exorbitant usury, and the taking of pledges (Thomson, *Land and Book*, i, 499 sq.). See LOAN.

PLEDGE is *something* given in hand as a security for the fulfilment of a contract or the performance of a promise. When a man of veracity pledges his word, his affirmation becomes an assurance that he will fulfil what he has promised. But as the word of every man is not equally valid in matters of importance, it becomes necessary that a valuable article of some kind should be deposited as a bond for fulfilment on his part. In the Protestant Episcopal Church Catechism a sacrament is defined as "an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace given unto us; ordained by Christ himself, as a means whereby we receive the same, and a pledge to assure us thereof;" in which the pledge is the token that we receive the grace.

Plegmund, a noted prelate of the early English Church, flourished near the close of the 9th century. He was the friend and fellow-student of Alfred, and was in 890 elevated to the archbishopric of Canterbury. We know next to nothing about his personal history, but we are aware of the influence he exerted on ecclesiastical affairs through Alfred. See Churton, *Early English Church*, p. 210, 221; Wright, *Biogr. Brit.* (see Index).

Pleiădès is the rendering in the A. V. of כִּימָה, *kimâh*, in Job ix, 9; xxxviii, 31; but in Amos v, 8 our A. V. has "the seven stars," although the Geneva version translates the word "Pleiades" as in the other cases. In Job the Sept. has Πλειάς, the order of the Hebrew words having been altered [see ORION], while in Amos there is no trace of the original, and it is difficult to imagine what the translators had before them. The Vulgate in each passage has a different rendering: *Hyades* in Job ix, 9; *Pleiades* in Job xxxviii, 31; and *Arcturus* in Amos v, 8. Of the other versions, the Peshito-Syriac and Chaldee merely adopt the Hebrew word; Aquila in Job xxxviii, Symmachus in Job xxxviii and Amos, and Theodotion in Amos, give "Pleiades," while with remarkable inconsistency Aquila in Amos has "Arcturus." The Jewish commentators are no less at variance. Rabbi David Kimchi in his lexicon says: "Rabbi Jonah wrote that it was a collection of stars called in Arabic *Al-Thuraiyâ*. And the wise rabbi Abraham Aben-Ezra, of blessed memory, wrote that the ancients said *Kimâh* is seven stars, and they are at the end of the constellation Aries, and those which are seen are six. And he wrote that what was right in his eyes was that it was a single star, and that a great one, which is called the left eye of Taurus; and *Kesîl* is a great star, the heart of the constellation Scorpio." On Job xxxviii, 31, Kimchi continues: "Our rabbins of blessed memory have said (*Berachoth*, lviii, 2) *Kimâh* hath great cold and bindeth up the fruits, and *Kesîl* hath great heat and ripeneth the fruits: therefore He said, 'or loosen the bands of *Kesîl*;' for it openeth the fruits and bringeth them forth." In addition to the evidence of rabbi Jonah, who identifies the Hebrew *Kimâh* with the Arabic *el-Thuraiyâ*, we have the testimony of rabbi Isaac Israel, quoted by Hyde in his notes on the Tables of Ulugh Beigh (p. 31–33, ed. 1665), to the same effect. That *el-Thuraiyâ* and the Pleiades are the same is proved by the words of Aben-Ragel (quoted by Hyde, p. 33): "Al-Thuraiyâ is the mansion of the moon, in the sign Taurus, and it is called the celestial hen with her chickens." With this Hyde compares the Fr. *Pulsinière*, and Eng. *Hen and Chickens*, which are old names for the same stars; and Niebuhr (*Descr. de l'Arabie*, p. 101) gives as the result of his inquiry of the Jew at Sanâ, "*Kimeh*, Pleïades, qu'on appelle aussi en Allemagne la poule qui glousse." The "Ancients," whom Aben-Ezra quotes (on Job xxxviii, 31), evidently understood by the seven small stars at the end of the constellation Aries the Pleiades, which are indeed in the left shoulder of the Bull,

but so near the Ram's tail that their position might properly be defined with reference to it. With the statement that "those which are seen are six" may be compared the words of Didymus on Homer, *τῶν δὲ Πλειάδων οὐσῶν ἑπτά, πάνυ ἀμαυρὸς ὁ ἑβδομος ἀστήρ*, and of Ovid (*Fast.* iv, 170):

"Quæ septem dici, sex tamen esse solent."

The opinion of Aben-Ezra himself has frequently been misrepresented. He held that *Kimâh* was a single large star, *Aldebaran*, the brightest of the Hyades, while *Kesîl* [A. V. "Orion"] was *Antares*, the heart of Scorpio. "When these rise in the east," he continues, "the effects which are recorded appear." He describes them as *opposite* each other, and the difference in right ascension between Aldebaran and Antares is as nearly as possible twelve hours. The belief of Eben-Ezra had probably the same origin as the rendering of the Vulg. *Hyades*. One other point is deserving of notice. The rabbins, as quoted by Kimchi, attribute to *Kimâh* great cold and the property of checking vegetation, while *Kesîl* works the contrary effects. But the words of rabbi Isaac Israel on Job xxxviii, 31 (quoted by Hyde, p. 72), are just the reverse. He says, "The stars have operations in the ripening of the fruits, and such is the operation of *Kimâh*. And some of them retard and delay the fruits from ripening, and this is the operation of *Kesîl*. The interpretation is, 'Wilt thou bind the fruits which the constellation *Kimâh* ripeneth and openeth; or wilt thou open the fruits which the constellation *Kesîl* contracteth and bindeth up?'" On the whole then, though it is impossible to arrive at any certain conclusion, it appears that our translators were perfectly justified in rendering *Kimâh* by "Pleiades." The "seven stars" in Amos clearly denoted the same cluster in the language of the 17th century, for Cotgrave in his French Dictionary gives "Pléiade, f., one of the *seven stars*." Hyde maintained that the Pleiades were again mentioned in Scripture by the name Succoth Benoth. The discussion of this question must be reserved to the article on that name.

The etymology of *Kimâh* is referred to the Arabic *Kumeh*, "a heap," as being a heap or cluster of stars. The full Arabic name given by Gesenius is "the knot of the Pleiades;" and, in accordance with this, most modern commentators render Job xxxviii, 31, "Is it thou that bindest the knots of the Pleiades, or loosenest the bands of Orion?" Simon (*Lex. Hebr.*) quotes the Greenland name for this cluster of stars, "*Killukturset*, i. e. *stellas colligatas*," as an instance of the existence of the same idea in a widely different language. The rendering "sweet influences" of the A. V. is a relic of the lingering belief in the power which the stars exerted over human destiny. The marginal note on the word "Pleiades" in the Geneva Version is, "Which starres arise when the sunne is in Taurus, which is the spring tyme, and bring flowers," thus agreeing with the explanation of R. Isaac Israel quoted above.

The word is used as the name of the cluster of stars in the neck of the constellation *Taurus*, of which seven are the principal. Six or seven may be usually seen if the eye is directed towards it; but if the eye be turned carelessly aside while the attention is fixed on the group, many more may be seen. Telescopes show a number of large stars there crowded together into a small space. The name Pleiades is probably derived from the Greek word *Pleios*, i. e. *full*, so that it merely denotes a condensed assemblage of stars. The Romans called the Pleiades *vergiliæ*, because they arose in the spring, in the first part of May, and set early in November. See Hyde on Ulugh Beigh's *Tabb.* p. 32; Niebuhr, *Arab.* p. 114; Ideler, *Ursprung und Bedeutung der Sternnamen*, p. 146. See Astronomy; Constellation.

Plenarty (opposed to a vacancy) denotes in ecclesiastical language that an office or parish is filled.

Plenary Indulgence. See Indulgence.

Plenary Inspiration. See Deists; Inspiration.

Plerōma (*πλήρωμα, fulness*) is the Gnostic term for that fulness of pure and radiant light and perfection in which the Divine Being was supposed to dwell, and whom they named Bythus. See Gnosticism.

Plessing, Friedrich Victor-Lebrecht, a German philosopher, was born at Belleben, near Magdeburg, Dec. 20, 1752. He was the son of John Frederick Plessing, who was counsellor of the consistory at Werningerode, and wrote an *Essai sur l'Origine du Paganisme* (Leips. 1757–1758, 2 vols. 8vo), and a *Histoire des Tombeaux* (Werningerode, 1786, 8vo); he died in 1793. Young Plessing attended the theological courses at different universities, and finally devoted himself to philosophy at Königsberg, under Kant's direction. From 1788 he was a professor of that science at Duisburg. He died Feb. 8, 1806. He left, *Von der Nothwendigkeit des Uebels und der Schmerzen bei fühlenden Geschöpfen* (Dessau, 1783, 8vo):—*Osiris und Socrates* (Berl. 1783, 8vo):—*Historische Untersuchungen über die Theologie und Philosophie der ältesten Völker bis auf Aristoteles Zeiten* (Elbingen, 1785, 8vo):—*Memnonium, oder Versuch zur Enthüllung der Geheimnisse des Alterthums* (Leips. 1787, 2 vols. 8vo):—*Versuche zur Aufklärung der Philosophie des ältesten Alterthums* (ibid. 1788–1790, 5 vols. 8vo).—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xl, 465.

Plessis, Joseph Octave, a somewhat noted Roman Catholic prelate, was born at Montreal, Canada, March 3, 1772, of very humble parentage. He decided to give himself to the service of the Church, and after completing his theological studies was ordained priest, March 11, 1786; was employed as professor of humanity at the College of St. Raphael, also as secretary to the bishop of Quebec, and curate of the capital; Sept. 6, 1797, he was made coadjutor to bishop Denault; April 26, 1800, he was appointed bishop of Canatte, in Palestine, with the succession to the seat at Quebec, of which he became incumbent Jan. 17, 1806. He founded the college at Nicolet, as well as primary schools at Quebec. He was called by the crown to the legislative council in 1818, and proved himself a loyal and patriotic senator. In 1796 he pronounced an oration at Quebec on the occasion of the naval battle of Aboukir. He died at Quebec Dec. 4, 1825. See Ferland, *Biog. Notice of J. O. Plessis* (Queb. 1864, 8vo).

Plessis-Mornay. See Duplessis.

Pletho or **Gemistus**, Georgius, a distinguished philosopher, theologian, publicist, historian, geographer, and scholar of the 15th century, is one of the most prominent of the Greeks who contributed to the revival of Greek studies in Western Europe, and the restorer of the Platonic philosophy.

Life.—The dates of the birth and death of Pletho have not been ascertained. He is supposed to have died before the capture of Constantinople by the Turks, and not many years after the Council of Florence. He is vaguely reported to have been nearly a hundred years of age at the period of his demise. If this were true, he must have first seen the light about the middle of the 14th century. His birthplace was probably Constantinople, but much of his life was spent in Peloponnesus, and was passed in official employment. He received the name of Pletho, and perhaps of Gemistus, from the extent, multiplicity, and fulness of his erudition, which he displayed in numerous works on a great variety of subjects. "He was admired," says a writer near his time, "by not Greece alone, but by nearly the whole world, for his various and manifold knowledge of things divine and human, so that, by the universal consent of both Greeks and Latins, he approached most closely to Plato, the prince of philosophers, and to Aristotle." Yet this great name is one which posterity has willingly let die. He wrote on philosophy, theology, history, geog-

raphy, oratory, music, etc. He composed orations, occasional essays, polemical tracts, letters, etc., and made collections, in the fashion of declining centuries, from Diodorus, Appian, and Plutarch; from Xenophon and Dionysius Halicarnassensis, from Aristotle and Theophrastus. He was engaged in numerous controversies, with George Gennadius, who became patriarch of Constantinople after the Ottoman conquest; with Theodore of Gaza, and with George of Trebizond. The number of his works might encourage the belief that a century of years had been accorded to their author; but this longevity is discredited by the incidents of his life. If he died, almost a centenarian, in 1452, as some reporters allege, he must have been about seventy when he held the first public employment recorded as held by him; and he must have been verging on ninety when last commemorated as an imperial officer in the Peloponnesus. The years of *macrobians* are so readily exaggerated by themselves, and by their more juvenile contemporaries, that no great weight need be attached to the allegation that he was born in 1355. His name of Pletho has been stated to have been bestowed on him in consequence of his learning, but it may have been designed as an approximate reproduction of the name of Plato, to whose memory and speculations he devoted himself with unrestrained enthusiasm. The surname may, indeed, have been assumed by himself, for it furnished frequent occasions of sarcasm and ridicule to the numerous adversaries whom he provoked. He occupied a high place at court, in the close of the reign of the emperor Manuel II Palæologus (Brucker says Michael, but the last emperor of that name had died almost a century and a half before. Dr. Plate, in Smith's *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Mythol.*, etc., gives 1426 as the date of this official function, but Manuel died in 1425). Gemistus "the Philosopher," as he was already called, was one of the notables at the conference in Constantinople which recommended conciliation with the Latin Church (Michael Attaliotes, *Hist. Polit.* c. iv). He attended the emperor John V, as a senator and deputy of the Greek Church, to the Council of Florence in 1439 (Ducas. *Hist. Byzant.* c. xxxi). Among his companions were Bessarion, his pupil; Isidore of Russia; George the Scholarius, his future antagonist; and Argyropulus. Pletho distinguished himself by the active part which he took in the conferences, and by his violent opposition to the union of the churches. He yielded ultimately, however, and was one of the signatories of the formulary of compromise. This sacrifice of religious opinion embittered the feelings of his countrymen to him. He did not accompany the emperor on his return to Constantinople. During his stay in Florence he formed an intimacy with Cosmo the Magnificent, and by the fascination of his lectures converted the great Florentine to the Platonism which Gemistus had espoused with the utmost fervor—though it was rather the mystical excesses of the later Neo-Platonists than the genuine doctrine of Plato which he had adopted. Marsilius Ficinus states, in his Dedication of Plotinus, that it was at Pletho's suggestion that Cosmo di Medici instituted the Platonic Academy at Florence, of which Ficinus became the first director. He certainly succeeded in rendering Platonism the rage in Italy, supported as he was by the countenance of his illustrious disciple, cardinal Bessarion, and by the favor of the Medicean house. Most of his labors henceforth were devoted to the illustration and dissemination of the Platonic doctrine. This endeavor, and the success which attended it, provoked the hostility of the Aristotelians, whose opinions had been for centuries in almost unchallenged possession of the domain of philosophy, and involved him in virulent controversy with their leaders. Nor was the hostility mitigated by the suspicion that Pletho desired to supplant not merely Peripateticism, but Christianity also, by his revived Platonism. He was charged by George of Trebizond with being not less dangerous to the faith than Mohammed himself. The suspicion was in some sort justified by the language of Pletho, and corroborated subsequently by the tenor of the Commentaries of Ficinus. The quarrels thus excited were further exacerbated by the revolutionary doctrines of Pletho's treatise *On Laws*, written after the example of Plato, and far transcending the socialistic reveries of the Platonic *Republic*. The work seems not to have been published, or even completed. It is said to have been burned after his death by the directions of his ancient antagonist, George Scholarius, or Gennadius. Fragments of the work only remain. The imitation of Plato might have tempted him to the composition of the work, have determined its form, and suggested its doctrines. Any such temptation would have been encouraged by the meditated socialistic experiment of Plotinus. But the wretched condition of his countrymen, their destitution, their hopeless oppression by taxes which they could not pay—especially in Peloponnesus, ravaged as it had been for centuries by Sclavonians and Saracens and Franks, and ground into the dust by the Latin barons introduced by the Fourth Crusade—are alleged as the inducements to this wild device of social reorganization. There is every reason to believe that Pletho was as sincere as he was earnest in this dream of political renovation; which was neither more nor less insane in the 15th century than have been the numberless analogous schemes which have deluded the 19th. The project seems to have occupied his declining age. The years of Pletho were as full as was his assumed name.

Writings.—The treatises, abstracts, essays, polemics, letters, and other productions of Pletho were both numerous and varied. They still remain, for the most part, in manuscript, nor has there been any complete enumeration, or sufficient investigation of those that survive. The wish has several times been expressed for their collection, recension, and publication; but the wish is still ungratified, notwithstanding the acknowledgment of the various and valuable services that might be expected from its satisfaction. The editors of the Bonn edition of the Byzantine historians, who proceed so languidly with the continuation of the labors auspiciously and energetically commenced by Niebuhr, may contemplate, or may be induced to contemplate, an edition at some future time of the *Opera omnia quæ supersunt* of Georgius Gemistus Pletho. The variety of these works has already been indicated. Of those which have been given to the press, the most important, as reported in Smith's *Dictionary of Mythology*, etc., are: 1. *De Gestis Græcorum post pugnam ad Mantineam*, extracted from Diodorus and Plutarch:—2. *De Fato*:—3. *De Virtutibus*:—4. *De Platonicæ atque Aristotelicæ Philosophiæ Differentia*:—5. *Oracula Magica Zoroastris.* Since this list was prepared, some of the smaller tracts of Pletho, previously unedited, have been published, and M. Alexandre has brought out at Paris, 6. *De Legibus, Fragmenta.*

Philosophy.—There is no distinctive system of philosophy to be ascribed to Pletho. He was a revivalist and restorer only, except in the department of politics; and even here he was a legitimate disciple of Plato. He asserted the exclusive doctrine of Plato against Aristotle and the Aristotelians, and also against the experiment of the Neo-Platonists to conciliate the principles of Aristotle with those of Plato. He did not, however, avoid the transcendental excesses of the Alexandrian school, or refrain from following the example of the later members of that school, in blending Oriental fantasies with the speculations of the First Academy. Still his restitution of Platonism exercised a great and beneficial influence on the intellect of the 15th century, by presenting a new object of regard, by quickening intelligence through the conflict of opinions and through the controversies excited, and by liberating inquiry from the solitary predominance of the one great teacher, whose views had been converted into a tyrannical authority, distorted and cramped in their application, and

deflected into the perilous systems of the Alexandrists and Averröists. The institution of the Florentine Academy was one of the most potent agencies in the emancipation of modern thought; and its establishment may fairly be credited to the labors and to the impulse of Pletho. What is truly distinctive of his philosophical career is his political project for the reformation and amelioration of the Peloponnesus. Though some of its outlines were derived from antiquity, and the route was in some sort indicated by Plato and Plotinus, yet it possesses originality of its own, and was immediately induced by an active desire of ministering to present needs, and of supplying practical remedies, even if they were impracticable, to the actual miseries of the society around him.

The plan proposed by Pletho was a sweeping agrarianism, resembling in some respects the system of Lycurgus and that of Cleomenes II in the same region of Laconia; resembling in others the socialism of Plato, but resembling still more the extreme projects of land-reform which have recently been proposed in England, Ireland, France, and other countries. The evils which he proposed to redress by a complete alteration of the fabric of society were the insecurity of person and property; the squalor occasioned by ravages and multitudinous taxes, ill-imposed and unfairly levied; the uncertain and defective administration of justice; and the varied and degraded currency in circulation. Like Plato, he proposed to divide the people into three classes, but the classes were different from those of Plato: they were to be the agriculturists, the capitalists, and the guardians. The farmers or agriculturists were intended to include the greater part of the industrial body; the capitalists were to embrace the owners of all the appliances for the assistance of labor, and apparently the lessors of the land; the guardians, or defenders, comprehended all who were engaged in the protection of the society and its members, or in the maintenance of right and order: princes, magistrates, lawyers, doctors, and soldiers—priests also, probably. There was to be no private property in land; it was to belong exclusively to the state, and to be leased out, from time to time, to landlords or capitalists. A right of temporary occupancy was all that was admitted. Of the produce of the soil, one third was to be paid to the government for the maintenance of the guardians, and for other public burdens; one third went to the landlords or capitalists; and one third was to be the remuneration of the actual cultivators. Pletho, like the French *Économistes*, thought that all wealth was the production of land, and that all impositions should be charged upon it. The guardians, whether princes or soldiers or magistrates, were a class entirely apart from the rest of the community. They paid no taxes, but protected the people from external violence and internal disorders, and were supported by the government from the proceeds of the public third. The soldiers were quartered on the farmers to consume the government thirds, so far as required for their support: "fruges consumere nati." No money-taxes were imposed: the funds required for the public service were to be derived exclusively from the export and sale of the surplus which remained out of the government's share of the produce. Such is a brief abstract of Pletho's *plethoric* state. The plan was never completed; the book was burned; its author died; and the Turks conquered the Morea before the experiment could be tried.

Literature.—Gass, *Gennadii et Plethonis Scripta quædam edita et inedita* (Breslau, 1844); Pellissier, *Pléthon, Traité des Lois, ou Recueil des Fragmens, en Partie inédits de cet Ouvrage, par C. Alexandre* (Paris, 1851); Leo Allatius, *De Georgiis diatriba* (ibid. 1651); Boivin, *Querelle des Philosophes du XVme Siècle;* Hody, *De Græcis Illustribus*, etc. (Lond. 1742); Bayle, *Dict. Hist. et Critique;* Brucker, *Hist. Crit. Phil.* per. iii, ps. i, lib. i, c. ii, § 1; c. iii, § 4, 5; Tiraboschi, *Storia della Letteratura Italiana;* Ginguéné, *Hist. de la Littérature Italienne;* Smith, *Dict. Anc. Mythol. and Biog.;* Hallam, *Hist. of the Lit. of Europe*, ch. ii, § ii, p. 13, 14; Finlay, *Hist. of the Byzantine Empire*, bk. iv, ch. ii, § 5, vol. ii, p. 608; id. *Hist. of Med. Greece*, etc., ch. ix, § 2, p. 282; Ueberweg, *Hist. of Philosophy*, § 109. (G. F. H.)

Pletz, Joseph, doctor of theology, imperial chaplain, and abbot of the monastery of the Holy Virgin of Pagrany, Hungary; imperial counsellor, consistorial counsellor, deacon-emeritus of the metropolitan chapter of St. Stephen, at Vienna; director of the theological studies in the Austrian empire, referent of the same, assistant of the imperial commission of studies, director and president of the theological faculty; and, in 1835, ex-rector magnificus of the University of Vienna, member of the high schools of Vienna, Pesth, and Padua, etc., was born at Vienna Jan. 3, 1788; attended the lessons of the gymnasium of St. Anna; studied philosophy and theology at the University of Vienna; received orders Aug. 30, 1812, and was appointed adjunct at the university, prefect of the studies, and librarian in the episcopal seminary. During the years 1814 and 1815 he taught dogmatics at the High School of Vienna. In 1816 he was appointed chaplain of the court, and first director of the studies at the institute for the education of secular priests, then recently founded by Francis I. In 1823 he was called upon to teach dogmatics at the University of Vienna, and Feb. 15, 1827, he became canon of the metropolitan chapter of St. Stephen. He received successively the functions and dignities mentioned above, and discharged the duties thereof with active zeal, commendable prudence, with disinterestedness and conscientiousness, for the good of the State and the Church. A fit of apoplexy put an end to his restless activity, in 1841. Pletz was a worthy, unblemished priest, a learned theologian, a zealous protector of true science, and at the same time a father to the poor, a consoler of the afflicted, a helper in need, and to his friends a true and upright friend. Besides several works of edification and some sermons, which he published in the years 1817–1833, he wrote a number of essays in Frint's theological journal, and in his own, which he edited from 1828 to 1840, under the title of *Neue theologische Zeitschrift* (Vienna), in twelve annual volumes; the thirteenth, commenced by Pletz, was completed by his friend, Prof. Seebach.

Plicāta, the "folded" chasuble worn on Good Friday by the deacon and subdeacon, or by a priest, folded on the shoulder, when acting as a deacon. It is a relic of ancient usage, anterior to the use of the dalmatic and tunic, when they wore the trabea rolled up in front to leave their hands free and unencumbered, and is also a peculiarity belonging to times of penance.

Pliny *the Younger*, or Caius Cæc. P. Secundus, the nephew and adopted son of the elder Pliny, was born at Como in A.D. 61 or 62; was a pupil of Quintilian; and pleaded successfully as an advocate in his nineteenth year. He was successively tribune of the people, prefect of the treasury, consul, proconsul in Pontus and Bithynia, and augur; and died, universally esteemed, in 115. The name of Pliny the Younger has, from the days of Tertullian, been mentioned with peculiar interest by Christian writers on account of the testimony which he bore concerning the Christians of his day in Bithynia. They form the subject of a rather long letter (x, 97) to Trajan, written about forty years after the death of St. Paul, and followed by a short answer from Trajan. With all his advantages of education, Pliny was superstitious and credulous. Though a kind-hearted man even to slaves (viii, 1, 16, 19), he was intolerant and cruel to the Christians; and, according to his own account, he put to death the Christians of Bithynia who would not abjure their religion, though he considered it only an innocent superstition. The materials for Pliny's life may be collected from his Epistles, from which a brief notice has been drawn up by Cellarius, and one more elaborate by Masson; there is also a

very complete Life of Pliny, with abundant references to his letters, prefixed to E. Thierfeld's German translation of the "Epistles and Panegyric" (Munich, 1828). But the reader is referred to the Epistles themselves for the most gratifying notice of Pliny the Younger, every epistle being, as Melmoth observes, "a kind of historical sketch, wherein we have a view of him in some striking attitude either of active or contemplative life." Pliny's Epistles have been translated into English by Lord Orrery and Mr. Melmoth. The best edition of Pliny's Epistles is that of Cortius and Longolius (Amst. 1734, 4to). Of the editions of the Epistles and Panegyric together may be recommended those of Christopher Cellarius (Leips. 1693, 12mo); Hearne, with Life by Masson prefixed (Oxford, 1703, 8vo); Gierig (Leips. 1806, 2 vols. 8vo), and Gesuetan and Schaefer (ibid. 1805). Of his writings, the letter addressed to the emperor Trajan in the year 107 is considered one of the most important documents remaining of early Christian history, and we therefore transcribe here some portion of it. After mentioning the difficulty of his own situation, and his perplexity in what manner to proceed against men charged with no other crime than the name of Christian, the writer proceeds as follows:

"Others were named by an informer, who at first confessed themselves Christians, and afterwards denied it; the rest said they had been Christians, but had left them —some three years ago, some longer, and one or more above twenty years. They all worshipped your image and the statues of the gods; these also reviled Christ. They affirmed that the whole of their fault or error lay in this—that they were wont to meet together on a stated day before it was light, and sing among themselves alternately a hymn to Christ, as to God, and bind themselves by an oath, not to the commission of any wickedness, but not to be guilty of theft, or robbery, or adultery, never to falsify their word, nor to deny a pledge committed to them when called upon to return it. When these things were performed, it was their custom to separate, and then to come together again to a meal, which they ate in common without any disorder; but this they had forborne since the publication of my edict, by which, according to your commands, I prohibited assemblies. After receiving this account, I judged it the more necessary to examine, and that by torture, two maid-servants, which were called ministers; but I have discovered nothing besides a bad and excessive superstition. Suspending, therefore, all judicial proceedings, I have recourse to you for advice, for it has appeared to me matter highly deserving consideration, especially upon account of the great number of persons who are in danger of suffering, for many of all ages and every rank, of both sexes likewise, are accused, and will be accused. Nor has the contagion of this superstition seized cities only, but the lesser towns also, and the open country; nevertheless, it seems to me that it may be restrained and corrected. It is certain that the temples which were almost forsaken begin to be more frequented; and the sacred solemnities, after a long intermission, are revived. Victims likewise are everywhere bought up, whereas for a time there were few purchasers. Whence it is easy to imagine what numbers of men might be reclaimed if pardon were granted to those who repent."

So few and uncertain are the records left to guide our inquiries through the obscure period which immediately followed the conclusion of the labors of the apostles, that the above testimony to the numbers and virtues of our forefathers in faith becomes indeed invaluable. See Milman, *Hist. of Christianity;* Liddon, *Divinity of Christ;* Mosheim, *Commentary of Christian History;* Schaff, *Hist. of the Christian Church*, i, 164 sq.; Smith, *Dict. of Class. Biog.* s. v.; Bähr, *Gesch. der römischen Literatur;* Hagenbach, *Kirchengesch. der ersten drei Jahrh.* ch. viii; Alzog, *Kirchengesch.* i, 112, 136; Riddle, *Christian Antiquities*, p. 176 sq.; Bender, *Der jüngere Plinius* (Tüb. 1873); Cudworth, *Intellectual Universe;* Jules Janin, *Pline le jeune et Quintilien* (1838); Church, *Pliny's Letters* (Lond. 1872).

Plisson, Marie-Prudence, a French female mathematician, celebrated in her time by her eccentricities, was born at Chartres Nov. 27, 1727. Her father was a magistrate. Her taste for learned pursuits kept her aloof from the world, and induced her to prefer single-blessedness to matrimonial bliss. Her quaint disposition soon engaged her in disputes with which her sex evidently ought to have nothing to do. She first made herself known by several pieces in prose and in verse, published by the newspapers of the time. In 1764 the question was agitated whether a child born ten months and ten days after the dissolution of the matrimonial tie was legitimate? Mlle. Plisson boldly intervened in this momentous debate, and attacked with no little vivacity the opinion of Lebos, Bertin, Antoine Petit, etc.: many were the epigrams darted at the female philosopher. There was a time when she took to observe with passionate curiosity the nature of the cat, and comparing notes with all the naturalists who had written anything about it. She undertook to write the physiology of this interesting animal. "What animal," she says, in one of her pamphlets, "is more common, more at hand to be examined by educated people, than the cat?" Her library was remarkable in every respect. She died Dec. 17, 1788. Mlle. Plisson left, *Odes sur la Vie champêtre* (1750):—*Projet pour soulager les Pauvres de la Campagne* (Chartres, 1758):—*Recherches sur la Durée de la Grossesse* (Amsterdam, 1765):—*La Promenade de Province, Nouvelle, avec les Voyages d'Oromasis dans l'Ile de Bienveillance et dans la Planète de Mercure* (Paris, 1783, 12mo):—and *Maximes morales d'un Philosophe Chrétien* (Paris, 1783, 16mo).—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xl, 486.

Ploos van Amstel, Cornelius, a celebrated Dutch amateur engraver and designer, was born at Amsterdam in 1726. He is chiefly distinguished for his imitations of the drawings of old masters, of which he possessed one of the best collections known, amounting to five thousand drawings by celebrated Italian, German, French, Flemish, and Dutch masters, from Giotto to his own time. Born of a good and wealthy family, he had every opportunity for improving his taste and advancing his pursuits. Being acquainted with all the principal collectors of Amsterdam, he commenced making his own valuable collection at a very early age. He had likewise a very valuable collection of prints and etchings, especially of the works of Lucas van Leyden, Albert Dürer, Golzius, Cornelius and Jan Visser, N. Berchem, and especially Rembrandt. Ploos van Amstel's own works consist chiefly of imitations of drawings of old masters, in chalk, washed and colored; the colored imitations were accomplished by printing with several plates. In 1765 he published a collection of forty-six such imitations in various styles, after drawings by A. Vandevelde, Rembrandt, Ostade, Gerard Dow, Backhuysen, Metzu, Berchem, A. Bloemaert, Wouvermann, Mieris, Terburg, and others. There are altogether upwards of one hundred imitations of drawings by Ploos van Amstel, and many of these are published in various stages of progress, but very few impressions were taken of any. They are enumerated and described by Weigel in the *Kunst-Katalog*, and in Nagler's *Künstler-Lexikon*. A collection of one hundred of Van Amstel's and some additional similar imitations, with a portrait of Van Amstel, was published by C. Josi (London, 1821, royal folio); but only one hundred copies were printed, and at the enormous price of forty guineas per copy. Ploos van Amstel died at Amsterdam Dec. 20, 1798, and on March 3, 1800, his valuable collection, with the exception of the etchings of Rembrandt, was sold at auction, and realized the large sum of 109,406 florins. See Van Eynden en Vander Willigen, *Geschiedenis der Vaterlandsche Schildekunst sedert de Helft der XVIII Eeuw.* 1816–1842.

Plotinus, the most prominent and celebrated of the Neo-Platonic philosophers, the most elaborate and authoritative exponent of the school of Alexandria, was the most transcendental of the ancient transcendentalists, and was mainly instrumental in transforming into the Pantheism of Iamblichus and Proclus the doctrine deduced through many successions from Plato.

Life.—The outlines of the career of Plotinus have already been given, and have been accompanied with a brief notice of his opinions, under Neo-Platonism.

The esteem in which the sage of Lycopolis was held by his contemporaries is shown by the application to him of the current proverb, "The productions of Egypt are few, but they are great." His asceticism led him to regard his body, the casket of his soul, with such contempt that he would never suffer his likeness to be taken. His pupil Amelius, however, introduced the painter Carterius to his lectures, who was thus enabled to take a portrait of him from memory, without his knowledge. His philosophical temperament is further illustrated by his dying words, addressed to Eustochius, "I am striving to reunite what is divine in me to the pure divinity which reigns throughout the universe." When he expired, a dragon rushed from under his bed, and escaped through a hole in the wall. Amelius inquired of the Delphic oracle, not yet entirely dumb, "What has become of him?" and was informed, in a string of loose hexameters, that he dwelt with Minos, Rhadamanthus, Abacus, Pythagoras, and other blessed spirits, in the contemplation of the Deity, to whom he had been conjoined in ecstatic union four times during life. After the biographical notice already given, it only remains to give a somewhat fuller account of his writings, and a more extended and connected exposition of his views.

Writings. — The philosophy of the Neo-Platonic school of Alexandria, founded by Ammonius Saccas, was an exclusive *cult*, designed to be a secret and privileged possession for the training and elevation of an elect body of theorists and enthusiasts. The seal of reticence having been broken by Herennius, his fellow-disciple, Plotinus deemed that there was no longer either obligation or expediency in endeavoring to preserve the secrets of the new speculation, and accordingly promulgated it by oral lectures at Rome, continued for twenty-five years, and by treatises written at various times during this long course of instruction. His exposition was, however, so curt, intricate, and obscure; so full of inapprehensible subtleties and impalpable distinctions, that he was under the necessity of invoking the aid of his pupils to interpret and to develop his doctrine. He thus employed his veteran disciple, Amelius, to combat the repugnances and to remove the doubts of the neophyte Porphyry. All the earlier writers who have occasion to mention Plotinus speak of his brief, terse, thought-oppressed, oracular style; and the few among the moderns who have had the patience and have taken the pains to wade through his tantalizing compositions must have often re-echoed the ancient censures. The sublimation of the recondite thought is rendered more evanescent by the dryness of the phraseology and the niggardliness of words. The difficulty of the compressed and indistinct utterance is made more difficult by the abundance of the nebulous thought. Yet through all the clouds of utterance and of contemplation gleams continually a more than earthly radiance, which lights up the darkness, and converts the dim, disjointed, spasmodic communications into exquisite revelations of supernal purity and beauty, and into wonderful graces, which are equally without art, in violation of art, and beyond art. The intense flame of passionate love illumines dialectical subtleties and scholastic formulas in the Letters of Eloïse and Abelard; and the ethereal splendor of "the heavenly love," which fills his whole intellectual being, frequently clothes with its own light the technical phrases, the visionary abstractions, and the jagged points of the diction of Plotinus. Knowledge with him is intuition: he sees the divine and the eternal by the influx and the communion of the divine: he is himself in turn apprehended, rather than understood, by an immediate contact between his own rapt spirit and the enkindled intelligence of his readers. He says that in the pure universe of the intelligible there are neither "discourse of reason" nor the voices of speech, but only immediate knowledge by sympathetic community of thought (*οὐ δὲ δὴ φωναῖς οἶμαι χρῆσθαι νομιστέον, ἐν μὲν τῷ νοητῷ οὔσας καὶ πάμπαν . . . γιγνώσκοιεν δ' ἂν καὶ τὰ παρ' ἀλλήλων ἐν συνέσει, Enn.* iv, iii, 18). There is something of the same inspiration by contact and association which quickens and assimilates the eager intellect, and enables us to divine and appropriate rather than to understand the mystic communications of Plotinus. He seems himself to have been fully aware of the vagueness and unintelligibility of his compositions. They were bursts of sudden revelation, gushing out in hasty, spontaneous expression. The weakness of his sight, and the feverish impatience of his overteeming mind, prevented him from recasting what he had once committed to parchment. He, therefore, intrusted to Porphyry, a rhetorician trained in the school of Longinus, the onerous task of collecting, revising, and co-ordinating his works. Porphyry undertook the office with reverence, and discharged it with affectionate fidelity. Plotinus had already produced and disseminated among his acolytes twenty-one books, when Porphyry came to Rome and attached himself to him: he added twenty-four during the six years that Porphyry attended his instructions, and he sent nine for revision to Porphyry, in his Sicilian retreat, during the last period of his life. It is probable that these books did not embrace all the philosophical lucubrations of the master, but that there were other treatises or essays in various stages of development, which were left behind, or were preserved as notes or memoranda in the hands of the disciples—like the college notes of the lectures of Niebuhr, Sir William Hamilton, and many others, which have been expanded and published to complete or to extend the lessons of the preceptors. Of such materials there are ample evidences in the surviving remains of Plotinus, the greater part of which appears as brief and undeveloped jottings, often as bare hints, while numerous passages have been elaborated with great care, and are expressed with adequate precision, fulness, and accesses of rugged grace. Porphyry collected fifty-four essays of various dimensions, which, in imitation of the Platonic Trilogies and Tetralogies, he arranged in six series of nine each, to which he gave the name of Enneads; being guided in their combination and disposition by the agreement or affinity of their topics, and in their succession by the ascending progress from human observation and experience, through the constituent principles of abstract nature, to ontology and theology. This is not the line of systematic exposition, nor is it, in its execution, the strict order of discovery. The whole body is irregular and confused; incomplete and often incoherent in its members; undeveloped and fragmentary in the exposition of the several parts. There are a few sufficiently thorough discussions: On Beauty (*Enn.* i, vi); On Nature and the One (*Enn.* iii, viii); On Psychical Problems (*Enn.* iv, iii–v); On the Species of Existence (*Enn.* iv, i–iii); and On Unity and Multiformity (*Enn.* vi, iv–v); to which may be added On the Essential Good (*Enn.* vi, vii and ix). That there was a definite system in the mind of Plotinus may be readily admitted, for there is a general congruity of thought pervading the whole collection, and his characteristic principles were entertained from the first. This system might possibly be reproduced in its substantial integrity by a liberal employment of conjecture and logical evolution. Such a system may have been propounded by Plotinus in his oral course—though, from his remains and from the testimony of antiquity, we may safely conclude that even the instructions to the school were marked by the absence of method, consecution, perspicuity, and proportion. The written expansions of his doctrine appear to have been determined by transitory contingencies—the doubts of his scholars, the cavils of opponents, the apparent urgency of particular questions, as in the papers *Against the Gnostics* (*Enn.* ii, ix). Yet even what was written in this disconnected manner was composed at various times, in diverse moods, and left in different degrees of completion. None of the books can be regarded as a just, rounded, and complete essay. They

are, for the most part, a collection of remarks upon discontinuous points, associated with a common subject of inquiry, thus resembling the *Pensées*, like those of Pascal, which were for a long time a favorite but imperfect form of enunciation with French thinkers. This, however, does not exhaust the impediments to any coherent and satisfactory ordination of the productions of Plotinus. There is no reason to suppose that all his written remains were in a condition to be made available. There is reason to believe that other materials besides those employed by Porphyry, either in his form of synoptical abridgments or of formal tractates, were in the hands of other disciples. In view of all the difficulties of his position, so far as they can now be ascertained and appreciated, there is a concert of opinion among scholars and critics that the procedure of Porphyry was judicious, and that no better plan of arrangement could have been adopted than the aggregation of the fragmentary materials in accordance with the loose bond of coherence supplied by similarity of subject, although this plan utterly disregards the chronological order of their production, and shuffles confusedly together the writings of very distinct periods. Less inconvenience would result from this disorder, if there had been entire constancy and consistency in the development of his speculation; but in his earlier career Plotinus was much influenced by the tenets of Numenius; in his maturer life he acquired greater independence of thought, but inclined most closely to the teachings and tendencies of Plato; and in his later years he gave evidence of diminished power of intellect. What could be done to correct or compensate for the confusion of the text was supplied by the *Sentences* of Porphyry, which gave an abstract of the doctrine, but these have come down to us only in a sadly mangled form.

In the arrangement of Porphyry [see NEO-PLATONISM] the logical order is disturbed, and in a great measure inverted. The last two Enneads are the most characteristic, and in some respects the most important for the estimation of the philosophy of Plotinus. The first Ennead is noted by Porphyry as pre-eminently ethical (being occupied with *τὰ ἠθικώτερα*, or *τὰς ἠθικωτέρας ὑποθέσεις*). The recension of Porphyry was not the only promulgation of the lectures of Plotinus. Three other publications have been specified, and other copies of special parts of his philosophy may have been circulated. As soon as he commenced reducing his views to writing, demands for copies were made upon him by his followers, and these exemplars would naturally be multiplied and disseminated to some extent. We know that some of his productions were sent in his lifetime from Rome to Syria, to the rhetorician Longinus. These loose and flying sheets would soon be lost after the more complete body of his doctrine became accessible. This, however, is acknowledged to have existed in two forms—that issued with authority by Porphyry, and another presentation by Eustochius, a pupil who attended the death-bed of his teacher. These two versions are alone recognised by Creuzer, the accepted authority for all matters connected with the text and interpretation of Plotinus. These recensions did not agree either in the distribution of the matter or in all the details of doctrine. The Eustochian edition was still in existence in the Byzantine period, but has since perished, and has left the Porphyrian text as the sole representative of Plotinus. This exemplar is, however, believed by Creuzer to have received additions and alterations from the concurrent copy of the Eustochian rolls.

We would remark, before proceeding to the consideration of the peculiar philosophy of Plotinus, that neither he, nor the sect of which he was the expositor, contemplated the institution of a distinct, original type of speculation. The Neo-Platonists were the continuators of the Platonic Academy—drifted far, it may be, from the ancient shores. Their distinctive purpose was to conciliate Aristotle with Plato, and to harmonize with both the teachings of Pythagoras, and the asceticism which had flowed to Alexandria from Oriental sources. The energies of the teachers of the new and modified doctrine would thus be not equally expended over all parts of any complete system, but concentrated on the subjects of conciliation, the exposition of those leading principles which furnished the means of reconcilement, and their development in accordance with the scheme of agreement. Aspasius, Alexander, and Adrastus were read in the school and commented upon by Plotinus to the last, in company with Severus, Numenius, and other Platonists or Neo-Platonists. Thus is given a further explanation of both the incompleteness of the Neo-Platonic doctrine in Plotinus, and also of the inevitable difficulty of affording a clear, compact, and methodical exposition of that doctrine.

Philosophy.—The definition of metaphysics by the schoolmen as the branch of knowledge treating of abstract being and its modifications (*De Ente, Entibus et Entium affectibus*) is more applicable to the daring reveries of Plotinus than to any other scheme of speculation. For, whether we regard the term as having been originally invented by Theophrastus to designate inquiries outside of physics and subsequent to them, or beyond physics and transcending them, it is almost exclusively in this dim and unbounded region that the reflections and imaginations of Plotinus disport themselves. With the ordinary topics of English-speaking philosophy he scarcely concerns himself. He rises from the earth like the skylark, and rarely pours forth his song till he is lost from sight in the clouds, and commingles his notes with the mysterious voices of the upper air. The account given of his writings would preclude any expectation of a complete or detailed body of doctrine. His work was fragmentary and without order. Death seized the reaper in the midst of his harvest. His instruction must at all times have been broken and unsystematic, because it was merely the supplement and modification of opinions already current. He deals only with those sublimities of speculation—*apices cogitabiles*—which aid him in harmonizing the teachings of Plato, Aristotle, Parmenides, and Pythagoras, in developing their conclusions into a still higher range of thought, and in applying this development to the purification of the intellect and to the purgation of the heart. It is extremely difficult to breathe in this rarefied atmosphere. The pilgrim of the Alpine Club is oppressed and dizzied by the tenuity of the air on the heights of Mont Blanc or of Ararat; and the brain whirls in those extreme altitudes of speculation, where words become too hard and narrow for their contents, and language is only the symbolism of unutterable thoughts.

Whether, then, we consider the character of the investigations, the form in which they appear, their limitation to the highest and most insoluble problems, their incompleteness, or their discontinuity, it is a task of the greatest difficulty to present a clear, orderly, and coherent view of the philosophy of Plotinus. Within the space at command, all that can be attempted will be a rapid outline of his most distinctive positions, in what appears to be their natural dependence.

Creuzer condenses his summary of the Plotinian doctrine into three theses:

"1. There is a Supreme *One* whence all things proceed, which cannot be fitly declared by the thought or name of Essence or Being, yet is the fountain and original of all essences, and therefore of being itself.

"2. What is *One* in the ultimate apprehension becomes twofold in Mind (Νοῦς) and through Mind. For Mind, turning towards that Supreme *One* and regarding it, establishes difference, generates ideas, and produces the commencements of definite thought.

"3. The Soul (of the world) being turned towards the Mind and regarding it, develops the diversity and multiplicity of things which are discoverable in the sensible universe. The universal aggregate of things sensible

cannot, however, be conceived as unity, if the Supreme Mind be excluded, nor can it be thought of as *One*. Mind cannot form for itself the idea of the absolute *One*, without the original *One* and the Good; that is, without the author and father of Mind itself, and of all things; that is, without the Supreme" (*Prolegom. in Plotin.* § 9, p. xxiv–xxv, ed. Paris).

These three propositions correspond in a loose and indistinct way with the three principles of the intelligible universe assumed by Plotinus: the Absolute Good, the Supreme Intelligence, and the Soul of the Universe. From these three all other intelligences descend by gradual differentiations, and all sensible things by distinct creation. These three constitute the Neo-Platonic trinity: the Good, which is the father of all, the Mind (Νοῦς) or absolute Reason (Λόγος), and the animating Spirit, or universal soul (*Enn.* ii, ix, 1; v, i, 7; ii, 1; viii, 12). The second and third of these principles, and all other things in their orderly subordination, which possess active potencies in themselves, derive their power of acting and their rule of action from the contemplation and imitation of the superior essences in which they participate, and which they apprehend by intuition of the Divine, ever indwelling, informing, and inworking (*συμπαθὲς δὴ πᾶν τοῦτο τὸ ἕν*, *Enn.* iv, iv, 32; *νοῦς συνημμένος τῇ ἁπάσῃ οὐσίᾳ*, vi, iv, 14; *ἑσμὲν ἕκαστος κόσμος νοητός*, iii, iv, 3). High and chief over all intelligences, intelligibles, and sensibles is the absolute, eternal, unchanging, self-sustaining *One* (*Enn.* vi, ix, 3). This is the Absolute Good, and is wholly ineffable, being dimly apprehensible only by the purest and highest efforts of the most depurated intuition (*Enn.* ii, ix, 1; vi, viii, 8; ix, 3, 4; *ὑπὲρ ἐπιστήμην δεῖ δραμεῖν*). The *One* and the Good (which are one) is before and above being, and before and above mind, or the intelligence (*ὑπερβεβηκὸς τὴν τοῦ νοῦ φύσιν . . . τὸ ἐπέκεινα νοῦ, καὶ ἐπέκεινα οὐσίας*, *Enn.* v, i, 8). That the *One* is above the Νοῦς is a fundamental doctrine with Plotinus, which he professes to deduce from Plato. This *One* and Good is the Father of all things, the universal God, existing in all, moving through all, and embracing all (*ἓν πάντα τὰ ὄντα*, *Enn.* vi, v, 1; v, ii, 1).

This doctrine unquestionably presents the appearance of Pantheism, and approximates to it, especially when taken in connection with the *Scala Intelligibilis Ascensus ad Unum*, or progress towards the incommunicable union with the Universal Good. In Proclus it can scarcely be distinguished from Pantheism (*ἐν ἑνὶ πάντα καὶ ἀμερῆ ἥνωται ἀλλήλοις· καὶ φοιτᾷ πάντα διὰ πάντων*, *Inst. Theolog.* § clxxxvi). In Plotinus it is different. He carefully preserves the distinction between the *One* and the Many, between the Supreme Good and all its immediate and derivative products. He does not ascribe personality to the Divine *One* except by metaphor; but he avoids attributing to the Divine Being either the evolution or the absorption of the universe, and he accords to man personality, free-will, and responsibility (*Enn.* iii, iv, 5–7). He distinguishes between the agent in producing all things, and the all which is produced (*Enn.* iii, viii, 8, 9). But there is confusion in his utterances, if not contradiction; though he may be credited with a more earnest anxiety to escape pantheistic extravagances than can be accorded to his Christian admirer, translator, and paraphrast, Marsilius Ficinus (q. v.). According to Plato, genuine knowledge is intuitive: according to Plotinus, it is immediate — the union of the knowing and the known; and the knowledge of the Godhead is only by direct communion (*παρουσία*, *Enn.* vi, ix, 47; iii, vi, 18; v, v, 1; iii, 1–3; vi, 2; ix, 13). It is no wonder, then, that the meaning of Plotinus should be often obscure and ambiguous, and that it should be declared by Marsilius Ficinus to be discoverable, not by sense or human reason, but only by a more sublime capacity of intelligence (*Plotini. Opera. Exhort. ad Auditores*, etc.). This may afford some palliation for any indistinctness of the present exposition. It is due to a logical necessity rather than to a theological presumption that Plotinus asserts being to be posterior to the *One*, for he attaches being inseparably to the three hypostases of divinity which constitutes his three principles. It is an attempt to develop with entire internal consistency the Pythagorean doctrine of numbers, and the Platonic thesis of the *One* and the Many (*Enn.* vi, vi, 9). The *Unum* is *Ens* and *Summum Ens*—essential and primordial Being. There is no separation or division between them, but only a theoretical and shadowy antecedence and sequence—out of time, irrespective of time, and beyond time.

The second principle of Plotinus is Mind—the intelligence *per se*—the Universal Reason (Νοῦς). The *One*, or the Good, projects a perpetual effulgence of itself, without loss of integrity or diminution of totality (*περίλαμψις ἐξ αὐτοῦ*)—the image of its archetype (*εἰκόνα ἐκείνου λέγομεν εἶναι τὸν νοῦν*). This yearns unceasingly for its original (*ποθεῖ δὲ πᾶν τὸ γεννῆσαν τὸ γεννηθέν, καὶ τοῦτο ἀγαπᾷ, καὶ μάλιστα ὅταν ὦσι μόνοι τὸ γεννῆσαν καὶ τὸ γεγεννημένον*). The desire provokes an inclination or conversion of the offspring to its parent, of the similitude to its exemplar; and this reflection or bending back is itself the Divine Mind, Intelligence, Universal Reason, whence all reason and thought are engendered (*τῇ ἐπιστροφῇ πρὸς αὐτὸ ἑώρα· ἡ δὲ ὅρασις αὕτη νοῦς*, *Enn.* v, i, 6, 7). The Divine Mind embraces the eternal ideas which constitute the intelligible universe, and which it contemplates in the *One*. These are not types or shadows of things, but archetypes and perennial truths, whence all things sensible derive their essential constitution, and the broken and imperfect truth which they contain. It is a second cardinal tenet of Plotinus, in which he diverges from Plato, that ideas are immanent in the Divine Mind, and not extrinsic to it (*Enn.* v, i, 1, 2).

From Mind issues Soul—the universal spirit — the soul of the universe (*ψυχὴν γεννᾷ νοῦς*). It dwells in the universal reason, as the universal reason dwells in the *One* (*Enn.* v, i, 7). The soul turns partly to the Divine Mind whence it proceeds, and contemplates the ideas presented there. It turns partly towards the sensible universe, which it fashions after the ideas. All souls are not contained in the universal soul—a doctrine espoused by Amelius, which amounts to Pantheism. There is a genuine plurality and hierarchy of souls, derived from the soul of the universe, not by separation or division, but by deliberate and intelligent production (*Enn.* iv, ii, 2; ix, 1). These three—the *One*, the Mind, the Soul — constitute the trinity of Plotinus. These three are one in essence, though distinct in function and in origin, and are all divine. From them, by the inaugurating potency of the first, by the presentations and concurrence of the second, and by the permanent creative energy of the third, all the order and beauty and variety and harmony of the universe are produced. But the universe is twofold: the intelligible, archetypal and eternal (*ἀένναος οὖσα φύσις, οὐ ῥέουσα*); and that which is the image and adumbration of the archetype, the Sensible, factitious and transitory (*οὐ γὰρ μένει, ἀλλὰ ῥεῖ ἡ σώματος φύσις πᾶσα*, *Enn.* iv, iv, 5; vii, 8; comp. v, i, 6; ix, 9). In the intelligible universe are only incorporeal ideas. It is the ideal world. In the sensible universe souls are incorporated in bodies, and distributed through them (*Enn.* iii, iv, 1). The term *souls* is used by Plotinus with much greater latitude than would now be sanctioned, and is extended to irrational animals and plants, and even to the blind motions, chemical or physical, of organic and inorganic matter. The souls which actuate bodies descend from the realm of the intelligible, first to the sensible heavens, where they assume corporeal vesture, and thence proceed by successive declensions to lower and lower incorporations (*Enn.* iv, iii, 15). Yet the soul in its separable state retains its immortal essence and divine character (*θεῖον τὸ χρῆμα αὐτῆς καὶ θαυμαστόν, καὶ τῶν*

ὑπὲρ τὰ χρήματα φύσεων, *Enn.* iv, ii, 1; iii, 22). This demission of souls is not necessarily a penalty or a retribution—not a banishment from God, as Empedocles said was his case; but it is the fulfilment of the object of creation, that all things might be perfect according to their perfectibilities, and that the sensible world might be the complete but inadequate reproduction of all things in the intelligible world (*Enn.* iv, viii, 1).

These are the leading principles of the philosophy of Plotinus. They are extensions and sublimations of the tenets of Plato, to whom there is continually an implicit, and often an express reference ("Platonem ipsum sub Plotini persona loquentem," Mars. Ficin. *ad Audit.*). In accordance with them, and with the endeavor to conciliate Platonism with Aristotelism and the elder schools, the several topics discussed in the Enneads are developed with such modifications and expansions of previous doctrine as were deemed requisite. Continual *lacunæ* of course occur—both from the incompleteness of the remains and the absence of system in the procedure; but it is probable that most of these were designed to be supplied by reference to the body of the Platonic teachings. They may be certainly supplied in this manner, so far as is necessary to establish a general coherence between the several positions. With the execution of such a task we have no concern at present, our object being strictly limited to the exhibition of the distinctive characteristics of Plotinus.

The sensible world is occupied with body; and body is produced by the union of ideas with matter. The shadowy and attenuated nature of matter in the conception of Plato and the Platonists has already been exhibited. See Platonic Philosophy. It is the ultimate subject or *substratum* from which all bodies are formed: it is so entirely divested of all properties and accidents, which are the means of differentiation, it is such a pure *residuum*, or *caput mortuum*, that it is designated by Plotinus *Bathos*, the Depth—that which lies so low down in the constitution of body, so remote from apprehension, as to be accepted as its ultimate foundation. It is the lowest extreme, as the *One* is the highest. It is eminently characteristic of Plotinus that he recognises matter in the intelligible universe (*Enn.* ii, iv, 1–7; vi, vii, 33), probably as one of the necessary *primordia rerum*. Body, which is the first and simplest product from matter, is an infinite, indeterminate something, having three dimensions, unlimited, not truly existent, and yet more than nothing. The *One* is of course indivisible: body is essentially divisible and mutable, being patient of endless alterations and alternations.

The sensible universe and its component members in all their multiplicity and variety are created by the Spirit, by the infusion of appropriate spirits, and the union of appropriate ideas with body, or a determinate portion of matter. The idea moulds its subject-matter, differentiates it, individualizes (or *individuates*) it, animates it; dwelling and moving in it, or rather itself inhabited by its material partner. It is here that the conciliation of Plato and Aristotle is most thoroughly attained by Plotinus, the Platonic ideas being identified in their plastic function with the Aristotelian forms. These forms, or specific natures, descend by a regular concatenated series from the Universal Mind, which is the fountain of forms (*Enn.* v, ix, 3, 5, 8; vi, viii, 1). Everything, then, in the sensible world consists of the corporeal and the ideal, in unutterable commixture—the union being transitory—the corporeal being subject to endless change, the ideal being immortal and unalterable in its essence. The perfection of everything consists in the completeness with which it appropriates and manifests the idea belonging to it, and thereby approximates in its own particular order of being to the *One* and the Good. Everything seeks its own perfection, everything turns to its own idea; and the original conversion of the first divine effluence, Mind, towards its fountain, the Good, is imitated throughout every grade in the descending scale of existence to the last and most rudimentary exhibitions of form. There is a dull, inert antagonism, a sullen insubordination in matter, which resists the process of this perfection; not a decided malignancy, such as is ascribed to it by Plato, but a resilience which generates physical evil, as moral evil is produced by defect of essential goodness, and by deflection and aberrancy from the good. The operation of spirit or mind upon matter, of souls in their several degrees upon body, has been the stumbling-block of all philosophies, and was an insoluble enigma to Descartes and the Cartesians. Plotinus imagines a kind of pre-established harmony, like Leibnitz, but admits, also, a divine and concurrent grace (*προαιρέσεις συνεργούς . . . ὁ δαίμων συνεργὸς εἰς πλήρωσιν αὐτῶν . . . τὰ συμπεσόντα τάδε πάντως ἀναγκαῖον τὴν Ἄτροπον ἐπάγειν*, *Enn.* ii, iii, 15; iv, iii, 13; iv, 3, 9). All this is only Platonism developed; but the development is pressed to originality when Plotinus retraces the process of being, and ascends from the lowest forms to the source of all form, the *One*, Great, Good, which is all in all.

All derivative being turns to the superior being whence it proceeds, and to the inferior being which proceeds from it, by a constant and loving libration that directs its attention both to the exemplar above and to the product of imitation below. Hence results the best of worlds possible (*Enn.* ii, iii, 18; ii, ix, 8; iii, ii, 1–3), not pure from blemishes and blurs, in consequence of the inevitable contamination and *pejoration* through conjunction with matter, and the limitations occasioned by material restraint, but ever involving the ideas proceeding from the divine intelligence, and ever seeking, with a multitudinous concord of aspirations, to attain the primordial perfection of the appropriate ideas, in the whole and in the parts; and thus to return to that communion and union with the *One*, the Good, and the true or real, from whence they have descended. The perfection of every nature, which every nature undepraved desires, is this assimilation to the divine. In æsthetics and in the works of art, this gives us the interpretation of beauty and of the beautiful; in life and conduct it explains and prescribes virtue and holiness and sanctification.

The essence of the doctrine of Plotinus is contained and charmingly displayed in his theory of beauty (*Enn.* i, vi), and might be reproduced in its chief lines from it. A sagacious and just instinct has often led to the publication of this treatise by itself: for it is not only the most satisfactory and complete appreciation of the beautiful, it is also a miniature of the philosophy of Plotinus; and his theory of beauty is the counterpart and complement of his theory of righteousness (*Enn.* iii, v, 1). Of course, only the briefest abstract of this part of his speculations can be offered here. The simplest and most elementary form of beauty is the beauty of colors, sounds, forms; but the same principles are involved in every species of beauty. The sense of beauty arises from the joyous recognition in objects of sense of the perfections of the idea embodied in them (*τὸ δὲ κάλλος εὐμορφία τις ἐν τύποις*, *Enn.* iv, vii, 8; i, vi, 1). It is an immediate and instinctive perception, which discerns in the excellence of the form (the Aristotelian form is nearly equivalent to idea, and signifies essential character, not outward shape), the presence, the perfection, and the participation of the divine reason and purpose in the creation; for the eternal is kindred with the beautiful (*τὸ ἀίδιον συγγενὲς τῷ καλῷ*, *Enn.* v, iii, 1). The form, the idea, the design of God, revealed to the clear intelligence and quickened affection, constitutes beauty, both as producing cause and as produced emotion. Corporeal beauties, or things beautiful to sense, are only veils, shadows, spectral images of real beauty, and derive their power of communicating delight from the intellectual or transmundane beauty which they obscure even more than they display (*Enn.* i, vi, 3, 5). Intellectual beauty, or beauty in the intelligible world, is the pure effluence of God (*Enn.* iii, viii, 10; v, 1); the

perfect, beneficent plan of the good, accordant with the absolute excellence of the Divine Being (*ἡ καλλονὴ ἐκεῖ νοητοῦ ἀγαθοῦ φύσις*, *Enn.* vi, vii, 33). As the whole energies of the soul are directed towards the good for which it was constituted (*Enn.* i, vii, 1; Procl. *Inst. Theolog.* § ccix), its eager appetencies are instinctively excited by every manifestation of the good. The sense of beauty becomes both purified and intensified as the intelligent and sympathetic soul ascends nearer to the thought of the divine mind, and to the vision of the excellences and glories of the Divine (*Enn.* i, vi, 6). Thence all ideas proceed: thither all forms aspire; and "the power of beauty is the bloom of the universal beauty, which creates all beauty, generating it, and making it more beautiful from the redundance of the beauty in the Divine, which is the beginning and the end of all beauty" (*Enn.* vi, vii, 32). The whole nature of beauty, therefore, consists in the immediate and loving apprehension of the goodness and wisdom and excellence of the Creator, as imperfectly shown in the incomplete perfections of parts of the creation. Whence is this faculty of recognition derived? It comes from the yearning of all spirit for the beautiful and the good and the divine. It is sustained, elevated, and illumined by the influx of the beautiful—by the epiphany in the soul of the splendors and loveliness of God. As the eye sees the sun by the light which proceeds from it, so the soul recognises goodness by the goodness which God gives, and beauty by the apt sense and sensibility which are communicated from the source of all beauty—the beautiful in itself (*φῶς ἄρα φῶς ὁρᾷ, οὐ δι' ἄλλου*, *Enn.* v, iii, 6, et Mars. Ficin. ad loc. v, v, 7). Thus all things are suspended from the Divine, and are filled with divinity (*πάντα ἐξῆπται τῶν θεῶν. Μέστα πάντα θεῶν*, Procl. *Inst. Theolog.* § cxlv, cxlvi).

This explanation may appear vague and visionary; but the philosophy of Plotinus can find no other mode of expression for its transcendental reveries. It is, however, no more indistinct than the language of more prosaic intellects in regard to the like subjects. It accords with the declarations of Avicenna and Averroës, of Duns Scotus and S. Thomas Aquinas, of Leibnitz and of Coleridge (Scot. *In Sentent.* ii, xi, i, tom. vi, ps. ii, p. 652–5; S. Thom. Aquin. *Summ. Theolog.* i, lxxxix; i, iii; lxxix, iv; lxxxiv, v; Leibn. *Princ. Philos. ad Pr. Eugen.* § 42; Coleridge, *Aids to Reflection*, p. 242, 264, note).

Beauty thus connects itself immediately with the search after the first or supreme Good (*Enn.* ii, ix, 8); and in its grades of ascension is a sure progress towards its apprehension. "Since all things are beautiful, and in some sort full of delight, all creatures of this sensible world lead the wise and contemplative mind to the Eternal God: they are the shadows, the echoes, and the pictures; the traces, the images, and the visions of that effectuating, exemplifying, and ordaining Artist" (S. Bonaventura, *Itin. Mentis ad Deum*, c. vii; comp. Rog. Bacon, *Opus Tertium*, c. lxiv, p. 266).

> "Ipse vocat nostros animos ad sidera mundus"
> (Manilii *Astronom.* iv, 912).

Ugliness is defect of the idea and its inadequate realization. It corresponds to physical and moral evil, and indicates a falling away (*πτῶμα τῆς ψυχῆς*) from the goodness which was designed in the creation (*Enn.* i, vi, 8, 9; viii, 14). The perfection of every nature is this re-assimilation to the divine. In the expressions of Plotinus with regard to human souls and man's duties there are frequent echoes of the contemporaneous Christianity which he opposed—exquisite utterances of religious fervor, in which Platonism seems to lose itself in the beauties of the new religion (*Enn.* vi, ix; iii, ii, 2, 5; iv, 6; v, 1, 2; iii, 8, etc.). The highest aim of the spirit is access or reunion to God, which can be accomplished only through the constant intervention and co-operation of the Divinity (*σπουδαῖος συνεργοῦντα ἑαυτῷ τὸν δαίμονα ἔχων*, *Enn.* iv, iv, 6; comp. 1 Thess. ii, 13; Eph. ii, 18; Rom. viii, 11, 16). For it is "God which worketh in you both to will and to do of his good pleasure" (Phil. ii, 13). All things from the highest to the lowest turn by native constitution to the more excellent nature whence they are derived, and the love within their soul seeks union with their original above. This universal conversion, permeating all things, binds the whole universe in an attitude of affectionate regard to the *One* and the Supreme Good, which is the Creator and the desire of all (Procl. *Inst. Theolog.* § lvii). In the lover of all righteousness, in man spiritualized and filled with the desire of holiness, it becomes ecstatic elevation and intimate communion with the Spirit of the Divine. "We are not cut off, or separated from God. We breathe the *One*, whose breath is our life, and we are preserved. This support is not given at one moment, and withdrawn at another, but is ever present for our guidance. Nay, more, we incline to the Good, and to the happiness above. There the soul is at rest and beyond ill, ascending to our true country, to the place which is pure of all evils. For the soul filled with God produces beauty and righteousness and virtue. God is its beginning and its end—its beginning, because it descends from him; its end, because he is the Good to which it aspires. There is the heavenly Love, and every soul is love. The soul, in its pure nature, is possessed with the love of God, and longs for union with him, as a virgin nurses the love of the beautiful for the beautiful. Thus the life of good and godly and happy men is a transport from the things of earth—a life uncharmed by things below—the flight of the single and solitary soul to the only *One*" (*Enn.* vi, ix, 9, 11).

For such sublimities of enthusiasm no language will suffice but the rapt Greek of Plotinus or the fervid Latin of Marsilius Ficinus, and even these faint and fail beneath the divine burden of the thought.

Literature.—See the references under the art. Neo-Platonism, and add: Plotini Platonicorum Coryphæi, *Opera quæ exstant omnia. Per celeberrimum illum Marsilium Ficinum, Florent. Ex antiquissimis Codicibus Latine translata et eruditissimis Commentariis illustrata*, etc., Basileæ, Impensis Ludovici Regis (1615, fol.); Plotini *Opera Omnia* (ed. Kreuzer and Moser, Oxon. 1835, 3 vols. 8vo); Plotini *Enneades* (ed. Creuzer and Moser, Par. 1855, 1 vol. 8vo); Porphyrius, *Plotini Vita;* Taylor, Thomas, "The Platonist," *Select Works of Plotinus* (London, 1817, 8vo); Cousin, *Œuvres de Plotin* (Par.); Steinhart, apud Pauly, *Real-Encyklop.* v, ii; Kirchner, *Die Philosophie des Plotinus* (Halle, 1854); Valentiner, *Plotin und seine Enneaden* (1864); Richter, *Neu-platonische Studien* (Halle, 1864–7); Neander, *Christian Dogmas;* Baur, *Dreieinigkeitslehre*, ii, 207 sq.; Nourisson, *Pensées Humaines*, p. 134 sq.; Lecky, *Rationalism*, i, 240; *Westminster Rev.* 1868, Oct. p. 246. (G. F. H.)

Ploucquet, Gottfried, a German philosopher, was born Aug. 25, 1716, at Stuttgard. He came from a Protestant family of French origin; his father was an innkeeper. While he was studying at Tübingen, he was so strongly impressed by Wolf's writings that, without giving up theology altogether, he gave special attention to the study of philosophy and mathematics. This twofold tendency strikingly appears in the theses which he defended in 1740 (*Diss. qua Cl. Varignonii demonstratio geometrica possibilitatis transubstantionis enervatur*), and in which he endeavored to reconcile Wolf's doctrines with the teachings of the Christian faith. After discharging in different places the duties of a minister and tutor, he was appointed in 1746 deacon at Freudenstadt. His memoir on the monads (*Primaria Monadologiæ capita* [Berlin, 1748, 4to]) opened to him in 1749 the Academy of Sciences of Berlin, and directed to him the attention of the duke of Würtemberg, by whose protection he obtained, in 1750, the professorship of logic and metaphysics at Tübingen. He taught political economy at the same university, and was, in 1778, called to Stuttgard to teach this branch at the military school. His faculties having given way

in consequence of a stroke of apoplexy, in 1782 he was compelled to abandon teaching. Ploucquet was an honest and open character, and he was gifted by nature with a clear and methodical mind. "A champion of spiritualism," says Mr. Haag, "he combated, with a degree of penetration equalled only by his erudition, the materialistic doctrines proclaimed by the philosophers of the 18th century, and feared not even to enter into contest with Kant. Then, ascending the stream of the centuries, he submitted to strict analysis the systems of ancient philosophy, which he tried to build anew in historical essays, worthy even now of our attention." Ploucquet died at Stuttgard Sept. 13, 1790. He left a number of works, mostly published at Tübingen, and written with great purity, but rather exaggerated concision. The following are the most important: *De materialismo* (1750, 4to):—*Principia de substantiis et phenomenis* (Frankfort, 1758, 8vo):—*De Pyrrhonis epocha* (1758, 4to):—*Fundamenta philosophiæ speculativæ* (7th ed. 1759, 8vo); it is an exposition of Leibnitz's system:—*De dogmatibus Thaletis et Anaxagoræ* (1763, 4to):—*Methodus calculandi in logicis* (1763, 8vo). In this work he represents the syllogisms by geometrical figures and mathematical formulas; these methods, hinted at by Leibnitz, engaged him in discussions with Lambert and others:—*Problemata de natura hominis ante-et post mortem* (1766, 4to):—*Institutiones philosophiæ theoreticæ* (1772, 1782, 8vo):—*Elementa philosophiæ contemplativæ, sive de scientia ratiocinandi* (Stuttgard, 1773, 4to):—*Commentationes philosophiæ selectiores* (Utrecht, 1781, 4to):—*Variæ quæstiones metaphysicæ* (1782, 4to). —Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xl, 494.

Plough (*charash'*, חָרַשׁ, *to plough*; whence *macha-reshah'*, מַחֲרֵשָׁה, and *macharésheth*, מַחֲרֶשֶׁת, 1 Sam. xiii, 20; two instruments used in agriculture. One of these is perhaps the *ploughshare*, the other the *coulter*. See also EAR). Egypt, from the earliest times, has laid claim to the honor of the invention of this important implement, and as it was undoubtedly one of the first countries brought under culture by the hand of man after the flood, the claim may be well founded. Agriculture was also early practiced among the Hebrews, and, from their agreement in so many other matters, it is likely that the implements of the two nations were very nearly the same. The ancient Egyptian plough was entirely of wood, and of very simple form, like that

Ancient Egyptian Plough.

still used in Egypt. It consisted of a share, two handles, and the pole or beam, which last was inserted into the lower end of the stilt, or the base of the handles, and was strengthened by a rope connecting it with the heel. It had no coulter, nor were wheels applied to any Egyptian plough; but it is probable that the point was shod with a metal sock either of bronze or iron. It was drawn by two oxen, and the ploughman guided and drove them with a long goad, without the assistance of reins, which are used by the modern Egyptians. He was sometimes accompanied by another man, who drove the animals, while he managed the two handles of the plough; and sometimes the whip was substituted for the more usual goad. The mode of yoking the beasts was exceedingly simple. Across the extremity of the pole a wooden yoke or cross-bar, about fifty-five inches or five feet in length, was fastened by a strap, lashed backwards and forwards over a prominence projecting from the centre of the yoke, which corresponded to a similar peg or knob at the end of the pole; and occasionally, in addition to these, was a ring passing over them, as in some Greek chariots. At either end of the yoke was a flat or slightly concave projection, of semicircular form, which rested on a pad placed upon the withers of the animal; and through a hole on either side of it passed a thong for suspending the shoulder-pieces, which formed the collar. These were two wooden bars, forked at about half their length, padded so as to protect the shoulder from friction, and connected at the lower end by a strong broad band passing under the throat. See YOKE. Sometimes the draught, instead of being from the shoulder, was from the head, the yoke being tied to the base of the horns; and in religious ceremonies oxen frequently drew the bier, or the sacred shrine, by a rope fastened to the upper part of the horns, without either yoke or pole (Wilkinson, *Anc. Egypt.* ii, 14 sq.). According to modern travellers the plough now used in Palestine differs in some respects from the ancient implement above described. It is lightly built, with the least possible skill or expense, consisting of two poles, which cross each other near the ground. That nearest the oxen is fastened to the yoke, while the other serves, the one end as the handle, the other as the ploughshare. It is drawn by oxen, camels, cows, or heifers (Hackett, *Script. Illust.* p. 153 sq.; Thomson, *Land and Book*, i, 207 sq.). In Asia Minor substantially the same custom and implements prevail (Van Lennep, *Bible Lands*, p. 75 sq.). See AGRICULTURE.



Plough of Asia Minor.

a is the pole to which the cross-beam with yokes, *b*, is attached; *c*, the share; *d*, the handle; *e* represents three modes of arming the share; and *f* is a goad with a scraper at the other end, probably for cleansing the share.

Ploughman (אִכָּר, *ikkâr*, Isa. lxi, 5, which signifies not only a ploughman, but a *husbandman* in general). Among the Hebrews, the rich and the noble, it is true, in the cultivation of the soil did not always put themselves on a level with their servants; but none, however rich or noble or prophetically favored, disdained to put their hand to the plough, or otherwise to join occasionally

Ploughing in Palestine.

in the labors of agriculture (1 Sam. xi, 7; 1 Kings xix, 19; comp. 2 Chron. xxvi, 10). See AGRICULTURE.

Ploughman's Complaint, THE, a remarkable anonymous work, published in England in the year 1352, which severely condemned the practices of popery, especially auricular confession, the celibacy and selfishness of the priests, the rapacity of the friars, the covetousness and negligence of the popes, etc. It was one among many means which opened the eyes of the people to the iniquity of the system, and prepared the way for the glorious Reformation.

Plough-Monday, the first Monday after twelfth-day; so called from a diversion called *fool-plough*, which was formerly in use on Ash-Wednesday, but afterwards transferred to this day. Old ploughs are preserved in the belfries of Bassingbourne and Barrington. Plough alms were one penny paid for every plough harnessed between Easter and Pentecost in 878, and in 960 payable on the fifteenth night after Easter.

Ploughshare (אֵת, *êth*, Isa. ii, 4). The ploughshare is a piece of iron, broad but not large, which tips the end of the shaft. So much does it resemble the short sword used by the ancient warriors that it may with very little trouble be converted into that deadly weapon, and when the work of destruction is over, reduced again into its former shape, and applied to the purposes of agriculture. In allusion to the first operation, the prophet Joel summons the nations to leave their peaceful employments in the cultivated field, and buckle on their armor: "Beat your ploughshares into swords, and your pruning-hooks into spears" (Joel iii, 10). This image the prophet Isaiah has reversed, and then applied to the establishment of that profound and lasting peace which is to bless the Church of Christ in the latter days: "And they shall beat their swords into ploughshares, and their spears into pruning-hooks; nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more." See PLOUGH.

Plowden, CHARLES, an English Roman Catholic divine who belonged to the Order of Jesuits, was born in 1743, and educated at Rome, where he entered into the society in 1759. On his return to his own country, after the suppression of his order in 1773, he was one of the most zealous advocates for the proposed reorganization of the Jesuits in England. He afterwards became president of the Catholic college of Stonyhurst, in Lancashire, and died in 1821. His publications are against Butler and Berington, and for the restoration of the Jesuits (1792, 8vo; 1796, 8vo). Also, *Remarks on the Memoirs of G. Panzani* (Liège, 1794, 8vo):—*Considerations of the Modern Opinions of the Fallibility of the Pope* (1776, 8vo).

An older brother of his, Dr. FRANCIS PLOWDEN, a noted member of the English Chancery Bar, is the author of *Jura Anglorum, the Rights of Englishmen* (1792, 8vo), and *Church and State* (1795, 4to), which both plead for Roman Catholic recognition by the English government, and became the subject of much controversy. See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, ii, 1609, 1610. (J. H. W.)

Plüche, NOËL-ANTOINE, a French scientist of note, was born in 1688. He flourished at one time as abbot of Valence de St. Maur. He was also a professor of rhetoric at Rheims, and is distinguished as a naturalist and man of letters, and also for his opposition to the bull "Unigenitus." He is the author of *Spectacle de la Nature* (9 vols.):—*Hist. du Ciel* (2 vols.):—*La Mécanique des Langues;* and some lesser works, among which is a *Harmony of the Psalms and the Gospels* (12mo). He died in 1761.

Plumb-line (אֲנָךְ, *anâk*, *a plummet*) or **Plummet** (מִשְׁקֶלֶת, *mishkéleth*, Isa. xxviii, 17, or מִשְׁקֹלֶת, *mishkóleth*, *a weight*). Amos says (vii, 7), "Behold, the Lord stood upon a wall, made by a plumb-line, with a plumb-line in his hand;" and in the threatenings denounced against Jerusalem for the idolatries of Manasseh, we read, "I will stretch over Jerusalem the line of Samaria, and the plummet of the house of Ahab" (2 Kings xxi, 13). In Zech. iv, 10, the original term for the plumb-bob is אֶבֶן בְּדִיל, *êben bedîl*, *stone of tin*. The use of the plumb-line in the measurement of superficial areas was early known to the Egyptians, and is ascribed to their king Menes. See HANDICRAFT.

Plumptre, JAMES, an Anglican divine of note, was born in 1770, and was educated at Clare Hall, Cambridge, of which he afterwards became a fellow. After taking holy orders, he became in 1793 vicar of Great Gransdon, Huntingdonshire. He died in 1832. He is best known as a miscellaneous writer. Among his publications (of which there is a list in Allibone) we notice, *Three Discourses on the Animal Creation* (1816, 8vo):—*Popular Commentary on the Bible:—Sermons*, vol. i and ii (1821, 1827, 8vo), which are pronounced practical and useful by Bickersteth (in his *Christian Student*).

Plunket, Oliver, an Irish Roman Catholic prelate, was born in 1629 at the castle of Rathmore, county of Meath, of a good Irish family. He completed his studies at Rome, was a professor of theology in that city, and finally elevated to the twofold dignity of archbishop of Armagh and primate of Ireland (1669). His zeal having aroused against him the suspicions of the Protestants, he fell a victim to the violent reaction of Toryism which took place in 1681. Accused of conspiracy against the court, he was arrested, carried to London, and sentenced to death by a fanatical jury. In vain four successive governors of Ireland testified to his loyalty; the court did not even await the arrival of his witnesses, and his means of defence could be produced in London only three days after his execution, which took place July 1, 1681, at Tyburn. He left a *Collection of Episcopal Circulars and Pastoral Letters* (Lond. 1686, 2 vols. 4to). See Bp. Burnet, *Hist. of his Own Times*, ii, 279. (J. H. W.)

Plunket, Thomas, D.D., a noted Presbyterian Irish divine, flourished at Enniskillen in the second half of the 18th century. Having some scruples as to the received doctrine of the Trinity, he removed to Dublin, where he became minister of the Strand Street chapel. He died about 1780. His son was the noted Irish lord William Conyngham Plunket, and his grandson bishop Thomas Span Plunket.

Plunket, Thomas Span, an Irish lord and prelate, was a son of William Conyngham Plunket, the great Irish chancellor, and was born in 1792. He was educated at Trinity College, Dublin, and, after having held various preferments, was appointed dean of Down in 1831, and eight years later was raised to the bishopric of Tuam. He was consecrated at Christ Church, Dublin, by the archbishop of Dublin, assisted by the bishops of Derry and Cashel; was appointed ecclesiastical commissioner in 1851, succeeded his father as second baron Plunket in 1853, and was patron of ninety-five livings in his united dioceses of Tuam, Killala, and Achonry. According to Charles's *Church Directory*, the gross value of the see is £5265, and the net value £4039. He did not confine his attention and care to the members of the Church of England in his diocese, but he threw himself into the missionary work among the Roman Catholics with remarkable zeal and energy. No opposition (and he had much to encounter) could daunt or obstacles deter him, and to his exertions are due, in no small degree, those tangible and indisputable results, in the shape of new churches, schools, and congregations of converts, which remain a memorial of his piety and zeal. He died at Tourenakeady, Galway, Oct. 19, 1866. See Appleton's *Annual Cyclop.* vi, 600; *Ch. Journal*, vol. xi; *Men of the Times*, s. v. (J. H. W.)

Pluralism. See PLURALITIES.

Pluralist is one that holds more than one ecclesiastical benefice with cure of souls. See PLURALITIES.

Pluralities is a term used in canon law for the possession by one person of two or more ecclesiastical offices, whether of dignity or emolument. This practice, it is held by Non-Episcopalians, was generally forbidden in the early Church, and they quote for their authority the instructions of the apostle Paul (Titus i, 5). Others contend even that, instead of a plurality of churches to one pastor, we ought to have a plurality of pastors to one church (Acts xiv, 23). Episcopalians contend there is no impropriety in a presbyter holding more than one ecclesiastical benefice. A bishop could not hold two dioceses; a presbyter, however, might officiate in more than one parochial church, but not in two dioceses. In the Church of England pluralities originated in the poorness of many of the livings. Originally a clergyman might hold two or more livings if under the nominal value of £8. The distance between them was fixed by the canon law as not to be greater than thirty miles, but custom now tolerates forty-five. Two thousand parishes, it is said, want in this way a resident pastor. By those who thus evade the Canon, it is held that the prohibition is not absolute, and admits of possible exception, the natural ground of the prohibition being the impossibility, in ordinary cases, of the same individual adequately discharging the duties of more than one office, and that therefore, in cases in which this impossibility does not exist, the union of two or more offices in the hands of one person might, speaking absolutely, be permitted without infringing the divine law. Hence canonists distinguish between "compatible" and "incompatible" benefices or dignities. Two benefices may be incompatible in three ways: 1, If each requires residence (*ratione residentiæ*); 2, if the duties of both fall to be discharged at one and the same time (*ratione servitii*); 3, if the revenue of either fully suffices for the becoming maintenance of the incumbent (*ratione sustentationis*). In other cases, benefices or dignities are considered compatible, and with the due dispensation may be held by the same person. The rules by which dispensations from the law of residence are to be regulated, as well as the penalties for its violation, whether on the part of the patron or on that of the recipient, have formed the subject of frequent legislation, as in the third and the fourth councils of the Lateran, in the decretals of Innocent III and many other popes, and especially in those of the Council of Trent. In general, it may be said that the canon law regards as incompatible, 1, two benefices, each having the cure of souls; 2, two "dignities;" 3, a "dignity" and a cure of souls; 4, a cure of souls and a simple benefice requiring residence. In other cases than these, the pope is held to have the power of dispensing. There is no department of discipline, however, in which the tendency to relaxation has been greater or more persistent; and one of the gravest of the abuses of the Church was the prevalence of pluralism of incompatible benefices, even of bishoprics; and although a constant effort was made to prevent this abuse, the evasions of the law were not only frequent, but even screened from punishment. By 13 and 14 Victoria, c. 98, it is provided that no incumbent of a benefice shall take and hold together with it another benefice, unless the churches are within three miles of one another by the nearest road, and the annual value of one of them does not exceed £100. Nor can two benefices be held together if the population of one exceeds 3000, and that of the other exceeds 500. The word benefice, in this sense, includes any perpetual curacy, endowed public chapel, parochial chapelry, or district chapelry. But a dispensation or license can be obtained from the archbishop, so as to allow two benefices to be held together; and if the archbishop refuse his license, the party may appeal to the Privy Council. A special provision is also contained in the statute whereby the head ruler of any college or hall in the universities of Oxford or Cambridge, or warden of Durham University, is prohibited from taking any cathedral preferment, or any other benefice. If any spiritual person holding a benefice shall accept another benefice contrary to the statute, the first benefice shall *ipso facto* become void. At the same time provision is made by statutes for uniting benefices where the aggregate population does not exceed 1500, and the aggregate yearly value does not exceed £500. In Ireland, no faculty or dispensation can be granted to any spiritual person to hold two or more benefices. In Scotland, before the Reformation, pluralities were also common. Abbacies and priories were likewise often bestowed *in commendam*. See COMMENDAM. Of the twenty abbots that sat in the Parliament which decreed the Reformation, fourteen were commendators. Thus speaks the *Second Book of Discipline:* "Meikle less is it lawfull that ony person amang these men sould have fyve, sax, ten, or twenty kirks, or mae, all having the charge of saules: and bruik the patrimonie thairof, either be admission of the prince or of the kirk, in this licht of the evangell; for it is but mockage to crave reformation where sic lyke hes place." The question of pluralities in the Church of Scotland was raised in 1779, renewed in 1813, and the General Assembly decided against them in 1814 by an act which, however, was repealed in 1816. In 1817 it was enacted that no professor could hold a parish unless it was near the seat of the university. The question was again raised and keenly debated in 1824—to wit, the holding of a chair in a college and of a parochial charge at the same time. The university commission soon after disapproved of the practice, but not the General Assembly of that period. The tenure of many benefices by one person was finally abolished in the Church of England by 1 and 2 Victoria, c. 106. In the Roman Catholic Church this practice has been forbidden from a very early period in its history, as by the councils of Chalcedon (A.D. 451) and that of Nice (A.D. 787), and is still prohibited both by the Roman Catholic canon law and by statute law in the Established Church of England. But the prohibition is evaded in various ways; and in all established churches pluralism, in one form or another, is not uncommon. See Hammond, *Canons of the Church*, p. 105 sq.

Plüschke, JOHANN G., an eminent German Oriental scholar, was born Aug. 20, 1780, at Rohnstock, near Schweidnitz, in Silesia. He studied theology and philology, and for a number of years held the professorship of philology at Leipsic. In 1818 he was called as doctor and *professor ordinarius* of theology to Amsterdam, to take the presidency of the Lutheran seminary at Amsterdam, and died between 1837 and 1840. Plüschke wrote, *De radicum linguæ Hebraicæ natura, comm. grammatica* (Leips. 1817):—*De Psalterii Syriaci Mediolanensis a Cajetano Bugato editi peculiari indole ejusdemque usu critico in emendando textu Psalterii Græci sept. interpretum* (Bonn, 1835):—*Lectiones Alexandrinæ et Hebraicæ, sive de emendando textu Veteris Testamenti Græci LXX interpretum et inde Hebraico* (ibid. 1837):—*De emendando Pentateucho Græco LXX interpretum et inde Hebraico addito codd. Holmesianorum recensione et textus Græci denuo castigati specimine* (ibid. 1837). See Fürst, *Bibl. Jud.* iii, 107; Steinschneider, *Bibliogr. Handb.* p. 111; Winer, *Handb. der theolog. Lit.* p. 57, 121, 711; Thiersch, *De Pentateuchi versione Alexandrina*, p. 23; Zuchold, *Bibl. Theologica*, ii, 1001 sq. (B. P.)

Plutarch, an eminent Greek philosopher, noted also as a biographical and miscellaneous writer, deserves a place here for the moral tendency of all his writings, and the vast influence he has exerted in modern as well as ancient times. Indeed, all that we know of him, which is principally gleaned from his own and others' writings, places him in a high rank as measured by the ethics of society in his time, and sets forth the morality of certain portions of that society itself during the first century of our æra, and among so-called heathens, in a light of no doubtful brilliancy. Many things he wrote might have been written by the most ardent dis-

ciple of the new creed, and much of his belief was more strictly in accordance with the teachings of the apostles than are the dogmas of other writers of those days who call themselves Christians. Yet, in taking his works as our guide, we find that Plutarch had no knowledge of the great innovation amid which he lived, and which was disturbing the West and the East alike; or if he had a knowledge of it, he regarded it merely as a passing piece of Judaic sectarianism unworthy of his notice.

Life.—Plutarch, who lived from the reign of Claudius to that of Hadrian, was born at Chæronea, a small city of Bœotia in Greece, which had also been the birthplace of Pindar. Plutarch's family was ancient in Chæronea: his grandfather, Lamprias, was a man eminent for his learning and as a philosopher, and is often mentioned by Plutarch in his writings, as is also his own father. The time of Plutarch's birth is not known. He was early initiated in study, to which he was naturally inclined, and was placed under Ammonius, an Egyptian, who, having taught philosophy with reputation at Alexandria, thence travelled into Greece, and settled at Athens. Under this master he made great advances in knowledge; and like a thorough philosopher, more apt to regard things than words, he pursued this knowledge to the neglect of languages. The Latin language, at that time, was not only the language of Rome, but of Greece also. Yet he became not conversant with it until the decline of life; and though he is supposed to have resided in Rome at different times, yet he never seems to have acquired a competent skill in it at all. He is reputed to have visited Egypt, which was at that time, as formerly it had been, famous for learning; and probably the mysteriousness of their doctrine might tempt him, as it had tempted Pythagoras and others, to go and converse with the priesthood of that country. On his return to Greece he visited the various academies and schools of the philosophers, and gathered from them many of those observations with which he has abundantly enriched posterity. He does not seem to have been attached to any particular sect, but culled from each of them whatever he thought excellent and worthy to be regarded. He could not bear the paradoxes of the Stoics, and yet was more averse to the impiety of the Epicureans; in many things he followed Aristotle; but his favorites were Socrates and Plato, whose memory he reverenced so highly that he annually celebrated their birthdays with much solemnity. Besides this, he applied himself with extreme diligence to collect, not only all books that were excellent in their kind, but also all the sayings and observations of wise men, which he had heard in conversation, or had received from others by tradition; and likewise to consult the records and public instruments preserved in cities which he had visited in his travels. He took a particular journey to Sparta, to search the archives of that famous commonwealth, to understand thoroughly the model of their ancient government, the history of their legislators, their kings, and their ephori; and digested all their memorable deeds and sayings with so much care that he has not omitted even those of their women. He took the same methods with regard to many other commonwealths; and thus was enabled to leave us in his works such a rich cabinet of observations upon men and manners, as, in the opinion of some, Montaigne and Bayle in particular, have rendered him the most valuable author of antiquity. It appears from his writings that Plutarch visited Rome more than once, and that he delivered lectures on philosophy in his vernacular, then the language of the cultured Romans. It is probable that the substance of these lectures was afterwards embodied in his moral writings. The latter part of his life was spent in honor and comfort in his native city, where he passed through various magisterial offices, and enjoyed the honors and emoluments of the priesthood. The time and circumstances of his death are unknown.

Works.—The great work of Plutarch is his *Parallel Lives* (Βίοι Παράλληλοι), which contains the biography of forty-six distinguished Greeks and Romans, besides the lives of Artaxerxes Mnemon, Aratus, Galba, Otho, and Homer, which last is probably not by him. The forty-six lives are arranged in pairs or sets, each of which contains a Greek and a Roman, and the two lives in each pair are followed by a comparison of the characters of the two persons. These lives are: Theseus and Romulus, Lycurgus and Numa, Solon and Valerius Publicola, Themistocles and Camillus, Pericles and Fabius Maximus, Alcibiades and Coriolanus, Timoleon and Æmilius Paulus, Pelopidas and Marcellus, Aristides and Cato Major, Philopœmen and Flaminius, Pyrrhus and Marius, Lysander and Sulla, Cimon and Lucullus, Nicias and Crassus, Eumenes and Sertorius, Agesilaus and Pompey, Alexander the Great and Julius Cæsar, Phocion and Cato Minor, Agis and Cleomenes and the two Gracchi, Demosthenes and Cicero, Demetrius Poliorcetes and M. Antonius, Dion and M. Brutus. The biographies of Epaminondas, Scipio, Augustus, Tiberius, Caligula, Claudius, Nero, Vitellius, Hesiod, Pindar, Crates the Cynic, Diophantus, Aristomenes, and the poet Aratus are lost. Plutarch's son, Lamprias, made a list of his father's works, which is partly preserved and printed by Fabricius (*Bibliotheca Græca*).

In the department of biography, Plutarch is the only writer of antiquity who has established a lasting reputation. The plan of his biographies is briefly explained by himself in the introduction to the "Life of Alexander the Great," where he makes an apology for the brevity with which he is compelled to treat of the numerous events in the lives of Alexander and Cæsar. "For," he says, "I do not write histories, but lives; nor do the most conspicuous acts of necessity exhibit a man's virtue or his vice, but oftentimes some slight circumstance, a word or a jest, shows a man's character better than battles, with the slaughter of tens of thousands, and the greatest arrays of armies and sieges of cities. Now, as painters produce a likeness by a representation of the countenance and the expression of the eyes, without troubling themselves about the other parts of the body, so I must be allowed to look rather into the signs of a man's character, and thus give a portrait of his life, leaving others to describe great events and battles." The object then of Plutarch in his biographies was a moral end, and the exhibition of the principal events of a man's life was subordinate to this his main design; and though he may not always have adhered to the principle which he laid down, it cannot be denied that his view of what biography should be is much more exact than that of most persons who have attempted this style of composition. The life of a statesman or of a general, when written with the view of giving a complete history of all the public events in which he was engaged, is not biography, but history. This extract from Plutarch will also in some measure be an apology for the want of historical order observable in many of the lives. Though altogether deficient in that critical sagacity which discerns truth from falsehood, and disentangles the intricacies of confused and conflicting statements, Plutarch has preserved in his *Lives* a vast number of facts which would otherwise have been unknown to us. He was a great reader, and must have had access to large libraries. It is said that he quotes two hundred and fifty writers, a great part of whose works are now entirely lost. On the sources of Plutarch's *Lives* the reader may consult an essay by A. H. L. Heeren, *De Fontibus et Auctoritate Vitarum Parallelarum Plutarchi Commentationes IV* (Gött. 1820, 8vo). Besides the *Lives*, a considerable number of Plutarch's essays may be styled historical. They may all be read with pleasure, and some of them with instruction, not so much for their historical value as for the detached curious facts that are scattered so profusely through Plutarch's writings, and for the picture which they exhibit of the author's

own mind. In one of these essays, entitled *On the Malignity of Herodotus*, he has, unfortunately for his own reputation, attacked the veracity and integrity of the father of history, and with the same success that subsequent writers, more ignorant and less honest, have made their puny attacks on a work the merit of which the closest criticism may enhance but can never depreciate. The *Lives of the Ten Orators*, which are attributed to Plutarch, are of little value, and may not be his; still they bear internal evidence, at least negatively, of not being of a later age than that of Plutarch. The *Lives* of Plutarch first appeared in a Latin version by several hands, at Rome, in 2 vols. fol., about 1470. This Latin version formed the basis of various Spanish and Italian translations. The first Greek edition was printed by Philip Giunta (Florence, 1517, fol.). Among more recent editions are those of Bryan (Lond. 1729, 5 vols. 4to), in Greek and Latin, which was completed by Moses du Soul, after Bryan's death; that of Coray (Par. 1809–1815, 6 vols. 8vo); and that by Schäfer (Leips. 1826, 6 vols. 8vo). The translations are very numerous. The best German translation is said to be by Kaltwasser (Magdeburg, 1799–1806, 10 vols. 8vo). Another German translation appeared at Vienna in 1812. The best Italian translation is by Pompei. The French translation of Amyot, which appeared in 1559, has considerable merit, and has been often reprinted. The English translation of Sir Thomas North (Lond. 1612), which is avowedly made from that of Amyot, is often very happy in point of expression, and is deservedly much esteemed. The *Lives* were also translated into French by Dacier (Par. 1721, 8 vols. 4to). The translation sometimes called Dryden's, the first volume of which was published in 1683, was executed by a great number of persons. According to a note by Malone (Dryden's *Prose Works*, ii, 331), there were forty-one of them. Dryden himself translated nothing, but he wrote the dedication to the duke of Ormond, and the Life of Plutarch which is prefixed to the translation. The translation by John and William Langhorne, an insipid and tasteless version, has the merit of being tolerably correct in rendering the meaning of the original. The last and best English translation is that of professor Long, which however only includes the lives of those Romans who were concerned in the Civil Wars of Rome; this translation, which is enriched with a valuable body of notes, formed five volumes of Knight's "Monthly Volumes" (1844–1847).

The other writings of Plutarch, which consist of about sixty essays, are generally comprehended under the title of his *Moralia, or Ethical Works*, many of them being entirely of an ethical character. The minor historical pieces already referred to, of which that on the malignity of Herodotus is one, are usually comprised in the collection entitled *Moralia*. Plutarch was fond of the writings of Plato; he was strongly opposed to the Epicureans: if he belonged to any philosophical sect, it was that of the Academics. But there is nothing like a system of philosophy in his writings, and he is not characterized by depth of thought or originality. He formed for himself a system, if we may so name that which had little of the connected character of a system, out of the writings of various philosophers. But a moral end is always apparent in his *Moralia*, as well as in his biographies. A kind, humane disposition, and a love of everything that is ennobling and excellent, pervade his writings, and give the reader the same kind of pleasure that he has in the company of an esteemed friend, whose singleness of heart appears in everything that he says or does. Plutarch rightly appreciated the importance of education, and he gives many good precepts for the bringing up of children. His philosophy was practical, and in many of its applications, as for instance his "Letter of Consolation to Apollonius," and his "Marriage Precepts," he is as felicitous in expression as he is sound in his precepts. Notwithstanding all the deductions that the most fastidious critic may make from Plutarch's moral writings, it cannot be denied that there is something in them which always pleases, and the more so the better we become acquainted with them; and this is no small merit in a writer. With regard to the purely ethical writings of Plutarch, archdean Trench says that they indicate a better state of society than is generally attributed to his age. Plutarch does not speak as one crying in the wilderness, but as to a circle of sympathetic hearers who will answer to his appeals. It may be supposed that his native kindliness of heart would prevent him from taking the full measure of the sin with which he was surrounded. No doubt he was deficient in the fierce indignation which consumed the heart of Tacitus and put a lash into the hands of Juvenal. But it is certain from many passages in his writings that he took no rose-colored view of life. Several of his statements almost amount to the confession of original sin. Plutarch's style bears no resemblance to the simplicity of the Attic writers. It has not the air of being much elaborated, and apparently his sentences flowed easily from him. He is nearly always animated and pleasing, and the epithet pictorial may be justly applied to him. Sometimes his sentences are long and ill-constructed, and the order of the words appears not the best that could be chosen to express his meaning; certainly it is not the order in which the best Greek writers of an earlier age would have arranged their thoughts. Sometimes he is obscure, both from this cause and the kind of illustration in which he abounds. He occasionally uses and perhaps affects poetic words, but they are such as give energy to his thoughts and expression to his language. Altogether he is read with pleasure in the original by those who are familiar with him, but he is somewhat harsh and crabbed to a stranger. It is his merit, in the age in which he lived, treating of such subjects as biography and morals, not to have fallen into a merely rhetorical style, to have balanced antitheses, and to have contented himself with the inanity of commonplaces. Whatever he says is manly and invigorating in thought, and clear and forcible in expression.

The first Greek edition of the *Moralia*, which is exceedingly incorrect, was printed by the elder Aldus, with the following title, *Plutarchi Opuscula, lxxxii*, Gr. (Ven. 1509, fol.). It was afterwards printed at Basle by Froben (1542, fol., and 1574, fol.). The only good edition of the *Moralia* is that printed at Oxford, and edited by D. Wyttenbach, who labored on it twenty-four years. This edition consists of six volumes of text (1795–1800), and two volumes of notes (1810–1821), 4to. There is a print of it which is generally bound in 5 vols. 8vo, with two volumes of notes. The notes by Wyttenbach were printed at Leipsic in 1821, in two vols. 8vo. The first edition of all the works of Plutarch is by H. Stephens (Geneva, 1572, 13 vols. 8vo), which is said to be correctly printed. This edition was reprinted several times. A complete edition, Greek and Latin, appeared at Leipsic (1774–1785, 12 vols. 8vo), with the name of J. J. Reiske, but Reiske did very little to it, for he died in 1774. An edition by J. C. Hutten appeared at Tübingen (1791–1805, 14 vols. 8vo). A good critical edition of all the works of Plutarch is still wanted. See *Meth. Qu. Rev.* July, 1851, art. vi; 1852, p. 383; *Christian Rev.* vol. x and xi; *Catholic World*, Sept. 1870; Neander, *Christian Dogmas;* Pressensé, *Religions before Christ*, p. 183 sq.; Donaldson, *Literature* (see Index); Cudworth, *Intellectual Development of the Universe* (see Index in vol. iii); Lardner, *Works;* Schaff, *Hist. of the Apostolic Church*, p. 140, 152; *Lond. Qu. Rev.* Oct. 1861; Trench, *Plutarch, His Life, His Lives, and His Morals* (Lond. 1873, 12mo); Smith, *Dict. of Class. Biog.* s. v.

Pluto (Πλούτων, *rich*), originally only a surname of Hades, as the giver or possessor of riches, is, in the mythology of Greece, the third son of Kronos and Rhea, and the brother of Zeus and Poseidon. On the

tripartite division of the universe, he obtained the sovereignty of the under-world—the realm of darkness and ghostly shades, where he sits enthroned as a "subterranean Zeus"—to use the expression of Homer, and rules the spirits of the dead. His dwelling-place, however, is not far from the surface of the earth. Pluto is inexorable in disposition, not to be moved either by prayers or flatteries. He is borne on a car, drawn by four black steeds, whom he guides with golden reins. His helmet makes him invisible, whence, according to some scholars, his name of *Hades;* although others, with at least equal probability, translate the word the "all-receiver." In Homer, Hades never means a place, but always a person. Moreover, it is to be noticed that the poet does not divide the realm of the shades into two separate regions. All the souls of the dead—good and bad alike—mingle together. Subsequently, however, when the ethical conception of future retribution became more widely developed, the kingdom of the dead was divided into Elysium (q. v.), the abode of the good, and Tartarus (q. v.), the place of the wicked. This change also exercised an important influence on the conception of Pluto. The ruler of the under-world not only acquired additional power and majesty, but the very idea of his character was essentially modified. He was now regarded as a beneficent deity, who held the keys of the earth in his hand, and possessed its metallic treasures (whence his new name *Pluto* or *Plutus*), and who blessed the year with fruits, for out of the darkness underground come all the riches and swelling fulness of the soil. Hence, in later times, mortals prayed to him before proceeding to dig for the wealth hidden in the bowels of the earth.

Pluto married Persephone (Proserpina), the daughter of Demeter (Ceres), after carrying her off from the plains of Enna. He assisted his brothers—according to the mythological story—in their war against the Titans, and received from the Cyclops, as a reward for delivering them from Tartarus, the helmet that makes him invisible, which he lent to Hermes (Mercury) in the aforesaid war, to Perseus in his combat with the Gorgons, and which ultimately came to Meriones. The Erinyes and Charon obey his behests. He sits in judgment on every open and secret act, and is assisted by three subordinate judges, Æacus, Minos, and Rhadamanthus. The worship of Pluto was widely spread both among the Greeks and Romans. Temples were erected to his honor at Athens, Elis, and Olympia. Among trees and flowers, the cypress, boxwood, narcissus, and maidenhair were sacred to him; bulls and goats were also sacrificed to him amid the shadows of night, and his priests had their brows garlanded with cypress wreaths. In works of art he resembles his brothers Zeus and Poseidon; only his hair hangs down somewhat wildly and fiercely over his brow, and his appearance, though majestic, as becomes so mighty a god, has something gloomy and terrible about it. There can be little doubt that he, as well as Pan (q. v.), helped to trick out the conception of the devil prevalent during the Middle Ages, and not yet extinct. If it was from Pan that the devil derived those physical characteristics alluded to in the famous "Address to the Deil" by the poet Burns:

> "O thou, whatever title suit thee,
> Auld *Hornie*, Satan, Nick, or *Clootie*,"

it is no less certain that it is to Pluto that he owes his position as "king of Hell," "his Blackness," and many of the insignia of his infernal royalty.

Plymouth Brethren, or **Darbyites**, is the name of a religious body which originated almost simultaneously at Plymouth, England, and Dublin, Ireland, about the year 1830. They are most generally called after the name of the place where they first started in England, but sometimes they are called after their principal founder, John Darby, at the time a clergyman of the Episcopal Church of Ireland. He himself gave to his adherents the name of *Separatists*, because they left the Establishment and determined to maintain a separate existence as a Church.

Early History.—John Darby was born in England of a wealthy family, studied jurisprudence and became a lawyer, but, brought into the Church, he was strongly impressed with a call to the ministry, and, though opposed by his father, he took holy orders. Disinherited by the parent for disobedience, Darby found a friend and patron in his uncle, from whom he obtained at his decease quite an ample fortune. After ordination, Darby became gradually impressed with the idea that there was no ground for the doctrine of apostolical succession, and that any person feeling called to preach should exercise that liberty. He therefore denounced the claim of the Establishment as unwarranted, and finally broke with the Episcopalians. He, however, still held that there was a true Church, and that all who thought as he did should band themselves together and wait until Christ made his personal appearance, which they anticipated would be speedily. There were a few who united themselves together on the strength of these views, in Plymouth, England, and at Dublin, Ireland. At the former place they seemed to meet with most success. There their numbers increased to seven hundred and up to fifteen hundred; and so marked was their success that they came to be called "Plymouth Brethren." (They have never taken this name themselves, but they do not seem to object to it.) The work increased, and bands were formed in London, Exeter, and several other places. Among those who united with them were many persons of wealth, who contributed considerable sums of money to spread their views. They established a newspaper, known as the *Christian Witness*, Mr. Darby being its chief contributor. It was not long before they were violently opposed by the English clergy. This opposition was so well directed and so ably conducted that the spread of the new faith was not only seriously checked, but their numbers were greatly reduced. In 1838, or near that time, Mr. Darby left England. He first visited Paris, where he remained for a time, and then went to Switzerland, where he found a more inviting field. The Wesleyan Methodists had commenced successful operations in Lausanne. Quite a number had withdrawn from the State Church and united with them. This excited the general attention of the people. Among the new proselytes to Methodism were many who still held the doctrine of predestination, and refused to accept the Wesleyan doctrine of Christian perfection. Those who held the doctrine of predestination were charged by those who had fully discarded it as having received but half the truth. At Vevay similar excitement prevailed. In this state of things, for the purpose of overthrowing the new faith, an influential member of the State Church at Lausanne invited Mr. Darby to come there and fight the Methodists. He went, and by his preaching, and the publication of a book entitled *The Doctrine of the Wesleyans regarding Perfection, and their Use of the Holy Scriptures*, he succeeded in so far bewildering them that not long after the greater part of them abandoned their faith, and either returned to the State Church or united with the Dissenters. Mr. Darby, besides, gave a series of lectures on the prophecies, entitled "Views regarding the actual Expectation of the Church, and the Prophecies which establish it." They were largely attended by others than Dissenters, and produced a deep impression upon the public mind. They were published in book form, first in French, and subsequently translated into German and English, and may be found in Mr. Darby's published works. In the estimation at least of the author they lifted the veil which had long, if not from the beginning, covered the prophecies. Such was Mr. Darby's influence among the people that the regular ministry was almost entirely ignored, and he became the accepted prophet. In fact, his publications had the effect directly to turn the people from the min-

istry as a whole. It was his custom to administer the sacrament every Sabbath indiscriminately to Churchmen and Dissenters, which practice earned for him the reputation of being a large-hearted Christian, and anxious to make the Church one. But really his object was to alienate the people until he could get them under his personal control for organization, he himself being the centre of the organization, as is but too clearly apparent from the fly-sheets or tracts which he published. One of these, entitled *Apostasy of the Actual Economy*, lays the axe at the root of the tree of the Christian Church, leaving it a shapeless wreck. Another, *On the Foundation of the Church*, attacks all Dissenters, and denies their right to form any new Church. And still another, *Liberty to preach Jesus possessed by every Christian*, denies the existence of any priestly office in the Church, except the universal priesthood of believers. A tract entitled *The Promise of the Lord*, based on Matt. xviii, 20, gave the *shibboleth* for the Darbyite gatherings. Another tract, entitled *Schism*, was issued, in which all who hesitated to take part in these gatherings were denominated "schismatics." Thus the work of demolition went on. A small seminary was established in which to prepare men for the evangelistic work—that is, to spread their views and make disciples to them, and the result has been a widespread sect, with little or no organic unity.

Later History.—A division took place among the "Brethren," under the leadership of B. W. Newton. It commenced in England and extended to the Continent. Mr. Newton, it is claimed, held with Irving that Christ was not sinless. This notion was repelled by most of the Darbyites, and Newton was subsequently expelled by Mr. Darby. (It might be interesting to inquire how Mr. Darby could consistently expel a man from his society when he ignores all organizations? If there be no organization, what is there to be expelled from?) The Newton heresy extended to Vevay, where there was much trouble, the "Brethren" splitting into two factions, which was followed soon after by many other societies. Another division took place among them, in which the famous George Müller, of Bristol, England, was the most prominent. Other divisions have occurred, but they are of very little importance. The "Brethren" are more or less numerous in Paris, Lausanne, Holland, Italy, and Belgium, on the Continent; in Plymouth, Exeter, and London, in England; a very few are in the United States, but more in Canada. They are an earnest, self-sacrificing people.

Doctrines, etc.—The "Brethren" profess to have no creed but the Bible, and condemn all who avow a creed, as putting human opinions in the place of the Word of God; and yet we seriously doubt if there is a Church in the land which has a more clearly defined creed than they have. They denounce all commentaries on the Bible as misleading, and yet Mr. Darby himself has written commentaries quite extensively on the Bible, to say nothing of M'Intosh. In faith they seem to be strongly Antinomian. If once justified, it is their belief that the soul not only can never fall from grace finally, but can never fall into condemnation. The soul's standing remains as pure as Christ himself. In other respects they hold substantially the great and leading doctrines of the Gospel; but as they have no written creed or confession, it is exceedingly difficult to find out exactly what they do hold. Each one is in every respect allowed to hold what he pleases, consistently with continued practical evidence that he is a real Christian, which includes a belief in the leading doctrines of evangelical Christians. No one pretends in anything to judge for another, or make his convictions obligatory any further than he can, by more perfectly instructing the other, induce him to accept them. Their views of what are called worship are also peculiar. This consists, they say, not in preaching or praying—petitioning—though these exercises may lead to worship, but simply in adoration, praise, and thanksgiving to God for what he is in himself, and what he is for those who render it. Hence worship can only be rendered by true Christians, in the breaking of bread and in the praise and thanksgiving which they render. Their services, therefore, for believers and for unconverted people are entirely distinct. They hold the obligation of the Church to come together the first day of the week to break bread; hence they observe the Lord's Supper every Sabbath morning, and believers alone are expected to come together then. They never preach in the morning, but usually simply exhort, two, or at the most three of them, speaking during the service. In the afternoon or evening of the Sabbath they preach to sinners. The Plymouth Brethren are the opposite extreme to Irvingism and Mormonism, and yet resemble these in several respects. They, too, are a protest against the present state of the Church, Protestant as well as Catholic, which they denounce as Babel, and expect the speedy coming of the Lord. But while the Irvingites and Mormons lay claim to an apostolical hierarchy, the "Brethren," like the Quakers, reject the specific ministry, and all written creeds and outward Church organization. They derive the disunion of the Church from the neglect to recognise the Holy Spirit as Christ's vicar on earth, and the all-sufficient interpreter of the Holy Scriptures. All human creeds, they say, involve a vital denial of this sufficiency of the Spirit, and practically restrict his operations. All believers are true spiritual priests, capacitated for worship (Heb. x, 19, 25), and all those who possess the qualifications from the Lord are not only authorized but obliged to evangelize the world and build up the Church, without any ordination of men. This they consider to be the true apostolic mode of worship, according to 1 Cor. xii and xiv. But, unlike the Quakers, they retain the ordinance of baptism, and administer the Lord's Supper every week. As a body, they hold to adult believers' baptism only; but if one comes to them who was baptized in infancy, while they receive him, they generally manage to convince him very soon of the importance of being rebaptized. As to the remainder of their creed, they seem to agree most with the Calvinistic system, and are said to be zealous in good works. See Guinness, *Who are the Plymouth Brethren?* (Phila. 1861); Dennett, *Plymouth Brethren, their Rise*, etc.; *Brit. Qu.* Oct. 1873, art. iii; *Presbyt. Qu.* Jan. 1872, p. 48; Marsden, *Dict. of Churches*, p. 91; *Jahrb. deutscher Theologie*, 1870, vol. iv; Dr. Steele, in the *Advocate of Christian Holiness*, 1876; *Brit. and For. Ev. Rev.* July, 1865, art. ii; *Lond. Qu. Rev.* No. liii, 1869, art. iii. (J. H. W.)

Pneumatology (from πνεῦμα, *spirit*, and λόγος, *word*) is the doctrine of spiritual existence. Considered as the science of mind or spirit, pneumatology consists of three parts: treating of the divine mind, theology; the angelic mind, angelology; and the human mind. This last is now called psychology, "a term to which no competent objection can be made, and which affords us, what the various clumsy periphrases in use do not, a convenient adjective, *psychological*" (Sir W. Hamilton, *Reid's Works*, p. 219, note). The belief in a return from the dead, apparitions, and spirits is largely incorporated in the traditions of the Jews, and prevailed almost universally in the scholastic ages. The mystic Jacob Böhme and Emanuel Swedenborg made it a popular phase of belief in Northern Europe, and Martinez Pasqualis and his disciple St. Martin caused it to prevail among the people of France and in Southern Europe. All these teachers have given accounts of the orders of spiritual beings who held communication with the living. In our own day *spiritualism* has branched out so extensively that it will be treated separately under that heading.

Pneumatomăchi, i. e. *adversaries of the Holy Spirit*, is a name properly applied to all those who entertain heretical opinions as to the Scripture doctrine of the Holy Ghost, e. g. the *Sabellians* (q. v.). The

name originated after the subsidence of the Arian controversy, and was applied to that party, distinguished by the denial of the catholic faith regarding the Third Person of the Holy Trinity; some denying his divinity, others his personality also. The name is, however, more specially used to designate the *Macedonians*, so called after Macedonius, who, after the death of Eusebius of Nicomedia, was called by the Arian faction to the see of Constantinople, in opposition to the catholic bishop Paul. This led to bloody strife, inasmuch as a majority of the citizens were for Paul. The Arians got the better of their catholic adversaries with the help of the emperor Constantine, who took the part of Macedonius, and established him in the disputed see by force of arms: three thousand persons perished on that occasion. Macedonius, although called to the bishopric of Constantinople by strict Arians, seems not to have been very much of an Arian himself, but persecuted the catholics after the fashion of other Semi-Arian bishops, and became, with Basilius of Ancyra, one of the chiefs of the Semi-Arians. As a natural consequence of the rest of their doctrine, the Arians declared the Holy Ghost, who was little spoken of explicitly at the beginning of the Arian difficulties, to be a mere creature, and most of them held him to be an inferior creature to the Son. Not only the strict Arians, but also the Semi-Arians, who called the Son "God" and ὁμοιούσιος, questioned the divinity of the Holy Ghost. Macedonius made himself the leader of this increasing and strengthening pneumatomatical party, teaching emphatically that the Holy Ghost was a creature subservient to the Father and Son, and wholly different in nature from them (comp. Socrates, *Hist. Eccles.* ii, 46; Sozomen, iv, 27; Theodoret, *Hist. Eccles.* ii, 6; *Hæret. Fab.* v, 11; Epiphanius, *Hær.* 73 and 74). He then invented the artifice of the "Homoion," and connecting himself closely with the Semi-Arian party, gave them his name (Theodoret, *Hær. Fab.* iv, 5). At first therefore the term Macedonian was simply equivalent to Semi-Arian, and Socrates calls the reply of Liberius to the Semi-Arian legates a letter to the bishops of the Macedonians (Socrates, *Hist. Eccles.* iv, 12). The name of Macedonius appears in this reply. The good faith of this transaction is (to say the least) very doubtful (see the notes on the chapter of Socrates in *Variorum Annotationes* in Reading's edition of Valesius). and we are in uncertainty as to the opinions which Macedonius really held at the close of his life. But there is no uncertainty as to the course of the heresy. The letters of Liberius were exhibited at the Council of Tyana, and the deputies who presented them were acknowledged as members of the catholic body. This was probably in A.D. 368. But just as among the Arians there never was any unity of views as to the Son, there was none among the Pneumatomachi and Macedonians as to the Holy Ghost. Some contented themselves with holding the divinity of the Holy Ghost dubious, others denied it outright; some called him a creature, but most seem to have fallen in with the ideas of Macedonius. Among the most active partisans of this heresy were Marathonius and Eleusius, whom Macedonius called respectively to the sees of Cyzicum and Nicomedia. The influence of Marathonius is shown by the fact that the Macedonians are sometimes called *Marathonians*. Macedonius was deposed by the strict Arians at the Synod of Constantinople in 360: he spent the remainder of his life obscurely in the vicinity of Constantinople. The exact date of Macedonius's death is not known, but it appears to have been soon after the Council of Tarsus (see Tillemont, *Hist.* vol. ix).

The appearance of the Pneumatomachi, as such, is to be dated from A.D. 360, when Athanasius wrote against them, giving them the name here adopted. Athanasius was then in the deserts of Egypt, and Serapion, bishop of Thmuis, in Lower Egypt, requested his interposition. The heresies themselves were no novelties. It was a part of the Arian creed that the Holy Spirit was a created being, superior it might be in dignity, but nowise different in nature from the angels; and in the Gnostic systems we meet with Christ and the Holy Ghost as æons [see VALENTINIANS], the latter being held, in some cases at least, to be not a distinct person, but a divine energy diffused through the universe. But there was a great difference in the mode in which these heresies were held. They then appeared, not as proceeding from a special opposition to the greatness of the Holy Spirit, but as deductions from some other leading heresy to which they were subordinate. Thus in the case of the Arians, with which our present subject is concerned, the denial of the divinity of the Holy Spirit follows upon the denial of the divinity of the Son. For as it is impossible to advance the Third Person of the Trinity above the Second Person, the controversy turned therefore on the divinity of the Second. Dealing with this, the Council of Nicæa did not touch specifically upon the subordinate heresy, but left it to stand or fall with the leading one. But when the leading heresy was abandoned, and yet the subordinate heresy retained, then the latter not only became prominent, but was seen to be adopted on its own independent grounds, for its own sake. The Arian half converted to catholicity was properly a Pneumatomachist. Such were those whom Athanasius dealt with in his letter to Serapion. They were seceders from the Arians who had embraced the true faith regarding the Son, but retained their error regarding the Holy Spirit. They were consequently opposed both by catholics and Arians, but their true controversy was with the former: their contest with the latter (Athanasius urges) could only be pretended, inasmuch as both agreed in opposing the doctrine of the Trinity (*Ad Serap.* i, 1, 2, 9, 32). This class, then, differed from the later Macedonian class: it held Homoousian doctrine regarding the Son, whereas the Macedonians were Homoiousians. Athanasius calls them also *Tropici*, from their figurative interpretations of Scripture; but this is rather an epithet than a proper name.

In comparison with the Macedonian party, this earlier party can have been but small. It was, however, reinforced a few years later, as we shall show, upon the return of a large portion of the Semi-Arian body to catholicity. The adoption of the truth concerning the Son leads almost necessarily to the adoption of the truth concerning the Holy Spirit. The arguments of Athanasius (*Ad Serap.* i, 29; iv, 7) show forcibly how untenable a position is that which maintains a duality instead of a trinity. The original Monarchian tenet from which the Arians started is much more easily admissible.

The Pneumatomachi of the Macedonian school were the Semi-Arians left behind in schism when, in the year 366, the majority of the sect gave in their assent to orthodoxy, and were received into the Church. Before this time Macedonius, as we have seen above, had joined the Semi-Arian party, but proving thereby unacceptable to the Arians, was deposed by the Council of Constantinople, A.D. 360 (Theodoret, *Hist. Eccles.* ii, 6). A council was appointed to meet in Tarsus to effect a reconciliation, but just before the meeting thirty-four Asiatic bishops assembled in Caria refused the Homoousion; and Valens, at the instigation of the Arian Eudoxius, by whom he had been recently baptized, forbade the council (Sozomen, *Hist. Eccles.* vi, 12). From this time, however, Semi-Arianism disappears from ecclesiastical history. The controversy regarding Christ's divinity ceased, and the denial of the divinity of the Holy Spirit became the distinguishing tenet of the Semi-Arian party, the tenet thus becoming associated with the name Macedonian, which the Semi-Arians had recently acquired. Of course there were some, as we have already had occasion to state, who called them Marathonians, saying that Marathonius, bishop of Nicomedia, had introduced the term Homoiousion (Socrates, *Hist. Eccles.* ii, 45).

It is to be noticed here that several writers, when

treating of the present heresy, use the word Semi-Arian in another sense than that now given it. Philaster (*Hær.* c. lxvii) defines the Semi-Arians thus: "Hi de Patre et Filio bene sentiunt, unam qualitatis substantiam, unam divinitatem esse credentes, Spiritum autem non de divina substantia, nec Deum verum, sed factum atque creatum Spiritum prædicantes." Augustine also (*Hær.* c. iii): "Macedoniani de Patre et Filio recte sentiunt, quod unius sint ejusdemque substantiæ vel essentiæ, sed de Spiritu Sancto hoc nolunt credere, creaturam eum esse dicentes. Hos potius quidam Semi-Arianos vocant, quod in hac quæstione ex parte cum illis sint, ex parte nobiscum." This use of the term Semi-Arian is now to be avoided, the distinctive mark of that party being the Homoiousion. But these two authorities show that the original Pneumatomachi, against whom Athanasius wrote, must have been largely reinforced from those who joined the Church under Liberius. This appears also from Epiphanius, who states that the Pneumatomachi proceeded partly from the Semi-Arians and partly from the orthodox. In the preceding article he had defined the Semi-Arians by the Homoiousion; and the "orthodox," it cannot be doubted, were not the old Nicenes, but those who from the Arians had come over to the Homoiousion, and had been accepted by Liberius as orthodox. Thus of the Pneumatomachi some were orthodox regarding the divinity of the Son, and some retained the Homoiousion, and these latter are properly Macedonians, being Semi-Arians.

All these started with the tenet of the sect from which they sprung, namely, that the Holy Spirit is a created being, of the same order as the created angels (Theodoret and Epiphanius, *l. c.*). The authorities of Philaster and Augustine are sufficient to show that this was retained by the majority of the party. But another opinion arose early. It proceeded—Eustathius of Sebastia being an example (Socrates, *Hist. Eccles.* ii, 45)—from a reluctance to call the Holy Spirit a creature. But as they who felt this reluctance would not consent to call him God, it followed necessarily that they were obliged to deny his personality. Still they assigned to the impersonal Spirit that which is assigned to the personal Spirit by Roman Catholics, as being the Vinculum (see Augustine, *De Fide et Symbolo*, § 19; Bull, *Def. Fid. Nic.* ii, 3, 13) of the persons of the Godhead. This is noted by Augustine (*Hæres.* c. lii): "Quamvis a nonnullis perhibeantur non Deum, sed Deitatem Patris et Filii dicere Spiritum Sanctum, et nullam propriam habere substantiam." What catholics regard as God the Holy Ghost working in the world, they regarded as a divine energy diffused through the world. Mosheim represents this, it appears upon insufficient grounds, to be the tenet of the Macedonians in general (Walch, *Gesch. der Ketzereien*, iii, 98).

The heresy of the Pneumatomachi was condemned, first, in a synod at Alexandria, A.D. 362, held by Athanasius on his return (Athanasius, *Synod. Epist. ad Antioch.* The epistle states that Arians, on their reception into the Church, are to anathematize those who say that the Holy Spirit is a created being and divided from the substance of Christ. A true renunciation of Arian doctrine is to abstain from dividing the Holy Trinity, from saying that one of the Persons is a created being). The Pneumatomachi were condemned secondly in a synod in Illyricum, A.D. 367 (*Epist. Synod. ad Orient.;* Hardouin, *Concil.* i, 794; Sozomen, *Hist. Eccles.* vi, 22); thirdly, in a synod at Rome, A.D. 367 (Damasi, *Epist.* ap. Theodoret. *Hist. Eccles.* v, 11, Vales. note); and, lastly, at the great Oriental council held at Constantinople, A.D. 381, where, in opposition to the heresies of Macedonius, Apollinarius, and Eunomius, the Nicene faith was confirmed and more fully stated. The first canon anathematizes the "Semi-Arians, or Pneumatomachi;" the seventh canon uses the name Macedonians, and orders the admission of converts from this heresy to be by unction. To the simple article of the Nicene Creed, "I believe in the Holy Ghost," were added those clauses (excepting the Filioque) which stand at present as the complement of the catholic faith, viz., that to the Holy Ghost, who emanates from the Father, is due the same adoration and glorification as to the Father and to the Son. The Macedonians were invited to the Council of Constantinople in the hope that the reconciliation interrupted at Tarsus might be effected, but the hope was not realized (Socrates, *Hist. Eccles.* v, 8; Sozomen, *Hist. Eccles.* vii, 7). Facundus states that Macedonius himself was invited to the council. This is no doubt an error. The council completed the work which was begun at Nicæa, and finally declared the catholic faith regarding the Holy Trinity. Against its determination the Semi-Arian, now the Pneumatomachist, party was not able to make any effectual resistance.—Blunt, *Dict. of Sects*, s. v. See Schaff, *Church History*, ii, 639, 644; Neander, *Hist. of Christian Dogma* (see Index); Hefele, *Conciliengesch.* vols. i and ii; Alzog, *Kirchengesch.* i, 281; Schröckh, *Kirchengesch.* vol. vi; Klee, *Dogmengesch.* pt. i, ch. ii, p. 215.

Poach, Andreas, a German Lutheran minister of the 16th century, studied at Wittenberg under Martin Luther, where also he was made *magister*. In 1542 he was called to Jena as archdeacon; then he was appointed pastor at Nordhausen; and in 1550 he was called as pastor and professor of theology to Erfurt, where in 1572 in company with four others, he was deposed. He then moved to Utenbach, near Jena, where he died, April 2, 1585. He edited Luther's *Hauspostille, with Corrections and Additions* (Jena, 1559 sq.), and wrote the biography of Ratzeberger (q. v.), *Vom christlichen Abschied aus diesem Sterblichen*, etc. (Jena, 1559). See Jöcher, *Gelehrten-Lexikon*, s. v.; Winer, *Handbuch der theol. Literatur*, ii, 130. (B. P.)

Pobian, Moses, also called *Fobian*, a Jewish writer of some note, flourished in Greece in the first part of the 16th century. He published, איוב עם תרגום רומאני, the book of Job, with a Rumic, i. e. neo-Greek, translation in Hebrew letters (Constantinople, 1576):—משלי עם תרגום רומאני, the Proverbs, in the same manner (ibid. 1548):—חומש עם תרגום רומאני וספרדי, i. e. the Pentateuch, with a Rumic and Spanish translation, both in Hebrew letters, with the Chaldee of Onkelos and Rashi's commentary (ibid. 1547). The Spanish version of this work was reprinted at Ferrara in 1583. See Fürst, *Bibl. Judaica*, i, 285 sq.; Wolf, *Bibl. Hebræa*, I, iii, 1520. (B. P.)

Pochard, Jean, a French theologian, was born in 1715 at La Cluse, near Pontarlier. After going through the regular course of studies at Besançon, he was offered by the archbishop of that diocese the direction of the seminary, and Pochard there taught theology for thirty years. He was afterwards appointed superior of the seminary, but the weakness of his health compelled him to resign these functions, as he had already resigned his chair. He died at Besançon Aug. 25, 1786. To him is due the revision of the Missal and Breviary of the diocese of Besançon, printed by order of the cardinal of Choiseul-Beaupré. These works are considered model performances. He had the largest share in the *Méthode pour la Direction des Ames* (Neufchâteau, 1772, 2 vols. 12mo) of Urbain Grisot, which has often been reprinted. —Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.

Poche'reth (Heb. *Poke'reth*, פֹּכֶרֶת, *ensnaring;* Sept. Φακεράθ, v. r. Φαχεράθ, etc.), the name apparently of a person ("P. of Zebaim," the Sept. in some copies supplies "son of" between the words) whose "children" were among the Nethinim that returned from the captivity with Zerubbabel (Ezra ii, 57; Neh. vii, 59). B.C. ante 540.

Pociey, Hypatius, a Russian prelate, was born at Bajanise in 1541. He occupied a conspicuous place in the religious history of Russia by the share he had, in 1595, in the return of the western provinces of the em-

pire to the Roman Catholic Church. He was sent to Rome, with several of his colleagues, to signify the obedience of the converted provinces to the holy see: we have an account of this event by Baronius. Pociey devoted his whole life to cementing and extending this union, which was finally destroyed by the emperor Nicholas in 1839. Pociey was bishop of Wladimir and Bresc, and died at Wladimir July 28, 1613. He left a number of *Homilies*, published by Leo. Kiszka (*Kazania y Homilie Hipacyscza Pocieia*, 1714, 4to):—*The Union*, an exposition of the principal articles relating to the union of the Greeks with the Roman Church (Wilna, 1595):—an *Account* of the embassy which the Ruthenians, in 1476, sent to Sixtus IV (Wilna, 1605, 4to); we know only one copy of this work, that in the Imperial Library of St. Petersburg:—*Privileges granted to the Uniates by the Kings of Poland* (Wilna, s. d., about 1706):—divers *Epistles* disseminated in the *Annales de la Société Archéologique de Saint-Pétersbourg*, the most remarkable being addressed to the patriarch of Alexandria:—his *Testament*, inserted in the *Review of Posen*.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.

Pockels, Carl Friedrich, a German moralist, was born Nov. 15, 1757, at Wörmlitz, near Halle. In 1780, having completed his studies at the university in Halle, he was appointed tutor of the princes of Brunswick, and afterwards guardian of one of them, the duke Augustus. When this house lost their estates, he lived as a private citizen at Brunswick. In 1813 he occupied again his former relation to duke Augustus. He died at Brunswick Oct. 29, 1814. Pockels's works, written in a fluent and elegant style, contain a treasury of sagacious and curious observations on man and society. He left, *Beiträge zur Beförderung der Menschenkenntniss* (Berlin, 1788–89, 2 parts, 8vo; followed by *Neue Beiträge*, etc., Hamb. 1798, 8vo):—*Fragmente zur Kenntniss des menschlichen Herzens* (Hanover, 1788–94, 3 vols. 8vo):—*Denkwürdigkeiten zur Bereicherung der Charakterkunde* (Halle, 1794, 8vo):—*Versuch einer Charakteristik des weiblichen Geschlechts* (Hanover, 1799–1802, 5 vols. 8vo); it is a writing full of witty remarks; the author published as a pendant *Der Mann* (ibid. 1805–8, 4 vols. 8vo):—*Karl Wilh. Ferdinand von Braunschweig* (Stuttgard, 1809, 8vo):—*Ueber den Umgang mit Kindern* (1811):—*Ueber Gesellschaft, Geselligkeit und Umgang* (Hanover, 1813–16, 3 vols. 8vo). Pockels published a *Taschenbuch*, as keepsake, for the years 1803 and 1804; and, in common with Ch. Ph. Moritz, the *Denkwürdigkeiten zur Beförderung des Edlen und Schönen* (Berlin, 1786–88, 2 vols. 8vo), some articles in the *Magazin zur Erfahrungsseelenlehre*, and in the *Braunschweigisches Magazin*.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.

Pocklington, John, D.D., an English divine, noted also as an educator, flourished near the middle of the 17th century. He was at one time president of Pembroke Hall and Sidney College, Cambridge. He published *Sermons* (Lond. 1636):—*Altare Christianum* (1637, 4to), in answer to Williams's *Holy Table*. See Williams, John.

Pocock, Edward (1), an English Orientalist and theologian of great note, not only in his own times, but one whose scholarly acquirements are gladly acknowledged even in our day, was born Nov. 8, 1604. He studied in Oxford, his native place, at the university, and devoted himself especially to the Oriental tongues, the Hebrew, Arabic, Chaldee, and Syriac, first under the direction of Matthew Pason, and afterwards under that of William Bedwell. Pocock took his bachelor of arts' degree in 1622, and his master's in 1626. Lud. de Dieu publishing a Syriac version of the Apocalypse at Leyden the following year, our author, after his example, began to prepare those four epistles which were still wanting to a complete edition of the New Testament in that language. These epistles were the second of Peter, the second and third of John, and that of Jude. All the other books, except these five, had been well printed by Albertus Widmanstadius, at Vienna, in 1555, who was sent into the West for that purpose by Ignatius, the Jacobite patriarch of Antioch, in the 16th century. Having met with a manuscript in the Bodleian Library proper to his purpose, Pocock engaged in this work and finished it; but laid it by, not having the courage to publish it, till the fame of it, in 1629, brought him into the acquaintance of Gerard Vossius, who, being then at Oxford, obtained his consent to carry it to Leyden, where it was printed that year, in 4to, under the immediate care and inspection of Lud. de Dieu. In 1628 Pocock had been received a fellow of the principal college of Oxford; but having decided to enter the priesthood, he was ordained priest in 1629, having entered into deacon's orders some time before, and he was appointed chaplain to the English factory at Aleppo, by the interest of Selden, as appears very probable. He arrived at that place, after a long voyage, Oct. 17, 1630. His residence in the East for six years furnished an opportunity of further study in the Oriental tongues. He acquired great skill in the Arabic tongue, and he likewise endeavored to get a further insight, if possible, into the Hebrew; but soon found it fruitless, the Jews there being very illiterate. He also improved himself in the Ethiopic and Syriac, of which last he made a grammar, with a praxis, for his own use. On Oct. 30, 1631, he received a commission from Laud, then bishop of London, to buy for him such ancient Greek coins and such manuscripts, either in Greek or the Oriental languages, as he should judge most proper for a university library —which commission Pocock executed to the best of his power. He also translated a number of historical works from the Arabic, collected a great quantity of Oriental manuscripts, which he sent to England, and made a careful study of the environs of Aleppo, with respect to natural history: the result of the latter study was intended to furnish a desirable addition to the commentaries of the Old Testament. In 1634 the plague raged furiously at Aleppo; many of the merchants fled two days' journey from the city, and dwelt in tents upon the mountains: Pocock did not stir, yet neither he nor any of the English caught the infection. In 1636 he received a letter from Laud, then archbishop of Canterbury, informing him of his design to found an Arabic lecture at Oxford, and of naming him to the university as the professor; upon which agreeable news he presently settled his affairs at Aleppo, and took the first opportunity of returning home. On his arrival at Oxford this year, he took the degree of bachelor of divinity in July, and entered on the professorship in August; however, the next year, when his friend Mr. John Greaves concerted his voyage to Egypt, it was thought expedient by Laud that Pocock should attend him to Constantinople, in order to perfect himself in the Arabic language, and to purchase more manuscripts. During his abode there, he was for some time chaplain to Sir Peter Wych, then the English ambassador to the Porte, and who became Pocock's most zealous protector. He collected during his stay in that city a number of Oriental manuscripts. In 1639 he received several letters from his friends, and particularly from the archbishop, pressing him to return home; and accordingly, embarking in August, 1640, he landed in Italy, and passed thence to Paris. Here he met with Grotius, who was then ambassador at the court of France from Sweden, and acquainted him with a design he had to translate his treatise *De veritate Christianæ Religionis* into Arabic, in order to promote the conversion of some of the Mohammedans. Grotius was pleased with and encouraged the proposal, while Pocock did not scruple to observe to him some things towards the end of his book which he could not approve: as his advancing opinions which, though commonly charged by Christians upon Mohammedans, yet had no foundation in any of their authentic writings, and were such as they themselves were ready to disclaim. Grotius was so far from being displeased that he heartily thanked

Pocock for the freedom he had taken; and gave him full leave, in the version he intended, to expunge and alter whatever he should think fit. This work was published in 1660 at the sole expense of Mr. Bobert Royle: Grotius's introduction was left out, and a new preface added by Pocock, showing the design of the work, and giving some account of the persons to whom it would be of use. On his return to England, in 1640, Pocock found himself in very difficult circumstances. His chair of Arabic had been stipended by archbishop Laud, but after the death of that prelate the revenues had been seized upon. Pocock now devoted himself entirely to study, and escaped by his retreat, as well as by the friendship of John Selden, who enjoyed a great influence in the republican party, the vexations, if not dangers, which his royalist opinions would have been sure to bring upon him. In 1643 he was presented by his college with the living of Childrey, in Berkshire, and in 1647, in consequence of the exertions of John Selden, he was reinstated in his Oxford chair, and two years later he was appointed professor of Hebrew. The king, who was at that time a prisoner in the Isle of Wight, also bestowed on him a rich canonry. An act of Parliament confirmed the gift; but the canonry thus assigned to him being different from that originally annexed to the professorship, Pocock entered a protest against it, and refused to receive the profits. In the meantime he composed his *Specimen Historiæ Arabum*, being extracts from the work of Abul-faraj in the original Arabic, together with a Latin translation and copious notes. This work, which was printed at Oxford in 1648 and 1650 (4to), was reprinted in 1806 by White, with some additions by Sylvestre de Sacy. In November, 1650, about a year after publishing the preceding work, Pocock was ejected from his canonry, and it was intended to deprive him of the Hebrew and Arabic professorships; but, thanks to a petition signed by all the heads of houses, the masters, and scholars at Oxford, Pocock was suffered to enjoy both places. In 1655 he was on the point of being deprived of his living, on the ground of "ignorance and insufficiency;" at least such were the charges preferred against him by Cromwell's committee. Some of his Oxford friends, however, wisely prevented the disgrace to the Roundhead party which would have followed the ejection, upon such grounds, of so eminent a scholar as Pocock. The most determined against this measure was Dr. John Owen (himself one of the Parliamentary commissioners), Seth Ward, John Wilkins, and John Wallis, who withstood the stupid and bigoted creatures to their face, and made them sensible of "the infinite contempt and reproach" which would reward such treatment of a man "whom all the learned, not of England only, but of all Europe, so justly admired for his vast knowledge and extraordinary accomplishments." Meanwhile nothing had sufficed to check either his pious care of his parish or his pursuit of sacred and Oriental learning. In Arabic and Hebrew learning he was allowed to be second to none of his age.

From the first Pocock made his Oriental attainments subservient to Biblical illustration; and his contributions, directly and indirectly, to Biblical learning were numerous and extremely valuable. Of his connection with Walton's *Polyglot*, his biographer says: "From the beginning scarce a step was taken in that work [not excepting even the *Prolegomena*] till communicated to Mr. Pocock, without whose assistance it must have wanted much of its perfection;" he collated the Arabic Pentateuch, with two copies of Saadias's translation; drew up an account of the Arabic versions of that part of the Bible which is to be found in the Appendix to the Polyglot, and lent some of his own rich store of MSS. to the conductors of the work, viz. a Syriac MS. of the entire Old Testament, an Ethiopic MS. of the Psalms, two Syriac MSS. of the Psalms, and a Persian MS. of the Gospels. Soon after his escape from the commission's purposes Pocock published his *Porta Mosis*, being six prefatory discourses of Moses Maimonides's "Commentary upon the Mishna," written in Arabic, but with the Hebrew letters. This work, which was the first production of the Hebrew press at Oxford, appeared in 1655, together with a Latin translation and numerous notes. Pocock made this work the more useful to Biblical students by his copious *Appendix Notarum Miscellanea*, where he discusses many points of interest to Biblical scholars. Pocock reaped golden opinions on the publication of this now neglected though still very valuable work. In the following year Pocock appears to have entertained the idea of publishing the *Expositions of Rabbi Tanchum on the Old Testament*, as he was at that time the only person in Europe who possessed any of the MSS. of that learned rabbi; but, probably from want of encouragement, he did not prosecute his design. In 1657 the English Polyglot appeared, in which Pocock had a considerable hand. He collated the Arabic Pentateuch, and also wrote a preface concerning the different Arabic versions of that part of the Bible, and the reason of the various readings to be found in them, the whole of which was inserted in the Appendix to the Polyglot. Those parts of the Syriac version of the New Testament which had remained unpublished are due to him; he accompanied them with a Latin version and annotations. In 1658 his Latin translation of the *Annals of Eutychius* was published at Oxford (in 2 vols. 4to), at the request and at the expense of Selden, who died before it appeared. At the Restoration, Pocock was restored (June, 1660) to his canonry of Christ-church, as originally annexed to the Hebrew professorship by Charles I; but the frivolous court of Charles II thought as little of rewarding further his attachment to the royal cause as they were able to appreciate his works and his worth. He took his doctor of divinity's degree, and continued afterwards to discharge the duties of both his lectures, and to give to the world, to the end of his life, new proofs of his unrivalled skill in Oriental learning. He was consulted as a master by all the most learned men in Europe: by Hornius, Alting, Hottinger, Golius, from abroad; and by Cudworth, Boyle, Hammond, Castel, at home. His next publication, in 1661, was the Arabic poem by Abú Ismail Thograí, entitled *Lámiy-yatu-l-'ajem*, with a Latin translation, copious notes, and a learned preface by Dr. Samuel Clarke. But by far the most important as well as the most useful of Pocock's works was his translation of the entire work of Abul-faraj, which, along with the text and a few excellent notes, was printed at Oxford in 1663 (2 vols. 4to), entitled *Gregorii Abul Farajii historia Dynastiarum*. (This is a compendium of the general history of the world from the creation to his own time, i. e. about the end of the 13th century, and is divided into ten dynasties.) After the publication of this work Pocock seems to have devoted himself entirely to Biblical learning. In 1674 he published, at the expense of the university, his Arabic translation of the Church Catechism and the English Liturgy. Some time after, Fell, dean of Christchurch, having concerted a scheme for a commentary upon the Old Testament, to be written by some learned hands in that university, engaged our author to take a share. This gave occasion to his commentaries. In 1677 appeared his *Commentary on the Prophecies of Micah and Malachi*; in 1685 that on *Hosea*, and in 1691 that on *Joel*. It was his intention to comment upon others of the lesser prophets. In these commentaries, which are all in English, Pocock's skill in his favorite subject of Biblical Hebrew is very apparent. The notes, no doubt, are too diffuse, but they exhibit much profound learning in rabbinical as well as sacred Hebrew. In his critical principles he warmly defends the general purity of the Masoretic text against the aspersions of Isaac Vossius and the theory of Capellus; but, although his Masoretic predilections are excessive, he does not depreciate the Septuagint. His scheme ever was to *reconcile* by learned explanations the sacred original and the most venerable

of its versions. This great and good man labored on, harassed by enemies and neglected by friends, but respected for his purity of life, and admired for his matchless learning, in his professional and pastoral pursuits, to the very end of his life, his only distemper being extreme old age, which yet hindered him not, even the night before he died, from his invariable custom of praying from the liturgy with his family. He expired Sept. 10, 1691, after a gradual decay of his constitution, and his remains were interred in the cathedral of Christchurch, where a monument with an inscription is erected to his memory. As to his person, he was of a middle stature, and slender; his hair and eyes black, his complexion fresh, his look lively and cheerful, and his constitution sound and healthy. In his conversation he was free, open, and affable, retaining even to the last the briskness and facetiousness of youth. His temper was modest, humble, sincere; and his charity brought such numbers of necessitous objects to him that dean Fell used to tell him complainingly "that he drew all the poor of Oxford into the college property." His theological works were collected in 2 vols. fol. in 1740 by Leonard Twells, who also wrote an account of the life and works of Pocock. Pocock's services to Oriental scholarship in Europe, especially in England, are well-nigh inestimable. Bishop Marsh says of him: "Should I begin to speak of the rare endowments of this admirable man, I should not be able to end his character under a volume. His rare learning appears in his writings." "Pocock," says Hallam, "was probably equal to any Oriental scholar whom Europe had hitherto produced. . . . No Englishman probably has ever contributed so much to that province of [Arabic] learning." See Cattermole, *Literature of the English Church*, i, 175; Hook, *Ecclesiastical Biography*, viii, 98; Skeats, *Hist. of the English Free Church*, p. 63; Orme, *Bibliotheca Biblia*, s. v.; Perry, *Hist. Ch. of Engl.* (see Index in vol. iii); Stoughton, *Eccles. Hist. of Engl.* (since the Restoration), ii, 332; Kitto, *Cyclopædia of British Literature*, iii, 553; Allibone, *Dict. of British and American Authors*, vol. ii, s. v.; *Biblical Repository*, x, 2 sq. (J. H. W.)

Pocock, Edward (2), an English Orientalist, son of the preceding, was born at Oxford in 1647, and educated at the university of that place. He published, under his father's direction, a philosophical treatise of Ibn-Tofaïl, with a Latin version and notes, entitled *Philosophus autodidactus* (Oxford, 1671, 4to). The same treatise was translated into English by Ockley. He was on the point of publishing the *Description of Egypt by Abdallatif* in Arabic and in Latin when, being refused in 1691 the succession to the chair left vacant by his father's death, he renounced entirely his Oriental studies. This valuable work remained long unpublished: the Arabic text was printed at Tübingen at the close of last century, and was almost immediately translated into German. White published in 1800 the original and Pocock's Latin version (Oxf. 4to), with notes of his own.

His brother THOMAS translated into English a Hebrew treatise of Manasseh ben-Israël (*Of the Term of Life*, Lond. 1699, 12mo). (J. H. W.)

Pococke, RICHARD, an English prelate, was born in 1704 at Southampton. It is believed that he belonged to the family of the preceding, notwithstanding the slight difference in the spelling of his name. He studied at Oxford, was received doctor, and embraced the ecclesiastical career. In 1734 and 1741 he travelled in the East, and published on his return a narrative of his journey, under the title, *A Description of the East and some other Countries* (Lond. 1743–45, 3 vols. in 2, folio, with 179 drawings and maps). This work most fully and with care delineates the countries and manners which make its reading interesting even now. Having accompanied lord Chesterfield to Ireland as chaplain, he remained in that country, and was appointed in 1756 bishop of Ossory. He had just been transferred to Meath when he died of apoplexy, in September, 1765. There are some notices of him in the *Philosophical Transactions* and in the *Archæologia*. (J. H. W.)

Pocularies is an ecclesiastical term used for drinking-cups consecrated in churches.

Poderis or **Talaris** is another name for the *alb* (q. v.).

Podico, JOHN DE (also called *John de Valladolid* or *John Conversus*), a convert from Judaism and noted as a writer, was born about the year 1335. He is the author of two anti-Jewish works, viz. *Concordia legis*, cited very often by Alfonso de Spina in his *Fortalitium fidei* (p. 117, 155, 169, 170 sq.), and *Declaratio super Aben Esram in decem præcepta;* also quoted by Alfonso de Spina. He was permitted by the king, Don Henry, to hold religious disputations with Jews, and in 1375 such a disputation took place in the cathedral of Avila, where Moses Kohen de Tordesillas was the spokesman of the Jews. The main points to be discussed were the dogmas of Christianity, the Messiahship of Jesus, his divinity and incarnation, the Trinity, and the virginity of Mary. Four discussions were held, the result of which was published by Tordesillas in his עֵזֶר הָאֱמוּנָה, or examination of one hundred and twenty-five passages of Scripture usually urged by Christians in favor of their religion. This book, which he designated "The Stronghold of the Faith," he presented to the synagogue of Avila and Toledo. See Fürst, *Bibl. Judaica*, iii, 435, 467; De Rossi, *Dizionario storico degli Autori Ebrei* (Germ. transl. by Hamberger), p. 317; the same, *Bibl. Judaica antichristiana*, p. 26; Grätz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, viii, 21 sq.; Lindo, *Hist. of the Jews*, p. 159; Finn, *Sephardim*, p. 311; Kalkar, *Israel und die Kirche*, p. 25. (B. P.)

Podoniptæ (i. e. *Feet-washers*) is one of the names by which that branch of the Mennonites, otherwise known as *Flemings*, are sometimes designated. They maintain that the example of Christ, which has in this instance the force of a law, requires his disciples to wash the feet of their guests in token of their love; and for this reason they have been called *Podoniptæ*. But others deny that this rite was enjoined by Christ. See MENNONITES.

Poe, Adam, D.D., a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, noted for his devotion to its interests, literary, social, and religious, was born in Columbiana County, Ohio, July 21, 1804. Such limited advantages as the times and the means of his parents afforded him for acquiring an education were eagerly embraced, and in the schools and by private tuition he secured the elements of a good English education and some knowledge of the classics, and formed a taste for reading and study which he continued through life. He received his early Christian training in the Presbyterian Church, and ever cherished for it a profound respect; but its distinctive doctrines did not find a response in his heart, and after careful examination and many severe spiritual conflicts he preferred the doctrines of religion as taught by the Methodist Episcopal Church. Having decided to give himself to the work of the ministry, to which he felt called of God, he was licensed to preach, and in 1826 became a travelling preacher in the Ohio Annual Conference. He was effective from that date to the time of the illness which resulted in his death; and as a pastor, and in the other capacities in which he served the Church and her cause, he was a most efficient laborer of the Master. Dr. Poe entered the travelling ministry when the work involved sacrifices and demanded labors of no ordinary character. The circuits were of vast extent. An absence from home of twenty-eight days, with a sermon and a class or prayer meeting for each and every day, and a horseback ride of six hundred miles through the forests and the rough

roads of the border settlements to complete a single round, was common. Unchecked by heat or cold, through drenching rains or chilling sleet or snow, along miry ways, and for unmeasured reaches of distance, the Christ-loving and Christ-serving itinerant pressed forward in his tireless rounds, hunting up the lost sheep of the house of Israel, and gathering them into the fold of the great Shepherd. No man ever entered the cause with firmer faith, with greater singleness of purpose, or with more unreserved devotion than did Adam Poe. As he began, so he continued to the end. His whole being was rooted and grounded in God. His pastoral appointments were as follows: 1827, on Brunswick Circuit; 1828, on Huron Circuit; 1829, in charge of Wayne Circuit; 1830, on Columbus Circuit; 1831, on Deer Creek Circuit; 1832–3, on Miami Circuit; 1834, Marietta. In 1835 Dr. Poe succeeded the celebrated William B. Christie as presiding elder of Wooster District, and continued on that and the Tiffin District some five years, when his impaired health demanded relief from such exhausting labors. In 1839 he was stationed in Mansfield; in 1840–41, in Delaware; in 1842, presiding elder on Norwalk District; in 1843 in Delaware a second time; in 1844, agent for the Ohio Wesleyan University; 1846, again in Mansfield; 1847–9, on Norwalk or Elyria District. From 1850 to the spring of 1852, he was presiding elder of Mansfield District. At the General Conference of 1852 he was, in a manner highly creditable to himself, elected assistant agent of the Western Book Concern. To this office he was re-elected in 1856. Upon the failure of the health of the Rev. L. Swormstedt in 1860, he was elected principal agent. To this office he was re-elected in 1864. The General Conference of 1868 would have gladly continued him in this relation had it not found him hovering between life and death. He died June 26, 1868. Dr. Poe was a sound thinker, safe rather than brilliant in his theological views, colloquial rather than oratorical in his style of speech, ever interesting and instructive in the pulpit and on the platform. His life was genial and Christian. A man of sterling integrity of character and honesty of purpose, of sound and godly judgment, he enjoyed the confidence of the Church to a degree rarely awarded to living men. Traversing the circuit, laboring in the station, charged with the arduous administration of the expansive district, or managing the vast interests of the Western Book Concern, he was the same sincere-hearted man, with one single purpose, to do well the work committed to him by the Church. This was the grand secret of his success. Dr. Poe had a commanding presence. The spirit of benevolence ruled in his heart, and its winning sunshine beamed in his countenance. He was frank almost to bluntness, yet no one could mistake the generous impulses of his heart. He was fearless, but his courage was tempered with wisdom. He was social in a high degree; his winning smile, his genial spirit, and the facility and effectiveness with which he drew upon the rich storehouse of anecdote will not soon be forgotten by his intimate friends. Dr. Poe was greatly interested in the educational advantages of the Methodist Episcopal Church, but particularly the Ohio Wesleyan University, of which he may almost be said to have been the founder. His faith in the enterprise, and his devotion to it, were truly heroic. From its inception down to the hour of his death no personal or family interest was dearer to his heart than this grand, central educational institution of the Church in the state of Ohio. He was a member of the board of trustees from the time of its foundation. See bishop Clark, in the *Western Christian Advocate*, July 8, 1868; *Minutes of the North Ohio Conference*, p. 34 sq.; *N. Y. Christian Advocate*, July 4, 1868. (J. H. W.)

Poe, Daniel, a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and brother of the preceding, was born in Columbiana County, Ohio, Oct. 12, 1809. In August, 1825, he united with the Methodist Episcopal Church. Young as he was, he was soon appointed a class-leader, and was licensed to exhort. He prepared at an academy for college, and studied at Augusta College, Kentucky. He was licensed to preach, and admitted into the Ohio Conference, and appointed to travel the Letart Falls Circuit, where he labored acceptably and successfully. The next year he was appointed to the Eaton Circuit, and the year following to the Hamilton Circuit, and in 1835 to the Oxford Circuit. In May, 1836, he was sent to the Oneida and Menomonee Mission, west of Green Bay. He commenced a school among the Oneida Indians, and extended his visits to those at Brothertown, and other fragments of tribes scattered through the Wisconsin Territory, and finally succeeded in building up a flourishing mission, which continues to our day to exert a most salutary influence among this reclaimed savage tribe. In the autumn of 1838 Mr. Poe travelled on horseback, through an almost unbroken wilderness, from Green Bay to Alton, Ill., to attend the Illinois Conference. He was then transferred back to the Ohio Conference; but he could not get to Ohio in time to receive an appointment that year. In January, 1839, his brother, who was presiding elder of the Tiffin District, employed him on the Mexico Circuit, where he labored till the session of his Conference in September, 1839, when he was appointed to the M'Arthurstown Circuit. The next two years he was appointed to Tariton. In September, 1842, he was transferred to the Texas Conference. On his arrival there he addressed himself with his accustomed zeal and energy to his work, but one of the great wants of the country that first impressed him was the need of schools and teachers. In view of this destitution he returned to Ohio, in order to secure a corps of teachers. After a few months he returned to Texas, and shortly after commenced laying the foundations of an institution of learning at San Augustine. The next Conference resolved to adopt it and give it their patronage. But, besides this educational work, Mr. Poe served the San Augustine Circuit, which subjected him to the necessity of travelling some three hundred miles every four weeks. He kept up his engagements with regularity, and to the satisfaction of all concerned, but the exertion necessary to this end proved too much, and in 1844 he fell a prey to disease, and died after a very short illness. His last words were a testimony of the happy servant to whom the Master bade a hearty welcome. "Happy—very, very happy!" were the last words of Daniel Poe. "As a man of intellect," says bishop Morris, "I should place Poe considerably above the medium, though his mind was sober and practical rather than striking or brilliant. His perceptions were quick and clear, and he had that strong common-sense and sound, discriminating judgment that gave great weight to his counsels and great efficiency to his movements. In his moral constitution he was distinguished chiefly for the resolute and the heroic. He had a naturally kind and amiable spirit. He was far from being impetuous in his movements or hasty in his decisions; . . . but when his purpose was once deliberately and conscientiously formed, it was impossible to divert him from the course of his sober convictions. With the highest degree of physical courage, he united that higher courage which has its foundation in principle and in faith. The sentiment of fear, except as it had respect to God, never found a lodgment in his bosom." His preaching was such as might have been expected from his solid and well-disciplined mind, and his earnest, resolute, and eminently Christian spirit. He spoke with great simplicity and directness, but without any of the graces of oratory. His discourses were well-considered, well-digested expositions of divine truth. See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, vii, 786 sq.; Finley, *Sketches; Minutes of Conferences*, 1845. (J. H. W.)

Poelemberg, Kornelius, a Dutch painter, was born at Utrecht in 1586. His master was Abraham Bloemaert. He then went to Rome, where he en-

joyed the lessons of Adam Elzheimer (1600). A member of the academic rank, he was there called *Il Brusco* and *Il Satiro*. He Italianized his manner. His paintings were esteemed, and brought a good price even in Italy. Pope Paul V and the grand-duke of Tuscany, Ferdinand II, endeavored in vain to keep him. After a few months spent in Florence (1621), he went back to Holland, where his fame had preceded him. He was received with great honors; Rubens became his friend. Charles I called him to London, where Poelemberg painted a great deal; but he finally abandoned the service of the English monarch and returned to Utrecht, where he died, in 1660. His chief sacred works are: *The Birth of Jesus*, at Düsseldorf; *Lot and his Daughters;* the *Martyrdom of St. Stephen;* a *Flight to Egypt;* a *Holy Family;* an *Angel announcing to the Shepherds the Birth of the Saviour*, in the Louvre, and one of his best; etc. At the great exhibition at Manchester (1851) the portrait of Poelemberg and his wife, painted by himself, and several landscapes, were greatly admired. He left also some good *eau-fortes*, but his engravings are rare and out of the market. Poelemberg's manner is remarkable for suavity and lightness; it betokens great facility and an uncommon science of the chiaro-oscuro; his masses are large, his backgrounds and first plans full of harmony; the details, especially those related to architecture, are carefully worked out; his figures (generally naked females) are well grouped, but the drawing is seldom correct. See Descamps, *Vie des Peintres*, i, 214 sq.; Blanc, *La Vie des Peintres* (*École Hollandaise*), liv. 94; Spooner, *Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts*, s. v.; Mrs. Clement, *Handbook of Painters*, etc. p. 461.

Poelenburg, Arnold, a Dutch theologian, was born Sept. 12, 1628, at Horn, in the Netherlands, where he also became pastor in 1653, after having completed his studies. He removed to Rotterdam, and in 1659 became professor of theology of the Remonstrants (q. v.), and died Oct. 30, 1666. He wrote, *Confutatio disputationis Fr. Spanhemii de quinque articulis controversis, cum refutatione argumenti Guil. Tuissi, cui solvendo ne diabolum quidem et angelos ejus esse pares gloriatur: — Dissert. epistol. qua demonstratur non posse remonstrantes integra conscientia cum Contraremonstrantibus vel congregationis vel S. Synaxeos communionem colere:—Epistola ad Christ. Hartzaekerum in qua liber octavus summæ controversiarum Joh. Hornbeckii, qui est adversus remonstrantes refellitur*, etc. See Cattenburgh, in *Biblioth. Remonstrantium;* Jöcher, *Gelehrten-Lexikon*, s. v. (B. P.)

Pœnitentiālè Romanum, a collection of rules used in the Roman Catholic Church, prescribing the time and manner of penance, the forms of prayer to be employed for the reception of those who enter upon penance, and for reconciling penitents by solemn absolution. Its history can be traced to the ninth century. See Penitential.

Poet (ποιητής, *a doer*, as often translated) occurs but once in this sense in the Bible. Paul quotes the poet Aratus, a native, as well as himself, of Cilicia (Acts xvii, 28): "*We are the children* (*the race*) *of God.*" This is part of a longer passage, whose import is, "We must begin from Jupiter, whom we must by no means forget. Everything is replete with Jupiter. He fills the streets, the public places, and assemblies of men. The whole sea and its harbors are full of this god, and all of us in all places have need of Jupiter." It was certainly not to prove the being or to enhance the merit of Jupiter that Paul quotes this passage. But he has delivered out of bondage, as we may say, a truth which this poet had uttered, without penetrating its true meaning. The apostle used it to prove the existence of the true God, to a people not convinced of the divine authority of the Scriptures, and who would have rejected such proofs as he might have derived from thence. See Aratus.

The same apostle gives a pagan poet the name of prophet (Tit. i, 12, "One of themselves, even a prophet of their own, said," etc.), because, among the heathen, poets were thought to be inspired by Apollo. They spoke by enthusiasm. Oracles were originally delivered in verse. Poets were interpreters of the will of the gods. The poet quoted by Paul is Epimenides, whom the ancients esteemed to be inspired and favored by the gods. See Epimenides.

The son of Sirach, intent on praising eminent men, enumerates bards or poets; who were, he says, "Leaders of the people by their counsels, and by their knowledge of learning meet for the people; wise and eloquent in their instructions: such as found out musical tunes, and recited verses in writing" (Ecclus. xliv, 4). It is evident that he considered them as of great importance to the community; and we know that they were of great antiquity, for Moses, himself a poet, refers to those who spoke in proverbs (Numb. xxi, 27), of which he inserts a specimen. Jacob was a poet, as appears from his farewell benediction on his sons. It appears extremely probable that the honorable appellation Nebi equally denoted a prophet, a poet, and a musician, as the poets principally were. See Poetry.

Poetry, Hebrew. We propose here to discuss only the poetical elements of the Bible, or ancient Hebrew poetry. For the sake of brevity and perspicuity, we shall treat this subject under the distinct heads of the character of Hebrew poetry, its existing remains, its classification, its history, and its literature. In doing this we treat the subject from a modern scientific point of view.

I. *The Essential Character of Ancient Hebrew Poetry.*—Poetry is in its nature the language of the imagination stimulated by the passions. While prose expresses the calm statements of memory and observation, or the deliberate conclusions of the judgment, poetry gives utterance to the impulsive sentiments of the taste, the emotions and the aspirations of the heart. History can only appear in poetry in the guise of legend, and reasoning only in the form of animated colloquy. The phraseology is in keeping with the difference in spirit. Poetry tends to a more exalted and elaborate style of language in accordance with the fervid state of the mind. Hence the invention—spontaneous in most instances—of measure, whether of simple numbers or rhyme, to meet this overwrought state of the mental faculties. Biblical poetry partakes of these characteristics. It is distinguished from the prose compositions of the same book by its peculiarities of diction, as marked as those of other languages, although not so prosodiacal. The reader is at once made aware of entering the poetical domain by a certain elevation of style, and by the employment of more frequent and extended tropes, as well as by greater abruptness and more decided energy in the phraseology. The formal rhythm consists not—as in Greek and Latin, or even in the modern tongues—in a measured *quantity* of syllables of a particular length in utterance, but in a peculiar balance and antiphony of the clauses, constituting what is known as *parallelism*. Each of these peculiar traits of Hebrew poetry we take space to develop somewhat in detail.

One characteristic of Hebrew poetry, not indeed peculiar to it, but shared by it in common with the literature of other nations, is its intensely national and local coloring. The writers were Hebrews of the Hebrews, drawing their inspiration from the mountains and rivers of Palestine, which they have immortalized in their poetic figures, and even while uttering the sublimest and most universal truths never forgetting their own nationality in its narrowest and intensest form. Their images and metaphors, says Munk (*Palestine*, p. 444 *a*), "are taken chiefly from nature and the phenomena of Palestine and the surrounding countries, from the pastoral life, from agriculture and the national history. The stars of heaven, the sand of the sea-shore, are the image of a great multitude. Would they speak of a mighty host of enemies

invading the country, they are the swift torrents or the roaring waves of the sea, or the clouds that bring on a tempest; the war-chariots advance swiftly like lightning or the whirlwinds. Happiness rises as the dawn and shines like the daylight; the blessing of God descends like the dew or the bountiful rain; the anger of Heaven is a devouring fire that annihilates the wicked as the flame which devours the stubble. Unhappiness is likened to days of clouds and darkness; at times of great catastrophes the sun sets in broad day, the heavens are shaken, the earth trembles, the stars disappear, the sun is changed into darkness and the moon into blood, and so on. The cedars of Lebanon, the oaks of Bashan, are the image of the mighty man, the palm and the reed of the great and the humble, briers and thorns of the wicked; the pious man is an olive ever green, or a tree planted by the water-side. The animal kingdom furnished equally a large number of images: the lion, the image of power, is also, like the wolf, bear, etc., that of tyrants and violent and rapacious men; and the pious who suffers is a feeble sheep led to the slaughter. The strong and powerful man is compared to the he-goat or the bull of Bashan: the kine of Bashan figure, in the discourses of Amos, as the image of rich and voluptuous women; the people who rebel against the divine will are a refractory heifer. Other images are borrowed from the country life, and from the life domestic and social: the chastisement of God weighs upon Israel like a wagon laden with sheaves; the dead cover the earth as the dung which covers the surface of the fields. The impious man sows crime and reaps misery, or he sows the wind and reaps the tempest. The people yielding to the blows of their enemies are like the corn crushed beneath the threshing instrument. God tramples the wine in the wine-press when he chastises the impious and sheds their blood. The wrath of Jehovah is often represented as an intoxicating cup, which he causes those to empty who have merited his chastisement: terrors and anguish are often compared to the pangs of childbirth. Peoples, towns, and states are represented by the Hebrew poets under the image of daughters or wives; in their impiety they are courtesans or adulteresses. The historical allusions of most frequent occurrence are taken from the catastrophe of Sodom and Gomorrah, the miracles of the departure from Egypt, and the appearance of Jehovah on Sinai." Examples might easily be multiplied in illustration of this remarkable characteristic of the Hebrew poets: they stand thick upon every page of their writings, and in striking contrast to the vague generalizations of the Indian philosophic poetry. There is accordingly no poetry which bears a deeper or broader stamp of the peculiar influences under which it was produced. It never ceases to be Hebrew in order to become universal, and yet it is universal while it is Hebrew. The country, the clime, the institutions, the very peculiar religious institutions, rites, and observances, the very singular religious history of the Israelites, are all faithfully and vividly reflected in the Hebrew muse, so that no one song can ever be mistaken for a poem of any other people. Still it remains true that the heart of man, at least the heart of all the most civilized nations of the earth, has been moved and swayed, and is still pleasingly and most beneficially moved and swayed by the strains of Biblical poesy.

There is no ancient poetic age that can be put into comparison with that of the Hebrews but that of the two classic nations, Greece and Rome, and that of India. In form and variety we grant that the poetry of these nations surpasses that of the Hebrews. Epic poetry and the drama, the two highest styles so far as mere art is concerned, were cultivated successfully by them, while among the Israelites we find only their germs and first rudiments. So in execution we may also admit that, in the higher qualities of style, the Hebrew literature is somewhat inferior. But the thought is more than the expression; the kernel than the shell; and in substance the Hebrew poetry far surpasses every other. In truth, it dwells in a region to which other ancient literatures did not and could not attain—a pure, serene, moral, and religious atmosphere; thus dealing with man in his highest relations, first anticipating, and then leading onwards, mere civilization. This, as we shall presently see more fully, is the great characteristic of Hebrew poetry; it is also the highest merit of any literature, a merit in which that of the Hebrews is unapproached. To this high quality it is owing that the poetry of the Bible has exerted on the loftiest interests and productions of the human mind, for now above two thousand years, the most decided and the most beneficial influence. Moral and religious truth is deathless and undecaying; and so the griefs and the joys of David, or the far-seeing warnings and brilliant portrayings of Isaiah, repeat themselves in the heart of each successive generation, and become coexistent with the race of man. Thus of all moral treasuries the Bible is incomparably the richest. Even for forms of poetry, in which it is defective, or altogether fails, it presents the richest materials. Moses has not, as some have dreamed, left us an epic poem, but he has supplied the materials out of which the *Paradise Lost* was created. The sternly sublime drama of *Samson Agonistes* is constructed from a few materials found in a chapter or two which relate to the least cultivated period of the Hebrew republic. Indeed, most of the great poets, even of modern days, from Tasso down to Byron, all the great musicians, and nearly all the great painters, have drawn their best and highest inspiration from the Bible.

It may have struck the reader as somewhat curious that the poetical pieces of which we spoke above should, in the common version of the Bible, be scarcely, if at all, distinguishable from prose. We do not know whether there is anything extraordinary in this. Much of classical poetry, if turned into English prose, would lose most of its poetic characteristics; but, in general, the Hebrew poetry suffers less than perhaps any other by transfusion into a prosaic element: to which fact it is owing that the book of Psalms, in the English version, is, notwithstanding its form, eminently poetic. There are, however, cases in which only the experienced eye can trace the poetic in and under the prosaic attire in which it appears in the vulgar translation. Nor until the subject of Hebrew poetry had been long and well studied did the learned succeed in detecting many a poetic gem contained in the Bible. In truth, poetry and prose, from their very nature, stand near to each other, and in the earlier stages of their existence are discriminated only by faint and vanishing lines. If we regard the thought, prose sometimes even now rises to the loftiness of poetry. If we regard the clothing, the simpler form of poetry is scarcely more than prose; and rhetorical or measured prose passes into the domain of poetry. A sonnet of Wordsworth could be converted into prose with a very few changes; a fable of Krummacher requires only to be distributed into lines in order to make blank verse. Now in translations the form is for the most part lost; there remains only the substance, and poetic sentiment ranges from the humblest to the loftiest topics. So with the Hebrew poetry in its original and native state. Whether in its case poetry sprang from prose, or prose from poetry, they are both branches of one tree, and bear in their earlier stages a very close resemblance. The similarity is the greater in the literature of the Hebrews, because their poetic forms are less determinate than those of some other nations: they had, indeed, a rhythm; but so had their prose, and their poetic rhythm was more like that of our blank verse than of our rhymed metre. Of poetical feet they appear to have known nothing, and in consequence their verse must be less measured and less strict. Its melody was rather that of thought than of art and skill — spontaneous, like their religious feelings, and therefore deep and impressive, but less subject to law,

and escaping from the hard limits of exact definition. Rhyme, properly so called, is disowned as well as metre. Yet Hebrew verse, as it had a kind of measured tread, so had it a jingle in its feet, for several lines are sometimes found terminating with the same letter. In the main, however, its essential form was in the thought. Ideas are made to recur under such relations that the substance itself marks the form, and the two are so blended into one that their union is essential to constitute poetry. It is, indeed, incorrect to say that "the Hebrew poetry is characterized by the recurrence of similar ideas" (Latham's *English Language*, p. 372), if by this it is intended to intimate that such a peculiarity is the sole characteristic of Hebrew poetry. One, and that the chief, characteristic of that poetry is such recurrence; but there are also characteristics in form as well as in thought. Of these it may be sufficient to mention the following:

1. There is a *verbal rhythm*, in which a harmony is found beyond what prose ordinarily presents; but as the true pronunciation of the Hebrew has long been lost, this quality can only be imperfectly appreciated.

2. There is a *correspondence of words*, i. e. the words in one verse, or member, answer to the words in another; for as the sense in the one echoes the sense in the other, so also form corresponds with form, and word with word. This correspondence in form will fully appear when we give instances (see below) of the parallelism in sentiment; meanwhile an idea of it may be formed from these specimens:

> "Why art thou cast down, O my soul?
> And why art thou disquieted in me?"
> (Psa. xliii, 5).
>
> "The memory of the just is a blessing;
> But the name of the wicked shall rot"
> (Prov. x, 7).
>
> "He turneth rivers into a desert,
> And water-springs into dry ground"
> (Psa. cvii, 33).

In the original this similarity in construction is more exact and more apparent. At the same time it is a free and not a strict correspondence that prevails; a correspondence to be caught and recognised by the ear in the general progress of the poem, or the general structure of a couplet or a triplet, but which is not of a nature to be exactly measured or set forth by such aids as counting with the fingers will afford.

3. *Inversion* holds a distinguished place in the structure of Hebrew poetry, as in that of every other; yet here again the remark already made holds good; it is only a modified inversion that prevails, by no means (in general) equalling that of the Greeks and Romans in boldness, decision, and prevalence. Every one will, however, recognise this inversion in the following instances, as distinguishing the passages from ordinary prose:

> "Amid thought in visions of the night,
> When deep sleep falleth upon men,
> Fear and horror came upon me"
> (Job iv, 13).
>
> "To me men gave ear and waited,
> To my words they made no reply"
> (Job xxix, 21).
>
> "For three transgressions of Damascus,
> And for four will I not turn away its punishment"
> (Amos i, 3).
>
> "His grave was appointed with the wicked,
> And with the rich man was his sepulchre"
> (Isa. liii, 9).

4. The chief characteristics, however, of Hebrew poetry are found in the peculiar form in which it gives utterance to its ideas. This form has received the name of "*parallelism*." Ewald justly prefers the term "thought-rhythm," since the rhythm, the music, the peculiar flow and harmony of the verse and of the poem, lie in the distribution of the sentiment in such a manner that the full import does not come out in less than a distich. The leading principle is that a simple verse or distich consists, both in regard to form and substance, of two corresponding members: this has been termed Hebrew rhythm, or *parallelismus membrorum*. Three kinds may be specified:

(1.) There is, first, the *synonymous parallelism*, which consists in this, that the two members express the same thought in different words, so that sometimes word answers to word; for example:

> "What is man that thou art mindful of him,
> And the son of man that thou carest for him!"
> (Psa. viii, 4).

There is in some cases an inversion in the second line:

> "The heavens relate the glory of God,
> And the work of his hands the firmament declares"
> (Psa. xix, 2).
>
> "He maketh his messengers the winds,
> His ministers the flaming lightning"
> (Psa. civ, 4).

Very often the second member repeats only a part of the first:

> "Woe to them that join house to house,
> That field to field unite" (Isa. v, 8).

Sometimes the verb which stands in the first member is omitted in the second:

> "O God, thy justice give the king,
> And thy righteousness to the king's son"
> (Psa. lxxii, 1).

Or the verb may be in the second member:

> "With the jawbone of an ass, heaps upon heaps,
> With the jawbone of an ass have I slain a thousand men" (Judg. xv, 16).

The second member may contain an expansion of the first:

> "Give to Jehovah, ye sons of God,
> Give to Jehovah glory and praise" (Psa. xxix, 1).

Indeed the varieties are numerous, since the synonymous parallelism is very frequent.

(2.) The second kind is the *antithetic*, in which the first member is illustrated by some opposition of thought contained in the second. This less customary kind of parallelism is found mostly in the Proverbs:

> "The full man treadeth the honey-comb under foot,
> To the hungry every bitter thing is sweet"
> (Prov. xxvii, 7).

Under this head comes the following, with other similar examples:

> "Day to day uttereth instruction,
> And night to night showeth knowledge"
> (Psa. xix, 2).

(3.) The third kind is denominated the *synthetic*: probably the term *epithetic* would be more appropriate, since the second member not being a mere echo of the first, subjoins something new to it, while the same structure of the verse is preserved; thus:

> "He appointed the moon for seasons;
> The sun knoweth his going down" (Psa. civ, 19).
>
> "The law of Jehovah is perfect, reviving the soul;
> The precepts of Jehovah are sure, instructing the simple" (Psa. xix, 7).

5. Intimately connected with the parallelistic structure is the *strophic arrangement* of Hebrew poetry. Usually the parallelism itself furnishes the basis of the versification. This correspondence in thought is not, however, of universal occurrence. We find a merely rhythmical parallelism in which the thought is not repeated, but goes forward throughout the verse, which is divided midway into two halves or a distich:

> "The word is not upon the tongue,
> Jehovah thou knowest it altogether"
> (Psa. cxxxviii, 4).
>
> "Gird as a man thy loins,
> I will ask thee; inform thou me"
> (Job xxxix, 3).

Here poetry distinguishes itself from prose chiefly by the division into two short equal parts. This peculiarity of poetic diction is expressed by the word זָמַר, *to sing* (strictly *to play*), which properly denotes dividing the matter, and so speaking or singing in separated portions. Among the Arabians, who, however, have syllabic measure, each verse is divided into two hemistichs

by a cæsura in the middle. The simple two-membered rhythm hitherto described prevails especially in the book of Job, the Proverbs, and a portion of the Psalms; but in the last, and still more in the Prophets, there are numerous verses with three, four, or yet more members. In verses consisting of three members (tristicha) sometimes all three are parallel:

"Happy the man who walketh not in the paths of the unrighteous,
Nor standeth in the way of sinners,
Nor sitteth in the seat of scoffers" (Psa. i, 1).

Sometimes two of the members stand opposed to the third:

"To all the world goes forth their sound,
To the end of the world their words;
For the sun he places a tabernacle in them"
(Psa. xix, 4).

Verses of four members contain either two simple parallels:

"With righteousness shall he judge the poor,
And decide with equity for the afflicted of the people;
He shall smite the earth with the rod of his mouth;
With the breath of his lips shall he slay the wicked"
(Isa. xi, 4).

Or the first and third answer to each other; also the second and fourth:

"That smote the people in anger
With a continual stroke;
That lorded it over the nations in wrath
With unremitted oppression" (Isa. xiv, 6).

If the members are more numerous or disproportionate (Isa. xi, 11), or if the parallelism is important or irregular, the diction of poetry is lost and prose ensues; as is the case in Isa. v, 1–6, and frequently in the later prophets, as Jeremiah and Ezekiel. The strophe, however, is frequently preserved in a quite extended form with several subdivisions, and the parallelism is often carried out in subordinate clauses; instances of this are very common, especially in the book of Ecclesiastes. (See § iv, below.)

It is not to be supposed that each poem consists exclusively of one set of verse; for though this feature does present itself, yet frequently several kinds are found together in one composition, so as to give great ease, freedom, and capability to the style. We select the following beautiful specimen, because a chorus is introduced:

DAVID'S LAMENT OVER SAUL AND JONATHAN.

The Gazelle, O Israel, has been cut down on thy heights!

Chorus. How are the mighty fallen!

Tell it not in Gath, publish it not in the streets of Ascalon,
Lest the daughters of the Philistines rejoice,
Lest the daughters of the uncircumcised exult.

Hills of Gilboa, no dew nor rain come upon you, devoted fields!
For there is stained the heroes' bow,
Saul's bow, never anointed with oil.

From the blood of the slain, from the fat of the mighty,
The bow of Jonathan turned not back,
And the sword of Saul came not idly home.

Saul and Jonathan! lovely and pleasant in life!
And in death ye were not divided;
Swifter than eagles, stronger than lions!

Ye daughters of Israel! weep for Saul!
He clothed you delicately in purple,
He put ornaments of gold on your apparel.

Chorus. How are the mighty fallen in the midst of the battle!
O Jonathan, slain in thy high places!

I am distressed for thee, brother Jonathan,
Very pleasant wast thou to me,
Wonderful was thy love, more than the love of woman.

Chorus. How are the mighty fallen,
And the weapons of war perished!

We have chosen this ode not only for its singular beauty, but also because it presents another quality of Hebrew poetry—the strophe. In this poem there are three strophes marked by the recurrence three times of the dirge sung by the chorus. The chorus appears to have consisted of three parts, corresponding with the parties more immediately addressed in the three several portions of the poem. The first choral song is sung by the entire body of singers, representing Israel; the second is sung by a chorus of maidens; the third, by first a chorus of youths in a soft and mournful strain, and then by all the choir in full and swelling chorus. But in order to the reader's fully understanding with what noble effect these "songs of Zion" came on the souls of their hearers, an accurate idea must be formed of the music of the Hebrews. See MUSIC. Referring to the articles which bear on the subject, we merely remark that both music and dancing were connected with sacred song in its earliest manifestations, though it was only at a comparatively late period, when David and Solomon had given their master-powers to the grand performances of the Temple-service, that poetry came forth in all its excellence, and music lent its full aid to its solemn and sublime sentiments.

6. In Hebrew, as in other languages, there is a peculiarity about the diction used in poetry—a kind of poetical dialect, characterized by archaic and irregular forms of words, abrupt constructions, and unusual inflections, which distinguish it from the contemporary prose or historical style. It is universally observed that archaic forms and usages of words linger in the poetry of a language after they have fallen out of ordinary use. A few of these forms and usages are here given from Gesenius's *Lehrgebäude.* The Piel and Hiphil voices are used intransitively (Jer. li, 56; Ezek. x, 7; Job xxix, 24): the apocopated future is used as a present (Job xv, 33; Psa. xi, 6; Isa. xlii, 6). The termination תִ־ is found for the ordinary feminine תָ־ (Exod. xv, 2; Gen. xlix, 22; Psa. cxxxii, 4); and for the plural תֶם־ we have תֶן־ (Job xv, 13; Ezek. xxvi, 18) and תֵ־ (Jer. xxii, 14; Amos vii, 1). The verbal suffixes, מוֹ, מָ־, and מוֹ־ (Exod. xv, 9), and the pronominal suffixes to nouns, מוֹ for מָ־, and רוּ־ for רִי־ (Hab. iii, 10), are peculiar to the poetical books; as are וֹתַר (Psa. cxvi, 12), רְמוֹ־ (Deut. xxxii, 37; Psa. xi, 7), and the more unusual forms, רְהַמָּה־ (Ezek. xl, 16), רְהֶנָּה־ (Ezek. i, 11), רְכֶנָּה־ (Ezek. xiii, 20). In poetical language also we find לָמוֹ for לוֹ or לָהֶם, לָמוֹ for לְ, בְּמוֹ for בְּ, כָּמוֹ for כְּ; the plural forms of the prepositions, אֵלֵי for אֶל, עֵדֵי for עַד, עֲלֵי for עַל; and the peculiar forms of the nouns, חַרְרֵי for חָרְרִי, חָרְרִי for חַרְרֵי, עֲמָמִים for עַמִּים, and so on.

II. *Existing Remains of Ancient Hebrew Poetry.*—The poetry which is found in the Bible, rich and multifarious as it is, appears to be only a remnant of a still wider and fuller sphere of Shemitic literature. The New Testament is in fact comprised in our definition, for, besides scattered portions, which, under a prosaic form, convey a poetic thought, the entire book of the Apocalypse abounds in poetry. In no nation was the union of the requisites of which we have spoken above found in fuller measure than among the Hebrews. Theirs was eminently a poetic temperament; their earliest history was a heroic without ceasing to be a historic age, while the loftiest of all truths circulated in their souls, and glowed on and started from their lips. Hence their language, in its earliest stages, is surpassingly poetic. In one sense the Bible is full of poetry; for very much of its contents, which is merely prosaic in form, rises, by force of the noble sentiments which it enunciates, and the striking or splendid imagery with which these sentiments are adorned, into the sphere of real poetry. Independently of this poetic prose, there is in the Bible much writing which has all the ordinary characteristics of poetry. Even the unlearned reader can hardly fail to recognise at once the essence of poetry in various parts of the Bible. It is no slight attestation to the essentially poetic character of Hebrew poetry that its poetical qualities shine through the distorting coverings of a prose translation. Much of the Biblical poetry is, indeed, hidden from the ordinary reader by its prose ac-

companiments, standing, as it does, undistinguished in the midst of historical narrations.

It is a phenomenon which is universally observed in the literature of all nations, that the earliest form in which the thoughts and feelings of a people find utterance is the poetic. Prose is an aftergrowth, the vehicle of less spontaneous, because more formal, expression. Snatches of poetry are discovered in the oldest prose compositions. Even in Gen. iv, 23 sq. are found a few lines of poetry, which Herder incorrectly terms "the song of the sword," thinking it commemorative of the first formation of that weapon. To us it appears to be a fragment of a larger poem, uttered in lamentation for a homicide committed by Lamech, probably in self-defence. See LAMECH. Herder finds in this piece all the characteristics of Hebrew poetry. It is, he thinks, lyrical, has a proportion between its several lines, and even assonance; in the original the first four lines terminate with the same letter, making a single or semi-rhyme.

Another poetic scrap is found in Exod. xxxii, 18. Being told by Joshua, on occasion of descending from the mount, when the people had made the golden calf, and were tumultuously offering it their worship—

"The sound of war is in the camp;"

Moses said:

"Not the sound of a shout for victory,
Nor the sound of a shout for falling;
The sound of a shout for rejoicing

do I hear." The correspondence in form in the original is here very exact and striking, so that it is difficult to deny that the piece is poetic. If so, are we to conclude that the temperament of the Israelites was so deeply poetic that Moses and Joshua should find the excitement of this occasion sufficient to strike improvisatore verses from their lips? Or have we here a quotation from some still older song, which occurred to the minds of the speakers by the force of resemblance? Other instances of scattered poetic pieces may be found in Numb. xxi, 14, 15; also ver. 18 and 27; in which passages evidence may be found that we are not in possession of the entire mass of Hebrew, or, at least, Shemitic literature. Further specimens of very early poetry are found in Numb. xxiii, 7 sq., 18 sq.; xxiv, 3, 15. The ordinary train of thought and feeling presented in Hebrew poetry is entirely of a moral or religious kind; but there are occasions when other topics are introduced. The entire Song of Solomon many regard as purely an erotic idyl, and considered as such it possesses excellences of a very high description. In Amos vi, 3 sq. may be seen a fine passage of satire in a denunciation of the luxurious and oppressive aristocracy of Israel. Subjects of a similar secular kind may be found treated, yet never without a moral or religious aim, in Isa. ix, 3; Jer. xxv, 10; xlviii, 33; Rev. xviii, 22 sq. But, independently of the Song of Solomon, the most sensuous ode is perhaps the 45th Psalm, which Herder and Ewald consider an epithalamium. Further illustrations of this part of the subject appear under the next division.

The poetical character of the Revelation of John is evident to every attentive reader. Many parts are professedly songs, formal expressions of praise, triumph, or mourning. The language is not only highly figurative, but it everywhere abounds with the most poetical images and modes of expression. Bishop Jebb has presented some of the songs in the form of Hebrew poetry; and Prof. Stuart has shown the metrical arrangement of a few other portions; he has also expressed his conviction that the form of poetry, as well as its spirit, prevails to a great extent throughout the work. The references to the Old Test. in this book are more numerous than in any other book of the New Test.; and they are not simple quotations, nor the transference of thought to a less poetic style of expression; but they are imitations, in general more poetic than the original. That they are presented in the form of Hebrew, and not of Grecian poetry, can occasion no surprise. No other poetry would accord, either with the habit of the apostle, or with the general character and design of the Bible. But this form of poetry would perfectly harmonize with both. The poetry of the Revelation of John appears to consist of the same description of parallelisms, with those intercalary lines and other irregularities which are found in the larger specimens of Hebrew poetry. The species of parallelism which most prevails is the synthetic or constructive; the others being obviously less suitable to the subject of the composition. There are, however, instances of every kind. Indeed, this book not only possesses the form and the spirit of Hebrew poetry, but it exhibits as much regularity in its parallelisms as any Hebrew poetry with which it can be justly compared. We give the following passages (Rev. i, 1, 5, 6; xxi, 23):

"The revelation of Jesus Christ,
Which God to him imparted,
To indicate unto his servants
What must come to pass ere long.

"To Him who loveth us, and washed us
From our sins in his own blood:
And constituted us a kingdom,
Priests unto God, even his Father,
To him be glory and dominion,
For ever and ever, Amen!

"And the city has no need of the sun
Nor of the moon to shine in it;
For the glory of God illumines it,
And the light thereof is the Lamb."

III. *Classification of Poetic Styles.*—1. *According to the Ancient Hebrew Designations.*—These appear to have special, if not exclusive reference to what is now known as *lyric* poetry. The terms are of two classes. See PSALMS.

a. General titles, referring apparently to the musical *form* or purpose of the compositions.

(1.) שִׁיר, *shîr*, a song in general, adapted for the voice alone.

(2.) מִזְמוֹר, *mizmôr*, which Ewald considers a lyric song, properly so called, but which rather seems to correspond with the Greek ψαλμός, a psalm, or song to be sung with any instrumental accompaniment. See PSALM.

(3.) נְגִינָה, *neginâh*, which Ewald is of opinion is equivalent to the Greek ψαλμός, is more probably a melody expressly adapted for stringed instruments.

(4.) מַשְׂכִּיל, *maskîl*, of which it may be said that if Ewald's suggestion be not correct, that it denotes a lyrical song requiring nice musical skill, it is difficult to give any more probable explanation. See MASCHIL.

(5.) מִכְתָּם, *miktâm*, a term of extremely doubtful meaning. See MICHTAM.

(6.) שִׁגָּיוֹן, *shiggayôn* (Psa. vii, 1), a wild, irregular, dithyrambic song, as the word appears to denote; or, according to some, a song to be sung with variations. The former is the more probable meaning. The plural occurs in Hab. iii, 1. See SHIGGAION.

b. But, besides these, there are other divisions of lyrical poetry of great importance, which have regard rather to the *subject* of the poems than to their form or adaptation for musical accompaniments. Of these we notice:

(1.) תְּהִלָּה, *tehillâh*, a hymn of praise. The plural *tehillîm* is the title of the book of Psalms in Hebrew. The 145th Psalm is entitled "David's (Psalm) of praise;" and the subject of the psalm is in accordance with its title, which is apparently suggested by the concluding verse, "The *praise* of Jehovah my mouth shall speak, and let all flesh bless his holy name for ever and ever." To this class belong the songs which relate to extraordinary deliverances, such as the songs of Moses (Exod. xv) and of Deborah (Judg. v), and the Psalms xviii and lxviii, which have all the air of chants to be sung in triumphal processions. Such were the hymns sung in the Temple-services, and by a bold figure the Almighty is apostrophized as "Thou that inhabitest the *praises* of Israel," which rose in the holy

place with the fragrant clouds of incense (Psa. xxii, 3). To the same class also Ewald refers the shorter poems of the like kind with those already quoted, such as Psa. xxx, xxxii, cxxxviii, and Isa. xxxviii, which relate to less general occasions, and commemorate more special deliverances. The songs of victory sung by the congregation in the Temple, as Psa. xlvi, xlviii, xxiv, 7–10, which is a short triumphal ode, and Psa. xxix, which praises Jehovah on the occasion of a great natural phenomenon, are likewise all to be classed in this division of lyric poetry. See HYMN.

(2.) קִינָה, *kinâh*, the lament, or dirge, of which there are many examples, whether uttered over an individual or as an outburst of grief for the calamities of the land. The most touchingly pathetic of all is perhaps the lament of David for the death of Saul and Jonathan (2 Sam. i, 19–27), in which passionate emotion is blended with touches of tenderness of which only a strong nature is capable. Compare with this the lament for Abner (2 Sam. iii, 33, 34) and for Absalom (xviii, 33). Of the same character also, doubtless, were the songs which the singing men and singing women spake over Josiah at his death (2 Chron. xxxv, 25), and the songs of mourning for the disasters which befell the hapless land of Judah, of which Psalms xlix, lx, lxxiii, cxxxvii are examples (comp. Jer. vii, 29; ix, 10 [9]), and the Lamentations of Jeremiah the most memorable instances. See LAMENTATION.

(3.) שִׁיר יְדִידֹת, *shîr yedidôth*, a love-song (Psa. xlv, 1), in its external form at least. See CANTICLES.

(4.) תְּפִלָּה, *tĕphillâh*, prayer, is the title of Psa. xvii, lxxxvi, xc, cii, cxlii, and Hab. iii. All these are strictly lyrical compositions, and the title may have been assigned to them either as denoting the object with which they were written, or the use to which they were applied. As Ewald justly observes, all lyric poetry of an elevated kind, in so far as it reveals the soul of the poet in a pure swift outpouring of itself, is of the nature of a prayer; and hence the term "prayer" was applied to a collection of David's songs, of which Psa. lxxii formed the conclusion. See PRAYER.

Other kinds of poetry there are which occupy the middle ground between the lyric and gnomic, being lyric in form and spirit, but gnomic in subject. These may be classed as—

(5.) מָשָׁל, *mashâl*, properly a similitude, and then a parable, or sententious saying, couched in poetic language. Such are the songs of Balaam (Numb. xxiii, 7, 18; xxiv, 3, 15, 20, 21, 23), which are eminently lyrical in character; the mocking ballad in Numb. xxi, 27–30, which has been conjectured to be a fragment of an old Amoritish war-song; and the apologue of Jotham (Judg. ix, 7–20), both which last are strongly satirical in tone. But the finest of all is the magnificent prophetic song of triumph over the fall of Babylon (Isa. xiv, 4–27).

(6.) חִידָה, *chidâh*, an enigma (like the riddle of Samson, Judg. xiv, 14), or "dark saying," as the A. V. has it in Psa. xlix, 5; lxxviii, 2. The former passage illustrates the musical, and therefore lyrical character of these "dark sayings:" "I will incline mine ear to a parable, I will open my dark sayings upon the harp." *Mashâl* and *chidâh* are used as convertible terms in Ezek. xvii, 2.

(7.) Lastly, to this class belongs מְלִיצָה, *melitsâh*, a mocking, ironical poem (Hab. ii, 6).

2. *The Masoretic Distribution.*—The Jewish grammarians have attached the poetic accentuation only to the three books of Psalms, Job, and Proverbs. There is no doubt that the Song of Solomon is also poetical; and with these the book of Ecclesiastes was anciently, as it is still usually, conjoined, though the form of composition is less decidedly poetical. To these five are to be added the Lamentations of Jeremiah, and the smaller pieces scattered over the historical and prophetic writings. Keeping these latter out of view, we may say that the Hebrew poetical books are six in number; and these six may be divided into two groups of three, according to the class of poetical composition to which each belongs, viz.: (1) Psalms, Song of Solomon, and Lamentations, which are predominantly *lyrical* in their character; and (2) Proverbs, Job, and Ecclesiastes, which are predominantly *didactic*. In the former the leading aim of the poet is not to instruct, but to give free utterance to the feelings of his own heart; in the latter the instruction of others is the object that is principally aimed at; though neither is the lyrical element altogether excluded from the latter, nor the didactic from the former. Of the more sustained and elaborate epic and dramatic poetry—which was alike alien to the character of the Hebrew mind, and also in a certain measure inconsistent with the purpose of the Hebrew writings as a divine revelation—we have no examples, though some have applied the term "dramatic" in a loose sense to the book of Job, and in a more strict sense to the Song of Solomon.

3. *Modern Terminology.*—For *epic poetry* the constituent elements do not appear to have existed during the classic period of the Hebrew muse, since epic poetry requires a heroic age — an age, that is, of fabulous wonders, and falsely so-called divine interpositions. But among the Israelites the patriarchal, which might have been the heroic age, was an age of truth and reality; and it much raises the religious and historical value of the Biblical literature that neither the singular events of the age of the patriarchs, nor the wonderful events of the age of Moses, nor the confused and somewhat legendary events of the age of the Judges, ever degenerated into mythology, nor passed from the reality, which was their essence, into the noble fictions into which the imagination, if unchastened and unchecked by religion, might have wrought them; but they retained through all periods their own essential character of earnest, lofty, and impressive realities. At a later period, when the religion of Moses had, during the Babylonian captivity, been lowered by the corruptions of the religion of Zoroaster, and an entirely new world of thought introduced, based not on reality but fancy, emanating not from the pure light of heaven, but from the mingled lights and shadows of primitive tradition and human speculation — then there came into existence among the Jews the elements necessary for epic poetry; but the days were gone in which the mind of the nation had the requisite strength and culture to fashion them into a great, uniform, and noble structure; and if we can allow that the Hebrews possessed the rudimental outlines of the epic, we must seek for them not in the canonical, but in the apocryphal books; and while we deny with emphasis that the term Epos can be applied, as some German critics have applied it, to the Pentateuch, we can find only in the book of Judith, and with rather more reason in that of Tobit, anything which approaches to epic poetry. Indeed fiction, which, if it is not the essence, enters for a very large share into both epic and dramatic poetry, was wholly alien from the genius of the Hebrew muse, whose high and noble function was not to invent, but to celebrate the goodness of God; not to indulge the fancy, but to express the deepest feelings of the soul; not to play with words and feign emotions, but to utter profound truth and commemorate real events, and pour forth living sentiments.

Of the three kinds of poetry which are illustrated by the Hebrew literature, the *lyric* occupies the foremost place, commencing, as we have seen, in the pre-Mosaic times, flourishing in rude vigor during the earlier periods of the Judges, the heroic age of the Hebrews, growing with the nation's growth and strengthening with its strength, till it reached its highest excellence in David, the warrior-poet, and thenceforth began slowly to decline. In this period art, though subordinate, was not neglected, as indeed is proved by the noble lyrics which have come down to us, and in which the art is

only relatively small and low—that is, the art is inconsiderable and secondary—merely because the topics are so august, the sentiments so grand, the religious impression so profound and sacred. At later periods, when the first fresh gushing of the muse had ceased, art in Hebrew, as is the case in all other poetry, began to claim a larger share of attention, and stands in the poems for a greater portion of their merit. Then the play of the imagination grew predominant over the spontaneous outpourings of the soul, and among other creations of the fancy alphabetical poems were produced, in which the matter is artistically distributed sometimes under two-and-twenty heads or divisions, corresponding with the number of the Hebrew letters.

Gnomic poetry is the product of a more advanced age than the lyric. It arises from the desire felt by the poet to express the results of the accumulated experiences of life in a form of beauty and permanence. Its thoughtful character requires for its development a time of peacefulness and leisure; for it gives expression, not like the lyric to the sudden and impassioned feelings of the moment, but to calm and philosophic reflection. Being less spontaneous in its origin, its form is of necessity more artificial. The gnomic poetry of the Hebrews has not its measured flow disturbed by the shock of arms or the tumult of camps; it rises silently, like the Temple of old, without the sound of a weapon, and its groundwork is the home life of the nation. The period during which it flourished corresponds to its domestic and settled character. From the time of David onwards through the reigns of the earlier kings, when the nation was quiet and at peace, or, if not at peace, at least so firmly fixed in its acquired territory that its wars were no struggle for existence, gnomic poetry blossomed and bore fruit. We meet with it at intervals up to the time of the Captivity, and, as it is chiefly characteristic of the age of the monarchy, Ewald has appropriately designated this æra the "artificial period" of Hebrew poetry. From the end of the 8th century B.C. the decline of the nation was rapid, and with its glory departed the chief glories of its literature. The poems of this period are distinguished by a smoothness of diction and an external polish which betray tokens of labor and art; the style is less flowing and easy, and, except in rare instances, there is no dash of the ancient vigor. After the Captivity we have nothing but the poems which formed part of the liturgical services of the Temple.

Whether *dramatic* poetry, properly so called, ever existed among the Hebrews, is, to say the least, extremely doubtful. In the opinion of some writers the Song of Songs, in its external form, is a rude drama, designed for a simple stage. But the evidence for this view is extremely slight, and no good and sufficient reasons have been adduced which would lead us to conclude that the amount of dramatic action exhibited in that poem is more than would be involved in an animated poetic dialogue in which more than two persons take part. Philosophy and the drama appear alike to have been peculiar to the Indo-Germanic nations, and to have manifested themselves among the Shemitic tribes only in their crudest and most simple form.

Each of these forms of poetry, as they appear in the Bible, requires a more distinct notice separately.

(1.) *Lyrical Poetry.*—The literature of the Hebrews abounds with illustrations of all forms of lyrical poetry, in its most manifold and wide-embracing compass, from such short ejaculations as the songs of the two Lamechs, and Psa. xv, cxvii, and others, to the longer chants of victory and thanksgiving, like the songs of Deborah and David (Judg. v; Psa. xviii). The thoroughly national character of all lyrical poetry has already been alluded to. It is the utterance of the people's life in all its varied phases, and expresses all its most earnest strivings and impulses. In proportion as this expression is vigorous and animated, the idea embodied in lyric song is in most cases narrowed or rather concentrated. One truth, and even one side of a truth, is for the time invested with the greatest prominence. All these characteristics will be found in perfection in the lyric poetry of the Hebrews. One other feature which distinguishes it is its form and its capacity for being set to musical accompaniment. The names by which the various kinds of song were known among the Hebrews will supply some illustration of this. (See above.)

(2.) *Gnomic Poetry.*—The second grand division of Hebrew poetry is occupied by a class of poems which are peculiarly Shemitic, and which represent the nearest approaches made by the people of that race to anything like philosophic thought. Reasoning there is none: we have only results, and these rather the product of observation and reflection than of induction or argumentation. As lyric poetry is the expression of the poet's own feelings and impulses, so gnomic poetry is the form in which the desire of communicating knowledge to others finds vent. There might possibly be an intermediate stage in which the poets gave out their experiences for their own pleasure merely, and afterwards applied them to the instruction of others, but this could scarcely have been of long continuance. The impulse to teach makes the teacher, and the teacher must have an audience. It has already been remarked that gnomic poetry, as a whole, requires for its development a period of national tranquillity. Its germs are the floating proverbs which pass current in the mouths of the people, and embody the experiences of many with the wit of one. From this small beginning it arises, at a time when the experience of the nation has become matured, and the mass of truths which are the result of such experience have passed into circulation. The fame of Solomon's wisdom was so great that no less than three thousand proverbs are attributed to him, this being the form in which the Hebrew mind found its most congenial utterance. The sayer of sententious sayings was to the Hebrews the wise man, the philosopher. Of the earlier isolated proverbs but few examples remain. One of the earliest occurs in the mouth of David, and in his time it was the proverb of the ancients, "From the wicked cometh wickedness" (1 Sam. xxiv, 13 [14]). Later on, when the fortunes of the nation were obscured, their experience was embodied in terms of sadness and despondency: "The days are prolonged, and every vision faileth," became a saying and a byword (Ezek. xii, 22); and the feeling that the people were suffering for the sins of their fathers took the form of a sentence, "The fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge" (Ezek. xviii, 2). Such were the models which the gnomic poet had before him for imitation. These detached sentences may fairly be assumed to be the earliest form, of which the fuller apophthegm is the expansion, swelling into sustained exhortations, and even dramatic dialogue. See PROVERB.

(3.) *Dramatic Poetry.*—The drama, in the sense in which the phrase is applicable to productions such as those of Euripides, Shakespeare, or Schiller, had no place in the literature of the Hebrews. This defect may be owing to a want of the requisite literary cultivation. Yet we are not willing to assign this as the cause, when we call to mind the high intellectual culture which the Hebrews evinced in lyric and didactic poetry, out of which the drama seems naturally to spring. We rather look for the cause of this in the earnest nature of the Hebrews, and in the solemnity of the subjects with which they had to do in their literary productions. Nor is it any objection to this hypothesis that the drama of modern times had its birth in the religious mysteries of the Middle Ages, since those ages were only secondary in regard to religious truth, standing at a distance from the great realities which they believed and dramatized; whereas the objects of faith with the Israelites were held in all the fresh vividness of primitive facts and newly recognised truths. It is impossible, however, to assert that no form of the drama existed among the Hebrew people; the most that can be done is to examine

such portions of their literature as have come down to us, for the purpose of ascertaining how far any traces of the drama proper are discernible, and what inferences may be made from them. It is unquestionably true, as Ewald observes, that the Arab reciters of romances will many times in their own persons act out a complete drama in recitation, changing their voice and gestures with the change of person and subject. Something of this kind may possibly have existed among the Hebrews; but there is no evidence that it did exist, nor any grounds for making even a probable conjecture with regard to it. A rude kind of farce is described by Mr. Lane (*Mod. Egypt*, ii, ch. vii), the players of which "are called *Mohabbazîn*. These frequently perform at the festivals prior to weddings and circumcisions at the houses of the great; and sometimes attract rings of auditors and spectators in the public places in Cairo. Their performances are scarcely worthy of description: it is chiefly by vulgar gestures and indecent actions that they amuse and obtain applause. The actors are only men and boys, the part of a woman being always performed by a man or boy in female attire." Then follows a description of one of these plays, the plot of which was extremely simple. But the mere fact of the existence of these rude exhibitions among the Arabs and Egyptians of the present day is of no weight when the question to be decided is whether the Song of Songs was designed to be so represented, as a simple, pastoral drama. Of course, in considering such a question, reference is made only to the external form of the poem, and, in order to prove it, it must be shown that the dramatic is the only form of representation which it could assume, and not that, by the help of two actors and a chorus, it is capable of being exhibited in a dramatic form. All that has been done, in our opinion, is the latter. It is but fair, however, to give the views of those who hold the opposite. Ewald maintains that the Song of Songs is designed for a simple stage, because it develops a complete action and admits of definite pauses in the action, which are only suited to the drama. He distinguishes it in this respect from the book of Job, which is dramatic in form only, though, as it is occupied with a sublime subject, he compares it with *tragedy*, while the Song of Songs, being taken from the common life of the nation, may be compared to *comedy*. But M. Rénan, who is compelled, in accordance with his own theory of the mission of the Shemitic races, to admit that no trace of anything approaching to the regular drama is found among them, does not regard the Song of Songs as a drama in the same sense as the products of the Greek and Roman theatres, but as dramatic poetry in the widest application of the term, to designate any composition conducted in dialogue and corresponding to an action. The absence of the regular drama he attributes to the want of a complicated mythology, analogous to that possessed by the Indo-European peoples. Monotheism, the characteristic religious belief of the Shemitic races, stifled the growth of a mythology and checked the development of the drama. Be this as it may, dramatic representation appears to have been alien to the feelings of the Hebrews. At no period of their history before the age of Herod is there the least trace of a theatre at Jerusalem, whatever other foreign innovations may have been adopted; and the burst of indignation which the high-priest Jason incurred for attempting to establish a gymnasium and to introduce the Greek games is a significant symptom of the repugnance which the people felt for such spectacles. The same antipathy remains to the present day among the Arabs, and the attempts to introduce theatres at Beyrût and in Algeria have signally failed. But, says M. Rénan, the Song of Songs is a dramatic poem: there were no public performances in Palestine, therefore it must have been represented in private; and he is compelled to frame the following hypothesis concerning it: that it is a *libretto* intended to be completed by the play of the actors and by music, and represented in private families, probably at marriage-feasts, the representation being extended over the several days of the feast. The last supposition removes a difficulty which has been felt to be almost fatal to the idea that the poem is a continuously developed drama. Each act is complete in itself; there is no suspended interest, and the structure of the poem is obvious and natural if we regard each act as a separate drama intended for one of the days of the feast. We must look for a parallel to it in the Middle Ages, when, besides the mystery plays, there were scenic representations sufficiently developed. See CANTICLES.

It is scarcely necessary after this to discuss the question whether the book of Job is a dramatic poem or not. Inasmuch as it represents an action and a progress, it is a drama as truly and really as any poem can be which develops the working of passion, and the alternations of faith, hope, distrust, triumphant confidence, and black despair, in the struggle which it depicts the human mind as engaged in, while attempting to solve one of the most intricate problems it can be called upon to regard. It is a drama as life is a drama, the most powerful of all tragedies; but that it is a dramatic poem, intended to be represented upon a stage, or capable of being so represented, may be confidently denied. See JOB, BOOK OF.

(4.) *Acrostics.*—It only remains to notice that there are twelve poems in which the letters beginning each verse or couplet or stanza are arranged in alphabetical order. These are seven Psalms (viz. xxv, xxxiv, xxxvii, cxi, cxii, cxix, cxlv), Prov. xxxi, 10–31, and the first four chapters of the book of Lamentations. The device is a very simple one, and was probably adopted for the purpose of assisting the memory, and to make up for the want of a logical connection and progress in the thought. The more sublime poetry does not admit of being thus fettered. The Psalms in which we meet with it are all of a subdued and simple character, usually didactic. Yet even in these the alphabetical arrangement is seldom quite exact, usually one or two letters are omitted or repeated or transposed. In some of the alphabetic poems the strophical arrangement is marked more distinctly than in any other of the Hebrew poetical compositions; for example, in Psa. cxix, which consists of twenty-two stanzas of eight lines each; and Lam. iii, in which the stanza is of three lines. See PSALMS, BOOK OF.

IV. *History of the Treatment of Hebrew Poetry.*—In the 16th and 17th centuries the influence of classical studies upon the minds of the learned was so great as to imbue them with the belief that the writers of Greece and Rome were the models of all excellence; and consequently, when their learning and critical acumen were directed to the records of another literature, they were unable to divest themselves of the prejudices of early education and habits, and sought for the same excellences which they admired in their favorite models. That this has been the case with regard to most of the speculations on the poetry of the Hebrews, and that the failure of those speculations is mainly due to this cause, will be abundantly manifest to any one who is acquainted with the literature of the subject. But, however barren of results, the history of the various theories which have been framed with regard to the external form of Hebrew poetry is a necessary part of the present article.

The form of Hebrew poetry is its distinguishing characteristic, and what this form is has been a vexed question for many ages. The Therapeutæ, as described by Philo (*De Vitâ Contempl.* § 3, vol. ii, p. 475, ed. Mang.), sang hymns and psalms of thanksgiving to God, in divers measures and strains; and these were either new or ancient ones composed by the old poets, who had left behind them measures and melodies of trimeter verses, of processional songs, of hymns, of songs sung at the offering of libations or before the altar, and continuous choral songs, beautifully measured out in

strophes of intricate character (§ 10, p. 484). The value of Philo's testimony on this point may be estimated by another passage in his works, in which he claims for Moses a knowledge of numbers and geometry, the theory of rhythm, harmony, and metre, and the whole science of music, practical and theoretical (*De Vitâ Mosis*, i, 5, vol. ii, p. 84). The evidence of Josephus is as little to be relied upon. Both these writers labored to magnify the greatness of their own nation, and to show that in literature and philosophy the Greeks had been anticipated by the Hebrew barbarians. This idea pervades all their writings, and it must always be borne in mind as the key-note of their testimony on this as on other points. According to Josephus (*Ant.* ii, 16, 4), the Song of Moses at the Red Sea (Exod. xv) was composed in the hexameter measure (*ἐν ἑξαμέτρῳ τόνῳ*); and again (*Ant.* iv, 8, 44), the song in Deut. xxxii is described as a hexameter poem. The Psalms of David were in various metres, some trimeters and some pentameters (*Ant.* vii, 12, 3). Eusebius (*De Præp. Evang.* xi, 3, p. 514, ed. Col. 1688) characterizes the great Song of Moses and the 118th (119th) Psalm as metrical compositions in what the Greeks call the heroic metre. They are said to be hexameters of sixteen syllables. The other verse compositions of the Hebrews are said to be in trimeters. This saying of Eusebius is attacked by Julian (Cyrill. *Contr. Jul.* vii, 2), who on his part endeavored to prove the Hebrews devoid of all culture. Jerome (*Præf. in Hiob*) appeals to Philo, Josephus, Origen, and Eusebius, for proof that the Psalter, the Lamentations of Jeremiah, and almost all the songs of Scripture, are composed in metre, like the odes of Horace, Pindar, Alcæus, and Sappho. Again, he says that the book of Job from iii, 3 to xlii, 6 is in hexameters, with dactyls and spondees, and frequently, on account of the peculiarity of the Hebrew language, other feet which have not the same syllables but the same time. In *Epist. ad Paulam* (*Opp.* ii, 709, ed. Martianay) occurs a passage which shows in some measure how far we are to understand literally the terms which Jerome has borrowed from the verse literature of Greece and Rome, and applied to the poetry of the Hebrews. The conclusion seems inevitable that these terms are employed simply to denote a general external resemblance, and by no means to indicate the existence among the poets of the Old Testament of a knowledge of the laws of metre, as we are accustomed to understand the term. There are, says Jerome, four alphabetical Psalms, the 110th (111th), 111th (112th), 118th (119th), and the 144th (145th). In the first two, one letter corresponds to each clause or versicle, which is written in trimeter iambics. The others are in tetrameter iambics, like the song in Deuteronomy. In Psa. cxviii (cxix) eight verses follow each letter: in Psa. cxliv (cxlv) a letter corresponds to a verse. In Lamentations we have four alphabetical acrostics, the first two of which are written in a kind of Sapphic metre; for three clauses which are connected together and begin with one letter (i. e. in the first clause) close with a period in heroic measure (*Heroici comma*). The third is written in trimeter, and the verses in threes each begin with the same letter. The fourth is like the first and second. The Proverbs end with an alphabetical poem in tetrameter iambics, beginning, "A virtuous woman who can find?" In the *Præf. in Chron. Euseb.* Jerome compares the metres of the Psalms to those of Horace and Pindar, now running in iambics, now ringing with Alcaics, now swelling with Sapphics, now beginning with a half foot. What, he asks, is more beautiful than the song of Deuteronomy and Isaiah? What more weighty than Solomon? What more perfect than Job? All these, as Josephus and Origen testify, are composed in hexameters and pentameters. There can be little doubt that these terms are mere generalities, and express no more than a certain rough resemblance, so that the songs of Moses and Isaiah may be designated hexameters and pentameters with as much propriety as the first and second chapters of Lamentations may be compared to Sapphic odes. The resemblance of the Hebrew verse composition to the classic metres is expressly denied by Gregory of Nyssa (1 *Tract. in Psalm.* cap. iv). Augustine (*Ep.* 131 *ad Numerium*) confesses his ignorance of Hebrew, but adds that those skilled in the language believed the Psalms of David to be written in metre. Isidore of Seville (*Orig.* i, 18) claims for the heroic metre the highest antiquity, inasmuch as the Song of Moses was composed in it, and the book of Job, who was contemporary with Moses, long before the times of Pherecydes and Homer, is written in dactyls and spondees. Joseph Scaliger (*Animadv. ad Eus. Chron.* p. 6 *b*, etc.) was one of the first to point out the fallacy of Jerome's statement with regard to the metres of the Psalter and the Lamentations, and to assert that these books contained no verse bound by metrical laws, but that their language was merely prose, animated by a poetic spirit. He admitted the Song of Moses in Deuteronomy, the Proverbs, and Job to be the only books in which there was necessarily any trace of rhythm, and this rhythm he compares to that of two dimeter iambics, sometimes of more, sometimes of fewer syllables, as the sense required. Gerhard Vossius (*De Nat. et Const. Artis Poët.* lib. i, c. 13, § 2) says that in Job and the Proverbs there is rhythm but no metre; that is, regard is had to the number of syllables, but not to their quantity. In the Psalms and Lamentations not even rhythm is observed.

But in spite of the opinions pronounced by these high authorities, there were still many who believed in the existence of a Hebrew metre, and in the possibility of recovering it. The theories proposed for this purpose were various. Gomarus, professor at Groningen (*Davidis Lyra*, Lugd. Bat. 1637), advocated both rhymes and metre; for the latter he laid down the following rules. The vowel alone, as it is long or short, determines the length of a syllable. *Shĕva* forms no syllable. The periods or versicles of the Hebrew poems never contain less than a distich, or two verses, but in proportion as the periods are longer they contain more verses. The last syllable of a verse is indifferently long or short. This system, if system it may be called (for it is equally adapted for prose), was supported by many men of note; among others by the younger Buxtorf, Heinsius, L. de Dieu, Constantin l'Empereur, and Hottinger. On the other hand, it was vigorously attacked by L. Cappellus, Calovius, Danhauer, Pfeiffer, and Solomon van Til. Towards the close of the 17th century Marcus Meibomius announced to the world, with an amount of pompous assurance which is charming, that he had discovered the lost metrical system of the Hebrews. By the help of this mysterious secret, which he attributed to divine revelation, he proposed to restore not only the Psalms, but the whole Hebrew Scriptures, to their pristine condition, and thus confer upon the world a knowledge of Hebrew greater than any which had existed since the ages which preceded the Alexandrine translators. But Meibomius did not allow his enthusiasm to get the better of his prudence, and the condition on which this portentous secret was to be made public was that six thousand curious men should contribute £5 sterling apiece for a copy of his book, which was to be printed in two volumes folio. It is almost needless to add that his scheme fell to the ground. He published some specimens of his restoration of ten Psalms and six entire chapters of the Old Test. in 1690. The glimpses which he gives of his grand secret are not such as would make us regret that the knowledge of it perished with him. The whole book of Psalms, he says, is written in distichs, except the first Psalm, which is in a different metre, and serves as an introduction to the rest. They were therefore intended to be sung, not by one priest, or by one chorus, but by two. Meibomius "was severely chastised by J. H. Mains, B. H. Gebhardus, and J. G. Zentgravius" (Jebb, *Sacr. Lit.* p. 11). In the last century the learned Francis Hare,

bishop of Chichester, published an edition of the Hebrew Psalms, metrically divided, to which he prefixed a dissertation on the ancient poetry of the Hebrews (*Psalm. lib. in versiculos metrice divisus*, etc., Lond. 1736). Bishop Hare maintained that in Hebrew poetry no regard was had to the quantity of syllables. He regarded *shĕvas* as long vowels, and long vowels as short at his pleasure. The rules which he laid down are the following. In Hebrew poetry all the feet are dissyllables, and no regard is had to the quantity of a syllable. Clauses consist of an equal or unequal number of syllables. If the number of syllables be equal, the verses are trochaic, if unequal, iambic. Periods for the most part consist of two verses, often three or four, sometimes more. Clauses of the same periods are of the same kind, that is, either iambic or trochaic, with very few exceptions. Trochaic clauses generally agree in the number of the feet, which are sometimes three, as in Psa. xciv, 1; cvi, 1, and this is the most frequent; sometimes five, as in Psa. ix, 5. In iambic clauses the number of feet is sometimes the same, but they generally differ. Both kinds of verse are mixed in the same poem. In order to carry out these rules, they are supplemented by one which gives to the versifier the widest license. Words and verses are contracted or lengthened at will, by syncope, elision, etc. In addition to this, the bishop was under the necessity of maintaining that all grammarians had hitherto erred in laying down the rules of ordinary punctuation. His system, if it may be so called, carries its own refutation with it, but was considered by Lowth to be worthy a reply under the title of *Metricæ Harianæ Brevis Confutatio*, printed at the end of his *De Sacra Poes. Heb. Prælectiones*, etc.

Anton (*Conject. de Metro Heb. Ant.* Lips. 1770), admitting the metre to be regulated by the accents, endeavored to prove that in the Hebrew poems there was a highly artistic and regular system, like that of the Greeks and Romans, consisting of strophes, antistrophes, epodes, and the like; but his method is as arbitrary as Hare's. The theory of Lautwein (*Versuch einer richtigen Theorie von der bibl. Verskunst*, Tüb. 1775) is an improvement upon those of his predecessors, inasmuch as he rejects the measurement of verse by long and short syllables, and marks the scansion by the tone accent. He assumes little more than a free rhythm: the verses are distinguished by a certain relation in their contents, and connected by a poetic euphony. Sir W. Jones (*Comment. Poes. Asiat.* 1774) attempted to apply the rules of Arabic metre to Hebrew. He regarded as a long syllable one which terminated in a consonant or quiescent letter (א, ה, י); but he did not develop any system. The present Arabic prosody, however, is of comparatively modern invention; and it is not consistent with probability that there could be any system of versification among the Hebrews like that imagined by Sir W. Jones, when in the example he quotes of Cant. i, 5 he refers the first clause of the verse to the second, and the last to the fifteenth kind of Arabic metre. Greve (*Ultima Capita Jobi*, etc., 1791) believed that in Hebrew, as in Arabic and Syriac, there was a metre, but that it was obscured by the false orthography of the Masorets. He therefore assumed for the Hebrew an Arabic vocalization, and with this modification he found iambic trimeters, dimeters, and tetrameters to be the most common forms of verse, and lays down the laws of versification accordingly. Bellermann (*Versuch über die Metrik der Hebräer*, 1813) was the last who attempted to set forth the old Hebrew metres. He adopted the Masoretic orthography and vocalization, and determined the quantity of syllables by the accentuation, and what he termed the "Morensystem," denoting by *moren* the compass of a single syllable. Each syllable which has not the tone accent must have three *moren;* every syllable which has the tone accent may have either four or two, but generally three. The *moren* are reckoned as follows: a long vowel has two; a short vowel, one; every consonant, whether single or double, has one *more*. *Shĕva* simple or composite is not reckoned. The quiescent letters have no *more*. *Dagesh forte* compensative has one; so has *metheg*. The majority of dissyllabic and trisyllabic words, having the accent on the last syllable, will thus form iambics and anapæsts. But as many have the accent on the penultimate, these will form trochees. The most common kinds of feet are iambics and anapæsts, interchanging with trochees and tribrachs. Of verses composed of these feet, though not uniform as regards the numbers of the feet, consist, according to Bellermann, the poems of the Hebrew Scriptures.

Among those who believed in the existence of a Hebrew metre, but in the impossibility of recovering it, were Carpzov, Lowth, Pfeiffer, Herder to a certain extent, Jahn, Bauer, and Buxtorf. The opinions of Lowth, with regard to Hebrew metre, are summed up by Jebb (*Sacr. Lit.* p. 16) as follows: "He begins by asserting that certain of the Hebrew writings are not only animated with the true poetic spirit, but in some degree couched in poetic numbers; yet he allows that the quantity, the rhythm, or modulation of Hebrew poetry, not only is unknown, but admits of no investigation by human art or industry; he states, after Abarbanel, that the Jews themselves disclaim the very memory of metrical composition; he acknowledges that the artificial conformation of the sentences is the sole indication of metre in these poems; he barely maintains the *credibility* of attention having been paid to numbers or feet in their compositions; and at the same time he confesses the utter impossibility of determining whether Hebrew poetry was modulated by the ear alone, or according to any definite and settled rules of prosody." The opinions of Scaliger and Vossius have already been referred to. Vitringa allows to Isaiah a kind of oratorial measure, but adds that it could not on this account be rightly termed poetry. Michaelis (*Not.* 4 *in Præl.* iii), in his notes on Lowth, held that there never was metre in Hebrew, but only a free rhythm, as in recitative, though even less trammelled. He declared himself against the Masoretic distinction of long and short vowels, and made the rhythm to depend upon the tone syllable; adding, with regard to fixed and regular metre, that what has evaded such diligent search he thought had no existence. On the subject of the rhythmical character of Hebrew poetry, as opposed to metrical, the remarks of Jebb are remarkably appropriate. "Hebrew poetry," he says (*Sacr. Lit.* p. 20), "is universal poetry; the poetry of all languages, and of all peoples: the collocation of words (whatever may have been the sound, for of this we are quite ignorant) is primarily directed to secure the best possible announcement and discrimination of the sense: let, then, a translator only be literal, and, so far as the genius of his language will permit, let him preserve the original order of the words, and he will infallibly put the reader in possession of all, or nearly all, that the Hebrew text can give to the best Hebrew scholar of the present day. Now, had there originally been metre, the case, it is presumed, could hardly have been such; somewhat must have been sacrificed to the importunities of metrical necessity; the sense could not invariably have predominated over the sound; and the poetry could not have been, as it unquestionably and emphatically is, a poetry, not of sounds or of words, but of things. Let not this last assertion, however, be misinterpreted: I would be understood merely to assert that sound, and words in subordination to sound, do not in Hebrew, as in classical poetry, enter into the essence of the thing; but it is happily undeniable that the words of the poetical Scriptures are exquisitely fitted to convey the sense; and it is highly probable that, in the lifetime of the language, the sounds were sufficiently harmonious: when I say sufficiently harmonious, I mean so harmonious as to render the poetry grateful to the ear in recitation, and suitable to musical accompaniment; for which purpose

the cadence of well-modulated prose would fully answer; a fact which will not be controverted by any person with a moderately good ear that has ever heard a chapter of Isaiah skilfully read from our authorized translation; that has ever listened to one of Kent's anthems well performed, or to a song from the *Messiah* of Handel."

Abarbanel (on Isa. v) makes three divisions of Hebrew poetry, including in the first the modern poems which, in imitation of the Arabic, are constructed according to modern principles of versification. Among the second class he arranges such as have no metre, but are adapted to melodies. In these occur the poetical forms of words, lengthened and abbreviated, and the like. To this class belong the songs of Moses in Exod. xv, Deut. xxxii, the song of Deborah, and the song of David. The third class includes those compositions which are distinguished not by their form, but by the figurative character of their descriptions, as the Song of Songs, and the song of Isaiah.

Among those who maintain the absence of any regularity perceptible to the ear in the composition of Hebrew poetry may be mentioned Richard Simon (*Hist. Crit. du V. T.* i, c. 8, p. 57), Wasmuth (*Inst. Acc. Hebr.* p. 14), Alstedius (*Enc. Bibl.* c. 27, p. 257), the author of the book Cozri, and R. Azariah de Rossi, in his book entitled *Meor Enayim*. The author of the book Cozri held that the Hebrews had no metre bound by the laws of diction, because their poetry, being intended to be sung, was independent of metrical laws. R. Azariah expresses his approbation of the opinions of Cozri and Abarbanel, who deny the existence of songs in Scripture composed after the manner of modern Hebrew poems, but he adds, nevertheless, that beyond doubt there are other measures which depend upon the sense. Mendelssohn (on Exod. xv) also rejects the system of יתדות ויתנועות (literally, pegs and vowels). R. Azariah appears to have anticipated bishop Lowth in his theory of parallelism: at any rate his treatise contains the germ which Lowth developed, and may be considered, as Jebb calls it, the technical basis of his system. But it also contains other elements, which will be alluded to hereafter. His conclusion, in Lowth's words (*Isaiah*, prel. diss.), was as follows: "That the sacred songs have undoubtedly certain measures and proportions; which, however, do not consist in the number of syllables, perfect or imperfect, according to the form of the modern verse which the Jews make use of, and which is borrowed from the Arabians (though the Arabic prosody, he observes, is too complicated to be applied to the Hebrew language); but in the number of things, and of the parts of things —that is, the subject and the predicate and their adjuncts, in every sentence and proposition. Thus a phrase containing two parts of a proposition consists of two measures; add another containing two more, and they become four measures: another again, containing three parts of a proposition, consists of three measures; add to it another of the like, and you have six measures." The following example will serve for an illustration:

Thy-r'ght-hand, O-Jehovah, is-glorious in-power,
Thy-right-hand, O-Jehovah, hath-crushed the-enemy.

The words connected by hyphens form terms, and the two lines, forming four measures each, may be called tetrameters. "Upon the whole, the author concludes that the poetical parts of the Hebrew Scriptures are not composed according to the rules and measures of certain feet, dissyllables, trisyllables, or the like, as the poems of the modern Jews are; but nevertheless have undoubtedly other measures which depend on things, as above explained. For this reason they are more excellent than those which consist of certain feet, according to the number and quantity of syllables. Of this, he says, you may judge yourself in the Songs of the Prophets. For do you not see, if you translate some of them into another language, that they still keep and retain their measure, if not wholly, at least in part? which cannot be the case in those verses the measures of which arise from a certain quantity and number of syllables." Lowth expresses his general agreement with R. Azariah's exposition of the rhythmus of things; but instead of regarding terms or phrases or senses in single lines, as measures, he considered "only that relation and proportion of one verse to another which arises from the correspondence of terms, and from the form of construction; from whence results a rhythmus of propositions, and a harmony of sentences." But Lowth's system of parallelism was more completely anticipated by Schöttgen in a treatise, of the existence of which the bishop does not appear to have been aware. It is found in his *Horæ Hebraïcæ*, i, 1249–1263, diss. vi, "de Exergasia Sacra." This *exergasia* he defines to be the conjunction of entire sentences signifying the same thing; so that *exergasia* bears the same relation to sentences that synonymy does to words. It is only found in those Hebrew writings which rise above the level of historical narrative and the ordinary kind of speech. Ten canons are then laid down, each illustrated by three examples, from which it will be seen how far Schöttgen's system corresponded with Lowth's. (1.) Perfect *exergasia* is when the members of the two clauses correspond, each to each, as in Psa. xxxiii, 7; Numb. xxiv, 17; Luke i, 47. (2.) Sometimes in the second clause the subject is omitted, as in Isa. i, 18; Prov. vii, 19; Psa. cxxix, 3. (3.) Sometimes part of the subject is omitted, as in Psa. xxxvii, 30; cii, 28; Isa. liii, 5. (4.) The predicate is sometimes omitted in the second clause, as in Numb. xxiv, 5; Psa. xxxiii, 12; cxxiii, 6. (5.) Sometimes part only of the predicate is omitted, as in Psa. lvii, 9; ciii, 1; cxxix, 7. (6.) Words are added in one member which are omitted in the other, as in Numb. xxiii, 18; Psa. cii, 29; Dan. xii. 3. (7.) Sometimes two propositions will occur, treating of different things, but referring to one general proposition, as in Psa. xciv, 9; cxxviii, 3; Wisd. iii, 16. (8.) Cases occur, in which the second proposition is the contrary of the first, as in Prov. xv, 8; xiv, 1, 11. (9.) Entire propositions answer each to each, although the subject and predicate are not the same, as in Psa. li, 7; cxix, 168; Jer. viii, 22. (10.) *Exergasia* is found with three members, as in Psa. i, 1; cxxx, 5; lii, 9. These canons Schöttgen applied to the interpretation of Scripture, of which he gives examples in the remainder of that and the following Dissertation.

But whatever may have been achieved by his predecessors, there can be no question that the delivery of Lowth's lectures on Hebrew poetry, and the subsequent publication of his translation of Isaiah, formed an æra in the literature of the subject more marked than any that had preceded it. Of his system we have already given (§ i) a somewhat detailed account, which we here slightly expand; for whatever may have been done since his time, and whatever modifications of his arrangement may have been introduced, all subsequent writers have confessed their obligations to the two works above mentioned, and have drawn their inspiration from them. Starting with the alphabetical poems as the basis of his investigation, because in them the verses or stanzas were more distinctly marked, Lowth came to the conclusion that they consist of verses properly so called, "of verses regulated by some observation of harmony or cadence; of measure, numbers, or rhythm," and that this harmony does not arise from rhyme, but from what he denominates parallelism. Parallelism he defines to be the correspondence of one verse or line with another, and divides it into three classes—synonymous, antithetic, and synthetic.

(*a.*) Parallel lines *synonymous* correspond to each other by expressing the same sense in different but equivalent terms, as in the following examples, which are only two of the many given by Lowth:

"O-Jehovah, in-thy-strength the-king shall-rejoice;
And-in-thy-salvation how greatly shall-he-exult!
The-desire of-his-heart thou-hast-granted unto-him;
And-the-request of-his-lips thou-hast-not denied"
(Psa. xxi, 1, 2).

"For the-moth shall-consume-them like-a-garment:
And-the-worm shall-eat-them like wool:
But-my-righteousness shall-endure for-ever;
And-my-salvation to-the-age of-ages" (Isa. li, 7, 8).

It will be observed from the examples which Lowth gives that the parallel lines sometimes consist of three or more synonymous terms, sometimes of two, sometimes only of one. Sometimes the lines consist each of a double member, or two propositions, as Psa. cxliv, 5, 6; Isa. lxv, 21, 22. Parallels are formed also by a repetition of part of the first sentence (Psa. lxxvii, 1, 11, 16; Isa. xxvi, 5, 6; Hos. vi, 4); and sometimes a part has to be supplied from the former to complete the sentence (2 Sam. xxii, 41; Job xxvi, 5; Isa. xli, 28). Parallel triplets occur in Job iii, 4, 6, 9; Psa. cxii, 10; Isa. ix, 20; Joel iii, 13. Examples of parallels of four lines, in which two distichs form one stanza, are Psa. xxxvii, 1, 2; Isa. i, 3; xlix, 4; Amos i, 2. In periods of five lines the odd line sometimes comes in between two distichs, as in Job viii, 5, 6; Isa. xlvi, 7; Hos. xiv, 9; Joel iii, 16; or after two distichs closes the stanza, as in Isa. xliv, 26. Alternate parallelism in stanzas of four lines is found in Psa. ciii, 11, 12; Isa. xxx, 16; but the most striking examples of the alternate quatrain are Deut. xxxii, 25, 42, the first line forming a continuous sense with the third, and the second with the fourth (comp. Isa. xxxiv, 6; Gen. xlix, 6). In Isa. l, 10 we find an alternate quatrain followed by a fifth line. To this first division of Lowth's Jebb objects that the name *synonymous* is inappropriate, for the second clause, with few exceptions, "*diversifies* the preceding clause, and generally so as to rise above it, forming a sort of climax in the sense." This peculiarity was recognized by Lowth himself in his 4th Prælection, where he says, "idem iterant, variant, augent," thus marking a cumulative force in this kind of parallelism. The same was observed by Apb. Newcome in his Preface to Ezekiel, where examples are given in which "the following clauses so diversify the preceding ones as to rise above them" (Isa. xlii, 7; xliii, 16; Psa. xcv, 2; civ, 1). Jebb, in support of his own opinion, appeals to the passages quoted by Lowth (Psa. xxi, 12; cvii, 38; Isa. lv, 6, 7), and suggests as a more appropriate name for parallelism of this kind, *cognate parallelism* (*Sacr. Lit.* p. 38).

(*b.*) Lowth's second division is *antithetic parallelism;* when two lines correspond with each other by an opposition of terms and sentiments; when the second is contrasted with the first, sometimes in expressions, sometimes in sense only, so that the degrees of antithesis are various. As for example:

"A wise son rejoiceth his father;
But a foolish son is the grief of his mother"
(Prov. x, 1).

"The memory of the just is a blessing;
But the name of the wicked shall rot" (Prov. x, 7).

The gnomic poetry of the Hebrews abounds with illustrations of antithetic parallelism. Other examples are Psa. xx, 7, 8:

"These in chariots, and those in horses;
But we in the name of Jehovah our God will be strong.
They are bowed down, and fallen;
But we are risen, and maintain ourselves firm."

Comp. also Psa. xxx, 5; xxxvii, 10, 11; Isa. liv, 10; ix, 10. On these two kinds of parallelism Jebb appropriately remarks: "The *antithetic parallelism* serves to mark the broad distinctions between truth and falsehood, and good and evil: the *cognate parallelism* discharges the more difficult and more critical function of discriminating between different degrees of truth and good on the one hand, of falsehood and evil on the other" (*Sacr. Lit.* p. 39).

(*c.*) *Synthetic* or *constructive parallelism*, where the parallel "consists only in the similar form of construction; in which word does not answer to word and sentence to sentence, as equivalent or opposite; but there is a correspondence and equality between different propositions, in respect of the shape and turn of the whole sentence, and of the constructive parts—such as noun answering to noun, verb to verb, member to member, negative to negative, interrogative to interrogative." One of the examples of constructive parallels given by Lowth is Isa. l, 5, 6:

"The Lord Jehovah hath opened mine ear,
And I was not rebellious;
Neither did I withdraw myself backward—
I gave my back to the smiters,
And my cheeks to them that plucked off the hair;
My face I hid not from shame and spitting."

Jebb gives as an illustration Psa. xix, 7–10:

"The law of Jehovah is perfect, converting the soul,
The testimony of Jehovah is sure, making wise the simple," etc.

It is instructive, as showing how difficult, if not impossible, it is to make any strict classification of Hebrew poetry, to observe that this very passage is given by Gesenius as an example of synonymous parallelism, while De Wette calls it synthetic. The illustration of synthetic parallelism quoted by Gesenius is Psa. xxvii, 4:

"One thing I ask from Jehovah.
It will I seek after—
My dwelling in the house of Jehovah all the days of my life,
To behold the beauty of Jehovah,
And to inquire in his temple."

In this kind of parallelism, as Nordheimer (*Gram. Anal.* p. 87) observes, "an idea is neither repeated nor followed by its opposite, but is kept in view by the writer, while he proceeds to develop and enforce his meaning by accessory ideas and modifications."

(*d.*) To the three kinds of parallelism above described Jebb adds a fourth, which seems rather to be an unnecessary refinement upon than distinct from the others. He denominates it *introverted parallelism*, in which he says, "there are stanzas so constructed that, whatever be the number of lines, the first line shall be parallel with the last; the second with the penultimate; and so throughout in an order that looks inward, or, to borrow a military phrase, from flanks to centre" (*Sacr. Lit.* p. 53). Thus:

"My son, if thine heart be wise,
My heart also shall rejoice;
Yea, my reins shall rejoice
When thy lips speak right things"
(Prov. xxiii, 15, 16).

"Unto Thee do I lift up mine eyes, O Thou that dwellest in the heavens;
Behold as the eyes of servants to the hand of their masters;
As the eyes of a maiden to the hands of her mistress:
Even so look our eyes to Jehovah our God, until he have mercy upon us" (Psa. cxxiii, 1, 2).

Upon examining these and the other examples quoted by bishop Jebb in support of his new division, to which he attaches great importance, it will be seen that the peculiarity consists in the structure of the stanza, and not in the nature of the parallelism; and any one who reads Ewald's elaborate treatise on this part of the subject will rise from the reading with the conviction that to attempt to classify Hebrew poetry according to the character of the stanzas employed will be labor lost and in vain, resulting only in a system which is no system, and in rules to which the exceptions are more numerous than the examples.

A few words may now be added with respect to the classification proposed by De Wette, in which more regard was had to the rhythm. The four kinds of parallelism are: 1. That which consists in an equal number of words in each member, as in Gen. iv, 23. This he calls the original and perfect kind of parallelism of members, which corresponds with metre and rhyme, without being identical with them (*Die Psalmen, Einl.* § 7). Under this head are many minor divisions. 2. Unequal parallelism, in which the number of words in

the members is not the same. This again is divided into —*a*. The simple, as Psa. lxviii, 33. *b*. The composite, consisting of the synonymous (Job x, 1; Psa. xxxvi, 7), the antithetic (Psa. xv, 4), and the synthetic (xv, 5). *c*. That in which the simple member is disproportionately small (xl, 10). *d*. Where the composite member grows up into three or more sentences (i, 3; lxv, 10). *e*. Instead of the close parallelism there sometimes occurs a short additional clause, as in Psa. xxiii, 3. 3. Out of the parallelism, which is unequal in consequence of the composite character of one member, another is developed, so that both members are composite (xxxi, 11). This kind of parallelism again admits of three subdivisions. 4. Rhythmical parallelism, which lies merely in the external form of the diction. Thus in Psa. xix, 11 there is nearly an equal number of words:

> "Moreover by them was thy servant warned,
> In keeping of them there is great reward."

In Psa. xxx, 3 the inequality is remarkable. In Psa. xiv, 7 is found a double and a single member, and in Psa. xxxi, 23 two double members. De Wette also held that there were in Hebrew poetry the beginnings of a composite rhythmical structure like our strophes. Thus in Psa. xlii, xliii, a refrain marks the conclusion of a larger rhythmical period. Something similar is observable in Psa. cvii. This artificial structure appears to belong to a late period of Hebrew literature, and to the same period may probably be assigned the remarkable gradational rhythm which appears in the Songs of Degrees, e. g. Psa. cxxi. It must be observed that this gradational rhythm is very different from the cumulative parallelism of the Song of Deborah, which is of a much earlier date, and bears traces of less effort in the composition. Strophes of a certain kind are found in the alphabetical pieces in which several Masoretic clauses belong to one letter (Psa. ix, x, xxxvii, cxix; Lam. iii); but the nearest approach to anything like a strophical character is found in poems which are divided into smaller portions by a refrain, and have the initial or final verse the same or similar (Psa. xxxix, xlii, xliii). In the opinion of some the occurrence of the word Selah is supposed to mark the divisions of the strophes.

It is impossible here to do more than refer to the essay of Köster (*Theol. Stud. und Krit.* 1831, p. 40–114) on the strophes, or the parallelism of verses in Hebrew poetry, in which he endeavors to show that the verses are subject to the same laws of symmetry as the verse-members, and that consequently Hebrew poetry is essentially strophical in character. Ewald's treatise requires more careful consideration; but it must be read itself, and a slight sketch only can here be given. Briefly thus: Verses are divided into verse-members in which the number of syllables is less restricted, as there is no syllable metre. A verse-member generally contains from seven to eight syllables. Two members, the rise and fall, are the fundamental constituents. Thus (Judg. v, 3):

> "Hear, ye kings! give ear, ye princes!
> I to Jehovah, I will sing."

To this all other modifications must be capable of being reduced. The variations which may take place may be either amplifications or continuations of the rhythm, or compositions in which a complete rhythm is made the half of a new compound, or we may have a diminution or enfeeblement of the original. To the two members correspond two thoughts which constitute the life of the verse, and each of these again may distribute itself. Gradations of symmetry are formed, 1. By the echo of the whole sentence, where the same sense which is given in the first member rises again in the second, in order to exhaust itself more thoroughly (Gen. iv, 23; Prov. i, 8). An important word of the first member often reserves its force for the second, as in Psa. xx, 8; and sometimes in the second member a principal part of the sense of the first is further developed, as Psa. xlix, 5 [6]. 2. When the thought trails through two members of a verse, as in Psa. cx, 5, it gives rise to a less animated rhythm (comp. also cxli, 10). 3. Two sentences may be brought together as protasis and apodosis, or simply to form one complex thought; the external harmony may be dispensed with, but the harmony of thought remains. This may be called the intermediate rhythm. The forms of structure assumed by the verse are many. (1.) There is the single member, which occurs at the commencement of a series in Psa. xviii, 2; xxiii, 1; at the end of a series in Exod. xv, 18; Psa. xcii, 9; and in the middle, after a short pause, in Psa. xxix, 7. (2.) The bimembral verse is most frequently found, consisting of two members of nearly equal weight. (3.) Verses of more than two members are formed either by increasing the number of members from two to three, so that the complete fall may be reserved for the third, all three possessing the same power; or by combining four members two and two, as in Psa. xviii, 7; xxviii, 1.

The varieties of this structure of verse are too numerous to be recounted, and the laws of rhythm in Hebrew poetry are so free that of necessity the varieties of verse-structure must be manifold. The gnomic or sententious rhythm, Ewald remarks, is the one which is perfectly symmetrical. Two members of seven or eight syllables, corresponding to each other as rise and fall, contain a thesis and antithesis, a subject and its image. This is the constant form of genuine gnomic sentences of the best period. Those of a later date have many members or trail themselves through many verses. The animation of the lyrical rhythm makes it break through all such restraints, and leads to an amplification or reduplication of the normal form; or the passionate rapidity of the thoughts may disturb the simple concord of the members, so that the unequal structure of verse intrudes with all its varieties. To show how impossible it is to attempt a classification of verse uttered under such circumstances, it will be only necessary to quote Ewald's own words: "All these varieties of rhythm, however, exert a perfectly free influence upon every lyrical song, just according as it suits the mood of the moment to vary the simple rhythm. The most beautiful songs of the flourishing period of poetry allow, in fact, the verse of many members to predominate whenever the diction rises with any sublimity; nevertheless, the standard rhythm still returns in each when the diction flags, and the different kinds of the more complex rhythm are employed with equal freedom and ease of variation, just as they severally accord with the fluctuating hues of the mood of emotion and of the sense of the diction. The late alphabetical songs are the first in which the fixed choice of a particular versification—a choice, too, made with designed art—establishes itself firmly, and maintains itself symmetrically throughout all the verses" (*Dichter d. Alten Bundes*, i, 83; transl. in Kitto's *Journal*, i, 318). It may, however, be generally observed that the older rhythms are the most animated, as if accompanied by the hands and feet of the singer (Numb. xxi; Exod. xv; Judg. v), and that in the time of David the rhythm had attained its most perfect development. By the end of the 8th century B.C. the decay of versification begins, and to this period belong the artificial forms of verse.

It remains now only to notice the rules of Hebrew poetry as laid down by the Jewish grammarians, to which reference was made in remarking upon the system of R. Azariah. They have the merit of being extremely simple, and are to be found at length, illustrated by many examples, in Mason and Bernard's *Heb. Gram.* (vol. ii, No. 57), and accompanied by an interesting account of modern Hebrew versification. The rules are briefly these: 1. That a sentence may be divided into members, some of which contain *two*, *three*, or even *four* words, and are accordingly termed *binary*, *ternary*, and *quaternary* members respectively. 2. The sentences are composed either of *binary*, *ternary*, or *quaternary*

members entirely, or of these different members intermixed. 3. That in two consecutive members it is an elegance to express the same idea in different words. 4. That a word expressed in either of these parallel members is often not expressed in the alternate member. 5. That a word without an accent, being joined to another word by *Makkeph*, is generally (though not always) reckoned with that second word as one. It will be seen that these rules are essentially the same with those of Lowth, De Wette, and other writers on parallelism, and from their simplicity are less open to objection than any others that have been given.

In conclusion, after reviewing the various theories which have been framed with regard to the structure of Hebrew poetry, it must be confessed that beyond the discovery of very broad general laws, little has been done towards elaborating a satisfactory system. Probably this want of success is due to the fact that there is no system to discover, and that Hebrew poetry, while possessed in the highest degree of all sweetness and variety of rhythm and melody, is not fettered by laws of versification as we understand the term. Some advance towards an elucidation of the metrical structure of the poetical books, and especially in their strophic arrangement, has been made by Delitzsch in his *Commentaries;* but the whole subject admits of a more careful and minute adjustment of the clauses and phrases than has yet been achieved.

Modern Hebrew poetry, although tolerably copious, is altogether cast in the mould of the poems of the several European nations among whom the Jews are scattered, and is therefore stiffly artificial, generally with rhyme, etc. It is of little value theologically. A very fair collection of specimens may be seen in Martinet's *Hebräische Chrestomathie* (Bamberg, 1837).

V. *Literature.*—England has the credit of opening a new path in this branch by the above-noticed publication of bishop Lowth's elegant and learned *Prælectiones de Sacra Poesi Hebræorum* (Oxon. 1753, which may be found also in Ugolini *Thesaur.* vol. xxxi; the editions having Michaelis's *Notæ et Epimetra* are to be preferred; that of Oxon. 1810, is good: the work was translated into English by Gregory). On the didactic poetry of the Hebrews the reader may consult Umbreit, *Sprüche Sal. Einleitung;* Rhode, *De Vet. Poetar. Sapientia Gnom. Hebræor. imp. et Græcor.* (Havn. 1800); Unger, *De Parabolar. Jesu natura,* etc. (Leipz. 1828). Le Clerc, in his *Biblioth. Univers.* ix, 226 sq., has given what is worth attention; see also *Hist. abrégée de la Poésie chez les Hébr.* in the "History of the Academy of Inscriptions," xxiii, 92 sq. But the work which has, next to that of Lowth, exerted the greatest influence, is a posthumous and unfinished piece of the celebrated Herder, who has treated the subject with extraordinary eloquence and learning, *Vom Geist der Ebräischen Poesie* (1782, to be found in his collected writings; also Tübing. 1805; and Carlsruhe, 1826); see also Gügler, *Die Heilkunst der Hebräer* (Landshut, 1814); and Guttenstein, *Die poet. Literat. d. alten Israelit.* (Mannh. 1835). The subject of metre has been skilfully handled by Bellermann, *Versuch über d. Metrik der Hebräer* (Berl. 1813). Much useful information may be found in De Wette's *Einleitung in d. A. Test.* (ibid. 1840; translated into English by Theodore Parker, Boston, 1843). In Wellbeloved's Bible translations of the poetical portions may be found, in which regard is paid to rhythm and poetical form; a very valuable guide in Hebrew poetry, both for form and substance, may be found in Noyes's *Translation of Job* (Cambridge, 1827); of the *Psalms* (Boston, 1831); and of the *Prophets* (ibid. 1833); but the best, fullest, and most satisfactory work on the subject is by Ewald, *Die poet. Bücher des Alten Bundes* (Göttingen, 1835-9, 4 vols. 8vo). See also *Critica Biblica,* i, 111 sq.; Carpzov, *Introd. ad Libr. Can. Bibl.* pt. ii, c. i; Schramm, *De Poesi Hebræor.* (Helmst. 1723); Jebb, *Sacred Literature;* Saalschütz, *Von der Form der Hebr. Poesie* (Königsberg, 1825, which contains the most complete account of all the various theories); Nicolas, *Forme de la Poésie Hébraïque* (Paris, 1833); Sarchi, *Heb. Poetry, Ancient and Modern* (Lond. 1824); Wenrich, *De Poesiæ Heb. et Arab. indole* (Leipz. 1843); Meier, *Gesch. der poet. National-Literatur der Hebräer* (Leipz. 1853); the commentaries of De Wette, Delitzsch, and Hupfeld on the Psalms; and the works enumerated in Danz, *Universal-Theol. Wörterbuch,* p. 215 sq.; in Darling, *Cyclopædia Bibliographia* (Holy Scriptures), col. 28 sq.; and in Schaff's essay on the *Poetical Books of the O. T.,* prefixed to the Am. ed. of Lange's *Commentary on Job,* p. vii.

POETRY, HEBREW (*Post-Biblical*). In speaking of post-Biblical poetry, we mean those poetical productions which have come down to us from the so-called *Sopherite Age,* i. e. from about B.C. 500 to A.D. 70. Productions written after this period are properly designated by the name *Neo-Hebraic Poetry.*

The divine service of the second Temple, under Ezra and his successors, was mainly a restoration, rather than a new institute; but the inspired material for liturgy was now more copious. The Psalms, several of which, like the melodious swan-song of a departing inspiration, were written in the Ezra-Nehemiah time, formed of themselves a primary element. So, at the Feast of Tabernacles, the Asaphites chanted the *Confitemini* of the 118th Psalm (Ezra iii, 10, 11; comp. Neh. xii, 24; 1 Chron. xxvi, 1). The titles given to some Psalms by the men of the Great Synagogue indicate a stated use of them at certain periods of week-day and Sabbath worship (comp. Mishna, *Taamid,* ad fin.; *Sopherim,* sect. 18; and the inscriptions for the Psalms in the Septuagint, evidently rendered from Hebrew ones). Thus Psa. xxiv is called ψαλμὸς . . . τῆς μιᾶς σαββάτου; xlviii, δευτέρᾳ σαββάτου; xciv, τετράδι σαββάτου; xxix, ἐξοδίου σκηνῆς; xxxviii, περὶ σαββάτου; cxi–cxix, Ἀλληλούϊα. The "fifteen Songs of Degrees" (שירי המעלות, Chald. שורא דאתאמר על מסוכין דתהומא, i. e. "the hymn which was said upon the steps of the abyss") were evidently liturgical, and probably derive their name from the fifteen semicircular steps at the Nicanor gate of the great court of the Temple, on which the Levites stood while singing them. So the Mishna (*Succah,* v, 4): "On the fifteen steps which led into the women's court, corresponding with the fifteen songs of degrees, stood the Levites with their instruments of music, and sang." Besides, the *Great Hallel* (q. v.) and certain verses of Psalms were also used, as may be seen from the treatise *Succah,* iv, 5.

The poetry of this period is preserved in four forms: of *Tephillah, Berakah, Shir,* and *Mashal.*

I. *The Tephillah, or Prayer.*—Of this form we have the four collects offered by the high-priest on the Day of Atonement (q. v.), as preserved in the Jerusalem Gemara and Midrash Jelamdenu, and which run thus: 1. *For Himself and his Family:* "Lord, I have committed iniquity, I have transgressed, I have sinned, I and my house. Pardon, O Lord, the iniquities and transgressions and the sins which I have committed and sinned before thee, I and my house, as it is written in the law of Moses, thy servant: for on that day will he atone for you to make you clean, from all your transgressions shall ye before Jehovah be cleansed" (*Yomah,* iii, 7). 2. *For Himself and the Priesthood:* "Lord, I have committed iniquity, I have transgressed, I have sinned, I and my house, and the sons of Aaron, thy consecrated people. I beseech thee, Lord, to pardon the iniquities, transgressions, and sins which I and my house, and the sons of Aaron, thy consecrated people, have perversely committed, as it is written in the law of Moses, thy servant: for on that day," etc. (*ibid.* iv, 2). 3. *For the People at large:* "Lord, thy people, the house of Israel, have done perversely; they have transgressed, they have sinned before thee. I beseech of the Lord to pardon the iniquities, transgressions, and sins which thy people, the house of Israel, have perversely committed, and by which

they have sinned and transgressed; as it is written in the law of Moses, thy servant: for on that day," etc. 4. *When he came out from the Holy of Holies*: "May it please thee, O Lord our God, and the God of our fathers, that neither this day nor during this year any captivity come upon us; yet if captivity befall us this day or this year, let it be to a place where the law is cultivated. May it please thee, O Lord our God, and the God of our fathers, that no want come upon us either this day or this year; but if want visit us this day or this year, let it be due to the liberality of our charitable deeds. May it please thee, O Lord our God, and the God of our fathers, that this year may become a year of cheapness, of fulness, of intercourse, and of trade: a year with abundance of rain, of sunshine, and of dew: one in which thy people Israel shall not require assistance one from another. And listen not to the prayers of those who go forth on a journey. And as to thy people Israel, may no enemy exalt himself against them. May it please thee, O Lord our God, and the God of our fathers, that the houses of the men of Saron may not become their graves."

II. *The Berakah, or Benediction.*—The benedictory adoration of the name and dominion of God is a most proper and all-pervading element in the Hebrew liturgy. Many of their prayers begin and end with it. The *berakahs* at the close of the several books of the Psalms (Psa. xli, 13; lxxii, 18; lxxxix, 53; cvi, 48) were probably added by Ezra, or the prophetical men of his time, on the final arrangement of the canonical Psalter (comp. on these doxologies Grätz, in *Monatsschrift für d. Judenthum*, 1872, xxi, 481 sq.). Those which accompany the prayers of the *Shemoneh Esreh*, or eighteen benedictions [comp. the art. LITURGY], are believed to be of the same period. Thus Maimonides: "These benedictions were appointed by Ezra the *sopher*, and the *beth-din;* and no man hath power to diminish from or add to them" (*Hilchoth Keriath Shema*, i, 7; and *Hilch. Tefila*, i, 11). "In the innumerable instances where, in the Mishna and Aboda, this form occurs, in which the everlasting name is hallowed, and the truth of the divine dominion is reverently confessed, it appears to have been the pious desire of the institutors of the synagogue ritual that supplication, with prayer and thanksgiving, should give a spirit and tone to the entire life of the people. Indeed, almost all the affairs of Hebrew life have the prescription of their appropriate benedictions" (comp. *Berachoth*, ch. vi–ix; *Rosh ha-Shanah*, iv, 5; *Taanith*, ii, 2, etc.).

III. *The Shir, or Song, Chant* (from *shevar*, שִׁבַּר, Sansc. *swar, swara*, "a song;" the Arab. *zabara*, i. q. *savara*, whence *zubar*, like the Hebrew *mizmor*, of the same import), is a metrical composition, designed for chanting, and consisting generally of the strophe, antistrophe, and epode. We have a fine Biblical model in the fifteenth chapter of Exodus, on which see Kennicott and Lowth. Apart from the divine poetry of the Scriptures, there are but scanty remains of Hebrew songs of a date prior to the destruction of Jerusalem. In the Mishna and Gemara we come upon a few reminiscences of them, as in the treatise *Succah*, fol. 53, col. 1, where, in connection with the solemnities of the Feast of Tabernacles, we find the following chant:

THE PIOUS AND THE MEN OF RENOWN.

"O happy youth, devoted sage,
Who will not put to shame our age!

THE PENITENTS.

"O happy, also, is our age,
Which now atones for youth, not sage!

CHORUS.

"O happy be on whom no guilt doth rest,
And he who sinn'd with pardon shall be blest."

These songs were accompanied by the musical instruments of the Levites, who stood on the fifteen steps which led to the court of the women. Here is another, a sort of confession made by the Levites at the same feast. "When the Levites," says the Mishna, "reached the gate that leads out to the east, they turned westward, their faces being towards the Temple, and employed these words:

"Our fathers, here established by thy grace,
Had turn'd their backs upon thy holy place,
And to the rising sun they set their face;
But we will turn to thee, Jehovah God,
Our eyes are set on thee, Jehovah God."

Another fragment of a song has been preserved in the Mishna (*Taanith*, ad fin.), and was sung on the 15th day of Ab, when the collection of wood required in the sanctuary was finished. Then the maidens all went forth, arrayed in white garments specially lent them, that so rich and poor might be on an equality, into the vineyards around Jerusalem, where they danced and sung:

"Around in circle gay the Hebrew maidens see,
From them the happy youth their partners choose;
Remember beauty soon its charms must lose,
And seek to win a maid of fair degree.

"When fading grace and beauty low are laid,
Yet her who fears the Lord shall praise await;
God blessed her handiwork, and, in the gate,
'Her works have followed her,' it shall be said."

IV. *The Mashal.*—This word, according to its Sanscrito-Shemitic root, denotes comparison or resemblance. "In the older Hebrew writings the word is applied to prophecy, to doctrine, to history in the loftier style, and to instruction given in a kind of poetic form, sometimes with the accompaniment of the harp or other music; because, in these various manners of instruction, material things are employed in the way of parallel or comparison, to illustrate those which are supersensible or spiritual. Hence *mashal* became a general name for all poetry which relates to the ordinary or every-day economy of life, with a still more specific application to a distinct epigrammatic saying, proverb, maxim, or reflection, carrying in itself some important principle or rule of conduct. The *mashal*, then, may be said to consist commonly of two elements: the thesis, principal fact or lesson, and the type, emblem, or allusion by which it is explained or enforced. The latter may be one of the phenomena of nature, or an imaginary transaction in common life (*parable*); or an emblematic group of human agents (*apologue*); or of agents nonhuman, with an understood designation (*fable*). Sometimes the *mashal* takes a mathematical cast; and the doctrine or principle is laid down after a certain arithmetical proportion or canon, *midah* (Prov. vi, 16; xxx, 15, 18, 21; Ecclus. xxiii, 16; xxv, 1, 8, 9; xxvi, 5, 25; l, 27, 28). When there is no image or allusion of these kinds used, the *mashal* becomes sometimes an acute, recondite, yet generally pleasant assertion or problem—*gryphos*, the 'riddle,' or 'enigma;' in Hebrew, *chidah*, חִידָה (Judg. xiv, 12); and sometimes an axiom or oracle of practical wisdom—*massa*, מַשָּׂא, a 'burden,' a weighty saying, from *masa*, 'to bear;' and when conveyed in a brilliant, sparkling style of speaking it becomes *melitsah*, מְלִיצָה, the pleasant witticism or the pungent reproof. The remaining form of the *mashal* is the motto (apophthegm), where some moral is sententiously expressed without a simile, and generally without the parallelism, as we see in the mottoes of the Hebrew sages in the book *Aboth*." Of such mottoes, we mention the following of Hillel:

"The more flesh, the more worms;
The more riches, the more care;
The more wives, the more witchcraft," etc.;

or:

"Because thou madest float,
They made thee float:
In turn, who made thee float
Shall also float"—

this having reference to a skull floating on the water: or:

"Each one who seeks a name,
Shall only lose his fame;

Who adds not to his lore,
Shall lose it more and more;
Each one deserves to perish
Who study does not cherish;
That man shall surely fade
Who with his crown (i. e. of learning or merit) does trade."

A valuable relic of *meshalim* is preserved in a book known among us as *The Wisdom of Jesus the Son of Sirach*, from which we will quote a few sentences: "Honor the physician before you require his aid" (xxxviii, 1). "Three things are contrary to all reason: a proud beggar; a rich man who denies it (lives and acts as if he were poor); and an old man who commits adultery" (xxv, 3, 4). "A good wife is a good gift; such is granted to him who fears the Lord. A bad wife is a leprosy to her husband; let him divorce her, and he will be cured of his leprosy" (ch. xxvi). "Before you vow, consider the vow" (xxviii, 23). See PARABLE.

The non-Palestinian poetry of this time we pass over, it being written in Greek. See Delitzsch, *Zur Geschichte der jüdischen Poesie*, p. 17–29, 177 sq.; Etheridge, *Introduction to Hebrew Literature*, p. 92 sq.; Steinschneider, *Jewish Literature*, p. 35 sq.; Edersheim, *History of the Jewish Nation*, p. 349 sq., 559 sq.; id. *The Temple, its Ministry and Services as they were in the Time of Jesus Christ*, p. 246 sq., 270 sq., 286 sq. (B. P.)

POETRY, CHRISTIAN. See HYMNOLOGY; PSALMODY.

Poggio, BRACCIOLINI GIOVANNI-FRANCESCO, a celebrated Italian humanist, who contributed richly to the revival of classical studies in the period of the Italian Renaissance, and did much to encourage scholarship in the Church of Rome, was born at Terranuova, near Florence, in 1380. He was the grandson of a notary, and studied the Latin language under the direction of Giovanni di Ravenna, the Greek under Emanuel Chrysoloras, and applied himself also to the Hebrew, a fact which confutes the opinion of Huetius and others, who have said that this language was not cultivated in Italy till after the 14th and 15th centuries. After the completion of his education he went to Rome, and was for some time a copyist, and finally entered the service of the cardinal di Bari. In 1413 Poggio was appointed apostolic secretary, a poorly paid charge, which he occupied forty years. Thus he spent a large part of his life in brilliant surroundings. Eight popes bequeathed him to one another, as if he had belonged to the chattels of St. Peter. The life which he led in the office he held was favorable to study, and he devoted much of it to inquiries into antiquity. His great title to the esteem of posterity is the zeal he displayed in the search for the monuments of Roman literature. He made his most important discoveries during a protracted stay in Switzerland, whither he repaired in 1414 to attend the Council of Constance. He visited the library of the monastery of St. Gall, which he found in a kind of dungeon. Here he discovered a copy, almost complete, of Quintilian's *Institutiones Oratoriæ*, of which fragments only were known at the time; four books of the *Argonautica* of Valerius Flaccus, and the *Commentaries* of Asconius Pedianus. Afterwards he found, in divers places, the *History* of Ammianus Marcellinus and Frontinus's *Treatise on Aqueducts*. The searches which he caused to be made in the monasteries of France and Germany brought to light the works of Manilius, of Vitruvius, of Columella, of Priscianus, of Nonius Marcellus, a considerable portion of the poems of Lucretius and Silius Italicus, eight orations of Cicero, twelve comedies of Plautus, etc.

The freedom with which Poggio criticised several acts of the Council of Constance, especially in the affair of Jerome of Prague, was punished with a short disgrace, during which he visited England. Beaufort, bishop of Winchester, received him with distinction. But as little effect followed the brilliant promises of the prelate, and as the English libraries offered no temptations to a man of Poggio's propensities, he left a country the inhabitants of which he describes as plunged in the grossest sensuality, and returned to Rome at the close of 1420. He was reinstated into his former charge. The calm which the pontifical court enjoyed for some years gave him full leisure to correspond with his friends Niccoli, Leonardo d'Arezzo. Traversari, etc., and to write several dialogues and philosophical treatises, in which he exposes without mercy the failings of monks and priests, which Poggio was most competent to describe, as he had himself at the time three sons by a mistress, though he was an ecclesiastic. His own course he excuses in the following pleasantry, in one of his letters to cardinal Julian of St. Angelo: "You say that I have sons, which is not lawful for a cleric; and without a wife, which does not become a laic. I may answer that I have sons, which is fitting for laics; and without a wife, which from the beginning of the world has been the custom of clerics: but I will not defend my failings by any excuse."

When, after the accession of Eugenius IV, in 1434, a sedition compelled the pope to retire to Florence, Poggio set out on his way to join his master. He was taken by soldiers of Piccinino, and given his liberty only after a heavy ransom paid by his friends. In Florence he met Filelfo, against whom he had long entertained a secret jealousy, which changed into actual hatred when his venerated and beloved Niccoli was the object of a violent attack from Filelfo. He launched against his enemy a libel, in which he heaped up all the most injurious and obscene expressions which the Latin language would afford. Filelfo answered him in the same style; whereupon Poggio replied in a still more insulting strain. After a truce of four years this edifying dispute between two of the most distinguished men of their time recommenced: Poggio wrote against Filelfo a libel full of the most atrocious accusations, almost all of his own invention. Filelfo again returned the blow. They were reconciled afterwards: neither had damaged himself in the eyes of their contemporaries, who enjoyed these invectives as literary dainties. Meanwhile Poggio had bought a villa in the vicinity of Florence, and formed there a museum of sculptures, medals, and other objects of art. Towards the close of 1435 he had married the young and beautiful Vaggia di Bondelmonti. He was poor and on the decline of life; but the young heiress of an illustrious and ancient family was in love with his literary fame, which had induced the senate of Florence to grant immunity from taxes to him and his descendants. His married life was a happy one.

He returned to Rome with the papal court, after a sojourn of ten years at Florence. During this period he had published a choice selection of letters, and composed two dialogues, full of the most curious remarks on the manners of his time (*On Nobility* and *On the Misfortunes of Princes*). He had, besides, written the panegyrics of Niccoli, Lorenzo di Medici, of the cardinal Albergato, and of Leonardo d'Arezzo. At the request of pope Nicholas V, with whom he was in great favor, he translated into Latin the first five books of Diodorus Siculus; about the same time he dedicated his version of Xenophon's *Cyropædia* to Alfonso, king of Naples, and compelled the king, by the sarcastic remarks with which he filled his letters to his friends, to reward him with a present of six hundred ducats, whereupon he chanted, in the most pompous strains, the encomiums of the king. To please pope Nicholas, he wrote a violent invective against the antipope, Felix V. He wrote also, under the same pope's auspices, an interesting dialogue *On the Vicissitudes of Fortune*, which, besides many curious incidents in the history of Italy in the 14th and 15th centuries, contains an account of the journey of the Venetian Niccolo Conti into India and Persia, and a precious description of the monuments of Rome as they were at his time. During the plague which broke out in Rome in 1450, he retired to his birthplace,

where he published his famous *Facetiæ*, a collection of tales, partly borrowed from the French *fabliaux*, and excessively licentious. This book was eagerly read throughout Europe. Soon afterwards he published his *Historia Disceptativa Convivalis*, a dialogue full of satirical attacks against physicians and lawyers. He returned to Rome in 1451, but in 1453 he was offered the position of chancellor of the republic of Florence, and a few months after his removal to that city was in addition made prior of the arts. In the latter quality he had to look to the maintenance of good order and of the public liberties. Though he was now fully seventy-two years of age, he applied himself to study more intensely than ever; and in that last period of his life, though he had an employment which took up much of his time, he composed the most considerable of his works. His love of retirement induced him to build a country-house near Florence, which he called his academy, and in which he took much delight. He always spent the summer there. From this period and place dates his *History of Florence*, for which he consulted the archives of the republic, which were committed to his care. This book is one of the best historical works of the time. The Florentines, to show their gratefulness, erected to the author a statue, which now forms part of a group of the twelve apostles in the church of S. Maria del Fiore. Poggio died at Florence Oct. 30, 1459. He had some estimable parts, but these cannot make us forget his vindictive character, his irascibility, his bad manners and bad morals. Poggio appears by his works to have had a great passion for letters, and as great a regard for those that cultivated them. He excelled in Greek and Latin literature, and was one of the principal restorers of it. His pursuits were not confined to profane antiquity: we see by his quotations that he was versed in ecclesiastical history and the fathers, and especially in the writings of Chrysostom and Augustine. Poggio's treatises, especially his dialogues, are feeble imitations of the classics; though written in an easy, witty, and sometimes elegant manner, they are full of solecisms, Italicisms, and even barbarisms. His letters are altogether neglected. But the rest of his writings are still read, owing to their variety of subjects, to some ingenious ideas, and to the freedom of speech, sometimes the grace, by which they are characterized. His *Works* were published at Strasburg (1510, fol.; 1513, 4to), at Paris (1511, 4to; 1513, fol.), and at Basle (1538, fol.). The latter edition, by Bebel, is the best; but it is still incomplete, and does not contain the following works, afterwards published apart: *De Hypocrisia* (Lyons, 1679, 4to), a violent pamphlet against the clergy:—*Historia Florentina* (Ven. 1715, 4to; and in tom. xx of the *Scriptores* of Muratori), translated into Italian by Giacomo, the third of the five sons whom Poggio had by his legitimate wife (Ven. 1476, fol.; Florence, 1492 and 1598, 4to):—*De Varietate Fortunæ* (Par. 1723, 4to), with fifty-seven unpublished *Letters* of Poggio. The *Facetiæ* have often been printed apart (1470, 4to; Ferrara, 1471; Nuremb. 1475; Milan, 1477; Par. 1478, 4to; Utrecht, 1797, 2 vols. 24mo). Poggio's Latin translation of Diodorus Siculus was published at Venice (1473, 1476, fol.) and at Basle (1530, 1578, fol.). See Thorschmidt, *Vita Poggia* (Wittemb. 1713); Recanate, *Vita* (Ven. 1715); Lenfant, *Poggiana* (1720, and enlarged 1721); Nicéron, *Mémoires*, vol. ix; Shepherd, *Life of Poggio* (Lond. 1802, 8vo); Nisard, *Les Gladiateurs de la République des Lettres*, vol. i; Trollope, *History of Florence* (see Index in vol. v); Hallam, *Literary Hist. of Europe* (Harper's edition), i, 64, 92; id. *Middle Ages* (see Index); *Christian Schools and Scholars*, ii, 306–310; Piper, *Monumental Theologie*, § 148, 150, 153, 214; Milman, *Latin Christianity*, viii, 123; *Edinb. Rev.* lxiv, 32 sq.; Schlegel, *Hist. of Literature*, lect. xi; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.

Pogoda is in Slavic mythology the name of a god of the spring and of fine weather. Pogoda is a pure Slavic word, and means *weather*. He is supposed to have been of a kind and amiable disposition—the god of sunny weather, of bright skies, of smiling springs; yet the qualification of *dobra* (good) would seem to be necessary in such a case. The description given of his exterior appearance is perhaps still less authentic than that of his functions: young and beautiful, crowned with blue flowers, blue wings on his shoulders, clothed in a blue garment interwoven with silver, stretched on a bed of flowers resting quietly in the bright air. It is not likely that the Slaves one thousand years ago could have drawn such pictures of their gods.

Pohlman, William John, a missionary of the Reformed (Dutch) Church, was born at Albany, N. Y., in 1812, of pious parents who belonged to the Lutheran Church. His father was of German descent. Converted at the age of sixteen, he united with the First Reformed Church of Albany, under the care of Dr. John Ludlow. Devoting himself to the Christian ministry, Pohlman studied three years at the Albany Academy, entered Rutgers College in 1832, graduated in 1834, and then entered the theological seminary at New Brunswick. While a student in this institution he consecrated himself to the foreign missionary work. In August, 1836, he offered himself to the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, in a memorable letter, which concluded with these sentences: "I wish to enlist for life. If in your view I can be of any service, I lay my all at your feet. 'Silver and gold have I none, but such as I have give I thee.' Send me abroad to publish glad tidings to the idol-serving nations. Send me to the most desert part of all the howling wildernesses of heathenism, to the most barbarous climes, or to more civilized regions. Send me to the millions of pagans, to the followers of the false prophet, to the Jews or the Gentiles, to Catholics or Protestants. Send me, in fine, wherever God opens an effectual door. Send me—'for necessity is laid upon me; yea, woe is unto me if I preach not the Gospel' to the perishing heathen." In this spirit he was sent to Borneo. He was ordained as an evangelist in April, 1838, by the Classis of Albany, and with his wife, a sister of the late Dr. John Scudder, the famous missionary to India, sailed for his field May 25. They arrived at the island of Java Sept. 10, and after a brief sojourn at Singapore went to Batavia, where they were compelled to remain a whole year before the Dutch government would permit them to go to Borneo. Meanwhile he studied the Malay language, which prepared him to hold intercourse with the people to whom he was sent. After the year expired he settled at Pontianak, in Borneo, and immediately began his missionary labors. Mrs. Pohlman died in 1845. She was a woman of like spirit with himself and with her brother—a devoted, intelligent, and laborious missionary's wife and sister. After six years of unremitting toils on this island, Mr. Pohlman was transferred to China in 1844, with the Rev. Elihu Doty, to establish the Amoy Mission, in connection with David Abeel, D.D. He had studied the Chinese language during his residence in Borneo, and so was the better prepared to do efficient work at once in his new field. For five years more he gave himself up unreservedly to this noble service. Dr. Abeel's feeble health compelled his return to America in 1845, and he died in 1846. See Abeel, David. But the mission was planted under the most encouraging auspices. A church building was erected in Amoy, with funds from America, when there were but three communicant members of the mission. Three other distinct missionary churches, all of which are now self-sustaining, have swarmed out of this hive. Native preachers and helpers have been raised up, and the mission has been long regarded as a model of evangelizing work in China. The strictly missionary work in Amoy is now at an end; and the churches there would doubtless live and grow and propagate Christianity, like those of ancient times, even if all American missionaries were withdrawn

from them. Such is the fruit of the labors of Mr. Pohlman and his associates and successors. His valuable life and labors were suddenly ended at Breaker's Point by shipwreck of the vessel on which he was bound from Hong Kong to Amoy, Jan. 5, 1849. Pirates attacked the sinking ship, but "Mr. Pohlman sprang from the ship and was drowned." The ruling principle of Mr. Pohlman's life was his *consecration to God*. He gave himself and his all to Christ, and to the world for Christ's sake. He spared nothing. He was "totus in illis." He was amiable, buoyant, frank, earnest, enthusiastic, and tenacious to the last degree in prosecuting his good purposes. His disposition was very cheerful. He had no crotchets. But with practical common-sense and intense energy and zeal, he lived and labored for the kingdom of Christ. His preaching, correspondence, and public services glowed with this one spirit, which has left its permanent impress upon the mission and Church of which he was so conspicuous a servant. (W. J. R. T.)

Poilly, François de, a French engraver, was born at Abbeville in 1622 or 1623. His father was a goldsmith. After working for three years in the studio of Pierre Daret, he went to Rome in 1649, and remained there until 1656. He engraved during his stay in Italy some drawings in a manner which resembles that of Bloemaert. On his return to France, he engraved with equal success portraits and historical subjects. His portraits are sought for even now, perhaps less on account of the merits of an art which must be confessed to be somewhat cold and monotonous, than of the persons they represent. Poilly was honored with the title of ordinary engraver to the king. He reproduced the works of Raffaelle, Giulio Romano, Guido, Carraccio, Le Brun, Mignard, Le Sueur, Poussin, Ph. de Champagne, etc. The great reputation he enjoyed in his time attracted to his studio a number of pupils, among them Gerard Edelinck, Nicolas de Poilly, his brother, Scotin, Roullet, etc. Poilly and his brother lived together with the Mariette family, for whom Gerard worked. Poilly died at Paris, March, 1693. Though Poilly's style is very laborious, there are about four hundred prints which bear his name, in which however he was of course assisted by his pupils. His masterpiece is the print from Mignard's celebrated picture, now lost, of *San Carlo Borromeo administering the Sacrament to the Milanese attacked with the Plague*. A catalogue of his prints was published by R. Hecquet in 1752. See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.; Mrs. Clement, *Handbook of Painters, Sculptors, Architects, and Engravers*, s. v.

Poimen (ποιμήν), i. e. *pastor*, is a name given to ministers of the Gospel in the New-Testament writings and by the early Church. It is a term recommended by the circumstance that Christ had compared himself to a shepherd and his people to a flock; and the apostle Peter had called him the Chief Shepherd. See Pastor.

Pointed. In the English Prayer-book the *Psalter*, *Venite*, *Te Deum*, etc., are punctuated throughout in a peculiar manner by the insertion of a colon in or near the middle of each verse without regard to grammatical rules. This is done with the design of facilitating the chanting by presenting to the eye the most natural division of the verse, or that which will most readily correspond with the movement of the chant-tune. In allusion to this, the title of the English Prayer-book states that the Psalms of David are "pointed (or punctuated) as they are to be sung or said in churches." In the American editions the grammatical punctuation has been restored, and the above portion of the title omitted.

Pointed Style, especially applied to the Pointed arch, is an architectural term first used in the 14th century. The Pointed style occurs in Egypt, Italy, Greece, and Mexico in ancient buildings, merely as a freak of the architect, an accident, or irregularity. Some authors have traced its origin to the avenues of a forest; others have seen it in the palm, in the wooden churches of an earlier period, or the intersecting arcade. Some refer it to the Goths, like Warburton; or to the Saracens, like Christopher Wren. See Gothic Architecture.

Pointer, John, an English divine of some note, flourished in the first half of the 18th century as chaplain of Merton College, Oxford, where he was probably educated, and as rector of Slapton. He published, besides several works of an altogether secular character, *Oxonienses Academia* (Lond. 1749, 12mo). See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s. v.

Points, Hebrew. See Masorah.

Pointz, Robert, an English theologian of some repute, flourished near the middle of the 16th century. He was educated at Oxford University, and was made perpetual fellow of New College in 1554. He was obliged to go abroad after the accession of queen Mary, he having embraced the Reformed doctrines, and preferring exile to abnegation of his religious convictions. He went to Louvain, and settled there as pastor of a Protestant congregation. He wrote several controversial works against the Romanists, examining their different characteristic doctrines. Among these are, *Testimonies for the Real Presence* (Lond. 1566, 16mo): — *Miracles performed by the Eucharist* (1570). See Wood, *Athenæ Oxonienses*, iii, 715.

Poiret, Pierre, a French philosopher of mystical tendency, and a writer whose works are of great importance to the students of French theological thought, was born at Metz April 15, 1646. He lost his father, a mechanic, when but six years of age. As he showed some disposition for the fine arts, he entered as an apprentice the studio of a sculptor, where he learned the elements of drawing. At thirteen years he studied humanities, and from 1661 to 1663 he was tutor at Basle, and there studied at the same time philosophy and theology. He finally entered the evangelical ministry, and after residing for a while at Hanau, was called as pastor to Heidelberg in 1667; married there, and acquired the reputation of a good preacher. In 1672 he was appointed pastor at Anweiler, in the duchy of Zweibrücken. Here he familiarized himself with the writings of the philosopher Descartes, and of the mystics Kempis, Tauler, and Antoinette Bourignon, and commenced to turn his thoughts towards the spiritual life. In 1673 a dangerous illness converted him fully to mysticism. The war having disturbed his peaceful studies, he first took refuge in Holland, then at Hamburg, in the house of Mlle. Bourignon, to whom he had been long attached by feelings of esteem and admiration. In 1680 he established himself at Amsterdam. Speaking of his exemplary life there, Bayle says that "from a great Cartesian he had become so pious that, in order to apply himself the better to the things of heaven, he had broken off almost every intercourse with the earth." In order to live in more complete seclusion, he retired in 1688 to Rheinsberg, near Leyden, where he spent more than thirty years in the exercise of piety, and in the composition of spiritual and ascetic works. He died there May 21, 1719. Poiret is not the founder of a sect; he established no conventicles, because he attached no importance whatever to dogmatical questions. His theological system lacked speculative clearness and consistency, and was rather a subjective theology of the adoring heart and soaring fancy than of the seeing intellect. It lays little stress upon the forms and rules of any particular Church, and placed the ideal of the Christian life in retired, uninterrupted communion with self and with God. For him, morals were the essence of religion. Hence there was never a more tolerant theologian. If he avoided all intercourse with the world, it was to preserve the integrity of his conscience. Far from

being indifferent, he was full of zeal for the Christian religion, which he defended on several occasions, especially against Spinoza. All those who were acquainted with him agree in the praise of his meekness, his modesty, the purity of his life, the kindness of his heart. It would be unjust to deny that there are excellent things in his works. He displays a surprising sagacity in resolving the most subtle questions of metaphysics, and an uncommon talent in throwing light on the most obscure principles of theosophy. There is a methodical spirit in his writings, which is a fruit of his close study of Descartes, and his system, under an appearance of disorder, is admirably connected and developed. He left about forty works, of which by far the most important is his *De Œconomia Divina*, under the French title, *L'Économie Divine, ou Système universel, et démontré des Œuvres et des Desseins de Dieu envers les Hommes* (Amsterd. 1687, 7 vols. 8vo), in which he means to show with certainty the general harmony of nature and grace, of philosophy and theology, of reason and faith, of natural and Christian ethics. The principle of the philosophic fabric which Poiret sought to construct, and which really systematizes and also explains the wild and incoherent rhapsodies of Bourignon, is *abstraction*, or the preference of a presumed illumination to reason; the same in essence as the *quietism* of Molinos, the *annihilation* of the Hindû philosophy, and the *divine vision* of Böhme. Theologically there are, perhaps, some things that may be considered valuable in Poiret's writings. Opposed on the one hand to Descartes, and on the other to the then growing opinions of Locke, against whom he wrote an able treatise (*Fides et Ratio collatæ ac suo utraque loco novitæ adversus Principia J. Lockii*), Poiret sought to mend weakness of reason by *faith*, and badness of will by *grace*. But the extension of his religious notions into the proper boundaries of speculative philosophy, to say nothing of his strong tendency to fanaticism, points him out to us as one of the most decided instances of mysticism in his age. Most peculiar are Poiret's Christological views. According to ch. xi of this same treatise, the (ideal) Son of God assumed human nature soon *after* the creation of man, and *prior* to his fall, in such a manner that he (the Son of God) took from Adam his body and a divine soul. Poiret also ascribed to Christ, previous to his incarnation in the Virgin Mary, not only various manifestations, but also human "emotions and sufferings," and an unwearying intercession for mankind, his brethren (his office as high-priest). But in the Virgin Mary he assumed *mortal* flesh. "The body of Jesus Christ, assuming the flesh and blood of the blessed Virgin, is as little composed of two different bodies as a white and shining garment, dipped in a vessel dark and full of color, and coming into contact with the matter which composes this darkness, is thereby changed into a double garment, or into two garments instead of one." A complete list of Poiret's works would be useless without a description of them, for which we have not space. The curious may consult the *Catalogue Raisonné*, in the *Mémoires* of J. P. Nicéron (Par. 1727–1745). We have room here for the most important writings only. Among these we would mention *Cogitationes Rationalis de Deo, animo et malo* (Amsterd. 1677, 4to). The edition of 1715 has besides a dissertation against the hidden atheism of Bayle and Spinoza: —*La Paix des bonnes Ames dans toutes les Parties du Christianisme* (ibid. 1687, 12mo). He advises peace in God between all righteous persons, without distinction of communion or rites. the essential is to go to God by the road of morality, the rest is of little account:—*Idæa Theologiæ Christianæ juxta Principia J. Bœhmi* (ibid. 1687, 12mo). He avows that to understand Böhme is all but impossible:—*Les Principes solides de la Religion et de la Vie Chrétienne appliqués à l'Education des Enfants* (ibid. 1690, 1705, 12mo). This book, disapproved by the ministers of Hamburg, was translated into German, English, Flemish, and Latin:—*De Eruditione triplici solida, superficiaria et falsa lib. iii* (ibid. 1692, 12mo, and 1707, 4to). His purpose is to show that there can be no real erudition without inspiration from above: —*Théologie du Cœur* (Cologne, 1696, 1697, 16mo):—*La Théologie réelle, vulgairement dits la Théologie Germanique* (Amsterd. 1700, 12mo). This translation of a German work of the 16th century, translated before by Castalion, had been published in 1676. Poiret accompanied it with a *Letter* on the mystical authors; the latter are 130 in number, and Poiret gives most curious details about their principles, character, life, and works:—*Theologiæ Mysticæ Idea* (ibid. 1702, 12mo):—*Fides et Ratio adversus Principia J. Lockii* (ibid. 1707, 12mo):—*Bibliotheca Mysticorum Selecta* (ibid. 1708, 8vo):—*Posthuma* (ibid. 1721, 4to). Poiret translated *The Imitation of Jesus Christ* (ibid. 1683, 12mo, sev. edit.), which he paraphrased partly according to the interior sense; the works of St. Catherine of Genoa (1691, 12mo), and those of Angèle de Foligny (1696, 12mo). He edited the *Œuvres d'Antoinette Bourignon* (Amsterd. 1679 and following, 19 vols. 12mo), with a most circumstantial *Life*, which was reprinted apart (1683, 2 vols. 12mo), and followed by an apologetic *Mémoire*, inserted in the *Nouvelles de la République des Lettres* (1685); an answer to the attacks of Seckendorf (*Monitum Necessarium*, 1686, 4to); several mystical *Opuscules;* and after having published several of the writings of Mme. Guyon, among others, *Le Nouveau et l'Ancien Testament* (Cologne, 1713–1715, 20 vols. 12mo); her *Vie, écrite par elle-même* (1720, 3 vols. 12mo); and her *Poésies* (1722, 12mo), brought out a complete edition with great care, in 39 vols., furnishing them with elaborate introductions, prefaces, and apologies, sufficient to make several volumes in themselves. In all this there is manifest, as in the editing of Mlle. Bourignon's writings, a remarkable willingness to hide himself entirely behind the beloved objects upon which he spends his toil; so that now in many instances it is impossible to tell just how much of the worth and beauty of whole volumes is to be assigned to himself rather than to the reputed authors. Nearly all of Poiret's writings have been translated into Latin, Dutch, and German. See Walch, *Religionsstreitigkeiten ausser der evangel.-luther. Kirche*, liv, 911 sq.; Nicéron, *Hist. des Hommes illustres*, iv, 144 sq.; x, 140 sq.; Grässe, *Literaturgesch.* vol. iii, pt. iii, p. 479 sq.; Erdmann, *Versuch einer Gesch. d. neuern Philosophie*, vol. i, pt. ii, p. 217 sq.; *Bibliotheca Bremens. Theol. Philol.* tom. iii, pt. i, p. 75; Noack, *Mystik*, § 217; Niedner, *Zeitschr. für die hist. Theol.* 1853–54; Hagenbach, *Vorlesungen über die Kirchengesch.* iv, 326 sq.; Dorner, *On the Person of Christ*, i, 231 sq.; Morell, *Speculative Philos. of Europe*, p. 201; *Comment. de Vita et Scriptes Petri Poiret*, in his *Posthuma* (Amsterd. 1721, 8vo); Jervis, *Hist. of the Church of France* (see Index); Hurst, *Hist. of Rationalism* (see Index); Haag, *La France Protestante*, s. v.; *Histoire des Dogmes* (see Index).

Poirey, François, a French Jesuit, was born in 1584 at Vesoul. He entered the Society of Jesus at the age of seventeen years; was a successful teacher of humanities, rhetorics, philosophy, and Holy Writ, and was appointed superior of a house of his order at Nancy; rector of the college of Lyons, and of that of Dôle. He left, *Ignis Holocaustî* (Pont-à-Mousson, 1629, 16mo):—*La Manière de se disposer à bien mourir* (Douai, 1638, 16mo):—*Le bon Pasteur* (Pont-à-Mousson, 1630, 12mo: —*Le Science des Saints* (Par. 1638, 4to), etc. He died at Dôle Nov. 25, 1637.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.

Poirier, Germain, *Dom*, a learned French Benedictine, was born Jan. 8, 1724, at Paris. He was not quite fifteen years of age when he entered the Congregation of Saint-Maur. After teaching philosophy and theology in the houses of his order, he was appointed secretary to the visitor-general of France, and resigned this place for another which was more congenial to his tastes,

that of guardian of the archives of Saint-Denis. In 1762 he published in the *Nouvelle Collection des Historiens de la France*, vol. xi, which contains the reign of Henry I, an excellent Preface, which forms the fourth part of it, and is, according to Dacier, the most substantial and best work ever written on the first Capetian kings. Tired of the troubles by which his congregation was agitated, he left it in 1765, but re-entered it two years later, and was intrusted with the archives of Saint-Germain-des-Près. In 1785 he was admitted as free associate into the Académie des Inscriptions. During the Revolution he was a member of the commission of monuments, and exerted himself actively in preserving from destruction a number of valuable manuscripts. In 1796 he was appointed librarian of the Arsenal, and in 1800 he succeeded Legrand d'Aussy in the National Institute. He united to a rare erudition a no less rare modesty; he worked for the pleasure he found in the work; hence his easy willingness to communicate the fruit of his researches to any one who recurred to him. His death revealed the secret of his virtues and of his benevolence; the blessings of the poor, their testimonies of gratitude—written testimonies, found, with a few pieces of money, in his bureau—were his whole treasure. He wore cheap clothes, and condemned himself to privations, to be able to give food and clothing to the poor. He died at Paris Feb. 2, 1803. Besides what has been mentioned, he wrote several historical *Mémoires*, which were read in the academy of which he was a member, etc. See Dacier, *Éloge de Dom Poirier* (Paris, 1804, 8vo).—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.

Poison is the rendering in the A. V. of the Bible of two Hebrew and two Greek terms, but they are so general as to throw little light upon the knowledge and practice of poisons among the Hebrews.

1. חֵמָה, *chemâh*, from the root signifying "to be hot," is used of the heat produced by wine (Hos. vii, 5), and the hot passion of anger (Deut. xxix, 27, etc.), as well as of the burning venom of poisonous serpents (Deut. xxxii, 24, 33; Psa. lviii, 4; cxl, 3). In all cases it denotes animal poison, and not vegetable or mineral. The only allusion to its application is in Job vi, 4, where reference seems to be made to the custom of anointing arrows with the venom of a snake, a practice the origin of which is of very remote antiquity (comp. Homer, *Od.* i, 261, 262; Ovid, *Trist.* iii, 10, 64; *Fast.* v, 397, etc.; Pliny, xviii, 1). The Soanes, a Caucasian race mentioned by Strabo (xi, 499), were especially skilled in the art. Pliny (vi, 34) mentions a tribe of Arab pirates who infested the Red Sea, and were armed with poisoned arrows like the Malays of the coast of Borneo. For this purpose the berries of the yew-tree (Pliny, xvi, 20) were employed. The Gauls (Pliny, xxvii, 76) used a poisonous herb, *limeum*, supposed by some to be the "leopard's bane," and the Scythians dipped their arrow-points in vipers' venom mixed with human blood. These were so deadly that a slight scratch inflicted by them was fatal (Pliny, xi, 115). The practice was so common that the name τοξικόν, originally a poison in which arrows were dipped, was applied to poison generally. See Arrow. In Palestine and the countries adjacent were many venomous snakes, as well as insects, such as the scorpion and the scolopendra; but no such practice obtained among the Jews. Poisonous plants were as well known as in other countries, and we have an instance of a miracle wrought by Elisha (2 Kings iv, 38), to prevent mischief by the accidental shredding of a wild gourd into a mess of pottage prepared for the sons of the prophets. This fruit or vegetable was probably the colocynth; and when those who were about to partake of it were repelled by its nauseous bitterness, the prophet commanded a handful of meal to be thrown into the pot, and thus rendered its contents fit for human food. See Gourd.

2. רֹאשׁ (once רוֹשׁ, Deut. xxxii, 32), *rôsh*, if a poison at all, denotes a vegetable poison primarily, and is only twice (Deut. xxxii, 33; Job xx, 16) used of the venom of a serpent. In other passages where it occurs it is translated "gall" in the A. V., except in Hos. x, 4, where it is rendered "hemlock." In the margin of Deut. xxix, 18 our translators, feeling the uncertainty of the word, gave as an alternative "*rosh*, or, *a poisonful herb*." Beyond the fact that, whether poisonous or not, it was a plant of bitter taste, nothing can be inferred. That bitterness was its prevailing characteristic is evident from its being associated with wormwood (Deut. xxix, 18 [17]; Lam. iii, 19; Amos vi, 12), and from the allusions to "water of *rosh*" in Jer. viii, 14; ix, 15; xxiii, 15. It was not a juice or liquid (Psa. lxix, 21 [22]; comp. Mark xv, 23), but probably a bitter berry, in which case the expression in Deut. xxxii, 32, "grapes of *rosh*," may be taken literally. It grew in the fields (Hos. x, 4), was bitter to the taste (Jer. xxiii, 15; Psa. lxix, 22; comp. Lam. iii, 5), and bore clusters, perhaps something like the *belladonna* (Deut. xxxii, 32. Yet here the words עִנְּבֵי רוֹשׁ might also be rendered *poison grapes*, carrying out the figure of the vine, without special allusion to the poison plant). Any special rendering which would suit all the passages is uncertain, since all the old translators have but general expressions (Sept. χολή, Vulg. *fel*, or else some word meaning bitter; yet in the passage from Hos. *l. c.* ἄγρωστις, Ven. MS. τιθύμαλος), and there is no kindred word found in the other dialects to compare. Oedmann (iv, 83 sq.) referred the word to the poisonous colocynth (*Cucumis colocynthi*, Linn.), which grows almost everywhere in Arabia and Palestine; a plant with a creeping stem, bright green leaves, and bears a fruit with a strangely bitter juice (Fabri *Evagat.* ii, 417 sq.). But this fruit is not a berry, but an apple, of the size of the closed hand; nor does the colocynth shoot up among the grain. Michaelis (*Fragm.* etc., p. 145) would understand the *hyoscyāmus* or the *darnel* (*Lolium temulentum*). (But see Oedmann, *ut sup.* p. 85.) This meaning suits the passage in Hosea well (Rosenmüller, *Alterth.* iv, i, 118), but not that in Deut. xxxii, 32; nor does the lolium produce so active a poison that it could be mentioned by way of eminence in these passages. Indeed, many moderns disbelieve its poisonous properties entirely. Celsius (*Hierobot.* ii, 46 sq.) explains *rosh* of the *cicuta* or *hemlock*, but is opposed by Michaelis and Oedmann (*ut sup.* p. 84). Gesenius (*Thesaur.* p. 1281), on the ground that the word in Hebrew also signifies "head," rejects the hemlock, colocynth, and darnel of other writers, and proposes the "poppy" instead (comp. Livy, i, 54, *Papaverum capita, Papaver somniferum*), from the "heads" in which its seeds are contained, and from which the Orientals have extracted opium from a remote antiquity. This was known to the ancients to be poisonous, when taken in excess (Pliny, xx, 76). But it may be doubted whether the poppy could be so directly and pre-eminently styled the poison plant (it was even placed on the table as a side-dish, Pliny, xix, 53); and if *rosh* had denoted a plant so well known, surely some one of the old interpreters would have discovered it. "Water of *rosh*" would thus be simply "opium;" but it must be admitted that there appears in none of the above passages to be any allusion to the characteristic effects of opium. The effects of the *rosh* are simply nausea and loathing. It was probably a general term for any bitter or nauseous plant, whether poisonous or not, and became afterwards applied to the venom of snakes, as the corresponding word in Chaldee is frequently so used. See Hemlock.

3. Ἰός, strictly something *emitted*, as a missile weapon; hence the venom of a serpent (James iii, 8; Rom. iii, 13). See Serpent.

4. Φάρμακον, prop. *medicine*, hence often a deadly potion. There is a clear case of suicide by poison related in 2 Macc. x, 13, where Ptolemæus Macron is said to have destroyed himself by this means. But we do not find a trace of it among the Jews, and certainly poison-

ing in any form was not in favor with them. Nor is there any reference to it in the N. T., though the practice was fatally common at that time in Rome (Sueton. *Nero*, 33, 34, 35; *Tib.* 73; *Claud.* 1). It has been suggested, indeed, that the *φαρμακεία* of Gal. v, 20 (A. V. "witchcraft") signifies poisoning, but this is by no means consistent with the usage of the word in the Sept. (comp. Exod. vii, 11; viii, 7, 18, etc.), and with its occurrence in Rev. ix, 21, where it denotes a crime clearly distinguished from murder (see Rev. xxi, 8; xxii, 15). It more probably refers to the concoction of magical potions and love philtres. See WITCHCRAFT.

The reference in Mark xvi, 18 seems to be to the custom of condemnation to death by means of poison (*κώνειον*, Plato, *Lys.* 219; Plutarch, *Phoc.* c. 36; Diog. Laert. ii, 42; Ael. *V. H.* i, 16; ix, 21; comp. J. Jac. Bose, *De potionibus mortiferis*, Lips. 1736). We read in 2 Macc. x, 13 of an example of suicide by poison (comp. Bose, *Diss.* p. 25 sq.). The administration of poisons seems to have been no unusual crime in the days of the apostles (see Winer, *Ad Galat.* p. 125; comp. Philo, *Op.* ii, 315 sq.), and the Arabian women were especially famous for their skill in preparing them (Joseph. *Ant.* xvii, 4, 1; comp. Rein, *Röm. Criminalrecht*, p. 427 sq.). But in the New Testament the words *φαρμακεία* and *φαρμακεύς* do not refer to this, but to necromancy (q. v.). On poisoned arrows, see Bow. Swords were sometimes also dipped in poison (*Curt.* ix, 8, 20). See MYRRH.

Poissi. See POISSY.

Poisson, NICOLAS-JOSEPH, a French ecclesiastic, noted as a writer of philosophy, was born in 1637 at Paris. He entered the Congregation of the Oratory at the age of twenty-three (1660), and undertook to propagate the principles of Descartes by writing a general commentary on all the works of that philosopher; but after publishing the *Traité de la Mécanique annoté* (Par. 1668, 4to), and *Remarques sur la Méthode* (Vendôme, 1671, 8vo), he gave up the project for fear of compromising his congregation, whom their zeal for the new philosophy exposed to the resentment of the followers of Aristotle. The same fear prevented him from complying with the solicitations of Clerselier and of queen Christina, who promised him ample materials for a Life of Descartes. In 1677 he went to Rome, and handed secretly to pope Innocent XI, in the name of the bishops of Arras and Saint-Pons, a *Mémoire* composed by Nicoles, and thus obtained the condemnation of sixty-five propositions of lax morals which were then in vogue in the schools of theology. The real object of his journey being discovered, he was recalled by order of Père Lachaise (1679), and relegated to Nevers, where bishop Valot made him his vicar, and gave him the direction of the diocesan seminary. After the death of this prelate, Poisson retired to a house of his order at Lyons (1705), where he died, May 3, 1710. He published, besides, *Acta Ecclesiæ Mediolanensis sub sancto Carolo* (Lyons, 1681–83, 2 vols. fol.), valuable for the number of documents translated by the author from Italian into Latin:—*Delectus actorum Ecclesiæ Universalis* (ibid. 1706, 2 vols. fol.). This summary of the councils is the most extensive abridgment which we have on the subject. He left a number of manuscripts, among them, *Vie de Charlotte de Harlay-Sancy*:—a *Description de Rome moderne*:—a *Relation* of his journey to Rome, etc. See Salmon, *Traité de l'Étude des Conciles*, p. 275 sq.; Moréri, *Grand Dict. Hist.* s. v.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.

Poissy, CONFERENCE OF, an ecclesiastical colloquy held September, 1561, is of very great importance in the reformatory history of the French Church. It has been somewhat spoken of in the article HUGUENOTS (q. v.). It was called by Catharine de' Medici, and was composed of all bishops and archbishops, and the representatives of the absent prelates of France. It was intended that the conference should prepare partly for the anticipated renewal of the *Tridentinum* (q. v.); partly as a sort of national council, to effect the reformation of the French Church; and partly to help reduce the debt of the kingdom by the treasures of the Church. But however friendly the prelates were to the state, they did not look very favorably upon the project of reform, though all classes of society were then anxiously discussing not only reform of abuses but of doctrine. Reformed preachers were invited to participate, and even Catharine wrote in favor of the project of keeping the Huguenots within the pale of the Church, and to facilitate a reconciliation by tolerating a difference of sentiment. Pius IV, then the Roman pontiff, objected to the conference, on the ground that "if every prince were to take upon himself to hold councils in his own dominions, the Church would soon become a scene of universal confusion" (Fra Paolo, *Hist. du Concile de Trente*, liv. v, § 53, 72).

The colloquy was opened Sept. 9, in presence of the young king, the queen-mother, the princes of the blood, the great officers of the crown, and a brilliant audience. Cardinal de Tournon presided. The Reformers were represented by twelve of their most eminent ministers, headed by Theodore Beza, the favorite disciple and confidential friend of Calvin. Peter Martyr, who was reckoned the ablest theologian of the party, was likewise present. The proceedings were opened with a speech by chancellor L'Hôpital in favor of this national council, and its advantages over an œcumenical synod. Beza spoke next in elaborate exposition of the doctrinal system of the Reformers as set forth in the "Institutions" of Calvin. Beza's tone was calm, conciliatory, and impressive. In treating of the Eucharist, he employed language which at first seemed almost tantamount to the Catholic terminology on that vital point. But on further explanation it appeared that the presence which he recognised was subjective only; depending not on the supernatural virtue of the sacrament, but on the power of faith; to be sought not in any change of the substance of the elements, but in the heart of the devout communicant. Beza repudiated both *transubstantiation* (q. v.) and *consubstantiation* (q. v.). Cardinal de Tournon objected to Beza's speech, and in a trembling voice prayed for its interruption on the ground that the young monarch's mind would be poisoned. Beza, however, managed to conclude, when, after a few hasty words of angry remonstrance from the cardinal, the assembly separated in a state of agitation (De Thou, *Hist. Univ.* liv. xxviii; La Place, *Commentaire de l'État de Religion*, liv. vi).

At the second meeting, several days afterwards, the cardinal of Lorraine replied to Beza in a very able discourse. The doctrine of the real presence, as held in the Church of Rome, he proceeded to establish by proofs drawn with great skill from the Holy Bible and the Church fathers. (The speech is given at full length in the *Collection des Procés-verbaux des Assemblées générales du Clergé de France*, vol. i, "Pièces Justifications," No. 2.) The sitting was then adjourned. The sessions which followed were not held in the royal presence, and were comparatively private. Though it was clear that there could be no successful settlement by the conference, it was resolved by all parties to make a final effort for approximation, and for this purpose a select committee of ten persons was named from the most moderate members of each party. After some days of negotiation, these divines drew up a formulary upon the doctrine of the Eucharist, in the terms of which it was hoped that all sincere friends of peace in the rival communions might be induced to concur. Its language, however, was so ambiguous that each party was at liberty to construe it in accordance with their own prepossessions. The following was the draft agreed upon: "We confess that Jesus Christ, in his Holy Supper, presents, gives, and exhibits to us the true substance of his body and blood by the operation of the Holy Spirit; and that we receive and eat sacramentally, spiritually,

and by faith the very body which died for us, that we may be bone of his bone and flesh of his flesh; and inasmuch as faith, resting on the Word of God, makes present things which are promised, so that thereby we receive actually the true and natural body and blood of our Lord by the power of the Holy Ghost, in that sense we acknowledge the real presence of Christ in the Holy Supper" (Beza, *Histoire des Églises Ref.* i, 608; *Contin. de Fleury*, liv. xlvii, 24). Of course such evasion could not prove satisfactory. The doctors of the Sorbonne being appealed to, rejected the formulary as "captious, insufficient, and heretical;" and then the prelates put forth a counter-statement, asserting the real presence by transubstantiation of the elements, according to the authorized traditions of the Church. This they forwarded to the queen, with a request that Beza and his associates might be ordered to signify their acceptance of it without further demur, under pain of being proscribed as heretics and banished from the kingdom. This peremptory demand was equivalent to a rupture of the negotiations; and the conference of Poissy terminated without satisfactory result.

The actions of the conference were therefore of very little advantage. Several regulations relating to discipline were made. Concerning the election of bishops, it was ordered that the name of the person nominated by the king to a bishopric shall be posted at the cathedral doors, and in other public places, that all persons may have the opportunity of objecting to him if they know anything against him. The following is a summary of other important actions of this synod:

Archbishops and bishops are forbidden to absent themselves from their dioceses for more than three months; are exhorted to apply themselves to preaching and visitations, and to hold annual synods.

Archbishops are directed to summon provincial councils every three years, according to the decrees of the Council of Basle. Excommunications, save for weighty reasons, are forbidden. Curates not to be admitted to their benefices until they have been examined by the bishop: they are ordered to proceed to priest's orders within a year from their admission; to reside constantly; to explain the Gospel to their people, and to teach them to pray. Private masses are forbidden to be said while solemn mass is celebrated.

Priests are enjoined to prepare themselves carefully before approaching the holy altar; to pronounce the words distinctly; to do all with decency and gravity; not to suffer any airs, save those of hymns and canticles, to be played upon the organ; to correct the church books; to try to abolish all superstitious practices; to instruct the people that images are exposed to view in the churches for no other reason than to remind persons of Jesus Christ and the saints. It is further directed that all images which are in any way indecent, or which merely illustrate fabulous and ridiculous tales, shall be entirely removed.

These regulations are closed by a profession of faith, in which the errors of Luther and Calvin, and other sectarians, are specially rejected.

See, besides the authorities already cited, De Felice, *History of French Protestantism*, p. 101 sq.; Bossuet, *Variations*, vol. i; Jervis, *Church of France*, i, 137–146; Soldan, *Gesch. des Protestantismus in Frankreich* (1855), etc., vol. i; Ranke, *Französische Gesch.* i, 236 sq.; Baum, *Theodor Beza* (1851), vol. ii; Smedley, *History of the Ref. Religion in France*, i, 148 sq., 178; Smiles, *History of the Huguenots* (see Index); Hardwick, *History of the Reformation*, p. 138 sq. (J. H. W.)

Poitier, Pierre-Louis, a French religious writer, was born Dec. 26, 1745, at Havre. As soon as he had taken holy orders, he was appointed superior of the seminary of Rouen, by cardinal La Rochefoucauld, archbishop of that city. After submitting to the law which exacted the constitutional oath of clergymen, he recalled it, and retired to the seminary of St. Firmin, at Paris, where he perished, Sept. 2, 1792, with almost all his companions. He left some works of edification, which had several editions.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xl, 582.

Poitiers (earlier Poictiers, a corruption of the Latin *Pictavium*, so called by the Gallic tribe, the *Pictavi*, who inhabited the district in Cæsar's time) is one of the oldest towns in France. It is the capital of the department of Vienne, and is situated on an eminence near the rivers Clain and Boivre. Its population is now about 31,034, and it possesses many churches, chapels, and monasteries. Its cathedral, named St. Pierre, is one of the finest in France, and belongs to the 12th century. It contains the ashes of Richard Cœur de Lion, and was the seat, in its present condition, or in the older edifice that occupied its site, of twenty-three ecclesiastical councils.

Poitiers, Councils of (*Concilium Pictaviense*), were convened here at different times in the Middle Ages.

I. The first of these was held in 593, and was provoked by a rebellion of nuns, under the leadership of Chrodielde, a Frankish princess and nun at Poitiers, who had rebelled against Leubovera, abbess of St. Croix. She was here called to account for leaving her nunnery, and for the violence which she had committed against Gondegesile and other bishops; also for the acts of rebellion which she, in concert with Besina, another nun, had committed against their abbess. Being exhorted to ask forgiveness of the abbess, she boldly refused, and threatened to kill her. The bishops, after consulting the canons, declared her to be excommunicated, and ordered that she should remain so until she should have done penance. They then re-established the abbess, Leubovera, in the government of the monastery. See Labbé, *Concil.* v, 1593; Gregor. Turon. *Hist. d. France*, ix, 4; x, 16, 19; Mansi, *Concil.* ix, 1011; x, 455, 459; Hardouin, *Concil.* iii, 490, 527, 531; Hefele, *Conciliengesch.* iii, 51.

II. Another council was held Jan. 13, 1004, convoked by William V, count of Poitiers and duke of Aquitaine. Five bishops were present, who published three canons:

1. Pronounces those persons to be under anathema who pillage the churches, rob the poor, or strike the clergy; and further declares that if they rebel against this sentence the bishops and barons shall assemble and march against them, ravaging all around them until they submit.

The other two canons forbid bishops to take any fees for penance and confirmation; and priests and deacons to retain women in their houses.

See Labbé, *Concil.* ix, 780.

III. The third council was held in 1073, before cardinal Gerand, the Roman legate, against Berenger. The question of the Holy Eucharist was discussed, and the minds of men were so exasperated against Berenger that he narrowly escaped with his life. See Labbé, *Concil.* x, 346.

IV. The fourth was held in 1078, by the legate Hugo, bishop of Die, who, by the account which he gave of this council to pope Gregory VII, seems to have encountered much opposition to his plans. He complains that the king of France had forbidden the count of Poitiers to allow the council to be held within his states; that the archbishop of Tours and the bishop of Rennes had rendered themselves almost complete masters of the council, and that the assembly had been disturbed by the armed followers of these prelates. Some attribute to this council, and others to the following one, ten canons, of which these are the most worthy of note:

1. Forbids to receive investitures at the hands of kings and other laymen.
2. Forbids simony and pluralities.
4. Forbids bishops to receive any present for conferring holy orders, for consecrating churches, or for giving any benediction.
6. Forbids monks and canons to purchase churches without the bishop's consent.
8. Forbids the ordination of the children of priests, and of bastards, except they be canons or regular monks.
10. Enjoins that clerks who carry arms, or who deal in usury, shall be excommunicated.

See Labbé, *Concil.* x, 366.

V. The last council convened at Poitiers was held Nov. 18, 1100, by order of John and Benedict, the two legates of the holy see, who presided in the place of Pascal II. About eighty bishops and abbots were present. Norigaudus, bishop of Autun, having been found

guilty of simony, was condemned to give up his stole and pastoral ring. Upon his refusal to do so, he was further deposed from his bishopric and from the priesthood, and sentence of excommunication was denounced against all who continued to obey him as their bishop. He, nevertheless, persisted in his refusal to submit to the sentence, and retained his stole and ring. In this council, moreover, Philip, king of France, who had taken back to him Bertrade, his wife, was excommunicated by the legates, in spite of the opposition of many of the bishops and of William, duke of Aquitaine. Lastly, sixteen canons were published:

1. Declares that it is lawful for bishops only to give the tonsure (*coronas benedicere*) to the clergy, and for abbots to do so to monks.
2. Forbids them to require any fee for performing the operation, or even the scissors and napkin employed.
4. Reserves to the bishop the benediction of the sacerdotal vestments, and of all the vessels, etc., of the altar.
7. Forbids, under excommunication, to buy or sell prebends, and to require any allowance (*pastus*) for having given one.
10. Gives permission to regular canons to baptize, preach, administer the sacrament of penance, and bury the dead during the bishop's pleasure.
12. Forbids to allow to preach those who carry about the relics of saints for the sake of gain.
16. Confirms all that the pope had enacted in the Council of Clermont.

See Labbé, *Concil.* x, 720; Hefele, *Conciliengesch.* vols. iv and v.

Poix, Louis de, a French monastic, was born Oct. 18, 1714, at Croixrault (diocese of Amiens). He devoted himself for some years to the study of the Greek, Hebrew, Chaldee, and Syriac languages, and conceived the design of a Polyglot Bible, to the redaction of which several of his confraternity (the Capuchin monks) promised to lend a hand. In 1744 the abbé Villefroy, professor at the College of France, took the direction of this enterprise; but the Bible impatiently expected by the learned world, and in regard to which Benedict XIV addressed a brief of felicitation to Louis de Poix, April 9, 1755, was not published, owing to divers contrarieties which at that time befell the Capuchins. In 1768 Poix wrote a *Memoir*, in which he advocated the foundation of an institution which, without being a burden to the State, would be of invaluable service to the Church, useful to the learned and men of letters, and honorable to the nation. He proposed the name of "Société Royal des Études Orientales," and on the plan suggested by him was founded, April 1, 1822, the "Société Asiatique." Louis de Poix died at Paris in 1782. He published, with the collaboration of several other Capuchins, the following works: *Prières que Nersès, Patriarche des Arméniens, fit à la Gloire de Dieu, pour toute Ame fidèle à Jésus Christ* (1770):—*Principes discutés pour faciliter l'Intelligence des Livres prophétiques* (Par. 1755-64, 16 vols. 12mo), the fruit of twenty years' labor:—*Nouvelle Version des Psaumes* (ibid. 1762, 2 vols. 12mo):—a *Translation of Ecclesiastes* (1771, 12mo):—*Prophéties de Jérémie* (ibid. 1780, 6 vols. 12mo):—*Prophéties de Baruch* (ibid. 1788, 12mo):—*Essai sur le Livre de Job* (ibid. 1768, 2 vols. 12mo):—*Traité de la Paix intérieure* (1764, 1768, 12mo):—*Traité de la Joie* (1768, 12mo). He left in manuscript a *Dictionnaire Arménien, Latin, Italien, et Français.*—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xl, 585.

Poki, Jehuda, *ben-Elieser* (*Tshelebi ben-Isaak Puki*), a Jewish writer of some note, who belonged to the sect of the Karaites, was born and educated at Constantinople in the first half of the 16th century. He made extensive travels through Palestine, Egypt, Irak, and Persia in order to become acquainted with the Karaite literature. But having no knowledge of the Arabic, he was unable to make use of a large portion of Karaite literature, as he himself confessed in the preface of a work of his. In the year 1571 he was at Kahira, where he found many writings of the Karaites in the house of the Nasi, or head of the Karaites, where he also resided, and was told that all congregations were in possession of such collections, which, however, were very often burned or plundered. He was told that the year before (1570) three hundred very valuable and interesting works of the Karaites had been taken from the synagogue at Kahira and destroyed. At Kahira, Poki finished his work שער יהודה about 1573, and died in 1575 in his native place. The above-named work, which was published by his son and brother at Constantinople in 1581, treats in a very elaborate way on the laws of incest, the preface of which has been reprinted by Wolf in his *Bibl. Hebr.* iii, 294 sq. See Fürst, *Gesch. des Karäerthums*, from 900 to 1575 (Leips. 1865), ii, 322 sq.; id. *Bibl. Jud.* iii, 108 sq.; De Rossi, *Dizionario storico degli Autori Ebrei*, p. 266 (Germ. transl. by Hamberger); Wolf, *Bibl. Hebr.* iii, 293 sq. (B. P.)

Pol. See Bean.

Polak, Jacob, a Jewish savant, one of the greatest Talmudic authorities in his time, was born about 1460, and died about 1530 at Prague, where under his lead a great Talmudic school had flourished. Polak was a pupil of Jacob Margoles of Nuremberg, from whom he learned a new method of Talmudic casuistry, known as the "Pilpul." In the times which were disastrous and troublesome to the Jews the study of the Talmud was left to itself, and, guided by no general scientific knowledge, it unavoidably degenerated into a method repulsive to the few who were really profound scholars, or whose minds were less distorted. The transition from the short explanation of words and things of the older commentators of the Talmud—through the discussions and disputations of the Tosaphoth (in the narrower sense)—to the exercises of wit of the Nurembergers (*Blauser*, from the German "bloss," by which the query was introduced) and Regensbergers (so called from the principal schools), and the pettifoggings of modern times, has not yet been specially investigated. There are many analogies in Christian jurisprudence and Mohammedan theology to this kind of casuistry and discussion ("Pilpul"), which devotes more attention to the mode of treatment than to the subject itself. For it is the nature of a practical science—and the Halacha must be regarded throughout as a theory of law—that over-theorizing causes it to degenerate from a practical aim to a mere play of intellect. During this unhappy time rules derived from idle speculation were enforced as rules of life belonging to the religious law, more strictly than at any former period; and subsequently the authors of the Tosaphoth and their successors, together with the great Spanish and Provençal legal authorities (particularly the authors of compendiums, judgments, etc.), were comprised under the expression "decernents" (*Pesukim*, פסוקים). But it must be said in honor of Jacob Polak, though he introduced this "Pilpul method," he was very careful not to write down nor publish the decisions achieved by this method of hair-splitting, for fear that his successors might follow him implicitly. The only work of his we have is a decision entitled ויקם נדות ביעקב, published with the approbation of Simon ben-Bezalel (Prague, 1594), and republished together with Löwe ben-Bezalel's הַסַּפֵּר עַל פְּטִירַת חָכָם (Frankfort-on-the-Main, 1719). See Fürst, *Bibl. Jud.* iii, 109 sq.; Wolf, *Bibl. Hebr.* iii, 1095; Grätz, *Geschichte der Juden*, ix, 63 sq.; Jost, *Gesch. d. Judenth. u. s. Sekten*, iii, 240 sq.; Güdemann, in Frankel's *Monatsschrift* (Breslau, 1854), xiii, 423 sq. (B. P.)

Polallion, Marie de Lumague, *Dame de*, a French lady renowned for her piety, and the founder of a religious order, was born Nov. 29, 1599, at Paris. Belonging to a noble and rich family, and having enjoyed a brilliant education, she was wooed by several gentlemen of high standing, but, resisting all the seductions of the world, gave the preference to a life of monastic quiet. At the instigation of Lebrun, a Dominican who directed

her conscience, she entered a monastery of the Capuchins. But as the weakness of her health did not suffer her to submit to the ascetic rules of the order, she was free to leave the monastery, and in 1617 she was married to François de Polallion. Her husband died about a year after, and from this time she lived in retirement as tutor of one of the daughters of the duchess of Orleans. Madame de Polallion, in the midst of the most brilliant court of Europe, remained true to her early monastic habits, and when relieved of her duties sought again her former retreat. According to St. Vincent de Paul, she founded the "Institut des Filles de la Providence" in 1630: the members of this sisterhood undertook to educate the children of the poor in the country. She directed that they should be thirty-three in number, and distributed them in the villages of the environs of Paris. Her own means were soon exhausted by the enterprise, but private charity came to the rescue, and Anne of Austria, taking the institution under her protection, presented it in 1651 with a mansion in the suburb of Saint-Marceau. She also helped in the founding of the "Maison des Nouvelles Catholiques," which was liberally endowed by marshal Turenne. The life of Madame de Polallion has frequently been written. She died at Paris Sept. 4, 1657.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xl, 587.

Polanco is the name of three brothers, esteemed Spanish painters of the 16th century, natives of Seville. Francisco Zurbaran was their master, and they were so proficient in art that even in their own times their works were confounded with those of their master. This mistake, says Quillet, has been quite frequent with those who beheld the paintings of San-Esteban at Seville, where Zurbaran painted *St. Peter* and *St. Stephen*, but where the *Martyrdom* of the patron, the *Nativity*, which is below, *St. Hermenegilde*, and *St. Hernan*, are works of Polanco. They always worked and lived together. Their great paintings adorn the monuments of Seville. At San-Paolo we find the *Apparition of the Angels to Abraham; Tobias the Younger guided by an Angel; Jacob Wrestling; Joseph's Dream;* and in the church of the Guardian Angels, *St. Theresa in Ecstasy* (1649). The last work of Carlo Polanco, who seems to have been the most celebrated of the brothers, bears the date of 1686.—Hoefer, *Nouvelles Biographies Générale*, xl, 588.

Poland, Ecclesiastical History of. The Polish historians Naruscewicz, Friese, Lelewel, and others assert that Christianity was introduced into the Slavic countries at a very early period by some disciples of Methodius from Moravia. Lelewel, upon very unsafe grounds, admits a bishopric of Posen anterior to the time of king Micislas I. According to Thietmar of Merseburg, the latter, under the influence of his wife Dambrouska, daughter of the Bohemian duke Boleslas, established the Christian religion in Poland in 965, prevailed upon his subjects to destroy the idols, and founded as early as 966, with the assistance of the German emperor Otho the Great, the bishopric of Posen (Poznani), over which, together with the bishoprics of Cizi, Misni, Merseburg, Brandenburg, and Havelberg, etc., jurisdiction was given to the archbishop of Magdeburg, at the Council of Ravenna, in 967. It follows that the year of foundation, 968, given by Boguphalus and the *Annales Poznan.*, has been accepted erroneously. The diocese of the bishop of Posen extended over the dominions of duke Boleslas, the boundaries of which cannot be ascertained for want of documents. Posen was the only Polish bishopric up to the year 1000, when the emperor Otho III, at the time of a pilgrimage to the tomb of St. Adalbert at Gnesen, founded the archiepiscopal see of Gnesen (Gnesna), and subordinated to it the bishoprics of Colobrega (Kolberg), Cracow, and Wratislavia (Breslau), all then situated in the duchy of Polonia. Stanislas Lubienski's assertion that Cracow was the seat of the oldest Polish bishopric is thus proved to be erroneous, as it could not, as an archbishopric, have been a dependence of Gnesen.

Early Period.—We know little about the ecclesiastical development of Poland in its first Christian century. Pope Gregory VII complained in 1075 of the small number of the bishops in proportion to the population; the dioceses were too large, and the bishops had not even fixed residences; nothing definite had been decided about the limits of the diocese of Gnesen and its dependent bishoprics, among which was then counted the bishopric of Lebus, founded by Micislas in 965; but as the city passed continually from Poland to Germany, and vice versa, its existence was a precarious one. It is believed that the papal legate Ægidius founded it a second time in 1123, and subordinated it to Gnesen; documents relating to it date only from 1133. Another episcopal see dependent upon Gnesen was the bishopric of Plock, whose foundation is referred to Boleslas the Great. It was formerly called *Ep. Masoviæ*. Gallus (*Chron. Pol.* ad ann. 1110) mentions a bishop Simeon: he seems to have been ordained in 1107, and to have died in 1129. A great victory of the Poles over the Prussians and Pomeranians is attributed to his intercession. And still another dependent bishopric was that of Leslau, which was founded by Micislas II, son of Boleslas the Great, and originally called *Episc. Cujaviensis*, because it was intended for the province of Cujawia; extended afterwards over the largest part of Western Prussia, on the left bank of the Vistula; reached in a northerly direction the Baltic Sea; and was bounded west by the archbishopric of Gnesen, which it also encircled on the south. Gallus (*Chronicle*) mentions bishop Paulas, who died in 1110. The bishopric of Ermeland, founded in 1243, came to Poland only in 1466. After the reign of Micislas II (1023–34), general anarchy ensued, and at the same time a general apostasy from the Christian faith. Bishops and priests were without authority, some were killed, and external and civil wars robbed Poland of its wealth, and of a considerable part of its population. In 1039 the Bohemians destroyed Posen and Gnesen, and took away the body of St. Adalbert. A multitude of Poles crossed the Vistula and took refuge in Masowia; wild beasts established their lairs in the churches of St. Adalbert and St. Peter. Kasimierz (Casimir) in that great distress arrived with a body of five hundred soldiers from Germany, and by his bravery and intelligence freed the country from foreign occupation. He retained the power until his death, which occurred in 1058. He promoted the interests of Christianity by all the means in his power. He was succeeded by his son, Boleslas II, whose feats were not inferior to those of his ancestors; but his ambition and pride caused his ruin. At Christmas, 1076, he put the diadem on his head, and was anointed by the bishops of the kingdom. About the same time Gregory VII sent a legate to Poland. A few years afterwards, in 1079, the king, being put under interdict by St. Stanislas, bishop of Cracow, avenged himself by the murder of the prelate. Hereupon the nobility expelled him, and he was obliged to take refuge in Hungary, where he died. He was succeeded by his younger brother, Boleslas Wladislas Hermann, who lived in peace with his neighbors and the clergy, to whom he granted rights and privileges. Having lived many years in childless matrimony with the Bohemian princess Judith, a son was granted him, in consequence of the intercession, it was believed, of St. Ægidius. This son was afterwards Boleslas Krzywousty. At this time Otho, afterwards the apostle of Pomerania, lived at the Polish court. He was instrumental in bringing about Wladislas Hermann's second marriage with Judith, the widowed sister of the emperor Henry IV. In 1099 the bishops of Poland dedicated the cathedral of Gnesen. On the day previous to that ceremony St. Adalbert is said to have appeared to the Poles in a battle with the Pomeranians, and given them victory. Wladislas divided his states during his lifetime between Boleslas

and another illegitimate son, Zbigniew. The latter had revolted a few years before, and was pardoned at the intercession of the bishops. Wladislas died in 1102, at Plock. The new ruler, Boleslas III (1102–1139), married a Russian princess, and undertook expeditions, considered in the light of crusades, against the pagan Pomeranians. In 1103 Walo, chosen bishop of Beauvais, and, after his return, bishop of Paris, came to Poland as the legate of pope Paschal II, and in his zeal for justice deposed two bishops—"nullo vel prece vel pretio subveniente." In 1109 Boleslas reported such a complete victory over the Pomeranians that, of their 40,000 warriors, 10,000 only escaped; he took the stronghold of Nakel, thus preparing the way for the spiritual expedition undertaken soon afterwards by Otho, bishop of Bamberg. In 1109 the emperor Henry V was utterly defeated in his attempt to submit Poland a second time to the empire. In 1110 Boleslas fought successfully against the Bohemians: the bishops, as usual, accompanied the troops, and distributed the Eucharist to the whole army on the eve of an engagement. In 1120–1121 the Pomeranians, after a desperate struggle, were completely subdued and Stettin was taken. The conquered foe promised tribute and conversion. It was then that Boleslas besought Otho of Bamberg to instruct the Pomeranians. See POMERANIA. The last years of the great king were less successful. In 1135 Boleslas recognised at Merseburg the emperor Lothair as his liege lord for Pomerania and Rügen; promised a tribute for twelve years, and carried the sword of the emperor as the imperial procession proceeded to church. In 1139 he divided his dominions among the four oldest of his sons, and died Oct. 28, 1139. In 1123 the papal legate Ægidius, bishop of Tusculum, sent by Calixtus II, had to establish more distinctly the limits between the dioceses, and this division of the temporal sovereignty in nowise affected the Church. But the Church was far from enjoying in Poland the privileges she possessed in other parts of Christian Europe. Her goods and subjects stood under the secular laws; there was no immunity from taxes, and the bishops were altogether dependent on the princes. Still at the beginning of the 13th century the princes disposed of the prebends of the cathedrals, and took hold of the goods of the bishops at their demise, as the patrons did of the heritage of curates. A number of priests lived in concubinage. There were churches, the charges of which had become, in some sense, the possession of certain families. The dissensions of the successors of Boleslas, as was to be expected, dismembered the empire after a century of bloodshed. Prussians, Lithuanians, Mongols, and other tribes devastated the country. The authority of the Church grew among those ruins. Papal legates appeared more frequently, synods became more frequent too, and altogether the Church sought for herself the rights she had long attained elsewhere. The Templars, assisted by Crusaders from the West, attacked the pagans of Prussia, and the voice of the popes constantly called the Western Christians to arms against the barbarians. In 1157 the emperor Frederick I indicted a crusade of the Germans against Poland, to re-establish the tie of vassalage that once united the land with Germany. The Poles were defeated, and Boleslas appeared at Krzyszkowo before the emperor barefooted, and with a naked sword tied around his neck. Wladislas died in Germany, and was succeeded by Boleslas IV, who died in 1173, leaving an only son, Leszek: but it was his brother Micislas who succeeded him. The people, led by Getka (Gedcon), bishop of Cracow, revolted against Micislas, and his younger brother, Casimir Sprawiedliwy (the Just), was put in his place. In 1180 there was a synod of Polish bishops. They threatened with interdict whoever should rob the peasants of their stores, appropriate the heritage of an ecclesiastic, or refuse to restore within a given time whatever of Church property had been taken. After Casimir, who died May 4, 1194, at table, while talking with the bishops about salvation—"non sine veneni suspicione"—Fulko assembled the primates, and prevailed upon them to recognise the sons of Casimir. Helena, Casimir's widow, made arrangements with Micislas, and, in the name of her minor sons, recognised him as archduke, and left him Cracow: her son Leszek was to be his successor. This Micislas died in 1202 at Kalisch, and Leszek waived in favor of his son Wladislas his own rights to Cracow. In these years the endeavors of the popes for the reformation of the Polish Church were crowned with some success. Clement III sent in 1189 cardinal Giovanni Malabranca to collect contributions for a crusade, and reform the clergy of Poland; several regulations for that purpose were agreed upon at the Synod of Cracow. Cardinal Peter came in 1197; but when he published at Prague the edict against the matrimony of clergymen, the wrath of the clergy was so great that his life was put in danger. He held another synod at Cracow, where he insisted on the same views; journeyed through the bishoprics, giving his attention to a dereliction of sound morals more deplorable than the marriage of ecclesiastics, and traditional with the Poles: for he besought the laymen to seek some consecration for their wild copulations. He made slow work of it, and it required all the energies of archbishop Henry Kentlitz to establish, little by little, a more Christianlike state of things. In 1212 bishop Peter was freely elected by the chapter of Posen. The dukes at that time promised to touch nothing of the heritage of prelates save gold, silver, etc., and waived their judiciary rights on clergymen and their subjects. In 1231 Wladislas Odonicz became the only ruler of Great Poland. At this epoch some crusades against the Prussians took place, and the Poles, though slowly and reluctantly, had a part in them. We find the same bishoprics in the 13th and 14th centuries, but not in those firm metropolitan relations which the interest of the Church required (see Gregory VII, *Epist. ad Boleslaum, Pol. regem*, lxxiii). The first bishop of Posen, Jordan, and the duke Boleslas Chrobry distinguished themselves by their successful attempts to expand the Christian faith; Bodzanta, archbishop of Gnesen, in the 14th century, by the conversion of the barbarians of Lithuania and Samogitia. This prelate extended his diocese, augmented by a half, over Pomerellia and Neringia, and added Silesia to his spiritual dominions: in one word, the country between the Netze River, the sources of the Vistula, the grand-duchies of Moscow and Semgallen, constituted the territory of his archiepiscopal see. In consequence of these aggrandizements the new bishoprics of Wilna, in the grand-duchy of Lithuania, and of Wornie or Miedniki, in the duchy of Samogitia, were established—the first in 1387, the latter in 1417.

The Reformation Period and Since.—In order to make clear the history of the Polish Church in the Reformation period, it is necessary to retrace our steps to the 11th century. It was then that the neighboring churches of Germany acquired a great influence over the Poles, while priests and monks flocked from France and Italy, but particularly from Germany, to Poland, built everywhere convents and churches, and at the same time used the Romish ritual in opposition to the simple worship of the Polish national churches, which, however, maintained their ground till the 14th century. The Hussites (q. v.) from Bohemia found a favorable field in Poland for the propagation of their peculiar tenets, and the Romish clergy in consequence took active measures for the purpose of checking the spread of the obnoxious doctrines. With this view the parish priests were ordered to seize and bring before the bishops all who were suspected of holding Hussite sentiments. Severe enactments were passed for the punishment of the heretics. But in the face of all opposition the new doctrines were embraced by some of the most influential families in the land, and the reforming party indeed was very numerous when their leader was slain on the field of battle. But although the doctrines of Huss

had found many supporters in Poland, the national feeling was still in favor of the dominant Church. We append an account of the progress of Protestantism in Poland dependent largely on Gardner, *Dictionary of Religions*, p. 670 sq.:

"In the commencement of the 15th century a powerful impulse was given to the cause of Polish education and literature by the establishment of the University of Cracow, and the encouragement given in that seminary to native scholars. Already a goodly number of accomplished literary men had issued from the University of Prague, some of whom were chosen to fill the chairs at Cracow; these again were generally selected to supply the vacant episcopal sees, and thus in a short time there were found in the Polish Church not a few prelates distinguished alike for their piety and learning. The enlightened views which some of these ecclesiastical dignitaries entertained were speedily manifested in various projects started for reforming the Church. Thus Martin Tromba, the primate of Poland, ordered the liturgical books to be translated into the national language, that they might be understood by the great mass of the people. But the boldest step in the direction of Church reform at this period was taken by Ostrowo, palatine of Posen, who presented to the Polish diet of 1459 a proposal for introducing improvements of such a vital character that, had they been adopted, a separation of the Church of Poland from Rome would have been the immediate result. 'In this plan,' says count Krasinski, 'of reforming the Church of Poland he maintained that, Christ having declared that his kingdom was not of this world, the pope had no authority whatever over the king of Poland, and should not even be addressed by the latter in humble terms, unbecoming his dignity; that Rome was drawing every year from the country large sums under the pretence of religion, but, in fact, by means of superstition; and that the bishop of Rome was inventing most unjust reasons for levying taxes, the proceeds of which were employed, not for the real wants of the Church, but for the pope's private interests; that all the ecclesiastical lawsuits should be decided in the country, and not at Rome, which did not take "any sheep without wool;" that there were, indeed, among the Poles people who respected the Roman scribblings furnished with red seals and hempen strings, and suspended on the door of a church; but that it was wrong to submit to these Italian deceits.' He further says: 'Is it not a deceit that the pope imposes upon us, in spite of the king and the senate, I don't know what, bulls called indulgences? He gets money by assuring people that he absolves their sin; but God has said by his prophet, "My son, give me thy heart, and not money." The pope feigns that he employs his treasures for the erection of churches; but he does it, in fact, for enriching his relations. I shall pass in silence things that are still worse. There are monks who praise still such fables. There are a great number of preachers and confessors who only think how to get the richest harvest, and who indulge themselves, after having plundered the poor people. He complains of the great number of monks unfit for the clerical office, saying, "After having shaven his head and endowed a cowl, a man thinks himself fit to correct the whole world. He cries, and almost bellows, in the pulpit, because he sees no opponent. Learned men, and even those who possess an inferior degree of knowledge, cannot listen without horror to the nonsense, and almost blasphemy, uttered by such preachers."'

"These sentiments avowed by a Polish senator in the assembly of the states, plainly indicated that public opinion, even in the 15th century, was prepared for the great ecclesiastical reformation which commenced a century later in Germany and Switzerland. As if still further to pave the way for that important movement, treatises were at every little interval issuing from the press in Poland containing opinions which Rome has always been accustomed to brand as heresies. One work, in particular, was published at Cracow in 1515, which openly advocated the great Protestant principle that the Holy Scriptures must be believed, and all merely human ordinances may be dispensed with. The date of the appearance of this treatise was two years before Luther publicly avowed his opposition to Rome. No sooner, accordingly, did the German Reformer commence his warfare with the pope than he was joined by many Poles, more especially belonging to the towns of Polish Prussia; and so rapidly did the principles of the Reformation spread in Dantzic, the principality of that province, that, in 1524, no fewer than five churches were occupied by the disciples of the Wittenberg Reformer. A very large part of the inhabitants of Dantzic, however, still adhered to the old Church; and, anxious to restore the ancient order of things, they despatched a deputation to Sigismund I, who at that time occupied the throne of Poland, imploring his interposition. The monarch, moved by the appeal made by the deputation, who appeared before him dressed in deep mourning, proceeded in person to Dantzic, restored the former state of things, and either executed or banished the principal leaders of the new movement. But while for purely political reasons Sigismund in this case acted in the most tyrannical and oppressive manner, he allowed the doctrines of Protestantism to spread in all the other parts of his dominions without persecuting those who embraced them. Even in Dantzic itself, when Lutheranism, in the course of a few years, began to be again preached within its walls, he refused to take a single step to check its progress, so that in the subsequent reign it became the dominant creed of that city, without, however, infringing upon the religious liberty of the Roman Catholics.

"The works of Luther found many readers, and even admirers, in Poland, and a secret society, composed of both clergymen and laymen, met frequently to discuss religious subjects, including those points more especially which the rise of the Reformation brought prominently before the public mind. It was in connection with this society that Antitrinitarian opinions were first adopted as a creed by several individuals, and the foundation laid in Poland for that sect whose members were afterwards known by the name of Socinians (q. v.). The spread of this heresy, however, was limited to the upper classes of society, while among the great mass of the people the scriptural views of the Reformers found ready acceptance; a result in no small degree owing to the arrival of Bohemian Brethren, to the number of about a thousand, who had been driven from their own country, and found a home in the province of Posen. This event happened in 1548, and the public worship of the Brethren being conducted in the Bohemian language, which was intelligible to the inhabitants of Posen, attracted towards them the sympathies of multitudes. The Romish bishop of Posen, alarmed at the influence which the Brethren were exercising over the people of his diocese, applied for and obtained a royal edict for their expulsion from the country. This order they immediately obeyed, and proceeded to Prussia, where they found full religious liberty. Next year, however, some of them returned to Poland, where they had formerly received so much kindness, and continued their labors without being molested in any form. Their congregations rapidly increased, and in a short time they reached the large number of eighty in the province of Great Poland alone, while many others were formed in different parts of the country.

"A circumstance occurred about this time which was providentially overruled for the still wider diffusion of Protestant principles in Poland. The students of the University of Cracow, having taken offence at some real or imagined affront offered them by the rector, repaired to foreign universities, put particularly to the newly erected University of Königsberg, from which the great majority of them returned home imbued with Protestant principles. The Reformed doctrines now made extraordinary progress, particularly in the province of Cracow. In vain did the Romish clergy denounce the growing heresy; all their remonstrances were unavailing, and at length they convened a general synod in 1551 to consider the whole subject. On this occasion Hosius, bishop of Ermeland, composed his celebrated Confession, which has been acknowledged by the Church of Rome as a faithful exposition of its creed. The synod not only decreed that this creed should be signed by the whole body of the clergy, but petitioned the king that a royal mandate should be issued ordering its subscription by the laity. It was now resolved that a violent persecution should be commenced against the heretics, and this determination was strengthened by an encyclical letter from Rome, recommending the extirpation of heresy. Several cases of bloody persecution occurred; but the nobles, aroused to jealousy by the high-handed measures of the clergy, openly declared their wish to restrict the authority of the bishops, and the people were unanimous in expressing a similar desire.

"Such was the state of matters in Poland when the diet of 1552 was convened; and scarcely had its deliberations been commenced, when a general hostility was evinced by the members to episcopal jurisdiction. The result was that at this diet religious liberty for all confessions was virtually established in Poland. At the diet of 1555 the king was earnestly urged to convoke a national synod over which he himself should preside, and which should reform the Church on the basis of the Holy Scriptures. It was proposed, also, to invite to this assembly the most distinguished Reformers, such as Calvin, Beza, Melancthon, and Vergerius. But the expectations of the Protestants in Poland were chiefly turned towards John à Lasco or Laski, who had been instrumental in promoting the cause of the Reformation in Germany, Switzerland, and England. For a long time he remained within the pale of the Romish Church, in the hope that it would be possible to effect a reformation without seceding from her communion. In 1540 he declared his adherence to the Protestant Church on the principles of Zwingli. The high reputation which Lasco had already gained, both as a scholar and a Christian, attracted the marked attention of the Protestant princes in various parts of Europe, several of whom invited him to take up his residence in their dominions. The sovereign of East Friesland, anxious to complete the reformation of the Church in that country, prevailed upon Lasco to allow himself to be nom-

inated superintendent of all its churches. To carry out the object of his appointment was a matter of no small difficulty, considering the extreme reluctance which prevailed to the entire abolition of Romish rites, but by energy, perseverance, and uncompromising firmness he succeeded, in the brief space of six years, in rooting out the last remains of Romanism, and fully establishing the Protestant religion throughout the whole of the churches of East Friesland. In 1548 Lasco received an earnest invitation from Cranmer, archbishop of Canterbury, to join the distinguished Reformers who had repaired to England from all parts of the Continent, that they might complete the reformation of the Church in that country. Having accepted Cranmer's invitation, the Polish Reformer left Friesland and went to England, where he was appointed, on his arrival in 1550, superintendent of the foreign Protestant congregation established at London. In this important sphere he continued to labor with much comfort and success, until the demise of Edward VI and the accession of Mary arrested the progress of the Reformation in England, and compelled Lasco with his congregation to leave the country. This little band of exiles, headed by the Polish Reformer, were driven by a storm upon the coast of Denmark, where, on landing, they were received at first with hospitality and kindness, but, through the influence of the Lutheran divines, they were soon obliged to seek an asylum elsewhere. The same hatred on the part of the Lutheran clergy was shown to the congregation of Lasco at Lubeck, Hamburg, and Rostock. At length the remnants of the congregation found in Dantzic a peaceful asylum, while Lasco himself retired to Friesland, where he was received with every mark of respect and attachment. In a short time, however, finding his position by no means so comfortable as at first, he removed to Frankfort-on-the-Main, where he established a church for the Belgian Protestant refugees, and made various attempts, without success, to unite the Lutheran and Protestant churches.

"Throughout all his wanderings Lasco's thoughts were habitually turned towards Poland, and he maintained a constant intercourse with his countrymen, and also with his sovereign, Sigismund Augustus, who entertained a high regard for him. He returned to Poland in 1556, and no sooner did his arrival become known than the Romish clergy, taking the alarm, hastened to implore the king to banish from his dominions a man whom they described as an outlawed heretic, and the source of troubles and commotions wherever he went. To this representation the king paid no regard; and, to the annoyance of the bishops and the papal nuncio, Lasco was soon after intrusted with the superintendence of all the Reformed churches of Little Poland. Through his influence the tenets of the Swiss Reformers were extensively adopted by the higher classes of his countrymen. The chief objects, however, which he kept steadily in view were the union of all Protestant sects, and the ultimate establishment of a Reformed National Church modelled on the plan of the Church of England, for which he had conceived a high admiration. But his exertions in the cause of reform were much weakened by the rise of Antitrinitarian sentiments in some of the churches which he superintended. He struggled hard, and not without success, to check the progress of these opinions. In the public affairs of the Church he took an active part, and assisted in preparing the version of the first Protestant Bible in Poland. In the midst of his unwearied labors in the cause of the Polish Reformation, Lasco was cut off in 1560, before he had an opportunity of fully maturing his great designs.

"One of the last objects on which the Polish Reformer had set his heart was the speedy convocation of a national synod. This proposal, however, met with violent opposition from Rome and its partisans. The pope, Paul IV, despatched a legate to Poland with letters to the king, the senate, and the most influential noblemen, promising to effect all necessary reforms, and to call a general council. Lippomani, the papal legate, was an able man, and a devoted servant to the see of Rome. The Romish clergy were much encouraged by the presence of this dignitary in the country, who endeavored, but without effect, to prevail upon the king to adopt violent measures for the extirpation of heresy. The crafty emissary of the pope succeeded also by his intrigues in fomenting discord among the Protestants. He assembled a synod of the Polish clergy, which, while it lamented the dangers which threatened the Church, both from within and from without, passed many resolutions for improving its condition and coercing the heretics. The extent to which the synod, instigated by Lippomani, pushed their jurisdiction may be seen from their proceedings in a case of alleged sacrilege recorded both by Romish and Protestant writers. 'Dorothy Laszecka, a poor girl, was accused of having obtained from the Dominican monks of Sochaczew a host, feigning to receive communion. It was said that she wrapped that host in her clothes, and sold it to the Jews of a neighboring village, by whom she had been instigated to commit this act of sacrilege by the bribe of three dollars and a gown embroidered with silk. This host was said to have been carried by the Jews to the synagogue, where, being pierced with needles, it emitted a quantity of blood, which was collected into a flask. The Jews tried in vain to prove the absurdity of the charge, arguing that, as their religion did not permit them to believe in the mystery of transubstantiation, they never could be supposed to try a similar experiment on the host, which they considered as a mere wafer. The synod, influenced by Lippomani, condemned them, as well as the unfortunate woman, to be burned alive. The iniquitous sentence could not, however, be put into execution without the *exequatur*, or the confirmation of the king, which could not be expected to be obtained from the enlightened Sigismund Augustus. The bishop Przerembski, who was also vice-chancellor of Poland, made a report to the king of the above-mentioned case, which he described in expressions of pious horror, entreating the monarch not to allow such a crime committed against the Divine Majesty to go unpunished. Myszkowski, a great dignitary of the crown, who was a Protestant, became so indignant at this report that he could not restrain his anger, and was only prevented by the presence of the king from using violence against the prelate, the impiety and absurdity of whose accusation he exposed in strong language. The monarch declared that he would not believe such absurdities, and sent an order to the *starost* (chief magistrate or governor) of Sochaczew to release the accused parties; but the vice-chancellor forged the *exequatur*, by attaching the royal seal without the knowledge of the monarch, and sent an order that the sentence of the synod should be immediately carried into execution. The king, being informed of this nefarious act of the bishop, immediately despatched a messenger to prevent its effects. It was, however, too late, and the judicial murder was perpetrated.' This atrocious affair excited, of course, a great sensation throughout Poland, and awakened such feelings of hatred against Lippomani that he lost no time in quitting the country, a step which was absolutely necessary, indeed, as his life was in danger.

"The Polish Reformation went steadily forward in spite of all the opposition of Rome and its emissaries. In Lithuania particularly it received a strong impulse from the influence exerted in its favor by prince Radziwill, who had been intrusted by the monarch with almost the sole government of that province. Taking advantage of the facilities which he thus possessed for advancing the good work, he succeeded in establishing the Reformed worship both in the rural districts and in many towns. He built also a splendid church and college in Vilna, the capital of Lithuania. To this enlightened and pious nobleman, besides, is due the merit of having caused to be translated and printed, at his own expense, the first Protestant Bible in the Polish language. It was published in 1564, and is usually known by the name of the Radziwillian Bible. The death of Radziwill the Black, as he was termed, which happened in 1565, was a severe loss to the Protestant cause in Lithuania; but happily his cousin and successor, Radziwill the Red, was also a zealous promoter of the Reformed religion, and founded a number of Protestant churches and schools, which he endowed with landed property for their permanent support. The king of Poland was strongly urged, by a portion of the clergy, to reform the Church by means of a national synod, but he was of too irresolute a character to take a step so decided. He adopted, however, a middle course, and addressed a letter to pope Paul IV, at the Council of Trent, demanding the concession of the five following points: (1) The performance of the mass in the national language; (2) The dispensation of the communion in both kinds; (3) The toleration of the marriage of priests; (4) The abolition of the *annates* or first-fruits of benefices; (5) The convocation of a national council for the reform of abuses, and the union of different sects. These demands, of course, were rejected by his holiness. But the Protestants in Poland, far from being discouraged by the conduct of the pope, became bolder every day in their opposition to the Romanists. At the diet of 1559 a proposal was made to deprive the bishops of all participation in the affairs of the government, on the ground that they were the sworn servants of a foreign potentate. This motion, though strenuously urged upon the acceptance of the diet, was not carried; but a few years later, in 1563, the diet agreed to convoke a general national synod, composed of representatives of all the religious parties in Poland—a measure which would, in all probability, have been carried into effect, had it not been prevented by the dexterity and diplomatic craft of cardinal Commendoni, who succeeded in dissuading the king from assembling a national council.

"The establishment of a Reformed Polish Church was much impeded by the dissensions which divided the Protestants among themselves. At that time, in fact, no less than three parties existed in Poland, each adhering to its own separate confession. Thus the Bohemian or Waldensian Confession had its own ardent admirers, chiefly in Great Poland; the Genevese or Calvinistic Confession in Lithuania and Southern Poland; and the Lutheran or Augsburg Confession in towns inhabited by burghers of German origin. Of these the Bohemian and the Genevese Confessions were so completely agreed on almost all points, that their respective supporters found

no difficulty in forming a union in 1555, not indeed incorporating it into one body, but holding spiritual fellowship together, while each Church retained its own separate hierarchy. This union being the first which took place among Protestant churches after the Reformation, caused great joy among the Reformers in different parts of Europe. The two churches thus united wished to include the Lutherans also in the alliance, but the doctrine of the Augsburg Confession on the subject of the Eucharist seemed likely to prove an insuperable obstacle in the way of any union with the Lutheran churches. An attempt, however, was made to effect so desirable an object. For this purpose a synod of the Bohemian and Genevese churches of Poland was convoked in 1557, and presided over by John à Lasco. At this synod overtures were made to the Lutherans to join the union, but to no effect, and they still continued to accuse the Bohemian Church of heresy. The obstacles thus thrown in the way of a union among the Protestants of Poland only roused the Bohemians to exert themselves still more actively for its attainment. They forwarded copies of their Confession of Faith to the Protestant princes of Germany, and to the chief Reformers, both of that country and of Switzerland, and received strong testimonials of approval—so strong, indeed, as to silence for a time the objections of the Lutherans. Shortly, however, the good understanding which had begun was interrupted by the unreasonable demands of some Polish Lutheran divines that the other Protestant denominations should subscribe the Confession of Augsburg. The Bohemians, therefore, in 1568, submitted their confession to the University of Wittenberg, and received from that learned body a strong expression of their approbation, which so operated upon the minds of the Lutherans that from that time they ceased to charge the Bohemian Church with heresy.

"The long-desired union was at length effected in 1570. A synod having assembled in the town of Sandomir, in April of that year, finally concluded and signed the terms of union under the name of the Consensus of Sandomir (q. v.). This important step excited the utmost alarm among the Romanists, who endeavored to bring it into discredit. But the union itself was essentially hollow and imperfect. The confessions, between which a dogmatic union had been effected, differed on a point of vital importance—the presence of Christ in the Eucharist. The union, accordingly, was rather nominal than real; and many Lutherans directed their whole efforts towards bringing about a disruption of the alliance which had been established at Sandomir. This hostility of the Lutherans to the other Protestant confessions was very injurious to the interests of Protestantism in general, and a number of noble families, followed by thousands of the common people, disgusted with the bitter contentions which raged among the Protestants of different denominations, renounced the principles of the Reformation, and returned to the Church of Rome. Another circumstance which tended to weaken the Protestant Church of Poland was the rise and rapid spread of a party who denied the divinity of the Lord Jesus Christ. Some learned divines of the Reformed churches combated these Antitrinitarian doctrines, and at length, in 1565, the professors of these doctrines seceded from their brethren, forming themselves into a separate ecclesiastical organization, called by its members the Minor Reformed Church of Poland. The arrival of Faustus Socinus in Poland in 1579 led to the tenets of the Antitrinitarians being thrown into a definite form, and to the formation of Socinian congregations, chiefly composed of nobles, among whom there were many wealthy landowners.

"When the Consensus of Sandomir was concluded in 1570, Protestantism in Poland had reached its highest state of prosperity. Many churches and schools, belonging to Protestants of various denominations, had been established; the Scriptures had been translated and printed in the national language; and religious liberty was enjoyed in Poland to a degree unknown in any other part of Europe. These favorable circumstances attracted great numbers of foreigners, who sought an asylum from religious persecution. Among these, besides many Italian and French refugees, there were also a great number of Scotch families settled in different parts of Poland, whose descendants are found there at this day.

"At the period at which we have now arrived Romanism had, to a great extent, lost its hold of the Polish nation. The most influential portion of the nobility were on the side of Protestantism, while many powerful families, and the population generally, of the eastern provinces belonged to the Greek Church. Nay, even within the national Church itself, not only was the primate favorable to Reformed principles, but many even of the inferior clergy, and a considerable proportion of the laity, would have welcomed any proposal to correct the flagrant abuses which had in course of time crept into the Church. In the senate, also, the great proportion of the members were either Protestants or belonged to the Greek Church; and even the king himself showed a decided leaning towards the adherents of the Protestant faith. The Roman Catholic Church in Poland, indeed, was on the verge of utter ruin; but in this hour of its extremest danger it was mainly saved by the exertions of cardinal Hosius, one of the most remarkable men of his age. This zealous Romish dignitary had early made himself conspicuous by his hostility to the Protestants, and now that he had been nominated a cardinal, he used every effort to check the progress of the Reformation in Poland. Finding, however, that his own Church was fast losing ground, and that Reformed principles were almost certain ere long to obtain the ascendency, he called to his aid the newly established Order of Jesuits, several of whom arrived from Rome in 1564, and by their intrigues and agitation the whole country was made for a long period the scene of the most unseemly commotions.

"During the life of Sigismund Augustus the Protestants indulged the hope that, although naturally of a wavering and undecided character, he might possibly decide on the establishment of a Reformed National Church; but the death of that monarch without issue, in 1572, put an end to all such expectations. The Jagellonian dynasty, which had governed Poland for two centuries, was now extinct. An earnest struggle commenced, therefore, between the Protestants and Romanists, each party being anxious that the vacant throne should be filled by a zealous supporter of their Church. The Romanists, headed by cardinal Commendoni, were anxious to confer the crown upon the archduke Ernest, son of the emperor Maximilian II, and were even ready to secure their object by force. Coligny and the French Protestants had for some time, even before the death of Sigismund Augustus, entertained the project of placing Henry of Valois, duke of Anjou, on the Polish throne; and Catharine de' Medici, the mother of the duke, eagerly lent her approbation to the proposal.

"The diet of convocation assembled at Warsaw in January, 1573, for the purpose of taking steps for the maintenance of the peace and safety of the country during the interregnum. At this diet, notwithstanding the opposition of the Romish bishops, instigated by Commendoni, a law was passed establishing a perfect equality of rights among all the Christian confessions of Poland, guaranteeing the dignities and privileges of the Roman Catholic bishops, but abolishing the obligation of Church patrons to bestow the benefices in their gift exclusively on Roman Catholic clergymen. The election of a new monarch was arranged to take place on April 7, at Kaminietz, near Warsaw. The principal competitors for the throne of Poland were the two princes already mentioned; and although meanwhile the horrid massacre of St. Bartholomew had rendered the Polish Protestants somewhat afraid to commit their interests to a French prince, yet, being unwilling to involve their country in a civil war, they accepted Henry, duke of Anjou, who was accordingly elected king of Poland.

"A deputation of twelve noblemen were immediately despatched to Paris to announce to Henry his election, and on Sept. 10, 1573, the ceremony of presenting the diploma of election took place in the church of Notre Dame. The circumstances attending the presentation are interesting as manifesting the intolerant spirit of the Polish Romanists. 'The bishop Karnkowski, a member of the Polish embassy, at the beginning of the ceremony, entered a protest against the clause for securing religious liberty inserted in the oath which the new monarch was to take on that occasion. This act produced some confusion, the Protestant Zborowski having interrupted the solemnity with the following words, addressed to Montluc: "Had you not accepted, in the name of the duke, the conditions of religious liberty, our opposition would have prevented this duke from being elected our monarch." Henry feigned to be astonished, as if he did not understand the subject in dispute; but Zborowski addressed him, saying, "I repeat, sire, that if your ambassadors had not accepted the condition of liberty to the contending religious persuasions, our opposition would have prevented you from being elected king; and that if you do not confirm these conditions, you shall not be our king." After this the members of the embassy surrounded their new monarch, and Herburt, a Roman Catholic, read the formula of the oath prescribed by the electing diet, which Henry repeated without any opposition. The bishop Karnkowski, who had stood aside, approached the king after he had sworn, and protested that the religious liberty secured by the royal oath was not to injure the authority of the Church of Rome; and the king gave him a written testimony in favor of that protest.'

"Henry set out for Poland, but after what had passed the fears of the Protestants were far from being allayed, and they resolved carefully to watch the conduct of the new monarch at his coronation. Firley, the leader of the Protestant party, insisted that on that solemn occasion the oath taken at Paris should be repeated; and even in the midst of the ceremony, when the crown was about to be placed on Henry's head, Firley boldly advanced forward and interrupted the proceedings, declaring in the name of the Protestants of Poland that, unless the Parisian oath was taken, the coronation would not be allowed to go forward. The scroll of the oath was put into the king's hand as he knelt on the steps of the altar, and Firley, taking the crown, said to Henry with a loud voice, 'If you will not swear, you shall not reign.' The intrepid conduct of the Protestant leader struck the

whole assembly with awe, and the king had no alternative but to repeat the oath. Thus the religious liberties of Poland were saved from utter overthrow, and the nation delivered from an impending civil war.

"The Polish Protestants were naturally suspicious of their new king, knowing that, having taken the oath by compulsion, he was not likely to respect their rights. The Romish bishops, on the other hand, supported by the favor of the monarch, formed projects for extending their influence, and an impression rapidly spread through the country that Henry had become a ready tool in the hands of the priests. This feeling, combined with disgust at his profligacy, rendered him so unpopular, and his subjects so discontented, that the country would undoubtedly have been speedily plunged into a civil war had not the king fortunately disappeared, having secretly left Poland for France on learning that the death of his brother, Charles IX, had opened the way for his succession to the throne of France. The crown of Poland was now conferred upon Stephen Batory, prince of Transylvania, who had earned so high a reputation that, although an avowed Protestant, his election met with no opposition from the Romish clergy. The delegation which announced to Stephen his election to the throne was composed of thirteen members, only one of whom was a Romanist; but this man, Solikowski by name, succeeded in persuading the new monarch that, if he would secure himself on the throne, he must profess the Roman Catholic religion. Next day, accordingly, to the dismay of the Protestant delegates, Stephen was seen devoutly kneeling at mass. During his reign, which lasted ten years, he maintained inviolate the rights of the Anti-Romanist confessions, while at the same time, through the influence of his queen, who was a bigoted Romanist, he openly encouraged and patronized the Jesuits, by founding and endowing various educational institutions in connection with their order.

"Stephen Batory died in 1586, and was succeeded by Sigismund III, in whose reign the Romish party acquired much strength, while many of the Protestants had become dissatisfied with the general confession, and sought to renew the former controversies which had so much weakened their influence in the country. Poland was unhappily subjected to the rule of this infatuated monarch from 1587 to 1632, and throughout the whole of that long period his policy was uniformly directed towards the promotion of the supremacy of Rome. The Jesuits exercised an unlimited influence over the government; and all the offices of state and posts of honor were exclusively bestowed upon Romanists, and more especially upon proselytes, who, from motives of interest, had renounced the principles of the Reformation. The whole country was covered with Jesuit colleges and schools, thus enabling the disciples of Loyola most effectually to exercise dominion over all classes of the people. 'The melancholy effects of their education,' says count Krasinski, 'soon became manifest. By the close of Sigismund III's reign, when the Jesuits had become almost exclusive masters of public schools, national literature had declined as rapidly as it had advanced during the preceding century. It is remarkable, indeed, that Poland, which, from the middle of the 16th century to the end of the reign of Sigismund III (1632), had produced many splendid works on different branches of human knowledge, in the national as well as in the Latin language, can boast of but very few works of merit from that epoch to the second part of the 18th century, the period of the unlimited sway of the Jesuits over the national education. The Polish language, which had obtained a high degree of perfection during the 16th century, was soon corrupted by an absurd admixture of Latin; and a barbarous style, called Macaronic, disfigured Polish literature for more than a century. As the chief object of the Jesuits was to combat the Anti-Romanists, the principal subject of their instruction was polemical divinity; and the most talented of their students, instead of acquiring sound knowledge, by which they might become useful members of society, wasted their time in dialectic subtleties and quibbles. The disciples of Loyola knew well that, of all the weaknesses to which human nature is subject, vanity is the most accessible; and they were as prodigal of praise to partisans as they were of abuse to antagonists. Thus the benefactors of their order became the objects of the most fulsome adulation, which nothing but the corrupted taste acquired in their schools could have rendered palatable. Their bombastic panegyrics, lavished upon the most unimportant persons, became, towards the end of the 17th century, almost the only literature of the country—proof sufficient of the degraded state of the public to which such productions could be acceptable. An additional proof of the retrocession of the national intellect and the corruption of taste under the withering influence of the Jesuits is that the most classical productions of the 16th century—the Augustan æra of the Polish literature—were not reprinted for more than a century, although after the revival of learning in Poland in the second half of the 18th century they went through many editions, and still continue to be reprinted. It is almost superfluous to add that this deplorable condition of the national intellect produced the most pernicious effects on the political as well as social state of the country. The enlightened statesmen who had appeared during the reign of Sigismund III—the Zamoyskis, the Sapiehas, the Zalkiewskis, whose efforts counterbalanced for a time the baneful effects of that fatal reign, as well as some excellent authors who wrote during the same period—were educated under another system; for that of the Jesuits could not produce any political or literary character with enlarged views. Some exceptions there were to this general rule; but the views of enlightened men could not be but utterly lost on a public which, instead of advancing in the paths of knowledge, were trained to forget the science and wisdom of its ancestors. It was therefore no wonder that sound notions of law and right became obscured, and gave way to absurd prejudices of privilege and caste, by which liberty degenerated into licentiousness; while the state of the peasantry was degraded into that of predial servitude.'

"Not contented with secretly imbuing the minds of the people with Romanist principles, the Jesuits connived at the ill-treatment to which many Protestants were subjected, and the courts of justice being wholly under Jesuit influence, it was vain for the injured to look for legal redress. Riotous mobs with complete impunity destroyed the Protestant churches in Cracow, Posen, Wilna, and other places. The natural result of the adverse circumstances in which Protestants were placed under this long but disastrous reign was that their numbers were daily diminished, and what was, perhaps, more melancholy still, those who held fast to Reformed principles were divided into contending factions; and although the Consensus of Sandomir maintained an apparent union for a time, that covenant even was finally dissolved by the Lutherans. An attempt was made without effect to arrange a union between the Protestants and the Greek Church at a meeting convened at Wilna in 1599, and although a confederation for mutual defence was concluded, it led to no practical results.

"At the close of the long reign of Sigismund III the cause of Protestantism was in a state of the deepest depression. But his son and successor, Wladislas IV, was a person of a very different character, and so opposed to the Jesuits that he would not allow a single member of that order to be near his court. He distributed offices and rewards solely according to merit, and, being naturally of a mild disposition, he discountenanced all persecution on account of religion. He endeavored in vain to effect a general reconciliation, or at least a mutual understanding, between the contending parties, by means of a religious discussion held at Thorn in 1644. But the early death of this benevolent monarch changed the whole aspect of affairs. His brother, John Casimir, who succeeded him, had been a Jesuit and a cardinal; but the pope had relieved him from his vows on his election to the throne. From a monarch who had formerly been a Romish ecclesiastic the Protestants had everything to fear and little to expect. The consequence was that the utmost discontent began to prevail among all classes, and the country having been invaded by Charles Gustavus, king of Sweden, the people were disposed to place him upon the throne of Poland. Elated, however, by the success of his arms, that haughty monarch declined to accept the sovereignty in any other mode than by conquest, whereupon the Poles, rising as one man, drove him from the country. Peace was restored by the treaty of Oliva in 1660; but not until the Protestants had suffered much during the war. The king had taken refuge in Silesia during the Swedish invasion, and on his return to Poland he committed himself to the special care of the Virgin Mary, vowing that he would convert the heretics by force if necessary. A considerable number of Protestants still remained after all the persecutions to which they had been exposed, and among them were several influential families, who, besides, were supported by the interest of the Protestant princes throughout Europe. The king, therefore, judged it best to direct the whole force of his persecution against the Socinians, whom he banished from the kingdom, declaring it to be henceforth a capital crime to propagate or even profess Socinianism in Poland.

"The ranks of the Protestants were now completely broken, and the Roman clergy acquired and exercised nearly uncontrolled power. John Sobieski, during his short reign, endeavored to put an end to religious persecution; but he found himself unable to maintain the laws which still acknowledged a perfect equality of religious confessions. Augustus II, also, who succeeded to the throne in 1696, confirmed, in the usual manner, the rights and liberties of the Protestants, but with the addition of a new condition, that he should never grant them senatorial or any other important dignities and offices. This monarch had renounced Lutheranism in order to obtain the crown of Poland, and now that he had secured his object, he allowed the Romish bishops to treat the heretics as they chose. Augustus having been expelled by Charles XII of Sweden, Stanislaus Leszczynski was elected in 1704, and the accession of this enlightened monarch revived the hopes of the Protestants. The treaty of alliance concluded between Stanislaus and the Swedish sovereign guaranteed to the Protestants of Poland the rights and liberties secured to them by the laws of their country,

abolishing all the restrictions imposed in later times. But such favorable circumstances were of short continuance. Stanislaus was driven from his throne by Peter, the czar of Russia, and Augustus II again restored to his kingdom. Civil commotions now arose, which were only terminated by the mediation of Peter the Great, who concluded a treaty at Warsaw in 1716, into which the Romanists had sufficient influence to get a clause inserted to the following effect: 'That all the Protestant churches which had been built since 1632 should be demolished, and that the Protestants should not be permitted, except in places where they had churches previously to the above-mentioned time, to have any public or private meetings for the purpose of preaching or singing. A breach of this regulation was to be punished, for the first time by a fine, for the second by imprisonment, for the third by banishment. Foreign ministers were allowed to have divine service in their dwellings, but the natives who should assist at it were to be subjected to the above-mentioned penalties.'

"The terms of this treaty excited feelings of discontent and alarm, not only in the minds of the Protestants, but also of the more enlightened portion of the Roman Catholics. Protests poured in from all quarters against the measure. But all remonstrance was vain; the Romanists continued to prosecute the Protestants with inveterate rancor, in some cases even to blood. The Protestant powers of Europe from time to time made representations in favor of the Polish Protestants; but, instead of alleviating their persecutions, these remonstrances only increased their severity. In 1733 an act was passed excluding them from the general diet, and from all public offices, but declaring at the same time their peace, their persons, and their property inviolable, and that they might hold military rank and occupy the crown-lands.

"During the reign of Augustus III, which lasted from 1733 to 1764, the condition of the Polish Protestants was melancholy in the extreme; and, despairing of relief from every other quarter, they threw themselves under the protection of foreign powers, by whose interference they were admitted, in 1767, to equal rights with the Roman Catholics. This was followed by the abolition of the Order of Jesuits in 1773. Augustus had throughout his reign kept Poland in a state of subserviency to Russia, and that power placed his successor Poniatowski on the throne. When Catharine II, empress of Russia, obtained possession of the Polish Russian provinces, part of the people became members of the United Greek Church, and part joined the Russian Church. Even the most bigoted Romanists were gained over in course of time, so that at the Synod of Polotsk, in 1839, the higher clergy of Lithuania and White Russia declared the readiness of their people to join the Russo-Greek Church, and, accordingly, these Uniates, or United Greeks, to the number of 2,000,000, were received back into the Muscovite branch of the Eastern Church on their solemn disavowal of the pope's supremacy, and declaration of their belief in the sole Headship of Christ over his Church."

The unfortunate determination of pope Pius IX to force the infallibility dogma on the Church of Rome has had its damaging consequences to papal Christianity in Russia. After the encyclical of 1874 the czar's government saw itself forced to *urge* the union with the Russian Church of all Polish Christians not Protestant. Several popes had confirmed to the United Greeks the privileges of the use of the vernacular tongue and the marriage of the clergy. Ritualistic movements, however, had been introduced by some of the clergy, tending to assimilation to Rome, and the disputes engendered by the changes had frequently been referred to the Vatican. When the encyclical came to the laity, only two ways seemed to lie open —either to submit to the new orders or openly defy them. In Sedletz the decision was prompt, and one sixth of the whole population of the government determined to ask the "White Czar" to admit them into his Church. Though the parish priests in no case commenced the movement, when it had once taken root they joined their flocks. The government took no notice of the first petition sent in till convinced that the movement was perfectly spontaneous, when the emperor authorized the governor-general of Warsaw to admit them into the Russian Church; and on Sunday, Jan. 24, the public ceremony was performed before an immense crowd in the town of Sedletz. Of the 50,000 people admitted, 26 were priests. The first parish entered was that of Bielsk, to which the archbishop of Warsaw proceeded, with all the convert priests and delegates from the forty-five parishes, and where a solemn service of consecration was performed in the parish church.

The Berlin correspondent of the London *Times*, under date of June, 1875, writes: "The orthodox movement is steadily progressing in Poland, and will very shortly lead to the extinction of the United Greeks. Nearly 250,000 persons in the provinces of Siedice, Lublin, Suvalki, and Lomsa have already embraced the established faith of the empire. The Uniad remnant left is estimated at only 30,000, and as the priests who are adverse to the movement are running away to Galicia, the last trace of the sect will soon disappear. The political advantage accruing to the Russian government from this wholesale conversion of a religious community, half Roman Catholic and half Greek, cannot well be overrated. Not only are all their subjects of Russian blood brought within the pale of the national Church, but a number of Poles being likewise included in the sweeping change of creed, a way is paved to a further and even more comprehensive conquest in the same field." In 1876 the Russian government, feeling that the Papists were intriguing against the union movement, occasionally interfered by force for the transition of whole congregations from Rome. In consequence several of the bishops and priests were brought into rebellious conditions to the czar's government. More recently a concordat has been signed between the czar and the pope, which restores full diocesan authority to the bishops, together with the right to direct correspondence with Rome. The ukase of 1868 is abolished, and appeals of the bishops will henceforth be transmitted to Rome through the metropolitan of Warsaw, instead of being sent to the synod at St. Petersburg. On the other hand, the pope acknowledges the legal status of the St. Petersburg Synod, which is to form the council of a Catholic primate residing in the Russian capital.

It is computed that the Protestant Poles amount in round numbers to 442,000, the great majority of whom are found in the Prussian portion. There is a considerable number of Protestants in Poland itself, but these are chiefly German settlers. In that part of Poland which was annexed to Russia by the treaty of Vienna, it was calculated in 1845 that, in a population of 4,857,250 souls, there were 252,000 Lutherans, 3790 Reformed, and 546 Moravians. In Prussian Poland, according to the census of 1846, there were in the provinces of ancient Polish Prussia, in a population of 1,019,105 souls, 502,148 Protestants; and in that of Posen, in a population of 1,364,399 souls, there were 416,648 Protestants. As the Russian government is determined to make the Poles adopt its nationality, the Russian language only is tolerated in the churches where a popular tongue is used, and all hymn and prayer books, as well as school-books, must be in the Russian tongue. The Prussian government, too, anxious to use all means of Germanizing its Slavonic subjects, caused the worship in almost all the churches of Prussian Poland to be conducted in the German language, and the service in Polish is discouraged as much as possible.

On the modern ecclesiastical history of the former kingdom of Poland, see PRUSSIA and RUSSIA. See also Röpell, *Gesch. Polens* (Hamb. 1840); Lengnich, *Diss. de Religion. Christ. in Polonia initiis* (1734); and Friese, *Gesch. Polens* (Breslau, 1786). On the Reformation: Stanislaus Lubieniecius, *Hist. Reformationis Polonicæ* (Freistadii, 1685); Krasinski, *Historical Sketch of the Reformation in Poland* (Lond. 1838, 2 vols. 8vo), part i treating of the introduction and progress of Christianity in that country; Maclear, *Hist. of Christian Missions in the Middle Ages;* Gieseler, *Eccles. Hist.* (see Index in vol. iii); *Brit. and For. Ev. Rev.* 1843, p. 502 sq.

POLAND, MISSION AMONG THE JEWS IN. The Polish mission was commenced by the London Society for promoting Christianity among the Jews in the year 1821. The first missionaries there were the late Dr. A. M'Caul (q. v.), at that time a simple graduate of the University of Dublin, and the Rev. W. F. Becker. The centre of their operation was made in Warsaw. For a while all seemed promising, but the missionaries were compelled for a time to quit Warsaw. Early in the year 1822 the missionaries were summoned to appear before the "Commission of the Religious Confessions," and had to sign a protocol as to what was their object, of which it was said that it would be sent to St. Petersburg. Learning, however, that the answer which would be given them would be that foreign missionaries were not wanted in the country, and that if the Jews wished to be converted there were priests enough for that purpose, the missionaries—in order to avoid being sent out of the country, and hoping to get permission from the emperor Alexander—left Warsaw and went to Posen. The permission was obtained not only for Poland, but also for Russia. The first two missionaries were now joined by two others, Messrs. Wendt and Hoff, and in the winter of 1822 missionary operations were fairly commenced at Warsaw. In the year 1823 a service according to the ritual of the Church of England was established in the Reformed Church, Mr. M'Caul having received ordination in England; and this, in 1824, was followed up by the commencement of a German

service in the same place in the afternoon. As the labor increased two more missionaries were sent, Messrs. Reichardt and Wermelskirch. Visits were paid to various towns, and for a time Lublin was made the scene of missionary labor. The chief work of the winter of 1825 was the preparation of a translation of the Word of God, for the use of Hebrew women more especially. It was completed by M'Caul, with the assistance of the other missionaries, as far as the end of the Pentateuch, by the spring of 1826, and has proved a work of considerable value.

The death of the emperor Alexander rendered it necessary to apply to his successor for a confirmation of the permission which had been accorded to them. The answer to their application was of a modified character: it gave them liberty to labor among the Jews of Poland, but was silent concerning Russia itself, and as was afterwards stated by the grand-duke Constantine, that, as far as Russia was concerned, the permission was withdrawn. All efforts to reobtain it were without success.

In 1829 Lublin was permanently occupied as a missionary station, and proved a success, for no less than forty-four Israelites were there admitted into the visible Church. The year 1830 was marked by some events materially affecting the state of the mission and the position of the missionaries: by an order from St. Petersburg the missionaries were placed under the General Protestant Consistory, and their correspondence with the committee was required to be laid before it, the Commission of the Interior, and the police. On Nov. 29 in the same year the Polish revolution broke out, without affecting materially the missionary labors. This year may be regarded as marking the close of the second period in the history of the Polish mission, lasting from the year 1823 to 1830.

The event of most consequence that marked the following years was the occupation of a new station, in 1834, in the south of Poland. Kielce was the place selected, a place equidistant from Warsaw and Lublin. The main features of the work that now present themselves are the missionary journeys to Suvaltri, Calvary, and other places. We have now arrived at the year 1841, and up to that period, in connection with the mission, there had been baptized at Warsaw 115, at Lublin 33, and at Kalisch—selected in 1838 as the station—and other stations, occupied only for a short time, 5, making altogether a total of 153. During the year 1842 the missionaries made several journeys, and in spite of the "Cherem," or Jewish excommunication, pronounced against those who should have any intercourse with the missionaries, the work went on with great blessings, and in the year 1851 the number of those who were baptized through the mission in Poland was 326, some of the converts occupying the highest stations in life. We have now brought the history of the Polish mission down to that period when the door was closed against it. The war of England with Russia effected this change, for it could not reasonably be expected, while that war was carried on with the greatest vigor, that an English mission, however peaceful its object, would be tolerated in the very heart of the Russian empire, and indications were not wanting that soon its work was to cease. Various tracts about to be printed, which had already received the sanction of the Consistory, were unaccountably detained at the censor's office; and in the month of May, 1854, "the missionaries in Warsaw were summoned before the Russian authorities to receive various injunctions and restrictive orders on pain of being expelled from the country. One of these was to submit all their official correspondence with the committee to the Russian government, who promised to forward it to London; and to circulate no books, not even the Bible, among Christians. The letters and journals were from that time submitted as prescribed, but never reached London. This state of things continued from the end of May till Dec. 28, when the missionaries were again summoned to appear before the Russian authorities to hear an imperial order read, which imposed upon them and their brethren in the country the discontinuance of all missionary work from that day, and to be prepared to leave the country in three weeks, viz. on Jan. 13, 1855, the New-year's day of the Russian Church."

Thus closed the Polish mission, just *three* weeks before the death of the Russian emperor, a mission which had not been in vain, for, besides the 361 members of the house of Israel who were admitted by baptism into the Christian Church, more than 10,000 Bibles, in different languages, and upwards of 10,000 New Testaments have been circulated, of which many had come into the hands of Jews.

The missionary work which had thus been suspended for over twenty years was again resumed in the year 1877, permission having been granted by the present emperor. To the Rev. J. C. Hartmann, one of the oldest missionaries of the society, was intrusted the temporary charge of the mission-field at Warsaw, where about 100,000 Jews reside, divided into Talmudists, Chasidim, and Reformers. According to the latest report of 1877, the Warsaw station is now occupied by the Revs. O. J. Ellis and H. H. F. Hartmann, son of the above, N. D. Rappoport, A. E. Ifland, and a colporteur. Comp. the *Jewish Intelligencer* and the *Annual Reports of the London Society*. (B. P.)

Pole (נֵס, *nês*, a flagstaff, Numb. xxi, 8, 9; hence the flag or standard itself, "sign," "banner," etc., as elsewhere).

Pole, Reginald, a famous English cardinal, who figures so prominently in the English Reformation period, upon whose character rests the stigma of duplicity and selfishness, and against whom both Protestants and Romanists have written in censure or praise, was descended from royal blood, being a younger son of Sir Richard Pole, lord Montague, cousin-german of king Henry VII, and Margaret, daughter of George, the duke of Clarence, and younger brother to king Edward IV. Pole was born at Stourton Castle, Staffordshire, in March, 1500. When seven years old he was sent to the Carthusian monks at Sheen for instruction. At twelve he became a student at Magdalen College, Oxford, where the famous Linacre and Will. Latimer, two great masters of Latin and Greek, were his teachers. At fifteen he took the B.A. and entered into deacon's orders, and in 1517, the year that Luther began to preach against indulgences, Pole was made prebendary of Salisbury, to which preferment the deanery of Exeter and others were soon after added by king Henry VIII, who greatly admired Pole, and desired his elevation to the highest ecclesiastical dignity. At the age of nineteen Pole went to Italy, there to continue his studies, and was by the king afforded support suitable to his rank. He visited different universities, and finally rested at Padua, where he entered a distinguished group of scholars, among whom were Leonicus, a great philosopher and philologist, Longolius, Bembo, and Lupset, a learned Englishman. These masters were his constant companions, and they have told us how he became the delight of that part of the world for his learning, politeness, and piety. From Padua he went to Venice, where he continued for some time, and then visited other parts of Italy. Having spent five years abroad, he was recalled home; but being desirous to see the jubilee, which was celebrated this year at Rome, he went to that city: whence, passing by Florence, he returned to England, where he arrived about the end of 1525. He was received by the king, queen, court, and all the nobility with great affection and honor, and was highly esteemed, not only on account of his learning, but for the sweetness of his nature and politeness of his manners. Devotion and study, however, being what he solely delighted in, he retired to his old habitation among the Carthusians at Sheen, where he spent two years in the free enjoyment of them. In 1529, when

king Harry determined upon his divorce from Catharine of Aragon, Pole, foreseeing the troubles consequent upon this, and how he must needs be involved in them, resolved to withdraw, and obtained leave of his majesty to go to Paris. Here he continued in quiet till the king, prosecuting the affair of the divorce, and sending to the most noted universities in Europe for their opinion upon the illegitimacy of his marriage, commanded him to concur with his agents in procuring the approval for his contemplated step from the faculty of the University of Paris. Pole left the affair to the commissioners, excusing himself to the king as unfit for the employ, since his studies had lain another way. Henry was angry, upon which Pole returned to England in order to pacify him; but failing in this, and unwilling to make a tool of himself to the king in his questionable designs, Pole returned to Sheen, where he continued two years. It has been asserted that scruples of conscience and of religion were not his only motive: that, though a priest, he was not without hope of marrying the princess Mary Tudor, and that it was not without such views that Catharine of Aragon had committed the education of her daughter to his mother, the countess of Salisbury. Henry at length perceiving that the court of Rome resolved to oppose the affair of the divorce, conceived a resolution to shake off their authority, and to rely upon his own subjects. Pole was again pressed, but as steadfastly refused as before, even under the temptation of being made archbishop of York if he should comply with the king's demands. The king having dismissed Pole in anger, he consulted his safety by leaving the kingdom, and rejoined the company of the distinguished men he had known abroad. The first year he spent at Avignon; but as his health declined there he went to Padua, making now and then excursions to his friends at Venice. The literary circle in which he moved was formed by Caraffa (Paul IV), Sadoleto, Gilberto, Fregoso, archbishop of Salerno, Bembo, and Contarini. These men even embraced the doctrine of justification, and in their social meetings discussed the means of reforming the papacy—their great principle being to preserve the unity of the Church under the papal government. In Italy, during the reign of Henry VIII, Reginald Pole rose to great distinction, and on the accession of Paul III in 1534 was raised to the cardinalate, as were his friends just mentioned. Thus the days passed very agreeably in Italy, while fresh troubles were rising in England. Henry had not only divorced Catharine, but married Anne Boleyn, and resolved to throw off the papal yoke and assert his right to the supremacy, with the title of Supreme Head of the Church. To this end he procured a book to be written in defence of that title by Sampson, bishop of Chichester, which he immediately sent to Pole for his confirmation. Pole, taking courage from the security of the pope's protection, not only disapproved the king's divorce and separation from the apostolic see, but shortly after drew up a treatise, entitled *De unitate ecclesiastica*, in which he controverted the pretensions of Henry to the headship of the Church, and compared him to Nebuchadnezzar. He forwarded a copy of it to the king, who, displeased with Pole, under pretence of wanting some passage to be explained, sent for him to England; but Pole, aware that to deny the king's supremacy was high-treason there, and considering the fate of More and Fisher, refused to obey the call. The king therefore resolved to keep measures with him no longer, and accordingly his pension was withdrawn, he was stripped of all his dignities in England, and an act of attainder passed against him.

Pole was abundantly compensated for these losses and sufferings by the bounty of the pope and emperor. At the same time Paul III, having in view a general council for the reform of the Church, called to Rome several persons renowned for their learning, and among them Pole, to represent England. In vain his mother, brothers, and friends tried to dissuade him from going to Rome. After some wavering, the exhortations of his friend Contarini prevailed over the fears of his family, and he went to Rome in 1536. There he was, against his earnest wish, created cardinal, Dec. 22, 1536. Two months afterwards (February, 1537) Paul appointed him his legate on the other side of the Alps, and sent him on a most delicate and dangerous errand. The rebellion of the northern Catholics against Henry VIII seemed to the pope a favorable occasion to attempt the reconciliation of England with the Roman see. The legate's instructions were to promote a good understanding between the emperor and the king of France, to establish himself in the Netherlands, and if circumstances allowed of such a course to pass over to England. Scarcely had he put his foot on the French territory when Cromwell, his personal foe, claimed him in virtue of an article of a treaty concluded between Francis and Henry; but, secretly put on his guard by the king himself, he pursued his journey with the utmost speed, and stopped only at Cambrai. The regent here refused to allow him to enter the Netherlands; and, after a short stay with the prince-bishop of Liege, he was obliged to make his way back to Rome (August, 1537). At the same time Henry VIII set a price of fifty thousand crowns on his head, and promised to the emperor a subsidy of four thousand men in his war against Francis for his extradition. If the pope had up to that time shrunk from extreme measures against the schism of England, it was because he felt powerless to put them into execution. Having succeeded in restoring peace between the two great rulers of the Continent, he at last published his bull of excommunication. Pole was sent in secret mission to the courts of Spain and France; but, forestalled by the English agents, he could only get evasive answers. Charles, at Toledo, declared that he had more urgent business to attend to, but that he was ready to fulfil the promises made by him to the pope if Francis assisted him without afterthought. Francis, in his turn, protested his good-will, but besought the legate not to enter his states if he did not bring some positive proof of the emperor's sincerity. After carrying on negotiations for several months, Pole came to the conclusion that he was being deluded on both sides, and advised the pope to wait patiently for a better opportunity to turn up in the course of political events. His share in these negotiations proved fatal to his relations. Henry wreaked his savage vengeance on him by sending to execution his brother, lord Montague, and his aged mother, lady Salisbury, who was dragged to the scaffold May 17, 1541. The second brother of the cardinal, Sir Geoffrey, saved his life by revealing the secrets of his relations and friends. In 1539 cardinal Pole was sent to Viterbo, where, in the exercise of his functions, until 1542, he distinguished himself by his piety, the encouragement he gave to letters, and his tolerance towards the Protestants. In 1545 he repaired to Trent, under strong escort, to superintend the works preparatory to the council. After the death of Henry (1547), he wrote to the Privy Council in favor of the Catholic communion, and to Edward VI in justification of his acts; but his letters were left unopened. Pole's book, *De unitate ecclesiastica*, was published in Rome in 1536; and though, as Burnet says, "it was more esteemed for the high quality of the author than for any sound reasoning in it," it yet gave the most certain proof of his invincible attachment and zeal for the see of Rome, and was therefore sufficient to build the strongest confidence upon. Accordingly Pole was employed in negotiations and transactions of high concern, was consulted by the pope in all affairs relating to kings and sovereign princes, was made one of his legates at the Council of Trent, and, lastly, his penman when occasion required. Thus, for instance, when the pope's power to remove that council was contested by the emperor's ambassador, Pole drew up a vindication of that proceeding; and when the emperor set forth the interim, was employed to answer it. This was in 1548, and

pope Paul III dying the next year, our cardinal was twice elected to succeed him, but refused both the elections: one as being too hasty and without due deliberation, and the other because it was done in the nighttime. This unexampled delicacy disgusted several of his friends in the conclave, who thereupon concurred in choosing Julius III, March 30, 1550. The tranquillity of Rome being soon after disturbed by the wars in France and on the borders of Italy, Pole retired to a monastery in the territory of Verona, where he lived agreeably to his natural humor till the death of king Edward VI in July, 1553.

On the accession of queen Mary, Pole was appointed legate for England, as the fittest instrument to reduce that kingdom to an obedience to the pope; but he did not think it safe to venture his person thither till he knew the queen's intentions with regard to the re-establishment of the Romish religion, and also whether the act of attainder which had passed against him under Henry, and confirmed by Edward, was repealed. It was not long before he received satisfaction upon both these points; and he set out for England, by way of Germany, in October, 1553. The emperor, suspecting a design in queen Mary to marry Pole, contrived means to stop his progress; nor did he arrive in England till November, 1554, when her marriage with Philip of Spain was completed. (The English ecclesiastical historian Soames thinks that Pole was delayed by bishop Gardiner, who himself desired this distinguished post.) On his arrival Pole was conducted to the archbishop's palace at Lambeth, Cranmer being then attainted and imprisoned; and on the 28th went to the Parliament and made a long and grave speech, inviting them to a reconciliation with the apostolic see, for which purpose, he said, he was sent by the common pastor of Christendom. This speech of Pole occasioned some motion in the queen, which she vainly thought was a child quickened within her womb: so that the joy of the times was redoubled, some not scrupling to say that as John the Baptist leaped in his mother's womb at the salutation of the Virgin, so here the like happiness attended the salutation of Christ's vicar. The Parliament being absolved by Pole, all went to the royal chapel, where the *Te Deum* was sung on the occasion; and thus, the pope's authority being now restored, the cardinal, two days afterwards, made his public entry into London, with all the solemnities of a legate, and presently set about reforming the Church and freeing it from heresy. In conformity with a pontifical bull, he published a decree by which, 1, churches, hospitals, and schools founded during the schisms should be preserved; 2, persons who had married at unlawful degrees without dispensation should be considered as legitimately united; 3, buyers of ecclesiastical property should not be disturbed in their possession. But such a triumph did not satisfy the fanatics. Encouraged by the chancellor, Gardiner, they filled England during four years with those horrors which left forever a bloody stain on Mary's memory. Pole had formerly been suspected of favoring the Reformation, because he had advocated in the Council of Trent (q. v.) and at Ratisbon (q. v.) the adoption by the Church of Rome of the doctrine of justification as held by the Protestants, and being now anxious to satisfy the Papists, altered in his actions, and became the severe opponent of all Protestants. In the cruel measures which were adopted it is sometimes claimed for Pole that he had no direct part, as he was by nature humane and of good temper, and had ever previously proved most lenient to Protestants; but it would appear as if Pole, in his desire to please the pope and the queen, did adopt sterner measures than heretofore. The poet Tennyson has recently taken the favorable view of Pole's conduct, and thus makes him speak of his decision how to reconcile the heretics:

> "For ourselves, we do protest
> That our commission is to heal, not harm;
> We come not to condemn, but reconcile;
> We come not to compel, but call again;
> We come not to destroy, but edify;
> Nor yet to question things already done:
> These are forgiven—matters of the past—
> And range with jetsam and with offal thrown
> Into the blind sea of forgetfulness"
> (*Queen Mary*, act iii, scene iii).

In a later scene he makes bishop Gardiner (q. v.) the persecutor, and Pole the advocate and friend of the heretic:

> "Indeed, I cannot follow with your grace;
> Rather would say—the shepherd doth not kill
> The sheep that wander from his flock, but sends
> His careful dog to bring them to the fold"
> (Act iii, scene iv).

There is somewhat to favor this interpretation of Pole's acts. After the death of pope Julius, and his successor Marcellus, who rapidly followed him to the grave, the queen recommended Pole to the popedom; but Peter Caraffa, who took the name of Paul IV, was elected before her despatches arrived. This pope, who had never liked our cardinal, was pleased with Gardiner, bishop of Winchester, whose temper exactly tallied with his own; and therefore favored his views upon the see of Canterbury in opposition to Pole, whose nomination to that dignity was not confirmed by him till the death of his rival, which happened Nov. 13, 1555. After Pole's decease, pope Paul IV himself acknowledged that if the cardinal's humane policy had been accepted, England might not have been lost again to Rome.

After his elevation to the legateship of England, Pole had the sole management and regulation of ecclesiastical affairs in that country. His concurrence in the butcheries of Protestants did not, however, secure him against the attacks of his old enemy Paul IV, who upon various pretences accused him as a suspected heretic, summoned him to Rome to answer the charge, and, depriving him of his legantine powers, conferred them upon Peyto, a Franciscan friar, whom he had made a cardinal for that purpose. The new legate was upon the road for England when queen Mary, apprised of his business, assumed some of her father's spirit, and forbade him at his peril to set foot upon English ground. Pole, however, was no sooner informed of the pontiff's pleasure, or rather displeasure, than, out of that implicit veneration which he constantly and unalterably preserved for the apostolic see, he voluntarily laid down the legate's ensigns and forbore the exercise of its power, despatching his trusty minister Ornameto to Rome with letters clearing him in such submissive terms as melted even the obdurate heart of Paul. The cardinal was restored to his legantine powers soon after, but did not live to enjoy them a full twelvemonth, being seized with a double quartan ague, which carried him off, Nov. 17, 1558. During his illness he often inquired after her majesty, and his death is said to have been hastened by that of his royal mistress, which, as if one star had governed both their nativities, happened about sixteen hours before. After lying forty days in state at Lambeth, Pole's remains were carried to Canterbury, and there interred. He was a learned, eloquent, modest, humble, and good-natured man, of exemplary piety and charity, as well as generosity becoming his birth. Though by nature he was more inclined to study and contemplation than to active life, yet he was prudent and dexterous in business, so that he would have been a finished character had not his superstitious devotion to the see of Rome led him from the path his own convictions marked out to him. Burnet, who has drawn Pole in very favorable colors, acknowledges this fault in the great cardinal. Froude's delineation of Pole as a narrow-minded and fanatical bigot is precisely the reverse of the fact. Pole, like his friend Contarini, was a leading member of that moderate party of Romanists who, though they dreaded the disruption of Christendom, desired a reform not only in the discipline but also in the doctrine of the Church. From this position he was only scared by fear of losing his mitre. This betrays a weakness, it is true, but

rather of ambition than of fanaticism or narrow-mindedness. It is, besides, unjust to make Pole the *sole* responsible party for the persecutions which were inaugurated; for Fox (viii, 308) has furnished clear evidence against such an insinuation. He even gives two instances where Pole personally interfered to save Protestants from execution. All that Pole did, even at the worst, was to suffer the law to take its course, and not preventing what he knew should not have been done. But, of course, this is bad enough; we only desire that it be made no worse. Hook has taken a view very much dependent on Froude. In the instructions which Pole was putting out at the time of his decease for the clergy, and in the devotional books which he was putting together for his people, it is hard to find anything but good-sense, deep piety, and hearty benevolence.

Pole wrote various controversial and theological tracts, besides the work above referred to. Among these publications are, *Liber de Concilio* (Venet. 1562, 8vo, and elsewhere):—*Reformatio Anglica ex Decretis ipsius Sedis Apostolicæ Legati* anno MDLVI (Rome, 1562, 4to); one of the most elegant pieces of composition in the Latin language, and which, for perspicuity, good-sense, and solid reasoning, is equal to the importance of the occasion on which it was written (Phillips, *Sacred Literature*):—*De Summo Pontifices Christi in Terris Vicario et de ejus Officis et Potestate; a Treatise of Justification* (Lovanii, 1569, 4to); this work is reported to have been "found among the writings of cardinal Pole." See Hume, *Hist. of England*, ch. xxxvii (very favorable); Froude, *Hist. of England*, vi, 369 sq.; Collier, *Eccles. Hist. of England* (see Index in vol. vii); Schröckh, *Kirchengesch. seit der Ref.* ii, 575 sq.; Soames, *Hist. of the Ref.* i, 251 sq.; ii, 185 sq., 229 sq., 327 sq., 357 sq.; iv, 66 sq., 77, 238, 495, 545 sq., 577 sq., 595; Ffoulkes, *Divisions in Christendom*, i, § 63; Hook, *Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury* (Lond. 1869), vol. iii; Hardwick, *Hist. of the Reformation*, p. 64, et al.; Seebohm, *Hist. of the Prot. Religion*, p. 194, 206, 212; *North Brit. Rev.* Jan. 1870, p. 283; *Westminster Rev.* April, 1871, p. 266; and especially the references in Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s. v.

Pole-axes were the ensigns of legates *a latere*, carried with silver pillars (Gal. ii, 9) before cardinals Wolsey and Pole.

Polehampton, Henry Stedman, an English divine, was born in 1824, and educated at Pembroke College, Oxford. He took holy orders, and was ordained deacon in 1848; in the year following became assistant curate of St. Chad's, Shrewsbury; in 1855 chaplain in the Bengal Presidency. During the great Sepoy rebellion he was shot through the body in the insurrection at Lucknow, and died July 20, 1857. He was a good man, and his loss was greatly deplored in all England, as well as among the English of India. See *Memoir, Letters, and Diary of the late Rev. Henry Polehampton, and the Rev. Thomas Stedman Polehampton* (Lond. 1858, 8vo, and often); *London Athenæum*, 1858, pt. ii, 451 sq., 487.

Polehampton, Thomas Stedman, brother of the preceding, of lesser note, died at Lucknow. See Polehampton, Henry S.

Polemics (from πολεμικός, *warlike*) is the controversial branch of scientific theology. It is also sometimes called by German theologians *elenchtics*, and differs from *apologetics* (q. v.) in that it is not simply intended to defend Christianity in general, but aims to attack a rival or disputed system in particular, and is the direct opposite of *irenics* (q. v.), which aims to establish peace within the Christian fold. This distinction has not always been observed in Christian theology, but is of rather recent date. As a rule, the theologians of the Church mixed the polemical and apologetical elements in all theological controversy. In our own century, however, and especially since the days of Schleiermacher, theological encyclopædists have insisted upon a strict severance of *polemics* from *apologetics* and *symbolics* (q. v.), and have dealt with it in an independent manner. In theory nothing can be more accurately defined and distinguished than apologetics and polemics; they bear the same relation to each other as in physical conflict the *offensive* and the *defensive* operations. In practice, however, it is impossible always to separate the apologetic and the polemical elements. See the art. Apology. In the ages of the Church fathers no great difficulty was encountered, because their object was to combat the Jewish or the heathen systems of religion, and their writings therefore bear a predominant polemical coloring. But it is one thing to combat a single religious system like paganism, and it is quite another to attack heresy within the Church, or to make war on religious systems claiming a like foundation. Polemics, then, narrowed down to its proper sphere, is the controversy within the Christian fold regarding the *essentials* of the Church faith. In the early Church the polemical activity was confined to heresies and schismatics. Indeed, from the death of Origen to John of Damascus (A.D. 254–730)—the time which elapsed between the Sabellian and the Monothelite controversies—the polemics of the Church were developed much more prominently than either the apologetic tendency, as in the preceding period, or the systematic tendency, as in the next period. The heresies which called out polemical activity from 730 till the outbreak of the Reformation differed in tendency from those of the preceding period in their opposition to the whole ecclesiastical system rather than to any particular doctrines. But with the establishment of Protestantism the polemical activity began in real earnest, and from that time to this has continued to develop and expand in strength both among Romanists and Protestants. Among the former it has been specially cultivated by the Jesuits, who, on account of the many methods which they have proposed for attack of Protestants, have been given the appellation "Methodists" (comp. Pelt, *Theol. Encyklopädie*, § 63, p. 386 sq.). They even published large works containing the *modus operandi* for controversies of a confessional nature, under the title *Theologia Polemica* (Vitus Pichler, 1753; Gazzaniga, 1778 sq.). The Protestants were not far behind, and provided material under the more appropriate title of a *Synopsis Controversiarum* (Abraham Calow, 1685; Musæus, 1701), to which may be added Walch, *Einleitung in die polemische Gottesgelahrtheit* (Jena, 1752, 8vo), and his other writings; Schubert, *Institutiones Theologiæ Polemicæ* (1756–58); Baumgarten, *Untersuchung theologischer Streitigkeiten* (1762–64); Mosheim, *Streittheologie* (1763 sq.); Bock, *Lehrb. für die neueste Polemik* (1782). No work of importance on the science of polemics appeared until Schleiermacher treated of it in his *Darstellung des theol. Studiums* (Berl. 1811); and his ideas found further and fuller elucidation by his disciples Sack in his *Christliche Polemik* (Bonn, 1838), and by Pelt in his *Theol. Encyklopädie* (1843); Hagenbach, *Theol. Encyklop.* (1864, and since); Hill, *System of Divinity* (N. Y. 1847, 8vo); McClintock, *Encyclop. and Method of Theol. Science* (N. Y. 1873).

The literature of polemics is divided properly into:

I. Treatises on the Controversy between Protestants and Romanists.
  1. General Treatises by writers of the Church of Rome.
  2. General Treatises against Popery by Protestant Divines.
II. Treatises on the Arian Controversy.
III. Treatises on the Socinian Controversy.
IV. Treatises occasioned by the Controversies between the Church of England, and between them and Dissenters.
  1. The Bangorian Controversy.
  2. Subscription to the 39 Articles.
  3. Baptismal Regeneration Controversy.
  4. Controversial Treatises on Dissent.
V. Treatises on Heresies.

The various publications on these divisions must be sought for under their respective headings. We will refer the reader here for general treatises to the works

cited by Werner, *Gesch. der apologet. u. polemischen Literatur*, and to Spanheim, *Controversiarum de Religione cum Dissidentibus Hodie Christianis Prolixe et cum Judeis Elenchus Historico Theologicus*, and Horneck, *Summa Controversiarum*; Clarisse, *Encyclopædiæ Theologicæ Epitome* (Lugd. 1835, 8vo), § 91, p. 499 sq. See, also, Möhler's *Symbolik*; Piper, *Monumental-Theologie*, § 135 sq.

The principles which should govern the Christian theological polemic are those of an honest offensive warfare. They may be condensed into the following points: (1) The question is not about persons, but about things. Only when both stand and fall together may personalities be allowed. (2) The attack must be directed to the point where the strength of the enemy is most formidable: as soon as the principles of the adversary have been refuted the hostility must cease. (3) We must not impute to the adversary more wrong than he is really guilty of; or else the attack itself assumes the appearance of a wrong, and will be considered in that light by every third party, even if successful. Polemics, then, must take the cause of the adversary just as it is; they must not attribute to him any opinions which can only be made his own by exaggerating his expressions, or even by putting false constructions upon them. (4) It is imprudent to think too little of an adversary. The reasons given by him must be recognised in all their force, and on the basis of full acknowledgment the proof must be given that they are not convincing. (5) A struggle with unequal arms is not honorable. The polemic, then, will have to prove either that the weapons of his adversary are illegal, or, if this cannot be done, to inquire into his standpoint and his reasons, and to prove in error the cause in its very principles. (6) If the polemic thus succeeds in reducing his adversary *ad absurdum*, i. e. to an illogical condition, which, by reason of its untenability, forces him *hors de combat*, the vanquished is turned into a friend and convert, and the truth has indeed triumphed, as God would have it.

POLEMICS, Jewish. The friendly relation which existed at first between the Church and the Synagogue could not always last, and a separation became a matter of necessity. The result was that the non-identification of Christianity with Judaism gave rise to bitterness and enmity, and some of the fiercest persecutions were instigated and encouraged by the Jews. The Christians were no more called so, but "Minim," or heretics. So great became at last the enmity, that a celebrated Jewish sage (Tarphon) declared that, although the Gospels and the other writings of the "Minim" contained the sacred names of the Deity, they ought to be burned; that heathenism was less dangerous than Christianity; that heathens offended from ignorance, while Christians did so with full knowledge; and that he would prefer seeking shelter in a heathen temple rather than in a meeting-place of the "Minim" (Tarph. *Sabb.* 116 *a*). Another and more moderate rabbi (Ishmael) also recommended the burning of every copy of the Gospels, as in his opinion inciting to rebellion against God, and to hatred against the commonwealth of Israel (*Aboda Sara*, 43). By and by all friendly relations between the two parties entirely ceased, and the mutual estrangement was such that the ordinary civilities of life were not to be exchanged, and the bread, wine, oil, and meat used by Christians were declared polluted.

One of the earliest polemics against Christianity is that of R. Simlai, of the 3d century, who became famous for his virulent opposition to Christianity. His polemics were especially directed against the doctrine of the Trinity (comp. *Genesis Rabba*, c. 8; *Jerus. Berach.* ix, 11 *d*, 12 *a*). It has been suggested, and with apparent probability, that he had been chiefly engaged in controversy with Origen. Another polemic was R. Abbahu, of the 4th century, who likewise attacked the Trinity and the ascension of Christ (*Jerus. Taanith*, ii, 65 *b*; *Genesis Rabba*, c. 29; *Exodus Rabba*, c. 29). Of this R. Abbahu, we also read (*Abodah Sarah*, fol. 4 *a*) that he recommended a certain R. Saphra to a noble Christian. At this recommendation the Christian permitted R. Saphra an exemption for thirteen years. When the Christian asked R. Saphra about the meaning of the passage in Amos iii, 2, and perceived his ignorance, he asked R. Abbahu about its meaning. Having received a satisfactory answer, the Christian asked, "Why is R. Saphra, whom you recommended to me as a great man, so ignorant in the Scriptures, which thou didst explain right away?" To this R. Abbahu answered, "We, who come in contact with you Christians, are obliged, for our self-preservation, to study the Scriptures, because you dispute so often with us from the Scriptures, and because we know that you study the Scriptures: but the other Jews, who live among Gentiles, have no need of that, since they do not dispute with them concerning the Scriptures." What a gloomy picture! The Jews read the Bible, not because they are concerned about the "one thing needful," but only for the sake of controversy! Next in order are those passages of the Talmud which speak of Jesus, and have been expurgated in the earliest editions. Eisenmenger has collected a great many of these passages in his *Neuentdecktes Judenthum*, and also Meelführer, in his *Jesus in Talmude* (Altorf, 1699, 2 vols.).

We now give an alphabetical list of such as wrote against Christianity, and who, for the most part, have been treated upon in this *Cyclopædia*, to which reference is made:

Abendana, Jacob (q. v.), carried on a controversy with Hulsius (1699), and translated the *Cusari* into Spanish.

Abrabanel, Isaac (q. v.), whose commentaries contain the strongest invectives against Christianity; and so likewise his משמיע ישועה and ישועות משיחו.

Albo, Joseph, who died in 1444, took part in the conference held with Jerome de Santa Fé, which took place at Tortosa in 1413–14 under the presidency of Peter de Luna, afterwards Benedict XIII. He is the author of the *Sepher Ikkarim*, ספר עקרים, i. e. "the Book of Principles." "This book," says R. Wise, "was the first, and for a long time the only one which attacked the dogmas of the Roman Catholic Church. His opponents spoke, wrote, and argued so much against him that he became quite popular in Christian circles, and thus also a forerunner of the Reformation." This effusion of the Cincinnati rabbi is of course only to be taken *cum grano salis*, for a personal acquaintance with the work would have told him that only the last division contains what can be called antichristian.

Arama, Isaac, one of the Spanish exiles, impugns Christianity in his חזות קשה, i. e. "the Heavy Vision."

Bechai ben-Asher's attacks upon Christianity can only be found in the earliest editions of his commentary on the Pentateuch.

Farrissol, Abraham (q. v.), is the author of מגן אברהם, i. e. "the Shield of Abraham," written against Christianity.

Isaac-Jacob ben-Saul, of the 18th century, wrote his *Buch der Verzeichnung. Eine Unterweisung wie man seine Religion gegen die Angriffe des Christenthums, und wie man überhaupt den Einwürfen der Polemik antworten soll* (Amsterdam, 1693).

Jechiel ben-Joseph (q. v.), author of ובוח, was a member of the conference held at Paris between Nicolaus Donin and some Jewish savans. Jechiel would not admit that the Jesus mentioned in the Talmud is Jesus of Nazareth, but another, a discovery which was copied by later writers. But Jews themselves acknowledge the failure of such an assertion; for, says Dr. Levin, in his prize essay, *Die Religionsdisputation des R. Jechiel von Paris*, etc. (published in Grätz's *Monatsschrift*, 1869, p. 193), "We must regard the attempt of R. Jechiel

to ascertain that there were two by the name of Jesus as unfortunate, original as the idea may be."

Jehudah ha-Levi ben-Samuel (q. v.) is the author of the famous *Cusari*.

Joseph ben-Shemtob (q. v.), the commentator on Profiat Duran's (q. v.) Epistle.

Joseph Ibn-Jachja (q. v.) attacks Christianity in his commentary on the Hagiographa.

Kimchi, David and Joseph (q. v.), made their commentaries the arena of attacks.

Lipmann, Yomtob (q. v.), is the author of the well-known *Nizzachon*.

Lupercio, Isaac, defended Judaism against a monk of Seville in his *Apologia* (Basle, 1658).

Machir of Toledo is the author of an eschatology of Judaism in three sections; the first Hulsius translated into Latin, with a refutation.

Montalto, Elias (q. v.), wrote an apology of Judaism in his *Livro Fayto*.

Mortera, Saul (q. v.), the teacher of Spinoza, was so virulent in his תורת משה that it could not be printed.

Nachmanides, Moses (q. v.), speaks against Christianity in more than one of his works.

Offenhausen, Sal. Zewi (q. v.), wrote his *Jewish Theriaca* against Brenz.

Onquenira, Isaac (q. v.), is the pretended editor of an antichristian work written by Joseph Nasi of Naxos.

Orobio, Isaac (q. v.), wrote his *Israel Vengé* and *Scripta adversus Christianam Religionem*.

Profiat Duran (q. v.) is the author of the well-known satirical epistle entitled אל תהי כאבותיך, "Be not like thy Fathers," which R. Isaac Wise, of Cincinnati, published in English for the readers of his paper, under the pompous heading, "A Relic of Great Significance," respectfully inscribed "to religion peddlers." This last expression puts R. Wise on the side of these Jewish polemics, but with the difference that "quod licet Jovi, non licet bovi."

Roman, Abraham, showed his animosity by publishing antichristian works (Constantinople, 1710).

Saadia, Gaon (q. v.), devotes the second and eighth chapters of his philosophical work to attack Christianity.

Troki, Isaac ben-Abraham (q. v.), is the author of the famous חזוק אמונה, which has been made use of by critical writers upon the New Testament from Voltaire to Strauss. Some years ago it was published, with a German translation by R. David Deutsch (2d ed. 1875), under the patronage of M. Rothschild (!), of Paris. In English some chapters were published by a New-York rabbi.

In the same year in which the second German edition of Troki's work appeared, a similar work in five volumes was published at Warsaw, under the title *Zerubbabel*, written by Lebensohn, under the patronage of Sir Moses Montefiore, of London; a work which, as reviewer says, by far surpasses the author of the *Chizzuk Emunah*. It is characterized by coarse vituperation.

The literature on this subject is very meagre. For the older literature, we would refer to De Rossi, *Bibliotheca Judaica Antichristiana* (Parmæ, 1800); Steinschneider, *Jewish Literature*, p. 122 sq., 211 sq. (B. P.)

Polemioi. See Synusiastæ.

Polemius (or Salvius or Sylvius), a Gallican ecclesiastic of the 5th century, flourished as bishop of Martigny, in the Valais. He is the author of a sacred calendar, drawn up A.D. 448, which is entitled *Laterculus s. Index Dierum Festorum*, and which includes heathen as well as Christian festivals. A portion of this *Laterculus* was published by Bollandus, in the general preface to the *Acta Sanctorum* (i, 44, 45), and the whole will be found, but in a mutilated state, in the seventh volume of the same work (p. 178). See Mansi, *Ad Fabric. Bibl. Med. et Infim. Lat.* vol. vi; Schönemann, *Bibl. Patrum Lat.* vol. ii, § 50.—Smith, *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. and Mythol.* s. v.

Polĕmo, Antonius, a highly celebrated sophist and rhetorician, who flourished under Trajan, Hadrian, and the first Antoninus, and was in high favor with the two former emperors (Suid. s. v.; Philostr. *Vit. Sophist.* p. 532). He is placed at the sixteenth year of Hadrian, A.D. 133, by Eusebius (*Chron.*). His life is related at considerable length by Philostratus (*Vit. Sophist.* ii, 25, p. 530–544). He was born of a consular family at Laodicea, but spent the greater part of his life at Smyrna, the people of which city conferred upon him at a very early age the highest honors, in return for which he did much to promote their prosperity, especially by his influence with the emperors. Nor, in performing these services, did he neglect his native city Laodicea. An interesting account of his relations with the emperors Hadrian and Antoninus is given by Philostratus (p. 533, 534). Among the sophists and rhetoricians whom he heard were Timocrates, Scopelianus, Dion Chrysostom, and Apollophanes. His most celebrated disciple was Aristides. His chief contemporaries were Herodes Atticus, Marcus Byzantinus, Dionysius Milesius, and Favorinus, who was his chief rival. Among his imitators in subsequent times was St. Gregory Nazianzen. His style of oratory was imposing rather than pleasing, and his character was haughty and reserved. During the latter part of his life he was so tortured by the gout that he resolved to put an end to his existence: he had himself shut up in the tomb of his ancestors at Laodicea, where he died of hunger, at the age of sixty-five. The exact time of his death is not known; but it must have been some time after A.D. 143, as he was heard in that year by Verus. The only extant work of Polemo is the funeral orations for Cynægeirus and Callimachus, the generals who fell at Marathon, which are supposed to be pronounced by their fathers, each extolling his own son above the other. Philostratus mentions several others of his rhetorical compositions, the subjects of which are chiefly taken from Athenian history, and an oration which he pronounced, by command of Hadrian, at the dedication of the temple of Zeus Olympius at Athens, in A.D. 135. His Λόγοι ἐπιτάφιοι were first printed by H. Stephanus, in his collection of the declamations of Polemo, Himerius, and other rhetoricians (Paris, 1547, 4to; afterwards by themselves in Greek, Paris, 1586, 4to; and in Greek and Latin, Tolosæ, 1637, 8vo). The latest and best edition is that of Caspar and Conrad Orelli (Leips. 1819, 8vo). See Fabricius, *Bibl. Græc.* vi, 2–4; Clinton, *Fasti Romani*, s. a. 133, 135, 143. There is a coin of Hadrian, bearing the inscription ΠΟΛΕΜΩΝ. ΑΝΕΘΗΚΕ. CMΥΡΝΑΙΟΙC. (Rasche, *Lexic. Rei Num.* s. v. Polemo; Eckhel, *Doctr. Num. Vet.* ii, 562). This coin belongs to a class which Eckhel has explained in a dissertation (vol. iv, c. 19, p. 368–374). There is a question respecting the identity of this sophist with Polemo, the author of a short Greek work on Physiognomy, who, it is supposed, was a Christian, and must have lived in or before the 3d century. See the discussion on this question by Passow, *Ueber Polemo's Zeitalter*, in the *Archiv für Philologie und Pädagogik* (i, 7–9), 1825.

Polĕmo (Πολέμων) of Athens, (1) an eminent Platonic philosopher, and for some time the head of the Academy, was the son of Philostratus, a man of wealth and political distinction. In his youth Polemo was extremely profligate; but one day, when he was about thirty, he broke into the school of Xenocrates at the head of a band of revellers. His attention was so arrested by the discourse, which the master continued calmly in spite of the interruption, and which chanced to be upon temperance, that he tore off his garland and remained an attentive listener, and from that day he adopted an abstemious course of life, and continued to frequent the school, of which, on the death of Xenocrates, he became the head, in Ol. 116, B.C. 315. According to Eusebius (*Chron.*) he died in Ol. 126, 4, B.C. 273. Diogenes also says that he died at a great age,

and of natural decay. He was a close follower of Xenocrates in all things, and an intimate friend of Crates and Crantor, who were his disciples, as well as Zeno and Arcesilas; Crates was his successor in the Academy. Polemo gave his attention mainly to ethics, and esteemed the object of philosophy to be to exercise men in things and deeds, not in dialectic speculations. His character was grave and severe, and he took pride in displaying the mastery which he had acquired over emotions of every sort. In literature he most admired Homer and Sophocles, and he is said to have been the author of the remark that Homer is an epic Sophocles, and Sophocles a tragic Homer. He left, according to Diogenes, several treatises, none of which were extant in the time of Suidas. There is, however, a quotation made by Clemens Alexandrinus, either from him or from another philosopher of the same name, *ἐν τοῖς περὶ τοῦ κατὰ φύσιν βίου* (*Strom.* vii, 117), and another passage (*Strom.* ii, 410) upon happiness, which agrees precisely with the statement of Cicero (*De Fin.* iv, 6), that Polemo placed the *summum bonum* in living according to the laws of nature. Cicero gives (*Acad. Pr.* ii, 43) the following as Polemo's ethical principles: "Honeste vivere, fruentem rebus iis, quas primas homini natura conciliat." See Diog. Laert. iv, 16–20; Suid. s. v.; Plut. *De Adul. et Amic.* 32, p. 71 *e*; Lucian, *Bis Accusat.* 16 (ii, 811); Athen. ii, 44 *e*; Cic. *Acad.* i, 9; ii, 35, 42; *De Orat.* iii, 18; *De Fin.* ii, 6, 11; iv, 2, 6, 16, 18; v, 1, 5, 7, et al.; Horat. *Serm.* ii, 3, 253 fol.; Val. Max. vi, 9; Menag. *Ad Diog. Laert.* l. c.; Fabricius, *Bibl. Græc.* iii, 183; comp. p. 323, note *hhh*; Smith, *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. and Mythol.* s. v.; Ueberweg, *Hist. of Philos.* i, 133–135; Butler, *Hist. of Anc. Philos.* (see Index).

(2.) Another Platonic philosopher was the disciple of Plotinus; but very little is known of him (Porphyr. *Plot. Vit.*; Fabricius, l. c.; Clinton, *F. H.* sub ann. B.C. 315, vol. ii, 3d ed.).

(3.) Of Athens by citizenship, but by birth either of Ilium or Samos or Sicyon, a Stoic philosopher and an eminent geographer, surnamed *ὁ περιηγήτης*, was the son of Euegetes, and a contemporary of Aristophanes of Byzantium, in the time of Ptolemy Epiphanes, at the beginning of the 2d century B.C. (Suid. s. v.; Athen. vi, 234; Clinton, *F. H.* vol. iii, sub ann. B.C. 199). In philosophy he was a disciple of Panætius. He made extensive journeys through Greece, to collect materials for his geographical works, in the course of which he paid particular attention to the inscriptions on votive offerings and on columns, whence he obtained the surname of *Στηλοκόπας* (Ath. l. c.; Casaub. ad loc.). As the collector of these inscriptions, he was one of the earliest contributors to the *Greek Anthology*, and he wrote a work expressly, *Περὶ τῶν κατὰ πόλεις ἐπιγραμμάτων* (Athen. x, 436 *d*, 442 *e*); besides which, other works of his are mentioned upon the votive offerings and monuments in the Acropolis of Athens, at Lacedæmon, at Delphi, and elsewhere, which no doubt contained copies of numerous epigrams. Hence Jacobs infers that in all probability his works formed a chief source of the *Garland* of Meleager (*Animadv. in Anth. Græc.* vol. i, Proœm. p. xxxiv, xxxv). Athenæus and other writers make very numerous quotations from his works, the titles of which it is unnecessary to give at length. They are chiefly descriptions of different parts of Greece; some are on the paintings preserved in various places, and several are controversial, among which is one against Eratosthenes. See Fabricius, *Bibl. Græc.* iii, 184; Vossius, *De Hist. Græc.* p. 159 fol. ed. Westermann; Clinton, *F. H.* iii, 524, where a list of his works is given.

Polenz, John, a Polish prelate of some note, flourished in the first half of the 16th century. He was of noble parentage, and having decided to give himself to the service of the Church, studied theology in the University of Cracow, and in Germany and other Continental high schools. He also visited Rome. After filling various minor ecclesiastical offices, he was made bishop of Saalland, a province at that time paying fealty to Poland, but under the secular rule of prince Albrecht of Brandenburg. In 1522 this prince, who had refused homage to the new king Sigismund, went to Germany, in company with bishop Jacob Dobeneck and bishop Polenz, to secure the independence of Poland and to accept the Protestant doctrines at the Diet of Nuremberg, which they finally did in 1524. Bishop Polenz died shortly after this event. See Krasinski, *Sketch of the Rise and Progress of the Reformation in Poland*, vol. ii; Alzog, *Kirchengesch.* ii, 327, 328; Theiner, *Herzog Albrecht von Preussen*, etc. (Augsb. 1846). See also Prussia. (J. H. W.)

Polhemus, Abraham, D.D., a minister of the (Dutch) Reformed Church in America, was a lineal descendant of the Rev. Johannes T. Polhemus, the first minister of the Dutch Church of Brooklyn, Long Island, who had previously been a missionary of the Reformed Church of Holland at Itamarca, Brazil. He came to this country in 1654, and died in 1676. But little more is known of him than these few dates and facts of his ministry. The subject of this notice was born at Astoria, L. I., in 1812; graduated at Rutgers College in 1831, and at the theological seminary in New Brunswick in 1835. Immediately after his licensure by the Classis of New York, in 1835, he settled at Hopewell, Dutchess Co., N. Y., and remained there until 1857, when he removed to Newark, N. J., and took charge of the newly organized North Reformed Church in May of that year. In October following he died at Newburgh, N. Y., of fever, after an illness of several weeks. He was a man of majestic physical proportions, tall, broad-shouldered, handsome, of amiable instincts and attractive manners. The attachment of his parishioners and friends to him was almost unbounded. He was modest, and yet energetic; frank and cordial, but always dignified and commanding respect. His pastoral qualifications were finely developed. As a preacher, he was easy, graceful, impressive in manner, solid and instructive in matter, evangelical and catholic in spirit, and full of "an unction from the Holy One" which gave him great acceptance with the people. He was a leading man in the councils of the Church and in her benevolent and educational institutions, and, had he lived, would have been eagerly sought for other high positions. His piety partook of the characteristics to which it gave its own burnished splendor. His death was a scene of glorious Christian triumph, which reminds one of Payson's experiences. A few hours before he died he exclaimed aloud, "I see Jesus! Now that I have seen him, I never can come back again. I see Jesus! Did I not tell you I should see Jesus? My soul is ravished with the sight." After a while he added, "I have perfect assurance; not a doubt, not a fear." His last sermon was on the death of Stephen, and the subject made a deep impression on his own heart. From the beginning of his sickness he felt that he would never recover, though with occasional encouragements to the contrary, and he prayed that, like Stephen, he might see Jesus. The answer came on his dying bed. A handsome memorial volume has been published, containing his biography and a selection of his sermons. His memory has been an inspiration to the church whose foundations he laid with faith and prayer, and which, after only three short months of earthly labors, he was destined to lead in person to heaven. (W. J. R. T.)

Polhemus, Johannes T. See Polhemus, Abraham.

Polhill, Edward, a learned English Calvinistic layman, flourished in the second half of the 17th century as justice of the peace at Burwast, Sussex. He wrote, *The Divine Will considered in its Eternal Decrees*, etc. (1673, 8vo):—*Answer to Dr. Sherlock's Discourse* (1675, 8vo):—*Precious Faith, considered in its Nature, Work-*

ing, and Growth (1675, 12mo):—*Speculum Theologiæ in Christo, or a View of some Divine Truths* (1678, 4to):—*Christus in Corde, or Mystical Union between Christ and Believers considered* (1680, sm. 8vo, and often):—*Armatura Dei, or a Preparation for Suffering in an Evil Day* (1682, 8vo):—*Discourse on Schism* (1824, 12mo). Several of his works were published in Ward's *Library of Standard Divinity*. "Everything of Polhill is evangelical and valuable," was the testimony of Cotton Mather; and Williams says: "All the works of this learned layman contain many excellent representations of Gospel truths, intermixed with a strain of sublime devotion." Of course Arminians fail to see the consistency of his Bible interpretations, but they nevertheless admire his unction and experience, and regard his writings as precious practical religious works. See *Eclectic Rev.* 4th series, xviii, 202. (J. H. W.)

Poliander, Johann (originally *Granmann*), a German theologian of the Reformation period, was born at Neustadt in 1487. He studied at Leipsic, where in 1516 he became magister, and in 1520 baccalaureate of theology. When the famous disputation between Dr. Eck and Luther and Carlstadt took place, he was Eck's amanuensis. The disputation convinced him of the truth of the evangelical doctrine, and in 1520 he commenced to preach in accordance with it. The consequence was that he had to leave Leipsic, and in 1522 went to Wittenberg. At the recommendation of Luther, the duke Albrecht of Prussia called Poliander to Königsberg, as pastor of the Altstadtkirche, where he remained until his death in 1541. Poliander is the author of the well-known hymn *Nun lob' mein' Seel' den Herrn* (Engl. transl. by Mills, *Horæ Germanicæ*, No. 75, p. 139, "Now to the Lord sing praises"). See Koch, *Gesch. des deutschen Kirchenliedes*, i, 355 sq.; *Theologisches Universal-Lexikon*, s. v.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* xii, 18–20. (B. P.)

Polias (Πολιάς), a surname given by the Athenians to *Minerva*, or Athene, as being the goddess who protected the city.

Polidoro, Caldara, called *Caravaggio*, from his birthplace, was an eminent Italian painter of the Pre-Raffaelites. He was born in 1495, near Milan. He went to Rome at the time when Leo X was raising some new edifices in the Vatican, and not knowing how to get his bread otherwise, for Polidoro was very young, he hired out as a day-laborer to carry stones and mortar for the masons there at work. He drudged this way till he was eighteen, when he was led to think of devoting his life to painting. It happened thus: Several young painters were employed by Raffaelle in the same place to execute his designs. Polidoro, who often carried them mortar to make their fresco, was touched with the sight of the paintings, and the pleasure he took to see the painters work stirred up the talent which he had for painting. In this disposition, he was very officious and complaisant to the young painters, pushed himself into their acquaintance, and opened to them his intention; whereupon they gave him lessons, which emboldened him to proceed. He applied himself with all his might to designing, and advanced so rapidly that Raffaelle was astonished, and set him to work with the other young painters; and Polidoro distinguished himself so much from all the rest, that, as he had the greatest share in executing his master's designs in the Vatican, so he had the greatest glory. The care he had seen Raffaelle take in designing the antique sculptures showed him the way to do the like. He spent whole days and nights in designing those beautiful things, and studied antiquity to the nicest exactness. The works with which he enriched the frontispieces of several buildings at Rome are proofs of the pains he took in studying the antique. He did very few easel pieces, most of his productions being in fresco, and of the same color, in imitation of the bass-reliefs. In this way he made use of the manner called scratching, consisting in the preparation of a black ground, on which is placed a white plaster, and where, taking off this white with an iron bodkin, we discover through the holes the black, which serves for shadows. Scratched work lasts longest, but being very rough, is unpleasant to the sight. He associated himself at first with Maturino, and their friendship lasted till the death of the latter, who died of the plague in 1526. After this, Polidoro, having by Raffaelle's assistance filled Rome with his pieces, thought to have enjoyed his ease and the fruits of his labors; when the Spaniards in 1527 besieging that city, all the men of art were forced to fly, or else were ruined by the miseries of the war. In this exigency Polidoro retired to Naples, where he was obliged to work for ordinary painters, and had no opportunity of making himself noted; for the Neapolitan nobility in those days were more solicitous to get good horses than good pictures. Seeing himself therefore without business, and forced to spend what he had got at Rome, he went to Sicily; and, understanding architecture as well as painting, the citizens of Messina employed him to make the triumphal arches for the reception of Charles V coming from Tunis. This being finished, and finding nothing further, he set out for Rome, but, scarcely out of the place, was murdered by his servant for his money. This happened in 1543. Polidoro's principal work was done at Messina, and represented *Christ bearing his Cross*. This, with several small pictures of sacred subjects, is now in the Studj Gallery at Naples. His works have power, life, and passion, and he may be said to have originated the style which in later time formed the basis of the Neapolitan school. See Spooner, *Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts*, s. v.; Mrs. Clement, *Handbook of Painters*, etc. p. 171, 172. (J. H. W.)

Polieia (Πολίεια), a festival anciently observed at Thebes, in Greece, in honor of Apollo, when a bull was wont to be sacrificed.

Polieus (Πολιεύς), a surname of *Zeus*, or Jupiter, under which he was worshipped at Athens, as the protector of the city. The god had an altar on the Acropolis, on which a bull was sacrificed.

Polignac, Melchior de, *Cardinal*, was one of the most illustrious scholars and courtiers of France in the latter years of Louis XIV, and in the early reign of Louis XV; an ecclesiastic and high dignitary of the Roman Catholic Church; a distinguished diplomatist, archæologist, philosopher, and poet. It is in the last of these characters that his reputation has survived, and is likely to survive, though with continually fading lustre. The elegant Latinist, whose name was for half a century in the mouths of the fashionable ladies of the court, and of the learned in their studious retreats; whose verses passed current in the gay world for years before they were committed to the press, and continued in circulation for half a century after the death of their author and the oblivion of their source; furnishing to America an inscription in honor of Franklin—

"Eripuit fulmenque Jovi Phœboque sagittas;"

whose poem was anxiously and frequently desired by Leibnitz, but who died without seeing it, thirty years before it saw the light—this elegant Latinist is now remembered only by a few, and the work which gave him his renown is known to still fewer, being almost as inaccessible as it is unsought. Yet Polignac can never be entirely forgotten, for he linked himself by his poetic labors with Lucretius; and so long as the profound but dreamy philosophy, and the exquisite but melancholy graces of the greatest of Roman poets are admired, so long will Polignac shine in the radiance reflected from the great luminary with which he is in opposition.

Life.—Melchior de Polignac, the descendant of one of the oldest houses of Auvergne, was born Oct. 11, 1661, at Puy-en-Velay, now Le Puy, the capital of the present department of Haute-Loire, in France. Puy is in the

heart of the mountainous region of Middle France, the region of which Puy-de-Dôme is the centre. It lies at the foot of Mount Anis, in a rugged valley between the great arms of the Cévennes. It is on the left bank of the Upper Loire, and is watered also by its two small tributaries, the Borne and Dolaison. The situation is wild and romantic, and is consecrated by romantic associations. The ground on which the city stands is so ragged and broken that the streets in the higher town are unfit for wheels, and are often mere stairs, like those of Valetta. The cathedral is escaladed by an approach of 118 steep steps. Within is a miraculous image of the Virgin Mary, carved by resident Christians of Lebanon from the cedars of that mountain, though sceptically suspected to have been an idol of the Egyptian Isis. In the suburb of L'Aiguille, the church of St. Michel crowns a basaltic rock 285 feet in height, and is gained by a flight of 216 steps hewn out of the rock. In the Dominican church of St. Laurent are the tomb and part of the remains of Bertrand Duguesclin, the great constable of France. Near by, and close to the village of Expailly, are the ruins of the ancient castle of Polignac, supposed to have been erected on the site of the temple of the Celtic Apollo. From this circumstance—the *Templum Apolliniacum*—the family of Polignac claimed to have derived its appellation. The tremendous forces of volcanic action are manifest in the country round about, and the streets of Le Puy are partly paved with the volcanic breccia. The race and the birthplace of the future cardinal were thus encompassed with the evidences on which were founded legends and traditions, pagan and Christian—antiquarian, classical, ecclesiastical, chivalrous, and poetic—which might well inspire the quick fancy of the descendant of an ancient family in that marvellous land; and they were enclosed in scenes of natural beauty or sublimity which might feed his imagination in those years of youth which are susceptible to all external influences. Who shall tell to what extent and in what modes the young mind is moulded by the circumstances in which infancy and boyhood are passed—in that impressible period of exulting life when it is facile to all impressions? There are no interesting recollections of Polignac's boyhood. As the cadet of a noble house, he was destined for the Church, and was educated at Paris in the colleges of Clermont and Harcourt. He completed his courses by the study of theology at the Sorbonne, and was early provided with a living through the intervention of his family. The young abbé soon attracted attention by the extent of his acquirements, the vivacity of his disposition, the polish of his conversation, and the elegance of his manners. He is said to have added to "a distinguished address and personal appearance a sweet and winning eloquence, which became masculine and powerful in the close of his harangues." Madame de Sévigné described him in her Letters as "a man of the world, of fascinating sprightliness, knowing all things and meditating all things; yet with all the gentleness, brilliancy, and complaisance which could be desired in the intercourse of life" (March 18, 1690). Equally flattering commendations were bestowed on him about the same time by Louis XIV and pope Alexander VIII. This pope was elected in a conclave attended by the cardinal de Bourbon, who had carried with him to Rome the young abbé, fresh from his theological studies. On this visit Polignac was charged with the discussion of the four articles of 1682 which asserted the liberties of the Gallican Church. He returned to France to report to Louis XIV the favorable results of the effort at conciliation between the French and Roman courts. In 1691 he accompanied the cardinal de Bourbon a second time to Rome, on the occasion of the election of Innocent XII to the pontificate. On his return to France, he shut himself up in the monastery of "Bons Enfants" to continue his studies. He was not suffered to remain long in this learned seclusion. The previous experience of his adroitness recommended him as a suitable person to conduct the delicate negotiations in support of the candidature of the prince de Conti for the crown of Poland. He was accordingly sent to Warsaw as ambassador extraordinary. This was his first diplomatic employment. On his journey he was wrecked on the Prussian coast; and, to add to the misfortunes of the sea, he was plundered and his life imperilled by marauders of Dantzic. He managed, however, to reach the court to which he was accredited, and was cordially welcomed by the heroic king, John Sobieski. In his confidential mission at Warsaw he displayed great dexterity and capacity for intrigue, which were, however, frustrated of their expected fruit by the listlessness and delays of the French prince. But the sentiment of Poland was expressed in an epigram cited by Leibnitz (Lett. vi à Burnet):

"Per vivum Deum
Nolumus Condæum."

The election resulted in placing the Polish crown on the head of Augustus, elector of Saxony, the first king of the Saxon line. Louis XIV manifested his disappointment by replacing Polignac at the court of Warsaw by the abbé de Châteaunay, and ordered the discredited ambassador to return to his abbey of Bon Port (or Fair Haven). The rusticated diplomatist accepted his banishment with apparent gratification, and declared it altogether conformable to his wishes and fortunes. Here he remained during four years, closely occupied with those studies and labors which enabled him to merit the high but pedantic compliment of Voltaire:

"Le cardinal, oracle de la France,
Réunissant Virgile avec Platon,
Vengeur du ciel et vainqueur de Lucrèce."

To these years of tranquil application must be assigned the conception and commencement of the poem by which his renown was mainly acquired, and by which it has been preserved. On his return from Poland, Polignac visited the celebrated sceptic Bayle, with whom he had many and earnest conferences. Bayle, in replying to the theological arguments of his clerical opponent, assumed to be a Protestant, and justified the genuineness of his Protestantism on the score of protesting against everything usually said or done—against "tout ce qui se dit et tout ce qui se fait." The French abbé could make no serious impression upon his astute and witty antagonist, but was much struck with the frequency and point of his citations from Lucretius. He determined in consequence to re-read the great Roman poet, and to refute his infidel and materialistic arguments. To this task he addressed himself at once in his retreat at Bon Port, and occasional passages of the incipient poem were communicated to his friends, were circulated from mouth to mouth, and excited general expectation among scholars.

Notwithstanding these diligent literary avocations and his professed enjoyment of the charms of contemplative repose, Polignac was too much of a Frenchman and courtier not to sigh and scheme for a renewal of the delights of Paris and of royal favor. On the proclamation of the duke of Anjou as king of Spain, he wrote to Louis XIV: "If your majesty's prosperity does not put an end to my misfortunes, at least it makes me forget them." The compliment was graciously accepted. He was recalled from his rural banishment, and was welcomed with the utmost cordiality. The king presented him with two additional abbacies. He seems to have recited at this time long passages from his growing poem to the king, the princes, and the learned. He was sent to Rome as auditor of the Rota; and was nominated to the English cardinalate by the Pretender, with whose interests he was intrusted. In 1706 he was joined with the cardinal De la Tremouille in the conduct of the French negotiations. He was recalled from Rome in 1710, and was commissioned, along with the maréchal D'Uxelles, as plenipotentiary to the conferences of Gertruydenburg, being already cardinal *in petto*. The recent victories of Marlborough had rendered the

plenipotentiaries of the Dutch provinces arrogant, exacting, and impracticable. He rebuked their domineering tone by remarking, "It is very evident, gentlemen, that you are unused to victory." Nothing was effected at this time towards the restoration of peace, but two years later he was sent to the Congress of Utrecht, where he appeared in the habit of a layman, and under the name of the Comte de Polignac. The Dutch negotiators, suspecting the existence of secret articles between France and England, threatened to expel the French ambassadors from their territory. Hereupon Polignac retorted, "We will not depart: we will treat of you, among you, and without you." He refused, however, to sign the treaty, as it excluded from the English throne the Stuart family, to whose head he was indebted for his nomination to the cardinalate. Before the negotiations at Utrecht were closed, the promotion of Polignac was promulgated, and he received the cardinal's hat at Antwerp, Feb. 10, 1713. In the summer of the same year the *beretta* was delivered to him at Versailles by Louis XIV himself. He did not neglect his poetic defence of Christianity even in the perplexity of diplomatic cares. He added new passages to his poem during his sojourn at Utrecht, and read his poetic labors to the eminent and aged scholar Le Clerc. Soon after his return to Paris he received the appointment of master of the Royal Chapel, an office which he resigned after three years' tenure. His influence and acceptability at court declined after the death of the great monarch. His stately manners belonged to the old régime, and were uncongenial to the license of the regency. He was involved in the conspiracy of Cellamare through his attachment to the duke and duchess of Maine, and his opposition to the regent Orleans. He was exiled to his abbey of Anchin, in Flanders; and though his arrival was distasteful to the simple and uncultivated Flemish monks, he won their regard by his gentleness and consideration, by the integrity of his government, and by the decoration of their church. He employed himself here with the continuation of his poem; but after three years returned to Paris on the death of the cardinal Dubois and of the regent. In 1724 he attended the conclave in Rome which resulted in the election of Benedict XIII, and rendered himself singularly acceptable to him and to his successor, Clement XII. He was appointed shortly after his arrival in Rome ambassador of France at the papal court, and at length brought to a happy termination the long controversy of the Gallican Church on the subject of the bull *Unigenitus*. He returned to his native land in 1730, "laden with the spoils of Rome"—both the tributes paid to his dexterity, wit, eloquence, and fascination of manner, and the antique treasures brought from the capital of the ancient world. During his absence he had been appointed, in 1726, archbishop of Auch, and in 1728 *Commandeur des Ordres du Roi*.

During this long political and diplomatic career there had been many intervals of literary retirement, as we have seen, which had been sedulously employed in the acquisition and application of various knowledge. His poetic taste and his learned labors he never entirely laid aside, but rendered them profitable to himself and attractive to statesmen and courtiers wherever his wanderings led him. His public avocations were thus far from filling up the measure of his distinction. In 1704 he succeeded the illustrious Bossuet as a member of the Royal Academy of France. His inaugural address on this occasion was greatly admired. More than twenty years after its delivery the marquis D'Argenson deemed it superior to any discourse delivered during the century in which the Academy had existed, and declared it to be "the most perfect model for those who have a like task to fulfil." In 1715 he was elected an honorary member of the Academy of Sciences, and in 1717 of the Academy of Belles-Lettres. These honors were fairly merited. He had through life been a diligent explorer and collector of antiquities. He gathered a large and valuable cabinet of coins and medals. He brought together at great expense a splendid assemblagé of archaic remains, due in great measure to his frequent and prolonged residences at Rome. He instituted explorations in its neighborhood, between Frascati and Grotta Ferrata, and discovered the villa of Marius, his conjectures being confirmed by the exhumation of a fragment of an inscription recording the fifth consulship of the conqueror of the Teutones and Cimbri. From these diggings he obtained six statues representing the detection of Achilles at the court of Lycomedes by Ulysses. The palace of the Cæsars, in the Farnese vineyard on the Palatine, was opened and examined in his presence. The duke of Parma, who had ordered the excavations, presented Polignac with a bass-relief containing fourteen figures, embodying the legend of Bacchus and Ariadne. It had formed the highest step of the state platform constructed for the imperial audiences. From the Columbarium of the *Libertines* of Livia he obtained several beautiful urns. He expressed the wish that he could be master of Rome, in order that he might turn the course of the Tiber for a fortnight, and rifle its bed of the precious relics supposed to be concealed beneath its yellow stream. He had surveys executed with the view to the gratification of such a desire. Could it have been satisfied, the project of Garibaldi would have been anticipated by one hundred and fifty years; but recent discussions have indicated the hopelessness of obtaining any considerable treasures by such a laborious procedure. The numerous relics which Polignac acquired by these and other opportunities were arranged as a grand museum of antiquities at his hotel in Paris. They ultimately met with a sorrowful fate. The cardinal had hoped to increase them by the examination of the ruins of the Templum Pacis, burned in A.D. 191, in the reign of Commodus. He expected to find amid the ashes and débris the sacred vessels carried off from Jerusalem by Titus. The hope and the expectation both remained ungratified.

Polignac's liberal studies were by no means restricted to poetry and classical archæology. A portion of his time was always devoted to philosophy, mathematics, and physics. He thus gained that diversified and extensive knowledge which is strikingly but not convincingly displayed in his *Anti-Lucretius*. The last decade of his life seems to have been chiefly consecrated to this graceful and remarkable poem; but it was also occupied with the arrangement and study of his ample gallery of instructive curiosities, and enlivened by pleasant intercourse with his friends, and with the distinguished strangers who were attracted to his hotel by his wide and long-established reputation. For half a century he was one of the notabilities of Europe. He died at Paris Nov. 20, 1741, and his collection was scattered at his death. His habits had been elegant and courtly—his living generous—his public employments and his private pursuits expensive—his ample means consumed in costly accumulations. He was embarrassed with debt, and after his decease his books, his gems, his medals, his sculptures, and his numerous articles of *virtu* were offered for sale. His statues were purchased by Frederick the Great, and were transported to Berlin, where they were destroyed on the capture of that city in the Seven-Years' War. All that remains as a memorial of Polignac is his confutation of Lucretius.

Even that great work—for it merits the epithet of great both by its design and by its execution—the great Latin poem which preserves his reputation, was left in as incomplete and fragmentary a condition as the ancient ruins from which he had recovered the shattered monuments of ancient art. He never finished it—he never put its finished parts together ("varias partes variis temporibus perpoliendo, dissolutas, ac dissipatas in unum corpus revocare numquam curaverat"). A few days before his death he consigned his unarranged manuscripts to his long-tried companion and friend the

abbé de Rothelin, appointing him his literary executor, to revise, arrange, connect, complete the scattered leaves, or to suppress them, according to his discretion. The provision for the performance of these duties seems to have been early made. The marquis D'Argenson reports it in his *Mémoires*, published fifteen years before Polignac's death: "A poem against Lucretius, of equal length with the original, and divided into nine books, requires the life of a man to carry it to perfection. The cardinal began too late, and cannot flatter himself with the hope of living to finish it. It is said that he means to charge the abbé de Rothelin with the task, who, from vanity, will not refuse it, and will think it an honor to put the work of his respectable friend in a state to appear before the public. But to this end the aid of some able professor of the university will be necessary: the abbé will never accomplish it of himself. . . . But who, at present, will read a Latin poem entirely philosophical, of five or six thousand lines? . . . Greek is entirely forgotten; it is to be feared that Latin will soon be so, and that the cardinal de Polignac, the abbé de Rothelin, and a certain M. Le Beau, coming up in the university, will be called *the last of the Romans*." From vanity, from affection, from love of learning, from zeal for philosophy, or from all these motives combined, the pious task intrusted to him was faithfully and creditably discharged by the abbé de Rothelin. With the counsel and assistance of the abbate Cerati, rector of the University of Pisa, he prepared the work for the press, and wrote the dedication to pope Benedict XIV. He, too, died without seeing the fruit of his labors; and the long-expected work, which for forty years it had been a mark of polite culture to know (*Anti-Lucretium nosse pars urbanitatis*), appeared at Paris under the supervision of Prof. Le Beau, to whom the charge of editing it had been consigned by Rothelin. It was reproduced at London in 1748. D'Argenson thought that translations would be left unread; but translations soon diffused the fame of the work among those who were ignorant of the classic tongues. At the commencement of the century, while the poem was in its crude infancy, a translation was begun by the dukes of Maine and Bourbon. The French version of Bougainville was issued in 1759, and the Italian of Ricci was produced in splendid form at Verona in 1767 (3 vols. 4to).

The Anti-Lucretius.—The philosophical poem of cardinal Polignac, as published by Le Beau, and, apparently, as originally designed by its author, consists of nine books; but it closes without epilogue, peroration, or envoy. Notwithstanding its length, its protracted gestation, and its elaborate execution, it ends like that canto of Butler's *Hudibras* which celebrates the Bear and Fiddle, but "breaks off in the middle." It wants alike completeness and completion. It is fragmentary and desultory, deficient and redundant. Its arguments are ingenious without being convincing, and its polemics are more dazzling than satisfactory. The blind and fanatical Cartesianism of the poet confines him in a labyrinth of bewildering errors, and conceals from him at once the vagaries and weaknesses of his master, and the strength and profundity of those who had risen up to confute his philosophic hallucinations. He is dizzied by the *vortices* in which he has involved himself. He forgets his specific function as the antagonist of Epicurean ethics and physics, and devotes himself with more earnest energy to the refutation of all anti-Cartesians, whom he assimilates to and often identifies with the Epicurean herd. He is in consequence both undiscerning and unjust in the treatment of his brilliant predecessors and contemporaries. The statement and confutation of the doctrines of Spinoza might have been very acceptable to the Cartesians and theologians of his own day, when Spinoza was so little understood and so harshly appreciated (iii, 803–872; iv, 1295–1307). It may be highly approved even now by those who still retain the old fanatical delusions and the old animosities in regard to Spinoza, and who cannot recognise in him Coleridge's "God-intoxicated sage." See SPINOZA But surely the language in which the cardinal assails the Newtonian system, and proceeds to confute Newton himself, does equal discredit to his good-sense and to his scientific perspicacity (ii, 865–1006; iv, 933–1124). He does, it is true, allow a faint echo of the universal admiration for Newton to escape him:

> "Dicam
> Tanti pace viri, quo non solertior alter
> Naturam rerum ad leges componere motus,
> Ac Mundi partes justa perpendere libra,
> Et radium solis transverso prismate fractum
> Septem in primigenos permansurosque colores
> Solvere" (ii, 874–880).

Yet how different is this deprecatory commendation from the enthusiastic eulogy bestowed on Des Cartes!

> "Quo nomine dicam
> Naturæ genium, Patriæ decus, ac decus ævi
> Cartesium nostri, quo se jactabit alumno
> Gallia fœta viris, ac duplicis arte Minervæ"
> (viii, 55–59).

This is the manifest reflection of the tribute of Lucretius to the "*Graius homo*," Epicurus. We may endure with patience Polignac's contempt for the materialistic tendencies of Locke's philosophy, and his omission of his contemporaries, Malebranche and the much greater Leibnitz (an omission which may be satisfactorily explained), but we cannot fail to observe his utter inability to discern the scientific acumen, and the wonderful faculty of logical co-ordination and development, which characterized his chosen antagonist Lucretius. One of the most admired, and probably the most brilliant passage in the *Anti-Lucretius*, is the opening, in which he announces his subject and its difficulties, and does earnest homage to the exquisite graces of the Roman poet. But this inauguration of his thesis does not prevent him from speaking of the spirit and doctrines of Lucretius in terms which reveal rather the controversialist eager to display his own powers in the best light than the sincere inquirer anxious to discover and to promulgate only the truth. With all our regard for the courtly and clerical poet, we must confess him to be more of a *dilettante* than a philosopher or adept in science.

But, while thus taking exception to the substance and argumentation of the poem, and to the narrowness and fanaticism inseparable from the advocacy of fantastic and erroneous theories, attention may be justly called to the general execution of the difficult task, and to many episodical disquisitions, which assail by anticipation the speculations of Darwin and the evolutionists, and present many topics and many suggestions which merit careful examination in connection with the scientific controversies that distract our own day by the revival of ancient hallucinations.

Whatever deductions may be properly made from the *Anti-Lucretius* on the score of scientific superficiality and philosophic aberration, the work merits high praise on account of its design and execution; and still deserves consideration as a memorable and singularly graceful production of the modern Latin muse.

The versification and expression of Polignac have been unfavorably compared with the excellences of some of the earlier Latinists. In making the comparison with Vida, one of the chief of those elders, some advantage may be derived from a direct, though unequal, counterpart to one of his poems. The description of the game of chess in the *Anti-Lucretius* may be fairly considered in connection with the *Scacchia, Ludus*, of the Cremonese poet. The same ingenuity in rendering the stiffness of classic Latinity plastic, for the purpose of describing things and processes entirely unknown to the classical vocabulary, may be admired in both. In the one instance chess is employed only as an illustration, and the description occupies only fifteen lines (*Anti-Lucr.* iii, 892–906); in the other it constitutes the thesis of a descriptive poem. In a few lines, and in a mere illustration, there is, of course, no opportunity for detail. Nor is there room for such elaborate intricacy of narration—such subtle twisting in and twisting

out of facile diction—nor for such surprising felicity of adaptation of old forms to new and undesigned uses, in the later episode as in the earlier poem. There is nothing possible within the narrower field which, for curious dexterity, admits of being adduced as a parallel for Vida's marvellous explanation of the diverse movements of the pieces at chess (*Scacch.* 85–168), or for his explanation of the manœuvres and fortunes of the game. But it may be permitted to act upon the artist's maxim, "*ex pede Herculem;*" and we may discern in the episode of Polignac (notwithstanding the deficiency of materials for an accurate and minute comparison) a command over the resources of the Latin tongue which is not unworthy of Vida, even in such fantastic sports of fancy and erudition. If the larger faculties of the poet are considered, Vida's epic, the *Christiad*, fails to exhibit such compass of expression, such grace and dignity, and even melody of utterance, or such vigor of imagination, as the *Anti-Lucretius*. Both Vida and Polignac, it is true, fall into the unclassical frailty of terminating their hexameters too frequently with monosyllables and enclitics. They are careless of their cæsuras, and repeat too often certain easy forms and mannerisms. There may be more liquidity and smoothness in Vida, but there is more elevation and a more masculine gravity in Polignac. If the former adheres with unconscious imitation to the transparent fluency of Virgil, the latter with equal success, but with deliberate endeavor, reproduces the peculiarities, and not rarely the splendors, of Lucretius, in the very diction of the greater Roman poet. But, whatever judgment may be passed on either the absolute or the relative merit of the *Anti-Lucretius*, it remains a very remarkable poem, which deserves to be reclaimed from the oblivion in which it has been suffered to remain so long. It was a praiseworthy and noble effort to repel the advances of scepticism in the day of Spinoza and Locke and Bayle; "to justify the ways of God to man," by explaining the wonder of the universe in consonance with a lively and intelligent faith in a wise, beneficent, and sustaining Creator. Despite of its imperfections, its disconnections, its disorder and incompleteness, the study of the poem may be advantageously renewed after the lapse of a century, though other weapons may be required for the renovated conflict between faith and science than can thence be drawn, in consequence of the vast changes which have since been made in all the implements of intellectual warfare.

Literature.—It results from the long neglect into which the *Anti-Lucretius* had fallen that the bibliography of the subject is exceedingly scant and unsatisfactory. The histories of philosophy pass it by with little or no notice; the editors of Lucretius, and the commentators on the *De Natura Rerum*, have scarcely bestowed more attention upon it. There is very little to assist investigation which is not due to the contemporaries of Polignac. Under these circumstances, the only references which it seems expedient to make are, *Biographie Universelle*, s. v. Polignac; De Boze, *Éloge de M. le Cardinal de Polignac, prononcé dans l'Academie Royale des Inscriptions et des Belles-Lettres;* De Mairan, *Éloge de M. le Cardinal de Polignac, prononcé dans l'Académie Royale des Sciences;* Fancher, *Hist. du Cardinal de Polignac* (Paris, 1772, 2 vols.); St. Simon, *Mémoires;* D'Argenson, *Mémoires; Anti-Lucretius, sive de Deo et Natura Libri Novem* (Lond. 1748, 2 vols. 12mo). The recent *History of French Literature* by Van Laun, though extending over three octavo volumes, has not a word on Polignac, so much has his memory fallen into neglect. For the relation of Polignac to the important ecclesiastical events of his time, see Jervis, *Hist. of the Church of France*, ii, 181, 224, and the art. NOAILLES in this *Cyclopædia*. (G. F. H.)

Polish Brethren. See SOCINIANS.

Politeness. See COURTESY.

Politi, Adriano, an Italian writer, was born at Siena at the close of the 16th century. He chose the ecclesiastical career, and was attached as secretary to the cardinals Capisucchi, San Giorgio, and Serbelloni. He died about the middle of the 17th century. Politi edited *Opere di C. Tacito* (Rome, 1611, 4to), and another and more satisfactory edition (Venice, 1644, 4to):—*Dizionario Toscano* (ibid. 1615, 8vo): this work, an abridgment of the *Dizionario della Crusca*, caused him some tribulations: he was accused of having wittingly introduced into it some errors and falsehoods, and was thrown into jail:—*Ordo Romanæ historiæ legendæ* (ibid. 1627, 4to, and in vol. iii of Roberti's *Miscellanea*).—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xl, 616.

Politi, Alessandro, an Italian writer, was born July 10, 1679, at Florence. After studying under the Jesuits, he entered at the age of fifteen the Congregation of the Regular Clerks of the Pious Schools, and was conspicuous among its members by his rare erudition. He was called upon to teach rhetoric and peripatetic philosophy at Florence in 1700. Barring a period of about three years, during which he was a professor of theology at Genoa (1716–18), he spent the greatest part of his life in his native city, availing himself of the manifold resources he could find there to improve his knowledge of Greek literature, his favorite study. In 1733 he was called to the chair of eloquence vacant in the University of Pisa. Accustomed to live among his books, aloof from the world, Politi was of an irritable disposition, and sensitive in the extreme to the lightest criticism. He was fond of displaying his erudition, and his useless digressions make the reading of his works a most harassing job. He died July 25, 1752. He left, *Philosophia Peripatetica, ex mente sancti Thomæ* (Florence, 1708, 12mo):—*De patriâ in testamentis condendis potestate, lib. iv* (ibid. 1712, 8vo):—*Eustathii Commentarii in Homeri Iliadem*, with notes and Latin version (ibid. 1730–35, 3 vols. fol.):—*Eustathii Commentarii in Dionysium Periegetem*, Greek and Latin (Cologne, 1742, 8vo):—*Orationes XII ad Academiam Pisanam* (Lucca, 1746, 8vo):—*Martyrologium Romanum castigatum* (vol. i, Florence, 1751, 8vo); and many unpublished works. All his orations have been collected (Pisa, 1774, 8vo). See Fabroni, *Vitæ Italiorum*, vol. viii; Tipaldo, *Biogr. degli Ital. illustri*, vol. iv.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xl, 616.

Politi, Giovanni, an Italian canonist, was born June 8, 1738, at Pinzano (Frioul). He studied at Padua, obtained in 1763 the diploma as a doctor of civil and canon law, and was a professor of literature at the Seminary of Portogruaro, and also of ecclesiastical jurisprudence, in which he was remarkably proficient. In 1800 he repaired to Concordia, where the bishop provided him with a canonicate. He published one considerable work, *Jurisprudentiæ ecclesiasticæ universæ, libri ix* (Venice, 1787, 9 vols. 4to), which was approved by a brief of Pius VI.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xl, 617.

Politian or **Poliziano,** ANGELO, a noted scholar of the Renaissance period, flourished in France and Italy, and was the favorite of the Medici at Florence. He was born at Montepulciano, in Tuscany, in 1454, and was the son of Benedetto Ambrogini, a doctor of law. In after-life he dropped his paternal name, and assumed that of Poliziano, from his native town Mons Politianus. Lorenzo de Medici took care of his education, placed him under good preceptors, and provided for all his wants. He afterwards entered into clerical orders, took his degree of doctor of law, and was made by Lorenzo a canon of the cathedral of Florence. He was also intrusted with the education of the ducal children, as well as with the care of the duke's library and collection of antiquities, and he was his guest and companion for the remainder of his life. Poliziano had studied Latin under Cristoforo Landino, Greek under Andronicus of Thessalonica, and philosophy under Ficino and Argyropulus of Constantinople. He was afterwards appointed professor of Latin and Greek at Flor-

ence, a chair which he filled with great reputation. He wrote *scholia* and notes on many ancient authors—Ovid, Catullus, Statius, Suetonius, Pliny the Younger, and the *Scriptores Historiæ Augustæ;* he translated into Latin the history of Herodian, the manual of Epictetus, the aphorisms of Hippocrates, some dialogues of Plato, and other works from the Greek. The *Miscellanea* of Poliziano, published at Florence in 1489, consist chiefly of observations he had made on the ancient authors, which he arranged for the press at the request of Lorenzo. Merula made an attempt to depreciate this work, which led to an angry controversy between the two scholars, in the midst of which Merula died. Poliziano had also a violent controversy with Bartolomeo Scala. Poliziano was conceited and vain, and very irritable, and his temper led him into an unbecoming altercation with Madonna Clarice, Lorenzo's wife, because she interfered in the education of her children, a thing which Poliziano seemed to think preposterous in a woman; and at last his behavior to her was so impertinent that she turned him out of her house in the country, and wrote to her husband at Florence to inform him of what she had done. Lorenzo, perceiving that a reconciliation between the offended woman and the irascible scholar was impracticable, gave Poliziano apartments in one of his houses at Fiesole, where he wrote his Latin poem *Rusticus.* During Lorenzo's last illness, Poliziano attended the death-bed of his patron, who gave him tokens of his lasting affection. Poliziano wrote an affecting monody on Lorenzo's death, and not long after died himself, in September, 1494, and was buried in the church of San Marco, agreeably to his request.—*English Cyclop.* s. v. See Moller, *De Politiano* (Altorf, 1698); Werner, *Politianus* (Magdeb. 1718); Mencken, *Hist. Vitæ A. Politani* (Leips. 1736, 4to); Bonafous, *De Politani Vita et Operibus* (Paris, 1845, 8vo); Greswell, *Memoirs of Politiano;* Roscoe, *Lives of Lorenzo de Medici and of Leo X;* Tiraboschi, *Storia della Letterat. Ital.; Christian Schools and Scholars* (Lond. 1867, 2 vols. 8vo), ii, 321 sq., 329; Lawrence, *Historical Studies* (N. Y. 1877, 8vo), p. 66.

Polity, Civil, of the Jews. See Government.

Polity (Gr. πολιτεία) is the term generally used to signify government or forms of government and administration in the Christian Church. Church polity may be considered in reference to its historical development during successive centuries, and also in reference to the various systems of government heretofore and now recognised in different branches of the Church.

Historical Development.—Nothing is more obvious from the New-Testament record than the simplicity which characterized the primary organization of the Church. In this particular Christianity was in marked contrast with Judaism. Without temple, tabernacle, or altars, without priests or Levites, and almost without ceremonies, it made known at once its character and purposes as spiritual and not carnal, as, in fact, a kingdom of God "not of this world." The first form of Church organization was that in which the Lord Jesus Christ was present as the visible Head of a body of believers. At this stage the ordinances were established by direct appointment of the Saviour himself, who also gave the great command to his disciples to "Go teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you."

Following the crucifixion, the resurrection, and ascension of the Lord Jesus, the Church had for a short period a second form of organization, in which the apostles were the only officers to teach and guide the followers of the Saviour. It was at this period that the promised gift of the Holy Ghost was miraculously imparted and signalized by a great awakening at Jerusalem, in which "the Lord added to the Church daily such as were saved." This period of increase was followed by the appointment of deacons or officers of help, who were especially chosen to relieve the apostles of their minor duties of a semi-secular kind, that they might give themselves "to prayer and the ministry of the Word." Notwithstanding their primary duties, some if not all of the deacons also devoted themselves to the preaching of the Word, as may be seen from the examples of Stephen and Philip. For a few years following there appear to have been no other officers in the Church besides the apostles and deacons. The next phase of Church administration is that in which elders were appointed. As no specific account is given of the mode of their first appointment, we are left to infer that it may have occurred as a natural designation of respect for seniority either among the deacons or the influential members of the Church, somewhat after the analogy of eldership among the Jews. Certain it is that as churches multiplied, the apostles recognised, possibly appointed, and actually ordained elders who from the first had greater or less functions of government, and were also active agents of evangelization. Elders were known at Jerusalem about A.D. 41, or eight years after the Pentecost. A few years later they were ordained generally in all the churches (Acts xiv, 23). In the council at Jerusalem they were associated with the apostles and brethren (xv, 4, 6, 23). The elders of the New Testament appear to have been evangelists, teachers, and pastors, and in a collective capacity to have ordained ministers of different grades.

Near the close of the New-Testament period the term bishop is used a few times by the inspired writers Luke and Paul, indicating an additional office growing up out of the presbyterate, somewhat as the latter had done from the diaconate. On questions that have arisen respecting the office of bishop in the New-Testament Church modern controversies in reference to Church polity have largely centred. One theory is that the apostles appointed bishops to be their direct and only official successors having the prerogative of ordaining future ministers by divine right. An opposite theory is that the ἐπίσκοποι and πρεσβύτεροι of the New Testament were absolutely identical in office and order, and, consequently, that every elder was a bishop. The more probable theory lies between these extremes. It is that the episcopate was a natural sequence of the presbyterate, not specially appointed, but, in fact, recognised by the apostles. Whereas for the work of evangelization not only an elder but elders were ordained in the principal churches, there would exist in every body of elders the necessity of a presidency or primacy for the purpose of general superintendence and direction. Thus one of the number would be designated, either by seniority or formal choice, as a *primus inter pares,* who should serve as overseer (ἐπίσκοπος) of the body and the flock under them. According to this theory, the episcopate was an office of superintendency rather than a distinct clerical order; and in this respect it was analogous if not identical in its functions with that of such apostolical legates as were Timothy and Titus. Nevertheless, it was an office of such importance in the administration of the affairs of the Church and so well adapted to the necessities of the times that it soon became general. Nothing in its original character would prevent its being held in rotation by several elders in the same church or diocese, yet a successful administration of it would tend to its perpetuation in the same individual. Hence it soon became an office for life.

The episcopacy of the primitive Church was diocesan, and in many cases dioceses embraced only single churches. But as Christian influences radiated from those churches, and contiguous churches were established, the dioceses expanded, and the bishoprics grew in importance. At this early period an error crept into the Church which had a great influence upon its polity in after-ages. It was that of attributing priestly functions to the Christian ministry. Soon after the custom became current of calling presbyters priests, it also be-

came customary to call bishops high-priests, and deacons Levites, and thus a full hierarchical system was initiated in the Church. After the conversion of Constantine this system became gradually expanded, until it exceeded in pomp and detail of ceremony the whole ritual of Judaism, and threw the pontifical rites of Greek and Roman paganism far in the shade. From the diocesan bishop as the primitive centre, episcopal offices expanded upwards into archbishops, metropolitans, exarchs, and patriarchs; downwards into chorepiscopi, or country bishops, suffragans, titular bishops, and in the African churches intercessors or episcopal advocates. Corresponding to this expansion, the lower ranks of the clergy were similarly increased by the addition of archpresbyters, archdeacons, and subdeacons, together with acolothists, exorcists, lectors, ostiarii, psalmistæ, copiatæ, parabolani, catechists, syndics, notaries, and still other officers in large churches. In the upward expansion of the episcopate, the Greek Church stopped at the patriarchate, but the Roman Church was content with nothing short of a universal patriarchate or papacy (q. v.).

To state somewhat more fully the organization of the Church in the 4th and 5th centuries, it may be said that the Church of that period consisted of several orders of men. Eusebius reckons three, viz. the Ἡγούμενοι, Πιστοί, and Κατηχούμενοι, i. e. rulers, believers, and catechumens. Origen reckons five orders; but then he divides the clergy into three orders, to make up the number. Both these accounts, when compared together, come to the same thing. Under the Ἡγούμενοι, or rulers, were comprehended the clergy, bishops, priests, and deacons; under the Πιστοί, or believers, the baptized laity; and under the Κατηχούμενοι, or catechumens, the candidates for baptism. The believers were called perfect Christians; the catechumens imperfect. The former, having received baptism, were allowed to partake of the Eucharist, to join in all the prayers of the Church, and to hear discourses upon the most profound mysteries of religion: more particularly the use of the Lord's Prayer was the sole prerogative of the believers, whence it was called Εὐχὴ πιστῶν, the prayer of believers. From all these privileges the catechumens were excluded. See Catechumens. The distinction between the laity and the clergy is by churchmen deduced from the very beginnings of the Christian Church; yet Rigaltius, Salmasius, and Salden insist that there was originally no distinction, but that it is an innovation, and was called forth by the ambition of the clergy of the 3d century, in which Cyprian and Tertullian lived. See Clergy.

The various orders of the clergy were appointed to their several offices in the Church by solemn forms of consecration or ordination, and had their respective privileges, immunities, and revenues. The unity and worship of the Church were secured by laws both ecclesiastical and civil. The ecclesiastical laws were either rules and orders made by each bishop for the better regulation of his particular diocese, or laws made in provincial synods for the government of all the dioceses of a province; or, lastly, laws respecting the whole Christian Church, made in general councils or assemblies of bishops from all parts of the Christian world. See Synod. The civil laws of the Church were those decrees and edicts made from time to time by the emperors, either restraining the power of the Church, or granting it new privileges, or confirming the old. The breach of these laws was severally punished both by the Church and State. The ecclesiastical censures respecting offenders among the clergy were chiefly suspension from the office and deprivation of the rights and privileges of the order. Those respecting the laity consisted chiefly in excommunication, or rejection from the communion of the Church, and penance both public and private. See Ecclesiastical Polity.

The idea of the papacy or spiritual supremacy of Rome was not fully developed before the middle of the 7th century, when Theodore of Rome, not content with the title of œcumenical patriarch, assumed that of sovereign pontiff. From that period the successive claims of the papacy — viz. temporal sovereignty, the vicariate of Peter and Paul, of Christ and of God, the janitorship of the kingdom of heaven, and the theocratic monarchy of the world—went on progressively, until in 1870 they apparently culminated in the official assumption of infallibility (q. v.). Meantime, as a system of ecclesiasticism, the papacy has retained most of the offices of the ancient Church, and added to them that of cardinal (q. v.), nuncio, chancellor, chamberlain, prefect, referendary, auditor, inquisitor, and numerous others of a political and ceremonial character. Within the sphere of papal authority no serious controversy ever arose on the subject of Church polity. Ceremonial expansion, unchecked by any idea of scriptural example or restraint, was for centuries the order of progress. It was not till the Reformation was so far inaugurated as to feel the necessity of organizing churches after the type of the New Testament that any important discussions took place respecting the principles of Church government. The Reformed churches on the Continent generally rejected episcopacy and adopted Presbyterianism. The Lutherans practically retained the episcopal office under the title of superintendent. But scarcely any two of the principal Reformed churches agreed in detail as to their plan of organization, nor were these minor differences regarded as of any serious importance.

Systems of Church Government. — England is the country that has given birth to the chief controversies concerning Church polity which have prevailed in modern times. As the Reformation in England was largely political in its character, it not only resulted in the transfer of the cathedrals, churches, colleges, etc., built under Roman supremacy, to the Reformed Church of England, but also many Roman Catholic ceremonies and usages. Hence from the first that Church was divided into two parties in reference to Church polity. Had they been content with temperate discussion, and with the peaceful separation of those who could not harmonize their views, the result might have been very different. But unfortunately both parties had inherited the principle of intolerance, either from the Roman Church or from preceding times, and also the theory of state rule in matters of religious faith and practice. To these false principles may be charged some of the most pitiable and disgraceful facts in the history of Great Britain. The oppugnant legislation, the strifes, the persecutions, and the martyrdoms which took place in the successive reigns of Henry VIII, of Bloody Mary, of queen Elizabeth, of James I, of Charles I and II, and even under the protectorate of Cromwell, are sufficient to impress any mind with the extent of human misery, and of reproach to the Christian name caused by the errors alluded to. In all history there is not a more significant comment upon the sin of constraining men's consciences by the arbitrary standards of human authority. It was not till after more than a hundred and fifty years of party strife and bloodshed that in 1689 the Toleration Act was passed, by which dissent from the faith and polity of the Established Church was legalized. Even after that it was a long time before many could see, and even yet it does not seem possible for all to understand, that details of Church polity were never appointed by divine authority, but designedly left by the Head of the Church to be adjusted on the basis of great principles rather than to be governed by fixed and uniform precepts. Scotland had adopted Presbyterianism from the Reformed churches of the Continent as early as 1550, but even after toleration was secured that form of Church government failed to become popular in England. Independency in various forms seemed to be preferred by the English Nonconformists and Dissenters. Between them and Presbyterians on the one hand, and the advocates of prelacy or episcopacy by divine right on the other, controversy

has never ceased. But since the controversy has been limited to words it has been an innocent, though often an exciting one, owing to the many phases it has assumed from time to time.

While the Church of England has continually antagonized the Church of Rome on the ground of papal supremacy, it has itself been in ceaseless agitation as between the High and Low Church parties within its own pale, and more especially since the period of the Oxford Tracts (q. v.) and the more recent ritualistic discussions. All the English controversies respecting Church polity have found their way to this country, but with greatly altered conditions of the various parties. Independency having escaped from persecution by way of Holland, itself established a species of theocracy and became a persecutor in New England. But its period of intolerance was brief; and, on the whole, the Christian churches of the United States have been remarkably free from the spirit and practice of intolerance. The free institutions of the country and the absolute separation of the State from all the churches have tended to place all on a common level, and to make all alike dependent upon good arguments and good practice as means of securing public respect and increasing strength.

Controversies on Church polity in America have chiefly prevailed in the rivalry of denominations. For the most part, different churches, while commending their own forms of polity, have respected that of others. Discussions conducted after that manner have greatly extended the feeling of Christian fraternity, and at the same time made almost universal the opinion that particular forms of Church government are of quite inferior importance as compared with the essential elements of Christian faith and practice. On the other hand, pretentious claims and intolerant practice have tended to defeat their own aims and to secure public disapprobation. Notwithstanding numberless varieties in unimportant particulars, the distinctive systems of Church government are few. Designated by the highest authority recognised in each, they may be enumerated as the Congregational, the Presbyterian, the Episcopal, the Patriarchal, and the Papal. The details of these systems may be seen by reference to articles on the churches adhering to them severally.

Literature.—The controversial literature of the subject of Church polity is very nearly identical with that of the subject of ordination (q. v.). The general, historical, and didactic literature of Church polity is also quite extensive. The following list of books will at least fairly represent it in its different branches and phases: Migne, *Dictionnaire des Cérémonies et des Rites sacrés* (Par. 3 vols. 8vo); also *Dictionnaire de Discipline Ecclésiastique* (2 vols. 8vo); Amyrald, *Du Gouvernement de l'Église;* Marsden, *Churchmanship of the New Test.;* Brokesby, *Government of the Church for the first Three Centuries;* Kay, *External Government of the Church in the first Three Centuries;* Parker, *Church Government of the first Six Hundred Years;* Thorndike, *The Forms of Church Government;* Cartwright, *Directory of Church Government; Canons of the Church of England;* Wilberforce, *Church Courts and Discipline; Clergyman's Assistant;* Clay, *Essays on Church Policy;* Birk, *Church and State;* Baptist Noel, *Church and State;* Thompson, *Church and State; Clergyman's Instructor;* Bannerman, *The Church of Christ;* Cunningham, *Discussions on Church Principles; Canons of the Prot. Episc. Church;* Vinton, *Manual Commentary on the Canon Law and Constitution of the Prot. Episc. Church;* Dobney, *Three Churches;* Uhden, *New England Theocracy;* Upham, *Ratio Disciplinæ;* Punchard, *Congregationalism;* Sawyer, *Organic Christianity;* Smyth, *Ecclesiastical Republicanism;* Miller, *On Presbyterianism;* also *Ruling Elders;* Engles, *Ruling Elders; Form of Government; Cambridge Platform of Church Discipline;* Bacon, *Church Manual;* Cummings, *Congregational Dictionary; Lutheran Liturgy;* Kurtz, *Why are you a Lutheran?* King, *Presbyterian Church Government;* also *On the Eldership;* Hiscox, *Baptist Church Directory;* Wayland, *Principles and Practices of the Baptists;* Ripley, *Church Polity;* Schmucker, *Lutheran Manual;* Grindrod, *Compendium of the Laws and Regulations of Wesleyan Methodism;* Barrett, *Ministry and Polity of the Christian Church; Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church;* Baker, *On the Discipline;* Emory, *Hist. of the Discipline;* Sherman, *Hist. of the Discipline;* Porter, *Compendium of Methodism;* also *Helps to Official Members;* Bond, *Economy of Methodism;* Stevens, *Ch. Polity;* Hodgson, *Polity of Methodism;* Morris, *Church Polity;* Crane, *Methodism and its Methods.* (D. P. K.)

Poliũchos (πολιοῦχος), a surname of several deities among the ancient Greeks, who were believed to be the *guardians of cities.*

Poliziano. See Politian.

Polk, Leonidas, a noted American prelate of the Protestant Episcopal Church, and a general in the late war between the Northern and Southern States, was born at Raleigh, N. C., in 1806. He was educated for the army in the United States military academy at West Point, N. Y., but had served only a few months as lieutenant when he determined to take orders in the Protestant Episcopal Church. He was ordained deacon in 1830, and in 1831 took a rectorate. In 1838 he was made the missionary bishop of Arkansas and the Indian Territory, south of 36° 30′, and in 1841 bishop of Louisiana. He then took up his residence at Lafourche parish, where he had extensive plantations. Being a man of wealth and enjoying a life of ease, he never paid very much attention to ecclesiastical labors, and did but little to strengthen the work of the Church within the range of his diocese. At the outbreak of hostilities against the North he was on the side of the planters, and did all in his power to further the secession movement. Not only did he speak in public and contribute from his purse, but he offered his services to the Southern Confederacy as soon as established, and was made a general in their army. He early urged upon Jefferson Davis and the other Confederate authorities the importance of fortifying and holding the strategical points of the Mississippi Valley, and in other ways proved himself a far-seeing and skilful adviser of their cause. He took part in several battles, and though not always very prominent in action, was ever indispensable in council, and contributed greatly to whatever success the Confederate cause achieved in his days and surroundings. During a reconnoissance near Marietta, Ga., he was killed by a cannon-shot, June 14, 1864. He had never resigned his episcopal dignity, but was buried with military honors. Though bishop Polk gave his life in what we consider an unworthy cause, we must revere his memory for his sterling qualities as a man who was not afraid to do what he believed to be his duty. He was noted for his kindness of heart and the most devout Christian life, such as he understood it to be. See *Men of the Times,* s. v.; *American Annual Cyclop.* 1868, p. 679; Drake, *Dict. of American Biography,* s. v.

Poll (גֻּלְגֹּלֶת, *gulgôleth,* Numb. i, 2, 18, 20, 22; iii, 47; 1 Chron. xxiii, 3, 24), the *head* (as rendered in 1 Chron. x, 10), or *skull* (as in Judg. ix, 53; 2 Kings ix, 35). The verb "to poll" in the A. V. is the rendering of גָּזַז, גָּלַח, or כָּסַם, all signifying *to shear.*

Pollajuolo, Antonio, a noted Italian artist of the Florentine school of painters and sculptors, flourished in the second half of the 15th century. He was the pupil of Lorenzo Ghiberti, and assisted this master in the celebrated gates of the Baptistery of San Giovanni. Antonio is said to have been the first artist who studied the dead subject for the purposes of design. In 1484 he was invited to Rome by pope Innocent VIII, to elaborate a monument of the then but just expired Sixtus IV, which is now in the chapel of the Sacrament of St.

Peter's, where is also the monument of Innocent VIII, which he afterwards elaborated. His brother PIETRO was likewise an artist of some celebrity. The two brothers wrought many great productions jointly. Their best is the *Martyrdom of St. Sebastian*, painted in 1475, and was for some time in the church De Servi at Florence. It is now in the National Gallery at London, and it is engraved in the *Etruria Pittrice* of Lastri. It is a fine work, without being refined or in the least idealistic. See Mrs. Clement, *Handbook of Painters*, etc., p. 462; Spooner, *Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts*, s. v.

Pollajuolo, Pietro. See POLLAJUOLO, ANTONIO.

Pollajuolo, Simone, a distinguished Italian architect, noted as the builder of many beautiful ecclesiastical structures, was born at Florence in 1454. He was related to Antonio del Pollajuolo, and lived with him some time at Rome. Becoming a devoted follower of Savonarola, he was discarded by the churchmen, and in his later years was obliged to spend his talents in secular labors. He was one of the most prominent architects in the building of the Strozzi Palace. He died in 1529.

Pollard, WILLIAM, an English Wesleyan minister, was born at Guisborough, in Yorkshire, in 1792. He was converted when but a youth, and soon after felt called of God to preach the Gospel. He prepared himself for the ministry, a work which he not only enjoyed, but one in which his labors always met with success. He was a man of great piety and sound faith, a faithful dispenser of the Word of Life, and an exemplary teacher. He possessed a strong memory and a cultivated mind, richly stored with divine truth. He died at Newport-Pagnell April 3, 1839.

Pollinctorii, an appellation given by the Romans to those who washed and anointed the dead preparatory to burial.

Pollio, a name common to a number of Lutheran theologians, of whom we mention the following:

1. JOACHIM, who was born Aug. 26, 1577, at Breslau, in Silesia. He pursued his studies at Leipsic, where he became magister of philosophy in 1597. In 1602 he was pastor at Buntzlau, in 1607 provost of the Church of the Holy Ghost and pastor of St. Bernard in Breslau; in 1615 he was made assessor of the evangelical consistory; in 1618 he was appointed pastor of St. Mary Magdalene, and died Jan. 29, 1644. He wrote *Centurias duas consiliorum theologicorum.*

2. LUCAS, who was born at Breslau in 1536. He studied at Frankfort and Wittenberg. In the latter place he especially attended the lectures of Melancthon on the Greek language. In 1562 he was appointed professor at the St. Elizabeth Gymnasium in Breslau; but three years afterwards, in 1565, he went to Leipsic for the study of Hebrew and theology. In the same year he was appointed deacon of St. Elizabeth in his native place, and in 1567 he was made pastor of St. Mary Magdalene. He died July 31, 1583. Lucas Pollio left a number of sermons behind him.

3. LUCAS, son of Joachim, who was born Aug. 4, 1605, at Breslau. He studied at Leipsic, where he also was archdeacon of St. Nicolai. He died April 25, 1643. See Pantke, *Pastores der Kirche zu St. Elisabeth in Breslau;* the same, *Pastores zu St. Maria Magdalene;* Adami *Vitæ theol. German. eruditorum*, i, 158; Jöcher, *Gelehrten-Lexikon*, s. v. (B. P.)

Pollok, ROBERT, A.M., the noted author of the *Course of Time*, a Scotch bard of no mean order, and a minister of the Church, was born at Muirhouse, parish of Eaglesham, south-east of Glasgow, Oct. 19, 1798, of humble parentage. In his youth he worked on his father's farm, but evincing more than ordinary mental strength and love for study, he was encouraged to prepare for college, and was entered in the University of Glasgow in 1812. He graduated five years after, and determined upon the life of the holy ministry, for which he then began his studies at the seminary of the United Sessions Church. He was ready for ordination in 1827, and was in that year licensed to preach. His first public discourse, which was delivered on May 3, 1827, is spoken of as a most brilliant and interesting effort, which, while it evinced a mind of extraordinary power and promise, at the same time gave indications that the Church would too soon be deprived of its service. Such was the fatigue occasioned by this single exertion that he was immediately confined to his bed; and although in a few days he was partially restored, he preached only three times afterwards. Just before he had received his license, Pollok had finished the poem on which his great literary reputation rests, the *Course of Time*. The object of the poet, whose sentiments are strongly Calvinistic, and whose piety is rather of a gloomy cast, is to describe the spiritual life and destiny of man; and he varies his religious speculations with episodical pictures and narrations to illustrate the effects of virtue or vice. A work so ambitious from the hands of a country student, attached to a small body of Dissenters, was not likely to find a patron among publishers. It happened to be shown to Prof. Wilson, of Edinburgh, as a curiosity; but this great man hesitated not to recognise worth even in a young and unknown student, and the work was by him so heartily commended for its great poetic power that its publication was undertaken by Mr. Blackwood, of Edinburgh. The *Course* speedily passed through several editions. It was a novelty in the class of evangelical religious literature to which it belonged, and besides pleasing those who are partial to that class of religious literature, it was a boon to many who are inclined to read religious books, but are repelled by their general dryness and insipidity, while it was warmly admired by the literary world at large. Pollok's partial admirers expected for him a place on a level with Milton. After the novelty of such a phenomenon had, however, passed off, the book became neglected by purely literary readers; and at this day it may be said that it is estimated too highly by the religious and perhaps too insignificantly by the literary world. It is certainly a work of great power, however meagre in fancy. There are many flashes of original genius which light up the crude and unwieldy design, and atone for the narrow range of thought and knowledge, as well as for the stiff pomposity that pervades the diction. There are in it a few passages which are strikingly and most poetically imaginative, and some of which are beautifully touching. It has also, however, a considerable amount of sentiment deeply tinged with religious asceticism, and whole pages of plain and humble prose. These defects, it should be borne in mind, Pollok would in all probability have removed himself, guided by a more ripened judgment, in a careful revision, had Providence been pleased to prolong his life. His mind was evidently imbued with *Paradise Lost*, and he follows Milton often to the verge of direct imitation; but even as the work stands it is the undoubted production of a poetic genius, and it will always be read with profit and delight. Before the publication of his poem Pollok had undermined his constitution by excessive mental labor, and he scarcely lived to see its success. On the recommendation and through the assistance of the friends his genius had secured him, he was preparing to set out for Italy, there to stay the inroads of consumptive tendencies; but while on the eve of leaving Britain he was so greatly reduced that he tarried at Devonshire Place, Shirley Common, near Southampton. He there expired on Sept. 18, 1827. Although it was painful at his early age to relinquish all the day-dreams of honorable fame which his young imagination had with so good reason been led to form, he acquiesced with unmurmuring submission in the will of God. He enjoyed during his last illness in rich abundance the comforts and hopes of the Gospel, and his death was that of the true Christian, characterized

by a calm faith in that religion he had preached, and a cheerful hope in that redemption which had been the theme of his song. The reception which the *Course of Time* has met with from the public is a sufficient testimony to the talents of its lamented author. His name is now recorded among the list of those illustrious Scotsmen who have done honor to their country; who, from obscurity, have secured for themselves an unfading reputation; and who will be remembered by distant generations with enthusiasm and admiration. His earliest productions—*Helen of the Glen*, *Ralph Gurnnell*, and the *Persecuted Family*—were in prose, and were issued anonymously. They have been republished, with his name, in one volume, entitled *Tales of the Covenanters*, and have passed through several editions. A very inadequate memoir of Robert Pollok, by his brother, with extracts from his correspondence, has been published by Messrs. Blackwood (Edinb. 1842), and there is a short memoir prefixed to the *Course of Time*. One of the best American editions of this poem is by W. C. Armstrong (Cinc. 1846, 12mo). See Chambers, *Cyclop. of English Lit.* ii, 412 sq.; id. *Biog. Dict. of Eminent Scotsmen*, vi, 138 sq.



Birthplace of Pollok.

Pollux, a tutelary deity of mariners in ancient times (Acts xxviii, 11), whose image was placed either at the prow or stern of the ship. See CASTOR.

Pollux, JULIUS (Ἰούλιος Πολυδεύκης), a celebrated Greek sophist and grammarian, who flourished near the close of the 2d century, was a native of Anacratis, in Egypt, and, after preparatory training under his father, studied at Athens under the rhetorician Adrian. He finally opened a school himself, and was subsequently appointed by the emperor Commodus to the chair of rhetoric. Several of his contemporaries thereafter attacked him, and in many ways aimed to detract from his scholarly repute. He was the author of several works, of which Suidas has preserved the titles. None of them are of interest to us except the Ὀνομαστικὸν ἐν Βιβλίοις ί, which has come down to us, and is valuable because it treats in the first part of the gods and their worship. See Fabricius, *Bibl. Græca*, vi, 141; Gräfenhahn, *Gesch. der class. Philologie*, iii, 166 sq.

Polones Fratres. See SOCINIANS.

Polotzk (Polish, *Polocz*), SYNOD OF, an important ecclesiastical gathering, was held on Feb. 12, 1839, and was attended by all the Greek Uniate bishops in Russia, assisted by several of the most distinguished of their clergy. Its most important action was a synodal ordinance drawn up and signed by Joseph, bishop of Lithuania; Vasili, bishop of Orsha; Anthony, bishop of Brest, and twenty-one other dignitaries, in which they declare their "firm and unalterable decision to acknowledge anew the unity of their Church with the orthodox Catholic Eastern Church; and, consequently, thenceforth, together with the flocks committed to their care, to continue in the same sentiment with the holy Eastern orthodox patriarchs, and in obedience to the holy governing synod of all the Russias." To this act was appended the declaration of thirteen hundred and five parish priests and monastic brethren, which number was afterwards increased to sixteen hundred and seven. Besides their act, a petition was drawn up to the emperor Nicholas, praying him to sanction the union of the Uniate with the orthodox Church; which, together with the synodal act above, was submitted to the holy governing synod for examination and approval. The synod shortly after issued its decree upon the subject, by which it was ordained:

1. To receive the bishops, clergy, and flocks of the hitherto called Greek Uniate Church into full and complete communion with the holy orthodox Catholic Eastern Church, and so to be integrally and inseparably incorporated with the Church of all the Russias.
2. To confer the general blessing of the most holy synod on the bishops and clergy in particular, with prayer of faith and love to the supreme bishop of our confession, Jesus Christ, that he would confirm them from above in the confession they have made, and that he would rightly direct the work of their ministry to the perfecting of the saints.
3. That in governing those flocks which are intrusted to them, they shall take as their fundamental guide the Word of God, the canons of the Church, and the laws of the empire, and shall confirm the flocks intrusted to them in the same sentiments with those of the orthodox faith; and that they exhibit an apostolical indulgence to any differences in local customs which do not affect the doctrines or the sacraments, and bring back their people to the ancient uniformity by free persuasion, without violence, with gentleness and long-suffering.

This decree was signed by Seraphim, metropolitan of Novgorod and St. Petersburg, by Philaret of Kief, Philaret of Moscow, and three prelates, besides two other ecclesiastics. It was confirmed March 25, 1839, by the emperor's own hand, with these words: "I thank God, and accept it." See Blackmore's Mouravieff, *Russian Church*, Append. iv, p. 430.

Polus, a Greek sophist, lived about B.C. 400. He was born in Agrigentum (Girgenti), and studied under the celebrated sophist Gorgias, a Sicilian like himself. In his dialogue *Gorgias, or about Rhetoric*, Plato introduces Socrates in discussion with some of his disciples, among whom is Polus. The point in contest is at first the nature of rhetoric, but as the debate progresses it expands its limits, and touches the question whether the unrighteous can be happy, and whether it is not preferable to suffer injustice rather than to inflict it. The notoriety of Polus rests exclusively on the part assigned to him by Plato in this dialogue. There remains nothing of his writings. Yet he seems, as a true disciple of Gorgias, to have written a rhetorical treatise; for Plato puts the following words in the mouth of Socrates: "To tell you the truth, Polus, I do not consider truth as an art, but only as a thing which you boast of having made an art of, in a writing which I have of late perused."

Polwhele, RICHARD, an English divine noted as an antiquarian, historian, poet, and miscellaneous writer, whose works are exceedingly voluminous, was born at Truro in 1760, where he was also educated, and where, when a boy, with the assistance of the celebrated Dr. Wolcott, then a physician in that town, he first essayed as a poet. He took holy orders, and finally settled in his native place, where he died in 1838. He is noted rather for his secular productions, though he published also on religious topics. His principal works are, *The History of Cornwall* (7 vols. 4to):—*The History of Devonshire* (3 vols.):—*Traditions and Recollections* (2 vols.):—*The Rural Rector* (3 vols.):—*Biographical Sketches in Cornwall* (3 vols.):—*Anecdotes of Methodism*:—*Illustrations of Scriptural Characters*:—several volumes of *Sermons*; with numberless poems, and other writings of a miscellaneous character. See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s. v.

Polyandry (from πολύς, *many*, and ἀνήρ, *a man*), that form of polygamy which permits a woman to have several husbands. See MARRIAGE. The hot-bed of polyandry is Thibet. There a wife commonly is the wife of a whole family of brothers, the elder brother

being chief husband. In the Himalayan and sub-Himalayan regions adjoining and under the influence of Thibet it is of frequent occurrence, in the same form as in the valley of Cashmere, in Ladakh, among the Koech, and among the Telingese. Farther south in India we find polyandry among the Tudas of the Neilgherry Hills, the Coorgs of Mysore, and the Nayars of Malabar. We find it again off the Indian coast in Ceylon; and, going eastward, strike on it as an ancient though now almost superseded custom in New Zealand, and in one or two of the Pacific islands. Going northward, we meet it again in the Aleutian Islands; and taking the continent to the west and north of the Aleutians, it is found among the Koryaks, to the north of the Okhotsk Sea. Crossing the Russian empire to the west side, we meet it among the Saporogian Cossacks; and thus have traced it at points half round the globe. This is not all, however. It is found in several parts of Africa; and it occurs again in many parts of America among the Red men. We have the authority of Humboldt for its prevalence among the tribes on the Orinoco, and in the same form as in Thibet. "Among the Avaroes and the Maypures," he says, "brothers have often but one wife." Humboldt also vouches for its former prevalence in Lancerota, one of the Canary Islands. Thus polyandry is a phenomenon of human life independent of race and country. See Latham, *Descriptive Ethnology* (1859), i, 24, 28; ii, 398, 406, 462; Humboldt, *Personal Narrative* (Williams's translation, 1819), vol. v, pt. ii, p. 549; and vol. i, chap. i, p. 84; Hamilton, *New Account of the East Indies* (Edinb. 1727), i, 274, 308; Reade, *Savage Africa*, p. 43; Erman, *Travels in Siberia*, ii, 531; Seignior Gaya, *Marriage Ceremonies* (translation) (2d ed. Lond. 1698), p. 70, 96; Emerson Tennant, *Ceylon* (3d ed. 1859), ii, 429; "Legend of Rupe," Grey's *Polynesian Mythology* (1855), p. 81; *A Summer Ramble in the Himalayas* (1860), p. 202; Vigne, *Kashmir*, i, 37; *Journal Asiat. Soc. of Bengal*, ix, 834; *Asiat. Research.* v, 13.

From ancient history we learn that the area over which polyandry at one time existed was even more extended; while in certain cantons of Media, according to Strabo (ii, 798; and see Goguet, vol. iii, bk. vi, c. i), polygynia was authorized by express law, which ordained every inhabitant to maintain at least seven wives; in other cantons precisely the opposite rule prevailed—a woman was allowed to have many husbands, and they looked with contempt on those who had less than five. Cæsar informs us that in his time polyandry of the Thibetan type prevailed among the Britons (*De Bello Gallico*, lib. v, c. xiv). We find direct evidence of its existence among the Picts in the Irish Nennius (App. li), not to mention the traces of it remaining in the Pictish laws of succession. Indeed, to pass over communities in which something like promiscuity of intercourse between the sexes is said to have prevailed—such as the Massagetæ, Agathyrsi, and the ancient Spartans—we find several among which polyandry, or a modified promiscuity, must have been the rule. Assuming that the legal obligation laid on younger brothers in their turn to marry the wives of their deceased elder brother is a relic of polyandry of the Thibetan type, then we must hold that polyandry prevailed at one time throughout India (*Institutes of Menu*, ch. iii, § 173, and ch. ix, § 57, 58), among the ancient Hebrews (Deut. xxv, 5–11); in Siam, Burmah, in Syria among the Ostiaks, the But (Bodo), the Kasia, and the Puharies of Gurhwal. Traces of it indeed remained in the time of Tacitus among the Germans (Tac. *Germ.* xx, Latham's edition, p. 67 sq.). In short, polyandry may be regarded as one of the transitional forms in the advance from a state of promiscuity, on the assumption that pure promiscuity ever existed. Of the origin of this peculiar institution our space forbids us to write; but we believe it to be connected with the want of balance between the numbers of the sexes, due to the practice of female infanticide, which is its almost invariable accompaniment. Tribes of warriors, wholly devoted to a military life, find women an incumbrance rather than a solace; and from this cause, and probably from the difficulties of subsistence, formed the practice of killing their female children, sparing them only when they were the first-born. The disparity of the sexes would lead to polyandry, and once instituted, the custom would in many cases continue to exist after the habits and necessities which produced it disappeared. In several places, as in Ladakh, where polyandry prevails, the sexes are now either equally balanced, or the female sex predominates. In these cases polygynia and polyandry are commonly found existing side by side. The subject is one which demands, and as yet has not received, full investigation.—Chambers, s. v. See also *London Academy*, Nov. 21, 1874, p. 557; Lubbock, *Origin of Civilization* (see Index); *Blackwood's Magazine*, January, 1875, p. 69 sq., 82 sq.

Polycarp (Πολύκαρπος), a distinguished father of the Christian Church, is one of a small number who were distinguished from the rest by the term *apostolic fathers*, as having been contemporaries of some of the apostles. The period of his death is well ascertained to have been by martyrdom in A.D. 155, in the reign of Antoninus Titus (see Waddington, *Mémoires de l'Academie des Inscriptions*, tom. xxvi, pt. ii, p. 232 sq.). The period of his birth is not known, and we can only determine it by approximation. At the time of his martyrdom he was reputed to have been a Christian eighty-six years, and according to this statement was born probably about A.D. 69. But if with other critics we suppose him to have been converted at a riper age, he must be referred to the reign of Nero. However, there seems no reason to doubt that he was contemporary with the apostle John, and known to him, the lengthened period of whose life connects so fortunately the men of the 2d century with those who had been in personal attendance on the Saviour. It is this circumstance which gives its chief importance to the lives of these persons, and thence arises the main value of the few and in other respects unimportant writings which remain of the apostolic fathers. The lives form links in the chain of Christian tradition; and their compositions recognise by frequent quotations the writings which remain of evangelists and apostles. (In the following account of Polycarp we rely largely upon Smith's *Dict. of Class. Biog.* s. v.)

Life.—An ancient life, or rather a fragment of a life of Polycarp, ascribed by Bollandus to a certain Pionius of unknown date, and given in a Latin version in the *Acta Sanctorum Januarii* (a. d. 26), ii, 695, etc., dwells much on the early history of Polycarp, but the record (if indeed it be the work of Pionius) is some centuries later than its subject, and is evidently false in several particulars. We are inclined to think, however, that it embodies some genuine traditions of Polycarp's history. According to this account, the apostle Paul visited Smyrna in his way from Galatia, through the proconsular Asia to Jerusalem (the writer apparently confounding two journeys recorded in Acts xviii, 18–22, and 23, etc.), and having collected the believers, instructed them in the proper time of keeping Easter. After Paul's departure, his host, Stratæas, the brother of Timotheus, became bishop of the infant Church; or, for the passage is not clear, Stratæas became an elder and Bucolus was bishop. It was during the episcopate of Bucolus (whether he was the contemporary or the successor of Stratæas) that Callisto, a female member of the Church, eminent for riches and works of charity, was warned of God in a dream to go to the gate of the city called the Ephesian gate, where she would find a little boy (puerulum) named Polycarp, of Eastern origin, who had been reduced to slavery, and was in the hands of two men, from whom she was to redeem him. Callisto, obedient to the vision, rose, went to the gate, found the two men with the child, as it had been revealed to her; and having redeemed the boy, brought

him home, educated him with maternal affection in the Christian faith, and, when he attained to manhood, first made him ruler over her house, then adopted him as her son, and finally left him heir to all her wealth. Polycarp had been from childhood distinguished by his beneficence, piety, and self-denial; by the gravity of his deportment, and his diligence in the study of the Holy Scriptures. These qualities early attracted the notice and regard of the bishop, Bucolus, who loved him with fatherly affection, and was in return regarded by him with filial love. By Bucolus he was ordained first to the office of deacon, in which he labored diligently, confuting heathens, Jews, and heretics; delivering catechetical homilies in the church, and writing epistles, of which that to the Philippians is the only extant specimen. He was subsequently, when of mature age (his hair was already turning gray) and still maturer conduct, ordained presbyter by Bucolus, on whose death he was elected and consecrated bishop. We omit to notice the various miracles said to be wrought by Polycarp, or to have occurred on different occasions in his life.

Such are the leading facts recorded in this ancient narrative, which has, we think, been too lightly estimated by Tillemont. That it has been interpolated with many fabulous admixtures of a later date is clear; but we think there are some things in it which indicate that it embodies earlier and truer elements. The difficulty is to discover and separate these from later corrections. The chief ground for rejecting the narrative altogether is the supposed difficulty of reconciling them with the more trustworthy statements of Irenæus (*Epistola ad Florinum*, apud Euseb. *Hist. Eccles.* v, 20), who, in his boyhood, had known, perhaps lived with Polycarp, and of other writers. According to Irenæus (*Epist. ad Victorem. Papam*, apud Euseb. *Hist. Eccles.* v, 24), Polycarp had intercourse with "John and others of the apostles;" or still more expressly (*Adv. Hæres.* iii, 3, et apud Euseb. *Hist. Eccles.* iv, 14), he was instructed (perhaps converted, *μαθητευθείς*) by the apostles, and conversed familiarly with many who had seen Christ; was by the apostles appointed (*καταστaθείς*) bishop of the Church at Smyrna; and always taught what he had learned from the apostles. Tertullian (*De Præscriptionibus Hæretic*, c. 32) and Jerome (*De Viris Illustribus*, c. 17) distinctly mention John as the apostle by whom Polycarp was ordained. But we question if the expressions of Irenæus, when critically examined and stripped of the rhetorical exaggeration with which his natural reverence for Polycarp has invested them, will prove more than that Polycarp had enjoyed opportunities of hearing some of the apostles; and was, with their sanction, appointed bishop of the Church at Smyrna. That John was one of the apostles referred to by Irenæus there is not the slightest reason to doubt; and we are disposed, with Tillemont, to regard Philip, whom Polycrates of Ephesus (apud Euseb. *Hist. Eccles.* v, 24) states to have ended his days in the Phrygian Hierapolis, as another of those with whom Polycarp had intercourse. We believe that intercourse with these apostles, and perhaps with some other old disciples who had seen Jesus Christ, is sufficient to bear out the statements of Irenæus, and is not inconsistent with the general truth of the ancient narrative given by Bollandus. His statement of the ordination of Polycarp by the apostles may perhaps be reduced to the fact that John, of whom alone Tertullian (*l. c.*) makes mention, was among "the bishops of the neighboring churches," who came, according to the narrative, to the consecration of Polycarp. This circumstance enables us to fix that consecration in or before A.D. 104, the latest date assigned to the death of the venerable apostle, and which is not inconsistent with the narrative. It must be borne in mind, too, that the whole subject of the ordination of these early bishops is perplexed by ecclesiastical writers utterly neglecting the circumstance that in some of the larger churches there was in the apostolic age a plurality of bishops (comp. Phil. i, 1), not to speak of the grave and much disputed question of the identity of bishops and presbyters. The apostolic ordination mentioned by Irenæus and Tertullian may, therefore, have taken place during the lifetime of Bucolus, and have been antecedent to the precedency which, on his death, Polycarp obtained. We are the more disposed to admit the early origin and the truth of the leading statements embodied in the narration, as the natural tendency of a forger of a later age would have been to exaggerate the opportunities of apostolic intercourse, and the sanctions of apostolic authority, which Polycarp certainly possessed.

Polycarp was bishop of Smyrna at the time when Ignatius of Antioch passed through that city on his way to suffer death at Rome, some time between A.D. 107 and 116. Ignatius seems to have enjoyed much this intercourse with Polycarp, whom he had known, apparently, in former days, when they were both hearers of the apostle John (*Martyr. Ignatii*, c. 3). The sentiment of esteem was reciprocated by Polycarp (*Epistol. ad Philipp.* c. 13), who collected several of the epistles of Ignatius, and sent them to the Church at Philippi, accompanied by an epistle of his own. Polycarp himself visited Rome while Anicetus was bishop of that city, whose episcopate extended, according to Tillemont's calculation, from A.D. 157 to 168. Irenæus has recorded (*Epistol. ad Victor.* apud Euseb. *H. E.* v, 14) the difference of opinion of these two holy men on the time of observing Easter, and the steadfastness of Polycarp in adhering to the custom of the Asiatic churches, derived, as they affirmed, from the apostles; as well as their mutual kindness and forbearance, notwithstanding this difference. Indeed, the character of Polycarp appears to have attracted general regard: Irenæus retained for him a feeling of deepest reverence (*Epistol. ad Florin.* apud Euseb. *H. E.* v, 21); Jerome speaks of him (*De Viris Illustr.* c. 17) as "totius Asiæ princeps," the most eminent man in all proconsular Asia. An anecdote given elsewhere shows that even reputed heretics, notwithstanding his decided opposition to them, desired to possess his esteem; and it is not improbable that the reverence excited by his character conduced to his success in restoring them to the communion of the Church. It has been conjectured that he was the angel of the Church of Smyrna to whom Jesus Christ directed the letter in the Apocalypse (ii, 8–11); and also that he was the bishop to whom the apostle John, according to a beautiful anecdote recorded by Clement of Alexandria (*Liber "Quis Dives salvetur?"* c. 42), committed the care of a young man, who, forsaking his patron, became a chief of a band of robbers, and was reconverted by the apostle; but these are mere conjectures, and of little probability.

The martyrdom of Polycarp occurred, according to Eusebius (*H. E.* iv, 15), in the persecution under the emperors Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus; and is recorded in a letter of the Church at Smyrna to the churches of Philomelium and other places, which is still extant, and of which Eusebius (*ibid.*) has given the chief part. The persecution began: one Germanicus, an ancient man, was thrown to the wild beasts, and several others, including some who were brought from Philadelphia, were put to death at Smyrna. Polycarp had at first intended to remain in the city and brave the danger of martyrdom; but the entreaties of his flock led him to withdraw to a retreat in the adjacent country, where he passed his time in prayer. Here, three days before his apprehension, he had a remarkable dream, which his anticipation of his fate led him to interpret as an intimation that he should be burned alive —a foreboding but too exactly verified by the event. Messengers having been sent to apprehend him, he withdrew to another hiding-place; but his place of retreat was discovered by the confession of a child, who had been forced by torture to make known where he was. Polycarp might still have escaped by leaving the place on the approach of those sent to apprehend him; but he refused, saying, "The will of God be done." His

venerable figure and calm and courteous deportment commanded the respect of his captors; and a prayer offered by him affected some of them with remorse for their share in his apprehension. The officer into whose custody he was delivered, with the usual laxity of paganism, would have persuaded him, apparently through pity, to offer divine honors and sacrifice to the emperor; but his steady refusal changed their pity into anger, and they violently threw him down from the carriage in which they were conveying him. On entering the amphitheatre where the proconsul, Stratius Quadratus, was, a voice which the excited feelings of the old man and his companions led them to regard as from heaven, exclaimed, "Be strong, O Polycarp! and quit you like a man." The proconsul was, like others, moved by his appearance, and exhorted him to consider his advanced age, and comply with the requirements of government: "Swear by the fortune of Cæsar, recant, and cry 'Away with the godless (τοὺς ἀθέους).'" Looking first round upon the heathen multitude, and then up to heaven, the old man sighed and said, "Away with the godless." The proconsul again urged him, "Swear by Cæsar's fortune, and I will release thee. Revile Christ." "Eighty and six years have I served him," was the reply, "and he never did me wrong: how then can I revile my King and my Saviour?" Threats of being thrown to wild beasts, and of being committed to the flames, failed to move him; and his bold avowal that he was a Christian provoked the wrath of the assembled multitude. "This man," they shouted, "is the teacher of impiety, the father of the Christians, the man that does away with our gods (ὁ τῶν ἡμετέρων Θεῶν καθαιρέτης); who teaches many not to sacrifice to nor to worship the gods." They demanded that he should be thrown to wild beasts, and when the Asiarch, Philip of Tralles, who presided over the games which were going on, evaded the demand, on the plea that the combats with wild beasts were ended, they demanded that he should be burned alive. The demand was complied with; and the populace, in their rage, soon collected from the baths and workshops logs and fagots for the pile. The old man ungirded himself, laid aside his garments, and took his place in the midst of the fuel; and when they would have secured him with nails to the stake, said, "Let me remain as I am; for he that has enabled me to brave the fire will so strengthen me that, without your fastening me with nails, I shall, unmoved, endure its fierceness." After he had offered a short but beautiful prayer the fire was kindled, but a high wind drove the flames on one side, so that he was roasted rather than burned; and the executioner was ordered to despatch him with a sword. On his striking him with it, so great a quantity of blood flowed from the wound as to quench the flames, which were, however, resuscitated, in order to consume his lifeless body. His ashes were collected by the pious care of the Christians of his flock, and deposited in a suitable place of interment. The day and year of Polycarp's martyrdom are involved in considerable doubt. Samuel Petit places it in A.D. 175; Usher, Pagi, and Bollandus in A.D. 169; Eusebius (*Chronicon*) places it earlier, in the seventh year of Marcus Aurelius, who acceded to the throne March 7, A.D. 161; Scaliger, Le Moyne, and Cave place it in A.D. 167; Tillemont in 166; the *Chronicon Paschale* in the consulship of Ælianus and Pastor, A.D. 163; and Pearson, who differs widely from all other critics, in A.D. 147, in the reign of Titus Antoninus Pius. Pearson brings various reasons in support of his opinion, which reasons are examined by Tillemont in one of his careful and elaborate notes. Polycarp is reverenced as a saint both by the Greek and Romish churches; by the former on Feb. 23, by the latter on Jan. 26, or (at Paris) on April 27. The Greeks of Smyrna, on his festival, used formerly to visit devoutly what is shown as his tomb, near the ruins of an ancient church or chapel, on a hill-side to the south-east of the city. Mr. Arundel (*Discoveries in Asia Minor*, ii, 397) is disposed to think that the tradition as to his place of interment is correct.

The principal authorities for the history of Polycarp have been cited. The account of Eusebius (*H. E.* iv, 14, 15, and v, 20) is chiefly taken from Irenæus (*ll. cc.*), and from the letter of the Church at Smyrna, giving an account of his martyrdom, which will be noticed below. Halloix (*Illustr. Eccles. Orientalis Scriptorum Vitæ*), Cave (*Apostolici, or the Lives, etc., of the Primitive Fathers*), and Tillemont (*Mémoires*, vol. ii) have collected the chief notices of the ancients, and embodied them in their narrative. See also Ceillier, *Hist. des Auteurs Sacrés*, i, 672, etc. The English reader may consult (besides Cave's work just mentioned) Lardner, *Credibility*, etc., pt. ii, ch. vi, vii; Neander, *Church Hist.* transl. by Rose, i, 106, etc.; Milman, *Hist. of Christianity*, bk. ii, ch. vii; and other ecclesiastical historians.

Works.—There is extant only one short treatise by this father, Πρὸς Φιλιππησίους ἐπιστολή, *Ad Philippenses Epistola.* That he wrote such an epistle, and that it was known in their time, is attested by Irenæus (*Adv. Hæres.* iii, 3, and *Epistol. ad Florinum*, apud Euseb. *H. E.* iv, 14, and v, 20), Eusebius (*H. E.* iii, 36; iv, 14), Jerome (*De Viris Illustr.* c. 17), and later writers whom it is needless to enumerate; and, notwithstanding the objections of the Magdeburg Centuriators (Cent. ii, c. 10); of Daillé (*De Scriptis Ignatianis*, c. 32), who, however, only denied the genuineness of a part; of Matthieu de la Roche; and, at a later period, of Semler, our present copies have been received by the great majority of critics as substantially genuine. Some have suspected the text to be interpolated; and the suspicion is perhaps somewhat strengthened by the evidence afforded by the Syriac version of the epistles of Ignatius, lately published by Mr. Cureton, of the extensive interpolation of those contemporary and kindred productions.

The *Epistola ad Philippenses* is extant in the Greek original, and in an ancient Latin version; the latter of which contains, towards the conclusion, several chapters, of which only some fragments preserved by Eusebius are found in the Greek. The letter partakes of the simplicity which characterizes the writings of the apostolic fathers, being hortatory rather than argumentative; and is valuable for the numerous passages from the New Testament, especially from the first Epistle of Peter and the epistles of Paul, which are incorporated in it, and for the testimony which it consequently affords to the early existence and wide circulation of the sacred writings. It was first published in black letter in the Latin version by Jac. Faber Stapulensis, with the works of the pseudo-Dionysius Areopagita and of Ignatius (Paris, 1498, fol.), under the title of *Theologia Vivificans;* and was reprinted at Strasburg in 1502; at Paris, 1515; at Basle, 1520; at Cologne, 1536; at Ingolstadt, with the *Clementina* (4to), 1546; at Cologne, with the Latin version of the writings of the pseudo-Dionysius, 1557; and with the *Clementina* and the Latin version of the *Epistolæ* of Ignatius (fol.), 1569. It appeared also in the following collections: the *Micropresbyticon* (Basle, 1550), the *Orthodoxographa* of Heroldus (ibid. 1555), the *Orthodoxographa* of Grynæus (ibid. 1569), the *Mella Patrum* of Francis Rous (Lond. 1650, 8vo), and in the various editions of the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, from its first publication by De la Bigne in 1575. The Greek text was first published by Halloix, subjoined to the life of Polycarp, in his *Illustrium Ecclesiæ Orientalis Scriptorum Vitæ et Documenta* (vol. i, Douai, 1633, fol.); and was again published by Usher, with the *Epistolæ* of Ignatius (Oxford, 1644, 4to), not in the *Appendix Ignatiana* (which came out in 1647), as incorrectly stated by Fabricius; by Maderus (Helmstädt, 1653); and in the *Patres Apostolici* of Cotelerius (Paris, 1672, 2 vols. fol.; and Amsterdam, 1724), of Ittigius (Leipsic, 1699, 8vo), of Frey (Basle, 1742), and of Russel (1746, 2 vols, 8vo). It is given likewise in the editions of Ignatius by Aldrich (Oxford, 1708, 8vo) and Smith (ibid. 1709, 4to). It is contained also in the

Varia Sacra of Le Moyne (vol. i, Leyden, 1685, 4to), and in the *Bibliotheca Patrum* of Gallandius (vol. i, Ven. 1765, fol.). Of more recent editions may be mentioned those of Hornemann, *Scripta Genuina Græca Patrum Apostolicorum* (Copenhagen, 1828, 4to); Routh, *Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Opuscula Præcipua quædam* (vol. i, Oxford, 1832, 8vo); Jacobson, *Patrum Apostolicorum quæ supersunt* (vol. ii, ibid. 1838, 8vo); and Hefele, *Patrum Apostolicorum Opera* (Tübingen, 1839, 8vo). There are English versions of this epistle by Wake and Clementson, and one in Cave's *Apostolici, or Lives of the Primitive Fathers.*

That Polycarp wrote other *Epistolæ* is attested by Irenæus (*Epistol. ad Florin.*): one, Πρὸς Ἀθηναίους, *Ad Athenienses*, is quoted by St. Maximus in his *Prologus ad Libros Dionysii Areopagitæ*, and by Joannes Maxentius, but is supposed to be spurious; at any rate it is now lost: another, Πρὸς Διονύσιον τὸν Ἀρεοπαγίτην, *Ad Dionysium Areopagitam*, mentioned by Suidas (s. v. Πολύκαρπος), is supposed to be spurious also. The life of Polycarp, ascribed to Pionius, states that he wrote various *Tractatus*, *Homiliæ*, and *Epistolæ*, and especially a book *De Obitu S. Joannis;* of which, according to Halloix (*l. c.*), some extracts from a MS. said to be extant in an abbey in Northern Italy had been given in a *Concio de S. Joanne Evangelista* by Franciscus Humblot; but even Halloix evidently doubted their genuineness. Some fragments ascribed to Polycarp, cited, in a Latin version, in a *Catena in Quatuor Evangelistas* by Victor of Capua, were published by Franciscus Feuardentius subjoined to lib. iii, c. 3 of his *Annotationes ad Irenæum*, and were subsequently reprinted by Halloix (*l. c.*), Usher (*Appendix Ignatiana*, p. 31, etc.), Maderus (*l. c.*), Cotelerius (*l. c.*), Ittigius (*l. c.*), and Gallandius (*l. c.*), under the title of *Fragmenta Quinque e Responsionum Capitulis S. Polycarpo adscriptis;* but their genuineness is very doubtful. See Cave, *Hist. Litt.* ad ann. 108, i, 44, etc. (Oxford, 1740, fol.); Ittigius, *De Biblioth. Patrum*, passim; Fabricius, *Bibl. Græc.* vii, 47, etc.; Ceillier, *Auteurs Sacrés*, l. c.; Lardner, *Credibility*, pt. ii, bk. i, ch. vi, etc.; Gallandius, *Biblioth. Patrum*, proleg. ad vol. i, c. ix; Jacobson, *l. c.* proleg. p. l, etc., lxx; Schaff, *Church Hist.* vol. i; Donaldson, *Literature* (see Index); Böhringer, *Christl. Kirche*, i, 30 sq.; Illgen, *Zeitschrift f. hist. Theol.* 1866, vol. i; Milman, *Hist. of Latin Christianity* (see Index); *Jahrb. f. deutsche Theol.* 1870, iii, 545; Jortin, *Remarks*, i, 323 sq.; *Amer. Presb. Rev.* iii, 517; Riddle, *Christian Antiquities* (see Index); Hefele, *Patrum Apostolicorum Opera*, p. xviii; Kitto, *Cyclop. of Bib. Lit.* i, 812; Alzog, *Patrologie*, § 1 sq.; Killen, *Anc. Church*, p. 365 sq.; Fisher, *Beginning of Christianity* (N. Y. 1877, 8vo), p. 321 sq., 552 sq.

The Τῆς Σμυρναίων ἐκκλησίας περὶ μαρτυρίου τοῦ ἁγίου Πολυκάρπου ἐπιστολὴ ἐγκυκλικός is almost entirely incorporated in the *Historia Ecclesiastica* of Eusebius (iv, 15); it is also extant in its original form, in which it was first published by archbishop Usher, in his *Appendix Ignatiana* (Lond. 1647, 4to); and was reprinted in the *Acta Martyrum Sincera et Selecta* of Ruinart (Paris, 1689, 4to), and in the *Patres Apostolici* of Cotelerius (vol. ii, Paris, 1672, fol.; Antwerp [or rather Amsterdam], 1698; and Amsterdam, 1724); it was also reprinted by Maderus, in his edition of the *Epistola Polycarpi*, already mentioned; by Ittigius, in his *Bibliotheca Patrum Apostolicorum* (Leips. 1699, 8vo); by Smith, in his edition of the *Epistolæ* of Ignatius (reprinted at Basle by Frey, 1742, 8vo); by Russel, in his *Patres Apostolici* (vol. ii, Lond. 1746, 8vo); by Gallandius, in his *Bibliotheca Patrum* (vol. i, Venice, 1765, fol.); and by Jacobson, in his *Patrum Apostolicorum quæ supersunt* (vol. ii, Oxford, 1838, 8vo). There is an ancient Latin version, which is given with the Greek text by Usher; and there are modern Latin versions given by other editors of the Greek text, or in the *Acta Sanctorum Januarii* (ad d. 26), ii, 702, etc. There are English versions by archbishop Wake (Lond. 1693, 8vo, often reprinted), by Chevallier (Cambridge, 1833, 8vo), and by Dalrymple, in his *Remains of Christian Antiquity* (Edinburgh, 1776, 8vo). See Cave, *l. c.* p. 65; Fabricius, *l. c.* p. 51; Lardner, *l. c.* c. 7; Ceillier, *l. c.* p. 695; Ittigius, Gallandius, and Jacobson, *ll. cc.*

Polycarp THE ASCETIC. There is extant in Greek a life of the female saint Syncletica, which has been ascribed to various persons. Some MSS. and the Greek ecclesiastical historian Nicephorus Callisti (*H. E.* viii, 40) ascribe it to Athanasius; but Montfaucon, though he gives the piece with a Latin version in his edition of the works of Athanasius (ii, 681, etc.), classes it among the spurious works, and declares that the difference of style, and the absence of any external testimony for five or six centuries after Athanasius, leave no room to doubt its spuriousness. A copy, which was among the papers of Combefis, contains a clause, stating that the discourses or sayings of the saint had been reported by "the blessed Arsenius of Pegadæ;" but this does not seem to describe him as the compiler of the narrative, but only as the author from whom part of the materials were derived. It is then most reasonable to follow the very ancient MS. in the Vatican Library, which ascribes the biography to Polycarp the Ascetic or Monk, but where or when this Polycarp lived cannot be determined. The biography was first published in the Latin version of David Colvillus in the *Acta Sanctorum Januarii*, i, 242, etc. The original Greek text is said to have been published with some other pieces (Ingolstadt, 1603, 4to); it is given with a new Latin version and notes in the *Ecclesiæ Græcæ Monumenta* of Cotelerius (Paris, 1677, 4to), i, 201, etc. The MS. used by Cotelerius contained neither the author's name nor the final clause about Arsenius of Pegadæ. The title of the piece is Βίος καὶ πολιτεία τῆς ὁσίας καὶ ἀοιδίμου μητρὸς ἡμῶν (in Montfaucon's edition, Β. κ. π. τῆς ἁγίας καὶ μακαρίας καὶ διδασκάλου) Συγκλητικῆς, *Vita et Gesta sanctæ celebrisque matris nostræ* (or, according to Montfaucon, *sanctæ beatæque magistræ*) *Syncleticæ*. See Fabricius, *Biblioth. Græca*, x, 329.

Polyeuct, the first martyr of Armenia, was a soldier in a Roman legion when converted to the Christian faith by one of his friends (Nearchus). For his faith he was sentenced to be beheaded. His martyrdom took place in 257. The Roman Catholic Church observes his memory on Feb. 13. The French poet, Pierre Corneille, made this case of martyrdom the subject of one of his most beautiful tragedies.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.

Polygamy was anciently and still is a prevailing custom in the East (comp. of the Persians, Strabo, xv, 733; Herod. i, 135; iii, 88; Rhode, *Heil. Sage*, p. 443; of the Indians, Strabo, xv, 714; of the Medes, xi, 526; of the Getæ, vii, 297; see also xvii, 835; on the Egyptians, see Herod. ii, 92; comp. Diod. Sic. i, 80; Hengstenberg, *Mos.* p. 210 sq.), which stands in close connection with the great fruitfulness of Eastern women; and some have tried to show that it is connected with a preponderance of female births (Mariti, *Reis.* p. 14), but this is denied by Burdach (*Physiol.* i, 403 sq.) and the most recent authorities. Even the Mosaic law did not forbid polygamy (*Polygyny*), which, indeed, existed among the Israelites from the beginning of their nation (Gen. xxviii, 9; xxix, passim; xxxvii, 2; xlvi, 10), but seems to be expressly permitted (Deut. xxi, 16 sq.; Exod. xxi, 9 sq.; Lev. xviii, 18); and there are several direct instances under the law (Judg. viii, 30), and more indirect ones (x, 4; xii, 9, 14), of polygamy, or at least bigamy, chiefly in the time of the Judges. Yet the lawgiver had certainly placed difficulties in the way of polygamy by many remarkable directions (comp. the Koran, iv, 3, which allows a Mussulman but four wedded wives, without, however, limiting the number of his concubines!). The Mosaic law aimed at mitigating rather than removing evils which were inseparable from

the state of society in that day. Its enactments were directed—

(*a.*) To the discouragement of polygamy; this object was forwarded by the following enactments: (1.) The castration of young men, which is usually associated with polygamy, was forbidden (Deut. xxiii, 1), and thus attendants in the harem were not easily to be obtained; while marriageable women might reasonably expect each to obtain a separate husband. (2.) Every act of sexual intercourse rendered the man unclean for a day (Lev. xv, 18), which, with a considerable number of women, each of them having her peculiar claims upon him, would have been very burdensome. (3.) The favoring of one wife among several was forbidden (Exod. xxi, 8 sq.), and the man was required to perform his marriage obligations in equal measure to every wife. This limitation also would be oppressive to many. Besides all this, the mutual jealousy of the several wives of one man, which is the inevitable consequence of polygamy (1 Sam. i, 2 sq.; 2 Chron. xi, 21), renders home life unpleasant (Niebuhr, *Beschreibung*, p. 73 sq.). The same reason keeps some Turks from polygamy now (D'Ohsson, ii, 366 sq.; Volney, ii, 360 sq.). The result was that most Israelites contented themselves with a single wife (see Prov. xii, 4; xix, 41; xxxi, 10 sq.), or at most took one or two concubines in addition. The same appears to have been the case with the ancient Egyptians (Wilkinson, *Anc. Egyptians*, ii, 62 sq.). In the age following the Captivity monogamy appears to have prevailed (comp. Tobit i, 11; ii, 19; viii, 4, 13; Susan. 29, 63; Matt. xviii, 25; Luke i, 5; Acts v, 1). It became acknowledged, too, as a prescriptive obligation, although the doctors of the law still held to their old canon, that a man might marry wives at pleasure—a hundred if he would—provided that he had means of support for them. Hence we cannot in 1 Tim. iii, 2; Titus i, 6, think of a simultaneous polygamy (comp. *Vesperæ Gronig.* [Amster. 1698], p. 125 sq.), although it must be confessed that Paul's expressions, taken alone, most naturally bear this interpretation. The Talmudists insist that no Jew can have more than four wives at once, and a king, at most, but eighteen (Otho, *Lex. Rabbin.* p. 528 sq.; see esp. Selden, *Jus. Nat. et Gent.* v, 6; Buxtorf, *Sponsal.* p. 47 sq., in Ugolino, *Thesaur.* vol. xxx; Michaelis, *Mos. Rit.* ii, 171 sq.; Jahn, I, ii, 235 sq.; comp. Selden, *De Polygamia*, bk. vii, in his *Otia theol.* p. 349 sq.). According to Deut. xvii, 17, kings were forbidden to take *many* wives; but in spite of this prohibition they (as e. g. David, 2 Sam. v, 13; Solomon, 1 Kings xi, 3; Rehoboam, 2 Chron. xi, 21; Abijah, xiii, 21, and others; and so Herod the Great, Josephus, *Ant.* xvii, 1, 3) had large harems, for whose service they procured eunuchs in foreign lands. See HAREM.

(*b.*) The second object of the Mosaic regulations on the subject was to obviate the injustice frequently consequent upon the exercise of the rights of a father or a master. This was attained by the humane regulations relative to a captive whom a man might wish to marry (Deut. xxi, 10–14), to a purchased wife (Exod. xxi, 7–11), and to a slave who either was married at the time of his purchase, or who, having since received a wife at the hands of his master, was unwilling to be parted from her (xxi, 2–6), and, lastly, by the law relating to the legal distribution of property among the children of the different wives (Deut. xxi, 15–17). These provisions embrace two quite distinct cases. (1.) The regulations in Exod. xxi, 7–11 deserve a detailed notice, as exhibiting the extent to which the power of the head of a family might be carried. It must be premised that the maiden was born of Hebrew parents, was under age at the time of her sale (otherwise her father would have no power to sell), and that the object of the purchase was that when arrived at puberty she should become the wife of her master, as is implied in the difference in the law relating to her (Exod. xxi, 7) and to a slave purchased for ordinary work (Deut. xv, 12–17), as well as in the term *amâh*, "maid-servant," which is elsewhere used convertibly with "concubine" (Judg. ix, 18; comp. viii, 31). With regard to such it is enacted (1) that she is not to "go out as the menservants" (i. e. be freed after six years' service, or in the year of jubilee), on the understanding that her master either already has made, or intends to make her his wife (ver. 7); (2) but, if he has no such intention, he is not entitled to retain her in the event of any other person of the Israelites being willing to purchase her of him for the same purpose (ver. 8); (3) he might, however, assign her to his son, and in this case she was to be treated as a daughter, and not as a slave (ver. 9); (4) if either he or his son, having married her, took another wife, she was still to be treated as a wife in all respects (ver. 10); and, lastly, if neither of the three contingencies took place (i. e. if he neither married her himself, nor gave her to his son, nor had her redeemed), then the maiden was to become absolutely free without waiting for the expiration of the six years or for the year of jubilee (ver. 11). (2.) In the other case (Deut. xxi, 10–14) we must assume that the wife assigned was a non-Israelitish slave; otherwise the wife would, as a matter of course, be freed along with her husband in the year of jubilee. In this case the wife and children would be the absolute property of the master, and the position of the wife would be analogous to that of the Roman *contubernalis*, who was not supposed capable of any *connubium*. The issue of such a marriage would remain slaves in accordance with the maxim of the Talmudists, that the child is liable to its mother's disqualification (*Kiddush.* iii, 12). Josephus (*Ant.* iv, 8, 28) states that in the year of jubilee the slave, having married during service, carried off his wife and children with him: this, however, may refer to an Israelitish maid-servant. See CAPTIVE.

(*c.*) The third object of the Mosaic statutes on this subject was to bring divorce under some restriction; and this was effected by rendering divorce a formal proceeding, not to be done by word of mouth as heretofore, but by a "bill of divorcement" (Deut. xxiv, 1), which would generally demand time and the intervention of a third party, thus rendering divorce a less easy process, and furnishing the wife, in the event of its being carried out, with a legal evidence of her marriageability: we may also notice that Moses wholly prohibited divorce in case the wife had been seduced prior to marriage (xxii, 29), or her chastity had been groundlessly impugned (xxii, 19).

(*d.*) The fourth object, which was to enforce purity of life during the maintenance of the matrimonial bond, forms the subject of one of the ten commandments (Exod. xx, 14), any violation of which was punishable with death (Lev. xx, 10; Deut. xxii, 22), even in the case of a betrothed person (Deut. xxii, 23, 24). See ADULTERY.

The practical results of these regulations may have been very salutary, but on this point we have but small opportunities of judging. The usages themselves, to which we have referred, remained in full force to a late period. We have instances of the arbitrary exercise of the paternal authority in the cases of Achsah (Judg. i, 12), Ibzan (xii, 9), Samson (xiv, 20; xv, 2), and Michal (1 Sam. xvii, 25). The case of Abishag, and the language of Adonijah in reference to her (1 Kings i, 2; ii, 17), prove that a servant was still completely at the disposal of his or her master. Polygamy also prevailed, as we are expressly informed in reference to Gideon (Judg. viii, 30), Elkanah (1 Sam. i, 2), Saul (2 Sam. xii, 8), David (v, 13), Solomon (1 Kings xi, 3), the sons of Issachar (1 Chron. vii, 4), Shaharaim (viii, 8, 9), Rehoboam (2 Chron. xi, 21), Abijah (xiii, 21), and Joash (xxiv, 3); and as we may also infer from the number of children in the cases of Jair, Ibzan, and Abdon (Judg. x, 4; xii, 9, 14). It does not, however, follow that it was the general practice of the country: the inconveniences attendant on polygamy

in small houses or with scanty incomes are so great as to put a serious bar to its general adoption, and hence in modern countries where it is fully established the practice is restricted to comparatively few (Niebuhr, *Voyage*, p. 65; Lane, i, 239). The same rule holds good with regard to ancient times: the discomforts of polygamy are exhibited in the jealousies between the wives of Abraham (Gen. xvi, 6), and of Elkanah (1 Sam. i, 6); and the cases cited above rather lead to the inference that it was confined to the wealthy. Meanwhile it may be noted that the theory of monogamy was retained, and comes prominently forward in the pictures of domestic bliss portrayed in the poetical writings of this period (Psa. cxxviii, 3; Prov. v, 18; xviii, 22; xix, 14; xxxi, 10-29; Eccles. ix, 9). The sanctity of the marriage-bond was but too frequently violated, as appears from the frequent allusions to the "strange woman" in the book of Proverbs (ii, 16; v, 20, etc.), and in the denunciations of the prophets against the prevalence of adultery (Jer. v, 8; Ezek. xviii, 11; xxii, 11).

In the post-Babylonian period monogamy appears to have become more prevalent than at any previous time; indeed, we have no instance of polygamy during this period on record in the Bible, all the marriages noticed being with single wives (Tob. i, 9; ii, 11; Susan. 29, 63; Matt. xviii, 25; Luke i, 5; Acts v, 1). During the same period the theory of monogamy is set forth in Ecclus. xxvi, 1-27. The practice of polygamy nevertheless still existed; Herod the Great had no less than nine wives at one time (Josephus, *Ant.* xvii, 1, 3); the Talmudists frequently assume it as a well-known fact (e. g. *Ketub.* x, 1; *Yebam.* i, 1); and the early Christian writers, in their comments on 1 Tim. iii, 2, explain it of polygamy in terms which leave no doubt as to the fact of its prevalence in the apostolic age. Michaelis (*Laws of Moses*, iii, 5, § 95) asserts that polygamy ceased entirely after the return from the Captivity; Selden, on the other hand, that polygamy prevailed among the Jews until the time of Honorius and Arcadius (cir. A.D. 400), when it was prohibited by an imperial edict (*Ux. Ebr.* i, 9). See MARRIAGE.

POLYGAMY, CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE CONCERNING. Jesus does not directly forbid polygamy, nor even revert to the subject, since it had been almost universally given up. No case of polygamy among the Jews is presented in the Gospel narrative; and when a wife is mentioned, it is stated or implied in the account that she is the only wife. The special evil of Jewish society was the facility of divorce—men putting away their wives for any, often a trifling, cause. Our Lord, when the Pharisees asked him (Matt. xix, 3-9) whether it was lawful for a man to put away his wife for every cause, replied that God at the beginning made them a male and a female (ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ), thus indirectly condemning polygamy as contrary to the original institution of marriage: with a male and a female only polygamy was impossible. He then declares that the bond of marriage is indissoluble; the husband and wife are no more twain, but one flesh; and what God hath thus joined together let no man put asunder; and afterwards replies to their question on divorce: "Moses because of the hardness of your hearts suffered you to put away your wives: but from the beginning it was not so." The practice of polygamy then existed by permission, not by command. It was a positive temporary regulation of Moses as a political governor, not of God as a moral ruler. The Jews had become hardened in their hearts; they were harsh and severe even to their own flesh. Their nearest relatives they treated with cruelty and injustice. Until the people could be brought into such a state that they could feel and understand the force of law, it was necessary for their rulers meanwhile to devise prudential regulations for the purpose of checking their lawlessness. All the evils of that early and idolatrous age of the world could not be remedied in a moment; and such was the state of society that not even until the advent of the Saviour was the institution of marriage restored to its primeval integrity by revoking the permission of polygamy and divorce. The teaching of the apostle Paul, too, is worthy of most serious attention, as the subject of polygamy must have come immediately before him. The Christian converts in the apostolic age may be divided into three classes: Jews, Romans, and Greeks. Polygamy, though not unknown among the Jews, had fallen, as we have said, into general disuse. It was positively forbidden by the Roman law, though divorce was even more frequent among the Romans than the Jews; but it undoubtedly was the common usage of the Greeks. Thus Theodoret says: Πάλαι γαὶ εἰώθεισαν καὶ Ἕλληνες καὶ Ἰουδαῖοι καὶ δύω καὶ τρισὶ καὶ πλείοσι γυναιξὶ νόμῳ γάμου κατὰ ταυτὸν συνοικεῖν (*Com. in* 1 *Tim.* iii, 2). The epistles of Paul were generally addressed to Grecian converts; let us see, then, how he dealt with the question, which must have come directly before him. Two ways were open to the apostle: either a partial or temporary toleration, or an immediate and direct prohibition of the custom. The multitude of Greek converts were undoubtedly polygamists; it might seem a hard measure, and would produce much domestic discontent and misery, to compel converts to abandon their wives legally married according to the Grecian law. Did, then, the apostle permit the usage temporarily, either till that generation had passed away, or until polygamists themselves were willing to conform to the higher Christian standard? We most emphatically reply that the apostle never for even the briefest period tolerated polygamy among baptized or Christian disciples, and that it never existed in the Christian Church at all. Had it been tolerated even temporarily, some notice or reference to it would be found in the apostolic epistles. The sincerity of converts must have been put to a severe test: to give up their wives no doubt often involved a painful sacrifice to Christian duty, yet so emphatic and peremptory must have been the apostle's prohibition that not a murmur of opposition was heard from Corinth, Ephesus, Philippi, Thessalonica, and other Christian communities. The apostle often censures Grecian converts for their violation of Christian duty, some of them having fallen from their regenerate state, and abandoned themselves to their old sins; but we find no reference to polygamy in his epistles, nothing which implies that it was continued or even known among them. There is no mention, however remote or indirect, of a believer's *wives*. This silence can only intimate the utter abandonment of the usage among Christians as clearly as the most emphatic statement. It could not have been tacitly allowed as indifferent, or permitted even for a brief period; since it must be remembered that the apostle had *expressly* forbidden polygamy, and if it existed at all in the Christian communities he planted, it could only have been in defiance of his direct prohibition. No language can be plainer than that of 1 Cor. ch. vii: "Let every man have his own wife, and every woman her own husband; let not the wife depart from her husband, let not a husband put away his wife." Again, the non-existence of polygamy in the apostolic churches is implied in the same apostle's comparison of marriage to the union of Christ and his Church. The apostle says: "The husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is the Head of the Church" (Eph. v, 23). But as Christ's Church, as Paul says, is one body (Eph. iv, 4), there would be no meaning in the comparison, no similarity in the things compared, if the husband might have a plurality of wives: the marriage union would not then have a typical representation of the union of Christ with the one body, which is his Church. Taking, again, the testimony of the Catholic Church, the evidence against polygamy will appear most positive and decisive. The mind of the divine Legislator was so clearly and ineffaceably stamped on his followers that the usage in early and later ages of the Church was

utterly unknown; there is no instance on record of a baptized polygamist for fifteen hundred years after Christ. Catholic, schismatic, and heretic, amid all their differences, agreed at least on this point. No professing Christian, however erroneous his belief or scandalous his life, ever ventured to revive the interdicted usage. The testimony of the Church, clearly brought before us by the consentient practice of Christians in all ages, is too explicit to leave room for further controversy, or any real doubt of the teaching of the New Testament on the subject. Besides, the practice of the whole world was strictly uniform, with one exception in the 16th century. In an evil hour Luther unhappily gave permission to one of his followers to marry a second wife during the lifetime of the first—the landgrave of Hesse. He was the first and the only Protestant polygamist of the Christian Church.

In recent times the question of polygamy has reopened in the Christian Church, and has resumed great importance. Bishop Colenso in Africa, and missionaries of several denominations in India, have deemed it expedient to allow heathen polygamists to retain their wives after baptism; though, on becoming Christians, they are forbidden to add to the number of them. Polygamist converts are not allowed, as being it is supposed in an inferior state, to bear office in the Church.* Now this view of the subject and corresponding practice can only be founded on an opinion or theory, which, if true, would render polygamy universally allowable among Christians. Let us ask ourselves the question, Is polygamy, according to the new dispensation, allowable, or indifferent, or sinful? If allowable or indifferent, why should it only be partially conceded, and not permitted at all times? If it be wrong or sinful, how can we be justified in allowing it even during the shortest period? Its temporary permission among heathen converts rests on no authority, scriptural or patristic, or any valid plea whatever: no primitive precedent can be quoted, though it is obvious that the same reasons for it might have been alleged in the apostolic age, and also, it may be added, by missionaries in any subsequent period, as in modern times. In truth, its permission under any circumstances can only by logical sequence lead to its full sanction, as in the foul and degraded system of Mormonism. But the defenders of modern polygamy will perhaps say that their strongest argument in its defence has not yet been examined: they lay especial stress on the examples of the Old-Testament saints, which is probably the real reason why they venture to allow it, maintaining that God would not have permitted it for many ages had it been necessarily immoral or sinful. But are they prepared to say—which is the real question at issue—that in the New Testament there is no precept on the subject of marriage? If there be, the argument derived from the permitted usage of the old dispensation is of no value whatever, and may thus be stated: there was no positive law on the subject in the old dispensation, and hence many of the Jews were polygamists; there is a direct law or precept in the New Testament, and as such binding on believers, by which the Christian is limited to one wife. But should it be asserted that there is no positive precept on marriage in the New Testament, we shall thus have to fall back upon the old dispensation for instruction and guidance; in which case, why should we permit polygamy only for a time, or in the case of heathen converts, instead of allowing Christians universally to follow, if they please, the example of the patriarchs and saints of the Jewish Church? If polygamy be permitted to converts from heathenism, on the ground that there is no positive precept on the subject in the New Testament, and that we may have recourse to the permission of the Jewish law, no reason most assuredly can be given why Christians generally may not be permitted to avail themselves of the sanction given to polygamy in the old dispensation, and by the example of its patriarchs and saints. "Experience," says Dr. Spring, "has abundantly and painfully proved that polygamy debases and brutalizes both the body and the mind, and renders society incapable of those generous and refined affections which, if duly cultivated, would be found to be the inheritance even of our fallen nature. Where is an instance in which polygamy has not been the source of many and bitter calamities in the domestic circle and to the state? Where has it reared a virtuous, heaven-taught progeny? Where has it been distinguished for any of the moral virtues; or, rather, where has it not been distinguished for the most fearful degeneracy of mankind? Where has it even been found friendly to population? It has been reckoned that the number of male infants exceeds that of females in the proportion of nineteen to eighteen, the excess of the males scarcely providing for their greater consumption by war, seafaring, and other dangerous or unhealthy occupations. It seems to have been 'the order of nature that one woman should be assigned to one man.' And where has polygamy ever been friendly to the physical and intellectual character of the population? The Turks are polygamists, and so are the Asiatics; but how inferior a people to the ancient Greeks and Romans!" The practice of polygamy has sometimes been alleged to originate in the influence of climate, but the fact cannot be denied that in the coldest as well as in the warmest climates it is found to exist. And though it must be admitted to prevail more extensively in regions situated towards the south, the more probable cause of this peculiarity will be found in ancient usage or religion. The manners of different countries have varied in nothing more than in their domestic constitutions. Less polished and more luxurious nations have either not perceived the bad effects of polygamy, or, if they did perceive them, they who in such countries possessed the power of reforming the laws have been unwilling to resign their own gratifications. Polygamy is retained at this day in all Mohammedan countries, and throughout the whole Eastern world (see a recent article on this subject in the *Westminster Review*, Oct. 1867, art. i); and even in countries like Algiers, where the French controlling influence is manifest, the Jews practice polygamy to a large extent.* But among Western, or, better, Christian nations, it is universally prohibited. In Sweden it is punished with death. In England, besides the nullity of the second marriage, it subjects the offender to transportation or imprisonment and branding for the first offence, and to capital punishment for the second. About the middle of the 16th century, Bernardus Ochinus, general of the Order of Capuchins, and afterwards a Protestant, published Dialogues in favor of polygamy, to which Theodore Beza wrote a reply. In 1682 a work entitled *Polygamia Triumphatrix* appeared under the name of Theophilus

* In 1834 the conference of missionaries of various denominations in Calcutta, including those of the Baptist, the London, and the Church Missionary Societies, of the Church of Scotland, and the American Presbyterian Board, after having had the whole subject frequently under discussion, and after much and serious deliberation, *unanimously* agreed on the following propositions, though there had previously been much diversity of opinion among them on various points: "If a convert before becoming a Christian has married more wives than one, in accordance with the practice of the Jewish and early Christian churches, he shall be permitted to keep them all; but such a person is not eligible to any office in the Church. In no other case is polygamy to be tolerated among Christians" (Brown, *Hist. of Missions*, iii, 365, 366). If proof had been given that polygamy was allowed in the early Church, all controversy on the subject would have been at an end; its permission in modern times to converts from heathenism might have been allowed, or even in many cases be desirable; but the statement itself has no support whatever either from Scripture or the writings of the fathers, or ecclesiastical history.

* Since 1870, when they were made citizens, they have been obliged to conform to the order of French law.

Aletheus. The true name of the author was Lyserus, a native of Saxony. In 1780 Martin Madan published *Thelyphthora, or a Treatise on Female Ruin*, in which he defended polygamy on the part of the male. The only exception in the West to monogamous practice occurs among the Mormons (q. v.). This strange sect teaches that the use and foundation of matrimony is to raise up a peculiar, holy people for the kingdom of God the Son, that at the millennium they may be raised to reign with him; and the glory of the man will be in proportion to the size of his household of children, wives, and servants. Quoting the Scripture that "the man is not without the woman, nor the woman without the man," they affirm that it is the duty of every man to marry at least once, and that a woman cannot enter into the heavenly kingdom without a husband to introduce her as belonging to himself. The addition of wives after the first to a man's family is called a "sealing to him," a process which constitutes a relation with all the rights and sanctions of matrimony. This introduction and continuance of the baneful and immoral practice of polygamy is likely, sooner or later, to prove destructive to the whole system of Mormonism.

The argument against polygamy from a strictly ethical and social standpoint is thus presented by Paley: "The equality in the number of males and females born into the world intimates the intention of God that one woman should be assigned to one man; for if to one man be allowed an exclusive right to five or more women, four or more men must be deprived of the exclusive possession of any; which could never be the order intended. It seems also a significant indication of the divine will that he at first created only one woman to one man. Had God intended polygamy for the species, it is probable he would have begun with it; especially as by giving to Adam more wives than one the multiplication of the human race would have proceeded with a quicker progress. Polygamy not only violates the constitution of nature, and the apparent design of the Deity, but produces to the parties themselves, and to the public, the following bad effects: contests and jealousies among the wives of the same husband; distracted affections, or the loss of all affection in the husband himself; a voluptuousness in the rich which dissolves the vigor of their intellectual as well as active faculties, producing that indolence and imbecility, both of mind and body, which have long characterized the nations of the East; the abasement of one half of the human species, who, in countries where polygamy obtains, are degraded into instruments of physical pleasure to the other half; neglect of children; and the manifold and sometimes unnatural mischiefs which arise from a scarcity of women. To compensate for these evils, polygamy does not offer a single advantage. In the article of population, which it has been thought to promote, the community gain nothing (nothing, I mean, compared with a state in which marriage is nearly universal); for the question is not whether one man will have more children by five or more wives than by one, but whether these five wives would not bear the same or a greater number of children to five separate husbands. And as to the care of children when produced, and the sending of them into the world in situations in which they may be likely to form and bring up families of their own, upon which the increase and succession of the human species in a great degree depend, this is less provided for and less practicable where twenty or thirty children are to be supported by the attention and fortunes of one father than if they were divided into five or six families, to each of which were assigned the industry and inheritance of two parents." Thus far Dr. Paley. We shall close this article with the words of an excellent writer on the same side of the subject: "When we reflect," he says, "that the primitive institution of marriage limited it to one man and one woman; that this institution was adhered to by Noah and his sons, amid the degeneracy of the age in which they lived, and in spite of the example of polygamy which the accursed race of Cain had introduced; when we consider how very few (comparatively speaking) examples of this practice there were among the faithful; how much it brought its own punishment with it; and how dubious and equivocal those passages are in which it appears to have the sanction of the divine approbation; when to these reflections we add another respecting the limited views and temporary nature of the more ancient dispensations and institutions of religion, how often the imperfections and even vices of the patriarchs and people of God in old time are recorded, without any express notification of their criminality—how much is said to be commanded which our reverence for the holiness of God and his law will only suffer us to suppose were for wise ends permitted; how frequently the messengers of God adapted themselves to the genius of the people to whom they were sent, and the circumstances of the times in which they lived; above all, when we consider the purity, equity, and benevolence of the Christian law, the explicit declarations of our Lord and his apostle Paul respecting the institution of marriage, its design and limitation; when we reflect, too, on the testimony of the most ancient fathers, who could not possibly be ignorant of the general and common practice of the apostolic Church; and, finally, when to these considerations we add those which are founded on justice to the female sex, and all the regulations of domestic economy and national policy, we must wholly condemn the revival of polygamy." See Paley, *Moral Philosophy*, i, 319–325; Madan, *Thelyphthora;* Towers, Wills, Penn, R. Hill, Palmer, and Haweis, *Answers to Madan; Monthly Rev.* lxiii, 338; and also vol. lxix; Beattie, *Elements of Moral Science*, ii, 127–129: Wuttke, *Christian Ethics*, ii, 306 sq.; Harless, *Ethics* (see Index); and the literature quoted in the article MARRIAGE.

Polyglot Bibles. Although the earliest specimen of a polyglot was that of a projected work of the celebrated printer Aldus Manutius, of which one page only was published, the first of this kind was the *Complutensiam Polyglot*, entitled *Biblia Sacra Polyglotta, complectentia Vetus Testamentum, Hebraico, Chaldaico, Græco, et Latino idiomate; Novum Testamentum Græcum et Latinum; et vocabularium Hebraicum et Chaldaicum, cum grammatica Hebraica; necnon dictionario Græco. De mandato et sumptibus Cardinalis Francisci Ximenis de Cisneros* (6 vols. fol., in Complutensi Universitate, 1514–17). As the title already indicates, we are indebted for this work to the celebrated cardinal, statesman, and general, Francis Ximenes de Cisneros [see XIMENES], who published it at his own expense, at the cost of 50,000 ducats. It was commenced in 1502, completed in 1517, and published in 1522. The editors were Ælius Antonius, Ducas, Pincianus, Stunica, Zamora, Coronellus, and Johannes de Vergara. The last three were originally Jews. The first four volumes contain the O. T., with the Hebrew, Latin, and Greek, in three columns, the Targum, and a Latin version of the same. The position of the Latin between the Hebrew and the Greek was to indicate that just as Christ was crucified between two thieves, so the Roman Church, represented by St. Jerome's version, is crucified between the synagogue, represented by the Hebrew text, and the Eastern Church, denoted by the Greek version. The fifth volume contains the Greek Testament, with the Latin Vulgate. The last volume consists of vocabularies, indexes, etc. The Greek Testament was finished in 1517; but the MSS. were modern, and not of much critical value (see Dr. Bowring's letter, *Monthly Repository* for 1827, p. 572). There is little doubt that the celebrated text of the Three Witnesses in this edition was translated from the Latin. There were only 600 copies printed of this splendid work, of which three were on vellum. One of these was sold in England in 1829 for 600 guineas.

The *Antwerp Polyglot* was published in 1569–72, in 8 vols. fol., at the expense of Philip II, king of Spain, whence it is also called *Biblia Regia*. It contains, in addition to the Complutensian texts, a Chaldee paraphrase, the Syriac version, and the Latin translation of Arias Montanus, which was a correction of that of Pagninus. It also contains lexicons and grammars of the various languages of the originals and versions. See ARIAS MONTANUS.

The *Paris Polyglot*, in addition to the contents of the former works, has a Syriac and Arabic version of both the O. T. and N. T., with the Samaritan Pentateuch, now published for the first time, and edited by J. Morinus. This polyglot also contains the Samaritan *version* of the same. It was published in 1645, in 10 vols. large folio. The editor of this valuable but unwieldy work was Michael le Jay, who was ruined by the publication. See LE JAY.

The *London Polyglot*, edited by Brian Walton, afterwards bishop of Chester, is much more comprehensive than any of the former. It was published in 1657, in 6 vols. fol. The first volume, besides prolegomena (published separately by A. Dathe, Lips. 1777), contains the Pentateuch, exhibiting on one page the Hebrew text, with the interlinear Latin version of Arias Montanus, the Latin Vulgate of the Clementine edition, the Septuagint of the Roman edition, and the various readings of the Cod. Alex., the Latin version of Flaminius Nobilius, the Syriac with a Latin version, the Targum of Onkelos with a Latin version, the Samaritan Pentateuch with the Samaritan version of the same, and a Latin translation serving for both, and the Arabic with a Latin version. The second volume comprises the historical books, with the Targums of Jonathan. The third volume contains the books from Job to Malachi, and, besides the versions in all the former languages, the Psalms in Ethiopic, and a Latin translation. The fourth volume has all the Deutero-canonical books in Greek, Latin, Arabic, and Syriac; the two Hebrew texts of Tobit, and two Chaldee and a Persian Targum on the Pentateuch, with Latin versions. The fifth volume has the N. T., with Arias Montanus's translation; the Syriac, Persic, Latin, Vulgate, Arabic, and Ethiopic versions. These, with separate Latin versions of the Oriental translations, are all given on one page. The sixth volume contains various readings and critical remarks. The whole of this stupendous labor was completed in four years. It was published by subscription, under the patronage of Oliver Cromwell, who died before its completion. This gave occasion to the cancelling of two leaves of the preface, in order to transfer to king Charles II the compliments addressed to Cromwell. There are in consequence both *republican* and *royal* copies, the former of which are the most scarce and valuable. For the variations between these, see Butler's *Horæ Biblicæ* and Adam Clarke's *Succession of Sacred Literature*. This polyglot was accompanied by Castell's *Heptaglot Lexicon*, in 2 vols. fol. See CASTELL; WALTON.

The *Leipsic* or *Reineccius's Polyglot*, published under the title *Biblia Sacra Quadrilinguica V. Test. Hebr.* etc. (1747–51, 3 vols. fol.). The N. T. was published first in 1713, and with a new title-page in 1747, while the O. T. was published in 1750–51. The first volume contains the historical books, the second the remaining books of the O. T., together with the apocryphal books. Besides the Hebrew, the Alexandrian version and Seb. Schmidt's Latin and Luther's German translation are given. The Greek text of the apocryphal books is that of Grabe. The N. T., comprising the third volume, has, besides the Greek, the Syriac, the vulgar Greek version, and S. Schmidt's Latin and Luther's German version.

Besides Reineccius's version, we may mention the *Heidelberg* or *Bertram's Polyglot* (3 vols. fol., ex officina Sanct-Andreana, 1586; 2d ed. 1599; 3d ed. 1616), the *Hamburg* or *Wolder's Polyglot* (Hamburg, 1596, fol.), and Hutter's, of which only the Pentateuch, Joshua, Judges, and Ruth were published (Norimbergæ, 1599, fol.), and the N. T. But by far the best of all these small polyglots is Reineccius's.

Of the polyglots published in our century, we mention Mr. Bagster's *Polyglot* (Lond. 1831, fol.), containing in one volume the Hebrew text, the Samaritan Pentateuch, the Septuagint, Vulgate, and Syriac versions, the Greek text of Mill in the N. T., together with Luther's German, Diodati's Italian, Ostervald's French, Scio's Spanish, and the English A. V. of the Bible. The prolegomena of S. Lee are a very useful help to the student. The cheapest and most generally useful polyglot is one entitled *Polyglotten-Bibel zum praktischen Handgebrauch*, edited by Drs. Stier and Theile. It contains the Hebrew, Septuagint, Vulgate, and German, in the O. T., and the Greek, Vulgate, and German, in the N. T. The latest polyglot edition is the *Hexaglot Bible, comprising the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments in the original Tongues, together with the Septuagint, the Syriac (of the New Testament), the Vulgate, the Authorized English and German, and the most approved French Versions*, edited by R. De Levante (Lond. 1876, 6 vols. royal 4to).

There are also polyglots of several portions of the Bible, of which one of the most valuable is that published at Constantinople, in Hebrew, Chaldee, Persian, and Arabic, in 1546. The Rabbinical Bibles (q. v.) are in many cases also to some extent polyglot. Besides the article BIBLE, see Ernesti, *De Bibliis Polyglottis* (Wittenb. 1688); Darling, *Cyclopædia Bibliographica* (Holy Scriptures), col. 39 sq.; Rosenmüller, *Handbuch der biblischen Literatur*, iii, 281 sq.; Le Long-Masch, *Bibliotheca Sacra*, i, 331 sq.; Eichhorn, *Einleitung in das A. Test.* (Index in vol. v, s. v. Polyglotte); Simon, *Hist. Critique du Vieux Testament* (Rotterdam, 1685), p. 514 sq.; Carpzov, *Critica Sacra* (Lipsia, 1748), p. 387 sq.; Kortholt, *Tract. de variis Scripturæ edition.* cap. xxxii, p. 374 sq.; Tenzel, *Diatribe Philol. de Bibliis Polyglottis* (Wittenb. 1686); Celsius, *De Bibliis Polyglottis dissertatio* (Upsala, 1707); Wolf, *Biblioth. Hebr.* vol. ii, § 10, p. 332 sq.; Walton, *Prolegom.* § 14; Hottinger, *Bibliothecar. Quadripartitum*, p. 133 sq.; Alter, *Bibliograph. Nachrichten* (Wien, 1779), p. 30 sq.; Reuss, *Bibliotheca Novi Testamenti*, etc. (Brunsviguæ, 1872), § 5; and his art. *Polyglotten-Bibeln* in Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.*; the art. *Polyglott* in Kitto; Diestel, *Gesch. des Alten Test.* (Jena, 1869), p. 207, 254, 255; and, as far as the *Complutensian Polyglot* is concerned, the excellent monograph of Delitzsch, *Studien zur Entstehungsgesch. der Polyglotten-Bibel des Cardinals Ximenes* (Leips. 1871). (B. P.)

Polyhistor, ALEXANDER, a Roman writer whose works have been used by the Church fathers, a native of Cotyæum in Phrygia, according to some, and of Miletus according to others, was a geographer and historian, who lived in the 7th century of Rome, and was taken prisoner by the Romans in the war of Sulla against Mithridates. Being purchased by Cornelius Lentulus, he was intrusted by him with the education of his children, and at last received his freedom. He then assumed the name of *Cornelius*, after that of his patron. He resided chiefly at Rome, and had a country-house at Laurentum, in which, having taken fire while he was there, he perished in the flames. He is often mentioned and quoted by Pliny the Elder, Diogenes Laertius, Clemens Alexandrinus, and Eusebius, as a man of very extensive learning, in consequence of which he was styled Polyhistor. He wrote a work in forty books, each book being the description of a distinct country. Stephanus Byzantinus mentions his account of Bithynia, Caria, Paphlagonia, Syria, Libya, Crete, and other countries. Clemens Alexandrinus quotes his *Treatise on the Jews*, of which Eusebius has inserted fragments in his "Chronography." Clemens Alexandrinus mentions another work of Polyhistor, on the *Symbol of Pythagoras*; and Cyril of Alexandria, in his work against Julian, quotes

his authority on the early history of the world. Unfortunately none of Polyhistor's works have come down to us.

Polyhymnia, a daughter of Zeus, or Jupiter, and one of the nine Muses. She presided over lyric poetry, and was believed to have invented the lyre.

Polynesia, or the region of many islands (*πολύς, many*, and *νῆσος, an island*), is the name usually given, with more or less of limitation, to the numerous groups of islands, and some few single islands, scattered throughout the great Pacific Ocean, between the eastern shores of Asia and the western shores of America. In its widest signification, the term Polynesia might be understood as embracing, besides the groups hereafter to be mentioned, the various islands, large and small, of the Indian Archipelago, in one direction, and the vast island of New Holland (q. v.) or Australia, with its dependency of Van Diemen's Land, in another. Including these, the whole region has sometimes been called Oceanica, and sometimes Australasia—generally, however, in modern times, to the exclusion of the islands in the Indian Archipelago, to which certain writers have given the name of Malaysia. In proportion, also, as the area of maritime discovery has become enlarged, it has been thought convenient by some geographers to narrow still further the limits of Polynesia, to the exclusion of Australia and Van Diemen's Land; while others, again, exclude Papua (q. v.) or New Guinea, New Ireland (q. v.), Solomon's Isles (q. v.), the Louisiade group, the New Hebrides (q. v.), New Caledonia (q. v.), and certain other groups and single islands, together with New Zealand (q. v.), from the area of Polynesia, and give to these, in union with Australia, the collective designation of Australasia. To all these, with the exception of New Zealand, French writers have given the name of *Melanesia*, or the *Black Islands;* while a similar name, *Kelænonesia*, has been given to them by Prichard and Latham—purely, however, on ethnological grounds, as we shall presently notice. Thus we have the three geographical divisions of Malaysia, Australasia, and Polynesia, the last mentioned of which embraces all the groups and single islands not included under the other two. Accepting this arrangement, still the limits between Australasia and Polynesia have not been very accurately defined; indeed, scarcely any two geographers appear to be quite agreed upon the subject; neither shall we pretend to decide in the matter. The following list, however, comprises all the principal groups and single islands not previously named as coming under the division of Australasia—viz.: 1. North of the equator—the Ladrone or Marian Islands, the Pelew Islands, the Caroline Islands, the Radack and Ralick chains, the Sandwich Islands, Gilbert's or Kingsmill's Archipelago, and the Galapagos. 2. South of the equator—the Ellice group, the Phœnix and Union groups, the Fiji Islands, the Friendly Islands, the Navigator's Islands, Cook's or Harvey Islands, the Society Islands, the Dangerous Archipelago, the Marquesas Islands, Pitcairn Island, and Easter Island. (In the former part of this article we largely depend upon Chambers's *Cyclopædia*, and in the latter part upon Gardner's *Faiths of all Nations.*)

Geographical Description.—These islands, which extend from about 20° north of the equator to about 30° south of it, are some of them volcanic in their origin, and some of them coralline. The volcanic islands generally rise to a considerable height above the level of the ocean, and are therefore called the high islands, in contradistinction to the coralline or low islands. They consist of basalt and other igneous formations. Of these, the principal are the Friendly Islands, one of which, Otaheite or Tahiti, has a mountain rising to the height of 10,000 feet; the Marquesas Islands (q. v.), also very high; the Samoan (q. v.) or Navigator's Islands; and the Sandwich Islands (q. v.), of which Owyhee or Hawaii possesses several both active and extinct craters, 13,000, 14,000, and even 16.000 feet high. The Galapagos group, nearest of all to South America, are likewise of igneous origin, and have several still active craters. The remaining islands are for the most part of coralline formation. Of the islands generally, we need only further observe that, although situated within the tropics, the heat of the atmosphere is delightfully tempered by a succession of land and sea breezes. The soil is exceedingly fertile, and, besides the vegetable productions found growing when the islands were first discovered by Europeans, it has given a welcome home to the orange, lemon, sugar-cane, guava, cotton, potato, melon, and other fruits and plants introduced by foreign visitants. The only native quadrupeds on any of the islands when first visited were pigs, dogs, and rats; but the ox, the sheep, the goat, and even the horse, have since been successfully introduced into many of the groups. The feathered tribes are numerous, likewise the insects, and the coasts everywhere abound with a vast variety of fish and crustacea, highly important as a matter of food to the inhabitants of those islands in which quadrupeds, whether native or introduced, are found in only a small number. For a more particular description of the several groups we refer to the distinct articles of Fiji; Friendly Islands; Sandwich Islands, etc.; and shall now proceed to speak of the Polynesians generally.

Inhabitants.—This race of people, supposed at one time by certain writers to be of American origin, is now almost universally admitted to have a close affinity with the Malays (q. v.) of the peninsula and Indian Archipelago, and hence is classified with them by Dr. Latham under his subdivision of *Oceanic Mongolidæ*. In physical structure and appearance, the Polynesians in general more nearly resemble the Malays than they do any other race, although differing from them in some respects, as, indeed, the natives of several of the groups also do from each other. In stature, they are generally taller than the Malays, and have a greater tendency to corpulence. In color, also, they more nearly approach that of the Europeans. The hair is often waved or curling, instead of long and straight, and the nose is frequently aquiline. These differences, however, which may all have been produced by lapse of time and different conditions of existence, offer no barrier to the strong presumption that at some long antecedent period these islands were colonized by Malay adventurers. The distance between the more western groups of Polynesia and the eastern islands of the Indian Archipelago is not so great but that it could have been easily overcome by a hardy race of sailors, even although their vessels may not have been so well constructed as in modern times; and the same reasoning holds good with respect to the other groups extending still farther east, or still more to the north or south. Each island or group, as it was attained, would only form a convenient point of departure in process of time for some other island or group more remotely situated. It is true that the affinities of language are not great between the Malays and the Polynesians; still some affinity has been recognised by philologists; while in their manners and customs a strong resemblance has been shown to exist, as in the institution of caste, the practice of circumcision, the chewing of the betel-nut, and other things. Many other facts might be mentioned in favor of the theory of a Malay settlement, not only of Polynesia, but of the islands called Melanesia or Kelænonesia as well; the last mentioned being inhabited by a race almost identical with the Negritos [see Negrillos] or Pelagian Negroes of the Eastern Archipelago.

Dr. Latham, in treating of the Polynesians, divides them into two branches—viz.: 1. The Micronesian branch, and 2. The Proper Polynesian branch. His theory as to the probable line of migration is as follows: "The reason for taking the Micronesian branch before the Proper Polynesian involves the following question: What was the line of population by which the innumerable islands of the Pacific, from the Pelews

to Easter Island, and from the Sandwich Islands to New Zealand, became inhabited by tribes different from, but still allied to, the Protonesian Malays? That line, whichever it be, where the continuity of successive islands is the greatest, and whereon the fewest considerable interspaces of ocean are to be found. This is the general answer *a priori*, subject to modifications from the counterbalancing phenomena of winds or currents unfavorable to the supposed migration. Now this answer, when applied to the geographical details regarding the distribution of land and sea in the great oceanic area, indicates the following line: New Guinea, New Ireland, the New Hebrides, the Fijis, and the Tonga group, etc. From hence the Navigator's Islands, the isles of the Dangerous Archipelago, the Kingsmill and other groups, carry the frequently diverging streams of population over the Caroline Islands, the Ladrones, the Pelews, Easter Island, etc. This view, however, so natural an inference from a mere land and sea survey, is complicated by the ethnological position of the New Guinea, New Ireland, and New Hebrides population. These are *not* Protonesian, and they are not Polynesian. Lastly, they are not intermediate to the two. They *break* rather than propagate the continuity of the human stream—a continuity which exists geographically, but fails ethnographically. The recognition of this conflict between the two probabilities has determined me to consider the Micronesian Archipelago as that part of Polynesia which is most likely to have been first peopled, and hence a reason for taking it first in order. The islands comprised in the Micronesian branch are the Pelew Islands, the Caroline Islands, the Marian Islands, and the Tarawan or Kingsmill group. In physical appearance, the inhabitants of these groups more nearly resemble the Malays than is the case with the Polynesians Proper. In person, they are not so tall as the latter. Their language has numerous dialects, most of which would perhaps be unintelligible to the groups farther south and east. In religion, they are pagans; but their mythology and traditions differ from those of the Polynesians Proper. Neither is the custom of the taboo and the use of kawa so prevalent as they are found to be among the latter.

The Proper Polynesians, so called, are found in the Fiji Islands, but not to the same extent as in the following—viz., the Navigator's or Samoan Islands, the Society Islands, and Friendly Islands; also in the Sandwich Islands, the Marquesas, the Dangerous Archipelago, etc. In physical appearance, they are the handsomest and tallest of all the natives of the Pacific islands, with the exception, perhaps, of the New Zealanders or Maoris. The aquiline nose is commonly seen among them, and there are many varieties both of hair and complexion. Their face is generally oval, with largish ears and wide nostrils. In the islands nearest to the equator the skin is said to be the fairest, and it is darker in the coral islands than in the volcanic. Their language is said to bear some affinity to the Tagala, and is split up into numerous dialects, all, however, to a great extent mutually intelligible among the several groups.

Religion.—Previous to the introduction of Christianity in Polynesia, in the end of the last and beginning of the present century, the Polynesians were involved in gross heathen darkness and superstition. Their objects of worship were of three kinds — their deified ancestors, their idols, and their *Etu*. Their ancestors were converted into divinities on account of the benefits which they had conferred upon mankind. Thus one of their progenitors was believed to have created the sun, moon, and stars. "Another tradition," says Mr. Williams, in his *Narrative of Missionary Enterprises in the South Sea Islands*, "stated that the heavens were originally so close to the earth that men could not walk, but were compelled to crawl. This was a serious evil; but at length an individual conceived the sublime idea of elevating the heavens to a more convenient height. For this purpose he put forth his utmost energy; and, by the first effort, raised them to the top of a tender plant, called *teve*, about four feet high. There he deposited them until he was refreshed; when, by a second effort, he lifted them to the height of a tree called *kauariki*, which is as large as the sycamore. By the third attempt he carried them to the summits of the mountains; and, after a long interval of repose, and by a most prodigious effort, he elevated them to their present situation. This vast undertaking, however, was greatly facilitated by myriads of dragon-flies, which with their wings severed the cords that confined the heavens to the earth. Now this individual was deified; and up to the moment that Christianity was embraced, the deluded inhabitants worshipped him as 'the elevator of the heavens.'" The Polynesians had various other gods who were deified men. The chief of these deities, to whom mothers dedicated their children, were *Hiro*, the god of thieves, and *Oro*, the god of war. The idols worshipped were different in almost every island and district. Besides the numerous objects of adoration, the islanders generally, and the Samoans in particular, had a vague idea of a Supreme Being, to whom they gave the name of Tangaroa. The mode in which these gods were adored is thus described by Mr. Williams: "The worship presented to these deities consisted in prayers, incantations, and offerings of pigs, fish, vegetable food, native cloth, canoes, and other valuable property. To these must be added human sacrifices, which, at some of the islands, were fearfully common. An idea may be formed of their addresses to the gods from the sentence with which they invariably concluded. Having presented the gift, the priest would say, 'Now, if you are a god of mercy, come this way, and be propitious to this offering; but if you are a god of anger, go outside the world, you shall neither have temples, offerings, nor worshippers here.' The infliction of injuries upon themselves was another mode in which they worshipped their gods. It was a frequent practice with the Sandwich Islanders, in performing some of their rites, to knock out their front teeth, and the Friendly Islanders to cut off one or two of the bones of their little fingers. This, indeed, was so common that scarce an adult could be found who had not in this way mutilated his hands. On one occasion, the daughter of a chief, a fine young woman about eighteen years of age, was standing by my side, and as I saw by the state of the wound that she had recently performed the ceremony, I took her hand, and asked her why she had cut off her finger. Her affecting reply was that her mother was ill, and that, fearful lest her mother should die, she had done this to induce the gods to save her. 'Well,' said I, 'how did you do it?' 'Oh,' she replied, 'I took a sharp shell, and worked it about till the joint was separated, and then I allowed the blood to stream from it. This was my offering to persuade the gods to restore my mother.' When, at a future period, another offering is required, they sever the second joint of the same finger; and when a third or fourth is demanded, they amputate the same bones of the other little finger; and when they have no more joints which they can conveniently spare, they rub the stumps of their mutilated fingers with rough stones, until the blood again streams from the wound. Thus 'are their sorrows multiplied who hasten after other gods.'"

The most affecting of the religious observances of the Polynesians was the sacrifice of human victims. This horrid custom did not prevail at the Navigator Islands; but it was carried to a fearful extent at the Harvey group, and still more at the Tahitian and Society Islands. At one ceremony, called the Feast of Restoration, no fewer than seven human beings were offered in sacrifice. On the eve of war, also, it was customary to offer human victims. It may be interesting to notice the circumstances in which the last sacrifice of this kind was offered at Tahiti. "Pomare was about to fight a battle, which would confirm him in, or deprive him of, his dominions. To propitiate the gods, therefore, by the most valuable offerings he could command, was with

him an object of the highest concern. For this purpose rolls of native cloth, pigs, fish, and immense quantities of other food were presented at the maraes; but still a *tabu*, or sacrifice, was demanded. Pomare, therefore, sent two of his messengers to the house of the victim whom he had marked for the occasion. On reaching the place, they inquired of the wife where her husband was. She replied that he was in such a place, planting bananas. 'Well,' they continued, 'we are thirsty; give us some cocoa-nut water.' She told them that she had no nuts in the house, but that they were at liberty to climb the trees, and take as many as they desired. They then requested her to lend them the *o*, which is a piece of iron-wood, about four feet long and an inch and a half in diameter, with which the natives open the cocoa-nut. She cheerfully complied with their wishes, little imagining that she was giving them the instrument which, in a few moments, was to inflict a fatal blow upon the head of her husband. Upon receiving the *o*, the men left the house, and went in search of their victim; and the woman, having become rather suspicious, followed them shortly after, and reached the place just in time to see the blow inflicted and her husband fall. She rushed forward to give vent to her agonized feelings and take a last embrace; but she was immediately seized and bound hand and foot, while the body of her murdered husband was placed in a long basket made of cocoa-nut leaves and borne from her sight. It appears that they were always exceedingly careful to prevent the wife or daughter, or any female relative, from touching the corpse, for so polluted were females considered that a victim would have been desecrated by a woman's touch or breath to such a degree as to have rendered it unfit for an offering to the gods. While the men were carrying their victim to the marae, he recovered from the stunning effect of the blow, and, bound as he was in the cocoa-nut leaf basket, he said to his murderers, 'Friends, I know what you intend to do with me: you are about to kill me, and offer me as a *tabu* to your savage gods; and I also know that it is useless for me to beg for mercy, for you will not spare my life. You may kill my body, but you cannot hurt my soul; for I have begun to pray to Jesus, the knowledge of whom the missionaries have brought to our island: you may kill my body, but you cannot hurt my soul.' Instead of being moved to compassion by his affecting address, they laid him down upon the ground, placed a stone under his head, and with another beat it to pieces. In this state they carried him to their 'savage gods.'" This was the last sacrifice offered to the gods of Tahiti; for soon after Christianity was embraced, and the altars of their gods ceased to be stained with human blood.

The Polynesians, in their heathen state, had very peculiar opinions on the subject of a future world. The Tahitians believed that there were two places for departed spirits. Among the Rarotongans paradise was a very long house encircled with beautiful shrubs and flowers, which never lost their bloom or fragrance. The inmates, enjoying perpetual youth and beauty, spent their days in dancing, festivity, and merriment. The hell of the Rarotongans consisted in being compelled to crawl around this house, witnessing the enjoyment of its inmates without the possibility of sharing it. The terms on which any one could find an entrance into paradise, as Mr. Williams informs us, were these: "In order to secure the admission of a departed spirit to future joys, the corpse was dressed in the best attire the relatives could provide, the head was wreathed with flowers, and other decorations were added. A pig was then baked whole, and placed upon the body of the deceased, surrounded by a pile of vegetable food. After this, supposing the departed person to have been a son, the father would thus address the corpse: 'My son, when you were alive I treated you with kindness, and when you were taken ill I did my best to restore you to health; and now you are dead, there's your *nomae o*, or property of admission. Go, my son, and with that gain an entrance into the palace of Tiki' (the name of the god of this paradise), 'and do not come to this world again to disturb and alarm us.' The whole would then be buried; and if they received no intimation to the contrary within a few days of the interment, the relatives believed that the pig and the other food had obtained for him the desired admittance. If, however, a cricket was heard on the premises it was considered an ill omen, and they would immediately utter the most dismal howlings, and such expressions as the following: 'Oh, our brother! his spirit has not entered the paradise; he is suffering from hunger—he is shivering with cold!' Forthwith the grave would be opened and the offering repeated. This was generally successful."

The Maori of New Zealand form a branch of the Polynesian family, and as they seem to have been preserved uncontaminated by intercourse with other nations, we may discover in their superstitions some of the primitive notions of the great mass of the islanders of the Pacific Ocean. They regarded the origin of all things as Night and Nothingness, and even the older gods themselves were supposed to have sprung from Night. Another series of divinities are gods of light, and occupy the highest and most glorious of the ten heavens. The *Etu* of the other districts of Polynesia was called *Atua* in the language of New Zealand, and instead of being worshipped like the *Etu*, was simply regarded as a powerful adversary, skilled in supernatural arts, and rendered proof against all ordinary worship. Hence arose the charms and incantations which form the chief element in Maori worship. The souls of their departed ancestors were ranked among the *Atuas*. An institution, which is common to the Maori and to all the Polynesian tribes, is the *Taboo*, which is applied both to sacred things and persons. Among the Maori, the head-chief being sacred almost to divinity, his house, his garments, and all that belonged to him was *Taboo*, his spiritual essence having been supposed to be communicated to everything that he touched. The religion of the Sandwich Islanders, before they embraced Christianity, was almost entirely a *Taboo* system—that is, a system of religious prohibitions, which had extended itself very widely, and been used by their priests and kings to enlarge their own power and influence. Temples or maraes existed in the South Sea Islands, but neither temples nor altars existed in New Zealand, nor in the Samoas nor Navigators Islands. The form of superstition most prevalent at the Samoas was the worship of the *Etu*, which consisted of some bird, fish, or reptile, in which they supposed that a spirit resided. Religious ceremonies were connected with almost every event of their lives. They presented their first-fruits to their gods, and at the close of the year observed a festival as an expression of thanksgiving to the gods for the mercies of the past year.

Paganism is becoming rapidly extirpated through the efforts of the missionaries, principally English and American, as in the Samoan, Sandwich, and Society groups, where but few absolute pagans now remain. Under date of December, 1876, a correspondent of the *Manchester Guardian* writes: "Heathenism is mainly confined to the islands in the western part of the Pacific. The missionary societies, whose efforts have been so greatly blessed in other parts of Polynesia, are combining their labors upon this western section. The London Missionary Society has undertaken the work on New Guinea and the islands at its eastern end. The Melanesian Mission will extend its labors to the Banks and Solomon Islands. The Presbyterians will enlarge their work on the New Hebrides. The Wesleyans have included New Britain and New Ireland in their field. The American Board, in connection with the Hawaiian churches, is enlarging its operations in Micronesia. The history of the Polynesian missions warrants us in expecting large results from this concentration of Christian influence upon numerous island groups, some of which have as yet been only par-

tially explored." The superstition of the taboo, the use of kawa as an intoxicating drink, cannibalism, infanticide, tattooing, and circumcision are now fast disappearing under the influence of Christianity. Unfortunately, however, the contact of these islanders with civilization has not been always productive of unmixed good; the introduction among them of the use of ardent spirits, and of the vices and diseases of Europeans, having thinned the population to a lamentable extent. Further particulars with respect to the natives of Polynesia will be found in some of our articles on the groups regarded as being the most important. See Littell's *Living Age*, 1854 (No. 513), art. iii; *The Lond. Rev.* 1854, pt. ii, p. 43 sq.; *Edinb. Rev.* July, 1876, art. ix; *Miss. World*, No. 630, p. 167 sq.; No. 458; *Lond. Acad.* July 15, 1876, p. 52 sq.; Gardner, *Dict. of Relig. Faiths*, s. v.; Lubbock, *Orig. of Civilization* (see Index).

Polyphēmus, in the Homeric mythology, the son of Poseidon and the nymph Thoosa, the most celebrated of the fabulous Cyclopes who inhabited the island of Sicily. He was of immense size, and had only one eye. When Ulysses landed on that island, he entered the cave of Polyphemus with twelve companions, of which number this tremendous cannibal ate six. The others stood expecting the same fate, but their cunning leader made Polyphemus drunk, then burned out his single eye with a blazing torch, and so escaped, leaving the blinded monster to grope about in the darkness.

Polystaurion (*many crossed*), a name given to the cloak of the Greek patriarchs, on account of the many crosses which ornament it.

Polytheism, a general name for those systems of religion which involve a belief in more deities than one.

I. *Name.* — Neither this word nor the similar ones, *atheism*, *monotheism*, *theism*, are to be found in the ordinary Greek or Latin dictionaries. Philo the Jew employs such words as the neuter adjective πολύθεον with the article to express the idea; also the forms πολυθεότης, and in Philo ἀθεότης, occur with the sense now attached to endings in μος. Polytheism denotes the belief that there is a plurality of gods, and for the sake of convenience may include dualism, which, however, can be used also to signify the doctrine of two *principles* that are not necessarily both *divine*. If it be asked what is intended by *gods*, we answer: (1.) That in the word polytheism the notion of gods does not include absolute attributes or creative efficiency, owing to the fact that the human mind cannot readily admit the idea of more than one such being. While, then, monotheism generally means the doctrine of one absolute infinite being, polytheism is not its exact opposite, except in putting many for one, since the attributes of the many are conceived of as inferior to those of the one. This is an accommodation to the state of facts; but in philosophical writing monotheism may itself be divided into absolute and relative, as Schelling has done, with whom the latter denotes the worship of one being, thought of not as infinite, but as limited in his nature. Atheism, again, denies the real existence of any kind of gods; it is alike opposed to polytheism and to monotheism. The idea of God, the infinite one, is not transferable to gods many, and hence there is a necessary vagueness in the heathen conception of their deities, as it respects power, knowledge, duration, especially *a parte ante*, and other properties. The question, then, arises as to gradations of gods, and as to the difference between them and demigods, heroes, etc. The Greek worshipped these latter; and they had in their mythologies *apotheoses* such as that of Hercules, the son of Zeus by a mortal mother. Hence worship is not a criterion of godship. But although the line cannot be drawn accurately between gods and superhuman beings, who stood below gods but above men, and had some local agency in human affairs, it may be said that great but not infinite power and knowledge, ability to answer prayer, special functions and agencies in providence, with immortality, entered generally into the conception or definition of a god or divine being. Polytheism is used synonymously with heathenism and paganism, only that the two latter are wider terms, denoting not a mere religious system, but including also the state of things connected with such a system. Paganism comes from the Latin word *pagus*, a country district, a canton, the adjective from which, *paganus*, denoted *pertaining* to such a *pagus*, then *not a soldier*, then *boorish* or unlearned, and finally, among the Christian writers, one not a *Christian* or *Jew*, from the fact, apparently, that Christianity came last into the rural districts. In Augustine's time this sense, though already it may not have been uncommon, was new enough for him to say, "The worshippers of gods false and many we call *pagans*." Heathenism, from *heathen*, is generally taken, as being a derivation from *heath*, to have meant a dweller in lonely or remote uncultivated parts of a district, and may have been a translation of *pagan* into the northern languages of the Germanic stock. From *gentes*, finally, as a Latin equivalent of the Hebrew word גּוֹיִם, denoting in the Old Testament the other *nations* who were polytheists, as opposed to the Jews, and from ἔθνη, with the same sense as used in the Septuagint, are derived *gentilism* and the *ethnic* religions. An interesting inquiry is whether the lower races of the heathen world can properly be called polytheists, or whether their spirit-worship is not so unlike the worship of gods among the higher pagan races as to require the putting of them into another class. A full answer to this question can only be given at a later stage of our way, and it is embarrassed by traces of the worship of one or more gods, strictly so called, which appear in the religions of this part of mankind. We shall adopt the plan of considering them by themselves, only remarking here that if their worship is more vague than that of the more highly endowed or more cultivated races, it is equally divided between a great number of objects. Polytheism is generally found in company with idolatry; but it can be shown that within the Aryan or Indo-European races all the branches were not primevally idolators. It is probable, therefore, that for a long period, in some parts of the world, the worship of divinities by means of visible forms was unknown; while in the dualistic religion of Iran, or the Persian religion, idol-worship was opposed with almost fanatical hostility. Another of the nations belonging to the same race, the Romans, had only symbols at first; their temples were without images for more than 170 years (Varro, in *Augustin. De Civ. Dei*, iv, 31); and, according to a tradition, Etrurian artificers made the first for them out of wood or clay.

History. — A very important question, therefore, respecting polytheism relates to its origin. What did mankind first worship? And among heathen objects of worship, which were the earliest? What is the genesis of the gods of the higher races?

1. The first question that here arises is, Was polytheism earlier, in the order of time, or later than monotheism? The answers to this question rest either on historical or philosophical grounds, or on the authority of revelation. (*a*) The rudest nations now, and the whole world, as far as we can go back, have had some form of polytheism, if we include the worship of spirits in this term. The Jews are the only strictly monotheistic nation of antiquity: and when Abraham left his clan to go westward, they had already begun to worship other gods (Josh. xxiv, 2). Some traces of the worship of one god appear in the history of Melchisedek and of Balaam. Yet all the nations with whom the Jews came into contact worshipped not only more gods than one, but worshipped them by means of images, with the exception of those addicted to the religion of Zoroaster. Approaches towards monotheism among heathen nations were the results of philosophical reflection, as in Brahminism, where a pantheistic doc-

trine of the universe prevailed; or in Iranism, where the reforms attributed to Zoroaster show a progress from the earlier Vedic religion, or from something like it. So much the more wonderful is it that the one small people of the Jews clung, amid innumerable temptations to idolatry and defections from their ancestral faith, to an exalted monotheistic idea of the Godhead, which has been the origin of all the monotheism now existing in the world. (*b*) Philosophers are divided on the point of the priority of the two religious systems, the belief in one or many gods. Although some deists of a former age regarded monotheism as the earlier of the two, the only consistent ground for those who deny supernatural revelation is that of Mr. Hume. This is, in brief, that the natural progress of human thought is from the less perfect through abstraction to the more perfect; that polytheism was universally diffused, and that monotheism, if earlier, could not have been lost. It is needless to say that a great part of the thinking of the present age runs in the same channel. Man was a savage before he became possessed of arts or settled any of the problems of the universe, just as species are evolved out of earlier less finished forms. The many gods were lost out of popular worship, according to Mr. Hume, by adulation, or the zealous attempt of some worshippers to exalt their god above the rest, which is an unfortunate way of accounting for a result that has never been reached, unless it can be shown that an elimination took place in the Jewish system. Opposite to this is Schelling's view in his lectures on mythology, written after he had left his first philosophical position: this was, in brief, that monotheism was prior in the order of time, but without any dogmatic definition or distinct view of the divine attributes. At the same time man was awake to all impressions from the material world, in which the great objects seemed to him full of power and life. Here were the beginnings of a worship of nature, which at length drew a part of men away from the worship of the God above nature. This defection made those who resisted it aware, as they were not before, of the vastness, the absoluteness of the one God. Thus the human mind, in the case of those who adhered to the primeval worship, was enlarged in its religious conceptions: it may even be regarded as a part of the scheme of Providence that the apostasy of some helped the infantile race to take grander views of the Supreme Being. (*c*) The account given in the Scriptures is that God revealed himself to mankind at the creation, but, as man fell away from God, he did not like to retain him in his knowledge, and that the teachings of the world itself concerning him were rejected (Rom. i, 19–20). He therefore devised a religion and an idolatry of his own, which were consistent with foul wickedness. As the world became darker in its apprehensions of God, God began a new revelation of himself to Abraham, when primeval monotheism was in danger of utterly fading out of human belief. If now we may suppose that polytheism arose when men were but children in art, and had no science, those who went farthest from the central points of the primeval world would easily fall into barbarism, and their religions might show the influences of their new and less favorable situations. (*d*) Have any traces remained in the world of this primeval monotheism? A number of Christian writers have given an affirmative answer, but they put their reasons for their opinions on diverse grounds. *First*, we may notice such writers as Cudworth, who in an uncritical way collect together the expressions of writers of every age, and give as much weight to later philosophers as to earlier authors. There is no doubt that philosophers like Plato reached a first principle of the world, or that, before him, Anaxagoras conceived of *mind* putting already existent matter into appropriate forms. But their voice is not that of popular religion. *Next to these* we may rank those writers who have noticed a subordination among the objects of worship. The supreme god of Greece is a monarch, father of gods and men, with very great powers, the head of moral order, the chief agent in providence. Some of the poets speak of him in terms truly sublime. There are passages in the *Suppliants* of Æschylus and in the *Antigone* of Sophocles which breathe the spirit of the Scriptures. But all that can be fairly drawn from such evidence is what Naegelsbach draws from it in his *Posthomeric Theology*—that there was in the best age of Grecian authors a certain monotheistic tendency which had no decisive control over Greek faith. "This tendency," to use his words, "was an almost unconscious, a *naïve* one, an obscure impulse, a light that shineth in darkness, but the darkness comprehendeth it not." "The religious consciousness, on the one hand, so to speak, reduced the world of gods to Zeus, but on the other could not shake off the plurality of divine forms which nature first furnished to it." If there was any monotheism in the Greek religion it had its representative in Zeus. But what kind of a representative was he? He was not eternal, but born; he was not a creator, for the Greek theology never embraced a creation. He was not all-powerful, but was generally represented as controlled by fate. He had in the popular faith and mythology attributes most unlike those of a divine being. He was, in short, a monarch surrounded by gods of his own kindred, and very far from the conception of a holy or an absolute being. How could a holy and absolute being become so completely changed in the faith of a nation as to lose not only his absolute character, but also what ought naturally to be fixed in the minds of men—his purity and holiness? We can conceive of men changing their gods, passing from one to many, or from many to one, but we cannot conceive of one and the same god as undergoing such utter transmutations. Still further it has been urged, with justice, that monotheism and polytheism rest on different bases. The first separates divinity from nature; the second identifies it with nature, and incorporates it in natural objects. The two are entirely different: how can the one slide into or retain characteristics of the other? This argument, however, does not derive its force from the oneness or manifoldness of the objects of worship, but from their essential relations to the world, so that a passing over from the worship of one not absolute god to that of more than one, also not absolute, is far from being incredible. Hence, if we could accept Schelling's view of the character of original monotheism, we could admit of addition to or subtraction from the number of divinities. Nor can we maintain that traces of a primitive monotheism are certainly preserved in the religions of the other nations of antiquity. The earliest records of the Aryan race, as they appear in the Vedas, give us no indication that one god was of a higher class than the rest. Indra, as Prof. Whitney (*Orient. and Ling. Studies*, p. 36) remarks, "stands at the head of the Vedic divinities. By this is not meant, however, that he is king among them, endowed with any authority over the rest: no such reduction to system of the religion had taken place as should establish a relation of this kind among its gods. They are as independent, each in his own domain, as the natural phenomena of which they are the personifications." And the further remark is made that the nature of Varuna's attributes and of his concern with the affairs of human life place him decidedly above Indra. Further, in the later stages of the Indian religions, a deity, comparatively subordinate, Vishnu, has reached a chief place, while the old gods have fallen more or less out of worship. The Iranian or Persian religion contains very exalted conceptions of its supreme divinity, Ormazd, or Ahura Mazda, i. e. the wise lord—called also Spentomainyus, or the holy-thinking one—the holy spirit, according to Spiegel, while Haug explains this name as denoting the white spirit. He is also a creator; and in many respects this religion stands very far above all others

of the same race. But if Ormazd is a creator, Ahriman (or Angramainyus), the bad spirit, is a creator also; and while there is an evident effort of philosophical reflection to elevate Ormazd, who perhaps represents Varuna, above the other mythological beings of the older faith—such, for instance, as Mithra—the religion has not succeeded in attaining to the position of a pure monotheism, but is a dualism with decided remains of polytheism. Once more the supreme divinity of the Greeks and Romans, Zeus or Jupiter, i. e. Diov-pater, is now thought by the best etymologists to answer to Dyaus-pitâ, a mythological conception of the Vedas, who is spoken of as the father of Indra, but who either dropped out of or never fully entered into the Vedic religious system. If he dropped out, we find him retained by other portions of the Indo-European race; if he had not entered into it, we find other members of the same family bringing forward this personality as their chief god. While the Greek and Italic branches did this, we find in Scandinavian mythology a god Tyr, answering, as Jacob Grimm (*Deutsche Mythol.* ch. ix) shows, to Ziu or Zio, with a genitive Ziuwas or Ziewes, in Old High-German, and thus standing for the same being as Zeus or Jupiter. How can we believe that the representative of monotheism was thus raised or depressed, that he took the place of another displaced supreme god, or himself gave way to Odin (Wuotan)? The true explanation is that the head of the gods, differing in rank but not in nature from the rest, rose and fell in his station, or even dropped out of worship altogether, owing to changes within a nation or race which we cannot now explain. This is only one of the many changes through which polytheism passed. It never had any stability or permanent condition. We only add that if Zeus can be explained, as etymology points out, to be the personification of the bright sky or daylight, this again must prevent us from regarding such a divinity as handing down the monotheistic idea, because this was only one of the most prominent of visible objects. The same remarks in general may be made in respect to the religions of all cultivated races—the Assyrian and Babylonian, the Egyptian and the Mexican religions, for instance. We do not deny that individual reflection may have risen above the level of the religions themselves, or that philosophical doctrine may have sought to mix itself with the prevailing mythologies, but that the polytheistic religions, including their highest divinities, did not hand down a distorted monotheism, but stood on essentially another foundation. (*e*) Can the actual monotheistic religions be explained on the hypothesis of elimination? This would mean that all the gods except one faded out of the religious system of a nation, or of certain nations. It is a matter of fact that there has been but one such nation. All the monotheism in the world came from Judaism into Christianity and Mohammedanism. Can the worship of one god in Judaism be accounted for on the hypothesis just spoken of, that there was a time when several gods divided the allegiance of the nation among them, and that one, by the adulation, as Mr. Hume calls it, or the superior zeal of his worshippers, crowded out the others from the minds of the people. Historically there is very small ground for such a hypothesis. The descendants of Jacob had such a hankering after polytheism and idolatry that their whole history is a succession of apostasies; new objects of worship were adopted continually, notwithstanding the efforts of prophets to inculcate what all regard as a vastly more exalted religion. The tradition carried back the worship of Jehovah—not perhaps under that name, but as the Almighty God, the maker of heaven and earth—to Abraham and to his progenitors, nay, to the very beginning; and the very idea of Judaism, that which has given to the race its historic importance, is its separation, as the people of Jehovah, from all the rest of the world. "Thou shalt have no gods before me," "Thou shalt not make any graven image," are the two "articuli stantis vel cadentis Judaismi." Without entering into this subject at length, we will only add that no hypothesis of the rise of Judaism can stand which derives it from a previous polytheism. It must have come from philosophical reflection, or from primeval tradition, or from revelation. Its unique character shows that it is no work of man, and its place in the education of the human race shows that it had an important place in the scheme of Providence (comp. O. Pfleiderer, *Das Wesen der Religion*, i, 11).

2. Among the objects worshipped by polytheists, which were the earliest? However we may answer this question, it ought to be laid down, before we attempt an answer, that the objects of worship must have been thought of as having personal qualities and relations to man. Worship, the recognition of a divine superintending power, did not begin, could not begin, in the adoration of dead matter; of a sun invested with material qualities, for instance, then personified, and finally converted into a person with will, feeling, and agency in the world. We must start with attributing to man a religious sense or sentiment. The world, to the first polytheists, was full of divine power and agency; they did not create to themselves the divine life in nature, quickening it into life by a personifying imagination, but it was there for them to recognise; they felt their dependence upon it; it surrounded them on every side. But it was broken up to their minds into the many great objects on which they depended; it met them everywhere, and they worshipped this divine power and will in its parts as the source of benefits. With this premised, we may say that the heavenly bodies, the phenomena of day and of light, the earth itself, the sea, the sky or heaven, were among the primeval objects of heathen worship. The sun, for instance, not only as a sun-god, but also, in what was perhaps an earlier form of religion, the visible luminary itself, was among the first divinities of heathenism. The luminary was considered as alive, and possessed of the power of seeing things upon the earth. When Hades snatched away the virgin Proserpine, and carried her to his realms below through a chasm of the earth to be his wife, no one heard her cries for help except Helios, son of Hyperion and Hecate. Zeus, to whom she cried for help, "was sitting apart from the gods in a thronged temple, and receiving choice offerings from mortal men," so he did not hear her (*Hymn. in Cer.* 25–29). The attributes of Helios in the Greek religion, in which he was by no means a very important deity, are all to be referred to the heavenly body, endowed with perception, and noticing as well as hearing what takes place here below. The people believed that the sun was a living being, and the philosophers had the same faith. Anaximander is said to have ascribed a fiery body and a vital principle to it; and Anaxagoras so offended the Athenians by his doctrine that the sun was a red-hot stone or mass of metal that he was accused of impiety, and, although defended by Pericles, was fined five talents and banished (Plat. *Apol. Socr.* 26 *D;* Diog. Laert. ii, § 12 sq.). In the same manner the worship of the sun, as distinguished from the sun-gods, appears in the Vedas, although of less importance than these latter; the Greeks attributed the same worship to this luminary among the Persians; and Plato makes Socrates use the following words: "It seems to me that the earliest inhabitants of Greece held those only to be gods—whom many of the barbarians now regard as such—sun, moon, stars, and heaven" (*Cratyl.* 397 *C*). In the Scriptures the worship of the heavenly bodies is spoken of as an apostasy from God to which Israel would be tempted: "Take ye good heed to yourselves . . . lest thou lift up thine eyes unto heaven, and when thou seest the sun, and the moon, and the stars, even all the host of heaven, shouldest be driven to worship them, and serve them" (Deut. iv, 15–19). And in fact they were *driven* into this kind of worship at as late an age of their history as

the reign of Josiah, who put down "them that burned incense to the sun, and to the moon, and to the planets, and to all the host of heaven." We hardly need to refer to the prevalence of such worship, especially of the planets, in Babylonia and Assyria, nor to the fact that sun-worship was the foundation probably of the honors paid to Baal and Moloch among the Ammonites, in Canaan and in Carthage, nor to the importance of this element in the Egyptian religion. We only add that the religion of Peru—that is, the religion of the Incas, which superseded an older religion—was direct sun-worship, and that the same was spread over a large part of this continent, among the tribes even of the Red men in North America. The heathen part of the Dakotas still have their sun-dances, and as late as 1872 one of their practices was to look steadily many minutes at the blazing orb, as an act, it was understood, of religious worship. This is only one of those objects of nature to which were paid divine honors. The earth, as the general nursing mother, the sea, the sky, the life in the air, in trees, even in animals, all seemed to be divine. The Earth particularly —as the Great Mother, the Syrian goddess Cybele, Demeter, Ceres—although exalted into a person separate from the dead earth, as the cause of life to vegetables, and ultimately to man, was worshipped, and in some countries, as in Asia Minor, with the most frantic rites.

3. But polytheism would have been comparatively dead, and possessed of fewer attractions to the religious sentiment of many, if it had stopped short in its development of the divine in nature. The next step was to convert these comparatively fixed objects, exhibiting superhuman agency to the eyes of men, into persons separated from the objects themselves. The sun, regarded as a god, in this process became a sun-god; that is, his personality was no longer identified with the sun, and confined to its orb, but he became free to go whithersoever he would, and to exercise supernatural powers away from the sun, his proper seat. This was a very great stage through which the religions of all the higher races passed. The spirit of the sun, possessed of will and feelings like a man's, but of more than human power, is now free to move abroad, to mingle in human affairs, and thus to transcend his first agency by a very much wider and more varied new one. It is possible for him thus to become mythological; that is, the effects which he produces become events in history. The sun-god's rays to the imagination become darts, and as the rays of the sun in summer cause malignant fevers, so he is conceived of as shooting his arrows at men and beasts, the cause being some offence or dishonor done to his sacred rites or to his servants. The beginning of the *Iliad* will illustrate what we mean, it being assumed, what is now generally admitted, but what some eminent scholars have denied, that Apollo is indeed a sun-god. This the Greeks of the time of Sophocles and Euripides held, but they held it more as an inference than from any traditional opinion. But, furthermore, the sun-god might become the especial object of worship of a city or a tribe—their tutelary god; and thus he acquired a new character, and stood in new relations to a part of a people. From them his worship might spread over the whole of a tribe or of a race, and his old original nature would be almost lost out of sight; he would have outgrown, so to speak, his youthful properties. In this way it could happen that a war-god could be developed out of the divinity of a nation of warriors, although his attributes at first might have had no relation to armed strife. Thus the Roman god Mars was the divinity of an agricultural people, it seems probable, a god of spring and of fructification, before he became a god of war. Apollo also, if a god of the sun and of light at first, had from this source naturally the attributes of a destroyer and of a healer (the latter attribute being shown in the names Apollo and Pæan, the *averter* and *healer*), of a pure one and a purifier; to which were added his connection with music and poetry, as well as his prophetic office of giving forth oracles as a mediator between Zeus and mortals. The relations of Apollo to social life in its various departments, and his connection with Delphi, where the religion of Greece found its centre, made him the most important of all the Greek divinities, Zeus only excepted. His attributes may possibly all be evolved from the original conception of him as a nature-god; but it is hard to see how this can be done.

We have reached the point where we can state in brief several laws, as they may be called, of polytheism, which might be illustrated by an infinite number of facts, but will, we trust, commend themselves to our readers, after what has been said, without much explanation. (1.) To a great extent, polytheism at its foundation is the worship of nature, i. e, of objects in nature which strike the attention of man, and are important aids to his well-being in the world. (2.) These objects are conceived of as living existences, and as having, together with superhuman power, the feelings and the will of men. (3.) In the course of time, the living thing or god in the natural object becomes detached from it, is conceived of as an agent in human affairs, and may greatly enlarge its sphere of operations. (4.) This process changes the attributes and functions of the divinities. In this way, or by the mythological processes, the religions of heathenism may for some time be in a constant flux, and this will last as long as faith in the gods and the mythological spirit lasts. (5.) Among the changes may be mentioned the following: (*a*) the god of a clan or district becomes the god of a race; (*b*) foreign gods are introduced; (*c*) the same divinity, through the help of a new name, becomes a new personality by the side perhaps of the old one; (*d*) old divinities drop out of worship; (*e*) the relative importance of different gods may change; (*f*) what is called *theocrasia*, that is, a confusion of gods, takes place, but generally this is due to philosophical reflection: this is sometimes a pantheistic process, and in the later stages of Greek history it is carried so far that all the leading gods are considered to be forms or expressions for one and the same potence; (*g*) in the most cultivated nations of heathenism there came on a time when the mythology was rejected as being immoral, or was explained on various principles so as to bring it within the limits of the natural; and the religion, under the attacks of a scepticism produced by moral feeling or philosophical doctrine, lost its hold on the national mind. This would naturally destroy the life of the nation, unless some new religion should take its place.

To illustrate the changes through which the heathen religions can pass, we refer, first, to Hindûism, which appears in the Vedas as a simple worship of the gods of light, fire, etc.; then passes into Brahminism, where Vishnu, an inferior god of the Vedas, and Siva, perhaps the same as the storm-god Rudra of the Vedas, take the principal place, and divide in their ramified mythologies the worship of the nation between their respective religions. A second instance is presented by the religion of Rome, which in its early stage was a punctilious, superstitious veneration of certain divinities, somewhat allied to those of Greece, together with other vague, shadowy powers, and in its second stage adopted many of the gods and much of the mythology of Greece, so as to throw its own indigenous religion into the shade. Then, in its third stage, Rome almost entirely lost its old religion, and was a common harbor for all Oriental superstitions—the worship of Cybele and Isis and Mithras, and the Virgo Cœlestis from Carthage, and the Moloch-Jupiters of Syria. A third instance, with less clear outlines, is presented by Mexico, the religion of which seems to be a composite made up of parts from the religion of the Mayas, from that of the Toltecs, from that of the Aztec conquerors, and of a residuum perhaps from other quarters. (6.) From this exposition it would seem safe to affirm that few religions preserve

anything more than the spirit of their original form. They continue to be religions of nature, that is, of divine power as it appears in the diversified objects of nature. Hence the philosophy which arises in heathen countries will be apt to be pantheistic, to confound God and nature.

Polytheism, in any true view of it, must be considered in its relations to mythology; but we must speak on this branch of our subject with the greatest possible brevity, as we have already considered mythology by itself. Mythology takes up the raw material, so to speak, furnished by heathen theology, and converts it into history, mingling with it much of poetic invention, but all in good faith; for there can be no doubt that the earliest successors of the mythological age believed in their religion in this shape, as presented to them by the imaginations of a prior age unconsciously coloring what they received for true. Mythology starts with attributing to its divinities human form and feelings (anthropomorphism and anthropopathism); and, of course, from these premises infers in regard to events of life certain specific feelings on the part of the gods, resentful or kindly, out of which the events grew. It attributes sex to the gods on natural principles, for in every language the gender of different objects in nature differs. Not always is the sun masculine nor the moon feminine, but all things are alive, and, according to the especial mode of thinking in each nation, are male or female. Causation, again, is conceived of under the image of procreation; and where the gods were thought of as coming into being, they themselves were begotten by parents, until the mind landed in a first cause, which was blind and impersonal. Thus theogonies arose, such as we find in Greece, Phœnicia, Scandinavia, and even among the passive races of this continent. See Mythology. A room was thus opened for the impure imagination, which, not content with imputing to the gods love and lust towards each other, without regard to the laws of kindred or wedlock, represented them as enamoured of men or women also, and as thus the progenitors of extraordinary persons, demigods or heroes. From this conception the way was easy towards attributing to extraordinary persons some divine sire or mother, and of allying them to the celestials. And as thus the gods were only a little higher than mortals, the distance was bridged over, so that demigods were both mortal and divine. Hence it became easier to fall down into the worship of men of great power or skill, until in the old age of some of the religions we find kings receiving divine honors even in their lifetime, and deified after their death. This vagueness of the line between the divine and the human reacted on religious theory, so that a doctrine like that of Euemerus had easy currency when the divine had sunk so low—the doctrine, namely, that all the gods were originally dead men, and were deified on account of great achievements and services to mankind.

This is only one theory of mythology, which, indeed, is a wilderness where one is in danger of getting lost, and, if one would attempt explanations, must do so with caution. There are many forms of explanation. There is the physical, where phenomena of nature are turned into events, and here the difficulty, not easily solved, meets us of explaining how an event of nature which happens every day is represented in mythology as a unique occurrence in history. There is, again, historical mythology, that in which some fact is the basis, and the drapery is mythological invention. But in adding this drapery, and in other such inventions, the poets did not feel that they were chargeable with fraud, any more than Milton blamed himself for uniting his own poetical threads with the woof of Scripture truth. There was also a mythology breathing an allegorical spirit, and dictated perhaps by the desire to teach moral truth in the form which religious truth assumed. This was more consciously fictitious. Theological mythology, again, concerned itself chiefly with the births and life of the gods before they came into the religious system. We have in Greek a working up of this that goes under the name of Hesiod, and may belong to the 8th century B.C.; and the fragments of another also ascribed to a primeval poet, Orpheus, but later by one or two centuries than that of Hesiod. A comparison of these seems to show that the theological poets were free in changing the myths which they had to deal with, either inventing in part, or drawing their materials from earlier poems where a different religious philosophy was exhibited. The mythology of Greece was fully grown in the age of Homer; it is not true that he and Hesiod created it, but rather they and others like them gathered it, and gave it a form of greater beauty. Nor is it true, as we think, that a priestly class gave the first form to mythology. More true is it to say that a nation did this, and an age—a very long age, perhaps. We are not to conceive of a body of philosophers teaching in figures, the shadows of things real, those realities that lay in sunshine before their own minds; on the contrary, the mythological spirit was spread over all; it was the way in which all conceived of things supernatural.

A word or two may not be inappropriate here in regard to objects of worship that may be called secondary, that is, such as do not attain to the rank of principal divinities, or even of divinities at all, but still played a not unimportant part in some heathen religions. Among these we name, (1) the representatives or personifications of the life in the inferior objects of nature, like those which went by the title of nymphs in the Greek mythology, as the nymphs of the wood, of fountains, of the sea—beings having a narrow range of habitation and of attributes. Some of these spirits inhabited the object or element after which they were called, but were thought of as more or less able to disengage themselves from it. Thus the sea-nymphs wandered over the coasts, the wood or mountain nymphs over the mountain. Some of them, being personifications of the life of perishable objects—as the hamadryads—were supposed to die when the tree, their substratum, died. (2) The spirits of the departed. Such were the heroes and demigods of Greece; the spirits of ancestors or of other mortals, who might be causes of good or of harm, might be believed to be present on earth, to be under the ground, and capable of being raised by rites of evocation, or to inhabit the stars, like the Fravashis in the Persian religion. Faith in the continued existence of men after death was very widely diffused over the world, and furnished a support for such arts as necromancy, and an explanation for the phenomena of dreams. Nations in which the family feeling was strong were especially addicted to the veneration of ancestors, as the Chinese and the Romans. (3) The attendants on other gods, who sometimes were almost deities in the popular mind. Such were the Fauns; Silvanus, among the Romans; Satyrs among the Greeks, the subordinate sea-gods of the latter, etc. (4) Abstract notions personified, which presuppose the tendency to give full personality to real objects. Examples of these are furnished by the Greek religion, such as Thermis and Dike, personified law and justice; Metis, Mnemosyne, Thanatos, the dæmons of battle; and a great number in the theogony of Hesiod. The Roman religion is full of vague, misty shapes floating between reality and abstraction, such as Pavor and Pallor, to whom in a battle the third king of Rome vowed to erect shrines; Honor and Virtus, Pax and Victoria, to the two last of whom important temples were built in the later days of Roman history. (5) The personified forces of inanimate nature. Here, as in the case of the abstractions just now mentioned, the cause or force was conceived of as an agent. Thus the winds, especially Boreas, were more or less worshipped in Greece; and the same is true of volcanic or other subterranean phenomena. In India, and even among our Red men, a similar kind of nature-worship prevailed; in some of the North American Indian tribes the

north-west wind attained to a high rank among the divinities, was confounded even with the Great Spirit, and played quite an important rôle in the mythologies. (6) Evil, that is malevolent, spirits, had a place in some religions of the more cultivated races, but in general not a very important place, nor were they worshipped except by way of propitiation. Such were the *rakshas* of India, the *dævas* of Iran, the god *Typhon* of Egypt, the *larvæ* and *lemures* of Roman superstition—the former of whom were bad spirits of departed men, and scarcely to be distinguished from the latter, to whom the propitiatory rites of the Lemuria on the ninth of May were offered. (7) Finally we mention certain house-spirits, who may be included under (3) as the attendants of family gods, such as the Roman Vesta. Such were the *penates*, the spirits presiding over the *penus* or the family stores and inner part of the houses of the Romans; and the *lares*, protectors of the house, the cross-road, etc. Such, too, may have been the *teraphim* of Scripture, or rather the beings represented by the teraphim, a kind of family gods answering somewhat to the protecting saints of the Roman Catholic Church.

We have come in the course of our subject to the religions of the uncultivated races, a department of the religions of mankind, where it is difficult to solve all the problems or to get upon entirely satisfactory ground. These religions have been divided, as by Wuttke (*Gesch. d. Heidenth.* vol. i.), into *fetichism* and *shamanism;* but as authors differ greatly in the meaning which they attach to the first of these words, and as what is called *shamanism* may be found everywhere, we cannot make much headway in our subject by the help of these words. We shall come upon fetichism again when we speak of worship; at present we content ourselves with saying that a fetich, as first used by Des Brosses in his *Essai sur le Culte des Dieux Fétiches* (1760), signified any object, however worthless, in which a god or spirit was supposed for the time to reside, and which might be used as a preservative against evil or malignant influences. The word—in the Portuguese form *feitiço*, connected with the Italian *fattizio, made by art*, from the Latin *facticius*—denoted a charm, or object employed as a charm; and it was used to set forth a striking characteristic of the religions of Western Africa with which the Portuguese at an early day came into contact. Wuttke (*u. s.*), after Stuhr, in his *Religious Systems of the Heathen Peoples of the East* (Berlin, 1836, p. 257), regards a *fétich* as an outward object of worship, selected at will or by accident. The fetich-worshipper chooses and discards, according to a freak, the object in which his divinity is supposed to lodge. To use Wuttke's language, while in sun or star worship the heavenly body says to the man, "I am thy god," the worshipper of a fetich says to the worshipped object, "thou mayest be, I will permit thee to be, my god" (*u. s.* vol. i, § 36). Others, as Meiners (*Allg. Geschichte d. Religion* [Hanover, 1806], vol. i, bk. ii) and J. G. Müller (*Amer. Urrelig.* p. 74, 75), regard the fetich as in the belief of the worshipper a divine essence; not a symbol of divinity, but, like the sun or moon, a god. The fetich-worshipper carries his subdivision of nature, which is divine to the rude heathen, further down than the higher races do; he worships many worthless objects. These definitions are not satisfactory to us, nor do they point out any generic difference between the fetich-worshipper and the worshipper of an image of Athene Polius by a principal artist of Greece. For (1) if the fetich were a precious thing in itself, doubtless the Negro would be constant in the respect he paid it. The selection and rejection need to be accounted for, but the worthlessness of the object must greatly contribute to the inconstancy of the devotee. (2) There are village as well as house fetiches in Africa, and these seem to have a more fixed hold on the religious feeling. (3) The use of the fetich as a charm or amulet is not essentially unlike the use of saints' bones for the same purpose, and the feeling is like that of the cultivated heathen towards his graven image. This feeling is to be accounted for in part by a confusion of the subjective and the objective. The sense of security, caused by the realization of the presence of a protector, is attributed to the object itself. (4) Some fetiches have the rude beginnings of likeness to men. Here, certainly, there is image-worship in its infancy. (5) The belief in spirits which—to say the least—very many rude races have, is inconsistent with Müller's view that the fetich-worship is worship of a detached part of nature. The spirit has the fetich for its house, it dwells there, as the Greek god was conceived by the mass of the people to inhabit the statue, and as the pictures of saints in some Catholic lands wink with their eyes because the saint is there in the belief of the superstitious. The fetich is discarded, perhaps, because it ceases to awaken certain religious feelings which it awakened for some reason at first, and so the Negro looks for some other reminder of the spirit's or the divinity's presence. (6) Some fetiches are living animals, and here the inquiry arises, which we must dismiss for the present, whether these are conceived of as tenanted by higher beings, or as symbols of higher beings. The same answer, as it appears to us, must be given as it regards Egyptian or Indian animal-worship, and as it regards that which prevails in Africa or America.

We conclude, then, that fetich-worship is not essentially distinct from idol-worship, and we may find all the characteristics of it in the religions of the cultivated men. Among the Greeks, as belonging to an early period of their religion before sculpture had made much proficiency, we find such memorials of gods as three-cornered pillars in the temples of the Charites at Cyzicus, conical pillars of Apollo, the pillar of Hera at Argos, and a plank of wood sacred to her at Samos, not to mention the sacred stones called *bætyli*, and the stone of the mother of the gods, transferred from Pessinus to Rome, and there venerated and carried about in processions. These were fetiches, and so were wrought images, as long as the faith continued that the god was present in the outward object. The most characteristic mark of fetich-worship—as it seems to us—was that which struck the eyes of the first travellers in Africa—its connection with charms, and in general the prevalence of witchcraft, and of various magic arts. The religions are religions of fear, in which a small body of men governs the rest by terror, and thus stands in the way of the higher religious ideas. This cannot have been coeval with the religions themselves. It must have taken some time, perhaps ages, to develop the system of witchcraft or magic art by which so many rude people have been kept down in their degradation, by which, according to the natural course of things, their degradation has been increased.

Shamanism may be defined as the worship of spirits, so called from the Shaman or priest-conjurer of many religions in the northern parts of the world. The spiritual world seems to embrace all things that have life, and in some parts the spirit detaches itself from the tree or other living thing at will, to return there again. This kind of religion has prevailed, or once prevailed, among the Finns, Huns, ancestors of the Magyars, Mongols, Japanese, Chinese, and in Thibet. Something like it is found among the Red men and other aborigines of this western continent.

Some of the Northern Asiatics make a threefold division of spirits: *first*, the souls or powers which have taken a concrete form in physical objects; *secondly*, the spirits of deceased ancestors; *thirdly*, spirits, some of which may have been human souls, which have a wider sphere of action, such as have relations to a whole tribe or as protectors in certain undertakings. These may be kindly or malignant.

Besides these spiritual beings, the Finns believed in a supreme god, Jumala, whose name, as Castrén thinks,

may have denoted at first place of thunder, heaven, then god of heaven, then god in general. The Lapps of Norway had three classes of spirits—those in the air, those in the heavens, and others above the heavens. Among the last is a higher god, who creates everything through his son—which must be a conception borrowed from the Christians in their neighborhood. Among the Tunguses there are several ranks and spheres of operation in the spirit system; but above them all is a god of heaven, Boa, who knows all things, but does not concern himself with what comes to pass, nor punish the wicked; and, besides him, a spirit of the sun, more powerful than the rest, to whom prayers are offered; a spirit of the moon, from whom dreams come; spirits of the stars, who are protectors of particular men, etc. (Comp. Castrén's lectures on Finnish mythology, translated from the Swedish.) In the religions of our continent the Great Spirit has been supposed, without reason, to have corresponded with God, the sun, north-west wind, etc. The spirits are supposed to be capable of detaching themselves from their corporeal frame, and of taking various forms as they see fit.

It is a most interesting inquiry, but one in which it is difficult to reach certainty, whether there are in the uncultivated races remembrances of a primeval monotheistic faith. The difficulty is due to several causes, the first of which is their reserve, often extreme, in communicating with persons higher in the scale of civilization, and their readiness to agree for the moment to what such persons may say. Another circumstance to be considered is the propagation of religious ideas from foreign sources—in Africa on both sides of the continent from the Mohammedanism which has long been making progress, and in this continent from Christianity. The Red men near the whites have forgotten their former human sacrifices and cannibalism, and neglect of parents in extreme old age; and they seem to have imbibed some religious notions from the white men which have modified their religions. We find, also, this to be sometimes confessed by some tribes in Africa that they believe in a being above all, but neglect him because he is too far off, too high to concern himself with their affairs. This may be an excuse for neglect of worship of such a being, or it may be conformed to a real but obscure tradition. We may suppose the supreme god to have been in the primeval religion of their fathers, and to have been thrust out of worship by the spiritual weakness and imbecility of fallen man. In some tribes, again, there appear to be no such faint traces of monotheism. A missionary, who lived over thirty years in Southern Africa, once told the present writer that he never found any such embers of an early religion among those with whom he was conversant. The question is thus one not so easily settled. We close what we have to say of it by a brief citation from the important work of Waitz (*Anthropol. d. Naturvölker*, pt. ii, p. 167). He is speaking of the religion of the Negroes. After denying the justice of imputing to them a peculiar and rude form of polytheism, he adds that "the deeper penetration into their religions, to which of late a number of conscientious investigators have attained, leads to the surprising result that a number of Negro tribes, among whom the influence of nations that stand higher in point of culture cannot be pointed out nor scarcely be suspected, have made much greater advances in the development of their religious conceptions than almost all other nations in a state of nature. And this to such a degree that, if we may not call them monotheists, still we may assert of them that they stand on the borders of monotheism; while yet their religion is mingled with a great amount of gross superstition, which in the case of other peoples where it is found seems entirely to cover up with its rank growth the purer religious conceptions."

II. *Observances.* —We have considered polytheism thus far on the side of its nature and origin. We proceed next to a brief exposition of its practical side, or its outward worship, including priests, images, altars, and temples, liturgical services, and offerings.

(1.) Throughout paganism it has been felt that the gods must be approached in a certain way, and the knowledge of that way has been in the hands of a certain tribe or class. If there were written records, sacred songs, or formulæ, the knowledge of these pertained to this class alone. Moreover, a method of ascertaining the divine will grew up of which they alone had the knowledge. Whatever rites were necessary to propitiate the anger of the gods, or to secure their favor, they alone could authoritatively tell. If any occult science relating to human destiny or the divine will existed, they possessed it exclusively. They had from their position such advantages that they first would have the literature, science, philosophy, and history of the nation in their keeping. Thus to a great extent they controlled the progress of events, stood by the side of rulers to direct their counsels, trained the people, shaped the theory of religion, turned it perhaps into a new direction.

The influence and standing of the priests varied with the freedom of the nation, with the compactness of the priestly order, and with various other causes. In some countries, as in Egypt and in India, they formed one of the leading castes, and all knowledge, secular or religious, was in their hands. In the Persian or Zoroastrian religion the priest, called Athrava in the records, has also in the inscription of Behistun (of the time of Darius Hystaspes), and in the Greek and Latin writers, the name of *Magus*. The Magi, according to Herodotus, were a Median tribe, which, becoming necessary for the offices of religion, was diffused over Persia also, and perhaps over East Iran or Bactria. They resembled the tribe of Levi in their living in villages, and had no great political power, owing perhaps to the almost religious authority of the Persian king. The Avesta consists, to a great degree, of long prayers, of invitations to the gods to be present at acts of worship, and the like, and religion entered into all the important concerns of life. Frequent purgations, and the maintenance also of the sacred fire, fell to their office. It is difficult to explain the connection between these *Magi* and the practice of magic, for there were Babylonian Magi also; but the word was probably indigenous in Iran. Duncker, the historian, finds the connection in the formulæ of conjuration which they used in order to drive away the *dævas* or *devs*, the evil-minded spirit-servants of Ahriman, which formulæ had a kind of constraining power over the spirits, just as prayer in India was conceived of as putting a force on the gods.

Greece differed from the nations already mentioned in having no order of priests: any one might assume the office, and discharge the duties which the priest performed, and "there is no trace of a priestly discipline propagated by instruction through generations, nor is there any trace of an abiding connection between the priests of different cities" (K. Ottfried Müller, *Proleg.* p. 249, 250). At Rome the religious institutions took stronger root, in conformity with the regard for precedent, the formality and the superstition which characterized the early Roman people. The public priesthoods were originally in patrician hands, and the priests long monopolized the knowledge of the calendar and the legal formulæ. Moreover, the private rites of families seem to have been thought of more importance than was the case among the Greeks. But there was no caste, there were no hereditary public priestly offices, and politics, becoming a vastly more inviting field, drew to itself the attention and efforts of all men who aspired to influence. The magistrates themselves observed the signs in the heavens and regulated the meeting of public bodies in accordance with their own wishes, under pretence of religious scruples. North

of Rome lay the Etruscans, belonging to another race, who had a gloomy religion, in which the art of divination played a more important part than in that of any other nation of which we have knowledge. Here the leading men held the office of priests, and the principal priesthoods were hereditary. Beyond the Alps, in Gaul, the Druids formed a great corporation, at the head of which was a kind of pope; while Julius Cæsar was struck by the want of a compact priestly class in Germany, and says that the race was not given to sacrifices. Of the nations inhabiting this continent, the Mexicans had a very numerous body of priests, some five thousand of whom are said to have belonged to the great temple at the capital. Over the hierarchy of priests two chiefs selected from leading families presided, whose position gave them high authority in state affairs. Under these chiefs a third, with his subordinates, had superintendence over the lower priests and the seminaries. There were also monks in Mexico, as well as in other adjoining countries, who have been compared with the similar bodies in Buddhist countries. In Peru, owing to the sacred dignity of the Incas, the priests, unless they pertained to the race of the Children of the Sun, had less independent weight than the similar class in Mexico, and the simplicity of the religion may have conduced to the same result. A remarkable institution of this country was that of the virgins of the sun, who, like the Roman vestals, had to keep alive the sacred symbol of fire.

(2.) The objects of worship were either invisible, or distant and yet visible, or something near at hand, in which a divine power was thought to reside. In the first case especially there was a longing in the pagan mind for some representation or image which might keep the presence of the deity in mind, and thus give a sense of protection to the worshipper. Image-worship, idolatry, arose from a desire, it seems probable, of feeling the nearness of the unseen power, or from conceiving that the divine power is lodged in or belongs to the object present before the eyes as being inherent or represented by it. Image-worship has been diffused over the heathen world, but some nations have rejected it. The religion of Ormuzd rejected images and even temples with a kind of fanatical hatred. We believe that there are no traces of it in the Vedas. The Romans at first had only symbols and not forms in the houses of their gods. The probability is therefore that through the whole of the Indo-European race idol-worship was not known at the first; but in Egypt, in Greece, in the Hamitic and in some of the Shemitic peoples, on this continent, in Africa, and over the world, no earlier period can be traced than one in which either image symbol or fetich-worship was a part of the religions. As for direct worship of nature, one would suppose that images would not be needed by the pagan religious sentiment. The heavenly bodies especially are so great a part of the time in sight that no memorial of them would be needed. Thus we find that in Babylonia and Assyria, where sun and star worship, as distinguished from the worship of sun and star gods, prevailed, idols were common. Yet we find images of Bel, Nebo, and Merodach (Mercury and Jupiter) spoken of by the prophets (Isa. xlvi, 1; Jer. l, 2), while the Phœnician and Canaanite sun-god Baal is represented by pillars (of stone and wood? 2 Kings x, 26, 27), and Asherah, probably the same as Astarte, by wooden posts (groves in our version, *passim*). It seems not unlikely that in proportion to the pagan mind's separation of a divinity from the object out of which it grew, the tendency to represent it by images, and especially "after the figure of man" (Isa. xliv, 13), would become more controlling, but to this there seem to be exceptions. As for the direct worship of other objects of nature, as trees and animals, especially snakes, there is no reason why this kind of worship should need images.

And here we come to the difficult inquiry whether the animal is a symbol or a fetich, that is, a tenement of a god; and we may doubt also whether in different parts of the world, as in Egypt and on this continent, the same conceptions lay under this species of cultus. In Egypt the sacred bulls Apis and Mnevis were certainly regarded as incarnations; but may not symbol have preceded and given rise to this belief? The representations with which the Egyptian religion abounds of gods in a composite form, partly human, partly bestial, hawk- or jackal-headed, etc., show a symbolizing of particular qualities united to the expression of intelligence like that of man. But, on the other hand, the worship of animals elsewhere, the great number of sacred animals in Egypt, which it was a crime to kill, and the mummies of which were preserved, seem to point to a stage of worship in that strange country where the marvellous instincts and powers of animals pointed to a god within them all.

After what has been said in another place we need not speak at length of fetich-worship. The vagueness of the word ought to be cured by definitions, or it ought to be driven out of works on the pagan religions. If a fetich is a material in which a god or spirit is conceived to dwell for the time, a spell-bound protector and coadjutor of those who offer him worship, this is a distinct idea; or if it is a tenement chosen by the worshipper for his god, that too is distinct enough; but when we find, together with stones, mountains, water, wind and fire, plants, animals, and men, heavenly bodies also in a certain stage of human culture reckoned as fetiches, it seems as if fetich-worship might be made to include everything. In Greece the Thessalian sorceresses were thought to be able to bring the moon down out of the skies, and to work magic arts by her help. That is, Hecate, the moon-goddess, was believed to be wandering abroad at night, and, being identified with the moon, was thought to come down from the skies. The same general notion of power over objects of nature appears in the rude fetich-worship of Africa. A clear line cannot be drawn between the religious conceptions of paganism in the lower and in its higher culture.

We have spoken of mixed human and animal forms, where the symbol was the main idea. The highest attainment of idol-worship is to represent the divinity under the form of man. God made man in his image; the pagan lover of beauty makes his god in man's image, a reversal of the true idea, and yet expressive of a relationship. The Greek, by his anthropomorphic representations of his divinities, employed the highest conceptions of beauty in the service of religion; and thus, while he laid the foundation of the highest art, subjected himself to the condemnation, "thou thoughtest that I was altogether such a one as thyself."

The image and symbol brought the god into mind, and gave him a visible connection with the worshipper. Hence, in part, the fascination of idolatry. To a great extent, even in the most refined countries of paganism, the divinity was thought—not indeed by the philosopher, but by the vulgar—to inhabit the statue, and to this both the Scriptures and the early Christian writers constantly allude. The idol was not only used at places of common worship, but in families, and gave the feeling of protection a certain vividness, as if the divine shape were there.

(3.) The images of the gods, rather than the desire of shelter for the worshipper, gave rise to the temples, which were houses of a divinity; thus *ναός* is a god's dwelling, from a root meaning to dwell, and *ædes*, in Latin, in the singular is usually a temple, but in the plural a human abode. But neither image nor temple was as important for worship as the altar, which might stand afar from any temple, or near a temple and outside of it, or, it might be, within the temple's walls, with no roof, or with an opening in the roof, for the purpose

of giving free passage to incense and the smoke of sacrifices into the upper air. When the altar of the god and his statue were near one another, the statue generally stood above, that the worshipper might look upwards to the representation of the divinity. The temple as well as the statue, in the progress of refinement and of the ritualistic spirit, gained an importance that did not belong to them in the earlier times. It is in the temple principally that architecture in most heathen lands has found the motive for its cultivation, as it was the images of the gods chiefly which promoted the progress of sculpture. We have already had occasion to say that in the Persian religion there were properly no altars nor temples. The veneration bestowed on fire and light was an obstacle in the way of confining religious rites within the walls of temples, and the pure original faith of Iran had little need of altars.

(4.) Worship, in the narrow sense of the word, may include public and private prayers and other liturgical services, with offerings unbloody or bloody, and their attendant lustrations or purgations. Some of these rites, especially such as symbolized certain mythological events, might be secret, but of these mysteries we have no time to speak.

Prayer, the natural voice of the being who realizes his dependence, might be informal in the family religion of the pagan, or attended with formalities; it might need the presence of a priest, especially on certain important occasions of family life, or the head of the household might act as priest. In public religion a class of priests took the lead; it was felt that a certain form of words had a peculiar efficacy, and from this notion perhaps belief in incantations derived its birth. In some religions the liturgical forms have been excessively minute and elaborate. We have already referred to the religion of Iran as an example of this. The Avesta is chiefly liturgical. The first part of the Yaçna, and a smaller collection, the Vispered, consist principally of praises, thanksgivings, and invitations addressed to various superior beings to be present at the offerings of the Haoma and at other celebrations. The Yeshts or Yasts, a part of the Khorda-Avesta (lesser Avesta), consist of prayers and praises addressed to particular objects of veneration, as to Mithras, Verethragna or Behrâm, and the souls of the good. In the early religion of India the three first Vedas are chiefly liturgical. The Rig-Veda contains about a thousand hymns in ten books, the first seven of which consist of hymns addressed to Agni, the fire-god, to Indra, and others. In the ninth book are classed hymns intended to be sung while the Soma offering is in preparation. The Sâma-Veda takes most of its materials from the Rig, and adapts them to the purposes of chanting. The Yajur-Veda consists of formulas proper to accompany the various actions of religious worship, and belongs to a time when the worship had become complicated and the importance of the priest had increased. The Romans were in their early days a devout and reverential, but also a formal people. The same adherence to legal precedent which built up their law appeared in the minute observances of their religion; formulas of words had a certain independent power; a breach of silence at prayer and sacrifice was ominous; the evocations addressed to the divinities of conquered towns that they would leave their old abodes were conceived to have the force of a charm; and they were afraid to let it be known what god was the especial guardian of Rome, lest their enemies should practice the same evocations against them. In India, also, prayer was thought of as having a magical power. The old invocation of the sun, called the Gayatri, is of such potence, it is said, that the Brahmin can obtain happiness by it whether he performs other religious services or not. The repeating of it in the morning dawn until the sun appears removes every unperceived fault of the night, and a similar repetition in the evening twilight is equally effectual (Wuttke, *u. s.* vol. ii, § 106, from Manu, ii, 87, 101, 102).

The offerings and sacrifices of a public nature were usually attended by lustrations, which are not to be confounded with purgations of a propitiatory character practiced by those who sought cleansing from guilt. Both kinds of lustrations, however, had the same moral idea, the necessity of a pure mind, for their foundation. In or near the Greek temples, and marking the division line between profane and sacred ground, stood the vessel of holy water (*perirrhanterium*), for the uses of those who entered the pure interior. After this preparation came the offerings with prayers and praises. In some nations there was a time when these offerings were only unbloody, or at least the bloody offerings or sacrifices played a small part. The institutions of Numa sanctioned only such things as the fruits of the field, and the *mola salsa*, or broken grains of spelt mixed with salt. Not even incense was then used by the simple Romans. The usages changed greatly in this particular at a later time, owing to the influence of the Greek settlements in Southern Italy. Among the Hindûs horses and horned cattle were frequent victims in the earlier times, but afterwards became less common. In the books of the Avesta little or nothing is said of animal sacrifices, but it is prescribed that for certain offences (as a fine or an atonement?) a hundred smaller cattle should be offered up. But in Persian history, whether in accordance with or in violation of the precepts of the religion, mention is made of animal victims. Xerxes on his march towards Greece honored the Trojan Athena by sacrificing a thousand cows. At the Strymon the Magi offered up white horses, and at a spot in Thrace called the Nine Roads nine boys and nine girls from among the native inhabitants were buried alive. Strabo remarks that no pieces of the victim were given, as elsewhere, to the gods, since they had need only of the animal's soul. Instead of victims, the great offering in the Indian religion of the Vedic period was that of the *Soma*, an asclepias or some other plant of the milk-weed tribe, the stalk of which was crushed between stones, and the narcotic juice, mixed with butter, was left to ferment. This mixture was supposed to nourish, strengthen, and even intoxicate the gods. The most absurd superstitions were connected with this sacred substance: it was originally in heaven, and came down with the rain to the earth; it was something that a man might offer to the higher gods only, and could feel that he had rendered a favor by it, and had a right to a return. Finally the Soma became identified with the moon-god as the cause of fruitfulness. An offering called by a corresponding name in Iran, the *Haoma*, and obtained from the same or similar plants, played a great part in the services of the old religion of that country. Similar notions that the divine powers partook of and enjoyed sacrifices which were offered to them may be found elsewhere in many religions, but probably none so extravagant.

Sacrifices of victims, or bloody offerings, were sooner or later almost universal. What victim should be selected depended on a variety of considerations. Sometimes it was an animal that injured the gifts presented to a god, or injured that which he protected, as a goat, the destroyer of the vine, was offered to Dionysus, and a swine, which rooted in the ground, to Demeter. Sometimes it was an animal under the god's protection. Sometimes, again, there was a symbolism in the sacrifice, as when a black-colored animal was offered to the Dii Manes at Rome, or a heifer never yoked to Minerva. In Egypt, notwithstanding that the number of sacred animals was very considerable, other victims were selected for offerings. Thus a pig was presented to the god answering to Hercules and Æsculapius, but not to Sarapis; a sheep to the mother of the gods, but not to Isis; a cat to Horus; a cockroach, or some kind of *blatta* at least, to the goddess identified with Thetis.

Throughout a large part of the world human beings were offered as sacrifices to the gods of the heathen, and the farther back we penetrate into antiquity the more common is this horrid practice. There are two forms of it, the sacrifice of children, especially of the first-born, and that of grown-up men. The first appears in countries where the worship of Moloch—perhaps of Baal and other kindred gods—prevailed, as in Phœnicia, the land of Canaan, Moab, perhaps, and Carthage, and traces of the same may be found in the island of Crete. Also in some parts of this continent the same practice seems to have gained some footing. To this the prophet Micah (vi, 7), the law of Moses (Lev. xx, 2–5), the historical books (2 Kings xvi, 3; comp. Deut. xii, 31), and other parts of the Scriptures refer, unless in some of these passages simple lustration by fire without burning may be intended. But far more common was the sacrifice of grown-up men. As nations grew more humane, this practice was softened down; either men condemned to death, who had to die at any rate, were selected as the victims, or a person was scourged or cut only until the blood ran, or the rite was performed upon an image substituted for a human being. Such substitution can be traced in Egypt, Greece, and Rome. In India human sacrifices were introduced, when the obscene and cruel Siva religion spread among the people, into his worship and that of his wife Durga, or Kali. The Kalika-Purâna is cited by Ward and others as saying that Kali "felt a pleasure for a month in the blood of fish offered to her; for nine months in that of wild animals; for a hundred years in that of a tiger; and in that of a lion, a stag, or a man, for a thousand years. Three men's blood appease her for a hundred thousand years. The offering of blood is like the drink of the gods (the Soma); Brahma and all the gods assemble at the offering" (Ward, iii, 174; Wuttke, ii, 355; *Asiat. Res.* v, 371). In other countries, as in Gaul, in Mexico, in Peru, above all in Mexico, this practice assumed frightful proportions, showing how man can be debased and made savage by his religion. There is ground for believing that cannibalism may have grown out of the sacrificial feasts after battle, when an enemy was slaughtered to the gods who gave the victory.

We ask at this stage of the subject, what was the meaning of pagan offerings? As they understood their religious rites, the unbloody were expressions of gratitude and acknowledgment for protection. Whatever the form of offering was, the god was conceived of as being pleased with them. How did they account for this pleasure? There are traces of the conception that the gods enjoyed offerings as we enjoy food. The faith of the Aryan race in regard to the Soma offering, and the idea that the smoke of burning sacrifices was agreeable to the divinities, show the grosser forms of anthropomorphism. Sacrifices of a public nature may be regarded as feasts to which a god or gods were invited; the altar was the public hearth; the victim was partaken of by all the worshippers after due purgations, libations, and other preparations; the god had his share of the meal, which went up to him in the skies. At the bottom of all this, however, the feeling no doubt was that the worshipper gave up something of value, and thus showed his devotion to his protector. But this explanation does not exhaust the entire meaning of animal sacrifices. Thus certain animals not used for food, as dogs, horses, wolves, bears, and even asses, were in some Greek rites the appropriate victims, the probable reason for which is given by K. Ottfried Müller (*Dorier*, i, 279) that animals hated by a particular god he would be pleased to see bleeding at his altar. The sacrifice of a dog to Hecate may be accounted for from the dog's baying at the moon, and of a stag to Artemis because she was a huntress.

But there were also propitiatory sacrifices required by a feeling of guilt and of dread. Here life is given for life. It seems impossible to put less meaning into such rites than that the worshipper acknowledged his life to be forfeited, and hoped by something which not only had value but was also a living object, to avert through confession made in this way the divine wrath. Human sacrifices were still more significant. In the case of children, especially of the first-born, the supposition that the first-fruits were consecrated and devoted, as an expression of gratitude, does not seem at all natural. It was, in short, a sacrifice made for the benefit of the family, caused by a painful sense of ill desert; it was giving the fruit of the body for the sin of the soul. The more general sacrifices of human beings, especially of grown-up men, which took place most frequently where some great crime had been committed by persons unknown, or when pestilence or defeat by enemies betokened the wrath of protecting divinities, must be regarded as an acknowledgment of sin, and a way of transferring and appeasing divine anger. Wrath demanded or exposed to death. The death of one or more freed the rest. In the Greek myths, the self-devotion of an innocent virgin, like Macaria in the *Heraclidæ* of Euripides, and in Roman history more clearly the act of the two Decii, father and son, their self-consecration, and in the case of the younger the devotion of the hostile army, point to a faith that victory might be secured by voluntary death for others. This is the highest form that human sacrifice took in heathen antiquity.

It remains to give the briefest possible estimate of the heathen religions in their influences on man. With regard to their lower forms, as seen in wild races, they are to a great extent religions of fear; dread of superior powers weighs on the minds even of light-hearted African negroes. A feeling of sin, and yet a very faint and half-conscious one, must be presupposed in their minds in order that this dread may exist; but the dread is greatly increased by magic practices which are kept up by priestly imposture. In the higher races it would be folly to deny that in the course of time, and partly by the help of moral sentiments which must grow up in well-ordered civil communities, the religions of paganism have been elevated in their moral tone; that under them men have more or less risen into art, freedom, philosophy; that great individual characters have appeared in such countries, and that tolerably high standards of moral excellence have counteracted depraving influences from bad religions or bad institutions. But there are some necessary evils in polytheism, owing to its very nature. They honor *power* rather than *character*, since it was divine power in objects of nature that impressed itself chiefly on the minds of men. Hence absolutism and ambition were under the protection of the religious sentiment. It was the worship of beings of *limited attributes*, more or less *under the control of fate*, who were for the most part *not from eternity*—not authors of the world, but parts of the world, local in their spheres of operation and functions. There could therefore be no *universal* religion. Buddhism spread because it was an atheism which abolished caste and limited transmigration, and which allowed the cultus in the countries where it travelled to continue. There was, further, a want of *allegiance* on the part of the worshipper to his divinity; even ridicule of them in the comic mimes of the Greeks was allowed, and sometimes the people treated the idols with great indignity. These religions could not resist any increase of knowledge, but gave way to scepticism, and this brought on national ruin. But the heaviest charge almost everywhere against paganism was its sensuality, not in the lower races only, but in the higher; not so much in earlier times as at the acme of refinement. The mythologies were impure. The gods were depraved, and examples of wickedness. Licentiousness was put under the protection of religion. On this point a long chapter might be written; but it is better to pass over this in silence, and to close with saying that the Apostle to the Gentiles was no maligner when he wrote the first chapter of the Epistle to the Romans.

III. *Literature.*—From the immense mass of works relating to the pagan religions we can only make a selection.

1. *Works on the Philosophy of Religion or of Paganism.*—Constant, *De la Religion*, etc. (Paris, 1824–1831, 5 vols.); Hegel, *Religionsphilosophie* (2 vols.; in *Werke*, vols. xi, xii, Berlin, 1840); Wuttke, *Gesch. d. Heidenthums* (Breslau, 1852, 1853, 2 vols., unfinished); Schelling, *Philos. d. Mythologie* (in *Werke*, pt. ii, vols. i, ii, Stuttgard, 1856, 1857); Pfleiderer, *Das Wesen d. Religion* (Leips. 1869, 2 vols.); several works of Max Müller, as his *Science of Religion*, etc.

2. *Explanations of Mythology.*—(*a.*) From the Old Testament, its events and characters, as by Vossius, *De theologia gentili* (Amsterdam, 1642); Huet, *Demonstr. evangel.* (Paris, 1672); and others of that school, now nearly forgotten. (*b.*) K. Ottf. Müller, *Prolegom. zu einer wissenschaftl. Mythologie* (Götting. 1825); Max Müller in his second course of *Lectures on Language*.

3. *General Pragmatical Treatises on Heathen Religions or Mythologies.*—Banier (Paris, 1710–1738) and Jacob Bryant, now forgotten; Creuzer, *Symbolik* (1st ed. 1819–1821, 4 vols.), with Mone's *Heidenth. d. nördl. Europas* (Leips. und Darmstadt, 1822, 1823, 2 vols.); Meiners, *Allgemeine Gesch. d. Religionen* (Hanover, 1806, 1807, 2 vols.); Stuhr, *Relig. Systeme des Orients* (Berlin, 1835–1838, 2 vols.); Schwenk, *Mythologie* (Frankf.-on-the Main, 1843–1853, 7 vols.); Eckermann, *Lehrb. der Religionsgesch. u. Mythologie* (Halle, 1848, 1849, 4 vols.).

4. *The Ancient Mythiographers.*—(*a.*) Heathen authors, as Lucian, *De Dea Syra;* Plutarch, *De Isidi et Osiri* (Parthey's ed., Berlin, 1850). (*b.*) The attacks on heathenism by early Christian writers, as Clement of Alex. in his *Protrept.* and in part of the *Stromata;* Theodoret, *De Græcor. affect. cur.*, with the Latin writers, esp. Arnobius, Augustine in parts of the *City of God*, Julius Firmicus, Minucius Felix, Lactantius, etc.

5. *Writers on the Greek Religion and Mythology.*—Lobeck's *Aglaophamus on the Mysteries*, etc. (Königsb. 1829, 2 vols.); Jacobi, *Handwörterb. d. gr. u. röm. Mythol.* (Leips. 1835, 2 vols.); Preller's *Demeter u. Persephone* (Hamb. 1837), his articles in Pauly's *Encyklop.*, and his *Griech. Mythol.* (3d ed. edited by Plew, Berlin, 1872–1876, 2 vols.); Welcker's *Griech. Götterlehre* (Göttingen, 1857–1862, 3 vols.); Gerhard, *Griech. Mythol.* (Berlin, 1854, 1855, 2 vols.); Braun, *Griechische Götterlehre* (Hamb. u. Gotha, 1854); the second vol. of Hermann's *Lehrb. d. Griechischen Alterthums* (1st ed. Heidelberg, 1846); Grote's *Greece*, vol. i; and the writers on Greek art.

6. *Writers on the Roman and Italic Religions.*—K. O. Müller, *Die Etrusker* (Berlin, 1828, 2 vols.); Gerhard, *Die Götter d. Etrusker;* Hartung, *Die Relig. d. Römer* (Erlangen, 1836, 2 vols.); Constant, *Du Polythéisme Rom.* (Paris, 1833, 2 vols.); Klausen, *Aeneas u. die Penaten* (Gotha, 1839); Ambrosch, *Studien* (Breslau, 1839); Merkel's ed. of Ovid's *Fasti* (Berlin, 1841); Marquardt, in vol. iv of the Bekker-Marquardt *Handb. d. Röm. Alt.* (Leips. 1856); Preller's *Röm. Mythologie* (Berlin, 1858).

7. *Egyptian Mythology.*—Jablonski's *Pantheon Ægypt.* (Frankf.-on-the-Oder, 1750–1752); Lepsius, *Ueber d. ersten ägyp. Götterkreis* (in the "Trans. of the Berlin Acad." 1851); also his *Todtenbuch* (Leips. 1842); Bunsen, *Aegypten's Stelle*, etc. (in Germ. and Engl.; bk. i esp. treats of the religion); Duncker, *Gesch. des Alterth.* (1st ed. Berl. 1852; vol. i treats of Egypt; four editions have appeared); Röth, *Gesch. der abendländ. Philos.* (in vol. i, Mannheim, 1862); also works of Wilkinson and others on Egyptian antiq., Brugsch, etc.

8. *Shemitic Religions.*—Mövers, *Die Phönizier* (Berl. u. Bonn, 1849–1856, 2 vols.); Duncker (*ut sup.* in vol. ii); the writers on Assyr. and Babyl. monuments, as Layard, the Rawlinsons, Oppert, G. Smith, Le Normant, Schrader, in his *Assyr.-babylon. Keilinschriften* (Leips. 1872), and *Keilinschr. u. das Alte Testament* (Giessen, 1872).

9. *Iranian Religion.*—Spiegel, in his *Avesta*, with introductions, and in other works; Windischman's *Zoroastrische Stud.* (Basle, 1831); Röth (*ut sup.* in vol. i); Haug, *Essays* (Bombay, 1862); Duncker (*ut sup.* in vol. ii, of which the third ed. [1867] appeared also with the title, *Gesch. d. Aryer.*).

10. *Indian Religions.*—Besides the writers on the Vedic literature and transl. of the Vedas, Lassen, *Ind. Alterthumskunde* (4 vols.; in vol. i, p. 735–792); Duncker (*ut sup.* in vol. ii); Max Müller, in several works; Whitney, *Or. and Ling. Studies* (New York, 1873); Wuttke (*ut sup.* in vol. i); Ward's *View*, etc. (Lond. 1822, 3 vols.); with the writers on Buddhism, as Bournouf, Köppen, etc.

11. *Chinese Religions.*—Wuttke (*ut sup.* in vol. ii); a number of transl., as of the Shu-King, by Gaubi and De Guignes (Paris, 1770); of Meng-Tsen, by Stanislas Julien (Paris, 1824); the Y-King, by Mohl (1834); Tshuhi, by Neumann (1837); Legge's *Chinese Classics;* also Stuhr's *Reichs-Religion d. Chinesen;* Plath, *Relig. u. Cultus d. alten Chinesen* (2 pts., reprinted from "Transactions of the Royal Bavarian Academy"); together with works of Du Halde, Gutzlaff, Williams, De Mailla, etc.

12. *Northern European and Asiatic Religions.*—(*a.*) Celtic: Davies, *Myth. of the Druids* (Lond. 1809); Mone and Eckermann (*ut sup.*). (*b.*) German: J. Grimm, *Deutsche Mythol.* (1st ed. Göttingen, 1835); transl. of the *Edda;* Anderson, *Northern Mythol.* (Chicago, 1874). (*c.*) Slavic: Mone, Ackermann, Schwenk (*ut sup.*). (*d.*) Finnish: Castrén, *Vorlesungen über d. fin. Mythol.*

13. *Religions of Lower Races.*—Waitz, *Anthrop.* (Leips. 1859–1872, 6 vols., the last by Garland); Tyler's *Primitive Culture* (Lond. 1871, 2 vols.); J. G. Müller, *Amer. Urrelig.* (Basle, 1867); Brinton, *Myths of the New World;* Wuttke (*ut sup.* in vol. i); Meiners (*ut sup.*); Des Brosses, *Dieux Fétiches;* Schultze, *Fetischismus* (Leips. 1871); Morgan, *Anc. Society* (N. Y. 1877); accounts by Schoolcraft, Catlin, and earlier writers on the Amer. Indians; Galitzin's transl. of Wrangell, *Le Nord et la Sibérie;* histories of Mexico and Peru; travellers in Africa; Ellis's *Polynesia*, etc. In Waitz copious lists of voyagers and travellers are given. (T. D. W.)

Pomarancio is the surname of Cristoforo Roncalli, a painter of the Florentine school. He was born in 1552 at Pomarancio, and was a pupil of Niccolo Circignani, who took him to Rome quite young to assist him in his works. At the same time, under the direction of Ignazio Danti, he helped, with Tempesti, Rafaellino da Reggio, the younger Palma, and some others, in finishing the logge of Raffaelle. This work being achieved, he painted, on slate, for Santa Maria degli Angeli at Rome, a *Death of Ananias and Sapphira*, a masterpiece that was deemed worthy to be copied on mosaic for the basilica of St. Peter. After painting at San Giovanni di Latrano *The Baptism of Constantine*, at San Giacomo *The Resurrection of Christ*, at San Gregorio a *St. Andrew*, one of his best works, he was selected to paint the cupola of the church of Loretto, getting the preference of Guido and Caravaggio. The latter avenged himself by having his rival's face disfigured by a spadassin. The cupola of Loretto, in the ornamentation of which Roncalli was assisted by Jaconetti, Pietro Lombardo, and Lorenzo Garbieri, offers a great variety and abundance of subjects. Although these paintings have suffered much, some heads of uncommon beauty are still discernible. Some subjects from the life of the Virgin, executed by Pomarancio, were the occasion of his being made a knight of the Order of Christ by Paul V. He worked in divers other places of the Picentino: there is a *Noli me tangere* at the Ermitani of San Severino; a *St. Francis in Prayers*, at San Agostino of Ancona; a *St. Palatia* at Osimo; and at the Palazzo Galli of the same place is a *Judgment of Solomon*, which Lanzi asserts to be his best fresco. During a rather protracted stay at Genoa, he embellished its churches and palaces with works fit to compete with the best of the century. We mention further among

his paintings *The Martyrdom of St. Simon*, at the Pinacothek of Munich, and a *Virgin shedding Tears over the Body of her Son*, at the Museum of Madrid. His manner is very variable, and reminds now of the Roman, now of the Florentine school; sometimes it comes near to the Venetian school. His colors are brighter and more brilliant in his frescos than in his oil-paintings. He likes to adorn his subjects with beautiful landscapes of great effect. Unfortunately, following the example of his masters, he was too often assisted by his pupils; hence some weak parts in his works. He is charged also with some errors of perspective. He died at Rome in 1626. See Lanzi, *Hist. of Painters* (see Index); Spooner, *Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts*, s. v. Roncalli.

Pomarancio is also a surname by which Niccolo Circignani is generally known. He was a painter of the Florentine school of the 16th century, and was born at Pomarancio, near Volterra. He was probably a disciple of Titian, whose assistant he was in his works in the great room of the Belvedere, in the Vatican. He arrived at Rome quite young, and painted there a number of frescos, among which we mention the cupola of St. Pudentiana, *The Lord surrounded by Angels* (tribune of S. Giovanni Paolo), *St. John the Baptist* (church of the Consolazione), and thirty-two horrible *Scenes of Martyrdom* (San Stefano Rotondo), vigorous, but executed with little care. It is probable that Pomarancio spent the last years of his life in his native place, where he died after 1591; for the works which must be referred to his last period are all among numerous paintings of his preserved in Volterra. At S. Giusto a *Descent from the Cross* is signed "Nicolaus Circinianus di Ripomarance pingebat A.D. 1580;" and at the Battisterio, on an *Ascension*, one of his best works, we read, "Nicolaus de Circignanis Volaterranus pingebat anno 1591." In the cathedral of the same city there remains of the frescos with which he had adorned the tribune a *God-Father;* at St. Pietro, in Selci, an *Annunciation* (oil-painting), and at San Francesco a *Pietà*. Pomarancio was frequently aided by his pupils, the best known of whom are Cristoforo Roncalli, called also Pomarancio, and his own son, Antonio Circignani, who remained in obscurity during his father's lifetime, and came suddenly into repute by the paintings with which he adorned a chapel of Santa Maria Traspontina at Rome: they exhibit some features successfully borrowed from Baroccio. At Florence, under the portico of the hospital of S. Matteo, he painted some frescos in 1614: *The Disputation with the Doctors; The Massacre of the Innocents; The Adoration of the Kings;* and *The Nativity*. Called at a mature age to Città di Castello, Antonio lived there several years, painting for churches and private persons. It is believed that at the age of sixty years he settled again in the village of Pomarancio, the cradle of his family, where he died in 1630. See Lanzi, *Hist. of the Painters;* Spooner, *Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts*, s. v.

Pomarius, Samuel Baumgarten, a German Lutheran divine, was born April 26, 1624, near Wintzig, in Silesia. His father, a miller, was opposed to his predilection for study, and he had many obstacles to surmount before he could get through his course of studies at the college. He pursued his studies at Breslau, Frankfort, and Wittenberg. On Jan. 1, 1653, he was called to Beshin, in Silesia, but soon went to that portion of Berlin then known as Cologne-on-the-Spree as deacon of St. Peter's, and from thence to Magdeburg as pastor of St. Jacobi. In 1665 he was made rector and professor of theology at Eperies, in Upper Hungaria. On account of the persecution against the evangelical party, he had to leave that position in 1673, and went to Wittenberg, where he lectured on theology, preaching at the same time. In 1674 he went as pastor and superintendent to Lubeck, where he died, March 2, 1683. Almost all the writings of Pomarius are of a polemical nature, and intended to defend the Lutheran tenets. He was engaged in many theological disputes with Jesuits, and even with Protestant theologians. We mention among his works, *De Noctambulis* (Wittenberg, 1649, 1650, 4to):—*De moderatione theologicâ* (ibid. 1674, 4to):—*Dissertatio de veritate religionis Lutheranæ:*—*Comment. in epistolam Judæ:* — *Analysin et exegesin articulorum Aug. Confessionis:* — *De majestate S. Scripturæ*, etc. See Jöcher, *Gelehrten-Lexikon*, s. v.; Chaufepié, *Dict. Hist.* s. v.; Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirch.-Lexikon*, s. v. (B. P.)

Pome (Lat. *pomum*, i. e. an apple) is in ecclesiastic language (1) a cup or ball filled with perfumes; (2) a ball of metal filled with hot water, and used by the priest to warm his hands at the altar. It was sometimes made four-footed and with rings of silver.

Pomegranate, the *Punica granatum* of Linnæus, is by universal consent acknowledged to denote the Heb. *rimmôn* (רִמּוֹן, also רִמֹּן, so called, according to Gesenius, from an Arab. root signifying *marrow;* but according to Fürst, from one signifying *blood-red;* Sept. ῥοά, ῥοιά, ῥοΐσκος, κώδων; Vulg. *malum punicum, malum granatum, malogranatum*), a word which occurs frequently in the O. T., and is used to designate either the pomegranate-tree or its fruit. It is described in the works of the Arabs by the name *roman*. The pomegranate is a native of Asia; and we may trace it from Syria, through Persia, even to the mountains of Northern India. It is common in Northern Africa. The pomegranate is not likely to have been a native of Egypt; it must, however, have been cultivated there at a very early period, as the Israelites, when in the desert, lamented the loss of its fruit in the wilderness of Zin (Numb. xx, 5)—this "is no place of figs, or of vines, or of pomegranates." The tree, with its characteristic calyx-crowned fruit, is easily recognised on the Egyptian sculptures (Wilkinson, *Anc. Egyptians*, i, 36, ed. 1854). That it was produced in Palestine during the same early ages is evident from the spies bringing some back when sent into Canaan to see what kind of a land it was; for we are told that they "came unto the brook of Eshcol, and cut down from thence a branch with one cluster of grapes, etc., and they brought of the pomegranates and of the figs" (Numb. xiii, 53; comp. also Deut. viii, 8). The villages or towns of Rimmon (Josh. xv, 32), Gath-rimmon (xxi, 25), En-rimmon (Neh. xi, 29), possibly derived their names from pomegranate-trees which grew in their vicinity. These trees suffered occasionally from the devastations of locusts (Joel i, 12; see also Hag. ii, 19). Mention is made of "an orchard of pomegranates" in Cant. iv, 13; and in iv, 3 the cheeks (A. V. "temples") of the Beloved are compared to a section of "pomegranate within the locks," in allusion to the beautiful rosy color of the fruit. Carved figures of the pomegranate adorned the tops of the pillars in Solomon's Temple (1 Kings vii, 18, 20, 42; 2 Kings xxv, 17; 2 Chron. iii, 16; iv, 13); and worked representations of this fruit, in blue, purple, and scarlet, ornamented the hem of the robe of the ephod (Exod. xxviii, 33, 34; xxxix, 24). This is explained mystically by Philo (*Opera*, ii, 153, 226), and differently by Meyer (*Blätter f. höhere Wahrheit*, x, 85; see also Bähr, *Symbolik*, ii, 123 sq.). The pomegranate seems also to have been used as a holy symbol in heathen religions (see Bähr, *Symbol.* ii, 122). Among the later Jews the pomegranate was used in some cases as a measure (Mishna, *Chelim*, xvii, 1, 4). Mention is made of "spiced wine of the juice of the pomegranate" in Cant viii, 2; with this may be compared the pomegranate-wine (ῥοΐτης οἶνος) of which Dioscorides (v, 44) speaks, and which is still used in the East. Chardin says that great quantities of it were made in Persia, both for home consumption and for exportation, in his time (*Script. Herb.* p. 399; Harmer, *Obs.* i, 377). Being common in Syria and Persia, it must have early attracted the attention of Eastern nations. In the present day it is highly valued, and travellers describe

the pomegranate as being delicious throughout Persia. The late Sir A. Burnes states that the famous pomegranates without seeds are grown in gardens under the snowy hills, near the river Cabul. It is still found in Palestine (Scholz, *Reis.* p. 140), Arabia (Niebuhr, *Beschr.* p. 148), Egypt (Pococke, *East.* i, 319), East and West Indies, and also in the southern countries of Europe (comp. Ritter, *Erdkunde*, xi, 549 sq.). The pomegranate was well known to the Greeks, being the ῥοά of Theophrastus and of Dioscorides (i, 151). It was employed as a medicine by Hippocrates, and is mentioned by Homer under the name *side*, supposed to be of Phœnician origin; Bœot. σίδη (Athen. xiv, 650), and called by Pliny *Punica arbor* (xiii, 38). The Romans gave it the name of *Punica* because the tree was introduced from Carthage; its English name is derived from the *pomum granatum* ("grained apple") of the Romans. Various parts of the plant were employed medicinally, as, for instance, the root, or rather its bark, the flowers which are called κύτινος by Dioscorides, and the double flowers βαλαύστιον; also the rind of the pericarp, called *malicorium* by the Romans, and σίδιον by Dioscorides. Some of the properties which these plants possess make them useful both as drugs and as medicines. In a natural state it is but a bush, eight or ten feet high, with a straight stem and a large number of branches, a red bark, lance-formed leaves of a bright-green color, each on its own stem; and bears flowers which stand separate, star-shaped, and without odor, of a deep-red color, and producing a round fruit, green and partly red on the surface, but yellow within (comp. Cant. iv, 3, and Celsius, i, 275. The Romans called this fruit *malum punicum*, the *Punic apple*, but sometimes also *malum granatum*, Plin. xiii, 34; xvi, 36; Marcell. *Med.* c. 27). It is of the shape and size of an orange, three or four inches in diameter, divided into longitudinal apartments, in which the grains lie as compactly as corn on the cob, and look much like a pale-red Indian corn, save that they are nearly transparent. They ripen about the middle of October, and remain in good condition all winter (Thomson, *Land and Book*, ii, 392; but in August, according to Russell, *Nat. Hist. of Aleppo*, i, 107). They are uncommonly fleshy, juicy, and sweet to the taste (Pliny, xiii, 34), and are much enjoyed by the Orientals as a refreshment (Carne, i, 8). The rind is used in the manufacture of morocco leather, and, together with the bark, is sometimes used medicinally to expel the tape-worm. Russell (*Nat. Hist. of Aleppo*, i, 85, 2d ed.) states that "lemons have by no means superseded the pomegranate; the latter is more easily procured through the winter, and is often in cooking preferred to the lemon. The tree is much cultivated in the gardens and orchards of Palestine and Northern Syria. The fruit is seldom ripe earlier than the end of August, when most families lay in a stock for winter consumption. There are three varieties of the fruit—one sweet, another very acid, and a third, in which both qualities are agreeably blended. The juice of the sour fruit is often used instead of vinegar. The others are cut open when served up to table; or the grains, taken out and besprinkled with sugar or rose-water, are brought to table in saucers. The grains likewise, fresh as well as dried, make a considerable ingredient in cookery." He adds that the trees are apt to suffer much in severe winters from extraordinary cold. See Celsius, *Hierobot.* i, 271 sq.; Oken, *Lehrbuch der Botanik*, II, ii, 917 sq.; Geiger, *Pharmaceutische Botanik*, ii, 1417 sq.; Plenk, *Plant. Med. Tab.* p. 376; Layard, *Nineveh*, ii, 233.

The Pomegranate.

Pomerania, a province of Prussia, situated in the north-east, and bordering on the Baltic, was once the possession of the Slaves and Swedes, and has such a peculiar ecclesiastical record that we here take space to detail it. In the 6th century some Slavic tribes settled in Northern Germany, and called the coast along the Baltic Sea *Pomorze*, i. e. on the sea-coast. The foremost deities of this Wendish people were Belbog, Czernibog, Radogost, Swantewit, Herovit, Gerovit, and Triglav.

I. *Introduction of Christianity.*—About the year 1000 the bishopric of Colberg was founded as a dependence of the archbishopric of Gnesen, and Reinbern appointed bishop; but Reinbern having gone to Kief to attend the celebration of the nuptials of the daughter of Boleslaus with the son of the czar Wladimir, and stopping at the Russian court, this commencement proved fruitless. The attempt of Bernhard, a Spanish monk, to introduce Christianity, which was made a century afterwards, was equally unsuccessful. But Boleslaus Krzyvousti, king of Poland, having subjected to his rule part of Pomerania, and wishing to make Christians of his new subjects, desired Otto, bishop of Bamberg, to bring those heathens the light of the Gospel. Otto, having obtained the agreement of pope Calixtus II, set on his way, April 19, 1124, over Prague, Breslau, Posen, and Gnesen, where he stopped seven days and celebrated Whitsuntide. Wratislav, the Pomeranian chief, who, as a boy, had been christened at Merseburg, came to meet the apostle, and gave him two of his warriors to guide him to Pyritz. In this place the pagans were engaged in the celebration of one of their feasts. Otto preached to the 4000 men assembled at that solemnity, and a week had scarcely elapsed, during which he and his associates were busy instructing the daily increasing crowd in the Christian doctrines, when the bishop prescribed a three days' fasting, after which more than 7000 heathens were admitted to baptism. After erecting an altar, and leaving one of his priests, Otto went *via* Stargard to Kammin, the residence of the prince. The wife of the latter received the apostle with great joy. He stopped fifty days, converted 3585 persons, laid the foundation of a church, and left a priest, for whose maintenance the prince had granted some lands. Julin, afterwards called Wollin, mostly inhabited by pirates, was not so favorably disposed towards the new religion; but, after more or less persecution, the Christians were permitted to leave the town unscathed and cross the Divenow. Here Otto, after resting a few days, entered upon negotiations with the inhabitants: but all he could obtain from the chiefs of the city was that they would direct themselves by the example of Stettin, the oldest and noblest city of Pomerania. Thither Otto repaired, crossing the Haff, in company with Redamir, a citizen

of Julin, and his son. The Stettinians at first turned a deaf ear to Otto's exhortations. Twice a week, on the market-days, he proceeded to the market-place with his eighteen priests in sacerdotal ornaments, and preached before the multitude. The people from the country listened to his words less reluctantly than the denizens of the city; yet, after two months had thus elapsed, the latter declared that they would accept baptism, if Poland would consent to diminish the tribute, to grant to the country a permanent peace, and to draw up a deed of the transaction. The bishop, whose meek ways, friendly behavior, and works of charity had won every heart, obtained those concessions from the Poles, and on Oct. 25 he christened both sons of the prominent citizen Domizlav, the father soon afterwards; then five hundred relations and other connections of that powerful family—an example which considerably influenced the people generally. The four temples of the city were destroyed, and Otto sent to the pope the three heads of the idol Triglav. After establishing two churches, one in honor of St. Adalbert—the patron saint of the Slaves—the other under the name of Peter and Paul, Otto, leaving two of his priests in the city, visited the towns of Garz and Lübezin, left a priest in each, and repaired to Julin, where the intelligence of Stettin's conversion had already been received. The inhabitants came to meet him on his way, and begged his pardon for their former conduct. Otto consecrated two altars in the city, interdicted the burying of the dead in forests, prohibited piracy, the intercourse with idolators, polygamy, and the inveterate custom of killing new-born girls when there were some girls already in the family. In the ensuing winter Otto, passing through Dodona (now Dodow), where he laid the foundations of two churches, went to Colberg and Belgard, the inhabitants of which did not prove open to his teachings. Hence he returned to Pyritz, Stettin, and Julin, where he confirmed the proselytes, inaugurated the building of churches, and then journeyed over Dodona and Belgard to Colberg, where he buried the deacon Hermann, drowned in the Persante. On Ash-Wednesday he set on his way homewards, having converted 22,166 persons and founded eleven churches; he travelled through Poland, Silesia, and Bohemia, and arrived at Bamberg on the Saturday before Easter, March 29. Epidemics and great mortality having afflicted Stettin, the idolators pointed at those plagues as being the punition visited by the gods upon the apostates. This caused a general relapse, and made Otto sensible of the necessity of interfering in person, and of converting the cities of Demmin, Götzkow, Usedom, and Wolgast, still left to idolatry. He set out April 19, 1128, crossed Saxony and Mecklenburg, carrying on fifty wagons the articles required for fitting out the churches. June 10 Wratislav assembled at Usedom the nobles of the left bank of the Oder: they were baptized, and promised to protect the Christian faith in their dominions. Otto longed to gain also to Christianity the inhabitants of the island of Rügen, but insuperable obstacles lay in his way. In Stettin, where a very few had remained faithful, Otto was threatened with death; he at once repaired to the church of Paul and Peter, and while the song of hymns filled the vaults of the church, the sound of arms was heard outside. The crowd calmed down by and by, and dispersed; a sermon in the market-place, whither the clergy repaired in procession under the protection of Wirtska, retrieved the strayed flock. Julin followed again the example of Stettin. The saint now visited again all the places of Pomerania where he had worked, and, journeying through Poland, reached Bamberg Dec. 20. Though he did not again see the country he had converted, he watched from afar over these young Christian communities to the time of his death, which occurred June 30, 1139. The conversion of Pomerania, and its accession to the German empire in 1181, induced a number of monks and colonists to emigrate to the country of the Wends, depopulated by long wars. Wratislav, the first Christian prince, was in 1134 murdered by a heathen at Stolpe, near Anelam. On the spot where the deed had been committed a little church was built, and in 1153 the first monastery was founded there, and occupied by Benedictines from Berg, near Magdeburg. We mention some other notable monasteries: Kolbatz, 1163; Belbuck, 1170; Eldena, 1207; Brukow and Neucamp, 1231; Hiddensee, 1299; Pudagla, 1308; all of which stood under "abbates baculati." The following places of pilgrimage were distinguished: 1. The Gollenberg, near Cöslin, celebrated throughout Europe, with a church consecrated to the Virgin, the spire of which served as a light-house; 2. The Revekohl, near Schmolsin (circle of Stolpe), a mountain on which a church had been founded in honor of St. Nicholas, the patron of mariners; 3. The Holy Mountain, south of the city of Pollnow, from 1290; 4. Bernstein; 5. Wusseken, near Cöslin, from 1395; 6. Kenz, near Barth, from 1405; 7. Werben, from 1474. While the largest part of the duchy of Pomerania, with part of the Ukermark, the Neumark, and of what is now called Western Prussia, was a dependency of the bishopric of Kammin, the western part of the country belonged to the diocese of Schwerin, and the island of Rügen, connected with Pomerania in 1325, resorted to the Danish bishopric of Röskilde. The names of the bishops of Kammin are as follows: 1. Adalbert, a Franconian (1128–1162), resided at Julin. 2. Conrad (1162–1185). The seat of the bishops was transferred to Kammin, because Julin was destroyed by the Danes in 1175. 3. Siegfried (1186–1202). Under his administration there was a considerable immigration of Germans, who founded a number of cities. Jacob Beringer, a knight from Bamberg, who settled in Stettin, built in 1187 for the Germans the church of St. Jacob, with 30 altars. 4. Sigwin (1202–1217) preached himself. While he was bishop Stralsund was built, in 1209; and in 1214 the Templars arrived in Pomerania, and, owing to the great esteem they enjoyed, became counsellors of the government. In November, 1216, Christian, the apostle and bishop of Prussia, visited Pomerania, his native country, and dwelt a few days with the old, sickly Sigwin at Kammin. Duke Casimir, in company with a number of Templars, undertook a pilgrimage to the Holy Sepulchre, where he died, in 1217. 5. Conrad II (1218–1238). Anastasia, the pious widow of Bogislav I, founded in 1223 the nunnery of the Virgins at Treptow, endowed it, and was buried in it. 6. Conrad III, count of Gützkow (1233–1248). The abbot of Eldena, Wigard, founded in 1233 the city of Greifswalde. In 1240 Franciscans settled at Stettin, and in 1244 a nunnery was founded in the same city. 7. Dr. Wilhelm, resigned in the following year. Under his administration the nunnery of Marienfliess was built by Wratislav III, whose daughter Barbara was the first abbess. 8. Hermann, count of Gleichen (1249–1288), a relation of the margraves of Brandenburg, promoted German civilization, and preserved a predilection for Brandenburg. In 1263 a chapter composed of twelve canons was erected in the church of St. Mary at Stettin, and confirmed by Urban IV. In 1270 was founded the nunnery of Mary at Cöslin, and in 1277 Barnim presented the diocese of Kammin with the town of Colberg. 9. Jarimar, prince of Rügen (1288–1296), directed the worldly business, while the Dominican Dr. Petrus administered the ecclesiastical affairs as a vicar, until 1299. 10. Henry of Wachholt (1299–1317), a Saxon, founded six archdeaconries (1303)—at Kammin, Stargard, Stettin, Demmin, Usedom, and Stolpe. The possessions of the suppressed Templars were given to the Joannites; the latter had their house first at Rörike, and in 1382 at Wildenbruck. In 1313 Wratislav IV presented the Augustines with his mansion at Anelam. 11. Conrad IV (1317–1322) was a learned and eloquent prelate, zealous defender of the independence of his see, and a faithful ally to the dukes in agitated times. 12. He was succeeded until 1329 by Dr. Wilhelm. 13. Frederick, count of Eichstädt (1329–1343), assisted the dukes in their wars, and

was intrusted with diplomatic negotiations. 14. John, duke of Saxe-Lauenburg, grandson of Wratislav IV (1343–1370). In 1346 the collegiate church of St. Otto, with a deacon and twelve canons, was founded near the castle of Stettin. In 1350 the pest swept away two thirds of the inhabitants of the country; troops of Flagellants walked through the land. In 1360 the Carthusian monastery of Stettin was founded. The bishop held a synod; and in 1363, when Charles IV, emperor of Germany, married Elizabeth, the daughter of Bogislav V, he appeared at court at Cracow. 15. Philip Lumbach (1370–1386), an active pastor. After his death Wenceslas (although expelled from the empire) invested his chancellor with the episcopal dignity. 16. John, canon of Lebus. 17. Bogislav VIII administered the diocese for a short time. 18. John of Oppeln changed sees with the bishop of Kulm, Nicolas Buck (1398–1410). 19. Magnus, duke of Lower Saxe-Lauenburg, a son of Eric (1410–1422), was at the Council of Constance. He was called to the see of Hildesheim, and is buried in the cathedral of that city. 20. Siegfried Buck, from Stolpe (1422–1446), accompanied, in 1423, king Eric of Denmark, Norway, and Sweden on a pilgrimage to the Holy Land, and went in 1433 to the Council of Basle. He held a synod, in which he interdicted the game of dice and the sport to his clergy. In 1438 the Hussites, attracted by Bogislav IX, penetrated as far as Stettin, and plundered Kolbatz. In 1440 the Putzkaller sect arose near Barth, and subsisted during thirty years. 21. Henning Jven, a very benevolent prelate, was greatly beloved for his Christian indulgence. He used to say, "Aut sumus, aut fuimus, aut possumus esse quod hic est." In 1450 Barnim VIII undertook a pilgrimage to Rome with his wife, at the occasion of the jubilee. In 1454, on the Sunday Judica, the bishop held a synod at Gülzow: the resolutions have been preserved. On Oct. 17, 1456, he inaugurated, in common with bishop Albert of Sydow, the Academy of Greifswalde, and was appointed its chancellor and conservator. 22. Lewis, count of Eberstein, who resigned in 1480. 23. The Italian, Marino di Fregeno, till 1482. The see of Kammin remained vacant for five years, Vrolinus Westfal being administrator. 24. Benedict, Bohemian baron of Waldstein, canon at Olmütz (1486–1499). Encouraged by him, Andrew, abbot of Michaelsberg at Bamberg, wrote in 1487 the life of St. Otto in Latin. In October, 1492, a synod met at Stargard. 25. Martin Carith, from Colberg, archdeacon at Arenswalde (1499-1521), resided at Cöslin; accompanied, in 1496–1498, Bogislav X to the Holy Land; held Oct. 5, 1500, a synod in the church of St. Mary at Stettin; and ordered the synodal statutes and the Breviary to be printed, 1505. He died Nov. 26, 1521, at Stettin. 26. Erasmus of Manteufel, the last Catholic bishop of Kammin, died in his mansion at Bast, Jan. 27, 1544.

II. *Introduction of Protestantism.*—The duke Barnim, who had studied at Wittenberg during the first effervescence of the Reformation (1518–1520), and who had even been chosen rector of the university, took in hand the reins of government, together with his elder brother George, in 1523, and favored Protestantism. George, whose sympathies remained with the old Church, died early, and his son Philip followed his uncle's example. A number of preachers travelled through Pomerania, urging on the people the necessity of returning to the purity of Christ's Church. Among these apostles of the new creed were: Paul of Rhoda, from Mansfeld, who stopped at Stettin; John Amandus, who exerted himself strenuously at Königsberg, Stolpe, Stettin, and finally went to Goslar; Nicolas Klein, at Colberg and Cöslin; Paul Klotze, at Marienthron; John Kniepstrow, at Stargard, Stettin, Greifswalde, and Stralsund; Peter Swawe, at Greifswalde; John Bugenhagen, Christian Kettelhodt, and John Kureke, at Stralsund. At the time of the wars of the peasants, Pomerania was not exempt from civil and ecclesiastical troubles, and bloody riots took place, especially at Stettin and Stralsund. The bishop Erasmus von Manteufel invited his clergy to assemble at Stargard Aug. 20, 1525, in order to deliberate on the measures by which the progress of the Reformation could be stopped. The princes, to accomplish the ecclesiastical revolution, convoked a diet at Treptow Dec. 13, 1534, and invited the chapters thereto, with the threatening remark that, whether they attended or not, the resolutions should be law for them in any case. The bishop, the abbots, prelates, and a considerable part of the nobility, protested against the resolutions of the diet, and retired before its close. The remainder of the assembly declared for the Reformation. Bugenhagen composed a liturgy, and Erasmus was offered, if he would submit to the decision of the diet, to remain the chief of the new Church, and to preserve his dignity and the possessions connected with it; but he declined. Only a tenth of the monasteries was spared: the nunneries of Marienfliess, Stolpe, Bergen, Kammin, and Colberg—and these also had to undergo great modifications. Almost all the monks left the country. Care was taken, however, of those whom old age kept back; the younger monks were sent to Wittenberg, to study there at public expense, and those who were willing to marry were similarly assisted. After Erasmus's death, the two dukes could not at first agree on the choice of his successor. At last Bartholomew Swawe, Barnim's chancellor, united both suffrages. He was ordained, and invested in 1545 by three superintendents, in the presence of seven ministers; but part of the clergy, objecting to his being a married man, complained at the court of Charles V, and obtained in 1548 a decree of suspension. Bartholomew in this distress sent a prelate, Martin Weiher, to pope Paul III, in order to obtain the papal confirmation. The bishop's legate came back with letters from the apostolic legate and from the emperor, by which the chapter was empowered to elect Martin himself. Weiher was elected, and Julius III confirmed his election by a brief of Oct. 13, 1551. But Oct. 24, 1552, he was inaugurated again, this time according to the Protestant rite. After Martin's death, the princes, to avoid the difficulties resulting from further elections, determined to establish in the episcopal see only members of the ducal house. This noble family (it was five centuries old) was condemned to early extinction: in a period of a few years six princes died without posterity. Bogislav XIV, the last of them, by his alliance with Gustavus Adolphus, who succeeded in making himself the master of Pomerania, had so exhausted all his resources that his funeral ceremonies could be celebrated only seventeen years after his death, which occurred in 1637. His nephew, son of his sister, Ernst Bogislav, duke of Croy, had sold the bishopric of Kammin to Frederick William, elector of Brandenburg (1650). But, if we except the episcopal election, everything remained unchanged. See Milman, *Mitslav, or the Conversion of Pomerania* (1854). The history of Pomerania after this time is clearly Protestant, and will be treated in the art. Prussia (q. v.).

Pomeranus. See Bugenhagen.

Pomerius, Julianus, a noted Spanish prelate, flourished in the latter part of the 7th century as archbishop of Toledo, about A.D. 680–690, while Spain was still under the dominion of the Goths, before the Saracen invasion. That he was of Jewish extraction may be seen from what Mariana (vi, 18) says of him: "Erat Julianus eruditionis laude ea ætate celebris, ut ejus libri testantur. Fuit ex Judæorum sanguine prognatus, Eugenii tertii discipulus, Quirini Toletani Præsulis successor, ingenis facili, copioso, suavi, probitatis opinione singulari." Great praise is awarded to him by the historians of that period, especially for his writings and labors as a bishop. He took part in the great monothelite disputes of his time concerning the twofold will of Christ—a question on which this bishop, or rather the Council of Toledo, at which he presided, declared quite independently of the bishop of Rome: "Nobis

(Juliani disputatio) aliquanto liberior visa est, quam ut Juliani modestiam erga Romanum pontificem summæ Ecclesiæ rectorem, deceret." Without going any further into details concerning this theological dispute, we shall only speak of Pomerius's writings concerning Jews and Judaism. At the instigation of king Ervigius, he wrote a work, which he dedicated to the king, entitled *De Sexta Ætatis comprobatione adversus Judæos*, reprinted in the *Bibl. Maxim. Patrum*, vol. xii. His aim was to demonstrate that the Messiah must have already come, although the Jews claimed that the Messiah was to come 6000 years after the creation of the world; on the other hand, he wished to strengthen the Christians in their faith, for said he in his modesty, "Ut si non corrigatur Judæus, saltem proficiat Christianus." Besides this work, he left as the fruit of his labors, *Responsionum liber in Defensionem Canonum et Legum, quibus prohibentur Christiana mancipia infidelibus deservire:—Prognosticorum futuri sæculi* (Leips. 1535) *lib. iii:—Historia Wambæ Regis Toletani de expeditione et victoria, qua rebellanten contra se Galliæ Provinciam celebri triumpho perdomuit:—De Anima* (which reminds us of a work by Nemesius):—*De Contemptu mundi ac rerum transiturarum:—De Vitiis et Virtutibus:—De Virginibus instituenda*, etc. See *Sacrorum Conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio*, ed. Mansi (Ven. et Flor. 1759), xii, 9; Andr. Duchesne, *Rerum Gallicarum et Francicarum Scriptores* (Par. 1739), ii, 707 sq.; Antonii *Bibl. Hisp. Vetus*, ii, 303; Ferrara, *Hist. of Spain* (Germ. transl.), ii, 453, etc.; Grätz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, v, 140–146; the same, *Die westgothische Gesetzgebung in Betreff d. Juden* (Bresl. 1858), p. 14 sq.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* xii, 51; Jöcher, *Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lex.* s. v.; Da Costa, *Israel and the Gentiles*, p. 309 sq.; Basnage, *Hist. des Juifs* (Engl. transl. by Taylor), p. 582; Kalkar, *Israel und die Kirche*, p. 19 sq.; Fürst, *Bibl. Jud.* iii, 111; Pick, in the *Evangelical Review*, July, 1876, p. 359; Gennadius, *De Viris illustribus*, c. 98; Fabricius, *Bibl. med. et infim. Latinit. v. Julianus Pomerius;* Tillemont, *Mémoires*, xvi, 29 sq. (B. P.)

Pomeroy, Benjamin, D.D., a Congregational minister, was born at Suffield, Conn., in 1704. He graduated at Yale College in 1733, and was ordained in December, 1735, pastor in Hebron, Conn., where he labored during his life. During Whitefield's revival he preached with great zeal and power. In 1742 he was brought before the General Assembly to answer under the new law for "having committed great disorders," but was acquitted. Some time after he was punished for lecturing to the people in a grove at Colchester, the parish minister having refused his permission; and in 1744 he was convicted of denouncing the recent ecclesiastical laws as cruel, and bound for fifty pounds to continue in "good behavior" during the year. He was a chaplain in the French and Revolutionary wars, and was an excellent scholar, a man of real genius, and one of the best preachers of his day. He died Dec. 22 1784. See Sprague, *Ann. of the Amer. Pulpit*, i, 394.

Pomeroy, Medad, an eminent Presbyterian minister, was born in Southampton, Mass., April 6, 1792. He was early left an orphan, but was blessed with prudent and kind relatives, by whom he was taught the way of life. He was educated at Williams College (Mass.), where he graduated in 1817. Soon after this he taught the academy at Aurora, N. Y., for two years, during which time and for some months after he studied theology under the direction of Dirck C. Lansing, D.D., pastor of the First Church of Auburn, N. Y. In 1820 he began preaching at Sherwood's Corner, where he labored ten months, and was then settled at Cayuga Bridge. For six years he preached at that place and at the "Stone Church," between Cayuga and Springport; for six additional years at Cayuga only; in February, 1833, he accepted a call to Elbridge, N. Y., where he remained for nearly eight years; in November, 1840, he returned to Cayuga, and ministered to that people for another twelve years, resigning on account of impaired health; in 1854 he removed to Wellsburg, Chemung County, N. Y., and served a church there; in 1856 he was called to Otisco, Onondaga County, N. Y., where he was pastor for five years, and 1861 he removed to Auburn, to spend the remainder of his days in rest. He died June 20, 1867. Mr. Pomeroy was a man of acute mind, penetrating discernment, and tenacious thought. His style was compact and lucid, and his preaching earnest and searching. His ministrations were greatly blessed. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1868, p. 223; Appleton's *Annual Cyclopædia* (1867), vii, 566. (J. L. S.)

Pomeroy, Swan Lyman, D.D., a Congregational minister, and a man of more than ordinary scholarship, was born March 4, 1799. He was a graduate of Brown University, and of Andover Theological Seminary, where he completed his course in 1824. He was settled for some years as a pastor in Bangor, Me., and was called thence to a secretaryship of the American Board of Commissioners of Foreign Missions. He displayed great ability and energy in this position for a number of years, but terminated his connection with it about 1860. He did not after that, we believe, have any pastoral charge. He died at Sunderland, Mass., March 17, 1869. See Appleton's *Annual Cyclopædia*, ix, 503.

Pomfret, John, an English clergyman, more noted as a poet than as a divine, was the son of a clergyman, who held at the time of John's birth the rectory of Luton, in Bedfordshire. He was born about 1667, and was educated at a grammar school in the country, and thence sent to Cambridge, but to what college is uncertain. He devoted himself especially to the study of polite literature, wrote most of his poetical pieces, and took both the degrees in arts. After that he took holy orders, and was presented to the living of Malden, in Bedfordshire. About 1703 he went to London for institution to a larger and very considerable living; but was stopped some time by Compton, then bishop of London, on account of these four lines of his poem entitled *The Choice*:

> "And as I near approach'd the verge of life,
> Some kind relation (for I'd have no wife)
> Should take upon him all my worldly care,
> While I did for a better state prepare."

The parenthesis in these lines was so maliciously represented that the good bishop was made to believe from it that Pomfret preferred a mistress to a wife; though no such meaning can be deduced, unless it be asserted that an unmarried clergyman cannot live without a mistress. But the bishop was soon convinced that this representation was nothing more than the effect of malice, as Pomfret at that time was actually married. The opposition, however, which his slanderers had given him was not without effect; for, being by this obliged to stay in London longer than he intended, he caught the small-pox, and died of it in 1702. "*The Choice*," says Dr. Johnson, "exhibits a system of life adapted to common notions, and equal to common expectations; such a state as affords plenty and tranquillity, without exclusion of intellectual pleasures. Perhaps no composition in our language has been oftener perused than Pomfret's *Choice*. In his other poems there is an easy volubility; the pleasure of smooth metre is afforded to the ear, and the mind is not oppressed with ponderous or entangled with intricate sentiment. He pleases many, and he who pleases many must have merit." A volume of his poems was published by himself in 1699, with a very modest and sensible preface. Two pieces of his were published after his death by his friend Philalethes; one entitled *Reason*, and written in 1700, when the disputes about the Trinity ran high; the other, *Dies Novissima, or The Last Epiphany*, a Pindaric ode. His versification is not unmusical, but there is not the force in his writings which is necessary to constitute a poet. A dissenting teacher of his name, who published some rhymes upon spiritual subjects, occasioned fanaticism

to be imputed to him; but his friend Philalethes has justly cleared him from this. Pomfret had a very strong mixture of devotion, but no fanaticism. See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth.* s. v.; *Gen. Biog. Dict.* s. v.

Pomis, Christian de, a converted Portuguese Jew, flourished in the 17th century. In 1668 he was baptized at Nüremberg, and in 1669 he was made teacher of the Hebrew and Talmudic language at the University of Altorf. He wrote *Comparatio agni Paschalis Vet. Test. cum agno Paschalis Novi Test. oratione Hebræa memoriter proposita*, in Hebrew, with a Latin transl. (Altorf, 1669). See *Cod. Senat. Lips.* xix, 4; Delitzsch, *Wissenschaft u. Kunst d. Judenthums* (Grimma, 1838), p. 302; Jöcher, *Gelehrten-Lex.* s. v. (B. P.)

Pomis, David de, a Jewish savant of note, was born in 1525 at Spoleto, of the celebrated family called in Hebrew הַתַּפּוּחִים, which, like the families מִן הַנְּעָרִים and הַנְּעָרִים, traced their origin to those Jews who were led into captivity after the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus and Vespasian. His father gave him his first instruction, initiating him in all the cycle of Biblical and Talmudic lore in Mecœnia. After his father's death De Pomis studied medicine, and greatly distinguished himself in that department. In 1545 he went to Perugia, where he remained till 1552, prosecuting his studies in medicine, philosophy, and philology. He then entered into official service at Maghaus in Sabionetta till 1555; became physician to count Nicolo Ursino (1555–1560), and to prince Sforza (1560–1563); went to Rome, and then to Venice, where he died. Of De Pomis we have the following works: צמח דוד, i. e. *The Offspring of David*, a Hebrew and Talmudic Lexicon in Hebrew, Latin, and Italian (Ven. 1587), dedicated to Sixtus V:—קהלת, an Italian commentary on Ecclesiastes (ibid. 1571):—*Discorso à l'humana misera*, etc., being a supplement to the commentary on Ecclesiastes (ibid. 1572):—a commentary on Job and a commentary on Daniel, which are still in MS. See Fürst, *Bibl. Jud.* iii, 111 sq.; Basnage, *Hist. des Juifs* (Engl. transl. by Taylor), p. 724; Kitto, *Cyclop.* s. v.; *Jahrbuch der Gesch. d. Juden*, ii, 359; De Rossi, *Dizionario storico degli Autori Ebrei* (Germ. transl. by Hamberger), p. 266 sq.; Acosta, *Israel and the Gentiles*, p. 487; Etheridge, *Hebrew Literature*, p. 454. (B. P.)

Pommel [an old English term, derived from the French *pomme*, an apple, and signifying anything round, but now applied only to a part of a saddle] (גֻּלָּה, *gullâh*, a *globular* or round thing, a bowl, which it signifies in Eccles. xii, 6; Zech. iv, 3), the *ball* or round ornament on the capital of a column (2 Chron. iv, 12, 13; "bowl," 1 Kings vii, 41, 42). See COLUMN.

Pommeraye, JEAN-FRANÇOIS, a French Benedictine monk, was born in 1617 at Rouen. He entered in 1637 the Congregation of Saint-Maur, made his profession at Tumièges, and renounced voluntarily all charges of his order to devote himself to study. He died at Rouen Oct. 28, 1687. He left several works, more remarkable for erudition than sound criticism. We mention, *Hist. de l'Abbaye de Saint-Ouen de Rouen, de Saint-Amand, et de Sainte-Catherine de la même Ville* (Rouen, 1662, fol.):—*Hist. des Archevêques de Rouen* (ibid. 1667, fol.), the best of his works:—*Hist. de la Cathédrale de Rouen* (ibid. 1686, 4to). Pommeraye published after the demise of Dom Jean Anger Godin, its true author, a *Recueil des Conciles et des Synodes de Rouen* (1667, 4to); but this collection was put into the shade by the excellent work *Conciles de Normandie*, published by Dom Bessin (1717, fol.).—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.

Pomōna, a female deity among the ancient Romans, who presided over fruit-trees. Her worship was under the superintendence of a special priest.

Pomorāni. See POMORYANS.

Pomoryans are a small body of Russian Dissenters, so called from their proximity to the Lake Ladoga and the White Sea, or from Pomori, a village in the government of Olonetz, where they appear to have originated. They believe that Antichrist has already come; reigns in the world unseen, that is, spiritually; and has put an end in the Church to everything that is holy. This belief they found upon the assertion by John (1st Epist. iv, 3), "This is that spirit of Antichrist whereof ye have heard that it should come, and even *now* already is it in the world." It is probable that Russian Dissenters, as well as others, consider the secular spirit of their Church establishment as the very spirit of Antichrist, blasting everything that is truly spiritual and holy. They are zealous in opposing the innovations of Nikon with regard to the Church books; prefer a life of celibacy and solitude, and rebaptize their converts from other sects. See Pinkerton, *Greek Church*, p. 330; Platon, *Greek Church* (see Index).

Pomp, Nicholas, one of the earliest and most prominent ministers of the German Reformed Church in this country, was a native of Germany, where he was born Jan. 20, 1734. He prosecuted his studies, classical and theological, in the University of Halle; came to America under the auspices of the Church of Holland in 1760, and took charge of the German Reformed Church in Faulkner Swamp, Montgomery County, Pa., where he labored with much success. In 1783 he received a call to Baltimore, Md., where he exercised his ministry for six years, when he returned again, in 1789, to the scene of his first labors; but in the following year he removed to Indianfield, in Bucks County, Pa., where he continued in the faithful discharge of his pastoral duties up to the close of the last century, when failing health compelled him to retire from the active duties of his office. From that time onwards he resided with his son, the Rev. Thomas Pomp, pastor of the German Reformed Church in Easton, Pa., where he died, Sept. 1, 1819. In the early part of his ministry he published an able little work in reply to a "mischievous book on Universalism" which was circulated among the Germans, entitled *The Everlasting Gospel*. Father Pomp occupied a prominent position in the Reformed Church of this country. See Harbaugh, *Fathers of the Ref. Church*, ii, 131–138. (D. Y. H.)

Pomp, Thomas, an amiable and eminent minister of the German Reformed Church, son of the former, was born in Montgomery County, Pa., Feb. 4, 1773. "His literary and theological studies he pursued principally, if not wholly, under the immediate care and supervision of his devoted and accomplished father." He entered the ministry when only twenty years of age. For a short time he was pastor of some congregations in his native county. In 1796, three years after being licensed, he accepted a call from the Reformed Church in Easton, Pa. Here, in connection with some country churches, he labored earnestly and with singular fidelity for considerably more than half a century, up to near the close of his quiet and beautiful life, April 22, 1852, when he was transferred from the Church militant on earth to the blessed "inheritance of the saints in light." Mr. Pomp was naturally gifted; but he was principally distinguished for his singular amiability, gentleness, meekness, and peaceful relations with all mankind. He retained to the last moment of his life the unabated confidence of his people and the warmest esteem of all who knew him. See Heisler, *Fathers of the Ref. Church*, iv, 15–25. (D. Y. H.)

Pompa, a solemn procession among the ancient heathens, on the occasion of a sacred festival, a funeral, a triumph, or for any special reasons.

Pompa CIRCENSIS, the sacred procession with which the Circensian games were introduced. On this occasion the statues of the gods, placed on wooden platforms, were borne upon the shoulders of men, and when very heavy they were drawn along upon carriages.

Pompæi (*πομπαῖοι*), certain gods among the ancient Greeks, who received this name as being conductors by the way; but what gods are specially referred to is uncertain, unless Mercury be meant, whose office it was to conduct souls to Hades. On certain days, called Apopompæ, sacrifices were offered to the Pompæi.

Pompignan, Jean-Georges le Franc dè, a French prelate, brother of the poet Pompignan, was born at Montauban Feb. 22, 1715. After finishing his studies at the College Louis le Grand and at the Seminary of St. Sulpice, he was made canon in his native diocese, but he had scarcely taken his license when he was appointed bishop of Le Puy (Dec. 25, 1742). In 1747 he obtained *in commendam* the abbey of St. Chaffre in his diocese, and was sent as a deputy to the assembly of the clergy held in 1755. He sided, in the strife which divided at that time the Church of France, with the party of the *Feuillants*, so called because they adopted the principles of the cardinal De la Rochefoucauld, the new minister of the portfolio of the prebendaries, in opposition to the party of the *Théatins*, who sided with the Theatine Boyer, previously bishop of Mirepoix. Pompignan was sent by the assembly to address the pope on the articles drawn up by both parties. He was one of the presidents of the assembly of 1760, and the author of the remonstrances to the king in favor of the members of the clergy banished by Parliament. He was untiring in writing against the vices and incredulity of his epoch—works which made him many enemies, among whom was Voltaire. In 1774 Louis XV made him archbishop of Vienne. In 1788 he sided with the tiers-état in the états of the Dauphiné, and this conduct caused him to be deputed to the États Généraux. He was true there to the same line of conduct, and was conspicuous at the head of the members of the clergy who, June 22, 1789, joined the tiers-état. The consequence was that he became one of the first presidents of the National Assembly. On Aug. 4 of the ensuing year the king intrusted him with the roll of the prebendary, and the following day he was appointed minister of state, and took his seat in the council. Being aware that he could not reside in his diocese, he resigned the episcopal see, and received in exchange the abbey of Buzai. The suspension of the nomination to the prebendaries, Nov. 9, 1789, left him minister without portfolio, and was followed by considerable changes introduced into the Church of France by the decree of July 12, 1790, on the civil constitution of the clergy. Pius VI addressed to Pompignan a bull, in which he condemned the new decrees, and exhorted him to bring his whole influence to bear upon the king to prevent him from giving them his sanction. This bull was resultless, as the king sanctioned the decrees on Aug. 24. Pompignan had nothing to do with this decision of Louis XVI, inasmuch as he had not attended the meetings of the council since Aug. 17, suffering already of the disease of which he died at Paris, Dec. 30, 1790. Besides a number of *Mandements*, pastoral letters, and reports to the assembly of the clergy, he left *Questions diverses sur l'Incrédulité* (Paris, 1753, 12mo):—*Le véritable Usage de l'Autorité séculière dans les Matières qui concernent la Religion* (1753, 1784, 12mo):—*L'Incrédulité convaincue par les Prophètes* (1759, 3 vols. 12mo):—*La Religion vengée de l'Incrédulité par l'Incrédulité elle-même* (1772, 12mo):—*L'Oraison funèbre de la Dauphine* (1747, 4to):—*L'Oraison funèbre de la Reine Marie Leczinska* (1768, 4to):—*Lettres à un Évêque sur plusieurs Points de Morale et de Discipline* (1802, 2 vols. 8vo). See biographical sketch in his posthumous publications; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.; Jervis, *Hist. of the Church of France*, ii, 371; Van Laun, *Hist. of French Lit.* (N. Y. 1877, 3 vols. 8vo).

Pomponatius, Peter. See Pomponazzi.

Pomponazzi, Pietro, a famous Italian philosopher, was born at Mantua in 1462, and after studying at the University of Padua became a professor of philosophy in his alma mater. He also taught and wrote at Bologna with the highest distinction. Although small in stature—for he was almost a dwarf—he yet astonished his contemporaries by his remarkable intellectual power, and became one of the most eminent men of his times. He had frequent disputations with the famous Achillini, whose puzzling objections would have confounded him had it not been for his skill in parrying them by his keen wit as well as by a sharp-cutting logic. He used to apply himself to the solution of difficulties so very intensely that he frequently forgot to eat, drink, sleep, and perform the ordinary functions of nature; nay, it made him almost distracted, and a laughing-stock to every one, as he himself tells us. He died in 1525. He wrote *De Immortalitate Animæ* (1516), in which he maintains that the immortality of the soul cannot be proved by philosophical (or natural) reasons, but depends solely on revelation, which he accepts. This precaution, however, did not save him from attacks, and many adversaries rose up against him who did not scruple to treat him as an atheist; and the monks caused his book, although he wrote several apologies for it, to be burned at Venice. Another work of his on *Incantations* was also regarded as dangerous. He shows in this that he does not believe in magic and sorcery, and lays a prodigious stress on occult virtues in certain men by which they produced miraculous effects. He gives a great many examples of this, but his adversaries do not admit them to be true, or free from magic. See Bayle, *Dict. Hist.* s. v.; Nicéron, *Mémoires*, vol. xxv; Olearius, *De Pomponatio* (Jena, 1705, 4to); Buhle, *Geschichte der neueren Philosophie*, vol. ii; Ueberweg, *Hist. of Philos.* (see Index); Neander, *Christian Dogmas* (see Index); Lecky, *Hist. of Rationalism*, i, 370; Fisher, *Hist. of the Reformation*, p. 542; Alzog, *Kirchengesch.* ii, 222; Morell, *Hist. of Philosophy* (see Index); Ranke, *Hist. of the Papacy*, i, 63, 64, 377.

Pomponia, Græcina, the wife of Plautius, a Roman general who commanded in England in the year 45, is thought, from a sentence in the *Annals* of Tacitus (xiii, 32), to have been a Christian, and the first in Britain. Tacitus says: "Also Pomponia Græcina, an illustrious woman, married to Plautius (who on his return from Britain entered the city with the pomp of an ovation), but accused of a foreign superstition, was left to the decision of her husband." She was tried, according to custom, for her abandonment of the national worship, by her own husband, Plautius, in the presence of her kindred, and was acquitted. She lived to a great age, apparently in sorrow, and wearing "no habit but that of mourning." This was attributed to grief for the fate of Julia, the daughter of Drusus, who was put to death by Messalina fourteen years before the accusation was brought against Pomponia. But this alone would not account for the charge of forsaking the Roman religion; and the supposition that she was a Christian, and that her mode of life grew out of her religious faith, is certainly quite probable. The wife of Plautius and Claudia Ruffina are supposed to be of the saints that were in Cæsar's household, mentioned by Paul (Phil. iv, 22). Claudia is celebrated by Martial for her admirable beauty and learning in the following epigram:

> "From painted Britons how was Claudia born!
> The fair barbarian! how do arts adorn!
> When Roman charms a Grecian soul commend,
> Athens and Rome may for the dame contend."

Speed, a very ancient British author, says that "Claudia sent Paul's writings, which she calls spiritual manna, unto her friends in Britain, to feed their souls with the bread of life; and also the writings of Martial, to instruct their minds with those lessons best fitting to produce moral virtues"—which Speed thinks was the occasion of this line in Martial's works:

"And Britons now, they say, our verses learn to sing."

Gildas, the most ancient and authentic British historian, who wrote about A.D. 564, in his book called *De Vict.*

Aurelii Ambrosii, affirms that the Britons received the Gospel under Tiberius, the emperor under whom Christ suffered; and that many evangelists were sent from the apostles into this nation, who were the first planters of the Gospel; and who, he elsewhere says, continued with them until the cruel persecution of Diocletian, the emperor, about A.D. 290. See Ivimey, *Hist. of the English Baptists;* Fisher, *Beginnings of Christianity* (N. Y. 1877, 8vo), p. 521. (J. H. W.)

Pomponius Lætus, Julius, a distinguished Italian humanist, was born in 1425 at Amendolara, in Upper Calabria. He seems to have been a bastard of the illustrious house of Sanseverini, in the kingdom of Naples. So far from being proud of this relationship, he shunned every reference to it; and when, in later times, his parents invited the admired writer to acknowledge them, he answered, "Pomponius Lætus cognatis et propinquis suis salutem. Quod petitis fieri non potest. Vale." He was still very young when he arrived at Rome, where he studied literature under Pietro di Monopoli, a clever grammarian of the time. At the death of Lorenzo Valla, his last master (1457), he was deemed fit to succeed him. He founded an academy, where several literary men, devoted like himself to the study of antiquity, assembled. Most of them were young men. Their enthusiasm for the classics made them renounce their Christian names, and adopt in their stead names borrowed from the classical languages. Perhaps these comparisons between the institutions of the past and of their own time may have resulted in depreciating criticisms of the latter. Malignity knew how to transform these, in the eyes of pope Paul II, into contempt for religion, complot against the Church, and finally conspiracy against its chief. Those of the academicians who could be got hold of were put to the rack—one of them died during the proceedings. Pomponius, who was at the time a resident of Venice, was arrested there, brought to Rome, and tortured like the others; but no avowal of his imagined crime could be pressed out of him. After interrogating him twice, Paul II declared that in future every one should be held for a heretic who, even in jest, pronounced the word "academy" (comp. on this point De Rossi, *Roma Sotteranea*, vol. i). In 1471 Sixtus IV, Paul's successor, allowed Pomponius to resume his professorship in the Roman college, where he met with the same favor he had formerly enjoyed, the students crowding to his lectures. Among those disciples (they were called Pomponiani) some were men of merit, as Alessandro Farnese, pope under the name of Paul III, Andrea Fulvio of Prænestе, and Conrad Peutinger. No one ever was fonder of manuscripts, medals, and inscriptions than Pomponius Lætus; he was constantly seen pacing the streets of Rome in search of some monument of those pagan times in which he wished he had lived. There was no dark corner, no trace of antiquity, but he had carefully examined it, and could give an account of it. In his little house on the Janiculan, with some chosen friends, he solemnized the anniversary of the foundation of Rome and the birth of Romulus. Pomponius was of a mild and kind disposition, always ready to help or to please, and of charming modesty. Nature made him a stammerer, but he completely conquered this defect. He was often seen in the streets with a lantern in his hands, like Diogenes, whose customs and habits he had taken to imitate. He died at Rome May 21, 1497. He left several works, monuments of a profound and rare erudition. They were published at Hagenau (1520). His *Opera varia* were edited at Mentz (1521, 8vo); they comprise, *De Sacerdotiis, De Jurisperitis, De Romanorum Magistratibus:—De Legibus* and *De Antiquitatibus urbis Romæ:*—along with *Compendium Historiæ Romanæ ab interitu Gordiani usque ad Justinum III*, originally edited at Venice (1498, 4to). He explained and commented besides on several classical authors, and devoted his care to editions of Sallust, Columella, Varro, Festus, Nonnius Marcellus, and Pliny the younger. His commentaries on Virgil were printed at Basle (1486, fol.). See *Christian Schools and Scholars*, ii, 316, 370; Tiraboschi, *Storia della Letter. Ital.* vol. vi, pt. i; Ginguené, *Hist. littér. d'Italie;* Hallam, *Lit. Hist. of Europe* (Harper's ed.), i, 266; Sabellicus, *Vita Pomponii Læti* (Strasb. 1510, 4to).—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.

Pomps of the Devil, a term used in the form of solemn renunciation which preceded baptism in the ancient Christian Church. The form referred to is given by the author of *The Apostolical Constitutions* in these words, "I renounce Satan, and his works, and his pomps, and his service, and his angels, and his inventions, and all things that belong to him, or that are subject to him." By the pomps of the devil appear to have been meant the shows and games of heathen idolatry. And even after idolatry was in a great measure destroyed, and the public games and shows in honor of the gods were discontinued, the expression "pomps" was still used in the form of renunciation to eradicate the vanity, lewdness, and profaneness which so extensively prevailed. Some have attempted to trace this renunciation back to apostolic times, founding it on the exhortation of Paul to Timothy: "Lay hold on eternal life, whereunto thou art also called, and hast professed a good profession before many witnesses." Others, again, are content to derive it from ancient tradition. That it existed from a remote period in the history of the Christian Church is admitted on all hands; and such was the importance attached to this renunciation that, as soon as baptisteries were built, a place was assigned peculiarly to this service, the porch or anteroom being set apart for this purpose. The catechumens on entering were placed with their faces to the west, and then commanded to renounce Satan and all his pomps, with some gesture and rite expressing indignation, as by stretching out their hands, or folding them, or striking them together; and sometimes by exsufflation, or spitting at him as if he were present. In this ceremony the faces of the catechumens were turned towards the west as being the place of darkness, and therefore suitable for the renunciation of him who is the prince of darkness. The form of renunciation was repeated three times, either because there were three things which were renounced in their baptism—the devil, his pomps, and the world—or to signify the three Persons of the Trinity, by whom they were adopted as sons upon renouncing Satan; or because it was usual in cases of civil adoption and emancipation of slaves for the master to yield up his right by a triple renunciation. See Bingham, *Christian Antiquities;* Riddle, *Christian Antiquities;* Staunton, *Eccles. Dict.* s. v.

Ponce, Pedro, a Spanish Benedictine monk in the convent of Oña, in Old Castile, was born about 1530. He is considered the inventor of the art of teaching the dumb to speak, which he carried to considerable perfection. According to Ambrosio Morales (*Antiguedades de España* [Alcala, 1575], fol. 38), Ponce had to instruct two brothers and one sister of the constable of Castile, and a son of the gran justicia of Aragon, all of whom were born deaf and dumb. These pupils made such progress that, after some time, they not only were able to write correctly, but also to answer any questions put to them. One of them, Don Pedro de Velasco, who lived to be only twenty years of age, spoke and wrote Latin as well as his mother tongue, and was at the time of his death making considerable progress in the Greek language. Another of Ponce's pupils became a Benedictine monk, and was able to make confession and explain his creed by word of mouth. These facts were attested by the best Spanish writers of the time, as well as by Sir Kenelm Digby, who, in his *Two Treatises concerning the Body and Soul of Man* (Paris, 1644, cap. xxviii, note 8), says, "This priest brought the young lord to speak as distinctly as any man whatsoever; and I have often discoursed with him whiles I wayted upon the prince

of Wales in Spaine." According to the same author (p. 254), and to Juan de Castañiza (*Vida de San Benito*), Ponce wrote a treatise in Spanish, in which he explained his method, and laid down certain rules as the result of his observations; but this interesting work has been lost, though it is generally believed that Juan Pablo Bonet, who in 1620 published his *Reduccion de las Letras, y Arte para enseñar á hablar los Mudos* (4to), saw and consulted it. Ponce died in 1584, and was buried in the convent of his order.

Ponce de la Fuente, CONSTANTINE, a Spanish martyr to the Protestant cause, was a native of San Clemente de la Mancha, in the diocese of Cuença. Possessing a good taste and a love of genuine knowledge, he evinced an early disgust for the barbarous pedantry of the schools, and an attachment to such of his countrymen as sought to revive the study of polite letters. Being intended for the Church, he made himself master of Greek and Hebrew, but at the same time learned to write and speak his native language with uncommon purity and elegance. Like Erasmus, with whose writings he was early captivated, he was distinguished for his lively wit, which he took pleasure in indulging at the expense of foolish preachers and hypocritical monks. But he was endowed with greater firmness and decision of character than the philosopher of Rotterdam. During his attendance at the university Ponce's youthful spirit had betrayed him into irregularities, of which his enemies afterwards took an ungenerous advantage; but these were succeeded by the utmost decorum and correctness of manners, though he always retained his gay temper, and could never deny himself his jest. Notwithstanding the opportunities he had of enriching himself, he was so exempt from avarice that his library, which he valued above all his property, was never large. His eloquence caused his services in the pulpit to be much sought after; but he was free from vanity, the besetting sin of orators, and scorned to prostitute his talents at the shrine of popularity. He declined the situation of preacher in the cathedral of Cuença, which was offered him by the unanimous vote of the chapter. When the more honorable and lucrative office of preacher to the metropolitan church of Toledo was afterwards tendered to him, after thanking the chapter for their good opinion of him, he declined it, alleging as a reason "that he would not disturb the bones of their ancestors," alluding to a dispute between them and the archbishop Siliceo, who had insisted that his clergy should prove the purity of their descent. Whether it was predilection for the Reformed opinions that induced him at first to fix his residence at Seville is uncertain, but once there we find him co-operating with Egidius in his plans for disseminating scriptural knowledge. The emperor, having heard him preach during a visit to that city, was so much pleased with the sermon that he immediately named Ponce one of his chaplains, to which he added the office of almoner; and he soon after appointed him to accompany his son Philip to Flanders, "to let the Flemings see that Spain was not destitute of polite scholars and orators." Constantine made it a point of duty to obey the orders of his sovereign, and reluctantly quitted his residence in Seville, for which he had hitherto rejected the most tempting offers. His journey gave him the opportunity of becoming personally acquainted with some of the Reformers. Among these was Jacob Schopper, a learned man of Biberach, in Suabia, by whose conversation his views of evangelical doctrine were greatly enlarged and confirmed. In 1555 Ponce returned to Seville, and his presence imparted a new impulse to the Protestant cause in that city. A benevolent and enlightened individual having founded a professorship of divinity in the College of Doctrine, Ponce was appointed to the chair; and by means of the lectures which he read on the Scriptures, together with the instruction of Fernando de St. Juan, provost of the institution, the minds of many of the young were opened to the truth. On the first Lent after his return to Seville he was, besides, chosen by the chapter to preach every alternate day in the cathedral church. So great was his popularity that, though the public service did not begin till eight o'clock in the morning, yet, when he was announced to preach the church would be filled by four, and even by three o'clock. Being newly recovered from a fever when he commenced his labors, he felt so weak that it was necessary for him repeatedly to pause during the sermon, on which account he was allowed to recruit his strength by taking a draught of wine in the pulpit, a permission which had never been granted to any other preacher.

While Constantine was pursuing this career of honor and usefulness, he involved himself in difficulties by coming forward as a candidate for the place of canon magistral in the cathedral of Seville, which had become vacant by the death of Egidius. Ponce did not want the office, but his friends pressed him to lay aside his scruples; and an individual who had great influence over his mind represented so strongly the services which he would be able to render to the cause of truth in so influential a situation, and the hurtful effects which would result from its being occupied by some noisy and ignorant declaimer, that he consented at last to offer himself a candidate. In spite of all manner of accusations and opposition he carried his election, was installed in his new office, and commenced his duty as preacher in the cathedral with high acceptance. From his visit abroad Ponce, like many other preachers whom the Spanish Romanists sent to the Netherlands "to give light to others, returned home blind, having followed the example of the heretics" (Juescas, *Historia Pontifical*, ii, 337, *b*). In 1555 he had embraced the Protestant faith. Now that he had dared to assume the responsibilities of the Seville cathedral canonate, the envious priests, disappointed in their own seekings, boldly confronted Ponce with his heretical opinions, and loudly urged the Inquisition to take its aim at this new-made cathedral dignitary; and when, in 1559, the familiars were let loose on the Protestants of Seville, Ponce was among the first who were apprehended. Among his books was found a treatise, in his own handwriting, on the points of controversy between the Church of Rome and the Protestants, and as Ponce had chosen to take sides with Luther and Calvin, and, when shown the work, not only acknowledged its authorship, but added, "You have there a full and candid confession of my belief; I am in your hands—do with me as seemeth to you good," his doom was sealed. Though put to the torture to reveal his associates and fellow-believers, he refused steadfastly to bring suffering upon any one else. After two years of imprisonment, oppressed and worn out by a mode of living so different from what he had been used to, he died before his enemies could bring him to public execution. It was slanderously reported that he had committed suicide, but a young monk and fellow-prisoner denied the calumny. Dec. 22, 1560, his effigy and bones were brought out in the public *auto-da-fé*, but the people, who had always greatly revered Ponce, rose up in rebellion, and the services were continued in private. In the character of Ponce's writings we have one of the clearest indications of the excellence of his heart. They were of that kind which were adapted to the spiritual wants of his countrymen, and not calculated to display his own talents, or to acquire for himself a name in the learned world. They were composed in his native tongue, and in a style level to the lowest capacity. Abstruse speculations and rhetorical ornaments, in which he was qualified both by nature and education to excel, were rigidly sacrificed to the one object of being understood by all, and useful to all. Among his works were a *Catechism*, whose highest recommendation is its artless and infantine simplicity; a small treatise on *The Doctrine of Christianity*, drawn up in the familiar form of a dialogue between a master and his pupil, which, without being deficient in simplicity, is more calculated to interest persons of learning and advanced knowledge; an

Exposition of the First Psalm, in four sermons, which show that his pulpit eloquence, exempt from the common extremes, was neither degraded by vulgarity nor rendered disgusting by affectation and effort at display; and the *Confession of a Sinner*, in which the doctrines of the Gospel, poured from a contrite and humbled spirit, assume the form of the most edifying and devotional piety. See Antonius, *Bibl. Hisp. Nov.* i, 256; M'Crie, *Hist. of the Ref. in Spain*, p. 154–156, 207 sq., 262 sq. (J. H. W.)

Poncet, Maurice, a French prelate of the 16th century, flourished as curate of St. Pierre des Arcis. He was a divine of great eloquence and considerable learning, though not remarkable for refinement of taste or diction. He was a Gallican, and when Henry III pursued that imbecile policy which finally cost France the loss of her best citizens for conscience' sake, Poncet ridiculed the Leaguers [see League], and especially visited with the full power of his sarcasm the grotesque processions of the *Confréries des Pénitents*. He made the walls of his church ring with denunciations of these hypocritical devotees, who, after parading the streets barefoot, arrayed in sackcloth, and displaying ostentatiously the outward signs of austere asceticism, were accustomed to pass the night in riotous feasting and gross debauchery. Henry, resenting this exposure, banished the offender to his abbey of St. Père at Melun; but he was released after a brief confinement, and returned to Paris by the king's permission, his majesty remarking that "he had always believed the good doctor to have a zeal for God, but not according to knowledge; and that there was much excuse for him, since he was not quick enough of apprehension to see through the artifices of those by whom he was instigated. He had plenty of scholarship, but was grievously deficient in judgment." Poncet, unsubdued by the king's leniency, resumed his usual incisive style of pulpit oratory, and persevered in it till his death, which happened in 1586. See Jervis, *Hist. Church of France*, i, 181 sq. (J. H. W.)

Poncher, Étienne, a French prelate, noted also as a diplomatist, was born at Tours in 1446. He was the son of a magistrate, studied law, and while yet a youth was provided with several canonicates. In 1485 he obtained the charge of counsellor-clerk at the Parliament of Paris, and in 1498 he became *Président aux Enquêtes*. He was elected bishop of Paris Feb. 25, 1503, in compliance with the request of king Louis XII, whom he was at that time accompanying to Milan. The same prince intrusted him in 1506 with several diplomatic missions to Germany; and Poncher, in the following year, being again in Italy with the king, was alone bold enough to speak in contradiction to the angry feelings of the king against the Venetians, and to oppose the confederation of Cambrai. Louis XII, who had already appointed Poncher chancellor of the duchy of Milan, bestowed on him in 1509 the abbey of Fleuri, and in 1512 made him the guardian of the seal of France, which office he kept till the death of the king, Jan. 1, 1515. Francis I appointed him, with Arthur Gouffier, one of the plenipotentiaries who signed, on Aug. 16, 1517, the treaty of Noyon between Francis and Charles V. In the same year Poncher went to Spain as ambassador of France, and in 1518 he was sent to Henry VIII of England, with whom he signed a new treaty of alliance. In virtue of the concordat he was transferred, March 14, 1519, to the archiepiscopal see of Sens. He died at Lyons, Feb. 24, 1524. Poncher published *Constitutions synodales*, which are still held in great esteem, especially in regard to the sacraments.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.

Poncher, François, a French prelate, nephew of the preceding, was born at Tours about 1480. His father, Louis Poncher, secretary of the king and receiver-general of the finances, was hung for embezzlement. Made counsellor at the Parliament of Paris (1510), François Poncher obtained soon afterwards the curacy of Issy, a canonicate at Notre Dame of Paris, the abbey of St. Maur-les-Fossés, and March 14, 1519, became bishop of Paris. So far from treading in the steps of his uncle, he was a simoniac and scandalous prelate. He forged documents to get possession of the abbey of Fleury-sur-Loire, but was balked in his design. While the king was a prisoner at Madrid, Poncher fell out with the queen-regent, the duchess of Angoulême, Francis's mother, plotted to deprive her of the regency, and by treacherous negotiations with the Spanish court tried to prolong the captivity of his sovereign. As soon as Francis was free again Poncher was arrested and accused of high-treason. While his process was in abeyance he died in the dungeon of Vincennes, Sept. 1, 1532. He wrote some commentaries on civil law, dedicated to his uncle, Étienne Poncher.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.

Pond is the rendering in the A. V. of אַגָּם, *agâm* (literally a *collection* of water), in Exod. vii, 19; viii, 15, where it probably denotes the putrescent reservoirs or swampy pools left by the inundation of the Nile (Sept. διώρυγες, Vulg. *paludes*). Again, in Isa. xix, 10, אַגְמֵי נֶפֶשׁ, which the A. V. translates "ponds for fish," following the Vulg. "lacunas ad capiendos pisces," Diodati and Luther, is rendered by the Sept. *τὰς ψυχὰς πονέσουσι*. This rendering is supported by the authority of Gesenius, Vatablus, and Ewald, *alle Lohnarbeiter* (עֹשֵׂי שָׂכָר = "they that earn wages"), *sind seelenbetrübt*; אָנַם being taken as equivalent to עָנַם (Job xxx, 25), "to be sad." Many interpreters, however, think that it designates fish-ponds. We have abundant evidence from the paintings in the tombs that the Egyptians were celebrated for their fish-ponds, and it appears that almost every villa possessed one, where the master of the house occasionally amused himself in fishing. The Jews, it seems, likewise constructed similar ponds, as in describing his bride in the Canticles (vii, 4) Solomon says, "Thine eyes are like the fish-pools in Heshbon." See Fish. The word occurs several times of marshy pools, in contradistinction to the dry sands of the desert (Psa. cvii, 35: cxiv, 8); "standing water" (Isa. xxxv, 7; xli, 18), "a pool." Such pools being commonly reedy, it is rendered "reeds" (Jer. li, 32). See Pool.

Pond, Enoch, D.D., a noted Congregational minister and writer, was born at Wrentham, Mass., July 29, 1791, and was educated at Brown University, where he graduated in 1813. He then decided to enter the ministry, and began a course in theology with the celebrated Dr. Emmons. In June, 1814, young Pond was licensed to preach, and in the spring of the following year was ordained pastor of the Congregational Church at Auburn, Mass. He left this charge in 1828 to become the conductor of the *Spirit of the Pilgrims*, a monthly publication in Boston. He was made professor of theology in the theological seminary at Bangor in September, 1832, and continued in that responsible position until 1856, when he became president, and changed to the professorship of ecclesiastical history, and lectured on pastoral duties. He died Jan. 21, 1882. Dr. Pond published reviews of *Judson on Baptism*:—*Monthly Concert Lectures* (1824):—*Memoir of President Davies* (1827):—*Memoir of Susanna Anthony* (1827):—*Memoir of Count Zinzendorf* (1839):—*Memoir of John Wickliffe* (1841):—*Morning of the Reformation* (1842, 12mo):—*No Fellowship with Romanism* (1843):—*The Young Pastor's Guide* (Portland, 1844, 12mo):—*The Mather Family* (1844, 12mo):—*The World's Salvation* (1845):—*Pope and Pagan, or Middleton's Celebrated Letters* (Portland, 1846, 18mo) [see Middleton, Conyers]:—*Swedenborgianism Reviewed* (new ed. 1846):—*Swedenborgianism Examined* (N. Y. 1861, 16mo):—*Plato, his Life, Works, Opinions, and Influence* (1846):—*Review of Bushnell's God in Christ* (1849):—*The Ancient Church* (1851):—*Memoir of John Knox* (1856):—*Bangor Lectures on*

Pastoral Theology (Andover, 1865, 12mo):—*Lectures on Christian Theology* (Boston, 1868, 8vo):—*Lectures on Pastoral Theology* (N. Y. 187–):—also separate *Sermons*, and articles in the *Bibl. Sacra*, *Bibl. Repos.*, *Lit. and Theolog. Rev.*, *Lord's Lit. and Theolog. Rev.*, *New-Englander*, and more than a dozen other periodicals.

Pone luctum, MAGDALENA. This is the beginning of a famous Easter hymn of uncertain date. Undoubtedly it belongs to the Middle Ages, for in this hymn, as well as in the *Dies Iræ* (q. v.) and other Latin hymns, the same identification of Mary Magdalene with "the woman that was a sinner" (Luke vii, 37), which runs through all the theology of the Middle Ages, is expressed. This hymn may be found in almost all collections of Latin hymns, and the first verse runs thus:

"Pone luctum, Magdalena,
Et serena lacrymas;
Non est jam Simonis cœna,
Non cur fletum exprimas;
Causæ mille sunt lætandi,
Causæ mille exultandi:
Alleluja resonet.

For the original, see Daniel, *Thesaurus Hymnol.* ii, 365; Trench, *Sacred Latin Poetry*, p. 159; Bässler, *Auswahl altchristl. Lieder*, p. 237; Simrock, *Lauda Sion*, p. 188; Königsfeld, *Hymnen u. Gesänge*, i, 230. English translations are given in Schaff's *Christ in Song*, p. 256. For German translations, see Bässler, *l. c.* p. 135; Simrock, Königsfeld, and Fortlage, *Gesänge christl. Vorzeit*, p. 142. (B. P.)

Ponet. See POYNET.

Pongilupus, HERMANNUS, an Italian monastic, flourished near the middle of the 13th century at Ferrara. He practiced great austerity as one of the *Consolati*, and died in 1269. Several years after his death (1300) charges of heresy were brought against him, and a judicial process having been declared, his bones were exhumed and burned, and his tomb demolished by order of pope Boniface VIII. His tomb, in the principal church at Ferrara, had been the object of great veneration, and many miracles were said to have been wrought there. Some think that the process was instituted and the tomb demolished to put an end to the extravagant devotion paid to his memory. The Franciscans attribute to Pongilupus the origin of the *Fratricelli* (q. v.), but Mosheim considers this an error, and believes him to have been one of the *Bagnotians*. Natalis Alexander (*Hist. Eccles.* viii, 87) speaks of Pongilupus as reviving several vile practices of the Gnostics. See Wadding, *Annal. Minor. Fratr.* vi, 279; Milman, *Hist. of Latin Christianity*, vii, 37 sq. (J. H. W.)

Pongol, a Hindû festival in honor of the sun, which is celebrated annually on Jan. 9. The high-caste Brahmins look upon this as a lucky and propitious day, but the Sudras hold it as sacred, and visit one another with presents. They boil rice on this day with milk outside the house, in some place exposed to the sun's rays, and when that luminary withdraws they cry out "Pongol!" and repeat it four times. The rice thus boiled is regarded as very holy, and kept as long as possible. The day after the Pongol the cows and buffaloes are led out early into the country, having their heads adorned with crowns and cakes.

Poniatowa, Christine, a German female visionary, was born in 1610 at Lessen, Western Prussia. Her father, Julian Poniatowa, was a Polish gentleman, who, having escaped from a monastery and embraced the Protestant communion, was at first minister at Duchnick, in Bohemia, then librarian of a nobleman. He probably brought up his daughter in mystical ideas, for he is said to be himself the author of a Latin dissertation on the knowledge which the angels may have of God. Christine had been intrusted to the care of the baroness of Zelking, who had taken a liking to her, when, Nov. 12, 1627, after severe pains, she fell into a trance, attended with visions and prophetic utterances relating to the future of the Reformed Church. This strange state returned at regular intervals for a whole year, always attended with the same phenomena, and a number of people testified to its genuineness. Jan. 27, 1629, the young visionary fell into so heavy a lethargy that she passed for dead, but when she finally recovered her senses she declared that her mission was fulfilled, and that she should thenceforth have no more visions. In 1632 she was married to a Moravian minister, Daniel Vetter, and died Dec. 6, 1644, at Leszno, near Posen. Her revelations, written by herself, were translated into Latin, and published by Amos Comenius, with those of Christopher Kotter and Nicolas Drabicki, under the title *Lux in Tenebris* (1657, 1659, 1665, 4to). They were retranslated into German by Benedict Balmsen (Amsterdam, 1664, 8vo). See Feustking, *Gynaec. fanat. kanst.* p. 238 sq.; Witsius, *Miscell. Sacra*, pt. iii, ch. xxii; Arnold, *Kirchen- u. Ketzerhistorie;* Mosheim, *Eccles. Hist.* iii, 391, 392. (J. H. W.)

Poniatowa, Julian. See PONIATOWA, CHRISTINE.

Pons, JEAN, a French Protestant writer, was born at Nismes May 15, 1747. He was brother-in-law to Rabaut-Dupuis. Intimately connected with Rabaut St. Étienne, he had a narrow escape from sharing his sad fate: he owed his life to the 9th Thermidor. He was afterwards justice of the peace at Nismes, and then director of the post department in the same city. He published *Réflexions philosophiques et politiques sur la Tolérance religieuse* (Paris, 1808, 8vo); besides *Notices biographiques sur Paul Rabaut* and *Notices biographiques sur Rabaut-Dupuis*. Pons died at Nismes Jan. 15, 1816. —Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.

Ponsard de Gisi OF PAYENS, a Crusader of the Order of the Knight Templars, flourished near the opening of the 14th century. He was a most earnest advocate of the order, and when, in 1309, it was brought to trial, and the papacy was questioning the feasibility of suffering its existence, Ponsard boldly declared himself ready to undertake its defence. All the enormous charges against the order were utterly, absolutely false; false were all the confessions, extorted by terror and pain, from himself and other brethren before the bishop of Paris. Those tortures had been applied by the sworn and deadly enemies and accusers of the order, by the prior of Montfalcon and William Roberts the monk. He put in a schedule: "These are the traitors who have falsely and disloyally accused the religion of the Temple—William Roberts the monk, who had them put to the torture; Esquin de Florian of Béziers, prior of Montfalcon; Bernard Pelet, prior of Maso, Philip's envoy to England; and Gervais Boysol, knight of Gisors." Had Ponsard himself been tortured? He had been tortured before the bishop of Paris three months ere he made confession. He had stood thus in a pit for the space of an hour. He protested that in that state of agony he should confess or deny whatever they would. He was prepared to endure beheading, the stake, or the caldron for the honor of the order; but these slow, excruciating torments he could not bear besides the horrors of his two years' imprisonment. He was asked if he had anything to allege wherefore the court should not proceed. He hoped that the cause would be decided by good men and true. The provost of Poitiers interposed: he produced a schedule of charges advanced by Ponsard himself against the order. "Truth," answered Ponsard, "requires no concealment. I own that in a fit of passion, on account of some contumelious words with the treasurer of the Temple, I did draw up the schedule." Those charges, however, dark as were some of them, were totally unlike those now brought against the brotherhood. Before he left the court, Ponsard expressed the hope that the severity of his imprisonment might not be aggravated because he had undertaken the defence of the order. The court gave instructions to the provost of Poitiers and De Jamville

that he should not be more harshly treated; but he was finally condemned to death, and was burned at the stake. See Milman, *Hist. of Latin Christianity*, vi, 429 sq.; Porter, *Hist. of the Knights of Malta* (see Index). (J. H. W.)

Pontano, Giovanni-Giovano (Lat. *Pontanus*), a celebrated Italian statesman, noted as a writer on morals, was born December, 1426, in the environs of Cereto, Umbria. His father having perished in a riot, his mother fled with him to Perugia, where he received a careful education. Having in vain asserted his claim to the heritage of his parents, he entered the army of Alfonso, king of Naples, then at war with the Florentines (1447), and followed that king to Naples, where he became acquainted with the celebrated Panormita, who took him along in his embassy to Florence, and had him appointed royal secretary. Pontano's verses, highly esteemed by all competent judges, seemed to entitle him sufficiently to a seat in the academy which Panormita, under the king's auspices, established at Naples. Ferdinand I, successor of Alfonso (1457), maintained him in his office of secretary, and appointed him tutor of his son Alfonso, duke of Calabria. He followed Ferdinand in his campaign against the duke of Anjou, and distinguished himself by his bravery. Taken prisoner on different occasions, he was always brought back without ransom to the camp of Ferdinand, out of respect for his genius. On his return to Naples the king lavished his favors upon him, bestowed upon him riches and dignities, and intrusted him with the conduct of the most important matters of state. In 1482 a war, which bade fair to become general, having broken out between the Venetians and the duke of Ferrara, Pontano brought about a reconciliation of the belligerents. He was equally successful in compounding the difficulties that had arisen between Ferdinand and pope Innocent VIII. Put on his guard against the negotiator, the pope exclaimed, "I treat with Pontano: is it meet that truth and good faith should abandon him who never abandoned them?" He became at that time first minister, and remained in that high position under Alfonso II (who erected to him a statue) and Ferdinand II. When Charles VIII of France approached Naples at the head of a French army, Pontano sent him forthwith the keys of the city, harangued the king at his coronation, and dishonored himself by the insults and aspersions which he cast in this speech at his royal benefactors. When Ferdinand returned, he contented himself with depriving Pontano of his offices. The fallen minister found in his retreat more happiness than he had enjoyed in the tumult of public business, and when Louis XII, after the conquest of the kingdom of Naples, offered to put him again at the head of the government, this new Diocletian preferred his literary life to royal grandeur. It was in his retreat that he wrote most of the works he has left. He died at Naples in August, 1503. Most of his works deal with moral subjects, and abound in sound precepts and judicious reflections. His history of the Neapolitan war is a masterpiece, sufficient alone to immortalize its author. His Latinity is pure and elegant, his style noble and harmonious. His poetical works excited envy and conquered it. He announced himself, like Horace, the eternity of his fame: "The remotest posterity," he said, "will speak of Pontano, and celebrate his name." Erasmus, though a parsimonious distributor of praise to the Italians, has acknowledged Pontano's merit in the *Ciceronians*. It must be recorded also that Pontano had the merit of correcting the manuscript, then the only one, of Catullus; that we owe to him the discovery of Donat's commentaries on Virgil, and of Rhemnius Palæmon's Grammar. In his physical treatises he first signalled the law of continuity, and seems to have been the first among the moderns who, after Democritus, declared the milky way to be composed of an infinity of small stars. His poems, some of which unfortunately are spoiled by obscenities, were published at Venice (1505–8, 2 vols. 8vo) and at Florence (1514, 2 vols. 8vo). His prose writings were published at Venice (1518–19, 3 vols. 4to) and at Florence (1520, 4 vols. 8vo). His *Works* were edited at Naples (1505–12, 6 vols. fol.), and more completely at Basle (1556, 4 vols. 8vo). His prose writings comprise the following works: *De Obedientia:*—*De Fortitudine:*—*De Principe:*—*De Liberalitate:*—*De Beneficentia:*—*De Magnificentia:*—*De Splendore:*—*De Convenienția:*—*De Prudentia:*—*De Magnanimitate:*—*De Fortuna:*—*De Immanitate:*—*De Aspiratione:*—*Dialogi v;* full of spirit, but blamed for their obscenity by Erasmus himself:—*De Sermone:*—*Belli libri vi quod Ferdinandus Neapolitanorum rex cum Joanne Andoyavense duce gessit;* this pamphlet was printed separately (Venice, 1519, 4to), and has been translated into Italian:—*Centum Ptolemæi sententiæ commentariis illustratæ:*—*De rebus cœlestibus:*—*De luna.* The poetry of Pontano comprises, *Urania, seu de stellis:*—*Meteora:*—*De hortis Hesperidarum:*—*Pastorales pompæ:*—*Bucolica:*—*Amorum libri ii:*—*De amore conjugali:*—*Tumulorum libri ii:*—*De divinis laudibus:*—*Hendecasyllaba:*—*Lyrici versus:*—*Eridani libri ii:*—*Epigrammata.*—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v. See Hallam, *Literary History*, i, 129 sq.; Roscoe, *Leo X*, ch. ii and xx; Nicéron, *Mémoires*, vol. viii; Tiraboschi, *Storia della Letter. Ital.* s. v.

Pontanus, Georg-Barthold von Braitenberg, a learned Bohemian prelate, was born at Brux about the middle of the 16th century. He had scarcely taken orders when he achieved a reputation by his eloquence in the pulpit, as well as for his remarkable Latin verses, for which last-named attainment he was in 1588 crowned with the poetical laurels by the emperor Rudolph. Appointed canon of the cathedral of Prague in 1582, he afterwards became provost and vicar-general in the same city. He exercised a great and happy influence on the important questions then under debate in Bohemia. He died in 1616. His works are, *Der Triumph des Podagra* (Frankf. 1605, 4to):—*Bibliothek der Predigten aus alten und neuen Schriftstellern* (Cologne, 1608, fol.):—*Das fromme Böhmen* (Frankf. 1608, fol.); a selection of the most remarkable acts of piety of the princes and prelates of Bohemia:—*Scanderbergus, seu vita Georgii Castriotæ* (Hanau, 1609, 8vo):—a number of Latin poems:—a good edition of the treatise *De geminis rerum proprietatibus* of Bartholomeus Anglicus (Frankf. 1601, 8vo).—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.

Pontard, Pierre, a French prelate, was born at Mussidan Sept. 23, 1749. He was curate of Sarlat when the Revolution broke out. He then embraced the new principles with an enthusiasm that was rewarded by his appointment as constitutional bishop of the Dordogne in 1791. A few months later he was elected deputy of this department to the Legislative Assembly. He spoke in favor of divorce, attacked the dogmas of the Catholic Church, authorized the marriage of priests, and finally took a wife himself. It is this same Pontard who induced the visionary Suzanne Labrousse to go to Paris. Under the consulate he kept a boarding-school at Paris, but his institution waned after a few years. He was intimate with Pigault-Lebrun, and aided him, if the report be true, in the composition of some of his novels. After the Restoration, the duchess-dowager of Orleans, to whom he had rendered some services during the Reign of Terror, on hearing of his precarious situation, bestowed on him a life-rent, which enabled him to enter the institution of St. Périne at Chaillot, where he died, without apparent contrition, Jan. 22, 1832. He left, *Recueil des Ouvrages de la célèbre Mlle. Labrousse* (Bordeaux, 1797, 8vo):—*Grammaire Mécanique élémentaire de l'Orthographe Française* (Paris, 1812, 8vo). He is also the author of the *Journal prophétique*, which was edited at Paris in 1792 and 1793.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.

Pontas, Jean, a French prelate, was born Dec. 31, 1638, at Saint-Hilaire-du-Harcouêt (diocese of Avranches). Brought up by his maternal uncle, M. d'Arque-

ville, he studied successively under his eyes in his native city, then at the Jesuits' College of Rennes, finally in Paris at the Collége de Navarre. In 1663 he received, for reasons unknown, in the space of ten days, all the orders, inclusive of that of priesthood, from the bishop of Toul, with the consent of the bishop of Avranches. He was scarcely twenty-four years old. In 1668 he obtained the titles of doctor of canon and of civil law. The archbishop of Paris, Péréfine, appointed him vicar of the parish of Sainte-Géneviève-des-Ardents, an easy place, which left him time enough for his learned pursuits. He next became sub-penitentiary of Notre Dame, and retired to the Petits-Augustins of the faubourg Saint-Germain, where he died, April 27, 1728. His principal work is the *Dictionnaire des Cas de Conscience* (Paris, 1741, 3 vols. fol.). It is the completest on this subject, in the treatment of which Pontas displayed uncommon sagacity and great caution. His decisions, founded on imposing authorities, are equally distant from loose morality and narrow rigorism—a twofold danger which works of this description seldom avoid altogether.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.

Pont-Audemer, Council of (*Concilium Pons-audemarense*), an ecclesiastical council, was held in 1279 by William de Flavecour, archbishop of Rouen, who presided; twenty-four canons were published. Among these:

5. Recommends the observance of the canons of Lateran ("omnes utriusque sexus") upon confession and communion.
9. Forbids Christians to dwell with Jews.
10. Forbids the keeping of vigils and assemblies, and all dancing, in churches and churchyards.
16. Forbids rural deans to deliver any sentence of excommunication or suspension, unless in writing.
23. Forbids all those of the clergy who have taken the cross to abuse the privileges granted to them.

See Labbé, *Concil.* xi, 1144.

Pontbriant, Henri-Guillaume-Marie, Du Breil de, brother of the two following, was born at Rennes in 1709. He was a canon, grand chantre of the cathedral of Rennes, and abbé of Lanvaux, in the diocese of Vannes. He died at Rennes in 1767. He left, *Poëme sur l'Abus de la Poésie*, crowned at the Jeux Floraux in 1722:—*Sermon sur le Sacre du Roi* (Toulouse, 1722, 4to):—*Essai de Grammaire Française* (1754, 8vo):—*Projet d'une Histoire de Bretagne depuis* 1567 *jusqu'en* 1754 (Rennes, 1754, fol.).—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.

Pontbriant, Henri-Marie, Du Breil de, brother of the preceding, was born at Vannes in 1711. He was canon of Rennes. He early entered ecclesiastical life, and after several promotions was made bishop of Quebec, April 9, 1741. He set out for Quebec shortly after, and arrived there Aug. 17. He died at Montreal (Canada) June 29, 1760. A pastoral letter which he issued on the approach of the English to Quebec in 1759 is in Smith's *Hist. of Canada*.

Pontbriant, René-François, Du Breil de, a French priest, was born at Rennes near the opening of the 18th century. Appointed abbé of Saint-Marien-d'Auxerre, he was one of the most zealous promoters of the institution of the Petits-Savoyards. The first idea of that institution is due to the abbé Joly, canon of Dijon, who founded at Paris, towards 1665, in the interest of those poor children, an establishment which, taken up by Claude Hélyet, could not support itself after his death in 1686. The abbé of Pontbriant, touched with pity at the sight of the misery of those poor little Savoyards, came to their help towards 1737, and devoted to them during the remainder of his life his time, his energies, and his fortune. The abbé de Fénelon, who died on the revolutionary scaffold in 1794, succeeded him in this task. Pontbriant died in 1760. He left, *Projet d'un Établissement déjà commencé pour élever dans la Piété les petits Savoyards qui sont dans Paris*, with several appendices (Paris, 1735-43, 4 parts, 8vo):—*Pélerinage du Calvaire sur le Mont Valérien* (ibid. 1745, 12mo; 1751, 16mo; 1816, 12mo):—*L'Incrédule détrompé et le Chrétien affermi dans la Foi* (1752, 8vo), a work which met with uncommon favor.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.

Ponte, Luis de, a Spanish Jesuit, noted as an ascetic writer, was born at Valladolid Nov. 11, 1554. He belonged to a noble family, but renounced all the advantages the world offered him, and at the age of twenty entered the Society of Jesus. He was during many years a teacher of philosophy and theology, but his failing health compelled him at last to monastical retirement. In his retreat he divided his time between prayer, good works, and the composition of pious writings, by which he obtained throughout Europe the reputation of an excellent master of spiritual life. He died Feb. 17, 1624. Most of his numerous writings were translated into Latin by Melchior Trevinnia. We mention *Meditaciones de los Mysterios de nuestra Santa Fé* (Valladolid, 1605, 1613, 2 vols. 4to). This work was translated into several languages: into Arabic by F. Fromaye, and into French by F. Brignon (1613, 3 vols. 4to):—*Guida Espiritual de la Oracion, Meditacion, y Contemplacion* (ibid. 1609, 4to):—*De la Perfeccion Cristiana* (ibid. 1612–16, 4 vols. 4to):—*Vida del D. Balthasar Alvarez* (Madrid, 1615, 4to):—*Expositio moralis et mystica in Canticum Canticorum* (Cologne, 1622, 2 vols. fol.; Paris, 1646, fol.):—*Directorio Espiritual* (Madrid, 1625, 8vo). He also wrote the first part of *Vida Maravillosa de Marina de Escobar* (ibid. 1665, fol.), which was finished and published by a member of his order, Miguel Oreña.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v. See Antonio, *Bibliotheca Hispana Nova*, s. v.

Pontianus, St., a pope of the 3d century, was a native of Rome, and descended from the gens Calpurnia, if we may believe the ancient writers. He succeeded Urban I in the pontificate in 230. Platina and others assert that he introduced the singing of psalms into the Church, but this custom must be older. The first years of his pontificate under Alexander Severus were quiet, but the persecutions commenced again under Maximinus, and Pontianus, together with a presbyter by the name of Hippolytus, suffered sentence of deportation to the usual place of exile, the island of Tavolato, near Sardinia, where he died from want and exposure, Sept. 28, 235. His body was carried to Rome by order of pope St. Fabian. Two epistles are falsely attributed to him. St. Anterus was his successor. See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.; Platina, *Vitæ Pontificum*, s. v.; Montor, *Hist. des Papes* (see Index); Milman, *Hist. of Latin Christianity*, i, 80.

Pontier, Gédéon, a French theologian, was born near Alais (Languedoc), near the middle of the 17th century. Though brought up in the Protestant communion, he embraced Roman Catholicism, entered the ecclesiastical state, and obtained the title of apostolic prothonotary. He died at Paris in 1709, at an advanced age. He left, *Le Cabinet, ou la Bibliothèque des Grands* (1680–89, 3 vols. 12mo); the last volume contains in addition, *Les Questions de la Princesse Henriette de la Guiche, Duchesse d'Angoulême et Comtesse d'Alais, sur toutes Sortes de Sujets, avec les Réponses* (1687, 12mo):—*Lettre de Saulx, Premier Évêque d'Alais* (1696, 12mo), etc. La Bruyère gives a portrait of Pontier in his "Caractères," under the name of Dioscurus, and makes very much of him.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.

Pontĭfex (1), a priest among the ancient Romans. The *pontifices* were formed into a college, and all matters of religion were placed under its exclusive superintendence. Their functions and duties were minutely detailed in the pontifical books, which were drawn up in the reign of Numa Pompilius, and contained the names of the gods and the various regulations for their worship, as well as a detailed description of the functions, rights, and privileges of the priests. The pontifices were not priests of any particular divinity, but of the

worship of the gods generally. Their duties embraced the regulation of all the religious rites and ceremonies (both public and private) of a state—e. g. how the gods should be worshipped, how burials should be conducted, how the souls of the dead (manes) should be appeased. To them was intrusted the care of the calendar, the proclamation of festival days, etc. They also saw that every religious and every judicial act took place on the right day. "As they thus had," says Dr. Mommsen, "an especial supervision of all religious observances, it was to them in case of need (as on occasion of marriage, testament, or *arrogatio*) that the preliminary question was addressed, whether the matter proposed did not, in any respect, offend against divine law." In matters of religion they were the supreme authorities; from their decisions there was no appeal, and they themselves were responsible neither to the senate nor the people; further, they had power to inflict punishment on such priests as dared to disobey their injunctions and deviate into schismatical courses. The words of Festus are: "Rerum quæ ad sacra et religiones pertinent, *judices et vindices*." The head of the college was called *Pontifex Maximus*. The pontiffs, according to Roman tradition, were instituted by Numa—a mythical person, to whom the origin of nearly all the religious institutions of Rome is ascribed. But as they appear in all the Latin communities, they are regarded by Mommsen as a "thoroughly national Italian institution," and probably found a place in the earliest religious organization of the Latin race. Their number was originally four, or, including the *pontifex maximus*, five, all of whom were taken from the patricians. In B.C. 300, the Ogulnian Law raised the number to nine, four of whom were to be plebeians. The first plebeian, however, who attained the dignity of *pontifex maximus* was Tib. Coruncanius, B.C. 254. Sulla, in B.C. 81, again increased the number to fifteen, and Julius Cæsar to sixteen. During the empire, the functions of *pontifex maximus* were generally discharged by the emperors themselves; and when at length the emperors dropped the name, it was picked up by the Christian bishops of Rome; and now this title, borrowed from a pagan cult, forms one of the sacred designations of his holiness the pope.

Pontifex (2) is hence also the title in the Roman Catholic Church of the archbishop or bishop of a diocese. The pope himself is styled the sovereign pontifex, or *pontiff* (q. v.). (J. H. W.)

Pontĭfex Maxĭmus. Before the time of Constantine the clergy were not recognised as holding any distinct rank in the state; but when Christianity was adopted as the religion of the Roman empire, its ministers were considered as occupying the place of those heathen priests whose superstitions had fallen into disrepute. According to Zosimus, Constantine himself, in the year 325, assumed the title of *Pontifex Maximus*, which the heathen emperors before him had appropriated, because it contributed to exalt at once the imperial and episcopal dignity, and served to justify the interference of the emperor in ecclesiastical councils and in the nomination of bishops. Constantine's successors followed his example until the days of Gratian, who was the last emperor to whom the title was applied. Some scholars doubt Zosimus's assertion, notwithstanding the fact that the medals of Constantine and his successors, down to Gratian, and the inscriptions relating to them, give them the title of *Pontifex Maximus*, on the ground that it may have been one of those traditional titles which the power of habit preserved, without any meaning being connected with them. As to the use of the sacerdotal garment, Zosimus may not be quite trustworthy in that respect. But even if the emperors had accepted the pontifical robes, brought to them by the pagan priests at their accession to the throne, it does not follow that they actually wore them, or even officiated as "Pontifices Maximi." It has been supposed by some authors that the first Christian emperors adopted this pagan title only as a means of proclaiming themselves the guardians and protectors of the Christian religion. At an early period of his reign Constantine issued edicts in favor of the Christian clergy, by which they were put on a footing, with respect to civil rights, with the heathen priests: these edicts were soon followed by others, which gave to the clergy some special and peculiar privileges. See Bingham, *Origines Eccles.* (Index in vol. ii); Riddle, *Christian Antiquities*, p. 337; Elliott, *Romanism*, p. 620; Alzog, *Kirchengesch.* i, 244, 251.

Pontiff, or High-Priest, a person who has the superintendence and direction of divine worship, as the offering of sacrifices, and other religious solemnities. The Romans had a college of pontiffs, called by them "pontifici." See Pontifex.

Pontiffs, Confraternities of, were in the 12th century guilds of associated masons for the building of churches. They appeared first at Chartres, in France, and spread thence throughout that country and England, Switzerland, and Germany. When their Christian character died out they became lodges of Freemasons.

Pontifical (i. e. belonging to a pontiff or bishop) is a book of rites and ceremonies appertaining to the office of a high-priest, pope, or prelate; therefore the name of a book used by a bishop at consecration of churches, etc. Thus the Roman Pontifical (*Pontificale Romanum*) is the book giving directions as to those acts of worship which Roman Catholic bishops exclusively perform, or at least a priest delegated by the bishop. Several mediæval pontificalia are extant, but they have merely a historical value. The edition published Feb. 10, 1596, by pope Clement VIII, has remained up to our day the rule of the Roman Catholic ceremonial. "Statuentes," says the pope, "Pontificale prædictum nullo unquam in toto vel in parte mutandum, vel ei aliquid addendum, aut omnino detrahendum esse, ac quoscunque qui pontificalia munia exercere, vel alia, quæ in dicto Pontificali continentur, facere aut exequi debent, ad ea peragenda et præstanda ex hujus Pontificalis præscripto et ratione teneri, neminemque ex eis . . . nisi formulis, quæ hoc ipso Pontificali continentur, servatis satisfacere posse." It may be seen by this quotation how stringent the prescriptions of the Pontifical are. The Pontifical contains the services for ordinations, for religious professions and receptions of monks and nuns, consecrations, benedictions, etc., as well as of the solemn administration by a bishop of those sacraments which are ordinarily administered by priests. Besides the prayers to be recited, the Pontifical also lays down the ceremonial to be observed. The rules of this ceremonial are of two kinds—*preceptive*, the literal observance of which is obligatory; and *directive*, which admit of a certain interpretation. The ceremonies must be performed as described in the several services without any omission, addition, or modification, whether in the administration of sacraments or the performance of public worship, in which the bishop exclusively, or a priest delegated by the bishop, officiates.

Another of the service-books of bishops is called the *Ceremoniale*, but it is chiefly confined to a description of the peculiar ceremonial with which bishops are required to celebrate solemnly those offices, as of the mass, vespers, the funeral office, etc., which are common to them with priests. The most prized editions of both these service-books are those published by authority of the learned pope Benedict XIV.

In England the Pontifical is not by authority published separately from the Liturgy, so that it is never called by that name; though the offices of confirmation and ordination, in fact, compose the English Pontifical. For the consecration of churches and churchyards there is no office appointed by sufficient authority. See *Bible and Missal*, p. 217; Coleman, *Primitive Ch.* (Index). See Consecration of Churches.

Pontificalia, properly the ensigns of a pontiff's or bishop's office, is a term loosely used for any ecclesiasti-

cal vestment or other ornament, wherein either of these functionaries performs divine service.

Pontificate means the state or dignity of a pontiff, or high-priest; but is more particularly applied in modern times to the reign of a pope.

Pontinus, Council of. See Pontyon.

Pontius, a deacon of the African Church, the tried friend and constant companion of Cyprian, drew up a narrative of the life and sufferings of the martyred bishop, which is styled an excellent production (*egregium volumen*) by Jerome. If the piece extant under the name of Pontius, entitled *De Vita et Passione S. Cypriani*, be genuine, it certainly does not merit such high commendation, since it is composed in an ambitious declamatory style, full of affectation and rhetorical ornaments. Perhaps the original work may have formed the basis of what we now possess, which has probably been built up into its present form by the labor of various hands. It will be found attached to all the most important editions of Cyprian, and is contained also in the *Acta Primorum Martyrum* of Ruinart (Paris, 1690, 4to; Amsterdam, 1713, fol.). The *Acta Pontii* are preserved in the *Miscellanea* of Baluze (Paris, 1678, 8vo), ii, 124, and in the *Acta Sanctorum* under March 8, the day marked as his festival in the Roman Martyrologies. See Jerome, *De Viris Ill.* p. 68; Schönemann, *Bibl. Patrum Lat.* vol. i, c. iii, § 6.

Pontius, Paul, a celebrated Belgian engraver, was born at Antwerp in 1596, according to some accounts, according to others in 1603. He was the pupil of Vorstermann, and is chiefly distinguished for his excellent prints after Rubens, which he executed under that great painter's inspection. He engraved also a celebrated set of portraits after Vandyck, including those of many of the most distinguished Flemish painters. He appears to have adapted himself wonderfully to whatever artist he copied. The date of his death appears not to be known. The *Slaughter of the Innocents*, after Rubens, one of his principal works, is dated 1653.

Pontius (Pilate). See Pilate.

Pontoppidan, Erik Eriksen, also called *Pontoppidan the Elder*, a Norwegian prelate, was born in 1616 at Broby (town-bridge=*pons oppidanus*), in Fühnen, in Denmark, from which he took his Latin name. He was for many years minister in Kjöge, but afterwards became bishop of the Trondhjem diocese in Norway. For his many Latin poems he had the honor of being crowned poet by the old Westhof, who had himself been crowned poet in Germany. Pontoppidan's funeral sermons are very famous. But what especially entitles him to an honorable name in history is his *Danish Grammar*, which was published in 1668, while he was still minister at Kjöge. It was the first Danish grammar ever published. He died in 1678. See Barfod, *Fortællinger*, p. 542. (R. B. A.)

Pontoppidan, Erik L., son of the nephew of the foregoing, also called *Pontoppidan the Younger*, was born Aug. 24, 1698, in Aarhus, in Denmark, where his father was dean. He became a student in 1716 at Fredericia, and afterwards at Copenhagen; after this he was tutor in the house of general Lützow, in Norway; travelled in foreign lands with a son of Iver Hvitfeldt, and then became tutor in the family of the last duke of Holstein-Plön. In 1723 he was appointed chaplain of the palace chapel at Nordborg; in 1734 chaplain of the palace chapel at Fredericksborg; and in 1735 he became court-chaplain in Copenhagen. In 1738 he was elected professor of theology in the Copenhagen University; was appointed bishop of Bergen in 1747; received the degree of doctor of theology in 1749; and in 1755 became chancellor of the Copenhagen University. He died Dec. 20, 1764. As a theologian he was semi-pietistic, but not at all fanatical. He was cheerful, and disapproved the severe pietistic laws that were enforced by the Danish government in his time. During the reign of Christian VI he had the courage to write, "God never permits the laws of nature to be violated for the sake of advancing the cause of the Church. When the Church of Christ consisted exclusively of volunteers, it had living members." Some fault has been found with him, and perhaps justly, in his direction of the affairs of the university; but at the same time he did much to advance the cause of science, and he was ever on the alert to see that the several professors did not neglect any portion of their duty to the university. As a German, Danish, and Latin author he exercised a great influence, especially in theology, history, natural history, and political economy. Of his numerous works, the following are the ones most known: *An Explanation of Luther's Catechism* (1737), a book that was for a long time the text-book in Denmark and Norway in the religious education of the children, and is as such used very widely yet:—*Marmora Danica* (1739–41, 2 vols. fol.), in which he copies a number of inscriptions of various ages which elucidate the history of his country:—*Gesta et Vestigia Danorum extra Daniam* (1740–41, 3 vols.):—*Annales Ecclesiæ Daniæ* (1741–52, 4 vols.), in German; a good history of the Danish Church:—*Menoza, an Asiatic Prince, who Travelled around the World in Search of Christians* (1742–43, 3 vols.). This is a philosophical work, written in Danish, and has been translated into Dutch, German, and other languages; it has recently been republished in Denmark by V. Birkeda:—*The Power of Truth in Conquering Infidelity* (1758):—*Collegium Pastorale Præticum* (1757):—*Origines Hafnienses* (1760):—*Danish Atlas* (1763–1781, 4 vols.). The fourth volume was completed by his brother-in-law, Hans de Hofman. He also published a *Hymn-book*, and wrote several short treatises. His *Natural History of Norway* (1752–54) was translated into English and German. He published *Economical Balance* in 1759, and a *Magazine of Political Economy*, from 1757 to 1764. See Barfod, *Fortællinger*, p. 542; *Nordisk Conversations-Lexikon*, s. v. (R. B. A.)

Pontormo, Jacopo da (or Jacopo Carrucci), a distinguished Florentine painter, was born at Pontormo in 1493. He was a short time the pupil of Leonardo da Vinci, and studied under Albertinelli, Pietro di Cosimo, and Andrea del Sarto. He painted for some time in a similar style to Andrea, and was that painter's rival; but he frequently changed his manner, and three distinct styles are ascribed to him, the last imitated from the works of Albert Dürer. Towards the close of his life he spent eleven years in painting some frescos of the *Deluge* and the *Last Judgment* in the church of San Lorenzo, in the manner of the imitators of Michael Angelo, but they have long since been washed over. He died at Florence in 1558.

Pon'tus (Πόντος, the *sea*), a large district in the north of Asia Minor, extending along the coast of the Pontus Euxinus, from which circumstance the name was derived. It is mentioned in the New Testament as furnishing a portion of that audience which listened to the apostles on the day of Pentecost (Acts ii, 9), as the birthplace of Aquila (xviii, 2), and as one of the districts through which "the strangers" addressed by Peter in his first epistle "were scattered abroad" (1 Pet. i, 1). All these passages agree in showing that there were many Jewish residents in the district. The term Pontus signified a country of very various extent at different times, and while the boundaries of all the provinces of Asia Minor were continually shifting, none were more affected by the changes of the times than those of Pontus. In the earlier period of its history it was merely a province of Cappadocia, which then extended from Mount Taurus to the Euxine; and tradition states that the petty kingdoms of which it was composed were subdued and consolidated by Ninus. It then fell under the alternate dominion of the Medes and Persians, the latter of whom divided it into satrapies; and in the reign of Darius Hystaspis the country of Pontus was

bestowed by that prince on Artabazes, a member of his own family, who henceforth assumed the title of king of Pontus, and was the ancestor of a long line of princes rescued from oblivion by the genius, the crimes, and the vicissitudes of Mithridates VII, sometimes called "the Great." The kingdom of Artabazes was comprised between 41° and 43° N. lat., and between 35° and 42° E. long.; and was bounded on the north by the Euxine, on the south by Armenia Minor, on the east by Colchis, and on the west by the river Halys. The inhabitants were a bold, active, and warlike race, and in the reign of Ariobarzanes they shook off the yoke of Persia, to whose sovereigns their own had from the time of Artabazes been tributary, and established the complete independence of their country. From this period the kingdom of Pontus prospered. Its monarchs gradually added to their dominions the whole of Cappadocia and Paphlagonia and a large part of Bithynia, thus dividing Asia Minor with the Attalian dynasty, which ruled at Pergamos. Mithridates VI formed an alliance with the Romans, sent a fleet to aid them in their wars against Carthage, and when, on the death of Attalus, who left his kingdom of Pergamos to the Roman people, Aristonicus contested the legacy, and attempted to make himself king of Pergamos, Mithridates espoused the cause of Rome, and aided in driving the usurper out of Asia. The policy of this able prince was reversed by his son and successor. Mithridates VII ascended the throne at the age of eleven years, and early began a career of enmity towards the Romans, the ultimate result of which was the entire subjugation of the country over which he ruled, and its reduction to the condition of a Roman province. Mithridates did, however, succeed so far as to make himself master of all Lesser Asia and of many of the adjacent islands. At Cos he plundered the Jews of a large sum of money, he annexed Athens itself to his kingdom, while his son Ariarathes overcame Macedonia and Thrace. At this period of his reign he was the master of twenty-five nations; and so great were his accomplishments as a linguist, that he is said to have been able to converse with the natives of all without the aid of an interpreter. He determined utterly to root out the Roman dominion from Asia, and in order to compromise the inhabitants of the country beyond the possibility of return, he issued orders that on a certain day throughout his dominions every Roman should be put to death, not excepting even women and children. This atrocious decree, which has covered the name of Mithridates with infamy, was carried out, and the number of persons who perished in the massacre is variously estimated at from eighty to one hundred and sixty thousand. From this time his real power began to decline; and after a romantic series of vicissitudes he was killed at his own request in the seventy-first year of his age, B.C. 64. After the death of Mithridates, his son Pharnaces submitted to the Romans. He was made king of Bosphorus, and proclaimed the ally of Rome; but after the return of Pompey he regained his hereditary kingdom, and ventured to oppose the Romans with as much obstinacy as his father, but with less success. Julius Cæsar marched against him, and reduced the country to the condition of a province. Marc Antony restored Darius, the son of Pharnaces; and a short line of princes, none of whom require any notice in this place, governed the country till the time of Nero. The last of these, Polemo II, was the father of that Berenice who married Herod Agrippa II, before whom Paul pleaded his cause with so much eloquence. From this time Pontus ceased to be an independent state, constituting a province or dependency of the Roman empire. On the east it was bounded by Colchis, on the south by Cappadocia and part of Armenia, and on the west by Paphlagonia and Galatia. Ptolemy (*Geog.* v, 5) and Pliny (*Hist. Nat.* vi, 4) regard Pontus and Cappadocia as one province; but Strabo (*Geog.* xii, 541) rightly distinguishes them, seeing that each formed a distinct government with its own ruler or prince. Ptolemy divides what may be called the true Pontus into three districts — Pontus Galaticus, Pontus Cappadocius, and Pontus Polemoniacus. This last was imagined to be the country of the Amazons.

The climate of Pontus is hot in summer, but severe in winter, especially along the shores of the Euxine. The soil is fertile, but less so than in the more southern parts of Asia Minor; yet it abounds with olives and cherry-trees, and the valleys produce considerable quantities of grain. These advantages it owes to its being watered by many small rivers, while the great river Halys flows far into the interior. The inhabitants were a hardy and industrious race; deriving their origin, according to tradition, from Tubal Cain. They were industrious as well as warlike, and addicted to commerce, and the inhabitants of Pontus Cappadocius were celebrated for their skill in the manufacture of arms, and for working in metal in general. They had many convenient harbors on the Euxine, and abundance of fine timber for ship-building, and of these they seem very early to have taken full advantage. They retained more of the Eastern elements in their language and religion than the inhabitants of Lydia and Pergamos, who were brought more entirely under the influence of Greek art, literature, and philosophy. They spoke a dialect of the Persian, largely corrupted with Greek; and their religion seems to have been a compound of Greek, Scythian, and Persian. Demeter, Zeus, and Poseidon were their chief deities; but this comes to us on Greek authority; and they sacrificed to the last-named deity white horses, by harnessing them four abreast to chariots, and driving them into the sea, where they were drowned. The principal towns of Pontus were Amasia, the ancient metropolis, and the birthplace of Strabo, Themiscyra, Cerasus, and Trapezus; which last is still an important town under the name of Trebizond. See Cellarius, *Notit.* ii, 287; Mannert, vi, 350; Rosenmüller, *Bibl. Geog.* iii, 5–9; *Encyclop. Méthodique*, sect. *Géog. Ancienne*, s. v. Pontos; Smith, *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Geog.* s. v. Pontus; Conybeare and Howson, *Life and Epistles* (N. Y. ed.), i, 247. See Asia Minor.

Pontyon, Council of (*Concilium Pontigonense*), was held in June and July, 876, by the Cisalpine bishops, the emperor Charles and the Roman legates being present. The pretensions of Ansegisus, metropolitan of Sens, whom pope John VIII, at the request of the emperor, had nominated primate vicar apostolic in Gaul and Germany (in violation of the canons and of the rights of the metropolitans), were brought before the council, and so resolutely opposed by the bishops that the affair, for the time, came to nothing; i. e. the pontifical rescript in favor of Ansegisus remained practically null and void. The archbishop of Sens, it is true, from that time forward assumed the title of "Primate of Gaul and Germany," but it was a mere nominal distinction, unattended by jurisdiction or authority. The acts of the Synod of Pavia, in the beginning of the year, were confirmed by the Council of Pontyon. Fifty-two bishops and archbishops subscribed the acts, together with five abbots. See Labbé, *Concil.* ix, 280; Hefele, *Conciliengesch.* vol. i, iv, and v; Sirmond, *Concil. Antiq. Gall.* vol. iii; Jervis, *Hist. of the Church of France*, i, 38 sq.

Pool is the rendering in the A. V. of the following Heb. and Greek words:

1. Usually בְּרֵכָה, *berekâh* (Sept. κρήνη or κολυμβήθρα), or בְּרָכָה, *berakâh* (Psa. lxxxiv, 6, see Berachah), from בָּרַךְ, "to fall on the knees" (see Judg. vii, 5, 6). This word is akin to the Arabic *Birkeh*, and its Spanish form *Al-berca*. In the Old Test. it stands for the larger reservoirs of rain or spring water; while *bôr*, "cistern," is used for the smaller domestic tanks, of which every house had one or more. Some are supplied by springs, and some are merely receptacles for rain-water (Burckhardt, *Syria*, p. 314). It is thus ap-

plied to the large public reservoirs, corresponding to the tanks of India, belonging to the towns of Gibeon (2 Sam. ii, 13), Hebron (iv, 12), Samaria (1 Kings xxii, 38), and Jerusalem; "the upper pool," 2 Kings xviii, 17; Isa. vii, 3; xxxiv, 2 (now the "Birket el-Mamilla"); "the lower pool," Isa. xxii, 9, 11 ("Birket es-Sultan"); "Hezekiah's pool," 2 Kings xx, 20 ("Birket el-Hammâm"); "the king's pool," Neh. ii, 14 ("the fountain of the Virgin"); "the pool of Siloah," Neh. iii, 15 ("Birket Silwân"); and "the old pool," Isa. xxii, 11. We read also (Eccl. ii, 6) of the "pools" or cisterns made by Solomon to irrigate his gardens. The importance of these reservoirs in a country possessing scarcely more than one perennial stream, and where wells are few and inconsiderable, can hardly be estimated by those accustomed to an unfailing abundance of the precious fluid. In Jer. xiv, 3 we have a powerful description of the disappointment caused by the failure of the water in the cisterns (גֻּבִּים; A. V. "pits;" comp. Isa. xlii, 15; Jer. ii, 13). In modern Palestine they are often very filthy, although in constant use (Thomson, *Land and Book*, i, 316). See Water.

2. *Agâm*, אָגָם (Isa. xiv, 23; xxxv, 7; xli, 18; xlii, 15); elsewhere "pond" (q. v.).

3. *Mikvêh*, מִקְוֶה (Exod. vii, 19), a *gathering together* (i. e. of water), as rendered Gen. i, 10.

4. In the New Test. κολυμβήθρα, only in John v, 2; ix, 7.

The following are the principal reservoirs mentioned in the Bible:

a. A *pool of Hezekiah*, 2 Kings xx, 20 (comp. Sirach, xlviii, 17 [19]). It was a basin which that king had opened in the city, and fed by a watercourse (תְּעָלָה, "conduit"). In 2 Chron. xxxii, 30 it is said more definitely that Hezekiah conducted the water from the upper pool of Gihon in the west of the city. This pool of Hezekiah, called by the Arabs *Birket el-Hammâm*, is pointed out by tradition in the north-western part of the modern city, not far east of the Jaffa gate (Robinson, ii, 134 sq.). And there is no doubt that this is the true location, since the waters of the upper pool of Gihon (Birket el-Mamilla) flow through small, roughly built aqueducts in the vicinity of the Jaffa gate, and thus reach the Birket el-Hammâm (Robinson, i, 396). See Hezekiah's Pool.

b. The *upper pool* (בְּרֵכָה עֶלְיוֹנָה) and *the lower pool* (בְּרֵכָה תַחְתּוֹנָה), the former lying near the fuller's field, and on the road to it, outside of the city (Isa. vii, 3; xxxvi, 2; 2 Kings xviii, 17), and connecting with a watercourse. The lower pool is named in Isa. xxii, 9. There still remain in the west of the city two water-basins, an upper and a lower; the one called *Birket el-Mamilla*, at the head of the valley of Gihon, and the other *Birket es-Sultan*, somewhat farther down the valley southward, almost in a line with the south wall of the city (Robinson, ii, 129 sq.). They are generally known as the upper and the lower pool of Gihon. It supports the identification of these with "the upper and lower pools" that there are no other similar or corresponding reservoirs in the neighborhood; and the western position of the upper pool suits well the circumstances mentioned in Scripture (see Isa. xxxvi. 2; 2 Kings xviii, 17; comp. Knobel, *Isa.* p. 153, 257). It may be added that a trustworthy tradition places the fuller's field westward of the city (Robinson, *ut sup.* p. 128). See Gihon.

c. The *old pool* (בְּרֵכָה יְשָׁנָה), not far from the double wall (חֹמָתַיִם, "*two walls*"), Isa. xxii, 11. This double wall was near the royal garden (2 Kings xxv, 4; Jer. xxxix, 4), which must be sought in the southeast of the city, near the fountain of Siloam (Neh. iii, 15). Near the mouth of the Tyropœon there are still two reservoirs or cisterns (Robinson, i, 384; ii, 146), a smaller one hollowed out in the rock, and the other, a little larger, lying a short distance to the south of the former, and receiving its water. The water flows from an opening in the rock a few feet north of the lesser basin; i. e. from the fountain of Siloam. The larger of these basins is doubtless the pool of Siloam, and the smaller is possibly the "*old pool*," and the same with the artificial pool named in Neh. iii, 16 as in this vicinity (Robinson, ii, 146; comp. Thenius, in Illgen's *Zeitschr.* 1844, i, 22 sq.). Perhaps, however, we may rather understand the passage in Isaiah as referring to

Pool of Hezekiah.

a mere damming up of the Tyropœon itself between the two parallel parts of the old wall lining the sides of the valley, for the purpose of containing (temporarily during the siege) the waters of the then "old" (i. e. superseded) pool of Gihon outside the city, thus diverted into a new channel. See JERUSALEM.

d. The *king's pool* (בְּרֵכַת הַמֶּלֶךְ, Neh. ii, 14) is probably to be found in the fountain of the Virgin Mary, on the east side of Ophel (Robinson, ii, 102, 149), and is perhaps the same with the pool of Solomon (κολυμβήθρα Σολομῶνος) mentioned by Josephus as on this side of the city (*War*, v, 4, 2; comp. Thenius, *op. cit.* p. 25). With less probability Schultz (*Jerus.* p. 58) takes the pool which lies south of Siloam, and which is now half choked with earth, for the king's pool. See JERUSALEM.

In Josephus, besides the foregoing, we find the *sparrow's pool* (τὸ Στρουθίον, which may have a different meaning; see Beekman, *Erfind.* iv, 19), opposite the Castle of Antonia, in the north of the city (*War*, v, 11, 4), now Birket Israil, or perhaps Birket el-Hejjah; the *pool of almonds* (ἀμύγδαλον), on the east side, at some distance from the city (*War*, ut sup.); the *pool of serpents* (κολυμβήθρα τῶν ὄφεων), near Herod's monument (Joseph. *War*, v, 3, 2), between Scopus (a hill seven stadia, or a mile, from the city, Joseph. *War*, ii, 19, 4) and the city, and hence to the north, perhaps near the road to Shechem (Robinson, i, 400; ii, 43, 189 sq.). This must, then, be different from the *dragon well* (*serpent well*) in Neh. ii, 13, which lay between the dung-gate in the south-west and the valley (comp. Thenius, *op. cit.* p. 17). There is no trace of it now to be found, for *Birket el-Mamilla* is to be identified with the upper pool, as above (Schultz, p. 67). See JERUSALEM.

For the pools of Gibeon, Hebron, Samaria, Solomon, Bethesda, and Siloam, see those words respectively. See also FOUNTAIN.

Poole, MATTHEW, an eminent English Nonconformist minister, was born in York in 1624. He received his education and took his degree at Emmanuel College, Cambridge. Having attached himself to the Presbyterians, he entered the ministry, and about the year 1648 became rector of St. Michael le Querne, in London. In 1657, when Richard Cromwell succeeded his father in the chancellorship at Oxford, Mr. Poole was incorporated master of arts in that university. He soon became famous and of influence among his brethren, especially after 1658, when he published *A Model for the Maintaining of Students of Choice Abilities at the University, and principally in order to the Ministry*, which was accompanied with a recommendation from the university, signed by several Cambridge professors and savans, among whom were Cudworth, Witchcot, Worthington, Dillingham, etc. In 1660, after the restoration of Charles II, he published a sermon upon John iv, 23, 24, preached before the mayor of London, against re-establishing the Liturgy of the Church of England; and refusing to comply with the Act of Uniformity, in 1662, he was ejected from his rectory. He published on this occasion *Vox clamantis in Deserto*, but submitted to the law with a commendable resignation, and retired to his studies at his paternal estate, resolving to employ his pen in the service of religion in general, regardless of the particular disputes among Protestants. He now devoted himself to a laborious and useful work entitled *Synopsis Criticorum Biblicum*, which was published in 1669 and the following years. The design was nothing less than to bring into one view whatever had been written by critics of all ages and nations on the books of Holy Scripture. The work when finally brought out was probably as good as any of the kind can be, and few will deny that it is a very valuable and useful abridgment; but synopses and abridgments are rather for the multitude than for scholars, who are rarely satisfied with the opinions of any author which are thus presented to them at second-hand, without the fulness of illustration which the author himself had given; yet being written in Latin, it is manifest that the compiler contemplated a work adapted to the necessities and tastes of Biblical scholars. Its chief use is as a convenient body of exegetical criticism for Biblical students who are placed in situations which cut them off from convenient access to large libraries, and for them it has been rendered to a great extent obsolete by the important results of recent research. But in its day it was a great work. In the midst of this employment he testified his zeal against popery in a number of works, the principal one of which is entitled *The Nullity of the Romish Faith concerning the Church's Infallibility* (1666, 8vo). When Oates's depositions concerning the Popish plot were printed in 1679, Poole found his name in the list of those that were to be cut off; and an incident befell him soon after which gave him the greatest apprehensions of his danger. Having passed an evening at the house of his friend, alderman Ashurst, he took one Mr. Chorley to bear him company home. When they came to the narrow passage which leads from Clerkenwell to St. John's Court, there were two men standing at the entrance; one of whom, as Poole came along, cried out to the other, "Here he is!" upon which the other replied, "Let him alone, for there is somebody with him." As soon as they had passed, Poole asked his friend if he heard what those men said; and upon his answering that he had, "Well," replied Poole, "I had been murdered to-night, if you had not been with me." It is said that, before this incident, he gave not the least credit to what was said in Oates's deposition; but he soon thought proper to retire to Holland, where he died, in October, 1679, not without a suspicion of being poisoned, as Calamy relates. He published several small pieces, besides what has been mentioned; and he also wrote a volume of *English Annotations upon the Holy Scriptures;* but was prevented by death from going farther than the 58th chapter of Isaiah. That work was completed by others, and published (1688) in two vols. fol. Poole is spoken of as profound in learning, strict in piety, and universal in his charity. He was more especially distinguished as a commentator. Mr. Cecil observes, "Commentators are excellent where there are but few difficulties; but they leave the harder knots still untied; but after all, if we must have commentators, as we certainly must, Poole is incomparable, and I had almost said, abundant of himself." Wood observes that "he left behind him the character of a very celebrated critic and casuist;" and Calamy tells us that "he was very facetious in conversation, very true to his friend, very strict in his piety, and universal in his charity." See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth.* s. v.; Middleton, *Evangel. Biogr.* vol. iii; *Gen. Biogr. Dict.* s. v.

Poor. This word, in the Scriptures, often denotes not so much a man destitute of the good things of this world, as a man sensible of his spiritual wants. In this sense the greatest and richest men of the world are on a level with the poorest in the eyes of God. In the following treatment of the subject we combine the Scriptural and the Talmudic information.

I. Hebrew and Greek terms so rendered in the A. V. These are: 1. אֶבְיוֹן, *ebyôn* (Sept. πτωχός; Vulg. *pauper*); 2. דַּל, *dal* (πένης; *pauper*); 3. חֶלְכָּה, *chelekâh* (πτωχός; *pauper*); 4. מִסְכֵּן, *miskên* (πένης; *pauper*), a word of later usage; 5. עֲנָה, *anâh*, Chald. (Dan. iv, 27) (πένης; *pauper*); from same root as, 6. עָנִי, *anî*, the word most usually "poor" in A. V. (πενιχρός, πτωχός, πένης; *indigens, pauper*. Also Zech. ix, 9, and Isa. xxvi, 6, πραΰς; *pauper*); 7. רֵשׁ, *rôsh*, part. of רוּשׁ (ταπεινός; *pauper*). In 2 Sam. xii, 1, רָאשׁ; πένης, πτωχός. 8. Poverty; מַחְסוֹר, *machsôr*, *lack* (ἐνδεία; *egestas*). In the N. T., πτωχός, *pauper*, and πένης; *egenus*, once only (2 Cor. ix, 9). "Poor" is also

used in the sense of "afflicted," "humble," etc., e. g. Matt. v, 3.

II. *Jewish Enactments.*—The general kindly spirit of the law towards the poor is sufficiently shown by such passages as Deut. xv, 7, for the reason that (ver. 11) "the poor shall never cease out of the land;" and a remarkable agreement with some of its directions is expressed in Job xx, 19; xxiv, 3 sq., where among acts of oppression are particularly mentioned "taking (away) a pledge," and withholding the sheaf from the poor (vers. 9, 10; xxix, 12, 16; xxxi, 17), "eating with" the poor (comp. Deut. xxvi, 12, etc.). See also such passages as Ezek. xviii, 12, 16, 17; xxii, 29; Jer. v, 28; xxii, 13, 16; Isa. x, 2; Amos ii, 7; Zech. vii, 10, and Ecclus. iv, 1, 4; vii, 32; Tobit xii, 8, 9. See ALMS. Among the special enactments in their favor the following must be mentioned:

1. The right of gleaning. The "corners" of the field were not to be reaped, nor all the grapes of the vineyard to be gathered, the olive-trees not to be beaten a second time, but the stranger, fatherless, and widow to be allowed to gather what was left. So, too, if a sheaf forgotten was left in the field, the owner was not to return for it, but leave it for them (Lev. xix, 9, 10; Deut. xxiv, 19, 21). Of the practice in such cases in the times of the Judges the story of Ruth is a striking illustration (Ruth ii, 2, etc.). See CORNER; GLEANING.

2. From the produce of the land in sabbatical years the poor and the stranger were to have their portion (Exod. xxiii, 11; Lev. xxv, 6).

3. Re-entry upon land in the jubilee year, with the limitation as to town homes (Lev. xxv, 25–30). See JUBILEE.

4. Prohibition of usury, and of retention of pledges, i. e. loans without interest enjoined (Lev. xxv, 35, 37; Exod. xxii, 25–27; Deut. xv, 7, 8; xxiv, 10–13). See LOAN.

5. Permanent bondage forbidden, and manumission of Hebrew bondsmen or bondswomen enjoined in the sabbatical and jubilee years, even when bound to a foreigner, and redemption of such previous to those years (Deut. xv, 12–15; Lev. xxv, 39–42, 47–54). See SLAVERY.

6. Portions from the tithes to be shared by the poor after the Levites (Deut. xiv, 28; xxvi, 12, 13). See TITHES.

7. The poor to partake in entertainments at the feasts of Weeks and Tabernacles (Deut. xvi, 11, 14; see Neh. viii, 10).

8. Daily payment of wages (Lev. xix, 13).

On the other hand, while equal justice was commanded to be done to the poor man, he was not allowed to take advantage of his position to obstruct the administration of justice (Exod. xxiii, 3; Lev. xix, 15).

On the law of gleaning the Rabbinical writers founded a variety of definitions and refinements, which, notwithstanding their minute and frivolous character, were on the whole strongly in favor of the poor. They are collected in the treatise of Maimonides's *Mithnoth Ainim*, translated by Prideaux (Ugolino, viii, 721), and specimens of their character will appear in the following titles: There are, he says, thirteen precepts, seven affirmative and six negative, gathered from Lev. xix, xxiii; Deut. xiv, xv, xxiv. On these the following questions are raised and answered: What is a "corner," a "handful?" What is to "forget" a sheaf? What is a "stranger?" What is to be done when a field or a single tree belongs to two persons; and further, when one of them is a Gentile, or when it is divided by a road or by water; when insects or enemies destroy the crop? How much grain must a man give by way of alms? Among prohibitions is one forbidding any proprietor to frighten away the poor by a savage beast. An Israelite is forbidden to take alms openly from a Gentile. Unwilling almsgiving is condemned, on the principle expressed in Job xxx, 25. Those who gave less than their due proportion were to be punished. Mendicants are divided into two classes, settled poor and vagrants. The former were to be relieved by the authorized collectors, but all are enjoined to maintain themselves if possible. Lastly, the claim of the poor to the portions prescribed is laid down as a positive right.

Principles similar to those laid down by Moses are inculcated in the N. T., as Luke iii, 11; xiv, 13; Acts vi, 1; Gal. ii, 10; Jas. ii, 15. In later times mendicancy, which does not appear to have been contemplated by Moses, became frequent. Instances actual or hypothetical may be seen in the following passages: Mark x, 46; Luke xvi, 20, 21; xviii, 35; John ix, 8; Acts iii, 2. See BEGGAR.

But notwithstanding this, the prophets often complain of the prevalent hardheartedness towards the poor, and especially of judicial oppression practiced upon them (Isa. x, 2; Amos ii, 7; Jer. v, 28; Ezek. xxii, 29; Zech. vii, 10). Among the later Jews kindness to the poor was regarded as a prominent virtue (Job xxix, 16; xxx, 25; xxxi, 19 sq.; Tobit ii, 15; iv, 11; xii, 9; Luke xix, 8), and pharisaic self-righteousness often took this form (comp. Matt. vi, 2; Otho, *Lex. Rabb.* p. 512). See ALMS. Beggars, in the proper sense, are unknown in the Mosaic economy (Deut. xv, 4; comp. Michaelis. *Mos. Recht*, ii, 456 sq.), yet such extremity of want is threatened in Psa. cix, 10 as a punishment from God. In the New Testament, however, they are mentioned, as Mark x, 46; Luke xviii, 35; John ix, 8; Acts iii, 2, but only in the case of infirm persons.

On the whole subject, besides the treatise above named, see Mishna, *Peah*, i, 2–5; ii, 7; *Pesach.* iv, 8; Selden, *De Jure Natur.* vi, 6, p. 735, etc.; Saalschütz, *Archäol. d. Heb.* ii, 256; Michaelis, vol. ii, § 142, p. 248; Otho, *Lex. Rabb.* p. 308. See POVERTY.

POOR, CHRISTIAN CARE OF THE. In the early Church great regard was had for those in want. As duly as the Lord's day returned, and as soon as they had brought their sacred duties to a close, the lists of orphans, widows, aged, and poor were produced for consideration, and forthwith a donation was ordered out of the funds of the Church. No heart-stirring appeal was necessary to touch the sympathies of the people of God, and no cold calculations of prudence regulated the distribution of alms: wherever there was an object of misery, or a proved necessity, there the treasures of the Church were expended. When the poor in any place were numerous, and the brethren in that place were unable to afford them adequate support, application was made to some richer Church in the neighborhood; and never was it known that the application was fruitlessly received. After the more complete organization of the Church, the poor had one fourth part in the distribution of the revenues, the other three parts going respectively to the bishop, the clergy, and the maintenance of the edifice. In Antioch, in the time of Chrysostom, three thousand poor people were thus provided for, and half that number were similarly supported at Rome in the days of Cornelius. In times of famine the plate of the church was sometimes melted down to support the poor. How pointedly Ambrose replies to the charge of sacrilege brought against him on this account by the Arians: "Is it not better that the bishop should melt the plate to sustain the poor, when other sustenance cannot be had, than that some sacrilegious enemy should carry it off by spoil and plunder? Will not our Lord expostulate with us on this account? 'Why did you suffer so many helpless persons to die with famine when you had gold to provide them sustenance? Why were so many captives carried away and sold without redemption? Why were so many suffered to be slain by the enemy? It had been better to have preserved the vessels of living men than lifeless metals.' What answer can be returned to this? For what shall a man say? I was afraid lest the temple of God should want its ornaments. But Christ will answer, 'My sacraments, which are not bought with gold, do not require gold, nor please me the more for being ministered in gold; the ornament of my sacraments is the redemption

of captives; and those are truly precious vessels which redeem souls from death.'" The very poor were often placed in the portico of the church to ask alms. Severe censure was also directed against those who permitted the poor to starve, or defrauded the Church of those dues which were set apart to maintain them. Many instances are recorded where churches in the early ages of Christianity, after providing for their own poor, gave to neighboring and foreign churches in distant parts. On intelligence of any pressing necessity, ministers and people would hasten with their treasures to the relief of those whom they had never seen, but with whom they were united by the strong ties of the same faith and hope. Thus when a multitude of Christian men and women in Numidia had been taken captive by a horde of neighboring barbarians, and when the churches to which they belonged were unable to raise the sum demanded for their ransom, they sent deputies to the Church in the metropolis of North Africa, and no sooner had Cyprian, who was at the head of it, heard the statement of distress than he commenced a collection in behalf of the unfortunate slaves, and never relaxed his exertions till he had obtained a sum equivalent to about £1000, which he forwarded to the Numidian churches, together with a letter full of Christian sympathy and tenderness.

"In the Roman Catholic states of Europe at the present day, the Church still remains, to a great extent, the public almoner. In Rome, a Commission of Aids has the general direction and administration of the principal public charities. It is composed of a cardinal-president and fifteen members, among whom is the pope's chaplain. The city is divided into twelve districts, over each of which a member of the central council presides. Each parish is represented by its curé and two deputies—a layman and a *dame de charité*, named for three years—and has a secretary and a steward or treasurer, who are paid. The alms are given in money, tools, and clothes. Requests for assistance are addressed to the parochial body, from which they are sent to the district, and thence to the central council. The more urgent cases are referred to the cardinal-president, or the curé of the parish. Three brotherhoods search out cases of hidden poverty; and not only do all the religious associations, convents, and monasteries distribute relief, but there is hardly a noble or wealthy house which does not take a regular part in the assistance of the poor.

"In Spain, the state supports several asylums for lunatics, the blind, and the deaf-and-dumb. It also distributes a large sum annually among the provinces for the relief of the poor—each province being bound to raise double the amount received from the state. The state also steps in for the relief of great calamities, and devotes a certain sum annually for the assistance of unfortunate Spaniards abroad. A general directory of the charitable and sanitary services superintends the parochial bodies charged with the distribution of assistance to the poor.

"In Austria, each commune is charged with the relief of its poor. All who have legal domicile, or, being unable to prove their domicile, are resident in the commune, are entitled to relief out of the general assessment. There is no special rate, and the administration is strictly municipal. In many provinces private charity is associated with public assistance, administered by the curé, a few chosen inhabitants, who are called 'Fathers of the Poor,' and an officer accountable to the commune. This system is called the 'Poor's Institutes;' and their funds are principally derived from private sources; but they receive a third part of the property of ecclesiastics who die intestate, and certain fines, etc. Applicants are subjected to minute inquiry as to the cause of poverty, and a weekly allowance is made on a scale according to age and necessity. The infirm poor, who have no relatives to reside with, are taken into hospitals established in almost every commune, where they receive, besides lodging, fire and light, clothing, medical care, and a small allowance in money to provide for their food and other wants. Children are either provided for in the homes of their parents, put into asylums, or boarded with people of probity, who receive a monthly payment, as in Scotland. The welfare of these children is superintended by the curés, the mayors, and the sanitary officers of the commune. Foundlings, lunatics, the blind, the deaf-and-dumb, are provided for by the state. Vagrancy is punished, and parents permitting children under fourteen to beg are liable to three months' imprisonment. Able-bodied vagrants are sent to houses of correction, and kept to work. Pawnbroking is a charitable institution in Austria, under government control; and many pawnbroking establishments rest on endowments, and lend without interest. The trade is forbidden to private persons.

"In France, the relief of the poor is not compulsory, in so far as its distributors may, after making inquiry, refuse relief, except in the case of foundlings and lunatics. The minister of the interior has a general superintendence of the machinery of relief, as well as the immediate administration of many large hospitals and refuges. He also assists a great number of private charities. The other ministers of state give assistance on the occurrence of great calamities. The departmental funds are called upon for the compulsory relief, but the commune is the main source of public assistance. Its duty is to see that no real suffering remains unrelieved, and that the nature of the relief is such as can most easily be discontinued when the necessity ceases. The commune encourages and stimulates voluntary charities, and receives gifts for the benefit of the poor's funds. Except in Paris, the administration of the hospitals, and of the relief given at the homes of the poor, are under different management, the communes only interfering to supplement the funds of the hospitals, when these are insufficient. The mayor is president both of the administration of the hospitals and of the body for giving out-door relief (the *bureau de bienfaisance*). During industrial calamities the poor are sometimes employed in workshops supported by the public, and in public works. In Paris, since 1849, there has been a responsible director set over all the charities of the city. He manages the out-door relief through the medium of the committees of assistance, formerly called *bureaux de bienfaisance*, in each arrondissement. He is under the inspection of a council, composed as follows: the prefect of the Seine (president), the prefect of police, two members of the Municipal Council, two maires or deputy-maires, two members of the committees of assistance, one councillor of state or a master of requests, one physician and one surgeon practicing at the hospitals, one professor of medicine, one member of the Chamber of Commerce, one member of the Council of Prud'hommes, and five members taken from other classes than those above mentioned. Begging is forbidden, and punished, wherever there are establishments for the relief of the poor"

The poor-law of England, and recently of Scotland, too, is a civil enactment. Formerly, in Scotland, many shifts were tried. Beggary was often resorted to, and as often condemned by statute. In Scotland, at the end of the 17th century, Fletcher says, there were 200,000 beggars—more on account of national distress at that time than at other times—but never less, he affirms, than 100,000. Various severe acts had been passed from time to time, and cruel punishments threatened—such as scourging and branding with a hot iron. The famous act of 1579, in enumerating the various classes of beggars condemned, has the following: "All minstrelles, sangsters, and tale-tellers, not avowed in special service, by some of the lords of Parliament or great burrowes, or by the head burrowes and cities, for their commoun minstrelles; all commoun labourers, being persones abill in bodie, living idle, and fleeing labour; all counterfaicters of licences to beg, or using the same, knowing them to be counterfaicted; all vaga-

bound schollers of the universities of Saint Andrewes, Glasgow, and Abirdene, not licensed by the rector and deane of facultie of the universitie to ask almes; all schipmen and mariners, alledging themselves to be schipbroken, without they have sufficient testimonials." The fines levied for ecclesiastical offences were often given to the poor, as may be seen in the notes to principal Lee's second volume of *Church History*. In 1643, 1644, and 1645, the general session of Edinburgh gives the following to the poor:

"1643.
Feb. 10.—Penalties and gifts for the use of the poor:
Given by Dr. Pont as a voluntary gift..... 100 merks.
Penalty for Neill Turner and his partie... 16 merks.
Feb. 15.—Given in by Geo. Stuart, advocat, for not coming to the ile..... 20 merks.
Given by Col. Hume's lady for private marriage with young Craigie..... 20 merks.
Given by Sir John Smyth as a yearlie voluntary gift..... 100 merks.
Given by Mr. Robt. Smyth for private marriage..... 20 merks.
"1644.
The six sessions ordain the ordinar poor enrolled to be threatened if they learn not the grounds of religion, and *to be deprived of their weeklie pensione if they cannot answer to the Cathechise.*
May 9.— By Mr. Luis Stuart and Isbell Geddes, for fornication..... 21 lib. 6s. 8d.
By Robert Martin, for his private marriage..... 20 merks.
"1645.
March 13.—Given for Wm. Salmond, relapse in fornication..... 53l. 6s. 8d."

See PAUPERISM.

In the United States, the poor who are members of any ecclesiastical organization are usually provided for by that body. Besides, the churches voluntarily assume very frequently the care of non-believers. In the Protestant Episcopal and in the Methodist Episcopal churches collections for the poor are taken on communion Sundays. Many churches make it the practice to take the poor collection every first Sabbath in the month.

Poor, DANIEL, D.D., a Congregational minister and missionary to India, was born June 27, 1789, in Danvers, Mass. He graduated at Dartmouth College in 1812; was ordained June 21, 1815, with the intention of becoming a missionary, and sailed Oct. 23 for Ceylon, which he reached March 22, 1816. He commenced to labor at Tillipally, Jaffna, and remained until July, 1823, when he went to Batticotta, to superintend the missionary seminary. In 1836 he went to Madras, on the mainland, and returned to Ceylon in 1841. He came home in 1848, and spent about two years in the service of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, visiting various parts of the country, delivering addresses, and otherwise stimulating missionary enterprise. He sailed again to Ceylon in 1850, and took his station at Mampy, where he died of cholera, Feb. 2, 1855. He is the author of various publications in the Tamil and English languages. See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, ii, 617.

Poor Catholics. See WALDENSES.

Pooree is the name of the little town situated near the temples where the *Jaggernaut* worship is performed by the Hindûs. It is situated in the province of Orissa (q. v.), in the south-eastern part of India, and is a dirty little town, with a district of about ten miles of like name, within which the temples are located. It constitutes a part of the endowment of the temple, nobody being allowed to enter the territory without paying a prescribed fee. The population of the town is about seventy-five thousand, there being among the number about four thousand priests, who attend daily upon the temple. Here is found probably one of the greatest strongholds of superstition in India, and it might be called the greatest seat of Brahminical power. The stone wall enclosing the great temples is about thirty feet high, and the area forms a rectangle of six hundred and fifty feet by six hundred and sixty. Within this wall are a number of smaller temples. A visit to these temples is enjoined upon a Hindû as one of the most important acts in the ritual of his religion, and year after year this Mecca is resorted to by representatives from every section of the country. See the literature quoted under the article JAGGERNAUT.

Poor Men's Box is a chest put up usually at the church entrance for the deposit of alms (q. v.). It is found on the continent of Europe not only in the churches, but also in the synagogues. In England the *Poor Men's Box* (*uniculus, pyxis ad oblationes faciendas*) is a box affixed near the high-altar, and was introduced there by archbishop Cranmer, to serve in lieu of pilgrimage. In 1559 it was enjoined in every church in England. As architectural specimens, many of these "boxes" are a curiosity. Thus there is a curious alms-box in St. Helen's, Bishopsgate, supported by the figure of a mendicant, and another at Outwell, with a grinning mouth. The idea for the style of these boxes was probably derived from such objects as the bracket of the 15th century adjoining the tomb of Edward II at Gloucester, and the oaken box with a slit for alms used at St. Richard's shrine at Chichester, which is of the 16th century, although the iron-work dates back three hundred years earlier. There is a wooden alms-box of the 14th century at Fribourg. There is a stone box at Bridlington. A flasket or box of wood for collecting alms is mentioned in England in the 17th century. At Selby there is a chest made out of the bole of a single tree. In 1292 such hutches were forbidden at Chichester, as the oblations hitherto made at the altar were placed in them. At St. David's, two centuries ago, old people could remember having seen basinfuls of oblations made by seamen and passengers.

Poor of Lyons. See WALDENSES.

Poor Pilgrims, an order that started up in the year 1500. They came out of Italy into Germany barefooted and bareheaded, feeding all the week, except on Sundays, upon herbs and roots sprinkled with salt. They remained not above twenty-four hours in a place. They went by couples, begging from door to door. This penance they undertook voluntarily—some for three, others for five or seven years, as they pleased, and then returned home to their callings. See WALDENSES.

Poor Priests were those of the Lollards who in the 14th and 15th centuries wandered about the country holding what are called in modern times "missions" wherever they pleased, without any cure of souls being given to them, or license by the bishop of the diocese. The name *poor* seems to show an association of idea with the *Pauperes Catholici* (q. v.), or the *Poor of Lyons*.

Pope. Having treated in the article PAPACY of the rise and development of the papal dignity and power, we shall speak in the present article of the personal attributes of the incumbent of the Roman see.

I. *The Title.*—The word *pope* is derived from the Latin *papa*, Greek πάππας, and means *father*. While the Greek word was used in the Greek Church to designate both bishops and priests, and has gradually come to be reserved for the priests exclusively, the Latin term was for several centuries a title applied to all bishops, and was finally reserved for the bishops of Rome. As far as is known, bishop Siricius, in the 4th century, was the first to use the word as a title. After the 5th century it came into more general use, and after the 7th it gradually disappeared from ecclesiastical language for every ecclesiastical dignity except that of the bishop of Rome. It was expressly made the exclusive prerogative of the Roman bishops by Gregory VII. In a like manner several other titles, which at first were applied to the bishops of the principal seats, such as *apostolicus, dominus apostolicus, sedes apostolica*, were gradually monopolized by the bishops of Rome. The designation

servus servorum Dei was first used by Gregory I, and though occasionally also bishops, priests, and emperors adopted it, it likewise remained in the course of time the prerogative of the popes. During the 8th and the following centuries it was common to call the bishop of Rome *vicarius Petri*. The expression occurs in the Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals, in the oath which was taken in 722 by Boniface to Gregory II, in the oath taken by Gregory VII to the king of Germany, in the conclusion of peace between Alexander III and the emperor Frederick Barbarossa; but from the time of Innocent III, when the power of the popes had become more absolute, the *vicarius Petri* gave way to the *vicarius Christi*. The title *Sanctitas tua* or *Beatitudo tua*, which came into use in the 3d or 4th century, the pope shares even now with the bishops of the Eastern Church. It is accorded to him even by Protestant governments. (See *Brit. and For. Ev. Rev.* Jan. 1866, p. 48 sq.)

II. *Rights and Functions.*—1. *Personal Prerogatives.*—The rights claimed by the popes within the Roman Catholic Church, and accorded to them by the bishops, priests, and laity of the Church, have of course greatly varied according to the degrees of power which the incumbents of the Roman see attained in various periods of Church history. For a long time they claimed and received as bishops of Rome and patriarchs of the West only those rights and honors which also belonged to other bishops and patriarchs. See Bishop; Patriarch. When their superiority over other bishops and patriarchs came finally to be recognised and established, the popes were by no means regarded as absolute rulers of the Church, but their rights were limited and circumscribed by general councils and secular princes. While the popes were with an unyielding consistency endeavoring to develop the extreme papal system which now prevails, many of the greatest scholars of the Church defended an episcopal system which assigned to the pope a position similar to that of a constitutional monarch, and, in particular, maintained the superiority of a general council over the pope. At the general councils of Constance and Basle the friends of this view had an undisputed majority; and in the following centuries the history of Gallicanism, of Febronius, of Joseph II, are some of many proofs that in several countries the episcopal system had numerous adherents, even among bishops. After having been long on the decline, the episcopal system within the Roman Catholic Church was totally extinguished by the Vatican Council, and the extensive rights which the popes, in the course of many centuries, had claimed as their exclusive monopoly, were recognised by the entire Church. A common division of the papal rights is that into *primatus jurisdictionis* and *primatus honoris*. The former comprises the sovereign law of legislation, the supreme administration and the final decision on all subjects relating to ecclesiastical offices, especially the right of confirming, consecrating, transferring, and deposing bishops; the regulation of all religious institutions, especially of the religious orders; the supreme ecclesiastical jurisdiction, the supreme right of supervision, and the supreme management of ecclesiastical finances and property; the highest authority in all doctrinal questions. In the decision of doctrinal questions the popes have long claimed *infallibility* (q. v.), and the Vatican Council has recognised this claim as a doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church. The pope has also the supreme right of regulating the divine worship, of granting indulgences (q. v.), and the sole right of beatifying and canonizing deceased members of the Church. See Beatification; Canonization. The *primatus honoris* comprises the following distinctions: 1. The *tiara*, also called *mitra turbinata cum corona, triregnum, regnum, diadema, phrygium*, consisting of the bishop's cap (*mitra*) encompassed with a triple golden crown. It is for the first time mentioned in the forged donation of Constantine (8th century), and was for the first time used at the coronation of Nicholas II (858). The third

Regalia of the Pope of Rome.

crown was added to the *mitra* by Urban V (1362–1370). The pope receives it on the day of coronation in the loggia of St. Peter's Church from two cardinal deacons, who place it upon his head with the words, "Accipe tiaram tribus coronis ornatam et scias, patrem te esse principum et regum, rectorem orbis in terra, vicarium salvatoris nostri Jesu Christi, cui est honor in sæcula sæculorum." The pope only wears the *tiara* at great ecclesiastical festivities and processions, but not during the performance of ecclesiastical functions. 2. The so-called *pedum rectum*, the straight bishop's staff ornamented with a cross, but not the crooked episcopal pastoral staff. 3. The *pallium*, a vestment having the form of a scarf, composed of white wool, and embroidered with six black silken crosses. The pope sends it as a mark of honor to patriarchs, primates, metropolitans, and sometimes to bishops, all of whom are only allowed to wear it within their own dioceses and on certain occasions, while the pope wears it always and everywhere on saying mass. 4. The so-called *adoratio*, a homage which in the old Oriental Church was shown to bishops and priests generally. It consists in kneeling down and kissing the pope's foot. Gregory VII still demanded it from princes, the *Dictatus Gregorii* saying on this subject, "Quod solius papæ pedes omnes principes deosculentur." The kiss upon the cross on the pope's shoes is still demanded from clergymen and laymen, but an exception is made with princes and persons of higher rank. Sovereign princes only kiss the hand, cardinals the foot and the hand, after which they are admitted to an embrace; archbishops and bishops the foot and the knee. 5. During the Middle Ages the popes received from the princes the *officium strepæ*, the princes holding the stirrups when the pope mounted the horse, and leading the horse for a while. Among the princes who are recorded to have rendered this homage were Louis II, Henry VI, Henry VII, Frederick III, Charles V, and Philip IV of France. Of Frederick Barbarossa, pope Adrian IV complained that he held the left, instead of the right stirrup.

2. *Dress, etc.*—At home the pope's habit is a white silk cassock, rochet, and scarlet mantle. In winter he wears a fur cap; in summer a satin one. When he celebrates mass, the color of his habit varies according to the so-

The Pope seated in the Pontifical Chair.

lemnity of the festival. At Whitsuntide, and all festivals of the martyrs, he officiates in red; at Easter, and all festivals of virgins, in white; in Lent, Advent, and eves of fasting-days, in violet; and on Easter-eve, and at all masses for the dead, in black. All these colors are said to be typical: the red expresses the cloven tongues and the blood of the martyrs; the white, the joy caused by our Saviour's resurrection and the chastity of virgins; the violet, the pale aspect of those who fast; and the black, grief and mourning. The tiara is a council-cap, with three coronets, rising one above another, and adorned with jewels. Paul II was the first who added the ornaments of precious stones to his crown. The jewels of Clement VIII's crown were valued, they say, at 500,000 pieces of gold. That of Martin V had five pounds and a half weight of pearls in it. "Nor is there anything unreasonable in this (says Father Bonani), since the pope governs the kingdom of Christ in quality of his viceroy: now this kingdom is infinitely superior to all the kingdoms of the universe. The high-priest of the Jews wore on his head and breast the riches which were to represent the majesty of the Supreme God. The pope represents that of the Saviour of the world, and nothing better expresses it than riches." We must not omit that the two strings of the tiara are said to represent the two different manners of interpreting the Scriptures, the mystical and the literal. The pope has two seals. One is called "the fisherman's ring," and is the impression of Peter holding a line with a bait to it in the water. It is used for briefs sealed with wax. The other seal bears the figures of Peter and Paul, with a cross on one side; and on the other an effigy, with the name of the reigning pope. This is used for the bulls, which are sealed with lead. On the decease of a pope these seals are defaced and broken by the cardinal-chamberlain in the presence of three others. When the pope goes in procession to St. Peter's, the cross is carried before him on the end of a pike about ten palms long. "Many reasons," says Father Bonani, "authorize this custom. It is a monument of the sufferings of Jesus Christ, and of the pope's adherence to the Saviour of the world. It is the true mark of the pontifical dignity, and represents the authority of the Church, as the Roman fasces did that of the consuls." At the same time two grooms bear two fans on each side of his holiness's chair, to drive away the flies. This (according to the above-cited author) represents the seraphim covering the face of God with their wings.

3. *Officers.*—The pope has a *Vicar* who is always a cardinal. He who manages that charge has jurisdiction over the priests and regulars, over the lay-communities, hospitals, places of piety, and Jews. His place may be worth to him two hundred ducats per month. He has two lieutenants, one for civil and the other for criminal affairs, and a vicegerent, who is a bishop, for the exercise of episcopal functions.

The *Penitentiary* has jurisdiction in cases referred to the pope; and gives to approved confessors power to absolve. At solemn feasts he goes into one of the churches of Rome, where, sitting in a high chair, he has a switch in his hand, and hears the confession of particular cases. This place is worth eight thousand crowns a year.

The *Chancellor* was properly secretary to the pope, *ab intimis*. This charge is now bestowed upon none but a cardinal, and it may be worth to him fifteen or sixteen thousand crowns a year. His business is to despatch the apostolic letters, except those signed by the pope, which are despatched by a brief *sub annulo piscatoris*. He has under him a regent, and twelve abbreviators *di parco maggiore*, who are all prelates. The regent has power to commit all causes of appeal to the *rota* and referendaries. The abbreviators *di parco maggiore* draw the bulls, and send them when they are written. Besides these, there are abbreviators *di parco minore*, who are scriveners, and other officers of the chancery, appointed to receive and sign bulls. The vice-chancellor keeps a register of the collation of titles given to cardinals, and of promotions to bishoprics and consistorial abbeys.

The *Chamberlain* is always a cardinal, and has for substitutes the clerks of the apostolic chamber, a treasurer, and a president. This office is worth to him fourteen thousand crowns a year. He takes cognizance of all causes within the verge of the apostolic chamber, and, besides, judges of appeals from the masters of the streets, bridges, and edifices. When the see is vacant, the chamberlain remains in the palace, in the pope's apartment, goes through the streets with the Swiss guards attending him, coins money with his own arms thereon, and holds a consistory. He is one of the three chief treasurers of the Castle of St. Angelo, whereof the dean is another, and the pope the third.

The *Prefect* of the signature of justice is also one of the cardinals, and has two hundred ducats in gold per month. His business is to make rescripts of all the petitions and the commissions of causes which are delegated by the court. Every Thursday the signature of justice is held in the palace of the cardinal-prefect, where assist twelve prelates-referendaries, that have votes, and all the other referendaries, with power to propose each two causes; as also an auditor of the *rota*, and the civil auditor of the cardinal-vicar, having no vote, but only to maintain their jurisdiction in what relates to them. The prefect of the signature of grace signs all the petitions and grants which the pope bestows in the congregations held in his own presence once a week. The prefect of the briefs is always a cardinal; he revises and signs the copies of the briefs.

The *General* of the Holy Church is created by a brief of the pope, who gives him the staff himself in his chamber, and takes his oath. In time of peace he has allowed him a thousand crowns per month, and three thousand in time of war. He commands all the troops and all the governors in the places and fortresses of the ecclesiastical estate. His lieutenant has three thousand crowns a year, and is made also by a brief from the pope, as is the general of the artillery, who has twelve hundred crowns per annum.

The governor of the Castle of St. Angelo has six thousand crowns per annum.

The pope has four *Masters of Ceremonies*, who are always clad in purple, and have great authority in public affairs. Besides these, there are other masters of the ceremonies, which are in the congregations of privileges, whereof one discharges the office of secretary, and the other despatches orders.

The *Master of the Sacred Palace* is always a Dominican. He reviews and approves all the books that are printed, being assisted by two priests of the same order. The palace, besides a table, allows him a coach.

The *Major-domo*, or steward to the household of the pope, is always a prelate. The chamberlains of honor are persons of quality, who come to the palace when they please.

The *Master of the Stables* is a gentleman who has the office of master of the horse, without the title of it; for the pope bestows no such upon any person. He is sword-bearer, and sometimes one of the greatest lords in Rome, as was Pompey Frangipani under Leo II.

The *Vestry-keeper* is an Augustine monk, who has the same allowance as the master of the palace. He takes care of all the riches in the pope's vestry. He goes like a prelate; and if he be a titular bishop, takes place among the assistant bishops.

The pope's *Secretary* is always a cardinal, and very often his nephew. This place is united to that of superintendent of the ecclesiastical estate. He writes and subscribes all the letters sent to the princes and nuncios. All ambassadors and all ministers at Rome, after having negotiated with the pope, are obliged to give him an account of their negotiations. The secretaries of state are subject to the secretary superintendent, or cardinal-patron, whose orders they receive, and to whom they send their letters to be subscribed. They live in the palace, and are prelates clad in purple.

There are twenty-four *Secretaries of Briefs*, the chief of whom lives in the palace. Their business is to subscribe and despatch all the briefs that are received by the cardinal-prefect of the briefs. The secretary of the secret briefs takes care to prepare them when the cardinal-patron or some one of the secretaries of state commands him. These briefs are shown to nobody, nor signed by the prefect of the briefs, except when they are sealed *sub annulo piscatoris*, and accompanied with a letter from the cardinal-patron. The copies of these briefs are carefully kept; and, when the pope is dead, they are carried to the Castle of St. Angelo.

The *Mareschal* of Rome has under him two civil judges, one of whom is called the first collateral judge, and the other the second collateral, with a judge for criminal affairs. He, together with these judges, takes cognizance of matters between the citizens and inhabitants of Rome. He is always a foreigner, and lives in the Capitol; while in the discharge of his office he appears clad like an old senator, having a robe of cloth of gold that hangs down to the earth, with large sleeves to it lined with red taffety.

4. *Official Powers.*—As we have seen above, the pope of Rome is now the supreme head of what is known as the Roman Catholic world. Held to be the successor of the apostle Peter, the pope is claimed to be Christ's vicar on earth. The Council of Florence, 1439, says: "Definimus, Sanctam apostolicam Sedem et Romanum Pontificem in universum orbem tenere primatum, et ipsum Pontificem Romanum successorem esse B. Petri principis apostolorum, et verum Christi vicarium, totiusque Ecclesiæ caput et omnium Christianorum patrem ac doctorem existere, et ipsi in B. Petro pascendi, regendi ac gubernandi universalem Ecclesiam a Domino Nostro Jesu Christo plenum potestatem traditam esse, quemadmodum etiam in gestis œcumenicorum conciliorum et in sacris canonibus continetur" (*Bullarium Romanum* [ed. Luxemb.], i, 336). A similar doctrine is proclaimed by the fifth Lateran Council of 1512 (c. i, *De Conciliis in V*, iii, 7), in the Roman Catechism, pt. i, c. x, qu. 11, and in the Profession of Faith of the Council of Trent: "Sanctam Catholicam et apostolicam Romanam Ecclesiam omnium Ecclesiarum matrem et magistram agnosco; Romanoque Pontifici, beati Petri apostolorum principis successori ac Jesu Christi vicario, veram obedientiam spondeo ac juro." As such he is to be invested with all power necessary for the government of the Universal Church. This embraces authority to examine and decide authoritatively all controversies, to convoke councils, to revise and confirm their decrees, to issue general decrees, whether upon discipline and morals or upon doctrine, to appoint bishops in all parts of the Church, to confirm the election when made by the clergy or by the civil authorities, no matter how it may have been made; he can also depose bishops, and set others in their place, and even, in cases of great emergency, suppress bishoprics, and change their ecclesiastical limits according to his judgment of the existing requirements of the Church; he is also to judge of the doctrines taught in particular books or by particular individuals, and to pronounce infallibly as to their conformity with the Catholic faith, or the contrary. In addition to these powers, it is still further claimed for him by the Ultramontanes, as we have seen above and in the article INFALLIBILITY, that he is endowed by God with infallibility; so that what he says *ex cathedra*, i. e. officially and as pope, is of divine authority, and cannot be questioned or denied; and that also, as the vicar of Christ, he has a supreme authority over all civil rulers and civil jurisdiction, the allegiance of all the faithful to him being superior to that which is due to their respective governments. See PRIMACY.

The principal scriptural authority for the papacy relied upon by the Roman Catholic Church is Matt. xvi, 18, 19. Without entering into a discussion of the meaning of this famous passage, we may here quote from Abbott's *Commentary* on the New Testament a statement of the Roman Catholic interpretation, and the grounds on which that view is rejected by all Protestants:

"The ordinary Roman Catholic view of this passage is that Christ declared his purpose to found a great ecclesiastical organization; that this organization was to be built upon Peter and his successors as its true foundation; that they were to represent to all time the authority of God upon the earth, being clothed, by virtue of their office, with a continuous inspiration, and authorized by the Word, and fitted by the indwelling Spirit of God, to guide, direct, illumine, and command the disciples of Christ, with the same force and effect as Christ himself (see Phillips, *Kirchenrecht*, i, 146). See art. PETER. This view is untenable for the following reasons: 1. Christ does not, as we have seen, refer to a definite ecclesiastical organization by the word *church*, and would not be so understood by his disciples. 2. Peter was not by nature rock-like; he was, on the contrary, characteristically impulsive and unstable. There must be, therefore, some other significance in the words 'Thou art a rock' which the Roman Catholic interpretation loses. 3. Neither he nor the other disciples understood that Christ invested him with any such authority and position. He did not occupy any such place in the Church while he lived. In the first council at Jerusalem (Acts xv, 7–11) he was simply an adviser, the office of chief or president being apparently held by James; Paul withstood Peter to his face, as no disciple ever withstood Christ, or would have withstood his acknowledged representative (Gal. ii, 11–14); and throughout the N. T. the apostles are all treated as co-equals (Matt. xviii, 1; xix, 28; xxiii, 8; John xv, 1–5; Rev. xxi, 14). 4. There is neither here nor anywhere else in the N. T. any hint of a successor to Peter, or of any authority in him to appoint a successor, or of any such authority vested in any of the apostles, or exercised, or assumed to be exercised, by any of them. 5. The N. T. throughout, and the O. T. in all its prophecies, recognises Christ as the chief corner-stone, the foundation on which the kingdom of God can alone be built. 6. Mark and Luke omit from their account this utterance of Christ; if it really designated Peter as the foundation of the visible Church, and was thus essential and not incidental to the right understanding of the whole incident, it would not be omitted from their accounts." See ROCK.

Few Christian governments have ever been willing to recognise to their full extent the rights claimed by and for the Roman popes. The *placet* (q. v.) was introduced in the Middle Ages by most of the states, and without it no papal bull could be promulgated; and the popes found it necessary to consent to the conclusion of special concordats (q. v.) or conventions, which, in

the way of compromise, regulated the papal rights which a state government bound itself to recognise.

Many popes in the Middle Ages also claimed the power of deposing kings, of absolving the subjects of excommunicated princes from their oath of allegiance, and, in general, an unlimited power over temporal as well as spiritual affairs. That a number of popes assumed this right is a fact admitted on all sides; but it is quite common among Roman Catholics to deny that this is a right inherent in the papal dignity, and also that it was ever claimed by the popes as a right belonging to them in virtue of their office. A few samples of pontifical arrogance may suffice for illustration here:

Pope Paschal II, in 1099, deprived Henry IV, and excited enemies to persecute him; telling them that they could not "offer a more acceptable sacrifice to God than by impugning him who endeavored to take the kingdom from God's Church." Pope Gregory VII says: "For the dignity and defence of God's holy Church, in the name of Almighty God, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, I depose from imperial and royal administration king Henry, son of Henry sometime emperor, who too boldly and rashly hath laid hands on thy Church; and I absolve all Christian subjects to the empire from that oath whereby they were wont to plight their faith unto true kings; for it is right that he should be deprived of dignity who doth endeavor to diminish the majesty of the Church. Go to, therefore, most holy princes of the apostles, and what I said, by interposing your authority, confirm; that all men may now at length understand, if ye can bind and loose in heaven, that ye also can upon earth take away and give empires, kingdoms, and whatsoever mortals can have; for if ye can judge things belonging unto God, what is to be deemed concerning these inferior and profane things? And if it is your part to judge angels, who govern proud princes, what becometh it you to do towards their servants? Let kings now, and all secular princes, learn by this man's example what ye can do in heaven, and in what esteem ye are with God; and let them henceforth fear to slight commands of holy Church, but put forth suddenly his judgment, that all men may understand that not casually, but by your means, this son of iniquity doth fall from his kingdom." Pope Boniface VIII, in 1294, has a decree extant in the canon law running thus: "We declare, say, define, pronounce it to be of necessity to salvation for every human creature to be subject to the Roman pontiff. One sword must be under another, and the temporal authority must be subject to the spiritual power, whence, if the earthly power doth go astray, it must be judged by the spiritual power." Before him, pope Innocent III affirmed "the pontifical authority so much to exceed the royal power, as the sun doth the moon;" and applies to the former the words of the prophet Jeremiah—*Ecce, constitui te super gentes et regna*—"See, I have set thee over the nations and over the kingdoms, to root out and to pull down, and to destroy and to throw down," etc. Of this power that pope made experiment by deposing the emperor Otho IV, "whom," says Nauclerus, "as rebellious to the apostolical see, he first did strike with an anathema; then him persevering in his obstinacy, did, in a council of prelates held at Rome, pronounce deposed from empire." This monstrous authority was avowed by that great council under this pope which, according to the Council of Trent, did represent or constitute the Church, when it was ordained that if a "temporal lord, being required and admonished by the Church, should neglect to purge his territory from heretical filth, he should, by the metropolitan and the other comprovincial bishops, be noosed in the band of excommunication; and that if he should slight to make satisfaction within a year, it should be signified to the pope, that he might from that time denounce the subjects absolved from their fealty to him, and expose the territory to be seized on by Catholics," etc. Pope Pius V, in 1570, begins his bull against queen Elizabeth in these words: "He that reigneth on high, to whom is given all power in heaven and in earth, hath committed the one holy catholic and apostolic Church, out of which there is no salvation, to one alone on earth, namely, to Peter, prince of the apostles, and to the Roman pontiff, successor of Peter, to be governed with a plenitude of power. This one he hath constituted prince over all nations and all kingdoms, that he might pluck up, destroy, dissipate, ruinate, plant, and build." And in the same bull he declares that "he thereby deprives the queen of her pretended right to the kingdom, and of all dominion, dignity, and privilege whatsoever; and absolves all the nobles, subjects, and people of the kingdom, and whoever else have sworn to her, from their oath, and all duty whatsoever, in regard of dominion, fidelity, and obedience." The bull of pope Sixtus V, in 1585, against Henry, king of Navarre, and the prince of Condé, begins thus: "The authority given to St. Peter and his successors, by the immense power of the Eternal King, excels all the powers of earthly kings and princes. It passes uncontrollable sentence upon them all; and if it find any of them resisting God's ordinance, it takes more severe vengeance of them, casting them down from their thrones, though never so puissant, and tumbling them down to the lowest parts of the earth, as the ministers of aspiring Lucifer." He then proceeds to thunder against them, "We deprive them and their posterity forever of their dominions and kingdoms;" and accordingly he deprives those princes of their kingdoms and dominions, absolves their subjects from their oaths of allegiance, and forbids them to pay any obedience to them. "By the authority of these presents, we do absolve and set free all persons, as well jointly as severally, from any such oath, and from all duty whatsoever in regard of dominion, fealty, and obedience: and do charge and forbid all and every of them that they do not dare to obey them, or any of their admonitions, laws, and commands."

For a full review of this question, see GALLICAN CHURCH; INVESTITURE; TEMPORAL POWER.

III. *The Election of the Pope.*—In the 2d and 3d centuries the bishops of Rome were, like all the bishops of the ancient Church, elected by the clergy and the people. When Christianity was declared to be the religion of the state, the emperors claimed a share in the election of the pope. The clergy of Rome greatly disliked the interference of the emperors in the election of their bishops, and, after the destruction of the Western Roman empire in 499, a Roman synod under bishop Symmachus vindicated to the Roman clergy the exclusive right of electing the bishop. Three years later, 502, the Roman synod declared a decree issued by Odoacer, who as successor of the Roman emperor demanded that no bishop of Rome should be elected "sine nostra consultatione," to be an unwarranted encroachment upon the rights of the Church. That Odoacer paid no attention to these resolutions is proved by the fact that in 514 he had a share in the election of Felix III. The Gothic kings Theodoric and his successors, as well as Justinian I and the Byzantine emperors, likewise disregarded the occasional protests of the Roman bishops. They are known to have appointed or confirmed several popes—as Vigilius, Pelagius I, and Pelagius II. The so-called *Liber diurnus*, a collection of formulas of the Roman Curia, which relates to the time from the 6th to the 8th century, and received its present shape in the 8th century, expressly mentions that the Roman bishops elected by the clergy and the people were confirmed by the Greek emperor, or his representative, the exarch of Ravenna. The weak rule of the last Longobardian kings, and the impotence of the emperors in Constantinople, greatly favored the endeavors of the popes to exclude altogether the influence of princes from the papal elections. During the reign of Pepin the Short and Charlemagne the elections were entirely free, and the report that a Roman synod under Adrian I conferred upon Charlemagne the right of confirming the elected pope is a forgery. The popes of this time only notified Pepin and Charles of the result of the elections. The baneful influence which was soon after obtained by the Roman nobility upon the elections of the popes induced again an interference of the imperial power, and in 824 Lothaire, the son of Louis le Débonnaire, entered into an agreement with Eugenius II, according to which the consecration of a newly elected pope was not to take place without the concurrence of an imperial delegate. This agreement remained in force throughout the following century. In the 10th century Otho the Great rescued the Church from the most disgraceful condition in which it had yet found itself, and rid it of some of the most wicked popes which have ever disgraced the see of Rome. It was quite common in the Church then to look upon the emperor as the chief pillar of reform, and it is therefore not to be wondered at that a greater influence was accorded to him than had been possessed by any of his predecessors. When he entered the city of Rome, the people, according to Luitprand, had to take an oath "numquam se papam electuros aut ordinaturos præter consensum atque electionem domini imperatoris Ottonis Cæsaris Augusti filiique regis Ottonis." After the Synod of Sutri had, in 1046, deposed

all the three popes, the Roman people conferred upon Henry III, for himself and his successors, the right "in electione semper ordinandi pontificis principatum." Henry availed himself of this in the appointment of the German popes Clement II, Leo IX, and Victor II, for which he consulted only his German advisers, as if it had been an affair of the German empire. After the death of Henry III, the influence of Hildebrand upon the popes of that time soon brought on the beginning of a new æra in the history of the papacy. One of the events which mark the beginning of this new æra is the radical change which was made in the papal elections by the famous decree of Nicholas II and the Lateran Synod in 1059. The essential points of the decree are the transfer of the papal election to the cardinal-bishops, the total abolition of the former concurrence of the Roman people and nobility, and virtual abolition of the former imperial right; for the words "salvo debito honore et reverentia" do not appear to imply more than the right of the emperor to demand a notification of the result of the election. The emperors were to possess the insignificant rights which were left to them only as a personal privilege, for the conferring of which every new emperor had to make an application. The decree of Nicholas I was further developed and defined by that of Alexander III and the Lateran Synod of 1179, which made the validity of the papal election contingent upon a two-thirds vote of the cardinals. The defeat of the emperor Frederick Barbarossa in his struggle with the papacy put an end forever to even the nominal rights of the emperors in regard to the papal elections. The first provisions concerning the conclave were made by Gregory X and the Council of Lyons in 1274. The town for holding the conclave (q. v.) was not to be exclusively Rome, but the city in which the pope died; and in case this city was under an interdict, the next adjacent city. The place for the conclave was the episcopal palace. The provisions of the decree of Gregory X were somewhat, though not essentially, modified by Clement V (1305–1314) and Clement VI (1342–1356). The councils of Pisa, Constance, and Basle elected new popes, without binding themselves to the papal provisions concerning the conclaves; but in this as in many other respects their proceedings were of an exceptional character, and were without abiding consequences in the law of the Church. In 1621 Gregory XV issued the constitution *Æterni Patris filius*, which contained all the principal provisions in regard to the conclave that are now in use. In a few points only it was supplemented by bulls of Urban VIII (1625) and Clement XII (1732).

The present mode of electing a pope has been fully described in the article Conclave. The right of voting is limited to the cardinals who have been ordained deacons. The lack of this ordination may, however, be supplied by a special privilege of the pope. The cardinals do not lose their right of voting even by excommunication, but they can cast their votes only if they are personally present in the conclave. Those who live outside of the city of Rome are not specially invited. Since Boniface IX (1389) all the popes have been taken from the College of Cardinals, but in a legal point of view the eligibility of the pope is not conditioned by his being a cardinal. The decree of Nicholas II abolished a former provision by a Roman synod which demanded it, and since then a number of popes have been elected who were not cardinals. Urban III, elected in 1185, was only archbishop of Milan; Urban IV (1261) was patriarch of Jerusalem; Clement V (1305), archbishop of Bordeaux; Urban VI, with whose election in 1378 the papal schism began, was archbishop of Bari. Celestine V (1294) was an eremite, who after a long conclave was agreed upon by two contending parties as a mere figurehead, and Urban V (1360) was abbot of St. Victor in Marseilles. No pope is allowed to appoint his own successor, and the election by a conclave is an indispensable condition. In troublesome times some popes, as Pius VI (died 1799) and Pius VII (died 1823), provided that at the election of their successors some of the regulations for the holding of the conclave might be dispensed with. Pius IX is reported to have made similar arrangements for the election of his successor. The emperor of Austria, as the successor of the Roman emperor, and the governments of France and Spain, have exercised, and the governments of Naples and Portugal have claimed, the right of excluding some particular cardinal, as *persona minus grata*, from the papal throne. The right is exercised before an election through a member of the College of Cardinals, who is commissioned for that purpose by the government, and it is limited to one veto at each conclave. It is generally believed at the time of this writing (1877) that, on the death of pope Pius IX, the empire of Germany will claim this right, in order to prevent the election of the candidate of the Jesuits. Long usage causes the selection of the candidate from the Italian cardinals. Several popes, like Celestine V, have resigned the office; quite a number, in the course of the Middle Ages, have been deposed by the emperors; and in the 15th century the councils of Pisa, Constance, and Basle claimed and exercised the right of deposing the pope. The principle, first enounced by the Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals, and ever since maintained by the advocates of the extreme papal system, that the apostolical see is not judged by any one ("apostolica sedes a nemine judicatur"), has more and more been accepted by the Church; and after the Vatican Council it would appear to be impossible that the Catholic world would ever recognise any vacancy of the papal see except those caused by the voluntary resignation or the death of the incumbent.

The coronation and consecration ceremonies attending the inauguration of the pope are of a very solemn and impressive character. We give a description in the words of an eye-witness:

"About eleven o'clock the procession began to arrive from the Quirinal Palace. It was immensely long. The cardinals were in their state carriages, and each was accompanied by several carriages full of attendants. The senator and governor of Rome formed part of the train. The pope was in a state coach drawn by six black horses, and preceded by a priest riding on a white mule, and bearing a large crucifix. The procession went round by the back of St. Peter's, and the pope went up to the Sistine Chapel, where various ceremonies were performed which I did not see. In about half an hour the procession entered the centre door of St. Peter's. In all these processions the lowest orders of the clergy came first, then bishops, archbishops, cardinals, and, lastly, the pope. He was borne aloft on his throne, carried by twelve bearers, the choir singing, *Ecce sacerdos magnus*—'Behold the great priest!' At the chapel of the Santissimo he stopped and adored the host. He was then borne forward to the high-altar, and, passing by the north side of it, alighted in a space enclosed for the use of the pope and the cardinals on the east side. He walked up to the altar, prayed at the foot of it, ascended the steps, and seated himself on the middle of the altar, on the very spot where the ciborium or pyx, containing the host, usually stands. The cardinals in succession went through the ceremony of adoration. This ceremony is performed three times: *first*, before quitting the conclave; *secondly*, in the Sistine Chapel before the procession came into St. Peter's; and now, for the *third* time, each cardinal prostrated himself before the pope, then kissed his toe, or rather his slipper, next kissed his hand, which was not bare, but covered by the cape of his robes; and, *lastly*, the pope embraced each twice, and when all had gone through this ceremony, the pope rose and bestowed his blessing on the people present, and retired in a sedan chair, on the back of which there is embroidered in gold a dove, to represent the Holy Spirit." On the Sabbath after his solemn installation his holiness performs mass at an altar of the richest decoration, the pontifical mantle being placed on him by the oldest cardinal-deacon, who addresses him thus: "Receive the holy mantle, the plenitude of the pontifical offices, to the honor of Almighty God, and of the most glorious Virgin Mary, his mother, and of the blessed apostles Peter and Paul, and of the holy Roman Church." After this comes the public coronation on the balcony above the great door of St. Peter's. His mantle as a priest is taken off, and his triple crown as a king is put on, with these words: "Receive the tiara adorned with three crowns, and know that thou art the father of princes and kings, the governor of the world, on earth vicar of our Saviour Jesus Christ, to whom is honor and glory for ever and ever.

Amen." His holiness then pronounces this prayer: "May the holy apostles Peter and Paul, in whose power and authority we confide, intercede for us with the Lord. By the prayers and merits of the blessed Mary, always a virgin, of the blessed Michael, the archangel, of the blessed John the Baptist, and the holy apostles Peter and Paul, and all the saints; may Almighty God have mercy upon you, and may Jesus Christ, having remitted all your sins, lead you to life everlasting. Amen." "May the Almighty and merciful Lord grant you indulgence, absolution, and remission of all your sins, space for true and fruitful repentance, a heart always penitent, and amendment of life, the grace and consolation of the Holy Spirit, and final perseverance in good works." Two keys are also given him in the church of St. John Lateran.

(See also *Wesleyan Mag.* 1851.)

IV. *List of the Roman Popes.*—In the article PAPACY we have referred to the uncertainty prevailing in regard to the first bishops of Rome. Roman Catholic writers themselves quite generally admit that the statements of ancient Church-writers on the subject are entirely irreconcilable, and that it is impossible to establish with any degree of certainty the order in which they followed each other, the years of their accession to the see of Rome, and the year of their death. The following table is given from the Roman almanac entitled *Gerarchia Cattolica* (with the original names of the popes, and notices of antipopes, from other sources), and although it is so uncritical in its first part that even the Roman historians do not adopt it, it is of some value, as presenting the claims of the Church of Rome:

[*St.* stands for *Saint*, *B.* for *Blessed*, *M.* for *Martyr*.]

No.	Name.	Place of Birth.	Term.
1.	*St.* Peter, *M.*	Bethsaida in Galilee	42–67
2.	*St.* Linus, *M.*	Volterra	67–78
3.	*St.* Cletus, *M.*	Rome	78–90
4.	*St.* Clement I, *M.*	Rome	90–100
5.	*St.* Anacletus, *M.*	Athens	100–112
6.	*St.* Evaristus, *M.*	Syria	112–121
7.	*St.* Alexander I, *M.*	Rome	121–132
8.	*St.* Sixtus I, *M.*	Rome	132–142
9.	*St.* Telesphorus, *M.*	Greece	142–154
10.	*St.* Hyginus, *M.*	Greece	154–158
11.	*St.* Pius I, *M.*	Aquileja	158–167
12.	*St.* Anicetus, *M.*	Syria	167–175
13.	*St.* Soterus, *M.*	Campania	175–182
14.	*St.* Eleutherius, *M.*	Epirus	182–193
15.	*St.* Victor I, *M.*	Africa	193–203
16.	*St.* Zephyrinus, *M.*	Rome	203–220
17.	*St.* Calixtus I, *M.*	Rome	221–227
18.	*St.* Urban I, *M.*	Rome	227–233
19.	*St.* Pontianus, *M.*	Rome	233–238
20.	*St.* Anterus, *M.*	Greece	238–239
21.	*St.* Fabian, *M.*	Rome	240–253
22.	*St.* Cornelius, *M.*	Rome	254–255
	[Novatian, first antipope.]		
23.	*St.* Lucius I, *M.*	Rome	255–257
24.	*St.* Stephen I, *M.*	Rome	257–260
25.	*St.* Sixtus II, *M.*	Athens	260–261
26.	*St.* Dionysius	Italy	261–272
27.	*St.* Felix I, *M.*	Rome	272–275
28.	*St.* Eutychianus	Tuscany	275–283
29.	*St.* Caius, *M.*	Dalmatia	283–296
30.	*St.* Marcellinus, *M.*	Rome	296–304
31.	*St.* Marcellus I, *M.*	Rome	304–309
32.	*St.* Eusebius	Calabria	309–311
33.	*St.* Melchiades	Africa	311–314
34.	*St.* Sylvester	Rome	314–337
35.	*St.* Marcus	Rome	337–340
36.	*St.* Julius I.	Rome	341–352
37.	*St.* Liberius	Rome	352–363
38.	*St.* Felix II.	Rome	363–365
39.	*St.* Damasus	Spain	366–384
	[Ursicinus, antipope.]		
40.	*St.* Siricius	Rome	384–398
41.	*St.* Anastasius	Rome	399–402
42.	*St.* Innocent I.	Albano	402–417
43.	*St.* Zosimus	Greece	417–418
44.	*St.* Boniface I.	Rome	418–423
45.	*St.* Celestine I.	Campania	423–432
46.	*St.* Sixtus III.	Rome	432–440
47.	*St.* Leo I, *the Great*	Tuscany	440–461
48.	*St.* Hilary	Cagliari	461–468
49.	*St.* Simplicius	Tivoli	468–483
50.	*St.* Felix III	Rome	483–492
51.	*St.* Gelasius I.	Africa	492–496
52.	*St.* Anastasius II	Rome	496–498
53.	*St.* Symmachus	Rome	498–514
54.	*St.* Hormisdas	Frosinone	514–523
55.	*St.* John I, *M.*	Tuscany	523–526
56.	*St.* Felix IV	Benevent	526–530
57.	Boniface II.	Rome	530–532
58.	John II	Rome	532–535
59.	*St.* Agapetus I	Rome	535–536
60.	*St.* Sylverius, *M.*	Frosinone	536–538
61.	Vigilius	Rome	538–555
62.	Pelagius I.	Rome	555–560
63.	John III	Rome	560–573
64.	Benedict I	Rome	574–578
65.	Pelagius II.	Rome	578–590
66.	*St.* Gregory I, *the Great.*	Rome	590–604
67.	Sabinianus	Volterra	604–606
68.	Boniface III	Rome	607–607
69.	*St.* Boniface IV.	The Marches	608–615
70.	*St.* Adeodatus I	Rome	615–619
71.	Boniface V.	Naples	619–625
72.	Honorius I.	Campania	625–638
73.	Severinus	Rome	640–640
74.	John IV	Dalmatia	640–642
75.	Theodorus I	Greece	642–649
76.	*St.* Martin I, *M.*	Todi	649–655
77.	*St.* Eugenius I.	Rome	655–656
78.	*St.* Vitalianus	Segni	657–672
79.	Adeodatus II	Rome	672–676
80.	Donus I.	Rome	676–678
81.	*St.* Agathon	Greece	678–682
82.	*St.* Leo II	Sicily	682–683
83.	*St.* Benedict II.	Rome	684–685
84.	John V.	Antiochia	685–686
85.	Conon	Thrace	686–687
86.	*St.* Sergius I.	?	687–701
87.	John VI	Greece	701–705
88.	John VII	Greece	705–707
89.	Sisinnius	Syria	708–708
90.	Constantine.	Syria	708–715
91.	*St.* Gregory II.	Rome	715–731
92.	*St.* Gregory III.	Syria	731–741
93.	*St.* Zachary	Greece	741–752
94.	*St.* Stephen II.	Rome	752–752
95.	Stephen III	Rome	752–757
96.	*St.* Paul I	Rome	757–767
97.	Stephen IV	Syracuse	768–771
98.	Adrian I.	Rome	771–795
99.	*St.* Leo III	Rome	795–816
100.	Stephen V	Rome	816–817
101.	*St.* Paschal I	Rome	817–824
102.	Eugenius II.	Rome	824–827
103.	Valentinus	Rome	827–827
104.	Gregory IV	Rome	827–844
105.	Sergius II.	Rome	844–847
106.	*St.* Leo IV.	Rome	847–855
	[Fabulous antipope Joan.]		
107.	Benedict III	Rome	855–858
108.	*St.* Nicholas I, *the Great.*	Rome	858–867
109.	Adrian II.	Rome	867–872
110.	John VIII.	Rome	872–882
111.	Marinus I.	Gallese	882–884
112.	Adrian III	Rome	884–885
113.	Stephen VI.	Rome	885–891
114.	Formosus	Ostia	891–896
	[Sergius, antipope.]		
115.	Boniface VI.	Rome	896–896
116.	Stephen VII.	Rome	897–898
117.	Romanus	Gallese	898–898
118.	Theodorus II	Gallese	898–898
119.	John IX	Tivoli	898–900
120.	Benedict IV.	Rome	900–903
121.	Leo V.	Ardea	903–903
122.	Christopher.	Rome	903–904
123.	Sergius III.	Rome	904–911
124.	Anastasius III	Rome	911–913
125.	Lando	Sabine	913–914
126.	John X	Ravenna	915–928
127.	Leo VI.	Rome	928–929
128.	Stephen VIII.	Rome	929–931
129.	John XI	Rome	931–936
130.	Leo VII.	Rome	936–939
131.	Stephen IX	Rome	939–942
132.	Marinus II.	Rome	943–946
133.	Agapetus II.	Rome	946–956
134.	John XII*	Rome	956–964
	(Octavian Conti.)		
	[Leo VIII, antipope.]		
135.	Benedict V.	Rome	964–965
136.	John XIII	Rome	965–972
	(Bishop John of Ravenna.)		
137.	Benedict VI.	Rome	972–973
138.	Donus II.	Rome	973–975
139.	Benedict VII.	Rome	975–984
	(Conti, bishop of Sutri.)		
140.	John XIV.	Pavia	984–985
	(Peter, bishop of Pavia.)		
141.	Boniface VII.	?	985–985
	(Cardinal Bonifacé Franco.)		
142.	John XV	Rome	985–996
143.	John XVI.	?	996–996
144.	Gregory V	Germany	996–999
	(Bruno, court chaplain of the emperor.)		
145.	John XVII.	?	999–999
146.	Sylvester II.	France	999–1003
	(Gerbert.)		

* The first pope who changed his name on ascending the papal throne.

No.	Name.	Place of Birth.	Term.
147.	John XVIII.	Rome	1003–1003
148.	John XIX.	Rome	1003–1009
149.	Sergius IV	Rome	1009–1012
150.	Benedict VIII.	Rome	1012–1024
	(Conti.)		
151.	John XX.	Rome	1024–1033
	(Conti, a brother of the preceding.)		
152.	Benedict IX.	Rome	1033–1044
	(Theophylact, nephew of the two preceding.)		
	[Sylvester, antipope.]		
153.	Gregory VI	Rome	1044–1046
	(Archpriest John Gratianus.)		
154.	Clement II.	Germany	1046–1047
	(Bishop Suidger of Bamberg.)		
155.	Damasus II.	Germany	1048–1048
	(Bishop Pappo of Brixen.)		
156.	*St.* Leo IX.	Germany	1049–1055
	(Bishop Bruno of Toul.)		
157.	Victor II.	Germany	1055–1057
	(Bishop Gebhard of Eichstädt.)		
158.	Stephen X	Germany	1057–1058
	(Abbot Frederick of Montecassino.)		
159.	Benedict X	?	1058–1059
	(John Mincius Conti, bishop of Velletri.)		
160.	Nicholas II	France	1059–1061
	(Bishop Gerard of Florence.)		
161.	Alexander II.	Milan	1061–1073
	(Anselm Badagio, bishop of Lucca.)		
162.	*St.* Gregory VII.	Soana	1073–1085
	(Cardinal Hildebrand.)		
	[Clement III, antipope.]		
163.	Victor III.	Benevent	1087–1087
	(Desiderius, duke of Capua, abbot of Montecassino.)		
164.	Urban II.	France	1088–1099
	(Otto de Lagers, cardinal-bishop of Ostia.)		
165.	Paschal II	Bieda	1099–1118
	(Cardinal Rainer.)		
	[Albert and Theodoric, antipopes.]		
166.	Gelasius II.	Gaeta	1118–1119
	(Cardinal Johannes Cajetani.)		
167.	Calixtus II.	France	1119–1124
	(Guido, count of Burgundy, archbishop of Vienne.)		
168.	Honorius II.	Bologna	1124–1130
	(Lambert, cardinal-bishop of Ostia.)		
169.	Innocent II.	Rome	1130–1143
	(Cardinal Gregory Papy.)		
	[Anacletus, antipope.]		
170.	Celestine II	Citta di Castello	1143–1144
171.	Lucius II.	Bologna	1144–1145
	(Caccianemici.)		
172.	*B.* Eugenius III	Montemagno	1145–1153
	(Bernardus, abbot at Rome.)		
173.	Anastasius IV.	Rome	1153–1154
174.	Adrian IV.	England	1154–1159
175.	Alexander III.	Siena	1159–1181
	(Roland Bandinelli.)		
	[Victor, Paschal, and Callixtus, antipopes.]		
176.	Lucius III.	Lucca	1181–1185
177.	Urban III.	Milan	1185–1187
	(Bishop Humbert of Milan.)		
178.	Gregory VIII.	Beneventum	1187–1187
179.	Clement III.	Rome	1187–1191
180.	Celestine III.	Rome	1191–1198
181.	Innocent III	Anagni	1198–1216
	(Cardinal Conti.)		
182.	Honorius III.	Rome	1216–1227
	(Savelli.)		
183.	Gregory IX	Anagni	1227–1241
	(Conti.)		
184.	Celestine IV	Milan	1241–1241
	(Castiglione.)		
185.	Innocent IV.	Genoa	1243–1254
	(Fieschi.)		
186.	Alexander IV.	Anagni	1254–1261
	(Conti.)		
187.	Urban IV	France	1261–1264
	(Jacob Pantalean, patriarch of Jerusalem.)		
188.	Clement IV	France	1265–1269
	(Guido Fulcodi.)		
189.	*B.* Gregory X	Piacenza	1271–1276
	(Theobald Visconti, archdeacon at Liège.)		
190.	Innocent V.	Savoy	1276–1276
	(Peter de Tarantaise.)		
191.	Adrian V	Genoa	1276–1276
	(Fieschi.)		
192.	John XXI.	Portugal	1276–1277
	(Peter Julian, bishop of Tusculum.)		
193.	Nicholas III.	Rome	1277–1280
	(Cardinal John Cajetan Orfini.)		
194.	Martin IV.	France	1281–1285
	(Simon de Brie.)		
195.	Honorius IV	Rome	1285–1287
	(Savelli.)		
196.	Nicholas IV.	Ascoli	1288–1292
	(Cardinal Jerome, bishop of Tusculum.)		
197.	*St.* Celestine V	Isernia	1294–1294
	(Peter, an eremite.)		
198.	Boniface VIII.	Anagni	1294–1303
	(Benedict Cajetan.)		
199.	*B.* Benedict XI.	Treviso	1303–1304
	(Boccasini.)		
200.	Clement V	France	1305–1314
	(De Gout, archbishop of Bordeaux.)		
201.	John XXII.	France	1316–1334
	(Cardinal Jacob de Esne.)		
	[Nicholas, antipope.]		
202.	Benedict XII.	France	1334–1342
	(Cardinal Jacob Fournier.)		
203.	Clement VI	France	1342–1352
	(Cardinal Peter Roger.)		
204.	Innocent VI.	France	1352–1362
	(Cardinal Stephen Aubert.)		
205.	*B.* Urban V	France	1362–1370
	(Abbot at Marseilles.)		
206.	Gregory XI.	France	1370–1378
	(Cardinal Peter Roger.)		
207.	Urban VI	Naples	1378–1389
	(Prignano, archbishop of Bari.)		
	[From 1378 to 1410 occurs the great Western Schism, during which, in conflict with the line of popes inserted in the catalogue, is found a rival line residing at Avignon—Clement VII, 1378–1394; Benedict XIII, 1394–1410. The Council of Pisa, 1410, deposed both rival popes; but Benedict XIII remained in schism till his death in 1424.]		
208.	Boniface IX.	Naples	1389–1404
	(Cardinal Peter Tomacelli.)		
209.	Innocent VII.	Sulmona	1404–1406
	(Migliorati.)		
210.	Gregory XII	Venice	1406–1409
	(Coriario.)		
211.	Alexander V	Bologna	1409–1410
	(Cardinal Peter Philargi.)		
212.	John XXIII.	Naples	1410–1415
	(Cardinal Cossa.)		
213.	Martin V.	Rome	1417–1431
	(Cardinal Otto Colonna.)		
214.	Eugenius IV.	Venice	1431–1447
	(Condulmero.)		
	[Felix, antipope.]		
215.	Nicholas V.	Sarzana	1447–1455
	(Thomas de Sarzano.)		
216.	Calixtus III.	Spain	1455–1458
	(Cardinal Alphons Borgia.)		
217.	Pius II.	Siena	1458–1464
	(Æneas Sylvius Piccolomini.)		
218.	Paul II.	Venice	1464–1471
	(Barbo.)		
219.	Sixtus IV	Savona	1471–1484
	(Cardinal Francesco della Rovere.)		
220.	Innocent VIII.	Genoa	1484–1492
	(Cardinal John Baptist Cibo.)		
221.	Alexander VI	Spain	1492–1503
	(Cardinal Rodrigo Borgia.)		
222.	Pius III.	Siena	1503–1503
	(Cardinal Francis Piccolomini.)		
223.	Julius II.	Savona	1503–1513
	(Cardinal Rovere.)		
224.	Leo X.	Florence	1513–1521
	(Cardinal de' Medici.)		
225.	Adrian VI.	Netherlands	1522–1523
	(Adrian Florent.)		
226.	Clement VII	Florence	1523–1534
	(Cardinal de' Medici.)		
227.	Paul III.	Rome	1534–1549
	(Cardinal Alexander Farnese.)		
228.	Julius III.	Tuscany	1550–1555
	(Cardinal del Monte.)		
229.	Marcellus II.	Montepulciano	1555–1555
	(Cardinal Cervino.)		
230.	Paul IV.	Naples	1555–1559
	(Cardinal Caraffa.)		
231.	Pius IV	Milan	1559–1565
	(Cardinal de' Medici.)		
232.	*St.* Pius V.	Bosco	1566–1572
	(Michael Ghisleri, cardinal of Alessandria.)		
233.	Gregory XIII	Bologna	1572–1585
	(Cardinal Hugo Buoncompagno.)		
234.	Sixtus V	Marchigiano	1585–1590
	(Felix Peretti, cardinal Montalto.)		
235.	Urban VII.	Rome	1590–1590
	(Cardinal Castagna.)		
236.	Gregory XIV.	Cremona	1590–1591
	(Cardinal Sfondrati.)		
237.	Innocent IX	Bologna	1591–1592
	(Cardinal Fachinetti.)		
238.	Clement VIII	Florence	1592–1605
	(Cardinal Aldobrandini.)		
239.	Leo XI.	Florence	1605–1605
	(Cardinal Octavian de' Medici.)		
240.	Paul V.	Rome	1605–1621
	(Cardinal Camillo Borghese.)		
241.	Gregory XV.	Bologna	1621–1623
	(Cardinal Alexander Ludovisio.)		
242.	Urban VIII	Florence	1623–1644
	(Cardinal Maffeo Barberini.)		
243.	Innocent X	Rome	1644–1655
	(Cardinal John Pamfili.)		
244.	Alexander VII.	Siena	1655–1667
	(Cardinal Fabio Chigi.)		
245.	Clement IX.	Pistoia	1667–1669
	(Cardinal Rospigliosi.)		
246.	Clement X.	Rome	1670–1676
	(Cardinal Altieri.)		

No.	Name.	Place of Birth.	Term.
247.	Innocent XI	Como	1676–1689
	(Cardinal Benedict Odescalchi.)		
248.	Alexander VIII	Venice	1689–1691
	(Cardinal Peter Ottoboni.)		
249.	Innocent XII	Naples	1691–1700
	(Cardinal Anthony Pignatelli.)		
250.	Clement XI	Urbino	1700–1721
	(Cardinal Albani.)		
251.	Innocent XIII	Rome	1721–1724
	(Cardinal Conti.)		
252.	Benedict XIII	Rome	1724–1730
	(Cardinal Orsini.)		
253.	Clement XII	Florence	1730–1740
	(Cardinal Corsini.)		
254.	Benedict XIV	Bologna	1740–1758
	(Cardinal Prosper Lambertini.)		
255.	Clement XIII	Venice	1758–1769
	(Cardinal Rezzonico.)		
256.	Clement XIV	St. Angelo in Vado	1769–1774
	(Cardinal Ganganelli.)		
257.	Pius VI	Cesena	1775–1799
	(Cardinal Braschi.)		
258.	Pius VII	Cesena	1800–1823
	(Cardinal Chiaramonte.)		
259.	Leo XII	Spoleto	1823–1829
	(Cardinal della Genga.)		
260.	Pius VIII	Cingoli	1829–1830
	(Cardinal Castiglione.)		
261.	Gregory XVI	Belluno	1831–1846
	(Cardinal Mauro Capellari.)		
262.	Pius IX	Sinigaglia	1846–1878
	(Cardinal Mastai Ferretti.)		
263.	Leo XIII	Carpinetto	1878–
	(Cardinal Gioacchino Pesci.)		

How uncertain the table of the early Roman bishops is, may be seen by comparing it with the catalogue, given in Alzog's *Handbuch der Kirchengeschichte* (9th ed. 1872), a work probably more extensively used as a text-book of Church history than any other Roman Catholic's work. It gives (ii, 649) the catalogue of the first Roman bishops, as follows:

St. Peter, 42–67 or 68.	St. Anterus, 235–236.
" Linus.	" Fabianus, 236–250.
" Anacletus (or Cletus).	" Cornelius, 251–252.
" Clement I, 92–101.	" Lucius, 253.
" Evaristus.	" Stephen I, 253–257.
" Alexander, until 119.	" Xystus or Sixtus II, 257–258.
" Xystus or Sixtus, until 127.	" Dionysius, 259–269.
" Telesphorus, 127–139.	" Felix I, 269–274.
" Hygiinus, 139–142.	" Eutychianus, 274–283.
" Pius I, 142–157.	" Caius, 283–296.
" Anicetus, 157–168.	" Marcellinus, until 304.
" Soter, 168–177.	" Marcellus, 308–310.
" Eleutherius, 177–192.	" Eusebius, 310.
" Victor, 192–202.	" Melchiades, 311–314.
" Zephyrinus, 202–219.	" Sylvester I, 314–335.
" Callistus, 219–223.	" Marcus, 336.
" Urbanus, 223–230.	" Julius I, 337–352.
" Pontianus, 230–235.	Liberius, 352–366.
Felix, 355 (*antipope*).	

It will be seen that, according to this list, one of the Roman bishops, whom the Roman list calls *St. Felix II*, was neither a saint nor even a legitimate pope.

In the Roman list of popes, 80 are enumerated as saints, 4 as blessed, and 32 as martyrs. In regard to their nationality, 14 were Frenchmen, 11 Greeks, 6 Germans, 6 Syrians and natives of Asia Minor, 3 Africans, 3 Spaniards, 2 Dalmatians, 1 Thracian, 1 Englishman, 1 Portuguese, 1 Dutchman; all the remainder were Italians. The last non-Italian pope was Adrian VI (1522–23); the last saint, St. Pius V (1566–72). As the Roman legend claimed that the apostle Peter had been 25 years bishop of Rome, although it is very doubtful whether he ever even visited Rome [see PETER], a belief gained ground within the Church that no pope would reign 25 years until the last, under whom the world would come to an end; but the pontificate of Pius IX, which in 1877 had already lasted 31 years, put an end to this tradition. Besides Pius IX, only the following nine popes reigned 20 years or more: Sylvester I, 23 years; Leo I, 21; Adrian I, 23; Leo III, 20; Alexander III, 21; Urban VIII, 20; Clement XI, 20; Pius VI, 24; Pius VII, 23. Sixty-four popes reigned from 10 to 20 years each; and forty-five reigned each less than one year.

The see of Rome was frequently disputed. The first antipope was Novatianus, who was chosen by some of the clergy and laity in opposition to Cornelius; the last, Felix V, who was elected in opposition to Eugenius IV. Sometimes the whole Church was for a number of years divided by the rival claims of two popes, and in one instance this division continued for thirty-nine years (1378–1417). See ANTIPOPES.

The story that at one time, in the 9th century, the papal chair was filled by a woman, the popess Joan, was quite generally credited from the latter part of the 11th until the opening of the 16th century, but it is now admitted by nearly all writers to be a fable. See JOAN.

On the several Latin titles given to the popes, see Ducange, *Glossarium*. On the rights and functions of the popes, see the manuals of ecclesiastical laws, especially those by Richter, *Lehrbuch des Kirchenrechts* (7th ed., by Dove, Leipsic, 1874); Meier, *Lehrbuch des Kirchenrechts* (3d ed. Götting. 1869); Schulte, *Lehrbuch des kath. Kirchenrechts* (3d ed. Giessen, 1873); Phillips, *Kirchenrecht* (Ratisbon, 1845–69, 7 vols.). The principal work on the papal elections is by Zöpffel, *Die Papstwahlen* (1872). See also Camarda, *Synopsis constitutionum apost. cum ceremoniali Gregoriano de pertinentibus ad electionem Papæ* (1732); Menschen, *Ceremonialia electionis et coronationis Pontif. Rom.* (Frankfort, 1732); Adler, *Ceremonien und Feierlichkeiten bei der Wahl und Krönung eines Papstes* (Vienna, 1834); Pipping, *De triplici corona Pontif. Rom.* (Leipsic, 1642); Hermansen, *De cor. trip. Pontif. Rom.* (Upsala, 1736); Krebs, *De mutatione nominum Pontif. Rom.* (Leipsic, 1719); Mayer, *De osculo pedum Pontif. Rom.* (Wittenberg, 1687); Ffoulkes, *Divis. of Christendom*, ii, 556; Thompson, *Papacy and the Civil Power* (N. Y. 1877, 12mo); *Brownson's Rev.* July and Oct. 1855; *North Brit. Rev.* vol. xi; *Cath. World*, Aug. 1870, art. xi; *Lond. Quar. Rev.* April, 1871; Oct. 1876, art. iii; *Princeton Rev.* Jan. 1871, art. ix; *Bibl. Sac.* Jan. 1871, art. iv; *Edinb. Rev.* July, 1871, art. v; July, 1872, art. iv. (A. J. S.)

POPE is the title given in the Russian Church to the secular clergy, and corresponds in import to the (Latin) word *curate* used in the English Church. We find full information about Russian curates or popes in the earliest times. A passage of Nikon (i, 198) shows plainly that about the year 1094, when Wewolod died, there were priests in Russia. They formed, with the deacons, subdeacons, and the persons belonging to an inferior degree of the ecclesiastic order, what was called the secular clergy, the highest office of it being that of archpriest or protopope. The verger, the bell-ringer, the lamb-baker, were counted also with the ecclesiastic order, and formed together a special class, distinguished from the regular and secular clergies as well by their cloth as by their peculiar privileges. The conditions required for admission into the ecclesiastic state had been set down, among others, by the metropolitan Cyrillus (1274) at the Synod of Wladimir on the Kläsma, celebrated in Russian history. It was decreed there: "If the bishops wish to ordain a pope, let them first examine his life from his childhood; only he who has lived temperately and chastely, who has married a virgin, who is proficient in the art of reading and writing, who is neither a gambler nor a cheat, who is not addicted to drinking, swearing, or cursing, who is not quarrelsome, shall receive the consecration." The right to appoint a pope belonged to the bishop in his diocese, and the community seem to have had originally no share whatever in the choice of their pastor. But it was one of the directions of the Stoglawnik (of the year 1551) that the parishioners should elect their pastors and deacons themselves. As the revenue of the popes accrued either from special properties or from the voluntary gifts of the parishioners, it would seem that in the first case the right of nomination was exercised by the bishop, and in the other case by the people. The pope was chosen from the deacons, the deacons from the subdeacons, and the latter were taken from among the sons of the secular clergy. Ordination was bestowed by the bishop, who received as a compensa-

tion the so-called ordination money. This practice was opposed in Novgorod and Pskow, and occasioned the formation of the sect called Strigolniks (q. v.). At the present time the priests are appointed by the bishop, archbishop, or metropolitan to whose eparchy they belong. Yet the right of the bishop is not of a quite unlimited description: he has to make sure of the consent of the church patron, i. e. the proprietor of the ground on which the church stands, or of the colonel, if the pope to be appointed is to officiate in a regiment. The lower servants of the Church are appointed by the priest or the patron, seldom by the higher dignitaries.

The official duties of the Greek popes are the following: Every Sunday and holyday, and at least three times in the week, they officiate mechanically and distribute the Eucharist; they give their blessing to confined wives, christen new-born children, administer confession, marry betrothed couples, recite their prayers in uninterrupted series before the bodies of the deceased until they are under ground, and visit from time to time their parishioners in their houses for the purpose of bestowing their benediction, etc. Extemporaneous preaching is severely prohibited. Once in a while they read for the assembled people after worship a homily of the fathers, or some composition sent to them by the bishop. Many liturgical acts cannot be done by the pope alone without the assistance of the deacon. Every pope must have married already as subdeacon, and the reputation of his bride must have been unblemished. If his wife dies, his usefulness as a pastor comes to an end, and, as a rule, he retires to some monastery, where, as a priest-monk, he enjoys special honors. But, according to more modern rules, popes of good repute are allowed to remain in office after the death of their wives; but a second marriage is entirely out of the question. If the widowed priest marries again, he renounces *ipso facto* the ecclesiastical state, for one marriage only is allowed and prescribed to him.

The honors paid to the secular priests do not follow them into private life. Their religious duties performed, the borrowed nimbus falls, and the boyar who devoutly kissed their hand at the altar ignores them in the street. The cause thereof is mostly to be found in their licentious conduct, their coarseness, their ignorance of worldly and spiritual things—in short, in their vices, against which the metropolitans, bishops, and even the councils have accumulated in vain all kinds of prohibitory measures. Witnesses relate that the ignorance of the Greek clergy is indescribable; that out of a thousand priests, scarcely ten are able to sign their names, and that he who can do it can pass himself off for a scholar: it does not seem that the Russian popes can lay claim to a much higher degree of consideration. Most of those who are destined to the Church belong to the lowest class of the population—they are generally the sons of the lower clergy. The sad predicament of the district schools and colleges allows of an inference as to the studies preparatory to them. The first son of a pope belongs by law to the clerical career; and if the necessities of the Church require it, two of his children receive orders. The embryo pastor gets his first education in the church, where he performs the lower church duties, and in the ecclesiastical schools of the district. Then he spends two years in a clerical seminary, where he learns reading, writing, elementary arithmetic, and the ritual: at this stage of his development the black cloak is thrown on his shoulders, and the priest is made. Now he has to marry, if he does not cherish the idea of retiring to a monastery. He has not the least smattering of Latin or Greek, nor indeed any kind of knowledge. The sum of his acquirements is the ability to read and write the liturgy of the Church. Even the little he has learned in school is slowly obliterated by the frequent mechanical performance of ceremonies and the toils of agriculture, to which he must devote his spare time to avoid starvation.

The income of the popes and inferior ecclesiastics is very scanty. As a rule they dwell in a house belonging to the parish, till with their own hands the land conceded to them for their maintenance, and have mostly to depend on their casual fees. It follows that everything—baptism, blessings, exorcisms, visits to the sick, celebration of the Eucharist, even confessions—must be paid for according to the rank and wealth of the parishioner, else the pope could not maintain himself and his family with a salary of $100 at the utmost. The dress of the popes differs little from that of laymen. Their long beard (which they consider sinful to shave off), their uncombed hair, hanging wildly about their neck and shoulders, give them an untidy appearance. In the church alone the popes appear bareheaded; outside they wear a kind of cap or a round hat, with a broad, flat border. A long stick is their constant companion.

The ordination of popes (hierey, presbyters, priests) is observed in the following way: The bishop makes the sign of the cross over the head of the candidate, while the latter kisses the bishop's knees. He then, with the other ecclesiastics, walks three times processionally around the altar, kneels down before the same, and lays his forehead between his hands, which he rests crosswise on the altar. The bishop lays his right hand on the head of the young priest, and says, "The divine grace promotes the most pious deacon to the order of priesthood." Then the ordinated youth receives the benediction, and kisses the hand of the bishop. As to priestly garments, he receives, instead of the *crarion*, a similar stripe, four inches wide and four ells long, around the neck: this ornament is called *epibrachelion;* further, a belt and a round cloak, the great *phelonion* (the casula of the Latins), which reaches to his feet.

The secular clergy stand under the control of the diocesan bishop, but are in many respects also amenable to the worldly authorities. See for literature the art. Russia.

Pope, Alexander, the celebrated English poet of the 18th century, deserves a place here as the writer of poems of a decidedly religious cast, for the speculative character of some of his productions, and their peculiar philosophical tendency. Pope was born May 21, 1688, in London, of rather humble parentage, of the Romish communion. A sickly child, Alexander's early educational advantages were scanty, but notwithstanding all deficiencies his poetic talent was manifest at a most tender age, though it is true that his celebrity is chiefly due to his satirical power, which was displayed in the writings of his maturer years. We would not, however, be understood as underestimating Pope's poetical qualifications; for, although he confined himself to the didactic style—leaving untouched the two higher orders of poetry, the epic and dramatic—he was yet in this department the master unsurpassed. No other English poet, not even Cowper, has combined such powers of reasoning with such splendid decorations of fancy; and Pope's works have been more frequently edited than those of any other British poet except Shakespeare. When but fifteen years old, Pope prepared poetical translations of several Latin poets, and thereby proved his attainments in the classical languages. From the age of twelve he had himself formed a plan of study, to which he rigidly adhered, and completed with little other incitement than the desire of excellence. His general reading, too, was uncommonly extensive and various, and at twenty-five he was one of the best-informed men of his generation. When only eighteen years old he produced his *Messiah*, a sacred eclogue in imitation of Virgil's *Pollio*. Pollio was a Roman senator in the time of Augustus, and celebrated not only as a general, but as a patron of letters and the fine arts. Virgil addressed to him his fourth eclogue at a time (B.C. 40) when Augustus and Antony had ratified a league of peace, and thus, as it was thought, es-

tablished the tranquillity of the empire, as in the times of the "golden age." In this eclogue Virgil is most eloquent in the praise of peace, and in some of his figures and expressions is thought to have imitated the prophecies of Isaiah, which he had possibly read in the Greek Septuagint. But, however this may be as regards Virgil, Roscoe well remarks of this production of Pope, that "the idea of uniting the sacred prophecies and grand imagery of Isaiah with the mysterious visions and pomp of numbers displayed in the *Pollio*, thereby combining both sacred and heathen mythology in predicting the coming of the Messiah, is one of the happiest subjects for producing emotions of sublimity that ever occurred to the mind of a poet." Pope's next remarkable work was his *Essay on Criticism* (written in 1709), which displays such extent of comprehension, such nicety of distinction, such acquaintance with mankind, and such knowledge both of ancient and modern learning, as are not often attained by the maturest age and longest experience. About 1713 he set about a translation of Homer's *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, which he published from 1715 to 1720, and secured by it a world-wide renown. It was received with admiration, and well deserved the praises of his contemporaries. But the work which gives him special interest in our line of study is his *Essay on Man* (1733), a philosophical didactic poem in vindication of the ways of Providence, in which the poet proposes to prove that, of all possible systems, Infinite Wisdom has formed the best; that in such a system coherence, union, subordination, are necessary; that it is not strange that we should not be able to discover perfection and order in every instance; because, in an infinity of things mutually relative, a mind which sees not infinitely can see nothing fully. Thus we see Pope setting forth, after Bolingbroke, a theory of *optimism* (q. v.), the consequences of which he probably did not fully understand. The *Essay* aspires to be, like Leibnitz's celebrated work, a theodicy, and is really a poetical version of the religious creed of Pope's age—of that deism which took various shapes with Clarke, Tindal, and Shaftesbury, and which Bolingbroke seems to have more or less put into shape to be celebrated in poetry by his friends. The poem is didactic, and not only didactive, but ratiocinative. The emotion is always checked by the sense that the Deity whose ways are indicated is after all but a barren abstraction, in no particular relation to our race or its history. He never touches the circle of human interests. Considered as a whole, this production, though Pope's most ambitious, remains radically unsatisfactory; yet there are, it must be granted, many brief passages marked by Pope's special felicity of touch; many in which the moral sentiment is true and tender; many in which he forgets for a moment the danger of open heterodoxy, and utters with genuine force some of the deeper sentiments that haunt us in this mysterious universe. Of his other works, none interest us here. One of the most admirable of Pope's religious poems is "The Universal Prayer," beginning with

> "Father of all! in every age,
> In every clime adored."

Pope's celebrated lyric, "Vital spark of heavenly flame," like some other productions of his pen, is an imitation. The original source of this hymn is supposed to be a poem composed by the emperor Adrian, who, dying A.D. 138, thus gave expression to his mingled doubts and fears. His poem begins: *Animulum vagula blandula, Hospes comesque corporis* ("Sweet spirit, ready to depart, guest and companion of the body"). It is afterwards found freely rendered in a piece by a poet of some note in his day—Thomas Flatman, of London, a barrister, poet, and painter. Flatman's poem is called "A Thought of Death;" and as he died in the year Pope was born, 1688, and the poems are very similar, there can be little doubt that Pope has imitated his predecessor. From Pope's correspondence we learn that on Nov. 7, 1712, he sent a letter to Mr. Steele for insertion in the *Spectator* on the subject of Adrian's last words; to which Steele responded by asking him to make of them an ode, in two or three stanzas of music. Pope replied immediately, saying that he had done as required, and sent the piece. To show how close is the parallel between the poets, we print a stanza of each:

FLATMAN.

> "Full of sorrow, full of anguish,
> Fainting, grasping, trembling, crying,
> Panting, groaning, shrinking, dying—
> Methinks I hear some gentle spirit say,
> 'Be not fearful, come away!'"

POPE.

> "Vital spark of heavenly flame!
> Quit, oh, quit this mortal frame!
> Trembling, hoping, ling'ring, flying,
> Oh, the pain, the bliss of dying!
> Cease, fond nature, cease thy strife,
> And let me languish into life!"

It has been urged by critics that it is inconsistent and inconceivable that a dying man should hold such a soliloquy with his soul—it is altogether too studied and rhetorical, too artificial. Although undoubtedly a grand poem, yet it cannot be regarded strictly as a hymn, any more than Toplady's famous production, "Deathless principle! arise," judged by the rule of St. Augustine, who tells us, "A hymn must be praise—the praise of God, and this in the form of a song."

Pope died May 30, 1744. He does not seem to have been a very lovable character, if we may judge him by his caustic satires. His person was small and deformed; and his temper of mind often also crooked, as we learn from one of his best friends, bishop Atterbury, who once, referring to Pope's irascibility, described him as "mens curva in corpore curvo." The best edition of his *Works* is by Roscoe (Lond. 10 vols. 8vo). It is one of the choicest contributions to English literature of the present century. See *Life* by Dr. Johnson prefixed to *Pope's Works;* Stephen, *Hist. of English Thought*, ii, 348–360 et al.; Chambers, *Cyclop. of Engl. Lit.* vol. ii; Warton, *Essay on the Genius and Writings of Pope;* Macdonald, *England's Antiphon*, p. 285. See also the excellent notes on the literature of Pope by Superintendent Winsor, of Boston, in his *Catalogue of the Boston Public Library* (2d ed. July, 1873), p. 221, col. i; *Westminst. Rev.* xcii, 149; *Lond. Qu. Rev.* Oct. 1875, art. iii. (J. H. W.)

Pope, Fielding, a Presbyterian divine, noted especially as an educator, was born in Virginia in 1800. He was educated in Marysville College, Tenn., studied divinity at the Southern and Western Theological Seminary, was licensed and ordained in 1826, and began his labors as stated supply for Mars' Hill, Columbiana, and Shilo churches, near Athens, Tenn. This relation existed until 1833, when he accepted a professorship in Marysville College, Tenn.; in 1844 he resigned this position and devoted all his time to the ministry; in 1852 he was connected as president with the Masonic Female Institute of Marysville; and in 1857 he took charge of New Providence Church in Marysville, in all of which labors he was earnest and faithful. He died March 23, 1867. Mr. Pope was a man of great power and popularity in the pulpit. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1868, p. 365. (J. L. S.)

Poper, Henry, a clergyman of the Church of England and missionary among the Jews, was born of Jewish parentage, in the year 1813, at Breitenbach, in Electoral Hesse, Germany. At Hildesheim, the native place of his mother, he received his early education at the famous school which flourished under the superintendence of the Jewish rabbi Wolfsohn. Besides, he was also privately instructed that he might prepare himself for the office of a teacher. When about the age of eighteen (May, 1831), Poper received an appointment as Jewish teacher and reader in the synagogue, having also occasionally to lecture in the synagogue. During the period of eight years he filled this office in two places in the

kingdom of Hanover, when, at last, by reading the N.-T. Scriptures and Christian intercourse, that change was brought about which was decisive for his whole future life. July 15, 1839, he received Christian baptism. When in the following year the London Society for Propagating Christianity among the Jews opened the Hebrew college for the purpose of training up missionaries to work among God's ancient people, Poper was enrolled as one of the first students. In June, 1842, Poper was appointed by the committee to labor at Frankfort-on-the-Main, was subsequently ordained to the ministry of the Church of England, and continued to be engaged in the Master's service in that city until his death, April 22, 1870. Poper was a very active missionary, and was highly esteemed for his zeal and efforts both among Jews and Christians. When, on April 25, 1870, his earthly remains were carried to their resting-place, all the Protestant pastors of the city, accompanied by many Hebrew-Christians and Jews, followed to the grave. A rabbi of a reformed synagogue, when informed by a missionary of Poper's death, said, "Mr. Poper was a very good man. I have known him well. He was greatly respected among my friends, who were also his friends. I liked him very much, although he was a convert to Christianity"—a remarkable testimony for a Jew to make of an apostate. See *Jewish Intelligencer*, 1870; *Missionsblatt für Israel*, 1870; *Dibreh Emeth* (Breslau, 1870). (B. P.)

Popery literally means attachment to the religion or to the party of the pope; and in this sense the word is synonymous with the profession of the Roman Catholic religion. In its use, however, it has come to involve either the idea of contempt or disparagement, or is intended to designate what are regarded by Protestants as the most exaggerated and superstitious among the doctrines and practices which they ascribe to Roman Catholics, and of which the principal are the infallibility of the Church; the supremacy of the pope; the doctrine of the seven sacraments—namely, baptism, confirmation, the Eucharist, penance, extreme unction, orders, and matrimony; the celibacy of the clergy; the worship of saints and the Virgin Mary, of pictures and images; prayers for the dead, intercession of saints, purgatory, unwritten traditions, etc. A proper distinction is made by some writers between popery and the papacy. Popery is the erroneous principle—*salvation by man*—in opposition to the truth of the Gospel, which is *salvation by grace*. The papacy is the secular organization in which this error is embodied. The one is the body, the other the animating and controlling spirit. See Popish View.

The Church of Rome is charged with having departed from apostolic Christianity by requiring all who communicate with her to believe, as necessary to salvation:

1. That that man is accursed who does not kiss and honor and worship the holy images.
2. That the Virgin Mary and other saints are to be prayed to.
3. That, after consecration in the Lord's Supper, the bread is no longer bread, and the wine no longer wine.
4. That the clergyman should be excommunicated who, in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, gives the cup to the people.
5. That they are accursed who say that the clergy may marry.
6. That there is a purgatory—that is, a place where souls which had died in repentance are purified by suffering.
7. That the Church of Rome is the mother and mistress of all churches.
8. That obedience is due from all churches to the bishop of Rome.
9. That they are accursed who deny that there are seven sacraments.

From these doctrines, contrary to Scripture and the primitive Church, have resulted these evil practices:

From the veneration of images has sprung the actual worship of them.

The invocation of the Blessed Virgin, and of other saints, has given rise to the greatest blasphemy and profaneness.

The bread in the Eucharist has been worshipped as it were the eternal God.

From the doctrine of purgatory has sprung that of indulgences, and the practice of persons paying sums of money to the Romish bishops and clergy to release the souls of their friends from the fabulous fire of purgatory.

We append a list of these principal heresies of the Church of Rome, and the time at which they were introduced:

Invocation of saints first taught with authority by a Council of Constantinople, A.D. 754.
Use of images and relics in religious worship first publicly affirmed and sanctioned in the Council of Nicæa, A.D. 787.
Compulsory celibacy of the clergy first enjoined publicly at the first Council of Lateran, A.D. 1123.
Papal supremacy first publicly asserted by the fourth Council of Lateran, A.D. 1215.
Auricular confession first enjoined by Innocent III, at the fourth Council of Lateran, A.D. 1215.
Prayers in a foreign tongue first deliberately sanctioned by the Council of Trent, A.D. 1562.
Transubstantiation was first publicly insisted on by the fourth Council of Lateran, A.D. 1215.
Purgatory and indulgences first set forth by the Council of Florence, A.D. 1438.
Judicial absolution authorized by the Council of Trent, A.D. 1551.
Apocrypha received as canonical at the Council of Trent, A.D. 1547.
Communion in one kind only, first authoritatively sanctioned by the Council of Constance, A.D. 1414.
The Roman number of the sacraments first settled by the Council of Trent, A.D. 1545.

This system of doctrine will be best understood by a reading of the creed of popery as adopted by pope Pius IV (q. v.), and published in 1564. See Professio Fidei. It embodies the decisions of the Council of Trent. Every Roman Catholic is bound by it, and Romish officials swear to it. After repeating the Apostles' Creed, the form of the oath goes on:

"I most firmly admit and embrace apostolical and ecclesiastical traditions, and all other constitutions and observances of the same Church. I also admit the sacred Scriptures according to the sense which the holy mother Church has held and does hold, to whom it belongs to judge of the true sense and interpretation of the holy Scriptures; nor will I ever take and interpret them otherwise than according to the unanimous consent of the fathers. I profess, also, that there are truly and properly seven sacraments of the new law, instituted by Jesus Christ our Lord, and for the salvation of mankind, though all are not necessary for every one—viz., baptism, confirmation, Eucharist, penance, extreme unction, order, and matrimony; and that they confer grace; and of these, baptism, confirmation, and order cannot be reiterated without sacrilege. I also receive and admit the ceremonies of the Catholic Church, received and approved in the solemn administration of all the above-said sacraments. I receive and embrace all and every one of the things which have been defined and declared in the holy Council of Trent concerning original sin and justification. I profess likewise that in the mass is offered to God a true, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead; and that in the most holy sacrament of the Eucharist there is truly, really, and substantially the body and blood, together with the soul and divinity, of our Lord Jesus Christ; and that there is made a conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the body, and of the whole substance of the wine into the blood, which conversion the Catholic Church calls transubstantiation. I confess, also, that under either kind alone, whole and entire, Christ and a true sacrament is received. I constantly hold that there is a purgatory, and that the souls detained therein are helped by the suffrages of the faithful. Likewise that the saints reigning together with Christ are to be honored and invocated, that they offer prayers to God for us, and that their relics are to be venerated. I most firmly assert that the images of Christ and of the mother of God, ever virgin, and also of the other saints, are to be had and retained, and that due honor and veneration are to be given to them. I also affirm that the power of indulgences was left by Christ in the Church; and that the use of them is most wholesome to Christian people. I acknowledge the holy Catholic and Apostolic Roman Church, the mother and mistress of all churches; and I promise and swear true obedience to the Roman bishop, the successor of St. Peter, prince of the apostles, and vicar of Jesus Christ. I also profess and undoubtedly receive all other things delivered, defined, and declared by the sacred canons and general councils, and particularly by the holy Council of Trent; and likewise I also condemn, reject, and anathematize all things contrary thereto, and all heresies whatsoever, con-

demned and anathematized by the Church. This true catholic faith, out of which none can be saved, which I now freely profess and truly hold, I, N., promise, vow, and swear most constantly to hold and profess the same whole and entire, with God's assistance, to the end of my life. Amen."

For literature, see ROMANISM.

Popish Plot, the name given to an imaginary plot on the part of the Roman Catholics in England during the reign of Charles II, the object of which was believed to be a general massacre of the Protestants. See OATES, TITUS.

Popish View OF CHRISTIANITY. The supporters of this view regard the Church as the mediator between God and the individual: the Church (by which some of them seem to mean "the clergy") is a sort of chartered corporation, by belonging to or by being attached to which any given individual acquires certain privileges. The opponents of such a view regard it as a priestcraft, because it lays the stress not on the relations of a man's heart towards God and Christ, as the Gospel does, but on something wholly artificial and formal—his belonging to a certain so-called Society; and thus, whether the Society be alive or dead, whether it really help the man in goodness or not, still it claims to step in and interpose itself, as the channel of grace and salvation, when it certainly is not the channel of salvation, because it is visibly and notoriously no sure channel of grace. The opponents of the popish views acknowledge that, where the Church is what it should be, it is so great a means of grace that its benefits are of the highest value; yet they regard relation to any Church as a thing quite subordinate and secondary, the salvation of a man's soul being effected by the change in his heart and life wrought by Christ's Spirit; and because all who go straight to Christ (their baptism into the communion of the Church being assumed) do "manifestly and visibly receive grace, and have the seal of his Spirit, and therefore are certainly heirs of salvation." They adopt this view of Christianity because it seems "simple and scriptural," while any other is complex in its character and human in its source. According to this view, all seems plain: "we are not to derive our salvation through or from the Church, but to be kept or strengthened in the way of salvation by the aid or example of our fellow-Christians, who are formed into societies for this very reason that they might help one another, and not leave each man to fight his own fight alone; the Scripture notion of the Church being that religious society should help a man to become better and holier, just as civil society helps us in civilization." See POPERY.

Popkin, JOHN SNELLING, D.D., a Congregational minister, was born June 19, 1771, in Boston, Mass. He graduated at Harvard College in 1792, and held the office of tutor of Greek from 1795 to 1798. Having entered the ministry, he was ordained pastor of the Federal Street Church, Boston, July 16, 1799, which charge he resigned in 1802, and became pastor of the First Parish in Newburgh Sept. 19, 1804. In 1815 he was elected professor of Greek in Harvard College, and served until 1826, when he accepted the professorship of Greek literature. He resigned it in 1833, and lived in retirement until his death, March 2, 1852. Dr. Popkin published *Three Lectures on Liberal Education* (1836), and a number of occasional sermons. Some of his lectures and sermons, with a *Life* by Prof. Felton, were published in 1852. See Sprague, *Annals*, ii, 434; *North Amer. Rev.* 1875, p. 473; *Christian Examiner*, vol. liii.

Poplar (לִבְנָה, *libnéh*; Sept. στυράκινος, in Gen. xxx, 37; λεύκη, in Hos. iv, 13; Vulg. *populus*), the rendering of the above-named Hebrew word, which occurs only in the two places cited. Peeled rods of the *libneh* were put by Jacob before Laban's ring-streaked sheep. This tree is mentioned with the oak and the terebinth, by Hosea, as one under which idolatrous Israel used to sacrifice.

Several authorities, Celsius among the number (*Hierob.* i, 292), are in favor of the rendering of the A. V., and think the "white poplar" (*Populus alba*) is the tree denoted. The Hebrew name *libneh*, being supposed to be derived from לָבַן (*to be white*), has been considered identical with the Greek λεύκη, which both signifies "white" and also the "white poplar." This poplar is said to be called *white*, not on account of the whiteness of its bark, but of that of the under surface of its leaves. It may perhaps be so designated from the whiteness of its hairy seeds, which have a remarkable appearance when the seed-covering first bursts. The poplar is certainly common in the countries where the scenes are laid of the transactions related in the above passages of Scripture (comp. Belon, *Obs.* ii, 106). Rauwolf also mentions the white poplar as abundant about Aleppo and Tripoli, and still called by the ancient Arabic name *haur* or *hor*, which is the word used in the Arabic translation of Hosea.

Others, however, have been of opinion that *libneh* denotes the storax-tree rather than the white poplar. Thus, in Gen. xxx, 37, the Sept. has ῥάβδον στυρακίνην, "a rod of styrax;" and the Greek translation of the Pentateuch, according to Rosenmüller, is more ancient and of far greater authority than that of Hosea. So R. Jonah, as translated by Celsius, says of *libneh*, "Dicitur lingua Arabum Lubna;" and in the Arabic translation of Genesis *lubne* is employed as the representative of the Hebrew *libneh*. *Lubne*, both in Arabic and in Persian, is the name of a tree, and of the fragrant resin employed for fumigating which exudes from it, and which is commonly known by the name of *storax*. This resin was well known to the ancients, and is mentioned by Hippocrates and Theophrastus. Dioscorides (i, 79) and Pliny (*Nat. Hist.* xii, 17 and 25) both speak of the *styrax*. Pliny says, "That part of Syria which adjoins Judæa above Phœnicia produces storax, which is found in the neighborhood of Gabala (Jebeil) and Marathus, as also of Casius, a mountain of Seleucia. . . . That which comes from the mountain of Amanus, in Syria, is highly esteemed for medicinal purposes, and even more so by the perfumers." Dioscorides describes several kinds, all of which were obtained from Asia Minor; and all that is now imported is believed to be the produce of that country. But the tree is cultivated in the south of Europe, though it does not there yield any storax. It is found in Greece, and is supposed to be a native of Asia Minor, whence it extends into Syria, and probably farther south. It is therefore a native of the country which was the scene of the transaction related in the above passage of Genesis. From the description of Dioscorides, and his comparing the leaves of the styrax to those of the quince, there is no doubt of the same tree being intended: especially as in early times, as at the present day, it yielded a highly fragrant balsamic substance which was esteemed as a medicine, and employed in fumigation. From the similarity of the Hebrew name *libneh* to the Arabic *lubne*, and from the Sept. having in Genesis translated the former by *styrax*, it seems most probable that this was the tree intended. It is capable of yielding white wands as well as the poplar; and it is also well qualified to afford complete shade under its ample foliage, as in the passage of Hos. iv, 13. We may also suppose it to have been more particularly alluded to from its being a tree yielding incense. "They sacrifice upon the tops of the mountains, and burn incense upon the hills, under the terebinth and the storax trees, because the shadow thereof is good."

Storax (στύραξ) is mentioned in Ecclus. xxiv, 15, together with other aromatic substances. The modern Greek name of the tree, as we learn from Sibthorpe (*Flor. Græc.* i, 275), is στουράκι, and is a common wild shrub in Greece and in most parts of the Levant. The

resin exudes either spontaneously or after incision. This property, however, it would seem, is only for the most part possessed by trees which grow in a warm country; for English specimens, though they flower profusely, do not produce the drug. Mr. Daniel Hanbury, who has discussed the whole subject of the storax plants with much care (see the *Pharmaceutical Journal and Transactions* for Feb. 1857), tells us that a friend of his quite failed to obtain any exudation from *Styrax officinale*, by incisions made in the hottest part of the summer of 1856, on specimens growing in the botanic garden at Montpellier. "The experiment was quite unsuccessful; neither aqueous sap nor resinous juice flowed from the incisions." Still Mr. Hanbury quotes two authorities to show that under certain favorable circumstances the tree may exude a fragrant resin even in France and Italy. The *Styrax officinale* is a shrub from nine to twelve feet high, with ovate leaves, which are white underneath; the flowers are in racemes, and are white or cream-colored. The *white* appearance agrees with the etymology of the Hebrew *libneh*. The *liquid storax* of commerce is the product of the *Liquidambar Orientale*, Mill. (see a fig. in Mr. Hanbury's communication), an entirely different plant, whose resin was probably unknown to the ancients. See STACTE.

Styrax Officinale.

Poplicani, a name applied to the *Albigenses* (q. v.).

Poppæa. See SABINA.

Popoftchins, or **Popovshchins**, a name given to the different sects of Russian dissenters who recognise the validity of ordination as given in the Established Church, and receive most of their *popes* (q. v.), i. e. priests, from that communion. The Popoftchins are divided into five principal sects: the Starobertzi, or Old Ceremonialists, the Diaconoftschins, the Peremayanoftschins, the Epefanoftschins, and the Tschernaboltsi. Those who have no priests at all, or who do not acknowledge the validity of Church ordination, are termed *Bez-Popoftchins*, or No-Priesters. See Mosheim, *Eccles. History*, vol. iii; Platon, *Greek Church* (see Index).

Popogano is the name by which the primitive inhabitants of Virginia designated *hell*, which they imagined floating in the air between heaven and earth.

Poppie, POPPY, POPPY-HEAD (from Fr. *poupé*=a doll, or Lat. *puppis*=the "poop" of a ship), an architectural term designating an elevated ornament often used on the tops of the upright ends, or elbows, which terminate seats, etc., in churches; they are sometimes merely cut into plain fleurs-de-lis or other simple forms, with the edges chamfered or slightly hollowed, but are frequently carved with leaves, like finials, and in rich work are sculptured into animals and figures, and are often extremely elaborate. No examples are known to exist of earlier date than the Decorated style, and but few so early; of Perpendicular date specimens are to be found in very many churches, especially in the cathedrals and old abbey churches. See STALL; STANDARD.



Ordinary Poppie. Kidlington, c. 1450.

Poppy-head. See POPPIE.

Populonia, a surname of *Juno* (q. v.) among the ancient Romans, as being the protectress of the whole Roman people.

Por'atha (Heb. *Poratha'*, פּוֹרָתָא, prob. Persian, perhaps *a lot bestowed;* Sept. Βαρδαθά v. r. Φαραδαθά), the fourth named of the ten sons of Haman, slain by the Jews in the palace of Ahasuerus (Esth. ix, 8). B.C. 473.

Porch is the rendering in the A. V. of the following words:

1. אוּלָם or אֻלָם, *ulâm* (from אהל, *before*), *a vestibule* or *hall* (Sept. αὐλάμ; Vulg. *porticus* [1 Chron. xxviii, 11]; ναός; *porticus*). It is used of the entrance-hall of a building (Ezek. xl, 7, 48); of the place where the throne was placed, and where judgment was administered (1 Kings vii, 7 [see PALACE]); and of the veranda surrounding a court (Ezek. xli, 15). It is especially applied to the vestibule of the Temple (1 Kings vi, vii; Joel ii, 17). See TEMPLE. "The porch of the Lord" (2 Chron. xv, 8; xxix, 17) seems to stand for the Temple itself.

2. מְסִדְרוֹן, *misderôn*, a sort of *colonnade* or balcony with pillars (Judg. iii, 23); probably a corridor connecting the principal rooms of the house (Wilkinson, *Ancient Egyptians*, i, 11). It may have been a sort of veranda chamber in the works of Solomon, open in front and at the sides, but capable of being enclosed with awnings or curtains, like that of the royal palace at Ispahan described by Chardin (vii, 386, and pl. 39). The word is used in the Talmud (*Middoth*, iii, 7).

3. Πυλών (Matt. xxvi, 71), probably the passage from the street into the first court of the house, in which, in Eastern houses, is the *mastábah*, or stone bench for the porter or persons waiting, and where also the master of the house often receives visitors and transacts business (Lane, *Mod. Eg.* i, 32; Shaw, *Trav.* p. 207). The word rendered "porch" in the parallel passage (Mark xiv, 68) is προαύλιον, the outer court. The scene therefore of the denial of our Lord took place either in that court or in the passage from it to the house-door. See HOUSE.

4. The term στοά is used for the colonnade or portico

of Bethesda, and also for that of the Temple called Solomon's porch (John v, 2; x, 23; Acts iii, 11; v, 12). Josephus describes the porticos or cloisters which surrounded the Temple of Solomon, and also the royal portico (*Ant.* viii, 3, 9; xv, 11, 3, 5; *War*, v, 5, 2). These porticos are described by Tacitus as forming an important line of defence during the siege (*Hist.* v, 12). See SOLOMON'S PORCH.

PORCH (Lat. *porticus*) is the term applied in ecclesiastic architecture to the adjunctive erection placed over the doorway of a church. In the early ecclesiastical structures, raised after infant baptism became prevalent in the West, and the discipline of the catechumens (q. v.) had fallen into desuetude, the narthex (q. v.) was given the form of a vestibule, frequently closed, and sufficiently capacious to contain a large number of persons and permit the celebration of different ceremonials. This was really what we now understand by *porch*. Few churches, cathedrals, conventual or parochial, were, until the middle of the 12th century, unprovided with a central porch in front of the principal entrance; but after the 13th century they were not so common.

The earliest porches in the West, dating from the 8th to the 11th century, are shallow, and extended across the church front, as at Clermont. One of the earliest is at St. Font, Perigueux. In some cases they were recessed under the tower, as at St. Germain-des-Prés (Paris), Limoges, Poissy, of the 9th or 10th century, St. Benet-sur-Loire, Moissac, and St. Savin. During the 11th century this became the rule; in the 13th it was rare, but at a later date it reappeared at Caen, Fribourg, and Cranbrook. At St. Savin the porch is defensible and protected by a ditch, just as the castellated palace stands in front of the western entrance of Cashel Cathedral. The giant porch of Vienna, imposing as it is, is far exceeded by the three magnificent Early English porches of Peterborough, which accord with the entire work, while those of many of the great French cathedrals are mere afterthoughts, noble but accidental additions. At Fribourg, Rheims, and Chartres (1250–80) the porches are covered with statuary.

Towards the close of the 12th century the ceremonies performed within them fell into desuetude, and they in consequence dwindled into a mere appendage of the nave. Then, from the exclusive use of western doors, large lateral porches, usually in cathedrals, as at Chartres, Mans, Bayeux, Puy-en-Velay, Chalons-sur-Marne, Wells, Salisbury, Lincoln, and Hereford, were built for the convenience of worshippers when entering or leaving the church, for benedictions, and the preliminaries of marriages and baptism, and the passage of funerals. The monastic churches in towns imitated the arrangement. These porches were usually closed at the sides, as in the Norman examples of Kelso, Selby, Southwell, Sherborne, and Malmesbury, although that of Alençon is open. At Hereford the outer porch (cir. 1513) is open, but the inner Decorated porch is closed. Until the close of the 14th century porches, generally of open form, were commonly built. The lateral porch fronted the side which faced the more populous portion of the city—at Gloucester, Canterbury, Malmesbury, Chester, and St. David's, on the south; at Durham, Hereford, Exeter, Christchurch (Hants), and Selby, on the north. At Chichester it is on the south side, opening on the cloister to admit processions to the shrine; at Westminster (called from its beauty Solomon's Porch) it stood in advance of the north front of the transept; at Lincoln the bishop's porch is in the presbytery. There are Early English porches at St. Alban's and Barnack, the latter, like All Saints', Stamford, Albury, and St. Mary's, Nottingham, having external and internal stone roofs. At Tewkesbury the vast western arch may have formed a gigantic porch. At Lincoln three recessed porches exist, as once at St. Alban's.

Wooden porches occur at all dates, and of these also fine examples remain. At Chevington, Suffolk, is a wooden porch of Early English date, but much impaired by modern work. In the Decorated style wooden porches are not unfrequently found; they are of one story only in height, sometimes entirely enclosed at the sides, and sometimes with about the upper half of their height formed of open screen-work; the gables have barge-boards, which are almost always feathered, and more or less ornamented: good specimens remain at Warblington, Hampshire; Horsemonden and Brookland, Kent; Aldham, Essex; Hascombe, Surrey; Northfield, Worcestershire, etc. Stone porches of this date have, not unusually, a room over them, as they have also in the Perpendicular style. Of this last-mentioned style there are many wooden porches, which differ but little from those of the preceding, except that the upper half of the sides is almost always formed of open screen-work: examples remain at Halden, Kent; Albury, Surrey, etc.

Bicester, Oxfordshire, c. 1420.

It is common to find porches of all ages considerably ornamented; those of the Norman style, and perhaps also the Early English, have the decorations principally on the inside and about the doorway; those of later date are often as much enriched externally as internally, and sometimes more so: the room over the porch frequently contains a piscina, which shows that it once contained an altar, and was used as a chapel, and is sometimes provided with a fireplace, as if it had served for a dwelling-room. There are large porches at Tours, Pol, St. Leon, and Ulrichsk, and smaller specimens in several churches at Cologne. English cathedrals and minsters are remarkable for the homeliness of their doorways, resembling those of parish churches on an enlarged scale. The cathedral, in distinction to a minster, in the 12th century, was built with many porches and western doors opening directly on the close, as if inviting the entrance of crowds. Noyon, at the end of the 13th or beginning of the 14th century, is a solitary exception to this rule in possessing large porches in advance of its principal front.

Up to the 6th century children were exposed in the porch, and the Council of Arles required those who adopted them to place in the priest's hand a letter of contestation with regard to the sex and age of the child; and the Council of Vaison, complaining that the children were exposed to dogs, for fear of scandal required the priest at the altar to announce on Sundays the name of the adopter. Kings and princes were permitted to be buried in porches by the Council of Nantes (658), and interments were forbidden within church walls till the 12th century. At Ely, as in many ascertained examples in France, probably the recesses above the arcading were used as charnels, fenced in with an iron screen; and at Chichester there are still lateral

Great Addington, c. 1180.

tombs. Gradually incense was used and litanies were chanted in porches. Fonts and basins for the ablutions of the faithful before entering the church were erected, and exhibitions of relics and sacred images were made. Markets were permitted, just as objects of piety are still sold in foreign porches on festival days. Feudal and other courts were held. At Sandwich a school was taught and books sold, and even, in 1519, pedlers hawked their wares at Riccald. Chapters and religious bodies appealed to the civil power to put an end to such irregularities, and the great abbeys of Clugny, Maulbronn, and Citeaux, about the beginning of the 12th century, began to erect large enclosed porches in front of their churches. The Clugniacs built large ante-churches of two stories, as at Lewes; at Tournus, near the close of the 11th century. At the latter place they consisted of a nave and aisles of thirteen bays, with an upper chapel of St. Michael, in which the altar was used for a mass attended by penitents. At Clugny in the 13th century an altar and pulpit adjoined the church door. Their influence is perceptible in the large upper chapel over the porch at Puy-en-Velay and Autun, and the tribune for an altar at Châtel Montagne, Monreale, and Dijon, which are said to have been used by women and minstrels. In many instances the view into the nave was unimpeded.

The Cistercians built western porches deep and longitudinal, in imitation of the narthex, according to the desire of St. Bernard, at Toury, Moutier, Charité-sur-Loire, Fountains, and Beaulieu. At Vezelay, in the 13th century, the porch, of two bays in length, forms a nave with aisles, lateral galleries, and a tribune for an altar over the minster door. In many French parish churches this plan was followed in order to accommodate mourners at funerals. In England an upper chamber sometimes occurs over porches, as at Southwell, Christchurch (Hants), and in parish churches used as a school-room or a chaplains' or watchers' dormitory. Placentia, Parma, and Modena have porches of two stories.

In the foreign examples pilgrims or penitents were marshalled on the ground-floor in order to hear an address from the pulpit, or mass said at the upper altar, while those who came from a distance found shelter in these vaulted porches, just as the country people on the eves of great festivals pass the night under the porticos of St. Peter's at Rome. At Paulinzelle, cir. 1150, there is, and at Sherborne there was, a large parochial ante-church. At Glastonbury and Durham the Lady-chapel was placed in a similar position.

It is possible that these outer buildings served the same purpose of a place of previous assembly, just as the great western transept of Ely or Lincoln may have been also occupied on occasions when large multitudes flocked to the church. In some monastic churches it served as the forensic parlor for conversation with persons inadmissible within the inner portions. The children of the abbey serfs were baptized and the office at which their domestic servants and laborers attended was said. In all large churches the processions were arranged in the porch on Palm-Sunday, on Holy-cross Day, and in Rogations. Sometimes it formed a sanctuary, containing a ring in the door to which the fugitive clung, as at Durham, and at Cologne there was an inscription to this effect, "Here stood the great criminal."—Walcott, *Sacred Archæology*, s. v.; Parker, *Glossary of Architecture*, s. v.

Porchet, Joseph, a converted Jew, flourished in the 14th century in Spain, and by his learning rendered great service to the Church of Christ in that day. He was acquainted with Martini (q. v.), the author of *Pugio Fidei*, and transcribed a great part of it into a work which he himself composed under the title of *Victoria adversus Hebræos* (1520), and which is one of the ablest polemics of the Christian Church against Judaism. See M'Crie, *Hist. of the Reformation in Spain*, p. 66.

Porcius Festus. See Festus.

Porcq, Jean le, a French Oratorian, was born near Boulogne-sur-Mer in 1636. Professor of theology for fifty years at the school founded at Saumur by the Oratorians, he was one of the most active adversaries of the Jansenists, and published against them *Les Sentiments de Saint-Augustine sur la Grâce* (Lyons, 1682, 1700, 4to). Although he abstains from all personalities, his adversaries spoke of it with the utmost contempt. Abbé Goujet acknowledges Porcq's piety, and says that he always carefully avoided anything that was akin to sectarianism, but that he wrote against Jansenism because he considered it wrong. He wrote as a true polemic against doctrines, and not persons. See Dupin, *Bibl. des Aut. Ecclés. du 18ième Siècle*, ii, 385.

Porcupine. See Bittern.

Pordage, John, an English mystic, who, with Jane Leade and Thomas Bromley, founded the so-called "Philadelphian" society, was born in London in 1608. He studied theology and medicine at Oxford, and became a curate at Reading; but, after a short pastorate, was settled at Bradfield, in Berkshire. From the works of Böhme, which Charles I had caused to be published in English, Pordage derived the germs of his strange and incoherent mysticism. A time of such sudden veering from the extreme of churchliness to the mildest independentism as was the case under Charles I and Cromwell is very favorable to sporadic outbursts of fanaticism. Hence, as Pordage was very susceptible in this direction, it was not long until he found himself the centre of a group of disciples. The effect of association was to intensify his delusion and to brighten his imagination. This culminated in a series of the wildest pretendedly supernatural visions. In the night of Jan. 3, 1651, he assumed to have had three of these. The first was that of a being with clothes, beard, and hat, who drew back his bed-curtains, and then mysteriously vanished. Hardly had Pordage fallen asleep again when he saw a giant with an uprooted tree on his shoulder and a sword in his hand. He threw the tree to the earth, and then began to wrestle with Pordage, but was successfully resisted by the latter with

spiritual weapons. The third vision was that of an immense dragon, which vomited fire upon him, and left him exhausted upon the floor. On occasion of such visions a session of the "Philadelphians" was held. Those in attendance also now fell into a state of ecstasy, and had visions of the heavenly and of the infernal world. As these visions continued for a period of three weeks, day and night, Pordage affirmed that they could not be mere fanatical imaginations, but were a heavenly admonition to them to break off from the world, and to enter upon a life of complete devotion to God. But their meetings called for the intervention of the police. The matter was investigated, but led to no other serious result than the deposition of Pordage from his priestly office. A very venomous book was now written against Pordage — *Dæmonium Meridianum* (Lond. 1655) — by one Fowler, a preacher in Reading. Pordage defended himself in *Innocency Appearing*. Thereupon Fowler retorted, with fresh accusations, in a new volume (1656). Meantime the enthusiasts had gone to London, but, driven away by the plague, they returned to Bradfield. On the death of Mrs. Pordage, in 1670, they went again to London. It was now that, in accordance with a vision granted to Jane Leade, the "Philadelphians" became an organized society. The members of the society were to live according to the laws of Paradise. Pordage opened to the society his own house in London. The membership reached near a hundred. Upon these the frequent visions of Pordage and Leade exerted a magnetic effect. In the close of 1671 Pordage fell into a trance, in which he affirmed that his spirit, breaking loose from his soul and body, was translated to the mountain of eternity. There he saw heavenly and eternal things with direct, naked vision.

Pordage lays claim to three degrees of revelation: (1) Visions placed before the human spirit by the Holy Ghost; (2) Illuminations shed directly by the Holy Spirit into the immortal part of man, making him to see the thoughts of the Spirit; (3) Translations of the mortal spirit into the very heart of the Deity, whereby it is enabled to behold and read the secret mysteries of the Trinity itself. The voluminous writings of Pordage contain a very elaborate and fantastic system of mystical theology. Throughout he claims to be in harmony with the Scriptures; he simply penetrates below the letter, and unveils their deeper meaning. Among the curiosities of his teaching are the following: The immortal spirits of men have a cylindrical form, and resemble a transparent whiff of mist; their movements are as rapid as thought; they can traverse mountains, rocks, ocean, earth, and have about the size and contour of a human body. Angels are sexless, or rather they are man and woman entirely merged into one person—the spirit being the male, and the soul the female element. Adam was also primarily a man-woman, and bore within himself the faculty of procreation. Christian perfection is a state of absolute celibacy, in which the soul is married to the heavenly *sophia*.

The whole system of Pordage claimed to rest upon a series of supernatural visions. With the other "Philadelphians," he regarded the actual state of the Church as one of utter degeneration, and as incapable of reformation. Even the Quakers he regarded as among the antichristian sects. He believed himself called to organize and restore the primitive Church. Up to his death, Pordage was the most influential of the "Philadelphians." When he died, in 1698, the society seemed ready to perish. But it lingered awhile, as will be seen by reference to the art. LEADE, JANE. See the literature there quoted. See also Morell, *Modern Philosophy*, p. 213; Mosheim, *Eccles. Dict.* iii, 481; Neal, *Hist. of the Puritans;* Haag, *Les Dogmes Chrétiennes;* Blackey, *Hist. of Philosophy*, ii, 414. (J. P. L.)

Pordenone, GIOVANNI ANTONIO LICIN(I)O REGILLO DA, generally called simply "*Il Pordenone*," an Italian painter of great celebrity, was born at Pordenone, in Friuli, in 1484. From the vigor of conception, the elevation of mind, and the style of execution which distinguish his works, it has been presumed, though it is not certain, that he frequented the school of Giorgione. Though on the whole inferior to Titian, he presumed to be his rival. Pordenone chiefly excelled in fresco. His composition was very simple, his heads rarely speak of deep passion, and his chief excellence was color. He painted flesh with a marvellous softness. His portraits were fine, and he frequently represented several persons on one canvas. It is difficult to see on what qualities his competition with Titian is founded; for though Pordenone painted lifelike and richtoned portraits, and grouped his compositions in a spirited manner, he is not by any means to be compared with Titian, of whom he professed himself in such dread that he painted with his shield and poniard lying at his side. Certainly the saints and virgins of Pordenone, which hang in the gallery of Venice beside the works of Titian, do not look as if it had cost the latter much trouble to distance his competitor. As Pordenone principally painted frescos in North or Upper Italy, he was known in Lower Italy only by his fine oil-paintings. His most splendid work in oil is the altar-piece of Santa Maria dell' Orto at Venice, representing a *San Lorenzo Giustiniani surrounded by other Saints*, among whom are St. John the Baptist and St. Augustine. The frescos of Pordenone are spread over the towns and castles of Friuli; some are at Genoa, Mantua, and Venice, but the best-preserved are on N.-T. subjects at Piacenza, and especially in the cathedral at Cremona. He was highly esteemed by the emperor Charles V, who ennobled him. Hercules II, duke of Mantua, called him to Mantua to paint cartoons for tapestry to be made in Flanders, but he soon afterwards died (in 1539), as it was suspected, of poison. We have very few easel pictures by Pordenone, and those which are attributed to him in galleries are oftentimes proved not to be his, or are under so much doubt that it is unsafe to risk a list of them. The *Glory of S. Lorenzo Giustiniani*, in the Academy of Venice, is one of his finest works. Much has been said of *The Woman taken in Adultery*, in the Berlin Museum, but it is so repainted (the heads of the Saviour and the woman being almost new) that it can do little honor to any artist of the 16th century. Several of Pordenone's pictures are in England. In the National Gallery is a colossal figure of *An Apostle*. See Mrs. Clement, *Handbook of Painters, Sculptors*, etc., s. v.; Radcliffe, *Schools and Masters of Painting*, p. 209 sq., et al.; Vasari, *Lives of the Painters;* Lanzi, *History of Painting in Italy;* Spooner, *Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts*, s. v. (J. H. W.)

Porée, CHARLES, a noted French Jesuit, was born in 1675. He became a member of the Society of Jesus in 1692, and flourished as a trainer of youth all his life, and it is presumed that no man ever exceeded him in this work. Voltaire says of him that "he was eloquent after the style and taste of Seneca, a very beautiful poet; but that his greatest merit consisted in inspiring his pupils with the love of learning and virtue." He died in 1741. His writings are of a secular character.

Porodakhsta is a personage of the Persian mythology, the father of the famous hero Eshevand. He is to be one of the assistants of Sosiash, son of Zoroaster, in his great work, the resurrection of the dead.

Porphyrians was the name given to the Arians in an edict of the emperor Constantine issued in the year 325, the reason stated being that, as they had emulated the impiety of Porphyry in their errors, so they ought to be named after him (Socrat. *Hist. Eccles.* i, 6). This decree was afterwards quoted as a precedent by Theodosius the Younger, who ordered that the Nestorians should, in a similar manner, be called Simonians. It may be doubted whether either name extended much beyond the four corners of the edicts in which they were given. See Baronius, *Annales*, ad ann. 325, vol. lxxxiv, lxxxv.

Porphyry (Πορφύριος), a celebrated heathen philosopher, the ablest expounder and defender of Neo-Platonism as taught by Plotinus (q. v.), and one of the most sagacious and learned antagonists of Christianity under the Roman empire, flourished in the second half of the 3d century.

Life.—Porphyry was born A.D. 233. Eunapius and Suidas (following, no doubt, Porphyry himself, *Vit. Plot.* viii, 107) in their biographies call him a Tyrian; but both St. Jerome (*Præf. Epist. ad Gal.*) and St. Chrysostom (*Homil. VI in I ad Corinth.* p. 58) term him Βατανεώτης, a word on the fancied correction of which a good deal of ingenuity has been unnecessarily expended; some imagining that it is a corruption of some term of reproach (such as βοτανιώτης, *herb-eater*, βιοθάνατος, or βαλανεώτης). The more reasonable view is that the word is correct enough, and describes more accurately the birthplace of Porphyry—Batanea, the Bashan of Scripture. To account for his being called a Tyrian some have supposed that he was originally of Jewish origin, and having first embraced, and afterwards renounced Christianity, called himself a Tyrian to conceal his real origin. Heumann, making a slight alteration in the text of Chrysostom, supposed that Porphyry falsely assumed the epithet Βατανεώτης, to induce the belief that he was of Jewish origin, so that his statements with regard to the Jewish Scriptures might have the more weight. None of these conjectures seems in any degree probable. The least improbable view is that of Jonsius, who is followed by Fabricius, Brucker, and others, that there was a Tyrian settlement in the district of Batanea, and that Porphyry was born there, but, from the neighborhood of the more important place, called himself, and was called by others, a Tyrian (Brucker, *Hist. Crit. Phil.* ii, 240; Harless, *Ad Fabricius Bibl. Gr.* v, 725).

The original name of Porphyry was *Malchus* (Μάλχος, the Greek form of the Syro-Phœnician *Melek*), a word, as he himself tells us, which signified *king*. His father bore the same name, and was a man of distinguished family (Porph. *Vit. Plot.* c. xvi). Aurelius, in dedicating a work to him, styled him Βασιλεύς. The more euphonious name Πορφύριος (in allusion to the usual color of royal robes) was subsequently devised for him by his preceptor, Longinus (Eunapius, *Porph.* p. 13; Suidas, s. v.). Suidas states that he lived in the reign of Aurelian, and died in that of Diocletian. Eunapius says, more explicitly, that he lived in the reigns of Gallienus, Claudius, Tacitus, Aurelian, and Probus. Porphyry himself tells us that he was thirty years of age when he first became the pupil of Plotinus, which was in the tenth year of the reign of Gallienus (*Vit. Plot.* iv, 99); the date of his birth was, therefore, A.D. 233. Exhibiting in his earliest youth a thirst for knowledge, a quickness of mental perception, combined with indications of intellectual vigor, his father provided the very best instruction for him, especially in philosophy and literature. From Porphyry himself, as quoted by Eusebius (*H. E.* iii, 19; comp. Proclus, *in Tim.* i, p. 20), it appears that when very young he was placed under the instruction of Origen. This could not have been, as some have imagined, at Alexandria, for about the time of the birth of Porphyry Origen quitted Alexandria, and did not return to it. It was most likely at Cæsarea that Porphyry attended the instructions of Origen. Eunapius has been charged with a gross blunder in making Origen the fellow-student of Porphyry; but it does not seem necessary to suppose that he meant the celebrated Church father of that name. Porphyry next removed to Athens, and became the pupil of Apollonius (Porph. *Quæst. Hom.* 25), and of the much-celebrated Longinus, whose reputation for wisdom and skill in instruction brought him scholars from all parts of the then civilized world. Under his tuition he received that early moulding which subsequently secured such vigor of thought and elegance of style, and the tutor was so much pleased with his scholar that he not only warmly commended him, but applied the name to him by which alone posterity has known him. At the age of twenty he went to Rome to study under Plotinus (q. v.), but as that philosopher was not then teaching, Porphyry returned to the care of his former preceptor. At the age of thirty he went again to Rome, this time in the company of Antonius of Rhodes, and he now studied philosophy with the great exponent of Neo-Platonism, and with Plotinus's oldest disciple, Amelius (*Vit. Plot.* c. iv). Porphyry remained six years, and became thoroughly attached to his master—a man endowed with an extraordinary understanding and vigorous imagination, who as a teacher of the eclectic philosophy capable of felicitously unfolding the sublime ideas of Plato had obtained a great reputation. Under such guidance the pupil, by nature well endowed for study, and led on by his zeal for distinction and acquirements, very soon came to be regarded as one of the chief ornaments of the school. He wrote and disputed with great freedom and masterly ability. Thus, e. g., when, having some doubts respecting a dogma which Plotinus had inculcated, Porphyry hesitated not to call the philosopher's dicta in question, and wrote a treatise endeavoring to establish in reply ὅτι ἔξω τοῦ νοῦ ὑφέστηκε τὰ νοητά, hoping to get a rejoinder, which Amelius wrote by request of Plotinus. Porphyry, still unsatisfied, again wrote, and was once more replied to by Amelius, who this time succeeded in pacifying the inquisitive pupil. Porphyry now evinced his manliness by a public recantation of his erroneous criticisms. This generous action gained so thoroughly the approbation and confidence of Plotinus that he was admitted by him to terms of close intimacy, and frequently had assigned to him the task of refuting opponents, and was besides intrusted with the still more difficult and delicate duty of correcting and arranging the writings of Plotinus (*Vit. Plot.* vii, 107; xiii, 115; xv, 117; xxiv, 139). So closely did Porphyry apply himself to these studies that his health became impaired, and, naturally of hypochondriacal disposition, a cloud, settling into confirmed melancholy, was cast over his mind. While in this state he formed a resolution of putting an end to his life, hoping by this method, according to the Platonic teaching, to release the soul from the prison of the body. From this mad design, however, he was dissuaded by his master, who advised a voyage to Sicily. Complying with this advice, Porphyry recovered his bodily vigor and serenity of mind, and devoted himself to authorship. He then wrote, according to Eusebius (*Hist. Eccles.* vi, 19) and Jerome (*Catal. Script. Illust.*), his treatise against the Christian religion (see below, under *Works*), on which account St. Augustine (*Retract.* ii, 31) styles him *Siculum illum cujus celeberrima fuma est.* The notion that this work was written in Bithynia is quite without foundation, being merely derived from a passage of Lactantius (v, 2), referring to somebody whose name is not mentioned, and who wrote against the Christians, and which was supposed by Baronius to refer to Porphyry. But the account does not suit him in any respect. It was very likely about this period that Porphyry took occasion to visit Carthage. That he also went to Athens after the death of Plotinus has been inferred (by Holstenius) from a passage quoted by Eusebius, where, as the text stands, Porphyry is made to speak of celebrating the birthday of Plotinus at Athens with Longinus. There can be little doubt, however, that the reading should be, as Brucker (*l. c.* p. 148) suggests, Πλατώνεια, and that the incident refers to the earlier part of the life of Porphyry, otherwise the allusion will not accord with the history either of Porphyry or Longinus.

Of the remainder of the life of Porphyry we know very little. According to Eunapius he returned to Rome, where he taught, and gave frequent public exhibitions of his acquirements and talents as a speaker, and was held in high honor by the senate and people till he died. But his mind again lost its balance, for he

pretended to be not only a philosopher "endued with superior wisdom, but a divine person, favored with supernatural communications from heaven." He avers that in the sixty-eighth year of his age (*Vit. Plot.* c. xxiii) he had a vision of the Supreme Intelligence, the God superior to all gods, without an image—the result, as Augustine thought, of the agency of evil spirits, but more probably an entire fiction, employed to offset the supernatural elements of Christianity, or a mere phantasm of an overwrought brain. When probably at a somewhat advanced period of his life, he married Marcella, the widow of one of his friends, and the mother of seven children (*Ad Marc.* 1), with the view, as he avowed, of superintending their education. About ten months after his marriage he had occasion to leave her and go on a journey; and to console her during his absence he wrote to her an epistle, which is still extant. The date of his death cannot be fixed with any exactness; it was probably about A.D. 305 or 306.

His Philosophy.—It appears from the testimony even of antagonists, and from what we have left of Porphyry's writings, that he was a man of great abilities and very extensive learning. Eusebius speaks of him as one *τῶν μάλιστα διαφανῶν καὶ πᾶσι γνωρίμων, κλέος τε οὐ μικρὸν φιλοσοφίας παρ' Ἕλλησιν ἀπενηνειγμένον* (*Præp. Ev.* iii, 9); and Augustine styles him "hominem non mediocri ingenio præditum" (*De Civ. Dei*, x, 32; comp. xix, 22). The philosophical doctrines of Porphyry were in all essential respects the same as those of his master, Plotinus. To that system he was ardently attached, and proved himself one of its most energetic defenders. His writings were all designed directly or indirectly to illustrate, commend, or establish it. His rhetorical training, extensive learning, and comparative clearness of style, no doubt did good service in the cause of his school. Thus Eunapius (*Vita Porph.* p. 8, Boiss) ascribes to Porphyry as his principal merit that by his perspicuous and pleasing diction he brought within the range of the understanding of all men the doctrine of Plotinus, which in the language of its author had seemed difficult and obscure. Indeed, Porphyry lays himself less claim to originality than to the merit of an expositor and defender of the doctrine of Plotinus, which he regarded as identical with that of Plato, and substantially also with that of Aristotle. Porphyry is, nevertheless, charged with inconsistencies and contradictions; his later views being frequently at variance with his earlier ones (Eunapius, *Vit. Porph.* fin.; Eusebius, *Præp. Ev.* iv, 10; Iambl. ap. Stobæum, *Ecl.* i, 866). The reason of this may probably be found in the vacillation of his views with respect to theurgy and philosophy—a vacillation which would doubtless attract the greater attention, as it was in opposition to the general tendencies of his age and school that he ranked philosophy higher than the theurgic superstitions which were connected with the popular polytheism. With the latter, some features of his doctrines had considerable affinity. He insisted strongly on the contrast between the corporeal and the incorporeal, and the power of the latter over the former. The influence of the incorporeal was, in his view, unrestricted by the limits of space, and independent of the accident of contiguity. When free from intermixture with matter, it is omnipresent, and its power unlimited. His doctrine with regard to dæmons pointed in the same direction. Over both them and the souls of the dead power could be obtained by enchantments (*De Abst.* ii, 38, 39, 41, 43, 47). Yet these notions seem to have been taken up by him rather in deference to the prevalent opinion of his times than as forming an essential part of his philosophy. Though at first somewhat disposed to favor theurgy, he still ranked philosophy above it, considering, with Plotinus, that the true method of safety consisted in the purgation of the soul and the contemplation of the eternal Deity. The increasing value set upon theurgy, and the endeavors to raise it above philosophy itself, probably produced something like a reaction in his mind, and strengthened the doubts which he entertained with regard to the popular superstition. These doubts he set forth in a letter to the Egyptian prophet Anebos, in a series of questions. The distrust there expressed respecting the popular notions of the gods, divinations, incantations, and other theurgic arts, may have been, as Ritter believes (*Gesch. der Philosophie*, iv, 678), the modified opinion of his later years, provoked, perhaps, by the progress of that superstition to which at an earlier period he had been less opposed. The observation of Augustine is, doubtless, in the main correct: "Ut videas eum inter vitium sacrilegæ curiositatis et philosophiæ professionem fluctuasse, et nunc hanc artem tamquam fallacem, et in ipsa actione periculosam, et legibus prohibitam, cavendam monere, nunc autem velut ejus laudatoribus cedentem, utilem dicere esse mundanæ parti animæ, non quidem intellectuali qua rerum intelligibilium percipiatur veritas, nullas habentium similitudines corporum, sed spirituali, qua rerum corporalium capiantur imagines." The letter to Anebos called forth a reply, which is still extant, and known under the title *Περὶ Μυστηρίων*, and is the production probably of Iamblichus (q. v.).

So many are the variations of Porphyry in his philosophic views from those of Plotinus, that Porphyry must really be assigned to a class of his own rather than called an exponent of Plotinus. Not only did Porphyry popularize the Neo-Platonism of Plotinus, but he distinguished it by the more practical and religious character which he gave to the system. Understanding the power of the Christian religion, which was fast superseding the national creeds, he felt the necessity for antagonizing it. He therefore undertook to spiritualize the old creeds, and to harmonize them with philosophy by treating them as symbolic. He perceived the national craving for a theology (Farrar, p. 57) which rested on some divine authority, or revelation from the world invisible (comp. Augustine's criticism on him in *De Civ. Dei*, x, c. 9, 11, 26, 28); and hence he drew such a system from the real or pretended answers of oracles in his *περὶ τῆς ἐκ λογίων φιλοσοφίας*, of which fragments exist in Eusebius and Augustine (Fabricius, *Bibl. Gr.* v, 744). Heathens, it would seem, had consulted oracles on this very subject of Christianity; and it is these, the genuineness of which may be doubted, that he uses.

The end of philosophizing, according to Porphyry, is the salvation of the soul (*ἡ τῆς ψυχῆς σωτηρία*). The cause of evil is to be found in the soul, in its desires after the low and base, and not in the body as such (*Ad Marc.* 29). The means of deliverance from evil are self-purification (*κάθαρσις*) through asceticism and the philosophical cognition of God. To divination and theurgical initiations Porphyry conceded only a subordinate significance; in his later years, especially, he was instant in warning his followers against their misuse (see, in particular, his epistle to Anebos, the Egyptian priest). He acknowledged one absolute, supreme Deity, who is to be worshipped with pure words and thoughts (*Ad Marc.* 18). He also, however, distinguished two classes of visible and invisible gods, the former being composed of body and soul, and consequently neither eternal nor immutable (*De Abst.* ii, 34, 36, 37–39). He also distinguished between good and evil dæmons, and held that the latter ought to be appeased, but that it should be the object of the philosopher to free himself as much as possible from everything placed under the power of evil dæmons. For that reason, among others, he rejected all animal sacrifices (*De Abst.* ii, 38, 39, 43). The ascetic tendency of his philosophy, as connected with his exalted ideas of the power of reason, which is superior to nature and the influence of dæmons, conduced to raise him above the superstitious tendencies of his age; the spirit of the philosopher being, in his view, superior to all impressions from without. The object of the philosopher should be to free himself as much as possible from all desires of or dependence on that which is external, such appetites being the most hateful tyrants, from which we should be glad to be set free, even with

the loss of the whole body (*Ad Marc.* 34). We should, therefore, restrain our sensual desires as much as possible. It was mainly in this point of view that he rejected all enjoyment of animal food (see Bernays, *Theosoph. Schr. über Frömmigkeit, mit krit. u. erkl. Bemerk. zu Porph. Schr. über Enthaltsamkeit.* p. 4–38). Though bad genii have some power over us, yet through abstinence and the steady resistance of all disturbing influences we can pursue the good in spite of them. If we could abstain from vegetable as well as animal food, he thought we should become still more like the gods (*De Abst.* iii, 27). It is by means of reason only that we are exalted to the supreme God, to whom nothing material should be offered, for everything material is unclean (*De Abst.* i, 39, 57; ii, 34; *Ad Marc.* 15). He distinguishes four degrees of virtues, the lowest being *political virtue*, the virtue of a good man who moderates his passions. Superior to this is *purifying virtue*, which completely sets the soul free from affections. Its object is to make us resemble God, and by it we become dæmonical men or good dæmons. In the higher grade, when entirely given up to knowledge and the soul, man becomes a god, till at last he lives only to reason, and so becomes the father of gods, one with the one Supreme Being (*Sent.* 34). Porphyry appears to have taught (in his six books περὶ ὕλης) more distinctly than Plotinus the doctrine of the emanation of matter from the supersensuous, and proximately from the soul (Procl. *in Tim.* p. 109, 133, 189). The doctrine that the world is without beginning in time was defended by Porphyry against the objections of Atticus and Plutarch (Procl. *in Tim.* p. 119).

His Attacks against Christianity.—Porphyry has especial interest for us, however, not so much as a philosopher of the New-Platonic school, great as he was as such, but as the constructor of a new philosophy, the aim of which was not merely speculation and the enchantment of reason, but its acceptance as a national creed, and its dethronement of Christianity. When made aware that his system could not of itself accomplish all that he desired, he left the apologetic domain, and became the most determined of heathen polemics the world ever beheld or Christianity ever encountered. Lucian and Celsus, a hundred years earlier, had vainly striven to stay the rising fortunes of the Gospel. He now came forward to attempt the death-grapple, and it must be confessed that he made a most vigorous effort to retrieve a sinking cause, to turn back the tide of new ideas, and to reinstate in the minds of the people of the Roman empire the principles of an effete religious system, of a waning and insufficient philosophy. As already indicated above, Porphyry was a man of remarkable powers of mind and of high culture, of a calibre altogether above that of Lucian and Celsus. Lucian, though endowed with keen wit, was a careless jester, and Celsus, in his attacks on the Gospel, often reminds us of the vulgar gibes and ribald remarks of Thomas Paine; but nothing of this is found in Porphyry. Speaking in the name of philosophy, he assumes a dignity, an elevation of tone, an apparent candor in the treatment of his subject, akin to that of the judge, who is supposed impartially to survey the whole field of evidence, and to give weight to no doubtful statements, to no specious arguments. Undoubtedly honest in his convictions and in his attachment to the philosophy of his master, he brought the resources of a great, a cultured mind to bear against the more vulnerable points of the Christian system, testing it by weapons of the highest temper. Porphyry certainly enjoyed a vantage-ground in the school of philosophy to which he belonged. Platonism, as already suggested, approximated more nearly than any of the other philosophic systems of antiquity to the elevated teachings of the Gospel. But during the past century or two, while Christianity had been spreading through the Roman world, this philosophy, under the teachings of Plotinus, had been drawing nearer to the doctrines of the New Testament, insomuch that to a casual observer the two streams of thought and speculation seemed likely to unite and flow on in a single channel. Like Christianity, Platonism opened a spiritual world superior to that of sense, and revealed a Supreme Being, if not absolutely free, yet capable of giving shape to the visible as the architect of the universe. It awakened also in man the consciousness of the supernatural, the divine, so that man was attracted towards the supreme spiritual existence, was permitted to have cognition of fellowship with it; not absorbed on the one hand in the depths of the infinite spirit, nor sunk on the other into the material. The one radical point of separation between the philosophy of the schools and that of the Church seemed to be the views of matter entertained by the former—that it was eternal, and the seat of evil in opposition to God. But even this view was softened as the system came in contact with the Gospel. Plotinus held that the evil principle is only apparent, and that only the good has a substantial and permanent existence. The opposers concluded that as the teachings of Christianity could not be entirely ignored or disproved, the philosophical system must be brought upon the same platform as a rival of the Gospel.

All former attacks against Christianity had proved futile because the Gospel could claim supernatural origin, and demonstrate its claims by the response which its teachings found in the depths of the human soul. Instead, therefore, of denying the grand ethical and religious principles of the evangelical scheme, Porphyry sought supernatural surroundings for his own system, and then moved in bold attack against the supernatural in Christianity, seeking to disprove, not the *substance* of the Gospel teachings, but the *records* in which that substance is delivered—an attack so general in our day among the disbelievers of the supernatural claims of Christianity. See Rationalism. Porphyry's course was in all respects a novel one. Indeed, it was the reverse of that pursued by all other opponents of the new religion who had preceded him. By them the facts, the records of the Gospel were acknowledged, but the facts were held to be wrong, and to have been produced by an unauthorized agency, to have been the work of magic or charms; now the lapse of a hundred years has convinced the enemy that the method of attack affording any hope of success is the direct one against the authority, the inspiration of the documents of the Gospel. If by the trenchant knife of criticism these supports could be cut away, the system would be left to sink down upon a level with philosophy, with all merely human systems of speculation.

Of the nature and merits of the work by Porphyry against Christianity it is not easy to judge, as it has not come down to us. He is reputed to have written it about the year 270, while in retirement in Sicily. It was entitled Κατὰ Χριστιανῶν. In A.D. 435 all the copies extant were burned by order of the emperor, and its contents are only preserved to us in part by the lengthy extracts made of it in the numerous refutations which were published by the Christian apologists of the early Church. The entire work consisted of fifteen books, but only concerning five of these is information thus afforded. From these we learn that the first book of his work dragged to light some of the discrepancies, real or supposed, in Scripture. The examination of the dispute between Peter and Paul was quoted as an instance of the admixture of human ingredients in the body of apostolic teaching. His third book was directed to the subject of Scripture interpretation, especially, with some inconsistency, against the allegorical or mystical tendency which at that time marked the whole Church, and especially the Alexandrian fathers. The allegorical method coincided with, if it did not arise from, the Oriental instinct of symbolism, the natural poetry of the human mind. But in the minds of Jews and Christians it had been sanctified by its use in the Hebrew religion, and had become associated with the apocryphal literature

of the Jewish Church. It is traceable to a more limited extent in the inspired writers of the New Testament, and in most of the fathers; but in the school of Alexandria it was adopted as a formal system of interpretation. It is this allegorical system which Porphyry attacked. He assaulted the writings of those who had fancifully allegorized the Old Testament in the pious desire of finding Christianity in every part of it, in spite of historic conditions; and he hastily drew the inference, with something like the feeling of doubt which rash interpretations of prophecy are in danger of producing at this day, that no consistent sense can be put upon the Old Testament. His fourth book was a criticism on the Mosaic history, and on Jewish antiquities. But the most important books in his work were the twelfth and thirteenth, which were devoted to an examination of the prophecies of Daniel; and in these he detected some of those peculiarities on which modern criticism has employed itself, and arrived at the conclusions in reference to their date revived by the English deist Collins in the last century, and by many German critics in the present. It is well known that half of the book of Daniel is historic, half prophetic. Each of these parts is distinguished from similar portions of the Old Testament by some peculiarities. Porphyry is not recorded as noticing any of those which belong to the historic part, unless we may conjecture, from his theory of the book being originally written in Greek, that he detected the presence of those Greek words in Nebuchadnezzar's edicts which many modern critics have contended could not be introduced into Chaldæa antecedently to the Macedonian conquest. The peculiarity alleged to belong to the prophetical part is its apocalyptic tone. It looks, it has been said, historical rather than prophetical. Definite events, and these in a distinct chain, are predicted with the precision of historical narrative; whereas most prophecy is a moral sermon, in which general moral predictions are given, with specific historic ones interspersed. Nor is this, which is shared in a less degree by occasional prophecies elsewhere, the only peculiarity alleged, but it is affirmed also that the definite character ceases at a particular period of the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes, down to which the very campaigns of the Seleucid and Ptolemaic dynasties are noted, but subsequently to which the prophetic tone becomes more vague and indefinite. Hence the conjecture has been hazarded that it was written in the reign of Antiochus by a Palestinian Jew, who gathered up the traditions of Daniel's life and wrote the recent history of his country in eloquent language in an apocalyptic form, which, after the literary fashion of his age, he imputed to an ancient seer, Daniel; definite up to the period at which he composed it, indefinite as he gazed on the future. It was this peculiarity, the supposed ceasing of the prophecies in the book of Daniel at a definite date, which was noticed by Porphyry, and led him to suggest the theory of its authorship just named. He seems also to have entered into some examination of the specific prophecies, for he objects to the application of the words "the abomination of desolation" to other objects than that which he considers its original meaning (see Jerome on Matt. xxiv, 15). These remarks will give an idea of the critical acuteness of Porphyry. A few other traces of Porphyry's views remain, which are of less importance, and are levelled against parts of the New Testament: e. g. the change of purpose in our blessed Lord (John vii), [Jerome, vol. iv, pt. ii, p. 521 (*Dial. adv. Pelag.*); *Ep.* (101) *ad Pammach.* Several are given in Holsten. (*Vit. Porphyr.* p. 86)], the reasons why the Old Economy was abrogated if divine [August. *Epist.* (102, olim 49, Benedict. ed. 1689), ii, 274, where six questions are named, some of which come from Porphyry]; the question what became of the generations which lived before Christianity was proclaimed, if Christianity was the only way of salvation; objections to the severity of Peter in the death of Ananias; and the inscrutable mystery of an infinite punishment in requital for finite sin (August. *Retract.* bk. ii, c. 31, vol. i, p. 53, concerning Matt. vii, 2). His objections are not, it will be observed, founded on quibbles like those of Celsus, but on instructive literary characteristics, many of which are greatly exaggerated or grossly misinterpreted, but still are real, and suggest difficulties or inquiries which the best modern theological critics have honorably felt to demand candid examination and explanation.

It was by no means an easy matter to reply to such a critique as Porphyry adopted, and it may be said that he never was answered as he should have been. The reply which Origen made to Celsus set aside all the objections of the heathen disputant, but the thirty separate replies to Porphyry, among which the best are those by Methodius, Eusebius, and Apollinarius, very insufficiently solve the intricate and deep problems proposed by the most successful exponent of Neo-Platonism. That he made a profound impression on the Church is seen in the fact that to all Christians his name became hateful, odious, the synonym for all that is vile and dangerous in unbelief, like that of Turk or Moslem or Papist in later ages. When Constantine wished to blacken the reputation of the Arians, he only had to attach to them the epithet of Porphyrian. That name carried in it a Satanic import, a heavy curse, able to sink to irretrievable infamy any individual or sect who bore it. A great deal of discussion has taken place respecting the assertion of Socrates (*H. E.* iii, 23), that in his earlier years Porphyry was a Christian, and that, having been treated with indignity by the Christians, he apostatized, and revenged himself by writing against them. The authority is so slight, and the improbability of the story so great (for it does not appear that any of his antagonists charged him with apostasy, unless it was Eusebius), while it may so easily have arisen from the fact that in his early youth Porphyry was instructed by Origen, that it may confidently be rejected. An able summary of the arguments on both sides is given by Brucker (ii, 251, etc.). A doubt has been raised as to the identity of the assailant of Christianity with the Neo-Platonic philosopher, but it is totally without foundation.

Other Works.—Of the very numerous writings of Porphyry the following are extant: 1. Πυθαγόρου βίος; supposed by many to be a fragment of his larger history of philosophers. 2. Περὶ Πλωτίνου βίου καὶ τῆς τάξεως τῶν βιβλίων αὐτοῦ. See PLOTINUS. 3. Περὶ ἀποχῆς τῶν ἐμψύχων, in four books, dedicated to his friend and fellow-disciple Firmus Castricius. 4. Fragments of his epistle Πρὸς Ἀνεβῶ τὸν Αἰγύπτιον. Large quotations from this work are made by Eusebius in his *Præparatio Evangelica.* 5. Πρὸς τὰ νοητὰ ἀφορμαί. 6. Ὁμηρικὰ ζητήματα, addressed to Anatolius. 7. Περὶ τοῦ ἐν Ὀδυσσείᾳ τῶν Νυμφῶν ἄντρου, a fanciful allegorical interpretation of the description of the cave of the nymphs in the *Odyssey*, showing both the ingenuity and the recklessness with which Porphyry and other writers of his stamp pressed writers and authorities of all kinds into their service, as holders of the doctrines of their school. 8. A fragment from a treatise Περὶ Στυγός, preserved by Stobæus. 9. Εἰσαγωγή, or Περὶ τῶν πέντε φωνῶν, addressed to Chrysaorius, and written by Porphyry while in Sicily. It is commonly prefixed to the *Organon* of Aristotle. 10. A commentary on the *Categories* of Aristotle, in questions and answers. 11. Some fragments of a commentary on Aristotle's books Περὶ φυσικῆς ἀκροάσεως. 12. A commentary on the *Harmonica* of Ptolemæus, leaving off at the seventh chapter of the second book. 13. Περὶ προσῳδίας (see Villoison, *Anecd. Græca*, ii, 103–118). 14. Scholia on the *Iliad*, preserved at Leyden among the books and papers of Is. Vossius. A portion of them was published by Valckenaer, in an appendix to Ursinus's *Virgil*, with a copious account of the scholia generally. Other scholia on the *Iliad*, preserved in the Vatican library, were published by Villoison (*Anecd. Græca*, ii, 266, etc.), and

in his edition of the *Iliad*. 15. Portions of a commentary, apparently on the *Ethics* of Aristotle, and of one on the *Organon*. 16. Two books on the philosophy of Plato were affirmed to be extant by Gesner. 17. An epistle to his wife Marcella. This piece was discovered by Angelo Mai in the Ambrosian library, and published at Milan in 1816. The letter is not quite complete, as the end of the MS. is mutilated. The contents of it are of a general philosophical character, designed to incite to the practice of virtue and self-restraint and the study of philosophy. The sentiments are a little obscure here and there, but many of the maxims and remarks exhibit great wisdom, and a considerable depth of very pure religious feeling. Porphyry considers sorrow to be a more wholesome discipline for the mind than pleasures (c. 7). With great energy and some eloquence he urges the cultivation of the soul and the practice of virtue, in preference to attention to the body. His views of the Deity, of his operations, and the right mode of contemplating and worshipping him, are of a very exalted kind, some reminding the reader strongly of passages in the Scriptures. The laws under which man is placed he distinguishes into natural, civil, and divine, and marks out their respective provinces with considerable beauty and clearness. 18. A poetical fragment, from the tenth book of a work entitled Περὶ τῆς ἐκ λογίων φιλοσοφίας, is published at the end of the preceding work. 19. An introduction to the *Tetrabiblos* of Ptolemæus is also attributed by some to Porphyry, by others to Antiochus. The ἐπίτομος διήγησις εἰς τὰς καθ' Ὁμήρου πλάνας τοῦ Ὀδυσσέως, the production of Nicephorus Gregoras, has also been attributed by some to Porphyry.

Besides these we have mention of the following lost works of Porphyry: 20. Περὶ ἀγαλμάτων (Euseb. *Præp. Ev.* iii, 7; Stob. *Ecl. Phys.* i, 25). 21. Περὶ ἀνόδου ψυχῆς (August. *De Civ. Dei*, x, 910, etc.). 22. Περὶ τοῦ μίαν εἶναι τὴν Πλάτωνος καὶ Ἀριστοτέλους αἵρεσιν (Suidas, s. v. Πορφ.). 23. A commentary on Aristotle's treatise Περὶ ἑρμηνείας (Boethius, ad loc. ii). 24. Πρὸς Ἀριστοτέλην, περὶ τοῦ εἶναι τὴν ψυχὴν ἐντελέχειαν (Suidas). 25. Ἐξήγησις τῶν κατηγοριῶν, dedicated to Gedalius (Eustath. *Ad Il.* iii, 293). 26. Περὶ ἀρχῶν (Suidas). 27. Περὶ ἀσωμάτων (ibid.). 28. Περὶ τοῦ γνῶθι σεαυτόν (ibid.). 29. Γραμματικαὶ ἀπορίαι (ibid.). 30. A reply to the Apology for Alcibiades in the *Symposium* of Plato, by Diophanes (Porph. *Vit. Plot.* 15). 31. Ἐπιγράμματα (Eustath.). 32. Περὶ τοῦ ἐφ' ἡμῖν, dedicated to Chrysaorius (Stob. *Ecl.*). 33. A treatise against a spurious work attributed to Zoroaster (Porph. *Vit. Plot.* 16). 34. Περὶ θείων ὀνομάτων (Suidas). 35. Εἰς τὸ Θεοφράστου περὶ καταφάσεως καὶ ἀποφάσεως (Boethius in Arist. *De Interpr.*). 36. Εἰς τὸ Θουκυδίδου προοίμιον, πρὸς Ἀριστείδην (Suidas). 37. Περὶ ἰδεῶν, πρὸς Λογγῖνον (Porph. *Vit. Plot.* 20). 38. Ὁ ἱερὸς γάμος, a poem composed for the birthday of Plato (ibid. 15). 39. Εἰς τὴν τοῦ Ἰουλιανοῦ Χαλδαίου φιλοσόφου ἱστορίαν (Suidas). 40. Εἰς τὴν Μινουκιανοῦ τέχνην (ibid.). 41. Ὁ πρὸς Νημέρτιον λόγος (Cyrill. *c. Julian.* iii, 79, etc.). It appears to have been a treatise on the providence of God. 42. Ὅτι ἔξω τοῦ νοῦ ὑφέστηκε τὸ νόημα (Porph. *Vit. Plot.* 18). 43. Περὶ τῆς Ὁμήρου φιλοσοφίας (Suidas). 44. Περὶ τῆς ἐξ Ὁμήρου ὠφελείας τῶν βασιλέων, in ten books (ibid.). 45. Περὶ παραλελειμμένων τῷ ποιητῇ ὀνομάτων. This and the two preceding were probably only parts of a larger work. 46. Περὶ τῶν κατὰ Πίνδαρον τοῦ Νείλου πηγῶν (ibid.). 47. Commentaries on several of the works of Plotinus (Eunap. *Vit. Porph.*). 48. Εἰς τὸν Σοφίστην τοῦ Πλάτωνος (Boethius, *De Divis.* Præf.). 49. Σύμμικτα ζητήματα, in seven books (Suidas). 50. Τὰ εἰς τὸν Τίμαιον ὑπομνήματα, a commentary on the *Timæus* of Plato (Macrob. *In Somn. Scip.* ii, 3; Proclus, *In Timæum*). 51. Περὶ ὕλης, in six books (Suidas). 52. Φιλόλογος ἱστορία, in five books (ibid.; Euseb. *Præp. Ev.* x, 3, who quotes a passage of some length from the first book). 53. Φιλόσοφος ἱστορία, in four books, a work on the lives and doctrines of philosophers (Socrates, *H. E.* iii, 23; Eunap. *Pr.* p. 10). 54. Περὶ ψυχῆς, in five books (Suidas; Euseb. *Præp. Ev.* xiv, 10). 55. Περὶ τῶν ψυχῆς δυνάμεων (Stob. *Eclog.*).

See Eusebius, *Dem. Evang.* iii, 6; Fabricius, *Bibl. Græc.* v, 725, etc.; Holstenius, *De Vita et Scriptis Porphyrii;* Ritter, *Gesch. d. Philos.* iv, 666 sq.; Lardner, *Credibility of the Gosp. Hist.* pt. ii, ch. xxxvii; Jortin, *Remarks*, ii, 389; Schaff, *Ch. Hist.* i, 190 sq.; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* i, 170 sq.; Ullman, in *Stud. u. Krit.* 1854; Neander, *Dogmas*, i, 85, 202; ii, 467; Donaldson, *Greek Lit.* ch. liii; Lecky, *Hist. of European Morals*, i, 344 sq.; Degerando, *Hist. de la Philos.* iii, 383 sq.; Valérien Parisot, *Dissertatio historica de Porphyrio* (1845); Ueberweg, *History of Philosophy*, i, 251 sq.; Mosheim, *History of the First Three Centuries*, ii, 103 sq.; *Theological Quarterly*, 1865, i, 59; *Revue des Deux Mondes*, May 15, 1866, p. 435; Farrar, *Critical History of Free Thought*, p. 56 sq.; *Journal of Speculative Philosophy*, vol. iii, No. 1, art. iii; Fisher, *The Beginnings of Christianity* (N. Y. 1877, 8vo), p. 178 sq.; Smith, *Dict. of Greek and Roman Biography and Mythology*.

Porrée, Gilbert de la. See Porretani.

Porreta, Margareta, one of the numerous victims of religious intolerance in the Middle Ages, was born in Hainault, and published at Paris a book which, according to the decision of the theologians who examined it, contained a number of errors and heresies, "et inter cæteras (hæreses) quod anima annihilata in amore conditoris sine reprehensione conscientiæ vel remorsu *potest* et *debet* naturæ, quidquid appetit et desiderat concedere." These errors the foolish woman refused to retract, and as she also scorned the excommunication visited upon her by the Inquisition, the Church delivered her up to the secular arm for execution. At the stake she is said to have changed her mind, and to have died with great signs of repentance; but for this we have only the testimony of the priests who attended her in her last hours as her persecutors.

Porretani, a name for the followers of Gilbert de la Porrée, bishop of Poitiers, a metaphysical divine of the 12th century, who held opinions respecting the personality and the essence of the Holy Trinity analogous to those of the Letratheitæ or Damianists of the 6th century. Porretanus attempted to distinguish the divine essence from the Deity, and the properties of the three divine Persons from the Persons themselves, not in reality, but by abstraction. In consequence of these distinctions, he denied the incarnation of the divine nature, respecting which he ventured to set forth the proposition, "Quod Divina natura non esset incarnata." Porretanus was accused by two of his clergy of teaching blasphemy, and at their instigation St. Bernard brought the matter before Eugenius III, the pontiff, who was then in France. The case was discussed first in the Council of Paris in A.D. 1147, and then in the Council of Rheims, which was held in the following year. To put an end to the contest, Porretanus yielded his own judgment to that of the council and the pope. It does not appear that any large party was formed by Porretanus, but some are spoken of under his name as his followers. See *Gallia Christiana*, ii, 1175; Harduin, *Concil.* VI, ii, 1297; Mansi, *Concil.* xxi. 712.

Porst, Johann, a Lutheran minister, was born Dec. 11, 1668, at Oberkotzau, not far from Hof. In 1689 he went to Leipsic for the study of theology. In 1695 he was appointed pastor at Malchow, near Berlin; in 1704 he was called to Berlin as preacher at Friedrichswerder and Dorotheenstadt; in 1709 he was made court-preacher, and in 1712 provost of St. Nicolai, pastor primarius, and inspector. He died Jan. 9, 1728, having occupied since 1717 the position as counsellor of consistory. Of his many writings, none is so well known as his hymn-book, published in 1713, and which is still in

use in some churches at Berlin. See Jöcher, *Gelehrten-Lexikon*, s. v.; Winer, *Handbuch der theolog. Literatur*, p. 113 and index; Koch, *Gesch. des deutschen Kirchenliedes*, iv, 297 sq.; Kurtz, *Lehrbuch der Kirchengesch.* (7th ed.) § 166, 2; Staudt, *In göttliche Führung* (Stuttg. 1850); Bachmann, *Zur Geschichte der Berliner Gesangbücher* (Berl. 1856); id. *Die Gesangbücher Berlin's* (ibid. 1857). (B. P.)

Port is the rendering in Neh. ii, 13 of the Heb. *sha'ar*, שַׁעַר, elsewhere rendered "gate" (q. v.), as twice in the same verse. These gates of the cities, and the unoccupied spaces on which they opened, served in all Hebrew antiquity for places of public assembling of the citizens (comp. the *forum*, ἀγορά, of the Greeks and Romans). In the East this is still the custom, the gates taking the place of the coffee-houses and other places of resort among the Western nations (Gen. xix, 1; 1 Sam. iv, 18; ix, 18; Job xxix, 7; Jer. xxxvii, 7). There the people came together in great numbers when any public calamity occurred (2 Macc. iii, 19), there the judges heard causes and complaints (Deut. xxi, 19 sq.; xxii, 15 sq.; Isa. xxix, 21; Job xxi, 21; Psa. cxxvii, 5; Amos v, 12, 15; Zech. viii, 16; Prov. xxii, 22), and there deeds which required legal sanction, especially important contracts, were performed (Gen. xxiii, 10, 18; Deut. xxv, 7; Ruth iv, 1, 11; comp. the early Germans, Grimm, *Deutsche Rechtsalterthümer*, p. 104 sq.; and see Höst, *Marokko*, p. 239). There princes stood to receive homage (2 Sam. xix, 8; but see below), or for public discussion of important affairs (1 Kings xxii, 10), and markets were held in the vicinity (2 Kings vii, 1; Arvieux, *Nachr.* v, 186; Rosenmüller, *Morgenl.* vi, 272; Jacobi, *De foro in portis* [Leips. 1714], in Ugolino, *Thes.* vol. xxv). At the gate public announcements were made (Jer. xvii, 19; Prov. i, 21; viii, 3). Idolatries, too, were sometimes practiced here (2 Kings xxiii, 8), just as in Catholic cities altars are placed at the gates. On the whole, we must consider the gate, not as a mere port or entrance, but as a strong defence, and as connected with an open place within; perhaps even with benches (Höst, *Marokko*, ut sup.). They were barred with strong bolts and posts [see City], and often built over (2 Sam. xviii, 33) with watch-towers (ver. 24 sq.). Gate-keepers are mentioned, at least in Jerusalem, with some political duties and powers (Jer. xxxvii, 13; Neh. xiii, 19). On the other hand, in 2 Sam. xv, 2 (and perhaps in xix, 8), the allusion is not to a city gate, but to that of a palace in the royal city; and in Esth. iii, 2; Dan. ii, 49, the word is used, according to a usage still customary in the East, for the king's court (*aula regia*, in Latin, is a similar synecdoche; comp. also the Arabic *Gate of Rashid* for court, in Elmacin, *Hist. Sarac.* p. 120; see Lüdeke, *Türk. Reich*, i, 281). To sit at the palace door or gate (Esth. ii, 19, 21; iv, 2; v, 9, 13 sq.; vi, 10), among the Persians, was to wait in the hall or vestibule of the king. Not only courtiers and attendants, but even high officers of the government were found there (Herod. iii, 20). See Door.

Porta, Baccio della, more generally known as *Fra Bartolomeo*, an Italian monastic of the Dominican order, distinguished as a painter of the Florentine school, and much noted for his intimate relation to Raffaelle and the other Umbrian painters of his time, was born at Savignano, not far from Florence, in 1469. He was a pupil of Cosimo Roselli in Florence, and lived near the gate of S. Piero, from which circumstance his name of "Della Porta" was derived. We have no detailed narrative of his youthful life, except that he was early brought under Roselli's tuition, where he formed a close friendship with Mariotta Albertinelli, his associate student, and showed such natural and artistic proclivities towards "sweetness and light" that the beauty of his Madonna faces and the sunny fervor of his coloring won the approbation even of the critical Florentines. He acquired such great fame that he was commissioned to execute a fresco of *The Last Judgment* in the convent of S. Marco, about the time when Savonarola went to Florence to preach against the sinfulness of the city. Bartolomeo became the earnest friend of the preacher, and was so carried away by his influence that he burned all his studies and drawings of profane subjects, and those which represented nude figures. He abandoned his art, and spent his time in the society of the enthusiast. When, at length, Savonarola was seized, tortured, and burned, Bartolomeo took the vows of a Dominican friar, and left his unfinished pictures to be completed by Albertinelli. During four years he led a most austere life, never touching his pencil. His superior finally commanded his practice of the art, and he resumed it with languor and entire want of interest. About this time Raffaelle arrived in Florence. He was then but twenty-one years old, yet was already noted as a great painter. He visited the friar's cell, and the consequence was a deep friendship between the two, to which the world owes the afterworks of Fra Bartolomeo. Raffaelle instructed his monastic friend in perspective, and he in turn gave new ideas of drapery to Raffaelle. Fra Bartolomeo was the first to employ lay figures in the study of drapery; he also imparted to Raffaelle his mode of coloring. The examination of the works of these painters will prove that from this time both of them produced more excellent pictures than they had done before; the friar had caught an intellectual grace from his young friend, and Raffaelle had advanced in color and drapery. About 1508 Fra Bartolomeo was allowed to go to Venice, where his coloring was greatly improved, and in 1513 he went to Rome. This visit was doubtless a deep joy to him, but the beauties of what he saw so far exceeded his imaginations that he seems to have been stupefied; he made no attempt to equal or excel the artists about him, and only commenced two figures of SS. Peter and Paul, which Raffaelle finished after his return to Florence. When once more in his convent, Bartolomeo showed the benefit he had received, and executed some of his most important works, among which are a *Marriage of St. Catharine*, now hanging in the Louvre, and the unfinished *Conception* of the Uffizi. But it is in his later days, when his mind had broadened and strengthened and his touch grown firm, that we find such masterpieces as the *Pietà* of the Pitti — the most purely beautiful Pietà ever painted; *The Presentation in the Temple*, at Vienna; and *The Madonna della Misericordia*, now at Lucca, and considered by many as his most important work. It had been said that he could do nothing grand: he now painted the *St. Mark*, which is in the Pitti Palace, and is so simply grand as to be compared to the remains of Grecian art. He lived only four years after going to Rome, and died at a time when his powers seemed daily increasing. His character was impressed on all his works. When Savonarola was seized, Porta hid himself, and vowed that if he escaped he would become a monk. This want of courage and energy in his nature we must admit; but he was enthusiastic, devout, and loving. His saints and virgins are tender, mild, and full of sweet dignity, and if we characterized his pictures in one word, holiness is what we should use, for it is that which they most express. His boy-angels were beautifully painted, and his representations of architecture were rich and grand. His works are rare. The Louvre has two of his pictures, and the Berlin Museum one; but he is best studied in Florence, where the larger number of his works remain. See Mrs. Clement, *Handbook of Painters, Sculptors*, etc., s. v.; Meehan, *Lives of the Most Eminent Painters, etc., of the Order of St. Dominic* (Dublin, 1852, 2 vols. 12mo), vol. ii, ch. i–viii; Radcliffe, *Schools and Masters of Painting* (N. Y. 1877), p. 120 sq., et al.; Schlegel, *Æsthetic and Miscellaneous Notes*, p. 7 sq.; Taine, *Travels in Italy* (Florence and Venice), p. 158 sq. (J. H. W.)

Porta, Conrad, a Lutheran divine, was born in 1541 at Osterwick, near Halberstadt. Having completed his studies, he was called in 1566 as rector to Osterwick. In 1567 he went as conrector to Eisleben; in 1569 he

was made deacon of St. Nicolai; in 1575, pastor of SS. Peter and Paul and assessor of the consistory, at the same time supplying the spiritual wants of the Church of the Holy Ghost and lecturing at the Gymnasium. When in 1572 the Flacian controversy took place, he sided with the Eisleben theologians against Spangenberg. Porta died in 1585. He wrote, *Pastorale Lutheri* (Eisleben, 1582):—*Oratio de assidua lectione operum Lutheri* (ibid.), etc. See Winer, *Handbuch der theolog. Literatur*, ii, 29; Jöcher, *Gelehrten-Lexikon*, s. v. (B. P.)

Porta, Egidio di, a Roman Catholic monastic, flourished in the period of the great Reformation movement of the 16th century. He had early taken the black cowl of the Augustinians, moved thereto, as he himself tells us, "under the impulse of a certain religious feeling, but not according to knowledge." For seven years he discharged the office of a preacher of the Word of God in deep ignorance; then, enlightened by the writings of the Swiss reformer Zwingli, which Providence had thrown in his way, he imparted the knowledge of the truth to his brethren of the same convent. It is to be regretted that we can learn nothing of his personal history beyond this period.

Porta, Guglielmo della, an Italian sculptor of the 16th century, was a noted follower of Michael Angelo. His most important work was the monument to Paul III in the tribune of St. Peter's. Two statues, of *Peace* and *Abundance*, which formerly made a part of this work, are now in the Farnese Palace.

Porta, Simon, an Italian philosopher of the first half of the 16th century, was a pupil of Pomponatius, and is celebrated especially as the author of *Magia Naturalis* (Naples, 1589, and since). In 1512 the Lateran Council condemned both those who taught that the human soul was not immortal and those who asserted that the soul is one and identical in all men. It condemned also the philosophers who affirmed that these opinions, although contrary to faith, were philosophically true. It enjoined professors of philosophy to refute all heretical doctrines to which they might allude, and prohibited the clergy from studying philosophy for a course longer than five years. Indeed, Averroism as early as the 13th century had become hostile to the doctrines of the Church, and in 1271, and again in 1277, it was condemned by Stephen Tempier, archbishop of Paris, who caused its principles to be embodied in distinct propositions. Among these were the following: "Quod sermones theologici sunt fundati in fabulis. Quod nihil plus scitur propter scire theologiam. Quod fabulæ et falsa sunt in lege Christiana, sicut et in aliis. Quod lex Christiana impedit addiscere. Quod sapientes mundi sunt philosophi tantum." Notwithstanding the condemnation of the Church, these ideas seemed to have taken hold of the philosophical mind of the age, and long continued to find favor among teachers and students. Like his preceptor, Pomponatius, Porta wrote, in agreement with the Alexandrians on the question of immortality, a work entitled *De rerum naturalibus principiis, de anima et mente summa* (Flor. 1551). Among other works of Porta, we mention *De humana mente disputatio* (1551):—*De dolore:—An homo bonus vel malus volens fiat* (1551). He died in 1555. See Ueberweg, *Hist. of Philos.* ii, 14, 467.

Porta-Leone (מֹשֶׁה אַרְיֵה), Abraham, also called *Arje Abraham*, a Jewish savant, was born in the year 1542. He belonged to a family which excelled in medical science to such a degree that one of the members of the family was employed as physician in the service of king Ferdinand I of Naples and duke Galeazzo Maria Sforza of Mailand. Abraham received an excellent education, and attended the lectures at the University of Pavia, where he especially betook himself to the study of Aristotle, Hippocrates, Galenus, and the Arabic writers. In the year 1563 he received the doctorate and became a member of the medical college at Mantua. He died in the year 1612. Porta-Leone takes a prominent place in Jewish literature, as he is the author of the שִׁלְטֵי הַגִּבּוֹרִים, an extensive work on Jewish antiquities, in which he minutely treats on the Temple and its structure—the holy of holies, the altar, candlestick, table, music, etc. The whole is divided into ninety sections, to which is appended a list of ninety-eight works, which he perused for his work, and an essay on the use of the Hebrew language, etc. This excellent work, which is now very scarce, was first published in the year 1612. A Latin translation, which Wagenseil pronounced a "librum optimum," "antiquitates Judaicas solide explicantem," "librum aureum," and Menasseh ben-Israel as an "ingeniosum opus," was published by Ugolino in his *Thesaurus antiquitatum sacrarum* (vol. ix, xi, xiii, xxxii). Iken used Leone's work in his antiquities to a great extent, and he promised a translation of the whole, which never appeared. See Fürst, *Bibl. Judaica*, iii, 114 sq.; De Rossi, *Dizionario storico degli Autori Ebrei* (German transl.), p. 268 sq.; Wolf, *Bibl. Hebr.* i, iii, iv, 63; *Jahrbuch für Geschichte der Juden u. des Judenthums*, ii, 345 sq.; Wolf, *Studien zur Jubelfeier der Wiener Universität* (Wien, 1865), p. 172; Delitzsch and Zunz, *Addit. ad Cod. Bibl. Senat.* (Lips.), xxvii. (B. P.)

Portable Altars (*viatica, gestatoria, itineraria*). During the Crusades the bishops and ecclesiastics who took part in them carried an "itinerant altar." The portable altar-stone or table was used on unconsecrated altars in private chapels. Bede mentions a consecrated table in lieu of an altar. The monks of St. Denis carried a table of wood, covered with a linen cloth, in Charlemagne's campaign against the Saxons. There were examples also of stone, metal, and terra-cotta. The *reposoir* is used in the street to rest the Sacrament on in the procession of the Fête Dieu in France. One is preserved at Santa Maria, in the portico d' Campitelli; and another, of carved porphyry, at Conques, cir. 1106. See Altar.

Portable Bells. Hand-bells were of Celtic origin, and were used in Brittany, in St. Patrick's time in Ireland, and in that of St. Selio in Wales. Unlike the small altar-bells, which were square, these were hexagonal or oval, without clappers, like the original cloc, usually of bronze, and sometimes jewelled, being regarded as specially sacred, and possessed of miraculous powers, as St. Iltyd's, the bell of Armagh of the close of the 11th century, the golden bell of St. Senanus, St. Ewin's at Monastereven, which was tied with a chain to prevent its automatic flight, and used as an ordeal for swearing criminals by the justices of Munster. The cloc was cylindrical, and in the 8th, 9th, and 10th centuries often gemmed. At Caerleon, in Wales, the bangu was used at a funeral recently. Hand-bells are preserved at Perros, Guirec, and St. Symphorien's, Côtes-du-Nord. See Bell.

Portail, Antoine, a French priest noted for his relation to the "Congregation of Priests of the Mission," which body he joined immediately after their institution by Vincent de Paul, flourished in the first half of the 17th century. Nothing is known of his personal history, but he is reputed to have been not only Paul's first companion, but also his most devoted coadjutor. See Jervis, *Hist. of the Church of France*, i, 320 sq.

Portal (i. e. *avant-portail*), an architectural term, designates an external canopy raised in front of the principal doors of a church by way of shelter, whereas a porch is a projecting outwork independent of the door. See Porch. There are fine examples of portals in the cathedrals of Rheims, Paris, St. Ouen's, and Rouen, Amiens, Sems, Senlis, and Bourges, Westminster, and of smaller dimensions at churches in Salisbury, Lichfield, and Verona and other Italian towns. "Penniless porch," the resort of beggars, was the local name of the cemetery-gate of Wells.

Portas vestras æternālès. This is the beginning of one of the few Ascension hymns which we have in the Latin language. "Nothing is poorer," says Trench, "throughout the whole Christian Church than the hymnology of the Ascension. Even the German Protestant hymn-book, so incomparably rich in Passion and Resurrection and Pentecost hymns, is singularly ill-furnished with these. . . . The Latin forms no exception; it does not possess a single first-rate hymn on the Ascension." This hymn, which strangely enough has never found its way into any of the more modern collections of Latin hymns, runs thus:

"Portas vestras æternales,
Triumphales, principales,
Angeli, attollite.
Eja, tollite actutum,
Venit Dominus virtutum,
Rex æternæ gloriæ."

An English translation is given by Benedict in *The Hymn of Hildebert*, etc., p. 81 (N. Y. 1867); for the original copy, see Trench, *Sacred Latin Poetry*, p. 172 sq.

Portatīlè ALTARE is the name of a square *portable* stone framed in wood, at the angles and in the middle of which there is a cross, and the cavity of which receives the relics. The portatile is consecrated by the bishop, and can be used after this ceremony for the purpose of saying mass in private chapels. See PORTABLE ALTARS.

Portatives is the technical term applied to candlesticks used in churches and carried by hand.

Porteous Mob. This tragical incident is introduced here from its connection with the ecclesiastical history of Scotland. Some new custom-taxes were felt to be odious and galling in Scotland, and revenue-officers were specially obnoxious in some of the seaports. Two men, named Wilson and Robertson, who had robbed the collector of Pittenweem, in Fife, were apprehended and condemned. Some attempts to break out of jail, after sentence had been passed upon them, had proved abortive. On the Sabbath before the execution the criminals, as usual, were taken to church, under custody of four soldiers of the city guard, when, as the congregation was dismissing, Wilson, laying hold of two of the soldiers, one in each hand, and seizing the third with his teeth, called on Robertson to run. The latter at once knocked down the remaining guard and fled, without any one trying to arrest him. The romantic pity of Wilson for his junior accomplice, and his successful deliverance of him, created great sympathy for him. At his execution, April 14, 1736, the mob became unruly, rushed to the scaffold, and cut down the dead man. Captain Porteous, of the city guard, who was at that time surly and excited, ordered his men to fire—nay, fired a musket himself on the crowd. Six or seven persons were killed by the first volley, and more by the second. Some respectable citizens were shot as they were looking out from their windows. Captain Porteous was tried before the High Court of Justiciary, and condemned to death. Queen Caroline, in the absence of George II on the Continent, sent down a reprieve. The populace were filled with terrible indignation, and resolved to take the law into their own hands. On Sept. 7 a crowd assembled under some unknown command, secured all the military posts, locked the gates, opened the prison, took out captain Porteous, entered a shop, brought away a halter, leaving a guinea on the counter to pay for it, and hanged him on a dyer's pole. The mob dispersed with perfect order, and did no other violence. The riot is enveloped in mystery—no one of the parties was ever apprehended. But a bill of great and vindictive penalties was prepared, and though shorn of many of its original terrors in passing through Parliament it contained the enactment that every minister in the Church of Scotland was to read a proclamation against the rioters from the pulpit, during public worship, on the first Sabbath of each month during a whole year. If any minister refused, he was, for the first offence, to be declared incapable of sitting and voting in any Church court, and, for the second, he was pronounced incapable of "taking, holding, or enjoying any ecclesiastical benefice in Scotland." The majority of the ministers bowed to this edict, some used ludicrous shifts to evade it, and only a few pointedly refused. The act was felt by many to be a wanton infringement on the rights of the Church—a dictation to which none but an Erastian community could submit. The Parliament had assumed the power of declaring what ministers should do, and of inflicting discipline if they should refuse. Compliance with the enactment raised commotion in many parishes, and aided the spread of the first Secession. The seceders were accused of disloyalty, because they unanimously, and without hesitation, refused to read the edict. In Carlyle's *Autobiography* will be found a graphic account. Carlyle saw the rescue and witnessed the execution.—Scott, *Heart of Mid-Lothian*.

Porter. This word, when used in the A. V., does not bear its modern signification of a carrier of burdens, but denotes in every case a gate-keeper, from the Latin *portarius*, the man who attended to the *porta*. In the original the word is שׁוֹעֵר or שֹׁעֵר, *shoêr*, from שָׁעַר, *sháar*, a gate; once (Ezra vii, 24) Chald. תָּרַע, *tara'*, the same (Sept. θυρωρός and πυλωρός; Vulg. *portarius* and *janitor*). This meaning is evidently implied in 1 Chron. ix, 21; 2 Chron. xxiii, 19; xxxv, 15; John x, 3. It is generally employed in reference to the Levites who had charge of the entrances to the sanctuary, but is used also in other connections in 2 Sam. xviii, 26; 2 Kings vii, 10, 11; Mark xiii, 34; John x, 3; xviii, 16, 17. In two passages (1 Chron. xv, 23, 24) the Hebrew word is rendered "doorkeeper," and in John xviii, 16, 17, ἡ θυρωρός is "she that kept the door." Thus, in 2 Kings vii, 10, 11, and 2 Sam. xviii, 26, we meet with the porter at the gates of a town. In the palace of the high-priest (John xviii, 17) the porter was a female, ἡ παιδίσκη, ἡ θυρωρός. See also Acts xii, 13. A porter seems to have been usually stationed at the doors of sheepfolds (John x, 3). According to Stier and others, this θυρωρός corresponds to the *Holy Spirit*, who opens the way for the true ministers of Christ. See DOOR.

The porters of the Temple, who were *guards* as well as porters, were very numerous in David's time; for in 1 Chron. xxiii, 5 no less than 4000 are mentioned. They were divided into courses (1 Chron. xxvi, 1–19), and had their post assigned them by lot (ver. 13). Besides attending to the gates and keeping order there, they seem, as Lightfoot says, to have had charge of certain treasures (ver. 15, comp. with 2 Chron. xxv, 24, and Lightfoot's *Prospect of the Temple*, c. v, § 6). Properly speaking, their office was in some respects military: they were the soldiers of Jehovah, and the guards of his Temple. The stations that were guarded were not all occupied by the same number—some being guarded by six, some by four, and others by two persons only. They were relieved every Sabbath-day by others who took their places (2 Kings xi, 5; 1 Chron. ix, 17–29; xvi, 42; 2 Chron. viii, 14; xxiii, 4; xxxi, 14; xxxv, 15). Their service was required by night as well as by day, and a man called "the Man of the Mountain of the House" went round every night to see that all were in their places, and that none of them slept. If he found any one asleep he struck him, and had liberty to burn his clothes. To this Lightfoot thinks there is a reference in Rev. xv, 16: "Blessed is he that watcheth and keepeth his garments" (*Temple Service*, c. vii, § 1). See TEMPLE.

Porter, David, D.D., a Congregational minister of some note, was a native of Hebron, Conn., where he was born May 27, 1761. He was educated at Dartmouth College, class of 1784, and, having been duly ordained, became pastor of the Congregational Church at Spencertown, N. Y., in 1787. In 1803 he removed to Catskill, N. Y., as pastor of the Presbyterian Church, and retained his relation to this Church until 1831. He died in that

place Jan. 7, 1851. He served nearly a year in the Revolutionary army. He published *Dissertation on Baptism* (1809), and some *Sermons*. He was, after his dissolution of the pastorate, the agent of several benevolent societies, member of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, and, though eccentric, a man of great influence. See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, iii, 496–506.

Porter, Ebenezer, D.D., an eminent Congregational minister, was born Oct. 5, 1772, in Cornwall, Conn. After graduating at Dartmouth College in 1792, he taught school some months; then studied divinity, and entered the ministry in 1794, and was ordained pastor at Washington, Conn., Sept. 6, 1796, where he remained until April 1, 1812, when, his health becoming impaired, he removed to Andover to take the Bartlet professorship of pulpit eloquence in the theological seminary. In 1817 he was chosen professor of divinity in Yale College, but did not accept, and during the same year refused successively the presidency of Hamilton College, of Middlebury College, and of the University of Georgia. In 1827 he was made president of the seminary, and held that office until his death, April 8, 1834. As a theological instructor, Dr. Porter had few equals. He was remarkably well endowed for the training of young men intended for the holy ministry. Thus Dr. Dewey writes: "A friend of mine attended service in the (Andover) seminary one morning some years after I left it, and heard one of Dr. Porter's grand discourses; and, as the audience was leaving the chapel, professor Stuart in his deep tone said, 'This is the majesty of the Gospel.' It was indeed the majesty of the Gospel!" Dr. Porter published, *The Young Preacher's Manual* (1819; 2d ed. 1829):—*A Lecture on the Analysis of Vocal Inflections* (1824):— *An Analysis of the Principles of Rhetorical Delivery as applied in Reading and Speaking* (1827):— *The Rhetorical Reader* (1831):— *Lectures on Revivals of Religion* (1832):—*A Lecture on the Cultivation of Spiritual Habits and Progress in Study* (1833): —*Lectures on Homiletics, Preaching, and Public Prayer* (1834):— and a large number of occasional *Sermons*. Since his death *The Biblical Reader* and *Lectures on Eloquence and Style* have also been published. Dr. Porter was a contributor to the *Quarterly Register*, and the translator of many sacred German poems. See notices of this excellent man and eloquent preacher in Sprague, *Annals of the American Pulpit*, ii, 351; Rev. Lyman Matthews, *Memoir of E. Porter, D.D.* (Boston, 1837, 12mo); *Amer. Quar. Reg.* ix, 1; *Christ. Month. Spec.* i, 79; *Lit. and Theolog. Rev.* v, 401 (by W. Lord); *Meth. Rev.* iii, 191; Ware, *Biogr. of Unitarians*, vol. i. (J. H. W.)

Porter, Eliphalet, D.D., a Congregational minister of Unitarian tendency, was born at North Bridgewater, Mass., June 11, 1758. He was educated at Harvard University, class of 1779, and, after studying theology with his father, Rev. John Porter, minister of North Bridgewater from 1740 till 1802, he was ordained Oct. 2, 1782, over the Congregational Society of Roxbury, and there continued fifty-one years. In 1830 the Rev. George Putnam was settled with him as colleague. He died in that place Dec. 7, 1833. He was a member of the Academy of Arts and Sciences. He published a *Eulogy of Washington* (1800), and nine single *Sermons*. See Sprague, *Annals of the American Pulpit*, viii, 157.

Porter, George D., a Presbyterian minister, was born in Juniata Co., Pa., March 1, 1805. He was educated for the medical profession, but subsequently felt called to the ministry. He graduated at the Western Theological Seminary at Alleghany, Pa., was licensed in 1832, and for a time preached in Monongahela City, Pa., but afterwards removed to Newburg and Roxbury, Pa., and was ordained by Huntingdon Presbytery in Nov., 1833. When the questions which led to the disruption of the Church came up, he took a lively interest in the controversy, having a fondness for discussion. He subsequently became pastor of Centre and Upper Millerstown churches; in 1851 he removed to the West, and engaged in the great missionary work there, locating at Tipton, Iowa, which, together with the Church at Red Oak, adjoining, constituted his charge for nearly eight years. From this he moved to Crow Meadow Church, Ill., where he labored for four years, after which he returned to his former home in Tipton. For two years he now gave attention to his farm, and preached as an occasional supply; and in 1866 he arranged to supply statedly the churches of Blairstown and West Irving, where he labored more than his strength would justify, and died Dec. 17, 1867. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1868, p. 133. (J. L. S.)

Porter, Huntington, D. D., a Presbyterian minister of some note, was born in 1755, and was educated at Yale College. After having completed his theological studies, he was made minister at Rye, New Hampshire, from which place he removed to Lynn, Mass., where he died in 1844. He published, *Century*, a sermon (1802):—*Funeral*, a sermon:—*New-Year*, a sermon:—*Sickness*, a sermon (1803).

Porter, James C., a Presbyterian minister, was born in Abbeville District, S. C., in 1809. He was educated in Jefferson College, Canonsburg, Pa., studied theology for some time with his father, and then finished his course in the Alleghany Associate Reformed Seminary. In 1834 he was licensed, and in 1835 was ordained and installed by Ohio First Associate Reformed Presbytery as pastor of the Church at Piqua, Ohio. In 1841 he removed to Illinois, and took charge of the congregations of Cedar and Pope Creek, in Mercer Co., Ill.; in 1850 he surrendered his charge of the congregation of Pope Creek, and his labors were confined to the congregation of Cedar Creek till the year 1862, when he resigned on account of ill-health. He died Nov. 15, 1863. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1866, p. 278. (J. L. S.)

Porter, John, a Congregational minister, father of Dr. Eliphalet Porter, was born about 1716, and was educated at Yale College. He was first minister of North Bridgewater, Mass., until his death, in 1802. He published, *Sermon* (ordination of S. Brett):—*Sermon on Justification* (1794):—*Reply to Mr. Bryant's Remarks on Sermon on Justification* (1751).

Porter, Lemuel, D.D., a Baptist minister, was born at Boston, Mass., May 1, 1809. His ministry extended over a period of thirty years, and included a long and successful pastorate at Lowell, Mass., and subsequently at Pittsfield, in the same state. He was a man of fine culture, an excellent preacher, and the author of several religious works. A short time previous to his death he was appointed associate secretary of the Western Department of the American Tract Society, and during the brief period which he served in that capacity won the esteem of all with whom he was brought in contact. He died at Chicago, Ill., Oct. 17, 1864. See Appleton's *Am. Cyclop.* iv, 620.

Porter, Nathaniel (1), D.D., a Congregational minister, was born Jan. 14, 1745, at Topsfield, Mass. He graduated at Harvard College in 1768, and was ordained pastor in New Durham, N. H., Sept. 8, 1773. In 1776 he was chaplain to Col. J. Wingate's regiment, in which he served six months. Leaving Durham on account of inadequate support, he became pastor in Conway Oct. 20, 1778, which charge he gave up in 1814, and died Nov. 11, 1837. He published *An Address at the Opening of an Academy at Fryeburg* (1806), and a few occasional *Sermons*. See Sprague, *Annals of the American Pulpit*, ii, 53.

Porter, Nathaniel (2), a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Worcester, Mass., A.D. 1800. He studied at the Wesleyan Seminary in New York, and in 1823 was admitted to the New York An-

nual Conference, from which time till his death, in 1832, he labored in that and other fields, chiefly in the Middle States. For two years of this time he was principal of the academy at Cazenovia, giving great satisfaction. Mr. Porter was an excellent preacher, and a zealous and consistent Christian. See *Minutes of Conferences*, ii, 161.

Porter, Samuel, a Presbyterian minister, was born in Ireland in 1760, came to this country in 1790, and accepted a pastorate at Poke Run in 1790, and in 1798 at Congruity, Pennsylvania. He published several *Sermons* (1793, 1805, 1811), which were reprinted with two Dialogues in 1853, with a biographical sketch of the author by Rev. David Elliott, D.D. He was also contributor to several periodicals. See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, iii, 539–550.

Porter, Thomas, an English dissenting divine, flourished in the second half of the last century. Scarcely anything is known of his personal history. He published, *A Defence of Unitarianism; intended as an Answer to Dr. Hawker on his Reply* (1793, 8vo):—*Serious Thoughts on the Birth of a Child* (1805).

Porter, Walter, an English musician of some note, flourished in the first half of the 17th century as gentleman of the Chapel Royal of Charles I, and master of the choristers of Westminster. He was killed during the civil war. He published, *Madrigals and Aires* (Lond. 1632):—*Aires and Madrigals* (1639).

Porter, William Henry, an American divine of some note, was born at Rye, New Hampshire, in 1817, and was educated at Yale College, class of 1841. After having studied theology he became pastor of the Presbyterian Church at Litchfield, N. J., in 1845. In 1851 he united with the Swedenborgians, and took a pastorate at Boston, Mass. He died at Roxbury, Mass., in 1861. He published, *Common and Scriptural Proverbs Compared* (Bost. 1845, 12mo):—*The Heavenly Union, or New Jerusalem on Earth* (1850, 12mo).

Portesse, Portasse, Porteus, or **Portiforium,** are technical terms applied to the *Breviary*, or a *portable* book of prayer used in the Church of Rome, and containing the mass and the other parts of the Church service to be said through the year at canonical hours, with the exception of the marriage service. The terms are derived from the Latin *portiforium* (a *portando foras*), through the French *porté-hors*, hence *portasse, portas.* The foreign breviaries were divided according to the four seasons, but in England into winter and summer parts.

Porteus, Beilby, an eminent English prelate, was born at York in 1731. He passed several years at a small school in his native city, and at the age of thirteen was sent to a school at Ripon, and entered at an earlier age than usual Cambridge University, where he was admitted a sizar of Christ's College. His personal worth, united with his superior attainments, both classical and mathematical, soon procured for him a fellowship in his college, and by the exertions of his friends he was made esquire-beadle of the university. This office he did not long retain, but chose rather to give his undivided attention to private pupils. In 1757, at the age of twenty-six, he was ordained deacon, and soon after priest; and only a little while later was appointed lecturer at Whitehall. He first became known as a writer by obtaining Seaton's prize for the best English poem on a sacred subject. On this occasion the topic was "Death," and the production of Mr. Porteus was universally regarded as one of great merit. In 1761 his fame was still further increased by a sermon which he preached before his alma mater on the character of David, king of Israel. Archbishop Secker was so much pleased with Porteus that he made him in 1762 his chaplain. Porteus's first preferments were two small livings in Kent, which he held a while and then took the rectory of Hunton in the same county. Hunton was his favorite residence. He delighted in the quiet of that rural retirement, and still more in exercising the duties of the ministry among its simple and attached people. He was most indefatigable in performing all the duties of the parish—preached in some district of it daily; and by his pastoral visits to the poor, as well as to the rich, secured the affections and esteem of all his parishioners. His high character for propriety and talents brought him into general notice, and he was soon appointed prebendary of Peterborough, and not long afterwards, in 1767, he became rector of Lambeth. In the same year he took the degree of D.D. at Cambridge, and in 1769 was made chaplain to king George III, and master of the hospital of St. Cross, near Winchester. In 1773 Dr. Porteus, with a few other clergymen, joined in an unavailing application to the bishops, requesting that they would review the Liturgy and Articles for the purpose of making some slight alterations. In 1776 Dr. Porteus, without any solicitation on his part, was made bishop of Chester; and in 1787, on the death of bishop Lowth, he was promoted to the diocese of London, over which he presided till his death. This appointment, with the new duties to which it called his attention, put a temporary stop to the immediate prosecution of several important undertakings he had contemplated; but they were resumed shortly after. The first of these was the publication of his excellent *Summary of the Principal Evidences of the Truth and Divine Origin of the Christian Revelation*, designed chiefly for the instruction of young persons. Besides, as a member of the Legislature, he pursued a long-formed plan for improving the condition of the negro slaves in the West Indian islands, and particularly for their instruction in religious knowledge. He was for many years one of the vice-presidents of the British and Foreign Bible Society, and took a lively interest, as well as an active part, in the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. In short, his public influence, as well as private patronage, were constantly exerted in devising or supporting measures for the diffusion of pure and undefiled religion. In 1798 he began a course of lectures on St. Matthew's Gospel, which he delivered at St. James's Church on the Fridays in Lent. These lectures, which he afterwards published, have been perhaps the most popular of all his works. He died May 14, 1808. Though bishop Porteus cannot be called a profound scholar or divine, he was a man of considerable learning and ability; and he pursued through life a steady course of pious exertion for the benefit of his fellow-creatures, which procured him a high reputation among men of all parties. He was a prelate of liberal and enlarged views, one proof of which may be adduced in the fact that when a bill was introduced into Parliament for the relief of dissenting ministers and schoolmasters, he pronounced it "a measure no less consonant to the principles of sound policy than to the genuine spirit of the Gospel." He was in private life distinguished by a cheerful disposition, affable manners, great benevolence, and deep and unaffected piety. As a preacher, few in his day surpassed him either in eloquence or pathos. He is conspicuous for sound judgment, solid argument, great knowledge of the human heart, accurate observation of the world, an unshrinking reprobation of vice, the most persuasive exhortations to piety, and an unqualified avowal of all the essential, fundamental truths and doctrines of the Gospel. His works, consisting of sermons and tracts, with a *Life of Archbishop Secker*, and the poems and lectures already mentioned, were collected and published, with his *Life*, making another volume, by his nephew, the Rev. Robert Hodgson, afterwards dean of Carlisle (1811, 6 vols. 8vo, and often). There are a few letters, sermons, etc., not included in this collection (see Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliogr.* i, 2425). Besides Hodgson's *Life of Bishop Porteus* (also published separately, 1810, 8vo), see *Churchman's Magazine*, vol. viii; Jones, *Christian Biogr.* s. v.; Perry, *Ch. Hist. of Engl.* iii, 428, 476; Clissold, *Lamps of the Church*, p. 69 sq.; Chambers, *Cyclop. Engl.*

Lit. ii, 654; *Lond. Quar. Review*, March, 1812, p. 34–38; *British Critic*, 1811; *North American Review*, x, 41, 396; Mathias, *Pursuits of Literature* (ed. 1812), p. 270 sq.

Tomb of Bishop Porteus, at Tunbridge, Kent.

Porthaise, JEAN, a French Franciscan monk of the 16th century, noted for his decided polemics against Protestantism, was born at Saint-Denis-de-Gatines, near the beginning of that æra. In 1564 we find him in the monastery of Sables d'Olonne, where he probably made his profession. He was more than once conspicuous by the vehemence of his speeches and the extravagance of his conduct. A certain Jean Trioche, minister of the Reformed Church at Châteauneuf, near Sablé, in Anjou, had distinguished himself by his preaching. Porthaise, as soon as informed of it, went to a place where he might meet his adversary; but Jean Trioche failed to put in an appearance. Porthaise forthwith drew up a list of questions, to which he requested the Calvinist minister to reply. The answers came two months afterwards. Porthaise's rejoinder to these declarations of his adversary are extant. Attached to the Church of Tours in 1566, Porthaise was meditating a great enterprise; it was nothing less than an assault upon heresy in the very stronghold of its power. For this purpose he repaired to the Netherlands, and hurled from several pulpits the most virulent imprecations against the doctrines and practices of the ministers. But his success was not equal to his courage; he returned to Tours in 1568. His enemies quoted this amusing passage from one of his sermons. "We hear with sorrow that there are people abandoned enough to commit adultery while they have in their houses wives so good-looking that we, for our part, should be quite contented with them." In 1582 a difference arose between the general of the Franciscans and the monks of the monastery of Paris on account of the election of the brother guardian. Porthaise had been appointed by the general to preside at this election; but his powers had been recognised neither by the king nor by the superior of the monastery; thus, in the absence of the commissary-president, the monks chose a certain T. Duret. The nuncio of the pope expressed his dissatisfaction, but the Parliament supported the Franciscans of Paris. Their superior was suspended. At last the general of the order came to Paris to conclude a compromise. But Porthaise continued in his violent protestations. He was summoned before Parliament, but did not appear. Summoned a second time, he appeared, only to inveigh against the court. He was ordered to leave Paris. Nevertheless he was in the ensuing year elected provincial of his order. In 1594 he was theological instructor at Poitiers. He mixed in the disorders of the League, which conduct he expiated subsequently by public penance. After the rendition of Paris he went to Saumur, solicited from Duplessis-Mornay the pardon of his past errors, and obtained permission to celebrate in the church of St. Peter the virtues of the king against whom he had uttered such violent imprecations. He left, *Les Catholiques, Démonstrations sur certains Discours de la Doctrine ecclésiastique* (Paris, 1567, 8vo):—*De Verbis Domini: "Hoc facite in meam commemorationem"* (Antwerp, 1567, 8vo), a pamphlet on the Lord's Supper:—*Chrétienne Déclaration de l'Église et de l'Eucharistie* (ibid. 1567, 8vo):—*De la Vanité et Vérité de la vraie et fausse Astrologie contre les Abuseurs de notre Siècle* (Poitiers, 1578):—*Défense à la Réponse faite aux Interdits de Bernard de Pardieu par les Ministres de la Religion prétendue réformée* (ibid. 8vo):—*De l'Imitation de l'Eucharistie* (ibid. 1602, 8vo):—*Parasève générale à l'exact Examen de l'Institution de l'Eucharistie* (ibid. 1602, 8vo):—*Traité de l'Image et de l'Idole* (ibid. 1608). See Wadding, *Script. ord. Minorum; Scaligerana* (2d ed.), p. 192; Liron, *Singularités hist. et littér.* iii, 84; Desportes, *Bibliogr. du Maine;* Haureau, *Hist. litt. du Maine,* i, 306.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale,* s. v.

Portico is an architectural term designating a range of columns in the front of a building. When of four columns it is called *tetrastyle;* when of six, *hexastyle;* of eight, *octostyle;* of ten, *decastyle.* The Latin *porticus,* however, from which the Italian *portico* and the French *portique* are derived, has a more extended signification in mediæval writers; comprehending, in fact, every kind of covered ambulatory of which one or more sides are opened to the air, by rows of columns or arches, whether it be attached to the front of a building or to its sides, or to the inner sides of an area, so as to form a cloister in the strict sense of the word. In an ancient church the porticos were the cloisters about the area, otherwise called the exterior *narthex* (q. v.), and the place of the mourners. See PORCH.

Temple of Vesta, Tivoli.

Portier, MICHAEL, D.D., an American Roman Catholic prelate, was born near the opening of our century, and was of French descent. He was educated in this country and at the Propaganda at Rome, and was consecrated to the priesthood Nov. 5, 1826. After holding various ecclesiastical appointments, he was made bishop of Mobile. He died May 14, 1859. As an ecclesiastic he was greatly beloved by his own denomination, and as a citizen he was highly respected by all classes. He was more tolerant towards those who differed from him in religious belief than is apt to be the case among Romanists.

Portiforium, otherwise called the *Pie* (q. v.), is a

book of rubrical directions to instruct the clergy as to the due performance of divine service and the administration of the sacraments. Sometimes, however, the word is used to signify a *Breviary*. This was made the title of the Breviary in England as soon as the latter title was used abroad. See Proctor, *Comment. on Book of Common Prayer*, p. 11. See PORTESSE.

Portio Canonĭca is an ecclesiastic term applied to different things: (1) the share which falls to the members of a congregation in the daily distributions in money or in kind; (2) the funeral tax (*quota funeralis*, or *mortuarium*) which, at the death of an ecclesiastic in office, must be paid to the bishop; finally (3), the casualty paid to the curate for the funeral service of a parishioner. If the funeral has not taken place in the parochial church, part of the profit which by it has accrued to the church chosen by the deceased must be paid to the parochial church. This also is called *portio canonica* or *quarta funeraria*.

Portio Congrŭa, the name given in the canon law to the suitable salary which was anciently allotted to the priest or minister of a parish.

Portion (חֵלֶק, *chélek*). In addition to the sense of dividing or allotting, this word is used in reference to a custom still prevalent among princes and rich people in the East, not only to invite their friends to feasts, but to send a portion of the banquet to those that cannot well come to it, especially their relations and those in a state of mourning. This sending of portions to those for whom nothing was prepared is alluded to in Neh. viii, 10, where it is said, "Go your way, eat the fat and drink the sweet, and send portions unto them for whom nothing is prepared, for this day is holy unto our Lord: neither be ye sorry; for the joy of the Lord is your strength." The historian is here describing a national festival where every one was supposed to be equally concerned; those then for whom nothing was prepared, it would seem, means those that were in a state of mourning; mourning for private calamities being here supposed to take the place of rejoicing for public concerns. But it is not only to those that are in a state of mourning that provisions are sometimes sent; others are honored by princes in the same manner who could not conveniently attend the royal table, or to whom it was supposed not to be convenient. M. D'Arvieux mentions that in Syria, when the grand emir of the Druses, with whom he resided, found it incommoded him to eat with him, he politely desired him to take his own time for eating, sending him what he liked from his kitchen, and at the time he chose. Thus David it may be presumed did to Uriah, for it is recorded "there followed him a mess of meat from the king" (2 Sam. xi, 8, 10). We likewise read in the book of Esther (ix, 19): "Therefore the Jews of the villages, that dwelt in the unwalled towns, made the fourteenth day of the month Adar a day of gladness and feasting, and a good day, and of sending portions to one another." See INHERITANCE.

Portion (PAROCHIAL) is the mediety of a parish which was divided into several vicarages or parsonages.

Portionist, a term employed to designate a beneficed person in a cathedral who received only half or a moiety of his prebend, called in France a *demiprebendary*, and in Spain a *rationero*. *Bursarius*, in Scottish universities, and the German *Bursch* were portions of money given to poor students, while the Cambridge pensioner lives at his own cost.

Portiuncula, THE INDULGENCE OF. In the vicinity of Assisi there stood a little church Nostra Signora degli Angeli, called also Portiuncula, which St. Francis, after his conversion, repaired, and soon afterwards received as a present for himself and his congregation, at the hands of the benedictine abbot of the Monastery of Monte-Subazio. A legend widely spread in the 14th century says that in this little church, the cradle of the Franciscan Order, Christ himself granted to the saint his prayer for plenary indulgence for all those who, after partaking worthily of the sacraments of penance and of the altar, should visit Portiuncula. Christ made it a condition of his absolution that the consent of him to whom he had committed the power of binding and unbinding should also be obtained. Honorius III, who was then at Perugia, was willing to grant one or a few years, but demurred at the request of a plenary indulgence, inasmuch as the practice of the Roman see did not warrant such a thing. But as soon as the pope was informed that the saint was speaking in the Saviour's own name, he thrice exclaimed, "Thy will be done!" The cardinals did not approve of the pope's decision, as this indulgence, which could be gained so easily, would put a check to the ultramontane pilgrimages and to the crusades, the only means by which, up to that time, a plenary indulgence could be obtained. Honorius, being made sensible of these dangers, compromised matters by making it a condition of the obtention of plenary indulgence that the visit to Portiuncula be made from the evening of August 1st to the evening of the 2d. At this decision of the pope Francis bowed his head in humility, and was about to leave the room, when the pope called him back, saying, "Foolish man, whither art thou going? what security hast thou for that which has just been granted to thee?" Whereupon the saint replied, "Your word, holy father, is enough for me. Let Jesus Christ be the notary, the Virgin Mary the deed, and the angels the witnesses; I need no other document." Some writers deem it a most doubtful matter that pope Honorius, contrary to the pontifical practice, which was not to grant indulgences for more than a few years, should have so liberally dealt with St. Francis, especially as no bull to that effect can be shown. But the testimonies of the 13th and 14th centuries in corroboration of the historical nucleus of the legend are too numerous to allow of any doubt. The Portiuncular indulgence was, besides, acknowledged not only by the popes of the 14th, but also by those of the 13th century; for instance, Alexander IV (1254–61) and others. Pope Innocent XII, in 1695, extended the indulgence to all days of the year. Besides, inasmuch as many Roman Catholics could not afford to visit Portiuncula, the popes extended said indulgence (obtainable from the 1st to the 2d of Aug.) to all the churches of the Franciscans and Capuchins. In our time the Portiuncular indulgence can be obtained in some countries on the first Sunday of August, not only in the Franciscan, but in all churches where Catholic worship is held regularly on Sundays and holidays.

Port-Royal, RECLUSES OF, occupy a most important position in the ecclesiastical and literary history of France, especially in the 17th century, and are largely identified with the Jansenistic controversy.

Port-Royal (*Porrigium*, *Portus Regis*, *Porreal*) lay in the vicinity of the hamlet of Chevreuse, three leagues from Versailles, and six from Paris. Here occurred a memorable reproduction of the austerities of the Thebaid and the ascetic labors of Lérins. The monastery of Port-Royal des Champs, an abbey of the Order of Cîteaux, was founded in 1204 by Matilda, wife of Matthew I of Montmorency-Marly, during her husband's absence in the fourth crusade. It lay on the left of the high-road from Rambouillet to Chartres, in a damp, low spot, which had once been called, from its natural features, Porrois (from *Porra* or *Borra*, dog-Latin for a woody valley with stagnant water: *cavus dumetis plenus ubi stagnat aqua*). Abandoned for a long time to the *far niente* existence of ordinary convents, it fell at length, in the beginning of the 17th century (1608), under the direction of the family of Arnauld. Angélique Arnauld was, through family interest, appointed abbess when only seventeen and a half years old (some declared that she was only eleven, and that her relatives falsely stated her age). Touched by grace as she grew to womanhood, she undertook the reform of the convent. Her

mother, five of her sisters, and six nieces became her spiritual children. Mère Angélique's change to such pious devotion is said to have been occasioned by a sermon on the death of Christ which was preached by a wandering Capuchin friar, father Basil, who had learned the truth of the Gospel of Christ, and had resolved formally to quit the communion of Rome, and, in passing the convent of Port-Royal while on his journey to the Protestant countries of the North, had secured permission to address the nuns. With love and kindness, but with unyielding firmness and great wisdom, the converted young woman restored the rule of the order in all its severity—as the strict observance of religious poverty, abstinence from meat, complete seclusion, and the most severe ascetic exercises. The abbey of Port-Royal des Champs had been erected for but a small number of nuns; in consequence, however, of the celebrity which it attained through the reforms and guidance of Mère Angélique, the number increased greatly, so that, instead of twelve, there were more than eighty; and thus the buildings of the abbey became overcrowded and unhealthy. In 1626 it was found necessary to make additional provisions. A house was purchased in Paris in the Faubourg St. Jacques (in great part at the expense of the Arnauld family), to which the nuns removed. This their new abode was called *Port-Royal de Paris*. In 1633 more spacious quarters were secured in the Rue de Boulai, near the Rue Coquillière, where they also owned a church, which was dedicated with great solemnity by the archbishop of Paris.

In 1223 the pope had conferred on the convent the right of affording an asylum to such lay personages as, being disgusted with the world, and being their own masters, should wish to live in monastic seclusion without binding themselves by permanent monastic vows. This privilege had not availed the Port-Royalists much until now. But the gradual transformation of Mère Angélique, under the influence of St. Francis de Sales, with whom she had been brought in contact, and who led her to accept the doctrine of perfection in the form of the possibility of a complete transformation of the human heart even before death, had become so manifest in her influence over her nuns and the severity they reached, that, inspired by this example, a number of learned and pious men, desirous of living in religious retirement, sought in 1638 the privilege of occupying the deserted establishment of Port-Royal des Champs. The leader of this new movement was the inflexible St. Cyran, who had been first an examiner and later the spiritual director of the nuns of Port-Royal. See Duvergier de Hauranne. He was a Jansenist, and a most intimate friend of the founder of these doctrines, and as the head of this new lay community instituted the new opinions and made Port-Royal des Champs the home of Jansenism in France. A whole colony of illustrious penitents joined him: the three brothers of La Mère Angélique; her nephew, the celebrated advocate La Maître, and his brothers Séricourt and De Sacy; Pierre Nicole; Claude Lancelot, the grammarian; Tillemont, the historian; Pascal, the philosopher; Racine, the poet, and Antoine Arnauld (q. v.), the "great Arnauld," the youngest brother of the abbess, the learned and impetuous Doctor of the Sorbonne, whose condemnation by that body occasioned Pascal's *Provençals*.

This religious movement of the 17th century in France is as remarkable as the philosophical for which that æra is noted. Jansenists and Jesuits undertook the re-establishment of that spiritual power which had suffered from the attacks of philosophy; but between these two parties there was bitter strife. Port-Royal had now become the headquarters of Jansenism, which has been called "Calvinistic Catholicism." The attempt of the Port-Royalists at reconstruction embraced exactly those parts of mediæval religion which the Jesuits had neglected. Wholly abandoning what the Jesuits had taken hold of—the social and political side of Catholicism—they clung to its personal, mystical, and ascetic side. They did not quarrel with the Church; they desired to remain Catholic in spite of the pope, believing in the priesthood and the sacraments. They arrived at a metaphysical and moral reform, and pointed to St. Paul and St. Augustine as their inspirers. The Jesuits adopted directly antagonistic views on grace and predestination, and proclaimed the opinions of the Spaniard Molina, who had undertaken, in his *De Concordia Gratiæ et Liberi Arbitrii*, to reconcile free-will and predestination. The solitaires of Port-Royal now became the Jansenists of France, insisted upon predestination, and taught that good works were without merit; that grace alone, arbitrarily given or refused, made saints—a Christianity as terrible as the Fate of the ancients. They pursued human nature, corrupted by the fall, with an implacable hatred, and the logical conclusion of such a doctrine was the salvation of the few—i. e. the Church of Jansenism became an aristocracy of grace. See Jansenism. However much we may find in Jansenism to take exception to, the men who espoused its doctrines were actuated by the noblest of motives, and deserved success in their undertaking, which aimed principally at the freedom of France from the trammels of the papal devotees—the Jesuits—and the spread of practical piety among the French people.

The Jesuits, who were prominent at this time in the Church of France, and effectually controlled the court, obtained under the ministry of Richelieu, and especially of Mazarin, repeated condemnatory acts against the teachings of the Jansenists in general, and the Port-Royalists especially. Persecution, however, only stimulated the growth of the new opinions. Duvergier, a Port-Royalist, was thrown into prison, and kept there until the death of Richelieu, in 1642. But the very time of his liberation was marked by a most noteworthy production. Antoine Arnauld, better known as "Le grand Arnauld," then wrote his *Frequent Communion*, the first work of that scientific school of religious philosophy of which Port-Royal was the focus and Pascal the principal exponent. Indeed, the best claim which the community of Port-Royal has upon our notice is this literary war which it waged against the scholastic theology, and against the Jesuits in particular. The Society of Jesus had, ever be it said to its credit, devoted itself to the education of youth: but whatever danger there was in their general teaching was thus intensified in the eyes of those who distrusted them. Port-Royal determined to meet them on this ground, by establishing schools and by issuing text-books of their own. The grammar, logic, and rhetoric of Port-Royal—the first by Arnauld, the second by Nicole—were the fruits of this resolve. They set themselves also, and not unsuccessfully, to countermine the power of the Jesuits in the confessional; for the integrity and piety which characterized the Port-Royalists caused them to be much sought after as confessors. They discovered and maintained the famous distinction of *fait* and *droit* in respect to papal infallibility. As to doctrine, the pope could not err; as to facts he might. See Gallicanism; Infallibility. When required, they were willing to condemn, as doctrines, the five propositions which were said to comprise the Jansenistic heresy; but they denied that these conclusions were to be found in or inferred from Jansen's *Augustinus*. No papal bulls or persecution could make them recede from this position. In their maintenance of Jansen's real doctrines, in their refusal to acknowledge papal infallibility as to facts, in their continual warfare against the Jesuits, they were exposed to constant persecution. For the Jesuits were not inert in the face of this opposition and defiance. They plotted incessantly at Rome, in order to bring the thunders of the Holy See to bear upon the over-bold Jansenists.

The persecution brought about a result the Jesuits hardly anticipated. Blaise Pascal was induced to step into the arena in defence of the Port-Royalists. One of the most independent minds of his age, Pascal had

never yet up to this point submitted himself to the actual guidance of Jansen, any more than he had frankly accepted the logical consequences of the discoveries of Descartes. He had felt the force of both these powerful influences; but a third feeling had exerted authority over his unwilling mind: he had been swayed by the sceptical influence of Montaigne. As a sort of refuge from the yawning abyss which had thus threatened to drown him, this stanch and devotional spirit threw him, as by a sudden and irresistible impulse, into the arms of the Jansenists, and he became a recluse at Port-Royal, and its champion against the world. See PASCAL.

In the meantime the number of nuns and novices of Port-Royal de Paris having greatly increased, the abbess Angélique Arnauld determined in 1648 to transfer part of them to Port-Royal des Champs. The school of Port-Royal was therefore removed from the latter place to Paris, Rue St. Dominique, Faubourg St. Jacques, but after three years the teachers were restored to Port-Royal des Champs, where they no longer occupied the monastic building, but a farm-house, called Les Granges, on the neighboring hill. In 1653, pope Innocent I having condemned five propositions in the book of Jansenius, Arnauld wrote to prove that these propositions did not exist in the book of Jansenius, at least not in the sense attributed to them. Upon this Arnauld was accused of Jansenism. The nuns of Port-Royal, with their abbess Angélique, having refused to sign the formulary acknowledging that the five alleged heretical propositions were contained in the work of Jansenius, preparations were begun by the Jesuits for scattering the community of Port-Royal, and placing them in close captivity, so as to bring them to submission. It seemed a strange spectacle that a body of women, and a few others who agreed with them in sentiment, should withstand the power of the decrees of Rome and all the pertinacity of the Jesuits in carrying out those decrees. On March 30, 1656, two months after the condemnation of Dr. Arnauld, the civil authorities proceeded to carry out an order in council that every scholar, postulant, and novice should be removed from Port-Royal. But, for some unknown reasons, the execution was suddenly interrupted and delayed several years. It is said that Mazarin's unpleasant relations with the papacy were the principal cause of this sudden suspense of procedure against the recluses. In 1660 the king himself ordered the school to be broken up. The nuns still continuing refractory, Péréfixe, archbishop of Paris, sent a party of police-officers in 1664, who arrested the abbess, her niece Angélique Arnauld the Younger, or Angélique de St. Jean, the mistress of the novices, and other nuns, and distributed them among several monasteries, where they were kept in a state of confinement. See ARNAULD, ANGÉLIQUE.

Previously some of the nuns who had remained at Port-Royal de Paris intrigued with the government in order to become independent of Port-Royal des Champs, and Louis XIV appointed a separate abbess to Port-Royal de Paris. In 1669 a compromise was made between the pope and the defenders of Jansenius, which was called "the Peace of Clement IX." The nuns of Port-Royal des Champs with their own abbess were then restored to their convent, but Port-Royal de Paris was not restored to them: a division of property was effected between the two communities, by order of the king, which was confirmed by a bull of Clement X dated 1671. Each convent retained its own abbess. Several disputes took place between the two communities, in which the archbishop of Paris and the Jesuits took an active part. At last, in March, 1708, a bull of pope Clement XI suppressed the convent of Port-Royal des Champs, and gave the property to Port-Royal de Paris. In 1709 Le Tellier had obtained from king Louis XIV a decree for the execution of the papal bull, and D'Argenson, the lieutenant of police of Paris, was sent with a body of men to Port-Royal des Champs, and he removed from thence the nuns, who were distributed among several convents. The convent and church of Port-Royal des Champs were stripped of all their valuables, which were transferred to Port-Royal de Paris, and the former building was levelled with the ground, by order of Louis XIV, as a nest of Jansenists and heretics. The sacred relics of the Church were borne from the altar, the bodies disinterred from the cemetery, and every trace of the establishment destroyed, the very soil being abandoned to the plough.

Literature.—Besoigne, Racine (1767, 2 vols.), Clémencet, Du Fossé, Fontaine (Col. 1738, 2 vols.), and others have written of Port-Royal. Dr. Reuchlin has published one of the most elaborate treatises, entitled *Geschichte von Port-Royal* (Hamb. 1839–44, 2 vols.); and other and more recent works to be consulted are, Saint-Beuve, *Hist. de Port-Royal* (Paris, 1840–58, 4 vols.); Beard, *Port-Royal* (Lond. 1860, 2 vols.); Schimmelpenninck, *Memoirs of Port-Royal* (ibid. 1855). On Reuchlin's work, see Sir James Stephen, *Essays*, vol. i; Wilkens, *Port-Royal, oder der Jansenismus in Frankreich*, in the *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie*, 1859; *Meth. Quarterly*, 1855. See also Jervis, *Hist. Ch. of France* (Lond. 1872), vol. i and ii, and his *History of France* (Student's Edition), p. 469–472; Ranke, *Hist. of the Papacy*, ii, 251, 259; Tregelles, *Hist. of the Jansenists*, p. 11 sq. et al.; Martin, *Hist. of France* (age of Louis XIV); Bridges, *France under Richelieu and Colbert*, lect. iv; Villemain, *Discours et Mélanges Littéraires;* Voltaire, *Siècle de Louis XIV*, ch. xxxvi; Bridge, *Hist. of French Literature*, p. 172 sq.; Van Laun, *Hist. of French Literature* (see Index); *Lond. Quar. Rev.* Oct. 1871, p. 173; *Brit. Quar. Rev.* April, 1873, p. 284; *Edinb. Rev.* April, 1841; *Amer. Theol. Rev.* April, 1860, p. 162, 356.

Portugal, the most westerly kingdom of Europe, a part of the great Spanish peninsula, lies in 36° 55′–42° 8′ N. lat., and 6° 15′–9° 30′ W. long. Its greatest length from north to south is 368 miles, and its average breadth from east to west about 100 miles. The kingdom of Portugal proper is bounded by the Atlantic on the S. and W., and by Spain on the N. and E. Its distinctive subdivisions, with their several areas and populations, are given in the following table:

CONTINENTAL PORTUGAL.

Provinces.	Districts.	Area in Sq. Miles.	Pop., 1871.
MINHO,	Viana, Braga, Porto.	2807	971,001
TRAS OS MONTES,	Braganza, Villa-Real.	4288	365,833
BEIRA,	Aveiro, Coimbra, Viseu, Guarda, Castello-Branco.	9245	1,294,282
ESTREMADURA,	Leiria, Santarem, Lisbon.	6873	839,691
ALEMTEJO,	Portalegre, Evora, Beja.	9416	331,341
ALGARVE,	Faro.	1873	188,422
		34,502	3,990,570

The insular appendages of Portugal are—the Azores, 1996 square miles, pop. (1871) 258,933; Madeira, etc., 315 square miles, pop. (1871) 118,379. Total home territories, 36,813, and the population (1871), 4,367,882. The colonial possessions of Portugal are—in *Africa:* Cape Verd Islands, 1630.02 square miles; pop. 67,347. Senegambia, 35,437.50 square miles; pop. 8500. Islands of San-Thome and Principe, off Guinea, 448.56 square miles; pop. (1868) 19,295. Angola, Benguela, 200,602.50

square miles; pop. 2,000,000. Mozambique and dependencies, 283,500 square miles; pop. 300,000. In *Asia:* Goa, Salcete, 1440.6 square miles; pop. 474,234. Damao, Diu, 94.08 square miles; pop. 53,283. In the *Indian Archipelago*, 2877 square miles; pop. 850,300. In *China:* Macao, 11.76 square miles; pop. (1866) 100,000. Total of colonies, 526,041.48 square miles; pop. 3,872,959.

Christianity was established in this country at the same time as in Spain, from which it is only politically separated: it therefore had its share of the misfortunes which, at the time of the great barbarian invasions, under the Alans, Sueves, Westgoths, and afterwards under the Arabs, came over the Christian Church. The weight of these calamities was made a little lighter for Portugal by the circumstance that, partly through the influence of the Roman bishops Anacletus and Anicetus, partly through the decrees of Constantine, which made metropolitan seats of the chief cities of the provinces, the diocesan system had been developed at an early period. In the country now called Portugal, in the province Galicia, Bracara, now Braga, was the metropolis. We learn from Garcia Louisa, in his remarks on the Council of Luco, that the bishops of Astorica, Portucale (Porto), Colimbria (Coimbra), Egitania (Idanha), Eminium (Agueda, in Estremadura), Lameco (Lamego, on the Douro), Loco (Lugo, on the sources of the Minho), Tria (El Padron, in Galicia), Veseo (Viseu), Auria (Orense), Tude (Tuy), Magneto or Britonia (Mondonedo), and Dumio, near Braga, were suffragans of Bracara. At the Council of Luco, A.D. 569, a second metropolis was established at Luco, but it remained dependent on Bracara. Veseo, Colimbria, Egitania, Lameco, and Magneto were then suffragan seats of Bracara, and Tria, Auria, Tude, Astorica, and Britonia formed the ecclesiastical province of Luco: it ceased to exist when the domination of the Sueves, in 585, was overthrown by the Westgoths. In Lusitania, Merida, on the Guadiana, was the metropolis; the ecclesiastical province included Numantia, Pax Tulia, Ossonoba, Olysippo, Caurio, Avila, and Elbora. Calixtus II transferred the metropolitan dignity to the bishop of Compostella. In the 7th century some changes appear to have taken place. The beginning of the 8th century saw the downfall of the Westgothic empire, and the invasion of the Arabs, invited by the sons of the expelled king, and by their uncle, Oppas, archbishop of Hispalis, for the purpose of driving from the throne the newly elected king Roderick. The land between the Douro and the Pyrenees, a small portion of the peninsula, remained under Christian rule. Ferdinand II (1038–65) wrenched from the Arabs Lamego, Veseo, Coimbra, etc. Though the Arabs had allowed the inhabitants the free exercise of their religion, many of them passed over to Mohammedanism, and thus, by degrees, bishoprics and monasteries disappeared. Even Bracara lost her metropolitan dignity; and when, in 1083, Alphonso VI took Toledo, which under the Arabian rule had continued still during two centuries to be the residence of an archbishop, there was scarcely a Christian to be found in the city. In consideration of these circumstances, and with the consent of pope John VIII, Ovetum, in Galicia, was made a metropolis, including the bishoprics Anca, Legio, Astorica, Salmantica, Caurio, Coimbria, Lamego, Veseo, Portucale, Bracara, Tude, Auria, Tria, Luco, Britonia, and Cæsaraugusta. Oviedo was the city of the bishops *in partibus infidelium;* but the former suffragans of Taracona did not acknowledge the archbishop of Ovetum, but that of Narbonne as their metropolitan. The dignity of the metropolitan of Ovetum was extinguished when Alphonso VI took Toledo and Castile, the old ecclesiastical provinces of Toledo, Braga, and Tarragona being then established anew by Gregory VII and Urban II. The long time during which the Spanish peninsula had stood under Mohammedan rule, Christianity being obliterated everywhere, justified, in the ideas of those times, the measures taken by the Church for the purpose of securing the rule and purity of the Roman Catholic religion. The complete expulsion of Mohammedans and Jews seemed commanded by the circumstances, and it was executed with pitiless energy. In 1536 a tribunal of Inquisition was established in Lisbon, and special severity was displayed against the Jews accused of practicing their old worship under the garb of Christianity. They formed, under the name of New-Christians (q. v.), a suspicious class, and many of them, in 1506, had been victims to the hatred and prejudices of the multitude. The power of the Church increased rapidly, and with it the pride of some of the bishops, for there soon arose between the crown and the clergy difficulties greatly detrimental to the influence of the latter, as it gave occasion to the people to get an insight into and speak freely of its sad condition, as well as of that of the Roman court. By the laws of 1822–26 every naturalized foreigner was granted civil and political rights regardless of his religion; they authorized every kind of private worship, and prohibited every religious persecution. The Catholic clergy were treated with the greatest distrust, and their riches were seized upon to fill the treasure of the state. It was not until 1843 that the government was reconciled with the pope, and the wounds of the Roman Church were long in healing even after that. The Portuguese Church is (since 1741) under the special jurisdiction of a patriarch, who is always a cardinal, and who is, to some extent, independent of Rome. Portugal is divided into three dioceses, which are presided over by the cardinal-patriarch of Lisbon. His suffragan seats are Castello-Branco, Guarda, Lamego, Leiria, and Portalegre. There are several colonial bishops: at Madeira, the Azores, and other islands. Besides the patriarchate or archbishopric of Lisbon, there is the archbishopric of Braga, who is primate of the kingdom, and whose suffragan seats are Porto, Viseu, Coimbra, Bragança-Miranda, Aveiro, and Pinhel; and the archbishopric of Evora, with the bishoprics Elvas, Beja, and Algarve. The archbishops have the rank of a marquis, the bishops of a count. They all belong to the grandeza, or higher nobility. The bishops are appointed by the king, and confirmed by the pope. No bull can be published without the agreement of the king. The number of clergy holding cures is given at 18,000. The total number of parishes is 4086. The monasteries were dissolved in 1834, but a few religious establishments still exist. At the time of the dissolution Portugal was possessed of 360 monasteries, with 5760 monks, and 126 nunneries, with 2725 nuns.

There are six orders of knighthood, viz. the Order of Christ, founded in 1319; St. Benedict of Avis; the Tower and Sword, founded in 1459, and reorganized in 1808; Our Lady of Villa Viçosa, established in 1819; and the Order of St. John of Jerusalem, which was separated in 1802 from that of Malta. In addition to these, there is one civil-service order, founded in 1288. Portugal stands below the other countries of Europe in regard to education. There is one university at Coimbra; there are military, naval, trade, and navigation schools, and many classical and higher schools; and in 1861 there were 1788 public schools, with 79,172 pupils, uncontrolled by the Church. There is an Academy of Sciences and a School of Arts at Lisbon, the former of which has a library of 50,000 volumes. The other public libraries are the Central Library, with 300,000 volumes; various royal libraries, as that of Lisbon, with 86,000 badly preserved volumes and 8000 MSS.; that at the Necessidades Palace, with 28,000 volumes; and that at the Ajuda Palace, with 20,000 volumes; and the University Library at Coimbra, with 45,000 volumes. The administration of the management of general education is conducted by a superior council of education at Coimbra, under the supervision of the ministry of the Home Department. See Schäfer, *Gesch. von Portugal* (Hamb. 1836, 3 vols. 8vo); Schubert, *Handbuch der Staatenkunde von Europa*, i, 3 sq.; Busk, *Hist. of Portugal* (1831); Dunham, *Hist. of Portugal* (1832); Ander-

sen (H. C.), *In Spain, and a Visit to Portugal* (1870); *Chambers's Cyclop.* s. v.

Portuguese Version. The oldest known Portuguese version is that of the Psalms, which was published at Oxford in 1695, together with a translation of the English liturgy, under the title, *O Livro da Oraçaõ commune Administraçaõ dos Sacramentos e outros Ritos e Ceremonias da Igreja, conforme o Oso da Igreja de Inglaterra, iuxtamente com o Salterio ou Salmos de David* (Oxford, na estampa do Teatro, anno de Christo, 1695). This translation is said to be very defective. Next in chronological order is the New Testament, or *O Novo Testamento, istohe, todos os sacro sanctos Livros e Escritos evangelicos e apostolicos do novo Concerto de nosso Fiel Senhor Salvador e Redemptor Jesu Christo: traduzido em Portugues pelo Patre Joam Ferreira d'Almeida, Ministro Pregador do Sancto Evangelho. Com todas as Licenças necessarias* (em Amsterdam, por Joam Crellius, 1712, 8vo). Seven years later the first part of the Old Testament, or the Pentateuch, was published under the title, *Os cinco Livros de Moyses, chamados:* 1, *Genesis;* 2, *Exodo;* 3, *Levitico;* 4, *Numeros;* 5, *Deuteronomio* (con privilegio real; Tranquebar, em India Oriental, na costa del Coromandel, em a estampa da Real Missaon de Dennemark, No anno de 1719, 4to). Then followed: *O Livro dos Salmos de David, com toda diligentia traduzido de Texto original na Lingua Portugueza, conferido com as outras Translaçoens e em multos Passos declarado pelo Padre Benjamin Schultze, Missionario del Rey de Dinamarca e Ministro da Palavra de Deus* (Trangambar, em India Oriental, na costa de Coromandel, na estampa da Real Mission, No anno de 1721, 12mo); *Os doze Prophetas Menores, convem a saber, Hoseas, Joel, Amos, Obadias, Jonas, Micheas, Nahum, Habacuc, Sophonias, Haggeo, Zacharias, Malachias* (com toda diligentia traduzido na lingoa Portugueza, pelos Padres Missionarios de Trangambar. Trangambar, na officina da Real Missaon de Dinamarca, anno de 1732, 4to); and *Os Livros historicos do Velho Testamento, convem a saber, o Livro de Josue, o Livro dos Juizes, o Livro de Ruth, o primeiro Livro dos Reys, o segundo Livro dos Reys, o primeiro Livro das Chronicas, o segundo Livro das Chronicas, o Livro de Esdras, o Livro de Nehemias, o Livro de Esther, traduzido na Lingoa Portugueza, pelo Reverendo Padre Joam Ferreira d'Almeida, Ministro Pregador do Santo Evangelho na Cidade de Batavia* (revistos e conferidos com o texto original pelos Padres Missionarios de Trangambar. Trangambar, na officina da Real Missaon de Dinamarca, anno de 1738, 4to). In the preface to the historical books, which is dated April 21, 1738, we are told that the ministers of Batavia sent this translation of Joh. Ferreira d'Almeida to Tranquebar to have it printed there, which was done at the expense of the Dutch governor-general, Theodor van Cloon, and his widow, Antonia Adriana Lengele. The Pentateuch is not preceded by any introduction, but the translation is accompanied by notes. The same is the case with the historical books. The whole is preceded by a Latin preface, in which the translator says that his predecessors, the two missionaries Barthol. Ziegenbalg and Johann Ernst Gründler, translated the Pentateuch into Portuguese; but in continuing their work he did not follow the common order of the Biblical books, but rather preferred to translate first the Psalms, because, of all the books of the Old Testament, they are best adapted for public and private devotion. These are all the parts of the Bible which were translated and known in the 18th century. A revised edition of Almeida's Bible under the joint editorship of R. Holden and the Rev. R. C. Girdleston was issued in 1876 (see the "73d Report of the British and Foreign Bible Society" [Lond. 1877], p. 89 sq.). Complete editions of the Bible in the Portuguese language were published by the American and British and Foreign Bible societies. See Rosenmüller, *Handbuch der biblischen Literatur*, iv, 298 sq. (B. P.)

Portumnalia, a festival celebrated among the ancient Romans in honor of Portumnus, the god of harbors. It was kept on the seventeenth day before the kalends of September.

Portumnus (Lat. *portus*, "a harbor"), the deity supposed among the ancient Romans to preside over harbors. A temple was erected in honor of him at the port of the Tiber, and he was usually invoked by those who undertook voyages.

Posadas, Francisco, a Spanish monk and preacher, was born at Cordova in 1644. He entered the Dominican Order, and, after teaching theology and exegesis, devoted himself to preaching with the greatest success. He was often prompted by his zeal to preach in public places and wherever he chanced to be, and even old age could not abate his fervor in teaching the poor of the country. Nothing equalled his charity and love of the degraded. He refused on several occasions the honors of the episcopate. He died at Cordova Sept. 20, 1713. He was beatified in 1817 by Pius VII. He left some works of edification: *The Triumph of Chastity, against the Errors of Molinos:—Life of St. Dominic:—Sermons* (3 vols. 4to).—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.

Pöschel, Philipp F., a German Protestant divine, was born Sept. 23, 1769, at Ansbach. In 1797 he was minister at Bulenheim, and in 1817 city pastor in Augsburg, where he died, Feb. 6, 1838. He wrote, *Meine Mussestunden, oder Resultate meines Nachdenkens über die wichtigsten Gegenstände aus dem Gebiete der Religionswissenschaft* (Nuremb. 1804):—*Freimüthige Gedanken zur Beantwortung der Frage: wie kann einzig u. allein der gesunkenen Achtung der Religion u. ihrer Lehrer aufgeholfen werden?* (ibid. 1803):—*Wünsche u. Vorschläge zur kirchl. Verfassung in Baiern* (Augsb. 1823):—*Ideen über Staat u. Kirche, Kultus, Kirchenzucht u. Geistlichkeit*, etc. (Nuremb. 1816):—*Erhebungen des Herzens in Predigten* (Augsb. 1825, 1826, 2 parts):—*Predigten auf alle Feste des Jahres*, etc. (ibid. 1826). See Winer, *Handbuch der theolog. Literatur*, p. 954.

Pöschel, Thomas, a German religious enthusiast, was born March 2, 1769, at Höritz, in Bohemia. He entered the ministry, and was ordained Sept. 6, 1796. While he was vicar at Braunau he had to prepare for death the unfortunate bookseller Palm, and to accompany him to the place of execution (Aug. 26, 1806). This incident seems to have exercised a detrimental influence on his mind, so naturally inclined to mysticism. When, in 1809, Braunau passed from Austria to Bavaria, Pöschel was placed under the dependency of the bishop of Salzburg; and in 1815, when the city became Austrian again, he returned to the diocese of Linz. Soon afterwards his insane behavior caused him to be sent from Braunau to a country place called Ampfelwang. He now considered himself a martyr of the faith, and preached his "new revelation." Christ, he says, dwells in the hearts of such as are pure, and directs all their actions. To them appear God and the Virgin, and make them the recipients of their revelations. He who does not get purified incurs damnation, and deserves death, which alone can purify him. This doctrine must be obeyed even if it should exact the sacrifice of life itself, if the fruit of the new revelation is not to be lost and given to the Jews. For God has determined that the Jews shall be converted. Judaism and Christianity melted together into one general, catholic religion, the millennial kingdom is to commence when these events have taken place. The new doctrine found proselytes not only in Ampfelwang, but in the surrounding localities —Azbach, Unkenach, Gampern, Schäfling, etc. The Pöschelians affected great piety, prayed with deeply bowed heads, some stretched on the ground; they made uncommon use of all religious practices, as pilgrimages, fasting, communion, with or without previous confession, solemn invocations of the Virgin and the saints. But the tide of extravagance rose apace. Women

heard confessions and gave absolution. They are said to have committed most indecent acts in their assemblies. The ceremony of purification preceded the admission of new members: a kind of oil or a powder which the proselyte was made to swallow produced dreadful convulsions, while a crowd of maddened females performed a savage dance around the sufferer, to expel the devil, who had hitherto held possession of the new member. The escape of Napoleon from Elba strengthened the belief that he was the Antichrist, and that, as a consequence, the millennium was at hand. Disorderly tramps roamed about, prophesying and preaching, held themselves for chosen members of the kingdom of God, and resisted both the ecclesiastical and civil authorities. At last government took the matter in hand, nightly raids were made upon their assemblies, their doings were investigated, and Pöschel was put into custody at Salzburg. This intervention of the police did not appease the fanaticism of the sectarians, who were misled several times even to sanguinary excesses. A mother tried to torture her child to death, to honor the Lord; a father to kill his child in prison. The insanity of these people reached its pitch in the Holy Week of 1817. In the night that followed Palm Sunday it was resolved, in a meeting held near Ampfelwang, to offer a sacrifice to the Lord. A peasant, of the name of Haas, was to be the victim. His mother and an old man were dragged to the scene of the holocaust: the woman was killed with one stroke, while the man died only a few days afterwards of his wound, the ceremony becoming by this postponement devoid of effect. Haas prevailed on his adopted daughter, a girl of nineteen years, to give her life for him. The monsters killed her most cruelly, and are even said to have drunk her blood, as being the blood of Christ. The scene of these horrors was on the ensuing day occupied by the militia and the actors arrested, but only six of the leaders were kept in custody. The sect, which did not count over 126 members, thereafter disappeared rapidly. Pöschel, who had always condemned the horrors committed by his disciples, was transferred to Vienna, where, his insanity being clearly demonstrated, he was placed under severe ecclesiastical custody. He died in 1837. In a wider sense, the name of Pöschelians was for some time used to designate fanatics of Pöschel's and the Pöschelians' description. See Alzog, *Kirchengesch.* ii, 680; Giesebrecht, *Kirchengesch. der neuesten Zeit* (Bonn, 1855), p. 338 sq. (J. H. W.)

Pöschelians. See Pöschel.

Poseidon, the god who was considered among the ancient Greeks as presiding over the sea. He was the son of Chronos and Rhea, and had his palace at the bottom of the sea, where the monsters of the deep play around his dwelling. This deity was believed to be the author of storms, and to shake the earth with his trident or three-pronged spear. His wife was Amphitrite. When the universe was divided between the brothers, the sea was given to Poseidon. He was equal to Zeus in dignity, but not in power. He once conspired with Hera (Juno) and Athena (Minerva) to put Zeus in chains, but usually he was submissive to the more powerful god. He rides over the waves in a chariot drawn by horses with brazen hoofs and golden manes, and the sea becomes smooth at his appearance, while the monsters of the deep gambol and play around him. Herodotus affirms that the Greeks derived the worship of Poseidon from Libya; but, from whatever quarter it was received, it spread all over Greece and Southern Italy. It prevailed more especially in the Peloponnesus. The usual sacrifices offered to this god were black and white bulls, and also wild boars and rams. At Corinth horse and chariot races were held in his honor. The Panionia, or festival of all the Ionians, was celebrated also in honor of Poseidon. The Romans identified him with their own sea-god Neptune. Troy was called *Neptuna Pergama,* because Poseidon assisted Apollo to surround it with walls for king Laomedon, who refused to give them their promised reward, and Poseidon sent a sea-monster to ravage the country, which was killed by Hercules. He always hated the Trojans, and assisted the Greeks against them. He prevented the return of Ulysses, in revenge for his having blinded Polyphemus, the son of Poseidon. In art he is easily recognised by his attributes, which are the trident, horses, and dolphins. See Neptune.

Poseidonia, a festival celebrated annually among the ancient Greeks in honor of Poseidon. It was kept chiefly in the island of Ægina.

Poseidonius. See Posidonius.

Posen, a Polish province, that portion of ancient Poland which fell to Prussia in the partition of the kingdom, has an area of 11,260 square miles, and a population (close of 1871) of 1,583,684. The territory is divided into two departments, that of Posen and Bromberg, and its principal cities are, besides the respective capitals named after the departments, Gnesen, Lissa, and Inowraclow. The principal river is the Wartha, which is navigable, but the commerce of the province is very light. For education little has been done as yet. The Prussian government is determined to force German culture. There are six gymnasia, several normal and training schools, a seminary for the training of priests, and about two hundred burgher or national schools. Nearly half the population belong to the Roman Catholic Church, which is under the spiritual jurisdiction of the archbishop of Gnesen and Posen, while 74,000 of the remainder are Jews. The inhabitants may still be said to be Poles, more than 800,000 persons employing Polish as their mother-tongue.

Posen formed an integral part of Poland till 1772, when, at the first partition of the Polish territory, the districts north of the Netze were given to Prussia. At the second and third partitions, which were made twenty years later, the remainder was incorporated in the Prussian kingdom under the name of South Prussia. In 1807 Posen was included in the duchy of Warsaw; but by the act of the Congress of Vienna it was separated in 1815 from Poland and reassigned to Prussia under the title of the Grand Duchy of Posen. In 1848 the Poles, who had never amalgamated with their new German compatriots, took advantage of the general political excitement of that period to organize an open rebellion, which gave the Prussian government considerable trouble, and was not put down till much blood had been spilled on both sides. On the cessation of disturbances, the German citizens of the province demanded the incorporation of Posen with those Prussian states which were members of the German Confederation, and the Berlin Chambers gave their approval of the proposed measure in 1850; but on the subsidence of revolutionary sentiment in Germany the subject was dropped, and Posen returned to its former condition of an extra-German province of the Prussian monarchy. For the ecclesiastical history, see Poland; see also Prussia.

Poser is the term applied to the bishop's examining chaplain. The annual examiner at Winchester and Eton still bears this name.

Posey, Alexander, a colored minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born about the year 1814. He came from the *African* Methodist Episcopal Church March 20, 1869, at which time the Washington Conference was sitting in Winchester, Va. He was received into full connection, and the same year (1869) was appointed to Johnmann Street Chapel, Winchester, Va. He was reappointed in 1870 to Winchester, Va.; in 1871 to Harrisonburgh, Va., and in 1872–73 to Lexington, Va. In 1874 he was appointed to Abingdon, Va., but did not reach his work, he being sick at the time he received his appointment. He never recovered, but died Aug. 1, 1874. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences,* 1875, p. 14.

Posey, John Henderson, a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born Sept. 17, 1819, in Breckinridge County, Ky.; emigrated with his parents in early life to Illinois, and settled in Morgan County. His first religious impressions were at about the age of seventeen. When he attained to the years of manhood he came to Missouri, and there connected himself with the Methodist Church. He was licensed to preach July 16, 1853, and retained the local relation for some time. In 1866 he joined the Illinois Conference, and was appointed to Barry Circuit. In 1868 he was appointed to Lima Circuit. Shortly after the next year's Conference his health failed, and he died Nov. 13, 1869. He ever regarded the ministry as the most sacred vocation on earth. His high appreciation of its sanctity and responsibility was such at times as almost to overpower his own spirit. He was a true itinerant in heart and practice. See *Minutes of the Annual Conferences*, 1870, p. 518, 519.

Posido'nius (Ποσιδώνιος), an envoy of the Syrian general Nicanor to Judas Maccabæus (2 Macc. xiv, 19).

Posidonius (Ποσειδώνιος), a distinguished Greek Stoic philosopher, was a native of Apameia in Syria, but a citizen of Rhodes, where he resided the greater part of his life (Strabo, xiv, 655; Athen. vi, 252 e). The dates of his birth and death are unknown; but he must have been born during the latter half of the 2d century before the Christian æra, as he was a disciple of Panætius, who probably died about B.C. 100, and whom he succeeded as the head of the Stoic school. He removed to Rome in the consulship of Marcus Marcellus (Suidas, *Posidon.*), B.C. 51, and probably died soon after. He lived, according to Lucian (*Macrob.* c. 20), to the age of eighty-four, and was one of the most celebrated philosophers of his day. Cicero, who had received instruction from him (Cicero, *De Fato*, c. 3; *De Nat. Deor.* i, 3; *De Fin.* i, 2), frequently speaks of him in the highest terms. Pompey also appears to have had a very high opinion of him, as we read of his visiting him at Rhodes shortly before the war against the pirates, B.C. 67 (Strabo, xi, 492), and again in B.C. 62, after the termination of the Mithridatic war (Plutarch, *Pomp.* c. 42; Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* vii, 30). He must have been a man of very extensive and varied information in almost all the departments of human knowledge. Strabo calls him, *ἀνὴρ τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς φιλοσόφων πολυμαθέστατος*. Besides his philosophical treatises, he wrote works on geography, history, and astronomy; but none of them have come down to us, with the exception of their titles, and a few sentences quoted by Cicero, Diogenes Laertius, Strabo, and others. He seems to have travelled in different parts of the world for the purpose of collecting information. We learn incidentally from Strabo (xiii, 614; iii, 165; iv, 197) that he had been in Spain, Liguria, and Gaul. Plutarch was also indebted to Posidonius, among others, for the materials of several of his lives. This is the case in the *Lives* of Marcellus, Paulus Æmilius, the Gracchi, and others; but particularly in the *Life* of Marius, with whom Posidonius had been personally acquainted (Plut. *Marius*, c. 45). Posidonius wrote *Meteorologica*. Cicero mentions (*Nat. Deor.* ii, 34) his artificial sphere, which represented the motions of the heavens. Posidonius was a much stricter Stoic than his master Panætius. He maintained that pain was not an evil, as we learn from an anecdote which Pompey frequently related respecting his visit to the philosopher at Rhodes (Cicero, *Tusc. Disp.* ii, 25). As a physical investigator he was greatly superior to the Stoics generally, attaching himself in this respect rather to Aristotle. Indeed, although attached to the Stoic system, he was far less dogmatical and obstinate than the majority of that school, refusing to admit a dogma because it was one of the school if it did not commend itself to him for its intrinsic merits. His works on divination and the nature of the gods are referred to by Cicero, who probably made use of them in his works on the same subject (Cicero, *De Div.* i, 3, 30, 64; *De Nat. Deor.* i, 44). Strabo says (xi, 492) that Posidonius wrote an account of the wars of Pompey, but did not pay much attention to accuracy. This account was, however, probably contained in his historical work, of which Athenæus quotes (iv, 168 d) the 49th book (comp. Athen. iv, 151 e). For further information respecting the opinions and writings of Posidonius, see *Posidonii Reliquiæ Doctrinæ; Collegit atque illustravit Janus Bake; Accedit D. Wyttenbachii Annotatio* (Lugduni Bat. 1810, 8vo). See also Smith, *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. and Mythol.* s. v.; Fabricius, *Bibl. Græc.* iii, 572; Vossius, *De Hist. Græc.* p. 193; Ritter, *Gesch. der Philos.* vol. iii, bk. xi, c. 6, p. 700; Ueberweg, *Hist. of Philos.* vol. i.

There was another Posidonius of Alexandria, who was a pupil of Zeno, and consequently was prior to Polybius. Suidas, however, by mistake, ascribes to this Posidonius a continuation of Polybius in fifty-two books, which is evidently the work of the younger Posidonius.

Positive Philosophy, a recent scheme of philosophy, on the basis of phenomenalism, founded by Auguste Comte of Paris. See Comte; Positivism.

Positivism, a distinct, scientific habit of mind, regulated by a characteristic principle, which was made the basis of an extensive and ambitious scheme of philosophy by Auguste Comte (see Comte), and which has matured, according to the intention of its author, into a sect, a creed, and a church, since the article on Comte was written. The term is applied to the intellectual habit, the characteristic principle, the philosophical procedure, and the consequent body of doctrine. The English Positivists, who have latterly been the most zealous propagators of the positive philosophy, and have very recently issued a complete translation of the *Système de la Politique Positive*, revolt from some of the later speculations of their founder and hierophant, by rejecting his theological and ecclesiastical reconstructions, and all the sentimental mimicry of the papal organization, which was elaborated under the quaint influence of Mme. Chlotilde de Vaux. They adhere rigidly to the distinctive principle of the positive philosophy, which constitutes its sole *ratio essendi* and determines its consistent developments and applications. It is the first duty, then, to ascertain what this principle is.

The epithet *Positive* has been employed in various significations in the history of philosophy, as will be shown at the close of this notice. The term *Positivism* is employed by the school of the Positivists and by its founder to denote the strict confinement of speculation and the rigorous limitation of knowledge to observed facts, and to their habitual antecedences, concomitances, and sequences. It eschews all laws but those of recognised association. It involves the exclusion of causes and effects; of supernatural, spiritual, or metaphysical agencies; of hidden forces, latent qualities, and immaterial essences. It contracts the intelligible universe within the sphere of the phenomenal. It refrains from investigating the intrinsic constitution of things, and prohibits any expatiation beyond the reach of purely scientific analysis and construction. It does not deny, but it ignores, extrudes, and repudiates as inaccessible and imaginary whatever transcends the observed facts and the logical deductions therefrom. It is the pure method of inductive science, accepted as practically sufficient and complete, though without asserting that it is necessarily exhaustive. Whatever lies beyond this circle is not only unknown, but incognizable and inapprehensible—not merely imperfect and uncertain, but impalpable and delusive.

It is impossible to give a sharp, precise, and formal definition of Positivism, because it is chiefly discriminated from other philosophical schemes by what it exfoliates, by its limitations rather than by its comprehension. One of the most eminent and earnest of living Positivists has within the late months given an ex-

planation of the character of the doctrine, which it may be well to cite as an authoritative testimony:

"Suffice it that we mean by the positive method of thought (and we will now use the term in a sense not limited to the social construction of Comte) that method which would base life and conduct, as well as knowledge, upon such evidence as can be referred to logical canons of *proof*, which would place all that occupies man in a homogeneous system of *law*. On the other hand, this method turns aside from *hypotheses*, not to be tested by any known logical canon familiar to science, whether the hypothesis claim support from intuition, aspiration, or general plausibility. And again, this method turns aside from ideal standards which avow themselves to be *lawless*, which profess to transcend the field of law. We say, life and conduct shall stand for us wholly on a basis of law, and must rest entirely in that region of science (not physical, but moral and social science) where we are free to use our intelligence in the methods known to us as intelligible logic, methods which the intellect can analyze" (Frederic Harrison, *The Soul and Future Life*, in *The Nineteenth Century*, No. 4, June, 1877, art. vii, p. 624, 625).

Mr. Harrison's contemplation is here, as will be readily conjectured, directed specially to the ethical developments of Positivism; but such language so applied reveals the severity with which everything but the processes and products of scientific observation and logical conclusion is excluded from the arena of the Positivist. This accords perfectly with the determination of the dogmatic principle originally formulated in the *Philosophie Positive* (tome i, p. 4, 5).

"In fine, in the Positive state the human mind, recognising the impossibility of attaining absolute notions, renounces the investigation of the origin and destination of the universe, and inquiry into the intrinsic causes of phenomena, and attaches itself instead solely to the discovery, by judicious combination of reasoning and observation, of their effective laws—that is, to the discovery of their invariable relations of succession and resemblance. The explication of facts thus reduced to its real terms is, thenceforward, nothing more than the connection established between the diverse phenomena and certain general facts whose number tends to be constantly diminished by the progress of science."

This procedure has long been regarded as alone appropriate in the domain of physical science, and as equally appropriate, within the limits of its applicability, in speculative science. It forms what is commonly regarded as the Baconian philosophy or the Baconian redintegration of philosophy. Positivism, however, both in the conception of the father of the system and in the doctrine and practice of his followers, extends its range so as to embrace and enclose all departments of knowledge and action, to profess itself the sole and exclusive method, and to stigmatize and repudiate whatever will not submit to its jurisdiction or remains beyond its reach. Indeed, in the elaboration of the system by Comte all its applications to the exact sciences were regarded as merely preliminary to social reconstruction, and to the establishment of a comprehensive and diversified ethical doctrine for public and private guidance. In this light it is still viewed by the existing school of Positivists, notwithstanding their rejection of much of the theological reverie of Comte.

It will readily be recognised that Positivism, as so understood, revives under strangely modernized aspects the old dogma of Protagoras that man is the measure of the universe. The ancient contrast and analogy of the macrocosm and the microcosm are reproduced in quaint disguise and more plausible form by limiting the intelligible universe (*mundus intelligibilis*) to its reflection from the mirror of the human mind so far, and so far only, as an image of it can be formed through the instrumentality of the bodily senses and of reasoning on the phenomena observed thereby. We will not be tempted into the easy misrepresentation of alleging that all is denied which is not so reflected, but the practical effect is nearly the same; for it is ignored, cashiered, and extruded from the field of speculation. Thus, the universe and all its marvels, the mind of man and its measureless potencies, the heart of man with its boundless duties, its multitudinous aspirations and its unfathomable mysteries, are shrivelled up into the narrow dimensions of the science of the day. Surely we require a philosophy of the unknown as well as of the known!

"Vere scire est scire per causas," said Aristotle, and the schoolmen after him. The maxim was unquestionably pressed by the latter to hazardous uses, and employed to authenticate hallucinations which obstructed science for centuries. "Vere scire est scire apparentias"—true knowledge is the knowledge of appearances—is the shibboleth of the Positivists, and is even more dangerous than the misapprehension which it has undertaken to dethrone. It results in pure phenomenalism, and renders man and the universe alike hollow, deceptive, and spectral. This tendency of Positivism, and the length to which it may be and has been carried, are well illustrated by the remarkable and exquisitely written article of Mr. Frederic Harrison on *The Soul and Future Life*, from which we have already made a citation, and by the very recent discussions provoked by it. Mr. Harrison, like his Coryphæus, will not endure "thoughts that wander through eternity," except it be a human eternity. He will not suffer them to travel "extra flammantia mœnia mundi." He compresses those flaming walls to the limits of the earth's horizon. He does not deny the existence of the human soul: he only starves it out and dissipates it into a technical abstraction. "The combined activity of the human powers," he says, "organized around the highest of them we call the soul." Again, "the consensus of human faculties, which we call the soul, comprises all sides of human nature according to one homogeneous theory."

"She, mouldering with the dull earth's mouldering sod,
Inwrapt tenfold in slothful shame,
Lay there, exiled from eternal God,
Lost to her place and name."

The future life is still more vacant, unreal, and inapprehensible than even the sublimated soul. It is indeed the shadow of a shade. Mr. Harrison does not give such distinct utterance to his conception of the *post-mortem* existence as to enable us to grasp it firmly. He employs phrases which indicate his acceptance of the Panhumanistic immortality, by absorption into the aggregate humanity of subsequent generations, if he refuses to adore with Comte *le Nouveau Grand-Être*—the New Supreme God—humanity itself. But the abstract term—the unsubstantial and unessential conception of humanity—does not become a more real being—a more capable receptacle of souls or extinct consensuses of human powers—by being stripped of the tawdry trappings and tinsel fringes with which Comte had decorated it, to set it up as an idol in place of Jehovah. Strange that the Positivists should reject as unphilosophical and invalid all that religion teaches and our instincts accept as true, and should recur to such a factitious and fictitious abstraction as this humanity must be! Waiving the divine attributes of creation, ordination, and government, and regarding only the functions of the Divinity as a moral influence exerted over men—as "the rewarder of them that diligently seek him"—it may well be asked what restraint or encouragement could a deified and posthumous humanity exercise retrospectively on the conduct of men in society or as individuals. The fancy is as futile as it is absurd. Roche Boyle's comic exclamation would recur to every transgressor—"What has posterity done for us!"

It may be frankly conceded that the ideas of duty, of obligation, of justice, of temporal responsibility—perhaps even of right and wrong, of righteousness and sin, of beauty and of æsthetic emotion—may be translated from the language of religious belief into the language of Positivism. M. Comte made a travesty of the rites and ceremonial of Catholic Christianity, and commended it to his devotees as the Positive religion. This invention has been abnegated, in form at least, by his followers, but it is a similar procedure by which Mr. Harrison and the rest profess and hope to retain the essential characteristics of a divine creed, after excluding

from the universe all recognition of divinity. It is mistaking the shell for the organism, after the substance and life, which were enclosed by the shell, and which informed the shell, have perished out. We can see the very nice distinction demanded by Positivism between the absolute negation of the divine and the supernatural and the mere declaration of its incognizability, and of its consequent elimination from the domain of faith, as of knowledge. But the practical effect in both cases will be nearly the same. The discrimination is very refined and theoretical, and may be perfectly valid in abstract reasoning. But it is only the purest and most intellectual natures which can perceive it and act upon it, and even they will forget it or lose their hold upon it in moments of passion and temptation. It cannot be adequately apprehended by dull minds, coarse temperaments, and undisciplined characters, and will consequently be wholly inoperative where most required. The defect—the fatal defect—is the absence of any imperative and extrinsic authority to secure effective responsibility and obedience to right. The injury to humanity thus portended is very evident; the advantage to be anticipated is indiscernible.

This notice proceeds on the same plane with that adopted by the Positivists, and the discussion of their principles does not travel beyond the domain of the human understanding. The danger of Positivism springs from the same source as that whence have issued the dangers of so many kindred schemes of philosophy in our day—the disposition to regard a partial truth as the complete body of truth—to make one principle the sufficient explanation of all things, and to render human knowledge co-extensive with all knowledge and, practically, with all truth. The unknown must always transcend the known: it must remain higher in dignity and in influence, as well as ampler in all dimensions. The temper of the present day, however, is to humanize the universe—to restrict all valid knowledge to purely scientific knowledge—to cramp the realm of the apprehensible within the narrow mould of the demonstrable. Positivism is true in its place and in its degree, as evolution is true under the like limitations, but it is not all-comprehending. It does not include all truth, and is far from embracing all reality. Its error and its pernicious consequences arise from the attempt to make it all-sufficient and exclusive. As a method of science it is true and valuable in all the applications of physical science, and of ethical science too, so far as the latter can appropriately employ observation and induction. But beyond all this stretch the unfathomable spaces of the unknown, including that which is known only by its effects; and we cannot wisely or safely leave this vast enclosing sphere out of our contemplation, for it is the main regulator of our conduct, by constant appeal to our highest sensibilities. If the hypothesis of the astronomer be true, that there is a mighty central sun in the unsounded depths of heavenly space, round which our sun, with all its attendant planets, revolves in a regular but measureless orbit, it would be neither logical nor prudent to deny the existence of such a centre of attraction, because it remains, and may forever remain, unattainable by human sense. It seems even more illogical and indiscreet to repudiate a moral centre of the universe, attracting and governing all things, and radiating its influences over the whole physical and rational world, because it lies beyond the limits of scientific observation, and cannot be measured, analyzed, or determined by the forms of science.

The factitious blindness or wilful shortsightedness of the Positive dogma is strangely illustrated by the history of the term Positive, and of the philosophy which it has been employed to designate. St. Thomas Aquinas (*Summ. Theol.* ii, 57) employs Positive in accordance with its juridical usage as opposed to Natural—"jus naturale et jus positivum." Accordingly, he uses it to denote that which is commanded, assumed, laid down, postulated, taken for granted; hence, arbitrary, not in the sense of wilful or fantastic, but of determined as a condition precedent. "Illud dicitur esse positivum quod ex voluntate humana procedit," etc. This meaning is frequently given to it by others of the schoolmen, and is sufficiently accordant with its etymology and with its classical usage. "Est hæc res posita, quæ ab adversario non negatur" (Cicero, *Pro Cæcin.* xi). As in the scholastic reasoning the most absolutely determined principles—the starting-points of speculation—were the dogmas of revealed truth, the positions authoritatively determined by religion, the transition was natural to the acceptance of Positive in the sense of received as a command, established by faith, in contrast to that which was believed on sensible evidence or demonstration. Hence it is found with this signification, or with one closely analogous to it, in a remarkable passage of Bacon, which furnishes an apt censure for the Positive philosophy and for the misapplication of the term, though supplying a step in the direction of Positivism. "Nil enim philosophiam peræquo corrupit, ac illa inquisitio parentum Cupidinis: hoc est, quod philosophi principia rerum, quemadmodum in natura inveniuntur, non receperunt et amplexi sunt, ut doctrinam quandam positivam, et tamquam fide experimentali" (*Parmen. Teles. et Democr. Phil.*).

There is here a coalescence and conciliation of both the earlier and the later meanings of the term—a restriction of investigation within the range of human observation, but an acceptance by faith of the principles beyond it, which must regulate human conduct and human speculation alike.

In like manner, Kant, while denying to the understanding the possibility of reaching any positive (demonstrable) knowledge in regard to things purely intelligible (*νούμενα*), asserts the determination of the moral law in a *positive* (conclusive, assured) manner, through the faculty of intuition (*Kritik der reinen Vernunft*, i, 1).

This employment of the term in both its applications, while the conclusion is contradictory to the speculations of the Positive school, acquires peculiar significance from the fact that the scheme of Positivism had been indicated and condemned by the sage of Königsberg as a possible but mutilated and delusive project of philosophy. The originality of Comte lay simply in the narrowness and defectiveness of his principles, and in the hardihood and vigor with which they were applied by him in his *Système de la Philosophie Positive*. His exclusion of the largest and most important half of human knowledge and experience (undefined and often shadowy as that knowledge and that experience may be) constitutes the latent and deadly malady of Positivism, and is prefigured as such in the vaticinations of Kant.

But instead of referring to the numerous passages in the Critical Philosophy in which Positivism is anticipated and censured before its appearance, we may suitably close these remarks with a citation from a scientific writer, whom we may presume to have been Sir David Brewster:

"A third dogma, which has of late been placed in prominence, much, as we conceive, to the detriment of philosophy, is that of the so-called, or rather miscalled, *positive philosophy*—an extravagant and morphological transformation of that rational empiricism which professes to take experience for its basis, resulting from insisting on the prerogatives of experience in reference to external phenomena, and ignoring them in relation to the movements and tendencies of our intellectual nature; a philosophy which, if it do not repudiate altogether the idea of causation, goes far at least to put it out of view, and with it everything which can be called *explanation* of natural phenomena, by the undue predominance assigned to the idea of *law*; which rejects, as not merely difficult, not simply hopeless, but as utterly absurd, unphilosophical, and derogatory, all attempt to render any rational account of those abstract, equation-like propositions, in which it delights to embody the results of experience, other than their inclusion in some more general proposition of the same kind. Entirely persuaded that in physics, at least, the inquiry into causes is philosophy, that nothing else is so, and that the chain of causation upwards is broken by no solution of continuity, constituting a gulf absolutely

impassable to human faculties, if duly prepared by familiarity with previous links, we are far from regarding the *whole* office of experimental philosophy as satisfactorily expressed by declaring it to consist in the discovery and generalization of laws" (*Edinb. Rev.* Jan. 1848, art. v, p. 180, 181).

Literature.—To the references given at the close of the article COMTE may now be added: Comte, *System of Positive Polity, or Treatise upon Sociology*, transl. by Bridges, Harrison, Beesly, Congreve, and Hutton (Lond. 1876, 4 vols. 8vo); Harrison, *Order and Progress* (1 vol. 8vo); Congreve, *Essays, Political, Social, and Religious* (1 vol. 8vo); Estasén y Cortada, *El Positivismo, ó Sistéma de las Ciencias experimentales* (Barcelona, 1877, 8vo); Cordier, *Exposé et Critique du Positivisme prolongé* (Par. 1877, 8vo); Adrian, *Essais sur quelques Points de la Philosophie positive; The Nineteenth Century*, No. 4, June, 1877, art. vii; No. 5, July, 1877, art. vi (*The Soul and Future Life*, by Frederic Harrison); *ibid.* No. 7, Sept. 1877, art. xi (*A Modern Symposium*, by R. H. Hutton, Prof. Huxley, Lord Blachford, Hon. Robert Noël; subj. "*The Future Life*"); *ibid.* No. 8, Oct. 1877, art. ix (*A Modern Symposium*, by Lord Selborne, Rev. Canon Barry, W. R. Greg, Rev. Baldwin Brown, Dr. W. G. Ward, Frederic Harrison; subj. [concluded] "*The Soul and Future Life*"). (G. F. H.)

Posner, AUGUSTUS SIEGMUND (formerly *Simon*), a German minister of the Lutheran Church, a convert from Judaism, was born May 19, 1805, at Auras, in Lower Silesia. His early education he received at the public schools of Breslau. When seventeen years of age, he went to Berlin to continue his studies. There he became acquainted with a Hebrew Christian, who sowed the first seed of the Gospel. In the year 1828 he received public baptism, assuming the name of Augustus Siegmund. He betook himself to the study of theology, and upon its completion filled several situations as tutor in private families. In the year 1838 he received a call to proceed as a missionary to the East, and accordingly set out for Berlin to prepare for his journey. On the road his intention became the subject of conversation with a fellow-traveller, a gentleman holding a high situation under government, and to his no small surprise he was informed by the latter that he must relinquish the intention of becoming a missionary, as he had just been appointed by the government chaplain of the Penitentiary at Sagan (in Silesia), and the necessary documents respecting it were nearly completed. In September, 1838, he entered on his new charge, which he discharged as becoming a faithful disciple of Christ. In addition to the discharge of his heavy duties, Posner edited a monthly publication under the title *The Prodigal Son*, which became a great blessing to many readers. In the year 1840 he was formally ordained by the consistory. Seeing that his duties at Sagan were far beyond his strength, the government made the offer to him of another ministerial charge at Lebenthal—adding, however, that if it were practicable his remaining at his present post would be regarded with great satisfaction. The expression of such a wish was sufficient to lead Posner to consider it his duty to remain. Thus he labored and suffered on. In the beginning of the year 1846 Posner was invited by the congregation of a newly erected church in Berlin to become their pastor; but the consistory refusing to comply with Posner's wishes to adhere to the formularies of the Lutheran Church instead of those of the Prussian National Church, Posner had to relinquish the appointment. Broken health, in connection with domestic afflictions, hastened his end, and on Monday, Jan. 22, 1849, he was called to his eternal rest, enunciating with a weak voice the words, "Make an end, make an end, O Lord! Come, Lord Jesus!—come, come, come quickly! Lead my soul out of darkness." See *A. S. Posner, Der treue Zeuge Gottes, weiland Pastor an der königl. Strafanstalt zu Sagan; Von einem Freunde* (Schreiberschau, 1851, 2d ed.); and the biography prepared by a brother of the deceased in the *Sonntags-Bibliothek*, vol. iv, pt. iii (Bielefeld, 1850); *Jewish Intelligencer* (Lond. 1853); Zuchold, *Bibliotheca Theologica*, ii, 1201. (B. P.)

Posselt, AUGUSTUS, a German Lutheran theologian, was born Jan. 6, 1658, at Zittau, in the Oberlausitz. He studied at Wittenberg, Kiel, and Jena, and for a long time he preached at Hamburg. In 1688 he was appointed preacher at SS. Peter and Paul in his native place; in 1714 he was made archdeacon, and in 1718 pastor primarius of St. John, in which position he died, Nov. 23, 1728. He wrote, *Richtige Erklärung der Epistel St. Pauli an die Römer:—Nachricht von den in Händen habenden biblischen Exemplaren.* See Jöcher, *Gelehrten-Lexikon*, s. v.

Possessed WITH DEVILS, the usual rendering in the A. V. of the Greek δαιμονιζόμενοι (but also δαιμονισθέντες, Mark v, 18; comp. δαιμόνια ἔχειν, Luke viii, 27; πνεῦμα δαιμονίου ἀκαθάρτου ἔχειν, iv, 33), Matt. iv, 24; viii, 16; xv, 22; Acts viii, 7; Luke viii, 2. These were persons afflicted with disease, as epilepsy (Matt. xvii, 15; Luke ix, 39), paralysis (Luke xiii, 11, 16), dumbness (Matt. ix, 32; xii, 22), and especially with melancholy and insanity (Matt. viii, 28; Mark v, 2 sq.; Luke viii, 27 sq.); whence the healed are said to be *of sound mind* (σωφρονοῦντες, Mark v, 15; Luke viii, 35). It is not necessary to suppose that the epilepsy or the dumbness, when this was the main feature of the case, was complicated with peculiar physical disorders, although epilepsy is very commonly connected with something of the kind (see Farmer, *Vers.* p. 89; Hippocrat. *Virg. Morb.* c. i; Esquirol, *Path. u. Therap. d. Seelenstörungen* [Leips. 1827], p. 73; comp. p. 503). Indeed, while these special disabilities of men in other respects in sound and vigorous health were naturally referred to a supernatural cause, this would be especially the case with the sudden attacks of epilepsy, falling at irregular intervals and without premonition. Everything of this kind the Jews, like the Greeks and Romans, referred to evil spirits taking possession of men (see Acts x, 38; Luke xiii, 16; comp. Josephus, *Ant.* vi, 8, 2, on 1 Sam. xvi, 14, 23; see also Lightfoot, p. 388; Eisenmenger, *Entdecktes Judenth.* ii, 454; Maimonides, *Schab.* ii, 5; *Erub.* iii, 4; Creuzer, *Symbolik*, iii, 4 sq.). The case was the same among the ancients with those extraordinary events and achievements, accomplished by men, which seemed too great to proceed from the natural human powers—they were referred to the operation of a divinity. Not only hallucinations, melancholy, and epilepsy (called by Herodotus the sacred disease, iii, 33), but also the ravings of Bacchantes and Corybantes were viewed as proceeding from superhuman inspiration (Herod. iv, 79; Eurip. *Bacch.* 298 sq.; Dion. Hal. *De Demosthen.* c. xxii; see also Herod. iii, 33; Heliod. *Æth.* iv, 10; Bos, *Exercit. Phil.* p. 62 sq.). Hence to dæmonize (δαιμονᾶν) is the common Greek expression meaning *to be insane* (Æsch. *Choeph.* 564; *Sept. c. Theb.* 1003; Eurip. *Phœn.* 899; Aristoph. *Thesmoph.* 1060; Plutarch, *Marsell.* 20; Lucian, *Philopseud.* c. xvi; and Wetst. i, 282; esp. Aretæi *Caussa Morb. diut.* i, 4). But these dæmons were generally viewed as the spirits of the deceased (Philostr. *Apoll.* iii, 38; Horace, *Epod.* v, 91; comp. Josephus, *War*, vii, 6, 3; and on exorcising them, see Plutarch, *Sympos.* vii, 5; Lucian, *Philopseud.* c. xvi; on the Syriac and Arabic usage of speech, see Jahn, *Nachträge*, p. 173 sq.). The practice of exorcism upon such men, for the purpose of driving out the dæmons, was very common (comp. Lucian, *Philopseud.* c. xvi; and see Matt. xii, 37; Luke ix, 49; Acts xix, 13 sq.; comp. Justin Mart. *Apol.* ii, 7). The exorcists made use of magical formulæ, said to have descended from Solomon (Josephus, *Ant.* viii, 2, 5), in connection with certain roots, stones, etc. (id. *War*, vii, 6, 3; Mishna, *Gittin*, lxvii, 2; Plutarch, *De Fluv.* xvi, 2). Afterwards these men were found also in other countries (Lucian, *Philopseud.* c. xvi). Many suppose that Jesus simply adopted the popular mode of speech in his age in speaking of dæ-

moniac possession, and healed the unfortunate sufferers without sharing in the view commonly taken of their disease (P. von Hemert, *Accommodat. in N. T.* p. 51 sq.; Hase, *Leben Jesu*, p. 71 sq.), just as the physicians in the time of Origen, who did not at all believe in real possession by devils (comp. the principles of Maimonides; Jahn, *Nachträge*, p. 185). On his method of healing, comp. Paulus, i, 423; ii, 621; and on Mark ix, 29, against the view of Paulus, Fritzsche on Matt. xvii, 21. Where prayer and fasting are recommended to the apostles as means of exorcism, Porphyry (*Abstinen.* ii, 204, 417 sq.) may be compared. It was very natural that the sufferers, when healed, wished to remain in the vicinity of the Great Physician (Luke viii, 38; comp. viii, 2); for there they considered themselves most safe against the return of the dæmons.

The symptoms recorded of individual dæmoniacs agree with those which are noticed in diseases of the kinds mentioned above. (*a.*) On Matt. xvii, 15, comp. Paul. *Ægin.* iii, 13, where he speaks of a *morbus comitialis*, in which the whole body is convulsed; which affects chiefly boys, sometimes young men; and in which the convulsion is accompanied with a sudden inarticulate cry. The chief distinguishing mark, however, is a foaming at the mouth (comp. Luke ix, 39; Lucian, *Philopseud.* c. xvi). Cœl. Aurelian (*Morb. Chron.* i, 4) speaks of a class of diseased persons, epileptics, who fell in public places (from which the disease is still sometimes called falling-sickness, and in German *Fallsucht;* comp. Rabb. נוֹפֵל or נִכְפֶּה, *an epileptic*), or even into rivers or the sea. Aretæus (*De Morbo Epil.* 5) speaks of some who fell in weakness into the river. It was early observed that this affliction seemed to have some connection with the changes of the moon (Dougtæi *Analect.* ii, 5; Bartholin, *Morb. Bibl.* c. xviii; comp. Aret. *Morb. Chron.* i, 4; Origen, in *Matt. iii*, p. 577; Lucian, *Tox.* c. xxiv; Isidor. *Orig.* iv, 7). Hence the use of the word σεληνιάζεσθαι, Matt. iv, 24; xvii, 15; comp. Suicer, *Thesaur.* ii, 946. In Latin, too, epileptics were called *lunatici*, or *moonstruck*. Again, epilepsy, in connection with partial insanity, was the disease of the man mentioned in Mark i, 23 sq.; Luke iv, 33 sq.; comp. esp. Mark i, 26. (*b.*) On Matt. viii, 28, comp. Wetstein, i, 354 sq. The proofs of vast strength, and of a violent rage against himself (Mark v, 4, 5; comp. Acts xix, 16), leave no doubt that this man was a maniac. The fact that he avoided society, and wished to dwell alone among tombs, point to the peculiar mania which Sauvages calls *Mania misanthropica*, or that which Keil (*Rhapsodie über die Anwend. d. psych. Kurmethode*, etc. [Halle, 1803], p. 363) calls *Mania errabunda*. Yet his mania was but temporary, though the delusion which it accompanied was permanent, showing itself in settled ideas (Mark v, 9; Luke viii, 30). Thus, according to the principles of Heinroth (*Lehrbuch der Seelenstörungen*, i, 360 sq.), the case is one of delusion joined with melancholy, and sometimes heightened to mania. Mental as well as physical diseases are often thus complicated with each other (Esquirol, p. 73); comp. further, *Targum Jerus. Terumoth*, xl, 2, where an insane man (שׁוֹטֶה) is thus described: "He goes forth and spends the night among the tombs; and tears his clothing, and destroys whatever is offered him." The leaping down of the swine, perhaps a part only of the herd, was produced, as some think, by the violent running towards them of the dæmoniacs, under the fixed impression that the dæmons could not leave them save by finding another dwelling-place in the unclean beasts (comp. Josephus, *Ant.* viii, 2, 5; see esp. Eichhorn, *Bibl.* vi, 835 sq.; Grimm, *Exeget. Aufs.* i, 123 sq.; Schmidt, *Exeget. Beitr.* ii, 85 sq.; Greiling, in Henke, *Mus.* i, 620 sq.; Friedrich, *Vers. einer Literaturgesch. d. Pathol. u. Therapie d. psych. Krankh.* [Würzb. 1830], p. 7 sq.; Schleiermacher, *Predigten*, iii, note 3, *on Acts xvi*, 16). The view of the earlier theologians and physicians was that in the case of the dæmoniacs healed by Jesus there had been an actual bodily indwelling of evil spirits. From this view (set forth by J. Marckius, *Textual Exercit.* p. 257 sq.; Deyling, *Observat.* ii, 371 sq.; Ernesti, *Neue theol. Bibl.* iii, 799 sq.; Zeibich, *Verm. Betracht.* iii, 306 sq.; Storr, *Opusc.* i, 53 sq.; Eschenbach, *Scriptor. Med. Bibl.* p. 41 sq.) many dissented long ago, following a hint of St. Augustine, *De Genesi ad lit.* xii, 17 (see Hobbes, *Leviathan*, c. viii and xlv; Bekker, *Byzant. Welt*, bk. iv, c. vii sq.; Wetstein, i, 279 sq.; Bartholin, *De Morb. Bibl.* c. xix). It was formally combated by Mead, *Bibelkrankh.* p. 63 sq. See Semler, *Com. de Dæmoniacis quorum in N. T. fit mentio* (Halle, 1760); *Umständliche Untersuchung der Dämon-Leute* (ibid. 1762); Gruner, *De Dæmoniacis a Chr. Percuratis* (Jena, 1775); Lindlinger, in his *Schr. de Ebræor. vet. Arte Med.* translated into German by Cölln, with preface by Semler (Brem. 1776); his *Briefe üb. die Dämonischen in d. Evang.*, with additions by Semler (Halle, 1783); Zimmerman, *Diatr. de Dæmonicis Evang.* (Rinteln, 1786); *Medicin.-hermen. Untersuch.* p. 15 sq. Comp. Carus, *Psychol. d. Hebr.* p. 393 sq.; Baur, *Bibl. Theol. d. N. T.* i, 213 sq.; Jahn, *Archäol.* I, ii, 400 sq. (omitted in the 2d ed.; comp. *Nachträge* to Jahn's *Theol. Werke*, p. 451 sq.). Additional literature is cited by Volbeding, *Index Programmatum*, p. 41; Hase, *Leben Jesu*, p. 99; Darling, *Cyclop.* col. 830, 923, 926, 1872, 1882; Danz, *Bibl. Theologiæ*, p. 125, 204. See also Woodward, *Dæmoniacal Possession* (Lond. 1839, 1856); *Meth. Quar. Rev.* July, 1857; *Free-will Bapt. Quar.* April, 1858; *Presb. Rev.* Oct. 1865. Comp. DÆMONIAC.

Possevino, ANTONIO, a celebrated Italian Jesuit, noted for the diplomatic services he rendered the Church of Rome, was born at Mantova in 1534. He belonged to a noble but poor family. Sent to Rome at the age of sixteen, he was in a short time proficient in the classical languages and literature, and cardinal Ercole di Gonzaga made him his amanuensis, and intrusted to his hands the education of his nephews, Francis and Scipio di Gonzaga. Possevino followed his patron to Ferrara, then to Padua, and gained by his merit the esteem of Paolo Manucci, Bartolomeo Ricci, and Sigonio. Although he had been rewarded by the Gonzagas with the donation of the rich commandery of Fossano, in Piedmont, he preferred to join the Jesuits. He had not finished his novitiate when he was sent on a very delicate errand to the duke of Savoy, Emanuel Philibert (1560). The object of this mission was to stop the progress of heresy, which, coming from France, threatened to invade Italy through Savoy and Piedmont. The Roman court, either to reward his services or to give full scope to his talents, employed him in several negotiations. The first of these missions was to Sweden. He arrived in Stockholm in December, 1577. The king received him with great favor, abjured severally all his heresies, made a general confession, and promised obedience to the apostolic see. The ensuing day, May 17, 1578, the mass was celebrated after the Roman rite in presence of the king. Possevino returned to Rome, and the queries and propositions of the king were examined by an ecclesiastical commission. The mass in the vulgar tongue, the chalice for the laymen, the marriage of priests, the omission of the invocation of saints and of the prayers for the dead, the suppression of holy water and other ceremonies were rejected; seven other proposals were accepted. On Possevino's return to Stockholm (July, 1579), the king, who was of a very fickle disposition, showed great dissatisfaction at the negative answer he had met with on the five points above mentioned, broke up all negotiations, and would not even consent to the establishment of a Church for Romanists. In February, 1580, the regsdag of Wadstena, at which Possevino was present, took a threatening attitude, and king John was compelled to publish an edict against the introduction of Roman Catholic works, and to promise to promote only Protestants to the professorships. In the same year Possevino returned to Rome. King John, having lost his wife Catharine in

1583, married in 1585 Gunilla Bjelke, who became for the Lutherans what the former queen had been for the Catholics.

Soon afterwards Possevino was sent on a similar errand to Poland and Russia. The czar, Ivan Vasilivitch II (1533–1584), called the Terrible, had vastly aggrandized his empire in all directions. In 1580 he had made the conquest of Livonia. Here he met Stephen Bathori, king of Poland (1575–1585), who defeated him and compelled him to retreat. To stop the Polish invasion the czar invoked the mediation of pope Gregory XIII. Possevino was sent to the headquarters of the king of Poland at Wilna. Bathori consented to receive the envoys of the czar, but rejected their conditions. Hereupon Possevino set on his way to the interior of Russia under an escort of Cossacks. The czar received him at Stacilza, and gave him a solemn audience, Aug. 8. Ivan sat on his throne, surrounded with Oriental pomp, dressed in a long robe interwoven with golden threads and covered with pearls and jewels; he bore a kind of tiara on his head, and held a golden sceptre in his left hand. Senators, bojars, and army-officers filled the rooms; gold and precious stones glittered everywhere. The rest was in accordance. After five days of feasting the negotiations commenced; during the whole proceedings the czar gave frequent evidence of astuteness and duplicity. Possevino subordinated his intervention to the following conditions: free passage through Russia for the apostolic nuncios and missionaries; free exercise of the Roman Catholic worship for foreign merchants, and admission of Catholic priests to administer to them the sacraments. Finally, as the czar himself had proposed an alliance against the Turks, the papal envoy hinted at the fusion of the two churches as being the best means to bring it to pass. Possevino was brimful of hope, while the czar gave only evasive answers. Thus a month elapsed in resultless debate, when the news of the siege of Pleskau (Pskov), the possession of which city would have opened Russia to the Poles, brought matters to a rapid conclusion. Ivan consented to the admission of Roman Catholic merchants, and Possevino repaired to the Polish camp. Through his exertions a congress of plenipotentiaries of both belligerents was held at Porchau, in which the mediator presided. Bathori demanded the cession of the whole of Livonia, and as Possevino knew that the king of Poland would not swerve from his purpose, he prevailed on the Russians to consent. But when the Poles demanded also the town of Weliki, and the life of the Russian envoy was at stake, the papal legate had to pledge his own life to obtain their signature. At last peace was concluded, Jan. 15, 1582. When Possevino, after a truly triumphal journey, reached Moscow, he found the court in consternation and the czar beside himself: he had killed his son with a blow of his golden sceptre. Five weeks after the conclusion of the peace a conference was held in the Kremlin, when the czar declined the proposal of a fusion of the churches, but consented to the passage of the missionaries, and granted religious freedom to foreign merchants and priests. During these latter negotiations Ivan at one time had lifted his sceptre, still red with his son's blood, against the Jesuit. Failing to intimidate Possevino, he laid a snare for him, trying to prevail on him to kiss the hand of the patriarch: his purpose was to make believe that the pope had submitted to the patriarch. But the clerical diplomatist remained faithful to his task, and succeeded.

He was scarcely returned when he was sent to Livonia and Transylvania to combat Protestantism, which was fast gaining ground in those provinces. Possevino held a conference with the sectarians at Hermannstadt. On the same occasion he increased the importance of the colleges of his order in those parts, and founded a seminary at Clausenburg. In 1583 he took his seat, in his quality of a papal nuncio, at the great Diet of Warsaw. As Possevino several times interposed his mediation between Poland and the German empire, he was, as could be expected, accused of partiality by both parties. The general of his order, Agnaviva, hereupon insisted on his being recalled, and Gregory XIII complied with the demand. Possevino was glad to leave his political toils. He journeyed about as a simple missionary in Livonia, Bohemia, Saxony, and Upper Hungary. While thus engaged he was called to Padua to hold lectures: there he became acquainted with the young count of Sales, whom he prevailed upon to leave the law for the Church, and who became St. Francis de Sales. After four years spent at Padua, he was called to Rome, where he took some pains in trying to reconcile Henry IV with the pope. This direction of his zeal displeased the Spanish party and his superiors, and he was sent to Bologna as rector of the college. He was at Venice when Paul V put the city under interdict; and here was a new case of mediation for the old man. He died at Ferrara Feb. 26, 1611. Among his works are, *Del Sacrifizio dell' Altare* (Lyons, 1563, 8vo):—*Il Soldato Cristiano* (Rome, 1569, 12mo), written at Pius V's request, when this pontiff sent troops to Charles IX against the Huguenots:—*Moscovia, seu de rebus Moscoviticis* (Wilna, 1586, 8vo; Cologne, 1587–95, fol.; Ital. transl. 1596, 4to):—*Judicium de quatuor scriptoribus* (Rome, 1592, 12mo; Lyons, 1593, 8vo). The four authors are Le Noue, Jean Bodin, Duplessis-Mornay, and Machiavelli. Possevino was here misled by his zeal against the Protestants; and as to Machiavelli, he refuted him without reading his works:—*Bibliotheca selecta de ratione Studiorum* (Rome, 1593, 2 vols. fol.; new ed. with correct. and addit., Cologne, 1607, 2 vols. fol.):—*Apparatus sacer* (Venice, 1603–6, 3 vols. fol.; Cologne, 1607, 2 vols. fol.); this is the greatest catalogue of ancient and modern authors that had been seen at that time. Although he had especially in view the interest of the Roman Catholic Church, yet he did not, like Bellarmin, Sixtus of Siena, and others, confine his task to the enumeration of ecclesiastical writers—his plan includes the profane too. He treats of nearly eight thousand writers—their lives, works, influence, editions:—*Vita di Lodovico Gonzaga, Ducer di Nevers, di Eleonora, Duchessa di Mantova* (1604, 4to). See Ranke, *Hist. of the Papacy*, i, 434 sq.; ii, 21 sq.; Alzog, *Kirchengesch.* ii, 341, 425, 466; Mosheim, *Eccles. Hist.* vol. iii; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.

Possidius, St., a prelate of the early Eastern Church, flourished at the close of the 4th and the commencement of the 5th century. He was a disciple of St. Augustine, and lived on intimate terms with him all his life. On being raised in 397 to the episcopal see of Calamo, a town in Numidia, at no great distance from Hippo-Regius, he endeavored to oppose the assemblies which pagans and Donatists were continually holding in spite of the imperial decrees. The pagans avenged themselves by setting fire to his church and compelling him to flee to Hippo. Recalled after a few years, Possidius was a member of all important assemblies held in Africa about Church matters, especially of the famous conference at Carthage in 411, in which none after St. Augustine played a more prominent part than himself. He was also at the Councils of Carthage and of Miletus, where Pelasgus and Celestius were condemned. He was also sent abroad on important missions. Thus in A.D. 410 he was one of four prelates despatched by the orthodox party in Africa to Honorius for the purpose of soliciting a repeal of the law which had been passed by their heretical opponents. Expelled from Calamo in 428 by Genseric, king of the Vandals, he assisted St. Augustine in his late moments, and wrote the life of the great saint, with a list of his works. He died after 431. The Roman Catholic Church has consecrated the 17th of May to his memory. Two tracts by Possidius, to which reference was made above, are still extant. They are entitled, *Vita Augustina; Indiculus Scriptorum Augustini.* These are attached to all the best editions of Augustine. The best edition of the *Vita*, in a separate

form, is that of Salinus (Rome, 1731, 8vo) and Aug. Vindel (1768); of the *Indiculus*, that published at Venice (1735, 8vo).—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.; Smith, *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog.* s. v.

Post (*courant*) is the rendering of רָץ, *râts* (Sept. βιβλιοφόρος, Vulg. *cursor*, 2 Chron. xxx, 6, 10; Esth. iii, 13, 15; viii, 10, 14; Job ix, 25; Jer. li, 31), a *runner*, or "guard," as elsewhere rendered; a courier or carrier of messages, such as is common in Oriental countries. See ANGAREUO. The term *post* is used to indicate primarily the person who conveyed with speed any message; and subsequently the means of regular postal communications. Some writers have thought that the use of posts as a system originated with the Persians. Diodorus Siculus observes that the kings of Persia, in order to have intelligence of what was passing through all the provinces of their vast dominions, placed sentinels at eminences at convenient distances, where towers were built. These sentinels gave notice of public occurrences from one to another, with a very loud and shrill voice, by which news was transmitted from one extremity of the kingdom to another with great expedition. But as this could not be practiced except in the case of general news, which it was expedient that the whole nation should be acquainted with, Cyrus, as Xenophon relates, appointed couriers and places for post-horses, building for the purpose on all the high-roads houses for the reception of the couriers, where they were to deliver their packets to the next, and so on. This they did night and day, so that no inclemency of weather was to stop them; and they are represented as moving with astonishing speed. Herodotus owns that nothing swifter was known for a journey by land. Xerxes, in his famous expedition against Greece, planted posts from the Ægean Sea to Shushan or Susa, to send notice thither of what might happen to his army; he placed also messengers from station to station, to convey his packets, at such distances from each other as a horse might easily travel. The regularity and swiftness of the Roman posts were likewise admirable. Gibbon observes, "The advantage of receiving the earliest intelligence, and of conveying their orders with celerity, induced the emperors to establish throughout their extensive dominions the regular institution of posts. Houses were everywhere erected at the distance only of five or six miles; each of them was constantly provided with forty horses; and by the help of these relays it was easy to travel a hundred miles a day along the Roman roads." In the time of Theodosius, Cesarius, a magistrate of high rank, went by post from Antioch to Constantinople. He began his journey at night, was in Cappadocia (165 miles from Antioch) the ensuing evening, and arrived at Constantinople the sixth day about noon. The whole distance was 725 Roman, or 665 English miles. This service seems to have been very laxly performed till the time of Trajan, previous to whose reign the Roman messengers were in the habit of seizing for the public service any horses that came in their way. Some regularity was observed from this time forward, as in the Theodosian code mention is made of post-horses, and orders given for their regulation. Throughout all this period posts were only used on special occasions. Letters from private persons were conveyed by private hands, and were confined for the most part to business of sufficient urgency. Yet the correspondence of ancient times, if we may judge from the immense number of Egyptian, Babylonian, and Persian seals still in existence, must have been far from inconsiderable. The institution of posts disappeared from Europe with the breaking up of the Roman empire, and its re-establishment is generally attributed to Louis XI of France, in the middle of the 15th century.

A Tartar Courier.

Post (*stationary*) is the rendering in the A. V. of the following words:

1. אַיִל, *áyil* (Sept. τὸ αἴθριον, Vulg. *frons*), properly a *ram* (as in Gen. xv, 9, and often); hence perhaps a *pilaster* or buttress (Ezek. xl, 9-49; xli, 1, 3; "lintel," 1 Kings vi, 31). In the Sept. it is sometimes left untranslated (αἴλ, αἰλεῦ, αἰλάμ); and in the Chaldee version it is represented by a modification of itself. Throughout the passages of Ezekiel in which it occurs the Vulg. uniformly renders it by *frons:* which Gesenius quotes as favorable to his own view, provided that by *frons* be understood the projections in front of the building. The A. V. of 1 Kings vi, 31, "lintel," is supported by the versions of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion of Ezek. xl, 21; while Kimchi explains it generally by "post." The Peshito-Syriac uniformly renders the word by a modification of the Greek παραστάδες, "pillars." Jarchi understands by *ayil* a round column like a large tree; Aquila (Ezek. xl, 14), having in view the meaning "ram," which the word elsewhere bears, renders it κρίωμα, apparently intending thereby to denote the volutes of columns curved like rams' horns. J. D. Michaelis (*Supp. ad Lex.* s. v.) considers it to be the tympanum or triangular area of the pediment above a gate supported by columns. Gesenius himself, after reviewing the passages in which the word occurs, arrives at the conclusion that in the singular it denotes the whole projecting framework of a door or gateway, including the jambs on either side, the threshold, and the lintel or architrave, with frieze and cornice. In the plural it is applied to denote the projections along the front of an edifice ornamented with columns or palm-trees, and with recesses or intercolumniations between them sometimes filled up by windows. Under the former head he places 1 Kings vi, 31; Ezek. xl, 9, 21, 24, 26, 29, 31, 33, 34, 36-38, 48, 49; xli, 3; while to the latter he refers xl, 10, 14, 16; xli, 1. Another explanation still is that of Böttcher (quoted by Winer, *Realw.* ii, 575), who says that *ayil* is the projecting entrance and passage wall—which might appropriately be divided into compartments by panelling; and this view is adopted by Fürst (*Handw.* s. v.). Akin to this is אֵילָם, *eylám*, "an arch," only used in the plur. (Ezek. xl, 16, etc.), probably a portico, and so ren-

dered by Symmachus and Syriac versions (Gesen. *Thesaur.* p. 48).

2. אַמָּה, *ammâh* (Sept. *ὑπέρθυρον*, Vulg. *superliminare*), literally, *mother*, or *cubit*, as the fundamental relation; a *foundation* (Isa. vi, 4).

3. מְזוּזָה, *mezuzâh* (Sept. *σταθμός, φλιά*; Vulg. *postis*), the *door-post* (the usual term). See MEZUZAH. The ceremony of boring the ear of a voluntary bondsman was performed by placing the ear against the door-post of the house (Exod. xxi, 6; see Juven. *Sat.* i, 103, and Plaut. *Pœn.* v, 2, 21). The posts of the doors of the Temple were of olive-wood (1 Kings vi, 33).

4. סַף, *saph* (Sept. *φλιά, πρόπυλον*; Vulg. *limen, superliminare*), the *threshold* (2 Chron. iii, 7; Ezek. xli, 16; Amos ix, 1; elsewhere "threshold," "door," or "gate"). See DOOR.

Post, Christian Frederick, a distinguished but somewhat erratic Moravian missionary, was born in 1710 at Conitz, in Polish Prussia. He immigrated to America in 1742. He preached, after his arrival in this country, among the Indians, with whom he was connected by marriage, his first wife, Rachel, having been a baptized Wompanoag, and his second wife, Agnes, a baptized Delaware. His earliest missionary labors extended over parts of New England and New York. In 1745, while among the Mohawks, he was arrested on the false charge of being a French spy, sent to New York, and there confined for seven weeks in the jail of the City Hall. His companion, David Zeisberger (q. v.), shared the same lot. The protest of Governor Thomas and other influential Pennsylvanians at last secured their release. After the death of his second Indian wife—his third wife was a white woman—he returned to Europe, and thence, in 1752, sailed to Labrador, attempting to bring the Gospel to the Esquimaux. Having come back to Pennsylvania in 1754, he established himself in the Wyoming Valley, where he instructed the Indians and entertained travelling missionaries until the breaking out of the French and Indian War. In the course of this war, in the summer of 1758, at the instance of the government of Pennsylvania, he undertook a perilous journey through the Indian country as far as Ohio, inducing the Western tribes which were in league with France to bury the hatchet and send deputies to a congress at Easton. This congress resulted in a general pacification, which embraced all the nations except the Twightwees. Undaunted by the dangers of his first tour, he thereupon visited the Indian country a second time, and induced the Twightwees also to conclude peace. Post thus conferred an incalculable benefit upon the colonies, and indirectly helped to bring the North American continent under the sway of the Anglo-Saxon race. The journal of his first tour, which caused a great sensation at the time, was published in London in 1759, in a work entitled *An Enquiry into the Causes of the Alienation of the Delaware and Shawnee Indians from the British Interest*, etc. It is also found in the *Penn. Archives*, iii, 520–544. After the war Post began (1761) an independent mission on the Tuscarawas, Ohio. The breaking out of the Pontiac conspiracy compelled him to retire. He went to the South, and in the beginning of 1764 sailed from Charleston to Mosquitia, where he preached to the natives. In 1767 he visited the colonies, but returned again to Mosquitia. After that we lose sight of him until 1784, when he is found residing in Germantown, Pa. There he died, April 29, 1785, and was buried in the Lower Graveyard of that place by the Rev. William White (afterwards bishop White), rector of Christ Church, Philadelphia. (E. de S.)

Post, Henry Albertson, a Presbyterian minister, was born in Brooklyn, N. Y., Sept. 2, 1835. He received a careful parental training, enjoyed all the advantages of the academies of New England, and graduated at the New York Free Academy. He studied theology in the Union Seminary, New York, and subsequently in the Princeton Seminary, N. J., where he graduated in 1858, and was licensed and ordained over the Church in Warrensburgh, N. Y., Jan. 10, 1860: this was his only charge, for he died Nov. 12, 1861. Mr. Post died in the very midst of his active work; still his short ministry gave full proof of his calling, and many souls were added to the Church. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1863, p. 308. (J. L. S.)

Post, Reuben, a Presbyterian minister, was born in Cornwall, Vt., in 1792. He received a good academical training, and graduated with honor at Middlebury College, Vt., in 1814, and at the Theological Seminary at Princeton, N. J., in 1818. On leaving the seminary, he spent some time as a missionary in Virginia, then accepted a call from the First Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., and was ordained in 1819. In 1836 he accepted a call from the Circular Church, Charleston, S. C., where he labored faithfully for twenty-three years, when he was taken ill, and died Sept. 24, 1858. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1860, p. 77. (J. L. S.)

Postel, GUILLAUME, one of the most learned Frenchmen of his time, is celebrated especially as one of the wildest religious visionaries the world has ever encountered. He was born May 28, 1505 (according to some historians, 1510), at Dolerie, near Barenton, in Normandy. He lost his parents early, and poverty compelled him to leave his country. At the age of thirteen years he found at Say, near Pontoise, a modest situation as schoolmaster. He saved some money, and went to Paris to pursue his studies. There he was the victim of a robbery, which reduced him to extreme misery, and he was confined by sickness to a hospital for two years. When he was restored to health, his poverty and the high price of living compelled him to leave Paris, and to support himself by gleaning in the Beauce. Afterwards he entered the College of Sainte-Barbe in the quality of a servant; there he became by private study one of the most learned Hebraists of his time. No less remarkable was his proficiency in the Greek language. He lived successively in Amiens and Rouen, and then went back to Paris to become a tutor. He accompanied La Forest to Constantinople to transact some political business. He went a second time to the capital of Turkey with the heirs of a citizen of Tours, who had died leaving 300,000 ducats as a deposit in the hands of Ibrahim Pasha. Postel improved these occasions to study the Arabic language, and brought back with him a number of manuscripts in Arabic and Syriac. The New Testament in Syriac, which he was the first to bring to Europe, was printed at the expense of the emperor Ferdinand I. Shortly after this Postel published an alphabet in twelve languages, and some other writings. His learning was now acknowledged by king Francis I, and he was given in 1539 a professorship of mathematics and Oriental languages, with a salary of 200 ducats, which allowed him much leisure to devote himself to linguistic studies; but he lost his chair when chancellor Poyet, his benefactor, fell into disgrace. Postel thereupon repaired to Vienna, where he helped Joh. Alb. Widmanstadt in the publication of his New Testament in Syriac (printed in 1555). Compelled to leave that city for motives unknown, he was mistaken for a murderer who had some likeness to him, and arrested on the frontier of the Venetian territory. He succeeded in escaping his captors, and went to Rome in 1544. He there made the acquaintance of Ignatius de Loyola, and determined to enter the Order of the Jesuits. But the head of the neophyte was full of fantastic ideas, due to the study of the rabbins, and also to the study of the stars. After a two-years' noviciate he was expelled from the order, and Ignatius prohibited all intercourse with him. Postel having exposed in some writings his mystical ideas, he was imprisoned. Escaping to Venice, he was denounced to the Inquisition, but was dismissed by that tribunal, being

considered more a fool than a heretic. He afterwards lived in Genoa and Basle. Beza asserts that Postel offered to abjure his errors and to enter one of the Protestant communities, which seems doubtful. It appears that in 1553 he was a teacher of mathematics at Dijon, when his obnoxious opinions compelled him again to flee. He lived for some time at the court of the emperor Ferdinand I, whence, after a public abjuration of his opinions, he was recalled to his former situation at the College of France by Francis I, but soon lost it again, and spent the last eighteen years of his life in the monastery of Saint-Martin des Champs. "In his old age," says a contemporary, "princes and men of science paid their visits to the venerable recluse at Saint-Martin des Champs, where he lived. He there sat in his chair, his white beard falling down to his girdle; and in his deportment was such a majesty, such gravity in everything he said, that no one ever left him without a wish to see him again, and without astonishment at what he had heard." He died Sept. 6, 1581. It was during his life at the monastery that Postel published in 1572 his ideas about the comet which appeared in that year, and in 1575 a new edition of his *Histoires Orientales*, dedicated to Francis of Valois. He says in the dedication that Catharine de' Medici had made choice of him for preceptor of her son Francis, and that he declined the position on account of the dangers of the court, which he had painfully experienced in his own life. It is related by contemporaries that when he lectured at Paris, at the College of the Lombards, he drew such crowds that, the great room of the institute being too narrow, he caused his auditors to go down into the yard, and spoke to them from a window. Maldonatus says that "there came out of his mouth as many oracles as words." He may have been wrongly accused of atheism, but he entertained strange theological opinions. Among the wild and extravagant notions that he entertained, one was that he had died, and risen again with the soul of Adam; whence he called himself "Postellus restitutus;" he also maintained that women shall have the dominion over men, and that his writings were revealed to him by Jesus Christ. He was therefore confident of being able to explain by reason and philosophy all Christian dogmas, inclusive of the mysteries, his personal reason having become so superior to that of other men that by its means he would convert all nations to the Christian faith. "Christ has given," he said, "the *excellence of faith* to the apostles; but faith being now almost extinct, he gave us, and especially to me, instead of the faith, nay, with the faith, *reason*, so powerful and victorious, as never did the apostles have it. And thus innumerable things in the Scripture and in nature, which never were understood, by said victorious reason will be understood." He asserted that the human soul of Christ was created and united with the eternal Word before the creation of the world. He affirmed that everything that was in nature was described in the heavens in Hebrew characters, formed by the arrangement of the stars. The world was to subsist only for 6000 years, an opinion he had taken from the Jewish Cabala. The end of the world will be preceded by the restoration of all things into the state they were in before the fall of Adam. He dreamed of the fusion of all religions into one creed; and in his desire to reconcile Christians, Jews, and Mohammedans, undertook to explain the most extravagant opinions. But, whatever judgment we may pronounce on his opinions, justice compels us to recognise that all historians commend the purity of his life, the wisdom of his conduct, and the benevolence of his character: he often neglected his own interests to take care of others'. He left, *Linguarum XII characteribus differentium alphabetum introductio ac legendi methodus* (Paris, 1538, 4to): —*De originibus seu de Hebraicæ linguæ et gentis antiquitate atque variarum linguarum affinitate* (ibid. 1538, 4to):—*Grammatica Arabica* (ibid. 1538, 4to):—*Syriæ descriptio* (ibid. 1540, 8vo):—*De magistratibus Atheniensium* (Basle, 1543, 8vo; Leipsic, 1591, 8vo, with the notes of John Frederick Hekelius):—*Alcorani seu legis Mahometi et evangelistarum concordiæ liber* (Paris, 1543, 8vo):—*Sacrarum apodexeon, seu Euclidis Christiani libri ii* (ibid. 1543):—*IV librorum de orbis terræ concordia primus* (ibid. 8vo):—*De rationibus Spiritus Sancti* (ibid. 1543, 8vo); in this work Postel endeavors to prove that there is nothing in religion that is not in accordance with nature and reason:—*De orbis terræ concordiæ libri iv* (Basle, 1544, 8vo); it is the best of Postel's works, and expounds with much talent his favorite ideas about the conversion of all the nations of the world:—*De nativitate Mediatoris ultima, nunc futura et toti orbi terrarum in singulis ratione præditis manifestanda opus* (ibid, 1547, 8vo):—*Absconditorum a constitutione mundi clavis, qua mens humana tam in divinis quam in humanis pertinget ad interiora velamina æternæ veritatis* (ibid. 16mo; and with appendix, Amst. 1646, 16mo):—*Candelabri typici in Mosis tabernaculo jussu divino expressi interpretatio* (Venice, 1548 — Hebrew, Latin, and French):—*De Etruriæ regionis, quæ prima in orbe Europæo habitata est, originibus, institutis, religione, et moribus* (Florence, 1551, 4to):—*Les Raisons de la Monarchie, et quels Moyens sont nécessaire pour y parvenir* (Paris, 1551, 8vo):—*Abrahami patriarchæ liber Jesirah, sive formationis mundi, patribus quidem Abrahami tempora præcedentibus revelatur*, etc. (ibid. 1552, 16mo):—*De causis seu de principiis et originibus naturæ utriusque* (ibid. 1552, 16mo):—*Eversio falsorum Aristotelis dogmatum* (ibid. 1552, 16mo):—*L'Histoire mémorable des Expéditions depuis le Déluge, faites par les Gauloys ou Françoys depuis la France jusques en Asie, ou en Thrace, et en l'orientale Partie de l'Europe* (ibid. 1552, 16mo):—*De Phœnicum litteris, seu de prisco Latinæ et Græcæ linguæ charactere* (ibid. 1552, 8vo):—*Tabulæ in astronomiam, in arithmeticam theoricam et in musicam theoricam* (ibid. 1552):—*La Loi Salique, livret de la première humaine Vérité* (ibid. 1552, 16mo; Lyons, 1559, 16mo):—*Proto-Evangelium Jacobi, fratris et potissimum orbi Latino ad hanc diem incognita aut inconsiderata historia* (ibid. 1553, 8vo):—*Descriptio Domini* (Basle, 1552, 8vo):—*De Originibus, seu de varia des Gaules* (Paris, 1553, fol.):—*Signorum cœlestium vera configuratio et significationum expositio* (ibid. 1553, 8vo):—*La Doctrine du Siècle doré, ou de l'évangélique Règne de Jésus, Roy des Roys* (ibid. 1551, 16mo; reprinted with the following):—*Les très-marveilleuses Victoires des Femmes du Nouveau-Monde; et comme elles doivent à tout le Monde par Raison commander, et même à ceux qui auront la Monarchie du Monde Vieil* (ibid. 1553, 16mo). This book has become very rare and precious. Postel declares that he speaks in the name and by the inspiration of a certain mère Jeanne, whom he had known in Italy, and whose substance has been absorbed by his own:—*Des Merveilles des Indes et du Nouveau-Monde où est démontré le Lieu du Paradis terrestre* (ibid. 1553, 16mo):—*Description de la Terre-Sainte* (ibid. 1553, 16mo):—*Le prime nove dell' altro mondo, cioi l'ammirabile storia intitolata: La Vergine Venetiana* (1555, 12mo):—*De la République des Turcs et des Mœurs et Loys de tous les Mahumédistes* (Poitiers, 1560, 4to):—*Cosmographiæ disciplinæ Compendium, cum synopsi rerum toto orbe gestarum* (Basle, 1561, 4to):—*La Concordance des quatre Évangiles* (Paris, 1562, 16mo):—*Les premiers Éléments d'Euclide Chrétien en Vers* (ibid. 1562, 8vo):—*De universitate seu cosmographia* (ibid. 1563, 4to; reprinted several times):—*De raris historiis et de admirandis rebus quæ a quinquaginta annis contegerunt* (1553–83; Paris, 1563, 4to). Postel is one of the authors to whom the celebrated work *De tribus impostoribus* has been attributed. — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v. See Ittig, *De Postello* (Leips. 1704); Desbillons, *Sur la Vie de Postel* (Liège, 1773); Sainte-Marthe, *Éloges;* Thevet, *Hist. des Hommes illustres;* Desbillons, *Nouveaux Éclaircissements sur la Vie de Postel;* Collomieo, *Gallia Orientalis;* De Thou, *Éloges des Savants;* Sallengre, *Mémoires de la Lit-*

térature, vol. i and ii; Marrier, *Hist. de Saint-Martin des Champs;* Nicéron, *Mémoires*, vol. viii; Chaufepié, *Remarques sur Postel;* Goujet, *Mém. hist. sur le Collége Royal.* Lelong also names a *Vie de Postel* by the abbé Joly, canon at Dijon. See also Brunet, *Manuel du Libraire*, iii, 822; Frère, *Manuel du Bibliographe Normand;* Hallam, *Introd. to the Literature of Europe* (Harper's ed.), i, 240, 406.

Postil (Latin *postilla*) originally designated in the ecclesiastical language of mediævalism explanatory remarks accompanying the text of the Bible, mostly in the form of sermons or homilies. The name sprung from the fact that these were usually delivered immediately after the reading of the Gospel, and were explanatory of it. Its etymology is to be found in the words "post illa verba textus" or "sacræ scripturæ," the first two words being combined in one, which is used as noun and verb (*postilla, postillare*). Charlemagne ordered a homiliarium to be composed for the clergy of his empire, in which the pericopes or texts of the Sundays and holydays are followed by a homily from one of the celebrated ancient preachers. This collection was long in use in the German empire, and was often called *Postilla.* But the meaning of the word became more comprehensive in the latter part of the Middle Ages, when a running commentary of Scripture was called *Postilla*, because the text was first exhibited, and *post illa* (after the words of the text) the comments of the writer. Thus we find "Postillavit evangelia, epistolas Pauli," etc. The most remarkable of these postillæ is that of the celebrated exegete Nicolas de Lyra (q. v.), under the title "Postillæ perpetuæ in Biblia," or "Postilla in universa Biblia." Luther, by his well-known "Postilla," introduced the word among the Protestant communions. It is still, but less frequently, employed, and only in the Church of Rome or of England, for collections of sermons connected with the pericopes of Sundays and holydays. See Siegel, *Christliche Alterthümer* (see Index in vol. iv); Wheatly, *On the Book of Common Prayer*, p. 272.

Post-Millennialists, the name applied to the large body of Christians belonging to all denominations who believe that the second coming of Christ will not precede, as the Pre-Millennialists allege, but follow after the Millennium (q. v.).

Post-Pridie (or the COLLECTIO POST MYSTERIUM or POST SECRETA, as it is called in the Gallican office) is the prayer of the *Anaphoræ* (q. v.) of the Mozarabic liturgy. Various opinions are entertained regarding the belief of the Eastern Church on the doctrine of the *Invocation of the Holy Ghost* (q. v.) in the consecration of the elements. These opinions may be summarized in the following three: (1) That the Eastern Church gives it no effect in the act of consecration, believing that to take place solely, entirely, and properly in the words of institution. (2) That it believes both the words of institution and those of invocation to be coordinately efficacious to the same end. (3) That the whole force of the consecration is vested in the invocation. (For the history of the controversy, see Neale, *Introd.* i, 493 sq.) Neale, than whom there is no better authority on the subject, believes "that the sense of the Oriental Church may be thus expressed: The bread and wine offered on the altar are transmuted into the body and blood of Christ by the words of institution, and by the invocation of the Holy Ghost by the Church; and if either of these things be wanting, the Eucharist, so far forth as the orthodox Eastern Church is concerned, is not valid. I make the limitation because the Oriental Church has not condemned her Roman sister for the omission of the invocation" (*Introd.* i, 496).

The *Post-Pridie* varies with the festival on which it is used. Thus, e. g., the prayer said on the first Sunday after apparition is as follows:

"Mindful, O Lord, of thy precepts, we earnestly pray thee that thou wouldst pour forth on these sacrifices the plenitude of thy Holy Ghost, that while we receive them blessed of thee, we may in all ways rejoice that we are filled with all manner of benediction, and are freed from the bonds of our sins. Amen. Through thy gift, holy Lord, for thou createst all these things very good for us, thy unworthy servants, sanctifiest them †, quickenest them †, blessest them †, and grantest to us that they may be blessed of thee, our God, to ages of ages. Amen."

Cardinal Bona, who calls the belief of the Greeks a *detestandus error*, though he denies it to be more than an opinion held by some members of the Eastern Church, is rather baffled by the Mozarabic office. He tries to prove that it is only to be taken relatively to the receiver, and quotes the Mass for the first Sunday after Pentecost: "Be pleased to bless and sanctify to us the gifts," etc. By parity of reasoning it might be argued that the Roman Church only believes in a relative change, because the prayer in the canon runs, respecting the yet unconsecrated bread and wine, "that to us they may become the body and blood of Jesus Christ." The *Post-Pridie* in the Gotho-Hispanic rite seems always to have contained this invocation; but in the mutilation and changes to which that office has been subjected comparatively few masses have retained it in direct terms. The *Post-Pridie* for Easter-day, though not containing a direct invocation of the Holy Ghost, has a most remarkable prayer for change: "Ut hic tibi panis cum hoc calice oblatus in Filii tui Corpus et Sanguinem, te benedicente, ditescat." This may be profitably compared with the Ximenian *Post-Pridie* for Corpus Christi; the difference is astonishing: "Ut panis hic transmutatus in Carnem, et calix transformatus in Sanguinem," etc. In some instances the prayer for the descent of the Holy Ghost is changed into a prayer for the descent of Christ; as, for example, in the first (=second) Sunday after Easter: "Christe . . . his sacrificiis propitius illabere, hisque benedicturus descende." The corruption sometimes takes a curious turn; thus on July 25 the *Post-Pridie* prays that by the intercession of St. Christopher the offerers may be filled with the Holy Ghost. We may gather on the whole that Ximenes, who (like Bona) must have considered the prayer for any change after the words of institution a detestable error, softened the expression in many cases, and omitted it in many others; though enough is still left to show us what the original design of the prayer was. See LITURGY. (J. H. W.)

Post-Sanctus. See POST-PRIDIE.

Postulate (*αἴτημα, postulatum*, that which is *asked* or assumed to prove something else). "According to some, the difference between axioms and postulates is analogous to that between theorems and problems: the former expressing truths which are self-evident, and from which other propositions may be deduced; the latter, operations which may easily be performed, and by the help of which more difficult constructions may be effected." There is a difference between a postulate and a hypothesis. When you lay down something which may be, although you have not proved it, and which is admitted by the learner or the disputant, you make a hypothesis. The postulate, not being assented to, may be contested during the discussion, and is only established by its conformity with all other ideas on the subject.

Postulation (Lat. i. e. *an asking*) is a term in ecclesiastical law designating a presentation or recommendation addressed to the superior to whom the right of appointment to any dignity belongs, in favor of one who has not a strict title to the appointment. Thus, if a chapter elect for bishop a person who wants one of the canonical requirements, or if there is a canonical impediment, the act of the chapter is not properly an election, but a request to the pope for dispensation and admission. It can only take place when the wanted requirements are of a trifling description. It is also used in the case of the presentation of candidates for the episcopacy as it exists in the Roman Catholic Church

in Ireland. See Neller, *De postulatione prælatorum*, in Schmidt, *Thes. jur. can.* ii, 733.

Postures are the bodily attitudes assumed in the various parts of divine worship, whether public or private. No act whatever can be performed without the body taking some posture. This is the case in divine worship as well as in matters of less consequence. The only question, therefore, is whether all possible postures are equally appropriate in that worship and in its different departments. Reason, Scripture, and universal consent testify that they are not. Kneeling and prostration seem peculiarly expressive of penitent humility; bowing, of deep veneration; standing, of joy and thanksgiving. They are all the natural expressions of the feeling which accompanies or characterizes the particular devotion in which they are employed, and are used by supplicants to man as well as to God. The four postures above mentioned are found to have been used by the ancient Christians in their prayer—standing, kneeling, bowing, and prostration. Standing was the posture generally observed on the Lord's day, and the fifty days between Easter and Pentecost, in memory of the Saviour's resurrection. This custom is traced up to an early period, and the reason assigned by Justin Martyr is, "Forasmuch as we ought to remember both our fall and our sin, and the grace of Christ by which we rise again from our fall, therefore we pray, kneeling, six days, as a symbol of our fall by sin; but our not kneeling on the Lord's day is a symbol of the resurrection, whereby, through the grace of Christ, we are delivered from our sins, and from death that is mortified thereby." Kneeling was the customary posture of devotion. Bowing down the head was chiefly used in receiving the bishop's or priest's benediction, and in all formal addresses to God for his mercy and favor on the people, whether catechumens, penitents, or others. In the paintings of the catacombs, and on the ancient enamelled glasses found therein, the standing posture in prayer is accompanied by outstretched and upraised hands. The bowing posture was rather a special act of reverence accompanying a particular address or a particular part of an address than a sustained posture. It occurred at frequent intervals in the ancient liturgy, and is still used in the Roman mass as well as (even more profusely) in those of all the various rites, Greek, Syrian, Coptic, Armenian, and Russian. Prostration was taken from the Jewish Church, and was chiefly appropriated to deep humiliations and expressions of shame or sorrow on particular occasions, and was mainly used by the Penitents (q. v.), especially in that grade of public penance which was known under the name "prostration." It is also used still in the solemn ordination of subdeacons, deacons, and priests, as performed in the Roman Catholic Church. The question as to the use of particular postures was a subject of much controversy between the Puritans and the Church of England, and has recently been revived in the Presbyterian Church of Scotland. See Attitude; Prayer.

Postvorta, a surname of the Roman goddess *Carmenta*, indicating her knowledge of the past, just as Antevorta denotes her knowledge of the future.

Pot, a term applicable to so many sorts of vessels that it can scarcely be restricted to any one in particular. See Basin; Cup, etc. But from the places where the word is used we may collect the uses, and also in part the materials of the utensils implied. This vessel, so necessary in cooking and serving up food (Numb. xi, 8; Judg. vi, 19; 1 Sam. ii, 14; 2 Kings iv, 38 sq.; 2 Chron. xxxv, 13; Isa. lxv, 4; Mic. iii, 3; Ezek. xi, 3; xxiv, 3 sq.), derives its ordinary names from its use in boiling. It was commonly, among the Israelites, made of clay (Heb. חֹמֶר, Gr. *πήλος*; comp. Isa. xxix, 16; xlv, 9; Jer. xviii, 4). But there were also brazen pots (Lev. viii, 28), especially in the sanctuary (1 Kings vii, 45; 2 Kings xxv, 14). The trade of the potters, called יוֹצְרִים (comp. Gesenius, *Monumenta Phœn.* p. 161) or יוֹצְרֵי חֶרֶשׂ (Jer. xix, 1), in Greek *κεραμεῖς*, was a separate pursuit, to whose mysteries allusions are often made (Jer. xviii, 2 sq.; Sirach xxxviii, 30 sq., 33 sq.). It was necessary first to work the clay with the feet, to make it plastic (Isa. xli, 25), and then to shape it with the hand (Jer. xviii, 4, 6; Sirach xxxiii, 13; xxxviii, 30) and the Oriental potter's wheel (אָבְנַיִם, Jer. xviii, 3; see Gesenius, *Thesaur.* i, 16). The vessels were glazed (Sirach xxxviii, 31; Prov. xxvi, 23), and then burned in the oven (*κάμινος*, Sirach, *l. c.*). Bähr (*Symbolik*, ii, 293) and Sommer (*Bibl. Abhandl.* i, 213) assume, indeed, that the Hebrews were ignorant of glazing, and explain the passages (Lev. vi, 21; xi, 33; xv, 12) which command the breaking of earthen vessels made unclean by this want of glazing. There are, indeed, no pots extant from Egyptian antiquity, but earthen figures show a glazing upon them; and it would be unreasonable to suppose that the Egyptians had failed to apply the art to their vessels. There is nothing inexplicable in the command to break the defiled vessels, inasmuch as they were of little value; and any of them might easily have lost part of its glazing, and so taken in some of the unclean substance; so that breaking was the safest method of disposing of them. Such a command would also produce more care in housekeeping to avoid uncleanness (comp. *Descript. de l'Égypte*, vol. ii, pl. 87 sq.; v, pl. 75; Wilkinson, iii, 164). See Pottery.

The following are the words so rendered in the English Bible:

1. אָסוּךְ, *asûk* (Sept. *ἀγγεῖον*), applied to holding oil (2 Kings iv, 2), probably was an earthen jar, deep and narrow, without handles, apparently like the Roman and Egyptian amphora, inserted in a stand of wood or stone (see Wilkinson, *Anc. Egypt.* i, 47; Sandys, *Trav.* p. 150). See Pitcher.

2. גָּבִיעַ, *gabîa* (Sept. *κεράμιον*, Vulg. *scyphus*, Jer. xxxv, 5; elsewhere "bowl" or "cup"), probably a bulging jar or bowl for liquids. See Bowl.

3. דּוּד, *dûd* (Sept. *κόφινος*, Job xli, 20; Psa. lxxxi, 6; elsewhere "basket," "caldron," "kettle"), a vessel for culinary purposes, mentioned (1 Sam. ii, 14) in conjunction with "caldron" and "kettle," and so perhaps of smaller size. See Kettle.

4. חֶרֶשׂ, *chéres* ("potsherd," Job ii, 8; Psa. xxii, 15; Prov. xxvi, 23; Isa. xlv, 9; elsewhere "earthen," etc.), an earthen vessel for stewing or seething. Such a vessel was used for baking (Ezek. iv, 9). It is contrasted in the same passage (Lev. vi, 28) with a metal vessel for the same purpose. See Potsherd.

5. כְּלִי, *keli* (Sept. *σκεῦος*, Lev. vi, 28), a *vessel* of any kind (as usually elsewhere rendered). See Vessel.

6. כִּיר, *kîr* (only once and in the dual, Lev. xi, 35, "ranges for pots"). See Range.

7. סִיר, *sîr* (Sept. *λέβης*, Vulg. *olla*, the most usual and appropriate word, Exod. xxxviii, 3; 2 Kings iv, 38-41; xxv, 14; 2 Chron. iv, 11, 16; xxxv, 13; Job xli, 31; Psa. lviii, 9; Eccles. vii, 6; Jer. i, 13; Ezek. xxiv, 3, 6; Mic. iii, 3; Zech. xiv, 10, 21). It is also used, combined with other words, to denote special uses, as with נָפַח (Jer. i, 13), "a seething-pot;" with בָּשָׂר, "flesh" (Exod. xvi, 3); רַחַץ, "washing" (Psa. lx, 8); מְצָרֵף, "fining-pot" (Prov. xxvii, 21). The blackness which such vessels would contract is alluded to in Joel ii, 6. See Caldron.

8. פָּרוּר, *parûr* (Sept. *χαλκεῖον*, Vulg. *cacabus*, Judg. vi, 19; 1 Sam. ii, 14; "pan," Numb. xi, 8), apparently an open flat vessel. See Pan.

9. צִנְצֶנֶת, *tsintse'neth* (Sept. *σταμνός*, Vulg. *vas*, Exod. xvi, 33), a covered vessel for preserving things (comp. Heb. ix, 4). See Manna.

10. שְׂפַתַּיִם, *shephatta'yim* (Sept. κλῆρος, Psa. lxviii, 13; "hooks," Ezek. xl, 43), opposite *rows*, as of sheepfolds.

11. ξέστης (Mark vii, 4, 8), properly a *sextarius* or sixteenth part of the *medius* or "bushel,"=nearly one pint English; hence a cup generally. See MEASURE.

12. στάμνος (Heb. ix, 4), an earthen *jug* or jar, =No. 9 above.

13. ὑδρία (John ii, 6, 7; iv, 28), a "*water-pot*" for any liquid. The water-pots of Cana appear to have been large amphoræ, such as are in use at the present day in Syria (Fisher, *Views*, p. 56; Jolliffe, i, 33). These were of stone or hard earthenware; but gold, silver, brass, or copper was also used for vessels both for domestic and also, with marked preference, for ritual use (1 Kings vii, 45; x, 21; 2 Chron. iv, 16; ix, 20; Mark vii, 4; Michaelis, *Laws of Moses*, § 217, iii, 335, ed. Smith). The water-pot of the Samaritan woman may have been a leathern bucket, such as Bedawîn women use (Burckhardt, *Notes*, i, 45). See WATER-POT.

POT, "HOLY-WATER POT" or "HOLY-WATER VASE," and *Sprinkle* (=sprinkling-brush), are implements used in Roman Catholic churches for sprinkling the altar and priest and people with the holy water on Sunday. Holy-water pots, such as is represented in the cut, are from five and a quarter to seven and a half inches in diameter.

Holy-water Pot.

Potamiāna, a Christian martyr in the time of Severus, in the beginning of the 3d century, was a slave of rare personal beauty; but for not reciprocating the passion of her master she was given up as a Christian to the prefect of Egypt. She was scourged; and, unmoved by threats, was led to the fire and burned, together with her mother, Marcella. Scalding pitch was poured upon her body, which she bore with great patience. Basilides, her executioner, embraced Christianity, and suffered martyrdom. See Schaff, *Church History*, i, 169.

Potamius, an ecclesiastic of Spanish birth, flourished as bishop of Lisbon in the middle of the 4th century; and if the first of the pieces mentioned below be genuine, he must, in the early part of his career, have been a champion of the Catholic faith. Subsequently, however, he was a zealous Arian, and it is believed that he drew up the document known in ecclesiastical history as *The Second Sirmian Creed*. The writings usually ascribed to Potamius are, *Epistola ad Athanasium Episcopum Alexandrinum de Consubstantialitate Filii Dei*, in some MSS. entitled *Epistola Potamii ad Athanasium ab Arianis* (impetitum?) *postquam in Concilio Ariminensi subscripserunt*, composed in the year A.D. 355, while the opinions of the author were yet orthodox. The authenticity of this piece, however, which is characterized by great obscurity of thought and of expression, and often half barbarous in phraseology, is very doubtful. It was first published by the Benedictine D'Achery, in his *Spicilegium veterum aliquot Scriptorum* (Paris, 1661, 4to), ii, 366, or iii, 299 of the new edition by Baluze (1717, fol.), and will be found in its best form in Galland's *Bibliotheca Patrum* (Venice, 1769, fol.), v, 96:—*Sermo de Lazaro:*—*Sermo de Martyrio Esaiæ Prophetæ*. These are two discourses resembling in style the epistle to Athanasius, long attributed to Zeno, bishop of Verona, and published, without suspicion, among his works, until the brothers Ballerini (*S. Zenonis Sermones* [ibid. 1739, fol.], p. 297-303) proved that they must be assigned to Potamius, whom, however, they supposed to be a person altogether different from the bishop of Lisbon, and belonging to a different age. The arguments which they employ to demonstrate this last position are founded upon the second title of the *Epistola ad Athanasium* as given above, but this title Galland, Schönemann, and others hold to be the blunder of an ignorant transcriber. The *Sermones* will be found in Galland, and the discussions with regard to the real author in the Prolegomena to the volume, ch. x, p. xvii. See Smith, *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. and Mythol.* s. v.; Ueberweg, *Hist. of Philosophy*, vol. i; Hefele, *Conciliengesch.* vol. i.

Potămo (Ποτάμων), a Greek philosopher of the Alexandrian school, lived in the 3d century of the Christian æra, and was a native of Alexandria. According to Suidas, under Αἵρεσις and Ποτάμων, he was a contemporary of the emperor Augustus; but Porphyry, in his life of Plotinus, states positively that Plotinus delighted in listening to Potamo's exposition of a new philosophy, of which he was laying the foundations. What was the purport of this new philosophy? It was developed in two treatises, one of which was a commentary on Plato's *Timæus*, the other a treatise on the first principles, Στοιχειώσις. Both works are lost; but something is known of the second by a passage of Diogenes Laertius in the introduction to his book *On the Life and Doctrines of Illustrious Philosophers*. "Of late," says the biographer, "an eclectic school, ἐκλεκτικὴ τις αἵρεσις, was founded by Potamo of Alexandria, which makes a choice among the doctrines of all sects. Two things, so he explains in his *Treatise on the First Principles* (Στοιχειώσις), are required to discern the truth: that which judges, reason (τὸ ἡγεμονικόν), and that by the means of which we judge, i. e. the accurate representation of the objects of our judgments. As to the principles of things, he recognises four of them—matter, quality, action, and place (τήν τε ὕλην, καὶ τὸ ποιόν, ποίησίν τε, καὶ τύπον); in other words, out of what, and by whom, how, and where a thing is done (ἐξ οὗ γάρ, καὶ ὑφ' οὗ, καὶ πῶς, καὶ ἐν ᾧ). The aim towards which everything should tend, according to him, is a life perfect in virtues, without discarding, however, the good of the body, nor general material interests." It follows from this passage of Diogenes Laertius, combined with the testimony of Porphyry, 1st, that Potamo was the founder of the eclectic school at Rome; 2d, that he combined the doctrines of Plato with the Stoical and Aristotelian, and was not without original views of his own; 3d, that in ethics he attempted a kind of conciliation of Stoicism and Epicurism.—Hoefer. But Potamo had no followers in his peculiar combinations. They were supplanted by the school that endeavored to engraft Christianity upon the older system of philosophy. See Porphyry, *Vita Plotini*, e. g. in Fabricius, *Bibl. Græc.* ii, 109; Diogenes Laertius, *Procem.* § 21; but especially Brucker, *Historia Criticæ Philosophiæ*, ii, 193 sq.; Glöckner, *De Potamonis Alex. Philosophia Eclectica, recentiorum Platonicorum Disciplinæ admodum dissimili, Disput.* (Leips. 1745, 4to), an abstract of which is in Fabricius, iii, 184 sq. For the statement that there were two or three Potamos there is no ground. See the examination of this point in Smith, *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog.* ii, 513.

Potent, CROSS, in heraldry, a cross crutch-shaped at each extremity. It is also called a *Jerusalem cross*, from its occurrence in the insignia of the Christian kingdom of Jerusalem, which are, Argent a cross potent between four crosslets or. This coat is remarkable as being a departure from the usual heraldic rule which prohibits the placing of metal upon metal.



Potent.

Potential is opposed to *actual*. This antithesis is a fundamental doctrine of the Peripatetic philosophy. "Aristotle saith that divided they (i. e. bodies) be in infinitum *potentially*, but actually not" (Holland's *Plu-*

tarch, p. 667). "Anaximander's infinite was nothing else but an infinite chaos of matter, in which were either actually or potentially contained all manner of qualities" (see Cudworth, *Intellectual System*, i, 128).

Pothier, Remi, a French theologian, was born at Rheims in 1727. After entering the service of the Church he was successively curate of Betheniville and canon of Laon. At the outbreak of the Revolution he retired to Belgium. After his return to his native country he did not again discharge any sacerdotal functions. He entertained original and often strangely bold opinions, and his obstinate character and polemical mania made him the terror of all who approached him. He was convinced that no one before him had made out the true meaning of the Bible; he undertook to make it known to the world, and started with his alleged *Explication de l'Apocalypse*, the *plan* of which, published in 1713, was burned by order of the Parliament of Paris at the requisition of the advocate-general Séguier, who pronounced it a masterpiece of human extravagance. Nevertheless Pothier had his work clandestinely printed *in extenso* (Douai, 1773, 2 vols. 8vo); he translated it into Latin (Augsburg, 1797, 2 vols., and 1798, 12mo), and published an extract of it, with the title *Les Trois Dernières Plaies*—The Three Last Plagues (1798, 12mo), in which he calls Bonaparte the precursor of the Antichrist. In 1802 he published in Latin an *Explanation of the Psalms of David* (Augsburg, 8vo). Under the empire two of his pamphlets against the four articles of the Gallican Church were confiscated by the police. Pothier died at Rheims June 23, 1812.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.

Pothīnus, St., a prelate of the Church in the 2d century, who died a martyr, was probably born at Smyrna in A.D. 87. He was a disciple neither of Peter nor of John, as some writers have asserted, but of Polycarp, bishop of Smyrna. He went to Rome with the latter while Anicetus was bishop of Rome, in 158, and was sent by that pontiff to evangelize the Gauls. Pothinus established himself at Lyons, and founded there a flourishing Church. He had presided over it twenty years when, in the reign of Marcus Aurelius, the persecutions against the Christians broke out with renewed violence. His hoary age did not protect the bishop from persecution. He was brought before the governor, and was asked who was the God of the Christians. "If you are worthy," said the old bishop, "you will know him." He was severely beaten, and dragged, half dead, to a dismal dungeon, where he expired two days afterwards, June 2, 177. At the same time with the apostle of Lyons, forty-seven faithful sealed their faith with their blood. These were the first martyrs of the Gauls: their remains were buried beneath the altar of a church built under the invocation of the holy apostles, now consecrated to St. Nizier. The Church celebrates on June 2 the memory of the martyrs of Lyons. Their history was written in Greek, in the name of the faithful of the churches of Lyons, and attributed to Irenæus, successor of Pothinus. It is one of the most precious monuments of the first centuries of Christianity. We owe its preservation to Eusebius, who inserted it partly in his *Hist. Eccles.* (lib. v, cap. i).—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v. See Longueval, *Hist. de l'Église Gallicane*, liv. i; *Gallia Christiana*, vol. v; Colonia, *Antiquités de Lyon*, p. 38; Du Tems, *Le Clergé de France*, vol. iv; Schaff, *Hist. of the Christian Church*, i, 167; Mosheim, *Commentaries*, and *Eccles. Hist.* vol. i; Alzog, *Kirchengesch.* i, 129, 138.

Pothos (Πόθος), a personification among the ancient Greeks of *love* or desire, and usually regarded as a companion of *Aphrodite*.

Pot'iphar (Heb. *Potiphar'*, פּוֹטִיפַר, contraction of פּוֹטִי פֶרַע, *Poti-pherah* [q. v.]; Sept. Πετεφρής), an officer of Pharaoh, probably the chief of his body-guard (Gen. xxxix, 1). B.C. cir. 1890. Of the Midianitish merchants he purchased Joseph. The keeper of the prison into which the son of Jacob was eventually cast treated him with kindness, and confided to him the management of the prison (Gen. xxvii, 36; xxxix, 1); and this confidence was afterwards sanctioned by the "captain of the guard" himself, as the officer responsible for the safe custody of prisoners of state (Gen. xl, 3, 4). It is sometimes denied, but more usually maintained, that this "captain of the guard" was the same with the Potiphar who is before designated by the same title. It is possible that this "captain of the guard" and Joseph's master were the same person. It would be in accordance with Oriental usage that offenders against the court, and the officers of the court, should be in custody of the captain of the guard; and that Potiphar should have treated Joseph well after having cast him into prison is not irreconcilable with the facts of the case. After having imprisoned Joseph in the first transport of his choler, he might possibly discover circumstances which led him to doubt his guilt, if not to be convinced of his innocence. The mantle left in the hands of his mistress, and so triumphantly produced against him, would, when calmly considered, seem a stronger proof of guilt against her than against him; yet still, to avoid bringing dishonor upon his wife, and exposing her to new temptation, he may have deemed it more prudent to bestow upon his slave the command of the state prison than to restore him to his former employment. See Joseph.

Potiphar is described as "an officer of Pharaoh, chief of the executioners (סְרִיס פַּרְעֹה שַׂר הַטַּבָּחִים), an Egyptian" (Gen. xxxix, 1; comp. xxxvii, 36). The word we render "officer," as in the A. V., is literally "eunuch," and the Sept. and Vulg. so translate it here (σπάδων, *eunuchus*); but it is also used for an officer of the court, and this is almost certainly the meaning here, as Potiphar was married, which is seldom the case with eunuchs, though some, as those which have the custody of the Kaaba at Mecca, are exceptions, and his office was one which would not usually be held by persons of a class ordinarily wanting in courage, although here again we must except the occasional usage of Muslim sovereigns, whose executioners were sometimes eunuchs, as Harûn er-Rashîd's Mesrû, in order that they might be able to carry out the royal commands even in the harems of the subjects. Potiphar's office was "chief of the executioners," not, as the Sept. makes it, "of the cooks" (ἀρχιμάγειρος), for the prison was in his house, or, at least, in that of the chief of the executioners, probably a successor of Potiphar, who committed the disgraced servants of Pharaoh to Joseph's charge (xl, 2-4). He is called an Egyptian; and it is to be noticed that his name contains that of an Egyptian divinity. He appears to have been a wealthy man, having property in the field as well as in the house, over which Joseph was put, evidently in an important post (xxxix, 4-6). The view we have of Potiphar's household is exactly in accordance with the representations on the monuments, in which we see how carefully the produce of the land was registered and stored up in the house by overseers, as well as the liberty that women of all ranks enjoyed. When Joseph was accused, his master contented himself with casting him into prison (ver. 19, 20), probably being a merciful man, although he may have been restrained by God from acting more severely. After this we hear no more of Potiphar, unless, which is unlikely, the chief of the executioners afterwards mentioned be he. If he were actually a eunuch, we may the more easily account for his wife's conduct. See Eunuch.

Potiph'erah (Heb. *Poti-phéra*, פּוֹטִי פֶרַע), the priest of On, or Heliopolis, whose daughter Asenath became the wife of Joseph (Gen. xli, 45, 50; xlvi, 20). B.C. cir. 1880. The name is Egyptian, and is in the Sept. accommodated to the analogy of the Egyptian language, being in the Cod. Vatican. Πετεφρῆ; Alex.

Πετεφρῆ, v. r. Πεντεφρή, Πεντεφρί; which corresponds to the Coptic *Pete-phrah, belonging to the Sun*, which is written in hieroglyphics thus:

Name of Pot-pherah, Pet-phre, or Pet-re.

(Champollion, *Précis, Tabl. Général*, p. 23). For the various forms, see Gesenius, *Thesaur.* p. 1094, from Roselini, *Monum. Storici*, i, 117. The name is the full form of that borne by Potiphar, Joseph's former master. See Asenath; On.

Potitii, a distinguished family among the ancient Romans, who are said to have received Hercules when he went into Italy, and treated him hospitably on the very spot where Rome was afterwards built. The Potitii were in return invested with the honor of being in all future time the hereditary priests of the god. They continued accordingly to enjoy this privilege until B.C. 312, when they sold their knowledge of the sacred rites for 50,000 pounds of copper. For this remuneration they instructed public slaves in the worship of Hercules; whereupon the deity was so enraged that the whole family of the Potitii perished within thirty days. See Smith, *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog.* s. v. Potitia Gens.

Potken, Johann, a German Roman Catholic ecclesiastic who flourished in the 16th century, is noted in the literary world as the editor of the first printed edition of the Psalms in the Ethiopic language. In 1511, while at Rome, he betook himself to the study of the Ethiopic language, and two years later, in 1513, he published the Psalms in quarto. The book has no title, but on the first page a likeness of David with the harp is given. On the second page of the book commences the preface in Gothic letters, in which he states the reason for the edition of the Psalter in Ethiopic, or, as he calls it, in the Chaldee language: "Quæ res mihi biennio vix elapso Romæ accidit. Nam cum nonnullos habitu et colore Æthiopes, qui se Indos appellabant, psallentes, ac Dei genetricem et sanctos quam plures, præsertim Apostolos, per eos inter psallendum nominari advertissem, non sine difficultate ab iis didici, ipsos in eorum sacris Chaldæis literis uti quærens itaque interpretem, per quem cumeis loqui plenius possem, nec illum in urbe gentium olim domina, etiam neque inter Hebræos quidem reperiens idoneum, demum ab ipsis erudiri, quoquo modo fieri posset, statui. Nec me mea fefellit spes. Tantum namque me ab eis didicisse mihi persuadeo, ut deo duce Psalterium David in ipsa vera lingua Chaldæa imprimi curare, in eorum qui peregrinas linguas nosse cupiunt, oblectationem valeam." As to the edition itself, the text is printed on a very fine paper, which is very surprising for those times. The superscriptions over each psalm are printed with red color. At the end of the Psalter is printed, "Impressum est opusculum hoc ingenio et impensis *Joannis Potken* prepositi ecclesiæ sancti *Georgii Coloniensis;* Romæ per *Marcellum Silber*, alias *Franck*, et finitum die ultima Junii, anno salutis MDXIII." Then follows the *Song of Songs* on eight pages, and on four pages the alphabet of the language, together with a short grammar, is given. This edition is now very rare. In 1518 Potken, after having returned from Rome, published a new edition of the Psalter, with the Hebrew text and Greek and Latin translations, under the title *Psalterium in quatuor linguis, Hebræa, Græca, Chaldaica, Latina.* These two editions form the basis of the Ethiopic version of Walton's Polyglot, published in 1657. See Jöcher, *Gelehrten-Lexikon*, s. v.; Alter, *Bibliographische Nachrichten*, p. 79; Le Long-Mash, *Bibliotheca Sacra*, ii, 146; Rosenmüller, *Handbuch*, iii, 66 sq.; Winer, *Handbuch der theolog. Literatur*, p. 714; Fürst, *Bibl. Judaica*, iii, 118; Steinschneider, *Bibliogr. Handbuch*, p. 112; id. *Catalogus Librorum Hebr. in Bibl. Bodleiana*, p. 8, n. 32 a. (B. P.)

Potrimpos is the name of an important deity of the Lithuanians and ancient Prussians previous to the conquest of their country by the Teutonic Order; the second person in the Northern triad—Perkunos, Potrimpos, and Pikollos. It was he who granted victory in war and fertility in time of peace; he also dispensed the bliss of domestic happiness. His image stood in a cavity of the holy oak at Romowe; it looked smilingly at Perkunos, and represented, as far as the rough art of those times would allow, the features of a cheerful youth. If Perkunos was the god of the warming and destroying fire, Potrimpos was the god of the fecundating and devastating water. Corn and incense were the offerings he preferred; a wreath of ears adorned his head. But he was not always content with these unbloody sacrifices: sometimes children had to be immolated in his honor, and reduced to ashes in burning wax. A snake was kept in his honor in an urn of clay, fed with milk, and always covered with ears of corn. For this reason the snake was a holy animal among the ancient Prussians. Warriors, marching to the bloody encounter, if they chanced to meet a serpent, fancying they beheld in it Potrimpos himself, were hopeful of his assistance, and thought themselves invincible. When a solemn sacrifice was to be offered to him, the priests remained three days stretched on the ground, fasting, and at intervals throwing wax and incense into the flames. It does not appear that particular places, lakes and woods, were consecrated to him, nor can any trace of the expansion of his worship into other countries be ascertained, unless we admit with Mone that he is one person with the priapic field-god Frivgo worshipped at Upsala; but this is very doubtful. Some modern historians assert that it was a female deity, the wife of the thunder-god; they assimilate him with the mother of the gods mentioned by Tacitus as solemnly worshipped by the Æsthians. See Anderson, *Northern Mythology*, s. v.

Potsherd (חֶרֶשׂ, *chéres*, from the root חָרַשׂ, *to scrape* or *scratch;* Sept. ὄστρακον; Vulg. *testa, vas fictile;* "sherd" in two places, once "stone," often "earthen vessel"), a bit of pottery ware (Job ii, 8), is figuratively used in Scripture to denote a thing worthless and insignificant (Psa. xxii, 15; Prov. xxvi, 23; Isa. xlv, 9). It may illustrate some of these allusions to remind the reader of the fact that the sites of ancient towns are often covered at the surface with great quantities of broken pottery, usually of coarse texture, but coated and protected with a strong and bright-colored glaze, mostly bluish-green, and sometimes yellow. These fragments give to some of the most venerable sites in the world the appearance of a deserted pottery rather than of a town. The fact is, however, that they occur only upon the sites of towns which were built with crude brick; and this suggests that the heaps of ruin into which these had fallen being disintegrated, and worn at the surface by the action of the weather, bring to view and leave exposed the broken pottery, which is not liable to be thus dissolved and washed away. It is certainly remarkable that of the more mighty cities of old time, nothing but potsherds now remains visible at the surface of the ground. Towns built with stone, or kiln-burnt bricks, do not exhibit this form of ruin, which is therefore not usually met with in Palestine. See Potter.

Pott, David Julius, D.D., a German theologian, was born at Eimbeckhausen, in Hanover, in 1760. In 1787 he was appointed professor of theology at Helmstädt, from which place he removed to occupy the same chair at Göttingen. While professor at the former place he, with Ruperti, edited the *Sylloge Commentationum Theologicarum* (8 vols. 1800–7), and afterwards at Göttingen undertook, as joint continuator with Heinrich, an edition of Koppe's *Testamentum Novum*, a commentary on the Catholic epistles (1810–16). He died about 1820. See Illgen, *Zeitschrift für historische Theologie*, 1868, p. 568.

Pott, Joseph Holden, an English divine, noted especially as a Biblical scholar, was born about 1759, and was educated at Eton and at St. John's College, Cambridge, where he graduated B.A. in 1780, M.A. in 1783; was made prebendary of Lincoln in 1785; rector of St. Olave, Jewry, and St. Martin, Ironmongers Lane, in 1787; archdeacon of St. Alban's in 1789; rector of Little Burstead, Essex, in 1797; rector of Northall, Middlesex, in 1806; vicar of St. Martin's-in-the-Fields in 1813; archdeacon of London in 1813; prebendary of London in 1822; vicar of Kensington in 1824, and chancellor of Exeter in 1826. He died in 1847. This exemplary divine published many separate sermons, collections of sermons, charges, theological treatises, and in early life some poems, etc., for a list of which we refer the reader to the *Lond. Gent. Mag.* Aug. 1847, p. 210–12, see also p. 659. We notice: *Two Sermons for the Festivals and Fasts* (Lond. 1790, 4to):—*Elementary Discourses, etc., after Confirmation* (1790, 16mo):—*Three Sermons on the Festivals and Fasts* (1794, 12mo):—*Christian Covenants* (1803, 8vo; 1807, 2d ed.):—*Controversies respecting Baptism* (1810, 12mo):—*Sermons for the Lord's Day* (1817, 2 vols. 8vo; 1818, 3d ed.):—*Course of Sermons for the Festivals and Fasts* (1821, 8vo):—*Testimonies of St. Paul concerning Justification* (1846, 8vo). (J. H. W.)

Pottage (נָזִיד, *nazîd*, something *boiled*, Gen. xxv, 29, 34). The red pottage for which Esau profanely bartered his birthright was prepared, as we learn from this chapter, by seething lentiles in water [see LENTILE]; but the common pottage in the East, at the present day, is made by cutting their meat into little pieces, and boiling them with flour, rice, and parsley, all which is afterwards poured into a proper vessel. See Thomson, *Land and Book*, ii, 397.

Potter (יוֹצֵר, *yotsêr*, a *fashioner*; Chald. פַּחַר, *pechâr*; κεραμεύς). This artificer, and the produce of his labors, are often alluded to in the Scriptures. The fragility of his wares, and the ease with which they are destroyed, supply apt emblems of the facility with which human life and power may be broken and destroyed. It is in this figurative use that the potter's vessels are most frequently noticed in Scripture (Psa. ii, 9; Isa. xxx, 14; Jer. xix, 11; Rev. ii, 27). In one place, the power of the potter to form with his clay, by the impulse of his will and hand, vessels either for honorable or for mean uses, is employed with great force by the apostle to illustrate the absolute power of God in moulding the destinies of men according to his pleasure (Rom. ix, 21). The first distinct mention of earthenware vessels is in the case of the pitchers in which Gideon's men concealed their lamps, and which they broke in pieces when they withdrew their lamps from them (Judg. vii, 16, 19). Pitchers and bottles are indeed mentioned earlier; but the "bottle" which contained Hagar's water (Gen. xxi, 14, 15) was undoubtedly of skin; and although Rebekah's pitcher was possibly of earthenware (xxiv, 14, 15), we cannot be certain that it was so. The potter's wheel is mentioned only once in the Bible (Jer. xviii, 2); but it must have been in use among the Hebrews long before the time of that allusion; for we now know that it existed in Egypt before the Israelites took refuge in that country (Wilkinson, *Anc. Egypt.* iii, 165, large ed.). The art of pottery is one of the most common and most ancient of all manufactures. The modern Arab culinary vessels are chiefly of wood or copper (Niebuhr, *Voy.* i, 188). The processes employed by the Hebrews were probably not in any way dissimilar to those of the Egyptians, from whom the use of the wheel may be supposed to have been adopted. They had themselves been concerned in the potter's trade in Egypt (Psa. lxxxi, 6). The clay, when dug, was trodden by men's feet so as to form a paste (Isa. xli, 25; Wisd. xv, 7) [see BRICK]; then placed by the potter on the wheel beside which he sat, and shaped by him with his hands. It consisted



Ancient Egyptian Potters.

a, c, f, p, the wheels on which the clay was put. Fig. 1 forms the inside and lip of the cup as it turns on the wheel, *a*; *b*, *c*, *d* are cups already made. Fig. 2 forms the outside of the cup, indenting it with the hand at the base, preparatory to its being taken off. Fig. 3 has just taken off the cup from the clay, *k*. Fig. 4 puts on a fresh piece of clay. Fig. 5 forms a round slab of clay with his two hands. Fig. 6 stirs and prepares the oven, *q*. At *s* is the fire, which rises through the long narrow tube or chimney of the oven, upon the top of which the cups are placed to bake, as in *v*. Fig. 7 hands the cup to the baker, 8. Fig. 9 carries away the baked cups from the oven.

Modern Egyptian Potters.

of a wooden disk placed on another larger one, and turned by the hand by an attendant, or worked by a treadle (Isa. xlv, 9; Jer. xviii, 3; Ecclus. xxxviii, 29, 30; see Tennant, *Ceylon*, i, 452). The vessel was then smoothed and coated with a glaze, and finally burned in a furnace (Wilkinson, *Anc. Egypt.* ii, 108). We find allusions to the potsherds, i. e. broken pieces of vessels used as crucibles, or burst by the furnace, and to the necessity of keeping the latter clean (Isa. xxx, 14; xlv, 9; Job ii, 8; Psa. xxii, 16; Prov. xxvi, 23; Ecclus. xxxviii, 29). The materials, forms, and manufacture of earthenware vessels are still very similar throughout Western Asia, and are also the same which were anciently in use. This we know from the comparison of ancient paintings and sculptures with modern manufactures, as well as from the vast quantities of broken pottery which are found upon the sites of ancient cities. The ancient potters "frequently kneaded the clay with their feet, and after it had been properly worked up, they formed it into a mass of convenient size with the hand, and placed it on the wheel, which, to judge from that represented in the paintings, was of very simple construction, and turned with the hand. The various forms of the vases were made by the finger during the revolution; the handles, if they had any, were afterwards affixed to them; and the devices and other ornamental parts were traced with a wooden or metal instrument, previously to their being baked. They were then suffered to dry, and for this purpose were placed on planks of wood; they were afterwards arranged with great care on trays, and carried, by means of the usual yoke, borne on men's shoulders, to the oven" (Wilkinson, *Anc. Egypt.* ii, 107 sq.; Birch, *Hist. of Pottery*, i, 152; Saalschütz, *Archäol. d. Hebr.* i, 14, 11). For a description of pottery as now, and from ancient times, practiced in Palestine, see Thomson, *Land and Book*, ii, 281 sq. Earthen vessels were used, both by Egyptians and Jews, for various purposes besides culinary. Deeds were kept in them (Jer. xxxii, 14). Tiles with patterns and writing were common both in Egypt and Assyria, and were also in use in Palestine (Ezek. iv, 1). There was at Jerusalem a royal establishment of potters (1 Chron. iv, 23), from whose employment, and from the fragments cast away in the process, the Potter's Field perhaps received its name (Isa. xxx, 14). Whether the term "potter" (Zech. xi, 13) is to be so interpreted may be doubted, as it may be taken for "artificer" in general, and also "treasurer," as if the coin mentioned were to be weighed, and perhaps melted down to be recoined (Gesen. *Thesaur.* p. 619). See Clay.

Potter, Alonzo, D.D., LL.D., bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church, was born in the town of Beekman (now La Grange), Dutchess County, N. Y., July 10, 1800. His parents, who belonged to the Society of Friends, were country-people of good blood, honestly devoted to the best interests of home and friends. They were remarkably well educated for their times and surroundings, and highly esteemed in the vicinity. After securing a good elementary training at the district school, Alonzo went, at twelve years of age, to an academy in Poughkeepsie, and three years after was admitted to Union College, where he at once took the highest rank in his class. Upon the completion of his college course he connected himself with the Episcopal Church, and soon after decided to prepare for holy orders in that communion. He commenced his theological studies under the direction of the Rev. Dr. Samuel H. Turner, but before Potter was one-and-twenty years old he reluctantly accepted the appointment of tutor in his alma mater. Within a twelvemonth he was promoted to the professorship of mathematics and natural philosophy, and at the age of twenty-three first appeared in print as the author of a treatise on *Logarithms*, which is said to have been a highly creditable scientific performance. He still continued his studies for the ministry, was admitted to deacon's orders by bishop Hobart, and was advanced to the priesthood by bishop Brownell in 1824. In the year 1826 he quitted the college to become rector of St. Paul's Church, Boston, a position in which he gained a wide influence by the simplicity and earnestness of his character, the fidelity of his ministrations, and the contagious fervor of his religious sympathies. The preaching of Dr. Potter opened a new æra. With no spirit of dogmatism or controversy, he set forth the cardinal doctrines of the Church, appealing equally to the intellect and the heart, and drawing many within a new circle of religious associations. "He was always ready," says his biographer, "to aid in promoting the interests of education and sound learning. He was an advocate of scientific pursuits. He gave his influence both by precept and example to the cause of temperance. Each of these subjects he advanced with great ability, sometimes by a course of public lectures, sometimes by a written discourse, but more frequently an extempore address, in all which he was pre-eminently successful. His engagements in these various objects, with his incessant parochial duties, constituted a vast amount of labor too great to be borne for a long time. Exhaustion from this amount of work, together with other causes not under his control, compelled him to resign his rectorship in 1831. No rector was ever more deeply loved by the people of his charge, or mourned with a deeper sorrow when he left them. Taken in all its aspects, his ministry in Boston was a marked success. It gave an impetus to vital religion which is still felt and will extend to the distant future." In 1831 Dr. Potter accepted the chair of moral and intellectual philosophy in Union College, which was urged upon him as soon as it was known that he would consent to sever his pastoral relations. He at once identified himself with the college as one who looked for nothing beyond it. He applied himself to study and instruction with the cheerful earnestness which was an attribute of his nature. He was eminently an educator, calling out the power of thought and language in his pupils and exerting his own. He was distinguished for his rare power of analysis, and his peculiar terseness and felicity of expression. He had a wonderful power of impressing himself upon those with whom he had to do. He transfused himself into their nature, took possession of their minds and wills, and imbued them with his own ideas and principles of action. In 1838 he was appointed vice-president of the college, and, with the advanced age of Dr. Nott, who had become his father-in-law, Dr.

Potter naturally took a leading share in the administration. He had an inborn aptitude for government, and, though more rigid and uncompromising in his measures than president Nott, understood the art of graciously blending suavity with decision. On the suspension of bishop H. U. Underdonk (q. v.) in 1845, and after a protracted balloting between the supporters of the Rev. Drs. Bowman and Tyng, Dr. Potter was elected bishop of Pennsylvania on May 23, and consecrated in the month of September of the same year. Henceforth his life is thoroughly identified with the interests of the Church he served. Says bishop Stevens:

"His idea of the office and work of a bishop was very high; regarding him not merely as an ecclesiastical officer, but as one who, from his position and opportunities and influence, had vast means, within and around him, of guiding that Church and shaping great institutions of charity or learning, moulding the clergy and being a leader of the Israel of God in its attacks upon the stronghold of sin, Satan, and death. Few men cared less for the honors of the episcopate; few used the office more as the instrument of largest good, and, as a necessary consequence following the divine law of God, who has said, 'Them that honor me I will honor,' few men were more honored in their episcopate; not by his own Church alone, but by all denominations of Christians, and by all the good and intelligent classes of the state. He made no show of power; it rather emanated from him than was wielded by him."—*Funeral oration.*

By his prudence and discretion he fused together elements of strife that had long wrangled with each other. He inaugurated great schemes of Christian benevolence and education, and carried them forward to almost complete success. He was diligent in cultivating all portions of the diocese, laboring when he should have been resting, and not sparing himself when the providential warnings of God were calling to him to pause and recruit. Although endowed with an admirable physical constitution, he was at length compelled to abstain entirely from intellectual exertion, and decided to accept an invitation from the Pacific Steamship Co. to take passage in one of their vessels for San Francisco by the way of the Strait of Magellan. He arrived in the harbor of that city on the 1st of July, 1865, but was already prostrate with a fever which he had contracted by landing on the Isthmus and passing a night at Aspinwall, and was too weak to be removed from the ship. He died July 4.

Sincerely attached to the Church in which he held a position of eminent honor and dignity, bishop Alonzo Potter was singularly free from ecclesiastical prejudice and narrowness. He was a man of no less conspicuous mark as a citizen than as a churchman. He was a friend of wholesome reforms, without the tenacious adherence to the past which dreads the progress of light in novel manifestations. He was a patriot of the purest type, a man of the antique virtue which seasoned our republic with salt in the days of her noblest development. In the darkest hours of our great national struggle he was always decided and hopeful. He took strong ground in behalf of the government, and never cherished a doubt of the justice or the success of the national cause. From his youth he took a lively interest in the welfare of the African race, and was ever ready to recognise the manhood of the negro and his claims to advancement to a higher sphere, and he was forced to a public declaration of these principles in order to silence the pro-slavery assumptions of bishop Hopkins of Vermont. The zeal, however, which bishop Potter exhibited on these occasions for the extension of equal rights to all orders and conditions of men, was no sudden impulse of feeling, but a conviction which was formed in his early days, and strengthened by subsequent experience and reflection. His influence, which extended to a wide circle, was due, in a great measure, to his weight of character rather than to any extraordinary brilliancy of intellectual endowment. He possessed talents of a solid and masculine order. His mind was eminently discriminating, clear in its perceptions, and sound in its deductions. He had great powers of reasoning, his judgment was almost unerring, and his habits of thought remarkable for justness and accuracy. His gifts of imagination were subordinate to the intuitive and logical faculty. He never sought to produce illusions by the pomp of words, but to generate convictions by the power of argument and illustration. But it was the singular probity of his nature, the temperate candor of his judgments, and the purity and elevation of his purposes which inspired such universal confidence in his character, and gave him such marked eminence among the eminent men of his day. Bishop Potter was especially identified with the organization of the hospital of the Protestant Episcopal Church and the establishment of the Divinity School of the Church in Philadelphia. He published, *The Principles of Science applied to the Domestic and Mechanic Arts* (1841):—*Political Economy* (1841):—*Handbook for Readers and Students* (1847):—*Discourses, Charges, Addresses, etc.* (1858):—*Religious Philosophy* (1870):—*Plan of Temperance Organization for Cities:*—and, with Geo. B. Emerson, *The School and Schoolmaster* (1844), which was widely distributed, especially in New York and Massachusetts, and greatly aided the cause of popular education. He edited six vols. of Harper's "Family Library;" Wilks's *Christian Essays* (1829); Maria James's *Poems* (1839), and *Fifteen Lectures on the Evidences of Christianity by Clergymen of the Protestant Episcopal Church* (1855, 8vo). Between 1845 and 1853 he delivered five courses of "Lowell Institute Lectures" on subjects connected with natural theology. Of these efforts bishop Stevens takes occasion to say:

"As a philosopher he would have been known with a European reputation had he published but one of the unfinished volumes which lie in the seclusion of his library. I refer to his 'Lowell Institute Lectures.' These lectures showed that he had studied deeply the physiology and psychology of man; that he comprehended the varying forms of philosophy, and the profound ethics of the old masters of that science. They evinced his boldness and his ability in grappling with the great questions that grow out of man's relations to God, to man, and to a fallen world. They were full of thoroughly digested thought, calm and logical reasoning, expressed with almost aphoristic terseness, illuminated by the most apt and forcible illustrations, and rose at times to a degree of eloquence which, even as read in the printed pages of a newspaper report, makes the mind glow and tingle with delight. These sixty lectures, ranking in the public mind as among the best of the many good ones which that institution has called forth, were delivered without any written page, and only occasionally did he use brief notes to guide his course."

See *Memoirs of the Life and Services of the Rt. Rev. Alonzo Potter, D.D., LL.D.*, by M. A. De Wolfe Howe, D.D. (Phila. 1871, 12mo); Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth.* s. v.; Drake, *Dict. of Amer. Biog.* s. v.; *Church Rev.* 1865, p. 499, 500. (J. H. W.)

Potter, Barnabas, an English divine of note, was born in Westmoreland in 1578. He was educated at Queen's College, Oxford, where he was first chosen a scholar, then a fellow, and afterwards provost. After leaving college, he was for a time lecturer at Abington and at Totness, in Devonshire. In the following year he determined to enter the ministry, and was installed pastor at Devonshire. He was next unanimously elected provost of Queen's College, and also made chaplain-in-ordinary to prince Charles, and was called at court "the penitential preacher." He held this position for ten years, when he decided to return to his former charge at Devonshire. King Charles, who held him in high esteem, promptly nominated him bishop of Carlisle, in 1628. In the episcopate he was a man of few words, and a very affecting preacher; his custom was to write his sermons in parts and commit them to memory. He was a close student, and possessed a remarkable memory. He became very proficient in the Hebrew language. He preached at Westminster, and so strongly did he attack the corruptions which had sprung into the Church that he was censured as popish; and this accusation, it is said, he took so much to heart that

he fell sick and died, in 1642. He published, *The Baronet's Burial* (Oxford, 1613), a sermon:—*Easter Tuesday*, another sermon:—*Lectures on some Chapters of Genesis*. See Wood, *Athenæ Oxon.*; Fuller, *Worthies of Westmoreland*; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s. v.; Middleton, *Evang. Biog.* iii, 152 sq. (J. H. W.)

Potter, Christopher, D.D., a learned English Arminian divine, nephew of the preceding, was born in Westmoreland about 1591. He was admitted to Queen's College, Oxford, in 1606, where he took, in due time, both the degrees in arts and divinity. He was first made fellow, and in 1626 succeeded his uncle in the provostship of his college. Though a zealous puritanical preacher, he became at length an adherent of Laud. In 1628 he preached a sermon at Ely House upon the consecration of his uncle, who, "though a thorough-paced Calvinist," says Wood (*Athen. Oxon.*), was made bishop of Carlisle by the endeavors of Laud. In 1633 Christopher Potter published, *An Answer to a late Popish Pamphlet entitled "Charity Mistaken,"* which he wrote by the special order of Charles I, whose chaplain he was. In 1635 he was promoted to the deanery of Worcester, and in 1640 became vice-chancellor of Oxford, in the execution of which office he met with some trouble from the members of the Long Parliament. Upon the breaking-out of the civil wars he sent all his plate to the king, and declared that he would rather, like Diogenes, drink out of the hollow of his hand than that his majesty should want; and he afterwards suffered much for the royal cause. He was nominated to the deanery of Durham January, 1646; but was prevented from being installed by his death, which happened at his college in the March following. He was learned, and of exemplary life and conversation. He published, *Father Paul's Hist. of the Quarrels of Pope Paul V with the State of Venice* (Lond. 1626, 4to):—*Sermons* (1629, 8vo):—*Want of Charitie* (Oxf. 1633, 12mo); to this publication reference was made above:—*Vindication of Myself touching the Doctrine of Predestination* (1651, 12mo, and often since). See Hook, *Eccles. Biog.* viii, 135; Fuller, *Worthies of Westmoreland*; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s. v. (J. H. W.)

Potter, Francis, an English divine, was born in 1594 at Myre, in Wiltshire, and was educated at Trinity College, Oxford. He took holy orders, and, after successively filling various preferments, became in 1637 rector of Kilmington. He died in 1678. He was a man of learning and mechanical ingenuity. He published, *An Interpretation of the Number* 666, etc. (Oxf. 1642, 4to; in Latin, translated by Thomas Gibbet and others, Amst. 1677, 8vo; also translated into French and Dutch). It was attacked by Rev. Lambert Morehouse, to whom Potter wrote a reply; but neither the attack nor reply was ever published. A great authority (Joseph Mede) thus commends Potter's *Interpretation*: "This discourse of the Number of the Beast is the happiest that ever yet came into the world, and such as cannot be read (save of those that perhaps will not believe it) without much admiration." See *Athen. Oxon.*; Aubrey's MSS., in *Letters of Eminent Persons* (1813, 3 vols. 8vo):—*General Dictionary*; Walker, *Sufferings of the Clergy*.

Potter, Isaiah, a Congregational minister, was born at Plymouth, Conn., in 1746. He was educated at Yale College, class of 1767, studied theology with Dr. Smalley, of Berlin, Conn., and was the first settled minister at Lebanon, N. H., from July 6, 1772, to his death, July 2, 1817. He published some occasional *Sermons*.

Potter, John, an Anglican prelate of much note, was born in 1674 of very humble parentage. He was, however, given all the educational facilities as if of superior rank, and, manifesting a more than usual aptitude for study, was sent at fourteen to the University College of Oxford; took the degree of B.A. in 1692, and in 1694 became fellow of Lincoln College. He had by this time made great attainments in classical learning, and, though still very young, was encouraged by Dr. Charlett, the master of University College, to publish in 1694 a collection which he had made of various readings and notes on Plutarch's treatise *De Audiendis Poetis*, a work which he followed soon after by various readings and notes on an oration of Basil. His greater works appeared soon after: his edition of *Lycophron*, and his *Archæologia Græca* (1697), the former gaining him a world-wide reputation. In 1698 he entered into holy orders, and from that time his studies appear to have been almost exclusively professional, and he passed from one preferment in the Church to another, till at last he reached the highest dignity. Archbishop Tenison made him his chaplain, and gave him the living of Great Mongeham in Kent, and subsequently other preferment in Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire. He became chaplain to Queen Anne and regius professor of divinity in the University of Oxford in 1708. In the same year he published an excellent edition of the works of Clemens Alexandrinus (2 vols. fol.). His other publications were *Sermons* and *Charges*, and *A Discourse on Church Government*. In 1715 he was made bishop of Oxford, and in 1737 archbishop of Canterbury, which high station he supported with much dignity to the time of his death, Oct. 21, 1747. His theological works were published at Oxford (1753, 3 vols. 8vo). Archbishop Potter was a man of much industry, but hardly a great scholar; a compiler rather than an original investigator, and hence his works are of little value in our day. As an ecclesiastic he was haughty and overzealous, as well as excessively narrow. See Hook, *Eccles. Biog.* viii, 142; *Biog. Brit.* s. v.; *English Cyclop.* s. v.; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth.* s. v.; Perry, *Eccles. Hist. of the Ch. of England*, iii, 199, 360 sq. (J. H. W.)

Potter, John W., a Presbyterian minister, was born in Beaver Co., Pa., July 30, 1832. He was the child of pious parents, and early made a profession of religion. He graduated at Jefferson College, Canonsburg, Pa., in 1859; studied divinity in the Western Theological Seminary, Alleghany, Pa.; was licensed by Alleghany City Presbytery; and, after supplying some churches for a time, he accepted a call to the Church of Plains, Pa., and was ordained and installed Sept. 8, 1863. Subsequently he was earnestly solicited, and, after prayerful consideration, consented to take charge of Fairmount Church, Pa., in connection with that of Plains, which relation existed till he died, June 10, 1866. Mr. Potter was a favorite pastor and an excellent preacher. His preaching was plain, pointed, and scriptural. He always carefully prepared his sermons. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1867, p. 191. (J. L. S.)

Potter, Robert, an Anglican divine, noted somewhat as a poet, was born in 1721; was educated at Emanuel College, Cambridge, and was for some years vicar of Scarning, after which he obtained the livings of Lowestoft and Kessingland, and a prebend in the cathedral of Norwich. He died in 1804. His original poetry consists of a volume of *Poems*, and two *Odes* from Isaiah (a translation of *The Oracle concerning Babylon* and *The Song of Exultation*), and is much above mediocrity. But he is best known by his spirited versions of Æschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides. He also published *A Sermon on the Thanksgiving for the Peace* (1802).

Potter's Field (ἀγρὸς τοῦ κεραμέως; Vulg. *ager figuli*), a piece of ground which, according to the statement of Matthew (xxvii, 7), was purchased by the priests with the thirty pieces of silver rejected by Judas, and converted into a burial-place for Jews not belonging to the city. In the narrative of the Acts (i, 18, 19) the purchase is made by Judas himself, and neither the potter's field, its connection with the priests, nor its ultimate application is mentioned. That Matthew was well assured of the accuracy of his version of the occurrence is evident from his adducing it (ver. 9) as a fulfilment of an ancient prediction. What that predic-

tion was, and who made it, is not, however, altogether clear. Matthew names Jeremiah; but there is no passage in the book of Jeremiah, as we possess it (either in the Hebrew or Sept.), resembling that which he gives; and that in Zechariah, which is usually supposed to be alluded to, has not a very perfect likeness to it.

Matt. xxvii, 9.	Zech. xi, 12.
Then was fulfilled that which was spoken by Jeremy the prophet, saying, And they took the thirty pieces of silver, the price of him that was valued, whom they of the children of Israel did value, and gave them for the potter's field, as the Lord appointed me.	And I said unto them, If ye think good, give my price; and if not, forbear. So they weighed for my price thirty pieces of silver. And Jehovah said unto me, Cast it unto the potter; a goodly price that I was prized at by them! And I took the thirty pieces of silver, and cast them to the potter in the house of Jehovah.

Even this coincidence is somewhat doubtful; for the word above translated "potter" (הַיּוֹצֵר) is in the Sept. rendered "furnace," and by modern scholars (Gesenius, Fürst, Ewald, De Wette, Herxheimer—following the Targum, Peshito-Syriac, and Kimchi) "treasury" or "treasurer." Supposing, however, this passage to be that which Matthew refers to, several explanations suggest themselves:

1. That the evangelist unintentionally substituted the name of Jeremiah for that of Zechariah, at the same time altering the passage to suit his immediate object, in the same way that Paul has done in Rom. x, 6–9 (comp. with Deut. viii, 17; xxx, 11–14), 1 Cor. xv, 45 (comp. with Gen. ii, 7). See Jowett, *St. Paul's Epistles* (*Essay on Quotations*, etc.).

2. That this portion of the book of Zechariah — a book the different portions of which have been thought by some to be in different styles and by different authors—was in the time of Matthew attributed to Jeremiah.

3. That the reference is to some passage of Jeremiah which has been lost from its place in his book, and exists only in the evangelist. Some slight support is afforded to this view by the fact that potters and the localities occupied by them are twice alluded to by Jeremiah. Its partial correspondence with Zech. xi, 12, 13, is no argument against its having at one time formed a part of the prophecy of Jeremiah; for it is well known to every student of the Bible that similar correspondences are continually found in the prophets. See, for instance, Jer. xlviii, 45, comp. with Numb. xxi, 27, 28; xxiv, 17; Jer. xlix, 27, comp. with Amos i, 4. For other examples, see Dr. Pusey's *Commentary* on Amos and Micah.

4. The name "Jeremiah" may have been added by some later hand. This is the most probable view. See JEREMIAH, BOOK OF.

There are several potteries now in Jerusalem, as there seem always to have been. On the present spot shown as "the Potter's Field," see ACELDAMA.

Potters' Gate (שַׁעַר הַחַרְסִית), a gate in Jerusalem which led to the valley of Hinnom (Jer. xix, 2). It is therefore to be sought on the west side of the city, and is perhaps the same with the Valley gate, so named from that valley; and with the Bethlehem or Jaffa gate of the present day, if not with the Dung gate (see Ewald, *Gesch. Israel's*, iii, 66). The Hebrew name seems to be derived from חֶרֶס, *chéres, a pot* (see Gesen. *Thesaur.* i, 522). Perhaps the potteries were in the vicinity. Others, as Buxtorf and Ewald, would render the word *East gate*, but this would not lead to the valley of Hinnom. If the custom had obtained so early of casting useless things into the valley of Hinnom or *Topheth*, the word might be rendered accurately Potsherd gate, or Refuse gate. The reference in Zech. xi, 13 is probably not to this gate (Gesen. *Thesaur.* p. 619). See JERUSALEM.

Pottier, FRANÇOIS, a French missionary, was born at Loches in 1718. He was educated at Paris in the Seminary of Saint-Esprit. In 1753 he was sent as a missionary to the countries of Western China. His zeal was rewarded with the apostolic vicariate of Tsetchouan, and subsequently honored with the title of bishop in partibus of Agathopolis. In 1769 he visited the Chen-si (more to the north), and there made more than sixty thousand proselytes. He died Sept. 28, 1792. Pottier wrote several letters on his peregrinations in the Celestial Empire. They abound in curious information about the principal Chinese provinces, about Southern Tartary, and even Thibet. The author describes the mountain-ranges of Sine-Ling, in which he often found a refuge in times of persecution. There is little flattery for the Chinese in his account of their manners, but he thinks that they are not incorrigible. It is to be regretted that Pottier neglected altogether to give us information about the natural history of those countries. His purpose was to write a journal of his life and of the progress of Romanism, rather than a work useful to the learned.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v. See Saint-Martin, *Éloge de P. F. Pottier; Nouvelles Lettres édifiantes*, vol. i and iii.

Potts, George, D.D., an eminent Presbyterian divine, was born in Philadelphia, Pa., March 15, 1802. In his father's family he enjoyed some of the best opportunities for forming his mind and heart. These were derived not only from parental counsels and instructions, but also from the frequent presence in his father's hospitable dwelling of refined Christian society. He had a good training for college, and graduated at the University of Pennsylvania in 1819. He studied theology at Princeton Seminary, and was licensed even before graduation in 1823, and ordained as an evangelist Oct. 7, 1823; was pastor of a Church in Natchez, Miss., 1823–35; of the Duane Street Church, New York, 1836–44; and of the University Place Church from 1845 till his death, Sept. 15, 1864. Dr. Potts was an eminent preacher. He was a man of fine presence, and possessed of great oratorical abilities. But his aim in preaching was practical rather than doctrinal; his style full, and bordering on the figurative; his executive ability was remarkable. He engaged at one time in a controversy with the Rev. Dr. Wainwright, on the rites and discipline of the Episcopal Church, in a pamphlet entitled *No Church without a Bishop*. Strongly attached to the doctrines of his own Church, and laboring zealously for the promotion of its interests, yet he ever cherished the most kindly and fraternal feelings for the followers of Christ in every communion. He was, during his ministry, connected with various literary, benevolent, and religious institutions, and rendered efficient service in the cause of humanity. He published single *Sermons, Addresses, Letters*, etc. (1826–54), and contributed two *Discourses* to *The National Preacher*, *The Character of Jezebel* to Dr. Wainwright's *Women of the Bible*, and *Introductions* to Potts's *Mary*, Nos. 1 and 2. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1866, p. 161; Appletons' *Ann. Cyclop.* 1864, p. 680; Wainwright, *Women of the Bible;* Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth.* s. v. (J. L. S.)

Potts, John, an eminent minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, flourished near the opening of this century. He began to preach in 1812 within the bounds of the Philadelphia Annual Conference, of which body he became a member in the following year. For a quarter of a century he continued in this connection, filling many of the most important posts, and always giving great satisfaction. He died Sept. 22, 1837, after a long and very painful illness. Mr. Potts was a man of varied talent, an efficient business man, an able and dignified presiding officer, a useful pastor, and a successful preacher.—*Minutes of Conferences*, ii, 577.

Potts, William Stephens, D.D., a Presbyterian minister, was born in Northumberland County, Pa.,

Oct. 13, 1802. His early education was limited. After learning the printer's trade in Philadelphia, he finally, in 1825, entered the Princeton Theological Seminary, which ill-health, the result of too close application to his studies, compelled him to leave in November, 1827. He was, however, licensed by the Presbytery of Philadelphia, and went to St. Louis, laboring on the way as opportunity offered, and was finally ordained and installed pastor of the only Presbyterian Church then in St. Louis, Oct. 26, 1828. Here he labored faithfully and successfully for the extension of the Church until, Marion College having been organized, he was elected president of that institution by the trustees in 1835, and entered at once upon this new field of labor. After four years of intense labor, the success of the enterprise not being equal to his expectations, he accepted another call to St. Louis. In 1841 his health obliged him to travel, and he went to Europe, whence he returned in October of the same year, greatly invigorated. Early in 1852 sickness compelled him to discontinue his labors, and he died March 28, 1852. He published a large number of occasional *Sermons, Addresses*, and controversial pamphlets. See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, iv, 723.

Pou de logoi (Ποῦ δὲ λόγοι πτερόεντες) is the beginning of one of Gregory of Nazianzum's (q. v.) hymns, which he probably composed during the eight years that he spent in retirement. "When his work was done, the Church of the Anastasia had arisen, and father, mother, brother, and sister, all were dead. In the depths of its natural fears, and the firmness of the hope to which at last it rises, it tells the history of those solitary years, and echoes well the music of those ancient psalms which soar so often 'out of the depths' into the light of God" (Mrs. Charles). Want of space does not allow us to give this beautiful hymn, of which the first stanza runs thus in Mrs. Charles's translation:

"Where are the winged words? Lost in the air.
Where the fresh flower of youth and glory? Gone.
The strength of well-knit limbs? Brought low by care.
Wealth? Plunder'd; none possess but God alone.
Where those dear parents who my life first gave,
And where that holy twain, brother and sister? In the grave."

Comp. Bässler, *Auswahl altchristlicher Lieder*, p. 11, 157; Fortlage, *Gesänge christlicher Vorzeit*, p. 360 sq.; Mrs. Charles, *Christian Life in Song*, p. 65 sq. (B. P.)

Pouget, Antoine, a French Benedictine monk, was born in 1650 in the diocese of Béziers. He entered the Congregation of St. Maur in 1674, and devoted himself to the study of mathematics, in which he is said to have been very proficient, although he published nothing about that science. He was a professor of the Hebrew language, and taught distinguished pupils, among others Dom Guarin. While teaching this language, he composed a very easy method, under the title *Institutiones linguæ Hebraicæ*. The work was not printed, but there are numerous copies of it. Pouget published, in collaboration with Montfaucon, the Latin translation of a volume of *Analecta Græca* (1688, 4to). He made, together with Dom Martianay, an edition of the works of Jerome, called the edition of the Benedictines (Paris, 1693–1706, 5 vols. fol.), of which he directed alone the first volume. He died at Sorèze Oct. 14, 1709.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v. See Le Cerf, *Bibl. des Auteurs de la Congrég. de St. Maur*; Fisquet, *Biog. (inédite) de l'Hérault*.

Pouget, Bertrand de, a French cardinal, was born in 1280 at Le Pouget, now the commune of Aynac. If we may believe Villani and Petrarch, it was rumored in Italy that he was the natural son of pope John XXII, who was born in the same diocese (Cahors); others affirm that the pope was his uncle. A simple deacon of Castelnau Montratier and canon of Saint-Sauveur d'Aix, he was comprised in the first promotion of cardinals, made Dec. 17, 1316, by John XXII, who, three years afterwards, sent him to Italy with the most unlimited powers for the purpose of retrieving the dominions of the Church. At the head of a small army, Bertrand, together with Philip of Valois, who afterwards became king of France, directed his first blows against Matteo Visconti, the nominal chief of the Lombard Ghibellines. He was, however, unsuccessful, and was obliged to resort to the anathemas of the Church, and to preach a crusade against Matteo. This attempt being unsuccessful also, he determined to unite with the Guelphs and oppose Galea Visconti, who had succeeded his father. Genoa and Piacenza took his part, Milan revolted, and the whole signoria was nearly lost to the Visconti, when the arrival of Louis of Bavaria, victorious at Mühldorf, changed the state of things. After some brilliant rather than real victories, Louis was compelled to return to Germany, leaving the field in possession of the cardinal, whom the pope had appointed bishop of Ostia and of Velletri. Parma and Reggio had surrendered to him in 1326; Bologna, Modena, and the other cities of the Romagna followed their example. But as he had neither the virtues nor the talents requisite to preserve his conquests, Bertrand had in 1329 to repress at Parma and Reggio several revolts against his authority. Towards the close of 1330 John of Luxemburg took, in the name of the emperor Louis V, Cremona, Parma, Pavia, and Modena. An interview held by the cardinal with the king of Bohemia excited the distrust of the Italians, and Bertrand, who had recently obtained the titles of marquis of Ancona and count of Romagna, saw the tide of ill-will and hostility rise all around him. The marquis of Este, whom he had basely deceived, defeated his army near Ferrara, and Bologna expelled him in March, 1334. He was fain to accept the mediation of the Florentines, and retired to Avignon, where the death of John XXII (Dec. 4, 1334) deprived him of all hopes of being put at the head of a new expedition. From that time he devoted himself entirely to religious matters. He died at Avignon Feb. 3, 1352, and was buried in the church of the Clarisse Nuns, a congregation founded by him.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v. See Aubery, *Hist. des Cardin.* vol. i; Sismondi, *Hist. des Républiques Italiennes*.

Pouget, François-Aimé, a French theologian, was born at Montpellier Aug. 28, 1666. Almost immediately after his ordination he was appointed vicar of Saint-Roche at Paris, and it was in this capacity that he administered the last sacraments to La Fontaine (see his account in the *Mém. de Littér.* of the P. Desmolets, vol. i, pt. ii). He was made doctor, and entered in 1696 the Congregation of the Oratory. Colbert, bishop of Montpellier, gave him the direction of his seminary. He returned to Paris, and held at the Seminary of Saint-Magloire public lectures on the conscience. He was appointed member of the commission charged with the liturgical reform of the diocese of Paris. The *Catéchisme de Montpellier*, the principal work of Pouget, was published at Paris in 1702 (4to, or 5 vols. 12mo); it was at once adopted in all parts of France, has gone through many editions, and has been translated into several languages. At the time of his death Pouget was publishing a Latin edition of it, in which the passages merely indicated in the French work were extensively filled out. This edition, when in the printing-office, was seized at the request of cardinal de Bissy, and was published after examination by doctor Clavel, with his comments. The work was completed by the P. Desmolets, and published under the title of *Institutiones Catholicæ* (1725, 2 vols. fol., and Ven. 1768). There are few works of this kind in which the Christian dogmas, the religious morals, the sacraments, prayers, ceremonies, and customs of the Church are set forth with greater distinctness and simplicity. The other writings of Pouget are some *Letters* to Colbert and to cardinal Noailles, *Instructions sur les principaux Devoirs des Chevaliers de Malte* (Paris, 1712, 12mo), and various manuscripts, especially a work on the *Breviary* of Narbonne, part of which had been printed in 1708. Pouget died at Paris April 4, 1723.—

Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v. See Richard et Giraud, *Bibliothèque Sacrée; Journal de Dorsanne*, vol. iv; *Dict. des Ecrivains ecclés.;* Fisquet, *Biog. (inédite) de l'Hérault;* Haag, *Hist. des Dogmes* (see Index).

Poulard, THOMAS-JUST, a French prelate, was born at Dieppe Sept. 1, 1754. He was ordained priest, and enjoyed an early renown as a preacher. His talents were rewarded by the Church with several prebendships, and a curacy in the diocese of Lisieux. Attached to the clergy of Saint-Roch, he submitted in 1791 to the law that exacted the oath to the civil constitution, and became episcopal vicar of the Orne. On the 27th Brumaire, an. ii (Nov. 17, 1793), he renounced the Catholic faith in the presence of the Convention, but in spite of this abjuration he was, after the Reign of Terror, appointed constitutional curate of the parish of Aubervilliers, near Paris, and took his seat as a deputy of the Haute-Marne in the council held at Paris in 1797. The Constitutionals made him bishop of Saône-et-Loire June 14, 1801, but he lost his see by the Concordat, and retired to Paris. Shortly before the Revolution of July he published a pamphlet under the title *Moyen de nationaliser le Clergé de France* (Paris, 1830, 8vo). At that same epoch he conferred orders on two young men, and on three in 1831. Poulard persevered in his opinions, and chose to die *un vrai constitutionnel.* He declined the assistance of the curate of his parish, and his body was carried directly to the cemetery. Poulard died at Paris March 9, 1833. The two following books have been most plausibly attributed to his authorship: *Ephémérides religieuses pour servir à l'Histoire ecclésiastique de la Fin du dix-huitième Siècle et du Commencement du dix-neuvième:—Sur l'État actuel de la Religion en France.*—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.

Poulle, NICOLAS-LOUIS, a French preacher, was born Feb. 10, 1703, at Avignon. He was destined to the magistracy, and studied law. But he did not allow those grave pursuits to interfere with his poetical tastes, and presented at the Jeux Floraux several poems which were crowned. Towards 1735 he received orders, and from that time devoted himself entirely to oratory. Encouraged by the favor some of his panegyrics and sermons had met with at the hands of his countrymen, he repaired to Paris in 1738, and preached in nearly all the great pulpits. In 1745 a life-rent of a thousand francs on the abbey of l'Argentière was bestowed upon him; in 1748 he was nominated commendatory abbé of Nogent-sous-Coucy, after pronouncing the panegyric of Saint-Louis before the French Academy. He was subsequently honored with the titles of ordinary preacher of the king and of grand vicar of Laon. Some writers have compared the abbé Poulle with Massillon: such a parallel can only be made by those who mistake brilliancy of style for eloquence. He might be more properly compared with the abbé De Boismont, his contemporary; they have the same qualities and the same defects. The abbé Poulle did not aspire to the honors of authorship: he was not in the habit of writing his sermons. In 1776, complying with the wishes of his nephew, Louis Poulle, grand vicar of Saint-Malo, he dictated to him eleven sermons which he had preserved in his memory for forty years, and these sermons were published, after he had corrected them himself, in Paris in 1778, 1781, 1818, 1821 (2 vols. 12mo). This edition contains also his *Panégyrique de Saint-Louis* (1748, 4to) and a *Discours pour la Prise d'Habit de Mme. de Rupelmonde aux Carmélites* (1752, 12mo). The *Bibliothèque des Orateurs Chrétiens* edited a volume of *Œuvres Choisies* of the abbé Poulle (1828, 18mo), preceded by a biographical notice. He died at Avignon Nov. 8, 1781.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v. See De Sainte-Croix, *Éloge de Poulle* (Avignon, 1783, 8vo).

Pound (*weight*) is the rendering of one Heb. and one Greek word in the A. V.

1. מָנֶה, *maneh'* (1 Kings x, 17; Ezra ii, 69; Neh. vii, 71, 72). See MANEH.

2. Λίτρα, *litra* (John xii, 3; xix, 39), is a Roman pound of twelve ounces, a *libra.* This pound, as used in trade and authorized by the Roman government, contained 6165 Paris grains, according to Boeckh (*Metallurg. Unters.* p. 160 sq.). The word λίτρα was adopted in the Aramæan dialect, לִיטְרָא (Buxtorf, *Lex. Rabb.* col. 1138). See WEIGHT.

Pound (*money*), a value (*μνᾶ, mina*) mentioned in the parable of the Ten Pounds (Luke xix, 12–27), as the talent is in the parable of the Talents (Matt. xxv, 14–30), the comparison of the Saviour to a master who intrusted money to his servants wherewith to trade in his absence being probably a frequent lesson in our Lord's teaching (comp. Mark xiii, 32–37). The reference appears to be to a Greek pound, a weight used as a money of account, of which sixty went to the talent, the weight depending upon the weight of the talent. At this time the Attic talent, reduced to the weight of the earlier Phœnician, which was the same as the Hebrew, prevailed in Palestine, though other systems must have been occasionally used. The Greek name doubtless came either from the Hebrew *maneh* or from a common origin; but it must be remembered that the Hebrew talent contained but fifty manehs, and that we have no authority for supposing that the maneh was called in Palestine by the Greek name, so that it is most reasonable to consider the Greek weight to be meant. See MINA.

Pounds, JOHN, an English philanthropist, flourished in the second half of last century. He was born at Portsmouth in 1766 of very humble parentage, and enjoyed himself no educational advantages worth mentioning. But, endowed with a remarkably active mind and generous disposition, he used his leisure hours from the busy trade he plied as a shoemaker for the amelioration of the poor children of his surroundings. He collected a number of them in his shop, and there taught them the elements of education he had been able to master successfully, and thus became the founder of what are now called the *Ragged Schools.* He died Jan. 1, 1839.

Pourchot, EDMONDE, a French philosopher of some note, was born at Poilly, near Sins, in 1651. About 1678 he became professor of philosophy in the University of Paris, of which he was chosen rector seven times. He was a friend of Racine and Boileau. He died in 1734. He published *Institutiones Philosophicæ* (1695), which was highly esteemed by his contemporaries. Pourchot was really the first of modern philosophers who taught by a rational method.

Poussin, NICOLAS, a French painter of great celebrity, was born near Le Grand-Andely, in Normandy, in 1593 or 1594; was first a pupil of Quintin Varin, then painting pictures for the Church of Grand-Andely, but at the age of eighteen went to Paris, studied under Ferdinand Elle, the Flemish painter, and others; but chiefly improved himself by drawing from casts and drawings and prints after Raffaelle and Julio Romano in the collection of M. Courtois, who accorded him access to them. After a long and hard struggle, he attained the object of his desire—namely, the means of visiting Rome. He was thirty years of age when he arrived there, and a considerable period elapsed after that before he obtained much employment. At length, however, he received several important commissions from the cardinal Barberini, which he executed so successfully that he afterwards rapidly acquired fame and fortune. After an absence of sixteen years he returned to Paris with M. de Chantelou, and was introduced by cardinal Richelieu to Louis XIII, who appointed him his painter in ordinary, and gave him apartments in the Tuileries. But while away at Rome, preparatory to removal to Paris, the king died, and Poussin abandoned the proposed return to France. He died at Rome in 1665, after a most successful career. His pictures have

been compared with colored bass-reliefs, a term not inexpressive of his style. His peculiar leaning to this sculpturesque treatment may in some measure be explained by his close intimacy with his friend Duquesnoy, the sculptor, known as Flammingo: they lived in the same house together at Rome. His coloring, compared with his drawing, is inferior and mannered, which is somewhat remarkable, considering that he studied in the school of Domenichino at Rome, whom he regarded as the best painter of his time. *The Seven Sacraments*, painted twice by Poussin, are among his most celebrated works, and both are now in England—one at Belvoir Castle, the other in the Bridgewater Gallery, London. His works are very numerous; the prints that have been engraved after his principal pictures only amount to upwards of two hundred. Some of his best works are in the British National Gallery, as, *The Plague among the Philistines at Ashdod*, *The Bacchanalian Festival*, No. 42, finely engraved by Doo, which constitutes an excellent exponent of his style, with all his merits and peculiarities in perfection. He was especially remarkable as a skilful landscape-painter. His sacred drawing entitled *The Finding of Moses* has been made popular by autotype, but it is by no means one of his best productions. Poussin has been called a classical painter by Sir Joshua Reynolds, so successfully did he imitate the works of antiquity. See Mrs. Clement, *Painters, Sculptors, Architects*, etc., p. 467; Spooner, *Biog. Dict.* s. v.; Bellori, *Vita di Nicolo Poussino*, etc. (Rome, 1672); Wornum, *Descriptive and Historical Catalogue of the National Gallery*, etc.

His brother-in-law, GASPAR POUSSIN, also quite a celebrated painter, was born in 1613, and was a pupil of Nicolas. Gaspar devoted himself principally to secular art, but his *Sacrifice of Isaac* is a notable production. He died in 1675. (J. H. W.)

Poussines, PIERRE, a French Jesuit, was born in 1609 at Laurac (diocese of Narbonne). After studying at Béziers, he entered the Society of Jesus at Toulouse in 1624, and was in the latter city and at Montpellier professor of humanities, of rhetoric, and of theology. Called to Rome in 1664 to continue *The History of the Society*, interrupted by the death of Sacchini, he devoted several years to that work, and was subsequently professor of exegetical theology at the Roman College. Many illustrious personages honored him with proofs of their esteem, among others queen Christina of Sweden and cardinal Barberini, who committed to him the interpretation of the works of Pachymeres. Poussines was chosen to give Greek lessons to the young prince Orsini and to the abbé Albani, who afterwards became pope under the name of Clement XI. He returned to Toulouse towards the end of 1682, and continued his literary activity in spite of his failing health. He died at Toulouse Feb. 2, 1686. He left, *Nicetæ Laudatio sanctorum archangelorum Michaelis et Gabrielis* (Toulouse, 1637, 8vo):—*Polemonis Sophistæ Orationes* (ibid. 1637, 8vo):—*Annæ Comnenæ Porphyrogenitæ Alexias* (Paris, 1651, fol.):—*Sancti Nili Opera quædam* (ibid. 1639, 4to):—*Nicephori Bryennii Commentarii de Rebus Byzantinis* (ibid. 1661, fol.):—*Georgii Pachymeris Michael Palæologus* (Rome, 1666, fol.):—*G. Pachimeri Andronicus Palæologus* (ibid. 1669, fol.):—*Sancti Methodii Convivium Virginum* (Paris, 1657, fol.):—*Catena Græcorum Patrum in Evangelium secundum Marcum* (Rome, 1673, fol.):—*Thesaurus Asceticus* (Paris, 1684, 4to):—*Theophylacti Institutio Regia* (ibid. 1641, 4to). All these editions are accompanied with commentaries and notes full of erudition. Poussines is the author of a considerable number of lives of saints of Greece, of Languedoc, and of Gascoyne, inserted in the collection of the Bollandists; of a Latin translation of the letters of St. Francis Xavier, and of a number of other works, the list of which is given in the *Biblioth. Soc. Jesu*. See Lombard, *Éloge hist. du P. Poussines*, in the *Mémoires de Trévoux* (Nov. 1750), and in the *Dict.* of Moreri (ed. 1759); De Baecker, *Biblioth. des Écrivains de la Compagnie de Jésus*, vol. i.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.

Poverty is that state or situation opposed to riches in which we are deprived of the conveniences of life. Indigence is a degree lower, when we want the necessaries, and is opposed to superfluity. Want seems rather to arrive by accident, and is opposed to abundance. Need and necessity relate less to the situation of life than the other three words, but more to the relief we expect or the remedy we seek; with this difference between the two, that need seems less pressing than necessity. Poverty has been sanctified by our blessed Lord in his own person, and in that of his parents; in that of his apostles, and of the most perfect of his disciples. Solomon besought the Lord to give him neither poverty nor riches (Prov. xxx, 8), regarding each extreme as a dangerous rock to virtue. Poverty of mind is a state of ignorance, or a mind void of religious principle and enjoyment (Rev. iii, 17). Poverty of spirit consists in an inward sense and feeling of our wants and defects, with a dependence on divine grace and mercy for pardon and acceptance (Matt. v, 3). It is the effect of the operation of the Divine Spirit on the heart (John xvi, 8). It is attended with submission to the divine will; contentment in our situation; meekness and forbearance to others, and genuine humility as to ourselves. It is a spirit approved by God (Isa. lxvi, 2), an evidence of true religion (Luke xviii, 13), and terminates in endless felicity (Matt. v, 3). See POOR.

POVERTY, MONASTIC. The Roman Catholic Church exacts of its monastic orders, besides other privations, that of absolute abandonment of worldly possessions. See MONASTICISM. To a certain extent this obligation was recognised even from the first origin of Monasticism; but it was enforced with far greater strictness than before by the two great Mendicant orders, the Franciscans and Dominicans, which took their rise in the beginning of the 13th century; one of the fundamental rules of these orders being that their members must possess no property, but be wholly dependent on alms for their support. Until the rise of the Mendicants, the individual members of the various monastic orders were bound to deny themselves the enjoyment of personal property, but the community to which they belonged might possess ample revenues. Even the Dominicans, though under a strict vow of poverty, allowed their convents to enjoy in common small rents in money. But St. Francis prohibited his monks from possessing either an individual or a collective revenue, and enforced a vow of absolute poverty. When asked which of all the virtues he thought was the most agreeable to God, he replied, "Poverty is the way to salvation, the nurse of humility, and the root of perfection. Its fruits are hidden, but they multiply themselves in ways that are infinite." In accordance with this view of the importance and value of poverty, the Franciscan monks for a time adhered strictly to the rule of their founder; but ere long a division broke out among them as to the precise interpretation of the rule, and in consequence a relaxation of its strictness was made, first by Gregory IX in 1231, and then by Innocent IV in 1245. About a century afterwards a dispute arose between the Franciscans and Dominicans in regard to the poverty of Christ and his apostles—the Franciscans alleging that they possessed neither private property nor a common treasure, while the Dominicans asserted the contrary opinion. The pope decided in favor of the followers of Dominic, and many of the Franciscans, still adhering to their opinions, were committed to the flames. See MENDICANTS. For this practice there is not the least authority in the early practices of celibates (see Lea, *Sacerdotal Celibacy*, p. 104, 114); and, however rigidly it may have been accepted by the monastic orders at their first institution, it has in modern times existed only in name. Convents of monks and nuns have succeeded in becoming rich communities. In England they laid hold of

the greater part of the riches of the kingdom; their possessions were so vast that the monopoly became the occasion to enact laws preventing the increase of their wealth or depriving them of their ill-gotten pelf. In the United States the monastics of Rome threaten to become the most powerful possessors of wealth. In New York they own property mounting up to several millions, and even in smaller cities are fast accumulating immense possessions. How admirably their rules are adapted to seize upon the property of unsuspecting individuals and to transfer it to some rich fraternity! Already in several states civil enactments have become necessary in order to restrain the inordinate acquisition of landed and other property by Roman Catholic institutions, and to prevent an undue interference by priests in the bequests of the sick.

The Fakirs and Dervishes of Mohammedan countries are under a vow of poverty, and go about asking alms in the name of God, being wholly dependent for their support upon the charity of the faithful. The Mohammedan monks trace their origin to the first year of the Hegira; and it is said that there are no fewer than thirty-two different orders existing in the Turkish empire, all of them grounding their preference of the ascetic life upon a saying of Mohammed, "Poverty is my glory." The monks of the East, particularly those of Buddha, are not allowed to partake of a single morsel of food not received by them in alms, unless it be water or some substance used for the purpose of cleaning the teeth. Hence the Buddhist monk is seen daily carrying his alms-bowl from house to house in the village near which he may happen to reside. The *Agyrtæ* of the ancient Greeks were mendicant priests of Cybele, and their origin is supposed to have been Eastern. The same priests among the Romans went their daily rounds to receive alms with the sistrum in their hands. The institutes of Manu lay down explicit rules for the Brahmin mendicant: "Every day must a Brahmin student receive his food by begging, with due care, from the houses of persons renowned for discharging their duties. If none of those houses can be found, let him go begging through the whole district around the village, keeping his organs in subjection and remaining silent; but let him turn away from such as have committed any deadly sin. . . . Let the student persist constantly in such begging, but let him not eat the food of one person only; the subsistence of a student by begging is held equal to fasting in religious merit. . . . This duty of the wise is ordained for a Brahmin only; but no such act is appointed for a warrior or a merchant." In the same sacred book the householder is enjoined to make gifts according to his ability to the religious mendicant, whatever may be his opinions.—Gardner, *Faiths of the World*, ii, 688, 689; Elliott, *Delineation of Romanism*, p. 744; Barnum, *Romanism*, p. 287, 293 sq.

POVERTY, VOLUNTARY. See POVERTY, MONASTIC.

Powell, Baden, an Anglican divine, noted rather as a scientific student than as a theologian, was the son of a London merchant, and was born at Stamford Hill, near London, Aug. 22, 1796. He studied at Oriel College, Oxford, where he graduated M.A., with first-class mathematical honors, in 1817; took holy orders in 1820, and was appointed vicar of Plumstead, in Kent, in 1821. In 1824 he was elected a fellow of the Royal Society; and three years later was appointed Savilian professor of geometry, a chair which he held till his death, which took place in London June 11, 1860.

As a professor, Powell's great aim was to bring about a larger recognition of the importance of physical and mathematical science in the curriculum of learned study at Oxford. To the "Philosophical Transactions," the "Reports" of the British Association, and other vehicles of scientific instruction, he contributed numerous valuable papers: but he is perhaps best known by his strenuous exertions to obtain for modern science the right of modifying the views of nature and the origin of the world, regardless of the views expounded in the O.-T. Scriptures, especially in *The Study on Evidences of Christianity* in *Essays and Reviews* (1860). In this perilous department of controversy he displayed great learning, logical power, moderation of tone, and philosophic urbanity; but his conclusions were too unmistakably rationalistic to be acceptable to orthodox Christianity. Powell does not exactly place himself on the same theoretical ground with Hume and Spinoza, but the moral effect of his attack upon miracles as an evidence of Christianity is not less antagonistic than the theories of either of these authors. "Spinoza," says Dr. Hurst (*Hist. of Rationalism*, p. 487 sq.), "held that miracles are impossible, because it would be derogatory to God to depart from the established laws of the universe, and one of Hume's objections to them was their incapability of being proved from testimony (*Replies to Essays and Reviews*, p. 135). Prof. Powell objects to them because they bear no analogy to the harmony of God's dealings in the material world; and insists that they are not to be credited, since they are a violation of the laws of matter, or an interruption of the course of physical causes. The orthodox portion of the Church are laboring under the egregious error of making them an essential doctrine, when they are really a mere external accessory. Reason, and not 'our desires,' must come to our aid in all examination of them. The keynote to Prof. Powell's opposition is contained in the following statement: 'From the nature of our antecedent convictions, the probability of *some* kind of mistake or deception somewhere, though we know not *where*, is greater than the probability of the event really happening in *the way* and from the *causes* assigned' (*Essays and Reviews*, p. 120). The inductive philosophy, to which great respect must be paid, is enlisted against miracles. If we only knew all about those alleged and held as such, we should find them resolved into natural phenomena, just as 'the angel at Milan was the aerial reflection of an image on a church; the balls of fire at Plausac were electrical; the sea-serpent was a basking shark on a stem of sea-weed. A committee of the French Academy of Sciences, with Lavoisier at its head, after a grave investigation, pronounced the alleged fall of aerolites to be a superstitious fable' (*ibid.* p. 155). The two theories against the reality of miracles in their received sense are, first, that they are attributable to natural causes; and, second, that they may involve more or less of the parabolic or mythic character. These assumptions do away with any real admission of miracles even on religious grounds." The animus of the whole essay may be determined by the following treatment of testimony and reason: "Testimony, after all, is but a second-hand assurance; it is but a blind guide; testimony can avail nothing against reason. The essential question of miracles stands quite apart from any consideration of *testimony;* the question would remain the same if we had the evidence of our own senses to an alleged miracle; that is, to an extraordinary or inexplicable fact. It is not the *mere fact*, but the *cause* or *explanation* of it, which is the point at issue" (*ibid.* p. 159). This means far more than Spinoza, Hume, or any other opponent of miracles, except the radical Rationalists of Germany, has claimed—that we must not believe a miracle, though actually witnessed. The different replies which this *Essay on the Study of the Evidences of Christianity* (in *Essays and Reviews*) elicited are: *No Antecedent Impossibility in Miracles—some Remarks on the Essay of the late Rev. Baden Powell*, etc. (1861, 8vo); *An Answer to Mr. Baden Powell's Essay*, etc., by William Lee, D.D. (1861, 8vo); *Examination of Mr. Baden Powell's Tractate on Miracles* (1861, 12mo); and are defended in, *A Few Words of Apology for the late Prof. Baden Powell's Essay*, etc., by a Lay Graduate (1861, 8vo); *The late Prof. Powell and Bishop Thirlwall on the Supernatural*, etc., by the Rev. R. B. Kennard (1864, 8vo). See also Farrar, *Crit. Hist. of Free Thought*, lect. iv, v; Moberley, *Sermons on the Beati*

tudes (1860), Preface; Young, *Science Elucidated by Scripture* (1863, fcp. 8vo); Goodwin, *American Theology* (1861), p. 438; *Christian Remembrancer*, July, 1861; *Brit. Quar. Rev.* Nov. 1864; *London Reader*, 1865, i, 77; *Journ. of Speculative Philosophy*, vol. xxxii; *Christian Examiner*, June to May, 1858; *North Brit. Rev.* Nov. 1859; Smith (H. W.), *Essays Theol. and Philos.*, edited after his death (N. Y. 1877, 8vo).

Among Prof. Powell's other works may be mentioned, *Revelation and Science* (Oxf. 1833):—*A Historical View of the Progress of the Physical and Mathematical Sciences* (Lond. 1834):—*The Connection of Natural and Divine Truth, or the Study of the Inductive Philosophy considered as Subservient to Theology* (ibid. 1838):—*Tradition Unveiled, a Candid Inquiry into the Tendency of the Doctrines advocated in the Oxford Tracts*:—*A General and Elementary View of the Undulatory Theory as applied to the Dispersion of Light*, etc. (ibid. 1841):—*The Unity of Worlds and of Nature*:—*Essays on the Spirit of the Inductive Philosophy, the Plurality of Worlds, and the Philosophy of Creation* (ibid. 1855):—*Christianity without Judaism* (1857):—*The Order of Nature considered with Reference to the Claims of Revelation* (1859). (J. H. W.)

Powel(l), David, a British clergyman, was a native of Denbighshire, and was born about 1552. He was educated at Oxford, and took holy orders after 1576, the year he quitted the university. He was successively vicar of Ruabon and rector of Llanfyllin; in 1579 vicar of Mivod, and in 1588 rector of Llansaintfraid. He died in 1598. His studies were principally in British antiquities, and are of a secular character. See *Biog. Brit.* s. v.; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth.* s. v.

Powell, Edward, D.D., a learned English Roman Catholic divine, who flourished early in the 16th century, was educated at Oxford, and considered one of the ornaments of the university. He was made fellow of Oriel College in 1495. After taking holy orders, divers prebendships were bestowed on him, and he was received among the canons of Salisbury and of Lincoln. So great was his fame that Henry VIII employed him to write, in refutation of Luther, the work *Propugnaculum summi sacerdotii evangelici ac septenarii sacramentorum numeri* (Lond. 1523, 4to). There is extant a letter addressed to the king by the University of Oxford to express their gratification at his excellent choice of a defender of the faith. But Henry could not forgive him for defending Catharine of Aragon in his book *De non dissolvendo Henrici regis cum Catharina matrimonio* (which was printed, but of which no copy is known); and for his advocacy of the supremacy of the Holy See he was arrested, and executed at Smithfield June 30, 1540. See Wood, *Athenæ Oxon.*; Dodd, *Church Hist.*; Perry, *Hist. of the Church of England.*

Powel(l), Gabriel, an English clergyman, son of David (see above), was born in 1575, and was educated at Jesus College, Oxford. He became in 1609 prebend of Portpoole, in 1610 vicar of Northall, and died in 1611. He is noted as the author of several treatises against Romanism (1602 to 1607); but he is best known by *Gabrielis Poweli, Ordovicis Britanni, Davidis F., Disputationum Theologicarum et Scholasticarum de Antichristo et ejus Ecclesia, Libri duo* (Lond. 1605, 8vo). Bliss says that he was a zealot and a stiff Puritan, and was esteemed a prodigy of learning in his time.—Wood, *Athenæ Oxon.* q. v.

Powell, Griffith, an English educator and philosopher, was born in 1561, and was a native of Llansawell. He was educated at Jesus College, Oxford, and became its principal in 1613. He died in 1620. He wrote, *Analysis Analyticorum Posteriorum seu Librorum Aristotelis de Demonstratione, cum Scholiis optimorum Interpretum* (Oxon. 1594, 8vo):—*Analysis Libri Aristotelis de Sophisticis Elenchis* (1594; reprinted 1598, 1664). "Accounted by all a most noted philosopher or subtle disputant."—Wood, *Athenæ Oxon.* q. v.

Powell, Howell, a Welsh Presbyterian minister, was born about 1820, and was a native of Glamorgan, South Wales, where he was educated for the ministry. He came to this country with his wife, and, settling in Ohio, began preaching. In 1851 he became pastor of the Welsh Presbyterian Church in Cincinnati, Ohio, where he labored prosperously for nineteen years. Accepting the call of the Welsh Presbyterian Church in Thirteenth Street, New York, he came to that city in 1870, and was actively engaged in the duties of his pastorate until his death in 1875. He was greatly beloved by his Welsh coreligionists both in this country and at home. He discharged his pastoral duties with zeal and diligence, and did many generous acts for the humbler members of his flock.

Powell, Thomas, an Anglican divine, flourished in the 17th century. He was born about 1608, and after taking holy orders was canon of St. David's, London. He died in 1660. His publications are of a secular character.

Powell, Vavasor, a Welsh Puritan preacher, who was born in 1617, was educated at Jesus College, Oxford, but left the Establishment and became an itinerating minister. He was very zealous for the Church of God, was very outspoken and gave much annoyance to Churchmen, and was often in trouble. He died in Fleet Prison, London, in 1671. He published a number of *Sermons, Theological Treatises*, etc. (between 1646 and 1671), for lists of which and notices of their author, see *Strena Vavasorensis* (1654), *Vavasoris Examen et Purgamen* (1654, 4to), and *Life and Death of Vavasor Powell* (1671, 8vo). His *Concordance to the Bible*, completed by N. P. and J. F., etc., was published in 1671 (8vo).

Powell, William Samuel, an English divine of remarkable ability, was born at Colchester Sept. 27, 1717; was admitted to St. John's College, Cambridge, in 1734; and, having taken the degree of bachelor of arts in 1738–9, was elected fellow of it in March, 1740. In 1741 he was taken into the family of lord Townshend as private tutor to his second son, Charles, afterwards chancellor of the Exchequer; was ordained deacon and priest at the end of the year, and instituted to the rectory of Colkirk, in Norfolk, on lord Townshend's presentation. He returned to college the year after, began to read lectures as an assistant to the principal tutor; but became himself principal tutor in 1744. He took the degree of bachelor of divinity in 1749, and of doctor in 1756. In 1765 he was elected master of his college, obtained the archdeaconry of Colchester the year after, and in 1768 was instituted to the rectory of Freshwater, in the Isle of Wight. He died Jan. 19, 1775. He published, *Defence of the Subscriptions required in the Church of England* (Lond. 1757, 4to):—*Observations on Miscellanea Analytica* (1760):—*Sermons on* 1 *Cor. i*, 23, 24 (1767, 4to):—*Charge* (1772, 8vo; 1773):—*Discourses on Various Subjects* (published with Life by Thomas Bulguy, D.D., 1776, 8vo). Dr. Powell's and Thomas Fawcett's *Discourses*, thirty-four in all, delivered before the University of Cambridge, were republished in 1832 (8vo) in *Divines of the Church of England*. These discourses of Powell, says bishop Watson, "are written with great acuteness and knowledge of the several subjects." "It would be impossible to produce a more eminent instance of the happy alliance of taste and genius with learning and good sense than in the sermons and charges of Dr. Powell; of whom, indeed, on every account, the whole society over which he presided might justly join with me in saying, 'Semper honos, nomenque tuum, laudesque manebunt'" (Prof. Mainwaring). Powell's discourses are also highly commended by Mathias. See *Pursuits of Literature* (ed. 1822), p. 225, 371; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s. v.; *Gen. Biog. Dict.* s. v.

Power, or the ability of performing, is in an essential degree an attribute of Deity: God is emphatically styled All-powerful. Power signifies sometimes a right

privilege, or dignity (John i, 12); sometimes absolute authority (Matt. xxviii, 18); sometimes the exertion or act of power, as of the Holy Spirit (Ephes. i, 19), of angels, or of human governments, magistrates, etc. (Rom. xiii, 1), and perhaps it generally includes the idea of dignity and superiority. So, the body "is sown in weakness, it is raised in power" (1 Cor. xv, 43). The "prince of the power of the air" (Ephes. ii, 2) is a figurative representation of Satan (q. v.). See AIR.

Power, Francis Herron, a Presbyterian minister, was born in Alleghany County, Pa., July 14, 1829. He received a careful academical training; graduated at Washington College, Washington, Pa.; studied theology in the Western Theological Seminary, Alleghany City, Pa., and was licensed by Redstone Presbytery. Being deeply interested in the efforts of the government to suppress the rebellion, he became a delegate of the United States Christian Commission. Joining the "Army of the Cumberland," he was zealous in his efforts in the hospitals and in the field to administer to the personal and spiritual wants of the sick and wounded of the Republic; but the extraordinary exposure to which he subjected himself broke down his system, and he died in the hospital at Nashville, Tenn., Oct. 17, 1863. Mr. Power was never ordained, but he was an earnest and faithful missionary. Forgetful of self, in his zeal for the good of others he sacrificed even his life to a work that had enlisted his whole soul. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1864, p. 190. (J. L. S.)

Power, John H., D.D., a noted minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Montgomery Co., Ky., March 15, 1798; was converted at a very early age; united with the Methodists in 1819; was licensed to preach two years after, and joined the Kentucky Conference, where his appointments were, Mount Sterling and Hinkston circuits, in Kentucky; Little Kanawha, Charleston, and Parkersburgh, in Virginia; Columbus, Salt Creek, Brush Creek, Chillicothe, and Deer Creek, in Ohio; Burlington Circuit, Old Zion, Muscatine, and South Burlington, in Iowa—embracing a period of eighteen years. As presiding elder, he served on Norwalk, Wooster, Mount Vernon, Delaware, and Mansfield districts, in Ohio; Burlington, Muscatine, and Keokuk districts, in Iowa—filling up twenty-eight years. In 1848 he was elected assistant agent of the Western Book Concern, where he remained until 1852. Failing health then necessitated rest, and he maintained a supernumerary relation until 1856, when he resumed the pastoral work by transfer to the Iowa Conference, and there held appointments (as above mentioned) until his death, which occurred Jan. 19, 1873. In manner Dr. Power was reserved. He shrank instinctively from that general acquaintance and notoriety in which persons differently constituted find pleasure. His friendship, though not demonstrative, was strong and enduring. As a preacher he was successful: enlightening the mind, directing the judgment, and influencing the will of his auditors—thereby winning souls to Christ. He was a prudent legislator, and as an administrator of discipline he had but few equals. Notwithstanding the exhaustive labors of an itinerant fifty years ago, at the age of forty-two he had acquired a liberal education, including Greek and Hebrew, so as to make the original available in the literal rendering of the Word of Life. He had also completed a course in law, with the view of meeting every demand that might be made upon him as a servant of the Church. As an author he holds a reputable place. His writings (*On Universalism:—Doolittle and Power;* a discussion on the same subject:—*Domestic Piety:*—and *Letters to Dr. Smith on Slavery*) are all attractive in style, and are models of logical clearness. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 1873, p. 103, 104. (J. H. W.)

Powers OF THE MIND are those faculties by which we think, reason, judge, etc. See GOD; SOUL. "They are so various," says Dr. Reid, "so many, so connected and complicated in most of their operations, that there never has been any division of them proposed which is not liable to considerable objections. The most common division is that of *understanding* and *will*. Under the will we comprehend our active powers, and all that lead to action, or influence the mind to act—such as appetites, passions, affections. The understanding comprehends our contemplative powers, by which we perceive objects; by which we conceive or remember them; by which we analyze or compound them; and by which we judge and reason concerning them. Or, the intellectual powers are commonly divided into simple apprehension, judgment, and reasoning." Locke divides powers into those "able to make, or able to receive, any change; the one may be called active, and the other passive power" (*Essay on Human Understanding*, bk. ii, ch. xxi). But Reid takes exception to this division, and passes the following stricture upon it: "Whereas he (Locke) distinguishes power into active and passive, I conceive *passive power* to be no power at all. He means by it the possibility of being changed. To call this *power* seems to be a misapplication of the word. I do not remember to have met with the phrase *passive power* in any other good author. Mr. Locke seems to have been unlucky in inventing it; and it deserves not to be retained in our language." "This paragraph," says Sir W. Hamilton (*Reid's Works*, p. 519, note), "is erroneous in almost all its statements." The distinction between power as active and passive is clearly taken by Aristotle. But he says that in one point of view they are but one power (*Metaphys.* lib. v, c. 12), while in another they are two (*ibid.* lib. ix, c. 1). He also distinguishes powers into rational and irrational—into those which we have by nature, and those which we acquire by repetition of acts. These distinctions have been generally admitted by subsequent philosophers. Dr. Reid, however, only used the word power to signify *active power*. That we have the idea of power, and how we come by it, he shows in opposition to Hume (*Act. Pow.* ess. i, ch. ii, iv).

According to Hume, we have no proper notion of power. It is a mere relation which the mind conceives to exist between one thing going before and another thing coming after. All that we observe is merely antecedent and consequent. Neither sensation nor reflection furnishes us with any idea of power or efficacy in the antecedent to produce the consequent. The views of Dr. Brown are somewhat similar. It is when the succession is constant—when the antecedent is uniformly followed by the consequent—that we call the one cause and the other effect; but we have no ground for believing that there is any other relation between them or any virtue in the one to originate or produce the other—that is, that we have no proper idea of power. Now, that our idea of power cannot be explained by the philosophy which derives all our ideas from sensation and reflection is true. Power is not an object of sense. All that we observe is succession. But when we see one thing invariably succeeded by another, we not only connect the one as effect and the other as cause, and view them under that relation, but we frame the idea of power, and conclude that there is a virtue, an efficacy, a force in the one thing to originate or produce the other; and that the connection between them is not only uniform and unvaried, but universal and necessary. This is the common idea of power, and that there is such an idea framed and entertained by the human mind cannot be denied. The legitimacy and validity of the idea can be fully vindicated.

"In the strict sense, power and agency are attributes of mind only; and I think that mind only can be a *cause* in the strict sense. This power, indeed, may be where it is not exerted, and so may be without agency or causation; but there can be no agency or causation without power to act and to produce the effect. As far as I can judge, to everything we call a cause we ascribe power to produce the effect. In intelligent causes, the

power may be without being exerted; so I have power to run while I sit still or walk. But in inanimate causes we conceive no power but what is exerted, and, therefore, measure the *power* of the cause by the effect which it actually produces. The power of an acid to dissolve iron is measured by what it actually dissolves. We get the notion of *active power*, as well as of cause and effect, as I think, from what we feel in ourselves. We feel in ourselves a power to move our limbs, and to produce certain effects when we choose. Hence we get the notion of *power*, *agency*, and *causation* in the strict and philosophical sense; and this I take to be our first notion of these three things" (Reid, *Correspondence*, p. 77, 78).

"The liability of a thing to be influenced by a cause is called *passive power*, or more properly susceptibility; while the efficacy of the cause is called *active power*. Heat has the power of melting wax; and, in the language of some, ice has the power of being melted" (Day, *On the Will*, p. 33). See CAUSE.

It is usual to speak of a power of resistance in matter, and of a power of endurance in mind. Both these are *passive power*. *Active power* is the principle of action, whether immanent or transient. *Passive power* is the principle of bearing or receiving. See Reid, *On the Active Powers;* Id. *On the Human Mind, and the Intellectual Powers;* Locke, *On the Understanding;* Stewart, Brown, and Abercrombie. See also MIND.

Powers, Grant, a Congregational clergyman, was born at Hollis, N. H., May 31, 1784; was educated at Dartmouth College, class of 1810; studied theology; was minister at Haverhill in 1815–29, and at Goshen from Aug. 27, 1829, to his death, April, 1841. He is the author of an *Essay upon the Influence of the Imagination on the Nervous System, contributing to False Hopes in Religion:—History of the Coos Country* (1841, 12mo): —and *Centennial Address at Hollis* (1830, 8vo).—Drake, *Dict. of Amer. Biog.* s. v.; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth.* s. v.

Powers, Hiram, an American sculptor, son of a farmer, and the eighth of nine children, was born at Woodstock, Vt., July 29, 1805, and acquired the rudiments of education at a free district school. While still a boy, he went to Cincinnati, Ohio, where he became an apprentice to a clock-maker, and about the same time formed the acquaintance of a German sculptor, who taught him to model in plaster. Subsequently he was employed for several years making wax-figures, and fitting them with machinery, for the Cincinnati Museum, where his *Infernal Regions* horrified thousands of visitors. It is a hideous scene representing hell filled with terrific figures, moved by machinery, and acting the supposed agonies of the damned. In 1835 he went to Washington, where he executed the busts of several distinguished persons. By the aid of Mr. Nicholas Longworth, he went to Florence, Italy, in 1837, to continue his art-studies. He resided in that country until his death, which took place at Rome, June 27, 1873. In 1838 Powers produced his statue of *Eve*, which excited the admiration of Thorwaldsen. His other works were of a secular character, but they gave him great renown. See H. F. Lee, *Familiar Sketches of Sculpture and Sculptors* (Boston, 1854, 2 vols. 12mo), vol. ii, ch. xxvii; Tuckerman, *Book of the Artists*, s. v.; *Living Age*, Oct. 1847.

Powers, Jesse K., a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born in the county of Albemarle, Va., June 8, 1801. In May, 1826, while engaged in teaching a classical school, he was converted, and united with the Methodist Episcopal Church. Shortly after he joined the travelling connection, at the session of the Virginia Conference (held at Raleigh in February, 1826). In 1830 he was admitted into full connection and ordained deacon, and in 1832 was ordained elder. He was a plain, faithful, earnest minister of the Gospel, always conscientiously discharging the duties of a Methodist preacher. Being unencumbered with a family, he readily and cheerfully entered on whatever field of labor was assigned him, and everywhere endeared himself to the people whom he served by his unaffected and consistent piety. For upwards of twoscore years he gave full proof of his ministry. In the latter part of his life, through affectionate regard for his welfare, and in consideration of his infirmities, his brethren of the Conference placed him on the list of supernumeraries; but so anxious was he to be in the regular pastoral work that he appealed to the Conference to place him among the effective men, and he was appointed to the New Kent Circuit; but the work was beyond his strength; he soon began to fail in health, and died March 1, 1869. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences of the M. E. Church, South*, 1869, p. 303.

Powers, John B., a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born May 16, 1814, in Union District, S. C.; as a boy, removed to Alabama, and shortly after was converted; and, feeling called of God to preach the Gospel, accepted license in 1845. In 1856 he entered the itinerant ranks of the Alabama Conference, and was appointed to the Weewokaville Circuit. He filled successively the Harpersville and the Moscow circuits. In 1861 he entered the Confederate army in command of a company. His health failed, however, and he returned. From 1863 to 1866 he was presiding elder of the Jasper District. In 1867 he served the Elyton Circuit; 1868-69, the Murfree's Valley Circuit; 1870, the Jonesborough Circuit. In 1871 he was appointed to the Monticello Circuit, but died March 30. He was a conscientious and pious man. His administration as presiding elder was marked by promptness and great faithfulness in the discharge of all the duties pertaining to his office. His broad common-sense and acquaintance with men gave him wisdom in council. As a preacher, he had great control over the emotions of men, and was eminently successful in seasons of revival. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences of the M. E. Church, South*, 1871, p. 565.

Powtai is the name of a Chinese divinity signifying contentment.

Powtai.

Poya the day on which the moon changes, which is held sacred among the Buddhists. They reckoned

four póya days in each month. 1. The day of the new moon. 2. The eighth day from the time of the new moon. 3. The day of the full moon. 4. The eighth day from the time of the full moon. It is said by Prof. H. Wilson that the days of the full and the new moon are sacred with all sects of the Hindûs; but according to the institutes of Manu the sacred books are not to be read upon these days.

Poydras, JULIEN, an American philanthropist of French descent, who flourished in the early days of our republic, and was first delegate to Congress from the territory of Orleans (1809–12), gave $100,000 for the founding of a French orphan asylum, and left $20,000 for a college at Point Coupée, La. He died there Jan. 25, 1824.

Poynet (or **Ponet**), JOHN, an English prelate of the Reformation period, was born about 1516 in Kentshire. He enjoyed a distinguished education, learned Italian and Flemish, was proficient in mathematics, and constructed in his youth a clock the complicated machinery of which was the admiration of Henry VIII's court. He graduated at King's College, Cambridge; was made doctor of theology and chaplain of archbishop Cranmer. At the age of thirty-three he was appointed bishop of Rochester (1549). In 1551 he succeeded at Winchester the deposed Gardiner, and was appointed to take a share in the redaction of the new code of ecclesiastical laws. He was indebted for these distinctions to his zeal for the cause of reform; he defended it in the pulpit and in his books, and explained its doctrines in his *Catechism*, adopted under the name of "King Edward's Catechism." At Mary Tudor's accession to the throne he repaired to foreign parts, either dreading persecution for having had a share in Wyatt's Rebellion, or because he had been deprived of his see for having married. He died April 11, 1556, at Strasburg. He is spoken of as a man of great erudition and eminent piety. In his theology he was a decided Calvinist. Other works of his are, *Defence for Marriage of Priests* (1549, 8vo):—*Short Treatise of Politic Power* (1556, 8vo; reprinted 1639 and 1642):—and *De Eucharistia* (1557, 8vo). See Strype, *Life of Cranmer;* Dodd, *Church History;* Fuller, *Worthies of England;* Milner, *History of Winchester*, i, 346; Lecky, *History of Rationalism*, ii, 174; Hook, *Eccles. Biography*, viii, 158; Collier, *Eccles. Hist. of England* (see Index in vol. viii). (J. H. W.)

Pozzi, Giovanni Battista, a Milanese painter who flourished in the latter part of the 16th century, was employed by Sixtus V in the palace of St. John of Lateran and in the library of the Vatican. In the Sistine Chapel he painted the *Visitation of the Virgin* and the *Angel appearing to St. Joseph* in his dream; in Il Gesù, a *Choir of Angels*. He died in the pontificate of Sixtus V, aged twenty-eight, deeply lamented as the most promising young artist of his time. He was considered the Guido of his day; and had he survived to the time of the Caracci, it is impossible to say what degree of perfection he might have attained.

Pozzi, Stefano, an Italian painter, born at Rome in the 18th century, studied first under Carlo Maratti and afterwards with Agostino Masucci. Lanzi says he was more noble in his design than Masucci, and more natural and vigorous in his coloring. He acquired considerable distinction, and executed several works for the churches at Rome, one of which, an altar-piece, represents the *Death of St. Joseph*. In the pontifical palace of Monte Carallo is a fine picture by him representing *St. Gregory*. He died in 1768.

Pozzo, ANDREA, an eminent painter and architect, was born at Trent in 1642. While studying at Milan he fell into vicious company and became extremely dissolute, until, disgusted by his course of life, he joined the Society of the Jesuits, who placed him under the instruction of Scaramuccia. Afterwards, at Rome and Venice, he studied design and color, and the works of Raffaelle and other great masters. His oil and fresco works at Rome, Genoa, and other places gained him the reputation of one of the ablest artists of the time. His pictures are composed in grand style, and he is excelled by few artists in perspective and architecture, the principles of which he perfectly understood, and published a treatise on them. Among his best works in oil are, *St. Francesco Borgia*, in the church of Il Gesù at Rome; the *Wise Men's Offering*, at Vienna, and four pictures from the life of Christ, in the church at Genoa. The ceiling of the church of St. Ignazio at Rome is regarded as one of the ablest productions of his time, because of its animated execution. As an architect he gained some distinction, and executed, among other works, the altar of St. Ignazio in the church of Il Gesù at Rome, which is said to be the richest altar in all Europe. He died at Venice in 1709.

Pracrat is, in the Indian mythology, one of the revelations of divinity as the supreme original being, and especially as the cause of all phenomena of change in the visible world. Pracrat is the essence of the three gods Brahma, Vishnu, and Siva; he is three-colored, because he is creative like Brahma (red); conservative like Vishnu (white); and destructive like Siva (black). Pracrat, in consequence, is also the being which unites and separates these three divinities, as through him there is a perpetual vicissitude of life and death, of birth and annihilation.

Pracriti is the by-name of Parwati, the wife of the Indian god Siva: it means *Nature*. The Hindûs make of her the wife of the destroyer, because, according to them, all life originates in death, there being no destruction, no annihilation, in the true sense of the word: matter only describes, in the course of its duration, an eternal circle, in which it undergoes a perpetual change of forms, while its substance remains the same.

Practical Religion is that department of practical theology which aims at the promotion of Christian practice, and the writings which are brought out to contribute to such an end are called *Practical Works*. They are from their very nature of a more temporary character than any other theological productions. Generally speaking, they are, and must be, adapted to the peculiar circumstances of their own age; they must be specially addressed to correct its prevailing evil tendencies; they must pre-eminently promote those parts of the Christian character which are least cultivated. Such as are founded on a deep knowledge of human nature, and animated with genuine piety, must indeed benefit other ages, since human nature remains essentially the same; but their most direct influence belongs to the age in which they are written. Subsequently they may often form individuals: transfused into their minds, they are reproduced in other shapes, but are themselves withdrawn from circulation. Their body perishes; while the soul which gave it life migrates into another and another frame, and thus continues often to diffuse an extensive blessing, when the very name under which they originally appeared is forgotten. See Pusey, *Historical Inquiry*, p. 11–180. See also PRACTICAL THEOLOGY; RELIGION; THEOLOGY. (J. H. W.)

Practical Theology is one of the departments of theology, and aims principally at the treatment of the functions of Church life. For centuries the term was abused and confused, and the sphere of practical theology in the organism of theological science was an ill-understood question until the proper conception of its nature and limits was given by that master-mind of German theology, Schleiermacher; and, thanks to his clear-sightedness, practical theology is no longer to be confounded with a diluted, popularized edition of scientific theology "for students incompetent to learn the theoretic science" (Planck), nor is it any longer used as a synonym of Christian ethics or pastoral theology, but

it has taken its place in the circle of theological sciences as an independent department, co-ordinate with exegetical, historical, and systematic theology.

The Christian religion presents itself to the student under four aspects—as a divine revelation, as a history, as a system of doctrines and duties, and, finally, as a corporate life. As now the department of exegetical theology embraces all those sciences which in any way treat of the Holy Scriptures; that of historical theology, all which in any way treat of sacred or Church history; that of systematic theology, all which set forth the doctrinal and ethical systems of Christianity; so practical theology comprehends all the practices and hourly needs of the Church, and as such this department embraces the subordinate sciences of Church government, edification, and worship. It includes and covers such special branches as *Pastoral Theology*, *Homiletics*, *Catechetics*, *Christian Pædagogics*, etc. Being the science of the collective functions of the Church regarded in her unity, it is able to give due attention and prominence to each of those functions—the regulative, the educational, and the edifying, a thing impossible, under the old-fashioned arrangement [see THEOLOGY], to compass within the limits of a *Pastoral Theology* (q. v.). Says Dorner, "It is since the idea of the Church, and of her essential functions and attributes, has been more clearly recognised that practical theology, which was formerly for the most part an aggregate of rules and regulations without any organic connection between its several precepts, has been reconstructed. Nitzsch's practical theology, in particular, brings forward its connection with the other branches of theology. *Systematic theology*, which is based upon *exegetic theology* and faith, and developed by the history of doctrines, exhibits Christian truth in the abstract, and therefore the ideal of faith and practice. *Historical theology*, finishing with a delineation of the present state of the Church, sets the empiric reality and its defects over against this ideal. The contrast between the two, the variance between the ideal and the real, produces the effort to reconcile this opposition by means of theological usages, in conformity with the requirements of the age. Thus practical theology, as a science, owes its origin to the ecclesiastical procedure of the times; and, as this is necessarily technical, practical theology is also a technical study."

Schleiermacher called practical theology the crown of a theological course of study, and, as we have already said, was the first to bestow upon it a scientific organization. In this labor he was laudably followed by theologians of the most diverse schools, as, e. g., Roman Catholic Von Drey, Protestant Nitzsch, Hegelian Marheineke, compromising Hagenbach, Lutheran Harless, and such other noted men as Ehrenfeuchter, Moll, Palmer, and Schweizer. Most are agreed in describing practical theology as a science for the clergy, and thus not doing full justice to the vocation of the believing laity in Church work. Their rights in this respect have chiefly been made apparent by the hitherto much neglected theory of Church government, and by voluntary associations for domestic missions. On the other hand, the just notion that, since the Church's existence and increase are brought about by constant reproduction, it is necessary to start from the origin of the Church in individuals, to proceed to their gathering together, and thence to the Church, may be designated as the prevailing tendency in the construction of a practical theology. Hence the theory of missions (called also *Halieutics*) and catechisation, the aim of which is a preparation for confirmation, form the first or main division. The second embraces the doctrine of *worship*, or of the construction of the public services of the Church (*liturgies*, with hymnology and sacred music and *homiletics*), the superintendence of the spiritual interests of individuals (cure of souls), and the direction of the flock (the pastoral office); while the organization of the Church, and the entire system of Church law, by which the activity, whether of the individual or of the community, must be limited, form a third division. See Nitzsch, *Praktische Theologie;* Dorner, *Gesch. d. protestantischen Theologie;* Bickersteth, *Christian Student's Biblical Assistant*, p. 498; and especially Moll, *Das System der praktischen Theologie* (Halle, 1864, 8vo), which is a compendious but very systematic and thorough treatise, covering the whole field of practical theology as now understood. See also M'Clintock, *Encyclopædia and Methodology of Theol. Science*, pt. iv; *Meth. Qu. Rev.* Jan. 1864, p. 159 sq. The Germans support a *Zeitschrift für praktische Theologie*, which is printed at Leipsic and has a wide circulation.

Prades, JEAN MARTIN DE, a French theologian, was born about the year 1720 at Castel-Sarrasin. He was destined to the ecclesiastical career, studied first in the country, then went to Paris and lived there in several seminaries, among others in that of Saint-Sulpice. He became acquainted with the authors of the *Encyclopédie*, and furnished several articles to their work. He came into repute by a thesis which he defended at the Sorbonne for the doctorate of theology (Nov. 18, 1751). It contained the boldest assertions concerning the nature of the soul, the origin of good and evil, the origin of society, natural and revealed religion, the miracles, etc. His parallel of the cures performed by Jesus and those of Æsculapius seemed particularly scandalous. The thesis was condemned forthwith by several prelates and by pope Benedict XIV. The Sorbonne, after having at first approved it, reconsidered its action, and declared it impious. Parliament ordered the arrest of the author at the request of the advocate-general D'Ormesson, whereupon De Prades fled to Holland (1752), and there published his *Apology* (1752, 3 pts. 8vo), to which Diderot added a refutation of a mandement of the bishop of Auxerre. Voltaire recommended Prades to the king of Prussia, who appointed him his lector, and bestowed upon him a life-rent and two canonries, one at Oppeln, the other at Glogau. The bishop of Breslau finally prevailed upon him to retract solemnly the principles he had defended (April 6, 1754). He became archdeacon of the chapter of Glogau. He died in 1782. Prades left, besides, an *Abrégé de l'Histoire ecclésiastique de Fleuri* (Berlin, 1767, 2 vols. small 8vo), supposed to be translated from the English, and to which Frederick II wrote a preface.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v. See Brotier, *Examen de l'Apologie de l'Abbé de Prades* (1753); Feller, *Dict. Hist.* s. v.; Jervis, *Hist. of the Church of France*, ii, 332-334.

Pradier, JACQUES, a Swiss artist of note, was born at Geneva in May, 1792; went as a youth to Paris, and finally to Rome, where he studied for over five years, especially under Canova. He devoted himself principally to sculpture, and produced some remarkable works. In 1819 he settled at Paris, and died there in 1852. Satyrs, Bacchantes, Venuses, and the like, make up principally the list of his works; but he also devoted himself to sacred subjects, and produced, among others, a colossal figure of *Christ on the Cross*, a *Pietà* (now at Toulon), a *Marriage of the Virgin* (for the Madeleine, Paris), four *Apostles*, a *Virgin* (for the cathedral of Avignon), etc. One of his greatest works is the tomb of Napoleon I at the Hôtel des Invalides in Paris. See Mrs. Clement, *Handbook of Sculptors, Painters*, etc., s. v.

Pradjapat is, in the Hindû mythology, the embodied creative desire of the original Being, or of that manifestation of this Being which includes the earthly elements.

Prado, BLAS DEL, a Spanish painter, was born at Toledo in 1544. He was a pupil of Francisco Comontes. Philip II sent him to Morocco, where he painted the emperor Maley-Abdallah, his favorites, his children, and principal officers. He returned to Spain a wealthy man. But, as he affected Oriental customs, and showed himself in public dressed in the Moorish attire, the Inquisition summoned him before her tribunal. He was

discharged on condition of painting exclusively religious subjects. He died about 1605. Prado is distinguished by the purity of his design and the majesty of his compositions, which are simple, but carefully worked out in all their details. There are of his works at Madrid, in the royal palace, an *Assumption;* a *Virgin with the Child; St. Anthony; St. Blasius; St. Maurice;* a *Descent from the Cross; St. Catharine.* At Toledo, *St. Blasius,* bishop; *St. Anthony; The Presentation;* a *Holy Family* (in the monastery of Guadalupe), etc.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale,* s. v. See Palomino, *El Museo Pittorico* (Cordova, 1713, 3 vols.); Quilliet, *Dict. des Peintres Espagnols,* s. v.; Mrs. Clement, *Handbook of Sculptors, Painters,* etc., s. v.

Pradt, Dominique Dufour de, a French prelate and diplomatist, was born at Allanches, in Auvergne, April 23, 1759. He studied for some time at the military school, but gave the preference to the ecclesiastical career, and gained in 1786 the degree of doctor of theology. Cardinal de la Rochefoucauld, archbishop of Rouen, bestowed upon him the title of vicar-general and one of the richest prebends of his cathedral. In 1789 the clergy of the diocese sent him to the États-Généraux, where he sided with the clerical and monarchical minority. He followed his patron into exile, and attended him at Munster, in 1800, in his last hours. In 1798 Pradt published anonymously his most celebrated work, *L'Antidote au Congrès de Rastadt* (Hamburg, 8vo). In 1800 he published, again anonymously, *La Prusse et sa Neutralité* (8vo). His opinion, as expressed in these writings, was that the Revolution would prove fatal to France. Cancelled from the roll of the emigrants, he returned to Paris, and was introduced by his relation, general Duroc, to the first consul. The latter was given to understand that military despotism could find no more faithful servant. De Pradt was appointed chaplain of the new emperor and bishop of Poitiers; he was, as such, consecrated by pope Pius VII himself, in the church of Saint-Sulpice, Feb. 2, 1805. The "chaplain of the god Mars," as he called himself, followed his master to Milan. In 1808 he was at Bayonne as one of the negotiators of the convention which removed the Bourbons from the throne of Spain, and was rewarded with a bounty of fifty thousand francs and the archiepiscopal see of Mechlin (May 12, 1808). He was one of the nineteen bishops who, March 25, 1810, solicited from the pope the dispensation which Napoleon wanted for his marriage with Maria Louisa. In 1811 he was a member of the second commission appointed for the purpose of preparing the questions to be proposed to the National Council, and the emperor, Aug. 20, appointed him member of the deputation sent to Savone to submit the decrees of that council for the pope's approbation. In the ensuing year he was sent as ambassador to Warsaw, where he opened with a speech the Polish diet, June, 1812. It was here that a spirit of opposition commenced to stir in the supple priest, and he was sent back to his diocese. He returned to France with the allies, who, he says, by his advice, "determined to break entirely with Napoleon and his dynasty, and re-establish the Bourbons on the throne." De Pradt owed to his relations with Talleyrand his nomination as grand-chancellor of the Legion of Honor, and the dignity of grand-cross of the order. In 1815 he retired to Auvergne, and in 1816 he accepted a life-rent of 12,000 francs from William, king of the Netherlands, in exchange for his archbishopric. In the reign of Louis XVIII he was pleased to side with the opposition. He wrote some brilliant pamphlets against the government: one of them brought him before the Cour d'Assises of the Seine, where he was defended by the elder Dupin. In 1827 he was elected deputy of Clermont-Ferrand. After the revolution of July his opinions underwent a new change: he again declared for unmitigated royalty and against the liberty of the press. He died at Paris March 18, 1837. We mention, among his numerous writings, *Histoire de l'Ambassade dans le Grand-Duché de Varsovie* (Paris, 1815, 1826, 8vo). In this amusing and witty composition he holds a review over the personages of the empire with uncommon satirical sharpness. We find in it the following regarding the principal figure: "The genius of Napoleon was fitted at the same time for the stage of the world and for that of the mountebanks; it was represented by royal attire mixed with the dress of a clown. The god Mars was nothing but a kind of Jupiter-Scapin, the like of which the world had never seen:"—*Mémoires historiques sur la Révolution d'Espagne* (Paris, 1816, 8vo):—*Des Colonies, et de la Révolution actuelle de l'Amérique* (ibid. 1817, 2 vols. 8vo):—*Les Quatre Concordats* (ibid. 1818–20, 3 vols. 8vo), one of his most curious writings:—*L'Europe apres le Congrès d'Aix-la-Chapelle* (ibid. 1819, 8vo):—*Le Congrès de Carlsbad* (ibid. 1819, 8vo):—*L'Europe et l'Amérique depuis le Congrès d'Aix-la-Chapelle* (ibid. 1821–2, 2 vols. 8vo):—*L'Europe et l'Amérique en* 1821 *et Ann. suiv.* (ibid. 1821–4, 4 vols. 8vo):—*Du Jésuitisme ancien et moderne* (ibid. 1825–6, 8vo), etc. See *L'Ami de la Religion* (1837); Pérennès, *Biog. univ. supplém. au Dict. hist. de Feller;* Jauffret, *Mém. hist. sur les Affaires eccles. de France;* Rabbé, etc., *Biog. univ. et portat. des Contemporains;* Quérard, *La France littér.*—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale,* s. v.; *Lond. Qu. Rev.* Jan. 1816; *Monthly Rev.* vol. lxxx (1816).

Præadamites. See Preadamites.

Præbend. See Prebend.

Præcentor. See Precentor.

Præcōnēs (i. e. *heralds*) is a name sometimes given to deacons, because it was their duty to pronounce the usual formularies of exhortation, etc., during the celebration of divine service. The word *præco* corresponds to the Greek *κήρυξ,* and gave rise to the English Church term *bidding prayer.* The deacons were required to *bid* prayer in the congregation, i. e. to dictate to the people the usual forms of prayer in which they were to join, and to act as their director and guide in all the other parts of divine service. The word *prædico* is used in a similar signification. See Bidding Prayer.

Præfatio is, in the mass, the prayer which immediately precedes the canon, an exhortation to thankfulness, commencing with the words "Sursum corda." In the Gothic or Mozarabic liturgy the præfatio is called *Illatio;* in the Gallican, *Immolatio* and *Contestatio.* It is also called *Hymnus Angelicus.* Originally there was but one præfatio for all days and feasts (*Præfatio Communis*); since the 12th century a number of præfationes, adapted to the variety of the feasts, the use of which is indicated by the Directory of the Church, have been introduced. Every præfatio ends with the triple "Sanctus," the introduction of which is attributed to Sixtus I. See Mass; Prefaces.

Præfĭcæ, a name for the mourning-women of the ancients. They were hired to make lamentation at Roman funerals, and were so called because they generally *preceded* the funeral processions in order to lament and sing the praises of the deceased. The early Christians very earnestly condemned the imitation of this custom in their funerals. They deemed immoderate grief unbecoming the character and profession of a Christian whose conversation is in heaven, and whose hope and expectation was a crown of life that fadeth not away. Chrysostom inveighed with great indignation against the introduction of heathenish practices into the Christian Church, and threatened those who should persist in the imitation of the funeral customs of the heathen with the highest ecclesiastical censures.

Prælāti (i. e. *preferred*), in the larger sense of the word, is the name of all higher officers of the Church with whose functions is connected a jurisdiction in their own name—*jure ordinario*—i. e. a jurisdiction belonging essentially to the office, not conferred by a higher dignitary of the Church. In this meaning of the word we distinguish between prælati *primigenii* and *secunda-*

rii. In a more restricted sense, prælati is the name given to the local superiors or directors of the congregations and abbeys of many ecclesiastical orders, especially to those who enjoy, either by privilege or tradition, the right of wearing the pontifical ensigns.

Prælati nullius dioceseos is the title of abbots or other high dignitaries who are not amenable to the jurisdiction of the bishop, but enjoy themselves *jurisdictionem quasi-episcopalem*, which as a rule extends only to the ecclesiastics subordinated to them, not to the laymen of their monastic district, except in cases where they may enjoy even such a spiritual jurisdiction in virtue of a special indult, as in consequence of prescription. See PRELATE.

Prælector is the ecclesiastical term for the divinity-reader in some cathedrals. Sometimes he is attached to the prebend (q. v.), and sometimes he lectures, as on saints' days, in Lent, and other important Church seasons. See LECTOR; READER.

Præmonstrants. See PREMONSTRATENSIANS.

Præmunīre is a term used in English canon law as well as British common law to designate a species of offence of the nature of a contempt of the ruling power, for which enactments were passed, and was so called from the mandatory words with which the writ directing the citation of a party charged with the offence commences. The different statutes of præmunire were originally framed in order to restrain the encroachments of the papal power. They begin with the 27 Edward III, st. i, c. 1, and continue from that period down to the reign of Henry VIII, when the kingdom entirely renounced the authority of the Roman pontiffs. The exorbitant powers exercised by the pope in presenting to benefices and in other ecclesiastical matters, and the privileges claimed by the clergy, who resisted the authority of the king's courts, and recognised no jurisdiction but that of the court of Rome, rendered some enactments absolutely necessary to uphold the law of the country and the independence of the nation. This, then, is the original meaning of the offence termed *præmunire*—viz., introducing a foreign power into the land, and creating an *imperium in imperio* by paying that obedience to the papal process which constitutionally belonged to the king alone. Its penalties have been subsequently applied to other heinous offences, some of which bear more and some less relation to this original offence, and some no relation at all, as a chapter refusing to elect as bishop the person nominated by the sovereign, neglecting to take the oath of allegiance, transgressing the statute of *habeas corpus* (by 6 Anne, c. 7), the asserting by preaching, teaching, or advisedly speaking that any person other than according to the Acts of Settlement and Union has any right to the British throne, or that the sovereign and parliament cannot make laws to limit the descent of the crown. The knowingly and wilfully solemnizing, assisting, or being present at any marriage forbidden by the Royal Marriage Act is declared by 12 George III, c. 11, to infer a præmunire. The penalties for the offence are no less than the following, as shortly summed up by Sir E. Coke (1 *Inst.* p. 129): "That from the conviction the defendant shall be out of the king's protection, and his lands and tenements, goods and chattels, forfeited to the king, and that his body shall remain in prison during the king's pleasure, or (as others have it) during life." The offender can bring no action nor recover damages for the most atrocious injuries, and no man can safely give him comfort, aid, or relief. (See Baxter, *Ch. Hist.* p. 291; Hardwick, *Hist. of the Ref.* p. 187, 361.) In very recent times the Dissenters have labored for the abolition of the statute of præmunire (see *London Globe*, Nov. 1869).

Præpositivus, PIETRO, an Italian theologian, who flourished near the opening of the 13th century, was a native of Cremona, taught theology in the schools of Paris, and was at the close of 1206 chancellor of the church of Notre Dame. In 1209 we find Jean de Candelis in his place. His chief work is a *Summa Theologiæ*, of which two or three pages only were printed; they are in the *Penitential* of Theodore. There are numerous copies of it at Oxford and in the National Library at Paris. Præpositivus died at Paris in 1209 or 1217. See Tiraboschi, *Storia della Letter. Ital.* iv, 120; *Histoire litt. de la France*, xvi, 583–586.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.

Præpositus (i. e. *set over*) is an ecclesiastical term usually employed to mean a *bishop* (q. v.), but also used to signify a presbyter. The same titles being applied to both is a proof that they were at one time considered of the same order. The corresponding titles in the scriptural appellations are προϊστάμενοι (1 Thess. v, 12) and προεστῶτες (1 Tim. v, 17). In Spain, in the time of the Gothic kings, about the end of the 4th century, it was a custom for parents to dedicate their children at a very early age to the service of the Church, in which case they were taken into the bishop's family and educated under him by a presbyter whom the bishop deputed for that purpose and set over them by the name of præpositus or superintendent, his chief business being to inspect their behavior and instruct them in the rules and discipline of the Church. See Riddle, *Christian Antiquities*, p. 211; Coleman, *Anc. Christianity Exemplified*, p. 130, 485. See also the art. PRELACY. (J. H. W.)

Præpositus, JACOBUS. See SPRENG.

Præpositus Domus was the name applied to the person whose duty it was to manage the revenues of the Church. See ŒCONOMI.

Præsanctificatio is in the Roman Catholic Church the mass celebrated on Green-Thursday, when two hosts are consecrated, whereof the priest tastes one at the communion, reserving the other for the next day, when the *missa præsanctificatorum* is to be solemnized. In the Greek Church *missa præsanctificatorum* (mass of the loaves blessed in advance) is the mass celebrated on the Wednesdays and Fridays of Lent; it consists in the communion of the holy elements which have been consecrated on the preceding Sundays. See MASS. See Siegel, *Christliche Alterthümer* (Index in vol. iv).

Præsides, or Presidents, was the name sometimes applied to bishops of the early Church, after the word πρόεδροι, derived from προεδρία, the elevated seat which the bishop occupied in the synod and in the religious assemblies of the people. See Coleman, *Anc. Christianity Exemplified*, p. 131.

Præstimonia were originally stipends derived from special foundations for theological candidates, to help them during their studies, or to give them the means, after their consecration, to enjoy the teachings of some distinguished theological establishment. The chapters, abbeys, universities, etc., in which such foundations existed, or which were possessed of the right of collation or presentation, granted these stipends, after examination of the testimonies with which the competitors accompanied their request, to the candidate who seemed to be the most worthy of such a favor, unless the deed of the foundation limited their choice to the individuals belonging to certain families. Sometimes the præstimonia were granted to ordained priests, as, for instance, in cathedral and collegiate churches to young ecclesiastics without prebend, but who, in the expectation of benefices to come, served in the choir and in other ecclesiastical ministries; in this case the præstimonia were sometimes considered as real benefices, and, like these, connected with determined functions. The question ventilated in more recent times, whether these præstimonia were rightly considered as prebends, can only in this latter case be answered in the affirmative, as no private foundation can be lawfully considered as a benefice before it has been admitted by the competent clerical authorities in *titulum beneficii*. Al-

lowances to ecclesiastics given otherwise than as beneficial revenue for ecclesiastical duties, or to laymen even for ecclesiastical services, are no prebends in the canonic meaning of the word.

Præto'rium is the rendering in Mark xv, 16 of the Greek notation Πραιτώριον of the Latin word *prætorium*, which properly meant the tent of the Roman general in the field, and hence the house of the Roman governor in his province (see Livy, xxviii, 27; xlv, 7; Valer. Max. i, 6, 4; Cicero, *Verr.* ii, 4, 28; ii, 5, 12, 35; comp. Walter, *Gesch. d. Röm. Rechts*, i, 340). In Matt. xxvii, 27 the common version renders the same word *common hall;* in Phil. i, 13, *palace;* in John xviii, 28, *hall of judgment;* and elsewhere, once in the same verse in John, in v, 33, in xix, 9, and Acts xxiii, 35, *judgment-hall.* It is plainly one of the many Latin words to be found in the New Testament [see LATINISMS], being the word *prætorium* in a Greek dress, a derivative from *prætor;* which latter, from *præeo*, "to go before," was originally applied by the Romans to a military officer—the general. But because the Romans subdued many countries and reduced them to provinces, and governed them afterwards, at first by the generals who subdued them, or by some other military commanders, the word *prætor* came ultimately to be used for any civil governor of a province, whether he had been engaged in war or not; and who acted in the capacity of chief-justice, having a council associated with him (Acts xxv, 12). Accordingly the word *prætorium*, also, which originally signified the general's tent in a camp, came at length to be applied to the residence of the civil governor in provinces and cities (Cicero, *Verr.* ii; v, 12); and being properly an adjective, as is also its Greek representative, it was used to signify *whatever* appertained to the prætor or governor; for instance, his residence, either the whole or any part of it, as his dwelling-house, or the place where he administered justice, or even the large enclosed court at the entrance to the prætorian residence (Bynæus, *De Morte Jesu Christi* [Amsterd. 1696], ii, 407). There dwelt not only the commandant and his family (Josephus, *Ant.* xx, 10, 1), but a division of the troops occupied barracks there, and the prisoners who awaited hearing and judgment from the chief were there detained (Acts xxiii, 35). The prætorium in the capital of a province was usually a large palace; and we see by Josephus (*War*, ii, 14, 8; comp. xv, 5; Philo, *Opp.* ii, 591) that the procurators of Judæa, when in Jerusalem, occupied Herod's palace as a prætorium, just as in Cæsarea a former royal residence served the same purpose. Yet the rendering of the Latin *prætorium* in general by the word *palace* (by Schleusner and Wahl) is wrong. The places in Suetonius misquoted refer only to the imperial palaces out of Rome. Verres as præses or prætor of Sicily resided in the *domus prætoria*, which belonged to king Hiero (Cicero, *Verr.* ii, 5; xii, 31). See JERUSALEM.

1. As to the passages in the Gospels referred to above, tradition distinguishes the judgment-hall of Pilate, which is pointed out in the lower city (Korte, *Reisen*, p. 75; Troilo, p. 234 sq.), from the palace of king Herod; and others have believed (as Rosenmüller, *Alterth.* II, ii, 228) that the procurator took up his quarters in Jerusalem in the tower of Antonia, and sat in judgment there. The tradition has no weight; yet on general grounds we may believe, since the palace of Herod stood vacant and was roomy and suitable, that the procurators usually resided there, surrounded by a body-guard, while the troops with their officers occupied the tower of Antonia (comp. Faber, *Archæology*, i, 321 sq.). A description of that marble palace of Herod, which joined the north wall of the upper city, and was so large and well fortified, is given by Josephus (*War*, v, 4, 4; comp. *Ant.* xv, 9, 3). The Roman procurators, whose ordinary residence was at Cæsarea (Acts xxiii, 23, etc.; xxv, 1, etc.), took up their residence in this palace when they visited Jerusalem, their tribunal being erected in the open court or area before it. Thus Josephus states that Florus took up his quarters at the palace (ἐν τοῖς βασιλείοις αὐλίζεται); and on the next day he had his tribunal set up before it, and sat upon it (*War*, ii, 14, 8). Philo expressly says that the palace, which had hitherto been Herod's, was now called τὴν οἰκίαν τῶν ἐπιτρόπων, "the house of the prætors" (*Legat. ad Caium* [ed. Franc.], p. 1033). It was situated on the western or more elevated hill of Jerusalem, overlooking the Temple (Josephus, *Ant.* xx, 8, 11), and was connected with a system of fortifications the aggregate of which constituted the παρεμβολή, or fortified barrack. It was the dominant position on the western hill, and—at any rate on one side, probably the eastern—was mounted by a flight of steps, the same from which Paul made his speech in Hebrew to the angry crowd of Jews (Acts xxii, 1 sq.). From the level below the barrack a terrace led eastward to a gate opening into the western side of the cloister surrounding the Temple, the road being carried across the valley of the Tyropœon (separating the western from the Temple hill) on a causeway built up of enormous stone blocks. At the angle of the Temple cloister just above this entrance, i. e. the northwest corner [see TEMPLE], stood the old citadel of the Temple hill, the βᾶρις, or Byrsa, which Herod rebuilt and called by the name Antonia, after his friend and patron the triumvir. After the Roman power was established in Judæa, a Roman guard was always maintained in the Antonia, the commander of which for the time being seems to be the official termed στρατηγὸς τοῦ ἱεροῦ in the Gospels and Acts. The guard in the Antonia was probably relieved regularly from the cohort quartered in the παρεμβολή, and hence the plural form στρατηγοί is sometimes used, the officers, like the privates, being changed every watch; although it is very conceivable that a certain number of them should have been selected for the service from possessing a superior knowledge of the Jewish customs or skill in the Hebrew language. Besides the cohort of regular legionaries there was probably an equal number of local troops, who when on service acted as the "supports" (δεξιόλαβοι, *coverers of the right flank*, Acts xxiii, 23) of the former, and there were also a few squadrons of cavalry; although it seems likely that both these and the local troops had separate barracks at Jerusalem, and that the παρεμβολή, or prætorian camp, was appropriated to the Roman cohort. The ordinary police of the Temple and the city seems to have been in the hands of the Jewish officials, whose attendants (ὑπήρεται) were provided with dirks and clubs, but without the regular armor and the discipline of the legionaries. When the latter were required to assist the *gendarmerie*, either from the apprehension of serious tumult, or because the service was one of great importance, the Jews would apply to the officer in command at the Antonia, who would act so far under their orders as the commmander of a detachment in a manufacturing town does under the orders of the civil magistrate at the time of a riot (Acts iv, 1; v, 24). But the power of life and death, or of regular scourging, rested only with the prætor, or the person representing him and commissioned by him. This power, and that which would always go with it—the right to press whatever men or things were required by the public exigencies—appears to be denoted by the term ἐξουσία, a term perhaps the translation of the Latin *imperium*, and certainly its equivalent. It was inherent in the prætor or his representatives—hence themselves popularly called ἐξουσίαι, or ἐξουσίαι ὑπέρτεραι (Rom. xiii, 1, 3)—and would be communicated to all military officers in command of detached posts, such as the centurion at Capernaum, who describes himself as possessing summary powers of this kind because he was ὑπ' ἐξουσίαν—covered by the privilege of the *imperium* (Matt. viii, 9). The forced purveyances (v, 40), the requisitions for baggage animals (v, 41), the summary punishments following transgression of orders (v, 39) incident to a military occupation of the country, of course must have been a perpetual source of irritation to the peasantry along the lines of the military roads, even

when the despotic authority of the Roman officers might be exercised with moderation. But such a state of things also afforded constant opportunities to an unprincipled soldier to extort money under the pretence of a loan, as the price of exemption from personal services which he was competent to insist upon, or as a bribe to buy off the prosecution of some vexatious charge before a military tribunal (Matt. v, 42; Luke iii, 14). See ARMY.

The relations of the military to the civil authorities in Jerusalem come out very clearly from the history of the Crucifixion. When Judas first makes his proposition to betray Jesus to the chief-priests, a conference is held between them and the *στρατηγοί* as to the mode of effecting the object (Luke xxii, 4). The plan involved the assemblage of a large number of the Jews by night, and Roman jealousy forbade such a thing, except under the surveillance of a military officer. An arrangement was accordingly made for a military force, which would naturally be drawn from the Antonia. At the appointed hour Judas comes and takes with him "the troops" (called *τὴν σπεῖραν*, although of course only a detachment from the cohort), together with a number of police (*ὑπηρέτας*) under the orders of the high-priests and Pharisees (John xviii, 3). When the apprehension of Jesus takes place, however, there is scarcely any reference to the presence of the military. Matthew and Mark altogether ignore their taking any part in the proceeding. From Luke's account one is led to suppose that the military commander posted his men outside the garden, and entered himself with the Jewish authorities (xxii, 52). This is exactly what might be expected under the circumstances. It was the business of the Jewish authorities to apprehend a Jewish offender, and of the Roman officer to take care that the proceeding led to no breach of the public peace. But when apprehended, the Roman officer became responsible for the custody of the offender, and accordingly he would at once chain him by the wrists to two soldiers (Acts xxi, 33) and carry him off. Here John accordingly gave another glimpse of the presence of the military: "the *troops then, and the chiliarch* and the officers of the Jews, apprehended Jesus, and *put him in bonds*, and led him away, first of all to Annas" (xviii, 12). The insults which Luke mentions (xxii, 63) are apparently the barbarous sport of the ruffianly soldiers and police while waiting with their prisoner for the assembling of the Sanhedrim in the hall of Caiaphas; but the blows inflicted are those with the vine-stick, which the centurions carried, and with which they struck the soldiers on the head and face (Juvenal, *Sat.* viii, 247), not a flagellation by the hands of lictors. When Jesus was condemned by the Sanhedrim, and accordingly sent to Pilate, the Jewish officials certainly expected that no inquiry would be made into the merits of the case, but that Jesus would be simply received as a convict on the authority of his own countrymen's tribunal, thrown into a dungeon, and on the first convenient opportunity executed. They are obviously surprised at the question, "What accusation bring ye against this man?" and at the apparition of the governor himself outside the precinct of the prætorium. The cheapness in which he had held the life of the native population on a former occasion (Luke xiii, 1) must have led them to expect a totally different course from him. His scrupulousness, most extraordinary in any Roman, stands in striking contrast with the recklessness of the commander who proceeded at once to put St. Paul to torture, simply to ascertain why it was that so violent an attack was made on him by the crowd (Acts xxii, 24). Yet this latter is undoubtedly a typical specimen of the feeling which prevailed among the conquerors of Judæa in reference to the conquered. The order for the execution of a native criminal would in ninety-nine instances out of a hundred have been regarded by a Roman magnate as a simply ministerial act—one which indeed only he was competent to perform, but of which the performance was unworthy of a second thought. It is probable that the hesitation of Pilate was due rather to a superstitious fear of his wife's dream than to a sense of justice or a feeling of humanity towards an individual of a despised race; at any rate, such an explanation is more in accordance with what we know of the feeling prevalent among his class in that age. When at last Pilate's effort to save Jesus was defeated by the determination of the Jews to claim Barabbas, and he had testified, by washing his hands in the presence of the people, that he did not consent to the judgment passed on the prisoner by the Sanhedrim, but must be regarded as performing a merely ministerial act, he proceeded at once to the formal imposition of the appropriate penalty. His lictors took Jesus and inflicted the punishment of scourging upon him in the presence of all (Matt. xxvii, 26). This, in the Roman idea, was the necessary preliminary to capital punishment, and had Jesus not been an alien his head would have been struck off by the lictors immediately afterwards. But crucifixion being the customary punishment in that case, a different course becomes necessary. The execution must take place by the hands of the military, and Jesus is handed over from the lictors to these. They take him into the prætorium, and muster *the whole cohort*—not merely that portion which is on duty at the time (Matt. xxvii, 27; Mark xv, 16). While a centurion's guard is told off for the purpose of executing Jesus and the two criminals, the rest of the soldiers divert themselves by mocking the reputed king of the Jews (Matt. xxvii, 28–30; Mark xv, 17–19; John xix, 2, 3), Pilate, who in the meantime has gone in, being probably a witness of the pitiable spectacle. His wife's dream still haunts him, and although he has already delivered Jesus over to execution, and what is taking place is merely the ordinary course, he comes out again to the people to protest that *he* is passive in the matter, and that *they* must take the prisoner, there before their eyes in the garb of mockery, and crucify him (John xix, 4–6). On their reply that Jesus had asserted himself to be the Son of God, Pilate's fears are still more roused, and at last he is only induced to go on with the *military* execution, for which he is himself responsible, by the threat of a charge of treason against Cæsar in the event of his not doing so (John xix, 7–13). Sitting, then, solemnly on the *bema*, and producing Jesus, who in the meantime has had his own clothes put upon him, he formally delivers him up to be crucified in such a manner as to make it appear that he is acting solely in the discharge of his duty to the emperor (John xix, 13–16). The centurion's guard now proceed with the prisoners to Golgotha, Jesus himself carrying the cross-piece of wood to which his hands were to be nailed. Weak from loss of blood, the result of the scourging, he is unable to proceed; but just as they are leaving the gate they meet Simon the Cyrenian, and at once use the military right of pressing (*ἀγγαρεύειν*) him for the public service. Arrived at the spot, four soldiers are told off for the business of the executioner, the remainder keeping the ground. Two would be required to hold the hands, and a third the feet, while the fourth drove in the nails. Hence the distribution of the garments into *four* parts. The centurion in command, the principal Jewish officials and their acquaintances (hence probably John [John xviii, 15]), and the nearest relatives of Jesus (xix, 26, 27), might naturally be admitted within the cordon—a square of perhaps one hundred yards. The people would be kept outside of this, but the distance would not be too great to read the title, "Jesus the Nazarene, the King of the Jews," or at any rate to gather its general meaning. The whole acquaintance of Jesus, and the women who had followed him from Galilee—too much afflicted to mix with the crowd in the immediate vicinity, and too numerous to obtain admission inside the cordon—looked on from a distance (*ἀπὸ μακρόθεν*). The vessel containing vinegar (John xix, 29) was set within the cordon for the benefit of the soldiers, whose duty it was to remain un-

der arms (Matt. xxvii, 36) until the death of the prisoners, the centurion in command being responsible for their not being taken down alive. Had the Jews not been anxious for the removal of the bodies, in order not to shock the eyes of the people coming in from the country on the following day, the troops would have been relieved at the end of their watch, and their place supplied by others until death took place. The jealousy with which any interference with the regular course of a military execution was regarded appears from the application of the Jews to Pilate—not to the centurion—to have the prisoners despatched by breaking their legs. For the performance of this duty other soldiers were detailed (John xix, 32), not merely permission given to the Jews to have the operation performed. Even for the watching of the sepulchre recourse is had to Pilate, who bids the applicants "take a guard" (Matt. xxvii, 65), which they do, and put a seal on the stone in the presence of the soldiers, in a way exactly analogous to that practiced in the custody of the sacred robes of the high-priest in the Antonia (Josephus, *Ant.* xv, 11, 4). See CRUCIFIXION.

2. The prætorium in Rome, mentioned in Phil. i, 13, where Paul lay imprisoned, has occasioned much discussion among the interpreters, and formed the theme of a learned dispute between Jac. Perizonius and Ulrich Huber (see Perizonii *Cum U. Hubero Disquisitio de Prætorio* [Lugd. Bat. 1696]). It was not the imperial palace (*ἡ οἰκία Καίσαρος*, Phil. iv, 22), for this was never called *prætorium* in Rome; nor was it the judgment-hall, for no such building stood in Rome, and the name *prætoria* was not until much later applied to the courts of justice (see Perizonius, *l. c.* p. 63 sq.). It was probably (as Camerarius perceived) the quarters of the imperial body-guard, the *prætorian cohort*, which had been built for it by Tiberius, under the advice of Sejanus (Sueton. *Tib.* 37). Before that time the guards were billeted in different parts of the city. It stood outside the walls, at some distance short of the fourth milestone, and so near either to the Salarian or the Nomentane road that Nero, in his flight by one or the other of them to the house of his freedman Phaon, which was situated between the two, heard the cheers of the soldiers within for Galba. In the time of Vespasian the houses seem to have extended so far as to reach it (Tacitus, *Annal.* iv, 2; Sueton. *Ner.* 48; Pliny, *H. N.* iii, 5). From the first, buildings must have sprung up near it for sutlers and others. An opinion well deserving consideration has been advocated by Wieseler, and by Conybeare and Howson (*Life of St. Paul*, ch. xxvi), to the effect that the prætorium here mentioned was the quarter of that detachment of the Prætorian Guards which was in immediate attendance upon the emperor, and had barracks in Mount Palatine. Thither, wherever the place was, Paul was brought as a prisoner of the emperor, and delivered to the præfect of the guard, according to the custom (Acts xxviii, 16; see Pliny, *Ep.* x, 65; Philostr. *Soph.* ii, 32), as the younger Agrippa was once imprisoned by this officer at the express command of the emperor Tiberius (Josephus, *Ant.* xviii, 6, 6). This office was then filled by Burrhus Afranius (Tacitus, *Annal.* xii, 42; see Anger, *Temp. Act. Ap.* p. 100 sq.). Paul appears to have been permitted for the space of two years to lodge, so to speak, "within the rules" of the prætorium (Acts xxviii, 30), although still under the custody of a soldier. See Olshausen, *Topogr. des alten Jerusalem*, § iii, p. 9; Perizonius, *De Origine et Significatione et Usu Vocum Prætoris et Prætorii* (Frank. 1690); Shorzius, *De Prætorio Pilati in Exercit. Phil.* (Hag. Com. 1774); Zorn, *Opuscula Sacra*, ii, 699. See PAUL.

Pragaladen, a particular and holy worshipper of the Hindû god Vishnu, who was for a long time tortured by the demon Tronya, until Vishnu, in his fourth incarnation, as man-lion, killed the giant. See VISHNU.

Pragmatic Sanction was a general term (from *πρᾶγμα, business*) for all important ordinances of Church or State—those perhaps more properly which were enacted in public assemblies with the counsel of eminent jurisconsults or *pragmatici*. The term originated in the Byzantine empire, and signified there a public and solemn decree by a prince, as distinguished from the simple rescript which was a declaration of law in answer to a question propounded by an individual. But the most familiar application of the term is to the important articles decided on by the great assembly held at Bourges (q. v.) in 1438, convoked and presided over by Charles VII. These articles have been regarded as the great bulwark of the French Church against the usurpation of Rome. King Louis IX had drawn up a pragmatic sanction in 1268 against the encroachments of the Church and court of Rome. It related chiefly to the right of the Gallican Church with reference to the selections of bishops and clergy. But the great articles of 1438 entirely superseded those of Louis IX; for though they reasserted the rights and privileges claimed by the Gallican Church under that monarch, the articles were chiefly founded on the decrees of the Council of Basle. Some of them relate to the periodical assembling and superior authority of general councils; some to the celebration of divine offices and other matters not connected with papal prerogation; but of the rest it has been truly said that the abuses of the papal prerogation against which they were directed were chiefly connected with its avarice. This was the most unpopular of the vices of the holy see, and was at the bottom of more than half the grievances which alienated its children from it. Pope Pius II succeeded in obtaining the abrogation of this sanction for a time; but the Parliament of Paris refused to sanction the ignominious conduct of Louis XI in setting it aside, and he was compelled to restore it to its original influential position. Accordingly the pragmatic sanction continued in force till Francis I's concordat in 1516 supplanted it. Although by the concordat privileges were given and received on both sides, yet the real advantages were on the side of Rome, which advantages it has ever since been her constant aim to improve. See Jervis, *Hist. Ch. of France*, i, 23 sq.; *Hist. of Popery*, p. 202; Gieseler, *Eccles. Hist.* (see Index to vol. iii); Fisher, *Hist. of the Ref.* p. 48, 49; Mosheim, *Eccles. Hist.* vol. iii; Milman, *Hist. Latin Christianity* (see Index to vol. viii); Hardwick, *Hist. of the Church in the Middle Ages*, p. 272, 358, 362; id. *Ref.* p. 7, 353; Waddington, *Eccles. Hist.* p. 576; Ranke, *Hist. of the Papacy*, i, 28 sq.; Alzog, *Kirchengesch.* ii, 48, 180, 189, 191; Ebrard, *Dogmengesch.* iv, 206; *Brit. Quar. Rev.* April, 1873, p. 273.

Prague, COUNCIL OF (*Concilium Pragense*), an important ecclesiastical gathering, was convened by archbishop Ernest of Prague in 1346, and passed among other regulations one relating to the proper observance of the Christian faith, the abuses arising from the use of rescripts from Rome, the impropriety of allowing strange priests to assist at communions without letters from their own bishop, the rights of Roman delegates upon subjects of interdicts, and the private life and morals of the clergy. (See Mansi, *Concil.* iii, col. 543 sq.; Hefele, *Conciliengesch.* vol. vi.) How little these efforts for the purifying of the Church and strengthening of the Christian cause availed is but too well known to the historical student of the Hussite movement which followed in the next century and finally brought about many strong reforms in Bohemia, besides preparing the way for the great Reformation. See HUSSITES.

Praise, an acknowledgment made of the excellency or perfection of any person or action, with a commendation of the same. "The desire of praise," says an elegant writer, "is generally connected with all the finer sensibilities of human nature. It affords a ground on which exhortation, counsel, and reproof can work a proper effect. To be entirely destitute of this passion betokens an ignoble mind on which no moral impression

is easily made, for where there is no desire of praise there will also be no sense of reproach; but while it is admitted to be a natural and in many respects a useful principle of action, we are to observe that it is entitled to no more than our secondary regard. It has its boundary set, by transgressing which it is at once transformed from an innocent into a most dangerous passion. When, passing its natural line, it becomes the ruling spring of conduct; when the regard which we pay to the opinions of men encroaches on that reverence which we owe to the voice of conscience and the sense of duty, the love of praise, having then gone out of its proper place, instead of improving, corrupts, and instead of elevating, debases our nature." See Young, *Love of Fame;* Blair, *Sermons*, vol. ii, ser. 6; Jortin, *Diss.* No. 4 passim; Wilberforce, *Pract. View*, ch. iv, § 3; Smith, *Theory of Moral Sent.* i, 233; Fitzosborne, *Letters*, No. 18.

Praise of God is a reverent acknowledgment of the perfections, works, and benefits of God, and of the blessings flowing from them to mankind, usually expressed in hymns of gratitude and thanksgiving, and especially in the reception of the Holy Eucharist, that "sacrifice of praise" and sublimest token of our joy, and which has received the name (*εὐχαριστία*) because it is the highest instance of thanksgiving in which Christians can be engaged. Praise and thanksgiving are generally considered as synonymous, yet some distinguish them thus: "Praise properly terminates in God, on account of his natural excellences and perfections, and is that act of devotion by which we confess and admire his several attributes; but thanksgiving is a more contracted duty, and imports only a grateful sense and acknowledgment of past mercies. We praise God for all his glorious acts of every kind that regard either us or other men—for his very vengeance, and those judgments which he sometimes sends abroad in the earth; but we thank him, properly speaking, for the instances of his goodness alone, and for such only of these as we ourselves are some way concerned in."—Buck, *Theol. Dict.* See Atterbury, *Sermon on Psalm l*, 14; Saurin, *Sermons*, vol. i, ser. 14; Tillotson, *Sermons*, ser. 146 (conclusion). See THANKSGIVING.

Praise-meeting, a meeting recently inaugurated in this country, first in New England, for a service of song by the congregation. The people gather, and, under the lead of some competent precentor, unite in a service which is wholly, or almost wholly, musical, and in which all participate.

Pra Mogla is, in the mythology of the Siamese, a celebrated disciple of Sommonacodom, their great saint and protector. His statue, which represents two bodies, is often found beside the statue of his master. He was so compassionate and benevolent that he attempted to extinguish the fire of hell by turning the earth upside down, and gathering in his hand all burning things he found; but the fire destined to punish the lost for their sins was so violent that it burned to ashes everything that was near, and dried up rivers and seas. In his distress Pra Mogla recurred to his master himself. The saint could easily have fulfilled his wishes, but he feared lest mankind, free from that salutary terror, should fall into greater depravity, and the fire was suffered to keep burning. The wisdom of the god was admired, but the love of the disciple was memorialized by numberless images and statues.

Pran is, in Hindû mythology, the breath, the vital principle, which dwells in every man, and has its seat in the heart; it is the divine principle of motion that spreads everywhere life and activity, through which alone the whole nature can subsist, and which manifests itself in the animal world by the act of breathing.

Pran Nathis, a sect among the Hindûs which was originated by Pran Nath, who, being versed in Mohammedan as well as Hindû learning, endeavored to reconcile the two religions. With this view he composed a work called *The Mahitáriyal*, in which texts from the Koran and the Vedas are brought together, and shown not to be essentially different from each other. Bundelkund is the chief seat of the sect, and in Punna they have a building in one apartment of which, on a table covered with gold cloth, lies the volume of the founder. "As a test of the disciple's consent," says Prof. H. H. Wilson, "to the real identity of the essence of the Hindû and Mohammedan creeds, the ceremony of the initiation consists of eating in the society of members of both communions; with this exception, and the admission of the general principle, it does not appear that the two classes confound their civil or even religious distinctions; they continue to observe the practices and ritual of their forefathers, whether Mussulman or Hindû, and the union, beyond that of community or that of eating, is no more than any rational individual of either sect is fully prepared for, or the admission that the God of both and of all religions is one and the same."

Pranzimas, a name for *destiny* among the Lithuanians, which, according to immutable laws, directs the gods, nature, and men, and whose power knows no limit.

Pra Rasi are, in the mythology of the Siamese, hermits who live in complete seclusion, and, by many years of a contemplative existence, have acquired a knowledge of the most recondite mysteries of nature. Those mysteries are described on the wall which encircles the world, and thence the Pra Rasi gathered their knowledge. Thus they possess the secret of flying, of assuming any form at their pleasure, of making precious metals, etc. As they know also the means of giving their body indefinite duration, they could enjoy eternal life; yet every thousand years they make a voluntary sacrifice of their life by burning themselves on a heap of wood, with the exception of one, who awakens the saints again to renewed life. There are religious writings which indicate the means of getting to these hermits, but it is said to be a very dangerous enterprise.

Pratensis, FELIX, is noted as the famous editor of the *editio princeps* of Bomberg's Rabbinic Bible. Little is known of his personal history beyond that he was born a Jew, was corrector of the press in Bomberg's famous printing-office, embraced Christianity in Rome in 1513, was created magister theologus in 1523, and that he died in 1539. The Rabbinic Bible, which immortalized him, was published in four parts (Venice, 1516–17) four years after his embracing Christianity; and, besides the Hebrew text, contains as follows: 1. In *The Pentateuch*, the Chaldee paraphrase of Onkelos and the commentaries of Rashi. 2. *The Prophets*, the Chaldee paraphrase and the commentaries of Kimchi. 3. *The Hagiographa*, the Chaldee paraphrase and Kimchi's commentary on *The Psalms*, the Chaldee paraphrase and Ibn-Jachja's commentary on *Proverbs*, the Chaldee paraphrase and Nachmanides's and Farissol's commentaries on *Job;* the reputed Chaldee paraphrases of Joseph the Blind and Rashi's commentary on *The Five Megilloth;* Levi ben-Gershom's commentary on *Daniel;* Rashi's and Simon Darshan's (פי׳ חשמעוני) commentary on *Ezra*, *Nehemiah*, and *Chronicles*, the latter consisting of excerpts from the Jalkut Shimoni. See CABA; MIDRASH. Appended to the volume are the Targum Jerusalem on the Pentateuch, the Second Targum on Esther, the variations between Ben-Asher and Ben-Naphtali, the differences between the Eastern and Western Codd., Aaron b.-Asher's Dissertation on the Accents, Maimonides's thirteen articles of faith [see MAIMONIDES], the six hundred and thirteen precepts [see PRECEPTS], a Table of the Parshoth and Haphtaroth, both according to the Spanish and German ritual. Considering that this was the first effort to give some of the Masoretic apparatus, it is no wonder that the work is imperfect, and that it contains many blunders. Pratensis also

published a Latin translation of the Psalms, with annotations, first printed at Venice in 1515, then at Hazenau in 1522, and at Basle in 1526. See Wolf, *Bibliotheca Hebraica*, ii, 363; iii, 935 sq.; Masch's ed. of Le Long's *Bibliotheca Sacra*, i, 96 sq.; Steinschneider, *Catalogus Libr. Hebr. in Bibliotheca Bodleiana*, col. b. 2111 sq.

Pratilli, Francesco-Maria, an Italian ecclesiastic, noted especially as an antiquarian, was born November, 1689, at Capua. He received holy orders, and was at once provided with a canonry at the Cathedral of Capua. He died at Naples Nov. 29, 1763. Among his archæological works we mention, *Della Via Appia riconosciuta e descritta da Roma a Brindisi* (Naples, 1745, 4to); this work is ornamented with plans and maps, and is full of varied erudition:—*Di una Moneta singolare del Tiranno Giovanni* (ibid. 1748, 8vo); explanation of a medal, the only one of its kind, of a usurper who was proclaimed emperor in 423:—*Della Origine della Metropolia ecclesiastica di Capoa* (ibid. 1758, 4to). Pratilli published an edition, enriched with unpublished documents, dissertations, and a life of the author, of the *Historia Principum Longobardorum* of C. Pellegrini (ibid. 1749–54, 5 vols. 4to). He left in manuscript a *History of the Norman Princes*, in 6 vols. See *Nomi illustri del Regno di Napoli*, vol. ix.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.

Prätorius, Abdias, a German theologian of some renown, was born in 1524 in the Brandenburg territory. He was master of many languages, and especially noted as a Greek scholar. He was at first rector of a school at Magdeburg, lived then at Frankfort-on-the-Oder, was called in 1560 to the electoral court of Brandenburg, and died in 1573 as professor of philosophy at Wittenberg. He attacked the Lutheran distinction between law and Gospel, and the definition of the latter as an unconditional message of grace. The most distinguished of his adversaries was Andrew Musculus, one of the authors of *The Formula of Concord.*

Prätorius, Stephen, a German minister, flourished at Salzwedel towards the close of the 16th century. He was involved in various disputes in consequence of some doctrines professed or approved by Luther, or which seemed to him logical conclusions to be drawn from Luther's theory of justification. He asserted that between righteousness and beatitude there was no difference; that every man who received baptism and believed in Christ was saved, and could dispense with seeking the means to be saved; that the law was useless; that faith and justification obtained by it could be darkened and benumbed by sin, but never lost. John Arnd, the Fénelon of the Lutheran Church, published a collection of the writings of Prätorius, and Martin Statius (1655), minister at Dantsic, edited extracts from them under the title *Geistliche Schatzkammer der Gläubigen.*

Pratt, Albert L., a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born at Wilmington, Vt., in 1828, and was converted and joined the Methodist Episcopal Church in 1851. He was licensed as a local preacher in 1853. In 1855 he was received into what was then the Oneida but is now the Central N. Y. Conference, and was stationed successively at Union Village, Bellows Falls, Brattleborough, Guilford, Woodstock, Bradford, Rochester, Windsor, and Colchester, where he finished his earthly work. Though constitutionally frail, his pastoral labors were prosecuted with great diligence until near his death, which occurred July 17, 1870, at Colchester, Vt. He was a good man, and succeeded well in the cause of his Master.

Pratt, Almon Bradley, a Congregational minister, was born in North Cornwall, Conn., June 3, 1812, received his preparatory training at South Cornwall, Conn., and then entered Yale College. He was not, however, able to complete his collegiate studies, as his health failed him. From 1839 to 1841 he was at the Union Theological Seminary in New York City. April 13, 1852, he was ordained as evangelist at Genesee, Mich., and acted in that place as pastor until 1865, when he removed to Flint, Mich. In 1868 he was called again to the work, and accepted the pastorate at Berea, Ohio. In 1873 he was made acting pastor at Camp Creek, Nebraska, and there he died, Dec. 28, 1875. See *The Congreg. Quar.* July, 1876, p. 432.

Pratt, Enoch, a Congregational minister of some note, was born at Middleborough, Mass., in 1781, and was educated at Brown University, where he graduated in 1803. He taught for a while and studied theology, and was finally ordained to the work of the holy ministry Oct. 28, 1807, as pastor of the Congregational Church at West Barnstable, Mass., and held this position until 1837. He never took another pastorate, but preached and wrote occasionally. He devoted himself principally to secular historical studies, especially local subjects, and published in 1844 a *Comprehensive History, Ecclesiastical and Civil, of Eastham, Wellfleet, and Orleans, Massachusetts* (Yarmouth, 8vo). He died at Brewster Feb. 2, 1860.

Pratt, James C., an Irish Wesleyan minister of some note, was born in Queens County, Ireland, in 1780. His parents were respectable members of the Church of England. In his twenty-first year he was converted, and joined the Wesleyans. He was licensed to preach in 1804, and four years later was accepted by the Conference as a travelling preacher and appointed to the Ballinamallard Circuit, in 1809 to Lisburn, in 1810 to Carrickfergus, and in 1811 to the city of Armagh, etc. He continued to travel regularly as a preacher, with "zeal, acceptance, and usefulness," until 1842, when he took a supernumerary relation and settled in Enniskillen, where he had been twice before stationed. In 1846 he removed to Wexford; but as several of his children had settled in New York, he decided to come to this country, and obtained full permission from his Conference, held in Dublin in 1848, to emigrate. He came here in the fall of that year, and for nearly twenty-two years resided in different places in this country, adorning by his holy life the religion of his Saviour that he loved so well to preach. He died at Jersey City March 11, 1875.

Pratt, Job, a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born about 1790, and was admitted in 1814 a member of the New England Annual Conference. At the organization of the Maine Conference he joined that body, and remained a member of it till his death, which occurred at Rumford Feb. 22, 1833. Mr. Pratt was a generally acceptable preacher.—*Minutes of Conferences*, ii, 216.

Pratt, John Bennett, LL.D., a Scottish Episcopal clergyman, antiquarian, and author, was born in the parish of New Deer in 1791. He took the degree of M.A. at Aberdeen, and, after his ordination as deacon in 1821, was sent to Stuartfield, where he served with acceptance four years, and was then chosen as pastor of St. James's Church, Cruden. There he became widely known for his theological learning, literary accomplishments, and professional zeal, and received from bishop Skinner the appointment of examining chaplain. He died at Cruden, Aberdeenshire, March 20, 1869. He was the author of several volumes, among which are, *Old Paths—Where is the Good Way?* (Oxford, 1840):—*Buchan*, with illustrations (Aberdeen, 1858):—*The Druids* (Lond. 1861):—*Letters on the Scandinavian Churches, their Doctrine, Worship, and Polity*:—and several *Sermons.*

Praxeans is the name of a sect of Monarchians, so called after Praxeas, the originator of their views. The heretical tenet that there is no distinction of persons in the Godhead, coupled with the acknowledgment of a divine nature in Jesus, leads logically to the conclusion that the Father was incarnate and suffered. Hence,

although he himself shrank from the inference, Praxeas is reckoned with the Patripassians. He did not form a schismatical party. Philaster states that the Sabellians, called also Patripassians and Praxeans, were cast out of the Church (*Hær.* c. liv), but we cannot infer from this that Praxeas himself was excommunicated.

Our knowledge of Praxeas is derived almost entirely from Tertullian's treatise against him. Augustine, as well as Philaster, names him and his followers under the heresy of Sabellius; and, excepting from Tertullian, we have only the bare mention of his name as a heretic. From Tertullian it appears that he went to Rome from Asia, and the words of Tertullian, "œconomiam intelligere nolunt etiam Græci," appear to contain reference to his nation. It is probable that he learned his heresy from a school in Proconsular Asia which produced Noetus (q. v.). If Praxeas held his heresy while in Asia, he can scarcely have been, as he is often said to have been, a Montanist. There was a connection between the later Montanists and the Sabellians; but the earlier Montanists were free from Sabellianism. Tertullian's words imply no more than that Praxeas had in Asia become acquainted with the character of Montanist pretensions and doctrine. See MONTANISM. In Asia Praxeas had suffered imprisonment ("de jactatione martyrii inflatus, ob solum et simplex et breve carceris tædium," is the polemical notice of it), and with the credit attaching to a confessor he preached his false doctrine at Rome. Whether the doctrine met with resistance, toleration, or favor is not told, but that Praxeas's endeavors to propagate it had but little effect we are entitled to infer from the silence of Hippolytus. There is, however, very great difference of opinion regarding this point: Gieseler says that Praxeas appears to have been unmolested in Rome on account of his doctrine (*Compend.* i, 218); Newman, that he met with the determined resistance which honorably distinguishes the primitive Roman Church in its dealings with heresy (*Hist. of Arians*, p. 130); Milman, that the indignation of Tertullian at the rejection of his Montanist opinions urged him to arraign the pope, with what justice, to what extent, we know not, as having embraced the Patripassian opinions of Praxeas (*Hist. of Latin Christianity*, i, 49 [ed. 1867]). The two latter mention, as if inclined to it, Beausobre's supposition that, in the words of the continuator of the *De Præscr. Hæret.*, "Praxeas quidem hæresim introduxit, quam Victorinus corroborare curavit," we should read Victor for Victorinus. One would be rather inclined to substitute Zephyrinus. The *Refutation of Heresies* was called forth by this very controversy, and Hippolytus details carefully the tenets of Noetus, and the action of the bishop of Rome with regard to them. Had Praxeas prepared the way to any considerable extent for Noetus, some notice of his influence would surely have been given, whereas all that can be said is, that in the separate tract against Noetus the opening words will include, but without naming, disciples of Praxeas joining Noetus. It is easy to suppose that Victor, discovering the heresy of Praxeas, and not wishing, for his own sake, to disgrace one upon whose information he had acted, and by whom perhaps he had been influenced in the matter of the Montanists, quietly sent Praxeas from Rome. From Rome Praxeas went into Africa. (We take "hic quoque" in Tertullian's "Fruticaverant avenæ Praxeanæ; hic quoque superseminatæ," etc., to mean Carthage; and that Tertullian speaks of himself in "per quem traductæ," etc.) The date at which Praxeas arrived at Rome, and the length of his stay there, are not accurately known, but he reached Africa before Tertullian became a Montanist (Tertull. *Adv. Prax.* c. i). Different dates, from A.D. 199 to 205, are assigned for this latter event. The history of the Montanists is best understood by supposing Praxeas to have been at Rome in Victor's time, and the date of Tertullian's Montanism to have been the earlier date. In Africa Praxeas held a dispute, probably with Tertullian, acknowledged his error, and delivered to the Church a formal recantation. But he returned again to his errors, and Tertullian, now a Montanist, wrote his tract in confutation of them.

Praxeas taught that there is only one divine Person, that the Word and the Holy Ghost are not distinct substances; arguing that an admission of distinct Personalities necessarily infers three Gods, and that the identity of the Persons is required to preserve the divine monarchy. He applied the titles which in Holy Scripture are descriptive of deity to the Father alone; and urged particularly the words from the Old Testament, "I am God, and beside me there is no god," and from the New Testament the expressions, "I and my Father are one," "He who hath seen me hath seen the Father," "I am in my Father, and my Father in me." While Tertullian unhesitatingly charges Praxeas with holding Patripassian tenets as necessarily following from his principles, Praxeas himself appears not to have gone so far. "Ergo nec compassus est Pater Filio; sic enim directam blasphemiam in Patrem veriti, diminui eam hoc modo sperant, concedentes jam Patrem et Filium duos esse; si Filius quidem patitur, Pater vero compatitur. Stulti et in hoc. Quid est enim compati, quam cum alio pati? Porro, si impassibilis Pater, utique et incompassibilis. Aut si compassibilis, utique passibilis" (Tertull. *Adv. Prax.* c. xxix).

The course of controversy brought out, in the example of the Praxeans, the second and altered position which Monarchians are obliged to assume when pressed by the difficulties of their original position. It is shown, as Tertullian remarks, that they are driven to conclusions involving the elements of Gnosticism. The Praxeans, when confuted on all sides on the distinction between the Father and the Son, distinguished the Person of Jesus from the Christ. They understood "the Son to be flesh—that is, man—that is, Jesus; and the Father to be spirit—that is, God—that is, Christ." Thus Tertullian says, "They who contend that the Father and the Son are one and the same do in fact now begin to divide them rather than to unite them. Such a monarchy as this they learned, it may be, in the school of the Valentinus" (*ibid.* c. xxvii). Now this separation of Jesus from Christ was common to all the Gnostics. They were unanimous in denying that Christ was born. Jesus and Christ were to them two separate beings, and the æon Christ descended upon Jesus at his baptism. The difference between them and the Praxeans appears to be that they would not say that Jesus was the Son of God, whereas the Praxeans are represented as arguing from the angel's words to Mary that the holy thing born of her was the flesh, and that therefore the flesh was the Son of God. Tertullian shows in opposition to them that the Word was incarnate by birth. In Praxean doctrine, then, in its second stage, we have Jesus called the Son of God, solely, it will follow, on account of a miraculous birth: Christ, or the presence of the Father, residing in Jesus: Jesus suffering, and Christ (=the Father) *impassibilem sed compatientem.* The interval between this and Gnostic doctrine is easily bridged over; and we have the cause of the comparisons and identifications that are often made of Sabellianism with Gnosticism. See MONARCHIANS.

The heresy of Praxeas, as distinguished from that of Noetus, did not make much progress. It was almost unknown in Africa in the time of Optatus (i, 37). See Schaff, *Church Hist.* vol. i; Neander, *Church Hist.* vol. ii; id. *Hist. of Dogmas*, i, 161; Gieseler, *Eccles. Hist.* (see Index in vol. iii); Baur, *Dreieinigkeitslehre*, i, 245–254; Liddon, *Divinity of Christ* (see Index); Allen, *Ancient Church*, p. 455; Alzog, *Kirchengesch.* i. 182; Pressensé, *Church Hist.* (*Heresies*), p. 139 sq.; Kaye, *Tertullian*, p. 493 sq.; Milman, *Hist. of Latin Christianity*, i, 70; Ueberweg, *Hist. of Philos.* i, 308; Mosheim, *Commentary on Eccles. Hist.* (see Index in vol. i); Lardner, *Works* (see Index in vol. viii); Waterland, *Works*, vol. vi; *Biblical Repository*, v, 339; and

the other sources of information indicated in these authorities.

Praxeas. See PRAXEANS.

Praxedes, ST., was an early convert to Christianity, according to some accounts, of the apostle Peter; but this is, of course, very doubtful, since we do not even know whether Peter was ever at Rome. The acts of her life are so surrounded by traditions as to be almost entirely devoid of trustworthiness; but from these we learn that she was the daughter of St. Pudentius, a Roman senator, and sister of St. Pudentiana (q. v.). According to the legendary account, Praxedes, with her sister Pudentiana, devoted herself, after Peter had suffered martyrdom, to the relief and care of the suffering Christians, and to the burying of the bodies that were slain in the persecutions. They had the assistance of a holy man named Pastorus, who was devoted in their service. They shrank from nothing that came in the way of their self-imposed duties. They sought out and received into their houses such as were torn and mutilated by tortures. They visited and fed such as were in prison. They took up the bodies of the martyred ones which were cast out without burial, and, carefully washing and shrouding them, they laid them reverently in the caves beneath their houses. All the blood they collected with sponges, and deposited in a certain well. Thus boldly they showed forth the faith which was in them, and yet, according to the most trustworthy accounts, they escaped persecution and martyrdom, and died peacefully and were buried in the cemetery of Priscilla. Pastorus wrote a history of their deeds and virtues. Their house, in which the apostle is reported to have preached, was consecrated as a place of Christian worship by pope Pius I. Their churches are among the interesting remains of ancient Rome. In the nave of the church of Santa Prassede is a well, in which she is said to have put the blood of those who suffered on the Esquiline, while the holy sponge is preserved in a silver shrine in the sacristy. In the church of St. Pudentiana there is a well, said to contain the relics of 3000 martyrs. In Christian art they have frequently been made the subject of the painter's brush, and the two sisters are usually represented together, richly draped. The sponge and cup are their especial attributes. They are commemorated on the days on which they are supposed to have died—July 21 and May 19, A.D. 148. See Schaff, *Church History*, vol. ii; Butler, *Lives of the Saints*. (J. H. W.)

Praxidĭce, a surname of Persephone among the Orphic poets, but at a later period she was accounted a goddess who was concerned with the distribution of justice to the human family. The daughters of Ogyges received the name of *Praxidicæ*, and were worshipped under the figure of heads of animals.

Praxiphănes (Πραξιφάνης), a Peripatetic philosopher, was a native either of Mytilene (Clem. Alex. i, 365, ed. Potter) or of Rhodes (Strabo, xiv, 655). He lived in the time of Demetrius Poliorcetes and Ptolemy Lagi, and was a pupil of Theophrastus, about B.C. 322 (Proclus, i, *In Timæum;* Tzetzes, *Ad Hesiod. Op. et Dies*, 1). He subsequently opened a school himself, in which Epicurus is said to have been one of his pupils (Diog. Laert. x, 13). Praxiphanes paid especial attention to grammatical studies, and is hence named along with Aristotle as the founder and creator of the science of grammar (Clem. Alex. *l. c.;* Bekker, *Anecdota*, ii, 229, where Πραξιφάνους should be read instead of Ἐπιφάνους). The writings of Praxiphanes appear to have been numerous, but have no special interest today. See Preller, *Disputatio de Praxiphane Peripatetico inter antiquissimos grammaticos nobili* (Dorpat, 1842).

Pray, GEORGES, a Hungarian Jesuit, noted as a historian, was born at Presburg in 1724. In 1740 he entered the Society of Jesus, taught in several of their schools, and became, after the suppression of his order, historiographer of the kingdom of Hungary, and conservator of the library of Buda. In 1790 he obtained a canonry at Grosswardein. He died near the close of the 18th century. Pray wrote, *Annales veteres Hunnorum, Avarorum et Hungarorum ad annum Christ. MDXCVII deducti* (Vienna, 1761, fol., followed by *Supplementa*, ibid. 1775, fol.):—*Annales regum Hungariæ ad annum Chr. MDLXIV deducti* (ibid. 1764–70, 5 pts. fol.):—*De sacra dextera divi Stephani Hungariæ regis* (ibid. 1771, 4to):—*De Ladislao Hungariæ rege* (Pesth, 1774, 4to):—*De Salomone rege et Emerico duce Hungariæ* (ibid. 1774, 4to):—*Specimen hierarchiæ Hungaricæ, complectens seriem chronologicam archiepiscoporum et episcoporum Hungariæ, cum diocesium delineatione* (Presburg, 1778, 4to):—*Index librorum rariorum bibliothecæ universitatis Budensis* (Buda, 1780–81, 2 pts. 8vo):—*Historia regum Hungariæ, cum notitiis ad cognoscendum veterem regni statum* (ibid. 1800-1, 3 pts. 8vo).—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v. See Horanyi, *Memoriæ Hungarorum*, vol. iii; Luca, *Gelehrtes Oesterreich;* Rotermund, supplement to Jöcher, *Gelehrten-Lexikon*, s. v.

Prayer. The words generally used in the O. T. are תְּחִנָּה, *tchinnâh* (from the root חָנַן, "to incline," "to be gracious," whence in Hithp. "to entreat grace or mercy;" Sept. generally, δέησις; Vulg. *deprecatio*), and תְּפִלָּה, *tephillâh* (from the root פָּלַל, "to judge," whence in Hithp. "to seek judgment;" Sept. προσευχή; Vulg. *oratio*). The latter is also used to express intercessory prayer. The two words point to the two chief objects sought in prayer, viz. the prevalence of right and truth, and the gift of mercy. A very frequent formula for prayer in the O. T. is the phrase קָרָא בְּשֵׁם יְהוָה, *to call upon the name of Jehovah*. The usual Greek term is εὔχομαι, which originally signified only a *wish;* but δέομαι, *to beg* (properly *to want*), is a frequent expression for prayer.

I. *Scriptural History of the Subject.*—1. That prayer was coeval with the fallen race we cannot doubt, and it was in all probability associated with the first sacrifice. The first definite account of its public observance occurs in the remarkable expression recorded in the lifetime of Enos, the son of Seth: "Then began men to call upon the name of the Lord" (Gen. iv, 26). From that time a life of prayer evidently marked the distinction between the pious and the wicked. The habit was maintained in the chosen family of Abraham, as is evident from frequent instances in the history of the Hebrew patriarchs. Moses, however, gave no specific commands with reference to this part of religious service (comp. Spanheim, *Ad Callimach. Pallad.* p. 139; Creuzer, *Symbol.* i, 164 sq.), and prayer was not by law interwoven with the public worship of God among the Hebrews (but comp. Deut. xxvi, 10, 13, and the prayer of atonement offered by the high-priest, Lev. xvi, 21). We do not know whether, before the exile, prayer was customarily joined with sacrificial offerings (*Iliad*, i, 450 sq.; *Odys.* xiv, 423; Lucian, *Dea Syr.* 57; Curtius, iv, 13, 15; Pliny, *H. N.* xxviii, 3; see Iamblich, *Myster.* v, 26). Yet, at least in morning and evening worship, those present perhaps joined in prayer, either silently or with united voices (see Luke i, 10). About the time of the exile our records begin of the custom of the Levites reciting prayers and leading others (1 Chron. xxiii, 30; comp. Neh. xi, 17; *Berach.* xxvi, 1; see Otho, *Lex. Rab.* p. 164). An extraordinary instance of public prayer occurs in 1 Kings viii, 22. We see that prayer as a religious exercise, in the outer court of the sanctuary, though not expressly commanded, was yet supposed and expected. (Psa. cxli, 2; Rev. viii, 3, 4, seem to indicate that incense was a symbol of prayer; but see Bähr, *Symbolik*, i, 461 sq.) As private devotion prayer was always in general use (comp. Isa. i, 15; Credner, *On Joel*, p. 192, supposes from Joel ii, 16, and Matt. xviii, 3; xix, 14; Psa. viii, 3, that especial virtue

was ascribed to the prayers of innocent children; but without ground). After the time of the exile prayer came gradually to be viewed as a meritorious work, an *opus operatum*. Prayer and fasting were considered the two great divisions of personal piety (Tob. xii, 9; Judith iv, 12). It was customary to offer prayer before every great undertaking (Judith xiii, 7; comp. Acts ix, 40; *Iliad*, ix, 172; xxiv, 308; Pythag. *Carmen Aur.* 48); as in war before a battle (1 Macc. v, 33; xi, 71; 2 Macc. xv, 26; comp. viii, 29). Three times a day was prayer repeated (Dan. vi, 11; comp. Psa. lv, 18; *Tanchum*, ix, 4, in Schöttgen, *Hor. Hebr.* i, 419): namely, at the third hour (9 A.M., Acts ii, 15, the time of the morning sacrifice in the Temple); at mid-day, the sixth hour (12 M., x, 9); and in the afternoon, at the ninth hour (3 P.M., the time of the evening sacrifice in the Temple; comp. Dan. ix, 21; Josephus, *Ant.* xiv, 4, 3; see also Acts iii, 1; x, 30; Thilo, *Apocr.* i, 352; Schöttgen, *Op. cit.* p. 418 sq.; Wetstein, ii, 471). Compare the three or four fold repetition of songs of praise by the Egyptian priests each day (Porphyr. *Abstin.* iv, 8). The Mohammedans, too, are well known to have daily hours of prayer. It was usual, too, before and after eating to utter a form of prayer or thanks (Matt. xv, 36; John vi, 11; Acts xxvii, 35; Philo, *Opp.* ii, 481; Porphyr. *Abstinen.* iv, 12; see Kuinöl, *De precum ante et post cibum ap. Judæos et Christ. faciendarum genere, antiquitate*, etc. [Lips. 1764]). The Pharisees and Essenes especially ascribed great importance to prayer. The former, indeed, made a display of this form of devotion (Matt. vi, 5), and humored their own conceit by making their prayers very long. See PHARISEE. Permanent forms of prayer were already customary in the time of Christ (Luke xi, 1), perhaps chiefly the same which are contained in the Mishna, *Berachoth* (comp. *Pirke Aboth*, ii, 13). The Lord's Prayer, too, has several, though not very important, agreements with the forms in the Talmud (see Schöttgen, i, 160 sq.; Vitringa, *De Synag. Vet.* p. 962; Otho, *Lex. Rab.* p. 539; Tholuck, *Bergpredigt*, p. 337 sq.). Private prayer was practiced by the Israelites chiefly in retired chambers in their houses (Matt. vi, 6), especially in the "upper room" (Dan. vi, 11; Judith viii, 5; Tob. iii, 12; Acts i, 13; x, 9), and on the roof. If in the open air, an eminence was sought for (Matt. xiv, 23; Mark vi, 46; Luke vi, 12; comp. 1 Kings xviii, 42). The inhabitants of Jerusalem were fondest of going to the court of the Temple (Luke xviii, 10; Acts iii, 1; comp. Isa. lvi, 7; see Arnob. *Adv. Gent.* vi, 4; Lakemacher, *Antiq. Gr. Sacr.* p. 425). He, however, who was surprised by the hour of prayer in the street stood there and said his prayer on the spot. In every case the face was turned towards the holy hill of the Temple (Dan. vi, 11; 2 Chron. vi, 34; 3 Esdr. iv, 58; Mishna, *Berach.* iv, 5), but by the Samaritans to Gerizim. In the court of the Temple the face was turned to the Temple itself (1 Kings viii, 38), to the Holy of Holies (Psa. v, 8; see Thilo, *Apocr.* i, 20). Thus the Jews praying then faced the west, while the modern Jews in Europe and America face the east in prayer. It was an early custom among Christians, too, to turn the face towards the east in praying (Origen, *Hom.* 5, *in Num.*, in *Op.* ii, 284; Clem. Alex. *Strom.* vii, 724; comp. Tertul. *Apol.* xvi). The Mohammedans turn the face towards Mecca (Rosenmüller, *Morgenl.* iv, 361). The usual posture in prayer was *standing* (1 Sam. i, 26; 1 Kings viii, 22; Dan. ix, 20; Matt. vi, 5; Mark xi, 25; Luke xviii, 11; comp. *Iliad*, xxiv, 306 sq.; Martial, xii, 77, 2; Al Koran, v, 8; Mishna, *Berach.* v, 1; Philo, *Opp.* ii, 481; Wetstein, i, 321). But in earnest devotion, bending the knee, or actual kneeling, was practiced (2 Chron. vi, 13; 1 Kings viii, 54; Esdr. ix, 5; Dan. vi, 10; Luke xxii, 41; Acts ix, 40), or the body was even thrown to the ground (Gen. xxiv, 26; Neh. viii, 6; Judith ix, 1; Matt. xxvi, 39). The hands before prayer must be made clean. Says the Mishna, He that prays with unclean hands commits deadly sin (*Sohar Deut.* f. 101, 427; comp. 1 Tim. ii, 8; *Odys.* ii, 261; Clem. Alex. *Strom.* iv, 531; Chrysost. *Hom.* 43, *in* 1 *Cor.*). The hands were then, in standing, often lifted up towards heaven (1 Kings viii, 22; Neh. viii, 7; Lam. ii, 19; iii, 41; Psa. xxviii, 2; cxxxiv, 2; 2 Macc. iii, 20; 1 Tim. ii, 8; Philo, *Opp.* ii. 481, 534; *Iliad*, i, 450; Virgil, *Æn.* i, 93; Horace, *Od.* iii, 23, 1; Plutarch, *Alex.* p. 682; Aristotle, *Mund.* vi; Seneca, *Ep.* 41; Wetstein, ii, 323; Doughtæi *Analect.* ii, 135); sometimes were spread out (Isa. i, 15; Ezra ix, 5); and in humble prayers of penitence were laid meekly on the breast, or sometimes the breast was struck with them (Luke xviii, 13). A posture peculiar to prayer was dropping the head upon the breast (Psa. xxxv, 13), or between the knees (1 Kings xviii, 42). This was done in great sorrow. The former is still customary among the Mohammedans (see the figs. in Reland's *De Relig. Muh.* p. 87). See ATTITUDES. Extensive treatises on the kinds of prayer, and their order and conduct, are given in the Mishna (treatise *Berachoth*) and the double Gemara (in German by Rabe [Halle, 1777]; see also Otho, *Lex. Rab.* p. 537 sq.). One species of prayer was intercession. Almost infallible virtue was ascribed to it when offered by a holy person (see James v, 16; comp. Diod. Sic. iv, 61; Apollod. iii, 12, 6; Gen. xx, 7, 17; Exod. xxxii, 11 sq.; 1 Kings xvii, 20 sq.; Josephus, *Ant.* xiv, 2, 1; 2 Cor. i, 11; 1 Tim. ii, 1 sq.; Phil. i, 19). Hence it was common to request the prayers of others (1 Thess. v, 25; 2 Thess. iii, 1; Heb. xiii, 18; comp. Deyling, *Observ.* ii, 587 sq.). See Jonath. *On Gen. xxvi*, 27; and esp. Suicer, *Observ. Sacr.* p. 149 sq.; Schröder, *Diss. de Precib. Hebræorum* [Marb. 1717]; Saubert, *De Precibus Heb.*; and Poleman, *De ritu præcandi vet. Heb.*, both in Ugolini *Thesaur.* vol. xxi; Carpzov, *Appar.* p. 322 sq.; Baur, *Gottesd. Verf.* i, 357 sq.; Rehm, *Historia Precum Biblica* (Götting. 1814); Hartmann, *Verbind. d. A. u. N. T.* p. 236 sq., 286 sq.; and on the whole subject, Brover, de Niedek, *De populor. vet. et recent. Adorationib.* (Amsterd. 1713). The Homeric prayers are treated in Naegelsbach's *Homer. Theol.* p. 185 sq. See PROSEUCHE; SYNAGOGUE.

2. The only form of prayer given for perpetual use in the O. T. is the one in Deut. xxvi, 5–15, connected with the offering of tithes and first-fruits, and containing in simple form the important elements of prayer, acknowledgment of God's mercy, self-dedication, and prayer for future blessing. To this may perhaps be added the threefold blessing of Numb. vi, 24–26, couched as it is in a precatory form; and the short prayers of Moses (Numb. x, 35, 36) at the moving and resting of the cloud, the former of which was the germ of the 68th Psalm.

Indeed, the forms given, evidently with a view to preservation and constant use, are rather hymns or songs than prayers properly so called, although they often contain supplication. Scattered through the historical books we have the Song of Moses *taught* to the children of Israel (Deut. xxxii, 1–43); his less important songs after the passage of the Red Sea (Exod. xv, 1–19) and at the springing out of the water (Numb. xxi, 17, 18); the Song of Deborah and Barak (Judg. v); the Song of Hannah in 1 Sam. ii, 1–10 (the effect of which is seen by reference to the Magnificat); and the Song of David (Psa. xviii), singled out in 2 Sam. xxii. But after David's time the existence and use of the Psalms, and the poetical form of the prophetic books, and of the prayers which they contain, must have tended to fix this psalmic character on all Jewish prayer. The effect is seen plainly in the form of Hezekiah's prayers in 2 Kings xix, 15–19; Isa. xxxviii, 9–20.

But of the prayers recorded in the O. T. the two most remarkable are those of Solomon at the dedication of the Temple (1 Kings viii, 23–53) and of Joshua the high-priest and his colleagues after the captivity (Neh. ix, 5–38). The former is a prayer for God's presence with his people in time of national defeat (ver. 33, 34), famine or pestilence (ver. 35–37), war (ver. 44, 45), and captivity (ver. 46–50), and with each individual Jew and stranger (ver. 41–43) who may worship in the Tem-

ple. The latter contains a recital of all God's blessings to the children of Israel from Abraham to the captivity, a confession of their continual sins, and a fresh dedication of themselves to the covenant. It is clear that both are likely to have exercised a strong liturgical influence, and accordingly we find that the public prayer in the Temple, already referred to, had in our Lord's time grown into a kind of liturgy. Before and during the sacrifice there was a prayer that God would put it into their hearts to love and fear him; then a repeating of the Ten Commandments, and of the passages written on their phylacteries [see FRONTLETS]; next, three or four prayers and ascriptions of glory to God; and the blessing from Numb. vi, 24–26, "The Lord bless thee," etc., closed this service. Afterwards, at the offering of the meat-offering, there followed the singing of psalms, regularly fixed for each day of the week, or specially appointed for the great festivals (see Bingham, bk. xiii, ch. v, § 4). A somewhat similar liturgy formed a regular part of the synagogue worship, in which there was a regular minister, as the leader of prayer (שְׁלִיחַ הַצִּבּוּר, *legatus ecclesiæ*), and public prayer, as well as private, was the special object of the Proseuchæ. It appears, also, from the question of the disciples in Luke xi, 1, and from Jewish tradition, that the chief teachers of the day gave special forms of prayer to their disciples, as the badge of their discipleship and the best fruits of their learning. See FORMS OF PRAYER.

All Christian prayer is, of course, based on the Lord's Prayer; but its spirit is also guided by that of his prayer in Gethsemane, and of the prayer recorded by St. John (ch. xvii), the beginning of his great work of intercession. The first is the comprehensive type of the simplest and most universal prayer; the second justifies prayers for special blessings of this life, while it limits them by perfect resignation to God's will; the last, dwelling as it does on the knowledge and glorification of God, and the communion of man with him, as the one object of prayer and life, is the type of the highest and most spiritual devotion. The Lord's Prayer has given the form and tone of all ordinary Christian prayer; it has fixed, as its leading principles, simplicity and confidence in our Father, community of sympathy with all men, and practical reference to our own life; it has shown, as its true objects, first the glory of God, and next the needs of man. To the intercessory prayer we may trace up its transcendental element, its desire of that communion through love with the nature of God which is the secret of all individual holiness and of all community with men.

The influence of these prayers is more distinctly traced in the prayers contained in the Epistles (see Eph. iii, 14–21; Rom. xvi, 25–27; Phil. i, 3–11; Col. i, 9–15; Heb. xiii, 20, 21; 1 Pet. v, 10, 11, etc.) than in those recorded in the Acts. The public prayer, which from the beginning became the principle of life and unity in the Church (see Acts ii, 42; and comp. i, 24, 25; iv, 24–30; vi, 6; xii, 5; xiii, 2, 3; xvi, 25; xx, 36; xxi, 5), probably in the first instance took much of its form and style from the prayers of the synagogues. The only form given (besides the very short one of Acts i, 24, 25), dwelling as it does (Acts iv, 24–30) on the Scriptures of the O. T. in their application to our Lord, seems to mark this connection. It was probably by degrees that they assumed the distinctively Christian character.

3. In the record of prayers accepted and granted by God, we observe, as always, a special adaptation to the period of his dispensation to which they belong. In the patriarchal period they have the simple and childlike tone of domestic supplication for the simple and apparently trivial incidents of domestic life. Such are the prayers of Abraham for children (Gen. xv, 2, 3); for Ishmael (xvii, 18); of Isaac for Rebekah (xxv, 21); of Abraham's servant in Mesopotamia (xxiv, 12–14); although sometimes they take a wider range in intercession, as with Abraham for Sodom (Gen. xviii, 23–32), and for Abimelech (xx, 7, 17). In the Mosaic period they assume a more solemn tone and a national bearing, chiefly that of direct intercession for the chosen people, as by Moses (Numb. xi, 2; xii, 13; xxi, 7); by Samuel (1 Sam. vii, 5; xii, 19, 23); by David (2 Sam. xxiv, 17, 18); by Hezekiah (2 Kings xix, 15–19); by Isaiah (2 Kings xix, 4; 2 Chron. xxxii, 20); by Daniel (Dan. ix, 20, 21): or of prayer for national victory, as by Asa (2 Chron. xiv, 11); Jehoshaphat (2 Chron. xx, 6–12). More rarely are they for individuals, as in the prayer of Hannah (1 Sam. i, 12); in that of Hezekiah in his sickness (2 Kings xx, 2); the intercession of Samuel for Saul (1 Sam. xv, 11, 35), etc. A special class are those which precede and refer to the exercise of miraculous power, as by Moses (Exod. viii, 12, 30; xv, 25); by Elijah at Zarephath (1 Kings xvii, 20) and Carmel (1 Kings xviii, 36, 37); by Elisha at Shunem (2 Kings iv, 33) and Dothan (vi, 17, 18); by Isaiah (2 Kings xx, 11); by St. Peter for Tabitha (Acts ix, 40); by the elders of the Church (James v, 14–16). In the New Testament they have a more directly spiritual bearing, such as the prayer of the Church for protection and grace (Acts iv, 24–30); of the Apostles for their Samaritan converts (viii, 15); of Cornelius for guidance (x, 4, 31); of the Church of St. Peter (xii, 5); of St. Paul at Philippi (xvi, 25); of St. Paul against the thorn in the flesh answered, although not granted (2 Cor. xii, 7–9), etc. It would seem the intention of Holy Scripture to encourage all prayer, more especially intercession, in all relations and for all righteous objects. See LORD'S PRAYER.

II. *Christian Doctrine on the Subject.*—1. Prayer is a request or petition for mercies; or it is "an offering-up of our desires to God, for things agreeable to his will, in the name of Christ, by the help of his Spirit, with confession of our sins, and thankful acknowledgment of his mercies." Nothing can be more rational or consistent than the exercise of this duty. It is a divine injunction that men should always pray, and not faint (Luke xviii, 1). It is highly proper we should acknowledge the obligations we are under to the Divine Being, and supplicate his throne for the blessings we stand in need of. It is essential to our peace and felicity, and is the happy means of our carrying on and enjoying fellowship with God. It has an influence on our tempers and conduct, and evinces our subjection and obedience to God.

2. The object of prayer is God alone, through Jesus Christ as the Mediator. All supplications, therefore, to saints or angels are not only useless, but blasphemous. All worship of the creature, however exalted that creature is, is idolatry, and is strictly prohibited in the sacred law of God. Nor are we to pray to the Trinity as three distinct Gods; for though the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost be addressed in various parts of the Scripture (2 Cor. xiii, 14; 2 Thess. ii, 16, 17), yet never as three Gods, for that would lead us directly to the doctrine of polytheism: the more ordinary mode the Scripture points out is to address the Father through the Son, depending on the Spirit to help our infirmities (Eph. ii, 18; Rom. viii, 26).

3. As to the nature of this duty, it must be observed that it does not consist in the elevation of the voice, the posture of the body, the use of a form, or the mere extemporary use of words, nor, properly speaking, in anything of an exterior nature; but simply the offering up of our desires to God (Matt. xv, 8). (See the definition above.) It has generally been divided into *adoration*, by which we express our sense of the goodness and greatness of God (Dan. iv, 34, 35); *confession*, by which we acknowledge our unworthiness (1 John i, 9); *supplication*, by which we pray for pardon, grace, or any blessing we want (Matt. vii, 7); *intercession*, by which we pray for others (James v, 16); and *thanksgiving*, by which we express our gratitude to God (Phil. iv, 6). To these some add *invocation*, a making mention of one or more of the names of God; *pleading*, arguing our case with God in a humble and fervent manner; *dedi-*

cation, or surrendering ourselves to God; *deprecation*, by which we desire that evils may be averted; *blessing*, in which we express our joy in God, and gratitude for his mercies; but as all these appear to be included in the first five parts of prayer, they need not be insisted on.

4. The different kinds of prayer are, (1.) *Ejaculatory*, by which the mind is directed to God on any emergency. It is derived from the word *ejaculor*, to dart or shoot out suddenly, and is therefore appropriated to describe this kind of prayer, which is made up of short sentences, spontaneously springing from the mind. The Scriptures afford us many instances of ejaculatory prayer (Exod. xiv, 15; 1 Sam. i, 13; Rom. vii, 24, 25; Gen. xliii, 29; Judges xvi, 28; Luke xxiii, 42, 43). It is one of the principal excellences of this kind of prayer that it can be practiced at all times, and in all places; in the public ordinances of religion; in all our ordinary and extraordinary undertakings; in times of affliction, temptation, and danger; in seasons of social intercourse; in worldly business; in travelling; in sickness and pain. In fact, everything around us, and every event that transpires, may afford us matter for ejaculation. It is worthy, therefore, of our practice, especially when we consider that it is a species of devotion that can receive no impediment from any external circumstances, that it has a tendency to support the mind, and keep it in a happy frame; fortifies us against the temptations of the world; elevates our affections to God; directs the mind into a spiritual channel; and has a tendency to excite trust and dependence on Divine Providence.

(2.) *Secret* or closet prayer is another kind of prayer to which we should attend. It has its name from the manner in which Christ recommended it (Matt. vi, 6). He himself set us an example of it (Luke vi, 12); and it has been the practice of the saints in every age (Gen. xxviii, xxxii; Dan. vi, 10; Acts x, 9). There are some particular occasions when this duty may be practiced to advantage, as when we are entering into any important situation; undertaking anything of consequence; before we go into the world; when calamities surround us (Isa. xxvi, 20); or when ease and prosperity attend us. As closet prayer is calculated to inspire us with peace, defend us from our spiritual enemies, excite us to obedience, and promote our real happiness, we should be watchful lest the stupidity of our frame, the intrusion of company, the cares of the world, the insinuations of Satan, or the indulgence of sensual objects, prevent us from the constant exercise of this necessary and important duty.

(3.) *Family* prayer is also another part not to be neglected. It is true there is no absolute command for this in God's Word; yet, from hints, allusions, and examples we may learn that it was the practice of ancient saints — Abraham (Gen. xviii, 19), David (2 Sam. vi, 20), Solomon (Prov. xxii, 6), Job (i, 4, 5), Joshua (xxiv, 15). (See also Eph. vi, 4; Prov. vi, 20; Jer. x, 25; Acts x, 2, 30; xvi, 15.) Family prayer, indeed, may not be essential to the character of a true Christian, but it is surely no honor to heads of families to have it said that they have no religion in their houses. If we consider what a blessing it is likely to prove to our children and our domestics; what comfort it must afford to ourselves; of what utility it may prove to the community at large; how it sanctifies domestic comforts and crosses; and what a tendency it has to promote order, decency, sobriety, and religion in general, we must at once see the propriety of attending to it. The objection often made to family prayer is want of time; but this is a very frivolous excuse, since the time allotted for this purpose need be but short, and may easily be redeemed from sleep or business. Others say they have no gifts; where this is the case, a form may soon be procured and used, but it should be remembered that gifts increase by exercise, and no man can properly decide unless he make repeated trials. Others are deterred through shame, or the fear of man: in answer to such, we refer them to the declarations of our Lord (Matt. x, 37, 38; Mark viii, 38). As to the season for family prayer, every family must determine for itself; but before breakfast every morning, and before supper at night, seems most proper: perhaps a quarter of an hour or twenty minutes may be sufficient as to the time.

(4.) *Social* prayer is another kind Christians are called upon to attend to. It is denominated social because it is offered by a society of Christians in their collective capacity, convened for that particular purpose, either on some peculiar and extraordinary occasions, or at stated and regular seasons. Special prayer-meetings are such as are held at the meeting and parting of intimate friends, especially churches and ministers: when the Church is in a state of unusual deadness and barrenness; when ministers are sick, or taken away by death; in times of public calamity and distress, etc. Stated meetings for social prayer are such as are held weekly in some places which have a special regard to the state of the nation and churches; missionary prayer-meetings for the spread of the Gospel; weekly meetings held in most of the congregations, which have a more particular reference to their own churches, ministers, the sick, feeble, and weak of the flock. Christians are greatly encouraged to this kind of prayer from the consideration of the promise (Matt. xviii, 20), the benefit of mutual supplications, from the example of the most eminent primitive saints (Mal. iii, 16; Acts xii, 12), the answers given to prayer (Acts xii, 1–12; Josh. x; Isa. xxxvii, etc.), and the signal blessing they are to the churches (Phil. i, 19; 2 Cor. i, 11). These meetings should be attended with regularity; those who engage should study simplicity, brevity, Scripture language, seriousness of spirit, and everything that has a tendency to edification. We now come, lastly, to take notice of public prayer, or that in which the whole congregation is engaged, either in repeating a set form or acquiescing with the prayer of the minister who leads their devotions. This is both an ancient and important part of religious exercise; it was a part of the patriarchal worship (Gen. iv, 56); it was also carried on by the Jews (Exod. xxix, 43; Luke i, 10). It was a part of the Temple-service (Isa. lvi, 7; 1 Kings viii, 59). Jesus Christ recommended it both by his example and instruction (Matt. xviii, 20; Luke iv, 16). The disciples also attended to it (Acts ii, 41, 42), and the Scriptures in many places countenance it (Exod. xx, 24; Psa. lxiii, 1, 2; lxxxiv, 11; xxvii, 4). See Wilkins, Henry, Watts, *On Prayer;* Townsend, *Nine Sermons on Prayer;* Paley, *Moral Philosophy*, ii, 31; Mather, *Student and Pastor*, p. 87; Wollaston, *Religion of Nature*, p. 122, 123; Hannah More, *On Education*, vol. ii, ch. i; Barrow, *Works*, vol. i, ser. 6; Smith, *System of Prayer;* Scamp, *Sermon on Family Religion;* Walford, *On Prayer*. See Worship.

III. *Philosophical Difficulties.*—1. Scripture does not give any theoretical explanation of the mystery which attaches to prayer. The difficulty of understanding its real efficacy arises chiefly from two sources: from the belief that man lives under general laws, which in all cases must be fulfilled unalterably; and the opposing belief that he is master of his own destiny, and need pray for no external blessing. The first difficulty is even increased when we substitute the belief in a personal God for the sense of an impersonal destiny; since not only does the predestination of God seem to render prayer useless, but his wisdom and love, giving freely to man all that is good for him, appear to make it needless.

The difficulty is familiar to all philosophy, the former element being far the more important: the logical inference from it is the belief in the absolute uselessness of prayer. But the universal instinct of prayer, being too strong for such reasoning, generally exacted as a compromise the use of prayer for good in the abstract (the "mens sana in corpore sano"); a compromise the-

oretically liable to the same difficulties, but wholesome in its practical effect. A far more dangerous compromise was that adopted by some philosophers, rather than by mankind at large, which separated internal spiritual growth from the external circumstances that give scope thereto, and claimed the former as belonging entirely to man, while allowing the latter to be gifts of the gods, and therefore to be fit objects of prayer.

The most obvious escape from these difficulties is to fall back on the mere subjective effect of prayer, and to suppose that its only object is to produce on the mind that consciousness of dependence which leads to faith, and that sense of God's protection and mercy which fosters love. These being the conditions of receiving, or at least of rightly entering into, God's blessings, it is thought that in its encouragement of them the entire use and efficacy of prayer consist.

Now, Scripture, while, by the doctrine of spiritual influence, it entirely disposes of the latter difficulty, does not so entirely solve that part of the mystery which depends on the nature of God. It places it clearly before us, and emphasizes most strongly those doctrines on which the difficulty turns. The reference of all events and actions to the will or permission of God, and of all blessings to his free grace, is indeed the leading idea of all its parts, historical, prophetic, and doctrinal; and this general idea is expressly dwelt upon in its application to the subject of prayer. The principle that our "Heavenly Father knoweth what things we have need of before we ask him" is not only enunciated in plain terms by our Lord, but is at all times implied in the very form and nature of all Scriptural prayers; and, moreover, the ignorance of man, who "knows not what to pray for as he ought," and his consequent need of the divine guidance in prayer, are dwelt upon with equal earnestness. Yet, while this is so, on the other hand the instinct of prayer is solemnly sanctioned and enforced in every page. Not only is its subjective effect asserted, but its real objective efficacy, as a means appointed by God for obtaining blessing, is both implied and expressed in the plainest terms. As we are bidden to pray for general spiritual blessings—in which instance it might seem as if prayer were simply a means of preparing the heart, and so making it capable of receiving them—so also are we encouraged to ask special blessings, both spiritual and temporal, in hope that thus (and thus only) we may obtain them, and to use intercession for others, equally special and confident, in trust that an effect, which in this case cannot possibly be subjective to ourselves, will be granted to our prayers. The command is enforced by direct promises, such as that in the Sermon on the Mount (Matt. vii, 7, 8), of the clearest and most comprehensive character; by the example of all saints and of our Lord himself; and by historical records of such effect as granted to prayer again and again.

Thus, as usual in the case of such mysteries, the two apparently opposite truths are emphasized, because they are needful to man's conception of his relation to God; their reconcilement is not, perhaps cannot be, fully revealed; for, in fact, it is involved in that inscrutable mystery which attends the conception of any free action of man as necessary for the working out of the general laws of God's unchangeable will.

At the same time it is clearly implied that such a reconcilement exists, and that all the apparently isolated and independent exertions of man's spirit in prayer are in some way perfectly subordinated to the one supreme will of God, so as to form a part of his scheme of providence. This follows from the condition, expressed or understood in every prayer, "Not my will, but thine be done." It is seen in the distinction between the granting of our petitions (which is not absolutely promised) and the certain answer of blessing to all faithful prayer; a distinction exemplified in the case of Paul's prayer against the "thorn in the flesh," and of our Lord's own agony in Gethsemane. It is distinctly enunciated by John (1 John v, 14, 15): "If we ask anything *according to his will*, he heareth us; and if we know that he hear us, whatsoever we ask, we know that we have the petitions that we desired of him."

It is also implied that the key to the mystery lies in the fact of man's spiritual unity with God in Christ, and of the consequent gift of the Holy Spirit. All true and prevailing prayer is to be offered "in the name of Christ" (John xiv, 13; xv, 16; xvi, 23–27), that is, not only for the sake of his atonement, but also in dependence on his intercession; which is therefore as a central influence, acting on all prayers offered, to throw off whatever in them is evil, and give efficacy to all that is in accordance with the divine will. So also is it said of the spiritual influence of the Holy Ghost on each individual mind, that while "we know not what to pray for," the indwelling "Spirit makes intercession for the saints, *according to the will of God*" (Rom. viii, 26, 27). Here, as probably in all other cases, the action of the Holy Spirit on the soul is to free agents what the laws of nature are to things inanimate, and is the power which harmonizes free individual action with the universal will of God. The mystery of prayer, therefore, like all others, is seen to be resolved into that great central mystery of the Gospel, the communion of man with God in the incarnation of Christ. Beyond this we cannot go. See PROVIDENCE.

2. The discussion provoked by Prof. Tyndall's so-called "Prayer-test" (q. v.) has given a fresh interest to the question, How far are we entitled to expect the divine interference with the ordinary course of nature in answer to prayer? The question practically resolves itself into another and simpler one, Have miracles ceased in the present age of the Church? This latter is properly a question *of fact;* and it is very generally answered in the affirmative. The modern instances of miracle-working are too few and uncertain to warrant any other conclusion. All those who of late years have come forward with claims to the power have sooner or later proved themselves miserable pretenders, and hence the world has justly abandoned all hope in this direction. Whether the power of working miracles was intended to be only a temporary grant to the apostolic age, and whether therefore it *need* have been lost out of the Church, is an entirely different question. For aught we can see, there is no limit set in the N. T. for its possession and exercise, save the implied one of its necessity; and whether this condition has yet wholly passed away admits of grave doubt, especially in view of the fact that large portions of the earth are yet unchristianized. But it would be of little avail to argue this abstract question. Unless we can bring recent and well-authenticated cases of miracles wrought publicly and indubitably, few, if any, will believe that we have now the right to look for them. This, we apprehend, is really the settled and universal conviction of Christian people of the present day—of Protestants at least. Hence to Prof. Tyndall's challenge that we should test the efficacy of prayer by a miraculous answer, we simply reply that we do not expect any such thing, nor do we feel ourselves authorized to pray for it. This is not now the legitimate scope or province of Christian prayer.

We are well aware that a certain class of well-attested and indeed not infrequent facts is commonly appealed to in order to maintain at least the vestiges of this power as still extant in the Church. Most striking, perhaps, among these occurrences are the remarkable cases of recovery from an apparently incurable sickness, some of which have transpired within the knowledge of almost every one. These have sometimes taken place in a very marked manner in answer to the prayers of friends and congregations. Far be it from us to deny the efficacy of prayer in such cases, or to say a word that would discourage prayer in other like cases. But none of these cases—we mean those of which we have sufficient details and full authentication—at all come up to the idea and definition of a proper miracle. They all

lack at least three of the essential circumstances of such an event: 1st. They are not obvious, palpable, direct, and instantaneous reversals of the established laws of nature. Many persons have been raised from a seeming bed of death as low as any of these, when all hopes and means of restoration had been abandoned, and yet no one thought of a miracle; perhaps no one had even prayed for recovery. The cases are not clearly supernatural. 2d. These cures are not effected by any individual consciously and avowedly authorized to exercise the divine power in the case. In a miracle there must be no misgiving, no hesitation, no shifting of responsibility on the part of the operator. He must positively know and explicitly assert that he is "the finger of God;" otherwise his act becomes the most blasphemous assumption. 3d. Genuine miracles have only been wrought as an ocular demonstration of the commission of a divine messenger or teacher; they have in all instances been resorted to solely in personal attestation of sacred truth. No new doctrine or fresh communication from Heaven purports to be made in connection with the remarkable cases under consideration. The cures are besought as a personal favor, out of regard for private feeling or public usefulness. But these were not the motives which induced our Lord or his apostles to work miracles. They simply wrought them to prove the truth of Christianity. Just here, if anywhere, may doubtless be discovered the reason why miracles have not been perpetuated. There remains no longer any fresh revelation of God's will to man; no new dispensation or even agencies are to be established on the divine part; and therefore no such special credentials are issued from the court of heaven. Its ambassadors have only the common seal of the Gospel—the fruits of their ministry.

The same kind of argument disposes of all the other special providences often cited in proof of a divine intervention in answer to prayer. These likewise are not miracles, nor are they commonly so regarded. There is, however, thus much of valuable truth in the assumption of their pertinency here, namely, that they are really and purposely interferences of God on behalf of those interested, and at the request of the petitioners. That God is able to introduce himself at any and every point in mundane affairs, whether great or small, is one of the clearest doctrines of the Bible; in fact, it is a necessary supposition in any religion. But that he is able to do this without disturbing the order usually styled "the laws of nature" is with equal certainty his prerogative as Creator and Preserver of all. To argue otherwise is either to dethrone him from the dominion of the universe, or to confound government with revolution. Providence is not miraculous; it may be special, or even extraordinary, but it is not therefore out of or contrary to fixed rule. Just here, on the other hand, we must be permitted to enter our protest against the specious reasoning in Bushnell's *Nature and the Supernatural*, which, in our judgment, virtually does away with all miracle by reducing it to an imaginary, higher, and hitherto unknown law of divine establishment, called "moral," so as to save it from the odium of conflict with nature. A miracle, by its very definition, must be a supersedure—or a temporary violation, if you please—of a well-known and fixed law of nature. It is upon precisely this point that its whole significance depends. Eliminate this element, and you destroy its entire moral force. That the laws of physical nature are administered in ultimate subservience to those of the moral universe is the economy approved no less by reason than by Scripture. But these must not be merged the one in the other, even if they should be imagined in any case to collide. Especially must we not assume the intrusion of a superior moral law into the domain of nature, supplanting it in that sphere, and so divesting a miracle of its real miraculousness. When God works a miracle he sets aside, we must suppose, a certain law or series of laws of nature for the time being, and in that particular respect, by virtue of his own superior right as creator. It is not merely the spontaneous supervention of a mightier countervailing law up to that time held in abeyance for such conjunctions. The latter assumption is only an insidious form of modern rationalism, which would fain, at all hazard, divest the miracles of the Bible of their supernatural character. We must never forget that a miracle is a physical fact, but one in its very nature abnormal from a scientific point of view.

Nor do we overlook the argument derived from the moral change effected by the Holy Spirit in regeneration and sanctification. These are often claimed as miracles of grace. That they are supernatural, in the sense of being wrought by a power beyond and superior to human nature, is certainly true; but the fact that they are specially, or even immediately, the work of God does not prove them to be properly miraculous. For, in the first place, in this respect they are merely analogous to any act of particular divine providence, and in like manner they lack all the essential characteristics of a miracle, namely, a point-blank contradiction of natural law, the authoritative behest of an operator, and a moral truth to be sanctioned. They are answers to prayer which await the divine pleasure, on the performance of certain well-known and universally fixed conditions. They are in no sense special or arbitrary. On the contrary, they are most fully under the dominion of law, and can be counted upon with the most invariable certainty. They are as sure to follow the diligent use of the appointed means as any other effect is to flow from its appropriate cause. Indeed, all the healthful and legitimate influences of the Spirit are normal and in the regular line of our own mental action (John iii, 8). Even the afflatus of inspiration is no exception to this rule (1 Cor. xiv, 32). But, in the second place, the spiritual character of the revolution at conversion places it altogether outside the category of miraculous events. These latter always have reference, more or less intimately, to the realm of physics; they appeal to the senses; they must be susceptible of ocular, audible, tangible proof. This is their only security against imposition or self-delusion. If in any case, as in the instance of the miraculous "gift of unknown tongues" in the early Church, and the expulsion of dæmons from the possessed, they have their seat in the mind, yet they exhibit palpable evidences through the organs and acts of the body, namely, the language of the endowed, and the rational behavior of the dispossessed. In short, miracles are *material* evidences of a supernatural authority.

In the discussion of this whole question we would do well to see what Scripture says on the subject. There is a large class of passages, chiefly in the words of our Lord Jesus himself, which seem to give the believer the broadest privilege in this respect. For example, he said to his disciples on one occasion, "If ye have faith as a grain of mustard-seed, ye shall say unto this mountain, Remove hence to yonder place; and it shall remove: and nothing shall be impossible to you" (Matt. xvii, 20); and on another occasion he told them, "If ye have faith, and doubt not, ye shall not only do that which is done to the fig-tree, but also if ye shall say unto this mountain, Be thou removed, and be thou cast into the sea, it shall be done; and all things whatsoever ye shall ask in prayer, believing, ye shall receive" (Matt. xxi, 21, 22). Elsewhere he adds another condition to this grant: "Whatsoever ye shall ask in my name, that will I do, that the Father may be glorified in the Son. If ye shall ask anything in my name, I will do it" (John xiv, 13, 14); and again, "Whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in my name, he will give it you" (xvi, 23). The force of these declarations is usually parried, as to the question under consideration, by the explanation that they were addressed to the apostles as such, and intended to apply in their full sense only to them in their official capacity, or at furthest only to

Christian teachers in the apostolic age. It is true there is nothing in the language that thus limits them, but it is claimed that the fact of the cessation of the miracle-working power proves that such was the intention of the Grantor. We suggest the query whether this very interpretation has not clipped the wings of that *faith* upon which the believer is here authorized to soar into the higher region of Christian privilege. For aught that legitimately appears to the contrary, if the grant has been revoked, it has been precisely and solely in consequence of unbelief in these identical promises. But, be that as it may, in point of fact, we repeat, few if any sane and orthodox Christians nowadays profess to have the requisite faith to venture upon such acts; and therefore the question is narrowed down, whether rightly or wrongly, to the commonplace sphere of non-miraculous subjects of prayer.

There is one passage of Scripture, however, that appears to have escaped the general attention of writers and speakers on this topic, but which is, as it seems to us, peculiarly apposite, if not conclusive of the whole ground of controversy. It is as follows in the ordinary English version: "The effectual fervent prayer of a righteous man availeth much" (James v, 16). The context shows that this language bears most appropriately on the points we have been discussing. The apostle had just been speaking of the prayer of the united Church on behalf of the sick, assuring them that these would be efficacious; and he goes on immediately to speak of the miracle-working prayers of Elias, taking care to observe that this noted prophet was after all only "a man subject to like passions as we are," and hence obviously inferring that prayer was still as available as it had been in his case. Unfortunately the common rendering of the passage as above has confused, if not wholly perverted, its real meaning. As it now stands, it contains a palpable tautology, for "*effectual* prayer," of course, "availeth much," and the epithet "fervent" likewise thus becomes superfluous, as well as the qualification "of a righteous man." The single Greek word translated by "effectual fervent" (*ἐνεργούμενος*) literally means *inwrought*. The only question among interpreters is whether it may not be reflexive (middle voice), and thus signify *inworking itself*, that is, operative or effective. This was evidently the view of our authorized translators, and they have been followed by many scholars, including Robinson (*Lexicon of the N. T.*) and Alford (*Greek Test.*), the latter of whom renders the passage after the order of the Greek words, "The supplication of the righteous man availeth much in its working," that is, as he explains it from Huther, "The prayer of the righteous can do much in its energy." But this leaves the tautology about the same. Lange's note (*Commentary*, ad loc.), after reviewing the other instances of the use of the word in the N. T., approaches the true idea, "The full tension of the praying spirit under its absolute yielding to the divine impulse:" but Mombert's gloss (in the American edition), "Absolute submission to the will of God," completely neutralizes its meaning. The *passive* sense of the participle is required by its grammatical form, and is justified by every passage where this form occurs: e. g. sinful passions are inwrought (Rom. vii, 5); salvation is inwrought by endurance (2 Cor. i, 6); death is inwrought (2 Cor. iv, 12); faith is inwrought by love (Gal. v, 6); God's power is inwrought (Eph. iii, 20, precisely parallel with our text, as also in Col. i, 29), and similarly his word (1 Thess. ii, 13), and on the other hand the "mystery of iniquity" (2 Thess. ii, 7). The thought of the apostle James, therefore, is, as Michaelis (after the Greek fathers) interprets, that the saint's prayer prevails when its earnestness is divinely inspired. To this sense the illustration of Elijah is most apt, as we may see by referring especially to the history alluded to (1 Kings xviii, 42-45). The scene is graphically described by Stanley (*Lectures on Jewish History*, 2d series, p. 337, Amer. ed.), but as usual he misses the spiritual import. The seven-times bent form of the prophet, with his head between his knees, was not merely "the Oriental attitude of entire abstraction;" it denoted the intense struggle of his soul after the boon which Jehovah inwardly urged him to crave. It was an agony of prayer that would not be denied, similar, though less exhaustive, to that of our Saviour in the garden, which we learn (Heb. v, 7) was effectual as to its main object (Luke xxii, 43). Another example of the same energized prayer for which Elijah is adduced by the apostle occurs earlier in the account of the raising to life of the son of the widow of Zerephath, where the praying prophet "stretched himself upon the child three times" (1 Kings xvii, 21), as if he would infuse his own ardent soul into the lifeless form (compare the more detailed narrative in the parallel case of Elisha and the Shunammite's son, 2 Kings iv, 34). He has had a very shallow experience of "the deep things of God" (2 Cor. iii, 10, the passage having reference to this very point) who has not felt "the Spirit itself making intercession with groanings which cannot be uttered" (Rom. viii, 26). At such times the veil between the natural and the miraculous becomes thin indeed. See Cocker, *Theism* (N. Y. 1876, 12mo); Dawson, *Nature and the Bible*, p. 59, 66; Farrar, *Crit. Hist. of Free Thought*, p. 395; *Blackwood's Magazine*, June, 1867, p. 680; *Meth. Quar. Rev.* Oct. 1854, p. 526; *New-Englander*, Oct. 1873, art. i; *Ch. Monthly*, June, 1866, p. 330; *Lond. Quar. Rev.* Oct. 1854, p. 32; *Presb. Rev.* April, 1870; *Bapt. Quar.* Oct. 1873, art. iv; *Brit. and For. Ev. Quar. Rev.* Oct. 1873, art. iii; *Theol. Medium*, Jan. 1874, art. iii; *Bibl. Sacra*, Jan. 1870, p. 199; Jan. 1875, art. v; *Contemp. Rev.* July, Aug., Oct. 1872; *South. Quar. Rev.* April, 1875, art. iv. Comp. MIRACLE.

PRAYER, CHRISTIAN ATTITUDES OF. 1. The first Christians prayed *standing*, with hands outstretched and raised towards heaven. Their face was turned towards the east. The proof of this appears everywhere in the primitive monuments. The frescos, sarcophagi, tombstones (especially those of the Roman catacombs), the painted glasses which are found there in abundance, the old mosaics with which the old basilicas were ornamented, etc., represent both sexes, especially women, in that attitude (Aringhi, *passim*, and especially ii, 285). These figures are generally called *orantes*. They are distinguished by the rich elegance of their garments; they wear long tunics or dalmatics with wide folding sleeves, trimmed with embroideries and purple borders; they are adorned with collars, bracelets, and other jewelry (Bottari, tab. 19, 153). These splendid garments might at first seem in contradiction with the well-known modesty of the women of the early Church; but in thus adorning their image the aim of the artist was not to show what they had been in life, but what glory surrounded them in heaven. In the sepultures of all kinds, the *orante*, generally standing between two trees—the emblem of Paradise—was the symbol of the soul who had become the bride of Jesus Christ, and as such was admitted to the celestial banquet. This explains the magnificence of the garment of St. Priscilla, represented as an *orante* in the cemetery of her name (Perret, *Catacombes*, vol. iii, tab. 3). Thus we find St. Praxedis, in a beautiful Roman mosaic, covered from head to foot with precious stones (Ciampini, *Vet. Monum.* vol. ii, tab. 47). In a celebrated vision St. Agnes had appeared to her parents, a week after her martyrdom, clothed in precious robes, and, to use the Bollandists' expression, *auro textis cycladibus induta*. This text became the type of most of the images of the young martyr: the most beautiful specimen is a gilded glass, published by Boldetti (*Cémèt.* tab. 3, fig. 3, p. 194). Several of these female *orantes*, who were probably noble Roman matrons, as if fatigued by a prolonged prayer, have their arms supported by men, who, by their garments, must be supposed to be servants (Bosio, p. 389, 405; Aringhi, ii, 17), which reminds us of Moses supported by Aaron and Hur in a similar manner (Exod. xvii, 12).

We know this custom not only by the pictures, but also by the written monuments of Christian antiquity. The Christians, says Tertullian (*Apol.* xxx), while praying, raise their eyes to heaven, stretch out their hands, because they are innocent; they pray bareheaded, because we have not to blush—"Illuc suspicientes (in cœlum) Christiani manibus expansis, quia innocuis, capite nudo, quia non erubescimus." To pray with uplifted hands is an attitude natural in the man who addresses himself to the Deity; it is a supplicatory posture which is found in all nations, even pagan, as among the Egyptians, where we meet it in funerary monuments; among the Etruscans there are in the Museo Campana two statues of Chiusi in terra-cotta, which have the arms raised in that way; among the Romans, as we see by the reverse of a number of imperial medals, especially those of Trebonianus Gallus, the praying figure is accompanied with the legend "Pietas Augg." (Mionnet, *Rareté des Médailles Romaines*, ii, 13). But Tertullian remarks that the attitude as well as intention of the faithful was quite different from those of the pagans. "As to us," says this father, "we do not content ourselves with raising our hands, we stretch them in memory of the passion of our Lord." They meant to imitate the posture of Christ on the cross, as did several martyrs at their execution, for instance, St. Montanus, disciple of St. Cyprianus (Ruinart, p. 235), and SS. Fructuosus, Augurius, and Eulogius (Usuard. xii, Kal. Febr.): "Manibus in modum crucis expansis orantes." Several other fathers gave expression to the same idea. It is therefore easy to tell the Christian *orantes* from similar pagan pictures. The latter raise their hands vertically, the curve of the elbow forming a right angle, while the arms of the Christians are almost in a horizontal position. Tertullian (*De Orat.* xiii) describes this difference most minutely, to remove all idea of idolatrous imitation: "We do not raise our hands with ostentation, but with modesty, with moderation." Now, the priest alone observes at mass this rite of venerable antiquity, which has preserved its primitive character in the liturgy of the Church of Lyons, for there the priest expands completely his arms in the form of a cross while reciting the oration which immediately precedes the elevation. It is to be observed that in the primitive Church the catechumens prayed standing like the rest of the congregation, with this difference, that the latter held their face somewhat raised to heaven (Tertull. *De Coron.* iii), while the former inclined slightly their heads, not having obtained yet, by baptism, the divine adoption, the title of children of the Father who is in heaven.

2. The practice of standing erect in prayer was not exclusive, and the first Christians sometimes prayed *kneeling*. We have an example of it in the Acts (xxi, 5): "And we kneeled down on the shore and prayed;" and another in the life of St. James Major, whose knees, by dint of prolonged praying, had become as callous as those of a camel; and another, of great celebrity, in the acts of the martyrdom of St. Ignatius (Ruinart, vii, 10, ed. Veron.). In less ancient times this custom becomes more frequent. We know by the testimony of Eusebius (*Vit. Constant.* iv, 21, 61) that Constantine often bowed his knees to offer his prayer to God. St. Jerome writes to the virgin Demetrias, "Frequently the solicitude of thy soul prompted thee to bend thy knees;" and to Marcella (*Epist.* xxiii, De ægrot. Blesillæ), "She bends her knees on the naked soil." It is likely that the custom of kneeling was borrowed by the Christians from the Hebrews. We read in the Scripture that Solomon, while dedicating his Temple to God, knelt down on both knees (1 Kings viii, 54), and that Daniel thrice a day knelt down in prayer (Dan. vi, 10). It is said also that St. Stephen, while suffering martyrdom (Acts vii, 59), knelt down and prayed for his murderers. St. Luke tells us that our Redeemer in the garden of Gethsemane prayed in this humble posture (Luke xxii, 41). It is natural that, in conformity with this divine example, the Christians should have adopted this way of praying as a mark of affliction, a demonstration of sadness and sorrow. This is what we are led to conclude from these lines of Prudentius, one of the most trustworthy interpreters of Christian antiquity (*Cathem.* hymn. ii, 50):

> "Te voce, te cantu pio
> Rogare *curvato genu*
> Flendo et canendo discimus."

This is also shown by the custom of the primitive Church in the liturgical practice. The Church had directed from the earliest time that prayers should be said standing on Sundays and during the paschal period, in sign of joy, and kneeling all the rest of the year in sign of penitence. This rule was already in force at the time of Justin (*Quæst. ad orthodox.* resp. 115); it is mentioned by Tertullian (*De Coron. milit.* iii), and stated by St. Jerome in that curious passage where he speaks of St. Paul (*Comment. Epist. ad Ephes.* Procem.): "St. Paul stayed at Ephesus until Pentecost, that time of joy and victory when we bend not our knees, nor bow to the ground, but when, resuscitated by the Lord, we raise ourselves to heaven." The same custom became a canonic law at the Council of Nicæa (Can. ult.). It is interesting to read what Pamelius, in his notes on the treatise of Tertullian (*De Coron.* c. iii, n. 38), and Suicer (*Thesaur. eccles.* s. v. γόνυ) wrote on the subject of this manner of praying common to the Jews and Christians. We have no pictures at all representing Christians on their knees, which speaks in favor of those who assert that the *orantes* are images of the glorified soul. In conformity with the apostolic prescriptions the men attended public prayers in the churches bareheaded and the women veiled. In some churches of Africa the virgins had exempted themselves from this custom. Tertullian recommends it anew to their observance in his treatise *De velandis virginibus.*

We must add, as a general observation, that the fathers endeavored, with all their might, to exclude from the prayers of the faithful all gestures and exterior practices bearing some strong features of paganism. Thus Tertullian (*De Orat.* xii) blames sternly such Christians as, in imitation of the pagans, thought fit to make their prayers acceptable to God by putting down their penulæ. See ATTITUDES.

Prayer-book. Since the article on this subject was written (vol. ii) the Church of England has considered the propriety of purging the Book of Common Prayer of the Athanasian Creed, which the American Church rejected. In the Irish Church (Protestant Episcopal), recently disestablished, the Athanasian Creed is purged of the damnatory clauses, and retained in that modified form. Since the organization of the Reformed Protestant Episcopal Church, the Prayer-book originally framed for the (American) Protestant Episcopal Church was made the basis of another Book of Common Prayer, from which all language that seems to justify the ritualism of the High-Church party has been carefully expunged. Recent literature on this subject may be found in the *Edinb. Rev.* Oct. 1874, art. vi; *Brit. Quar.* Jan. 1875, p. 144; *Church Journal* (N. Y.), June 17, 1875; Blunt, *Key to the Knowledge and Use of the Book of Common Prayer* (Lond. 1869); *Contemporary Rev.* Dec. 1872, art. vii. See COMMON PRAYER.

Prayer of Consecration is offered in the communion service for the elements served to the people as memorials of Christ's crucifixion. In the Church of Rome and other ritualistic bodies, this prayer is accompanied with much ceremony. In other Christian churches the form prescribed or adopted is in harmony with the grave occasion which it commemorates. See LORD'S SUPPER.

Prayer-days. There can be no doubt that the service in the Book of Common Prayer is intended to be daily; yet in the United States this practice has never come to prevail. As a substitute for this, and the nearest approximation the times will allow to the original

usage, certain days of the week are selected on which morning and evening service is publicly held. Such days are denominated "Prayer-days," and are thus distinguished from the usual "holydays." See the rubrics before the order of public baptism.—Staunton, *Ecclesiastical Dictionary*, p. 540.

Prayer FOR THE DEAD. See DEAD, PRAYERS FOR THE; PURGATORY.

Prayer, FORMULA OF. See FORMS OF PRAYER.

Prayer, Lord's, See LORD'S PRAYER.

Prayer TO SAINTS. See INVOCATION.

Prayer-test. This was a proposal anonymously put forth in the name of science in the *Contemporary Review* for July, 1872, with the strong endorsement of Prof. Tyndall, and couched in the following terms:

"I ask that one single ward or hospital, under the care of first-rate physicians and surgeons, containing certain numbers of patients afflicted with those diseases which have been best studied, and of which the mortality rates are best known, whether the diseases are those which are treated by medical or by surgical remedies, should be, during a period of not less, say, than three or five years, made the objects of special prayer by the whole body of the faithful; and that at the end of that time the mortality rates should be compared with the past rates, and also with the rates of other leading hospitals similarly well managed during the same period."

This proposal is open to several grave objections.

1. It is *not warranted* by the Scriptures nor by the nature of prayer. Neither religion nor science is under any obligation to accept all challenges. No system of truth does that. The true man of science comes to nature, not as a dictator, but as the humblest of learners. He does not invent tests and demand that she shall accept them; he ingeniously finds out what tests she proposes to him. It is his office, not to alter nor to criticise, but to interpret her hieroglyphics.

In the same spirit we must study Christianity. The Bible is our text-book. We compare its parts with each other, and the whole with human consciousness and experience. We come to the book as learners. We are to accept and try the tests it offers, and not to set up tests of our own. It teaches a doctrine of prayer; it makes prayer to be a real and mighty power—a power producing physical results—but efficient only under prescribed conditions. These conditions, so far as they relate to the special case before us, are sufficiently indicated in these words: "The fervent, effectual prayer of a righteous man availeth much;" "the prayer of faith shall save the sick." The promise is attached only to the earnest, importunate supplication of a righteous man, offered with full faith in God. The prayer proposed to us vacates the essential conditions of prayer. It aims not directly at the result it asks, but indirectly to test God. It says, "Will he?" Faith says, "He will." The thing it seeks is not really the healing of the sick, but "to confer quantitative precision on the action of the supernatural in nature."

This sort of challenge is not new in substance, if it is in form. How do the Scriptures treat it? On a certain occasion a personage of very acute intellect and large intelligence conducted the perfect man to a precipitous height, and challenged him to prove his claims by casting himself down, trusting to be borne up on angels' wings; and he quoted Scripture to enforce the test. The reply was simply, "Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God." When that perfect and divine man hung on the cross the minions of the arch-tempter proposed another test, "Let him now come down from the cross, and we will believe in him;" but he came not down. When once a miracle was demanded of Jesus he said, "You have already more convincing proofs than sufficed for the Ninevites and for the queen of Sheba; an evil and an adulterous generation seeketh after a *sign*." A lost spirit, himself convinced at last by the resistless argument of hell-torment, prayed for the resurrection of a dead man to convince his brothers, but was assured on the highest authority, "If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded though one rose from the dead."

2. The test proposed would be *nugatory*. Suppose it were admissible, and that the Christian world should gladly accept it, and that the results should be all that believers could desire. The hospital is selected—St. Luke's, the west wing; one hundred patients of the kinds indicated are entered. The same surgeons, physicians, and nurses have charge of both wings; the temperature, treatment, and diet are the same; there is perfect scientific exactness in all the conditions, except that the patients in the west wing are made the subjects of daily prayer wherever prayer to the God of the Bible is offered. After three or five years the hospital records are inspected and compared with other records, and it is found that twenty-nine and a half per cent. more recoveries have taken place in the wards which prayer has overshadowed than, in similar cases, anywhere else in the world.

Now, what will the sceptical men of science say? "The Lord, he is the God; prayer is vindicated forever; we have found a new force?" Not at all. We should hear such suggestions as these: "It may be the morning sun is bad, or the clatter of wheels and hoofs on the avenue has injured the patients in the east wing;" "We more than suspect some of the nurses and physicians in the west wing have a bias towards Christianity;" "Probably some new remedy has been secretly used; at all events, though there is something mysterious about it, this we know, nothing can contravene the laws of nature." Let not such a supposition be thought slanderous. The prototypes of such men were not convinced by miracles. Some of the persons who witnessed the resurrection of Lazarus went about from that very day to kill Jesus—yes, and to kill Lazarus too, lest the sight of him might convince others.

The test proposed would be nugatory for another reason—prayer could not be so offered. It is impossible so to dam up Christian sympathy. It would burst over all such artificial banks like a spring freshet. Such forms of prayer would be mere magical incantations, impious shams, which would either be dinned over with no thought of their scope, or else would paralyze the lips that uttered them. Imagine the whole Church on earth thus to pray, "Grant, O Lord, thy special mercy to the one hundred sick persons in the west wing of St. Luke's Hospital, New York, U. S. of America." If any influence could move the Church to begin a three years' course of such prayer, long before the time was up the Spirit of God would be searching many hearts with questions like this: "Who taught you so to limit your petitions?" "Professor Tyndall." "Why do you confine such supplications to one hundred of my needy millions, individuals towards whom you have no reasons for special sympathy?" "To prove thee, Lord, whether thou hearest prayers for the sick." "If you doubt it, you cannot offer such prayers acceptably; and if you believe it, why test me thus at the dictation of unbelievers? Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God."

Answers are promised only to sincere, single-minded prayer, which looks simply for the object it asks. Such prayer must be double-minded—one eye resting faintly on the hospital, the other intently scanning the scientific world. Under such circumstances faith would be impossible; for faith rests solely on God's promise, and God has nowhere promised to answer any prayer offered as a test of himself.

3. Our final objection to the proposition before us is that it proposes an *unnecessary* test. There are allowable experiments which afford abundant proof of the mooted point. What these are must be determined by the Word of God and the experience of praying men. For a scientific atheist, or pantheist, or deist, or mere nominal Christian to insist on other tests is as unscientific—we say not as irreligious, but as unscientific—as it would be for us to say, "If electricity be so powerful as

you assert, let it run along this hempen cord as you claim it does along the telegraphic wires," or, "Make your magnet attract copper." The prompt reply would be, "The laws of nature forbid." Our reply is, "The economy of grace forbids."

We can conceive of a strictly scientific test which might have been proposed by the author of this inadmissible, nugatory test. He might have sent out a circular letter to ten thousand of the ablest, most experienced, and most devout ministers of the Gospel and other Christians in all lands, explaining his object, and inviting careful answers to these questions: How many cases have you ever known of persons desperately sick who were made the subjects of fervent, importunate prayer? What were the particulars, and what the results? The candid and unbiassed collation of the facts so obtained from witnesses whose capacity and honesty would give their testimony on all other matters the highest credit, might or might not cast some light upon the subject. But it would not convince unbelievers, for unbelief is a matter of the heart more than of the intellect; and very probably the secret and unsearchable workings of the divine providence would remove the whole business beyond the range of the laws of induction. The scientists discard faith, while the Bible tells us that only by faith can we know either the person or the providence of God. A scientific test, in whatever pertains to the divine action, is impossible and absurd — a truth that Christians need to understand scarcely less than sceptics. See PRAYER; PROVIDENCE.

Preachers, Local. See LOCAL PREACHERS.

Preaching is usually and with literal correctness defined as the act of delivering religious discourses. But this definition fails to suggest the most important signification of the term. That can only be reached by considering it as designating the objective idea of a great and peculiar appointment of the Lord Jesus Christ. In this broad but legitimate sense, preaching means more than an individual act or series of acts. It represents an institution of Christianity which has been in existence some nineteen centuries, and an agency of religious influence destined to continue in action throughout the whole period of human affairs.

I. *The Proper Character and Design of Preaching.*— As Christ himself was the Divine Word made flesh, so, designing to employ human agency for the promotion of his kingdom among men, he made a special appropriation of man's distinguishing faculty of speech by appointing it as the primary and principal means of diffusing God's word of truth and message of salvation throughout the world. Having chosen disciples from among his own earliest hearers, "he ordained twelve, that they should be with him, and that he might send them forth to preach" (Mark iii, 14). To those disciples he said, "What I tell you in darkness that speak ye in light: and what ye hear in the ear that preach ye upon the house-tops" (Matt. x, 27). As had been foreshadowed in prophecy, so Christ represented the preaching of the Gospel to the poor as the distinguishing characteristic of his kingdom. The great Preacher himself, having completed his earthly mission, crowned it with the ever-binding command given to his disciples, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature" (Mark xvi, 15). Christian preaching, therefore, implies not only preachers, but hearers. It presupposes a personal conviction and a deep sense of truth in the mind of the preacher, accompanied by a purpose to transfer his convictions to the minds and hearts of his hearers. Although preaching is designed to embody an important element of instruction, yet, if properly executed, it rises in character superior to lecturing, or any of the forms of didactic discourse. It resembles the best forms of demonstrative address, but transcends all secular oratory in the moral grandeur of its themes, and especially in its specific design of enlightening and quickening the consciences of men as a means of affecting their earthly character and their eternal destiny.

II. *Historical Development.*—Prior to Christ, preaching was but little more known among the Jews than among the Gentiles. It had been to some extent anticipated by several of the prophets, the greatest and last of whom was John the Baptist; but, from the time that Christ began his public ministry, preaching became common and constant. Following our Lord's ascension, the apostolic ministry of preaching was elevated and vitalized by the gift of the Holy Ghost. The gift of tongues and the manifestation of the tongues of fire were alike designed to aid and encourage them in their work of evangelization. Hence, whether in the Temple, in synagogues, or in prisons, they preached Christ and him crucified as the power of God and the wisdom of God; and, when scattered abroad by persecution, "they went everywhere preaching the Word" (Acts viii, 4). It was thus that the Gospel became rapidly diffused throughout the Roman empire, which, in an important sense, represented "all the world" of that period.

It seems safe to believe that, had the apostolic zeal and fidelity in preaching been maintained without interruption, the triumphs of the Gospel would have been continuous, and perhaps ere this coextensive with the habitable world. But, unfortunately, the 2d and 3d centuries witnessed the introduction into the Church of two classes of influences which had a tendency to reduce the number of preachers and limit the work and influence of preaching. The first was that of asceticism (q. v.), which, by a powerful but mistaken impulse, sent into deserts and caves, and afterwards into monasteries, thousands of earnest men, whose lives were thus withdrawn from evangelical activity and wasted in penances and self-torture. The second was that of ceremonialism [see CEREMONY], by which the preaching office was taken away from the majority of the clergy, and for the greater part limited to bishops. Bingham states the limitation in these words:

> "Preaching anciently was one of the chief offices of a bishop; insomuch that in the African churches a presbyter was never known to preach before a bishop in his cathedral church till Austin's time, and St. Austin was the first presbyter in that part of the world that ever was allowed to preach in the presence of his bishop. . . . It is true, in the Eastern churches presbyters were sometimes allowed to preach in the great church before the bishop; but that was not to discharge him of the duty, for still he preached a sermon at the same time after them. . . . In the lesser churches of the city and country about, this office was devolved upon presbyters as the bishop's proper assistants; and the deacons, except in the forementioned cases (of reading the homilies of the fathers, and when the presbyter was sick or infirm), were not authorized to perform it" (*Antiq. Christian Church*, bk. xiv, ch. iv).

Not only was preaching shorn of its aggressive power by being thus limited and subordinated under the influence of a growing ceremonialism, but in some places it was for long periods scandalously neglected. Sozomen, the historian, "relates of the Church of Rome in his time that they had no sermons either by the bishop or any other." Some have thought Sozomen mistaken; but Cassiodorus, who was a senator and consul at Rome, quotes the same out of Sozomen in his *Historia Tripartita*, without correction, and further says that no one can produce any sermons preached to the people by any bishop of Rome before those of Leo. The revival of preaching by Leo appears to have been but temporary; for, according to Surius, a Roman writer, it was afterwards discontinued for five hundred years together, till Pius Quintus, like another Leo, revived the practice. Not merely at Rome, but through large portions both of the Latin and Greek churches, preaching, instead of being a constant custom, was rare and exceptional during the long period between the 6th and 16th centuries. It ceased to be a regular part of the services of the Sabbath, although it was retained as a part of the ceremonial of ordinations, while on festival days it took the form of panegyrics or eulogies upon the Virgin and the saints.

The preaching of the Crusades (q. v.) by Peter the Hermit, St. Bernard, and others, and the organization of the Dominicans (q. v.) as a preaching order of monks, may be considered as exceptional to the usual practice of the mediæval Church. Some other exceptions, however, of a far better character, and followed by better results, are also to be credited to the Church of the Middle Ages, while on the other hand it was disgraced by Tetzel and others, who used preaching as an agency for the sale of indulgences. But preaching never again became general till after the Reformation. It was seized upon by Luther and the other reformers as a means of propagating scriptural truth and exposing the corrupt doctrines and practices which had crept into the Church, and from that time forward preaching became frequent and universal among Protestants. Its influence in the Protestant world has reacted upon Romanism, so that long since, in all Protestant countries, and to some extent elsewhere, preaching has become a regular Sunday service in Roman Catholic churches, performed not only by bishops, but by presbyters and deacons, as well as by monks of several different orders.

III. *Preaching-places and Customs.*—In New-Testament times our Lord and his apostles found places for preaching wherever people could be assembled. The mountain-side, the shores of seas and rivers, the public street, private houses, the porch of the Temple, the Jewish synagogue, and various other places were found available for the proclamation of the Gospel. So far as the preaching customs of the first period of Christianity can be inferred from authentic records, they were simple in the extreme. Sometimes the message of the preacher was communicated in conversation, and when delivered in a more formal manner it rarely had any other accompaniments than the reading of the Sacred Word and prayer. For a considerable time there could have been no Church edifices adapted to the convenient preaching and hearing of the Word; but the earliest structures erected for Christian worship doubtless had that design in view. It was, therefore, a corruption in practice when churches began to be constructed for ceremonial display—as with altars for the celebration of mass, niches for images, and long-drawn aisles for processional parades. The conversion of heathen temples and basilicas into Christian churches, which in the 4th century became common, tended largely to foster and extend that form of corruption. At the period named, the most common form of preaching was that of the exhortation and the homily. A few of the great preachers, like Cyril, Chrysostom, and Augustine, delivered courses of homilies in daily succession, especially during Lent. More commonly short exhortations, sometimes two, three, or even four in succession, were delivered either at morning or evening prayer, or both. This was more particularly true in cities and the large churches, and it was only when presbyters and deacons were authorized to preach that preaching could be furnished with frequency or regularity in villages or country-places. Sometimes large assemblies were gathered at the graves of martyrs to hear panegyrics upon the virtues of those who had suffered death in persecution.

The custom of preaching extempore was at first general, but after a time yielded, in the case of ordinary preachers, to that of reciting discourses not unfrequently composed by others. Preachers frequently preceded their discourses by a brief prayer for divine assistance. Following prayer was the salutation "Peace be unto you," or "The Lord be with you;" to which the people responded, "Peace be with thy spirit." Sometimes the salutation gave place to a benediction, as may be seen in several of Chrysostom's homilies. Sometimes a text of Scripture was taken as a basis of the discourse, sometimes several were taken for the same object, and sometimes none. Generally the discourse was concluded with a doxology. It was usual for preachers to sit and the people to stand during the delivery of the discourse. It was common for the people when pleased by the utterances of a preacher to give applause by clapping their hands and by vocal acclamations. Sometimes handkerchiefs were waved and garments tossed aloft. At other times groans and sobs and tears were the responses made by sympathetic hearers. So great value was attached to the discourses of some of the more venerable and eloquent preachers that ready writers were employed to report the words they uttered. Copies of reported discourses were circulated among those who prized them, and were held for reading to other assemblies. In this way the homilies of the fathers descended to later times, when they could be better preserved and more rapidly multiplied by printing. During the mediæval period, where preaching was not wholly abandoned, sermons and homilies were to a great extent substituted by postils (q. v.), which were very brief addresses delivered at the conclusion of the mass, and holding about the same relation to the preceding ceremonies of worship that a postscript holds to a letter, or a marginal note to the text of a book.

The preaching customs of modern times differ in minor particulars somewhat with reference to differences of national habits, but more with reference to the predominance of the idea of worship or of religious address. In a certain class of churches the services are conducted with primary reference to forms of worship. In churches of that class, by whatever name designated, preaching is made subordinate. In other churches the leading idea of a Sabbath assembly is that of an audience gathered together to receive instruction from the Word of God, both as read from the sacred page and as declared by his appointed messengers. In the latter, preaching is regarded as of principal importance, prayer and psalmody being auxiliary to it.

The principal places for preaching in modern times are churches constructed with primary reference to that object. It may be here remarked that even in Europe church architecture has been greatly modified since the period of the Reformation, in a perhaps unconscious adaptation to the more general practice of preaching. Few large cathedrals have been built, but many churches of smaller proportions, and more available as auditoriums. Protestant churches in all countries are supplied with permanent seats for audiences, and, with rare exceptions, the pulpit occupies the central position allotted in Roman Catholic countries to the principal altar. On the continent of Europe movable seats only are used in the Roman Catholic churches, but in countries distinctively Protestant, pews or fixed sittings are generally introduced to accommodate hearers during the preaching services. But preaching, especially among Protestants, has by no means been limited to churches. While maintained with regularity in them, it has been extended as a missionary agency to highways and market-places, to public commons, to natural amphitheatres, to groves, to ships' decks, to extemporized tabernacles, and even to music-halls and theatres. In short, zealous evangelists show themselves ready, both in civilized and heathen countries, to preach wherever and whenever their fellow-men can be gathered to hear them.

IV. *Literature.*—The literature of preaching may be divided into two classes—the first embracing publications relating to the art and science of preaching, and the second embracing the printed products of preaching, whether postils, homilies, or sermons. Of the first class, an extensive list is given in connection with the article on HOMILETICS (q. v.). Of the second, it would be easy to enumerate authors and books by hundreds. For select and classified lists, see arts. PULPIT ELOQUENCE; SERMONS. Of recent books of the first class, the following may be named: Mullois (M. l'Abbé Isidore; translated by George Percy Badger), *The Clergy and the Pulpit in their Relations to the People* (N. Y. 1867, 12mo); Hood, *Lamps, Pitchers, and Trumpets: Lectures on the Vocation of the Preacher* (1st and 2d series, ibid. 1869, 2 vols. 12mo); Parker, *Ad Clerum: Advices to a Young Preacher* (Bost. 1871, 12mo); Broadus, *Preparation and*

Delivery of Sermons (Phila. 1871, 12mo); Beecher, *Yale Lectures on Preaching* (1st, 2d, and 3d series, N. Y. 1872–74, 3 vols. 12mo); Storrs, *Preaching without Notes* (ibid. 1875, 12mo); Hall, *God's Word through Preaching* (ibid. 1875, 12mo); Broadus, *Lectures on the History of Preaching* (ibid. 1876, 12mo); Taylor, *The Ministry of the Word* (ibid. 1876, 12mo); Brooks, *Lectures on Preaching* (ibid. 1877, 12mo); Dale, *Nine Lectures on Preaching* (ibid. 1878, 12mo). (D. P. K.)

Preaching Friars. See DOMINICANS.

Preadamite. Under this head we propose to consider, first, the question of the existence of men older than the Biblical Adam; second, Prehistoric tribes in general.

I. *Preadamic Men.*—Whether men existed upon the earth before Adam is a question first made prominent in Europe by Isaac Peyrerius (La Peyrère). His reasoning in support of the affirmative is embodied in a work published anonymously in Paris, in 1655, and entitled *Præadamitæ: sive Exercitatio super versibus duodecimo, decimotertio et decimoquarto capitis quinti Epistolæ S. Pauli ad Romanos, quibus inducuntur Primi homines ante Adamum conditi.* Very soon afterwards appeared, from the same author, the following: *Systema Theologicum ex Præadamitarum Hypothesi: Pars prima.* Both works are now very rare (see Solgeri *Bibl.* ii, 94; Freytag, *Anal.* p. 671; *Bibl. Feuerlin*, p. 588; Brunet, *Manuel*, et al.). The most accessible edition embraces the two works bound in one volume, 18mo, and published, without place, "anno salutis MDCLV." A work appeared in English the next year with the following title: *Man before Adam, or a Discourse upon the Twelfth, Thirteenth, and Fourteenth Verses of the Fifth Chapter of the Epistle of Paul to the Romans: by which are prov'd that the First Men were created before Adam* (Lond. 1656, 18mo, pp. 351. It purports to be a "First Part"). The novel teaching of Peyrerius was at once bitterly denounced, and a considerable number of treatises were written in opposition. A list of these has been compiled by Ebert (*Dictionnaire*, No. 16,555). The following are the most important: *Animadversiones in Librum Præadamitarum in quibus confutatur nuperus scriptor, et primum omnium fuisse, Adamum defenditur, authore Eusebio Romano* (Phil. Priorio, Paris, 1656, 8vo, and in Holland in the same year, sm. 12mo); *Non ens Præadamiticum: sive Confutatio vani cujusdam somnii, quo Sacræ Scripturæ prætextu incautioribus nuper imponere conatus est quidam anonymus fingens, ante Adamum primum fuisse homines in mundo; authore Ant. Hulsso* (Lugd. Bat. apud Joan. Elzevir. 1656, sm. 12mo); *Responsio exetastica ad tractatum cui titulus Præadamitæ libri duo, auctore J. Puthio* (Lugd. Batavor. apud Johan. Elzivirium, 1656, sm. 12mo). The argument on both sides, as might be supposed, was almost wholly Biblical and dialectic. The nature of the proofs employed by Peyrerius, and of his "theological system" built upon the fundamental doctrine of preadamic men, may be condensed in the following propositions: 1. The "one man" (Rom. v, 12) by whom "sin entered into the world" was Adam, for in ver. 14 that sin is called "Adam's transgression." 2. "Transgression" is a violation of "law;" therefore "the law" (ver. 13) signifies the law given to Adam—natural law, not that given to Moses. 3. The phrase "until the law" (ver. 13) implies a time before the law—that is, before Adam; and as "sin was in the world" during that time, there must have been men in existence to commit sin. 4. The sin committed before the enactment of the natural law was "material," "actual;" the sin existing after Adam, and through him, was "imputed," "formal," "legal," "adventitious," and "after the similitude of Adam's transgression." 5. Death entered into the world before Adam, but it was in consequence of the imputation "backwards" of Adam's prospective sin—"peccatum Adami fuisse retro imputatum primis hominibus ante Adamum conditis;" and this was necessary, that all men might partake of the salvation provided in Christ—"oportuerat primos illos homines peccavisse in Adamo, ut sanctificarentur in Christo" (*Præad.* cap. xix). Nevertheless, death before Adam did not "reign." "Peccatum tunc temporis erat mortuum; mors erat mortua, et nullus erat sepulchri aculeus" (*ibid.* cap. xii). 6. Adam was the "first man" only in the same sense as Christ was the "second man," for Adam "was the figure of Christ" (Rom. v, 14). 7. All men are of one blood in the sense of one substance—one "matter," one "earth." The Jews are descended from Adam, the Gentiles from Preadamites (*System. Theol.* lib. ii, cap. vi–xi). The first chapter of Genesis treats of the origin of the Gentiles, the second of the origin of the Jews (*ibid.* lib. iii, cap. i, ii). The Gentiles were created aborigines "in the beginning," by the "word" of God, in all lands; Adam, the father of the Jews, was formed of "clay" by the "hand" of God (*ibid.* lib. ii, cap. xi). Genesis, after chap. i, is a history, not of the first men, but of the first Jews (*ibid.* lib. iv, cap. ii). 8. The existence of Preadamites is also indicated in the Biblical account of Adam's family, especially of Cain (*ibid.* lib. ii, cap. iv). 9. Proved, also, by the "monuments" of Egypt and Chaldæa, and by the history of the astronomy, astrology, theology, and magic of the Gentiles (*ibid.* lib. iii, cap. v–xi); as well as by the racial features of remote and savage tribes, and by the recently discovered parts of the terrestrial structure (*ibid. Procem.*). 10. Hence the epoch of the creation of the world does not date from that "beginning" commonly figured in Adam. "Videtur enim altius et a longissime retroactis seculis petendum illud principium (*ibid. Procem.*). 11. The deluge of Noah was not universal, and it destroyed only the Jews (*ibid.* lib. iv, cap. vii–ix); nor is it possible to trace to Noah the origin of all the races of men (*ibid.* lib. iv, cap. xiv). Some of these positions were far in advance of the age, and it ought to be said were defended with knowledge and candor which were not appreciated by the adversaries of Peyrerius.

The question of Preadamites admits of discussion in our day from quite another standpoint. Recognising it as a question of scientific fact, we should unhesitatingly appeal to anthropology for a final answer. Ethnologists are generally agreed that the civilized nations of Europe, Northern Africa, and Western and Southern Asia belong to one race, which was designated Caucasian by Blumenbach, but which, with recent authorities, is known under the name of the Mediterranean Nations. They are recognised as constituting three groups of peoples, commonly called Hamites, Shemites, and Indo-Europeans or Japhetites. These designations are derived from the names of the three sons of Noah, to whom, through the invaluable aid of the Biblical ethnology, the learned have traced the pedigree of these three types of people. They may, therefore, be designated collectively as Noachites. (1.) The Hamites are known to have distributed themselves through the north of Africa, the Nile valley, and the east of the continent as far as the Strait of Bab el-Mandeb. The ancient Egyptians are pure Hamites, and are generally regarded as the founders of the oldest civilization. They are still more or less perfectly represented by the Fellahîn, or peasantry of the lower Nile, and especially by the Coptic Christians of the towns. The Hamitic Berbers, including Libyans, Moors, Numidians, and Gætulians, are spread, intermingled with Shemites and Europeans, through the countries south of the Mediterranean and through the Sahara. Other Hamitic nations, possessing a civilization far beyond that of any of the purely black races, occupy some of the regions about the Nile, especially in Nubia, and are scattered in distinct tribes, united by common linguistic elements, through Abyssinia, and in one direction as far as the heart of Africa, from 8° north to 3° south, and in the other direction from near Bab el-Mandeb to Juba on the Indian Ocean. The antiquity of the Hamitic civilization in Egypt is indicated by the evidence in our possession that the

heliacal rising of Sirius must have been observed (apparently) as early as B.C. 4242 (Lepsius, *Chronol. der Aegypter*, pt. i, p. 165 sq.).* (2.) The Shemites, from the date of earliest records, have inhabited Western Asia, whence they have taken possession of parts of Eastern Africa. They are represented by the Jews, the Arabs, the Abyssinians, the Aramæans, the Canaanites, and the Assyrio-Babylonians. Linguistic researches lead to the belief that the Hamites and Shemites developed their languages in a common primeval home, and hence are nearly related. This view is favored by Genesis, where (Shemitic) Sidon is described as the eldest son of Canaan, who was descended from Cush, and thus from Ham (Gen. x, 1–15), the father of the Hamites. (3.) The Indo-European (Japhetic) family appear to have dwelt originally, according to the conclusions of Peschel, along the slopes of the Caucasus, and through the gorge of Dariel, within reach of both the Euxine and the Caspian Sea (*Races of Man*, Amer. ed. p. 507). Hence a migration westward of a portion of them led to the separation into Asiatic and European Aryans. Some of the Asiatic Aryans crossed the Hidû-Kush, according to Max Müller and others, and dispossessed the aboriginal population of the territory along the Ganges, transplanting there the religion of Brahminism, while those left behind developed the Zoroastrian religion. The European Aryans swept over Europe in successive waves. The Celts displaced in Spain and France an older population, the Basques—perhaps also Aryans—and were succeeded by the other nations of southern Aryans—Greeks, Albanians, and Italians. The northern Aryans are represented by the Letts, the Slavonians, and the Germanic nations.

We thus discover the posterity of Noah in all their ramifications; but in this survey the Mongoloid nations and the black races do not seem to be embraced. The Mongoloids are spread widely over the earth's surface. The best modern authorities unite here the Malay tribes which are dispersed over South-eastern Asia and many of the islands of Polynesia; certain southern Asiatics, embracing Chinese, Siamese, Burmese, and races in Thibet and the Himalayas; Coreans and Japanese; the Ural-Altaic race in several European and Asiatic divisions; the tribes on both sides of Behring's Strait and the aborigines of America—including as well civilized nations of both parts of the continent as the wild hunting tribes. The Dravida, also, according to modern ethnology, should be recognised as a race distinct from the posterity of Noah. These aborigines of western India have dark skins, long, black, curly hair, somewhat intumescent lips, but nothing of the prognathism of some of the black races. They linger in some parts of Beluchistan, in the extreme south and south-west of Hindostan, and in the northern half of Ceylon. One of their languages is the Tamul, spoken by not less than ten millions, and possessing an ancient literature. Other tribes occupy a belt along the east coast of Hindostan, and even stretching into the interior. The Mongoloids and the Dravida, which may be designated as the Dusky Races, cannot be very far removed from the Noachites. Their common ancestor was an antediluvian—perhaps Seth, or some one of his descendants older than Noah. It is open to conjecture that their father was Cain, the brother of Seth, or some other son of Adam. In any event, as Noah was the parent of the White Races, and as these are so closely allied to the Dusky (including copper-colored) Races, it seems quite possible that the Biblical Adam was removed sufficiently far in the past to be the progenitor of both the White and the Dusky Races. The name Adam, signifying red, would imply that he was not the parent of the Black Races. Cain, moreover, as he went out from his native country, found other nations already in existence. The natural inference from these considerations would be that the Black Races existed before Adam.* Such a conclusion is sustained by other anthropological considerations. The Black Races—a term used only for present convenience—may be regarded as comprising (1) Negroes, (2) Hottentots and Bushmen, (3) Papuans, (4) Australians. They possess in common a dark or black skin and a marked degree of dolichocephalism, as well as much greater prognathism than the White and Dusky races. They are further characterized by long thigh-bones, sometimes long arms, lean shanks, oblique pelves, and deficiency of secondary sexual characters. The Negroes are distinguished generally by short crisped hair, with a flattened section, scanty or absent beards, thick lips, flattened nose, retreating forehead, and projecting jaws; and they inhabit Africa from the southern border of the Sahara to the territory of the Hottentots and Bushmen, stretching from ocean to ocean save where the Hamites have intruded on the extreme east. The Bantu or southern Negroes embrace the Zanzibar and Mozambique nations, and the well-known Betchuans and Kaffirs. The Soudan or northern Negroes embrace the tribes speaking a variety of languages, and stretching from the coast well into the interior. The Hottentots and Bushmen occupy the southern parts of Africa nearer the Atlantic Ocean, and are characterized by the tufted matting of their hair, and among the women by the peculiar formation known as steatopygy. The Bushmen have a leathery-brown skin, which becomes much wrinkled with age. The Koi-Koin (Hottentot) language possesses great ethnological interest, as it has been thought by Moffat, Lepsius, Pruner Bey, Max Müller, Whitney, and Bleek to present affinities with the ancient Egyptian. Though other authorities have pronounced against any relationship, it is certain that we find among these savages linguistic elements which belong to a refined civilization, and which leave the question open whether they have lived in contact with the Egyptians or have descended from them, or from some common stock not very remotely removed. But even if it should appear probable that the Hottentots (and, inferentially, the Bushmen) are descended from the Hamitic Egyptians, we are not in possession of evidence indicating any immediate relationship between the other black races and the Adamites; so that the residual probability remains that these races are more ancient than the (perhaps Adamic) father of the White and Dusky races. The Papuans are intermingled with the population of Australia, and inhabit New Guinea, the Pelew Islands, New Hebrides, New Caledonia, the Loyalty Islands, and the Fiji Archipelago. They possess peculiarly flattened, abundant long hair, which grows in tufts surrounding the head like a crown eight inches high. The beard is abundant, the skin very dark, varying to chocolate color in New Guinea and blue-black in Fiji. The jaws are less projecting than in Negroes, and the nose is broad and aquiline, giving the features a Jewish cast. The Australians occupy the continent of Australia and the islands contiguous, including Tasmania. Their body is thickly pilose; the hair of the head is black, elliptical in section, and stands out around the head in a shaggy crown less striking than that of the Papuans. Though less gifted than the

* In our article MANETHO we have shown the untrustworthiness of many of these astronomical data as foundations for Egyptian chronology. The English Egyptologists in general reduce the beginning of the first dynasty to B.C. 2717 (Lane, Poole, Wilkinson), and even this is unnecessarily far back. There is good reason for dating the reign of Menes from B.C. 2417.—ED.

* We call the attention of the reader to the fact that these positions of our respected contributor are purely inferences from the presumption that the ethnographical list in Gen. x is intended to specify *all* the posterity of Noah as now or historically known to exist on the earth, whereas it is evidently meant only as a catalogue of those tribes with which the Hebrews were more or less acquainted. The black races were certainly included under the Cushites (q. v.), and this disposes at once of the argument that Noah is the progenitor of the whites only. Indeed, if anything is to be inferred from the meaning of the name Adam, it would go to make him the parent, not of the Caucasian, but of the copper-colored or Tartar tribes.—ED.

Papuans, they are higher in the psychic scale than formerly represented. They were, indeed, found living in the age of rude stone implements, and used simple tree-trunks for boats; but their language reflects a considerable degree of refinement and grammatical perfection. Viewing the Black races from either a psychic, a zoological, or an archæological standpoint, we discover evidence that they diverged from the White and Dusky races at a period which, compared with the epoch of Egyptian and Assyrian civilization, must be exceedingly remote. The conclusion is indicated, therefore, that the common progenitor of the Black and the other races was placed too far back in time to answer for the Biblical Adam. This view has been maintained by M'Causland (*Adam and the Adamite* [Lond. 1872]; *The Builders of Babel*, ch. v), and was recently favored by Dr. Whedon (*Meth. Quar. Rev.* Jan. 1871, p. 153, and July, 1872, p. 526). See also an article entitled *Was Adam the First Man?* in *Scribner's Monthly*, Oct. 1871; and Pozzy, *La Terre et le Récit Biblique de la Création*, liv. iii, c. xii. *

To those who think the language of the Bible contemplates Adam as "the first being who could be called a man"—not alone the progenitor of the races which figure in Biblical history—it may be conceded that such is its meaning, in case it shall appear allowable, on Biblical grounds, to carry back the advent of man sufficiently far; and provided, further, that a progenitor having the complexion which seems to be indicated by the term Adam can be reasonably regarded as the progenitor also of races of black color, and seemingly much lower in the organic and intellectual scale than the father of Seth and his civilized posterity not far removed.† The time-question involved is admittedly serious. In reference to the difficulty presented by the color of Adam's skin, it will be borne in mind that color alone is one of the most untrustworthy of ethnological characters (Peschel, *Races of Man*, p. 88). In reference to the inferior psychic and bodily endowments of the Black races, it may also be observed that degradation and deterioration of tribes are phenomena familiar to ethnology. But there are strong objections to the assumption that the Black races represent, in general, a degeneracy. We have no knowledge of the degeneracy of entire races, but only of tribes and fragments of tribes. Nor has tribal degeneracy taken place, except where the oppression of superior tribes has driven the weaker into the midst of natural conditions unfriendly to existence. But the Black races have been free to roam over entire continents in search of the most congenial conditions. Yet, on the healthful and luxuriant table-lands of Central Africa the black man is marked by an inferiority as real and almost as great as along the pestilential borders of the west coast, or in the least-favored regions of Australia and New Guinea. The structural peculiarities of the Black races, moreover, are inheritances of lower grade rather than reminiscences of a higher. The black man is not on a descending grade, but is ascending, according to the organic and psychic law of existence. His remotest progenitor was lower rather than higher. All these considerations militate against the idea that Adam, the father of the Noachian races, was low enough in the scale of organization, and remote enough in the genealogical line, to be the father also of the Melanic races. Thus, while the conflicting nature of the insufficient evidences forbids our dogmatism, the balance of proof seems rather to sustain the opinion that the Melanic races are descendants of real Preadamites.‡

II. *Prehistoric Men.*—By prehistoric peoples we commonly understand the ancestors of the historic peoples; and, in a still stricter sense, the ancestors of the Aryan nations. In fact, most that has been directly learned respecting prehistoric men concerns the predecessors of the historic nations of Europe. It should be borne in mind, however, that questions respecting primeval man—his antiquity, endowments, condition, and birthplace—are to be clearly distinguished from similar questions concerning the Caucasian race—the race with which, as we have seen, our revealed Scriptures are primarily concerned. What may be true of this race may be very wide of the truth respecting mankind at large. See SPECIES. In discussing prehistoric man we are constrained to confine ourselves to the predecessors of the modern Caucasians, both because discoveries of prehistoric monuments have been chiefly restricted to Caucasian countries, and because the non-Caucasian races (especially if we except the Mongoloids) can hardly be said to possess any indigenous history; so that their prehistoric period reaches to the present. This circumstance, nevertheless, is fortunate for anthropological research, since it enables us, by comparison, to draw inferences respecting the prehistoric conditions of the Caucasian race.

1. *Sources of Information.*—(1.) *Caverns.*—Nearly every country of Europe contains caverns in which have been discovered either the bones of human beings or the relics of their industry. More than forty of these were explored by Dr. Schmerling in Belgium (*Recherches sur les Ossemens fossiles découverts dans les Cavernes de la Province de Liège* [1833–34]), and others more recently, by M. E. Dupont (*Les Temps Préhistoriques;* see also Le Hon, *L'Homme Fossile* [2d ed. 1877]). The most important Belgian caverns are those of Engis, Engihoul, Chokier, Naulette, and Frontal (or Furfooz). Dr. Buckland published in 1823 (*Reliquiæ Diluvianæ*) accounts of the contents of several English caverns; and, in later times, further details have been given by Evans (*Ancient Stone Implements of Great Britain* [1872]), Owen (*History of British Fossil Mammals and Birds* [1846]), Dawkins (*Cave Hunting* [1875]), Lubbock (*Prehistoric Times* [Lond. 1865]), Lyell (*The Geological Evidences of the Antiquity of Man* [4th ed. 1873]), Sanford, Falconer, Austen, Pengelly, and others whose works are scattered through the publications of the geological and palæontological societies and periodicals. The most important English caverns are those of Kent and Brixham (near Torquay), Wokey Hole in Somersetshire, Kirkdale in Yorkshire, and those in the Gower Peninsula of South Wales. The British caverns have afforded thirty-seven species of mammals, of which eighteen are extinct. A large number of French caverns and "rock-shelters" have proved fruitful in archæological and anthropological remains. As early as 1826 M. Tournal, and in 1829 M. Christol, had announced discoveries in the south of France. Later investigations have been made by Lartet and Christy (*Reliquiæ Aquitanicæ* [Lond. 1865–69]), Desnoyers, Mortillet, Rivière, Garrigou, and many other French and English anthropologists. Nearly a hundred bone- and flint-producing caverns have been described in France, the greater number of which are situated in the Department of the Dordogne (e. g. Moustier, Eyzies, Madeleine, Laugerie-Haute, and Laugerie-Basse) and the north flanks of the Pyrenees (e. g. Aurignac, Lourdes, Izeste, and Lortet). M. Garrigou states that he has explored two hundred and seventy-five caverns in the Pyrenees. Others equally important, however, occur in the departments of Hérault (Pondres), Ariége (Massat, Bouicheta), Aude (Bize), Tarn-et-Garonne (Bruniquel), and on the Medi-

* Such a conclusion, however, has in our judgment a very slender foundation, and cannot for a moment stand in comparison with the arguments in favor of the common origin of man adduced under our article ADAM.—ED.

† The question rather is simply a philological one. The statements of Scripture must stand or fall by themselves, when fairly expounded by the usual laws of exegesis, and we are not at liberty to warp them into an accommodation with discoveries in other fields.—ED.

‡ From this conclusion we beg leave to dissent *toto cœlo*, and we especially disagree with the view that the Black races are in any essential point inferior to the others. We judge it far more philosophical to argue that their unfavorable surroundings have produced their present degradation, rather than to make it an evidence of inherent lack of capacity. Had the latter been the real cause, it must forever operate; whereas we know that under better auspices they have been able to surmount it.—ED.

terranean coast (Mentone). The most celebrated caverns of Germany are those of Gailenreuth in Bavaria, Rabenstein in Franconia (Bav.), Eggisheim (near Colmar), and Neanderthal (near Düsseldorf [respecting the Engis, Neanderthal, and Borreby skulls, see Lyell, *l. c.* pt. i, ch. v]). Other ossiferous caverns occur in Denmark, Switzerland (near Geneva), Italy (in the north, and along the north coast of Sicily), Spain (southern flanks of the Pyrenees), Portugal, Austria, Algeria, Egypt, Syria, Australia, and other countries. Dr. Lund explored eight hundred caverns in Brazil.

Human remains occur in caverns promiscuously intermingled with the bones of wild animals. Very rarely is a human skeleton found complete. Bones are often associated with implements of stone, bone, or reindeer's horn, and with traces of ancient fires. The bones of animals useful for food are frequently marked by the teeth of carnivorous quadrupeds, and the long ones are generally split and broken, as if for the extraction of the marrow. In some cases human bones have been similarly treated. All these relics are found imbedded, sometimes in beds of stalagmitic material, and sometimes in deposits of loam and of pulverulent material known as bone-earth. The aggregate depth of the various accumulations reaches, in some cases, ten to twenty feet, or even more. The deposits in Kent's Cavern may serve as an illustration. We find here, beneath the fragments fallen from the roof—1. "Black mould," consisting mainly of vegetable matter, and containing various articles of mediæval, Roman, and pre-Roman date, three to twelve inches deep; 2. Stalagmite, varying from a mere film to upwards of five feet in thickness, containing fragments of limestone, a human jaw, and the remains of extinct animals; 3. A "black band," in a certain place about thirty-two feet from the entrance, consisting mainly of charcoal, and containing bone and flint implements; 4. Red "cave-earth," with stone implements and bones and teeth of extinct animals, including the cave-lion. 5. Stalagmite, three to twelve feet, and enclosing only bones of the cave-bear; 6. Cave-earth, known as "breccia"—being a dark-red sandy loam, and containing bears' bones. Three flint implements and one flint chip have been found also in the lowest layer. Another example may be taken from the rock-shelter of Aurignac, a shallow grotto opening on a hill-side, which seems to have been employed for burial. Until 1852 the opening was concealed by materials washed down the hill-slope. When uncovered, the cavity within afforded the remains of seventeen human beings. In 1860 M. Lartet discovered outside of the grotto, underneath the sloping talus, a layer containing the remains of extinct animals and some works of art; and beneath this, resting on a sloping terrace, a layer of ashes and charcoal, about six inches thick, covering an area of six or seven square yards, and terminating at the entrance of the grotto. In the midst of this were fragments of a sandstone reddened by heat, and resting on a levelled surface of limestone, which appears to have been used as a hearth. From the ashes and the overlying layer was obtained a great variety of bones and implements, including two hundred flint articles—knives, projectiles, sling-stones, and chips, as well as a curious tool for working flints. The bone instruments embraced arrows without barbs, other tools of reindeer's horn, and a bodkin of the same. In the stratum overlying the ashes were found numerous bones of carnivora, also of reindeer, ox, rhinoceros, one hundred and sixty-eight human bones, and many fragments of sun-dried or half-baked and hand-made pottery. The extinct species found here were the cave-bear, cave-lion, cave-hyena, mammoth, two-horned rhinoceros, and stag; but the remains of living species, especially of the fox, horse, reindeer, and aurochs, were much more abundant. Within the grotto, after the removal of the skeletons, there remained only about two feet of earth, with a subjacent band of lighter tint, and a bottom layer of yellowish color.

(2.) *River-drifts.*—These are thick beds of sand and gravel lining the valleys of certain rivers, and containing a great variety of stone implements, chiefly of flint, with occasional occurrences of human bones, and more abundant remains of extinct quadrupeds of the species just cited, together with a smaller proportion of remains of living mammals; and, along the valley of the Somme, of fresh-water and marine shells, of species still living in France and along the contiguous coast. The river-valleys most celebrated for such discoveries are those of the Somme, Seine, and Oise in France, and the Thames, Ouse, and Avon in England. The facts respecting the valley of the Somme have been chiefly developed by M. Boucher de Perthes (*Antiquités Celtiques et Antédiluviennes* [1847]), MM. Rigollot, Pouchet, Gaudry, Hébert, and the English savans Falconer, Prestwich, Evans, and Lyell. We should mention here the delta of the Tinière on the Lake of Geneva, investigated and described by Morlot, and more lately by Dr. Andrews of Chicago (*Amer. Jour. Sci.* [2] xlv, 180). In the deeper parts of these deposits remains of extinct quadrupeds predominate; at higher levels, those of living quadrupeds. Rude flint implements abound below, improved forms above, and still higher occur sometimes relics of Gallo-Roman times.

(3.) *Loess and Moraines.*—In the loess or loam, as well as in other deposits overlying the glacial drift, have been found occasional remains of man—as at Lahr, near Strasburg; at Maestricht, where human bones were associated with those of the mammoth and other extinct animals; at Kreuzberg, in the suburbs of Berlin; at Bournemouth, England, on the top of a sea-cliff one hundred feet high, where flints occur in gravel; in the drift-covered cliffs of Hampshire, and many other localities. At the bottom of an ancient glacier-moraine at Ravensburg, near Lake Constance, was found, in 1866, a great quantity of bones and broken instruments. Of the bones ninety-eight hundredths were those of reindeer. The moraine, therefore, dates apparently from the "second glacial epoch."

(4.) *Volcanic Tuff.*—In 1844 an account was published by M. Aymard of the discovery of the remains of two human beings imbedded in a volcanic tuff ejected, during its last eruption, by the mountain of Denise, in Le Puy, Central France. In ejections of the same age have been found remains of the cave-hyena and a hippopotamus.

(5.) *Peat Bogs.*—The peat bogs of Denmark, ranging from ten to thirty feet in depth, have afforded a large quantity of human remains, mingled with those of animals contemporary with man (Morlot, *Études Géologico-archéologiques en Danemark et en Suisse*). In the lowest portion of the bogs are found remains of the Scotch fir, a tree no longer growing in Denmark; and with these are associated implements of flint. Above are found remains of the common oak, now very rare in Denmark, and associated therewith implements and ornaments of bronze, as well as stone; while in the still newer peat occur remains of the existing beechen forest, mingled with relics of an age of iron. The bogs of Ireland have been similarly productive, affording, among other things, many skeletons of the great Irish elk. From the bogs of the Somme, newer than the river-drifts, many human relics have been exhumed, as well as from those in the neighborhoods of Brussels and Antwerp.

(6.) *Kitchen-middens* (Danish *kjökkenmödding*).—These are heaps of earth and human relics occurring along the Baltic shore of Denmark. They vary in height from three to ten feet, and some are 150 to 200 feet wide, and 1000 feet long. They are largely made up of the shells of the oyster, cockle, and other edible mollusks, but plentifully mixed with the bones of various quadrupeds, birds, and fish, which seem to have served as food for rude sea-side inhabitants. Interspersed with the animal remains are flint knives, hatchets, and other instruments of stone, horn, wood, and bone, with fragments of coarse pottery, mixed with

charcoal and cinders, but never with implements of bronze or iron. The stone hatchets and knives, nevertheless, have been polished and sharpened by grinding, and are thus less rude than those of the river-drifts and many of the caverns. Kitchen-middens also occur in England, Scotland, France, the United States, and other countries.

Very similar are the refuse-heaps ("terramares") farther inland, accumulated (according to a custom still prevailing in Ecuador, Mexico, and other Spanish countries) upon the outskirts of ancient palustrine villages in the north of Italy. They embrace, naturally, relics of everything pertaining to the life of the ancient villagers, including implements for weaving, mill-stones, and spear-heads, hatchets, and ornaments of bronze. They occur especially over the plain bounded by the Po, the Apennines, the Adda, and the Reno (Strobel and Pigorini, *Les Terramares et les Pilotages du Parmésan*, Milan, 1864). Similar palustrine settlements have recently been discovered in Moravia and Mecklenburg. They are said to exist also on the coasts of Africa and Brazil. Certain mounds along the coasts of Holland, containing Roman and Carthaginian antiquities, seem to have served as earthworks, or places of refuge.

(7.) *Megaliths and Tumuli.*—Rude structures of huge rough stones, whose origin is fixed in the night of prehistoric times, are known to exist in nearly all the countries of Europe, and even of Asia, and were long regarded as druidical remains. Those called "dolmens" consist of a huge more or less flattened rock, resting on stones planted upright in the ground—the supposed stone-altars of the Gauls. Sometimes a series of massive slabs rests on two lines of upright stones, so arranged as to form a covered passage. In other cases the entire dolmen is covered to the depth of several feet by earth, and thus becomes a tumulus-dolmen. Some tumuli enclose two or more stone-covered passages. The passages seem to have been burial-crypts, for we often find within them human skeletons placed originally in a sitting posture. In one tomb hundreds of skeletons were discovered. Sometimes the crypts are divided into numerous compartments, each containing a skeleton. With the skeletons were deposited weapons and implements (generally of stone) and earthen vessels. The pottery was of a finer character than that of the kitchen-middens (Leguay, *Sépultures de l'Age de la Pierre*, 1865). Some of the tumulus-dolmens attain colossal proportions. That of Silbury Hill, England, is nearly 200 feet high. The Egyptian pyramids belong properly in this connection. See STONE.

The structure known as a "cromlech" is a dolmen surrounded by one or more circles of stones planted like posts in the ground. Cromlechs occur singly or in groups. These erect, roughly hewn stones are known as "menhirs," and also occur either singly or in long parallel ranges, as at Carnac, in Brittany. Thousands of the various sorts of megalithic structures are known in Brittany and the south and south-west of France, in England, in Denmark, and, in less abundance, in all the other countries of Europe, except Southern Germany, Spain, Italy, Greece, the Danubian principalities, and Russia.

(8.) *Lake-dwellings.* — The pile-habitations (*Palafittes, Pfahlbauten*) were cabins erected on piles in the bottoms of lakes. First discovered and most abundant in the lakes of Switzerland (Desor, *Palafittes, ou Constructions Lacustres du Lac de Neuchâtel;* Troyon, *Habitations Lacustres des Temps anciens et modernes*), they are now known in the existing and the peat-filled lakes of several other countries (the Italian lakes Varese and Mercurago are especially rich); and Herodotus (lib. iv, cap. 16) states that such habitations were anciently employed by a tribe dwelling in Pæonia, now a part of Roumelia. By dredging the lakes which contained the Swiss lake-dwellings an enormous quantity of relics has been brought to light, embracing the different varieties of stone weapons and implements, industrial and ornamental articles in bronze, remains of plaited cloth, stores of wheat and barley—in one instance baked into flat, round cakes — carbonized apples and pears, and the stones of the wild plum, and seeds of the raspberry and blackberry, together with the nuts of the beech and hazel. In a few instances implements of iron have been discovered; and in one instance bronze and silver coins and medals of Greek production, and some iron swords, but all of pre-Roman origin. The bones of twenty-four species of wild mammals have been dredged up, besides eighteen species of birds, three of reptiles, and nine of fish, all of which have lived in historic times (Rütimeyer, *Die Fauna der Pfahlbauten in der Schweiz*, Basel, 1861).

In some instances, as on the north bank of Lake Neuchâtel, where the bottom was rocky, heaps of stones were thrown down, among which piles were fixed. The piles thus served to retain further supplies of stones, and by this means artificial islands were formed, on which cabins were built. These are designated as *tenevières*. The transition from these to the "crannoges" of Ireland is easy, for the latter are simply artificial islands formed of piles, stones, and earth, or sometimes of a framework of oaken beams mortised together, and made to serve as a crib for the retention of masses of stones (Wylie, *Archæologia*, vol. xxxviii, 1859). The buildings erected on these islands are now sometimes covered with peat, as in the Drumkellin bog, to the depth of fourteen feet. The Irish crannoges have afforded vast quantities of bones of domestic animals, and works of human industry in stone, bronze, and iron.

(9.) *Modern Savages.* — Since, beyond controversy, prehistoric man existed in a condition similar to that of rude and primitive peoples of historic times, it appears that the study of modern savages should afford important aids in the interpretation of prehistoric monuments, and the determination of the condition and capacities of prehistoric peoples. For instance, the flint arrow-heads of the American Indian are fashioned precisely like some of those found in European caverns and lake-habitations. To understand the ancient lake-dwellings and their occupants, we have not only the historical account of Herodotus, but D'Urville's narrative of the lake-dwellers of New Guinea. As illustrative of the kitchen-middens, we may turn to the modern shell-heaps on the north-west coast of Australia, and the city-border offal-heaps of Guayaquil and Mexico. In India some of the hill-tribes still erect cromlechs. Prehistoric monuments even receive a light shed from the accounts of early historic times. Thus "Jacob took a stone and set it up for a pillar" (Gen. xxxi, 45; see further, ver. 46–52); and at Mount Sinai, Moses erected twelve pillars—menhirs (Exod. xxiv, 4; see also Josh. iv, 21, 22). In connection with tumuli, it may be remembered that Semiramis raised a mound over her husband; stones were piled up over the remains of Laïcus; Achilles raised to Patroclus a mound more than 100 feet in diameter; Alexander erected one over the ashes of Hephæstio which cost $1,200,000; and in Roman history we meet with several similar instances. So, finally, the small bronze chariot exhumed from a tumulus of Mecklenburg recalls the wheeled structures fabricated for Solomon by Hiram of Tyre (1 Kings vii, 27–37).

2. *Interpretation of the Facts.*—(1.) *Divisions of Prehistoric Time.*—The voice of all civilized nations has given expression to the belief in the existence of three great ages in the unwritten history of mankind: the ages of Stone, of Bronze, and of Iron. The concurrent indications from the relics of prehistoric times sustain this belief. In the Age of Stone the metals were unknown, and all implements, weapons, utensils, and ornaments were of stone, bone, horn, shells, or moulded and unbaked clay. In the Age of Bronze, arms and cutting instruments were made largely of that alloy, though stone continued long in use. In the Age of

Iron that metal had superseded bronze for arms, axes, and knives, though bronze continued in use for ornaments, and often for the handles of weapons. This succession, which is confidently traced for European populations, probably holds good, modified by various circumstances, for mankind at large. It must not by any means be supposed, however, that the social condition implied by the Stone Age, or either of the others, answers to any particular period of absolute time in the history of the world. One race or nation has emerged from the condition of its Stone Age at a much earlier period than another, and some races and tribes still remain in their Stone Age. These three conditions of society are generally regarded as prehistoric, and it is certain that bronze and iron were already known to the northern nations of Europe when the Roman armies invaded them; but it appears also that the weapons used in the Trojan War, at the dawn of history, were mostly of bronze, though iron was beginning to appear, and that in the time of Joshua knives of stone were in use.

A closer examination of the relics of the Stone Age indicates a division into three epochs. In the Palæolithic, or Rude Stone Epoch, all implements were of stone, and shaped by chipping, without grinding. In the Reindeer Epoch, bone and reindeer's horn displaced flint to a large extent; while in the Neolithic, or Polished Stone Epoch, multitudes of stone implements were ground to an edge ("celts"). Mortillet makes the following classification, based on implements from the cairns of France: *A*. Flint implements predominant (Palæolithic). (*a*.) Epoch of Moustier—the flints chipped only on one side, and having somewhat an almond shape. (*b*.) Epoch of Solutré—the flints chipped on both sides, and the extremities brought to a good point. The almond shapes wanting. *B*. Bone implements predominant. (*c*.) Epoch of Aurignac (Early Reindeer)—the lance- and arrow-heads slit at the base, so that the tapering shaft enters the bone. (*d*.) Epoch of the Madeleine (Late Reindeer)—the lower extremity of the lance- or arrow-head enters the shaft. Many implements of flint still remain. Some recognise three divisions of Palæolithic flints: (*a*) the type of St. Acheul—large, thick, oval, roughly chipped on both sides; (*b*) the type of Moustier—thinner, and wrought on one side; (*c*) the type of Solutré—smaller, finely wrought, with thin borders and symmetrical form.

The Palæolithic Epoch is further characterized by a nearly complete absence of pottery and of attempts at ornamentation or artistic delineation, as also by the contemporaneous existence of several quadrupeds now extinct—especially the cave-bear, the cave-hyena, cave-lion, tichorhine rhinoceros, and hairy elephant, or mammoth. The Reindeer Epoch, with a colder climate, witnessed the disappearance of these animals, and the advent of several species now native in the north of Europe or at Alpine elevations—such especially as the reindeer, musk-ox, elk, chamois, ibex, hamster-rat, lemming, grouse, and snowy owl. With them existed the horse, the urus, the deer, and various rodents. The Neolithic Epoch was marked by the presence of many species of domesticated animals—especially the dog, sheep, goat, ox, horse, and hog. The domestic cat and fowl, and the crooked-horned sheep, did not appear till the epoch of the very latest lake-dwellings (Noville and Chavannes), generally referred to the 6th century.

The Palæolithic Epoch is illustrated chiefly by the finds of the river-gravels, the caverns of Belgium and England, the volcanic tuff of Denise, and a few of the caverns and rock-shelters of France; the Reindeer Epoch by a majority of the French caverns and rock-shelters; and the Neolithic Epoch by a few caverns in the south of France, the kitchen-middens, crannoges, dolmens, the lowest portion of the Danish bogs, and the lake-dwellings of Eastern Switzerland. The Bronze Age is represented by the finds of the lake-dwellings of Western Switzerland, many of the tumuli and the middle portion of the Danish bogs; and the Iron Age by the upper portion of the Danish bogs, and some of the latest Swiss lakes (as Bienne and Neuchâtel).

(2.) *Geological Conditions.*—The physical conditions of Europe have changed to a remarkable extent since the first advent of man. At the epoch of the oldest finds Europe was just emerging from a secular winter which had buried all the mountains and plains beneath a mantle of glacier material, as far south, probably, as the Pyrenees. England and Scandinavia had been connected with the Continent; the English Channel and the German Ocean had been dry land, and the Thames had been a tributary of the Rhine. A subsidence now took place, which made Great Britain an island. An amelioration of the climate caused a rapid melting of the glaciers; the land was extensively flooded, and the drainage of the Continent now began to mark out and excavate the river-valleys of the modern epoch. The cave-bear, mammoth, and other quadrupeds of Pliocene time still survived; and now man appeared in Europe to dispute with them the possession of the forests and the caverns. The swollen rivers flowed at elevations of twenty to fifty feet above their present levels, and the relics of the stone-folk were mingled with the deposits along their borders. The Reindeer Epoch witnessed another elevation, and a new invasion of cold. England was again joined to the Continent. The cave-bear and mammoth dwindled away. The reindeer and other northern quadrupeds were driven south over the plains of Languedoc and through the valleys of Perigord. The hyena went over to England and took possession of the caverns. But the men of Europe had made a slight advance in their industries. Next, another subsidence resulted in the isolation of England and the Scandinavian peninsula; the climate was again ameliorated, and the reindeer and other arctic species retreated to Alpine elevations and northern latitudes. Now the modern aspects of the surface of the land began to appear, and now appeared various species of mammals destined to domestication—or, more probably, already domesticated in their Oriental home. The ages of Bronze, Iron, and authentic history succeeded.*

(3.) *Character of Prehistoric Europeans.*—Physically, the men of the Palæolithic Epoch, judging from the few skeletons and skulls discovered in Belgium and England, were of rather short stature, and of a Mongoloid type, like modern Finns and Lapps. In the Reindeer Epoch, the remains of Southern Europe indicate men nearly six feet in stature; but the men of Belgium were still small and round-headed, and such they continued to be to the end of the Stone Age. The Neolithic men of the Swiss lakes were much like the modern Swiss. The Palæolithic men were not decidedly divergent from the Caucasian type, but a jaw-bone found at Naulette has several marks of inferiority, being somewhat thick and small in height, and having molar teeth increasing in size backwards, the wisdom teeth being largest instead of smallest, and having, moreover, five fangs instead of two, while the chin also is deficient in prominence. The famous Neanderthal skull has a low forehead and prominent brow-ridges; but the cranial capacity was seventy-five cubic inches—about the average of modern races, and "in no sense," as Huxley says, "to be regarded as the remains of a human being intermediate between man and the apes." The Engis skull exhibits no special marks of inferiority. The Cro-Magnon skull of the Reindeer Epoch had a capacity of ninety-seven cubic inches—far above the human average. There was no prominence of the jaws or the cheek-bones, but the tibia was much flattened (platycnemic), as in most primitive men. The Neolithic Borreby skull belonged to the type of Neanderthal.

Socially and intellectually, Palæolithic man, in the

* The reader should note the conjectural character of these changes, especially of the cause of the climatic reverses; these may have been due to far more ordinary and recent vicissitudes than geological subsidence and elevation.—Ed.

regions in question, seems to have existed in a most primitive condition. Dwelling in wild caverns, he hunted the beasts with the rudest stone implements, and clothed himself in their skins. We find no evidence of the use of fire, though probably known, and there are some indications that he made food of his own species (on anthropophagy, see *Congrès International, d'Anthropologie et d'Archéologie Préhistoriques*, 1867, p. 158; Fliegier, *Zur Prähistorischen Ethnologie Italiens*, Wien, 1877, p. 7, 8). Few attempts at pottery have been discovered, and in these the product was rude, hand-made, and simply sun-dried. In the Reindeer Epoch fire was in general use, and it was employed in baking (imperfectly) a better style of hand-made pottery, and in cooking food employed in funeral, and quite possibly cannibalistic, feasts. Many pieces of highly ornamented reindeer's horn, pierced with one, two, or three holes, discovered in Périgord, are regarded as staves of authority, either civil or priestly. Here also occur numerous phalangeal bones of the deer so pierced with a hole as to serve for whistles. Bone and reindeer's horn were now wrought into barbed harpoons and arrow-heads. On one of the bones from the cavern of La Vache (Ariége) were graven some peculiar characters, which, as suggested, may have been a first attempt at writing, though this is very questionable. In the Neolithic Epoch cereals were cultivated, and ground into flour for cakes; cloth was formed for clothing, and bone combs for the hair; stores of fruits were preserved for winter's use; garden-tools were fashioned from stag's horn; log-canoes were employed in navigation; planks and timbers of oak were made by splitting tree-trunks with stone wedges; log cabins were constructed on piles or artificial islands; fortifications were employed in war; fish-nets, well made from flaxen cords, have been dredged at Robenhausen, and the abundant débris of numerous flint-workshops, implying a degree of division of labor, have been discovered at Grand-Pressigny and other places in Belgium and France. As to intelligence and manual dexterity, a surprising amount is developed in the working of flint implements, especially in the north of Europe.

Æsthetically, Palæolithic man had advanced no further than the use of necklaces formed of natural beads, consisting of fossil foraminifera from the chalk. Some flints from the river-drift of St. Acheul present rough sketches which, it has been conjectured, may have been prompted by the artistic feeling. Some of them bear remote resemblances to the human head, in profile, three-quarter view, and full face; also to animals, such as the rhinoceros and mammoth. If the cavern of Massat (Ariége) is Palæolithic, it affords us the most ancient known successful attempt at portraiture, for M. Fontan found there a stone on which was graven a wonderfully expressive outline of the cave-bear. In the Reindeer Epoch the taste for personal adornment had become considerably developed. They manufactured necklaces, bracelets, and pendants, piercing for these purposes both shells and teeth, and the bony part of the ear of the horse. Amber also came into use. The æsthetic feeling was specially developed in the south. Some of the curious pieces of reindeer's horn supposed to be staves of authority are handsomely enchased. Some remarkable illustrations of primeval art belonging to this epoch are the following: (*a.*) *Sculptures.*—Handsomely wrought spoons of reindeer's horn; hilt of a dagger carved in the form of a reindeer; two ivory daggers, artistically executed, representing reindeer; a harpoon in the shape of an animal's head; the head of a staff of authority, consisting of reindeer's horn carved into a faithful representation of a pair of steers; another representing the head of a mammoth; a pair of pieces representing the chase of the aurochs—on one a rude aurochs fleeing from a man casting a lance (remarkably well done), on the other piece a figure of a bovine animal different from the first; a serpent in relief on reindeer's horn. Many of these from Laugerie-Basse. (*b.*) *Carvings on slate, ivory, horn, and bone.*—A staff of authority, with representations of a man, two horses, and a fish; a stag graven on reindeer's horn; part of a large herbivorous animal; head of lion on a staff of authority; reindeer-fight on slate; some horned animal on reindeer's horn; slates bearing other unknown animals; a young reindeer at full gallop; a hare; a curious animal with feline characteristics; a spirited profile of a horse on bone; human head in profile on a bone spatula, in the style of a child's work; finally, the entire outline of a mammoth on ivory (Madeleine), and another on reindeer's horn, forming the hilt of a poniard (Bruniquel). Most of these from Laugerie-Basse. The Neolithic Epoch seems to have been marked by a decline of the artistic feeling. The ornamentation of the pottery is more elaborate, and the finish of the stone and bone implements more symmetrical and neat, but we discover few relics of carving and engraving.

Religiously, there is little to be affirmed or inferred of the Palæolithic tribes. Some of the curiously wrought flints may have served as religious emblems; and occasional discovery of deposits of food near the body of the dead may very naturally be regarded as evidence of a belief in the future life. In the Reindeer Epoch this class of evidences becomes very greatly augmented, as shown in the systematic and carefully provided burials in some of the tumulus-dolmens, and in the traces of funeral repasts in these and the rock-shelters of Aurignac, Bruniquel, and Furfooz. The numerous specimens of bright and shining minerals found about many settlements—as of hydrated oxide of iron, carbonate of copper, fluor-spar—may have been used as amulets, and thus testify to the vague sense of the supernatural which characterizes the infancy of human society. The Neolithic people add to such indications the erection of megalithic structures, some of which, surrounded by their cemeteries, as at Abury, England, must naturally be considered as their sacred temples.

Prehistoric man, in brief, represented, in Europe, the infancy of his race. All his powers were undeveloped and uneducated. Every evidence sustains us in the conclusion that he was not inferior in psychic endowments to the average man of the highest races; but he was lacking in acquired skill, and in the results of experience accumulated through a long series of generations, and preserved from forgetfulness by the blessings of a written language.

(4.) *Antiquity of Prehistoric Europeans.*—In debating this question, social and intellectual considerations signify nothing, since all conditions have existed in all ages. As to the geological antiquity of European man, we have stated that he dates from some part—probably an early part—of the Champlain period. It has been earnestly maintained, however, and is still believed by some, that man appeared in Europe before the epoch of the last general glaciation. The following are the grounds on which the opinion has been based: (*a.*) *Preglacial remains erroneously supposed human.*—Some bones found at Saint-Prest (Loir-et-Cher) in stratified sand and gravel bore cuts, notches, and scratches supposed to indicate the use of flint implements. The bones, however, were associated with those of *Elephas meridionalis*, which ranged from the Later Pliocene to the beginning of the Quaternary age. But it was proven by experiment that very similar markings are made upon bones by porcupines; while in the beds containing the bones in question were abundant remains of a large rodent, quite capable of causing the supposed human markings. Again, the shell-marls (*faluns*) of Léognan, near Bordeaux, enclose bones of an extinct manatee and of certain cetaceans and cheloneans, which bear marks appearing to have been made by human implements. The manatee in question is of Miocene age. But in the same deposits occur the remains of a carnivorous fish (*Sargus serratus*) whose serrated teeth fit exactly the markings on the fossil bones. A similar explanation probably awaits the furrowed *Halitherium*

PREADAMITE 491 PREADAMITE

COMPARATIVE TABLE OF PREHISTORIC TIMES IN EUROPE.

GEOLOGICAL.

Time Divisions. AGES.	PERIODS.	EPOCHS.	Characteristic Animals and Plants.
QUATERNARY.	RECENT OR TERRACE.	MODERN.	Beech of Danish bogs.
			Oaks (mostly) of Danish bogs.
		REINDEER OR 2D GLACIAL.	Existing Quadrupeds. Domestic Animals: Goat, sheep, ox, horse, dog. Scotch firs of Danish bogs. Domestic Plants: Wheat, barley.
			Short Mongoloid Men in Northern Europe.
			Existing Quadrupeds. Northern or Migrated Animals: Reindeer, marmot, ibex, chamois, grouse, snowy owl. Domestic Animals: Horse, dog.
			Tall Men in Southern Europe.
	CHAMPLAIN.	ALLUVIAN.	Latest Extinct Quadrupeds: Hairy Elephant, cave-bear, cave-hyena, cave-lion, two-horned rhinoceros, hippopotamus, Irish elk.
		DILUVIAN.	Wild boar, horse, goat, stag, marmot, squirrel, hare, water-rat, wolf, brown bear, fox, weasel, beaver, rabbit, hedgehog, etc., etc.
			Short Mongoloid Men in Northern Europe.
	GLACIAL OR DRIFT.	*Pleistocene* (Lyell).	All animals and men (if any) living in this period had migrated southward.
TERTIARY.	PLIOCENE, MIOCENE, EOCENE.		

ARCHÆOLOGICAL.

Time Divisions. AGES.		EPOCHS.	Sources of Evidence.	Human Works.
HISTORIC.	IRON.	IRON.	Lakes: Bienne, Neuchâtel. Terramares: Parma, Modena. Bogs: Upper part of Danish and Irish.	Implements of Iron. Ornaments of Bronze, Silver, Gold.
	BRONZE. (LARTET.)	BRONZE.	Lake-dwellings: Newer (of Western Switzerland). Bogs: Middle portion of Danish. Tumuli.	Implements and Ornaments of Bronze.
PREHISTORIC.	STONE. AUROCHS.	NEOLITHIC OR POLISHED STONE.	Lake-dwellings: Oldest (of Eastern Switzerland). Bogs: Lowest portion of Danish. Tumuli: Borreby; Dolmens. Crannoges: Kitchen-middens. Few Caverns: Massat, Lourdes, St. Jean d'Alcas.	Implements: Polished stone (celts), bone, reindeer's horn. Fishing-gear; Canoes. Pottery—rude, badly baked, varied, feebly ornamented. Fruits and Cereals in earthen jars. Art: Rudimentary ornaments. Religion: Burials, temples (Abury, Stonehenge), cinerary urns.
	REINDEER.	REINDEER.	Caverns: Most in south of France—Les Eyzies, Madeleine, Laugerie-Haute, Laugerie-Basse, Bruniquel, Bize, La Vache, Massat, Chaffant, Aurignac; some in Belgium: Naulette (part), Furfooz, Frontal, Chaleux. Moraines: Schüssenried (?).	Implements: Rude Stone (hatchets, spear-heads, knives), bone (needles, fish-hooks). Ornaments: Rudimentary. Art: Carvings of mammoth, reindeer, cave-lion, bison, ox, horse, human figure, ibex, fishes, reptiles, tadpole, flowers. Religion: Symbolic wands (?); funeral feasts.
	MAMMOTH. CAVE-BEAR.	PALÆOLITHIC OR RUDE STONE. *Palæolithic* (Lubbock).	Caverns: Most in England—Kent's Hole, Brixham; Wokey Hole, Kirkdale. Wales—Gower Caves. Most in Belgium—Naulette (part), Engis, Engihoul, Chokier. Oldest of France—Solutré, Moustier, Mentone. River-drifts: Abbeville (Menchecourt, Mautort). Amiens (St. Acheul, Moutiers, St. Roch). Rivers Seine, Oise. Rivers Thames, Ouse, Avon. Volcanic Breccia: Puy-en-Velay. Löss: Mästricht, Strasburg.	Implements: Flints—the oldest rudely made, almond-shaped—hatchets, knives, spear-heads, scrapers. Pottery: Traces of unbaked; urn of rough clay at Furfooz. Ornaments: Beads of shells and of fossil foraminifera. Art: Doubtful etchings (Magrite); rude carvings on reindeer's bone (Naulette); outline of bear (Massat). Religion: Symbolic articles (?).
No human relics recognised as of Glacial age—unless those of Schüssenried near Lake Constance are such.				
Certain flints and markings on fossil bones of Tertiary age, once regarded as human relics, are not so regarded at present. Certain human relics once supposed Tertiary are now proven to be Post-glacial.				

bones of Pouancé (Maine-et-Loire), as well as the notched and scratched bones of a cetacean (*Balænotus*) described from Pliocene deposits in Tuscany by Prof. Capellini (*L'Uomo pliocenico in Toscana* [1876]). Finally, at Thenay (Loir-et-Cher) occur flints in certain Lower Miocene limestones which were at first declared to be the works of human hands (*Congrès International* [1867], p. 67); but that opinion is scarcely entertained at present. (*b.*) *Human remains erroneously supposed preglacial.*—A human skeleton found in volcanic breccia near the town of Le Puy-en-Velay, in Central France, was for a time supposed to have been enclosed by the same eruption that buried, in the same neighborhood, the remains of the Pliocene *Elephas meridionalis*. The elephant-bearing lava, nevertheless, was of a different character; and exactly the same lava as that containing human remains was subsequently observed at another point. This enclosed the bones of the mammoth and other animals of the Champlain period, and thus demonstrated that the "man of Denise" was post-glacial. Again, the river-drifts of the Somme have been set down as glacial or preglacial; but that opinion is now almost wholly abandoned, for abundant localities are known in which it appears to a demonstration that the river-valley was excavated after the glacial drift was laid down; while the flint-bearing drifts have been subsequently deposited along the chalk-slopes of the valley. Examples are seen in the sections at Menchecourt and other places; and the same is shown in England at Biddenham and Summerbonn Hill, in the valley of the Ouse, and at Icklingham, in the valley of the Lark. In 1856 a human skull and numerous bones of the same skeleton were exhumed (but now mostly lost) from the Colle del Vento, in Liguria (Issel, *Congrès International* [1867], p. 75, 156), said to be associated with extinct species of oyster of the Pliocene age. The age of the bones is questioned by Pruner Bey; and as no naturalist saw the remains *in situ*, we must candidly await further investigation. Similarly, the celebrated pelvic bone of Natches, in Mississippi, once thought to have been derived from a preglacial deposit, is now generally believed to have fallen down the bluff from an Indian grave at the surface; and the human remains of California reported to have come from beneath a bed of Tertiary lava are perhaps not sufficiently well authenticated to form the subject of speculation (Blake, *Congrès International* [1867], p. 101; Whitney, *Geological Survey of California*, i, 243–252). As, however, prehistoric men in America were non-Caucasian, and therefore probably of preadamic origin, we must expect to find their remains attaining a much higher antiquity than those of Europe.

As to the absolute measure of the time which separates Palæolithic man from the present, it is likely that a medium judgment will be reached at last. (Consult on this question Southall, *The Recent Origin of Man* [1875]; and Andrews, *Amer. Journ. of Science* [2], xlv, 180; *Trans. of the Chicago Acad. of Science*, ii, 1; *Meth. Quar. Rev.* Dec. 1876, and Jan. 1877.) The impression of his high antiquity has been derived from the magnitude of the geological changes which have transpired since his advent. But the time required for these, in the judgment of the writer, has by some been greatly exaggerated. The contemporaneous existence of man with animals now extinct has little bearing on the question, since it has been ascertained that extinctions have been occurring throughout historic periods, even down to the present century. The disappearance of the glaciers does not seem enormously remote when we remember that their stumps are still visible in the valleys of the Alps, in the gulches of the Sierra Nevada, and even in the ice-wells of Vermont and Wisconsin. The elevation requisite to join England to the Continent cannot be thought to require a vast period after learning the rate of oscillations in actual progress upon various shores, and the enormous changes in the hydrographical features of China within 3000 years (Pumpelly, *Smithsonian Contributions to Knowledge*, vol. xv, art. iv). The calculations based on the rate of erosion of modern river-valleys, and the growth of sphagnous peat, are very misleading, since it is certain that these processes went forward with indefinitely greater rapidity in the pluvial and palustrine conditions of the Champlain period. (For the results of sundry calculations, see Le Hon, *L'Homme Fossile*, p. 247.) Furthermore, the extreme opinions entertained within a few years on all these points have more recently been greatly modified (see King, *Catastrophism and Evolution*, in the *Amer. Naturalist*, Aug. 1877). At the same time, the evidences seem to tend towards the conclusion that the advent of man in Europe occurred from 5000 to 7000 years ago; still more, that the Oriental stock from which he had descended came first into existence more than 6000 years ago.* Such a conclusion would not be alarming on Biblical grounds, since it does not appear that the absolute age of Adam is stated either directly or by clear inference; and there is room to suspect that, in those singular cases in which the ages of the patriarchs as given in the Hebrew text differ as they do from the Septuagint, the integrity of the Greek text has been better preserved than that of the Hebrew, since the Jews had a direct interest in the abbreviation of the time before Christ, to make it appear that the epoch always assigned by their rabbins for the advent of the Messiah had not yet arrived.† Moreover, there are some indications that Palæolithic man in Europe was not of the Adamic (Caucasian) type, though it is pretty certain that he was succeeded, probably as early as the Reindeer Epoch, by an Eastern tide of Caucasian immigration.

We must remind the reader, in conclusion, that our condensed discussion of prehistoric peoples relates only to the European continent, and that the primitive history of the men of other quarters of the world may have differed in some important respects; while it is certain, since European man seems to have immigrated from the east, that the first appearance of his Oriental ancestors must have been considerably more remote; and still further, in view of the probable common origin of the Adamic and the other races of man, the first advent of the human species upon the earth must have taken place at an epoch removed perhaps into the Tertiary age of the world's history. [See, however, GEOLOGY.]

In addition to the works already cited, see Figuier, *L'Homme Primitif;* translation, *Primitive Man* (N. Y. 1870); Quatrefages, *Rapport sur le Progrès de l'Anthropologie* (1868); Rau, *Early Man in Europe* (N. Y. 1876); Tylor, *Researches into the Early History of Mankind and the Development of Civilization* (Lond. 1865); Nilsson, *Les Habitans Primitifs de la Scandinavie;* Vogt, *Lectures on Man* (ibid. 1864), translation of *Vorlesungen über den Menschen;* Pozzy, *La Terre et le Récit Biblique de la Création*, bk. i, ch. vi–ix; bk. iii, ch. xi, xii; Lubbock, *The Origin of Civilization and the Primitive Condition of Man* (Amer. ed. 1871); Morgan, *Ancient Society* (N. Y. 1877, 8vo); Caspari, *Die Urgeschichte der Menschheit* (Leips. 1873); Tylor, *Primitive Culture* (Lond. 1871, 2 vols.); *Evang. Quar. Rev.* April, 1866. Figuier, Quatrefages, and Pozzy oppose the doctrine of the derivative origin of man. For information respecting America, see Foster, *Prehistoric Races of the United States* (3d ed. Chicago, 1874); B. C. Y., *The Remote Antiquity of Man not Proven* (Lond. 1882). (A. W.)

Preadamites is the name of a Christian sect which was originated in the 17th century by Isaac La Peyrère (q. v.) upon the publication of two small treatises of his in 1655, the chief object of which was to show that Moses had not recorded the origin of the hu-

* These figures are evidently little more than *guesses*, not to be placed in comparison with the definite data of Bible chronology.—ED.

† A careful examination leads to the opposite conclusion. See CHRONOLOGY; SEPTUAGINT.—ED.

man race, but only of the Jewish nation; and that other nations of men inhabited our world long before Adam. His views were espoused by many people, especially at Groningen and other places in Holland. At Brussels, however, he was seized as a heretic, and only escaped punishment by renouncing the Reformed opinions and embracing the Roman Catholic faith; and at the same time he, of course, also retracted his Preadamite views. See PREADAMITE.

Prebend (from the Lat. *præbenda, provender*, i. e. an allowance of food, from *præbere*, to furnish), in its common acceptation signifies an allowance or provision of any sort. As an ecclesiastical term it denoted originally any stipend or reward given out of the ecclesiastical revenues to a person who had by his labors procured benefit to the Church. See BENEFICE. When, in the course of the 10th century, the cathedral churches —having then become well endowed—left off receiving the income of their lands into one common bank, and the members of most cathedral and collegiate churches ceased living in common and separated from the episcopal mensal property, certain shares or portions fell to all those so entitled. Besides, the lands were parcelled out in shares, and the income thus obtained was used for the support of all the clergymen within the cathedral territory. After the definite constitution of chapters for the maintenance of the daily religious services in the bishop's church, or in other churches similarly established, endowments were assigned to them, which were to be distributed (*præbendæ*) in fixed proportions among the members. These portions were called *portiones canonicæ* or *prebendæ*. Hence arose the difference between a *prebend* and a *canonry* (q. v.). A canonry was a right which a person had in a church to be deemed a member thereof, to have the right of a stall therein, and of giving a vote in the chapter; but a prebend was a right to receive certain revenues appropriated to his place. The number of prebends in the several cathedral churches is increased by the benefit of the revenues of the rural clergy, and oftentimes by exonerating the lands of prebends from paying tithes to the ministers of the parishes where they lay. To the prebend was commonly attached a residence; and when an insufficient number of houses existed, the oldest prebendaries enjoyed their advantages in exchange for a fixed tax, until it became the practice to pay small indemnities to those who had no houses, and these payments were called *distributiones*. In England there is a trace, previous to the arrival of William I, of the tenure of distinct lands, afterwards made prebendal, at St. Paul's; but the definite name of prebends is not much earlier than the time of Edward I. In the time of Henry III the bursaries, prebends paid out of the bishop's purse, were reconstituted at Lichfield, and endowed with lands. It is a separate endowment impropriated, as distinguished from the *communa*, manors or revenues appropriated to maintain all the capitular members. At Lincoln, in the 11th century, forty-two prebends were founded; in the 12th century, at Wells, the prebends were formally distinguished and the dignities founded; in the 13th century fourteen prebends were founded at Llandaff. At York archbishop Thomas divided the lands of the common fund into separate prebends; these were augmented by archbishops Grey and Romaine, who added the last stall in the 13th century. In the 16th century bishop Sherborne founded four stalls at Chichester, the latest endowed in England. The prebends were divided into stalls of priests, deacons, and subdeacons, a certain number coming up to reside in stated courses; but in 1343 all the stalls of York were declared to be sacerdotal. Dignitaries almost invariably held a prebend attached to their stall.

Prebendary is the name applied to a clergyman who is attached to a cathedral or collegiate church and enjoys a prebend (q. v.), in consideration of his officiating at stated times in the church. See DEAN and CHAPTER.

Precarium (from the Lat. *precari*, to request, beseech), in the language of civil law, is a compact by which one leaves to another by request the use of a thing, or the exercise of a right, without compensation, but the grantor reserving to himself the power of a reclaimer. The receiver, as a rule, obtains thus the judicial use of the object in question; but the giver can regain possession at any time; and he can, if the surrender be refused, recur to the interdict *De precario*, or to the *Actio præscriptis verbis*. Hence the expression, *Precarie possidere*, to possess precariously. In canonic law, *precarium* has not exactly the same meaning. Here the word is feminine (*precaria, æ*), and is never applied to movable goods, but always to real estate, which is not necessarily bestowed gratuitously, but generally for the obligation of paying certain taxes, or rendering certain services, and as a consequence it cannot be taken away at pleasure. The origin of the ecclesiastical *precariæ* is found in the 6th century, when the custom began to prevail, especially in the country, of giving the priests the use of portions of land. Pope Gelasius, in 496, had disapproved of this custom, yet a few years afterwards we find it widely spread. This transfer of real estate to the priest at first depended on the bishop, and was entirely personal, not essentially connected with the office. The ecclesiastical usufructuary had sometimes to recognise its revocability by a special deed, this declaration being accompanied with the promise of paying interest. But little by little the Frankish legislation made these cessions permanent, and the possession of the land was so intimately connected with the performance of duties that it passed uninterruptedly from every occupant to his successor. Thus the *precariæ* took in the course of time the character of real benefices. See BENEFICE. It was not of rare occurrence that ecclesiastical property of that kind was given for services rendered, or to be rendered, or against payment of a tax, even to laymen. These possessions also were called *precariæ*, for not only did their collation depend on the bishop, but the deed had to be renewed every five years. But this also took in course of time the character of a real lease. Still another meaning given to the word *precaria* is that of *deed*—an instrument donating property to the Church, but stipulating for the grantor the use of it during the remainder of his life. The deed of consent given by the other side was called *præstaria*. Formularies of precaries and prestaries may be found in Marculfi *Formul.* lib. ii, no. 5, 40, and in the *Append. Formul.* no. 27, 28, and 41, 42. See Walter, *Corp. jur. Germ. antiq.* vol. iii.

Precedence, a recognition of superiority in certain acts due to one person over another. Thus in the ecclesiastical order recognised in the hierarchies of Rome, England, and Russia, or wherever such distinctions of clergy exist, priests precede deacons; and rectors, vicars; and vicars, perpetual curates; and incumbents, assistant-stipendiary curates. Rectors rank with each other according to the size and importance of their livings or the date of their induction; bishops according to the precedence of their sees, as in the Anglican establishment, e. g. in the case of London, Durham, and Winchester, and of Meath in Ireland, where the incumbent bears the title of Most Reverend; or, otherwise, of the date of consecration, by the councils of Milevi (416), Braga (573), Toledo (633), and London (1075), unless their sees were privileged by ancient custom. Priests and deacons rank according to the date of their ordination. For a cathedral of the old foundation in England the order runs—dean, præcentor, chancellor, treasurer, archdeacons, canons residentiary (subdean, subchanter of canons), and canons non-resident. In chapter the bishop sits with the dean, chancellor, archdeacon, and residentiaries on the right, and the præcentor, treasurer, archdeacon, and residentiaries on

the left; the rest of the canons in order of installation. At Salisbury two extra archdeacons sat on either side of the entrance. In all processions the members walked two and two, at regular distances—dignitaries in copes, canons priests in chasubles, canons, deacons, and subdeacons in dalmatics, with one pace between collaterals, and three paces between each rank; juniors first and seniors last in going, but in reverse order on their return; the right-hand side is the place of honor. At St. Paul's the dean walked last, between two dignitaries. The parish clergy go first, then follow vicars, canons, dignitaries, the dean, the bishop, and last the lay persons. Each parish had its cross or banner. Abbots took precedence according to the date of their benediction; Glastonbury, St. Alban's, and Westminster at various times challenged the first place among those who were mitred. Rural deans and honorary canons have only local precedence in a ruridecanal meeting or cathedral respectively.

Precentor (Gr. *πρωτοψάλτης, κανονάρχα*; Lat. *domesticus cantorum;* Fr. *grand chantre;* Sp. *chantre,* or *capis col*) was in the ancient and mediæval churches the person who led the singing. He generally commenced the verse of the psalm, and the people joined him in the close. The versicles were divided into two parts, and sung alternately, the singers answering to one another; but ordinarily the precentor commenced, and the people joined in the middle, and sometimes at the end of the verse. This was called singing acrostics. See Acrostics. The precentor was the dignitary collated by the diocesan and charged with the conduct of the musical portion of divine service, and required on great festivals and Sundays to commence the responses, hymns, etc., to regulate processions, to distribute the copes, to correct offences in choir, and to direct the singers. In France, England, Germany, and Spain he ranked next to the dean. He gave the note at mass to the bishop and dean as the succentor did to the canons and clerks. He superintended the admission of members of the choir and tabled their names for the weekly course on waxen tablets. He corrected and had charge of the choir books. In England when he ruled the choir he wore a rochet, cantel or cantor's cope, ring, and gloves, and carried a staff; and the rectors followed him in soutanes (often of red color), surplices, and copes. He installed canons at Exeter, at York the dean and dignitaries, and at Lichfield the bishop and dignitaries. He attended the bishop on the left hand, as the dean walked on the prelate's right hand. At Paris he exercised jurisdiction over all the schools and teachers in the city and respondents in the universities. In French cathedrals, upon high festivals he presides over the choir at the lectern, and carries a baton of silver as the ensign of his dignity. At Rodez, Puy-en-Velay, and Brionde he, like the other canons, wears a mitre at high mass, and at Cologne was known as *chorepiscopus.* At Chartres during Easter week all the capitular clergy go to the font, with the subchanter preceding the junior canons, carrying white wands, in allusion to the white robes of the baptized. At Rouen the chanter carries a white wand in certain processions, and no one without his leave could open a song-school in the city. In England his stall faces the dean, being on the north-west. In foreign cathedrals he occupied either the same position or sat next to the dean. The Greek precentor at Christmas wore white, and the singers violet. The exarch was the imperial protospaltes. The dignity of precentor was founded at Amiens in 1219; at Rouen in 1110; at Exeter, Salisbury, York, Lincoln, in the 11th century; at Chichester, Wells, Lichfield, Hereford, in the 12th; and at St. Paul's in the 13th century. The precentor was required to be always resident, and usually held a prebend with his dignity. The Clugniac precentor was called *armarius* because he was also librarian, the treasurer being *aprocrisiarius.* The singers of the primitive Church were regarded as a minor order by pope Innocent III, by the Council of Laodicea (360), and by that of Trullo. When the service of song was intrusted to lay persons in course of time, the title of chanter was preserved in cathedral chapters and collegiate churches as that of a capitular dignitary, having precedency, rights, and duties.

In modern times the name is applied to those who, in non-ritualistic churches, lead the congregation in singing. This office, lately revived, appears, from Bingham's *Antiquities,* to be of a very early date; the precentor, or *phonascus* (q. v.), as he was called in the early Church, either leading the congregation, or singing one part of the verse, the other part being sung by the congregation in response. See Music. In the mediæval churches the *precentor* was one of the officers belonging to the old religious houses, whose office was afterwards continued in collegiate and cathedral churches in the capacity above first referred to. In Scotland the duties of the precentor have been greatly curtailed. He seems to have succeeded to the *reader* (q. v.) of earlier times. It was the habit of the precentor to repair to church about half an hour before the minister came, and read to the people several passages of Scripture. When the minister entered the precentor gave out a psalm and led the singing. After the beginning of last century he ceased by degrees either to read the Scriptures or prescribe the psalm. But his desk is still, from its original use, called by the old people the lectern—that is, reading-desk.—Walcott, *Sacred Archæology,* s. v.; Hook, *Eccles. Dict.* s. v.; Eadie, *Eccles. Dict.* s. v. See Desk; Lectern; Singing; Staff; Worship.

Precept is a direction, command, or rule enjoined by a superior. Religious precepts are divided into moral and positive. The precepts of religion, says Saurin, are as essential as the doctrines; and religion will as certainly sink if the morality be subverted, as if the theology be undermined. The doctrines are only proposed to us as the ground of our duty. A moral precept derives its force from its intrinsic fitness; a positive precept from the authority which enjoins it. Moral precepts are commanded because they are right; positive are right because commanded. The duty of honoring our parents and of observing the Sabbath are instances, respectively, of each kind of precept. See Law.

Preceptories (or **Commanderies**) are estates or benefices anciently possessed by the Knight Templars. On these lands they erected churches for religious service and convenient houses for habitation, and placed some of their fraternity, under the government of one of those more eminent Templars who had been by the grand-master created *preceptores templi,* to take care of the lands and rents in that neighborhood. All the preceptories of a province were subject to a provincial superior, called Grand Preceptor; and there were three of these who held rank above all the rest—the grand preceptors of Jerusalem, Tripolis, and Antioch. Other houses of the order were usually called *commanderies.*

Precepts, the Six Hundred and Thirteen, or תרי"ג מצות. In the preface to his *Jad Hachezaka* (fol. 2, col. 2), Moses Maimonides (q. v.) writes thus: "The number of the precepts of the law is 613, of which there are 248 affirmative precepts, or *precepts of commission,* מצות עשה, corresponding to the 248 members of the human body, and 365 negative precepts, or *precepts of omission,* מצות לא תעשה, corresponding to the number of days of the solar year." The rabbins assert that the multiplicity of precepts which God has given to the nation of Israel in preference to all others is a sign of his predilection for them, for, says rabbi Chanania ben-Akashiah, "The Holy One (blessed be he!) has been pleased to render Israel meritorious; therefore he multiplied to them the law and the commandments, as it is said, 'The Lord is well pleased for his righteousness' sake; he will magnify the law, and

make it honorable'" (Isa. xlii, 21). If we may believe Jewish notions, we also learn that the patriarchs already fulfilled the 613 precepts. The Jewish commentator Rashi (q. v.) thus comments very gravely on Gen. xxxii, 5: "עם לבן גרתי, 'I have sojourned with Laban:' the word גרתי, according to the Gematria [comp. the art. CABALA, vol. ii, p. 4], amounts to 613 (i. e. ר=10, ת=400, ר=200, ג=3, or 10+400+200+3=613), by which he (i. e. Jacob) wished to communicate (to his brother Esau), 'It is true I have sojourned with the wicked Laban, but still I observed the 613 precepts, and I have not been infected with his evil deeds;' or, as the original reads, גרתי בגי' תרי"ג בלומר עם לבן חרשע גרתי ותרי"ג מצות שמרתי ולא למדתי ממעשיו חרעים;" the same is the remark of *Baal Haturim*, ad loc. Strictly orthodox Jews make their children commit to memory all the 613 precepts, as they consider a thorough knowledge of them to be a key to the oral law, though the majority of them are unintelligible to a child. Rabbi Gedaliah, of Amsterdam, published a catalogue of them in 1745, which he designated תורת קטן, *Torath Katon*, or *The Law in Miniature*. He says in his preface, "Which children are to learn in their infancy, to know them off by heart; which will be a great introduction for them to learn the oral law; and also that what they have learned in their youthful days they may remember in their old age; that they may know to do them, and live by them in this world and in the world to come." The arrangement of these precepts is different. Some, as Maimonides, arrange them according to the matter, and the same has been followed by Jon. Eybenschütz, who put them in verse (Prague, 1765). Another is that by Gedaliah, of Amsterdam, who gives them according to the order of the Pentateuch, which is by far more preferable. As it would be tedious and fruitless to enumerate them, we will refer the reader who may feel interested to Jost, *Geschichte d. Juden u. s. Sekten*, i, 451 sq.; Bodenschatz, *Kirchliche Verfassung der heutigen Juden* (Erlangen, 1748), iv, 181 sq. (where the Hebrew is also given); Margoliouth, *Modern Judaism Investigated* (Lond. 1843), p. 115 sq.; and *The Home and the Synagogue of the Modern Jew* (ibid. 1843), p. 202 sq. (B. P.)

Preces (i. e. *prayers*) are the verses and responses said in the Roman Catholic, English, and other churches at the beginning of *matins* and *even-song*.

Preces Dominicāles FERIALES. The *preces Dominicales*, so called from the Dominica or Lord's Day, when they are usually recited, are those prayers which are added as a complement of devotion to *prim* and *completorium*, after the regular psalms. These preces are not recited at all duplices (double feasts), nor within the "octaves," nor in the "vigil of Epiphany," in the *feriæ sexta*, nor in *sabbato*, after the "octave of Ascension." The *preces feriales* take place in penitential times, and on the days of penitence. They are prayed kneeling at *laudes*, and at every single *hora* (time of the day) at all ferial offices in Advent, in the forty days of Lent, in the Ember days, and vigils connected with a day of fast; with the exception of the vigil of Christmas, the vigil of Pentecost, and the ensuing Ember days. These preces are also omitted on the vigils of Epiphany and Ascension, as these feasts have no day of fast. The *preces feriales* begin with the "Kyrie eleison" and a whispered "Pater-noster;" then, at *laudes* and *vespers*, follow, "in versicles" and "responsories," prayers for the clergy, sovereign and people, for the community, for the deceased, for the absent brethren, the oppressed, and prisoners. Then follows the psalm "De profundis," so full of abnegation and contrition (at *laudes*), or "Miserere" (at *vespers*), with some suitable final versicles and the oration of the day.

Prechtl, MAXIMILIAN, a German Benedictine, noted as a theologian and renowned as a student of canon law, was born Aug. 20, 1757, at Hahnbach, in the Bavarian Palatinate; he studied first under the Jesuits at Amberg, and was at the age of eighteen years admitted to the college of the Benedictines at Michaelfeld, where he studied philosophy and theology, and was consecrated in 1781. In 1782 his monastery sent him to Salzburg, where he acquired a knowledge of the law, which served in good stead to his congregation in several lawsuits. He was then a professor of dogmatics and morals; in 1790 he was called to Amberg as teacher of dogmatic and ecclesiastical history, and in 1798 he was rector in the same city. Jan. 14, 1800, he was elected abbot of the monastery of Michaelfeld. After the suppression of his monastery he lived at Vilseck, entirely devoted to study and to acts of benevolence. He died Jan. 13, 1832. The following are his works: *Positiones juris ecclesiastici universi, Germaniæ ac Bavariæ accommodati* (Amberg, 1787):—*Succincta series theologiæ theoreticæ, quam in monasterio Michaelfeld defendent*, etc. (ibid. 1791):—*Historia Monasterii Michaelfeldensis*:—*Trauerrede auf das Hinscheiden Carl Theodors*:—*Wie sind die oberpfälzischen Abteien im Jahre* 1669 *abermal an die geistlichen Ordensstände gekommen?* (1802):—*Friedensworte an die katholische und protestantische Kirche für ihre Wiedervereinigung* (Salzb. 1810):—*Seitenstücke zur Weisheit Dr. Martin Luthers an den neuesten Herausgeber seiner Streitschrift: Das Papstthum zu Rom vom Teufel gestiftet* (ibid. 1817):—*Abgedrungene Antwort auf das zweite Sendschreiben Dr. Martin Luthers an den Herausgeber*, etc. (ibid. 1818):—*Kritischer Rückblick auf Hrn. Chr. Buberts kritische Beleuchtung der Seitenstücke zur Weisheit Dr. M. Luthers* (ibid. 1818). Prechtl, it will be noticed from the list of his works, entered into a controversy on the questions at issue between Romanists and Protestants. His own desire was a union of all Christians, and he first wrote for this purpose; but, like all Romanists, he was unwilling to acknowledge the corrupt condition of his own ecclesiastical body, and was therefore assailed by the Lutherans. The result was a decided polemical cast in his later writings, and a proportionate decline of scholarship and increase of haste and acrimony. (J. H. W.)

Precipiano, HUMBERT WILLIAM, *Count of*, a Spanish prelate of French birth, was a native of Besançon, where he was born in 1626. He came from an ancient family, originally from Genoa. He was canon at Besançon, counsellor-clerk at the Parliament of Dôle, and abbé of Bellevaux in 1649. In 1661 he was elected high-dean of the chapter, but the validity of his election was contested by the Holy See. He found a compensation in the confidence of king Philip IV of Spain. In 1667 he was delegated by the states of Burgundy, with his brother Prosper-Ambroise, to the Diet of Ratisbon. The talents which he displayed on that occasion were rewarded five years later by his nomination to the dignity of supreme counsellor of Charles II for the affairs of Burgundy and the Netherlands. His nomination to the episcopal see of Bruges in 1682, whence he passed in 1689 to the archiepiscopal see of Mechlin, was the reward of his devotion to Don Juan of Austria. His zeal for the consolidation of the ultramontane doctrines was so great that he imagined a formulary more exacting than that of Alexander VII. Two decrees of the Inquisition (Jan. 28 and Feb. 6, 1694) condemned the new formulary. The prelate refused to submit to the decrees. Innocent XII enjoined all bishops of Belgium to abandon those quarrels, which had already lasted too long, and which the fanaticism of Precipiano endeavored to revive. In 1696 he recommended, somewhat harshly, a little more moderation to the archbishop of Mechlin. The great blot in Precipiano's life is his consent to the Jesuits for the arrest of Quesnel (q. v.), May 30, 1703, at Malines. The cities of Bruges, Besançon, Brussels, Mechlin, and the abbey of Bellevaux are in possession of monuments of the magnificence and piety of this prelate. He died at Brussels June 9, 1711. See

Hist. ecclés. du 18me Siècle, vol. i; *Caléndrier ecclés. ann.* 1757; Fuller, *Dict. Hist.* s. v.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.

Precisians, one of the names given to the *Puritans*, or those who, about the time of the Commonwealth, evinced by their conduct that they were in earnest on the subject of religion. They were called *precise* because they condemned swearing, plays, gaming, drinking, dancing, and other worldly recreations on the Lord's day, as well as the time-serving, careless, and corrupt religion which was then in fashion.

Precist (from the Latin *precista*) is the name of a candidate who applies, by means of the *primæ preces*, for a vacant spiritual prebend. See PREBEND.

Preconization (i. e. *publication*, from *præco*, "a herald"). The appointments to all higher offices of the Church, especially episcopal and archiepiscopal sees, whether they be made by canonical election or by nomination, are subject as *causæ majores* to the papal confirmation. This confirmation, according to the resolutions of the Council of Trent, and the closer directions given by pope Gregory XIV in 1591, is preceded by a double examination, called *informative process* and *definitive process*. The latter is gone through with at Rome by the congregation of cardinals established by Sixtus V *pro erectione ecclesiarum et provisionibus apostolicis;* the cardinal protector of the nation in which the appointment is to be made acts as referent, and is assisted by three other cardinals. The opinion, written by the protector, and signed by the three assessors, is brought immediately before the "S. Congregatio Consistorialis," where it is prepared for the consistory in which the confirmation is to take place. In one of the ensuing secret consistories the cardinal referent repeats his complete account of the matter, whereupon all the cardinals present give their vote as to the worthiness of the elected or nominated bishop. If the majority pronounces in his favor, the pope passes, in the same assembly, his solemn confirmation in the customary formula. This declaration of the pope is called *præconisatio;* it is posted *ad valvos ecclesiæ*, and a deed of it, "the bull of preconization," or confirmation, is sent to the confirmed nominee. In France, where the promotion of an ecclesiastic to a bishopric is by nomination of the king, the person nominated, after receiving his warrant from the crown, is furnished with three letters —one from the king to the pope, another to the cardinal protector of France at Rome, and the third to his majesty's ambassador at the pope's court. When this is done, a certificate of the life and behavior of the person nominated is given in to the pope's nuncio. He likewise makes profession of his faith, and gives in a schedule of the condition of the bishopric to which he is nominated. The letters being transmitted to Rome, the cardinal protector declares in the first consistory that at the next consistorial meeting he intends to propose such a person for such a see, which declaration is called *preconization*. See BISHOP. (J. H. W.)

Predestinatians. A sect which arose in Gaul shortly after the time when the Pelagian and Semi-Pelagian disputes commenced. They held that God not only predestinated the wicked to eternal punishment, but also to the guilt and transgression for which they are punished; and that thus all the good and bad actions of men are determined from eternity by a divine decree, and fixed by an invincible necessity. In the 9th century the tenets of this sect were revived by Gottschalk, a German, whose followers were termed Predestinatians. They taught what Gottschalk himself termed a double predestination—that is, a predestination of some from all eternity to everlasting life, and of others to everlasting death. On promulgating this doctrine in Italy, Gottschalk was charged by Rabanus Maurus with heresy, and thereupon hastened to Germany to vindicate his principles. A council accordingly assembled at Mentz in A.D. 848, when Maurus procured his condemnation and his transmission as a prisoner to Hincmar, archbishop of Rheims, to whose jurisdiction he properly belonged. On the arrival of Gottschalk, Hincmar summoned a council at Quiercy, in A.D. 849, when, although his principles were defended by the learned Ratramnus, as well as by Remigius, archbishop of Lyons, he was deprived of his priestly office, ordered to be whipped, and afterwards to be imprisoned. Worn out with this cruel treatment, and after languishing for some years in the solitude of a prison, this learned and thoughtful man died under excommunication, but maintaining his opinions to the last While Gottschalk was shut up within the narrow walls of a prison his doctrines were the subject of a keen and bitter controversy in the Latin Church. Ratramnus and Remigius on the one side, and Scotus Erigena on the other, conducted the argument with great ability. The contention was every day increasing in violence, and Charles the Bald found it necessary to summon another council at Quiercy, in A.D. 853, when, through the influence of Hincmar, the decision of the former council was repeated, and Gottschalk again condemned as a heretic. But in A.D. 855 the three provinces of Lyons, Vienne, and Arles met in council at Valence, under the presidency of Remigius, when the opinions of Gottschalk were approved, and the decisions of the two councils of Quiercy were reversed. Of the twenty-three canons of the Council of Valence, five contain the doctrinal views of the friends and defenders of Gottschalk. Thus in the third canon they declare, "We confidently profess a predestination of the elect unto life, and a predestination of the wicked unto death. But in the election of those to be saved, the mercy of God precedes their good deserts; and in the condemnation of those who are to perish, their ill-deeds precede the righteous judgment of God. In his predestination God only determined what he himself would do, either in his gratuitous mercy or in his righteous judgment." "In the wicked he foresaw their wickedness, because it is from themselves; he did not predestine it, because it is not from him. The punishment, indeed, consequent upon their ill-desert he foresaw—being God, he foresees all things—and also predestined, because he is a just God, with whom, as St. Augustine says, there is both a fixed purpose and a certain foreknowledge in regard to all things whatever." "But that some are predestinated to wickedness by a divine power, so that they cannot be of another character, we not only do not believe, but if there are those who will believe so great a wrong, we, as well as the Council of Orange, with all detestation, declare them anathema." The five doctrinal canons of the Council of Valence were adopted without alteration by the Council of Toul, in A.D. 859, which last council was composed of the bishops of fourteen provinces. But on the death of Gottschalk, which happened in A.D. 868, the contention terminated. See PREDESTINATION.

Predestination, a doctrine upon which great division of opinion prevails among Christians.

I. *Definition.*—The word predestinate properly signifies to *destine* (i. e. to set apart, or devote to a particular use, condition, or end) *beforehand*. It therefore denotes a mere act of the will, and should be carefully distinguished from that exercise of power by which volitions are actualized or carried into effect. Etymologically it would be proper to say that God before the foundation of the world predestinated the sun to be luminous, the loadstone to attract, the atmosphere to perform its varied ministries. In theological language, however, God would be said to have "foreordained" or "decreed" these things, the term "predestinate" being restricted to God's supposed determinations respecting the destinies of men in the future world. The early Lutheran divines generally distinguished *prædestinatio stricte dicta*, or predestination in its narrower sense, and *prædestinatio late dicta*, or predestination in its wider signification. The former was God's decree to save all

persevering believers in Christ; the latter was that original redemptive volition in which he "will have all men to be saved" (1 Tim. ii, 4). In the Reformed Church the word has sometimes been employed as synonymous with election (q. v.), sometimes as covering both election and reprobation (q. v.). Arminius, in his *15th Pub. Disputation*, seems to prefer the former usage as more scriptural, but he is not followed in this respect by his remonstrant successors. Calvin and most of his followers employ the term as applying to the reprobative decrees of God as much as to the elective (see this point discussed under CALVINISM in vol. ii, p. 43, col. 2).

II. *Is Predestination Absolute or Conditional?*—The cardinal point of the predestination controversy has always been this question: Are the decrees by which certain individuals are elected to eternal life and other individuals doomed to everlasting misery *respective* or *irrespective*—that is, were these decrees based upon God's foreknowledge (q. v.) of the different use individuals would make of their moral agency, or were they not? The Arminian takes the affirmative, the Calvinist the negative. The former reasons in this wise: Divine predestination in its widest sense is God's free and perfect foreplanning of creation and providence. It was antecedent to the production of the first created thing. So viewed, it must be evident to any rational theist that predestination was objectively absolute but subjectively conditioned—*absolute objectively* because there existed nothing extraneous to the divine mind to limit its action; *conditioned subjectively* because the essential perfections of God demand that his will should always act in strict conformity with the dictates of his own infinite wisdom, justice, and benevolence. But though predestination, regarded as the complete, all-embracing plan of God, was objectively absolute, it is obvious that the various individual decrees which are conceived of as components of that plan must mutually limit and condition each other. Thus the divine determination that "while the earth remaineth seed-time and harvest shall not cease" was not an absolute decree, but one conditioned upon the divine determination, antecedent to it in the order of nature, that there should be an earth with planetary motion, etc. Were not each decree adjusted to every other they could not conspire to the attainment of a common end. Instead of being integrating elements of one wise and self-consistent plan, some might be found superfluous, some perhaps in direct collision. Hence no individual decree can be regarded as irrespective or unconditioned; each is conditioned on the one hand by the perfections of God, on the other by the whole system of divine pre-volitions of which it forms a part. Now an absolute, irreversible decree, continues the Arminian, either electing an individual to eternal life or dooming him to everlasting death, fails to answer to either of these essential conditions or characteristics of a divine decree. It would be palpably inconsistent with the divine perfections on the one hand, and absolutely irreconcilable with known determinations of God on the other. Such an elective decree would be incompatible with God's rationality and impartiality, while such a reprobative one would directly conflict not only with his benevolence, but even with his justice. Both would be at open war with the known design of the Creator that men should enjoy the endowment of moral agency and shape their own eternal destinies. Hence an unconditional, irrespective election of some unto life, and an unconditional, irrespective reprobation of others unto death, cannot be maintained. If any are individually elected or reprobated, they must have been elected or reprobated with reference to the foreseen use they would make of their moral agency, for only on this principle can any theory of predestination be constructed which shall not compromise the divine character or conflict with known determinations respecting man.

So just and conclusive is this reasoning that the long task of the absolute predestinarians has been to devise some expedient by which unconditional election and reprobation may be shown to be compatible with the divine attributes and with all known divine decrees. Several have been tried. (1.) Perhaps the most legitimate of them all is that adopted by those divines who consider the divine will the ground of all rational and moral qualities and distinctions. If, as these divines affirm, nothing is rational or irrational, just or unjust, right or wrong, except that for the time being it is God's will that it should be so, then evidently an arbitrary damnation of innocent beings may be just as right and proper an act as any other. If he wills it to be right, then it is right, however it may seem to us. Hence, on this scheme, we have only to suppose that God wills an act to be right to render it perfectly proper and consistent for him to perform it. Only on this hypothesis can irrespective predestination be successfully defended. (2.) Another class of divines, unable to adopt this bold principle (according to which God is able to abrogate the moral law as easily as the old ceremonial one of the Jews), yet forced to mitigate in some way the revolting horrors of an irrespective reprobation, have sought relief in the following scheme: Men, considered *in puris naturalibus*, in themselves only, were incapable of anything supernatural. Only by the aid of supernatural and divine grace could their nature be confirmed and strengthened if it should remain in its integrity, or restored if it should become corrupt. To illustrate his grace, God determined by an immutable decree to elect certain men, so viewed, to participancy in his grace and glory. To show his sovereign freedom, he determined to pass by the remainder (*præterition*), and not communicate to them that divine aid requisite to keep them from sin; then, when the persons passed by become sinners, he proposes to demonstrate his justice by their damnation. How much real relief this device affords may be seen by consulting Arminius, *Declaration of Sentiments*, or Watson, *Institutes*, pt. ii, ch. xxviii. (3.) Another expedient sometimes employed in the construction of a predestinarian theodicy is to regard sin as a mere negation. As brought forward by Dr. Chalmers (*Institutes*, pt. iii, ch. v), it might be viewed as a modification of the last-mentioned. Both fail to vindicate even the justice of God, since in each case the finally damned are damned solely for failing to do what they have no ability, natural or vouchsafed, to perform. (4.) A fourth scheme is called *sublapsarianism*. In this the fall of man was antecedent in the order of the divine decrees to election and reprobation. All men are viewed as personally guilty of Adam's sin and justly obnoxious with him to eternal death. From this mass God sovereignly and graciously elected some unto life for a demonstration of his mercy; the rest he reprobated to everlasting woe for a demonstration of his justice. In all this it is claimed that there was nothing inconsistent with God's character, since all might justly have been damned. It happens, however, that few are ready to acquiesce in this all-important premise, to wit, that all the descendants of Adam are justly obnoxious to eternal death on account of his sin, hence the conclusion avails nothing to most men. Failing in all these ingenious contrivances to harmonize unconditional predestination with God's known attributes and principles of administration as moral governor, the abettors of the doctrine usually come finally (5) to bare assertion. They maintain the unconditionality of election and reprobation on the one hand, and on the other the perfect justice and benevolence of God and adequate agency of man, without attempting to reconcile the two. They resolve the palpable contradiction into a mere "mystery," and imperiously shut every opponent's mouth with the misemployed Scripture, "Who art thou that repliest against God?"

As our limits do not admit of a methodical examination of the various passages of Scripture in which Calvinists find their doctrine asserted or assumed, we shall be obliged to refer the reader to Watson, and to those

commentators who have not devoted themselves to Biblical interpretation merely as an advantageous polemical agency. We only remark, in passing, that no fact is more striking or significant in the whole history of Scripture exegesis than the steady gravitation of all sound expositors to the exegetical views of the early Remonstrants. Tholuck gratefully acknowledges his obligation to them, and even Prof. Stuart quite as often follows Grotius as Calvin. Indeed, he confesses that he cannot find irrespective election in Rom. viii, 28–30, nor can he see "how it is to be made out" on rational grounds (*Com. Excursus*, x, 477). In like manner he adopts the interpretation of Rom. vii, 5–25, which it cost Arminius so much to establish, and believes the time is coming "when there will be but one opinion among intelligent Christians about the passage in question, as there was but one before the dispute of Augustine with Pelagius" (*Excursus*, vii).

III. *History of the Doctrine.*—The unanimous and unquestioned doctrine of the Church on this point for more than four hundred years was, so far as developed into distinctness, precisely identical with that which owes its scientific form and name to Arminius (q. v.). The early fathers often expressed themselves unguardedly, and, in so doing, sometimes laid themselves open to the charge of a leaning towards the erroneous views afterwards systematized by Pelagius (q. v.) and his coadjutors [see PELAGIANISM]; but their general sentiment was soundly evangelical and capable of an enunciation entirely free from every suspicion of consanguinity with that heresy. "In respect to predestination," says Wiggers, "the fathers before Augustine differed entirely from him. . . . They founded predestination upon prescience. . . . Hence the Massilians were entirely right when they maintained that Augustine's doctrine of predestination was contrary to the opinion of the fathers and the sense of the Church" (*Augustinism and Pelagianism*, transl. by Prof. Emerson). Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, and Chrysostom—all in clear and decisive statements—gave their adherence to the theory of conditional predestination, rejecting the opposite as false, dangerous, and utterly subversive of the divine glory. It is evident that they did not investigate the subject to the depth to which it is requisite for the full discussion of it to go, and that various questions, which must be put before it can be brought completely before us, they either did not put or hastily regarded as of very little moment; but it is enough to dwell upon the fact that they did employ their thoughts upon it, and have so expressed themselves as to leave no doubt of the light in which it was contemplated by them. Justin, in his dialogue with Trypho, remarks, that "they who were foreknown as to become wicked, whether angels or men, did so not from any fault of God, *αἰτίᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ*, but from their own blame;" by which observation he shows that it was his opinion that God foresaw in what manner his intelligent creatures would act, but that this did not affect their liberty, and did not diminish their guilt. A little after he says more fully that "God created angels and men free to the practice of righteousness, having planted in them reason, through which they knew by whom they were created and through whom they existed, when before they were not, and prescribed to them a law by which they were to be judged, if they acted contrary to right reason. Wherefore we, angels and men, are through ourselves convicted as being wicked, if we do not lay hold of repentance. But if the Logos of God foretells that some angels and men would go to be punished, he does so because he foreknew that they would certainly become wicked; by no means, however, because God made them such." Justin thus admits that man is wholly dependent upon God, deriving existence and everything which he has from the Almighty; but he is persuaded that we were perfectly able to retain our integrity, and that, although it was foreseen that we should not do so, this did not abridge our moral power, or fix any imputation on the Deity in consequence of our transgression. Tatian, in his oration against the Greeks—an excellent work, which, although composed after the death of Justin, was written, in all probability, before its author had adopted the wild opinions which he defended towards the conclusion of his life—expresses very much the same sentiments avowed by Justin. He says, "Both men and angels were created free, so that man becoming wicked through his own fault may be deservedly punished, while a good man, who, from the right exercise of his free will, does not transgress the law of God, is entitled to praise; that the power of the divine Logos, having in himself the knowledge of what was to happen, not through fate or unavoidable necessity, but from free choice, predicted future things, condemning the wicked and praising the righteous." Irenæus, in the third book of his work against heresies, has taken an opportunity to state his notions about the origin of evil. The seventy-first chapter of that book is entitled, "A proof that man is free, and has power to this extent, that of himself he can choose what is good or the contrary." In illustration of this he remarks, "God gave to man the power of election, as he did to the angels. They, therefore, who do not obey are justly not found with the good, and receive deserved punishment, because God, having given them what was good, they did not keep it, but despised the riches of the divine mercy." The next chapter is entitled, "A proof that some men are not good by nature and others wicked, and that what is good is within the choice of man." In treating on this subject, Irenæus observes that "if the reverse were the case, the good would not merit praise nor the wicked blame, because, being merely what, without any will of theirs, they had been made, they could not be considered as voluntary agents. But," he adds, "since all have the same nature, and are able to retain and to do what is good, and may, on the other hand, lose it and not do it, some are, even in the sight of men, and much more in that of God, deservedly praised and others blamed." In support of this he introduces a great variety of passages from Scripture. It appears, however, that the real difficulty attending the subject had suggested itself to his mind, for he inquires in the seventy-third chapter why God had not from the beginning made man perfect, all things being possible to him. He gives to this question a metaphysical and unsatisfactory answer, but it so far satisfied himself as to convince him that there could not, on this ground, be any imputation justly cast on the perfections of the Almighty, and that, consequently, a sufficient explanation of the origin of evil and of the justice of punishing it was to be found in the nature of man as a free agent, or in the abuse of that liberty with which man had been endowed (see Irenæus, iv, 392; Justin, *c. Trypho*, c. 140).

In the Western Church all the early theologians and teachers were equally unanimous. While the Alexandrian theologians laid special stress on *free will*, those of the West dwelt more on *human depravity* and on the necessity of *grace*. On the last-named point all agreed. It was conceded that it was conditioned by *free will*. Unconditional predestination they all denied. This stage of Church doctrine is represented by Hilary of Poitiers and Ambrose of Milan, as well as by Tertullian (*Adv. Marcion*, ii, 6), who, much as he sometimes needed the doctrine of irresistible grace, would never so much as adopt an unconditional election, much less an unconditional reprobation. Tertullian had also speculated upon the moral condition of man, and has recorded his sentiments with respect to it. He explicitly asserts the freedom of the will; lays down the position that, if this be denied, there can be neither reward nor punishment; and in answer to an objection that since free will has been productive of such melancholy consequences it would have been better that it had not been bestowed, he enters into a formal vindication of this part of our constitution. In reply to another suggestion that God

might have interposed to prevent the choice which was to be productive of sin and misery, he maintains that this could not have been done without destroying that admirable constitution by which alone the interests of virtue can be really promoted. He thus thought that sin was to be imputed wholly to man, and that it is perfectly consistent with the attributes of God, or rather illustrates these attributes, that there should be a system under which sin was possible, because without this possibility there could have been no accountable agents. From what has been stated on this subject, it seems unquestionable that the apostolic fathers did not at all enter upon the subject of the origin of evil; that the writers by whom they were succeeded were satisfied that, in the sense in which the term is now most commonly used, there was no such thing as predestination; that they uniformly represented the destiny of man as regulated by the use or abuse of his free will; that, with the exception of Irenæus, they did not attempt to explain why such a creature as man, who was to fall into sin, was created by a Being of infinite goodness; that the sole objection to their doctrine seemed to them to be that prescience was incompatible with liberty, and that, when they answered this, they considered that nothing more was requisite for receiving, without hesitation, the view of man upon which they often and fondly dwelt, as a free and accountable agent, who might have held fast his integrity, and whose fall from that integrity was to be ascribed solely to himself, as it did not at all result from any appointment of the Supreme Being. So Hilary of Poitiers declares that the decree of election was not *indiscretus*, and emphatically asserts the harmonious connection between grace and free will, the powerlessness of the latter, and yet its importance as a condition of the operation of divine grace. "As the organs of the human body," he says (*De Trinit.* ii, 35), "cannot act without the addition of moving causes, so the human soul has indeed the capacity for knowing God, but if it does not receive through faith the gift of the Holy Spirit it will not attain to that knowledge. Yet the gift of Christ stands open to all, and that which all want is given to every one as far as he will accept it." "It is the greatest folly," he says in another passage (*Psa. li*, § 20), "not to perceive that we live in dependence on and through God, when we imagine that in things which men undertake and hope for they may venture to depend on their own strength. What we have, we have from God; on him must all our hope be placed." Accordingly he did not admit an unconditional predestination; he did not find it in the passages in Rom. ix commonly adduced in favor of it respecting the election of Esau, but only a predestination conditioned by the divine foreknowledge of his determination of will; otherwise every man would be born under a necessity of sinning (*Psa. lvii*, § 3). Neander, in portraying his system, says: "Hilary considered it very important to set forth distinctly that all the operations of divine grace are conditioned on man's free will, to repel everything which might serve to favor the notion of a natural necessity, or of an unconditional divine predestination" (ii, 562). So Ambrose, who lived a little later, and even Jerome, who exhibited such zeal in behalf of Augustinism, declares, without reservation, that divine election is based upon foreknowledge. True, Augustine cites two passages (*De Dono Perseverantiæ*, 19) from Ambrose as favoring his scheme, but all commentators upon this father assure us that these passages by no means give ground for attributing to him the Augustinian view of election. Ambrose carries the approximation to Augustine a step further. He says (*Apol. David*, ii, § 76): "We have all sinned in the first man, and by the propagation of nature the propagation of guilt has also passed from one to all; in him human nature has sinned." A transfer of Adam's guilt may seem to be here expressed, but in other expressions it is disowned (*Psa. xlviii*, § 9). Ambrose admitted neither irresistible grace nor unconditional predestination; he made predestination to depend on prescience (*De Fide*, lib. v, § 83). In other places, however, his language approaches more nearly to that of Augustine (see Hase, *Dogmatik*, § 162; Gieseler, *Dogmengesch.* § 39; Neander, *History of Dogmas*, i, 343, 344). To quote Neander again: "Although the freedom of the divine election and the creative agency of grace are made particularly prominent in these passages, still they do not imply any necessary exclusion of the state of recipiency in the individual as a condition, and accordingly this assertion of Ambrose admits of being easily reconciled with the assertion first quoted. In another place, at least (*De Fide*, lib. v, § 83), he expressly supposes that predestination is conditioned by foreknowledge (*ibid.* ii, 564)." The substantial doctrines of the fathers as to the extent of grace before Augustine was that Christ died, not for an elect portion of mankind, but for all men, and that if men are not saved the guilt and the fault are their own (Gieseler, *Dogmengeschichte*, § 72).

Thus we see that for more than four hundred years not a single voice was heard, either in the Eastern or Western Church, in advocacy of the notion of an unconditional divine predestination. At this point Augustine, already in very advanced old age, and under controversial pressure, took the first step towards Calvinism by pronouncing the decree of *election* unconditional. In explaining the relation between man's activity and decisive influence, Pelagius had denied human depravity, and maintained that, although God gives man the power to do good, the will and the act are man's. He denied that there was any divine energy in grace that could impair the operations of free will. Augustine, on the other hand, maintained that grace is an internal operation of God upon those whom he designs to save, imparting not only the power, but also the will to do good. The fact that some are saved and others lost he attributed to the will of God. Hence his doctrines of unconditional predestination, of particular redemption, and of special and irresistible grace. *Reprobation*, he granted, was based upon foreseen guilt, but apparently unconscious of the inconsistency, he denied the applicability of the same principle to election. In 529 the system of Augustine was established as Church doctrine by the Council of Arausio (Orange), but the reaction against the strictly logical yet essentially immoral nature of his dogma has been perpetually manifested. See AUGUSTINE.

Four hundred years more passed away before a man could be found bold enough to complete Augustine's theory by declaring that, as God has sovereignly and immutably elected whomsoever he has pleased unto life, without any foresight of faith and obedience, so he has of his own good pleasure freely and unchangeably predestinated whomsoever he has pleased unto everlasting misery, without any reference to foreknown sin and guilt on their part. This anticipator of Calvin was a Saxon monk named Gottschalk (Godeschalcus). His novel view brought down upon him not merely ecclesiastical censure, but even persecution. His doctrine was condemned by a council which archbishop Rabanus Maurus had called at Mayence, A.D. 848 (Mansi, *Concil.* xiv, 914), and Gottschalk, who was then travelling, was sent to his metropolitan, archbishop Hincmar of Rheims, who called another council at Quiercy in 849. Here he was defended by Ratramnus, the opponent of Paschasius Radbertus in the Eucharistic controversy, and also by Remigius, afterwards archbishop of Lyons; but notwithstanding these powerful supporters, he was condemned a second time, and ordered to undergo the penalty of flogging, which the rule of St. Benedict imposed upon monks who troubled the Church. After this condemnation he was imprisoned in the monastery of Hautvillers, where he died, without having recanted his opinions, about the year 868. See GOTTSCHALK.

While the friends of Gottschalk were endeavoring to obtain his absolution and release, Hincmar put forward Johannes Scotus Erigena (q. v.) to answer his predesti-

nation theory, which Erigena did in 851, in his treatise *De Prædestinatione*, in which he raised up a cloud of adversaries by the freedom with which he contradicted the established doctrines of the Church as to the nature of good and evil. Further controversy being thus aroused, Hincmar summoned a second council at Quiercy in 853, which confirmed the decision as to the real doctrine of the Church arrived at by the previous council (Mansi, *Concil.* xiv, 995). A rival council was called by the opposite party from the provinces of Lyons, Vienne, and Arles, which met at Valence in 855. But instead of fully confirming the opinion of Gottschalk, this council considerably modified it by declaring that although sin is foreknown by God, it is not so predestined as to make it inevitably necessary that it should be committed (*ibid.* xv, 1). Hincmar now wrote two works on the subject, one of which is not extant; the other is entitled *De Prædestinatione Dei et Libero Arbitrio adversus Gottschalcum et cæteros Prædestinatianos.* Having thus explained his views at length, they were substantially accepted, in the form of six doctrinal canons, by the Synod of Langres, and by that of Toul (A.D. 859), held at Savonières a few days afterwards (Mansi, *Concil.* xv, 525–27), and thus the controversy terminated. See Manguin, *Collect. auctor. de Prædest. et Gratia* (1650); Ussher, *Gotteschalci et Prædest. Controv. Hist.;* Cellot, *Hist. Gotteschalci Prædest.* (1655).

No authoritative or influential teacher appeared to support Gottschalk's views for seven hundred years. The most conspicuous of those who did so was Thomas Bradwardine (A.D. 1290–1349), warden of Merton College, and afterwards archbishop of Canterbury. His work on the subject is entitled *De Causa Dei contra Pelagium et de Virtute causarum ad suos Mertonenses*, and in this he gave free will so low a place that he may be almost called a necessitarian. Thomas Aquinas, who flourished during the 13th century, wrote largely upon the nature of grace and predestination. His opinions upon these subjects were nearly the same with those of Augustine; and so much, indeed, was he conceived to resemble in genius and understanding that distinguished prelate, that it was asserted the soul of Augustine had been sent into the body of Aquinas. He taught that God from all eternity, and without any regard to their works, predestinated a certain number to life and happiness; but he found great delight in endeavoring to reconcile this position with the freedom of the human will. His celebrated antagonist, John Duns Scotus, an inhabitant of Britain, surnamed, from the acuteness and bent of his mind, the Subtile Doctor, also directed his attention in the following century to the same thorny speculations, but he took a different view of them from Aquinas; and we find in the works of these two brilliant lights of the schoolmen all that the most learned in the dark ages thought upon this question.

In the midst of the ferment of the Reformation, the subject of predestination was revived by a controversy between Erasmus and Luther, the former writing an able *Diatribe de Libero Arbitrio* in 1524, and Luther following it up with his halting treatise *De Servo Arbitrio*, in which he went so near to the predestinarians as to deny that any free will can exist in man before he has received the gift of faith. But at this stage stepped forth John Calvin (q. v.) as the champion of predestinarianism. He found the Reformed churches in a perfectly chaotic state as respects doctrines. They possessed no coherent creed or system. They were held together by agreement in mere negations. They needed nothing so much as a positive system. Calvin, a stripling of twenty-five, gave them one. It answered all the essential conditions. It was anti-popish, anti-Lutheran, anti-Socinian. In the pressing exigency it was seized upon, and Calvin became the dictator of all the Reformed churches. Scotland sent her young men to him to be educated, so also did Holland, the Puritans of England, and the Protestants of France. Among the Romanists, the Molinists (q. v.), and Jansenists (q. v.), in their controversy on the subject of free will, carried on with great acrimony, the opinions of Gottschalk were discussed anew, but without lessening the majority of the Arminianists (see Sismondi, *Hist. Prædest.* in Zacharius's *Thesaur. Theol.* ii, 199).

In the Church of England the later Low-Church party have tempered down the opinions of their Puritan predecessors, and are not often disposed to go beyond the doctrine of "predestination to life" as stated in the seventeenth of the Thirty-Nine Articles of Religion, which carefully excludes the double predestination of Gottschalk and the predestinarians. This article of the Church of England is often adduced by Calvinists as favorable to their peculiar views of absolute predestination; but such a representation of it is rendered plausible only by adding to its various clauses qualifying expressions to suit that purpose. In our articles CHURCH OF ENGLAND, CONFESSIONS, and CALVINISM, have been exhibited the just and liberal views of Cranmer and the principal English reformers on this subject, the sources from which they drew the Articles of Religion and the public formularies of devotion, and some of the futile attempts of the high predestinarians in the Church to inoculate the public creed with their dogmas. Cartwright and his followers, in their second "Admonition to Parliament" in 1572, complained that the Articles speak dangerously of "falling from grace;" and in 1587 they preferred a similar complaint. The labors of the Westminster Assembly at a subsequent period, and their abortive result, in relation to this subject, are well known. Long before Arminius had turned his thoughts to the consideration of general redemption, a great number of the English clergy had publicly taught and defended the same doctrine. It was about 1571 that Dr. Peter Baroe, "a zealous anti-Calvinian," was made Margaret professor of divinity in the University of Cambridge, and he went on teaching in his lectures, preaching in his sermons, determining in the schools, and printing in several books, divers points contrary to Calvinism. And this he did for several years, without any manner of disturbance or interruption. The heads of the university, in a letter to lord Burleigh, dated March 8, 1595, say he had done it for fourteen or fifteen years preceding, and they might have said twenty; for he printed some of his lectures in 1574, and the prosecution he was at last under, which will be considered hereafter, was not till 1595. In 1584 Mr. Harsnet, afterwards archbishop of York, preached against absolute reprobation at St. Paul's Cross, the greatest audience then in the kingdom; as did the judicious Mr. Hooker at the Temple in the year following. In the year 1594 Mr. Barret preached at St. Mary's in Cambridge against Calvinism, with very smart reflections upon Calvin himself, Beza, Zanchi, and several others of the most noted writers in that scheme. In the same year Dr. Baroe preached at the same place to the same purpose. By this time Calvinism had gained considerable ground, being much promoted by the learned Whitaker and Mr. Perkins; and several of the heads of the university being in that scheme, they complained of the two sermons above mentioned to lord Burleigh their chancellor. Their determination was to bring Barret to a retraction. He modified his statements, but it may reasonably be doubted whether he ever submitted according to the form they drew up. When the matter was laid before archbishop Whitgift, he was offended at their proceedings, and wrote to lord Burleigh that some of the points which the heads had enjoined Barret to retract were such as the most learned Protestants then living varied in judgment upon, and that the most ancient and best divines in the land were in the chiefest points in opinion against the heads and their resolutions. Another letter he sent to the heads themselves, telling them that they had enjoined Barret to affirm that which was contrary to the doctrine held and expressed by many sound and learned divines in the Church of England, and in other churches likewise men

of best account; and that which for his own part he thought to be false and contrary to the Scriptures; for the Scriptures are plain that God by his absolute will did not hate and reject any man. There might be impiety in believing the one, there could be none in believing the other; neither was it contrary to any article of religion established by authority in this Church of England, but rather agreeable thereto. This testimony of the archbishop is very remarkable; and though he afterwards countenanced the Lambeth Articles, that is of little or no weight in the case. The question is not about any man's private opinion, but about the doctrine of the Church; and supposing the archbishop to be a Calvinist, as he seems to have been at least in some points, this only adds the greater weight to his testimony, that the English Church has nowhere declared in favor of that scheme. The archbishop descended to the particulars charged against Barret, asking the heads what article of the Church was contradicted by this or that notion of his; and Whitaker in his reply does not appeal to one of the articles as against Barret, but forms his plea upon the doctrines which then generally obtained in pulpits. His words are, "We are fully persuaded that Mr. Barret hath taught untruth, if not against the articles, yet against the religion of our Church, publicly received, and always held in her majesty's reign, and maintained in all sermons, disputations, and lectures." But even this pretence of his, weak as it would have been though true, is utterly false, directly contrary, not only to what has been already shown to be the facts of the case, but also to what the archbishop affirmed, and that too, as must be supposed, upon his own knowledge. As to Dr. Baroe, he met with many friends who espoused his cause. Mr. Strype particularly mentions four — Mr. Overal, Dr. Clayton, Mr. Harsnet, Dr. Andrews—all of them great and learned men, men of renown, and famous in their generation. How many more there were nobody can tell. The heads in their letter to lord Burleigh do not pretend that the preaching against Calvinism gave a general offence, but that it offended many—which implies that there were many others on the opposite side; and they expressly say there were divers in the anti-Calvinistic scheme, whom they represent as maintaining it with great boldness. But what put a stop to this prosecution against Baroe was a reprimand from their chancellor, the lord Burleigh, who wrote to the heads that as good and as ancient were of another judgment, and that they might punish him, but it would be for well-doing." But Dr. Whitaker, regius professor of divinity in Cambridge, could not endure the further prevalence of the doctrines of general redemption in that university; he therefore, in 1595, drew up nine affirmations, elucidatory of his views of predestination, and obtained for them the sanction of several Calvinian heads of houses, with whom he repaired to archbishop Whitgift. Having heard their *ex parte* statement, his grace summoned bishops Flecher and Vaughan, and Dr. Tyndal, dean of Ely, to meet Dr. Whitaker and the Cambridge deputation at his palace in Lambeth, on Nov. 10, 1595; where, after much polishing and altering, they produced Whitaker's affirmation, called the "Lambeth Articles" (q. v.). Dr. Whitaker died a few days after his return from Lambeth with the nine articles to which he had procured the patronage of the primate. After his demise, two competitors appeared for the vacant king's professorship—Dr. Wotton, of King's College, a professed Calvinist, and Dr. Overal of Trinity College, "almost as far," says Heylin, "from the Calvinian doctrine in the main platform of predestination as Baroe, Harsnet, or Barret are conceived to be. But when it came to the vote of the university, the place was carried for Overal by the major part; which plainly shows that though the doctrines of Calvin were so hotly stickled here by most of the heads, yet the greater part of the learned body entertained them not." "The Lambeth Articles," it is well observed, "are no part of the doctrine of the Church of England, having never had any of the least sanction either from the parliament or the convocation. They were drawn up by Prof. Whitaker; and though they were afterwards approved by archbishop Whitgift, and six or eight of the inferior clergy, in a meeting they had at Lambeth, yet this meeting was only in a private manner, and without any authority from the queen; who was so far from approving of their proceedings that she not only ordered the articles to be suppressed, but was resolutely bent for some time to bring the archbishop and his associates under a *præmunire*, for presuming to make them without any warrant or legal authority." Such, in brief, was the origin and such the fate of the Lambeth Articles, without the countenance of which the defenders of Calvinism in the Church of England could find no semblance of support for their manifold affirmations on predestination and its kindred topics. At the census of 1851 two congregations calling themselves "Predestinarians" were returned.

Through the Puritans the Calvinistic notions were spread all over New England, and by the Reformed Dutch and other Presbyterian bodies carried through most of the Middle and Western States of America. In some quarters they have been either outgrown [see OBERLIN THEOLOGY] or so modified by outside Arminian influences as to be scarcely discernible; still, in the creeds and standards of several large denominations of the world the peculiar doctrines of Calvinism are unequivocally enunciated. From that celebrated synod known as the Westminster Assembly came forth the Calvinistic Confession and its catechisms, and its form of Church government. These wonderful documents have been preserved unchanged to the present time. The formulas of the Presbyterian Church of America at this time are essentially the same that were promulgated by the Westminster Assembly of Divines more than two hundred years ago. These forms of doctrine must be assented to, at least tacitly, by all the members of that Church. They must be distinctly professed by all its ministers and office-bearers. They are taught from the chairs of its theological schools, and they are elaborately systematized and ably defended in its noble "bodies of divinity"—of which the best and ablest, by Dr. Hodge, of Princeton, has recently been issued. That these teach the doctrines of predestination nobody denies; that to unsophisticated minds they exalt the divine sovereignty at the expense of his justice and his grace has seemed to be the case to Arminianists, who hold that, to make them agree with the language of Holy Scripture, entirely illegitimate methods of accommodation have had to be resorted to. See ARMINIANISM; CALVINISM.

IV. *Connection of Predestination with other Doctrines.*—Much confusion and obscurity has arisen in the progress of the predestinarian controversy from failing to keep the real issue always distinctly in view. The point in controversy is not whether or not God had a plan when he entered upon creation. See FOREKNOWLEDGE; PROVIDENCE. Neither is it whether or not that plan embraced a positive preappointment of every individual event in the whole range of futurity. Nor yet is it whether or not an exercise of divine energy is inseparably connected with any or all of God's predeterminations so that they are "effectual" decrees. See CALLING; GRACE. The real question is: Has God by an immutable and eternal decree predestinated some of the human family unto eternal life, and all the others unto everlasting perdition, without any reference whatever to the use they may make of their moral agency? This the Calvinist affirms, usually basing his affirmation solely on what he regards as Scripture authority, and often admitting that the human mind cannot reconcile it with the character of God or the dictates of human reason. Among the deniers, some have repudiated the supposition of any "decrees" at all respecting *individual* salvation, maintaining only the general ones, "He that

believeth shall be saved, he that believeth not," etc. Others allow an individual or personal election, but, like Watson, understand by it "an act of God done in time, subsequent even to the administration of the means of salvation" (*Inst.* ii, 338). Others, as the older Arminians generally, suppose that specific individuals were eternally predestinated to life and death, but strictly according to their foreknown obedience or disobedience to the Gospel.

V. *Literature.*—The bibliography of this subject is blended with that of ARMINIANISM, ELECTION, FREE WILL, GRACE, REMONSTRANTS, REPROBATION, and will be found under these titles. In addition to the works there cited, the following may be referred to as treating specifically of predestination: respecting the views of the Reformers, consult the symbolic writings of Möhler and Buchmann; Staudenmayer, *In Behalf of the Religious Peace of the Future* (Freib. im Br. 1846, 1st pt. 1 vol.); id. *Theol. Encycl.* (Mentz, 1840, fol.), p. 622; Vatke, *Die menschliche Freiheit in ihrem Verhältniss zur Sünde und zur göttlichen Gnade* (Berl. 1841); Müller, *Die christliche Lehre von der Sünde*, ii, 241-301; Dähne, *De præscientiæ divinæ cum libertate humana concordia* (Leips. 1830); Braun, *De Sacra Scriptura præscientiam docente*, etc. (Mogunt. 1826); Anselm, *De concordia præscientiæ et prædestinationis nec non Dei cum lib. arbit.* etc.; Augustine, *De Prædestinatione Sanctorum*, and *De Dono Perseverantiæ;* Wiggers, *Augustinism and Pelagianism*, and art. in Illgen's (Niedner's) *Zeitsch. für hist. Theol.* pt. ii, 1857; Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrines*, § 183 (Leips. 1857): the works of Calvin, Beza, Zanchi, Perkins, Gomar, Turretin; Arminius, *Declaration of Sentiments, Friendly Discussion with Prof. Junius*, and *Review of Perkins;* id. *Scripta Synodalia Remonstrantium;* the works of Episcopius, Curcellæus, Limborch; Plaifere (early Eng. Armin.), *Apello Evangelium;* id. *Tracts on Predestination* (Camb. 1809); Womack, *Calvinistic Cabinet Unlocked* (very rare); *Examination of Tilenus*, printed in Nicholl's *Calvinism and Arminianism Compared* (Lond. 1824); Wesley, *Predestination Calmly Considered;* Fletcher, *Checks;* Mozley, *Augustinian Doctrine of Predestination* (ibid. 1857). A curiosity of the subject is Henry Bleby's *Script. Predest. not Fatalism; Two Conversations on Rom. viii*, 29, 30, *and Ephes. i*, 5, *designed to show that the Predestination of the Bible refers chiefly and primarily to the Restoration and Perfection of the Physical Nature of the Saints at the Last Day* (ibid. 1853, 16mo). The best exposition of Calvinistic predestination is of course by Dr. Hodges, the Nestor of American theology of that type. See, therefore, his *Systematic Theology*, and compare Pope, *Compendium of Christian Theology* (ibid. 1875, 8vo); Raymond, *Systematic Theology* (Cincinnati, 1877, 2 vols. 8vo). See also *Bibl. Sac.* Oct. 1863; Oct. 1865, p. 584; *North British Rev.* Feb. 1863; *Journal Sac. Lit.* vol. xvi, xviii; *Contemp. Rev.* Aug. 1872, art. vii; *Meth. Quar. Rev.* July, 1857, p. 352; Oct. 1867; July, 1873; *Studien u. Kritiken*, 1838-47; *Theol. Medium*, July, 1873, art. iv; *Brit. Quar. Rev.* Dec. 1871, p. 202 sq.; *Jahrb. für deutsche Theologie*, 1860, ii, 313; *Christian Remembrancer*, Jan. 1856, p. 132; 1861, p. 188.

Predicable is a term of scholastic logic, and connected with the scheme of classification. There were five designations employed in classifying objects on a systematic plan: *genus*, *species*, *difference* (differentia), *property* (proprium), and *accident* (accidens). The first two—genus and species—name the higher and lower classes of the things classified; a genus comprehends several species. The other three designations—difference, property, accident—express the attributes that the classification turns upon. The difference is what distinguishes one species from the other species of the same genus; as, for example, the peculiarities wherein the cat differs from the tiger, lion, and other species of the genus *felis*. The property expresses a distinction that is not ultimate, but a consequence of some other peculiarity. Thus, "the use of tools" is a property of man, and not a difference, for it flows from other assignable attributes of his bodily and mental organization, or from the specific differences that characterize him. The accident is something not bound up with the nature of the species, but chancing to be present in it. For instance, the high value of gold is an accident; gold would still be gold though it were plenty and cheap. It was by an arbitrary and confusing employment of the notion of predication that these various items of the first attempt at a process of systematic classification were called predicables, or attributes that might be "predicated," that is, affirmed, of things. All that is needful to affirm is that a certain thing belongs to a given species or genus; and that to belong to the species is to possess the specific differences; and to belong to the genus is to possess the generic differences. We may also, if we please, *affirm* (or predicate) that the thing does belong to the species, or does possess the specific difference; but this power of affirming has no need to be formally proclaimed, or made the basis of the whole scheme. The allied term "predicament" is another case where an abusive prominence is given to the idea of predication. The predicaments, or categories, were the most comprehensive classes of all existing things—under such heads as substance, attribute, quantity, quality, etc.; and it could be predicated of anything falling under any one head that it does so fall under. Thus, "virtue" is an attribute; and therefore we might say that "attribute" can be *predicated* of "virtue." But the notion of predicating does not indicate the main fact of the process in this case, any more than "predicable" in the foregoing. *Classification*, and not predication, is the ruling idea in each.

Pre-eminence of Christianity, i. e. the higher power and honor due to Jesus the Christ. This doctrine is laid down in Colossians i, 18. In all things in nature, in person, in office, work, power, and honor, Christ *has the pre-eminence* above angels and men, or any other creature. But a man has no *pre-eminence* above a beast as to his body; he is liable to the same diseases and death (Eccles. iii, 19). See *Bibliotheca Sacra*, 1863, p. 681; *Church Remembrancer*, Jan. 1856, p. 132 sq.

Pre-established Harmony. See LEIBNITZ.

Pre-existence of Jesus Christ is his existence before he was born of the Virgin Mary. That he really did exist is taught plainly in John iii, 13; vi, 50, 62, etc.; viii, 58; xvii, 5, 24; 1 John i, 2; but there are various opinions respecting this existence. Some, acknowledging, with the orthodox, that in Jesus Christ there is a divine nature, a rational soul, and a human body, go into an opinion peculiar to themselves. His body was formed in the Virgin's womb; but his human soul—the first and most excellent of all the works of God—they suppose was brought into existence before the creation of the world, and subsisted in happy union in heaven with the second Person of the Godhead till his incarnation. The doctrine is thus clearly set forth by bishop Bull in his *Defence of the Nicene Creed:* "All the Catholic orators of the first three centuries taught that Jesus Christ, he who was afterwards so called, existed before he became man, or before he was born, according to the flesh, of the Blessed Virgin, in another nature far more excellent than the human nature; that he appeared to holy men, giving them an earnest, as it were, of his incarnation; that he always presided over and provided for the Church, which in time to come he would redeem with his own blood, and of consequence that, from the beginning, the whole order or thread of the divine dispensation, as Tertullian speaks, ran through him; further yet, that he was with the Father before the foundation of the world, and that by him all things were made."

Those who advocate this doctrine differ in their christological views from those called Arians, for the latter ascribe to Christ only a created deity, whereas the

former hold his true and proper divinity. They differ from the Socinians, who believe no existence of Jesus Christ before his incarnation; they differ from the Sabellians, who only own a trinity of names; they differ also from the generally received opinion, which is, that Christ's human soul began to exist in the womb of his mother, in exact conformity to that likeness unto his brethren of which St. Paul speaks (Heb. ii, 17). The writers in favor of the pre-existence of Christ's human soul recommend their opinion by these arguments: 1. Christ is represented as his Father's messenger, or angel, being distinct from his Father, sent by his Father, long before his incarnation, to perform actions which seem to be too low for the dignity of pure Godhead. The appearances of Christ to the patriarchs are described like the appearance of an angel, or man really distinct from God; yet one in whom God, or Jehovah, had a peculiar indwelling, or with whom the divine nature had a personal union. 2. Christ, when he came into the world, is said, in several passages of Scripture, to have divested himself of some glory which he had before his incarnation. Now if there had existed before this time nothing but his divine nature, this divine nature, it is argued, could not properly have divested itself of any glory (John xvii, 4, 5; 2 Cor. viii, 9). It cannot be said of God that he became poor: he is infinitely self-sufficient; he is necessarily and eternally rich in perfections and glories. Nor can it be said of Christ, as man, that he was rich, if he were never in a richer state before than while he was on earth. 3. It seems needful, say those who embrace this opinion, that the soul of Jesus Christ should pre-exist, that it might have an opportunity to give its previous actual consent to the great and painful undertaking of making atonement for man's sins. It was the human soul of Christ that endured the weakness and pain of his infant state, all the labors and fatigues of life, the reproaches of men, and the sufferings of death. The divine nature is incapable of suffering. The covenant of redemption between the Father and the Son is therefore represented as being made before the foundation of the world. To suppose that simple Deity, or the Divine Essence, which is the same in all the three Personalities, should make a covenant with itself, is inconsistent.

Dr. Watts, moreover, supposes that the doctrine of the pre-existence of the soul of Christ explains dark and difficult Scriptures, and discovers many beauties and proprieties of expression in the Word of God, which on any other plan lie unobserved. For instance, in Col. i, 15, etc., Christ is described as the image of the invisible God, the first-born of every creature. His being the image of the invisible God cannot refer merely to his divine nature, for that is as invisible in the Son as in the Father; therefore it seems to refer to his pre-existent soul in union with the Godhead. Again, when man is said to be created in the image of God (Gen. i, 2), it may refer to the God-man, to Christ in his pre-existent state. God says, "Let us make man in our image, after our likeness." The word is redoubled, perhaps to intimate that Adam was made in the likeness of the human soul of Christ, as well as that he bore something of the image and resemblance of the divine nature. Dr. Samuel Clarke, it will be borne in mind by the well-read student of Christology, did not accept the general orthodox view of the Trinity doctrine, but endeavored to form a theory holding an intermediate place between the Arian and orthodox systems, neither allowing Jesus to be called a creature nor admitting his equality with the Father. He held that from the beginning there existed along with the Father a second Person, called the Word or Son, who derived his being, attributes, and powers from the Father. The Jews uniformly maintained the pre-existence of the Messiah. In English theology, Dr. Watts was the ablest espouser of this doctrine. In American theology the Rev. Noah Worcester advocated Dr. Watts's theory, but with decided modifications founded on the title "Son of God," which is so frequently applied to Christ in the N. T., and which Worcester alleged "must import that Jesus Christ is the Son of the Father as truly as Isaac was the son of Abraham; not that he is a created intelligent being, but a being who properly derived his existence and nature from God." Mr. Worcester thus maintains that Jesus Christ is not a self-existent being, for it is impossible even for God to produce a self-existent son; but as Christ derived his existence and nature from the Father, he is as truly the image of the invisible God as Seth was the likeness of Adam. He is therefore a person of divine dignity, constituted the creator of the world, the angel of God's presence, or the medium by which God manifested himself to the ancient patriarchs. According to this theory the Son of God became man, or the Son of man, by becoming the soul of a human body.

Those who object to the doctrine of the pre-existence of the human soul of Christ do so on the principle that such a doctrine weakens and subverts that of his divine personality, and assign as grounds for such a position that—1. A pure intelligent spirit, the first, the most ancient, and the most excellent of creatures, created before the foundation of the world, so exactly resembles the second Person of the Arian Trinity that it is impossible to show the least difference except in name. 2. This pre-existent Intelligence, supposed in this doctrine, is so confounded with those other intelligences called angels that there is great danger of mistaking this human soul for an angel, and so of making the person of Christ to consist of three natures. 3. If Jesus Christ had nothing in common like the rest of mankind except a body, how could this semi-conformity make him a real man? 4. The passages quoted in proof of the pre-existence of the human soul of Jesus Christ are of the same sort with those which others allege in proof of the pre-existence of all human souls. 5. This opinion, by ascribing the dignity of the work of redemption to this sublime human soul, detracts from the deity of Christ, and renders the last as passive as the first is active. 6. This notion is contrary to the Scripture. St. Paul says, "In all things it behooved him to be made like unto his brethren" (Heb. ii, 17): he partook of all our infirmities except sin. St. Luke says, "He increased in stature and wisdom" (Luke ii, 52). Upon the whole, this scheme, adopted to relieve the difficulties which must always surround mysteries so great, only creates new ones. This is the usual fate of similar speculations, and shows the wisdom of resting in the plain interpretation of the Word of God. See Robinson, *Claude*, i, 214, 311; Watts, *Works*, v, 274, 385; Gill, *Body of Divinity*, ii, 51; Robinson, *Plea*, p. 140; Fleming, *Christology;* Simpson, *Apology for the Trinity*, p. 190; Hawker, *Sermon on the Divinity of Christ*, p. 44, 45; Haag, *Histoire des Dogmes Chrét.;* Martensen, *Dogmatics;* Müller, *Doctrine of Sin;* Liddon, *Divinity of Christ;* Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrines; Studien u. Kritiken*, 1860, No. 3. Comp. INDWELLING SCHEME; JESUS CHRIST.

Pre-existents (or **Preexistiani**) is the name given to those who hold the hypothesis of the pre-existence of souls, or the doctrine that, at the beginning of creation, not that of this world simply, but of all worlds, God created the souls of all men, which, however, are not united to the body till the individuals for whom they are destined are begotten or born into the world. According to this theory, says Schedd, "Men were angelic spirits at first. Because of their apostasy in the angelic sphere, they were transferred, as a punishment for their sin, into material bodies in this mundane sphere, and are now passing through a disciplinary process, in order to be restored, all of them, without exception, to their pre-existent and angelic condition. These bodies to which they are joined come into existence by the ordinary course of physical propagation; so that the sensuous and material part of human nature has no existence previous to Adam. It is only the rational and spiritual principle of which a preadamic life is asserted."

The doctrine of pre-existence first found its advocates in the Christian Church in the 2d century. The fathers Justin Martyr, Origen, and others espoused it, particularly Origen, who became its principal exponent and advocate. It was a belief very prevalent anciently, and is still widely spread throughout the East. The Greek philosophers, too, especially those who held the doctrine of transmigration (q. v.), as the Pythagoreans, Empedocles, and even Plato—if with him pre-existence is not simply a symbolical myth—were familiar with the conception; and so were the Jews, especially the cabalists. It is generally received by the modern Jews, and is frequently taught in the writings of the rabbins. One declares that "the soul of man had an existence anterior to the formation of the heavens, they being nothing but fire and water." The same author asserts that "the human soul is a particle of the Deity from above, and is eternal like the heavenly natures." A similar doctrine is believed by the Persian *Sofis* (q. v.). With the pre-existents should also be classed the metempsychosists, for pre-existence is connected with the idea of *metempsychosis* (q. v.), according to which doctrine the soul was, in a former life, in punishment for sin, united with a human body, in order to expiate, by the miseries of earthly existence, anterior transgressions. Therefore St. Augustine, invoking Cicero's authority, says (*Contra Julian.* iv, 15): "Ex quibus humanæ vitæ erroribus et aerumnis fit, ut interdum veteres illi sive vates sive in sacris initiisque tradendis divinæ mentis interpretes, qui nos ob aliqua scelera suscepta in vita superiori pœnarum luendarum causa esse natos dixerunt, aliquid vidisse videantur." Nemesius, as a philosopher, and Prudentius, as a poet, seem to have been the only defenders of the pre-existence theory, which was condemned formally in the Council of Constantinople, in A.D. 540. But the doctrine has been embraced by *mystics* (q. v.) generally, both in ancient and modern times; and has since been revived, in a modified form, in German theology, by Julius Müller, and forms the basis of his work on *The Christian Doctrine of Sin*, one of the deepest works in modern theology. In American theology it has its able advocate in Dr. Edward Beecher (*The Conflict of Ages*), but the Christian Church generally has thus far failed to give its assent to it. In the domain of philosophy, direct intellectual interest in this doctrine has nearly ceased in modern times; yet the dream—for, whether true or false, it is and can be nothing but a dream in our present state, and with our present capabilities of knowledge—has again and again haunted individual thinkers. Wordsworth has given poetical expression to it in his famous ode, *Intimations of Immortality from Recollections of Early Childhood:*

> "Our birth is but a sleep and a forgetting.
> The soul that rises with us—our life's star,
> Hath had elsewhere its setting,
> And cometh from afar.
> Not in entire forgetfulness,
> And not in utter nakedness,
> But trailing clouds of glory do we come
> From God, who is our home."

The latest philosophy of Germany—that of Hegel and of the younger Fichte (*Psychologie* [1864])—has moderately revived the doctrine, and, with the alliance of such theologians as Müller, may crowd it into prominent consideration upon the Church. It remains for us to say here that the name *Preexistiani* was given to the advocates of this belief to distinguish them from the *Creatiani*, those who hold to the immediate creation of the human soul at the moment of the production of the body; and to distinguish them from the *Traducianists*, who held that children received soul as well as body from their parents. See Cudworth, *Intellectual Development of the Universe;* Delitzsch, *Biblical Psychol.* p. 41–43; Lawson, *Church of Christ;* Goodwin, *Works;* Register, *Studien u. Kritiken*, 1829–37, s. v. *Seele; Westminster Rev.* April, 1865; *Bibliotheca Sacra*, Jan. 1855, p. 156; *Methodist Rev.* Oct. 1853, p. 567. (J. H. W.)

Prefaces (*Immolatio;* the Gallican *Contestatio missæ;* the priest's witness to the *vere dignum* of the people; the Mozarabic and Gallican *illatio* or *inlatio*), certain short occasional forms in the communion-service of the Church of England, which are introduced in particular festivals, more especially Christmas, Easter, Ascension, and seven days after; also Whit-Sunday and six days after, together with Trinity-Sunday. They are introduced by the priest immediately before the anthem beginning, "Therefore with angels, archangels," etc. "This anthem is a song of praise, or an act of profound adoration," says dean Comber, "equally proper at all times; but the Church calls upon us more especially to use it on her chief festivals, in remembrance of those events which are then celebrated. Thus, on Christmas-day, the priest, having said 'It is very meet, right, and our bounden duty that we should at all times, and in all places, give thanks unto thee, O Lord [Holy Father] Almighty, everlasting God,' adds the proper preface which assigns the reason for peculiar thankfulness on that particular day, viz.: '*Because* thou didst give Jesus Christ, thine only Son, to be born as at this time for us; who, by the operation of the Holy Ghost, was made very man, of the Virgin Mary his mother, and that without spot of sin, to make us clean from all sin; *therefore*, with angels,' etc.

"The antiquity of such prefaces may be estimated from the fact that they are mentioned and enjoined by the 103d canon of the African code, which code was formed of the decisions of many councils prior to the date of 418. The decay of devotion let fall the apostolical and primitive use of daily and weekly communions, and the people in the later ages did not receive but at the greater festivals; upon which custom there were added to the general preface mentioned before some special prefaces relating to the peculiar mercy of that feast on which they did communicate, the Church thinking it fit that, since every festival was instituted to remember some great mercy, therefore they who received on such a day, besides the general praises offered for all God's mercies, should at the Lord's table make a special memorial of the mercy proper to that festival; and this seemed so rational to our reformers that they have retained those proper prefaces which relate to Christmas, Easter, Ascension-day, Whit-Sunday, and Trinity-Sunday, so as to praise God for the mercies of Christ's birth, resurrection, and ascension, for the sending of the Holy Ghost, and for the true faith of the holy Trinity. On the greater festivals there are proper prefaces appointed, which are also to be repeated, in case there be a communion, for seven days after the festivals themselves (excepting that for Whit-Sunday, which is to be repeated only six days after, because Trinity-Sunday, which is the seventh, hath a preface peculiar to itself); to the end that the mercies may be the better remembered by often repetition, and also that all the people (who in most places cannot communicate all in one day) may have other opportunities, within those eight days, to join in praising God for such great blessings." "The reason," says bishop Sparrow, "of the Church's lengthening out these high feasts for several days is plain; the subject-matter of them is of so high a nature, and so nearly concerns our salvation, that one day would be too little to meditate upon them, and praise God for them as we ought. A bodily deliverance may justly require one day of thanksgiving and joy; but the deliverance of the soul by the blessings commemorated on those times deserves a much longer time of praise and acknowledgment. Since, therefore, it would be injurious to Christians to have their joy and thankfulness for such mercies confined to one day, the Church, upon the times when these unspeakable blessings were wrought for us, invites us, by her most seasonable commands and counsels, to fill our hearts with joy and thankfulness, and let them overflow eight days together." "The reason of their being fixed to eight days," says Wheatley (*Book of Common Prayer*), "is taken

from the practice of the Jews, who by God's appointment observed their greater festivals, some of them for seven, and one—namely, the Feast of Tabernacles—for eight days. And therefore the primitive Church, thinking that the observation of Christian festivals (of which the Jewish feasts were only types and shadows) ought not to come short of them, lengthened out their higher feasts to eight days."

These prefaces are very ancient, though there were some of them as they stood in the Latin service of later date. For as there are ten in that service, whereof the last, concerning the Virgin Mary, was added by pope Urban (1095), so it follows that the rest must be of a more remote antiquity. The Church of Rome holds that they were composed by Gelasius in memory of Christ's singing a hymn with his disciples after the Last Supper, the Jews at their Paschal supper singing seven Psalms (Psa. cxiii–cxix). Pope Sixtus added to them the *Ter Sanctus*. Pope Victor calls them *capitula*. From the 6th to the 11th century the Western Church had prefaces for every festival, but after that date they were reduced to nine, and are enumerated by pope Pelagius and Alexander as Easter, the Ascension, Pentecost, Christmas, the Apparition of Christ (Epiphany), the Apostles, Holy Trinity, Cross, and Quadragesima. The eucharist of Paul (1 Cor. xiv, 16) and St. Justin is probably the germ of the Western preface and the long thanksgiving prayer corresponding to it in the Greek Church. The Greeks, by the way, use only one preface. The Church of England has retained five, and those upon the principal festivals of the year, which relate only to the Persons of the Trinity, and not to any saint. "In this 'preface' a distinction is made between ceremonies which were introduced with a good design, and in process of time abused, and those which had a corrupt origin, and were at the beginning vain and insignificant. The last kind the Reformers entirely rejected, but the first were still used for decency and edification. Some well-disposed Christians were so attached to ancient forms that they would, on no account, suffer the least deviation from them; others were fond of innovation in everything. Between these extremes a middle way had been carefully observed by the Reformers. Many ceremonies had been so grossly abused by superstition and avarice that it was necessary to remove them altogether; but since it was fit to use some ceremonies for the sake of decency and order, it seemed better to retain those that were old than to invent new. Still, it must be remembered that those which were kept rested not on the same foundation as the law of God, and might be altered for reasonable causes; and the English Reformers, in keeping them, neither condemned those nations which thought them inexpedient, nor prescribed them to any other nation than their own" (Carwithen, *Hist. of the Church of England*). See, besides the authorities already referred to, Walcott, *Sacred Archæology*, s. v.; Hook, *Church Dictionary*, s. v.

Prehistoric Man. See PREADAMITE.

Preissler, Johann Justinus, a German painter and engraver of repute, was born at Nuremberg Dec. 4, 1698. His father, Johann Daniel, was his early master; then he spent eight years in Italy, and after his return to Germany succeeded his father in the direction of the Academy of the Fine Arts at Nuremberg (1742). Among his works, several of which were engraved, we mention the *Burial of the Lord*, the *Ark of the Covenant*, the *Transfiguration*, *Christ crowned with Thorns*, *Christ before Herod*, the *Cure of the Lame*. He engraved the paintings of Rubens in the church of the Jesuits at Antwerp, twenty drawings (Nuremberg, 1734, fol.); a collection of fifty of the most beautiful statues of Rome, after the drawings of Bouchardon (ibid. 1732, fol.); and *Ornamenti d' Architettura*. He died at Nuremberg Feb. 17, 1771.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.

Preissler, Johann Martin, an engraver, brother of the preceding, was born at Nuremberg March 14, 1715. After learning, under the direction of his father and his brothers, the arts of drawing and engraving, he went to Paris in 1739, where he made several engravings for the Galerie de Versailles. In 1744 he was called as professor of the art of engraving to Copenhagen, was subsequently honored with the title of engraver to the court, and received other honorable distinctions. Among his numerous and much esteemed engravings we mention, of sacred subjects and ecclesiastical historic interest, the *Cardinal of Bouillon*; *J. Andrew Cramer*; *Balth. Munter*; *Struensee*; *M. Luther*; *Gellert*; Juel's *Klopstock*; Raffaelle's *Madonna of the Chair*, a work in which we find in the highest degree all the excellent qualities of Preissler; Paul Veronese's *Carrying of the Cross*; Rosa's *Jonah preaching to the Ninevites*; Guido's *Ninus and Semiramis*; Rubens's *Mary, Mother of Grace*, and *St. Cecilia*; the *Adoration of the Shepherds*, after Vanloo; the *Judgment of Solomon* and the *Happy Meeting*, after his own sketches; the *Inoculation of the Countess of Bernstorf*; *Moses*, after Michael Angelo. Preissler made several engravings for the Museum of Florence and for the antique marbles of Dresden. He died at Copenhagen Nov. 17, 1794.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v. See Will, *Nürnbergisches Lexikon*, and Supplement of Nopitsch.-Fuessli, *Allgem. Künstlerlexikon*; Nagler, *Neues Allgem. Künstlerlexikon*.

Preiswerk, SAMUEL, *Dr.*, a Swiss theologian, was born Sept. 19, 1799, at Rümlingen, Switzerland. After having completed his theological studies at Basle, he was appointed in 1824 a minister at the Orphan-house, and in 1828 he succeeded R. Stier (q. v.) as professor at the Mission-house. He had hardly entered upon a new field of ministerial labors in 1830 at Muttenz, when the revolution broke out, which compelled him to leave the place, and two years afterwards he was appointed professor of Old-Testament exegesis and Oriental languages at the École de Théologie of the Evangelical Society at Geneva. In 1837 he returned to Basle, was appointed deacon in 1840, and in 1845 pastor of St. Leonhard, occupying at the same time the chair for Old-Testament exegesis at the university. From 1859 he occupied the position as antistes, or superintendent, of the Church at Basle, till he was called to his rest in 1871. Preiswerk was an excellent preacher and poet, and his fine missionary hymn, "*Dies ist der Gemeinde Stärke*," has been translated into English by Mrs. Winkworth (*Lyra Germ.* ii, 88—"Hark! the Church proclaims her honor"). He also published, *Das alte und neue Morgenland für Freunde der heiligen Schrift* (Basle, 1834–40):—*Die Nestorianer oder die 10 Stämme Israels* (ibid. 1843); this is a translation of *The Nestorians, or the Lost Tribes*, by A. Grant (q. v.):—*Grammaire Hébraïque, précedée d'un Précis historique sur la Langue Hébraïque* (3d ed. 1871). See Fürst, *Bibliotheca Judaica*, iii, 120; Zuchold, *Bibliotheca Theologica*, iii, 1012; Steinschneider, *Bibliogr. Handbuch*, p. 112; Peck, *Samuel Preiswerk*, in the "Evangel. Messenger" (Cleveland, Ohio, 1877); Koch, *Geschichte des deutschen Kirchenliedes*, vii, 99 sq.; Knapp, *Evangelischer Liederschatz*, s. v. (B. P.)

Prejudice (*præjudico*, to *judge before* inquiry) is a prejudging, that is, forming or adopting an opinion concerning anything before the grounds of it have been fairly or fully considered. The opinion may be true or false; but in so far as the grounds of it have not been examined, it is erroneous or without proper evidence. "In most cases prejudices are opinions which, on some account, men are pleased with, independently of any conviction of their truth; and which, therefore, they are afraid to examine, lest they should find them to be false. Prejudices, then, are unreasonable judgments, formed or held under the influence of some other motive than the love of truth. They may therefore be classed according to the nature of the *motives* from which they

result. These motives are either, 1, pleasurable, innocent, and social; or, 2, they are malignant" (Taylor, *Elements of Thought*). Dr. Reid (*Intell. Powers*, essay vi, ch. viii) has treated of *prejudices*, or the causes of error, according to the classification given of them by lord Bacon, under the name of *idols*. Locke (*Essay on the Human Understanding*, bk. iv, ch. xx) has treated of the causes of error. Some excellent observations on the *prejudices* peculiar to men of study may be seen in Malebranche (*Search after Truth*). See *Christian Examiner and Gen. Rev.* iv (1830), 280.

Prelacy. The organization of the Christian Church was in the beginning eminently simple, free, and popular. The government of the Church was at first a pure democracy, allowing to all its constituents the most enlarged freedom of voluntary religious association. Prelacy takes its name and character from the assumed prerogatives of the bishop as a distinct order or rank—*prælati, preferred*, promoted over others. It began in the 2d century with the distinction between *presbyter* and *bishop*, which were originally identical, merely different names for the same office. In the New Test. the appellations as titles of bishops and presbyters are the same. They are required to possess the same qualifications and to perform the same official duties; neither was there in the apostolical churches any ordinary and permanent class of officers superior to the presbyters.

I. *In the Early Church.*—Various circumstances conspired to give certain of the clergy influence and distinction over others. The pastors of churches founded by the apostles took precedence of presbyters of later and subordinate churches. The churches of Jerusalem, Antioch, Ephesus, Corinth, etc., became central points of influence which gave importance to their incumbents. They were the principal agents in appointing new stations for the extension of the Christian Church and in the organization of new churches dependent on the parent institution. With the increase of these chapels a parochial system of churches arose, more or less relying on the central Church for support and spiritual instructors—all of which gave to the prelate of the metropolis importance and pre-eminence over his subordinate presbyters.

In their persecutions the feebler churches relied for relief and protection on the parent Church. In their ecclesiastical assemblies the bishop of the metropolitan Church was of course the leading spirit, the moderator of the assembly, giving direction to their deliberations and the results of the council. He was still only *primus inter pares*, foremost among his equals in rank in the ministry. Prelacy had not yet taken form and character by asserting the rights and prerogatives of the bishop, but the concessions granted began in time to be claimed as an official right. Baptism was one of the rights of the bishop in the 2d century ("Dandi baptismum quidem habet summus sacerdos qui est episcopus," Tertullian, *De Cap.* § 7). The imposition of hands by the bishop in baptism and ordination soon followed as a prescriptive right of the bishop. This right was soon accorded to the presbyters and deacons by the authority of the bishop—*non tamen sine episcopi auctoritate*. In the unity of the Church and its officers Cyprian sought safety and defence both from the schismatic efforts of Felicissimus and Novatian and the persecution of Decius, A.D. 251. "No safety but in the Church"—*extra ecclesiam nulla salus*. As is the branch to the tree, the stream to the fountain, and the members to the body, so is the constituency to the Church. Moreover, the bishop is the embodiment of the Church, and there can be no Church without a bishop (Cyprian, *De Unit. Eccles.* ep. 4, 5). The bishop is appointed of God and invested with inviolable authority to rule over the Church. Such are the divine rights which were assumed by Cyprian as prelate of the Church, invested with divine authority and power over the Church of Christ. The bishop now claimed affinity with the Jewish priesthood, a daysman of the laity, the medium of grace from God to man, and the recipient of spiritual illumination and divine guidance. The synodical letter of the Council of Carthage contains similar pretensions ("Placuit nobis, Sancto Spirito suggerente, et Domino per visiones multas et manifestas admonente"). A sacerdotal caste was formed by Cyprian about A.D. 250, who claimed the prerogative of a distinct order of the priesthood, separate from and superior to the presbyters. Prælati, bishops, diocesan bishops were the titles designating the assumed prerogatives.

Provincial synods began now to be held, in which the presbyters were for a time admitted, but the predominant influence of the bishops directed the deliberations and enacted the laws of the synod. Thus they became the law-makers of the Church by the exercise of their prelatical authority under the guidance of the Divine Spirit—*Spiritu Divino suggerente*. Gradually they constituted themselves at once the enactors and the executors of the ordinances of the Church.

The rule of the priesthood was made more stringent over private members of the Church. In their travels they were required to have letters of recommendation—*literæ formatæ, clericæ, canonicæ*—from the bishop of the diocese. A long course of catechetical instruction and probation was required for admission to the Church. Rigorous and relentless was the discipline of offending constituents. Subordinate orders of the clergy were created—subdeacons, acolytes, readers, exorcists, doorkeepers, etc.—all having the effect to exalt the rank of the prelate as prominent above all. But the prelatical aspirations of bishops were restricted by the controlling influence which the laity still retained over the elections of the Church. This was gradually restricted by a crafty policy of having the candidates nominated by the subordinate clergy and their election confirmed by the bishop.

But a master stroke of policy was requisite to obtain control of the revenues of the Church. It was accomplished by successive expedients through a period of considerable time. The apostolic injunction was carefully urged on the Church to lay aside for charitable purposes "on the first day of the week or of the month a store as God had prospered them" (1 Cor. xvi, 2). At their love-feasts and sacramental seasons contributions were required as voluntary offerings—indeed, as late as Tertullian ("Nam nemo compellitur, sed sponte confert," *Apol.* § 39). Tithes began to be urged upon the members of the Church as early as the 3d century, but to the honor of the Church the offerings and contributions continued to be voluntary on the part of its members. Whatever taxes were imposed in later times for the maintenance of public worship and of the clergy were effected by the relations of the Church to the State under the Christian emperors. On the rules of the Church requiring the gratuitous performance of religious offices the following references may be consulted: *Concil. Illiber.* c. 48; Gelasius, *Epist.* l, al. 9, c. 5; Gregorius Naz. *Orat.* 40; Gratian, *Decr.* c. l, qu. i, c. 8; *Concil. Trullan.* ii, c. 23; Jerome, *Quæst. Hebr. in Gen.* 23.

The Council of Braga, in Portugal, A.D. 563, ordered a tripartite division of the property of the Church—one for the bishop, one for the other clergy, and the third for the lighting and repairs of the church. According to another authority four divisions were made, of which one portion was for the poor.

II. *Under the Emperors.*—When Christianity was the religion of the State, various other revenues accrued to the Church and the bishop. Upon the abolition of the heathen rites, under Theodosius the Great and his sons, the property of the heathen temples and priests which fell to the State was delivered over to the Christian clergy, or at least was appropriated to ecclesiastical uses (*Cod. Theodos.* lib. xvi, tit. 10, leg. 19–21; comp. Sozom. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. v, c. 7, 16). On the same principle the ecclesiastical property of heretics was confiscated and made over to the Catholic Church, as, for

instance, in the case of the Novatians (*Cod. Theodos.* lib. xvi, tit. 5, leg. 52; Socrat. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. vii, c. 7). It was also enacted that the property of such of the clergy as died without heirs, and of those who had relinquished their duties without sufficient cause, should lapse to the Church funds (*Cod. Theodos.* lib. v, tit. 3, leg. 50; *Cod. Justin.* lib. x, tit. 3, leg. 20, 53; *Cod. Nov.* 5, c. 4; 123, c. 42). The Church was also made the heir of all martyrs and confessors who died without leaving any near relatives (Euseb. *Vit. Const.* lib. ii, c. 36). The clergy enjoyed many privileges by which on the one hand they were in a measure shielded from the operations of the law, and on the other were intrusted with civil and judicial authority over the laity. Three particulars are stated by Planck: 1. In certain civil cases they exercised a direct jurisdiction over the laity. 2. The State submitted entirely to them the adjudication of all offences of the laity of a religious nature. 3. Certain other cases, styled ecclesiastical, *causæ ecclesiasticæ*, were tried before them exclusively. The practical influence of these arrangements and their effects upon the clergy and the laity are detailed by the same author, to whom we must refer the reader (*Gesell.-Verfass.* i, 308 sq.). The laity were ultimately separated from the control of the revenues which they contributed for the maintenance of the government of the Church and for charitable purposes. All measures of this nature, instead of originating with the people, as in all popular governments, began and ended with the priesthood (*Conc. Gan. Can.* 7, 8; *Bracar.* xi, c. 7; the canons alluded to clearly indicate the unjust and oppressive operations of this system). The wealth of the laity was now made to flow in streams into the Church. New expedients were devised to draw money from them. (It was a law of the Church in the 4th century that the laity should every Sabbath partake of the sacrament, the effect of which law was to augment the revenues of the Church, each communicant being required to bring his offering to the altar. Afterwards, when this custom was discontinued, the offering was still claimed [*Conc. Agath.* A.D. 585, c. 4]). Constantine himself contributed large sums to enrich the coffers of the Church, which he also authorized, A.D. 321, to inherit property by will (*Cod. Theodos.* 4, 16, tit. 2, leg. 4; Euseb. lib. x, c. 6; Sozomen, lib. i, c. 8; lib. v, c. 5). This permission opened new sources of wealth to the bishops, while it presented equal incentives to their cupidity. With what address they employed their newly acquired rights is apparent from the fact stated by Planck, that "in the space of ten years every man at his decease left a legacy to the Church, and within fifty years the clergy in the several provinces, under the color of the Church, held in their possessions one-tenth part of the entire property of the province. By the end of the 4th century the emperors themselves were obliged to interpose to check the accumulation of these immense revenues—a measure which Jerome said "he could not regret, but he could only regret that his brethren had made it necessary" (Planck, *Gesell.-Verfass.* i, 281; comp. Pertsch, *Kirchengesch.* c. 9, § 11).

Prelacy also gained great power from the Church by controlling the elections of the clergy. The sovereign rights of the people in their free elective franchise began at an early period to be invaded. The final result of these changes was a total disfranchisement of the laity and the substitution of an ecclesiastical despotism in the place of the elective government of the primitive Church. Of these changes one of the most effective was the attempt, by means of correspondence and ecclesiastical synods, to consolidate the churches into *one Church universal*, to impose upon them a uniform code of laws, and establish an ecclesiastical polity administered by the clergy. The idea of a holy catholic Church and of an ecclesiastical hierarchy for the government of the same was wholly a conception of the priesthood. Whatever may have been the motives with which this doctrine of the unity of the Church was first promulgated, it prepared the way for the overthrow of the popular government of the Church.

Above all, the doctrine of the divine right of the priesthood aimed a fatal blow at the liberties of the people. The clergy were no longer the servants of the people, chosen by them to the work of the ministry, but an independent and privileged order, like the Levitical priesthood, and, like them, by divine right invested with peculiar prerogatives. This independence they began by degrees to assert and to exercise. The bishop began in the 3d century to appoint at pleasure his own deacons and other inferior orders of the clergy. In other appointments, also, he endeavored to disturb the freedom of the elections and to direct them agreeably to his own will (Pertsch, *Kirchengesch. des drit. Jahrhund.* p. 439–454; Planck, *Gesell.-Verfass.* i, 183). Against these encroachments of ecclesiastical ambition and power the people continued to oppose a firm but ineffectual resistance. They asserted, and in a measure maintained, their primitive right of choosing their own spiritual teachers (Gieseler, i, 272; for a more full and detailed account of these changes of ecclesiastical policy and of the means by which they were introduced, the reader is referred to the volume of J. G. Planck, *Gesch. der christ.-Kirchl. Gesellschaftsverfassung*, i, 149–212, 433 sq.). There are on record instances in the 4th, and even in the 5th century, where the appointment of a bishop was effectually resisted by the refusal of the people to ratify the nomination of the candidate to a vacant see (Gregorius Naz. *Orat.* 10; comp. *Orat.* 19, p. 308; 21, p. 377; Bingham, bk. iv, ch. i, § 3; Planck, i, 440, n. 10). The rule had been established by decree of councils, and often repeated, requiring the presence and unanimous concurrence of all the provincial bishops in the election and ordination of one to the office of bishop. This afforded them a convenient means of defeating any popular election by an affected disagreement among themselves. The same canonical authority had made the concurrence of the metropolitan necessary to the validity of any appointment. His veto was accordingly another efficient expedient by which to baffle the suffrages of the people and to constrain them into a reluctant acquiescence in the will of the clergy (*Conc. Nic.* c. 4; *Conc. Antioch.* c. 16; *Carthag.* A.D. 390, c. 12; Planck, i, 433–452).

Elections to ecclesiastical offices were also disturbed by the interference of secular influence from without, in consequence of that disastrous union of Church and State which was formed in the 4th century under Constantine the Great. During this century (1) the emperors convened and presided in general councils; (2) confirmed their decrees; (3) enacted laws relative to ecclesiastical matters by their own authority; (4) pronounced decisions concerning heresies and controversies; (5) appointed bishops; (6) inflicted punishment on ecclesiastical persons. Agitated and harassed by the conflict of these discordant elements, the popular assemblies for the election of men to fill the highest offices of the holy ministry became scenes of tumult and disorder that would disgrace a modern political canvass.

To correct these disorders various but ineffectual expedients were adopted at different times and places. The Council of Laodicea (A.D. 361, c. 13) denied to the multitude—*τοῖς ὄχλοις, the rabble*—any vote in the choice of persons for the sacred office. Justinian in the 6th century sought, with no better success, to remedy the evils in question by limiting the elective franchise to a mixed aristocracy composed of the clergy and the chief men of the city. These were jointly to nominate three candidates, declaring under oath that in making the selection they had been influenced by no sinister motive. From these three the ordaining person was to ordain the one whom he judged best qualified (Justin. *Novell.* 123, c. 1; 137, c. 2; *Cod.* lib. I, tit. 3; *De Episcop.* leg. 42). The Council of Arles (A.D. 452, c. 54) in like manner ordered the bishops to nominate three candidates, from whom the clergy and the people

should make the election; and that of Barcelona (A.D. 599, c. 3) ordered the clergy and people to make the nomination, and the metropolitan and bishops were to determine the election by lot. But even these ineffectual efforts to restore measurably the right of the people show to what extent it was already lost.

The doctrine that to the clergy was promised a divine guidance from the Spirit of God had its influence also in completing the subjugation of the people. Resistance to such an authority under the infallible guidance of God's Spirit was rebellion against High Heaven, which the laity had not the impiety to maintain. The government and discipline of the Church by the priesthood was but the natural result of their control of the elective franchise. It established and commemorated the independence, the supremacy of prelacy. The bishops, no longer the ministers and representatives of the Church, are the priests of God to dictate the laws and administer the discipline of the Church (Mosheim, *De Rebus Christ.* sæc. ii, § 23). By the middle of the 4th century prelacy, by various expedients, acquired the control of the whole penal jurisdiction of the laity, opening and closing at pleasure the doors of the Church, inflicting sentence of excommunication, prescribing penances, absolving penitents, and restoring them to the Church by arbitrary authority (Planck, *Gesell.-Verfass.* ii, 509).

III. *Under the Papacy.*—Such are the various causes —influential in different degrees, perhaps, in the several organizations—in supplanting the popular government of the primitive Church and substituting in its place prelacy, which, under different forms of centralization, finally culminated in the pope of Rome. This culmination, and the craft by which it was accomplished, require a fuller detail than our limits will allow. We can only affirm that this important period in history, when the foundation was laid for rendering the hierarchy independent both of clerical and secular power, has not been noticed by historians so particularly as its importance requires. They seem not to have noted the fact that Hildebrand, who A.D. 1073 became Gregory VII, concerted measures for the independence of the Church. "It was the deep design of Hildebrand, which he for a long time prosecuted with unwearied zeal, to bring the pope wholly within the pale of the Church, and to prevent the interference in his election of all secular influence and arbitrary power. And that measure of the council which wrested from the emperor a right of long standing, and which has never been called in question, may deservedly be regarded as the masterpiece of popish intrigue, or rather of Hildebrand's cunning. The concession which disguised this crafty design of his was expressed as follows: *That the emperor should continue to hold, as he ever had held, the right of confirming the election of the pope derived from him.* The covert design of this clause was not perceived, but it expressed nothing less than that the emperor should ever receive and hold from the pope himself the right of confirming the appointment of the pope" (Voigt, *Hildebrand* [Weimar, 1815, 8vo], p. 54, cited by Augusti, i, 209).

As might have been expected, the lofty claim of the pope was resisted; but he had the address to defend his usurped authority against all opposition, and proudly proclaimed himself "the successor of St. Peter, set up by God to govern, not only the Church, but the whole world." The gradations of ecclesiastical organization through which prelacy has passed are from congregational to parochial, parochial to diocesan, diocesan to metropolitan, metropolitan to patriarchal, patriarchal to papal—from the humble pastor of a little flock to the pope of Rome, the supreme and universal prelate of the Church of Christ on earth. See Coleman, *Prelacy and Ritualism; National Repository*, Feb. 1878 (*Ex Cathedra*). (L. C.)

Prelate (Lat. *prælatus*, i. e. *promoted*) is an ecclesiastic who has direct authority over other ecclesiastics. The term is a general one, and includes not merely bishops of various degrees, but also in Roman Catholic countries the heads of religious houses or orders and other similar ecclesiastical dignitaries. These, for the most part, are privileged to wear the insignia of the episcopal rank. In the Roman court many of the officials, although not possessing episcopal or quasi-episcopal jurisdiction, have the insignia and the title of prelate. They are of two classes—the higher, called *del mantelletto* ("of the little mantle"), and the secondary, called *del mantellone* ("of the great mantle"), from the robe which they respectively bear. The same root underlies other ecclesiastical terms in which all the clergy are on an equality, and are governed by a representative body or by the local church; *prelatic* and *prelatical*, i. e. pertaining to a prelacy or a prelate, as prelatical authority. Prelates are confined to those churches which recognise in the bishop (q. v.) a distinct and superior order of clergy. See PRELACY.

Prémare, JOSEPH-HENRI, a French Jesuit, was born about 1670 in Normandy. March 7, 1698, he embarked with several other Jesuits at La Rochelle to preach the Gospel in China. He arrived Oct. 6 at Suneian, and addressed, Feb. 17, 1699, a relation of his journey to père La Chaise, with a descriptive notice of the countries he had visited. As soon as he had mastered the Chinese language he made a careful study of the antiquities and literature of the country. Though he expressed some strange ideas, it cannot be denied that his erudition was considerable, and that he thoroughly knew the philosophical works of the Chinese. He died at Peking about 1735. He left, *Recherches sur les Temps anterieurs à ceux dont parle le Chou-King et sur la Mythologie Chinoise*, published by Deguignes in the translation of the *Chou-King*, by père Gaubii, in the form of a preliminary discourse (Paris, 1770, 4to):—a number of other works, three of them in Chinese:—*The Life of St. Joseph*, the *Lou-chou-chii*, or true sense of the six classes of characters, and a small treatise on the attributes of God, inserted in the *Notitia linguæ sinicæ*, which is the best of all those composed hitherto by Europeans on this subject:—several other treatises in Latin and in French, preserved among the manuscripts of the National Library of Paris, where we find also the originals of several letters of père Prémare. Three letters of this missionary were published in the *Lettres édifiantes*, and a fourth in the *Annales encyclopédiques* of Klaproth. He translated also a drama, *Tchao chi Kou-cul* (the Orphan of the House of Chao), which furnished to Voltaire some ideas for his *Orphelin de la Chine*. See *Lettres édifiantes*, vols. xvi and xxi; *Catalogue de Fourmont l'aîné*.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.

Premice (*primitiæ* or *prima missæ*) is the first mass celebrated by the newly ordained priest (*neomysta*), with the help of an assistant. The solemnity begins thus: the new priest sings on the steps of the altar "Veni Sancte Spiritus," performs the corresponding ovation, and then distributes the holy water, if this is prescribed by the rubrics of the day. It is an open question among the rubricists if at a premice the mass of the day or a votival mass is to be read. The probable solution of the difficulty is that, on simple Sundays and ordinary "festis duplicibus," a votival mass may be said, such a mass being permitted on such days *pro re gravi et publica*, to which a premice solemnity may be said to belong; but the mass of the day must be preserved on high feasts, and on such Sundays on which votive masses are never admissible. The solemnity ends with the sacerdotal benediction, given by the new priest to the people by the imposition of hands (Lohner, *Instructio practica de SS. Missæ sacrificio*, pt. iv, tit. v; and Vogt, *Instructio practica de Missis votivis*, p. 197 sq.). The festivities connected with a premice, and not belonging directly to the ecclesiastical celebration, vary with the customs of countries and places, and are not seldom regulated by special prescriptions of the ecclesiastical authorities.

Premice Sermons are discourses preached on the occasion of the first mass of an incipient priest. Their aim is to call the attention of both ecclesiastics and laymen to the dignity and importance of the sacerdotal state, and the duties which it imposes on both classes. Therefore the object of the sermon can only be some truth which relates to the clerical state: e. g. the dignity, the importance, of the priestly career; the priesthood of the Romish Church, its destination, or the duties arising from it, etc. According to the theme chosen, the sermon enlarges upon the object of the priestly functions, or the qualities, conditions, mode of action of the priesthood, or its duties and beneficial influences, etc. At the end of the sermon there may be a prayer, or an exhortation to prayer.

Premonstratensians or PREMONSTRANTS is the name of a monastic order which was founded at Prémontre (Lat. *Præmonstratum*), in the diocese of Laon, France, about 1120, by St. Norbert of Cleves, afterwards archbishop of Magdeburg, with a view to restore the discipline of the regular canons, which had greatly deteriorated. The order followed the rule of St. Augustine, and was confirmed by popes Honorius II and Innocent III. The ground on which the order was established was given to St. Norbert by the bishop of Laon, with the approbation of Louis the Gross, king of France, who gave the Premonstratensians a charter of privileges. The place was called Præmonstratum, because it was pretended that the Blessed Virgin herself pointed out (*præmonstravit*) beforehand the site for the principal house of the order. According to these legendary authorities, the members of the order were at the same time commanded to wear a white habit, and consequently the White Canons wore a white cassock and rochet and a long white cloak. The abbots never wore pontificals; and any member promoted to the cardinalate or popedom retained his habit. At the time of the founding of the order St. Norbert had thirteen companions, but as the popes and kings of France granted it many privileges, and were very liberal to the Premonstratensians, they rapidly increased, and counted among their number many persons of distinguished birth, deep piety, and great scholarship. In the early history of the order there was such strict adherence to the rule of poverty that they had nothing they could call their own but one ass, which served them to carry wood, cut down by them every morning and sent to Laon, where it was sold to purchase bread; but in a short time they received so many donations, and built so many monasteries, that thirty years after the foundation of this order they had above a hundred abbeys in France and Germany. The order has likewise given the Church a great number of archbishops and bishops. It once had 1000 abbeys and 500 nunneries (until 1273 their monasteries were double, a house of women always adjoining the convent of men), but it is now the mere skeleton of what it was. Of the sixty-five abbeys which they had in Italy not one now remains. These monks, vulgarly called *White Canons*, went first to England in the year 1146, where the first monastery, called Newhouse, was built in Lincolnshire by Peter de Saulia, and dedicated to St. Martialif. In the reign of Edward I, when that king granted his protection to the monasteries, the Premonstratensians had twenty-seven houses in different parts of the country. They were commonly called "White Friars." They had six monasteries in Scotland—four in Galloway, one at Dryburgh, and one at Ferne, in Ross-shire. They had also several houses in Ireland. In England their churches and conventual buildings were at Eastby, Leiston, Bayham, Wendling, and Eggleston. They were very irregular in plan, the greater portion of the minster being aisleless and the transept unimportant, as they eschewed all processions. There is a fine ruin at Ardaines, near Caen, which gives a vivid illustration of the farming arrangements of the order—homely and retired lovers of the country, and enterprising farmers. The principal houses were Torre, East Dereham, and Hales Owen. They carried the almuce over the right arm; the Canons of St. Victor wore it like a tippet round the neck. See Fosbroke, *Ancient Monachism* (see Index); Herzog, *Real-Encykl.* xii, 82 sq.; Helyot, *Hist. des Ordres*, s. v.

Premonstrant Monk.

Prémord, CHARLES-LÉONARD, a French priest, was born at Honfleur July 30, 1760. He obtained in 1790 a canonry in the college of St. Honoré at Paris. Deprived of it soon afterwards, he retired to England, where he began by giving French lessons. Madame de Lévis-Mirepoix went with some French Benedictine nuns to establish herself at Cannington Court, and intrusted Prémord with the spiritual direction of the community. In 1816 he established himself at Paris, where cardinal Talleyrand-Périgord appointed him honorary canon of Notre Dame and chaplain of Charles X (1825). Prémord was also appointed vicar-general of Strasburg and of Quimper. After the Revolution of July he returned to England to rejoin the Benedictine community which he had so long directed. He left an English edition of *Rules of a Christian Life*, and a publication of the *Œuvres choisies de M. Asseline, evêque de Boulogne* (Paris, 1823, 6 vols. 12mo), accompanied with an incomplete notice. He died Aug. 26, 1837, at Colwich, Staffordshire. See *L'Ami de la Religion*, 1837.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.

Prenorman Architecture. In a large class of English ecclesiastical structures reared anterior to the Norman invasion the style is so peculiar that it should be classified as distinctively Prenorman. The walls are of rag or rubble, frequently of herring-bone work, and unbuttressed; the quoins present long and short work; strips of stone or pilasters bisect or relieve the towers; the imposts of the shafts are rude, massive, and ornamented either with classical mouldings or rude carvings; the arches are round or angled, and sometimes constructed of bricks; and baluster-like pillars are introduced in the windows, which are often deeply splayed within and without. Two pillars from Reculver Basilica are standing in the Green Court of Canterbury. The churches of Lyminge, Barnack, Bosham, Bradford (Wilts), Brixworth (the oldest remaining church in England, and possessing a basilican type), Stanton Lacy, Dover Castle, Brytford, Corhampton, Dunham Magna, Caversfield, and part of the crypt of York, those of Ripon and Hexham, the towers of Deerhurst, Barton, St. Benet's (Cambridge and Lincoln), Cholsey, St. Mary (York), Bolam, Brigstock, Earl's Barton, and the steeples of Bosham and Sompting, and portions of many other churches, exhibit some or other of these peculiar-

ities. The base story of the tower of Barnack formed a judicial and council chamber, with an angle-headed sedile on the west, with stone benches for the assessors on either side. They were erected either by the English, or possibly by the Danes under Canute, as that king ordered churches of stone and lime to be built in all places where the minsters had been burned by his countrymen, and out of the hundred, which is the number of these buildings, two thirds are in the eastern counties and Lincolnshire, where the compatriots of the French Normans settled before the latter arrived. In the first half of the 11th century churches so rapidly multiplied in France and Italy that a chronicler says the world seemed to be putting on a new white robe. Westminster Abbey was built by the Confessor in the Norman style; while in Lincolnshire the Prenorman mode was preserved late in the 11th century, just as the Perpendicular lingered in Somerset in the time of Elizabeth, and produced Wadham College chapel by the aid of west country masons.

Prentiss, Erastus L., a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born at New London, Conn., in 1825, was converted at the age of fifteen, and, after joining the Methodists, was licensed to preach in 1848. Seeing the necessity of thorough educational training for the great work of the Gospel, he prepared for college at Amenia Seminary, and then entered Wesleyan University. Failing health interrupted his studies for a time, but he finally graduated at Amherst College in 1855. The following year he entered New York Conference, and took a position from the first which he ever maintained, as will be seen in reviewing his fields of labor. His first appointment, 1856, was the Second Methodist Church in Kingston; the next year, 1857, at St. Paul's, New York City, as assistant to the lamented Dr. John M'Clintock, the late editor of this *Cyclopædia*. In 1858 and the following year Prentiss was stationed at the Second Methodist Church in Newburgh; in 1860 and 1861 at Chester; in 1862 and 1863 at Matteawan; in 1864, 1865, and 1866 at Tuckahoe; in 1869 and 1870, Cannon Street Church, Poughkeepsie; in 1870 and 1871, St. Paul's Church at Peekskill. In the spring of 1872 he received his last appointment, which was Warwick. There he was received with open arms, engaged in his ministerial duties with great delight, and was exceedingly useful, as his name was "like ointment poured forth," until the day of his death, Feb. 28, 1873. Prentiss possessed rare outward attractions. His fine and delicate form, his noble brow, his bright eye, and his genial features made him a beautiful specimen of humanity that it was refreshing to behold; but they were far surpassed by the inward adorning, his childlike spirit, the kindness of his heart, the gentleness of his disposition, the warmth of his affections, and his pure and unspotted life. His ministry was evangelical and practical in its character to a pre-eminent degree, and was a success. Heaven put the broad seal of its approbation upon his labors. See *Christian Advocate* (N. Y. May 8, 1873); *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 1873.

Prentiss, Thomas, D.D., a Congregational minister, was born Oct. 27, 1747, at Holliston, Mass. He graduated at Harvard College in 1766, entered the ministry in 1769, and was ordained Oct. 30, 1770, pastor in Medfield, where he continued until his death, Feb. 28, 1814. During the Revolutionary struggle he was for a time chaplain in the army. He was also identified with different reform movements, and was a leader in temperance reform. He established a public library in the place of his pastorate, and greatly benefited the community in many ways. He published, *A Sermon on the Duty of Offending and Offended Brethren* (1773):—*Religion and Morality United in the Duty of Man*, two sermons (1802):—*Professed Christians Cautioned, and Evil Speakers Admonished*, a sermon (1804):—*The Sin and Danger of Strengthening the Hands of Evil-doers*, a sermon (1805); and several occasional *Sermons*.—Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, i, 678.

Preparation (*παρασκευή*) in Mark xv, 42; Luke xxiii, 54; John xix, 42, and Matt. xxvii, 62, is doubtless the day or evening before the commencement of the Sabbath, with which, at that time, according to the Synoptical Gospels, coincided the first day of the Passover. (But Schneckenburger [*Beiträge zur Einleit. ins N. T.* p. 1 sq.] supposes the "preparation" in Matthew to mean the feast-day of the Easter period, and which was viewed as a preparatory festival to the Passover.) This day was devoted to preparation for the holyday —especially preparing food for the Sabbath. Mark explains the word by "the day before the Sabbath" (*προσάββατον*; comp. Judith viii, 6; Josephus, *Ant.* xvi, 6, 2). The Jewish expression for it is ערובתא (see Buxtorf, *Lex. Talm.* col. 1660). So, too, the Peshito renders in the places quoted above. Every feast, like the Sabbath, had a preparation-day before it, which is often mentioned by the Talmudists (Deyling, *Observ.* i, 162; with this may be compared *παρασκευὴ τοῦ πάσχα*, John xix, 14; *Preparation for Easter*, the 14th of Nisan; comp. Bleek, *Beiträge zur Evangelienkritik*, p. 114 sq.). See PASSOVER.

Prepon, an early Marcionite, was a native of Assyria, and flourished at the close of the 2d century. The Marcionites were then divided into several factions, some of which admitted two original principles, as Potitus and Basilicus; others three (Rhodon, in Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* v, 13). To the latter belonged Prepon, who held that, besides what is *good* and *evil*, there is what constitutes a third principle, viz. what is *just*. This intermediate principle Hippolytus identifies with the "Musa," or impartial Reason of Empedocles, a myth to whom is attributed the restoration to the good power Unity of what is disturbed by the wicked power Discord (Hippol. *Hær. Refut.* vii, 19). A letter from Prepon to the Armenian Bardesanes is mentioned (*Philos.* I, viii, 253).

Prerogative Court of the archbishop is, in Roman Catholic countries where the Church is granted extraordinary privileges, a court of that ecclesiastic wherein all testaments are proved and all administrations granted, when a party dying within the province has *bona notabilia* in some other diocese than where he dies; and is so called from having a prerogative throughout his whole province for the said purposes.

Presanctified. See PRÆSANCTIFICATIO.

Presburg, COUNCIL OF (*Concilium Presoniense*), an ecclesiastical gathering which convened on Nov. 10, 1309, and was presided over by the papal legate cardinal Gentil, of Hungary. Nine canons of discipline were published, of which the eighth forbids Christian women to marry infidels, heretics, or schismatics. See Labbé, *Concil.* ix, 2453.

Presbyter (Gr. *πρεσβύτερος*) is the title of an office or dignity in the Jewish synagogue (זקן). It was introduced into the Christian Church, and designated an officer whose functions in the apostolic period are disputed by different ecclesiastical bodies. In the Roman Catholic and in the English hierarchy, the title has been the occasion of a protracted controversy as to the respective claims of the bishop (q. v.) and the presbyter. Those who maintain the presbyter as on equality with the episcopos argue as follows: With respect to the successors of the apostles, they seem to have been placed on a footing of perfect equality, the *διάκονοι*, or deacons, not being included among the teachers. They were inferior officers, whose province it originally was to care for the poor, and to discharge those secular duties arising out of the formation of Christian communities which could not be discharged by the ministers without interfering with the much higher duties which they had to perform. These ministers are sometimes

in the New Testament styled πρεσβύτεροι, or presbyters, at other times ἐπίσκοποι, or bishops; but the two appellations were indiscriminately applied to all the pastors who were the instructors of the different churches. Of this various examples may be given from the sacred writings. The apostle Paul, upon a very affecting occasion, when he was convinced that he could never again have an opportunity of addressing them, sent for the elders, or presbyters, of Ephesus, the persons to whom the ministry in that Church had been committed; and after mentioning all that he had done, and intimating to them the sufferings which awaited him, he addressed to them what may be considered as his dying advice, and as comprehending in it all that he judged it most essential for them to do: "Take heed, therefore, unto yourselves, and to all the flock over which the Holy Ghost hath made you bishops or overseers, to feed the Church of God" (Acts xx, 17, 28). Here they whose duty it was to feed the Church of God, as having been set apart through the Holy Spirit for that interesting work, are termed by the apostle presbyters and bishops, and there is not the slightest reference to the existence of any other ἐπίσκοπος, or bishop, superior to those ἐπίσκοποι, or bishops, to whom he gives the moving charge now recorded. In his epistle to Titus, Paul thus writes: "For this purpose I left thee in Crete," where, as yet, it is probable that no teachers had been appointed, "that thou shouldest ordain elders, or presbyters, in every city." He then points out the class of men from which the presbyters were to be selected, adding, as the reason of this, "for a bishop must be blameless as the steward of God" (Titus i, 5, 7). It is quite plain that the term bishop is here applicable to the same persons who were a little before styled elders, and both are declared to be the stewards of God, the guardians and instructors of his Church. The apostle Peter, in his first epistle addressed to the Jewish converts, has these words: "The elders which are among you I exhort, who am also an elder, ὁ συμπρεσβύτερος, and a witness of the sufferings of Christ: feed the flock of God which is among you, taking the oversight of it, ἐπισκοποῦντες, being bishops of it, not by constraint, but willingly" (1 Pet. v, 1, 2). This passage is a very strong one. The apostle speaks of himself in his extraordinary capacity, a witness of the sufferings of Christ, and in his ordinary capacity as a teacher; showing, by the use of a very significant term, that as to it he was on a footing of equality with the other pastors or presbyters. He gives it in charge to them to feed the flock of God; the charge which, under most particular and affecting circumstances, he had received from the Lord after the Resurrection, and which includes in it the performance of everything requisite for the comfort and the edification of Christians; and he accordingly expresses this by the word ἐπισκοποῦντες, being bishops over them. It cannot, with any shadow of reason, be supposed that the apostle would exhort the elders, or presbyters, to take to themselves the office, and to perform the duties, of a bishop, if that term really marked out a distinct and higher order; or that he would have considered the presbyters as fitted for the discharge of the whole ministerial office, if there were parts of that office which he knew that it was not lawful for them to exercise. See ELDER.

It seems, by the passages that have been quoted, to be placed beyond a doubt, that, in what the apostles said respecting the ministers of Christ's religion, they taught that the ἐπίσκοποι and the πρεσβύτεροι were the same class of instructors; and that there were, in fact, only two orders pointed out by them, bishops or presbyters, and deacons. This being the case, even although it should appear that there were bishops, in the common sense of that term, recognised in the apostolic age, all that could be deduced from the fact would be, that the equality at first instituted among the teachers had, for prudential reasons, or under peculiar circumstances, been interrupted; but it would not follow either that the positive and general declarations on the subject by the inspired writers were not true, or that it was incumbent at all times, and upon all Christians, to disregard them. It has been strenuously contended that there were such bishops in the infancy of the Church, and that allusion is made to them in Scripture; but, without directly opposing the assertion, this much must be admitted, that the proof of it is less clear than that bishops and presbyters were represented as the same in rank and in authority. Indeed, there does not appear to have been any occasion for this higher order. To presbyters was actually committed the most important charge of feeding the Church of God, that is, of promoting the spiritual improvement of mankind; and it is remarkable that their privilege of separating from the people by ordination the ministers of religion is explicitly acknowledged in the case of Timothy, whom the apostle admonishes not to neglect the gift that was in him, and which had been given by prophecy, and by the laying-on of the hands of the presbytery; by which can be meant only the imposition of the hands of those who were denominated presbyters or bishops. But although all the parts of the ministerial duty had been intrusted to presbyters, it is still contended that the New Testament indicates the existence of bishops as a higher order. There has, however, been much diversity of opinion in relation to this point by those who contend for the divine institution of EPISCOPACY (q. v.). Some of them maintain that the apostles, while they lived, were the bishops of the Christian Church; but this, and upon irrefragable grounds, is denied by others. Some urge that Timothy and Titus were, in what they call the true sense of the term, bishops; but many deny this, founding their denial upon the fact that these evangelists did not reside within the bounds, and were not limited to the administration, of any one church, but were sent wherever it was resolved to bring men to the knowledge of divine truth. Many conceive that the question is settled by the epistles in the book of Revelation being addressed to the angels of the respective churches named by the apostle. But it is far from being obvious what is implied under the appellation angel. There has been much dispute about this point, and it is certainly a deviation from all the usual rules by which we are guided in interpreting Scripture to bring an obscure and doubtful passage in illustration of one about the import of which, if we attend to the language used, there can be no doubt.

It may, therefore, be safely affirmed that there is nothing clear and specific in the writings of the New Testament which qualifies the positive declarations that bishops and presbyters were the same officers; that the ground upon which the distinction between them is placed is, at least, far from obviously supporting it; and that there is not the slightest intimation that the observance of such a distinction is at all important, much less absolutely essential, to a true Christian Church, insomuch that where it is disregarded the ordinances of divine appointment cannot be properly dispensed. If, therefore, it be established—and some of the most learned and zealous advocates for the hierarchy which afterwards arose have been compelled to admit it—that Scripture has not recognised any difference of rank or order between the ordinary teachers of the Gospel, all other means of maintaining this difference should be with Protestants of no force. Says Coleman, "Even the most zealous advocates of the episcopal system in the Greek, Roman, and English Church are constrained to recognise and admit the identity of the terms ἐπίσκοπος and πρεσβύτερος, according to the *usus loquendi* of the ancient Church. They are constrained to admit that the distinction between the office of bishop and presbyter, which prevailed about the 3d and 4th centuries, and to a period still later, was unknown in the first two centuries." It may be shown that the admission of the distinction is not incompatible with the great ends for which a ministry was appointed, and even in particular cases may tend to promote them; but still it is merely a matter of human regulation, not binding

upon Christians, and not in any way connected with the vital influence of the Gospel dispensation. The whole of the writers of antiquity might be urged in support of it, if that could be done; and, after all, every private Christian would be entitled to judge for himself, and to be directed by his own judgment, unless it be maintained that where Scripture has affirmed the existence of equality, this is to be counteracted and set at naught by the testimonies and assertions of a set of writers who, although honored with the name of fathers, are very far, indeed, from being infallible, and who have, in fact, often delivered sentiments which even they who, upon a particular emergency, cling to them must confess to be directly at variance with all that is sound in reason or venerable and sublime in religion. It also follows, from the Scriptural identity of bishops and presbyters, that no Church in which this identity is preserved can on that account be considered as having departed from the apostolic model, or its ministers be viewed, at least with any good reason, as having less ground to hope for the blessing of God upon their spiritual labors; because if we admit the contrary, we must also admit that the inspired writers, instead of properly regulating the Church, betrayed it into error by omitting to make a distinction closely allied with the essence of religion. What is this but to say that it is safer to follow the erring direction of frail mortals than to follow the admonitions of those who, it is universally allowed, were inspired by the Holy Spirit, or commissioned by him to be the instructors of the world? It is to be observed, however, that although bishops and presbyters were the same when the epistles of the New Testament were written, it would be going too far to contend that no departure from this should ever take place; because, to justify such a position, it would be requisite that a positive injunction should have been given that equality must at all times be carefully preserved. There is, however, no such injunction. Unlike the Old Testament, which specified everything, even the most minute, in relation to the priesthood, the New only refers in general terms, and very seldom, to the ministry; and the reason probably is, that, being intended for all nations, it left Christians at liberty to make such modifications in the ecclesiastical constitution as in their peculiar situation appeared best adapted for religious edification. The simple test to be applied to the varying or varied forms of Church government is that indicated by our Lord himself: "By their fruits ye shall know them." Wherever the regulations respecting the ministry are such as to divert it from the purposes for which it was destined, to separate those who form it from the flock of Christ, to relax their diligence in teaching, and to destroy the connection between them and their people, so as to render their exertions of little or of no use, there we find a Church not apostolical. But wherever the blessed fruits of Gospel teaching are in abundance produced, where the people and the ministers are cordially united, and where every regulation is calculated to give efficacy to the labors of those who have entered into the vineyard, we have an apostolical Church, or, to speak more properly, a Church of Christ built upon a rock, because devoted to the beneficent objects for which our Saviour came into the world.

Schaff, in his *Hist. of the Christian Church* (i, 418 sq.), adduces, in favor of the view which denies the apostolic origin of the episcopate as a *separate* office or order, the following facts: "1. The undeniable identity of presbyters and bishops in the New Testament, conceded even by the best interpreters among the Church fathers, by Jerome, Chrysostom, and Theodoret. 2. Later, in the 2d century, the two terms are still used in like manner for the same office. The Roman bishop Clement, in his first epistle to the Corinthians, says that the apostles, in the newly founded churches, appointed the first-fruits of the faith, i. e. the first converts, *ἐπισκόπους καὶ διακόνους*. He here omits the *πρεσβύτεροι*, as Paul does in Phil. i, 1, for the simple reason that they are in his view identical with *ἐπίσκοποι*; while, conversely, in ch. lvii, he enjoins subjection to presbyters, without mentioning bishops. Clement of Alexandria distinguishes, it is true, the deaconate, the presbyterate, and the episcopate; but he supposes only a twofold official character, that of presbyters and that of deacons — a view which found advocates so late as the Middle Ages, even in pope Urban II, A.D. 1091. Lastly, Irenæus, towards the close of the 2d century, though himself a bishop, makes only a relative difference between *episcopi* and *presbyteri;* speaks of successions of the one in the same sense as of the other; terms the office of the latter *episcopatus;* and calls the bishops of Rome *πρεσβύτεροι*. Sometimes, it is true, he appears to use the term *πρεσβύτεροι*, in a more general sense, for the old men, the fathers. But, in any case, his language shows that the distinction between the two offices was at that time still relative and indefinite. 3. The express testimony of the learned Jerome is that the churches originally, before divisions arose through the instigation of Satan, were governed by the common council of the presbyters, and not till a later period was one of the presbyters placed at the head to watch over the Church and suppress schisms. He traces the difference of the office simply to ecclesiastical custom as distinct from divine institution. 4. The custom of the Church of Alexandria was, from the evangelist Mark down to the middle of the 3d century, that the twelve presbyters elected one of their number president and called him bishop. This fact rests on the authority of Jerome, and is confirmed independently by the *Annals* of the Alexandrian patriarch Eutychius of the 10th century."

Killen, in his *Ancient Church*, asserts: "Though the senior presbyter presided in the meetings of his brethren, and was soon known by the name of bishop, it does not appear that he originally possessed any superior authority. He held his place for life; but as he was sinking under the weight of years when he succeeded to it, he could not venture to anticipate an extended career of official distinction. In all matters relating either to discipline or the general interests of the brotherhood, he was expected to carry out the decisions of the eldership; so that, under his presidential rule, the Church was still substantially governed by 'the common council of the presbyters.' The allegation that presbyterial government existed in all its integrity towards the end of the 2d century does not rest on the foundation of obscure intimations or doubtful inferences. It can be established by direct and conclusive testimony. Evidence has already been adduced to show that the senior presbyter of Smyrna continued to preside until the days of Irenæus, and there is also documentary proof that meanwhile he possessed no autocratical authority. The supreme power was still vested in the council of the elders. This point is attested by Hippolytus, who was now just entering on his ecclesiastical career, and who, in one of his works, a fragment of which has been preserved, describes the manner in which the rulers of the Church dealt with the heretic Noetus. The transaction probably occurred about A.D. 190." It shows that the presbyters then exercised episcopal functions, even to excommunication.

Says Dr. Blakie (*The Presbyterian Churches throughout the World* [Edinb. 1877], p. 1): "It is admitted even by many Episcopalians that, so far as Scripture indicates, the primitive Church constituted under the apostles was governed by elders. The office of apostle was temporary, and some other temporary arrangements were resorted to in the peculiar circumstances of the Church. But everywhere in settled churches there was a body of presbyters or elders; the terms presbyter and bishop were applied freely to the same individuals; and when the presbyters were addressed together, as those of Ephesus were addressed at Miletus, there was no hint of one of them having authority over the rest; they were called equally to feed and care for the Church

over which the Holy Ghost had made them overseers."

The offices of presbyter and bishop, according to the Roman Catholic theory, belong both, though in different degrees, to what Roman Catholics regard as the priesthood of the New Law. They teach that the presbyter is, in the sacerdotal order, an intermediate degree between the deacon and the highest functionary of the hierarchy, the episcopos. They also maintain stoutly that Scripture and tradition attest alike the divine institution of the presbyteriate. "Besides the apostles, the Lord marked out of the troop of his followers seventy (according to the Vulg. seventy-two), whom he sent out before him, two by two, into the cities and towns he intended to visit, with the mission of healing the sick and proclaiming the kingdom of God. These seventy men were, in consequence, the assistants of the apostles, but subordinated to them. Soon their number proved insufficient, and the apostles established in every city of some importance, at the foundation of the community, or when it had reached a certain degree of development, besides the bishop, whom they intended for their permanent representative and successor, a number of presbyters, who assisted the bishop in his functions." The Roman Catholic Church, as she considers the bishops the successors of the apostles, so she holds the presbyters to be the successors of the seventy assistants chosen by Christ himself. Inasmuch as they are entitled to perform the highest function of the priesthood, the administration of the Eucharist, they are called also *sacerdos* (ἱερεύς); yet this denomination, if not specified, applies only to the bishop: therefore we find frequently the *summus sacerdos*, or *sacerdos primi ordinis*, i. e. the bishop, thus distinguished from the simple priest, who is *sacerdos secundi ordinis*. The presbyters of an episcopal church had a share in the government, not individually, but as a college, presided over by the bishop; they had no jurisdiction of their own, and were merely assistants to the bishop. The bishop took their advice on the admission of higher clerical functionaries, on the management of discipline, especially of penitence, etc. They were themselves amenable to the spiritual jurisdiction of the bishop, and depended on him in the discharge of their duties as teachers and as priests. According to Roman Catholics, the bishop alone possesses the priesthood in its fulness, while the presbyter possesses it only in part. The functions, however, which belong to that part are discharged alike by the bishop and the presbyter. What those functions are will be detailed under the head PRIEST (q. v.). It is, of course, an easy matter for the prelatical churchmen to prove that by the end of the 2d century the bishop was above the presbyter. Even before the end of the 2d century the Church had departed from her early simplicity, and soon the episcopacy became the only prevalent government of the Church, although in some cases, as among the Culdees or the Waldenses, government by presbyters continued to prevail during the Middle Ages. The Church fathers of the 3d and 4th centuries point to the superiority of the episcopos. Thus Clement of Rome points out clearly three different hierarchical degrees—bishops, priests, and deacons; and Ignatius of Antioch lays particular stress on the superior power of the bishops (*Epist. ad Magnes.* c. 6; *Smyrn.* c. 8, etc.). Affirmations of the same kind are given by Tertullian, Irenæus, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Cyprian, etc. "It is true," say the Romanists, "that the bishops, in the fathers as well as in Scripture, are sometimes called merely priests, but there is not one passage in which a simple priest is called bishop." Those who accept the authority of St. Jerome for the equality of the bishop and presbyter because he says (*Comment. on the Epistle to Titus*), "Noverint episcopi, se magis consuetudine quam dispositione Dominica presbyteris esse majores, et in commune debere ecclesiam regere, imitantes Moysen, qui cum haberet solus præesse populo Israel, septuaginta elegit, cum quibus populum judicaret," are replied to by Romanists that (1) "even this parallel between Moses and his seventy, and the bishop and his presbyters, implies the pre-eminence of the bishop," and (2) that, "in the passage in question, St. Jerome is upbraiding a number of deacons who, in several places, and especially at Rome, had committed several encroachments on the rights of the presbyters in the administration of the ecclesiastical possessions. He, on this occasion, exalts the presbyters as much as he can, and in such cases where an abuse is to be eradicated, it frequently happens to this father to fall into the opposite extreme, as he does in his treatise *De Virginitate adv. Jovinianum*, in which, as an encomiast of virginity, he deems fit to treat matrimony with the most cruel contempt. He shows in other places his sense of the superiority of the episcopate: 'Quod Aaron et filii ejus atque Levitæ in templo, hoc sibi episcopi et presbyteri et diaconi vindicant.' The bishops have the same authority over priests and deacons that Aaron had over his sons and Levites. He speaks still more pointedly in his work against the Luciferians: 'Ecclesiæ salus in summi sacerdotis (i. e. episcopi) dignitate pendet, cui si non exsors quædam et ab omnibus eminens detur potestas, tot in ecclesiis efficientur schismata, quot sacerdotes.' But even if Jerome's opinion were contrary to the episcopal supremacy, what could it avail against the uninterrupted and unanimous tradition of so many fathers and ecclesiastical writers of the early centuries? If really the episcopate had not been originally distinct from the presbyteriate, we should then have to understand that a sudden and uniform change in the constitution of the Church took place in the whole extent of its expansion—that in all the communities, and at the same time, some ambitious and proud individualities set themselves above their colleagues." "But how," ask Romanists, "could this have come to pass without a long and desperate struggle; and how could this struggle, if it did take place, end so uniformly, in all the churches without exception, with the victory of the usurpers? History does not mention the least fact that anything of that kind ever took place. When several presbyters were attached to a single church, of which there were some instances, one of the number received the title of *proto-presbyter*, or *archi-presbyter;* but it is quite certain that this office bore no analogy to that of the bishop." To these arguments of Roman Catholics it is readily replied that the New Testament (as above seen) does explicitly refer to the original equality of presbyters and bishops, and that history contains not a few nor obscure indications of the usurpation of exclusive prerogatives by the latter. See, for Roman Catholic views, Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon;* for High-Church Anglican views, Blunt, *Dict. Hist. Theol.;* for Low-Church views, Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.*, the authorities already quoted, and the *Lond. Quar. Rev.* Jan. 1878, art. v; *Princeton Rev.* Jan. 1878, art. iv. See PRELACY.

Presbyterial Consecration, in the Roman Catholic Church, comprises the ceremonies and religious acts by which a deacon is invested with the presbyterial power—the power over the *true* and the *symbolic* body of Christ. The exterior apparatus of the ceremony consists in the oil of the catechumens, a chalice with wine and water, a paten with a host, some crumbs of bread, a vessel for the washing of the hands, some linen towels. The ceremony performed is as follows: The bishop, after consecrating the deacons, reads the Tractus (and the Sequence) to the last verse, exclusively. Then he advances with the infula to the middle of the altar, where he sits down on the faldistorium (chair). At this moment the archdeacon calls all to be ordained priests with the words, "Accedant qui ordinandi sunt ad ordinem presbyteratûs." The notary reads their names; they proceed, each with taper in hand, to form a half-circle (*in modum coronæ*) in front of the bishop, to whom they are introduced by the archdeacon with the words, "Reverend father, the holy Catholic

Church requires that you consecrate the deacons here present for the burdensome office of priesthood." Whereupon the bishop asks, "Doest thou know that they are deserving of it?" The archdeacon answers, "So far as human weakness allows me a knowledge of it, I know and declare that they are worthy to take upon them the burden of that office." The bishop says, "God be thanked!" and turns to the clergy and people with these words: "Beloved brethren! as the pilot of a ship and those who travel on it share together both security and danger, they must in matters concerning their common interest share the same convictions. Not without good reason, the fathers have directed that the people also should be consulted on the choice of those who are to be admitted to the service of the altar; for sometimes a few can give information about the way of life and habits of those who present themselves for consecration not known to the masses, etc. If, therefore, any one have objections of importance, let him step out before God, and for God's sake speak fearlessly; yet let him not forget that he is only a man (that he may err)." After a short, expectant pause, the people assenting by their silence, the bishop turns to the candidates and addresses them thus: "Consecrandi, filii dilectissimi, in presbyteratûs officium, illud digne suscipere, ac susceptum lautabiliter exequi studeatis," etc. In the course of this allocution, mention is made of the high purpose of the New-Testament priesthood, and after a comparison with the priesthood of the Old Covenant, follow these words: "Hâc certe mirâ varietate ecclesia sancta circumdatur, ornatur et regitur: cum alii in eâ pontifices, alii minoris ordinis sacerdotes, diaconi et subdiaconi, diversorum ordinum viri consecrantur, et ex multis et alternæ dignitatis membris unum corpus efficitur." If no deacons or subdeacons have been consecrated, the Litany of All-Saints is recited, while the ordinands are on their knees. Hereupon they step, in pairs, into the presence of the bishop, who, standing erect (with the infula), lays both his hands on the head of each of them, without speaking or singing. The same is done by all the priests present, dressed in the stola, and of whom there must be at least three. Then the priests and the bishop hold their right hands extended over the ordinands, and the bishop, standing with the infula, thus addresses the clergy: "Beloved brethren! let us implore God Almighty that he may pour over these, his servants, whom he has chosen for the office of priesthood, heavenly gifts in abundance, so that, with his help, they may be able to perform the duties which they have been deemed worthy of assuming. Amen." The bishop lays down the infula, turns towards the altar, and says, "Oremus." The ministri add, "Flectamus genua." The responsorium is "Levate!" Then he turns to the ordinands, saying, "Exaudi nos, quæsumus, Domine Deus noster." After the conclusion—"in unitate ejusdem spiritûs sancti Deus"—he extends his hands, saying, "Per omnia sæcula," etc. Now follow long prayers, after which the bishop sits down with the mitre, seizes that part of the stola which hangs backwards from the left shoulder of the ordinand, lays it over his right shoulder, and puts both parts crosswise over each other on the chest, saying, "Take the yoke of the Lord upon thee; for his yoke is easy and his burden is light." Hereupon the bishop dresses each of them in the missal garment, which hangs loose in front, but is rolled or pinned up behind, saying, "Take the priestly garment, which means love; for God is mighty to increase love in thee and make thy work perfect." Response, "Thanks to God." Now the bishop rises, lays down the infula, and prays, while all kneel, "Deus sanctificationum omnium auctor," etc. After this the bishop kneels, facing the altar, and begins the hymn, "Veni Creator Spiritus," etc., which the choir sings. As soon as the first verse is sung the bishop rises, sits down on the chair, with the infula on his head, pulls off his gloves, puts on his ring, takes a white linen towel on his knees, and anoints the hands of each of the ordinands kneeling before him with the oil of the catechumens, passing with his thumb dipped into the holy oil crosswise from the thumb of one hand to the index of the other, with this prayer: "Consecrate and sanctify, O Lord, these hands by this anointment and our blessing." Then, with his right hand, he makes the sign of the cross over the hands of the candidate whom he consecrates, and continues: "In order that everything that they bless may be blessed, and what they consecrate may be consecrated and sanctified, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ." Each of the ordinands says "Amen." (From this anointment the thumbs and forefingers of a priest are called the canonic fingers; and as this anointment is performed on the inner side of the hand, the priests to whom the last sacraments are administered are anointed on the outside of the hand.) Then the bishop joins the hands of each of them, and one of the ministrants ties them together with a piece of linen. When all hands are anointed, the bishop wipes his thumb with crumbs of bread; then he presents to each of them a chalice with wine and water, with the paten placed over it, and containing a host. The ordinands touch the top of the chalice and the paten with the index and middle finger, and the bishop says to each in particular, "Receive the power of offering God the sacrifice, and to say mass for the living as well as for the dead, in the name of the Lord." Response: "Amen." Now the bishop washes his hands, returns to his chair, and reads the last verse of the Tractus, and then the Gospel. Meanwhile one of the newly consecrated deacons steps in front of the altar with the book of the Gospels, prays the "Munda cor meum," and reads the Gospel, after receiving the benediction thereto. The newly consecrated priests wipe their hands with breadcrumbs, wash them, and dry them with the linen with which they were bound. The water used for washing is poured into the piscina. As all consecrated receive the Eucharist at the hands of the bishop, there must be as many hosts prepared as there are candidates for ordination. After the reading of the offertorium (short prayer preceding the sacrifice of the bread and wine), all those who have been consecrated—first the priests, then the deacons, then the others according to their rank—step in pairs into the presence of the bishop, who sits on his chair with the infula on his head, kneel down, kiss his hand, and present a burning taper as an offering. The bishop, after receiving the offerings, washes his hands, lays down the infula, rises, and, the chair being removed, continues the ceremony of the mass. The consecrated priests kneel down behind the bishop on the prie-dieus prepared for them, each his mass-book open before him; they say with the bishop the prayers accompanying the offering of the bread and the wine, and the whole mass. The bishop speaks slowly and somewhat loud, so that the consecrated priests can at the same time pronounce the same words, especially the words of consecration. The "secreta" (silent prayer) for the consecrated ones is pronounced with the secreta of the mass of the day under one formula of conclusion: "Per Dominum nostrum," etc. The *secreta pro ordinandis* is, "We ask thee, O Lord! let thy holy mysteries effect that we offer thee these offerings with a worthy disposition, through our Lord Jesus Christ, thy Son," etc. After the paternoster and the prayer "Domine Jesu Christe, qui," etc., which follows the "Agnus Dei," the bishop kisses the altar; and after the first of the newly consecrated has done the same, he kisses him at each step, with the words "Peace be with you." The new priest answers, "And with your mind." Each of the consecrated ones gives the kiss of peace to the other person ordained to the same rank and standing next. After the communion of the bishop, the deacons and subdeacons (if there are any) pray "Confiteor" in a subdued voice, the bishop, facing them, pronouncing the "Misereatur vestri" and "Indulgentiam." If priests only have been ordained, they do not receive absolution, as they perform the sacrifice together with the bishop. All

proceed, two by two, to the highest step of the altar, and receive the sacrament in the form of the bread. The bishop says, "The body of our Lord Jesus Christ preserve you for eternal life." Each answers "Amen." When all have partaken of the communion, the bishop removes the paten from his chalice, moistens his fingers, takes the ablution, puts on the infula, and washes his hands. Then he lays down the infula again, and, standing at the epistle side of the altar, sings the responsorium, "Henceforward I shall no more call you my servants, but my friends, because you have known everything which I have done among you. Alleluia," etc. Then the bishop, with the infula, turns to the newly consecrated priests, who recite the credo. This done, the bishop sits down on his chair in the middle of the altar, and puts both hands on the head of each of them, who kneel before him, saying, "Take the Holy Spirit; they whom thou shalt forgive their sins, they shall be forgiven; and they," etc. Then he pulls down the missal garment, saying, "In the garment of innocence the Lord dresses thee." Then each of the young priests approaches again, kneels before the bishop, puts his folded hands into the bishop's hands; and he, if he is the diocesan bishop, says to each, "Doest thou promise to me and my successors reverence and obedience?" Answer: "I promise." If the newly consecrated belongs to another diocese, the bishop says, "Doest thou promise to thy bishop," etc. After the answer "I promise," the bishop kisses each of them, holding still his hands in his, and says, "The peace of the Lord be with thee always." Now the bishop takes his cross and gives, sitting, the following admonition to the new priests: "Quia res quam tractaturi estis satis periculosa est," etc. Finally he pronounces, standing, the triple benediction over the kneeling priests: "The blessing of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost come upon you, that you may be blessed in your priesthood, and offer expiatory sacrifices for the sins and transgressions of the people of God, to whom glory and praise be given in all eternity. Amen." The bishop continues the mass, and connects with the last missal prayer the prayer for the consecrated ones: "Quos tuis, Domine, reficis sacramentis," etc., under one formula of conclusion. Then follows the "Ite, missa est" or the "Benedicamus Domino," as the time may require. This is followed by the "Placeat tibi sancta Trinitas;" and the bishop, the infula on his head and the cross in his hand, pronounces the benediction in the usual manner: "The name of the Lord be blessed," etc. Response: "Now and in all eternity." "Our help comes in the name of the Lord." Response: "Who hath created heaven and earth." "The blessing of the Almighty God, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost descend upon you and remain with you. Amen." Then the bishop holds a parting address to the newly consecrated: "Beloved sons, consider earnestly what consecration you have received and what burden has been put on your shoulders. Let it be your foremost endeavor to lead a holy, godly life, and to please God Almighty," etc. Finally the archdeacon turns to the clergy and people and announces an indulgence. Hereupon the bishop reads the last Gospel, returns to his seat, and lays down the pontifical robes. The consecrated priests repair to the vergery and put down the missal garments. It must not be overlooked that the ordained priests, after the offertorium, from the sacrificial act, "Suscipe, sancte Pater," say all the missal prayers with the bishop—concelebrate with him. This concelebration is in use also in the Greek Church. It is difficult to ascertain the age of this custom. It seems to have been adopted at different times in different places. The Synod of Carthage, in 398, in the accurate description it gives of the consecration, does not mention the anointment, neither does Isidore of Spain; but the rite was known to Theodulph of Orleans and Amalarius of Treves. The rite of the consecration differs considerably in the Eastern Church from the account given above; but the imposition of the hands is also the essential part of it. According to Goar's description, the principal parts of the Greek rite are the following: Two deacons lead the ordinand to the church-door; here they leave him; he is received by two priests, who walk thrice with him around the communion-table, singing, "Sancti martyres præclarè præliati." Passing before the bishop, they bow, and the ordinand kisses his knee. The bishop rises, the ordinand approaches, and the bishop makes three times the sign of the cross over the candidate's head. The deacon exclaims, "Attendamus!" and the bishop lays his right hand on the candidate's head, saying, "Divina gratia, quæ semper infirma curat, et ea quæ desunt adimplet, promovet N. devotissimum diaconum in presbyterum: oremus pro eo, ut veniat super eum sanctissimi Spiritûs gratia." The people present say thrice, "Domine, miserere." The bishop makes again the sign of the cross and puts his right hand on the candidate, saying, in an undertone, while the deacon exclaims "Dominum precemur," the prayer, "Deus principio et fine carens, omni creaturâ antiquior . . . ipse omnium Domine, istum quem tibi a me promoveri complacuit, in conversatione inculpatâ, et fide indeficiente ingentem etiam hanc gratiam Sancti tui Spiritûs recipere complaceat," etc. Again the bishop implores the gift of the Holy Ghost for the newly consecrated, extending his hand over him, with the words, "Deus in virtute magnus, intellectu investigabilis . . . ipse Domine, etiam et istum, quem tibi presbyteri gradum subire complacuit, dono sancto tui Spiritûs adimple, ut inculpate sancto tuo altari assistere dignus fiat," etc. This short extract shows that the Greek rite resembles greatly the Latin ceremony, and differs from it specially in this, that it prescribes only the imposition of *one* hand. The *traditio instrumentorum* is not part of the Greek rite.—Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, s. v. Presbyteriatsweihe. See Foye, *Romish Rites* (Lond. 1851).

Presbyterian Churches. The different bodies into which the Presbyterians are divided will here be treated nearly in the historical relation which they sustain towards each other as it is possible to place them. We begin with the Presbyterians of Scotland, because they are, among all English-speaking nations, the only ones directly allied with the state by establishment, and because it is from Scotland that English and American Presbyterianism has obtained nourishment and succor, rather than from the Continent, however true it be that Presbyterianism had there its origin. See Presbyterianism; Presbyterians.

1. Presbyterian Church in Scotland.—A history of the Presbyterian Church in Scotland would be, in effect, a history of that country; for since its establishment by the Reformation its political and religious history have flowed on in one and the same channel. Christianity was planted in Scotland about the beginning of the 3d century; and it is claimed that the early churches, particularly those of the ancient Culdees, were non-prelatical. Under the vigorous missions of Palladius and Augustine they were, however, reduced to conformity with the rule of Rome, and so remained until the period of the Reformation. At that time the corruption of the hierarchy, its encroachments on the civil power, and its greedy appropriation of the right of patronage to benefices, had created a wide-spread dissatisfaction, and prepared the way for the favorable reception of the principles of the Reformation. For twenty years persecution followed, and many were burned at the stake, among whom were Patrick Hamilton and George Wishart. The first general and public movement leading to the organization of the Presbyterian Church of Scotland was the drawing-up of a common bond or covenant, known as "The First Covenant," and subscribed at Edinburgh, Dec. 3, 1557, by several of the most powerful of the Scotch nobility and a large number of lesser barons and influential country gentlemen, known subsequently (on account of their frequent use of the word congregation to designate those for whom they pro-

fessed to act) as lords of the congregation. The signing of the covenant was followed by a proclamation from the queen regent forbidding any one to preach or administer the sacrament without the authority of the bishop. At length, however, the party of the Reformers triumphed, and in the year 1560 (Aug. 17–24) the Parliament abolished the Roman Catholic worship, adopted a confession of faith agreeing with the confessions of the Reformed churches on the Continent, appointed ministers of the Protestant religion in eight principal towns, and assigned the remaining portions of the country to five other ministers as superintendents, who were to take temporary charge of the interests of religion in their several districts.

On Dec. 20, 1560, the first General Assembly of the Church of Scotland was constituted in Edinburgh, consisting of six ministers and thirty-four laymen. Up to this period, the Scottish Reformers had followed, as their rule of worship and doctrine, the Book of Common Order used by the English Church at Geneva. In April, 1560, however, the Privy Council appointed a committee of five persons, including Knox, "to commit to writing their judgments touching the reformation of religion." This *First Book of Discipline*, setting forth a polity adapted to the existing condition of affairs, though adopted by the Church, was rejected by the nobles, who wished to appropriate to themselves the patrimony of the old Church. In 1581 the *Second Book of Discipline*, drawing its system directly from the Scriptures, was adopted by the Assembly, and this—confirmed in 1592 by King James, along with the Westminster documents—is still in force. Nothing but the undaunted perseverance of those two eminent men, John Knox and Andrew Melville, succeeded at last in procuring the complete recognition of the Calvinistic faith and the Presbyterian form of government as the established religion of Scotland, which was finally and formally effected by act of Parliament and with the consent of king James (I of England and VI of Scotland) in the year 1592.

The duplicity of the king, however, soon became apparent, for within a few years he intrigued to bring about the establishment of Episcopacy, and to assimilate the two national churches of Scotland and England. In this he was followed by his successors, Charles I, Charles II, and James II. The resistance of the people, the bloody persecutions that ensued, the civil turmoil, and the subsequent downfall of the Stuart dynasty, are matters of history. From 1660 to 1688, the Church was in the wilderness, scourged by such men as Claverhouse (q. v.) and Dalziel (q. v.), but leaving the record of many noble martyrdoms — as given in the story of the *Scots Worthies* and the *Cloud of Witnesses*. See COVENANT AND SOLEMN LEAGUE. Under William and Mary, Presbyterianism again became ascendant. In 1690 an "Act of Settlement" was passed, prelacy was abolished, and the Westminster Confession recognised as the creed of the Church. But the settlement of the Church on this basis was objected to by a small body of earnest men, the "Reformed Presbyterians," who had already distinguished themselves in zeal for the "Covenants" as securities alike for the freedom of the Church and the Christianity of the State, and who now felt unable either to enter into the Church or to give their unqualified adherence to the constitution of the State. Many of the more earnest descendants of the *Covenanters* (q. v.) protested against the reception of such men into the Church, and, finding their protest in vain, withdrew, and organized the *Reformed Presbyterian Church*. (See below.) Though this secession took place in 1681, the churches were not finally organized into a presbytery till 1743. Upon the union of the two kingdoms in 1707, Presbyterianism obtained every guarantee that could be desired. Since that time it has continued to be the established religion of Scotland, as much as Episcopacy is that of England.

The only confession of faith legally established before the Revolution of 1688 was that which is published in the *History of the Reformation in Scotland*, attributed to John Knox. It consists of twenty-five articles, and was the confession of the Episcopal as well as of the Presbyterian Church. The Parliament, however, during the Commonwealth, adopted the Westminster Confession. At the Revolution this confession was declared to be the standard of the national faith; and it was ordained by the same acts of Parliament which settled Presbyterian Church government in Scotland, "that no person be admitted or continued hereafter to be a minister or preacher within this Church unless he subscribe the [that is, this] confession of faith, declaring the same to be the confession of his faith." By the act of union in 1707 the same is required of all professors, principals, regents, masters, and others bearing office.

The Westminster Confession of Faith, then, and what are called the Larger and Shorter Catechisms, contain the publicly recognised doctrines of this Church; and it is well known that these formularies are an embodiment of the Calvinistic faith. No liturgy or public form of prayer is used in the Church of Scotland, the minister's only guide being the *Directory for the Public Worship of God*. The administration of the Lord's Supper, as a general thing observed four times a year, is conducted with simple forms, but is accompanied, usually preceded and followed, by special religious services, consisting of prayers and exhortations. A metrical version of the Psalms on the basis of that of Rous (died 1659) is used, and supplementary hymns have recently been introduced.

The provision which has been made by the law of Scotland for the support of the clergy of the Established Church consists of a stipend, a small glebe of land, and a manse (parsonage house) and office houses. By an act of Parliament passed in 1810, £10,000 per annum were granted for augmenting the smaller parish stipends in Scotland. By this act the lowest stipend assigned to a minister of the establishment is £150 sterling, with a small sum, generally £8 6*s*. 8*d*., for communion elements. Patronage, in part abrogated at the Revolution, was restored in 1712 by act of Parliament. Scottish independence rebelled at this, the people claiming the right to elect their own clergy, or at least to exercise a veto over the appointment of an unsatisfactory one; and the controversy which ensued led to secession, which was ushered in first by indifference, and was helped on by the renewal of the old interest. From that time a worldly spirit crept into the Church; men of talents, but lax in principle, obtained possession of influential positions; the leaven of moderatism—ridiculed in Dr. Witherspoon's *Characteristics*—set extensively to work; and in the course of time Arminian, Pelagian, and even Socinian tenets were propagated, with little attempt at concealment. The result was the secession of several important bodies from the Church. The first who formally withdrew were the Covenanters, or Cameronians, who objected to the interference of the state authorities in Church affairs, and to the Erastian principle involved in the existing establishment, as inconsistent with the covenant to which the Church had sworn. See CAMERONIANS. A few faithful men, led by Ebenezer Erskine, endeavored to breast the tide; but, being deposed by the commission of the Assembly, who were Moderates, they seceded in 1733, and formed themselves into a distinct body, called the Associated Presbytery, more commonly known as Seceders. They became known as the *Secession Church*. This secession proved a severe blow, and shook the establishment to its foundations. Another secession arose in 1760, and from it was formed the *Presbyterians of Relief*, better known as "The Relief Synod." These bodies have since been united, and constitute the *United Presbyterian Church of Scotland*. Those who remained in the Established Church were divided in opinion on the subject of lay patronage. The sentiment against it continued to grow because of the indifference of the clergy. For a while moderatism held the upper hand, but its reign was dreary. Under the dominant influ-

ence of principal Robertson, whose studies were more devoted to elegant literature than to the Holy Scriptures, the preaching of the Gospel was superseded by moral essays, and Dr. Blair's cold and polished sermons were regarded as models of the highest excellence. This state of things continued till near the close of the 18th century, when Christians in Scotland began to share in that general reviving of evangelical principles which then pervaded Great Britain. A positive reaction set in, and gradually new life began to animate the frozen limbs of the Established Church. The evangelical party took heart, and constantly increased in strength. Dr. Andrew Thomson, Dr. Chalmers, and others came upon the stage of action, and under their vigorous lead a new æra was inaugurated. The Assembly entered with zeal into the subject of foreign missions, while it multiplied churches to supply the need at home. The burden of patronage was felt to be a great hindrance to the progress of vital piety and active effort, and the autonomy or independent jurisdiction of the Church became a topic of earnest debate.

In 1834 the General Assembly passed the celebrated "Veto Act," giving to the Church courts the power of rejecting a presentee if judged by them unfit. This act was set aside by the civil court, and subsequently, on appeal, by the House of Lords, in the Auchterarder case, in 1839. The Assembly yielded so far as the temporalities were concerned, but at the same time unequivocally maintained the principle of non-intrusion as one that could not be given up consistently with the doctrine of the headship and sovereignty of Christ. The Strathbogie case next occurred, bringing the civil and ecclesiastical courts into direct collision, which ended at last in the *Disruption* of 1843, under the lead of Chalmers, Cunningham, Welsh, Candlish, and Dunlop; 470 members signed an "Act of Separation and Deed of Demission," and the *Free Church of Scotland* was organized. Soon after the separation of 1843 an act of Parliament was passed, called "Lord Aberdeen's Act," to define the rights of congregations and presbyteries in the calling and settlement of ministers. But in 1874 this was suspended by another act, whereby patronage was abolished, and the right of electing ministers was vested in the people. Government still reserves, however, the appointment of theological professors. The Free Church carried off about one half the communicants of the Established Church, and became a rival communion in most of the parishes of Scotland. The three denominations—the *Established Presbyterian Church*, the *United Presbyterian Church*, and the *Free Church* (in which the *Reformed Presbyterian Church* merged in 1876)—constitute the chief Presbyterian churches of Scotland at the present time. See SCOTLAND, PRESBYTERIAN CHURCHES OF.

The government, discipline, and worship of the Established Church of Scotland are in all respects the same as those of other Presbyterian churches. According to the constitution of the Church, there is a kirk-session in every parish, consisting of the minister and a body of lay elders. All the ministers within a certain district, with one lay elder from each session, constitute the Presbytery of that district. The next higher court is the Provincial Synod, which embraces several neighboring presbyteries. The highest court of all is the General Assembly. It is a representative court, consisting of 247 members and 178 elders, the greater part chosen by the presbyteries, but a considerable number of elders chosen by the town-councils and universities. It meets early in May, is presided over by its moderator, and has the presence of a lord high commissioner, appointed by the crown, who, however, is not a member, and has no authoritative voice in the court. A "Commission of Assembly" meets in August, November, and March, consisting of the members of Assembly, and a minister named by the moderator, to attend to matters remitted to it by the Assembly, or that may arise in the intervals. In consequence of the connection with the state, there are certain peculiarities connected with the support of the ministers which it may be proper to notice. Dr. Jamieson, in his interesting sketch of the "Church of Scotland" contributed to the *Cyclopædia of Religious Denominations*, thus describes these peculiarities: "The provision made for parish ministers by the law of Scotland consists of a stipend arising from a tax on land. It is raised on the principle of commuting tithes or *teinds* into a modified charge—the fifth of the land produce, according to a method introduced in the reign of Charles I, ratified by William III, and unalterably established by the treaty of union. To make this intelligible, we may observe that at the Reformation the *teinds* were appropriated by the crown, with the burden of providing for the minister. In after-times they were often bestowed as gifts on private individuals totally unconnected with the parish, and who thus came so far in place of the crown. These persons received the name of titulars, from being entitled to collect from the heritors the unappropriated teinds; but they were also bound on demand to sell to any heritor the titularship to his own teinds at nine years' purchase. From the collective land-produce of a parish the court of teinds determines how much is to be allotted for the support of the minister. This general decree having fixed the amount, a common agent, appointed by the court, proceeds to divide it proportionally among the landholders, and this division, when fully made, is sanctioned by the court. It is called a *decreet of modification*, and forms the authority or rule according to which alone the minister collects his stipend. According to this system, which has proved a very happy settlement of a *quæstio vexata*, the burden falls not on the farmer or tenant, as in other countries where tithing exactions are made, but on the landholder or titular of the teinds, to whom a privilege of relief is opened by having them *fixed*. He may value them, that is, to use the words of principal Hill, 'lead a proof of their present value before the Court of Session, and the valuation, once made by authority of that court, ascertains the quantity of victual or the sum of money in the name of teind payable out of his lands in all time coming.' The advantage of this system is that it enables proprietors to know exactly the extent of the public burdens on their estate; and the teind appropriated to the maintenance of the minister, or to educational and other pious uses, being sacred and inviolable, is always taken into account, and deducted in the purchase or sale of lands. But that would not be so advantageous to the minister by fixing his income at one invariable standard were it not that provision is made for an augmentation of stipend every twenty years in parishes where there are free teinds. This is done by the minister instituting a process before the judges of the Court of Session, who act as commissioners for the plantation of kirks and valuation of teinds; and in this process the act of 1808 requires that he shall summon not only the heritors of the parish, but also the moderator and clerk of presbytery as parties. In the event of the minister being able to prove a great advance in the social and agricultural state of the parish, the judges grant his application, allocating some additional chalders; but where the arguments pleaded appear to them unsatisfactory, they give a small addition, or refuse altogether. In many parishes, however, from the teinds being exhausted, ministers had no prospect of augmentation in the ordinary way; but redress was afforded through the liberality of Mr. Percival's government in 1810, who used his influence in procuring an act of Parliament to be passed according to which all stipends in the Establishment should, out of the exchequer, be made up to £150. This, though but a poor and inadequate provision for men of a liberal profession, was felt and gratefully received at the time as a great boon. But such is the mutability of human society that these stipends, which in 1810 formed the minimum, are now greatly superior to many which at the same period

were considered, for Scotland, rich benefices; but which, being wholly paid in grain, have, through the late agrarian law, fallen far below that standard. The incomes of city ministers are paid wholly in money. Besides the stipend, every parish minister has a right to a manse or parsonage-house, garden, and offices—the style as well as the extent of accommodation being generally proportioned to the value of the benefice and the character of the neighborhood. According to law, the glebe consists of four acres of arable land, although, in point of fact, it generally exceeds that measure; and, besides, most ministers have a grass glebe, sufficient for the support of a horse and two cows. All these, by a late decision of the Court of Session, are exempt from poor-rates and similar public burdens. Ministers in royal burghs are entitled to manses only."

The statistics of the Established Church of Scotland vary very slightly from year to year. The number of parish churches was in 1877, 1222. In addition to these there are forty-two Parliamentary churches, and a considerable number of chapels of ease and *quoad sacra* churches, which, under a scheme efficiently organized by the Rev. Prof. Robertson, are in course of being endowed and erected into new parishes in the terms of Sir James Graham's Act, passed in 1846. Altogether there are about 1500 congregations and 1384 ministers.

The following are the chief missionary and other benevolent undertakings of the Church:

1. *The Home Mission Scheme.*—It has three departments: (1.) *Church Extension.* Local efforts in places requiring additional church accommodation are supplemented by grants from the funds of the scheme. In 1876, thirty-three churches, providing nearly 32,000 sittings, were thus aided. (2.) *Mission Churches*, designed to be centres of mission work in destitute localities or in the more populous parishes of Scotland. These churches or chapels number ninety-three, with upwards of 22,000 worshippers. The Home Mission Committee insist that they shall be served with invariable regularity. (3.) *Mission Stations*, not having the permanent character of churches, intended as points of evangelical work among the lapsed, non-church-going, or far-scattered people. There are seventy-seven such stations supplied by licentiates, or students in divinity, or qualified evangelists. Besides these operations, aid is given in certain cases towards the employment of Scripture-readers in the Highlands and Islands. The revenue of the scheme in 1876 from church-collections and legacies amounted to £11,780.

2. Of undertakings more especially affecting the clergy of the Church may be noticed the *Association for Augmenting the Smaller Livings*, i. e. livings under £200 per annum. For this purpose the sum of £7305 was reported to last General Assembly. Also the *Ministers' and Professors' Widows' Fund*, to which every parish minister and every professor in the national universities is bound to subscribe. The capital sum of the fund amounts to upwards of £212,000. Ministers and professors may subscribe according to one or other of four rates, viz. £3 3*s*., £4 14*s*. 6*d*., £6 6*s*., or £7 17*s*. 6*d*.

3. A report is yearly presented to the Assembly as to the condition of the *Sabbath-schools* in connection with the Church. Between 15,000 and 16,000 persons are engaged in the work of teaching 167,000 juvenile scholars, and upwards of 24,000 adults of both sexes.

4. *Colonial Missions* seek to provide means of grace for Scottish colonists in the various British dependencies and elsewhere. When the scattered communities are organized into churches—some large and influential, as in the dominion of Canada—the aid given by the Home Church is curtailed, if not wholly withdrawn. But the committee have a great sphere of labor in the ever-enlarging and developing colonial empire of Great Britain. Agents of the mission report from British Columbia, the South American continent, Fiji, New Zealand, Australia, Ceylon, India. Under the Colonial Mission are also included European stations, such as Paris and Dresden, where ministrations are maintained for the benefit of resident Presbyterians. The total income of the scheme in 1877 was upwards of £15,000.

5. *Jewish Missions.*—The efforts put forth in connection with this mission are concentrated on Turkey and Egypt. It has agents in Constantinople, Smyrna, Alexandria, Beyrût, and Salonica. The sum of the charge on which it operates is upwards of £7000.

6. *Missions to the Heathen.*—The scenes of these missions, comprehended under the word "Foreign Missions," are India, Africa, and China. It can scarcely, indeed, be said that a mission exists in China; but steps have been taken to originate a Christian work in that vast empire. The agency in Africa is not yet complete. A station has been formed and is partly occupied by a company of Christian artisans, headed by a medical missionary, in the Highlands of East Africa—the station having received the name of Dr. Livingstone's birthplace, Blantyre. The Indian missions retain the mixed character which Scotch missions in India have hitherto borne—educational and evangelistic. In the three great Presidency towns, the educational institutions are still maintained, and are at present in a state of efficiency. Evangelical efforts are also carried on in connection with the institutions and in native churches. In the Punjab there are stations at Sealkote, Gûjrat, and Wazirabad. An interesting work is also promoted among the Highlanders of India at Darjeling, and outside the British territory an agency is maintained at Chumba, whose feature is that the mission, conducted by Europeans, is kept apart from the Church, presided over by natives. The income of these foreign missions for the year ending January, 1876, was upwards of £19,000.

7. Two other agencies may be briefly noted:

(1.) *Continental and Foreign Churches Committee.*—Established as the medium of communication between the churches and other Reformed churches of Christendom. It is charged with the duty of cultivating friendly relations with such churches, and administering such sums as the liberality of the Church bestows on societies and agencies abroad seeking to spread the pure Gospel of Jesus Christ. For many years the committee have been able to aid the *Central Society* of the *French Reformed Church*, and the *Evangelization Commission of the Waldensian Church in Italy*. From time to time it has aided other agencies. The care of certain chaplaincies on the Continent intended for the benefit of Presbyterians temporarily resident there also devolves on this committee. Its income in 1876 was £1205.

(2.) The *Army and Navy Chaplains Committee* are intrusted with the oversight of chaplains laboring in garrison towns or at the camps. The convener of the committee communicates, in behalf of the Church, with the naval and military authorities.

No Church in Europe has taken more prompt and energetic steps for the general diffusion of school education than the Presbyterians of Scotland. As early as 1695 it was enacted "that there be a school founded and a school-master appointed in every parish by advice of the presbyteries, and to this purpose that the heritors do, in every congregation, meet among themselves, and provide a commodious house for a school, and modify a stipend to the school-master, which shall not be under ten merks (£6 13*s*. 4*d*.) nor above twenty merks." As almost all the population of the country is Presbyterian, the common-school system long sustained a parochial character. When, in 1843, the Free Church of Scotland was organized, it was resolved to erect schools in connection with the congregations of the Free Church, and the educational scheme which in consequence sprang up was co-extensive with the parochial system of the Established Church. In 1873, of 2108 schools inspected by the government inspectors, 1379 belonged to the Established and 577 to the Free Church; while of non-Presbyterian schools there were eighty-six belonging to the Episcopal and sixty-six to the Catholic Church. The introduction of the new national system of educa-

tion has in a great measure superseded the operations of the educational scheme of the Church of Scotland. Few schools now remain in relation to it. The care of the committee is now chiefly occupied with providing religious instruction in all schools desiring it, and giving grants for excellence in religious instruction. The Scottish universities of Edinburgh, Glasgow, and Aberdeen are in organic connection with the Church of Scotland by means of theological professorships; while at St. Andrew's an entire college, St. Mary's, is appointed solely to the teaching of theology and the languages connected with it. The theological institutions are the theological faculties of the several national universities. The number of professors is, at Edinburgh, four; Glasgow, four; St. Andrew's, three; Aberdeen, four. Students, 198. Students of divinity are required to attend a full course of arts at the university, and three years more at the Divinity Hall. The sessions in both cases last about five months. Students in this and the other Presbyterian churches of Scotland have often assistance from bursaries or scholarships, which are allotted chiefly by competition. See Hetherington, *Hist. of the Church of Scotland;* M'Crie, *Lives of Knox and Melville;* id. *Sketches of Church History,* and *Review of Scott;* Fessenden, *Encycl. of Relig. Knowledge; Cyclop. of Relig. Denominations* (Lond. and Glasg.); Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac;* Schem, *Eccles. Year Book.*

2. United Presbyterian Church. — In 1732 the Rev. Ebenezer Erskine, as retiring moderator of the Synod of Stirling and Perth, preached a sermon on Christ as the Corner-stone, in which he sharply inveighed against the corruptions and abuses that had crept into the Scottish Church. His sermon gave great offence, and incurred the censure of the synod. He appealed to the General Assembly, who condemned and rebuked him. Upon entering his protest, they handed his case over to the Commission. The Commission summarily suspended Erskine and three other ministers — Wilson, Moncrieff, and Fisher, who had joined in his protest — and cast them out of ministerial communion. The four brethren, deeming this treatment unconstitutional and unscriptural, immediately organized themselves into a presbytery, to which they gave the name of the *Associate Presbytery,* and published their testimony, or vindication of their secession. The next Assembly showed a disposition to make concessions, but the seceders refused to listen. How far they were right in this has been debated. That they were not satisfied to return to the bosom of the Establishment is clear, for they went on to gather congregations and appoint a professor of theology; and, in consequence of their activity and the popular sympathy, they increased rapidly. The Assembly next proceeded to harsher measures, and in 1740 deposed the seceding ministers, now eight in number. The doors of the churches were closed against them, and some of them, as Moncrieff, preached all winter in the open air. Great difficulty was found in procuring sites for houses of worship. Still they grew, and in 1745 the presbytery expanded into a synod with thirty settled congregations and sixteen vacancies. But now a dissension arose about the burgess oath, and in 1747 they split into two synods. The General Associate Synod, or Anti-burghers, denounced the oath as sanctioning the Establishment with all its corruptions; the Associate Synod maintained that it only referred to the true Protestant faith, in opposition to popery. After seventy-three years of separation, during which each throve and sent offshoots to other parts of the world, both branches reunited (a few only standing aloof) in 1820, under the name of the *United Secession Church,* when the new body embraced 373 congregations.

The *Relief Church* was the result of Mr. Gillespie's deposition by the General Assembly in 1752. He had refused to assist in intruding an obnoxious presentee over the parish of Inverkeithing. After his deposition he continued to preach in Dunfermline, but labored alone for several years. At length, being joined by Messrs. Boston and Colier, the three constituted the Relief Presbytery. Soon after another presbytery was necessary, and in 1775 (Eadie says 1773) the two met as a synod. It was characteristic of the Relief Church to maintain free communion with all true Christians, and to disapprove of the very principle of establishments. They founded a divinity hall, and increased to seven presbyteries, 114 congregations, and 45,000 communicants.

These two bodies, the United Secession and the Relief, having so much in common, for some time contemplated a union, which was at last consummated in Edinburgh, May 10, 1847, in Tanfield Hall, Canonmills. They took the title of the *United Presbyterian Church.* In common parlance, they are often familiarly spoken of as the "U. P. Church." They constitute a very popular and powerful body of Christians in Scotland, reporting, as the statistics of May, 1876: number of congregations, 620; of elders, 5075; members, 190,242; Sunday-school teachers, 12,129; Sunday-school scholars, 92,502; total income for 1875, £419,965. In the synod held at Edinburgh May 11, 1876, its sanction was given by a vote of 373 to 45 for the union of the United Presbyterian congregations in England with the English Presbyterian Church; and an animated discussion took place in advocacy of separation of the Church from the State. The following are the articles of the basis as adopted by the two synods:

"1. That the Word of God contained in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments is the only rule of faith and practice.

"2. That the Westminster Confession of Faith, and the Larger and Shorter Catechisms, are the confession and catechisms of this Church, and contain the authorized exhibition of the sense in which we understand the Holy Scriptures, it being always understood that we do not approve of anything in these documents which teaches, or may be supposed to teach, compulsory or persecuting and intolerant principles in religion.

"3. That Presbyterian government, without any superiority of office to that of a teaching presbyter, and in a due subordination of Church courts, which is founded on and agreeable to the Word of God, is the government of this Church.

"4. That the ordinances of worship shall be administered in the United Church as they have been in both bodies of which it is formed; and that the Westminster Directory of Worship continue to be regarded as a compilation of excellent rules.

"5. That the term of membership is a credible profession of the faith of Christ as held by this Church — a profession made with intelligence, and justified by a corresponding character and deportment.

"6. That with regard to those ministers and sessions who think that the second section of the twenty-sixth chapter of the Westminster Confession of Faith authorizes free communion (that is, not loose or indiscriminate communion, but the occasional admission to fellowship in the Lord's Supper of persons respecting whose Christian character satisfactory evidence has been obtained, though belonging to other religious denominations), they shall enjoy what they enjoyed in their separate communions — the right of acting on their conscientious convictions.

"7. That the election of office-bearers of this Church, in its several congregations, belongs, by the authority of Christ, exclusively to the members in full communion.

"8. That this Church solemnly recognises the obligation to hold forth, as well as to hold fast, the doctrine and laws of Christ; and to make exertions for the universal diffusion of the blessings of his Gospel at home and abroad.

"9. That as the Lord hath ordained that they who preach the Gospel should live of the Gospel; that they who are taught in the Word should communicate to him that teacheth in all good things; that they who are strong should help the weak; and that, having freely received, they should freely give the Gospel to those who are destitute of it — this Church asserts the obligation and the privilege of its members, influenced by regard to the authority of Christ, to support and extend, by voluntary contributions, the ordinances of the Gospel.

"10. That the respective bodies of which this Church is composed, without requiring from each other an approval of the steps of procedure by their fathers, or interfering with the right of private judgment in reference to these, unite in regarding as still valid the reasons on which they have hitherto maintained their state of secession and separation from the judicatories of the Established Church, as expressed in the authorized documents of the respective bodies; and in maintaining the lawfulness and obligation of separation from ecclesiastical bodies in which dangerous error is tolerated, or the discipline of

the Church or the rights of her ministers or members are disregarded.

"The United Church, in their present most solemn circumstances, join in expressing their grateful acknowledgment to the great Head of the Church for the measure of spiritual good which he has accomplished by them in their separate state, their deep sense of the many imperfections and sins which have marked their ecclesiastical management, and their determined resolution, in dependence on the promised grace of their Lord, to apply more faithfully the great principles of Church-fellowship, to be more watchful in reference to admission and discipline, that the purity and efficiency of their congregations may be promoted, and the great end of their existence as a collective body may be answered with respect to all within its pale and to all without it, whether members of other denominations or 'the world lying in wickedness.'

"And, in fine, the United Church regard with a feeling of brotherhood all the faithful followers of Christ, and shall endeavor to maintain the unity of the whole body of Christ by a readiness to co-operate with all its members in all things in which they are agreed."

The United Presbyterian Church is a voluntary Church. The doctrine of its voluntary condition is not formally contained in any portion of her standards, but it is distinctly implied. She holds to the theology of the Westminster Confession of Faith, and of the Larger and Shorter Catechisms, but she objects to every part of the Westminster Confession "which teaches, or is supposed to teach, compulsory or persecuting and intolerant principles in religion." "Her creed," says Eadie, "is that the exalted Jesus is the only King and Head of his Church, and that this headship wholly supersedes the patronage and endowment of the Church by civil rulers. She believes, indeed, that Christ is King of nations, and that therefore nations should serve God, and that all rulers and magistrates are bound to glorify him in their respective spheres and stations. But such service and such glorification of God must be in harmony with the revealed mind of Christ; and the duty of endowing Christianity nowhere appears among the statutes of the New Testament. States which establish Christianity venture beyond divine enactment, and contravene the spirituality of that kingdom which 'is not of this world.' It is plain, too, from recent events in Scotland and England, that neither purity nor freedom can exist as it ought in an established Church. Spiritual independence can flourish only in a Church which has no connection with the State." Ebenezer Erskine said in his day, "There is a great difference to be made between the Church of Scotland and the Church of Christ in Scotland; for I reckon that the last is to a great extent drawn into the wilderness by the first; and since God in his adorable providence has led us into the wilderness with her, I judge it our duty to tarry with her for a while there, and to prefer her afflictions to all the advantages of a legal establishment." Christ's house, according to Ebenezer Erskine, is "the freest society in the world." It should bear no trammels, and it bore none for 300 years. Accordingly the United Presbyterian Church is a free Church, and will not submit to any law of patronage. The Relief Church had its origin in this grievance; and the Secession Church, while it had a special struggle for doctrine, no less distinctly vindicated the rights of the people. Pastors are therefore chosen by the united voice of the members in full communion; for Christ's ordinances are meant solely for Christ's people. The Presbytery exercises no control whatever over the popular suffrage. It sends one of its members to *moderate* in the call, and sees that the call is gone about in a regular way. No canvassing is allowed, and the whole work of the Presbytery is, in fact, to guard and preserve purity of election. The Presbytery *sustains* the call after being convinced that there is nothing to vitiate it as a free expression of the mind of the people. The minister so called may either be one who is or has been in a charge, or he may be what is called a probationer. The vacant churches are supplied by these probationers — a body of men who have finished the educational curriculum appointed by the Church, been examined by their respective presbyteries, and licensed as persons qualified to preach the Gospel, and fit, if they shall be called, to take the pastoral charge of a congregation. The probationers are thus a body of lay preachers, authorized candidates for the ministry. They are sent among the vacant churches without partiality and by rotation, that their gifts may be tried, and sometimes they are located for months together at a missionary station. When a probationer is called, and accepts the call, he appears before the Presbytery in whose bounds the Church calling him is situated, and preaches what are called trial discourses. Such appearance in the Presbytery on the part of the pastor elect is to win the confidence of his brethren. After all the prescribed trials have been gone through and sustained, a day for the ordination is fixed. One of the ministers of the Presbytery is appointed to preside and ordain, and another is appointed to preach. An edict* is at the same time appointed to be publicly served in the congregation by the officiating minister or preacher at least ten days before the day of ordination. Upon the day fixed, the Presbytery meets at the appointed time and place, and is constituted by the moderator. The officer is then sent to the assembled congregation to intimate that the Presbytery has met, and requiring all who have any valid objections to the ordination being proceeded with immediately to appear before the Presbytery and state them. The officer having returned, and no objectors appearing, the Presbytery then proceeds to the place of worship. If objections are made, they must be decided upon before the ordination takes place. After sermon, the moderator gives a brief narrative of the different steps of procedure regarding the call. He then calls on the candidate for ordination to stand up, and in presence of the congregation puts to him the questions of the formula. But before proposing the ninth question, he asks the members of the congregation to signify their adherence to the call by holding up their right hands. These steps being taken, the moderator comes down to the platform, where the candidate kneels, and, surrounded by the other brethren of the Presbytery, he engages in solemn prayer, and towards the conclusion of the prayer, or after it is concluded, he, by the imposition of hands (in which all the brethren of the Presbytery join), ordains him to the office of the holy ministry, and to the pastoral inspection of the congregation by whom he has been chosen and regularly called, commending him for countenance and success to the grace of God in all the duties incumbent upon him as a minister of the Gospel. After the ordination is thus completed, the members of Presbytery give to the newly ordained pastor the right hand of fellowship, and appropriate addresses are then delivered to minister and people. These services being concluded, the moderator accompanies the newly ordained pastor to some convenient place, where the members of the congregation may acknowledge him as their minister by taking him by the right hand. The Presbytery then returns to its place of meeting, when the newly ordained minister's name is entered on the roll, and he takes his seat as a member of the Presbytery, on which the commissioners for the congregation crave extracts. A member of Presbytery is also appointed to

* The form of edict is as follows: "Whereas the Presbytery of ——— of the United Presbyterian Church have received a call from this congregation, addressed to A. B., preacher (or minister) of the Gospel, to be their minister, and the said call has been sustained as a regular Gospel call, and been accepted by the said A. B., and he has undergone trials for ordination; and whereas the said Presbytery, having judged the said A. B. qualified for the ministry of the Gospel and the pastoral charge of this congregation, have resolved to proceed to his ordination on the ——— day of ———, unless something occur which may reasonably impede it. Notice is hereby given to all concerned that if they, or any of them, have anything to object why the said A. B. should not be ordained pastor of this congregation, they may repair to the Presbytery which is to meet at ——— on the said ——— day of ———; with certification that, if no valid objection be then made, the Presbytery will proceed without further delay. By order of the Presbytery. A. B., *Moderator*. C. D., *Clerk*."

constitute the session of the congregation and introduce the minister to his seat there. The whole procedure of the day is entered on the Presbytery's record.

The formula put to ministers on their ordination is as follows:

"1. Do you believe the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments to be the Word of God, and the only rule of faith and practice?

"2. Do you acknowledge the Westminster Confession of Faith, and the Larger and Shorter Catechisms, as an exhibition of the sense in which you understand the Holy Scriptures; it being understood that you are not required to approve of anything in these documents which teaches, or is supposed to teach, compulsory or persecuting and intolerant principles in religion?

"3. Are you persuaded that the Lord Jesus Christ, the only King and Head of the Church, has therein appointed a government distinct from and subordinate to civil government? And do you acknowledge the Presbyterian form of government, as authorized and acted on in this Church, to be founded on and agreeable to the Word of God?

"4. Do you approve of the constitution of the United Presbyterian Church as exhibited in the Basis of Union; and, while cherishing a spirit of brotherhood towards all the faithful followers of Christ, do you engage to seek the purity, edification, peace, and extension of this Church?

"5. Are zeal for the glory of God, love to the Lord Jesus Christ, and a desire to save souls, and not worldly interests or expectations, so far as you know your own heart, your great motives and chief inducements to enter into the office of the holy ministry?

"6. Have you used any undue methods, by yourself or others, to obtain the call of this Church?

"[*The members of the Church being requested to stand up, let this question be put to them:*

"Do you, the members of this Church, testify your adherence to the call which you have given to Mr. A. B. to be your minister? And do you receive him with all gladness, and promise to provide for him suitable maintenance, and to give him all due respect, subjection, and encouragement in the Lord?

"*An opportunity will here be given to the members of the Church of signifying their assent to this by holding up their right hand.*]

"7. Do you adhere to your acceptance of the call to become minister of this Church?

"8. Do you engage, in the strength of the grace that is in Christ Jesus, to live a holy and circumspect life, to rule well your own house, and faithfully, diligently, and cheerfully to discharge all the parts of the ministerial work to the edifying of the body of Christ?

"9. Do you promise to give conscientious attendance on the courts of the United Presbyterian Church, to be subject to them in the Lord, to take a due interest in their proceedings, and to study the things which make for peace?

"10. All these things you profess and promise, through grace, as you shall be answerable at the coming of the Lord Jesus Christ with all his saints, and as you would be found in that happy company?"

The Church has one theological institution, with a staff of seven professors, including the principal. The number of students for 1876–77 was 107, and the average for the ten preceding years 136. Students have to pass through a full course of arts at the university before joining the theological hall, and the theological curriculum is over three years, with a session each year from the beginning of November to the middle of April. Very recently a change was made in the management of the theological hall, with a view to the more efficient training of the students. It was agreed that the means of maintaining the hall should be partly by a capital fund and partly by annual contributions, and the capital fund of £40,000 has already been nearly realized. In connection with the theological hall there is a scheme of scholarships, and a committee who have charge of the distribution of these on competitive examination of applicants. In 1876 eleven special scholarships were awarded of the aggregate value of £275; and from the ordinary fund two of £20 each, ten of £15, and forty-one of £10. In 1876 the number of young people under religious instruction in Sabbath-schools and Bible-classes was 103,750.

The following are among the other undertakings of the United Presbyterian Church:

Home Mission Fund.—This fund is under the direction more immediately of the Home Committee of the Board of Missions. Its object is to supplement the stipends of the weaker congregations, to support missionary stations, to aid in the support of catechists, and maintain a scheme of home evangelization.

By the *Stipend Augmentation Scheme* and its *Surplus Fund*, including arrangements which have been made with certain congregations in reference to allowances for house-rent where manse accommodation has not been provided, the following general results in regard to the stipends of ministers for the year 1877 have been obtained:

104	Stipends have been raised to £200 per annum, with manse or allowance for rent of £20.					
38	Stipends are less than	£200,	but not under	£197	10*s.*	
37	"	"	197 10*s.*,	"	"	190.
32	"	"	190,	"	"	180.
14	"	"	180,	"	"	170.
10	"	"	170,	"	"	160.
8	"	"	160,	"	"	157 10*s.*
13	Stipends are under the former minimum of					157 10*s.*
256	All the other Stipends in the Church are upwards of £200 per annum.					

In evangelistic effort and home evangelization £5047 were expended in 1876 under the direction of the Home Committee of the Board of Missions.

The *Aged and Infirm Ministers' Fund* has a capital fund of £35,593, with a reserve fund of £1000, and provides an annuity of not less than £50 per annum to aged and infirm ministers and missionaries of the Church.

Manse Fund.—For this scheme £52,772 have been raised by subscriptions and donations up to December, 1876, and £49,449 expended up to April, 1877, in grants to 232 congregations; and the conditions on which these grants were offered required the congregations to raise not less than £90,341, as it is stipulated where grants are given that the manse shall be free of debt when the last instalment of the grant has been paid.

The *Foreign Mission Fund* is to defray the expenses of the foreign missionary operations of the Church. The missions supported out of the fund, nine in number, are situated in Jamaica, Trinidad, Old Calabar, Kaffraria, India, China, Spain, Japan, and Algeria. In these nine missions there are 61 ordained missionaries, 7 European medical missionaries, 2 European male teachers, 21 European female teachers, 22 ordained native missionaries, 91 native evangelists, 212 schoolmasters, 44 native female teachers, 86 other agents, 84 principal stations, 131 out-stations, 13,242 communicants, 2033 inquirers, 197 week-day schools, 13,387 pupils, with a total educated agency of 384. The income of the Foreign Mission Fund for 1887 was £56,872 17*s.* 4*d.*

Under the direction of the synod, the Foreign Mission Board voted, during 1876, the following grants, viz.: (1) To the Union of Evangelical Churches of France, £500; (2) to the Evangelical Society of Lyons, £150; (3) to the Evangelical Society of Geneva, £250; (4) to the Belgian Missionary Society, £200; (5) for evangelical work in Bohemia, £150; (6) to the Waldensian Church, £350 (including £100 towards the salary of the Rev. J. Simpson Kay of Palermo); (7) to the Free Church of Italy, £100; (8) for evangelical work at Aix-les-Bains, Savoy, £50; (9) to the French Canadian Missionary Society, £100; (10) for Rev. Ferdinand César's work in Moravia, £75; (11) for outfit and passage of two ministers to Australia, £340; (12) to Rev. David Sidney, Napier, New Zealand, for salary of evangelist (three years), £150; and (13) salary of Rev. Dr. Laws, of the Nyassa mission of the Free Church. These grants amount in all to £2715. Besides these special grants made directly by the Foreign Committee, the following special contributions by individuals were sent through the hands of the synod's treasurer: (1) £1530 from the Theological Hall Students' Missionary Society, for pastor Yakopian's work in Cesarea, Cappadocia; (2) £5 for Protestant churches in Bithynia; (3) £1 6*s.* 3*d.* for Mount Lebanon Schools; (4) £100 for Protestant Church in Bohemia; (5) £50 5*s.* for Rev. F. César's work in Mo-

ravia; (6) £20 for the Union of Evangelical Churches in France; (7) £45 4*s.* 4*d.* for evangelical work at Aix-les-Bains, Savoy; (8) £44 for Christian work in Paris; (9) £25 for Reformed Church in the Netherlands; (10) £131 2*s.* 4*d.* for the Waldensian Church; (11) £50 for the Free Italian Church; (12) £4 2*s.* for Rev. J. S. Kay, Palermo; (13) £5 for Mrs. Boyce's Orphanage, Bordighera; (14) £33 6*s.* 8*d.* for Freedmen's Missions Aid Society; and (15) £606 18*s.* 7*d.* for the Agra Medical Mission (Dr. Valentine's scheme). These donations, destined by the donors for the objects specified, amounted in all to £2631 5*s.* 2*d.*, which, added to the grants administered by the Board—viz., £2715—make the total contribution of the Church during 1876, for objects outside the Foreign Mission, £5346 5*s.* 2*d.* The ordinary congregational income of the Church for the year 1876 was £233,114; the missionary and benevolent income £82,927; and the benevolent income not congregational £62,226—the total, including the English congregations, up to June, 1876, being £406,204. See Hetherington, *Hist. of the Church of Scotland; Cyclop. of Religious Denominations* (Lond. and Glasgow); Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac.* See UNITED PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.

3. FREE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND.—This large and useful body of Christians, now numbering nearly a million of people, was organized into a separate religious denomination in May, 1843. The circumstances which led to its formation as a Church distinct from the Establishment have already been detailed in a previous article. The conflict which at length terminated in the Disruption had its origin in the two reforming acts passed by the General Assembly of 1834, the one of which, the Act on Calls, asserted the principle of non-intrusion, and the other, usually called the Chapel Act, asserted the right of the Church to determine who should administer the government of Christ's house. Both of these acts gave rise to lawsuits before the civil tribunals, thus bringing into discussion the whole question as to the terms of the connection between the Church and the State. As the various processes went forward in the courts of law, it became quite plain to many, both of the Scottish clergy and laity, that attempts were made by the civil courts to coerce the courts of the Church in matters spiritual. Every encroachment of this kind they were determined to resist, as being contrary to the laws and constitution of the Church of Scotland, as well as an infringement on the privileges secured to her by the Act of Security and Treaty of Union.

Matters were evidently fast hastening onward to a crisis, and in the Assembly of 1842 a Claim of Rights was agreed upon to be laid before the Legislature, setting forth the grievances of which the Church complained in consequence of the usurpations of the courts of law, and declaring the terms on which alone she would remain in connection with the State. This important document was adopted by a majority of 131. The claim, however, which it contained, was pronounced by government to be "unreasonable," and intimation was distinctly made that the government "could not advise her majesty to acquiesce in these demands." This reply on the part of the supreme branch of the legislature was decisive, and put an end to all hope of averting the impending catastrophe. At the next meeting of Assembly, accordingly, the moderator, instead of constituting the court in the usual form, read a solemn protest, which he laid upon the table, and withdrew, followed by all the clerical and lay members of Assembly by whom it was subscribed. This document protests against the then recent decisions of the courts of law on the following grounds:

"1. That the courts of the Church by law established, and members thereof, are liable to be coerced by the civil courts in the exercise of their spiritual functions; and in particular in the admission to the office of the holy ministry, and the constitution of the pastoral relation, and that they are subject to be compelled to intrude ministers on reclaiming congregations in opposition to the fundamental principles of the Church, and their views of the Word of God, and to the liberties of Christ's people.

"2. That the said civil courts have power to interfere with and interdict the preaching of the Gospel and administration of ordinances as authorized and enjoined by the Church courts of the Establishment.

"3. That the said civil courts have power to suspend spiritual censures pronounced by the Church courts of the Establishment against ministers and probationers of the Church, and to interdict their execution as to spiritual effects, functions, and privileges.

"4. That the said civil courts have power to reduce and set aside the sentences of the Church courts of the Establishment deposing ministers from the office of the holy ministry and depriving probationers of their license to preach the Gospel, with reference to the spiritual status, functions, and privileges of such ministers and probationers—restoring them to the spiritual office and status of which the Church courts had deprived them.

"5. That the said civil courts have power to determine on the right to sit as members of the supreme and other judicatories of the Church by law established, and to issue interdicts against sitting and voting therein, irrespective of the judgment and determination of the said judicatories.

"6. That the said civil courts have power to supersede the majority of a Church court of the Establishment, in regard to the exercise of its spiritual functions as a Church court, and to authorize the minority to exercise the said functions, in opposition to the court itself, and to the superior judicatories of the Establishment.

"7. That the said civil courts have power to stay processes of discipline pending before courts of the Church by law established, and to interdict such courts from proceeding therein.

"8. That no pastor of a congregation can be admitted into the Church courts of the Establishment, and allowed to rule, as well as to teach, agreeably to the institution of the office by the Head of the Church, nor to sit in any of the judicatories of the Church, inferior or supreme—and that no additional provision can be made for the exercise of spiritual discipline among the members of the Church, though not affecting any patrimonial interests, and no alteration introduced in the state of pastoral superintendence and spiritual discipline in any parish, without the sanction of a civil court.

"All which jurisdiction and power on the part of the said civil courts severally above specified, whatever proceeding may have given occasion to its exercise, is, in our opinion, in itself inconsistent with Christian liberty, and with the authority which the Head of the Church hath conferred on the Church alone."

The document goes on to protest that in the circumstances in which the Church was thereby placed, "a free Assembly of the Church of Scotland, by law established, cannot at this time be holden, and that an Assembly in accordance with the fundamental principles of the Church cannot be constituted in connection with the State without violating the conditions which must now, since the rejection by the Legislature of the Church's Claim of Right, be held to be the conditions of the Establishment." At the close of this solemn protest, the subscribers claim to themselves the liberty of abandoning their connection with the State, while retaining all the privileges and exercising all the functions of a section of Christ's visible Church. "And, finally," they declare, "while firmly asserting the right and duty of the civil magistrate to maintain and support an establishment of religion in accordance with God's Word, and reserving to ourselves and our successors to strive by all lawful means, as opportunity shall in God's good providence be offered, to secure the performance of this duty agreeably to the Scriptures, and in implement of the statutes of the kingdom of Scotland and the obligations of the Treaty of Union as understood by us and our ancestors, but acknowledging that we do not hold ourselves at liberty to retain the benefits of the Establishment while we cannot comply with the conditions now to be deemed thereto attached—*we protest* that, in the circumstances in which we are placed, it is, and shall be, lawful for us, and such other commissioners chosen to the Assembly appointed to have been this day holden as may concur with us, to withdraw to a separate place of meeting, for the purpose of taking steps for ourselves and all who adhere to us—maintaining with us the Confession of Faith, and standards of the Church of Scotland as heretofore understood—for separating in an orderly way from the

Establishment, and thereupon adopting such measures as may be competent to us, in humble dependence on God's grace and the aid of the Holy Spirit, for the advancement of his glory, the extension of the Gospel of our Lord and Saviour, and the administration of the affairs of Christ's house, according to his holy Word; and we do now, for the purpose foresaid, withdraw accordingly, humbly and solemnly acknowledging the hand of the Lord in the things which have come upon us, because of our manifold sins, and the sins of this Church and nation; but, at the same time, with an assured conviction that we are not responsible for any consequences that may follow from this our enforced separation from an Establishment which we loved and prized, through interference with conscience, the dishonor done to Christ's crown, and the rejection of his sole and supreme authority as King in his Church." This document, embodying the protest against the wrongs inflicted on the Church of Scotland by the civil power, was signed by no fewer than 203 members of Assembly. When the moderator had finished the reading of the protest, he retired, followed by a large majority of the clerical and lay members of the court; and the procession, joined by a large body of ministers, elders, and others who adhered to their principles, moved in solemn silence to Tanfield Hall, a large building situated at the northern extremity of the city, in the valley formed by the Water of Leith. Here was constituted the Free Church of Scotland, which, while renouncing the benefits of an Establishment, continues to adhere to the standards and to maintain the doctrine, discipline, worship, and government of the Church of Scotland. Dr. Chalmers was chosen as their first moderator, and the ordinary business was proceeded with according to the usual forms. On Tuesday, the 23d of May, the ministers and professors, to the number of 474, solemnly subscribed the Deed of Demission, formally renouncing all claim to the benefices which they had held in connection with the Establishment, declaring them to be vacant, and consenting to their being dealt with as such. Thus, by a regular legal instrument, the ministers completed their separation from the Establishment; and the Free Church of Scotland assumed the position of a distinct ecclesiastical denomination, holding the same doctrines, maintaining the same ecclesiastical framework, and observing the same forms of worship as had been received and observed in the National Church. In fact, they had abandoned nothing but the endowments of the State, and even these they had abandoned, not from any change in their views as to the lawfulness of a Church Establishment, but solely because in their view the State had altered the terms on which the compact between the Church and the State had been originally formed.

The Free Church, strong in the conviction that her distinctive principles were sound and scriptural, entered upon her arduous work with an humble but confiding trust in her great and glorious Head. In the course of her history she has become united with two other bodies. In 1852 the majority of the Original Seceders, with whom the name of Dr. Thomas M'Crie, father and son, was so honorably connected, joined the Free Church; and in 1876 a union was formed with the Reformed Presbyterian Church, consisting of thirty-six ministers and thirty-six congregations. The General Assembly of the Free Church consists of 730 members, half being ministers and half ruling elders, and all appointed by the presbyteries. Each Presbytery returns one third of its ministers, and an equal number of ruling elders. The temporal affairs of each congregation are managed by a body called "The Deacons' Court." This court is composed of the minister, the ruling elders, and a body of deacons chosen, like the elders, by the members of the congregation. The spiritual interests of each congregation are attended to by the kirk-session, consisting only of the minister and elders.

In preparation for the new position in which the Church would be placed when deprived of state support, Dr. Chalmers had made arrangements some months previous to the Assembly of 1843 for establishing associations throughout the country with the view of collecting funds for the support of the ministry. With such energy and activity had these preparations been carried forward that before the day of the Disruption came 687 separate associations had been formed in all parts of the country. So extensive and ardent was the sympathy felt with the movement, not in Scotland only, but throughout the kingdom, and even throughout the world, that funds were liberally contributed from all quarters in support of the cause, and at the close of the first year of the history of the Free Church her income amounted to the munificent sum of £366,719 14*s.* 3*d.* Nor has the source of her supply afforded the slightest symptoms of being exhausted even after the lapse of thirty-five years. On the contrary, she raised £10,250,000 in her first thirty years, and has now an annual income of over £500,000. The Sustentation Fund for the support of the ministry reached in 1877 the gratifying sum of £172,641 13*s.* 3*d.*, yielding an annual salary to nearly 800 ministers of about £150 each. The Building Fund for the erection of churches and manses amounted in 1877 to £41,179 2*s.* 0½*d.* This year (1878) a Church Extension scheme of £100,000 has been entered upon with spirit. The Congregational Fund, composed of ordinary collections at the church-doors on Sabbaths, and a great part of which goes to supplement the ministers' stipends, is £94,481 19*s.* 6*d.* The Fund for Missions in 1887–8 amounted to £83,813. There are various other objects connected with the Free Church which it is unnecessary to detail, but the sum total of the contributions for the last year was £565,195 10*s.* 4*d.*, an amount which plainly indicates that its friends and supporters are still animated with an intense and undiminished attachment to the principles on which this peculiar section of the Christian Church is based. Upwards of 800 churches have been reared by the liberality of her people, who are calculated to amount to somewhere about 1,000,000. To the large majority of the churches, manses, or parsonage-houses, have also been added. The Free Church has established a divinity school in Edinburgh, called the New College, which was completed at a cost approaching £40,000, is provided with a more complete staff of professors than any similar institution in Scotland, and with more effectual means of training an educated ministry than is to be found elsewhere in Great Britain. The Free Church has also built a divinity hall in Aberdeen, and a third in Glasgow. The number of theological students in attendance on these colleges amounts in 1878 to 230.

In connection with the Free Church, a fund was instituted in 1848 for Aged and Infirm Ministers, which already exceeds £39,000. In addition to the home ministry, which in 1878 numbered 1059, there are nearly 300 settled ministers belonging to this Church in the different departments of the colonial field.

The *Widows' and Orphans' Funds* are chiefly made up of yearly contributions (compulsory) from each minister of £5 to the Widows' and £2 to the Orphans' fund. At present the fund gives an annuity of £42 to each widow and £15 to each child under eighteen. Larger sums are given to the children when their mother is dead. The accumulated fund of the two schemes is upwards of £224,000. There is a society for sons and daughters of the clergy, not under the General Assembly, designed to aid ministers in the education of their families. In 1876 it paid £1758 in 125 grants, from £10 to £18 each.

The Home Mission and Church Extension Scheme.—Its purpose is to keep stations supplied by preachers or catechists in thinly peopled districts; also to foster missions in mining and manufacturing localities, and other populous places, and form them into regular charges; to aid such charges until they are taken on the equal

dividend platform; to maintain lay evangelists, and send out ministerial evangelists from time to time; and to encourage the employment of students and others as missionaries in necessitous districts in large towns. To encourage ministers of experience to undertake mission congregations in populous places, grants of £200 a year are given for a limited time; the grant diminishing gradually from year to year, till it is extinguished. In other cases the grants are smaller. The income of the fund, derived from a church-door collection thrice in two years, donations, legacies, etc., is between £9000 and £10,000 a year. This year a special Church Extension Fund, amounting to £100,000, is being raised, and the greater part of it has been contributed in a few months.

Highland Mission.—This is a somewhat similar scheme, managed by a separate committee of the General Assembly, for districts of the country where Gaelic is spoken. It has a collection every second year. Its average revenue is about £3000.

Church and Manse Building Fund.—This is intended to help congregations in their building operations. At first it was very large, Dr. Guthrie having raised for a General Manse Fund alone about £100,000, but of late years its income has been only about £1500. A special Building Fund is contemplated for new charges.

Education Scheme.—Till recently a large proportion of the congregations had day-schools, for which grants were given. Most of these are now absorbed in the national scheme of education. There are still some schools receiving grants; but the chief remaining part of the scheme is the Normal Schools, of which there are two—at Edinburgh and Glasgow. The instructors receive a salary from a general fund, which is raised by monthly contributions in all the congregations, and which is divided at the end of the year according to a certain scale, proportioned to the qualifications of the respective teachers. The number of normal students, male and female, for 1876–77 was 494.

College Scheme.—This provides for the support of the three theological institutions, partly by interest of endowments and partly by an annual collection at church-door, donations, legacies, etc. For 1876–77 the revenue was a total of £8995. There are large Bursary and Scholarship Funds for the encouragement of students, from £10 to £100 annually.

Continental Scheme.—For aiding stations, societies, and churches on the continent of Europe. Revenue about £4000.

Colonial Scheme.—For sending out ministers to the colonies and aiding colonial churches, especially in their earlier stages. Revenue about £4000.

The Foreign Missions Scheme.—The late Rev. Dr. Duff, the first missionary to the heathen from the Church of Scotland, went to Calcutta in 1829, and founded the India Mission of the Church of Scotland. In the previous year Dr. Wilson went to Bombay, and later, the Rev. John Anderson to Madras. In 1843 all the missionaries in India adhered to the Free Church, and the old localities were continued. The Foreign Missions of the Free Church embrace India, Africa, Syria, and New Hebrides. In India, there are 6 principal and 12 branch stations in Bengal; 3 principal and 10 branch stations in Western India; 2 principal and 3 branch stations in Central India; and 1 principal and 7 branch stations in Southern India. In South Africa there are 6 principal and 31 branch stations in Kaffraria; 2 principal and 2 branch stations in Natal; and 1 principal station at Livingstonia. In New Hebrides, where the Reformed Presbyterians (who joined the Free Church in 1876) had their field, are 4 stations, on three islands; and in Syria, the headquarters are at Shweir, about twenty miles from Beyrût. In all, the Free Church missions embrace 107 stations, 38 European missionaries, 3 European medical missionaries, 21 European teachers, 19 European artisans, 15 native missionaries, 327 Christian teachers, and Christian laborers of various sorts. In the native churches are 3350 communicants, and about 3000 baptized adherents. The number of institutions and schools is 223, and the total number of scholars is 13,109. In the principal Indian stations many of the pupils are undergraduates of the universities. The revenue of this scheme for 1876–77 was £51,217.

Mission to Jews.—This mission was begun in 1839, and in 1843 it was continued by the Free Church, all the missionaries having adhered. At present it has stations at—(1) Amsterdam, (2) Prague, (3) Pesth, (4) Breslau, (5) Constantinople. The Pesth mission has been especially blessed. The amount raised for the scheme in 1876–77 was £13,468.

The following is a summary of the contributions of the Free Church for 1876–77:

Sustentation fund	£170,209
Local buildings fund	86,291
Congregational fund	176,290
Missions and education	104,325
Miscellaneous	28,079
Total	£565,194

In all its operations, indeed, whether at home or abroad, the Free Church exhibits a vitality and energetic power which have gained for it a high place among Christian churches. See SCOTLAND, CHURCHES IN.

4. REFORMED PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH OF SCOTLAND.—This is the only Church which claims to be legitimately descended from the Covenanted Church of Scotland in her period of greatest purity, that of the Second Reformation. It was that memorable period of Scottish history between 1638 and 1650 which formed the æra of the Solemn League and Covenant, of the Westminster Assembly, of the revolution which dethroned the first Charles and asserted those principles of civil and religious liberty which all enlightened Christians and statesmen are now ready with one voice to acknowledge and to admire. For their strict adherence to these principles Cameron, Cargill, and Renwick shed their blood, and to these principles the Reformed Presbyterian Church gloried in avowing her attachment. As has already been noticed in the article COVENANTERS, on the day after the execution of Charles I was known at Edinburgh, his son, Charles II, was proclaimed king at the public cross by the Committee of Estates, with this proviso, however, that "before being admitted to the exercise of his royal power, he shall give satisfaction to this kingdom in the things that concern the security of religion according to the National Covenant and the Solemn League and Covenant." This condition or proviso was considered as so necessary to the maintenance of the constitution of the country, as well as the promotion of the great principles of civil and religious liberty, that it was enacted both by the Parliament and the General Assembly. The document issued by the latter body exhibits, in the clearest manner, their design in insisting upon the subscription by the king. It is dated July 27, 1649, and contains the following important statements: "But if his majesty, or any having or pretending power and commission from him, shall invade this kingdom upon pretext of establishing him in the exercise of his royal power—as it will be a high provocation against God to be accessory or assisting thereto, so it will be a necessary duty to resist and oppose the same. We know that many are so forgetful of the oath of God, and ignorant and careless of the interest of Jesus Christ and the Gospel, and do so little tender that which concerns his kingdom and the privileges thereof, and do so much doat upon absolute and arbitrary government for gaining their own ends, and so much malign the instruments of the work of reformation, that they would admit his majesty to the exercise of his royal power upon any terms whatsoever, though with never so much prejudice to religion and the liberties of these kingdoms, and would think it quarrel enough to make war upon all those who for conscience' sake cannot condescend thereto. But we desire all those who fear the Lord, and

mind to keep their Covenant, impartially to consider these things which follow:

"1. That as magistrates and their power is ordained of God, so are they in the exercise thereof not to walk according to their own will, but according to the law of equity and righteousness, as being the ministers of God for the safety of his people; therefore a boundless and unlimited power is to be acknowledged in no king or magistrate; neither is our king to be admitted to the exercise of his power as long as he refuses to walk in the administration of the same according to this rule and the established laws of the kingdom, that his subjects may live under him a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty.

"2. There is one mutual obligation and stipulation betwixt the king and his people; as both of them are tied to God, so each of them is tied one to another for the performance of mutual and reciprocal duties. According to this, it is statute and ordained in the eighth act of first Parliament of James VI, 'That all kings, princes, or magistrates whatsoever, holding their place, which hereafter shall happen in any time to reign and bear rule over this realm, at the time of their coronation and receipt of their princely authority, make their faithful promise by oath, in the presence of the Eternal God, that during the whole course of their lives they shall serve the same Eternal God to the utmost of their power, according as he hath required in his most holy Word, contained in the Old and New Testaments; and, according to the same Word, shall maintain the true religion of Christ Jesus, the preaching of his most holy Word, and due and right ministration of his sacraments now received and preached within this realm; and shall abolish all false religion contrary to the same; and shall rule the people committed to their charge according to the will and the command of God revealed in his Word, and according to the laudable laws and constitutions received within this realm; and shall procure to the utmost of their power to the Kirk of God, and the whole Christian people, true and perfect peace in all time coming, and thus justice and equity be kept to all creatures without exception;' which oath was sworn first by king James VI, and afterwards by king Charles at his coronation, and is inserted in our National Covenant, which was approved by the king who lately reigned. As long, therefore, as his majesty who now reigns refuses to hearken to the just and necessary desires of State and Kirk propounded to his majesty for the security of religion and safety of his people, and to engage and to oblige himself for the performance of his duty to his people, it is consonant to Scripture and reason, and the laws of the kingdom, that they should refuse to admit him to the exercise of his government until he give satisfaction in these things.

"3. In the League and Covenant which hath been so solemnly sworn and renewed by this kingdom, the duty of defending and preserving the king's majesty, person, and authority, is joined with, and subordinate unto, the duty of preserving and defending the true religion and liberties of the kingdoms; and therefore his majesty, standing in opposition to the just and necessary public desires concerning religion and the liberties of the kingdoms, it were a manifest breach of Covenant, and preferring of the king's interest to the interest of Jesus Christ, to bring him to the exercise of his royal powers, which he, walking in a contrary way, and being compassed about with malignant counsels, cannot but employ to the prejudice and ruin of both."

The stipulation was made known to Charles while he was still in Holland, where he had been for some time residing, but he refused to accede to it. The following year (1650) he set sail for Scotland, and before landing on its shores he consented to subscribe the Covenant, and the test was accordingly administered to him with all due solemnity. On the following August he repeated an engagement to support the Covenant. Yet the unprincipled monarch was all the while devising schemes for the subversion not only of Presbyterianism, but even of Protestantism in Scotland. Again, when crowned at Scone on Jan. 1, 1651, Charles not only took oath to support and defend the Presbyterian Church of Scotland, but, the National Covenant and the Solemn League and Covenant having been produced and read, the king solemnly swore them. The imposing ceremonial, however, was only designed, on the part of the profligate Charles, to deceive his Scottish subjects. Nor did the calamities in which he was subsequently involved—his dethronement and exile for several years in France—produce any favorable change upon his character. No sooner was he restored to his throne in 1660, than he forthwith proceeded to overturn the whole work of reformation, both civil and ecclesiastical, which he had solemnly sworn to support. The first step towards the execution of this project was the passing of the Act of Supremacy, whereby the king was constituted supreme judge in all matters civil and ecclesiastical. To this was afterwards added the Oath of Allegiance, which declared it to be treason to deny the supremacy of the sovereign both in Church and State. The crowning deed of treachery, however, which Charles perpetrated, was his prevailing upon his Scottish counsellors to pass the Act Rescissory, by which all the steps taken from 1638 to 1650 for the reformation of religion were pronounced rebellious and treasonable; the National Covenant and the Solemn League and Covenant were condemned as unlawful oaths; the Glasgow Assembly of 1638 was denounced as an illegal and seditious meeting; and the right government of the Church was alleged to be the inherent prerogative of the crown. The result of these acts was, that the advances which the Church and the country had made during the period of the Second Reformation were completely neutralized, and the Church of Scotland was subjected for a long series of years to the most cruel persecution and oppression. With such flagrant and repeated violations of the solemn compact into which Charles had entered with his subjects, it is not to be wondered at that, on high constitutional grounds, this body of the Covenanters, headed by Cameron, Cargill, and others, should have regarded the treacherous sovereign as having forfeited all title to their allegiance. They felt it to be impossible to maintain the principles of the Reformation, and yet own the authority of a monarch who had trampled these principles under foot, and that, too, in violation of the most solemn oaths, repeated again and again. The younger M'Crie, in his *Sketches of Scottish Church History*, alleges that the principle laid down by Cameron's party was, "that the king, by assuming an Erastian power over the Church, had forfeited all right to the civil obedience of his subjects—a principle which had never been known in the Church of Scotland before." Such a view of the matter, however, is scarcely fair to the Cameronians. It was not because Charles had usurped an Erastian authority over the Church that they deemed it their duty to renounce their allegiance, but because he had broken the solemn vows made at his coronation. On that occasion he had entered, as they held, into a deliberate compact with his subjects, and yet, in the face of all his vows, he had openly, and in the most flagrant manner, broken that compact, thus setting his subjects free from all obligation to own him as king. It is quite true, as the Westminster Confession of Faith alleges, that "infidelity or difference in religion doth not make void the magistrate's just and legal authority, nor free the people from their due obedience to him;" but this remark does not meet the case as between Charles and the Cameronian party. They renounced their allegiance not because the sovereign was an infidel, or differed from them in matters of religion, but solely and exclusively because he had broken a civil compact entered into between him and his Scottish subjects on receiving the crown, and confirmed by a solemn religious vow. By his own deliberate deeds the traitorous monarch had forfeited his right to rule before they had renounced their obligation to obey. Such were the simple grounds on which Cameron, Cargill, Renwick, and their followers considered themselves justified in disowning the authority of the king, and bearing arms against him as a usurper of the throne and a traitor to the country.

This earnest and intrepid band of Covenanters brought down upon themselves, by the fearless avowal of their principles, the special vengeance of the ruling powers. One after another their leaders perished on the scaffold, and thus the people who held Cameronian principles found themselves deprived of religious instructors, and wandering as "sheep without a shepherd." In these circumstances they resolved to form themselves into a united body, consisting of societies for worship and mu-

tual edification, which were formed in those districts where the numbers warranted such a step. To preserve order and uniformity, the smaller societies appointed deputies to attend a general meeting, in which was vested the power of making arrangements for the regulation of the whole body. The first meeting of these united societies was held on Dec. 15, 1681, at Logan House, in the parish of Lesmahagow, Lanarkshire, where it was resolved to draw up a public testimony against the errors and defections of the times. The name which this body of Covenanters took to themselves was that of the "Persecuted Remnant," while the societies which they had formed for religious improvement led them to be designated the "Society People." "They had taken up no new principles," as Dr. Hetherington well remarks: "the utmost that they can be justly charged with is, merely that they had followed up the leading principles of the Presbyterian and Covenanted Church of Scotland to an extreme point, from which the greater part of Presbyterians recoiled; and that in doing so they had used language capable of being interpreted to mean more than they themselves intended. Their honesty of heart, integrity of purpose, and firmness of principle cannot be denied—and these are noble qualities; and if they did express their sentiments in strong and unguarded language, it ought to be remembered that they did so in the midst of fierce and remorseless persecution, ill adapted to make men nicely cautious in the selection of balanced terms wherein to express their indignant detestation of that unchristian tyranny which was so fiercely striving to destroy every vestige of both civil and religious liberty."

The first manifestation of the views held by the Society People took place during the dissensions at Bothwell Bridge, when a body of the Covenanters refused to make a public avowal of their allegiance to the king in their declaration. A rude outline of the declaration was drawn up by Cargill, assisted by Henry Hall, of Haughhead, who was mortally wounded at Queensferry, and the document, being found on his person, received the name of the "Queensferry Paper." It contained some of the chief points held by the Society People; but it unfortunately embodied in it an avowal of dislike to a hereditary monarchy, as "liable to inconvenience, and apt to degenerate into tyranny." Though the paper in question emanated from only a few persons, and its errors, therefore, could not be charged upon the whole of the strict Presbyterian party, yet it was quoted without reserve by their enemies as a proof of disloyal and even treasonable intentions. To counteract the prejudices thus excited against them, the leaders of the Society People drew up deliberately a statement of their principles, which is usually known by the name of the "Sanquhar Declaration." This document, which carefully excluded all reference to a change in the form of government, was, nevertheless, classed by the persecutors along with the Queensferry Paper in all their proclamations, as if they had been identical, and made an excuse for issuing to the army the most ruthless and cruel commands to pursue to the death all who were suspected of being connected with these bold declarations. Cameron, Cargill, and ten other persons were proclaimed traitors, and a price was set upon their heads. Nothing daunted, Cargill in 1630 boldly pronounced what is known as the Torwood Excommunication. In a meeting held at Torwood, in Stirlingshire, the intrepid Covenanter, after divine service, solemnly excommunicated Charles and his chief supporters, casting them out of the Church, and delivering them up to Satan. This bold act of a Christian hero roused the government to greater fury, and a series of civil and military executions followed, down to the Revolution in 1688.

In the persecutions of this eventful period, the Society People had been subjected to painful discouragement by the loss of their able and devoted leaders. Cameron and Cargill, and many others, had sealed their testimony with their blood, but in this time of sore trial Providence graciously raised up one admirably calculated to take a prominent part in promoting Christ's cause in days of bloody persecution. The individual to whom we refer was Mr. James Renwick, who, having himself witnessed the execution of Mr. Donald Cargill, resolved from that moment to engage with his whole soul in the good cause. Having studied for the ministry in Holland, and received ordination, he returned to his native land that he might share with his persecuted brethren in their trials, and preach among them the unsearchable riches of Christ. Often, accordingly, were the Society People encouraged amid their severe hardships by his faithful instructions. Danger and persecution everywhere awaited him, but he was ready to endure hardness as a good soldier of Jesus Christ. In 1683, at the early age of twenty-six, he died on the scaffold with a heroism and unflinching fortitude worthy of the last of that noble band of martyrs who sealed with their blood their devoted attachment to the work of Covenanted Reformation in Scotland.

The deeper the darkness, the nearer the dawn. On the death of Charles II in 1685, his brother James ascended the throne. At heart a bigoted adherent of the Church of Rome, he sought to restore popery to the ascendant both in England and Scotland. In making the attempt, however, he rushed upon his own ruin. He fell a victim to his own infatuated policy. After bearing for a time with his tyranny, an indignant people rose as one man, and hurled him from his throne, substituting in his place William and Mary, prince and princess of Orange, who, in the Revolution of 1688, restored civil and religious liberty to an oppressed and persecuted people, to a greater extent than had ever before been enjoyed.

The arrival of the prince of Orange in England was hailed by all classes of Presbyterians in Scotland as an event likely to be fraught with blessings to their distracted country. Lord Macaulay, in his *History of England*, indeed, strangely accuses the Society People of eagerness to disown William. So far is this charge from being well founded, that they were the first to own and hail him as their deliverer. Thus in the "Memorial of Grievances" issued by the societies, they declare, "We have given as good evidence of our being willing to be subject to king William as we gave before of our being unwilling to be slaves to king James. Upon the first report of the prince of Orange's expedition, we owned his quarrel, even while the prelatic faction were in arms to oppose his coming. In all our meetings we prayed openly for the success of his arms, when in all the churches prayers were made for his ruin; nay, when, even in the indulged meetings, prayers were offered for the popish tyrant whom we prayed against, and the prince came to oppose. We also associated ourselves, early binding ourselves to promote his interest, and were the first who openly armed and declared our desire to join with him." But while the Society People welcomed William as an expected deliverer, they openly dissented from the Revolution settlement as defective in various points. In particular, the Covenant, so far from being adopted either in the letter or in the spirit by the State, was not even owned by the Church; and the monarch took oaths in express contradiction to it. Presbyterianism, so far from being established in all his majesty's dominions, was only established in Scotland, and that under Erastian conditions, while prelacy was established in England and Ireland, and the king himself became an Episcopalian. The establishment of these different forms of Church government in different parts of the British dominions was effected by the sole authority of the king and Parliament, even before the Assembly of the Church was permitted to meet; and thus the principle of the royal supremacy over the Church continued to be asserted, and was even incorporated with the Revolution settlement. The principal objections, then, which the Society People alleged against the Revolution settlement

were, (1) that as it left the Acts Rescissory in full force, it cancelled the attainments of the Second Reformation, together with the Covenants; and (2) that the civil rulers usurped an authority over the Church which virtually destroyed her spiritual independence, and was at variance with the sole headship of the Redeemer himself.

The defects of the Revolution settlement were due partly to William's Erastian policy, and his desire to retain the prelatic clergy within the Established Church of Scotland, but partly also to the temporizing policy of the Church itself. "Though the acts of Parliament," as Dr. Hetherington justly remarks, "made no mention of the Second Reformation and the National Covenants, it was the direct duty of the Church to have declared her adherence to both; and though the State had still refused to recognise them, the Church would, by this avowal, have at least escaped from being justly exposed to the charge of having submitted to a violation of her own sacred Covenants. In the same spirit of compromise, the Church showed herself but too ready to comply with the king's pernicious policy of including as many as possible of the prelatic clergy within the National Church. This was begun by the first General Assembly, and continued for several succeeding years, though not to the full extent wished by William, till a very considerable number of those men whose hands had been deeply dyed in the guilt of the persecution were received into the bosom of that Church which they had so long striven utterly to destroy. It was absolutely impossible that such men could become true Presbyterians; and the very alacrity with which many of them subscribed the Confession of Faith only proved the more clearly that they were void of either faith or honor. Their admission into the Presbyterian Church of Scotland was the most fatal event which ever occurred in the strange, eventful history of that Church." It was not to be expected that the Society People could approve of the conduct either of the king or of the Church in the matter of the Revolution settlement. They occupied, accordingly, an attitude of firm and decided protest against the principles avowed by William and acted on by the Church; and they maintained that there had been a decided departure on the part of both the one and the other from the principles of the Second Reformation and the obligations of the Covenant.

Holding such views, it was impossible for the Society People to incorporate themselves with the Established Church of Scotland. They were compelled, therefore, to occupy a separate position as Dissenters from a Church whose constitution was radically vitiated, and as protesters against a professedly national government which had violated the most solemn national obligations. Three Cameronian ministers, it is true—Messrs. Shields, Linning, and Boyd—applied for admission into the National Church for themselves and their people, on condition that they might acknowledge breach of Covenant, and purge out the ignorant and heterodox and scandalous ministers who had taken part in shedding the blood of the saints. But every proposal of this nature was rejected. After unsuccessful efforts to obtain redress, they at last submitted, and the people who had adhered to them remained in a state of dissent.

For upwards of sixteen years after the avowal of their peculiar principles, the strict Presbyterians had remained without a stated ministry, or without any separate organization as a Church. In 1681, however, societies were formed which, though exercising no ecclesiastical functions, tended to give unity to the body, and to make such arrangements as were necessary for the maintenance of worship and ordinances, encouraging at the same time among the people a devoted attachment to Reformation principles. Availing themselves of these praying societies for nearly twenty years after the Revolution, the people waited patiently until the Lord should send them pastors. At length, in 1707, their wishes and prayers were answered, the Rev. John M'Millan, of Balmaghie, having resigned connection with the Established Church, and joined himself to their body. For a few years before, he had been contending within the pale of the Church for the whole of the Covenanted Reformation; but instead of meeting with sympathy from his brethren, he was hastily and irregularly deposed. Having joined the Society People, he labored for many years in the work of the ministry among them with indefatigable earnestness and zeal, maintaining the principles of the Second Reformation till his dying day.

Soon after the secession of Mr. M'Millan from the Established Church, he was joined by Mr. John M'Neil, a licentiate, who, having adopted Cameronian views, had also seceded. These two faithful and zealous servants of Christ traversed the country, preaching everywhere, and encouraging the adherents of the Covenant. In 1712 the Covenants were renewed at Auchensaugh. Amid many trials and persecutions the cause went steadily forward; and in 1743 Mr. M'Millan, who had hitherto stood alone as an ordained minister, Mr. M'Neil never having been ordained for want of a presbytery, was joined by the Rev. Thomas Nairn, who had left the Secession Church in consequence of his having embraced Cameronian views. There being now two ministers, a meeting was held at Braehead on Aug. 1, 1743, when a presbytery was for the first time formed under the name of the "Reformed Presbytery."

One of the first acts of the newly organized Church was to despatch missionaries to Ireland, and by the blessing of God upon the labors of these men, and others who speedily followed, a fully organized and independent section of the Reformed Presbyterian Church was formed in the sister isle.

In Scotland a Declaration and Testimony was published in 1741, and the Covenants were renewed in 1745, at Crawford-John, in Lanarkshire; but notwithstanding these steps, which were so well fitted to promote unity of sentiment and feeling, a few years only had elapsed when a division took place in the Reformed Presbytery, two of the brethren, Messrs. Hall and Innes, having separated from their communion in consequence of their having imbibed heretical opinions on the subject of the atonement. The two brethren, after seceding from the Presbytery, formed themselves into a new presbytery at Edinburgh, which at length became extinct. The Reformed Presbytery, in reply to their misrepresentations, found it necessary to issue a treatise in defence of their proceedings in the case of the erring brethren, as well as in refutation of the doctrine of an indefinite atonement. In 1761 a very important step was taken by the Reformed Presbytery, the emission of a Testimony for the whole of the Covenanted Reformation as attained to and established in Great Britain and Ireland, particularly between the years 1638 and 1649 inclusive.

From this time the Reformed Presbyterian Church went steadily forward, adhering to their peculiar principles with unflinching tenacity; and amid much obloquy, misunderstanding, and even misrepresentation, from the other religious denominations around them, witnessing boldly, and without compromise, for a Covenanted Reformation. Their numbers in many parts of Scotland increased beyond the means of supplying them with ministers. This was unhappily the case, for a considerable time, in various districts of the country. But at length such was the increase of ministers connected with the body that in 1810 three presbyteries were formed, and in the year following a general synod was constituted for the supervision of these presbyteries. Since that time so rapidly has the denomination advanced in numbers that in the year 1859 the synod included six presbyteries, which consisted in all of thirty-six ordained ministers and eight vacant congregations. The synod met annually either in Edinburgh or Glasgow. The Divinity Hall met during the months of August and September, when the students, in five sessions, received the instructions of two pro-

fessors, one for systematic theology, and the other for Biblical literature and Church history.

In the year 1830 the synod resolved to commence the prosecution of missionary operations. Their attention was first directed to the colonial field, particularly to Canada. Nor have they been unmindful of foreign missions, three missionaries in connection with the synod being employed in New Hebrides. There has also been a missionary laboring since 1846 among the Jews in London.

These Presbyterians have been sometimes called *Cameronians*, from Richard Cameron; but they are otherwise called "M'Millans," or "M'Millanites," from the name of the first minister who espoused their cause after the Revolution. But these, as well as the terms "Whigs" and "Mountain Men," which are also occasionally applied to them, they regard as accidental epithets. They are sometimes also called "Covenanters," from their adherence to the National Covenant of Scotland, and to the Solemn League and Covenant of the three kingdoms. Their proper designation, however, or that which they themselves adopt, is that of "Reformed Presbyterians." They hold the Holy Scriptures to be the absolute rule of faith and conduct, and to contain the standard of these both in Church and State. Next to this they adopt the early standards of the Church of Scotland, the Westminster Confession of Faith, the Larger and Shorter Catechisms of the Church, the Books of Discipline, and the Westminster Directory for Public Worship. And, lastly, they regard the National Covenant of Scotland as a continuing obligation. To these are to be added the documents published by the body itself in explanation of their principles: namely, their *Judicial Act and Testimony*, the 5th edition of which was published at Glasgow in 1818; *A Short Account of the Old Presbyterian Dissenters*, published by authority of the Presbytery in 1806; and an *Explanation and Defence of the Terms of Communion adopted by the Reformed Presbyterian Church*. According to the statistical report made at the Synod in Glasgow, March 13, 1876, the Church included 42 congregations with 7500 members, and its annual contributions were £14,000. The synod then, by a vote of 57 to 6, adopted a resolution in favor of union with the Free Church, and such union was finally consummated in the General Assembly of that body, May 25, 1876.

The residuary Reformed Presbyterian Church musters in 1878 eight ministers who held back, and are still contending about their Church property. Thus the *Original Seceders*, popularly known as "Auld Lichts" (Old Lights), are a more considerable body. Though most of these joined the Free Church (as the *true* Church of Scotland free) in 1852, they have still some thirty congregations of poor but very worthy people, who consider it their mission to hold up the banner of the Covenants, and to *protest* against the all but universal defection of their time and country. At the union in 1852, Drs. Candlish and Thomson, of Edinburgh, White, of Haddington, and the younger M'Crie (whose father had been in former days the great pillar of the Old-Light community) were added to the Free Church. The present Old Lights are notably strict both in doctrine and practice. Unlike the New Lights, who ultimately went to form the United Presbyterian Church in 1847, they are stanch supporters of the Establishment principle, which the Free Church also upholds in theory. It is chiefly the faithlessness of the latter with respect to the Covenants which prevents the residuary "Auld Lichts" from joining the communion. See SCOTLAND, CHURCHES IN; also Nos. 12 and 13 below.

5. UNITED ORIGINAL SECESSION CHURCH. — In common with all true Protestants, the Synod of United Original Seceders acknowledges the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments to be the supreme and only rule of faith and practice. They claim to be a branch of the Reformed and Covenanted Church of Scotland, and adhere to the whole of the Westminster standards as these were received by the Church of Scotland as standards of union and uniformity for the churches in the three kingdoms, and feel themselves bound by the sacred pledge given in the Solemn League and Covenant to adhere to them as such. They thus take their stand upon the principles of the first and particularly of the second Reformation, which took place between the year 1638 and 1650, and which embodied in its proceedings and settlement all the valuable attainments of the first Reformation and carried them to a greater extent. They own the morality of public covenanting, and the continued and perpetual obligation of the National Covenant of Scotland, and of the Solemn League and Covenant, upon all ranks and classes in these lands, and acknowledge the duty of renewing these covenants in a bond suited to the circumstances. As Presbyterians, they hold that the Lord Jesus Christ, the alone king and head of his Church, has appointed a particular form of government to take place therein, distinct from civil government and not subordinate to the same, and that Presbyterial Church government is the only form laid down and appointed by the Lord Jesus Christ in his Word. As they believe that Church communion consists in the joint profession of the truths and observance of all the ordinances which Christ has appointed in his Word, and that the visible unity of the Church lies in the unity of her visible fellowship, they regard free communion as an obvious violation of that unity, and hold it to be unscriptural, and that the practice encourages persons to continue in corrupt communions, by leading them to conclude that there is no conscientious ground of difference between them and the persons who make no scruple of occasionally joining with them in the intimacies of Church fellowship. In the worship of God they make use of the Psalms of David only, believing that they were delivered to the Church by the Holy Spirit to be used as the matter of public praise, and they regard hymns of human composition as unsuitable to the worship of God, and tending to endanger the purity both of the worship and the doctrines of the Church.

The Original Secession Synod dates its rise from 1733, and claims to represent the first seceders who in their testimony published in 1737 were careful to make it known that they were not dissenters from the National Church because of her civil establishment, but seceders from a corrupt and prevailing party in her judicatories, who carried on a general course of defection from the reformed and covenanting principles. The Original Secession Testimony, published in 1827, applies the principles of the Judicial Testimony to public events that had occurred up to the date of its publication, and like it was designed to be a declaration of the sense of the standards, and of the way in which they were received by the Reformed and Covenanted Church of Scotland. It is a term of ministerial and Christian communion in the body—that is, office-bearers are required to signify their approval of its principles, and members to accede to them, so far as they know and understand them.

The synod has from time to time been lessened by the separation of brethren. At present it consists of 41 congregations in Scotland, England, and Ireland; of these 29 (including one in England) are in connection with the synod in Scotland, and 12 constitute the Secession Synod in Ireland, in full communion with the Scottish Synod. The members and adherents are estimated at 6500. The income of the Scottish Synod last year amounted to about £5400.

The synod has several Home Mission stations, and also a prosperous Foreign Mission agency at Seoni, in India, under the immediate charge of Rev. George Anderson, who is assisted by two catechists. There is an orphanage in connection with the mission, having eleven children, who are well fed, clad, and educated, and it is expected that the number will shortly be materially increased. A school is also carried on, having 170 scholars,

and four teachers in addition to the missionary, and one catechist; the children are instructed in English, Urdu, and Hindi. The synod is desirous of obtaining, and has ample funds for maintaining, another ordained missionary in India. The synod supports a divinity hall, which is carried on under the superintendence of the Rev. Prof. W. F. Aitken, A.M., and the Rev. Prof. James Spence. The library in connection with the hall has 1400 volumes. Under the editorship of the Rev. John Sturrock a bimonthly magazine is published having a circulation of 1200 copies.

6. Presbyterian Church in England. — In the reign of queen Elizabeth there were two well-defined parties—the Prelatists, favored by the queen, who were satisfied with the reforms begun by king Edward; and the Presbyterians, who desired a simpler form of worship and government, like that set up by Calvin in Geneva. The first adherents of this form of Church government in England were those Protestants who returned from Frankfort, to which place they had fled for refuge in the reign of queen Mary. There they became acquainted with the Geneva platform, and, returning to their native country in the time of Elizabeth, they at first met in private houses, and afterwards more publicly, on which occasions the worship was conducted agreeably to the forms of the Geneva service-book. These latter were called Nonconformists, from their aversion to the established liturgy and hierarchy, and Puritans, from their anxiety for purity of life and worship. At the Convocation in 1562, the proposition to dispense with all ceremonies that had not the clear warrant of Scripture was lost by only one vote. Hallam says that the Puritan party outnumbered either the Roman Catholic or the Church of England, and that they composed the majority of Parliament under Elizabeth and her two successors (*Const. Hist. Engl.* ch. iv, n.). See Puritans. They were taken up at the time with questions of doctrine and discipline, and with resistance to power exercised, as they believed, contrary to the Word of God. But they felt so much the constraint of circumstances, that they paid little heed to the development of their principles in Church government, and certainly had no thought of attempting to constitute a Church on the principles which they maintained, resting satisfied in giving effect to these principles by mere resistance in particular cases in which their consciences were aggrieved. Yet in 1572 a presbytery was formed at Wandsworth, in Surrey, by ministers of London and its neighborhood, separating from the Church of England; and other presbyteries were soon formed, notwithstanding the extreme hostility of queen Elizabeth. Synods were now held occasionally. The court, looking to the episcopate as the support of its own supremacy, strove with all its might to maintain it unweakened, and enforced with reckless energy the bloody laws enacted against the Catholics on one side and the radical Protestant sects on the other. The king having established a liturgy calculated to set limits to the arbitrary freedom of Puritan worship, the Presbyterians set it down as a "worship of Baal" and a quenching of the Spirit of God. The dissension threatened to take the form of civil war, for the Presbyterians of England united with those of Scotland. On July 1, 1643, in obedience to a summons from Parliament (which summons had been issued in consequence of a remonstrance of the Presbyterian divines against prelacy), the Westminster Assembly met in Westminster Abbey. This Assembly was composed of 121 English divines, 10 lords, 20 commoners, with 5 ministers and 5 elders representing the Church of Scotland. They drew up a Confession of Faith, commonly known as the Westminster Confession, a Form of Church Government, a Directory for Public Worship, and two Catechisms, the Larger and the Shorter, which were all approved by Parliament in 1648. Parliament then enacted an ordinance making Presbyterianism the established religion of England, but without attaching any penalties to nonconformity. A loud cry has been raised against the English Presbyterians on the alleged ground that, at this period of their history, their whole efforts were directed towards the attainment of Church power. "Now, what was this Church power," says the younger M'Crie, "which the Presbyterians were so anxious to secure, and which Neal would represent as 'a civil authority over men's persons and properties?' Will it be believed that it was neither more nor less than the power of keeping back scandalous and unworthy persons from the ordinances of baptism and the Lord's Supper? This was, in fact, the great point in dispute between them and the Parliament; for the Parliament had insisted on having the supreme power in ecclesiastical matters, and had passed a law to the effect that if any person were refused admission to sealing ordinances by the Church courts, he might appeal to Parliament, which might, by virtue of its authority, compel the Church courts to receive him, whatever his character might be. The Presbyterians, as Neal himself admits, 'were dissatisfied with the men in power, because they would not leave the Church independent of the State.' And would Mr. Neal, himself an Independent, have had the Church to be dependent on the State? Would he have had the Presbyterians tamely submit to see the royal prerogatives of Christ assumed by a Parliament, after they had succeeded in wresting them out of the hands of a monarch against whom, for this very reason, the nation had long been engaged in a bloody war?"

The ordinance which they had secured from Parliament in 1648, however, never went into practical operation, for as soon as Cromwell and the Independents rose into power, they showed an uncompromising hostility to the Presbyterians. This was partly owing to the resistance the latter had made to the trial and execution of Charles I, insomuch that they had to be driven out of the House of Commons by force before those measures could be effected. London and its neighborhood were, meanwhile, formed into twelve presbyteries, constituting the Provincial Synod of London, which continued to hold regular half-yearly meetings till 1655, the meetings of presbyteries being continued till a later date; but the whole Presbyterian system was overturned by Cromwell's Committee of Triers, composed of thirty-eight persons of different sects, who were appointed in place of the Assembly for the examining and approving of all persons elected or nominated to any ecclesiastical office. Cromwell's policy aimed at bringing all ecclesiastical matters under the immediate control of the civil power.

On the Restoration, Charles II no sooner found himself firmly seated on the throne than he proved false to the Solemn League and Covenant which he had sworn to observe, restored prelacy to its former power, and gave up the Presbyterians, who had exerted themselves for his return to persecution. The fruitless Savoy Conference (q. v.) was followed by the Act of Uniformity, which was carried into effect on St. Bartholomew's Day, Aug. 24, 1662. Two thousand conscientious ministers who would not consent to be episcopally re-ordained, to assent to the Book of Common Prayer, or to abjure the Solemn League and Covenant, were then ejected from their benefices, and wandered forth to a life of poverty. Sixty thousand of the laity were imprisoned or fined, 5000 of whom died in prison, and the fines, confiscations, and other consequent losses of property amounted to £2,000,000 sterling. See Nonconformists.

After the Revolution, and the passage of the Act of Toleration in 1689, Presbyterianism revived, chapels sprang up in every part of the kingdom, and within twenty-five years the Presbyterians numbered 800 congregations. They became one of the "three denominations" who received the recognition of the State and were permitted to petition the crown in a corporate capacity, and in the business meetings of deputies from these denominations the Presbyterians had two representatives for one Baptist and one Independent.

Prosperity, however, proved more injurious than per-

secution, and there was an abatement of zeal and spirituality. Besides this, another cause operated disastrously. In 1691 the Presbyterians were induced to enter into Articles of Agreement with the Independents. As a consequence, Presbyterian discipline began to be relaxed, the system was not carried out, the office of ruling elder was allowed to be dropped, the disuse of Church sessions naturally followed, presbyteries and synods were given up, the churches became virtually independent, and finally Arian and Socinian errors infected the ministers and congregations to such an alarming extent that the name *Presbyterian* became synonymous in England with *Socinian* or *Unitarian;* old endowments, legacies of Presbyterians, being in many instances enjoyed by Unitarians. Notwithstanding the numerous Presbyterian houses of worship which had been erected, the organization of Presbyterianism was very imperfectly kept up. The "discipline" which has flourished so well in Scotland under the form of "Kirk Session" never obtained a firm footing in England, nor have the English Presbyterians ever possessed a completely organized system of presbyteries, synods, and General Assembly. Along with the extensive deviation from sound doctrine among the English Presbyterians there arose a strong feeling of discontent with the compulsory subscription of the Thirty-nine Articles which the Toleration Act required from all Dissenters. The subject was discussed in various pamphlets; and at length, constrained by the force of public opinion, government passed an act in 1779 by which every preacher or teacher of any congregation who scrupled to declare and subscribe his assent to any of the articles was allowed to make and subscribe instead thereof the declaration of Protestant belief, and was thereby entitled to similar exemptions. A subsequent statute renders qualifying in the case of Dissenters for the exercise of ministerial functions unnecessary, except in obedience to a legal requisition. But although forced subscription to the Articles was no longer required, the Protestant Dissenters, including the Presbyterians, still retained their own symbolic books which coincided in doctrine with the Thirty-nine Articles. Up to this time both Presbyterians and Congregationalists were in the habit of requiring confessions of faith at ordinations, and on such occasions ministers of both denominations frequently took part in the religious services. At the present day numbers of churches exist in England originally planted on a Presbyterian foundation, which are only Presbyterian in name, being, in fact, Socinian in faith and Independent in government. Probably there are not less than 170 such churches; but, protected by acts of Parliament and decisions of the lord-chancellors, they remain unmolested in the enjoyment of their endowments.

There existed, however, for some time in England a few congregations connected with the Church of Scotland and with the Scottish Secession Church. The former organized into a separate ecclesiastical body in 1836, but in 1843 a portion of this adhered to the Scottish Established Church, while a portion, in sisterly alliance with the Free Church of Scotland, prosecuted its work in England on the footing of a Church with separate and independent jurisdiction. In 1872 the two bodies into which the English Presbyterians finally divided—the one then called *The Presbyterian Church in England,* the other *United Presbyterians*—presented the following relative strength:

	English Presb.	United Presb.	Total.
Presbyteries	7	5	12
Churches	132	105	237
Settled ministers	123	90	213
Ruling elders	546	560	1,106
Communicants	23,966	17,861	41,827
Missionary and benevolent collections	£7,308	£7,781	£15,089
Stipends	£27,525	£18,487	£46,012

In 1876 the statistics presented at the fortieth meeting of the Synod of the English Presbyterian Church showed that the number of communicants was 29,045, the total amount of receipts for the year £98,484, and the amount of stipends paid £38,069. The income for home missions had been £2133. Seven new fields of labor had been occupied. The expenditures of the Foreign Mission Committee had been £8268 for the support of 12 missionaries in China, besides 3 at home for rest, 56 native evangelists, and 23 students. On June 18, 1876, the first Synod of *The Presbyterian Church of England* was constituted by the union of the two bodies. The United Church then consisted of 11 presbyteries, with 263 congregations; 50,000 members, with a yearly income of £160,000. In 1877 the Synod of the Presbyterian Church of England comprised 258 congregations, distributed into 10 presbyteries, with a membership of 43,434 communicants. The entire income of the Church during that year, both congregational and synodical, inclusive of £6210 2*s.* from special sources, was £157,455 12*s.*

The schemes of the Church, placed under the charge of standing committees, are as follows:

1. *Home Missions,* including Church Extension, Evangelization, Temperance.

2. *Foreign Missions.*—Principally in China, where there are 15 European missionaries and 85 native evangelists, and 35 students in training. There are 106 stations in all, many of which have been organized as churches, situated in the districts of Amoy and Swatow and the island of Formosa. In connection with these there were, at the close of 1888, 3553 communicants. There is one missionary station in India. Many of the late United Presbyterian congregations maintain more or less their connection meanwhile, as was understood at the union, with the foreign missions of their former Church. The committee aids missions in Germany, France, Belgium, Spain, Portugal, Italy, Bohemia, and Russia.

3. *Jewish Mission.*—The sphere of this work, with one missionary, the Rev. Thomas Meyer, is London. There is a mission-hall, with reading-room. The means used are domestic visitations, public meetings in the hall, prayer-meetings, and meetings with inquirers. Thirty-seven Jews, besides casual inquirers, were more or less under regular instruction in 1877. There were three baptisms.

4. *Education.*—A theological seminary is maintained in London. It has three professors: the Revs. Dr. Lorimer, Dr. Chalmers, and the Rev. Mr. Gibb (resident). A generous member of the Church, R. Barbour, Esq., of Manchester, having made provision for the endowment of an additional chair, the Church is taking steps for making appointment of another professor in 1878. The committee also takes charge of superintending and aiding a number of schools, especially in rural districts.

5. *Sabbath-schools.*—The committee reported to the Synod in 1877 348 schools, 5382 teachers, 51,185 scholars on the roll, of whom 20,271 are children of parents belonging to the Church, and 4510 are in senior classes. Much Christian work is done among the young by other means.

6. *Sustentation Fund.*—This was a scheme in operation, at the date of the union, in the Presbyterian Church in England only—the United Presbyterian Church aiding its weaker congregations by another plan. This necessitates now some transitional and imperfect action. The equal dividend for last year to the congregations on the fund was £200, raising the minimum ministerial stipend to that amount. The whole sum paid as salaries was £63,214, of which forty per cent. passed through this fund.

7. *Publications.*—This committee issues the *Messenger* and *Children's Messenger,* monthly periodicals of the Church, and during the past year has prepared a memorial volume containing records of the union. It contemplates the continuance of instructive manuals, of which two have been published for the use of the Church.

Other provisions are: (*a*) Widows and Orphans'

Fund; (*b*) Church Building Committee; and (*c*) Aged and Infirm Ministers' Fund. See Hume, *Hist. of England;* Neal, *Hist. of the Puritans; Sketch of the History and Principles of the Presbyterian Church in England* (Lond.); Hallam, *Constitutional History of England;* Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac;* M'Crie, *Annals of English Presbyterianism* (1872).

7. Presbyterian Church in Ireland.—In Ireland as well as in England there was a strong Puritan section of the clergy holding Presbyterian principles during the earlier years of the 17th century, and the party was considerably strengthened by the settlement of Ulster by Scottish colonists during the reign of James I. Scottish ministers also carried over to Ireland their peculiar views. But the Presbyterian party was not consolidated into a separate community until the civil war broke out. The first Presbyterian minister who appeared in Ireland after the Reformation was the Rev. Walter Travers, the first regular provost of Trinity College, Dublin. He entered on his official duties in 1594; but, owing to the civil war in which the country was then involved, he did not remain long at the head of the university. Of those ministers who went to Ireland in the reign of James I, the earliest was Mr. Edward Brice, who became rector of Templecorran, near Carrickfergus, in the county of Antrim. About that time a number of Scotchmen obtained bishoprics in Ulster. These prelates, who had been brought up in the Presbyterian Church, and who had themselves been originally ordained by presbyters, were not at first disposed to exact conformity to the Episcopal ritual from the Scottish ministers settled around them. Thus it was that the ministers, though refusing to use the Liturgy, were permitted to preach in the parish churches and enjoy the tithes. But when the imperious Wentworth was placed at the head of the government of Ireland, a new policy was inaugurated. All the clergy were obliged to strict conformity; and in a few years all the Presbyterian ministers were driven into exile. At the time of the horrid massacre in 1641, not one of them was in the country. Thus they most providentially escaped that catastrophe. In 1642, when a Scottish army arrived in Ulster to put down the rebellion, Presbyterianism obtained a permanent footing in Ireland, and, after various struggles, a Presbyterian Church was founded by the formation of a presbytery at Carrickfergus on the 10th of June, 1642. The Presbyterian population of Ulster was greatly increased in number by immigration from Scotland about the middle of the 17th century; and notwithstanding many difficulties, from the opposition of prelates and of the civil power, the Church continued to increase. While the civil war was going on in Scotland great numbers of the Scotch emigrated to the north of Ireland, and these made a still larger addition to the Presbyterian population, a strong bond being also established between the two communicants. For a time their ministers in Ireland were silenced by Cromwell because they refused to take the "engagement" of fidelity to the commonwealth; but for the last five or six years of his administration he treated the Irish Presbyterians with less severity, and at the Restoration they numbered nearly eighty congregations, with seventy ministers. Sixty-one of these were obliged to give up the benefices into which they had been placed (Jeremy Taylor deprived thirty-six in one day), and only seven out of the seventy conformed to the Episcopal establishment. Within a few years, however, the Presbyterians organized into a compact body as the Synod of Ulster, and it is a curious fact that the Presbyterian ministers received a pension from government, under Charles II, in 1672, which *regium donum* (q. v.), however, was not regularly paid, and soon ceased to be expected by the Presbyterian ministers. In the reign of William the *regium donum* was augmented, although only to the paltry amount in all of £1200 a year. The sum has since, however, been repeatedly augmented. With the disestablishment of the Episcopal Church of Ireland, under Gladstone's ministry, the *regium donum* was discontinued, and the Presbyterian Church of Ireland is entirely relieved from State dependence. It was valued at fourteen years' purchase, and the sum of nearly £600,000 was paid over therefor, thus securing the division among the ministers of nearly £30,000 a year of interest. In 1710 the synod of the Presbyterian Church resolved to institute the preaching of the Gospel to the Irish in their own language. During this period of its history the Irish Presbyterian Church experienced the utmost opposition from the High-Church party. Afterwards dissensions sprang up within it, and these with reference to the most important doctrines. Irish Presbyterians could not escape the influence of the latitudinarian spirit which prevailed during the 18th century. Early in the reign of George I, some of their ministers began to speak ambiguously on doctrinal subjects, and to oppose subscription to the Westminster Confession of Faith. In consequence, in 1726, a schism took place among them, and the non-subscribers formed themselves into what was called "The Presbytery of Antrim." The separatists did not obtain much support from the mass of the Presbyterian population; but not a few who remained connected with the larger body, known as "The Synod of Ulster," exhibited very little zeal in upholding and propagating the sound theology of their forefathers. Meanwhile the Scotch Seceders, who appeared in Ireland shortly before the middle of the 18th century, did much to maintain purity of doctrine in the Northern province. Their congregations rapidly multiplied, and within little more than sixty years after the organization of their first church, there were upwards of ninety Secession ministers in Ulster. In 1761 the Rev. Matthew Lynd, the first Irish Covenanting minister, was ordained at Vow, near Rasharkin, in the county of Antrim. Owing very much to the growing laxity of doctrine and discipline in the Synod of Ulster, the Covenanters, or Reformed Presbyterians, continued, from this date till the close of the century, to make steady progress; and in 1792 their first Irish Presbytery was constituted. But early in the present century indications of a religious revival appeared in the Synod of Ulster, and when Arianism was openly avowed an earnest protest was raised against it. In 1829 the Arian controversy issued in the separation of the Unitarians from the great Northern Synod, and immediately afterwards the Irish Presbyterian Church, as if invigorated with new life, commenced a prosperous career. Its congregations rapidly increased; its ministers exhibited new zeal and enterprise; and some of them attracted attention all over the empire as platform-speakers and pulpit orators. In 1835 the Synod of Ulster adopted an overture requiring unqualified subscription to the Westminster Confession of Faith from all its licentiates and ministers; and as the grounds of separation between this body and the Secession Synod were now removed, a union between them was happily consummated in 1840. The united body, which assumed the designation of "The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland," consisted, at the time of its incorporation, of 433 congregations. Ever since the date of this union, the Irish Presbyterian Church has occupied a more commanding position in the country. It has at present under its care about half a million of people, including a large proportion of the substantial farmers and merchants of Ulster. Very few of the aristocracy were ever attached to it; but of late its members have been advancing steadily in social position; and at the present time it has in its communion seven members of Parliament, several considerable landed proprietors, and many gentlemen holding the commission of the peace.

The Remonstrant or Arian body has not increased in like proportion. After their withdrawal from the orthodox majority in 1829, the Unitarians formed themselves into an association which assumed the name of "The Remonstrant Synod of Ulster." This body has since maintained a lingering existence in the north of Ire-

land; but doctrinal laxity does not flourish among Presbyterians; and though the Unitarians can reckon some forty congregations in the island, their numbers, including the adherents of the Presbytery of Antrim, amount, according to the government census of 1871, only to 9373 individuals.

The Covenanters, or Reformed Presbyterians, who are all strict Calvinists, are considerably more numerous. There are besides a few congregations in Ireland connected with the United Presbyterian Church of Scotland, as well as a few others known by the designation of Seceders; but they form a very small item in the national census. The Irish Presbyterian Church now consists of about 600 congregations, and has not only displayed much zeal for the advancement of Protestantism in Ireland, but also of Christianity in other parts of the world. Immediately after its formation, the General Assembly inaugurated a Foreign Mission. India was selected as the scene of its missionary operations, and its agents have ever since been laboring there with encouraging success in Gujarat and Kattiawar. Connected with it there are now 10 ordained European missionaries, assisted by a staff of native catechists, colporteurs, and school-teachers. Within the year 1888 there were 201 baptisms, and the total number connected with the native Church amounted to 2158 individuals. The mission has been maintained during the year 1888 at an expense of £13,054. Its operations have been recently extended to China, where three mission stations have been established. In addition to this mission the Presbyterian Church of Ireland supports a Jewish mission, a Continental and Colonial mission, and a mission for Soldiers and Sailors. In 1876 the Presbyterian Church in Ireland reported five synods, thirty-six presbyteries, 639 ministers, 78,445 families, and 107,262 communicants. The sustentation fund amounted to £122,000; the total ministerial income for the previous year was £513,000. The average salary of the ministers was £870. In the schools of the National Board of Education, the Presbyterian children, in 1874, numbered 115,258, equal to about 11 per cent. A Presbyterian college (Magee College) was opened at Londonderry Oct. 10, 1865. In 1846, Mrs. Magee, widow of the Rev. William Magee, a Presbyterian minister, left £20,000 in trust for the erection and endowment of a Presbyterian college. This sum was allowed to accumulate for some years, until eventually the trustees were authorized, by a decree of the lord-chancellor, to select a convenient site at or near Londonderry. The Irish Society have granted an annual endowment of £250 to the chair of natural philosophy and mathematics, and £250 for five years towards the general expenses of the college. The Rev. Richard Dill, who died in 1858, bequeathed £5000 to establish two professorships. The appointment of the trustees is vested in the General Assembly. The professors are required to sign the Westminster Confession of Faith, but no religious test is prescribed for students. The majority of the Irish Presbyterian ministers are educated in the General Assembly's Theological College at Belfast. It has a faculty of six professors, but provides only a theological curriculum. The students attending it receive their undergraduate education in the adjoining Queen's College. The Assembly College has an attendance of from 70 to 150 students; the students of the younger college are not yet nearly so numerous. Previous to the passing of the Irish Church Act in 1869, a parliamentary grant of £1750 per annum sufficed for the maintenance of six professors, at £250 each, leaving £250 to defray the expense of management. The government, on the passing of the act, granted a sum of £43,976 as compensation; and the interest of this sum, together with that on £5000 subscribed by friends of the institution, and the fees of the students, make up the annual income. Patrons have recently added prizes, worth from £20 to £50 per annum. A most valuable agency sustained by the Church and of comparatively recent establishment is the *Orphan Society*, which already supports 2400 poor children deprived of one or both of their parents, and has an annual revenue of about £9000. See IRELAND.

8. PRESBYTERIAN SYNOD OF SECEDERS IN IRELAND.—This denomination of Christians was formed by a union, which was effected in 1818, between the two sections of the Secession Church in Ireland, the Burghers and Antiburghers. From the commencement of the present century negotiations had been carried on with a view to the accomplishment of this most desirable object; but such negotiations had uniformly failed, from the circumstance that the Antiburghers, who were subject to the general synod in Scotland, had been prevented by that court from taking effective steps in the matter. At length, however, they resolved to act independently of the Scottish judicatory, and the two synods of Seceders in Ireland, having agreed upon a basis of union, met at Cookstown July 9, 1818, and formed themselves into one body under the designation of "The Presbyterian Synod of Ireland, distinguished by the name Seceders." The ministers of the united synod at this period amounted in number to 97. The basis on which the union rested consisted of the six following points:

"1. To declare their constant and inviolable attachment to their already approved and recognised standards; namely, the Westminster Confession of Faith, Larger and Shorter Catechisms, Directory for Worship, and Form of Presbyterian Church government, with the Original Secession Testimony.

"2. That, as they unite under the banner of a testimony, they are determined, in all times coming, as their forefathers have set them the example, to assert the truth when it is injured or opposed, and to condemn and testify against error and immorality whenever they may seem to prevail.

"3. To cancel the name of Burgher and Antiburgher forever, and to unite the two synods into one, to be known by the name 'The Presbyterian Synod of Ireland, distinguished by the name Seceders.'

"4. To declare their insubordination to any other ecclesiastical court, while, at the same time, they do hereby signify their hearty inclination to hold a correspondence with their sister Church in Scotland or elsewhere, for their mutual edification; but think it expedient not to lay themselves under any restrictions as to the manner of said correspondence.

"5. To allow all the presbyteries and congregations in their connection to bear the same name, and, in the meantime, stand as they were before the coalescence.

"6. Carefully to preserve all the public records of the two synods from their formation in this kingdom till the present day."

This union was the means of imparting considerable strength and vigor to the Secession Church in Ireland. A home mission was now commenced, and the cause of Presbyterianism began to flourish in various towns and villages where it had been hitherto unknown. The whole proceedings of this Church were characterized by a high regard to purity of doctrine and the advancement of vital religion. The Irish Presbyterian Church, on the contrary, had long been hindered in its progress by the prevalence of Arian and Socinian doctrines, both among its ministers and people. By the divine blessing, however, they were at length enabled to rid themselves of the New-Light party; and, to secure uniformity of teaching in the Church, they passed an overture requiring absolute subscription to the Confession of Faith. The general synod was now, in almost all respects, assimilated to the Irish Secession Church, and the proposal of a union between the two was seriously entertained. An arrangement in regard to the *regium donum* made in 1838 paved the way for its completion, government having in that year agreed to equalize the bounty, and on certain conditions to grant £75, late Irish currency, per annum, to every minister connected with the two synods. Being thus placed on an equal footing by the government, and agreed both in doctrine and Church polity, the great obstacles to a complete incorporation of the two churches were thus removed.

The first movement towards union had taken place among the theological students of both churches attending the Belfast Academical Institution, who had

established among themselves a united prayer-meeting. The desire for union, and a strong feeling of its propriety, rapidly spread both among ministers and people. Memorials on the subject, accordingly, were presented to the Synod of Ulster, and the Secession Synod, at their respective meetings in 1839. Committees were appointed by the two synods, and, the matter having been fully considered and preliminaries adjusted, the final act of incorporation took place at Belfast on July 10, 1840, the united body taking to itself the name of the *Presbyterian Church in Ireland*. See IRELAND.

9. WELSH CALVINISTIC METHODISTS.—This body of believers is sometimes ranked among Presbyterians, because its form of Church government is a *modified* Presbyterianism. Each Church manages its own affairs, admits or expels members by the vote of the majority of those who belong to it, but this is rather Congregational than Presbyterian. It, however, allows an appeal from the decision of the individual Church to the monthly meeting of the county or presbytery to which it belongs, and then there is an appeal from the monthly meeting to the quarterly association of the province. Matters are finally disposed of as follows: those relating to South Wales by the South Wales Association, and so of the North; but a few years ago a General Assembly of the whole connection was established, and the two associations may agree to refer matters to that body, which meets once a year, for final decision. Its Confession of Faith is, of course, strictly Calvinistic. See METHODISM (vol. vi, p. 156, col. 6).

10. PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES.—The denomination commonly known by this name, both on account of its numerical superiority and its priority of organization, derived its origin from the Presbyterians of Scotland and Ireland, and particularly the latter, with a considerable infusion of French Huguenots, Dutch and German Reformed emigrants. Many fugitives from persecution in the mother country took refuge in the more liberal colonies of Pennsylvania, Maryland, New Jersey, Virginia, and the Carolinas. Francis Makemie, who may be called the founder of American Presbyterianism, was an Irishman, who several years before the close of the 17th century had gathered churches in Maryland. For several years before the organization of the first presbytery, his most intimate ministerial friend was Jedediah Andrews. The earliest traces of Church organizations of a trustworthy character indicate a congregation gathered in Upper Marlborough, Md., in 1690, and others collected by Mr. Makemie in the same colony about the same date, if not as early as 1684—one in Freehold, N. J., called the Scotch Meeting-house, in 1692; and one in Philadelphia, under the care of Mr. Andrews, in 1698. The Presbytery of Philadelphia is supposed to have been formed about the year 1705, if not before, this uncertainty arising from the first page of the manuscript minutes being lost. It was composed of seven ministers—Samuel Davis, John Hampton, Francis Makemie, and George M'Nish, from Ireland; Nathaniel Taylor and John Wilson, from Scotland; and Jedediah Andrews, from New England. The growth of the body was so rapid as to justify, in 1716, the formation of the Synod of Philadelphia, consisting of three presbyteries. The presbytery of Philadelphia had six ministers and six churches; that of Newcastle six ministers and churches; that of Snowhill three ministers and churches; and that of Long Island two ministers and several churches—in all twenty-three ministers and more than that number of congregations.

The Adopting Act was passed in 1729, designed to announce the Westminster Confession and Catechisms as the standards of the Church more formally than had ever yet been done. The bearing of this act has been of late years sharply discussed. It may be found in the printed minutes. It was a compromise measure accepted in consequence of the agitation which had been occasioned by the Irish presbyters. These had been in the midst of an exciting controversy against the intrusion of Arian principles into the Presbyterian Church of Ireland, and had come over determined to suffer no looseness of subscription to the standards of faith. The Adopting Act occasioned, therefore, not a little controversy. The non-subscribers in sentiment disliked even the general terms of the Adopting Act, while the others desired the adoption of the *ipsissima verba* of the standards. Though the measure was finally a compromise, it failed to set differences at rest. They continued to develop, and became manifest in connection with certain synodical action on ministerial education, and ripened until they resulted in one or two secessions, which prepared the way for the establishment in this country of a branch of the *Associate Presbyterian Church*. In 1739, party feelings were revived by the visit of Whitefield, and the synod was divided into those who were known as friends or enemies of the revival. By 1741 the controversy resulted in a schism, by which the body was rent into two synods—that of the Old Side party, called the Synod of Philadelphia; that of the New, called the Synod of New York. The principal cause of the division was the insisting of the Old Side on a thoroughly educated ministry, while the New laid more stress on piety and zeal. There was no difference of opinion as to doctrine or discipline. Gilbert Tennant, the friend of Whitefield, was the leader and master-spirit of the New branch, and published several sermons and pamphlets very severe in their tone. After a separation of thirteen years, passion and party feeling cooled down, the leaders were disposed to make mutual concessions, past errors and mistakes were frankly confessed, and the two synods became again united, May 29, 1758, under the style and title of "the Synod of New York and Philadelphia," comprising ninety-four ministers. During the half century of existence that had now closed, the Church had taken some important steps. It had committed itself, for instance, to a polity distinctly Presbyterian, it had adopted Calvinistic doctrinal standards, and had set up a high standard of ministerial education. Nor were these things needless, or done too soon. A stream of population was rapidly flowing westward, having on its front line settlers of very diverse characters. Some were men of such lawless habits that they could no longer stay in orderly communities; others loved the wild excitements of frontier life, and others thought only of bettering their temporal condition by obtaining homes in the new lands. All classes were very poor. Indians were numerous, causing the preacher to carry his rifle as well as his Bible—while State-Church opposition added to the difficulties of the Presbyterian evangelist. Only men of education—men of energy, full of zeal and of varied resource, could have even held their own in the face of such hindrances. Such men the Presbyterian Church desired to have in its ministry, nor desired in vain. Many of its early preachers—the Tennants of New Jersey, Brainerd of the Indian Mission, Davies of Virginia, and a host of others, have been pre-eminent for ministerial efficiency, and will assuredly be held in everlasting remembrance. While the Church was thus supplying the Gospel in sparsely peopled districts and forming new presbyteries in every direction, it was led to enter into such relations with the Congregationalists as materially influenced its after-course. For some years before the Revolution, the Colonial Episcopal Church had sought to obtain a legal Establishment. Fearing the success of its efforts, the synod agreed in 1766 to meet in annual convention with the General Association of Connecticut, "to unite their endeavors and counsels for spreading the Gospel and preserving the religious liberties of the churches." This arrangement was carried out until the outbreak of war in 1776 interrupted the intercourse.

When the war of the Revolution broke out, the Presbyterians, to a man, arrayed themselves on the side of the patriots—which may, at least in part, be explained by the fear, which they shared in common with the Congregationalists of New England, that there was a

design to introduce bishops and establish an oppressive and odious hierarchy in the colonies. During the Revolutionary war, in common with all religious interests, the Presbyterian Church suffered greatly. Many of its church buildings were destroyed, and not a few congregations disorganized, yet its vitality remained unbroken. Rallying quickly on the return of peace, new interest in religious ordinances was manifested by the people, and synodical meetings were better attended by the ministers.

In 1785, steps were taken for revising the standards of the Church and organizing a General Assembly. A committee consisting of Drs. Witherspoon, Rodgers, Robert Smith, Patrick Allison, Samuel Stanhope Smith, John Woodhull, Robert Cooper, James Latta, George Duffield, and Matthew Wilson, was appointed "to take into consideration the constitution of the Church of Scotland and other Protestant churches," and to form a complete system for the organization of the Presbyterian Church in the United States. In May, 1788, the synod convened and resolved itself into a General Assembly, which had its first meeting the following year, embracing four synods (New York and New Jersey, Philadelphia, Virginia, and the Carolinas), 17 presbyteries, 419 congregations, and 180 ministers. By this assembly the Westminster Confession of Faith was adopted with three slight alterations (in chapters xx, xxiii, and xxxi), and the Larger and Shorter Catechisms with but a single alteration, while the form of government and discipline of the Scottish Church was so modified as to discountenance the right of the civil magistrate to interfere in the affairs of the Church except for the purpose of protection alone. Shortly after the war, the Presbyterian ministers renewed their friendly relations with the Congregationalists. In 1792 the General Assembly and the Association of Connecticut agreed that each denomination should be represented in the annual meetings of the other by three commissioners, an agreement that afterwards embraced the general associations of Vermont, New Hampshire, and Massachusetts. In 1794 these representatives were allowed to vote on all matters under discussion. All these measures prepared the way for the adoption, in 1801, by both parties of the "Plan of Union." Under this arrangement a congregation, Congregational in polity, might have installed as its pastor a Presbyterian minister who still retained his seat in the presbytery, and was personally responsible thereto, and be itself represented in that court not by an elder, but by a committeeman or delegate chosen from its membership. On the other hand, a congregation Presbyterian in its polity, connected with a presbytery and represented therein by an elder, might have installed over it as pastor a Congregational minister who remained a member of some Congregational association. This procedure was the fruit partly of the co-operations of the previous years, but it made Presbyterianism less systematic in its movements and less authoritative in its administration, as we shall see presently. During the earlier years of the present century, there appeared in the southern and western portions of the Church striking manifestations of religious interest, having, in many cases, singular physical accompaniments. In connection with these, zeal outran discretion; strange doctrines were soon taught; presbyterial order was violated, and confusion became widespread. Ultimately these things led to the withdrawal of some of the offenders and the removal of others from the Presbyterian Church, and the formation in 1811 of what is now known as "The Cumberland Presbyterian Church." (See No. 11 below.)

The increase of the Church was rapid, and by 1834 it contained 22 synods, 111 presbyteries, and about 1900 ministers. But only four years later (in 1838) Presbyterianism suddenly encountered a severe reverse by a widespread schism, for which the materials had been gathering for several years. In 1822, the Synod of the Associate Reformed Church having been brought, under the lead of Dr. John M. Mason, to favor union with the Presbyterian Church, that union took place; but a very considerable minority refused to acquiesce in the measure, and retained a separate existence. During the fifteen years that followed, the growth of the Church was unprecedentedly rapid. New churches and presbyteries were multiplied in the Middle and Western States. Already measures had been adopted (1812) which resulted in establishing Princeton Seminary, Union Seminary in Virginia, and, though unendowed, the Southern and Western at Marysville, Tenn. Auburn followed in 1816; the Western at Allegheny City and Lane at Cincinnati in 1726–27; Columbia, S. C., and Danville, Ky., in 1828; and Union at New York in 1836. The accessions from New England, at the time in full theological sympathy with the Presbyterian Church, were provided for by the "Plan of Union" agreed to by the General Association of Connecticut and the General Assembly in 1801. It aimed to secure the rights and the harmonious co-operation of two denominations entering the same field. For nearly a quarter of a century no fault was found with it; but it led to the representation in Presbytery and General Assembly of committeemen from Congregational churches, and these were found to favor voluntary missionary societies not under the Assembly's control. Of these societies, that for home missions, within a few years after its organization in 1826, had several hundred missionaries under its patronage. Most of these were from New England, and many of them were alike opposed to Church boards and in sympathy with "New Haven theology." Parties were thus formed in the Church, and the agitation on the subject of slavery, springing up at that time, tended to increase the alienation.

The crisis came in 1837. Two parties were arrayed against each other, known as the Old and New Schools. In general, it may perhaps be said that the division was one of sentiment between the more progressive and the more conservative members of the Church. In the Old there was more of a leaning to the strict views of the Scotch Church on doctrine and discipline; in the New, the preference was as decidedly in favor of the laxer and more latitudinarian practice of New England, from which region many of the party had originally come. The New Lights wished to bear a decided testimony against slavery; the Old Lights thought that duty did not require any action of the Church on that subject; the former wished to unite with other denominations in Christian work through voluntary societies; the latter believed that such work could be more efficiently and economically conducted by their denomination through boards which should be under its own control. Instead of brotherly love, bickerings and heart-burnings now prevailed; the General Assembly was an arena of constant strife; each party, as it obtained an accidental majority, set itself to work to nullify the measures of its opponents. The Old School made ineffectual attempts to try and condemn Drs. Barnes, Beecher, and Duffield for publishing heterodox opinions; the New School stood up for "substance of doctrine," and for the Great Voluntary or National Societies in opposition to denominational action. Confident in superior numbers and strategy, the latter anticipated an easy victory, and refused any concessions. The Old School, crippled on every side, and chagrined at being cast into the shade, held conventions to decide upon their future course. In 1834 appeared "The Act and Testimony," drafted by Rev. Robert J. Breckinridge, complaining of the prevalence of doctrinal errors, the relaxation of discipline, and the violation of Church order. The signatures amounted to 2075. In 1837 another convention, meeting a week before the General Assembly, prepared a testimony and memorial to be laid before the Assembly, in which they testified against sixteen doctrinal errors, ten variations from Presbyterian order, and five declensions in Christian discipline, and proposed a method of reform. The Old-School

party, finding themselves that year (the first for five years) in the majority, adopted the suggestions of the memorial as a basis of action, and pressed matters to a speedy issue. They established a Board of Foreign Missions, dissolved the Elective Affinity Presbytery, abrogated the Plan of Union of 1801 with the Congregational bodies, and disowned (or, as the New-School party termed it, exscinded) the four synods of Genesee, Geneva, Utica, and Western Reserve as un-Presbyterian in their composition. The next year (1838) both parties made strenuous exertions for the ascendency in the Assembly. Upon calling the roll, it was found that the delegates from the four synods were not recognised, nor would the moderator, Dr. Elliott, entertain any motion in their behalf. Hereupon, according to a concerted plan, the commissioners from the four synods and those who sympathized with them protested against the moderator's decision, and proceeded to make a new organization and elect new officers, after which they withdrew in a body to another place, and there held their sittings as the true Constitutional Assembly, and, among other things, elected several trustees of the property of the corporation. These trustees, being subsequently refused admission into the board, instituted legal proceedings, and received a verdict in their favor. The case being taken up to the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, chief-justice Gibson ordered a new trial. This, however, was never had, the rulings being such as to completely set aside the decision of judge Rogers in the inferior court, and after a few years the suit was withdrawn. The New School declared themselves satisfied with the moral effect of the trial, and with a later decision of the chief-justice in the York case. The two bodies went on as separate denominations, though each claimed to have the genuine constitutional succession, and employed the same style and title, "The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America." Both of these churches were extended over the whole of the United States, and both of them had missions in different parts of the heathen world, their collections for missions forming a large part of the contributions for that object from the United States of America. The Old-School Presbyterians possessed the following theological seminaries: Princeton (Princeton, N. J.), Western (Allegheny City, Pa.), Columbia (Columbia, S. C.), Danville (Danville, Ky.), and North-west (Chicago, Ill.). The New-School Presbyterians held the Union (New York City), Auburn (Auburn, N. Y.), Lane (near Cincinnati, O.), Blackburn (Carlinville, Ill.), and Lind (Chicago, Ill.). The Old and New School Presbyterian churches were reunited in 1871. At that time the former comprised 2381 ministers, 2740 churches, and 258,903 communicants; and the latter, 1848 ministers, 1631 churches, and 172,560 communicants.

The theological history of the Old-School Presbyterian Church for the thirty-two years of its separate existence may be presented in a very few words. It was left by the separation in a state of almost unprecedented doctrinal homogeneity. One may well doubt whether any other Christian communion of equal size has ever excelled it as to unity in the reception of an evangelical creed of such extent as the Westminster Confession and Catechisms. Differences of opinion, even among its ministers, have, of course, existed; but these differences were comparatively trifling, or of very little prominence or prevalence. If in any quarter serious error was adopted, for the most part it must have been kept secret, or have been known to but a few. No agitating discipline on this ground was exercised, or, to the knowledge of the Church at large, needed. "Princeton theology," as it has often been called, was, beyond question, almost universally prevalent among the Old-School Presbyterians. If opposing systems must take a modern nomenclature, there may be no harm in making Princeton and New Haven respectively the synonyms of the Old and the New Divinity; but it should be remembered that the text-books of Princeton have constantly been the simple Westminster symbols, and such long and generally approved systematic presentations of the reformed theology as the *Institutio Theologiæ Elenchticæ* of Franciscus Turretin. Old-School men have been slow to admit the idea of any possible improvement in the generally received system of Gospel truth. Recognising fully the recent progress made in Biblical criticism and exegesis—the fact, too, that from time to time fuller and more exact statements of Christian doctrine may be, as they have been, elaborated—and by no means maintaining that any uninspired man has been wholly free from error, they have, nevertheless, rejected with singular unanimity the assumption that any part of the substance of the Gospel had lain hidden in Holy Scripture until modern times, or that the Church of Christ has new discoveries to make as to the system of truth in Jesus. A well-known Presbyterian quarterly publication—one identified with it from the beginning—has lately said, "It has been the honest endeavor of its conductors to exhibit and defend the doctrines of our standards, under the abiding conviction that they are the doctrines of the Word of God. They have advanced no new theories, and have never aimed at originality. Whether it be a ground of reproach or of approbation, it is believed to be true that an original idea in theology is not to be found on its pages from the beginning until now." And this praise or blame may be said to belong to the Old-School Church in general as distinctively as to the publication from which it has been quoted. The interval of separation was one of very marked literary activity in the Old-School body. Some thirty original volumes, from this source, of comment upon various portions of Holy Scripture appeared; and a very large number of important works, biographical, historical, dogmatical, practical, and miscellaneous. Probably no other denomination in the United States has produced within the same period so many theological books of standard value.

A deep conviction of the Church's duty to carry on, through strictly ecclesiastical agencies, the work of foreign missions, had led the Synod of Pittsburgh, as early as 1831, to organize itself for this purpose as the Western Foreign Missionary Society. The New School had refused to consummate the desires and plans of the Old, by taking this enterprise under the care of the whole Church; but the Assembly of 1837 accepted the trust, establishing in New York City the Presbyterian Board of Foreign Missions. By the Assembly of 1838 a Board of Publication was appointed, to which were transferred the property and business of the Presbyterian Tract and Sabbath-school Book Society, organized by the Synod of Philadelphia a few years before. The Assembly of 1839, the fiftieth year having now been completed since this supreme judicatory had first convened, recommended the second Sabbath of December for a semi-centenary celebration, a day of jubilee and thanksgiving for past mercies, and the offering at that time, by all the members of the Church, of gifts for the endowment of the new board. The fund raised reached the sum of $40,000. This sum, with about $28,000 donated for building purposes a few years later, has been the nucleus of all that board's permanent property. Before the division, two boards had been organized—the Board of Missions, now of Domestic Missions, for the home work, in 1816; and, in 1819, the Board of Education, to aid candidates for the ministry; both located in Philadelphia. These had been fostered by the Old School, while, as a party, the New School had preferred the American Home Missionary Society and the American Education Society, voluntary associations, in which Congregationalists participated. The Board of Missions had, in 1844, the business of church extension or church erection added to its other operations. This was carried on by a special committee, which, ten years afterwards, for greater effect, was enlarged. But in 1855 an independent committee of church extension was established at St. Louis, the name of which was changed, in 1860, to that of the

Board of Church Building, then the Board of Church Extension. Two other departments of Christian liberality and effort have been committed to similar agencies. For more than a century and a half the Presbyterian Church has systematically raised funds for the relief of disabled ministers and their families. But in 1849 the General Assembly ordered collections for this purpose to be disbursed by the Board of Publication, a business transferred in 1852 to its own trustees; and in 1861 a secretary was appointed to devote his time mainly to this enterprise, which has since more prosperously advanced. In 1864, the condition of the freedmen at the South demanding immediate attention, two committees —one in Philadelphia, the other in Indianapolis—were appointed to take charge of educational and general evangelistic work among this class; and the next year, in place of the two, a single committee on freedmen was established and located at Pittsburgh. Various arrangements and changes have been made to secure to the boards the advantage of periodical publications to disseminate intelligence of their work through the churches. The latest accounts show a circulation of 16,000 copies of the *Monthly Record;* nearly 100,000 of the *Sabbath-School Visitor of the Month;* and 3500 of the pamphlet, with almost 52,000 of the newspaper edition, both monthly, of the *Foreign Missionary;* besides many thousands of the several yearly reports and of various occasional issues. From about 1849 the project of a weekly religious paper, like the *Methodist Advocate*, was pressed upon the Assembly for several years successively, but without effect. Yet the Church has always acknowledged the unspeakable importance of religious papers, many of which have been established by private enterprise.

The several departments of self-development in the New-School section at the time of union were as follows: (1.) "The Presbyterian Committee of Home Missions." It steadily increased in efficiency. Its receipts the first year were $27,244, and the number of its missionaries 195. In 1889 it had 1592 missionaries and an income of $885,518. Its missionaries reported 160 new churches formed during the year; 12,000 hopeful conversions, and 10,490 added to the churches on profession of their faith. The freedmen's department, organized in 1865, received and expended during the year 1888 $113,082; and reported 375 teachers employed and 20 others under appointment, all in the Southern States. (2.) The "Trustees of the Church Erection Fund," appointed in 1854, were incorporated by the Legislature of the State of New York in the year following. The original basis of their operations was the permanent fund of $100,000, raised by contributions from the churches, most of it in the year 1854, the *interest* to be employed in promoting the object *chiefly* in the way of loans. The establishment of this fund operated as a strong bond of union in the Church. In the year 1866 the basis was enlarged and an annual contribution and freer disbursements were ordered. Since that time this organization has been rapidly growing in importance, and now stands in the very first rank of the evangelizing agencies of the Church. In 1889 it reported an income of $125,202, and number of churches aided 185. (3.) The "Permanent Committee on Education for the Ministry," organized in 1856, came slowly into operation, moulding its plans gradually and embarrassed by the remains of the old voluntary system. In 1889 its income amounted to $155,843, and the number of its beneficiaries to 772—viz., 326 in the theological, 387 in the collegiate, and 59 in the preparatory department. (4.) The "Committee on Doctrinal Tracts," organized in 1852, became the "Presbyterian Publication Committee." In 1889 its income from all sources was $337,787, of which $37,057 was expended in its purely benevolent work. (5.) The "Trustees of the Presbyterian House," located in Philadelphia, and incorporated by the Legislature of Pennsylvania to care for a valuable property purchased chiefly by donations made by individuals in the city of Philadelphia, now estimated to be worth more than $100,000. Under their charge has been placed the Ministerial Relief Fund, managed by an executive committee which commenced its operations in 1864. In 1889 they reported $127,502 received from ordinary sources, and $595,734 as a special donation towards a permanent fund; also 223 disabled ministers, 341 widows, and 33 families of orphans aided. The average age of the ministers was 76 years, and the time of their ministry 40 years. The Assembly sustained also a Permanent Committee on Foreign Missions, whose functions were not the raising and distributing of funds or the conducting of missions, but the supervising of the work and reporting the results to the Assembly. From their report in 1889 it appears that contributions for that year to the American Board were, in money, about $709,735, and in laborers 71—viz. 52 male and 19 female missionaries. In 1867 the contributions were $110,725; in 1868, $110,602.

The beginning of a theological school for the education of ministers for the Germans, in which instruction is to be given both in German and English, has been made at Bloomfield, N. J., with encouraging success. The periodical literature of the New-School Church deserves honorable mention. Besides other local papers, the *American Presbyterian*, at Philadelphia, has shown a warm zeal for Church interests, and the *New York Evangelist* has done excellent service. Much credit is due to the *Presbyterian Reporter*, a monthly published at Alton, Ill., for the ability and faithfulness with which it served the interests of the Church in the North-west. During the ten critical years from 1852 to 1862, the *Presbyterian Quarterly Review*, ably conducted by an association of ministers in Philadelphia, defended the Church's cause and was an honor to Christian intelligence. The *American Theological Review*, founded in 1859 on a basis not distinctly denominational, united with the *Presbyterian Review* in 1863, combining the names and objects of both, under the charge of the late Prof. H. B. Smith. It was merged in the *Princeton Review*, published since 1878 in New York City. The *New Presbyterian Review* was founded in 1890.

Prior to the separation of the Church in 1838, a secession had taken place from it in Kentucky (1810), in consequence of a dispute between the Presbytery of Cumberland, in that state, and the Kentucky Synod of the Presbyterian Church in America, concerning the ordination of persons who had not passed through the usual educational curriculum, but whose services the Presbytery regarded as demanded for the ministry by the exigencies of the times. In doctrine this branch of the Church does not very materially differ from the New-School Presbyterian Church, but its symbols of faith are a modification of the Westminster Confession of Faith. It still exists as a separate organization. (See No. 11 below.)

In 1858 the New School experienced a defection of its Southern adherents. In 1857 the commissioners from the Southern section, who had attended the Assembly at Cleveland, O., proposed to withdraw and constitute the United Synod. This was organized at Knoxville, Tenn., April 2, 1858. In connection with the synod were over 100 ministers and about 200 churches, widely scattered over the Southern States. This body continued a separate organization until Aug. 24, 1864, when it was merged in the General Assembly formed by Southern ministers and churches previously in the Old-School connection. In 1861 the Old School suffered a like defection by the outbreak of the civil war. The entire Southern body of Old-School Presbyterians, aggrieved by the Assembly's resolution on the state of the country, withdrew their connection and united to the organization of a "General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the Confederate States of America," Dec. 4, 1861, at Augusta, Ga. The Second Assembly convened at Montgomery, Ala., May 1, 1862, since which time the meetings of the Assembly have been annually held

contemporaneously with those of the Northern assemblies. In 1876 fraternal relations were sought for the first time between the two bodies. (See No. 17 below.)

Presbyterianism has never prevailed extensively in New England; but it has had such a distinct and independent existence there from a very early period that we speak of it here by itself. The French Church in Boston, formed of Huguenots about 1687, was the first Church organized on a Presbyterian basis, but was continued no longer than while its service was conducted in the French language. The first Presbyterian organization in New England of any permanence dates back to about the year 1718, when a large number of Presbyterians, with four ministers, emigrated to this country from the north of Ireland. For some time, in cases of difficulty, the ministers and elders were wont to assemble informally, and hold what might be called *pro re nata* meetings; and where they were unable to reach a satisfactory result, they sometimes asked advice of the Synod of Ireland. On April 16, 1745, the Rev. Messrs. John Morehead, of Boston; David M'Gregor, of Londonderry, N. H.; and Ralph Abercrombie, of Pelham, with Messrs. James M'Keen, Alexander Conkey, and James Hughes, met in Londonderry, and "constituted themselves into a presbytery, to act, as far as their present circumstances will permit them, according to the Word of God and the constitution of the Presbyterian Church of Scotland, agreeing to that perfect rule." The body was called the Boston Presbytery, and met, according to adjournment, in that town Aug. 13, 1745. From the close of the year 1754 till October, 1770, there is a chasm in the records; but at the last-mentioned period the Presbytery consisted of twelve congregations and as many ministers. At a meeting held in Seabrook, N. H., on May 31, 1775, the Presbytery resolved to divide itself into three distinct bodies, viz., the presbyteries of Salem, of Londonderry, and of Palmer: these were then formed into the Synod of New England, which held its first meeting at Londonderry Sept. 4, 1776. At Boothbay, Me., on June 27, 1771, a new presbytery was erected called the Presbytery of the Eastward, consisting of three ministers and four ruling elders, representing four churches. It had no connection with the Boston Presbytery, and its origin is said to have been in some way connected with the removal of the Rev. John Murray to Boothbay. It never exhibited on its roll more than eight ministers. Its last recorded adjournment now known was to meet at New Boston, N. H., on the first Wednesday of October, 1792. The only relic of this presbytery known to exist is a curious volume printed in 1783, with the following title: *Bath-Kol. A Voice from the Wilderness. Being an humble Attempt to support the sinking Truths of God against some of the principal Errors raging at this time. Or a joint Testimony to some of the Grand Articles of the Christian Religion, judiciously delivered to the Churches under their care. By the First Presbytery of the Eastward.* In September, 1782, the Synod of New England, finding their numbers considerably reduced in consequence of existing difficulties, agreed to dissolve and form themselves into the Presbytery of Salem. For two succeeding years this Presbytery met regularly in Massachusetts proper, but after this its meetings were held in the district of Maine. Its last meeting was held at Gray Sept. 14, 1791. The Third Associate Reformed Presbytery, afterwards called the Associate Reformed Presbytery of Londonderry, was formed in Philadelphia Oct. 31, 1782, and held its first meeting at Londonderry on Feb. 11, 1783. It ceased to belong to its original denomination in 1802, and was thereafter an independent presbytery till 1809, when it was received into the Synod of Albany, and has since continued under the name of the Presbytery of Londonderry. The Presbytery of Newburyport was formed by the concurrent action of the Presbytery of Londonderry and the Synod of Albany. It held its first session in Boston on Oct. 27, 1826, and its last on Oct. 20, 1847, when it became reunited to the Presbytery of Londonderry. The Presbytery of Connecticut, consisting of several ministers and churches previously belonging to the Presbytery of New York, was constituted by the Synod of New York Oct. 15, 1850, and held its first meeting at Thompsonville on Oct. 29.

Missions.—(*a.*) *Home Missions.*—The home mission work of the Presbyterian Church may date from the year 1707, when it was resolved "that every minister of the Presbytery supply neighboring destitute places where a minister is wanting and opportunity of doing good offers." Since that period this work has continued to be one of its most important enterprises. At the beginning in the hands of the presbyteries, the Assembly took charge of it in 1802, appointing a "Standing Committee of Missions," to which the presbyteries were to report. During the fourteen years that followed this appointment the Church sent out 311 missionaries, and collected $49,349. In 1816 this committee was changed into a board, "with full power to transact all the business of the missionary cause," reporting annually to the General Assembly. Under this arrangement the home missions of the Church entered on a new course of prosperity, congregations multiplying till presbyteries were formed, and these in turn growing into synods. So vigorous was the Church life now developed that even the great division of 1838 was unable to hinder its continuous activity. During these twenty-two years the board collected $231,504, and sent out 2486 missionaries, while during the years 1838 to 1870 the Old-School Church alone collected $2,805,375, and sent out 16,113 missionaries. For a few years after the division of 1838, the New-School Assembly continued to carry on its mission work through the American Home Missionary Society. In 1852 the Assembly appointed a "Church Extension Committee," following this up in 1862 by assuming "the responsibility of conducting the work of home missions within its bounds," forming "The Presbyterian Committee on Home Missions." During the years 1838 to 1869 the New-School Church is considered to have sent out 8800 missionaries. After the reunion, the agencies of both churches were united under the name of "The Board of Home Missions of the Presbyterian Church," by which, since that period, the whole home-mission and church-extension work of the Church has been conducted, $1,840,997 having been collected and 6529 missionaries sent out, making a total since 1802 of $6,132,167 contributed for home missions and of 37,968 missionaries sent out. During the year 1875–76, 1035 ministers (or missionaries, as they are called) were aided to the extent, on an average, of $250 each.

Closely connected with this home mission is the *Sustentation Scheme*, organized in 1871 for the purpose of increasing the number of pastors in the Church, and of securing to these a larger measure of support. Under this plan, congregations paying not less than $700 a year of salary, and at the rate of $7 50 per member annually, and increasing their pastor's salary at the rate of $50 a year, receive grants-in-aid, so that the salary may be raised to $1000 a year.

(*b.*) *Foreign Missions.*—As early as 1742 the Church commenced her great work of preaching the Gospel to the heathen, in the ordination, by the Presbytery of New York, of a missionary to labor among the Indians. This work engrossed all her means and sympathies until 1817. In that year the General Assembly united with the Dutch Reformed and Associate Reformed Churches in forming "The United Foreign Missionary Society," a society whose object was "to spread the Gospel among the Indians of North America, the inhabitants of Mexico and South America, and in other portions of the heathen and anti-Christian world." In 1826 this society made over all its missions and property to the American Board, which thus became almost the National Foreign Mission Society of America. In 1831 the Synod of Pittsburgh formed itself into "The Western Foreign Missionary Society," and invited the co-operation and support of such as preferred Church

action to that of so-called union societies. Before eighteen months had elapsed, twelve missionaries had been appointed to different fields of heathen labor. In the following year sixteen more were sent out, while $16,246 had been contributed towards their expenses. In 1837, mission stations in Northern India, West Africa, Smyrna, China, and among the Indian tribes of the West were under its charge, conducted by forty-four agents, for whose support $40,266 were contributed during that year. Such results strengthened the hands of those in the Church that desired denominational agencies. In 1837, therefore, the Assembly severed its connection with the American Board, and established its own "Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church," to which the Western Society at once transferred all its agencies and property. During the period of the division, the Old-School Assembly extended its foreign mission staff, forming, on heathen soil, synods and presbyteries by means of native converts. The New-School Church at first continued to send its contributions of men and money to the American Board, but in 1854 appointed a standing committee on missions, changing this in 1855 into a permanent committee, who should "superintend the whole course of foreign missions in behalf of the Assembly." On the reunion, in 1869, these agencies were brought together, while the reunited Church received from the American Board a number of mission stations that previously it had sustained.

Summary View of the Foreign Mission Operations of the Presbyterian Church.

MISSIONS.	Communicants.	Amer. Miss.	Native Workers.	Pupils Schools
America—Indians	1,640	140	28	2,217
Mexico	4,976	58	...	1,376
South America	7,339	...	...	...
Africa	1,031	12	33	272
Asia—				
India	1,035	98	210	9,177
Siam	825	29	26	398
China	4,317	98	221	2,374
Chinese in the United States	335	13	7	985
Japan	3,429	102	41	560
Korea	25	5	6	55
Persia	2,199	50	230	2,846
Syria	1,493	35	171	4,950
Total	28,644	640	973	25,180

Contributions of the Presbyterian Church for Missionary and Benevolent Work during the Year 1888–9.

Foreign missions	$709,735
Home "	885,518
Sustentation	46,689
Education	155,843
Sunday-school work	101,473
Church erection	272,541
Aged ministers	272,024
Freedmen	112,682
And for colleges	108,953
Total	$2,726,758

The Presbyterian Church, from the earliest period, has been an earnest worker and strenuous advocate for education; and one of the chief causes of the secession of the Cumberland branch was the tenacity with which the General Assembly insisted on high educational qualifications for ministers. As early as 1739, a proposition was brought before the Synod of Philadelphia for the erection of a school or seminary of learning. The synod approved of the design and appointed a committee to carry it into effect, and in 1744 a synodal school was established. The College of New Jersey at Princeton, chartered in 1746 and opened in 1747, was founded under the auspices of the Synod of New York. Other institutions have been organized under Presbyterian auspices, as follows: Washington and Jefferson College (Washington, Pa., 1802), Hamilton College (Clinton, N. Y., 1815), Maryville College (Maryville, Tenn., 1819), Centre College (Danville, Ky., 1823), Hanover College (Hanover, Ind., 1827), Lafayette College (Easton, Pa., 1831), Wabash College (Crawfordsville, Ind., 1832), Lincoln University (Oxford, Pa., 1853), University College (San Francisco, Cal., 1859), Blackburn University (Carlinville, Ill., 1867), King College (Bristol, Tenn., 1868), University of Wooster (Wooster, Ohio, 1870), Evans University (Evans, Col., 1874), and Parsons College (Fairfield, Ia., 1875). Three colleges are jointly under Presbyterian and Congregational control: namely, Knox, at Galesburg, Ill., 1841; Beloit, at Beloit, Wis., 1847; and Olivet, at Olivet, Mich., 1828. The academies and ladies' colleges under the auspices of the denomination are numerous.

Not until 1812 did the Presbyterian Church make any provision for the theological education of persons seeking the ministry. In that year it organized its first theological seminary, locating it at Princeton, N. J., already well known for its college, which had been founded in 1746. Since then seminaries have been established in different parts of the country by presbyteries or by synods. Of these institutions the appointing the professors, the arranging the length of the curriculum, and the prescribing the course of study—the entire control, in fact—has remained in the hands of their founders. This state of things was so unsatisfactory and so unpresbyterian that, on the reunion in 1869, the directors of the different seminaries agreed that, while reserving to themselves the general control, the Assembly should in future have a veto power over the appointment of every professor, and should receive from the directors an annual report of their administration.

The Church has thirteen theological seminaries, as follows: at Princeton, N. J., 1812; at Auburn, N. Y., 1820; Western, Allegheny City, Pa., 1827; Lane, Cincinnati, O., 1832; Union, New York City, 1836; at Danville, Ky., 1853; Theological Seminary of the Northwest, Chicago, Ill., 1859; Blackburn University (theological department), 1867; at San Francisco, Cal., 1871; German, Bloomfield, N. J., 1869; German, Dubuque, Ia., 1870; Lincoln University (theological department), 1871; and Biddle Memorial Institute (theological department), Charlotte, N. C., 1867. Of these, the last two are for colored people, and the two immediately preceding them for Germans. In 1875-76 they had, in all, 56 professors and 578 students. The number graduating that year was 134. The board of education of the Church in 1876 received $72,040, and gave financial aid to 458 students (222 theological, 218 collegiate, and 18 academical). In the same year the Church maintained, for freedmen, 39 day schools, with 65 teachers and 3176 pupils and 5 higher schools, with 903 students, of whom 43 were preparing for the ministry. See Gillett, *Hist. of the Presb. Church* (2 vols. 12mo, rev. ed., Phila. 1875); Hodge, *Constitutional Hist. of the Presb. Church* (terminates in 1788; Phila. 1840–41, 2 vols.); Webster, *Hist. of the Presb. Church till* 1758 (Phila. 1857, 8vo); *Presb. Reunion Memorial Volume*, 1837–71 (N. Y. 1871, 8vo); Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac; Minutes of the General Assembly* (ibid. 1877, new series, vol. iv); Blaikie, *Sketch of the Presb. Churches throughout the World* (Edinb. 1877), p. 38 sq.

11. Cumberland Presbyterian Church.—In the beginning of the present century there was a very extensive revival of religion in the south-western part of Kentucky, within the bounds of the Presbytery of Transylvania. It is frequently called "the Great Western Revival of 1800," and is regarded by some as one of the most important religious movements in the history of the Protestant Church of the United States, as it firmly fixed the people of the valley of the Mississippi in the Christian faith. The supply of preachers being inadequate, the Presbytery appointed at different times a number of lay exhorters, and, after trial of their gifts, licensed some to preach. They did not require of them the usual course of classical studies, and permitted them to except to the doctrine of the divine decrees as involving the idea of Fatalism. In October, 1802, the Presbytery was divided, and the Presbytery of Cum-

berland was formed, covering the region just named. In April, 1803, the new Presbytery met, and ordained two of the licentiates — Finis Ewing (who had formerly been an elder) and Samuel King — and licensed other persons. In 1805, the synod, finding complaints laid before them of irregularity on the part of the Presbytery, appointed a commission of ten ministers and six elders, clothed with full synodical powers, to visit this remote region and investigate the whole matter. Accordingly the commission, when convened, summoned the Presbytery and the irregularly licensed or ordained persons, and endeavored to induce the latter to submit to an examination. This, with the sanction of the Presbytery, they refused; whereupon the commission prohibited them from preaching or administering ordinances in virtue of any authority derived from Cumberland Presbytery until they should submit. It was afterwards contended that, as the authority to preach had been originally conferred by the Presbytery of Transylvania, this prohibition was technically powerless in the case. It may also be observed that it seems now generally agreed by writers on both sides that the main objection was not to the illiterate character of the licentiates, but to their alleged unsoundness in doctrine. The Revival members (as they were called) of the Cumberland Presbytery after this met as a council and abstained from presbyterial acts. They memorialized the General Assembly, but in vain. The assembly sustained the synod, and exhorted the recusants to submit and act regularly. The synod, being directed to review their proceedings, complied, and on review confirmed all that had been done, and further dissolved the Cumberland Presbytery and re-annexed its members to the Presbytery of Transylvania. The council made an ineffectual effort to bring about a reconciliation, and offered to submit the licentiates to an examination; but as they required that all should be received in a body, the proposal was not accepted by the synod. On Feb. 4, 1810, Finis Ewing and Samuel King (ordained ministers, but silenced by the commission), and Samuel M'Adow, an aged minister, met and organized themselves into a presbytery under the name of the Cumberland Presbytery. In April following the Presbytery of Transylvania suspended Mr. M'Adow for his schismatical conduct.

The progress of the new body was rapid. In three years a synod was necessary, with 3 presbyteries and 60 congregations, and in 1829 a General Assembly was constituted. The statistics of 1859 reported in the connection 96 presbyteries, 927 ministers, 1188 churches, 82,158 communicants, and 24 educational institutions. In 1814 the synod published an edition of the Westminster Confession and Catechisms, altered to suit their system, which is understood to be an attempt to steer between Calvinism and Arminianism. It rejects eternal reprobation, limited atonement, and special grace, teaching that the atonement was made for all mankind, and that the operation of the Spirit is coextensive with the atonement. Other points of Calvinism, as the necessity of the Spirit's work in regeneration and the perseverance of the saints, are retained. The Cumberland Presbyterians are warm advocates of revivals and camp-meetings.

As an evidence of the altered state of feeling towards this body of Christians as contrasted with the deliverance of the General Assembly of 1814—to the effect that they could be treated with not as a body, but only as individuals—it may be added that first the New-School General Assembly entered into correspondence with the Cumberland Presbyterian General Assembly, and in 1860 the Old-School Assembly also took this step. The Cumberland Presbyterians have increased very rapidly. The minutes of the forty-sixth General Assembly, 1876, show 26 synods, including nearly 125 presbyteries, extending over the territory between the Great Lakes and the Gulf of Mexico, and reaching from the Appalachian Mountains, on the east, to the Pacific Ocean, on the west. The following statistical summary is approximately correct: Ministers, 1275; licentiates, 280; candidates, 220; congregations, 2000; elders, 6750; deacons, 2000; total communicants, 100,000; persons in the Sabbath-schools, 55,000; value of church property, $2,250,000; contributed during the year, $350,000. The following are the principal institutions of learning under the control of this Church: Cumberland College (Princeton, Ky., founded in 1829, discontinued in 1861), Cumberland University (Lebanon, Tenn., founded in 1842, which has the leading law-school in the South), Bethel College (M'Kenzie, Tenn., 1847), Waynesburg College (Waynesburg, Pa., 1850), M'Gee College (College Mound, Mo., 1853, now suspended), Lincoln University (Lincoln, Ill., 1866), Trinity University (Tehuacana, Texas, 1876), Cane Hill College, Boonsborough, Ark., 1852). The General Assembly, in 1876, approved the establishment of a Union Medical College, in connection with the three universities of the Church: namely, Cumberland, Lincoln, and Trinity. It is to be located at St. Louis, or some other large city. Waynesburg, Lincoln, and Trinity admit young ladies on equal terms with young men. There are also several institutions exclusively for girls, owned by, or under the patronage of, the Church.

The *Colored Cumberland Presbyterian Church* has been formed by the amicable separation of colored members from the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, and their organization into an independent body. The first number of their newspaper organ, *The Banner of Light*, was published in September, 1876. It stated that the number of members of the Colored Cumberland Presbyterian Church in the states of Kansas, Missouri, Illinois, Mississippi, Tennessee, Alabama, and Kentucky was, in May, 1874, 3925; that the number of ministers at that time was seventeen; and that the value of church property was $12,550. Since that time the Presbytery of Missouri had added 240 members, and the same presbytery had raised $529.25 in 1874. Later reports than for 1874 had not been received from the other states.

12. The Reformed Presbyterian Synod.—During "the persecuting times," some members of the Covenanting or Reformed Presbyterian Church of Scotland settled in Pennsylvania. In 1743 these met at Middle Octorara, and again solemnly subscribed the Old Scottish Covenant. In 1752 the Scottish Church sent the Rev. John Cuthbertson to be their minister. In 1774 he was joined by the Rev. Messrs. Linn and Dobbin from the Reformed Presbytery of Ireland, when a Reformed Presbyterian Presbytery was formed. In 1782 these three ministers and a portion of the people joined with the Associate Church in forming "The Associate Reformed Church." The members who were opposed to this union kept together as praying societies until 1792, when the Scottish Church had appointed a committee of their number to take the oversight of them judicially. In 1798 a presbytery was organized at Philadelphia, and in 1800 the question of slavery forced itself upon the consideration of the newly organized "Reformed Presbytery of the United States of America," when it enacted that no slaveholder should be retained in its communion, a position since then faithfully maintained. In 1806 it issued a Testimony defining its position on several points not mentioned in the Westminster Confession. In the following year it undertook the theological education of its ministry by opening a seminary at Philadelphia, and in 1809 organized itself into "The Synod of the Reformed Presbyterian Church in America," with three constituting presbyteries. Subsequent to the war of 1812 the relations of the Covenanting Church to the national government were much discussed. A variety of sentiments was apparent as to the extent to which the severance between the Church and that other ordinance of God — the State — should be carried. The result of these discussions was a rending of the Church in 1833, and the formation of an independent synod. The large losses which the synod—a representative, not delegated

court—sustained in 1833 noways disheartened it. More homogeneous than ever through the separation, it thenceforth proceeded rigidly to enforce the principles and practices that have at all times been accepted by the Church. Members of this Church therefore neither become nor act as American citizens: they neither vote at political elections, enlist in the army, accept of government situations, serve on juries, nor in any way identify themselves with the political system of the United States. In 1871 this Church, in accordance with its principle of the moral duty of religious covenanting, by its ministers and members entered into a solemn covenant with God and with each other to serve faithfully the great God and to keep his commandments, and to adhere to the Reformed Presbyterian principles and testimony. The theological seminary of the synod was organized in 1840, and is situated at Allegheny City, Pa., having at present a faculty of three professors.

Missions.—In 1856 the synod commenced a foreign mission at Latakiyeh, in Syria. Since then stations and schools have been opened in different localities. The missionary and benevolent contributions for the year 1876–77 were as follows:

Foreign missions	$8,522
Home missions	3,068
Freedmen	3,409
Education	2,565
Church erection	27,391
Total	$44,955

13. The General Synod of the Reformed Presbyterian Church.—The minority of the Reformed Presbyterian Church at the disruption of 1833 is now known by this name. (See No. 12 above.) Steadily adhering to the other distinctive principles of the Covenanters, it yet allows its members to discharge the duties and enjoy the privileges of citizens, and is popularly known as the New-Light Covenanting Church. The theological seminary, organized in Philadelphia in 1809, adhered to this portion of the Church at the time of the separation, and is still in connection with it. Recently a number of its ministers and congregations have withdrawn from its fellowship, leaving the General Synod greatly enfeebled. See Reformed Presbyterians.

14. United Presbyterian Church of North America.—This body is composed of the Associate and the Associate Reformed churches which were united in 1858. We give here an outline of the history of each of these bodies up to the time of their union.

1. *Associate Church.*—This Church in the United States had its origin from a number of Scotch and Irish Covenanters exiled for conscience' sake to the American colonies, where they maintained worship in a distinct form to the best of their ability. In 1680 Lord Cardross took measures for the establishment of a colony in South Carolina, with a view to furnish a place of refuge to his persecuted brethren. This was formed at Port Royal; but, in consequence of an invasion by the Spaniards, the colony was abandoned in 1688. Many, however, remained in Carolina, who were gathered into congregations under the care of a presbytery, which existed until about the close of the 18th century. The only one of these churches now remaining is the old Scots' Church in Charleston. From 1660 to 1688 a large number of Presbyterians (amounting, according to Wodrow, to about 3000) were transported to the American plantations and sold as slaves. They were for the most part sent to Virginia, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey; but scarcely any traces of their history now remain. As early as 1736 those American Presbyterians who sympathized with the Scottish Seceders applied to them for a minister, but at that time none could be sent. The application was renewed in 1750, but the first minister sent to this country by the Secession Church of Scotland, the Rev. Alexander Gelatly, did not arrive until 1753. In 1753 a presbytery was organized under the name of "The Associate Presbytery of Pennsylvania, subordinate to the Associate Synod of Scotland." While heartily accepting the Westminster standards as their symbolical books, this Presbytery gave prominence to the distinctive doctrines of the Marrow divines. See Marrow Controversy. Its members held the Gospel offer to be a free grant and promise of Christ and his salvation to sinners of mankind as such—all having a common interest in him—faith to be a person's real persuasion that Jesus Christ is his—that he shall have life and salvation by Christ, and that whatever Christ did for the redemption of mankind he did for him. Stress was also laid on the doctrine of the binding obligation of the Scottish covenants—National and Solemn League. While the origin and doctrinal views of the Associate Presbytery restricted its sphere of labor, inside of that sphere it grew rapidly, congregations being formed in New York, Virginia, and the Carolinas. In 1776 a second presbytery, that of New York, was formed—like that of Pennsylvania, in subordination to the Scottish Synod. In 1764 the Rev. Thomas Clark, minister of Ballybay in Ireland, belonging to the Burgher Synod of Scotland, with the greater part of his congregation, emigrated to this country, and settled in Salem, Washington County, N. Y. Two other ministers of the same communion followed them two years after, though one of them subsequently returned to Scotland. The Burgher ministers, not being disposed to keep up a separate organization on this side of the Atlantic, united with their brethren; but the union was disturbed by the refusal of the Scottish synod to approve of it. The revolution of 1776 was chiefly instrumental in bringing about the existence of the Associate Reformed Church.

During the progress of the war several conventions were held between the members of the Associate and the Reformed presbyteries with a view to union. Their three presbyteries met in Philadelphia in October, 1782, and formed themselves into a synod, under the name of "The Associate Reformed Synod of North America," on a basis consisting of the following articles:

"1. That Jesus Christ died for the elect.

"2. That there is an appropriation in the nature of faith.

"3. That the Gospel is addressed indiscriminately to sinners of mankind.

"4. That the righteousness of Christ is the alone condition of the covenant of grace.

"5. That civil government originates with God the Creator, and not with Christ the Mediator.

"6. The administration of the kingdom of Providence is given into the hand of Jesus Christ the Mediator; and magistracy, the ordinance appointed by the moral Governor of the world to be the prop of civil order among men, as well as other things, is rendered subservient by the Mediator to the welfare of his spiritual kingdom, the Church, and has sanctified the use of it and of every common benefit, through the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ.

"7. That the law of nature and the moral law revealed in the Scriptures are substantially the same, although the latter expresses the will of God more evidently and clearly than the former, and therefore magistrates among Christians ought to be regulated by the general directory of the Word as to the execution of their office.

"8. That the qualifications of justice, veracity, etc., required in the law of nature for the being of a magistrate, are also more explicitly revealed as necessary in the Holy Scriptures. But a religious test, any farther than an oath of fidelity, can never be essentially necessary for the being of a magistrate, except when the people make it a condition of government.

"9. That both parties, when united, shall adhere to the Westminster Confession of Faith, the Catechisms, the directory for worship, and propositions concerning Church government.

"10. That they shall claim the full exercise of Church discipline without depending upon foreign judicatories."

On this basis all the members of the Reformed presbytery, and all the Associate ministers with the exception of two members of the presbytery of Pennsylvania, united. A small minority of the people in the two communions also declined to enter into it; and in these minorities have been preserved the Covenanter or Reformed Presbyterian denomination, on the one hand, and the Associate, on the other. (See No. 12 above.) From 1782, the period of the formation of the Associate Reformed Church, the Associate Church was gradually increased

by ministers sent out from Scotland, and also by the return of a considerable part of those who had previously joined the union. In 1784 this Church put forth a Testimony intended to supplement the Westminster Confession, and containing special articles in favor of close communion, public covenanting, the exclusive use of the Psalms in praise, and against private oaths, that is, secret societies. The first institution for the purpose of educating students in theology by this body was established in 1793, under the care of the Rev. John Anderson, D.D., of Beaver County, Pa. The Presbytery of Pennsylvania, being unable to meet the applications for preaching which were made from Kentucky and Tennessee, directed the applicants to apply directly to the Synod of Scotland for missionaries. They did so; and Messrs. Armstrong and Andrew Fulton arrived in Kentucky in the spring of 1798, and in November formed the Presbytery of Kentucky. This accession of strength enabled these presbyteries to form themselves into a synod; and accordingly the synod, or court of review, designated as "The Associate Synod of North America" was constituted at Philadelphia in May, 1801. The synod consisted of seventeen ministers, who were divided into the presbyteries of Philadelphia, of Chartiers, of Kentucky, and of Cambridge. Until the year 1818 appeals might be taken from the synod to that of Scotland; but at that time it was declared a coordinate synod by the General Associate Synod of Scotland. Between the years 1838 and 1840 serious ecclesiastical difficulties arose, and several ministers were deposed or suspended. These, with a number of ministers and congregations in sympathy with them, at once organized separately, having several presbyteries, who constituted a synod and claimed to be the true Associate Synod. This painful division was afterwards adjusted, and a reunion was effected in 1854. To the Associate Church belongs the distinction of being one of the earliest churches on the American continent to take up a decided position on the subject of slavery. As early as the year 1800 the Presbytery of Pennsylvania issued a warning on the subject to the members of its churches, declaring slaveholding to be a moral evil and unjustifiable. This declaration was repeated in 1811, while in 1831 the synod judicially excluded slaveholders from its communion — an action which cost it all its congregations in the Southern States. The loss thus sustained was made up by the formation of new congregations and new presbyteries in Indiana, Illinois, and the far West. In 1858, previous to the union with the Associate Reformed Church, the Associate Synod comprised 21 presbyteries, 231 ministers and licentiates, 293 congregations, and 23,505 communicants.

2. *Associate Reformed Church.* — The earliest settlements of the Associate Reformed Church were in Pennsylvania, within the Cumberland valley; but colonies from these emigrated to South Carolina and Georgia, New York, Kentucky, and even to New Hampshire and Maine. One of the first acts of the synod, after its organization in 1782, was the adoption of a series of articles, afterwards published under the name of *The Constitution of the Associate Reformed Church;* but these articles were severely attacked both by the Seceders and Covenanters, and were finally laid aside for a fuller exposition of the Church's faith. The result was that the Westminster Confession and Catechisms, after a careful revision at several successive meetings of synod, in the articles relating to the power of the magistrate, were published in a volume in 1799, entitled *The Constitution and Standards of the Associate Reformed Church in North America.* In 1802 the synod organized itself into a general synod, with four subordinate synods — New York, Pennsylvania, Scioto, and the Carolinas. In 1804 the plan of the theological seminary was framed. Dr. John M. Mason was chosen professor of theology; and the sessions of the seminary began in the autumn of the same year in the city of New York. This was the second theological seminary established in the United States. Dr. Mason's work on *Catholic Communion,* published in 1816, was regarded as being in conflict with the Church's principles and practice; and this, in connection with some other grounds of complaint, led the entire synod of Scioto in 1820 to withdraw from the superintendence of the General Synod. In 1821 the Synod of the Carolinas petitioned the General Synod to be erected into an independent synod, on the ground that they were so distant from the place at which the General Synod usually assembled that it was impossible that they should be represented in it. The request was granted. For many years after that the Southern Synod gained but little in numbers, though in later years it became more prosperous; while the Scioto Synod rapidly extended itself and became more vigorous every year. About the time of the separation of this Western Synod, an unsuccessful attempt was made to unite the Associate Reformed and the Reformed Dutch churches, under the name of "The Reformed Protestant Church of North America." Immediately after this, that is, in 1821, a union was effected between the Associate Reformed and the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church; the consequence of which was that a portion of the former Church became incorporated with the latter, and the library of the Associate Reformed Church was immediately removed from New York to Princeton; though, as the result of a legal process, it ultimately fell back into the hands of its original owners. The act of union by the General Synod of the Associate Reformed Church was irregular, being contrary to the express will of a majority of the presbyteries. However, many of the ministers and congregations who had remained under the care of the General Synod went into this union. The Synod of Pennsylvania with but few exceptions was merged in it, and that synod never met again. The Synod of New York, however, survived the dissolution of the General Synod, becoming separate and independent, like its two sister synods of the West and South. But its interests languished till 1829, when it resolved to revive the seminary, whose operations had been suspended in 1821, and to establish it at Newburgh, under the care of the Rev. Joseph M'Carroll, D.D., who was at the same time chosen professor of theology. An attempt was made in 1827 to revive the General Synod on the old footing, but it proved a failure. However, the Synod of the West, having divided into two, erected a General Synod, which first met in 1841, and under which a union was formed with the New York Synod in 1855. This united body numbered 4 synods, 28 presbyteries, 253 ministers and licentiates, 367 congregations, and 31,284 communicants. Its name then became "The General Synod of the Associate Reformed Church." They adhered to the Westminster standards as adopted in the Testimony of 1799, and held the doctrines of close communion, anti-slavery, and the exclusive use of the Psalms in praise.

In May, 1858, the Associate Reformed and the Associate churches, having been separated for more than three quarters of a century, were reunited upon a common basis, under the name of "The United Presbyterian Church in North America," a Church which is now the largest representative of those distinctive views for which all the preceding churches have more or less contended. In addition therefore to its acceptance of the Westminster standards, which it modified, it has issued a Testimony whose adoption is a condition of communion both with ministers and members. In this Testimony are articles adverse to slavery and to secret societies, and in favor of close communion, the exclusive use of the Psalms, and of the moral duty of covenanting. A few years ago a new metrical version of the book of Psalms was adopted by this body. A small number protested against the union, and have since then continued under the name of "The Associate Synod of North America." (See No. 15 below.) In 1890, "The United Presbyterian Church of North America" embraced a General Assembly, 8 synods, 56 presby-

teries, 753 ministers, 866 congregations, and 101,858 communicants. It has theological seminaries at Newburgh, N. Y.; Allegheny, Pa.; and Xenia, O.; and missionary seminaries at Osioot and Ramleh, Egypt. Westminster, Monmouth, and Ohio Central colleges are also under its charge. It has boards of Foreign Missions, of Home Missions, of Publication, of Church Extension, of Freedmen, and of Education, with mission stations in India, Egypt, and Syria. The Mission to China, which was instituted as a memorial of the "union" of the different bodies in 1858, has been transferred to California. Its missionary contributions were, in 1876–77, for foreign, $77,126; home, $29,750. Its periodical publications are one monthly, one semi-monthly, and two weekly newspapers.

The *Associate Reformed Synod of the South* has still its separate organization. Cordial in its relations with the United Presbyterian Church, it has one missionary now laboring together with the missionaries of the latter Church in Egypt; and, slavery having ceased to be an object of contention, is now considering the propriety of organic union with that body. In 1875 a plan of co-operation was proposed between this Church and the United Presbyterian Church, North, which provides that "the presbyteries of each Church shall sustain the same relation to those of the other that they do to the co-ordinate courts of their own body, and that the ministers and licentiates of each shall be eligible to appointments and settlements in congregations of the other;" that the courts of each shall respect the discipline of the other; that ministers and members of the two bodies be recommended to cultivate friendly relations and Christian fellowship with each other; that the existing relations of the two churches (actual co-operation) in the work of foreign missions be continued; that a friendly co-operation of help and non-interference be practiced in the fields of home missions and Church extension; that the two bodies co-operate in building and sustaining the Normal or Training School of the United Presbyterian Church for the Freedmen, established at Knoxville, Tenn.; and that in the work of publication the Associate Reformed Synod co-operate with the Board of Publication of the United Presbyterian Church. These provisions were adopted by the synod. The committee on correspondence with the United Presbyterian Church was reappointed, but was instructed to take no direct steps towards union without further instruction. The Southern Church has a literary institution named Erskine College and a theological school, both at Due West, S. C. It numbers about 70 ministers, nearly one third of whom are in South Carolina, the rest in other Southern states.

15. The Associate Synod of North America is composed of some who declined to enter into the union with the Associate Reformed Synod in 1858 (see No. 14 above), and consists of the presbyteries of Iowa, Clarion, Muskingum, and Northern Indiana; and had, in 1876, 12 ministers, 2 licentiates, 34 congregational charges or stations, and 1115 communicants. The total contributions were $679.85.

16. The United Synod of the Presbyterian Church, South.—In 1857 the New-School Presbytery of Lexington affirmed slavery to be right and scriptural in principle. The Assembly (1857) replied by condemning the position, and refused to allow either the principle or the practice. The delegates from the Southern churches protested, and, declaring this action to be an "indirect excision" of their congregations, withdrew, and in 1858, at Knoxville, Tenn., organized themselves as "The United Synod of the Presbyterian Church, South," consisting of some 100 ministers and about 200 congregations. A proposal for union with the Old-School Presbyterian Church was declined by this latter body because coupled with the condition that the Assembly set aside its doctrinal decisions of 1838. In 1859 the United Synod reported 14 presbyteries, 118 ministers, 187 churches, and 12,125 communicants, of whom 323 were colored. In 1864 the synod joined the Presbyterian Church, South.

17. The Presbyterian Church, South, dates its organization from Dec. 4, 1861, when the commissioners from all the presbyteries of the Presbyterian Church within the Confederate States met in Augusta, Ga., and organized as a General Assembly. The style and title then chosen was, *The Presbyterian Church of the Confederate States of America;* but after the overthrow of the Confederacy the word *united* was substituted for *Confederate*, and *of America* was dropped. The Presbyterian Church, South, disavows all connection with political matters, and holds to strictly ecclesiastical labor. In 1876, at the Assembly held in Savannah, Ga., when the appointment of delegates to the Pan-Presbyterian Council of Edinburgh in 1877 was considered, all expressions used in the different courts during the exciting times of the civil strife were rescinded as inconsistent with the platform of 1862. The report then adopted closed with the following declarations:

> "1. We solemnly reaffirm the explicit and formal statement set forth at the time of the organization of our General Assembly in 1861, in an 'Address to the Churches of Jesus Christ throughout the Earth.' This document clearly and forcibly details our position concerning the nature and functions of the Church as a spiritual body, and, therefore, 'non-secular and non-political.'
>
> "2. Inasmuch as some incidental expressions, uttered in times of great public excitement, are found upon our records, and have been pointed out in the report of the committee aforesaid, which seem to be ambiguous or inconsistent with the above declarations and others of like import, this Assembly does hereby disavow them wherever found, and does not recognise such as forming any part of the well-considered, authoritative teachings or testimony of our Church."

At that time this Church consisted of 12 synods, 62 presbyteries, 1821 churches, 1079 ministers, and 112,183 communicants. Their contributions amounted to $1,138,681. The Assembly conducts its benevolent operations through three general committees (the work of foreign missions and of sustentation being united under the same committee), viz. the Executive Committee of Foreign Missions and Sustentation, of Education, and of Publication. Foreign missions are maintained in the Indian Territory, Mexico, South America, Greece, Italy, India, and China, and domestic missions in new and destitute localities in the South, at an annual cost of $71,121, supporting 75 missionaries in foreign fields, of whom 26 are ordained ministers, 4 licentiates, and 21 assistant missionaries, all from the United States; 9 ordained ministers and 25 assistant missionaries are natives of the countries in which they labor. With these foreign missions are connected 22 churches, with 1200 communicants; also 13 training-schools of various grades, containing 250 pupils. The Sustentation Board extends aid to the amount of $20,000 in support of their ministers to 185 churches in 57 presbyteries; $6000 to the support of evangelistic labor, and $10,000 to relieve disabled ministers and families of deceased ministers. A publishing house is maintained at Richmond, Va., and, with a capital of about $40,000, issues Presbyterian books for ministers and congregational and Sunday-school libraries. It also aids in the education for the ministry of young men of limited means, and in the publication and dissemination of a religious and doctrinal literature.

In all educational work, this branch of the Presbyterian Church has always held very advanced ground. It declares in its constitution that "because it is highly reproachful to religion, and dangerous to the Church, to intrust the holy ministry to weak and ignorant men, the Presbytery shall try each candidate as to his knowledge of the Latin language and the original languages in which the Holy Scriptures were written. They shall also examine him in the arts and sciences." The first written test required of the candidate is "a Latin *exegesis* on some common head in divinity." The common requirement in its presbyteries is equal to the *curriculum*

in most American colleges. The demands of the Church for the education of its ministry and its own youth have everywhere made it the patroness of learning and engaged it in the founding of institutions for higher education. It has been the pioneer of education in nearly all the older Southern communities. During the civil war, many of the institutions of learning founded and endowed by the Presbyterian Church in the South perished by the loss of endowments in the general financial wreck. Among them were Oglethorpe University, Ga.; Oakland College, Miss.; La Grange College, Tenn.; and other valuable institutions of less prominence. Centre College, Ky., was lost through decisions of the United States courts in favor of a minority adhering to the old Assembly. Others were suspended by the enlistment of the students in the armies, and were crippled by the partial loss of endowments. The following, founded and endowed by Presbyterians, survived the disasters of the war, and now, under Presbyterian control or auspices, are rendering valuable service to the country: Hampden Sidney College, Va.; Davidson College, N. C.; Stewart College, Tenn.; Westminster College, Mo.; King College, Tenn.; and Austin College, Texas. Central University, at Richmond, Ky., has been founded and successfully opened since the war. The synods of Nashville, Memphis, Alabama, Mississippi, Arkansas, and Texas, conjointly, have also projected a university (the South-western) to be strictly under Presbyterian control, for which they are now soliciting an endowment. It has been located at Clarkesville, Tenn. Stewart College has been merged in it. The financial prostration of the South since the war has rendered the endowment of its institutions of learning slow and difficult. Of academies and schools competent to prepare boys for college or young men for the university, or to give a good mathematical and classical education, thorough so far as it goes, to those whose means do not admit of more elaborate courses, there is a great insufficiency throughout the South. Those which had previously acquired success and reputation were generally broken up through the disastrous effects of the war, and the poverty and depression of the people have operated to the discouragement of efforts to establish others. Of such institutions there are some of a high character, maintained under Presbyterian auspices; as the Bingham School, Mebanesville, N. C.; Pleasant Ridge Academy, Green County, Ala.; Edgar Institute, Paris, Ky.; Military and Classical Institute, Danville, Ky.; Finlay High School, Lenoir, N. C.; and Kemper Institute, Booneville, Mo. The Southern Presbyterian Church has two theological seminaries, each endowed and furnished with buildings, libraries, and four professors of eminent ability and learning — Union Seminary, at Hampden Sidney, Va.; and Columbia Seminary, at Columbia, S. C. It has recently established a third, at Tuscaloosa, Ala., for the education and training of colored men for the ministry; and for this it is now gathering an endowment. There are no Presbyterian schools or colleges for girls in the South endowed beyond the provision of buildings, apparatus, and libraries; but there are many institutions under Presbyterian control or auspices in which every reasonable comfort is combined with advantages for the thorough education and accomplishment of girls. Among these are many colleges, collegiate institutes, and seminaries which afford a high grade of instruction to young ladies, and are widely esteemed for general excellence and efficiency.

The work of education for the ministry is conducted by the General Assembly, through an executive committee located at Memphis, Tenn. In the last ecclesiastical year, the committee received from the churches, for this purpose, $15,131, from which 95 young men, prosecuting their studies at various colleges and theological seminaries, received assistance.

The standards of the Southern Presbyterian Church are the Westminster Confession (with the chapter "Of the Civil Magistrate" amended), the Larger and Shorter Catechisms, and the Westminster Form of Government and Directory, somewhat altered to suit the circumstances of the Church, with "Rules of Discipline," or "Forms of Process," gathered from the usages and laws of the Scottish Church. These standards are adopted by every minister at his ordination, in answer to the questions put to him publicly by the presiding minister, but are not required to be adopted by subscription to any written formula.

Anterior to the division of the Church into Northern and Southern churches, the Southern churches were disposed to adhere more closely to the standards, and were more *churchly* in their ideas, after the fashion of the Westminster Era, than a large portion of the Northern churches, who came nearer the Congregational influence of New England. It was the united opposition of the Southern churches to what claimed to be a more liberal Presbyterianism which in large part caused the division of 1837 into Old and New School bodies. Since the separation in 1861, the Southern body has grown even more strict in its views of the standards, and the *jure divino* character of Church government. But, with all their zeal for a strict construction of the standards of doctrine and order, the Southern churches have ever been distinguished for their interest in protracted meetings and services of religion. The custom is almost universal of holding protracted services of several days' or weeks' duration in the churches at one or more communion services in the year, as the indication of the special presence of the Holy Spirit may suggest; and most frequently at such meetings there is a revival in the hearts of God's people, and awakenings of greater or less extent among the unconverted. The special labors of evangelists such as Moody and Sankey, and Whittle and Bliss, have not been enjoyed to any great extent in the Southern churches. It is an opinion generally accepted among the Southern ministry that there is great advantage, especially in a sparsely populated region but partially supplied with the means of grace, in bringing the Gospel to bear for successive days upon the minds of men. In this way their thoughts can be more effectually withdrawn from their worldly connections and pleasures, and fixed more intently upon the great matter of salvation. Hence the evangelists found that neither their methods nor their preaching of the Gospel of salvation by grace only, through faith, was much of a novelty to the Southern Presbyterian churches.

It has proved to be a great drawback to the proper influence of the Southern Presbyterian Church that, owing partly to its poverty, partly from lying out of the chief lines of the travel and commerce with Europe, and partly from lack of great commercial cities with their accumulated capital, its learned men are able to publish very little, and its journals are of necessity provincial in their character, and therefore the world at large knows little of them. Besides, so vast is the territory covered by this Church, and so diverse the local interests, that instead of patronage being concentrated upon one or two great religious journals, it is divided between some seven or eight, none of which has power enough to make itself felt abroad. The *Southern Presbyterian Review*, a quarterly journal of thirty years' standing, now published under the supervision of the professors in the two theological seminaries, compares most favorably in learning and ability with any theological quarterly in this country; yet, being published in the interior of South Carolina, without the aid of the machinery of a great publishing-house to bring it before the world, it is little known outside the circle of its local patrons and admirers.

In view of the calamities which have befallen this body of Presbyterians during the sixteen years of its history, bringing poverty and distress upon so large a part of its people, its success, so far, has been remarkable. In view of the vast territory to be evangelized

which is covered by it, and the hundreds of thousands of poor ignorant negroes, ever tending backward to heathenism, who must depend upon this Church very largely for a form of the Gospel that will enlighten and civilize them, no body of Presbyterians in the world has a greater work to do, or, in proportion to the work to be done, less financial ability to sustain it.

18. PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN CANADA.—In this British dominion the Presbyterians are in point of numbers the third among the religious denominations, being only exceeded by the Roman Catholics and the Church of England. Presbyterianism dates in Canada at least from the conquest, in 1759. Its first exponent is supposed to have been the Rev. George Henry. He appeared in Quebec as early as 1765, and was the chaplain of a British regiment stationed there. In 1784 the Rev. Alexander Spark went there, and in 1787 the first Presbyterian congregation was organized. It was composed principally of soldiers. In 1780 the Rev. Thomas Bethune, a minister of the Kirk who had come from Scotland as chaplain of a Highland regiment, preached first in Montreal, and afterwards organized several congregations in the county of Glengary. In Montreal itself, the first Presbyterian Church was organized in 1790. They built St. Gabriel Street Church, which is still used as a Presbyterian church, and is the oldest Protestant church in Canada. Previous to the completion of their own structure they worshipped, by permission of the Recollet Fathers, in a Roman Catholic Church. In recognition of these kind offices, "The Society of Presbyterians," as they were then called, presented the good fathers with "two hogsheads of Spanish wine and a box of candles," which were "thankfully accepted"—a manifestation of friendly feeling between Romanists and Protestants which continues to this day. In 1803 the first Presbytery of Montreal was organized by two ministers and one elder; and for years after the development of Presbyterianism was slow. In Upper Canada, now known as the Province of Ontario, the pioneers of Presbyterianism were sent out by the Reformed Dutch Church. One of the principal laborers thus sent was the Rev. Robert M'Dowell, who was appointed by the classis of Albany as their missionary to Canada in 1798. He itinerated throughout the greater part of Upper Canada, forming and fostering congregations in various places. He died at a very advanced age in 1841. The Rev. W. Smart, who was sent out from England in 1811, and who labored long and faithfully in Brockville; the Rev. W. Bell, sent out from Scotland in 1817; the Rev. William Jenkins, originally from Scotland, who went to Canada from the United States in 1817; the Rev. Robert Boyd, from the Synod of Ulster, ordained in 1821; and the Rev. James Harris, also from Ireland, who began his labors in 1820 as pastor of the first Presbyterian church in York (now Toronto), were among the founders of the Presbyterian Church in Canada. To Kingston and a few other places ministers were, on application, sent out by presbyteries in Scotland, the Rev. John Barclay being the first minister of Kingston. In 1825, the Glasgow Colonial Society was formed, which sent out many ministers to Lower and Upper Canada, as well as to Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. These ministers were all of the Church of Scotland. In 1827 bishop Strachan, of Toronto, published an ecclesiastical chart of Upper Canada, in which the Church of England was said to have thirty ministers, while two only belonged to the Church of Scotland—"one of whom," it was further alleged, "had made application to be received into the Anglican Communion." A change, however, was at hand. The tide of immigration had begun to flow in the direction of Canada, bringing large numbers of Presbyterians from Scotland and the north of Ireland. Societies also began to be formed in Scotland "for promoting the religious interests of Scottish settlers in British North America." Presbyterianism had taken root in Canada; it now began to make rapid progress. The supply of Scottish ministers being necessarily cut off, owing to the ecclesiastical condition of the country, these provinces were at this time thrown almost entirely on their own resources. In 1831 was formed "The Synod of the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland." On its first roll were 25 ministers. "The United Synod of Upper Canada," consisting chiefly of ministers of the Associate Church of Scotland, with some from Ireland, had formed about 1819, but in 1840 was amalgamated with the synod in connection with the Church of Scotland, and then numbered 82 ministers. Several ministers from the Secession Church of Scotland came to Canada about 1832, and the number was increased from time to time. They were organized as the Missionary Synod of the United Secession Church, and known afterwards as the Synod of the United Presbyterian Church in Canada. In 1844, the year after the disruption of the Church of Scotland, a division took place in the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland; 25 ministers agreeing with the Free Church of Scotland withdrew, and formed themselves into "The Presbyterian Church of Scotland." The synod formed immediately founded a theological hall at Toronto under the name of "Knox College." The United Presbyterians also instituted a theological hall at London. The synod in connection with the Church of Scotland, having in 1841 obtained a royal charter for Queen's University and College at Kingston, set themselves to work for its better equipment. Then began a struggle for pre-eminence between three vigorous branches of the Church. With varying success, each maintained a separate existence for seventeen years. To Nova Scotia and New Brunswick the first Presbyterian ministers were sent from Scotland by the Burgher and Anti-Burgher synods. A missionary was also sent in 1768 by the united synods of New York and Philadelphia. About 1769 the real work of building up a Presbyterian Church in Nova Scotia may be said to have begun, the Rev. David Smith and the Rev. Daniel Cock having been sent out by the Burgher or Associate Synod of Scotland. Seventeen years afterwards, the Rev. James M'Gregor was sent out by the Anti-Burgher or General Associate Synod. From these beginnings grew up the Presbytery of Truro (Burgher), established in 1786, and the Presbytery of Pictou (Anti-Burgher), in 1795. In 1817 these united, forming "The Presbyterian Church of Nova Scotia." This was the first colonial union of which there is any record. Ministers from the Church of Scotland came at a later date. This Church was first represented in these provinces by the Rev. Samuel Russel, called to be minister of St. Matthew's Church, Halifax, in 1784. But thirty-two years intervened before it could be said to have effected a permanent lodgment. In 1833 seven ministers of the Church of Scotland formed themselves into the Synod of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and Prince Edward's Island (the Presbytery of New Brunswick, however, declined to enter into the compact, and in 1835 constituted itself the Synod of New Brunswick). The Synod of Nova Scotia grew apace, and when the division came, in 1844, it had outnumbered its elder sister. But now it was well-nigh extinguished. Some of its ministers returned to Scotland, others joined the Free Church in these provinces. Three only maintained their former connection. The synod became defunct in 1843, and was not resuscitated till 1854, when it again put forth energetic efforts to recover its lost ground. In Canada the new body, founded in 1844, in sympathy with the Free Church of Scotland, took, as we have said, the name of "The Presbyterian Church of Canada." In 1861, after several years spent in negotiations, this body and the United Presbyterian Church in Canada united under the designation of "The Canada Presbyterian Church," the corresponding bodies in the Lower Provinces uniting under the name of "The Presbyterian Church of the Lower Provinces." "The Synod of the Canada Presbyterian Church" entered on a prosperous career, with

a roll of 226 ministers, of whom 128 had belonged to the Canada Presbyterian Church and 68 to the United Presbyterian Church. In 1870 the supreme court of this Church was for the first time constituted as a General Assembly. In 1868 the synods of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick in connection with the Church of Scotland were united into one synod. The synods of the United Presbyterian Church and the Free Church had already united, namely, in 1860. Thus the way was prepared throughout the Dominion of Canada for comprehensive union. In September, 1874, there were (omitting a few congregations connected with organizations in the United States) four Presbyterian bodies in the Dominion of Canada, viz.: the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland; the Canada Presbyterian Church; the Church of Scotland in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and adjoining provinces; and the Presbyterian Church of the Lower Provinces. In the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland there were 11 presbyteries and 122 ministers; in the Canada Presbyterian Church, 19 presbyteries and 329 ministers; in the Church of Scotland in Nova Scotia, etc., 6 presbyteries and 31 ministers; and in the Presbyterian Church of the Lower Provinces, 10 presbyteries and 124 ministers. There were theological colleges in Toronto and Montreal belonging to the Canada Presbyterian Church; at Kingston and Quebec, to the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland; and at Halifax, to the Presbyterian Church of the Lower Provinces. Nearly one half of the ministers in the several provinces have been supplied by the theological colleges of the country. From the date of the union above referred to, overtures having reference to a yet more comprehensive union began to engage the attention of the supreme courts of all the churches in British North America. Increased facilities for intercommunication helped to make the proposal at least possible of accomplishment. The confederation of the provinces which now form the Dominion of Canada having been consummated in 1867, there naturally followed a strong desire for that ecclesiastical union which had long been contemplated. This desire was shared by many who had previously opposed such a union. Formal negotiations were commenced in 1870 in all the provinces, culminating in the union which was happily consummated June 15, 1875, in the city of Montreal, when the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland, the Canada Presbyterian Church, the Church of the Maritime Provinces in connection with the Church of Scotland, and the Presbyterian Church of the Lower Provinces, declaring their belief that it would be for the glory of God and the advancement of the cause of Christ that they should unite, and thus form one Presbyterian Church in the Dominion, were formally united under the name of "The Presbyterian Church in Canada." The aggregate of the United Church at that date was 634 ministers, 1119 congregations, 90,658 communicants, and a population under its instruction of about 650,000. Statistics of the Presbyterian Church in Canada, as they were reported to the General Assembly in June, 1876, then showed it to contain 4 synods, 33 presbyteries, 1076 congregations, 664 ministers, 82,186 communicants, and 59,949 Sabbath-scholars. The contributions for all purposes amounted to $939,690; of this sum $418,058 were paid for the support of the ministry, $25,472 for home mission work, $16,173 for foreign missions, and $11,219 for missions among the French Canadians.

1. The *home missions* of the Church are co-extensive with this vast dominion. Their history is simply the history of the Church itself—one of continuous, steady progress. In the early years of Presbyterianism in Canada, owing chiefly to the lack of ministers, many cast in their lot with those branches of the Church whose missionaries first supplied them with the means of grace. Others, filled with romantic attachment to the Church of their fathers, waited long and patiently, and instances are not wanting of "vacant congregations" assembling themselves for public worship for years together to hear sermons read by one of their elders, or to be exhorted by "the men" whom they recognised as their temporary leaders. The work divides itself into two distinct departments: 1, the opening up of new fields, and supplying ordinances to purely mission stations; 2, to aid weak congregations in the support of their ministers. The number of purely mission fields occupied in the western section in 1876 was 130, including 300 preaching-stations, with 3000 communicants. The average Sabbath attendance at these stations was about 16,000 in the aggregate. There were also 78 supplemented congregations with settled pastors receiving grants from $50 to $300 each per annum from the home mission fund. The number of missionaries employed was as follows: 35 ministers and licentiates; 59 theological students; 44 catechists; 12 lay catechists —in all 150 missionaries. The grants made for 1877 to home mission fields amounted to about $20,000, to supplemented congregations $10,000, and for contingencies $2500, making in all $32,500. The eastern sections, although small in comparison with the immense territory assigned to the Western Committee, have a mission field which is neither very limited, very compact, nor very easily wrought. It embraces some nine or ten groups of stations requiring missionary services. The greater part of the work is done by student catechists, of whom many were employed in 1877. In addition to these, eight Gaelic catechists are employed in Cape Breton, and other parts of Nova Scotia. An interesting mission field was recently entered upon in New Brunswick. It is known as "The New Kincardine Colony," and is described as "a little bit of Scotland transplanted bodily into the forests of New Brunswick." Another has been opened in a long-neglected part of Newfoundland. The annual expenditure for home missions in this section is about $3500, and for supplementing the stipends of ministers in weak congregations about $4000.

In addition to the work above mentioned, missions of a special character are maintained. Of such is the mission to the lumbermen, instituted seven years prior to the union by the branch of the Church in connection with the Church of Scotland. The object of this mission is to supply the ordinances of religion to the large number of men employed in the forests during the winter. These are visited by ministers, and supplied with copies of the Scriptures, tracts, and other literature in French and English. The average number annually employed in this branch of industry, in the valley of the Upper Ottawa, is about 5000 men. The amount expended on their behalf is about $650 per annum.

Perhaps in no department of Church work are there more hopeful and encouraging signs of progress than in that under the care of the Assembly's Board of French Evangelization, which has for its herculean task the emancipation of 1,250,000 French Roman Catholics. Previous to 1875 missionary efforts in this direction had been conducted on a limited scale by the several churches. Since the union a great impetus has been given to the work, which is now assuming large proportions. In the service of the board there are at present forty missionaries, colporteurs, and teachers, several of whom were at one time priests of the Church of Rome. In Nova Scotia an ordained missionary labors in a wide field with a fair measure of success. He reports 125 Romanists having embraced Protestantism through his instrumentality during the year 1876. In the province of New Brunswick there are three French missions, each making steady progress. In the province of Quebec there are twelve rural missions, maintaining Sabbath-schools, besides the ordinary services. In Ottawa, the capital of the Dominion, the board employs two missionaries, who minister to about 250 persons. In Quebec city—the stronghold of popery in Canada—a church

was erected in 1876, the first French Protestant church built in the city.

2. The staff of *foreign* missionaries consists at present of ten ordained ministers, one catechist, who acts as superintendent of schools, and three female missionaries. These are assisted by a large number of trained native teachers. The salaries of the ordained missionaries average about $1200 each; their assistants receive from $400 to $600 each per annum. The Church contributes annually towards the expenditure, in connection with the mission-ship *Day-spring*, $1200. The fields are four in number:

(1.) *The New Hebrides.*—This is the oldest and most distant. It originated with the late Dr. John Geddie, formerly a minister of the United Presbyterian Branch of the Church at Cavendish, Prince Edward Island, who landed on the island of Aneityum on July 13, 1848. This is no place to enter upon the details of Dr. Geddie's life's work. Few missionaries have been more successful, and no higher encomium need be associated with his name than these touching words inscribed on a tablet recently erected to his memory on the wall of the chapel where he was wont to preach: "When he came here there were no Christians, and when he went away there were no heathens." Since the commencement of this mission twelve missionaries, with their wives, have gone from Nova Scotia to labor in this field.

(2.) *Trinidad.*—The mission to the Coolies of Trinidad was begun in 1869 by the Rev. John Morton, also a minister of the Church of the Lower Provinces. In 1871 he was joined by the Rev. R. J. Grant, and more recently by the Rev. Thomas Christie. Fifteen schools have been opened. Churches have also been built, and a number of native assistants take part in the work, which, notwithstanding many difficulties, is making satisfactory progress. The number of Coolie children under instruction is 500, and the missionary reports that 15 in one school can repeat the whole of the Shorter Catechism. The number of Coolies on the island is about 15,000.

(3.) *Formosa.*—This is one of the Church's most promising foreign mission fields. It was begun in 1872 by the Rev. G. L. M'Kay, of the Canada Presbyterian Church. In 1875 he was joined by the Rev. J. B. Fraser, M.D., as a medical missionary. In these five years there have been erected ten chapels and two mission-houses. Five hundred of the natives have renounced idolatry, and regularly attend Christian services. Seventy-five have, after careful preparation and examination, been admitted as communicants. There are five schools with native teachers, and nine native students are under training for missionary work.

(4.) *India.*—Previous to the union the Canada Presbyterian Church and the Church in the Maritime Provinces in connection with the Church of Scotland had each broken ground in India by sending female missionaries. In 1874 the Rev. J. F. Campbell, a minister of the last-named Church, offered himself for foreign mission work. He has since proceeded to Madras as a missionary of the Presbyterian Church in Canada. At the same time the Rev. James Douglas also accepted an appointment to labor at Indore.

Next to the New Hebrides, the Juvenile Mission to India, instituted by the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland, is the oldest foreign mission of the Church. It was originated twenty-five years ago, and has always been supported by a number of Sabbath-schools and the voluntary offerings of a few friends. The annual contributions received by the treasurer have been steadily increasing for some years. Besides supporting four Zenana day-schools and a Bible-woman, this juvenile agency provides for the education of about forty orphan children in India.

3. *Colleges.*—Queen's University and College at Kingston, founded in 1840, is the oldest. It was projected by the branch of the Church formerly in connection with the Church of Scotland, and is the only one that possesses the power of granting degrees. It combines the faculties of arts and theology. Since its establishment Queen's has educated more than 100 ministers for the Presbyterian Church. The combined resources and equipment of the Canadian Presbyterian colleges may be summed up as follows:

Colleges.	Theological Professors.	Divinity Students.	Endowment.	Annual Expenditures.	Volumes in Library.	Value of Property.
Queen's College.	2	11	£124,397	£16,274	11,000	£70,000
Knox "	3	40	48,000	14,000	8,000	130,000
Montreal "	2	28	40,000	9,000	5,000	60,000
Morrin "	2	5	35,000	4,000	4,500	25,000
Halifax Hall....	3	17	85.000	7,350	7,000	10,000
Total.....	12	101	£332,397	£50,624	35,500	£295,000

The General Assembly authorizes an annual collection to be made in all the congregations on behalf of its theological colleges. In addition to the above-mentioned theological colleges, there is a collegiate institute at Winnipeg, the capital of the province of Manitoba; it is controlled by the General Assembly, and supported by the Church at large. This institution has two professors—one of science and literature, and one of classics; also a lecturer in philosophy.

4. *Periodicals.*—Each of the churches previous to 1875 published a monthly magazine for the diffusion of missionary information and general religious intelligence. So that at the time of the union there were four such magazines—two in the maritime provinces, one in the province of Ontario, and one in the province of Quebec. Three of these had outlived more than a quarter of a century. The General Assembly agreed that there should be but one periodical for the whole Church, issued under its sanction, to be called *The Presbyterian Record*, and to be published monthly in the city of Montreal, at the rate of twenty-five cents per copy per annum. The first number of this periodical was published in January, 1876. Before the close of the year it had attained a circulation of 36,000 copies monthly.

5. A few ministers of the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland refused to enter into the union with the Canada Presbyterian Church, and, after the union was consummated, declared themselves to constitute the Synod in connection with the Church of Scotland. This synod met in Montreal in June, 1876. The Rev. David Watson was appointed moderator. Trustees were appointed for the various funds of the synod, and the usual committees were also appointed. A petition was presented from the congregation of West King, praying for ordinances in connection with the Church of Scotland, and complaining of the proceedings which had resulted in their being deprived of their Church property. A list was presented of congregations in similar circumstances. It was agreed that a commission with synodical powers be appointed to watch such cases, and, if that were called for, to appoint a deputation to proceed to Edinburgh and attend the next General Assembly, or the meetings at any time of the Colonial Committee of the Church of Scotland. See, besides the article in Blaikie, *Sketch of the Presb. Church throughout the World*, p. 49 sq., the references at the end of the article PRESBYTERIANISM.

19. PRESBYTERIAN CHURCHES OF COLONIES OF THE BRITISH EMPIRE.—Besides the above in Canada, there are the following. In the account of these we chiefly follow the report of the late Pan-Presbyterian Council of Edinburgh, which we have largely used in the preceding details:

1. *Australian Presbyterian Church.*—In 1836, while this country was still used for penal colonization, the Presbyterian doctrine found its exponent in Victoria in the person of the Rev. Mr. Clow, a retired chaplain of a Highland regiment. In 1838 a missionary preacher

was sent by the Church of Scotland to Melbourne, and soon others went over, and, until 1846, Presbyterianism in this colony was wholly dependent on the Kirk. After the discovery of gold in 1851, and the consequent rapid settlement of the colony, the Irish Presbyterian Church sent a number of ministers; and, by 1859, when a union of the different Presbyterian churches was proposed, there were congregations representing the regular Kirk, the Free Church, and the United Presbyterian, besides many smaller bodies. A complete union of all these various Presbyterians was finally effected in 1867, on the abolition of state aid.

The Presbyterian Church in Victoria has been formed on the Scottish model. In all its distinctive principles it remains loyal to the parent Church. While it has asserted an independent position for itself, it has adopted the Westminster Confession and Catechisms, and the Second Book of Discipline, as its standards. Some variations have been admitted on administration. For example—(1.) The General Assembly is not a representative body. (2.) The Commission, which meets six months after the Assembly, deals not only with matters sent to it, but with all matters of which due notice has been given; but its decisions in these latter are subject to review by the next General Assembly. (3.) It has no synods. (4.) And no deacons' courts. The secular affairs are intrusted to a committee elected by the congregation, one half of whom retire every year. (5.) Adherents as well as communicants are allowed to vote for the first minister of a newly formed congregation. (6.) The use of hymns and of instrumental music has been allowed, and congregations have almost without exception, and with wonderful unanimity, availed themselves of the allowance. The hymn-book of the English Presbyterian Church has been sanctioned and recommended. (7.) Further, the Assembly has sanctioned a "Book of Prayers for Social Worship," which has been compiled with the view of assisting Christian men in the bush to hold service where a minister is not available.

The following statistics will give an approximate view of the present numerical and financial state of the Church:

Presbyterian population	130,000
Pastoral charges	145
Ministers settled in pastoral charges	122
Unattached ministers supplying vacancies and new stations	19
Elders	400
Attending divine service	60,000
Communicants	15,000
Churches (besides halls and school-houses)	234
Sittings in churches	38,000
Sabbath-schools	264
Teachers	2,100
Scholars	23,000
Bible classes	73
Scholars	1,800
Income for all purposes, 1875-76	£80,000
Capital funds held in trust for various schemes	£60,632

The schemes of the Church embrace two departments, ministerial and missionary:

(I.) *Ministerial.*—In order to make suitable provision for the ministry, the following funds have been established—(*a.*) A capital fund for the endowment and support of a theological hall, established in 1865, with four chairs—Systematic Theology, Apologetics, Church History, and Exegetics—held provisionally by four ministers of the Church, and attended by fifteen students, of whom five are studying with a view to mission work. £50,000 will be required for the endowment of these four chairs. £14,000 are now in the hands of the Church, yielding an annual revenue of £900. Two university scholarships of £50 and £25 respectively have been founded for intending theological students, and two theological scholarships of the same amounts. But the larger of these is not confined to Presbyterian students. It is open to all denominations. The Assembly raises additional scholarships, when needed, by subscription. (*b.*) A sustentation fund, for the more adequate support of the ministry, aims at securing a *minimum* stipend of £300 to every minister. Congregations lodge their moneys monthly in the post-office savings bank. Their ministers draw the deposits once a quarter to the extent of £300 a year. The balance that remains undrawn, if any, accrues to the general sustentation fund, which is distributed among ministers whose stipend falls short of the minimum, with the proviso, however, that no congregation receives more than £50. Last year 38 out of 122 ministers participated in the fund. The income was derived from the following sources: Congregational subscriptions, £866; donations of £100 each from eight gentlemen, £800; small donations and legacy, £374; interest from savings bank, £35, in all £2075. (*c.*) A capital fund, for the support of aged and infirm ministers; instituted not only in the interest of ministers, but as emphatically of congregations, to relieve them, in some measure, at least, from a very painful burden, and to insure their enjoying the ministrations of men in the prime and vigor of life. It is raised by voluntary contributions, and by a payment of £25, spread over five years, from every minister. The allowance is £50 per annum, with £2 for every year beyond five that the annuitant has held a charge. (*d.*) A fund for the support of the widows and orphans of deceased ministers, raised by a minister's rate of £5 per annum, and an annual congregational collection. In 1876 these two sources of income yielded £990. Interest on capital, £1063; in all £2053. Annuities to twenty widows and twenty-four orphans, £965. The annuity is £50, with £10 for each child below eighteen. The latter sum is doubled when both parents are dead. By these respective agencies provision is made for the ministry in its four stages—when training for work, when at work, when past work, and when finally done with work.

(II.) *Missionary.*—Comprised under two branches—home and heathen missions: (*a.*) The home mission is charged with—(1) securing a supply of ministers; (2) admitting accredited ministers from other churches; (3) assisting presbyteries in supplying vacancies; and (4) fostering mission-stations. As the Church, in planting itself in a new land, is essentially a home mission, and as the demand for ministers has always been ahead of the supply, little has been attempted outside its own community. One or two of the larger congregations have, however, been vigorously prosecuting, while others are commencing, territorial work at their own hand. The committee have received generous assistance from the home churches in the way of ministerial supply. But the need is by no means abated. At this moment at least twelve men are urgently required. (*b.*) The heathen mission embraces three departments: (1.) The Chinese, of whom there are about 17,000 in Victoria. They are scattered in groups of two or three hundred over the colony. They are generally of an inferior type, but are very accessible to the teachings of the Gospel, which are given them at various points by the Christian churches. The Presbyterian Mission has taken the form for the present of a seminary for training Chinese catechists. It is conducted by one of the ministers of the Church, assisted by Mr. Cheong, a Chinese student. (2.) The Aborigines, now reduced to about 1600. Charles Kingsley and others have put the natives of Australia at the bottom of the scale of rational beings, "if indeed they are entitled to be called men." It seemed as if they were likely to furnish a link in the ascending development of humanity. The Presbyterian Mission at Rosmali has exploded this notion. It is under the charge of two Moravian brethren, and furnishes delightful proofs of the elevating influence of Christianity even upon the most degraded savage, while the children of the school have outstripped all their competitors in the State schools of Victoria. (3.) The New Hebrides, in conjunction with other churches in Scotland, Canada, and Nova Scotia. The Presbyterian Church of Victoria maintains a contingent of two

missionaries on this interesting field. The children of the Sabbath-schools are pledged to collect £500 per annum for the maintenance of the *Day-spring*, mission-ship. The total contributions to the home and heathen missions in 1876 amounted to £2220. The capital invested funds of the Church, Sept. 30, 1876, were as follows:

1. Theological Hall endowment	£14,220
2. Ormond and Patrick Hamilton scholarships	2,000
3. Rokewood Church endowment	1,000
4. Infirm Ministers' Fund	8,209
5. Widows and Orphans' Fund	18,203
6. Brodie Bequest (Home-mission work)	2,000
7. Loan Fund for church and manse building (being the accumulation of five years' state aid).	15,000
Total	£60,632

There are two colleges in connection with this Church —one for boys, under the principalship of Dr. Morison, which has run a long and prosperous career; the other for girls, under the charge of the Rev. George Tait, was but recently opened.

2. *Presbyterian Church of New South Wales.* — In 1802 about a dozen Presbyterian families, living on the banks of the Hawkesbury River, resolved to meet for the worship of God according to the forms of their fathers, though they had no minister. A Mr. James Mein ministered to them as catechist. At a cost of £400 they built a church, which bears the appropriate name of Ebenezer. In 1823 Dr. Lang went to the colony, the first Presbyterian minister. Considerable additions were made thereafter, but the history of the Church was not harmonious, and various divisions took place. At length, in 1865, a general union took place, through the amalgamation of separate bodies corresponding to the Church of Scotland, the Free Church, and the United Presbyterian; the new body being called "The Presbyterian Church of New South Wales."

According to the articles of union the Word of God is the supreme and only authoritative rule of faith and practice for the Church; the Westminster Confession of Faith, Larger and Shorter Catechisms, the Form of Presbyterial Church Government, the Directory for the Public Worship of God, and the Second Book of Discipline, are the subordinate standards of this Church; explanations are then given as to the relative authority of the subordinate standards, the renunciation of intolerant principles, and the recognition of the spiritual independence of the Church; the jurisdiction of the Church is declared to be independent of other churches, and ministers and probationers from other Presbyterian churches are admissible if they afford satisfactory evidence of their qualifications and eligibility, and on their subscribing the formula. The Church has prospered since the union, but not in proportion to the growth of the colony. It now consists of 7 presbyteries, 68 ministers, 70 charges, and 108 church-buildings. It has schemes for Church Extension, Foreign Missions, Sabbath-schools, Sustentation Fund, and Church and Manse Fund; its foreign missions are to the New Hebrides and the Chinese; it has three theological tutors, and its estimated total income for 1875 was £15,000. The minimum stipend is £200 with, or £250 without, a manse. It is expected that £300 will now be reached through the Sustentation Fund. The legislature having passed an act for the establishment of denominational colleges affiliated to the University of Sydney, St. Andrew's Presbyterian College has sprung into existence. It affords a home for young men attending the university, and the means of theological education for students of divinity. The General Assembly has enacted that after 1878 none but graduates shall be admitted as candidates for the office of the ministry.

Mission Work. — Three classes are recognised: the aborigines, the Polynesian tribes, and the Chinese in the gold-fields. The aborigines are so widely scattered that efforts among them have been chiefly desultory. A devoted Chinese catechist labors successfully among his countrymen at Sydney. The New Hebrides Mission has a share of support from this Church, which at one time supported the Rev. James D. Gordon, who, after returning to Eromanga, was murdered in 1872.

3. *The Synod of Eastern Australia* is formed of those who stood aloof from the general union of 1865, on the ground that Free-Church principles were not sufficiently maintained. It consists of two presbyteries, having nine ministers and charges.

4. *Presbyterian Church of Queensland.*—In 1859 the district of Moreton Bay was declared a separate colony, called Queensland. The first Presbyterian minister had arrived in 1847. In 1863 the separate congregations belonging to the different sections of Presbyterianism united as "The Presbyterian Church of Queensland." The basis of union was the Westminster Confession, and all the Presbyterian congregations in the colony were embraced. There are 3 presbyteries, 24 charges, and 20 ministers. The General Assembly meets the first Monday of May. There are committees for Sabbath-schools (2410 scholars), Home Mission and Church Extension, Sustentation, Training Young Men for the Ministry, and the Support of Aged and Infirm Ministers. The Presbyterian population of the colony is 22,000. The annual contributions are about £9000.

5. *Presbyterian Church of Tasmania.* — The first Presbyterian minister arrived at Hobart Town in 1822 or 1823. In 1835 there was constituted the Presbytery of Van Diemen's Land, and the Scotch Church was placed on an equality with the English. In 1845 an attempt was made by the bishop of the English Church in Van Diemen's Land to obtain authority over all the inhabitants, but the Presbyterians succeeded in checking this, and in getting a rule recognised limiting the power of the English bishop in these colonies to the superintendence of his own clergy. The Presbyterian Church has not been equally prosperous in this as in other colonies, and there is still a division in the ranks. The Presbytery of Tasmania and the Free Presbytery of Tasmania indicate this division. There are 17 charges in all, and 13 ministers.

6. *Presbyterian Church of South Australia.* — The first Presbyterian Church began in Adelaide in 1839, and for some years ministers from the different Presbyterian bodies continued to drop in. In 1865 a union was effected. There are now 11 ministers and 13 charges. Union College is supplied by an Independent professor of Church history; a Baptist, of the Greek Testament; and a Presbyterian, of theology.

7. *New Zealand Presbyterian Church.*—Presbyterianism was first planted here about the year 1840; at least the first minister went there then. The Church has made good progress, and has been geographically divided into *The Presbyterian Church of New Zealand* and *The Presbyterian Church of Otago.* In 1876 the Church in the northern section had 7 presbyteries, 57 ministers in charges, and 4 unattached. The Otago branch, founded in 1848 by a Free Church colony from Scotland, had 45 ministers, but in both sections there is a great demand for more. Besides the ministers there are a considerable number of evangelists who strive in some degree to make up for the want of a stated ministry. The New Zealand Churches present the same interesting spectacle as other young colonial churches, striving after an organization on the model of Scotland, and having committees and schemes organized for that purpose. Much has been done by the Presbyterian Church for general education, and the chair of moral philosophy in the University of Otago was endowed by them. The effort to obtain a well-educated ministry is conspicuous in its struggles, and in Otago a beginning has been made of a theological institution, and a professor of divinity and various tutors appointed. In other parts of the colony efforts have likewise been made to supply an educated ministry. But the difficulties in this direction have been great; many Presbyterians have joined other churches, and little has been done by the churches at home. Much is done in the way of Sunday-schools. Young Men's Christian Asso-

ciations abound. Some congregations do little or nothing for missions; others are much interested in them. The New Hebrides Mission receives a good share of help, and recently something has been attempted for Fiji. There are committees for Sustentation, Church Extension, Mission, Temperance, Psalmody, and similar objects in both sections of the Church, betokening no small amount of activity and earnestness.

8. *Presbyterian Church in South Africa.*—When the Cape became an English colony in 1804, an application was made to the Church of Scotland for ministerial supply, and in 1822 and following years eleven ministers joined the Cape Church. In 1860 eight more Scotch ministers joined this Dutch Reformed body. There are, besides, nine Independent Presbyterian congregations in Cape Colony and Natal, numbering about 1000 members.

9. *Other Colonial Churches.*—In connection with the Church of Scotland, there are:

	Congregations.	Ministers.
In South America	14	13
In West Indies	4	4
In Ceylon	9	8

Connected with the Free Church of Scotland are:

	Congregations.	Ministers.
In South Africa	5	3
In Natal	4	3
In other places	10	9

10. *Presbyterian Church in Japan.*—This body was organized in 1878 by a union of all Presbyterian missionaries in Japan. For doctrine, the Westminster Catechism, the canons of the Synod of Dort, the Shorter Catechism, and the Heidelberg Catechism were adopted. The constitution of the American Presbyterian Church was chosen as the model for administration.

See, besides the works already quoted in different sections of this article, Smith, *Tables of Church History;* Gardner, *Faiths of the World,* vol. ii; *The American Cyclop.* xiii, 809 sq.; Schem, *Cyclop. of Education,* s. v.; Marsden, *History of Christian Churches and Sects,* ii, 109 sq.; and Blaikie's *Report,* all of which we have freely used.

Presbyterianism, in its narrowest sense, is commonly understood as the synonym of Anti-Prelacy. But, in truth, there are three systems of religious opinion, by no means necessarily affiliated, which are, with a noticeable uniformity, found in combination under this name. These are, a Calvinistic theology, the Parity of the Clergy, and Pædobaptism. See PRESBYTERIAN CHURCHES. All branches of Presbyterianism organized themselves into a *Presbyterian Alliance* in London in 1875 on the basis of the Concensus of Reformed Confessions and Presbyterian government, and held the first council at Edinburgh in 1877. The next will convene in Philadelphia in 1880.

I. *Doctrines.*—The doctrines espoused by Presbyterians, in Great Britain and America, are found in the Confession of Faith of the Westminster Assembly of Divines, together with the Catechisms, Larger and Shorter, thereto appended. As a system, they are the doctrines generally known as Augustinian or Calvinistic. Presbyterians coincide with other orthodox bodies in the reception of the Apostles' Creed, the Trinity, Redemption through Christ, Regeneration by the Holy Spirit, the Resurrection, and Eternal Judgment. They are distinguished specifically by opposition to Arminian, Pelagian, and semi-Pelagian tenets. The decisions of the Synod of Dort on the "five points" of Predestination, Particular Atonement, Original Sin, Special Grace, and the Perseverance of the Saints, have usually been acknowledged as setting forth their views. But while there is a substantial unity on these points, there are shades of difference, from High or Hyper Calvinism to Moderate Calvinism; from Supralapsarianism to Sublapsarianism; from Hopkinsianism to Baxterianism; from the unbending Covenanters to the laxer Cumberlands; from the strict Old School with Scottish predilections to the more flexible New School with New England leanings. Though consenting to be called Calvinistic for purposes of convenience, Presbyterians do not receive all Calvin's views without qualification; neither do they admit that they owe their system to the Genevese reformer, for they claim for it a higher antiquity, reaching even beyond the great champion Augustine to no less an authority than St. Paul. They assert that the Reformers of the 16th century were agreed upon the points named, as appears from the harmony of the Augsburg Confession, the Heidelberg Catechism, the Helvetic Confession, the Scotch Confession, the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England, the French Confession presented to Francis II, the Belgic Confession, and the Decrees of the Synod of Dort in 1618.

The Westminster Confession, rejecting the Apocrypha, recognises Holy Scripture as the only infallible rule of faith and practice. Hence every position is supported by proof-texts. The Confession teaches that there are in the godhead three persons, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, the same in substance, equal in power and glory. To God are ascribed the works of creation, providence, and redemption. Man having fallen, the Covenant of Works is replaced by the Covenant of Grace, of which Christ is the Mediator and Administrator for his elect people. Divine sovereignty and man's free agency are both fully and equally admitted, without attempting to explain this high mystery, but rather requiring it to be handled with special providence and care. The doctrine of the Divine Purpose, Decree, Predestination, or Fore-ordination, is guarded from fatalism or perversion in several ways: it is explicitly stated that neither is God the author or approver of sin; nor is violence offered to the will of the creature; nor is the liberty or contingency of second causes taken away, but rather established; and they who perish are punished for their sins. The Covenant of Works having been broken by the first man, who was the federal head, representative, and root of his race, a consequent corruption of nature, a disability of the will to spiritual good, and a liability to suffering and death, temporal and eternal, were conveyed to all his posterity. Effectual calling consists in the special grace of God operating on the minds and hearts of all those whom he has predestinated to eternal life, in the reception of which grace men are passive, yet submit most freely, being made willing by his power. Elect infants dying in infancy, and other elect persons who are incapable of the outward call, are nevertheless regenerated and saved by Christ through the Spirit, who worketh when, where, and how he pleaseth. That all infants dying in infancy come under the above conditions and are saved is a general sentiment of Presbyterians, so far as can be collected from their published writings. (See Chalmers, *Rom.* lect. xiv, xxvi; Cumming, *Infant Salv.* p. 25; Smyth, *Bereaved Parents,* p. 13; Junkin, *Justification,* p. 143; Hodge, *System of Theology* [see Index].) Justification consists, not in inherent righteousness, nor in imputing the act of faith or any other act as righteousness, but in the pardon of sin for Christ's sake, and the accepting as righteous by imputing the righteousness of Christ received by faith. Adoption and sanctification accompany justification. Saving faith is a fiducial belief of the truth, and is shown to be sincere and active by repentance and good works, as evidential of regenerating grace. The perseverance of the saints is not owing to anything in them, but to the grace of God, which will not suffer them finally to fall away. Personal assurance does not belong to the essence of faith, and may be dimmed or lost, but it is a high privilege, and every believer should strive to attain it. It does not lead to laxity of morals, for the law, though no longer a covenant of works, is still binding as a rule of life and conduct.

II. *Worship.*—The Presbyterian forms of worship are extremely simple. The reading of a portion of Scripture, extemporaneous prayers, the singing of two or three psalms or hymns, a sermon or exhortation, and the pronouncing of the apostolic benediction at the close by the minister, comprise the entire service.

When no preacher is present, the people conduct the meeting themselves, an elder presiding and directing the several parts of reading, prayer, and praise. Nothing can be simpler or more flexible, capable of adapting itself to the necessities of the missionary or the street-preacher, as well as to the wants of the most cultivated audiences. But while the Presbyterian Church neither uses nor condemns a liturgy, she provides for the dignity and propriety of divine service by means of a Directory for Public Worship as a guide, and by requiring ministers to qualify themselves for this duty, no less than for that of preaching, by reading, premeditation, and habitual communion with God in secret.

Presbyterians keep the Sabbath-day strictly as a day of rest and devotion; but they have conscientious scruples against the obligatory observance of such days as Christmas, Good-Friday, and Easter. The key to their practice in this and other respects (as declining to bow at the name of Jesus, avoiding the sign of the cross in baptism and its form in church architecture, refusing sponsors and confirmation, not marrying with a ring, discountenancing clerical vestments, etc.) is to be found in the adoption by the early Presbyterians of the principle that nothing is allowable in divine worship but what is divinely commanded, in opposition to the principle that everything is allowable except what is forbidden, and only two sacraments are recognised as of divine warrant—baptism and the Lord's Supper. Dipping or immersion is not in so many words forbidden, but is pronounced not necessary, and the ordinance is considered to be rightly administered by pouring or sprinkling —purification, not burial, being the idea symbolized thereby. The infant children of one or both believing parents have a right to baptism in virtue of the Abrahamic covenant, which, being anterior to Moses, was unaffected and unrepealed by the abrogation of the Mosaic law. Baptism being regarded as a public Church ordinance, private baptisms, except in cases of absolute necessity, are discouraged. The Lord's Supper is only a commemoration with bread and wine, and the idea of a sacrifice or of the real presence is carefully repudiated. At the same time, the spiritual presence of Christ, his special nearness to worthy receivers, and a peculiar blessing are as strongly maintained. To avoid the appearance of adoration of the elements, as well as better to conform to the supposed original posture of the apostles, this sacrament is taken sitting, either in the adjacent pews or around long tables provided for the purpose. To this ordinance such only are admitted as have on profession of their faith in Christ been received into the membership of the Church by the session, or such other persons as are known to be in good Church standing elsewhere. During the field-preaching of the Scottish Reformation period and subsequently, several neighboring congregations often joined together to observe the communion. On such occasions there were several successive celebrations of the Supper, called the first, second, or third "table," and so on. A small pewter token bearing a certain number was given to each worshipper, and specified the table or service at which its bearer was expected to communicate. Settled congregations thus came to employ the token in their own services. Latterly the token has been replaced by a card on which the communicant writes his name and address, keeping in this manner the pastor aware of his residence. This using of a card at the same time exhibits the Presbyterian opposition to *open* or indiscriminate communion, while the welcome given to members of other evangelical churches shows equally opposition to *close* communion, so that the doctrine of the Church is that of *restricted* communion, restricting or confining this privilege to brethren of known Christian character.

III. *Government.*—Presbyterianism is the government of elders, being derived from the Greek πρεσβύτερος, presbyter, or elder. It is conceived to be analogous to the eldership of the Hebrews, the δημογερόντες of the Greeks, the *senatus* of the Romans, and the aldermen or eldermen of the Anglo-Saxons, and, so, to be founded in the necessities, instincts, and common-sense of human nature as well as in Scripture itself. Presbyterians acknowledge no other head of the Church than Christ. Instead of recognising, like episcopacy, a *bishop* as different from and superior to *presbyter*, and maintaining a distinction of ranks among the ministers of religion, it holds, on the contrary, that both in Scripture and the constitution of the Primitive Church *bishop* and *presbyter* are convertible terms, and that there is complete equality in point of office and authority among those who preach and administer the sacraments, however they may differ in age, abilities, or acquirements. The argument as between the *Presbyterians* and *Episcopalians* is treated in the articles Bishop and Presbyter, and as between the *Presbyterians* and *Congregationalists*, or *Independents*, in the articles Elder and Ordination.

According to the views of Presbyterians, there ought to be three classes of officers in every completely organized Church — viz. at least one teaching elder, the bishop or pastor, a body of ruling elders, and deacons. The first is designed to minister in word and doctrine and to dispense the sacraments, the second to assist in the inspection and government of the congregation, and the third to manage its financial affairs. They disallow all jurisdiction or interference on the part of the civil magistrate, except for protection. They are no less jealous of ecclesiastical encroachments, and boldly assert that synods and councils may err, and have erred; that all Church power is only ministerial and declarative; that no Church judicatory has the right to make laws to bind the conscience by virtue of its own authority; that God alone is lord of the conscience; and that the right of private judgment is universal and inalienable. They maintain the parity of the clergy, and protest against prelacy or episcopacy, or the one-man power, as a usurpation finding no warrant in the writings of the apostles or of those of the early fathers nearest to their time. They no less disapprove of the opposite extreme of Independency, or the complete autonomy of each separate congregation. They view the whole collection of believers as one body, constituting the universal or catholic Church (meaning by "catholic" not confined to one nation, as before under the law), though distributed into particular congregations for the purpose of meeting together more conveniently.

Though Presbyterian churches hold the doctrine of a parity of ministers, they have, when fully organized, a gradation of Church courts for the exercise of government and discipline, and the Presbyterian system is thus further distinguished from others by this ascending series of appellate courts. The first or lowest court is the Church Session, consisting of the pastor and ruling elders chosen by a particular congregation. The elders are chosen and ordained for life, although, either of their own motion or that of the people, they may resign and cease to be acting elders. The next court above is the Presbytery, which is the only ordaining body, meeting twice or oftener in the year, and consisting of all the ministers and one elder from each Church session within a given district. The Synod, which meets but once a year, comprises a number of adjacent presbyteries (those within a state, for instance), and is composed of all the ministers, and one elder from each Church session, within those bounds. (For the peculiar authority and character of the synods in the state establishments of the Continent, see the article Synod.) The General Assembly, which meets annually, is the fourth and highest court in order, and embraces all the presbyteries in the connection. It is entirely a delegated body, composed of an equal proportion of ministers and ruling elders elected by the presbyteries to represent them, the ratio being determined by the size of the body, and care being taken to prevent its becoming unwieldy. Each superior court or judicatory has the constitutional right of reviewing and controlling, confirming or reversing, the doings and decisions of the court below. A mooted

question or a judicial case may thus be removed successively from one court to another, till the collective wisdom of the whole Church, represented in the court of final resort, free from local prejudices or partialities, has an opportunity of deciding upon it. The General Assembly enjoys also, through its trustees, directors, boards, or committees, a general jurisdiction over the common finances, theological seminaries, foreign and domestic missions, education for the ministry, publication, church building, and correspondence with foreign churches.

It only remains to add that though Presbyterians maintain that truth is in order to goodness, and are tenacious of what they understand to be the teaching of Scripture, they are, at the same time, neither bigoted nor exclusive, and to represent them as such they consider unfair in the extreme. They do not unchurch other denominations, but are ready to extend the hand of fellowship wherever they discern substantial truth and the image of Christ. Their standards explicitly say, "We embrace in the spirit of charity those Christians who differ from us, in opinion or practice, on these subjects. . . . There are truths and forms with respect to which men of good character and principles may differ; and in all these they think it the duty, both of private Christians and societies, to exercise mutual forbearance towards each other" (*Form of Gov.* bk. i, ch. i, p. 8). See Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doct.* ii, 178; Schaff, *Harm. of the Ref. Conf.* (1877); Lewis, *Presb. Manual, containing Forms for the Records of the Session Presbytery and Synod, and the Judicial and other Ecclesiastical Proceedings required by the Polity of the Presb. Church;* Shedd, *Hist. of Doctrines* (see Index); Neander, *Hist. of Dogmas* (see Index); *Hist. of the Westminster Assembly; Hist. of Confessions;* Miller, *on Presbyterianism;* Smyth, *Works and Tracts on Presbyterianism;* Schaff, *Creeds of Christendom*, vol. iii; and the *Theol. Index* by Malcom, p. 378–380. (E. H. G.)

Presbyterians, a name derived from the peculiar Church government which is advocated (see PRESBYTER and PRESBYTERIANISM), designates a large body of Protestant Christians, not bound together in one large denomination, but associated in independent churches. As, however, the term Congregationalist embraces not merely the denomination which assumes that title, but also those whose principles of government are the same though their doctrines may be diverse, as the Baptists, the Christians or Campbellites, the Unitarians, etc., so the term Presbyterian properly embraces all those that accept the Presbyterian principles of government, even though there be some differences in their theological beliefs. All Protestant or Reformed churches may in general be said to be divided into three classes—those who hold to government by or through bishops, i. e. to an Episcopal government; those who hold to government directly by the members of the Church without the mediation of any representatives, i. e. to a Congregational or Independent form of government; and those who hold to government by a board of elders or presbyters, i. e. to a Presbyterian form of government. Presbyterianism, variously modified, is the form of Church government observed by many Protestant churches, but is most perfectly developed in Britain and America. In Britain it prevails chiefly in Scotland, although during the Commonwealth in the 17th century it was for a very short time in the ascendant in England also. In the "General Presbyterian Council" held at Edinburgh in July, 1877, the German state establishments and the French and Dutch Reformed churches, as well as other bodies that admit of certain features of Presbyterianism in government, were represented; and Dr. Blaikie, in his *Report on Presbyterian Churches*, which was submitted and approved by the Pan-Presbyterian Council at Edinburgh, treats of all these churches as Presbyterian bodies. In most, if not all of those churches, while there is a consistorial system that connects them with the state, giving the latter considerable control, there is also a true Presbyterian and synodal constitution. In virtue of the former, these churches have in some cases a general oversight of all matters affecting the moral and religious well-being of the community, and in the exercise of the latter they deal more especially with spiritual questions. This was substantially the system advocated by the Scottish Reformers, and still exhibited to some extent by the presence in the General Assembly of the Scottish Established Church of a representative of the sovereign called the lord high commissioner, authorized to bring its sessions at any time to a close should the proceedings conflict with the royal prerogatives — by the presence as members of the Assembly not only of elders chosen by the churches, but of elders appointed to be there by the town councils of such places as are possessed of royal charters, and hence called royal burghs, and by the wide range of social as well as of religious questions that it considers. In Presbyterian churches not connected with the state, whether in Great Britain, on the continent of Europe, in this country or elsewhere, the jurisdiction being over only their own members and civil representatives unknown, the discussions are confined to matters directly affecting the interests of religion, and a more purely spiritual type of Presbyterianism in consequence prevails. See the articles BELGIUM; BOHEMIA; FRANCE; HOLLAND; HUNGARY; ITALY; PRUSSIA; RUSSIA; SPAIN; SWITZERLAND. The French consistorial system is more nearly Presbyterian than the German, and is not perfectly so only from the pressure of the civil power. In other churches, also, as well as in the Protestant Church of France, Presbyterianism is more or less modified by the relations of the Church to the State. See REFORMED CHURCHES.

The Presbyterians are for the most part Calvinistic in doctrine. They generally accept the Westminster Assembly's Confession of Faith as their symbol of belief, and every minister in the Presbyterian Church of the United States is required to declare his personal belief in it as an embodiment of the truths taught in the Scriptures. They do not agree, however, in their interpretation of that standard, and are divided into strict Calvinists and moderate Calvinists. See CALVINISTS. This division in sentiment, combined with other circumstances, divided the Presbyterian Church of the United States into two bodies for a time, as we have already seen; but the division has been healed and a reunion effected, the theological differences having abated. See PRESBYTERIAN CHURCHES. The chief Presbyterian Church in America not Calvinistic is the Cumberland Presbyterian. There was at one time, however, a serious defection in England, many of the churches becoming Socinian in doctrine; but the Unitarian churches in England at the present day are nearly all Congregational in their polity. Calvin is generally regarded as the founder of Presbyterianism; but it should be borne in mind that government by a board of elders was maintained by certain bodies, as the Waldensians, from a very early age. Of course, we are ready to grant that he adopted the form known as Presbyterianism because he believed it to be "founded on and agreeable to the Word of God." Calvin may be regarded as the founder of Presbyterianism in the sense that he was the first to organize the Reformed Church on a Presbyterian model, just as he was the first to frame the Reformed faith of Southern Europe in a clear, distinct, and affirmative form. Says Blaikie: "It is not correct to say that Calvin originated the Presbyterian system. But in connection with it he rendered very essential service both in theory and in practice; he unfolded the idea more lucidly than it had been set forth before, and with much struggle he set it in actual operation in Geneva. What he thus established became the model on which the Reformed Church in France and other countries was formed" (*Report*, p. 7).

The tables on the following page are from Blaikie's *Report*.

1.—Continent of Europe.	Parishes or Charges.	Ministers.
Germany (omitted, as not wholly Presbyterian).		
Switzerland	898	1038
France—		
Reformed Church	540	595
Union of Free Churches	46	46
Holland	1309	1583
Belgium	13	15
Christian Missionary Church	34	18
Italy—		
Vaudois	56	56
Free Italian	....	9
Hungary (including Transylvania)	2007	2017
Bohemia and Moravia	68	67
Russia	40	40
Spain	12	12
	5023	5496
2.—Great Britain.		
Scotland—		
Established Church	1493	1384
United Presbyterian Church	526	564
Free Church	1009	1068
Reformed Presbyterian	12	7
United Original Secession	41	23
Ireland—		
Irish Presbyterian Church	560	600
Reformed Presbyterian Church	41	31
England—Presbyterian Church	258	268
Wales	1098	522
	5038	4457
3.—British Colonies.		
Canada	1008	733
Australia—		
Victoria	145	141
New South Wales	70	68
Synod of Eastern Australia	9	9
Queensland	24	20
Tasmania	17	13
South Australia	13	11
New Zealand	70	61
Otago	50	45
South Africa	154	113
Miscellaneous	81	77
	1641	1291

4.—United States.	Parishes or Charges.	Ministers.	Elders.	Communicants.	S. S. Teachers.	S. S. Scholars.
Presb. Church, Northern	5077	4744	No rep.	535,210	No rep.	555,347
Presb. Church, Southern	1821	1004	5415	112,183	No rep.	67,384
United Presb.	783	640	No rep.	78,483	6985	58,839
Reformed (German)	1347	650	....	143,609	No rep.	88,256
Reformed (Dutch)	506	546	....	74,600	"	73,241
General Synod, Ref'd Presb.	55	24	....	....	"	....
Synod Reform'd Presb.	104	100	482	10,198	766	6,669
Associate Ref'd Synod of the South	100	80	....	6,000	No rep.	....
Associate Synod of N. America	39	12	....	1,155	"	....
Welsh Calvinistic Methodist	....	76	45	8,696	"	9,035
	9832	7876	5942	970,134	7751	858,771

MISSION CHURCHES.

ASIA.

Countries.	*Churches.*	*Ordained Missionaries (European or American).*
Syria	Presbyterian Church (U. S.)	13
	Irish Presbyterian Ch. "	2
	Reformed " " "	2
	Free Church of Scotland	1
Persia	Presbyterian Church (U. S.)	8
India	Presbyterian " "	36
	(Dutch) Reformed Ch. "	15
	United Presbyterian Church (U. S.)	—
	Free Church of Scotland	19
	United Presbyterian Ch. of Scotland	10
	Irish Presbyterian Church	10
	Established Church of Scotland	7
	Welsh Presbyterian Church	5
	Presbyterian Church of Canada	2
	Original Secession Church	1
Semi-Presbyterian:		
India	Basle Society	58
	Gossner's Mission	19
Syria	Chrischona Mission	2
Siam	Presbyterian Church (U. S.)	3
Japan	United Presbyterian Ch. of Scotland	8
	(Dutch) Reformed Church (U. S.)	13
	Presbyterian Church "	4
	Irish Presbyterian Church	1
China	Presbyterian Church (U. S.)	24
	(Dutch) Reformed Ch. "	7
	Southern Presb. Ch. "	2
	Established Church of Scotland	—
	English Presbyterian Church	15
	United Presbyterian Ch. of Scotland	3
	Presbyterian Church of Canada	2
	Irish Presbyterian Church	—
Semi-Presbyterian:		
	Basle Society	10
	Rhenish Missionary Society	4
Java and Neighboring Islands:		
	Netherlands Association	9
	" Reformed Miss. Assoc.	3
	" Missionary Society	4
	Utrecht Missionary Association	8
	Java Committee	4
Semi-Presbyterian:		
	Rhenish Missionary Society	22
New Guinea	Utrecht Missionary Society	2

AFRICA.

Algeria	United Presbyterian Ch. of Scotland	1
Egypt (Copts)	" " " (U. S.)	8
Cent. Africa	Free Church of Scotland	3
	Established Ch. "	—
W. Africa	Presbyterian Church (U. S.)	9
"	(Old Calabar)—	
	United Presbyterian Ch. of Scotland	4
"	(Senegal)—	
	Société des Missions Évan.	3
S. Africa (Natal):		
	Free Church of Scotland	2
"	(Kaffraria)—	
	Free Church "	14
	United Presb. "	7
	Société des Missions Évan.	15
	L'Église Libre du Canton de Vaud	2
Semi-Presbyterian:		
W. Africa	Basle Society	25
	North German Mission	6
S. Africa	Rhenish Missionary Society	34
	Berlin Missionary Society	47
Egypt	Chrischona Mission	3
Abyssinia	" "	4

AMERICA.

Indians: *Canada*—		
	Presbyterian Church of Canada	1
" *United States*—		
	Presbyterian Church (U. S.)	11
	Southern Presbyterian Church	7
Chinese: *California*—		
	Presbyterian Church (U. S.)	2
	United Presb. Ch. "	1
Among Roman Catholics:		
Mexico	Presbyterian Church (U. S.)	5
	Southern Presbyterian Church	1
Brazil, Chili, Colombia, Canada	Presbyterian Church (U. S.)	15
	Southern Presbyterian Church	4
	Presbyterian Church	—
Jamaica	United Presbyterian Ch. of Scotland	14
Trinidad	" " "	2
	Presbyterian Church of Canada	3
N. America	Moravian Church	4
West Indies and Surinam:		
	Moravian Church	79

POLYNESIA AND AUSTRALIA.

New Hebrides	Free Church of Scotland	3
	Presb. Ch. of Canada	4
	" " (Victoria)	2
	" " (Otago and Southland)	1
	" " (New Zealand)	1
Tahiti	Société des Missions Évan.	4
Australia (*Aborigines*):		
	Presbyterian Church (Victoria)	1
Semi-Presbyterian Churches and Societies:		
Australia (*Aborigines*):		
	Moravian Church	3

EUROPE.

Among Roman Catholics:		
Ireland	Irish Presbyterian Church	—
Spain	United Presbyterian Ch. of Scotland	2
	Spanish Evangel. Society, etc.	6
France, Brittany	Welsh Presbyterian Church	2
	Various Evangelical Soc. of France, which receive grants from British churches and individual members	—
Belgium	Société Évan. de Belgique	—
Italy	The Waldensian Church	30
	Free Italian Church	9
	Southern Presbyterian Church (U. S.)	1
Greek Christians	" " " "	3

JEWS.....Missions to the Jews are carried on by Established Church of Scotland, Free Church of Scotland, Reformed Presbyterian Church, Irish Presbyterian Church, English Presbyterian Church.

Presbyterium. (1.) A name sometimes given to the *bema*, or inner portion of an ancient church, because it was the place in which the presbyters sat and discharged their functions. See CHANCEL. (2.) The name also of the senate formed by the presbyters and deacons of the episcopal residence, with whom the bishop deliberated about the most important affairs of his diocese. Although the government of the Church was claimed by the episcopate, as inherited from the apostolate, yet the spirit of community, κοινωνία, which prevailed in the Church required that the bishop, when important business was to be transacted, should take the advice of the presbyters and deacons. The limits of the respective attributes, however distinctly they might be traced, were neglected where the common care of the interests of the Church made it desirable, and the superiority of the episcopal dignity stood the less in the way, as even the apostles, in their humility, had called themselves presbyters (1 Pet. v, 1, ὁ συμπρεσβύτερος; 2 John 1; 3 John 1, ὁ πρεσβύτερος). Irenæus gives the name of presbyters not only to the disciples of the apostles (Papias, in Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* iii, 39, even the apostles), but also to the bishops of his time (Iren. *Ep. ad Florin.* ap. Euseb. v, 20): ταῦτα τὰ δόγματα οἱ πρὸ ἡμῶν πρεσβύτεροι, οἱ καὶ Ἀποστόλοις συμφοιτήσαντες, οὐ παρέδωκάν σοι (Πολυκάρπος) ὁ μακάριος καὶ ἀποστόλικος πρεσβύτερος. Id. *Ep. ad Victor. ep. Rom.* (ap. Euseb. v, 24): Οἱ πρὸ Σωτῆρος πρεσβύτεροι, οἱ προστάντες τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἧς νῦν ἀφήγη Ἀνίκητον λέγομεν καὶ Πίον, Ὑγινόν τε καὶ Τελέσφορον καὶ Ξύστον. According to the literal meaning of presbyter, it applies to men rather advanced in years. The languages of all nations show us that the members of such assemblies were chosen from among persons of a certain age. (Xenophon [*Cyropæd.* 1, c. 2] speaks of οἱ γεραίτεροι ὄντες τε καὶ καλούμενοι. Livy [xxxiv, 49] says of the Carthaginians, "Seniores ita senatum vocabant." The Greeks had γερουσία, συνέδριον ἐν Σμύρνα, γερόντων; the Romans had their senatus; the Germans their aldermen. We find this counsellorship of the elders in the Greek translation of the Old Testament: [Deut. xi, 16] Sept. πρεσβύτεροι τοῦ λαοῦ καὶ γραμματεῖς; [Jer. xix, 1] ἀπὸ πρεσβυτέρων τοῦ λαοῦ καὶ ἀπὸ πρεσβυτέρων τῶν ἱερέων; [Ezek. viii, 11] ἑβδομήκοντα ἐκ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων οἴκου Ἰσραήλ; [1 Kings xii, 6, 8] τὴν βουλὴν τῶν πρεσβυτέρων; [xx, 8] οἱ πρεσβύτεροι καὶ πᾶς ὁ λαός.) The Jewish synedrium was also taken as a model (συνέδριον, i. e. college of judges, Sanhedrin); and it is expressly stated that the presbyterium is a copy of the "synedrium" of the apostles (εἰς τόπον συνεδρίου τῶν ἀποστόλων). St. Ignatius (110), who, more than any other writer, insists upon the distinction between the episcopate and presbyterate, and the superiority of the former, points out most decidedly the connection of the presbyterium, as an episcopal council, with the episcopate. We read in the *Ep. ad Smyrn.* c. 8: Πάντες τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ ἀκολουθεῖτε ὡς Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς τῷ πατρὶ καὶ τῷ πρεσβυτερίῳ ὡς τοῖς ἀποστόλοις τοὺς δὲ διακόνους ἐντρέπεσθε ὡς Θεοῦ ἐντολήν. *Ad Magnes.* c. 2: ὑποτάσσεται (ὁ διάκονος) τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ ὡς Χάριτι Θεοῦ καὶ τῷ πρεσβυτερίῳ ὡς νόμῳ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. *Ad Philad.* c. 4: μία γὰρ σὰρξ τοῦ κυρίου — καὶ ἓν ποτήριον εἰς ἕνωσιν τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ, ἓν θυσιαστήριον, ὡς εἷς ἐπίσκοπος ἅμα τῷ πρεσβυτερίῳ καὶ διακόνοις. *Ibid.* c. 8: Πᾶσιν μετανοοῦσιν ἄφιει ὁ κύριος, ἐὰν μετανοησώσιν εἰς ἑνότητα Θεοῦ καὶ συνέδριον τοῦ ἐπισκόπου. In all these passages we find the name πρεσβυτέριον; in other passages the father uses πρεσβύτεροι, although he means the presbyters united in a college, and not the same as individuals (*Ep. ad Polycarp.* c. 6): τῶν ὑποτασσομένων τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ, πρεσβυτέροις, διακόνοις. *Ad Philad. proœm:* ἐὰν ἐν ἑνὶ ὦσὶν σὺν τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ καὶ τοῖς σὺν αὐτῷ πρεσβυτέροις καὶ διακόνοις ἀποδειγμένους ἐν γνώμῃ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. *Ad Magnes.* c. 6: ἑνωθῆτε τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ καὶ τοῖς προκαθημένοις. *Ad Trall.* c. 3: Πάντες ἐντρεπεσθῆσαν τοὺς διακόνους ὡς ἐντολὴν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ τὸν ἐπίσκοπον ὡς Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν τοὺς δὲ πρεσβυτέρους ὡς συνέδριον Θεοῦ καὶ ὡς συνδεσμὸν ἀποστόλων. *Ad Magnes.* c. 6: Σπουδάζετε πάντα πράσσειν προκαθημένου τοῦ ἐπισκόπου εἰς τόπον Θεοῦ καὶ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων εἰς τόπον συνεδρίου τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ τῶν διακόνων — πεπιστευμένων διακονίαν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. Thus a natural want led to the foundation of the presbyterium, as a college of presbyters and deacons of the episcopal city, to advise the bishop in the most important ecclesiastical affairs of the diocese.

The form of this college had a positive model in the "synedrium" of the Old Testament, the judiciary competency of which was, in the presbyterium, increased by the addition of the most important questions of administration. Chrysostom (*De Sacerdot.* lib. iii, c. 15) calls the presbyterium τὸ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων συνέδριον. The purpose of the institution was to secure efficiency in the workings of the Church, as is proved by the phrase βουλὴ ἐκκλησίας Θεοῦ, by which Origen (*In Joann.*) designates the presbyterium. In this simple constitution the presbyters and deacons of the archiepiscopal city formed in the first five centuries the higher clergy, which, with its bishops, was considered as *one* body, as Thomassin says, *Vetus et Nova Ecclesiæ Disciplina* (Mogunt. 1787), iii, 32: "Ergo presbyteri diaconique civitatum episcopalium, qui clerus erat superior diœceseos — in unum corpus, in unum senatum consiliumque cum episcopo coibat, cum eoque principe et capite suo, clericis populisque diœceseos omnibus moderabatur." As this presbyterium forms the council of the bishop, it is said to be at the head of the Church, along with the bishop. Thus, in the Council of Antiochia, can. 1: "Si quis eorum, qui præsunt ecclesiæ, aut episcopus, aut presbyter, aut diaconus, εἴ τις τῶν προεστώτων." The Council of Sardica, can. 13, prohibits the elevation of neophytes to the highest dignities: to the episcopate, presbyterate, and diaconate; consequently to the governing clergy. In the œcumenical Council of Ephesus, pt. i, c. 31, 34, and act i, we find several letters of the bishop Cyril of Alexandria, addressed to the presbyters and deacons, and to the people of Alexandria. When pope Siricius prepared to condemn the heresy of Jovinian, he took the advice of his priests and deacons: "Facto ergo presbyterio constitit Christianæ legi esse contraria. Omnium nostrum, tam presbyterorum quam diaconorum, quam etiam totius cleri una suscitata fuit sententia." Pope Felix proclaimed his sentence against Petrus Enopheus, the unlawful bishop of Antioch, under the formula: "Firma sit hæc tua depositio a me et ab his, qui mecum apostolicum thronum regunt." The presbyters and deacons of Rome deliberated in the Roman synods with the bishops who happened to be at Rome on all matters which were of interest to the Roman see. In a Roman council under pope Hilary, the transmutation of a Spanish bishop being in question, the account says: "Residentibus etiam universis presbyteris, adstantibus quoque diaconibus;" and at the end of the council: "Ab universis episcopis et presbyteris acclamatum est, ut disciplina servetur, ut canones custodiantur, rogamus." The college of the cardinals is by the Romanists claimed to be a true picture of these presbyteries of the apostolic Church. If in the transaction of affairs concerning the Church in general the advice of the presbyteries was requested, this was still more natural where the special business of the several bishoprics was concerned. The fourth Council of Carthage prescribes, can. 22: "Ut episcopus sine consensu clericorum suorum clericos non ordinet;" and in can. 23: "Ut episcopus nullius causam audiat absque præsentia clericorum suorum. Alioqui

irrita erit sententia episcopi, nisi clericorum suorum *majorum* sententia confirmetur." St. Jerome says (*In Jesa*, 1, 3): "Et nos habeamus senatum nostrum, cœtum presbyterorum;" and Basil, *Ep.* 310, calls this senate *τὸ συνέδριον τοῦ πρεσβυτερίου τοῦ κατὰ τὴν πόλιν*. St. Cyprian transacted no business of any consequence without consulting his presbytery. In the matter of the fallen ones, he says: "Deinde sic collatione consiliorum cum episcopis, presbyteris, diaconis, confessoribus pariter astantibus laicis facta, lapsorum tractare rationem." In lib. iii, ep. 10: "Ad id vero, quod scripserunt compresbyteri nostri, solus rescribere nihil potui, cum a primordio episcopatûs mei statuerim, nihil sine consilio vestro et sine consensu plebis, me privatim sententia gerere. St. Ignatius (*Ep. ad Trallianos*) calls the presbyters the counsellors of the bishop: *σύμβουλοι καὶ συνεδρεύται τοῦ ἐπισκόπου εἰς τόπον συνεδρίου τῶν ἀποστόλων*. The difference between the presbyteries and the cathedral chapters, which were of later institution, is thus defined by Thomassin (c. 1, p. 36, nr. 8 sq.): "1. Non constabat clerus ille nisi presbyteris et diaconis. 2. Presbyteri et diaconi hi, parochi ipsi erant et pastores omnium civitatis ecclesiarum, aut si necdum essent divulsæ a cathedrali parochiæ, in eo ipsi parochorum munia omnia implebant. 3. Ipsa sua ordinatione hunc gradum et hunc dignitatem consequebantur. Nam presbyteratus et diaconatus peræque ac episcopatus beneficia erant, non ordines tantum; et id genus erant beneficia, quibus incumberet salutis animarum cura, pro suo certe modo. 4. Clerus etiam nunc Romanæ ecclesiæ formam præ se fert splendidissimam expressissimamque ejus cleri, qui olim singulis in cathedralibus ecclesiis episcopo copulabatur. Constat enim Romani pontificis clerus presbyteris, diaconisque cardinalibus, seu titularibus ecclesiarum omnium Romæ parochialium parochis, cum pontifice, et sub pontifice conspirantibus et collaborantibus Romano in consistorio, de negotiis omnibus, quæ ex pontificia spirituali ditione, ex universo, inquam, christiano orbe referuntur."

A consequence of the participation of the presbyters in the administration during the lifetime of the bishop was that they governed alone during the vacancy of the see. After the death of pope Fabian, the clergy of Rome wrote to the clergy of Carthage (*Ep.* 29 *ap. Cypr.*): "Omnes nos decet, pro corpore totius ecclesiæ, cujus per varias quasque provincias membra digesta sunt, excubare." Only the decisions about the most momentous concerns were postponed till after the new occupancy of the see. Thus the clergy of Rome say (*Ep.* 31): "Quanquam nobis differendæ hujus rei major necessitas incumbat, quibus post excessum Fabiani nullus est episcopus propter rerum et temporum difficultates constitutus;" and in another passage: "Ante constitutionem episcopi nihil innovandum putavimus, ut interim, dum episcopus dari a Deo nobis sustinetur, in suspensu eorum causa teneatur, qui moras possunt dilatione sustinere." It was the same when the bishop was for a longer period of time absent from his residence. Thus St. Ignatius says: "Pascite presbyteri eum, qui in vobis est, gregem, usquequo Dominus ostendat eum qui vobis principabitur." And St. Cyprian (*Ep.* 10) says to his presbyters and deacons: "Hortor et mando, ut vos vice mea, quem abesse oportet, fungamini circa ea gerenda quæ administratio religiosa deposcit;" and lib. iv, ep. 6: "Officium meum diligentia vestra præsentet, et faciat omnia, quæ fieri oportet circa eos," etc. Thus St. Hilarius, in his petition to the emperor Constantius, states that he has administered his diocese through his presbyters: "Licet in exilio permanens et ecclesiæ adhuc communionem per presbyteros meos distribuens." But at an early period the bishops commenced to appoint vicars for the despatch of all their business at the time of their absence. The institution of the old presbyteries melted organically into the cathedral chapters. St. Eusebius of Vercelli and St. Augustine, to promote Christian life in their presbyteries, had already given them monastical constitutions. Other cathedral churches imitated this arrangement; and in the empire of the Franks the institution of common life, after the model of the institutions founded by bishop Chrodegang of Metz, spread rapidly. In consequence of the confirmation of the rule proposed by the deacon Amalarius at the Council of Aix-la-Chapelle (816), the innovation was accepted in all episcopal churches. The bishops of those times, in imitation of those of the first centuries, did nothing of importance without their canons. We have an example of it in the business transacted concerning the lease of some real estate between Hincmar of Rheims and a Thuringian abbot. But if the cathedral chapter was the privileged part of the clergy in this respect, yet the bishop was free to take the advice of the other members both of the secular and regular clergy. Thus bishop Jonas of Autun, who wished to raise the income of his canons, insured the "consensum presbyterorum, diaconorum, ac totius sequentis ordinis ejusdem ecclesiæ." When, in the 10th century, the canonic common life was given up, the canons continued to form the senate of the bishop. According to the decretals, the canons are the born counsellors of the bishops. Calixtus II forbids archpriests and archdeacons to interdict clerks: "Præter episcopi et totius capituli commune consilium." Alexander III blames the patriarch of Jerusalem for appointing and deposing abbots and other prebendaries without consulting his chapter, and upon the mere advice of foreigners. Yet, as a rule, the bishop is not bound by the vote of the chapter, although there are questions which cannot be decided without its consent. The Council of Trent also, in sess. xxiv, c. 13, calls the cathedral chapter *the senate* of the bishop. He has to take its advice for the appointment of a lector of the Holy Scriptures (*Conc. Trid.* sess. v, c. 1); for the fixing of the holy orders, to be requested in those who are to be promoted to the dignities and canonries of the cathedrals (sess. xxiv, c. 12); for the establishment of seminaries (sess. xxiii, c. 18); for any addition to the number of the canonries (sess. xxiv, c. 15), etc. But the presumption is always in favor of the episcopal independence. Thus, when the chapters of the ecclesiastical province of Milan endeavored to increase to an unlawful extent the number of the *causæ majores*, in which the bishop has to obtain the consent or take the advice of the canons, St. Borromæus declared, in the fourth Council of Milan, that the bishop was bound to have the approbation or to take the advice of his chapter only in such cases as are stated by law. The litigations about these cases had become of quite frequent occurrence since the dissolution of the community of goods in the chapters, and the latter had often conducted themselves in regard to the bishop as independent corporations. In many places the bishop had become a simple member of the chapter. Up to the year 1803 the chapters of Germany held at the same time two sharply defined positions: they constituted, first, as of old, the senate of the bishop, and subordinate to him; and, secondly, they were independent corporations. The secularization of 1803 destroyed this latter position. The reorganization of the Church in Germany makes the chapter simply an episcopal council. The papal see has resolutely set its face against all pretensions of binding the bishops to the consent of the chapters.—Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* s. v. See Buss, *Gesch. des National u. Territorial-Kirchenthums in der Katholischen Kirche* (Schaffh. 1851).

Presbytery is (1) the space in the choir of a church in which the high-altar is placed; the name is sometimes extended to the whole choir. See CHANCEL. It is (2), in Scotch law, an ecclesiastical division of the country, as well as a court. (On the Continent this is known as the *classis*.) In its local sense it includes a combination of parishes, varying from four to thirty, and the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland has power to vary the size.—Chambers, s. v. See SCOTLAND, CHURCH OF. The presbytery is composed of the teaching elders of the churches of a given geographical

district, together with one of the ruling elders elected for that purpose by the Session from each church. Besides being a court of appeal from the inferior judicatory, it is bound to inspect carefully the personal conduct and pastoral labors of every minister within its bounds, and, when necessary, to admonish, suspend, or even depose. It belongs to presbyteries to grant licenses to preach the Gospel, to take cognizance of all preachers within its borders, to give certificates of character, etc., to those removing, and to furnish supplies where needed for the pulpit. Any Church member who feels himself aggrieved by the act of the Session may appeal from its decisions to the Presbytery. Superior in authority to the Presbytery is the *Synod*, which is composed of the teaching elders and one ruling elder from each church of a larger district than that represented by the Presbytery. Still above the Synod is the *General Assembly*. This embraces representatives, both lay and clerical, from every Presbytery, and is the supreme authority in all ecclesiastical matters. To it an appeal lies from the Presbytery in all ecclesiastical proceedings of a disciplinary character, and its decision is final. Its authority, however, though supreme, is not unlimited. In legislating for the churches it is required to refer the laws which it passes to the presbyteries for their approval; and the law does not become of binding force upon the churches until it receives the sanction of at least a majority; in certain cases two thirds are required. The Presbytery holds frequent and stated meetings, according as circumstances may require. In any emergency it is in the power of the *moderator* (q. v.), on his own responsibility, or on receiving a written requisition from several members, to call a *pro re nata* meeting of the Presbytery. In Presbyterian churches, where the supreme court consists of delegates, it belongs to each Presbytery to elect ministers and elders to represent them in that court. All the proceedings of the Presbytery must be duly minuted by the clerk, and are subject to the review of the Provincial Synod. See PRESBYTERIANISM.

Presbȳtis (*presbytress*). This word, in the various forms πρεσβύτερα, *presbytera*, *presbyterissa*, is of frequent occurrence in ancient writers, and denotes either the wife of a presbyter or a deaconess in the Church. Sometimes it denotes the matron of a cloister, and an abbess. See DEACONESS.

Prescience (Lat. *præscio*, to know before it happens) is an attribute of God popularly known under the term *Foreknowledge*, and ascribed to him in different degrees and extent by Arminians and Calvinists. The doctrine is deduced from the perfection of God's nature. But as man has no analogous faculty, it is difficult, if not impossible, for us to conceive of God's prescience. Man's knowledge of what is future is so obscure and inferential that it is in vain to fathom God's beholding of all things. Yet in the attempt made there arises the great question, how to reconcile the prescience of God with the liberty of man; and hence the doctrine becomes of vast importance to theologians of both the Arminian and the Calvinian schools.

I. *False Theories.*—Three leading theories have been resorted to in order to evade the difficulties which are supposed to be involved in the opinion commonly received.

1. Chevalier Ramsay (*Philosophical Principles of Natural and Revealed Religion* [Glasgow, 1748, 2 vols. 4to]), among his other speculations, holds it a matter of choice in God to think of finite ideas; and similar opinions, though variously worded, have been occasionally adopted. In substance these opinions are, that though the knowledge of God be infinite as his power is infinite, there is no more reason to conclude that his knowledge should be always exerted to the full extent of its capacity than that his power should be employed to the extent of his omnipotence; and that if we suppose him to *choose* not to know some contingencies, the infiniteness of his knowledge is not thereby impugned. To this it may be answered (1) that the infinite power of God is in Scripture represented, as in the nature of things it must be, as an infinite capacity, and not as infinite in act; but that the knowledge of God is, on the contrary, never represented there to us as a capacity to acquire knowledge, but as actually comprehending all things that are and all things that can be. (2) That the notion of God's choosing to know some things and not to know others supposes a reason why he refuses to know any class of things or events, which reason, it would seem, can only arise out of their nature and circumstances, and therefore supposes at least a partial knowledge of them, from which the reason for his not choosing to know them arises. The doctrine is therefore somewhat contradictory. But (3) it is fatal to this opinion that it does not at all meet the difficulty arising out of the question of the consistency of divine prescience and the free actions of men, since some contingent actions—for which men have been made accountable, we are sure—have been foreknown by God, because by his Spirit in the prophets they were foretold; and if the freedom of man can in these cases be reconciled with the prescience of God, there is no greater difficulty in any other case which can possibly occur.

2. A second theory is that, the foreknowledge of contingent events being in its own nature impossible, because it implies a contradiction, it does no dishonor to the divine Being to affirm that of such events he has, and can have, no prescience whatever, and thus the prescience of God as to moral actions being wholly denied, the difficulty in question is got rid of. To this the same answer must be given as to the former. It does not meet the case so long as the Scriptures are allowed to contain prophecies of rewardable and punishable actions. The great fallacy in the argument that the certain prescience of a moral action destroys its contingent nature lies in supposing that contingency and certainty are the opposites of each other. It is, perhaps, unfortunate that a word which is of figurative etymology, and which, consequently, can only have an ideal application to such subjects, should have grown into common use in this discussion, because it is more liable, on that account, to present itself to different minds under different shades of meaning. If, however, the term *contingent* in this controversy has any definite meaning at all, as applied to the moral actions of men, it must mean their freedom, and stands opposed, not to certainty, but to necessity. A free action is a voluntary one; and an action which results from the choice of the agent is distinguished from a necessary one in this, that it might not have been, or have been otherwise, according to the self-determining power of the agent. It is with reference to this specific quality of a free action that the term contingency is used: it might have been otherwise—in other words, it was not necessitated. Contingency in moral actions is, therefore, their freedom, and is opposed, not to certainty, but to constraint. The very nature of this controversy fixes this as the precise meaning of the term. The question is not, in point of fact, about the certainty of moral actions—that is, whether they *will* happen or not—but about the nature of them, whether free or constrained, whether they *must* happen or not. Those who advocate this theory care not about the certainty of actions simply considered, that is, whether they will take place or not: the reason why they object to a certain prescience of moral actions is this: they conclude that such a prescience renders them necessary. It is the quality of the action for which they contend, not whether it will happen or not. If contingency meant *uncertainty*, the sense in which such theorists take it, the dispute would be at an end. But though an uncertain action cannot be foreseen as certain, a free, unnecessitated action may, for there is nothing in the knowledge of the action in the least to affect its nature. Simple knowledge is in no sense a cause of action, nor can it be conceived to be causal, un-

connected with exerted power: for mere knowledge, therefore, an action remains free or necessitated, as the case may be. A necessitated action is not made a voluntary one by its being foreknown; a free action is not made a necessary one. Free actions foreknown will not, therefore, cease to be contingent. But how stands the case as to their certainty? Precisely on the same ground. The certainty of a necessary action foreknown does not result from the knowledge of the action, but from the operation of the necessitating cause, and, in like manner, the certainty of a free action does not result from the knowledge of it, which is no cause at all, but from the voluntary cause—that is, the determination of the will. It alters not the case in the least to say that the voluntary action might have been otherwise. Had it been otherwise, the knowledge of it would have been otherwise; but as the will which gives birth to the action is not dependent upon the previous knowledge of God, but the knowledge of the action upon foresight of the choice of the will, neither the will nor the act is controlled by the knowledge, and the action, though foreseen, is still free or contingent. The foreknowledge of God has then no influence upon either the freedom or the certainty of actions, for this plain reason, that it is knowledge, and not influence; and actions may be certainly foreknown without their being rendered necessary by that foreknowledge. But here it is said, "If the result of an absolute contingency be certainly foreknown, it *can* have no other result, it *cannot* happen otherwise." This is not the true inference. It *will* not happen otherwise; but it may be asked, Why *can* it not happen otherwise? *Can* is an expression of potentiality—it denotes power or possibility. The objection is that it is not possible that the action should otherwise happen. But why not? What deprives it of that power? If a necessary action were in question, it could not otherwise happen than as the necessitating cause should compel; but, then, that would arise from the necessitating cause solely, and not from the prescience of the action, which is not causal. But if the action be free, and it enters into the very nature of a voluntary action to be unconstrained, then it might have happened in a thousand other ways, or not have happened at all; the foreknowledge of it no more affects its nature in this case than in the other. All its potentiality, so to speak, still remains, independent of foreknowledge, which neither adds to its power of happening otherwise nor diminishes it. But then we are told that "the prescience of it in that case must be uncertain." Not unless any person can prove that the divine prescience is unable to dart through all the workings of the human mind, all its comparison of things in the judgment, all the influences of motives on the affections, all the hesitances and haltings of the will, to its final choice. "Such knowledge is too wonderful for us," but it is the knowledge of him "who understandeth the thoughts of man afar off." "But if a contingency *will* have a given result, to that result it *must* be determined." Not in the least. We have seen that it cannot be determined to a given result by mere precognition, for we have evidence in our own minds that mere knowledge is not causal to the actions of another. It is determined to its result by the will of the agent; but even in that case it cannot be said that it *must* be determined to that result, because it is of the nature of freedom to be unconstrained: so that here we have an instance in the case of a free agent that he *will* act in some particular manner, but it by no means follows from what *will* be, whether foreseen or not, that it *must* be.

3. The third theory amounts, in brief, to this: that the foreknowledge of God must be supposed to differ so much from anything of the kind which we perceive in ourselves, and from any ideas which we can possibly form of that property of the divine nature, that no argument respecting it can be grounded upon our imperfect notions, and that all controversy on subjects connected with it is idle and fruitless. But though foreknowledge in God should be admitted to be something of a "very different nature" from the same quality in man, yet as it is represented as *something* equivalent to foreknowledge, whatever that something may be, since in consequence of it prophecies have actually been uttered and fulfilled, and of such a kind, too, as relate to actions for which men have, in fact, been held accountable, all the original difficulty of reconciling contingent events to this something, of which human foreknowledge is a "kind of shadow," as "a map of China is to China itself," remains in full force. The difficulty is shifted, but not removed.

II. *Extent of Prescience.*—It may, therefore, be certainly concluded, if, at least, the Holy Scriptures are to be our guide, that the omniscience of God comprehends his certain prescience of all events, however contingent; and if anything more were necessary to strengthen the argument above given, it might be drawn from the irrational, and, above all, the unscriptural consequences which would follow from the denial of this doctrine. These are forcibly stated by president Edwards: "It would follow from this notion (namely, that the Almighty doth not foreknow what will be the result of future contingencies) that as God is liable to be continually repenting what he has done, so he must be exposed to be constantly changing his mind and intentions as to his future conduct—altering his measures, relinquishing his old designs, and forming new schemes and projections. For his purposes, even as to the main parts of the scheme (namely, such as belong to the state of his moral kingdom), must be always liable to be broken through want of foresight, and he must be continually putting his system to rights, as it gets out of order, through the contingence of the actions of moral agents: he must be a Being who, instead of being absolutely immutable, must necessarily be the subject of infinitely the most numerous acts of repentance and changes of intention of any being whatsoever, for this plain reason, that his vastly extensive charge comprehends an infinitely greater number of those things which are to him contingent and uncertain. In such a situation he must have little else to do but to mend broken links as well as he can, and be rectifying his disjointed frame and disordered movements in the best manner the case will allow. The supreme Lord of all things must needs be under great and miserable disadvantages in governing the world which he has made and has the care of, through his being utterly unable to find out things of chief importance which hereafter shall befall his system, which, if he did but know, he might make seasonable provision for. In many cases there may be very great necessity that he should make provisions in the manner of his ordering and disposing things for some great events which are to happen of vast and extensive influence and endless consequence to the universe, which he may see afterwards, when it is too late, and may wish in vain that he had known beforehand, that he might have ordered his affairs accordingly. And it is in the power of man, on these principles, by his devices, purposes, and actions thus to disappoint God, break his measures, make him continually to change his mind, subject him to vexation, and bring him into confusion."

III. *Speculations on the Subject.*—Some of the ancient philosophers denied that God could foreknow events depending on free will (see Cicero, *De Divinate*, ii, 5, 7; answered by Augustine, *De Civitate Dei*, v, 9, 10). Socinus (*Prælect. Theol.* c. 8–11) and his early followers would not allow that God possesses any knowledge of future contingencies. The schoolmen, in reference to this species of knowledge in God, invented that called *scientia media* (q. v.; see also Fonseca and Molina), which they define as "that by which God knows, *sub conditione*, what men or angels will do according to the liberty which they have when they are placed in these or those circumstances, or in this or in that order of things." When Gomarus, the opponent of Arminius, found that his opinion concerning the object of reproba-

tion was clogged with this absurdity—that it made God to be the author of Adam's sin—he very astutely took refuge in this conditional foreknowledge, and in his corrected theses on predestination, published after the death of Arminius, he describes it as "that by which God, through the infinite light of his own knowledge, foreknows some future things, not absolutely, but as placed under a certain condition." Walæus, the celebrated antagonist of Episcopius, had recourse to the same expedient. This distinction has been adopted by very few of those who espouse the doctrines of general redemption, and who believe that every event, how contingent soever to the creature, is, with respect to God, certainly foreknown. An old English divine thinks that "in the sacred Scriptures certain not obscure vestiges are apparent of this kind of knowledge of things that will happen thus or otherwise, on the supposition of the occurrence of this or that circumstance. Omitting the well-known example of David in Keilah (1 Sam. xxii, 12), and of Chorazin and Bethsaida (Matt. xi, 21; Luke x, 13), consult, among other sayings of the same description, Christ's answer to the chief priests and scribes who had asked 'Art thou the Christ? Tell us.' And he said unto them, 'If I tell you, ye will not believe.' In the subsequent verse he adds, 'If I also ask you, ye will not answer me, nor let me go' (Luke xxii, 67, 68). You have here three events specified which yet will not occur even on the supposition of Christ our Lord himself." This kind of knowledge might very well be included in that of *scientia visionis*, because the latter ought to include, not what God will do and what his creatures will do under his appointment, but what they will do by his permission as free agents, and what he will do, as a consequence of this, in his character of Governor and Lord. But since the predestinarians had confounded *scientia visionis* with a predestinating decree, the *scientia media* well expressed what they had left quite unaccounted for, and which they had assumed did not really exist—the actions of creatures endowed with free will and the acts of Deity which from eternity were consequent upon them. If such actions do not take place, then men are not free; and if the rectoral acts of God are not consequent upon the actions of the creature in the order of the divine intention, and the conduct of the creature is consequent upon the foreordained rectoral acts of God, then we reach a necessitating eternal decree, which, in fact, the predestinarian contends for; but it unfortunately brings after it consequences which no subtleties have ever been able to shake off—that the only *actor* in the universe is God himself, and that the only distinction among events is that one class is brought to pass by God directly and the other indirectly, not by the agency, but by the mere instrumentality, of his creatures.—Watson. See also Watson, *Theol. Institutes*, i, 375; ii, 357, 429; *Works*, vii, 298, 309; Pope, *Compendium of Christian Theology* (Lond. 1875), p. 145–149, 191 sq.; Raymond, *Systematic Theology* (see Index in vol. ii); Knapp, *Theology*, § 22; Fletcher, *Works; Presbyterian Confession; Church Remembrancer* (Jan. 1856); *Bulletin Théol.* (Oct. 1868), p. 26 sq.; Hodge, *Systematic Theology* (see Index); Bromley, *Divine Prescience;* Clarke, *Boyle Lectures* for 1705; King, *Sermons on the Divine Prescience;* Tillotson, *Sermons;* Waterland, *Works*, vol. vi; Haag, *Histoire des Dogmes* (see Index in vol. ii; Graves, *Works*, vol. iv; *Bib. Sacra*, July, 1868, p. 455; Neander, *Dogm.* p. 568 sq.; Callisen, *Essay with a View to bring into Harmony the Doctrine of the Omniscience of God and the Freedom of Man*, in Schmidt u. Schwarz, *Theol. Bibliothek*, vol. viii; Reid, *On the Active Powers*, essay iv, ch. xi; Pye Smith, *First Lines of Christian Theology*, p. 148, 149. See also the articles ELECTION; PREDESTINATION.

Prescription. I. This expression, borrowed from the civil law, has in the Roman Catholic Church a canonistic meaning. In order to put limits to the contests about mine and thine in rights, obligations, and possessions, that Church has fixed terms which invest with legality the possession of rights and goods, unless proof be produced that these rights or goods are of an alienable kind, or have been acquired by illegal means (usurpation or theft time does not consecrate). If the lawful term be elapsed, the possessor is confirmed in the possession of said rights or goods, and he who is bound by certain obligations cannot call them in question. The term of prescription varies with the nature of the object: movable property prescribes quicker than immovable, the property of adults quicker than that of minors, the property of those present quicker than that of absentees; ecclesiastical property is prescribed only after forty years. According to the rules of the papal chancery, the possessor of an ecclesiastical office, after a three-years' possession, if it be not obtained by violence or simony, cannot be lawfully expelled from it. There is prescription in his favor.

II. Tertullian transplanted this expression to the theological domain by his work on prescriptions against heretics, a kind of argument against erroneous doctrine. This is what he means: The Catholic Church enjoys, in her doctrines and discipline, the right of prescription; what she teaches and practices at the present hour she has taught and practiced from times immemorial—learned it from the apostles, as the apostles learned from Christ, as Christ had it from the Father. The catholic doctrine is the true one, because it is the old and original one, and rests on the divine revelation; the doctrines of heretics and sectarians, on the other side, are false, because new, because they have not prescription in their favor, and consequently are not founded on divine revelation. Irenæus taught similarly. It is easy to see that this proof by prescription is much the same as the proof by tradition, and that this mode of arguing can have no acceptability in Protestantism, where the Bible alone is regarded as the true test, and the apostolic or early Church practices have only an advisory influence, not authority. Of course, High-Churchmen, by their ritualistic tendency, can hardly be said to come under the full influence of Protestantism, and are therefore not to be considered as included in the exponents of evangelical Christianity. See Elliott, *Delineation of Roman Catholicism*, p. 61, 95, 407. See AUTHORITY.

PRESCRIPTION is also a law adopted in Presbyterian churches. If a scandal is not noticed for five years after it happens, it cannot be revived, but is then said to be prescribed.

Presence means, in canonical law, the uninterrupted personal residence of every regularly prebended ecclesiastic at the seat of his office; a duty emphatically imposed on him by the laws of the Church. It means also the personal attendance at the common choral prayer, to which the laws of the Church obligate all members of a monastic community, as well as the canons and choir-vicars of the cathedral and collegiate congregations.

Presence-money is the small daily payment in specie made by Roman Catholics to the canons for their presence in the choir at defunct cathedral or collegiate churches. After the dissolution of the communal life of those ecclesiastics, the bulk of the revenue of the chapters was divided into individual portions, to be distributed partly as daily stipends, called *distributiones quotidianæ*, or *quotidiana stipendia*, in opposition to the prebends, which went by the name of *fructus grossi* or *annui*. The purpose of this daily distribution was to induce the canons to a stricter obedience to the law of residence, and to more assiduous attendance to the public choir-prayers, as only those canons came in for their share who were either present in the choir or officiated during the service. Yet there were some grounds on which their absence could be excused without loss of their share. (These legal exceptions are formulated in the canonic regulations in *De cler. ægr.* iii, 6; *De cler. non resid.* iii, 3; *Conc. Trid.* sess. xxii, c. 3, and sess. xxiv, c. 8 fin. *De ref.*) The Council of Trent

directed that in those cathedral or collegiate congregations where there existed no presence-money, or where it reached but an insignificant amount, a third of the whole revenue of the chapter should be set apart and used for such distributions (*Conc. Trid.* sess. xxi, c. 3, *De ref.*). The portions of the canons absent without reasonable excuse were to be divided among the members present *pro rata*, or given to the fabric of the church, if it stood in need of such help, or employed for any pious purpose the bishop might devise (sess. xxii, c. 3, *De ref.*). It was not always the negligence of the canons, but also the peculiar—and partly abusive—composition of the chapters, which was the cause that their members so frequently dispensed with personal service in the choir, and were represented in it by simple vicars. The personal obligation of the canons has been insisted upon by the most ancient canonic rules, by the Council of Trent, and by the last circumscription bulls for the reorganization of the German bishoprics. Special presence-money is no more in use; for as the dotation of the restored bishoprics and chapters is not founded on immovable property, as the prebends flow, in the form of fixed salaries, out of the public treasure, the direction of the Council of Trent that a part of the revenue should be set apart and used for such distributions is not acted upon. See Schmidt, *Thesaurus jur. Eccles.* iv, 195 sq.

Presence, Real. See TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

Present. See GIFT.

Presentation, in ecclesiastical law, is, I, in the state-established churches, one of those forms of canonic collation of the prebends by which the rights of the bishop are limited, inasmuch as he cannot himself nominate an occupant to the vacant office, but must be content with confirming the nominee of the *patronus beneficii*. The *right of presentation* is therefore the right of the patron to designate to the bishop the successor elected by him of a deceased beneficiary, the bishop being obliged to confirm the candidate if he be worthy, capable, and proposed according to canonical rules. This right of presentation is the first and most important of all patronal rights. The patron, in the exercise of his right, is bound by the general conditions of a canonical provision: he has to propose a capable and worthy person gratuitously, and within the legal limits of time. If the patronate be an ecclesiastical or a mixed one, the time is six months; if it be a worldly one, four months: yet there are departures from this rule. In Austria the patron must choose his nominee out of a list drawn up by the ordinariate: if he be at home, within six months; if he be abroad, within three months, from the day of the receipt of the list. In Prussia six months are allowed to the lay patron, as well as to the ecclesiastical patron, from the day of the vacation of the office; or, if the beneficiary die abroad, from the day on which the news of his death is received. In Baden the time is limited to three months, except in the case of insurmountable hinderances. If the right of presentation belong to several persons individually, they can agree upon a common choice, or designate each his own candidate, leaving the choice to the bishop; or the matter may be decided by the majority of the votes; and in case of an equality of votes in favor of each candidate, the decision may be left again to the bishop. The same rules obtain when the right of a patron has been transmitted to several heirs, in which case, of course, the heirs of one patron can give only one vote. If the right of presentation belong to a college or a juridical person, the case is settled by the statutes of the corporation; or if regulations on the subject be wanting, by a collegiate vote. In the remainder, the right of the patron is unlimited: he can propose his nearest relation, but not himself, although he could, "via gratiæ," present a request for his own admission (*gratiosam petere admissionem*). He can submit several candidates to the choice of the bishop; if he be a layman, he can, so long as the legal term is not elapsed and the canonic collation has not taken place, propose successively several other names. This *jus variandi* is not allowed to an ecclesiastical patron. Here the first presentation, according to the principle "Tempore prior potior jure," makes null and void all subsequent nominations. If the legal term is passed without presentation, or if the presentation has not been made gratuitously, the nomination in that case is lost to the patron, and belongs exclusively to the collator. The same happens when an ecclesiastical patron wittingly proposes an unworthy subject, while the lay patron is allowed another presentation in the legal four months. But if the patron, whether layman or ecclesiastic, have unwittingly proposed an unworthy candidate, he obtains a new term of four or of six months. The Prussian law allows, after the expiration of the primitive term, only a supplementary term of six weeks. In Baden the patron, if his proposition have been rejected by the ordinariate, is allowed another presentation, to be made in the space of four weeks, and the same term is allowed him a second time, but not further. The presentation is made by letter, for which many ordinariates prescribe fixed formulas to the private patrons. The contests about the patronal rights are, according to decretal law, subject to the ecclesiastical courts; but modern legislation has almost everywhere added it to the competency of the worldly tribunals. If the patronal right itself be contested, the actual possessor has the "jus præsentandi," and the nomination resulting from the use he makes of it is not invalidated by his being afterwards defeated in the lawsuit. But if the right to hold the goods with which the patronate is connected should itself be questioned, then the right of presentation is suspended, and the bishop in this case enjoys a free right of collation. The winner of the suit may then, to insure his privilege, confirm the nomination made by the bishop; but if he should refuse his consent, this can have no influence on the situation of the nominee. See Schulte, *Kirchenrecht*, p. 67 sq.; Rosshirt, *Kanonisches Recht*, p. 437 sq.; Pachmann, *Kirchenrecht*, i, 268 sq.; Richter, *Kirchenrecht*, § 193; Gerlach, *Das Präsentationsrecht* (Regensb. 1855).

II. In the Established Church of Scotland the minister intended for a living by a patron must be presented to the presbytery for inquiry into his qualifications, and for induction if these are satisfactory. If the patron fail to present within six months, the right then devolves on the presbytery, *tanquam jure devoluto*. See JUS DEVOLUTUM. When a presentee was objected to by the major part of the congregation, whether with or without reason, the General Assembly of the Church formerly claimed the right to declare that he should not be inducted or entitled to the benefice. This declaration was contained in an act of Assembly, dated 1835, called the Veto Act. But after much litigation it was decided by the courts of law that such Veto Act was *ultra vires* and void; and this decision led to a secession of many ministers and people from the Established Church, and to the formation of a new dissenting Church, called the Free Church (q. v.). The law is now settled that it is the presbytery, and not the people, who are to judge of the reasonableness of any objections made to the presentee, for which purpose reasons and objections are heard on both sides, and a wide discretion is exercised by the presbytery. If the presbytery dismiss the objections, they then proceed to the trial and induction (q. v.) of the presentee. The following is the form of a Scotch presentation, and is a copy, indeed, of the one which led to the disputes and processes that ended in the disruption of the Scottish Church:

"The right honorable Thomas Robert Drummond Hay, earl of Kinnoull, undoubted patron of the parish church and parish of Auchterarder, lying within the presbytery of Auchterarder and sheriffdom of Perth, *considering* that the said church and parish is now vacant and become at my gift and presentation by and through the death of the Rev. Charles Stewart, late minister of the Gospel at the

said church of Auchterarder; and I, being sufficiently informed of the literature, loyalty, qualifications, good life and conversation of Mr. Robert Young, preacher of the Gospel, residing at Seafield Cottage, Dundee, do therefore, by these presents, nominate and present the said Robert Young to be minister of the said parish and church of Auchterarder during all the days of his lifetime, giving, granting, and disponing to him the constant, locallied, and modified stipend, with the manse and glebe, and other profits and emoluments belonging to the said church, for the crop and year 1835, and during his lifetime, and his serving the cure of the said church, requiring hereby the reverend moderator and presbytery of Auchterarder to take trial of the qualifications, literature, good life, and conversation of the said Robert Young; and having found him fit and qualified for the function of the ministry at the said church of Auchterarder, to admit and receive him thereto, and give him his act of ordination and admission in due and competent form, recommending hereby to the lords of council and session, upon sight of this presentation and the said presbytery's act of ordination and admission, to grant letters of horning, on a simple charge of two days only, and other executorials necessary at the instance of the said Robert Young, against all and sundry the heritors, life-renters, feuars, tacksmen, tenants, possessors, and occupiers of lands within the said parish, subject and liable in payment of the said locallied and modified stipend, for causing the said Robert Young, and others in his name, be readily answered and paid thereof in such due and competent form as effeirs. And I consent to the registration thereof in the books of council and session, or others competent, therein to remain for preservation: and for that effect I constitute —— —— my procurators. In witness whereof, etc., (signed) Drummond Kinnoul. R. A. Yates, *witness*. Thomas Neatham, *witness*."

See PATRONAGE.

Presentation of the Virgin, Feast of, a Romish festival held on Nov. 21. It is not older than the 13th century. See MARY.

President (סָרָךְ, *sarák*, or סָרְכָא, *sarēkâ*; Sept. τακτικός; Vulg. *princeps*), only used in Dan. vi; the Chaldee equivalent for Hebrew *shotêr*, probably from *Sara*, Zend. a "head" (see Strabo, xi, 331). Σαραπάρας=κεφαλοτόμος is connected with the Sanskrit *siras* or *çiras*, and is traced in *Sargon* and other words (Eichhoff, *Vergl. Spr.* p. 129, 415; see Her. iii, 89, where he calls *satrap* a Persian word).—Smith. See GOVERNOR.

President in Choir is the name given to the English dean's deputy, usually the senior residentiary or vice-dean, who in his absence corrects offences, besides acting as president in chapter (q. v.), and choragus, or director of the services, when there is no dignitary; also the precentor.

Presiding Elder is the name given in the Methodist Episcopal Church to an officer whose functions are those of a superintendent within limited jurisdiction. These elders serve under the bishops, and, together with them, constitute in their respective conferences a cabinet, in which resides the appointing power over the membership of itinerant preachers. The office is one of very great responsibility and far-reaching influence. Within the territory over which such an elder presides every minister is amenable to this officer, who visits the different charges three or four times during the year, usually at what is called the holding of the Quarterly Conference (q. v.), over which he presides, and by which all the business of the charge is disposed of. He also presides at the District Conferences, where literary and ecclesiastical culture is aimed at, and the licensing of candidates for the ministry takes place. Usually the territory is confined to an eighth or sixth of the Conference boundaries, and corresponds somewhat in extent to the average county in an Eastern state.

The office of presiding elder was created in the early history of Methodist economy in this country, and appears to have had its origin in the *assistants* whom John Wesley employed as helps. He had what we might call junior preachers at the circuits or districts into which he divided his work, and an assistant in charge of the whole. These assistants were then invested with nearly the same authority over the helps which the great founder of Methodism himself exercised, and hence they had an authority akin more to the bishopric of American Methodism. When, in 1784, Mr. Wesley caused the election of Asbury and Coke as superintendents or bishops, there were several assistants in office thus made subject to these two general superintendents. The question has arisen whether the twelve elders who were elected at the Christmas Conference of 1784 were simply travelling elders or assistants of the superintendents. See METHODISM.

As the presiding elders are now episcopal appointees, the answer to this query becomes important. There are two opinions. One party, advocating the elective eldership, insist that these twelve men were then elected by the Conference for the assistants' work, and base their decision on Dr. Emory's interpretation. He says, in his *History of the Discipline*, p. 125, "All elders were at first presiding elders," and the distinction between presiding elders and "travelling elders" was not made until 1792. Section v, of 1789, it would seem, proves the correctness of Dr. Emory's statement. The following is a part of the section on elders:

"*Ques.* 2. What is the duty of an elder?

"*Ans.* 1. To travel through his appointed district.

"2. To administer baptism and the Lord's Supper, and perform all parts of divine service.

"3. In the absence of a bishop to take charge of all the deacons, travelling and local preachers, and exhorters.

"4. To change, receive, or suspend preachers.

"5. To direct in the transaction of the spiritual business of his circuit.

"6. To take care that every part of our discipline be enforced.

"7. To aid in public collections.

"8. To attend his bishop when present, and give him, when absent, all necessary information by letter of the state of his district."

That every elder, in the absence of the bishop, was equal in point of supervisory office and duty is evident also from the fact that the third duty in this section gives an elder no authority to take charge of elders, but simply of deacons travelling, and local preachers, etc., seeing they were equal in authority. It was not until 1792 that a distinction was made between presiding elders and travelling elders, and these were then put under the charge of presiding elders. It was at this date that presiding elders were chosen by the bishop from the body of elders, and those elders not chosen by the bishops were disrobed of office as presiding elders, and placed for the first time under the care of presiding elders (see p. 126, 1792).

"*Ques.* By whom are the presiding elders to be chosen?

"*Ans.* By the bishop. Among the duties of the presiding elder, one is to take charge of all the elders, deacons, etc., of his district."

At this date, then, there was made a distinction between presiding elders and travelling elders, and not before. All the elders previous to 1792, therefore, were elected and appointed to the office and duties of presiding elder by the Conference, and each had equal authority in charge in the absence of the bishop.

Against this position, those who approve of the existing practice of the appointing of presiding elders by the bishop urge, first, that from 1785 to 1792 there were each year more elders than presiding elders; secondly, that the presiding elders were appointed to their districts, and that the *appointment* was by the bishop; and, thirdly, that if the bishops did appoint elders to preside over other elders, the Conferences not calling the bishops to account consented to the change, and thereby made it valid; and that it was the practice of the Church from 1784 to 1792, notwithstanding the disciplines required otherwise (see letter by Dr. D. Sherman in *Zion's Herald*, March, 1876); and that Dr. Emory and others interpreted falsely the *action* of the early Methodist Church in America (comp. Stevens, *Hist. of the M. E. Church*, ii, 222, 224). The presiding duties which made of an elder a presiding elder did not, in the practice of the Church, belong to this new order in the ministry as soon as it was constituted. They belonged to the assistants, and were gradually trans-

ferred to the elders; and when, after the practice of nearly two years, they were actually transferred, the custom was legalized, the office of assistant was abolished, and the word disappeared from the minutes (see the *Minutes* and *Discipline*, A.D. 1786). The idea of this transfer originated in the mind of bishop Asbury, who found, after the eldership was instituted, as he says in his *Notes on the Discipline*, "that this order was so necessary" that he would make them rulers. Even his idea of the presiding eldership was not contemporaneous with the instituting of the order of elders, but came, as he says, when he "afterwards found that" they would be useful in ruling (see *Notes on the Discipline*, by Coke and Asbury). His idea was not put in practice until the Annual Conferences of 1785, when, as Lee (*History*, p. 120) states, the presiding eldership originated, but only in an inchoate form. This was months after the order of elders had been instituted. When, in 1786, the first law was made relative to the presiding eldership, it was made possible by the Discipline for every elder to become a presiding elder, so far as the duties were concerned, and here is where Emory and others have been misled. But as the bishop always appointed the ruling or presiding elders from the order of elders (Lee, *History*, p. 150), the practice was never to make all the elders ruling or presiding elders. Hence, from 1786 to 1792, the *law* of the Discipline never entirely agreed with the *practice* in the appointments, for there were hosts of elders who were never presiding elders. In the Conference of 1792, however, the law was made to harmonize with the practice. In the ancient Church the *chorepiscopi* (περιοδευται) filled an office which must have given Mr. Wesley the suggestion for the assistant he called into office. See Emory, *Hist. of the Discipline*, p. 136 sq.; Sherman, *Hist. of the Discipline*, p. 153; Bingham, *Eccles. Antiquities*, i, 56, 69; Porter, *Compendium of Methodism; Meth. Quar. Rev.* Jan. 1875, art. iv; April, 1876, art. iv; *National Repository*, May, 1876, *Editor's Study*. See also *Rural Deans*, in the article DEAN of this *Cyclopædia*, ii, 711.

Press (פּוּרָה, *purâh*; ληνός). Among the Israelites this was a large trough, usually hewn out of stone (Isa. v, 2; Matt. xxi, 33; comp. Nonni, *Dionys.* xii, 330) or dug in the earth and walled up (Harmer, iii, 117). It had a trellised opening below. This trough was called *gath*, גַּת (in the Talmud also גִּתָּה), or *purâh*, פּוּרָה (Isa. lxiii, 3); and in it the grapes were trodden by men (five usually work together in Persia still; Kämpfer, *Amœn.* p. 377). Hence the phrase *to tread the wine-press* (Job xxiv, 11; Lam. i, 15; Isa. lxiii, 2). The juice (Heb. *tirôsh*, תִּירוֹשׁ) flowed through the opening into a vat, usually in the earth (called *yékeb*, יֶקֶב, Gr. προλήνιον, Isa. v, 2, or ὑπολήνιον, Isa. xvi, 10, Mark xii, and simply ληνός, Matt. xxi, 33; Lat. *lacus vinarius*, Colum. xii, 18: in Job xxiv, 11, this word means, however, the trough or press itself). From this it is taken for fermentation in earthen vessels. These presses, which are still common in the East and the Levant (Arvieux iv, 272 sq.; Kämpfer, *ut sup.*), were almost always outside of the towns, either in the vineyards or on mountains (Zech. xiv, 10; Isa. v, 2; Matt. xxi, 33; Mark xii, 1; Rev. xiv, 20). The slaves must usually have trodden the press, as it was hard labor (Isa. lxiii, 1 sq.). They were cheered in it by singing and music (see Isa. xvi, 10; Jer. xxv, 30; Judg. ix, 27; Jer. xxv, 30; xlviii, 33). See Ugolino, *De Re Rust. Vet. Heb.* vi, 14 sq., in his *Thesaur.* xxix. See OIL; WINE.

Pressly, Ebenezer Erskine, D.D., a Presbyterian divine, was born near Cedar Spring, Abbeville District, S. C., in 1808. His parents, of the good old Scotch-Irish stock, were remarkable for their piety and intelligence, and early dedicated their only son to the work of the Christian ministry. He pursued his preparatory studies at Union Academy, graduated at Miami University, Ohio, in 1826, was received as a student of theology by the Second Associate Reformed Presbytery, and studied under John T. Pressly, D.D., who was then professor of theology for the Southern Synod, was licensed at Due West in 1829, and on Aug. 7, 1830, was settled as pastor of Due West and Generostee churches. In 1837 he resigned the latter charge, and continued pastor of Due West alone; in 1838 he was chosen the successor of Dr. John T. Pressly. In 1839 he was elected president of the Clark and Erskine Seminary, which afterwards took the name of Erskine College, in which position he remained until the spring of 1848. He died July 26, 1860. Dr. Pressly was a man of more than ordinary talent, and a good general scholar. In the position of president of the college he was greatly beloved by his pupils. Possessed of excellent executive ability, and of special aptness to teach, much of the success of the college and seminary, in the early periods of their history, was traceable to his influence. Though an interesting writer, he had a singular aversion to appearing before the public as an author, and hence he never published anything except an occasional sermon. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1861, p. 226. (J. L. S.)

Pressly, John S., a Presbyterian minister, noted also as a classical teacher, was born in Abbeville District, S. C., in 1794. His means for acquiring the rudiments of a literary education were very limited. Until the years of manhood he had not enjoyed very fully the advantages of the common school. In 1812, however, he moved to the State of Ohio, and during a stay of three years in the Northwestern States he underwent much privation and hard labor in his endeavors to acquire knowledge. About the close of the year 1815 he was prostrated on a bed of suffering with a painful illness; a kind Providence brought him the medical services of Dr. Joseph Gilbert, who, on his recovery, suggested to him the desirableness of a classical education, and proposed to furnish him with the necessary books. Thus encouraged, and accepting the doctor's kind offer, he entered Church Hill Academy June 19, 1816; in 1819 he entered South Carolina College, and spent two years there. In 1822 his career of classical teacher began, and in this field of usefulness, in which he labored during the balance of his life, he attained an enviable reputation. His first charge was Union Academy, in the southern part of Abbeville District, S. C. Among his pupils here were the late Rev. E. E. Pressly, D.D., Rev. J. T. Pressly, D.D., Hon. T. C. Perrin, and J. A. Calhoun, Esq. In 1824–27 he taught at Cambridge and Beaver Dam—the latter in Laurens District. In 1828 he took charge of Church Hill Academy, but his labors there were soon interrupted by his being elected to the State Legislature of South Carolina by the people of Abbeville District. In 1835, at the close of his political career, he was invited to take charge of the high school at Due West, S. C., just founded by the Associate Reformed Synod of the South, where he continued to labor till 1839 with great success. At last released from all engagements connected with teaching, he turned his attention to the study of theology; studied one session in the seminary of the Associate Reformed Church at Oxford, Ohio; was licensed in 1840; and after attending during the ensuing session in the Associate Reformed Seminary at Alleghany City, Pa., he was employed until 1842 as a missionary to destitute churches within the bounds of the synod. Subsequently he was settled for five years as pastor of Bethel and Ebenezer churches, Ga.; the remainder of his life until 1851 was spent in teaching and missionary work. He died June 1, 1863. Mr. Pressly as a man was social and companionable; as a teacher he was a strict disciplinarian, and in the capacity to impart classical knowledge had few superiors. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Alm.* (1867), p. 398. (J. L. S.)

Pressly, John T., D.D., a Presbyterian minister.

noted as a professor in divinity and an author, was born in Abbeville District, S. C., in 1803. He studied for the ministry at the Theological Seminary in New York under Dr. John Mason. His first pastorate was in his native village, from which he was called to a professorship in the Theological Seminary, and the charge of the First Associate Reformed (now United Presbyterian) Church in Alleghany, Pa., both of which stations he filled with distinguished ability and success for nearly forty years. He died at Alleghany Aug. 13, 1870.—Appletons' *Annual Cyclopædia*, x, 573.

Pressy, François-Joseph-Gaston de Partz de, a French prelate, was born in 1712 at the castle of Écuire (diocese of Boulogne). He was one of the most distinguished pupils of Saint-Sulpice. He was called, Dec. 25, 1742, to the episcopal see of Boulogne. He administered his diocese during nearly forty-seven years with unremitting zeal, and spent considerable sums for the ransom of the Christians captive among the Mohammedans, and for the expansion of the faith by foreign missions. In 1752 he joined a protestation addressed to the king (June 11), by twenty-one bishops, against parliamentary encroachments on ecclesiastical authority. A mandement which he subsequently published on the subject was suppressed. He died at Boulogne Oct. 8, 1789. His principal writings are, *Statuts synodaux* (1746, 4to):—a collection of *Instructions pastorales* and *Dissertations théologiques* (2 vols. 4to):—a *Rituel du Diocèse de Boulogne* (Boulogne, 1780, 4to):—and a prayer-book in French, under the title of *Heures* (Lille, 1820, 8vo). See *Gallia Christiana*, t. x; *Gazette de France*, 1742–89; Fisquet, *France Pontificale* (not published).—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.

Prester, John. See John, Prester.

Preston, John, D.D., a noted English Puritan divine, was born at Heyford, Northamptonshire, in 1587, and educated at King's College and Queen's College, University of Cambridge, was made fellow and tutor of Queen's College, and finally became chaplain to Prince Charles. In 1622 he was appointed preacher of Lincoln's Inn, and subsequently lecturer in Trinity Church, Cambridge. He became so celebrated as a speaker that the towns-people went to his lectures on week-days as they would to his sermons on Sunday, and he was complained of by those who looked with envy upon his fast-growing reputation. He also became noted as an able advocate of Calvinism, and in a controversy with the famous Arminian, Dr. Montague, sustained the elective theory with much adroitness and boldness. He was certainly a man of great learning, a popular preacher, and a powerful writer. He died in 1628, greatly lamented not only by Calvinists, but by all lovers of the good cause. He wore himself out with work; and when his friends would remonstrate, his answer was always, "Our life, like iron, consumes with rust, as much without as by employment; that every one cannot be said to have lived long that is old, as seven years in the life of some men are as much as seventy in others; and therefore the question is not so much How long I have lived as How I have lived." He was naturally reserved, and only figured in public because his zeal for the doctrines of Calvin would not suffer him to let go unanswered those who maintained the opposite theories. Of his works (published 1615–58) which have never been collected, an abridgment by William Tennent was published in 1658 (1648 also [?]), 12mo. The best-known of his publications are, *The New Covenant*, fourteen sermons (Lond. 1629, 4to; ninth ed. 1639, 4to; again in 1655, 4to):—*The Breastplate of Faith and Love*, eighteen sermons (1630, 4to; 5th ed. 1634, 4to):—*Life Eternal*, eighteen sermons (1631, 4to; 4th ed. 1634, 4to):—*The Saint's Daily Exercise*, five sermons on Prayer (1633, 4to; 9th ed. 1635, 4to):—*The Saint's Qualifications*, ten sermons on Humiliation, nine on Sanctification, and three on the Sacrament (1634, 4to; 3d ed. 1637, 4to):—*Four Treatises* (sermons): 1, *Covetousness*; 2, *Spiritual Death and Life* (separate in 1633, 4to); 3, *Selfe Deniall* (separate in 1632, 4to); 4, *Lord's Supper* (together in 1635, 4to; 4th ed. 1636, 4to):—*Sermons before his Maiestie*, etc. (5th ed. 1637, 4to):—*Sinner's Overthrow, or Mortification* (1635, 4to; 4th ed. 1641, 4to):—*Remains* (three treatises): 1, *Judas his Repentance*; 2, *Saint's Spiritual Strength*; 3, *Paul's Conversion and Sermons*, etc. (2d ed. 1637, 4to):—*The Golden Sceptre*, etc. (1638, 4to):—*Doctrines of the Saints' Infirmities*, a sermon (1638, 4to):—*A Lifeless Life*, a sermon (4th ed. 1641, 4to):—*Fulnesse of Christ for Us*, a sermon (1640, 4to):—*Divine Love of Christ*, five sermons (1640, 4to):—*Two Treatises* (1641, 4to):—*Thesis de Gratiæ Convertendis Irresistibilitate* (1652, 8vo; in English, 1654):—*Riches of Mercy to Men in Misery* (1658, 4to). See Dr. R. Sibbs's preface; Middleton, *Evangel. Biog.* ii, 460 sq.; Perry, *Hist. Ch. of England* (see Index); Clark, *Lives*; Neal, *Hist. of the Puritans*; Burnet, *Own Times*; Fuller, *Worthies*; Darling, *Cyclop. Bibl.*; Jonathan Edwards, *Works*; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s. v. (J. H. W.)

Preston, Willard, D.D., an eloquent American divine and noted educator, was born at Uxbridge, Mass., May 29, 1785, and was educated at Brown University, where he graduated in 1806. After having studied law and practiced in that profession for a few years, he studied for the ministry, and was in 1811 ordained and became pastor of a church at Providence, R. I., where he preached until 1825, when he was chosen president of the University of Vermont. In 1829 he removed South for the benefit of his health, and in 1831 accepted the pastorate of the Presbyterian Church in Savannah, Ga., and there remained until his death in 1856. He published, *Farewell Sermon at St. Alban's* (1815):—*Sermons* (1817).—Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s. v.; Drake, *Dict. of Amer. Biog.* s. v.

Presumption, as it relates to the mind, is a supposition formed before examination. As it relates to the conduct or moral action, it implies arrogance or irreverence. As it relates to religion in general, it is a bold and daring confidence in the goodness of God, without obedience to his will.

Presumptuous sins must be distinguished from sins of infirmity, or those failings peculiar to human nature (Eccles. vii, 20; 1 John i, 8, 9); from sins done through ignorance (Luke xii, 48); and from sins into which men are hurried by sudden and violent temptation (Gal. vi, 1). The ingredients which render sin presumptuous are knowledge (John xv, 22), deliberation and contrivance (Prov. vi, 14; Psa. xxxvi, 4), obstinacy (Jer. xliv, 16; Deut. i, 13), inattention to the remonstrances of conscience (Acts vii, 51), opposition to the dispensations of Providence (2 Chron. xxviii, 22), and repeated commission of the same sin (Psa. lxxviii, 17). Presumptuous sins are numerous, such as profane swearing, perjury, theft, adultery, drunkenness, Sabbath-breaking, etc. These may be more particularly considered as presumptuous sins, because they are generally committed against a known law, and are so often repeated. Such sins are most heinous in their nature and most pernicious in their effects. They are said to be a reproach to the Lord (Numb. xv, 3); they harden the heart (1 Tim. iv, 2); draw down judgments from heaven (Numb. xv, 31); and even when repented of, they are seldom pardoned without some visible testimony of God's displeasure (2 Sam. xii, 10). As respects professors of religion, one observes, they sin presumptuously (1) when they take up a profession of religion without principle; (2) when they profess to ask the blessing of God and yet go on in forbidden courses; (3) when they do not take religion as they find it in the Scriptures; (4) when they make their feelings the test of their religion, without considering the difference between animal passion and the operations of the Spirit of God; (5) when they run into temptation; (6) when they indulge in self-confidence and self-complacency; (7) when they bring the spirit

of the world into the Church; (8) when they form apologies for that in some which they condemn in others; (9) when, professing to believe in the doctrines of the Gospel, they live licentiously; (10) when they create, magnify, and pervert their troubles; (11) when they arraign the conduct of God as unkind and unjust. See Walker, *Sermons*, vol. i, ser. 3; South, *Sermons*, vol. vii, ser. 10, 11, 12; Tillotson, *Sermons*, ser. 147; Saurin, *Sermons*, vol. i, ser. 11; Goodwin, *On the Aggravations of Sin;* Fuller, *Works;* Paley, *Sermons;* Bishop Hopkins, *On the Nature, Danger, and Cure of Presumptuous Sins.*

Pretas, sprites or hobgoblins among the Buddhists in Ceylon. They are believed to inhabit a hell called Lokantarika. In appearance they are extremely attenuated, like a dry leaf. There are some *pretas* that haunt the places near which they once lived as men; they are also found in the suburbs of cities, and in places where four ways meet. Their bodies are represented as being twelve miles high, and they have very large nails. On the top of the head there is a mouth about the size of a needle's eye. They continually think with sorrow on their fate, from not having acquired merit in former births; they are now tormented without ceasing by hunger and thirst, and have not the power of obtaining merit.

Preternatural stands generally for supernatural, because we suppose that that which is *præter naturam* is also *supra naturam*. Yet the former stands sometimes for unnatural, *præter naturam* being the synonym of *contra naturam*. Neither *præternaturale* nor *supernaturale*, or, as some say, *supranaturale*, is a good Latin word. They are, at least, not to be found in the classics.

Pretextātus, St., a Gallic prelate of the 6th century, occupied towards 555 the metropolitan see of Rouen, and was godfather to Mérovée, the second son of Chilperic. Towards 576 Brunehaut, the widow of Sigebert, was exiled to Rouen by Chilperic, who was under the influence of Frédégonde. Mérovée, who was in that city, fell violently in love with the charms of the queen of Austrasia, his aunt, and Pretextatus was induced to grant a dispensation for their union, and married them. At this intelligence Chilperic repaired to Rouen, transported with wrath, and ordered the bishop to be arrested. A council assembled at Paris in 577, and in spite of the exertions of Gregory of Tours, who ventured alone to defend him, Pretextatus was deposed by the vote of forty-four prelates. He was banished to the island of Jersey, where he devoted his time to prayer and study. In the meantime a creature of Frédégonde, the Gaul Melantius, was established in the episcopal see of Rouen. After the murder of Chilperic, September, 584, a deputation of the clergy and people of Rouen repaired to Jersey to request Pretextatus to resume the administration of his diocese. On the 5th of May an assembly of Frankish noblemen, held at Rouen, pronounced his rehabilitation. Frédégonde, who lived in a kind of retirement at Louviers, went often to Rouen; she found herself frequently face to face with the bishop, whom she accused of not showing her much deference. In her wounded pride she once let escape some threatening allusions to the past: Pretextatus improved the occasion to exhort her to repentance and reformation. The enraged queen avenged herself in a manner worthy of her past life. She, Melantius, and an archdeacon of the cathedral, gave two hundred gold dollars to one of the serfs of the domain of the church, and promised him his own emancipation and that of his wife and children, for the murder of Pretextatus. On Easter-Sunday, while in prayer at the foot of the altar, he was stabbed, and died an hour afterwards in a chamber contiguous to the church, whither a few of the faithful had carried him, and where Frédégonde, in the company of the dukes Beppolen and Ansowald, enjoyed the spectacle of his last moments, April 14, 586. Pretextatus had attended the third Council of Paris in 557, the second Council of Tours in 566, and the second Council of Mâcon in 585. During his exile he composed some writings, which have not reached us. His name is inscribed in the *Martyrologium* under the date of the 24th of February, although he did not shed his blood for the faith. See *Gallia Christiana*, t. xi; Pommeraye, *Hist. des Archevêques de Rouen;* Fisquet, *France Pontificale* (not published).—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.

Preti, Mattia, called *il Calabrese*, a painter of the Neapolitan school, was born in 1613 at Taverna, in Calabria. His brother Gregorio, about whom very little is known, who was honored in his life-time with the title of prince of the Academy of St. Luke, was Mattia's first master; subsequently he studied with Lanfranc and Guerino. Preti took from Caravaggio those dark and violent hues which impair the charm of his compositions. He delighted in retracing martyrdoms, murders, and other scenes of desolation. He painted with prodigious rapidity: a contemporary says that to see him handle the brush one would have thought that he was drumming. He painted the frescos of the church of Carmine in Modena, which are in a very good state of preservation. In 1657 he returned to Rome, but was compelled to flee, having killed one of his rivals. At Naples, again, whither he repaired, he killed a soldier who had stopped him on some forbidden ground, and was ordered for his punishment to paint the patron saints of Naples on the doors of the city. From Naples he went to Malta, where his works were rewarded with the title of knight and the commandery of Syracuse. In his last years he worked only, but with unremitting diligence, for the poor. He died at Malta in 1699. His works are met with in great number in Italy. The Louvre has his *Martyrdom of St. Andrew*, *St. Paul*, and *St. Anthony the Hermit;* the Museum of Dresden the *Martyrdom of St. Bartholomew*, the *Incredulity of St. Thomas*, and the *Deliverance of St. Peter;* the Pinakothek of Munich a *Repenting Magdalen;* the Museum of Vienna an *Incredulity of St. Thomas*, etc. See Spooner, *Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts*, s. v. (J. H. W.)

Pretorium. See Prætorium.

Prevent (some form of קָדַם, φθάνω, both meaning to *precede* or *anticipate*) is understood, in our translation of the Scriptures, only in the old Latin sense, as denoting—1. To *come before* one is expected or sought (Job xxx, 27); 2. To *go before*, or be sooner (Psa. cxix, 147). One is happily disappointed when favors come unasked (Job iii, 12; Psa. xviii, 18), or unhappily, when snares and afflictions come unexpectedly (2 Sam. xxii, 6).

Prevention is an ecclesiastical term denoting the right of a superior dignitary of the Church to interfere in the business of his subordinate; but it is more specially the right of the pope, in the nomination to ecclesiastical offices, to pass over the proper collators and give away the benefices himself. The Gallican Church has never recognised this papal prerogative. See Provisors.

Prevost, Claude, a French monk, was born at Auxerre Jan. 22, 1693. He taught philosophy and theology in the abbey of Sainte-Geneviève, and the care of the library was afterwards intrusted to him. In this employment, which he retained to the end of his life, he made use of the knowledge which he had acquired in the Greek, Italian, and English languages, and collected abundant materials, which he did not, however, publish. They were prepared for the instruction of Louis, duke of Orleans, son of the regent, who lived at the abbey of Sainte-Geneviève. The principal MSS. which this monk has left concerning the history of the regular canons, of which he had made a special study, are, *Library of Regular Canons:—Lives of Holy Canons, both Secular and Regular:*—and *History of all the Houses of Regular Canons.* His last work was *A History of the Abbey of Sainte-Geneviève.* It is from this last work that the Benedictines have extracted nearly all that they have said of this house in vol. vii of the new *Gallia Christiana.* Prevost furnished the material

to the abbot Lebeuf, his countryman, for the catalogue of the writers of Auxerre inserted in *The History of Auxerre*.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.

Prevost, Pierre Robert le, a French pulpit orator of some note, was born at Rouen in 1675. From his youth he displayed a marked propensity for preaching, and proceeded to Paris to improve himself after the model of celebrated orators. Sought after with eagerness in the city, he was no less a favorite at court, where he preached statedly during Advent from 1714 to 1727, and in 1718 during Lent. At this last date he was provided with a canonship at Chartres. The record of his funeral sermons, published by Lottin (Paris, 1765), contains those of the cardinal of Fürstenberg (of which Fléchier speaks with eulogy), of Godet of Marais, bishop of Chartres, of Louis XIV and of the duke of Berri; sermons, and a panegyric of St. Louis. He died in 1736 at Chartres.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v. See Vinet, *French Lit.* p. 116 sq.

Price, Henry, a minister of the Wesleyan Methodist Church in Ireland, was born in Dromore, Antrim County, Ireland, Jan. 30, 1802; was converted at seventeen, was made a local preacher about the year 1821, and entered the itinerant ministry at the Conference of 1823. He soon became an able and judicious preacher; "he was mighty in the Scriptures," reasoning out of them, and having a remarkable talent for apposite and convincing quotations from Holy Writ. He was a zealous and effective advocate for Christian missions, a section of evangelical work to which British and Irish Methodists pay more attention and devote more labor than does any other Christian Church. While Mr. Price adorned the Gospel of God our Saviour in all things, there were especially noticeable in him a childlike simplicity, a transparent sincerity, an uprightness which scorned to countenance anything low or mean, a charity "which thinketh no evil," and an unselfishness "which seeketh not its own." Sweeping revivals occurred on many of the circuits on which he was stationed. He was specially attentive to the sick and afflicted, and his visits to them were frequent, sympathizing, and consolatory. He was truly "a brother beloved," and his brethren in the ministry manifested their high appreciation of his character and talents by electing him repeatedly to fill the highest offices in their gift, and on all occasions he proved himself worthy of their esteem and confidence. He was cautious and practical, always ready to carry out every arrangement intrusted to his care with punctilious exactness. Never had Irish Methodism a more faithful son, or a minister of more perfect singleness of aim, purity of intention, or exemplary fidelity. Mr. Price died in the sixty-eighth year of his age.

Price, John (1), an English scholar of much renown, was born about the year 1600, and was educated at Christ Church, Oxford. He was of Protestant parentage, but after leaving college he joined the Romanists and went to Italy during the civil wars, as he found himself the object of much hatred and persecution. He settled in Florence, after having resided for a while in Paris; but when a professorship was offered him at Pisa, he removed thither, and there lived for some time. He subsequently retired to the St. Augustine Convent at Rome, where he died in 1676. He was the author of the following works: *Notæ et Observationes in Apologiam L. Apuleii Madaurensis Philosophi Platonici* (Paris, 1635, 4to; very rare, but republished in the Gouda ed. of *Apuleius*, 1650, 8vo):—*Matthæus ex Sacra Pagina, Sanctis Patribus, etc., illustratus* (Paris, 1646, 8vo):—*Adnotationes in Epist. Jacobi* (1646, 8vo):—*Acta Apostolorum, ex Sacra Pagina, Sanctis Patribus, etc., illustrata* (1647, 8vo):—*Commentarii in Varios Novi Testamenti Libros; his accesserunt Adnotationes in Psalmorum Librum* (Lond. 1660, fol. The notes on the New Testament, or some of them, had been published before separately [*supra*], and Orme says that those on the Psalms had also appeared before). Price brought to his expositions of the Scriptures an extensive knowledge of classical literature, and, imitating Grotius's method, frequently illustrated by profane authors, especially the Greek and Roman. See Orme, *Bibl. Biblica*, s. v.; *Crit. Sacri*, vol. v; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth.* s. v.;

Price, John (2), D.D., an English clergyman, flourished in the second half of the 17th century, and was chaplain to general Monk during the civil wars. Dr. Price published, *Serm. of Thanksgiving for the Success of General Monk* (Lond. 1660, 4to):—*Serm. on Matt. v*, 47 (Oxon. 1661, 8vo):—*Serm. on Gal. iv*, 16 (1661, 8vo):—*Serm. on Eccles. x*, 17 (1661, 8vo):—*Serm. on Heb. xiii*, 16 (1661, 8vo):—*Serm. on Phil. iv*, 5 (1663, 4to):—*The Mystery and Method of his Majesty's Happy Restauration laid open to Publick View* (Lond. 1660, 8vo).

Price, Jonathan D., a physician and missionary to Burmah in the first half of this century, was ordained in Philadelphia May 20, 1821, and immediately after set out for his field of labor. He arrived early in the next year at Rangoon. When his medical knowledge became known at court, he was ordered to repair to Ava, the capital, where he was introduced to the king, who gave him a house. When the British invaded Burmah, he and Mr. Judson were thrown into prison June 8, 1824. He was confined and subjected to dreadful sufferings till February or March, 1826, when he was released and employed to negotiate a treaty with the British, who had advanced near to the capital. After the war he resided at Ava, and was in favor with the emperor. Price taught several native scholars, and by his lectures hoped to shake the foundation of Buddhism. He fell a victim to pulmonary consumption Feb. 14, 1828, dying in the hope of that precious Gospel he wished to impart to the heathen. See *Amer. Bapt. Mag.; Memoir of Mrs. Judson;* Allen, *Biog. Dict.* s. v.

Price, Rice. See Price, Thomas.

Price, Richard, D.D., an eminent English divine, noted for his scholarly attainments, his philosophical and mathematical contributions, his general devotion to truth in its highest forms, and a most consistent life, was born at Tynton, Glamorganshire, Wales, Feb. 23, 1723. His father, of whose second marriage Richard was the sole offspring, was a rigid Calvinistic minister, remarkable for his intolerance, who spared no pains to imbue his son with sound Calvinistic doctrine. Richard, however, began early to claim the privilege of free opinion, and by his scruples often incurred the anger of his parent. The latter died in 1739, and by his will the bulk of the property, which appears to have been considerable, came into the possession of one son; the widow and six other children being left in straitened circumstances to provide for their own maintenance. The widow and her eldest son lived, however, only a few months longer, and shortly after their death Richard, then in his eighteenth year, set out for London in the hope of qualifying himself for the clerical profession. The heir of his father's fortune provided him with both horse and servant as far as Cardiff, but left him without the means of performing the rest of the journey except on foot or in a wagon. He chose the former as the most ready means, and thus made his way to the metropolis of England. His education during his father's lifetime had been superintended by several Dissenting ministers, and on reaching London he obtained, through the kindness of a paternal uncle, admission to a Presbyterian academy, where he pursued studies in mathematics, philosophy, and theology. In 1743 he was engaged as chaplain and companion to the family of Mr. Streathfield, of Stoke-Newington, where he resided for thirteen years, the death of his employer only terminating the engagement, but not without a recognition of faithful service rendered. In the disposition of Mr. Streathfield's property Price came in for a share, and by this aid and his appointment as morning preacher of the chapel at Newington-Green, he was

placed in independent circumstances. He had previously been made pastor of a congregation at Hackney, but he preferred the appointment at Newington-Green, married in 1757, and lived there until the death of his wife (in 1786), when he removed again to Hackney. Meanwhile his life had been one of considerable literary and scientific activity. His *Review of the Principal Questions and Difficulties in Morals* (Lond. 1758), though somewhat heavy, and designated by Brown as "very elaborate, very tedious, and not very clear," seems to have established his reputation as a metaphysician and a moralist. It is considered the ablest defence of the system of Cudworth and Clarke. It is an attempt to revive the intellectual theory of moral obligation, which seemed to have fallen under the attacks of Butler, Hutcheson, and Hume, and was made before that of Smith. Sir J. Mackintosh has briefly noticed it in his *Preliminary Dissertation* to *Encyclop. Brit.* (republished in his *Works* [ed. 1854], i, 158, 159). In 1769 Price published his *Treatise on Reversionary Payments;* this was followed by the compilation and publication of the celebrated *Northampton Mortality Tables*, and various other works relating to life-assurance and annuities, forming most valuable contributions to the branch of science to which they refer. In 1776 appeared his *Observations on Civil Liberty and the Justice and Policy of the War with America.* Of this work 60,000 copies are said to have been sold in a few months. So greatly was it admired in the United States that, in 1778, the American Congress, through Franklin, communicated to him their desire to consider him a fellow-citizen, and to receive his assistance in regulating their finances—an offer declined principally on the ground of age. On the termination of the war with the colonies, Mr. Pitt sought Mr. Price's advice as to the best mode of liquidating the British national debt, the result of which, it is said, was the adoption of the sinking fund. When the French revolution broke out, the doctor distinguished himself by a sermon, "On the Love of Country," in which he hailed that event as the commencement of a glorious æra. This drew upon the preacher some strong animadversions from Mr. Burke in his celebrated *Reflections.* Besides many papers in the *Transactions of the Royal Society*, of which he was a fellow, he published sermons and pamphlets, which established his character as a sound advocate for civil liberty and a profound master of financial calculation. He died April 19, 1791. One other of his publications of interest to our readers is his *Four Dissertations on Providence, Prayer, the State of Virtuous Men after Death, and Christianity* (1766–68). His views respecting the Son of God were what was called Low or semi-Arian. Mr. Price was a believer in the immateriality of the soul, holding that, according to the teaching of the Sacred Scriptures, it remains in a dormant state between death and resurrection; and because of these opinions he was led into a controversy of some celebrity with his friend Dr. Priestley, maintained by correspondence in 1778, and given to the public by the latter under the title of *A Free Discussion of the Doctrine of Materialism and Philosophical Necessity.* This friendly controversy shows how decided were his views on the philosophical aberration of the age, and how earnestly he desired to place moral and metaphysical truth upon a deeper and truer foundation. "Almost the only writer," says Morell, "of this (the rationalistic) school whose works are likely to form a part of our standard philosophy is Dr. Richard Price." In this high estimate of the merits of Price's philosophical writings, Mr. Morell is not alone. "Price investigated with acuteness and ability many important questions relative to morals, and controverted the doctrine of a moral sense as irreconcilable with the unalterable character of moral ideas, which, as well as those of substance and cause, he maintained to be eternal and original principles of the intellect itself, independent of the divine will" (Tennemann). "If, in England, you only look at London in the 18th century, you will doubtless there see little else than sensualism. But even at London you would find, by the side of Priestley, Price, that ardent friend of liberty—that ingenious and profound economist, who renewed and brilliantly sustained the Platonic idealism of Cudworth. I know that Price is an isolated phenomenon at London, but the whole Scotch school is more or less spiritualistic" (Cousin). But Mackintosh (*ut sup.*) by no means shares in this enthusiasm; nor can it be expected that the admirers of Locke should discover much merit in his opponent. Sir James's estimate of the characteristics of Price will be found in the *Edinburgh Review*, June, 1815, p. 171, 172. See also *The Lond. Mon. Rev.* lxxxiii, 77; and *Boston Christ. Disciple*, ii, 134. Dr. Price's moral character appears to have been a singularly beautiful one. "Simplicity of manners," says Dr. Priestley, "with such genuine marks of perfect integrity and benevolence, diffused around him a charm which the forms of politeness can but poorly imitate." See Morgan, *Memoirs of the Life of Richard Price, D.D.* (Lond. 1815); Hook, *Eccles. Biog.* viii, 162; Stephen, *Hist. of Engl. Thought* (1877, 2 vols. 8vo), vol. i and ii, especially ii, 3 sq.; Leckey, *Hist. of the 18th Century* (1878, 2 vols. 8vo), vol. ii. See also Tennemann, *Hist. of Philos.* (Johnson's transl. 1832) p. 384; Cousin, *Hist. of Mod. Philos.* (Wright's transl. 1854) ii, 132; Morell, *Hist. of Mod. Philos.* (2d ed. 1848) i, 215; Blakey, *Hist. of the Philos. of Mind* (1850) iii, 313–15; *Blackwood's Magazine*, xxxix, 803.

Price, Thomas, one of the most distinguished Welsh scholars of his age, was born Oct. 2, 1787, at Pencaerelin, in the parish of Llanafan Fawr, near Builth, in Brecknockshire. His father, the Rev. Rice Price, originally a stonemason, at the age of seventeen formed an attachment to Mary Bower, the descendant of a long line of clergymen; acquired, by incessant diligence and frugality, the means of attending the college-school at Brecknock; and finally obtained ordination from the bishop of St. Davids, and, in 1784, the hand he sought, after a courtship of twenty years. He was so fortunate as afterwards to be presented to three livings; but his income, like that of some other Welsh pluralists, was never believed to exceed fifty pounds a year. He had two sons, both of whom were brought up to the Church, the elder taking his degree at Oxford, while the second, Thomas, was obliged to finish his studies at the college of Brecknock. Welsh was the language the two boys heard constantly in the family; English they acquired at their second school; the elements of Latin and Greek were learned subsequently; and, from some French officers who were prisoners of war at Brecknock, Thomas acquired an excellent knowledge of French. In 1812 he received holy orders, and in 1825, after performing for thirteen years the duties of various curacies near Crickhowel, he was appointed to the vicarage of Cwmdu. This was his last preferment. The rest of his life was passed in historical and archæological studies of his country. He was regarded by his countrymen as one of the most accomplished champions of the Welsh language and literature. He died at Cwmdu Nov. 7, 1848. His writings are not of special interest to theological readers. Many of his English compositions are collected under the title of *Literary Remains of the Rev. Thomas Price*, with a *Memoir* by Jane Williams (Llandovery, 1854–55, 2 vols. 8vo). A memoir of Price is found in the *Lond. Gentleman's Mag.* Feb. 1849, p. 212; see also *Engl. Cyclop.* s. v.

Pricked Song is, in music, a term applied to a composition used in ecclesiastical service. It is divided into descant, pricksong, counterpoint, and faburden, the last being a highly pitched key.

Pricket, an ecclesiastical term designating a spike on which candles were fixed. There are specimens from Kirkstall Abbey in the collection of the Society of

Arts, London; and another, of Limoges enamel of the 13th century, is in the British Museum.

Prickett, MARMADUKE, an English clergyman, was born about the year 1805. He was educated at Cambridge University, and held the appointment of chaplain to Trinity College, where he died in 1839. He published, *Some Account of Barnwell Priory, in the Parish of St. Andrew the Less* (Camb. 1837, 8vo):—*An Historical and Architectural Description of the Priory Church of Bridlington* (Lond. 1831, 8vo; 1846, 8vo). See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s. v.

Pricks (Numb. xxxiii, 55; Acts ix, 5). See GOAD; THORN.

Pridden, JOHN, an English clergyman, was born in the year 1758 in London, and was educated at Queen's College, Oxford. After filling various appointments, he finally became rector of St. George's, Botolph Lane, London. He died in 1825. His publications are of a secular character only, and those interested may consult Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, ii, 1681.

Pride is inordinate and unreasonable self-esteem, attended with insolence and rude treatment of others. 1. "It is sometimes," says a good writer, "confounded with vanity, and sometimes with dignity; but to the former passion it has no resemblance, and in many circumstances it differs from the latter. Vanity is the parent of loquacious boasting, and the person subject to it, if his pretences be admitted, has no inclination to insult the company. The proud man, on the other hand, is naturally silent, and wrapped up in his own importance, seldom speaks but to make his audience feel their inferiority." Pride is the high opinion that a poor, little, contracted soul entertains of itself. Dignity consists in just, great, and uniform actions, and is the opposite to meanness. 2. Pride manifests itself by praising ourselves, adoring our persons, attempting to appear before others in a superior light to what we are; contempt and slander of others; envy at the excellences others possess; anxiety to gain applause; distress and rage when slighted; impatience of contradiction, and opposition to God himself. 3. The evil effects of pride are beyond computation. It has spread itself universally in all nations, among all characters; and as it was the first sin, as some suppose, that entered into the world, so it seems the last to be conquered. It may be considered as the parent of discontent, ingratitude, covetousness, poverty, presumption, passion, extravagance, bigotry, war, and persecution. In fact, there is hardly an evil perpetrated but pride is connected with it in a proximate or remote sense. 4. To suppress this evil, we should consider what we are. "If we could trace our descents," says Seneca, "we should find all slaves to come from princes, and all princes from slaves. To be proud of knowledge is to be blind in the light; to be proud of virtue is to poison ourselves with the antidote; to be proud of authority is to make our rise our downfall." The imperfection of our nature, our scanty knowledge, contracted powers, narrow conceptions, and moral inability are strong motives to excite us to humility. We should consider, also, what punishments this sin has brought on mankind. See the cases of Pharaoh, Haman, Nebuchadnezzar, Herod, and others; how particularly it is prohibited (Prov. xvi, 18; 1 Pet. v, 5; James iv, 6; Prov. xxix, 23); what a torment it is to its possessor (Esther v, 13); how soon all things of a sublunary nature will end; how disgraceful it renders us in the sight of God, angels, and men; what a barrier it is to our felicity and communion with God; how fruitful it is of discord; how it precludes our usefulness, and renders us really contemptible. Comp. Blackie, *Morals*, p. 244; Edwards, *Works;* Robert Hall, *Works;* Bates, *Works;* Brown, *Philosophy of the Mind;* *Wesl. Mag.* 1846, p. 1113; 1847, p. 548 sq.; Malcom, *Theol. Index*, s. v. See HUMILITY.

Prideaux, Humphrey, D.D., a learned English divine, noted as a historian, was born at Padstow, in Cornwall, May 3, 1648. He was educated first at Westminster School and later at Christ Church, Oxford, where he took his degree in 1672. While at the university he published the ancient inscriptions from the Arundelian Marbles, under the title of *Marmora Oxoniensia*, which recommended him to the patronage of the lord-chancellor Finch, afterwards earl of Nottingham, who gave him in 1679 a living near Oxford, and afterwards a prebend in Norwich cathedral. While there he became engaged in some severe contests with the Roman Catholics, the result of which was the publication of his work *The Validity of the Orders of the Church of England made out* (1688). He also took an active part in resisting the arbitrary proceedings of James II which affected the interests of the Established Church. In 1688 he was promoted to the archdeaconry of Suffolk; but it was not without much consideration that he could bring himself to take the oath of allegiance to William and Mary. But when once decided, he acted in good faith, and treated all non-jurors with kindness and respect. In 1691, upon the death of Dr. Pococke, the Hebrew professorship at Oxford was offered to Dr. Prideaux, but he refused it, though he afterwards repented of his refusal. In 1697 he published *The Life of Mahomet*, which was so well received that three editions of it were sold the first year. This *Life* was only a part of a greater work which he had long designed to write, and that was *A History of the Saracen Empire*, and with it *The Decay and Fall of Christianity in the East;* but, for certain reasons, he dropped this design, and only published that part which contained *The Life of Mahomet*, to which he annexed *A Letter to the Deists*, wherein he undertook to prove the truth of Christianity by contrasting it with the impostures of Mohammedanism. In 1702 he was made dean of Norwich. He died Nov. 1, 1724. He published, *The Original Right of Tythes:—Directions for Church-wardens*, and other small pieces for the service of the Church; also two tracts of Maimonides, with a Latin version and notes, under the title of *De Jure Pauperis et Peregrini apud Judæos*, as an introduction for Hebrew students to Rabbinical language. But Dr. Prideaux's great work was *The Connection of the History of the Old and New Testament*, the first part of which was published in 1715, the second in 1718. Both parts were received with the greatest approbation, and went through eight editions in London, besides two or three in Dublin, before the end of 1720. The best of the many excellent editions which have appeared of this work since the death of its author are probably the 22d, with *An Account of the Rabbinical Authorities* by Rev. A. M'Caul, D.D. (1845, 2 vols. 8vo), and the 25th, which, in addition, has *An Account*, etc., with notes and analysis, and *Introductory Review* by J. Talboys Wheeler (Lond. 1858, 2 vols. 8vo). The last named is by far the most desirable of all, as it contains, in addition to the excellent work done by M'Caul, the notes, etc., by Wheeler, who also edited Shuckford's *Connection of Sacred and Profane History* (1858, 2 vols. 8vo) and Russell's *Connection of Sacred and Profane History* (1865, 2 vols. 8vo), the three embracing the entire period from the Creation to the time of Christ. Prideaux's *Connection* was translated into French (Amst. 1728, 6 vols. 12mo), and, with John Dierberghe's annotations, into Dutch. Le Clerc published a critical examination of it, which appeared in English (Lond. 1722, 8vo). "The *Connection*," says Orme, "contains a large mass of erudition, and accurate information on every topic of Jewish history and antiquities, and on all the links which connected that peculiar people with the surrounding nations. It is indispensable to the Biblical and interesting to the general scholar. . . . Le Clerc's exceptions are not of great importance" (*Bibl. Bib.* s. v.). This history takes in the affairs of Egypt, Assyria, and all the other Eastern nations, as well as of the Jews; and likewise those of Greece and Rome, so far as was neces-

sary for giving a distinct view of the completion of the prophecies which relate to the times comprehended in it. The author has also set in the clearest light some passages of profane history which before lay dispersed and buried in confusion, and there appears throughout the whole work such an amiable spirit of sincerity and candor as sufficiently atones as well for the few mistakes which escaped his diligence as for some weaknesses arising from his individual temperament. About three years before his death he presented his collection of Oriental books, more than three hundred in number, to the library of Clare Hall, Cambridge. Several of his posthumous *Tracts* and *Letters*, with a *Life of Dr. Prideaux*, the author of which is not named, were published in 1748 (8vo). Dr. Prideaux was tall, well-built, and of a strong and robust constitution. His qualities were very good, solid rather than lively, and his judgment excellent. He possessed great moral worth, and more ardent piety than was usual in his generation. As a writer he is clear, strong, intelligent, and learned. See, besides the works above mentioned, *Biog. Brit.* s. v.; *Gentleman's Magazine*, vol. lxx; and especially the excellent article in Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, ii, 1681, 1682.

Prideaux, John, D.D., an English prelate of much note, was born of humble parentage at Stowford, near Ivybridge, in Devonshire, Sept. 17, 1578. While yet in his boyhood he was a candidate for the office of parish-clerk at Ugborough, a neighboring village; but he did not succeed, and to his failure he used to attribute his elevated position in after-life. He was then noticed by a lady of the parish, who, seeing that a boy of only common educational training attempted so much, felt persuaded that he would surely rise if given greater facilities; and she supported him at school till he had acquired a knowledge of Latin, and was ready to go to Oxford, where he was admitted a poor scholar at Exeter College in 1596. He was elected probationer fellow of his college in 1602, being then a B.A. In the following year he received holy orders, and, having become noted for his profound knowledge of divinity as well as his great learning in general, he was elected rector of his college upon the death of Dr. Thomas Holland in 1612. In 1615 he succeeded Dr. Robert Abbott, then promoted to the see of Salisbury, as regius professor of divinity, canon of Christ Church, and rector of Ewelme. He afterwards held the office of vice-chancellor for several years. "In the rectorship of his college," says Wood, "he carried himself so winning and pleasing by his gentle government and fatherly instruction that it flourished more than any house in the university with scholars, as well of great as of mean birth; as also with many foreigners that came purposely to sit at his feet to gain instruction." He no less distinguished himself in the divinity chair, which he occupied for twenty-six years. Although he maintained his decided convictions against the Socinians and Arminians, and was a most stout defender of the Calvinistic tendency, he was yet popular with all his hearers, and none failed to do him reverence, however widely they might differ from him. Though the university was agitated deeply by the controversy of those times, Prideaux happily escaped all partisan imbroglio, and in 1641 was elevated to the bishopric of Worcester. On account of his adherence to the king, he found his dignity neither pleasant nor profitable. He became so impoverished as to be compelled to sell his books, and so was, as Dr. Gauden says, "verus librorum helluo." "Having," continues Wood, "first, by indefatigable studies, digested his excellent library into his mind, he was afterwards forced again to devour all his books with his teeth, turning them, by a miraculous faith and patience, into bread for himself and his children, to whom he left no legacy but pious poverty, God's blessing, and a father's prayers." He died at Bredon, in Worcestershire, July 12, 1650. He was a man of most unassuming and gentle manners; of excellent conduct, and great integrity and piety of mind; quite regardless of worldly concerns, and careless and often imprudent in worldly matters. He was an excellent linguist, possessing a wonderful memory, and so profound a divine that some have called him "Columna Fidei Orthodoxæ et Malleus Hæreticorum," "Patrum Pater," and "Ingens Scholæ et Academiæ Oraculum." His works were as much esteemed as his learning. They were numerous, and mostly written in Latin—upon grammar, logic, theology, and other subjects. Those specially interested will find a list in Middleton's *Evangel. Biog.* iii, 203 sq. Though he died before the publication of the London *Polyglot*, he was well known to the editor, Brian Walton, who appeals to Prideaux's authority, on the nicer points of Hebrew criticism, in vindicating the *Polyglot* from certain cavils that had been raised against it. See Hook, *Eccles. Biog.* viii, 163; Perry, *Hist. of the Church of England*, iii, 239; *English Cyclopædia*, s. v.; Wood, *Athenæ Oxoniensis* (Bliss ed.), iii, 267; Fuller, *Worthies*, i, 408 sq.; Nicholls, ii, 456; and Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s. v.

Prie, René de, a French cardinal, was born in Touraine, in 1451, of a noble family. He was successively, by the favor of cardinal George D'Amboise, his cousin, grand archdeacon of Bourges, archdeacon of Blois, dean of St.-Hilaire-de-Poitiers, apostolic prothonotary, abbot commendatory of Landais, of Loroux, of Issoudun, etc., and, at last, almoner to the king. He was raised to the bishopric of Bayeux, on the express recommendation of Louis XII, Sept. 17, 1498. He was shortly after sent to Étaples to subscribe to the treaty concluded in 1499 with Henry VII, king of England. He accompanied, a little while after this, Louis XII in his expedition against the Genevese, and was promoted to the cardinalate by Julius II (May 17, 1507). When that pope took up arms against Louis XII, he prevented De Prie from leaving Rome, under pain of being deprived of his livings (1509). In spite of the pontifical interdict, the cardinal quitted Rome, and, together with some other prelates attached to the interests of France, opened at Pisa (Nov. 1, 1511) a council against Julius II, who, on Oct. 24, had declared him deposed from the cardinalate. In the interval he had been raised to the bishopric of Limoges (in 1510), and two years after he was provided with the bishopric of Lectoure. Seeing the chair of Limoges contested, De Prie made an arrangement with his competitors (Aug. 18, 1513) by which he relinquished his rights to the bishopric of Lectoure to William of Barton, who in his turn waived in De Prie's favor his claim to the chair of Limoges; Foucaud de Bonnival then obtained the bishopric of Soissons. René de Prie, who had in the meantime been created cardinal by pope Leo X, celebrated at St. Denis the funeral ceremonies of Anne of Brittany (Jan. 20, 1514); blessed the marriage of Louis XII and Mary of England (Sept. 14); held at Bayeux a diocesan synod, where he published the laws (April 15, 1515); and resigned his two bishoprics of Limoges and of Bayeux Sept. 1516. While at Milan, in 1512, whither the Council of Pisa had been transferred, the University of Paris declared against him in a work of Thomas de Vio (cardinal Cajetan), *On the Authority of the Pope*, wherein the doctrine of Gerson was attacked, which he had espoused. Cardinal De Prie died at Lyre Sept. 9, 1519.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.

Prie-Dieu is a term in ecclesiastical architecture designating a small lectern (q. v.), or book-desk, which was introduced in the 15th century.

Prierias, Sylvester, a Roman Catholic theologian of the time of the Reformation, and noted for his antagonism to the new movement, was born in 1460. His family-name was *Mazolini*, but he was called *De Prierio*, or *Prierias*, from the place of his birth (Prierio, in the county of Asti, in Piedmont). At the age of sixteen he entered the Dominican order, and was soon received as baccalaureate. As he had the gift of a singularly clear

and ready exposition, he was surrounded by a crowd of pupils at the Gymnasium of Bologna, of which he had become the director. At the request of the Senate of Venice he accepted for a few years a professorship of theology at Padua, and was then prior at Milan, Verona, and Como. In 1508, in an assembly of the members of his order from both Lombardys, held at Mantua, he was elected vicar-general; two years later he was elected prior at Bologna. His renown and the recommendation of Dominico Grimani, bishop of Porto, induced pope Julius II to call him to Rome in 1511 as public lecturer on theology. Upon the death of the *Magister Sacri Palatii*, Frater Joannes de Rafanellis (generally called De Ferraria), in 1515, Prierias was promoted to the vacant dignity by pope Leo X. Prierias died in 1523, and was buried in the church of St. Mary ad Minervam. He was the first non-German theologian who took up the pen against Luther. In 1518 he published *Dialogus in præsumptuosas Martini Lutheri conclusiones de potestate Papæ* and his *Replica in Lutherum;* then in the following years his *Errata et Argumenta Lutheri recitata, detecta, et copiosissimè trita*, and his *Epitoma Responsionis ad eundem Lutherum*. The style is quite scholastic, and his defence of the papal primacy not without ability from a Romanist standpoint. But Luther, in his blunt and telling manner, laid so bare all the weaknesses of papal pretension as to make the defence of Prierias contemptible. The pope himself saw the inferiority of his defender in the contest, and admonished Prierias to silence; though he appointed him one of the judges of Luther at a later time. Some writings attributed falsely to Prierias are the works of a later magister of the order, Franciscus Sylvester. After his death appeared under his name some satires, composed after the fashion of the *Epistolæ obscur.*—viz., *Modus solennis et authenticus ad inquirendum et convincendum Lutheranos valdè necessarius*, and the *Tractatus de arte et modo inquirendi hæreticos*. See Echard and Quetif, *Bibliotheca Prædicatorum;* Pressel (in Herzog), *Real-Encyclopädie*, for the Protestant, and Aschbach, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, for the Roman Catholic estimate of this man. See also Fisher, *Hist. of the Reformation*, p. 96; Alzog, *Kirchengesch.* ii, 262. (J. H. W.)

Priest, Hebrew (כֹּהֵן, *kohén*, ἱερεύς). We base the following article upon the Scriptural information, with important additions from other and more modern sources.) See also Sacerdotal Order.

I. *General Considerations.*—1. *The Name.* (1.) The English word *priest* is generally derived from the New-Test. term *presbyter* (πρεσβύτερος, *elder*), the meaning of which is, however, essentially different from that which was intended by the ancient terms. It would come nearer if derived from προΐστημι or προΐσταμαι, "to preside," etc. It would then correspond to Aristotle's definition of a priest, "presiding over things relating to the gods" (*Polit.* iii, 14), and with the very similar one in Heb. v, 1: "Every high-priest taken from among men is constituted on the behalf of men, with respect to their concerns with God, that he may present both gifts and sacrifices for sins." It would then adequately represent the ἱερεύς (ὁ ἱερὰ ῥέζων) of the Greeks, and the *sacerdos* (*à sacris faciundis*) of the Latins. See Presbyter.

(2.) It is unfortunate that there is nothing like a *consensus* of interpreters as to the etymology of the above Hebrew word *kohên*. Its root-meaning, uncertain as far as Hebrew itself is concerned, is referred by Gesenius (*Thesaurus*, s. v.) to the idea of *prophecy*. The *kohén* delivers a divine message, stands as a mediator between God and man, represents each to the other. This meaning, however, belongs to the Arabic, not to the Hebrew form, and Ewald connects the latter with the verb הֵכִין (*hekin*), *to array*, put in order (so in Isa. lxi, 10), seeing in it a reference to the primary office of the priests as arranging the sacrifice on the altar (*Alterthüm.* p. 272). According to Saalschütz (*Archäol. der Hebr.* c. 78), the primary meaning of the word is *to minister*, and he thus accounts for the wider application of the name (as below). Bähr (*Symbolik*, ii, 15) connects it with an Arabic root = קרב, *to draw near*.

Of these etymologies, the last has the merit of answering most closely to the received usage of the word. In the precise terminology of the law, it is used of one who may "draw near" to the Divine Presence (Exod. xix, 22; xxx, 20) while others remain afar off, and is applied accordingly, for the most part, to the sons of Aaron, as those who were alone authorized to offer sacrifices. In some remarkable passages it takes a wider range. It is applied to the priests of other nations or religions, to Melchizedek (Gen. xiv, 18), Potipherah (xli, 45), Jethro (Exod. ii, 16), to those who discharged priestly functions in Israel before the appointment of Aaron and his sons (xix, 22). A case of greater difficulty presents itself in 2 Sam. viii, 18, where the sons of David are described as priests (*kohanîm*), and this immediately after the name had been applied in its usual sense to the sons of Aaron. The writer of 1 Chron. xviii, 17, as if reluctant to adopt this use of the title, or anxious to guard against mistake, gives a paraphrase, "the sons of David were first at the king's hand" (A. V. "chief about the king"). The Sept. and A. V. suppress the difficulty by translating *kohanîm* into αὐλάρχαι and "chief officers." The Vulg. more honestly gives "sacerdotes." Luther and Coverdale follow the Hebrew strictly, and give "priests." The received explanation is that the word is used here in what is assumed to be its earlier and wider meaning, as equivalent to rulers, or, giving it a more restricted sense, that the sons of David were *Vicarii Regis*, as the sons of Aaron were *Vicarii Dei* (comp. Patrick, Michaelis, Rosenmüller, *ad loc.*, Keil on 1 Chron. xviii, 17). It can hardly be said, however, that this accounts satisfactorily for the use of the same title in two successive verses in two entirely different senses. Ewald accordingly (*Alterthüm.* p. 276) sees in it an actual suspension of the usual law in favor of members of the royal house, and finds a parallel instance in the acts of David (2 Sam. vi, 14) and Solomon (1 Kings iii, 15). De Wette and Gesenius, in like manner, look on it as a revival of the old household priesthoods. These theories are in their turn unsatisfactory, as contradicting the whole spirit and policy of David's reign, which was throughout that of reverence for the law of Jehovah and the priestly order which it established. A conjecture midway between these two extremes is perhaps permissible. David and his sons may have been admitted, not to distinctively priestly acts, such as burning incense (Numb. xvi, 40; 2 Chron. xxvi, 18), but to an honorary, titular priesthood. To wear the ephod in processions (2 Sam. vi, 14), at the time when this was the special badge of the order (1 Sam. xxii, 18), to join the priests and Levites in their songs and dances, might have been conceded, with no deviation from the law, to the members of the royal house. There are some indications that these functions (possibly this liturgical retirement from public life) were the lot of the members of the royal house who did not come into the line of succession, and who belonged, by descent or incorporation, to the house of Nathan, as distinct from that of David (Zech. xii, 12). The very name Nathan, connected as it is with Nethinim, suggests the idea of dedication. See Nethinim. The title *kohên* is given to Zabud, the son of Nathan (1 Kings iv, 5). The genealogy of the line of Nathan in Luke iii includes many names—Levi, Eliezer, Malchi, Jochanan, Mattathias, Heli—which appear elsewhere as belonging to the priesthood. The mention in 1 Esdr. v, 5 of Joiakim as the son of Zerubbabel, while in Neh. xii, 10 he appears as the son of Jeshua, the son of Josedek, indicates either a strange confusion, or a connection, as yet imperfectly understood, between the two families. The same explanation applies to the parallel cases of Ira the Jairite (2 Sam. xx, 26), where

the Sept. gives ἱερεύς. It is noticeable that this use of the title is confined to the reigns of David and Solomon, and that the synonym "at the king's hand" of 1 Chron. xviii, 17 is used in xxv, 2 of the sons of Asaph as "prophesying" under their head or father, and of the relation of Asaph himself to David in the choral service of the Temple.

2. *Essential Idea of the Hebrew Priesthood.*—This may be called *mediation;* hence the fact that in the epistle to the Hebrews mediator and priest are considered as synonymous. Yet by this the specific object of the priesthood, in contradistinction to the two other theocratical offices of prophet and king, is by no means sufficiently expressed. The prophet is also a mediator between God and man, since he *speaks* to the latter in the name of the former; while the king is the mediator of the judicial and executive power of God among his people, *acting* in the name of Jehovah. The priest also was clothed with representative power (Deut. xviii, 5); but this power was mainly directed to represent the *people* as a holy people in the presence of Jehovah, and to prepare a way by which they themselves might approach God.

Israel was the full-grown *family* of God, and the domestic priesthood was to become a nation of priests, a royal priesthood (Exod. xix, 3–6; Deut. vii, 6; Numb. xvi, 3). But that Israel was chosen to be the royal priesthood with respect to other nations, like many other things, was only expressed in idea, and not actually realized in fact. Israel was incapacitated by its natural sinfulness, and by its incessant transgressions of the very law through the fulfilment of which it was to be sanctified, to penetrate into the immediate presence of God (Exod. xix, 21). Hence the necessity of the nation having individual representatives to mediate between them and Jehovah. As a separate element the priesthood represented the nation as yet unfit to approach God. The people offered their gifts to God by means of a separated class from among themselves, and in connection with the propitiatory sacrifices this was calculated to keep alive the consciousness of their estrangement from God. The very place assigned to the priests in the camp was expressive of this idea. that they keep "the charge of the sanctuary for the charge of the children of Israel" (Numb. iii, 38).

The insufficiency of the priesthood was expressed by their being excluded from the most holy place. Only the high-priest, in whom the idea of this typical institution concentrated, could penetrate thither; and he only as the type of the future Mediator who was absolutely to lead us into the most holy of the world of spirits. Because the priests were not altogether removed from the sins of the people, even the chief-priest had access only once a year to the most holy, and that just on the day when the entire guilt of the nation was to be atoned for. He had on that occasion to confess his own sin, and bring a sin-offering; to lay aside his magnificent robes of office, and to officiate in a plain linen garment. Moreover, when he entered the dark, narrow space of the most holy, the cloud of incense was to cover the mercy-seat "that he die not" (Lev. xvi, 13).

The idea of mediation between God and the people is expressed by the priest presenting the atonement for the congregation, and the gifts of a reconciled people (הִקְרִיב, Lev. xxi, 7; Numb. xvi, 5; xvii, 5). Again, he brings back from God's presence the blessing of grace, mercy, and peace (Lev. ix, 27, etc.; Numb. vi, 22–27). In the earliest families of the race of Shem the offices of priest and prophet were undoubtedly united; so that the word originally denoted both, and at last the Hebrew idiom kept one part of the idea and the Arabic another (Gesenius, *Hebräisches und Chaldäisches Handwörterbuch* [Leips. 1823]). It is worthy of remark that all the persons who are recorded in Scripture as having legally performed priestly acts, but who were not strictly sacerdotal, come under the definition of a prophet, viz. persons who received supernatural communications of knowledge generally, as Adam, Abraham (Gen. xx, 7), Isaac, Jacob, Moses, Job, Samuel, Elijah (comp. Luke i, 70). The following definition of a priest may be found sufficiently comprehensive: A man who officiates or transacts with God on behalf of others, statedly, or for the occasion.

3. *Origin of the Sacerdotal Order.*—The idea of a priesthood connects itself, in all its forms, pure or corrupted, with the consciousness, more or less distinct, of sin. Men feel that they have broken a law. The power above them is holier than they are, and they dare not approach it. They crave for the intervention of some one of whom they can think as likely to be more acceptable than themselves. He must offer up their prayers, thanksgivings, sacrifices. He becomes their representative in "things pertaining unto God." He may become also (though this does not always follow) the representative of God to man. The functions of the priest and prophet may exist in the same person. The reverence which men pay to one who bears this consecrated character may lead them to acknowledge the priest as being also their king. The claim to fill the office may rest on characteristics belonging only to the individual man, or confined to a single family or tribe. The conditions of the priesthood, the office and influence of the priests, as they are among the most conspicuous facts of all religions of the ancient world, so do they occupy a like position in the history of the religion of Israel.

No trace of a hereditary or caste priesthood meets us in the worship of the patriarchal age. (For its occasional appearance in a general form, see § iii.) Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob perform priestly acts, offer sacrifices, "draw near" to the Lord (Gen. xii, 8; xviii, 23; xxvi, 25; xxxiii, 20). To the eldest son, or to the favored son exalted to the place of the eldest, belongs the "goodly raiment" (xxvii, 15), the "coat of many colors" (xxxvii, 3), in which we find perhaps the earliest trace of a sacerdotal vestment (comp. Blunt, *Script. Coincid.* i, 1; Ugolino, xiii, 138). Once, and once only, does the word *kohén* meet us as belonging to a ritual earlier than the time of Abraham. Melchizedek is "the priest of the most high God" (xiv, 18). The argument of the Epistle to the Hebrews has a historical foundation in the fact that there are no indications in the narrative of Gen. xiv of any one preceding or following him in that office. The special divine names which are connected with him as the priest of "the most high God, the possessor of heaven and earth," render it probable that he rose, in the strength of those great thoughts of God, above the level of the other inhabitants of Canaan. In him Abraham recognised a faith like his own, a life more entirely consecrated, the priestly character in its perfection. See MELCHIZEDEK. In the worship of the patriarchs themselves, the chief of the family, as such, acted as the priest. The office descended with the birthright, and might apparently be transferred with it. As the family expanded, the head of each section probably stood in the same relation to it. The thought of the special consecration of the first-born was recognised at the time of the Exodus (see below). A priesthood of a like kind continued to exist in other Shemitic tribes. The Book of Job, whatever may be its date, ignores altogether the institutions of Israel, and represents the man of Uz as himself "sanctifying" his sons, and offering burnt-offerings (i, 5). Jethro is a "priest of Midian" (Exod. ii, 16; iii, 1). Balak himself offers a bullock and a ram upon the seven altars on Pisgah (Numb. xxiii, 2, etc.).

In Egypt the Israelites came into contact with a priesthood of another kind, and that contact must have been for a time a very close one. The marriage of Joseph with the daughter of the priest of On—a priest, as we may infer from her name, of the goddess Neith—(Gen. xli, 45) [see ASENATH] the special favor which he showed to the priestly caste in the years of famine

(xlvii, 26), the training of Moses in the palace of the Pharaohs, probably in the colleges and temples of the priests (Acts vii, 22)—all this must have impressed the constitution, the dress, the outward form of life upon the minds of the lawgiver and his contemporaries. Little as we know directly of the life of Egypt at this remote period, the stereotyped fixedness of the customs of that country warrants us in referring to a tolerably distant past the facts which belong historically to a later period, and in doing so we find coincidences with the ritual of the Israelites too numerous to be looked on as accidental, or as the result of forces which were at work independent of each other, but taking parallel directions. As circumcision was common to the two nations (Herod. ii, 37), so the shaving of the whole body (ibid.) was with both part of the symbolic purity of the priesthood, once for all with the Levites of Israel (Numb. viii, 7), every third day with those of Egypt. Both are restricted to garments of linen (Herod. ii, 37, 81; Plutarch, *De Isid.* iv; Juven. vi, 533; Exod. xxviii, 39; Ezek. xliv, 18). The sandals of byblus worn by the Egyptian priests were but little removed from the bare feet with which the sons of Aaron went into the sanctuary (Herod. ii, 37). For both there were multiplied ablutions. Both had a public maintenance assigned, and had besides a large share in the flesh of the victims offered (ibid. *l. c.*). Over both there was one high-priest. In both the law of succession was hereditary (ibid.; comp. also Spencer, *De Leg. Hebr.* iii, 1, 5, 11; Wilkinson, *Anc. Egypt.* iii, 116). They were exempt from taxes. Wine was allowed to them only in the strictest moderation, and entire abstinence from it was required during the fasts, which were frequent (Plutarch, *De Isid.* 6). Each grade of the priests was distinguished by its peculiar costume. The high-priests, who, among other official duties, anointed the king, wore a mantle made of an entire leopard-skin; as did the king, when engaged in priestly duties. The sacerdotal order constituted one of the four principal castes, of the highest rank, next to the king, and from whom were chosen his confidential and responsible advisers (comp. 2 Sam. viii, 18; 1 Chron. xviii, 17; Isa. xix, 11; Diodorus, i, 73); they associated with the monarch, whom they assisted in the performance of his public duties, to whom they explained from the sacred books those lessons which were laid down for his conduct (Wilkinson, *Anc. Egypt.* i, 237, 257–282). See EGYPT.

Facts such as these leave scarcely any room for doubt that there was a connection of some kind between the Egyptian priesthood and that of Israel. The latter was not, indeed, an outgrowth or imitation of the former. The faith of Israel in Jehovah, the one Lord, the living God, of whom there was no form or similitude, presented the strongest possible contrast to the multitudinous idols of the polytheism of Egypt. The symbolism of the one was cosmic, "of the earth earthy," that of the other, chiefly, if not altogether, ethical and spiritual. But looking, as we must look, at the law and ritual of the Israelites as designed for the education of a people who were in danger of sinking into such a polytheism, we may readily admit that the education must have started from some point which the subjects of it had already reached, must have employed the language of symbolic acts and rites with which they were already familiar. The same alphabet had to be used, the same root-forms employed as the elements of speech, though the thoughts which they were to be the instruments of uttering were widely different. The details of the religion of Egypt might well be used to make the protest against the religion itself at once less startling and more attractive.

At the time of the Exodus there was as yet no priestly caste. The continuance of solemn sacrifices (Exod. v, 1, 3) implied, of course, a priesthood of some kind, and priests appear as a recognised body before the promulgation of the Law on Sinai (xix, 22). It has been supposed that these were identical with the "young men of the children of Israel" who offered burnt-offerings and peace-offerings (xxiv, 5) either as the first-born or as representing in the freshness of their youth the purity of acceptable worship (comp. the analogous case of "the young man the Levite" in Judg. xvii, and Ewald, *Alterthümer*, p. 273). On the principle, however, that difference of title implies in most cases difference of functions, it appears more probable that the "young men" were not those who had before performed priestly acts, but were chosen by the lawgiver to be his ministers in the solemn work of the covenant, representing, in their youth, the stage in the nation's life on which the people were then entering (Keil, *ad loc.*). There are signs that the priests of the older ritual were already dealt with as belonging to an obsolescent system. Though they were known as those that "come near" to the Lord (Exod. xix, 22), yet they are not permitted to approach the Divine Presence on Sinai. They cannot "sanctify" themselves enough to endure that trial. Aaron alone, the future high-priest, but as yet not known as such, enters with Moses into the thick darkness. It is noticeable also that at this transition-stage, when the old order was passing away, and the new was not yet established, there is the proclamation of the truth, wider and higher than both, that the whole people was to be "a kingdom of priests" (xix, 6). The idea of the life of the nation was that it was to be as a priest and a prophet to the rest of mankind. They were called to a universal priesthood (comp. Keil, *ad loc.*). As a people, however, they needed a long discipline before they could make the idea a reality. They drew back from their high vocation (Exod. xx, 18–21). As for other reasons, so also for this, that the central truth required a rigid, unbending form for its outward expression, a distinctive priesthood was to be to the nation what the nation was to mankind. The position given to the ordinances of the priesthood indicated with sufficient clearness that it was subordinate, not primary, a means and not an end. Not in the first proclamation of the great laws of duty in the Decalogue (Exod. xx, 1–17), nor in the application of those laws to the chief contingencies of the people's life in the wilderness, does it find a place. It appears together with the ark and the tabernacle, as taking its position in the education by which the people were to be led towards the mark of their high calling. As such we have to consider it.

II. *Personal Characteristics of the Hebrew Priesthood.*—1. *Consecration.*—The functions of the HIGH-PRIEST, the position and history of the LEVITES as the consecrated tribe, have been fully discussed under those heads. It remains to notice the characteristic facts connected with "the priests, the sons of Aaron," as standing between the two. Solemn as was the subsequent dedication of the other descendants of Levi, that of the priests involved a yet higher consecration. A special word (קָדַשׁ, *kadásh*) was appropriated to it. Their old garments were laid aside. Their bodies were washed with clean water (Exod. xxix, 4; Lev. viii, 6) and anointed with the perfumed oil, prepared after a prescribed formula, and to be used for no lower purpose (Exod. xxix, 7; xxx, 22–33). The sons of Aaron, it may be noticed, were simply sprinkled with the precious oil (Lev. viii, 30). Over Aaron himself it was poured till it went down to the skirts of his clothing (Lev. viii, 12; Psa. cxxxiii, 2). The new garments belonging to their office were then put on them (see below). The truth that those who intercede for others must themselves have been reconciled was indicated by the sacrifice of a bullock as a sin-offering, on which they solemnly laid their hands, as transferring to it the guilt which had attached to them (Exod. xxix, 10; Lev. viii, 18). The total surrender of their lives was represented by the ram slain as a burnt-offering, a "sweet savor" to Jehovah (Exod. xxix, 18; Lev. viii, 21). The blood of these two was sprinkled on the altar, offered to the Lord. The blood of a third victim, the ram of consecration, was used for another purpose. With it Moses sprinkled the right ear, that was to be open to the di-

vine voice; the right hand and the right foot, that were to be active in divine ministrations (Exod. xxix, 20; Lev. viii, 23, 24). Lastly, as they were to be the exponents, not only of the nation's sense of guilt, but of its praise and thanksgiving, Moses was to "fill their hands" with cakes of unleavened bread and portions of the sacrifices, which they were to present before the Lord as a wave-offering. This appears to have been regarded as the *essential* part of the consecration; and the Heb. "to fill the hand" is accordingly used as a synonym for "to consecrate" (Exod. xxix, 9; 2 Chron. xiii, 9). The whole of this mysterious ritual was to be repeated for seven days, during which they remained within the Tabernacle, separated from the people, and not till then was the consecration perfect (comp. on the meaning of all these acts, Bähr, *Symbolik*, vol. ii, ch. v, § 2). Moses himself, as the representative of the Unseen King, is the consecrator, the sacrificer throughout these ceremonies; as the channel through which the others receive their office, he has for the time a higher priesthood than that of Aaron (Selden, *De Synedr.* i, 16; Ugolino, xii, 3). In accordance with the principle which runs through the history of Israel, he, the ruler, solemnly divests himself of the priestly office and transfers it to another. The fact that he had been a priest was merged in his work as a lawgiver. Only once in the language of a later period is the word *kohén* applied to him (Psa. xcix, 6).

The consecrated character thus imparted did not need renewing. It was a perpetual inheritance transmitted from father to son through all the centuries that followed. We do not read of its being renewed in the case of any individual priest of the sons of Aaron. Only when the line of succession was broken, and the impiety of Jeroboam intruded the lowest of the people into the sacred office, do we find the reappearance of a like form (2 Chron. xiii, 9) of the same technical word. The previous history of Jeroboam and the character of the worship which he introduced make it probable that, in that case only, the ceremonial was, to some extent, Egyptian in its origin. In after-times the high-priest took an oath (Heb. vii, 23) to bind him, as the Jews say, to a strict adherence to established customs (Mishna, *Yoma*, i, 5).

2. *Dress.*—The "sons of Aaron" thus dedicated were to wear during their ministrations a special apparel—at other times apparently they wore the common dress of the people. The *material* of the sacred garments was to be linen, and not wool (Ezek. xliv, 17; Lev. xxi, 1–10); but Ewald (*Alterthümer*, p. 317), Josephus (*Ant.* iv, 8), and the rabbins (*Mass. Kilaim*, p. 9) maintain that the holy garments were made of a mixture of wool and linen, called שַׁעַטְנֵז (*shaatnez*); and a typical meaning is found in this by Braun (*Vest. Sac. Hebr.* § 30), as if it was to signify the imperfection of the Levitical priesthood; while Ezek. xliv, 17, which restricts the material to linen, was considered significant of the simplicity of the New Test. See HETEROGENEOUS. The prohibition in Lev. xix, 19; Deut. xxii, 11 against the people generally wearing any garments of such "mingled" material was hence explained by Josephus that they might not assume what was characteristic of the priests (*Ant.* iv, 11). But the more satisfactory and natural view is that the priests only wore linen, and that the Israelites were prohibited from wearing the mixture to teach them that even in garments they should avoid all needless artificiality, and to respect the creation of God in the simplicity of the material. See LINEN. It is well known that the Roman poets speak of the Egyptian priests as the *linigeri*, the wearers of linen (Juvenal, *Sat.* 6; Ovid, *Met.* i). The reason for fixing on this material is given in Ezek. xliv, 18; but the feeling that there was something unclean in clothes made from the skin or wool of an animal was common to other nations. Egypt has already been mentioned. The Arab priests in the time of Mohammed wore linen only (Ewald, *Alterthüm.* p. 289). As there were some garments common both to the priests and the high-priest, we shall begin with those of the former, taking them in the order in which they would be put on. See APPAREL.

(1.) The first was מִכְנְסֵי בָד, "linen breeches," or *drawers* (Exod. xxviii, 42; Sept. περισκελῆ λινά; Vulg. *feminalia linea*). These extended from the loins to the thighs, and were "to cover their nakedness." The *verecundia* of the Hebrew ritual in this and in other places (Exod. xx, 26; xxviii, 42) was probably a protest against some of the fouler forms of nature-worship, as e. g. in the worship of Peor (Maimonides, *Moreh Nebochim*, iii, 45; Ugolino, xiii, 385), and possibly, also, in some Egyptian rites (Herod. ii, 60). According to Josephus, whose testimony, however, of course relates only to his own time, they reached only to the middle of the thigh, where they were tied fast (*Ant.* iii, 7, 1). Such drawers were worn universally in Egypt. In the sculptures and paintings of that country the figures of workmen and servants have no other dress than a short kilt or apron, sometimes simply bound about the loins and lapping over in front; other figures have short loose drawers; while a third variety of this article, fitting closely and extending to the knees, appears in the figures of some idols, as in the cut. This last sort of drawers seems to have been peculiar in Egypt to the gods, and to the priests, whose attire was often adapted to that of the idols on which they attended. The priests, in common with other persons of the upper classes, wore the drawers under other robes. No mention occurs of the use of drawers by any other class of persons in Israel except the priests, on whom it was enjoined for the sake of decency. See BREECHES.

Fig. 1. Ancient Egyptian Drawers and Girdle.

(2.) Over the drawers was worn the "coat of fine linen" (כְּתֹנֶת שֵׁשׁ, *kethôneth shêsh*, *tunica byssina*, Exod. xxxix, 27), a close-fitting *shirt* or cassock, such as was worn by men in general (Gen. xxxvii, 3), also by women (2 Sam. xiii, 18; Cant. v, 3), next to the skin. It was white, but with a diamond or chess-board pattern on it (Bähr, *Symb.* vol. ii, ch. iii, § 2). This came nearly to the feet (ποδήρης χιτών, Josephus, *Ant.* iii, 7, 1), and was to be woven in its garment-shape (not cut out and then sewed together), like the χιτὼν ἄῤῥαφος of John xix, 23, in which some interpreters have even seen a token of the priesthood of him who wore it (Ewald, *Gesch.* v, 177; Ugolino, xiii, 218). Here also modern Eastern customs present an analogy in the woven, seamless *ihram* worn by the Mecca pilgrims (Ewald, *Alterthüm.* p. 289). Josephus further states that it sat close to the body, and had sleeves, which were tied fast to the arms, and was girded to the breast a little above the elbows by a girdle. It had a narrow aperture about the neck, and was tied with certain strings hanging down from the edge over the breast and back, and was fastened above each shoulder (*Ant.* iii,

Fig. 2. Ancient Egyptian Tunic.

7, 2). But this garment, in the case of the priests and high-priest, was to be broidered (Exod. xxviii, 4), כְּתֹנֶת תַּשְׁבֵּץ, "a broidered coat," by which Gesenius understands a coat of cloth worked in checkers or cells. Braun compares it to the reticulum in the stomach of ruminant animals (*De Vestitu*, i, 17). The Sept. gives χιτὼν κοσυμβωτός, which seems to refer to the tassels or strings; Vulg. *linea stricta*, which seems to refer to its close fitting.

(3.) The whole tunic was gathered at the waist by the "girdle" (אַבְנֵט, *abnêt*, Exod. xxviii, 40; Sept. ζώνη; Vulg. *balteus;* comp. Ezek. xliv, 17–19). This was also worn by magistrates (Isa. xxii, 21). The girdle for the priests was to be made of fine twined linen, and blue and purple and scarlet of needlework (xxxix, 29). Josephus describes it as often going round, four fingers broad, but so loosely woven that it might be taken for the skin of a serpent; and that it was embroidered with flowers of scarlet and purple and blue, but that the warp was nothing but linen. The beginning of its circumvolution was at the breast, and when it had gone often round it was there tied, and hung loosely down to the ankles while the priest was not engaged in any laborious service, for in that position it appeared in the most agreeable manner to the spectators; but when he was obliged to assist at the offering of sacrifices and to do the appointed service, in order that he might not be hindered in his operations by its motion, he threw it to the left hand and bore it on his right shoulder (*Ant.* iii, 7, 2). The mode of its hanging down is illustrated in Fig. 4, where the girdle is also richly embroidered, while the imbricated appearance of the girdle (מַעֲשֵׂה רֹקֵם) may be seen very plainly in Fig. 1. The next cut (Fig. 3), of a priestly scribe of ancient Egypt, offers an interesting specimen of both tunic and girdle. See GIRDLE.

Fig. 3. Ancient Egyptian Tunic and Girdle.

(4.) Upon their head they were to wear a *turban* (מִגְבָּעָה, *migbeâh;* Exod. xxviii, 40; Sept. κίδαρις; Vulg. *tiara;* A. V. "cap" or "bonnet," which two words are there synonymous) in the form of a cup-shaped flower, also of fine linen (xxxix, 28). In the time of Josephus it was circular, covering about half the head, something like a crown, made of thick linen swathes doubled round many times and sewed together, surrounded by a linen cover to hide the seams of the swathes, and sat so close that it would not fall off when the body was bent down (*Ant.* iii, 7, 3).

These garments they might wear at any time in the Temple, whether on duty or not, but they were not to sleep in them (Josephus, *War*, v, 5, 7). When they became soiled they were not washed or used again, but torn up to make wicks for the lamps in the Tabernacle (Selden, *De Synedr.* xiii, 11). In Ezek. xlii, 14; xliv, 17–19, there are directions that the priests should take off their garments when they had ministered, and lay them up in the holy chambers, and put on other garments; but these directions occur in a visionary representation of a temple, which all agree has never been realized, the particulars of which, though sometimes derived from known customs, yet at other times differ from them widely. The garments of the inferior priests appear to have been kept in the sacred treasury (Ezra ii, 69; Neh. vii, 70). They had besides them other "clothes of service," which were probably simpler, but are not described (Exod. xxxi, 10; Ezra xlii, 14). In all their acts of ministration they were to be barefooted. This is inferred (*a*) from the absence of any direction as to a covering for the feet; (*b*) from the later custom; (*c*) from the universal feeling of the East. Shoes were worn as a protection against defilement. In a sanctuary there was nothing that could defile. Then, as now, this was the strongest recognition of the sanctity of a holy place which the Oriental mind could think of (Exod. iii, 5; Josh. v, 15), and throughout the whole existence of the Temple service, even though it drew upon them the scorn of the heathen (Juven. *Sat.* vi, 159), and seriously affected the health of the priests (Ugolino, viii, 976; xiii, 405), it was scrupulously adhered to.

The dress of the *high-priest* was precisely the same with that of the common priests in all the foregoing particulars; in addition to which he had (1) a *robe*, מְעִיל, *meil* (Exod. xxviii, 4, ποδήρη, *tunica*). This was not a mantle, but a second and larger coat without sleeves; a kind of surtout worn by the laity, especially persons of distinction (Job i, 20; ii, 12, by kings; 1 Sam. xv, 27; xviii, 4; xxiv, 5–12). This garment, when intended for the high-priest, and then called "the robe of the ephod," was to be of one entire piece of woven work, all of blue, with an aperture for the neck in the middle of the upper part, having its rim strengthened and adorned with a border. The hem had a kind of fringe, composed of tassels, made of blue, purple, and scarlet, in the form of pomegranates; and between every two pomegranates there was a small golden bell, so that there was a bell and a pomegranate alternately all round (Exod. xxviii, 31–35). The use of these bells may have partly been that by the high-priest shaking his garment at the time of his offering incense on the great day of expiation, etc., the people without might be apprised of it, and unite their prayers with it (comp. Ecclus. xlv, 9; Luke i, 10; Acts x, 4; Rev. viii, 3, 4). Josephus describes this robe of the ephod as reaching to the feet, and consisting of a single piece of stuff parted where the hands came out (John xix, 23). He also states that it was tied round with a girdle embroidered with the same colors as the former, with a mixture of gold interwoven (*Ant.* iii, 7, 4). It is highly probable that this garment was also derived from Egyptian usage. There are instances at Thebes of priests wearing over the great-coat a loose sleeveless robe, which exposes the sleeves of the inner tunic. The fringe of bells and pomegranates seems to have been the priestly substitute for the fringe bound with a blue ribbon, which all the Israelites were commanded to wear. Many traces of this fringe occur in the Egyptian remains. The use assigned to it, "that looking on this fringe they should remember the Lord's commandments," seems best explicable by the supposition that the Egyptians had connected some superstitious ideas with it (Numb. xv, 37–40). (2.) The ephod, אֵפוֹד, ἐπωμίς, *superhumerale* (Exod. xxviii, 4). This was a short cloak covering the shoulders and breast. It is said to have been worn by Samuel while a youth ministering before the Lord (1 Sam. ii, 18); by David while engaged in religious service (2 Sam. vi, 14); and by inferior priests

Fig. 4. Ancient Egyptian Priestly Robe, Ephod, and Girdle.

(1 Sam. xxii, 18). But in all these instances it is distinguished as a linen ephod, and was not a sacred but an honorary vestment, as the Sept. understands it in 2 Sam. vi, 14, *στολὴν ἑξαλλον*. The ephod of the high-priest was to be made of gold, of blue, of purple, of scarlet, and fine twined linen, with cunning work, חֹשֶׁב. Though it probably consisted of one piece, woven throughout, it had a back part and a front part, united by shoulder-pieces. It had also a girdle; or, rather, strings went out from each side and tied it to the body. On the top of each shoulder was to be an onyx stone, set in sockets of gold, each having engraven upon it six of the names of the children of Israel, according to the precedence of birth, to memorialize the Lord of the promises made to them (Exod. xxviii, 6–12, 29). Josephus gives sleeves to the ephod (*Ant.* iii, 7, 5). It may be considered as a substitute for the leopard-skin worn by the Egyptian high-priests in their most sacred duties, as in Fig. 4, where the ephod appears no less plainly. In other figures of Egyptian priests, the shoulder-pieces were equally apparent. They are even perceptible in Fig. 1. The Egyptian ephod is, however, highly charged with all sorts of idolatrous figures and emblems, and even with scenes of human sacrifices. The Sept. rendering of חֹשֶׁב, "cunning work," is *ἔργον ὑφαντὸν ποικιλτοῦ*, a woven-work of the embroiderer, a word which especially denotes a manufacturer of tissues adorned with figures of animals (Strabo, xvii, p. 574, Sieb.). In the earlier liturgical costume, the ephod is mentioned as belonging to the high-priest only (Exod. xxviii, 6–12; xxxix, 2–5). At a later period it is used apparently by all the priests (1 Sam. xxii, 18), and even by others, not of the tribe of Levi, engaged in religious ceremonial (2 Sam. vi, 14). See EPHOD. Then came (3) the *breastplate*, חֹשֶׁן, *chôshen* (Sept. *περιστήθιον*; Vulg. *rationale*); a gorget ten inches square, made of the same sort of cloth as the ephod, and doubled so as to form a kind of pouch or bag (Exod. xxix, 9), in which were to be put the Urim and Thummim, which are also mentioned as if already known (xxviii, 30). The external part of this gorget was set with four rows of precious stones—the first row a sardius, a topaz, and a carbuncle; the second, an emerald, a sapphire, and a diamond; the third, a ligure, an agate, and an amethyst; and the fourth, a beryl, an onyx, and a jasper—set in a golden socket. Upon each of these stones was to be engraven the name of one of the sons of Jacob. In the ephod, in which there was a space left open sufficiently large for the admission of this pectoral, were four rings of gold, to which four others at the four corners of the breastplate corresponded; the two lower rings of the latter being fixed inside. It was confined to the ephod by means of dark-blue ribbons, which passed through these rings; and it was also suspended from the onyx stones on the shoulder by chains of gold, or, rather, cords of twisted gold threads, which were fastened at one end to two other *larger* rings fixed in the upper corners of the pectoral, and by the other end going round the onyx stones on the shoulders, and returning and being fixed in the larger ring. The breastplate was further kept in its place by a girdle, made of the same stuff, which Josephus says was sewed to the breastplate, and which, when it had gone once round, was tied again upon the seam and hung down. Here is another adaptation and correction of the costume of the higher Egyptian priests, who wore a large, splendid ornament upon the breast, often a winged scarabæus, the emblem of the sun, as in the cut, Fig. 5, which exhibits the connecting ring and chain to fasten it to the girdle. (4.) The remaining portion of dress peculiar to the high-priest was the *mitre*, מִצְנֶפֶת, *mitsnébeth* (Sept. *κίδαρις*; Vulg. *cidaris*, Exod. xxviii, 4). The Bible says nothing of the difference between this and the turban of the common priests. It is, however, called by a different name. It was to be of fine linen (ver. 39). Josephus says it was the same in construction and figure with that of the common priest, but that above it there was another, with swathes of blue, embroidered; and round it was a golden crown, polished, of three rows, one above another, out of which rose a cup of gold, which resembled the calyx of the herb called by Greek botanists hyoscyamus. He ends a most labored description by comparing the shape of it to a poppy (*Ant.* iii, 7, 6). Upon comparing his account of the bonnet of the priests with the mitre of the high-priest, it would appear that the latter was conical. The cut, Fig. 6, presents the principal forms of the mitres worn by the ancient priests of Egypt, and affords a substantial resemblance of that prescribed to the Jews, divested of idolatrous symbols, but which were displaced to make

Fig. 5. Ancient Egyptian Priestly Breastplate.

way for a simple plate of gold, bearing the inscription, "Holiness to Jehovah." This plate (צִיץ, *tsîts;* Sept. πέταλον; Vulg. *lamina*) extended from one ear to the other, being bound to the forehead by strings tied behind, and further secured in its position by a blue ribbon attached to the mitre (Exod. xxviii, 36–39; xxxix, 30; Lev. viii, 9). Josephus says this plate was preserved to his own day (*Ant.* viii, 3, 8; see Reland, *De Spol. Templi*, p. 132). Such was the dress of the high-priest: see a description of its magnificence in corresponding terms in Ecclus. l, 5–16.

Fig. 6. Ancient Egyptian Priestly Mitres.

Josephus had an idea of the symbolical import of the several parts of the pontifical dress. He says that being made of linen signified the earth; the blue denoted the sky, being like lightning in its pomegranates, and in the noise of its bells resembling thunder. The ephod showed that God had made the universe of four elements, the gold relating to the splendor by which all things are enlightened. The breastplate in the middle of the ephod resembled the earth, which has the middle place of the world. The girdle signified the sea, which goes round the world. The sardonyxes declare the sun and moon. The twelve stones are the twelve months or signs of the zodiac. The mitre is heaven, because blue (*Ant.* iii, 7, 7). He appears, however, to have had two explanations of some things, one for the Gentiles, and another for the Jews. Thus in this section he tells his Gentile readers that the seven lamps upon the golden candlesticks referred to the seven planets; but to the Jews he represents them as an emblem of the seven days of the week (*War*, vii, 5, 5; Whiston's notes *ad loc.*). It was not always worn by the high-priest. It was exchanged for one wholly of linen, and therefore white, though of similar construction, when on the day of expiation he entered into the holy of holies (Lev. xvi, 4, 23); and neither he nor the common priests wore their appropriate dress, except when officiating. It was for this reason, according to some, that Paul, who had been long absent from Jerusalem, did not know that Ananias was the high-priest (Acts xxiii, 5). Bähr (*Symbolik*, vol. ii, ch. iii, § 1, 2) finds a mystic meaning in the number, material, color, and shape of the priestly vestments, discusses each point elaborately, and dwells in § 3 on the *differences* between them and those of the Egyptian priesthood. According to Fairbairn (*Typol. of Script.*), the garments represent the office, and the person who was officially invested was to have them sprinkled with a mixture of oil and sacrificial blood (Kurtz, *Opfercultus*, p. 292). These garments, which were first worn at the consecration, and which were preserved in the Temple when not actually required, were not allowed except to such as were legally consecrated for service, though they belonged to the house of Aaron. These garments were "holy garments" (Exod. xxviii, 4), made "for glory and for beauty;" but they were not only for a glorious ornament, for the whole of the vestments bore a symbolical meaning, and the inscription on the golden plate which adorned the brow of the high-priest, "Holiness to Jehovah," might be properly applied to all the holy garments. The four pieces of the priestly attire were each and all of them required, none was to fail; nor was it permitted to wear more than was prescribed; and the warning "that he die not" (ver. 35, 43) seems to bear upon an exact fulfilment of the divine command in this, no less than in other things. The shining white of the linen garments typified that the servants of him who covers himself with light as with a garment (Psa. civ, 2; Dan. ii, 22; vii, 9), and who dwelleth "in light which no man can approach unto" (1 Tim. vi, 16), are clothed typically in light (Exod. xxxiv, 29); so that the ministers should minister in the earthly sanctuary in the same livery as his ministers wear in the heavenly sanctuary (Dan. xii, 6; Ezek. x, 2, 7; Matt. xvii, 2; xxviii, 3; Acts x, 30). But light (consequently *white*, as the most perfect *reflection* of light) is universally the type of salvation (Job xviii, 5, etc.; Psa. xxvii, 1; Isa. lix, 9), of righteousness (Psa. xxxvii, 6; Mal. iv, 2), of purity and holiness (1 John i, 5, 7); just as darkness, black, is the type of wickedness, uncleanness, etc. (Isa. v, 20; Lam. iv, 7, 8; John iii, 19; Rom. iii, 12; 2 Cor. vi, 14). It is not without meaning that the priests, like the angels, are specially called the holy ones.

3. *Regulations.*—The idea of a consecrated life, which was thus asserted at the outset, was carried through a multitude of details. Each probably had a symbolic meaning of its own. Collectively they formed an education by which the power of distinguishing between things holy and profane, between the clean and the unclean, and so ultimately between moral good and evil, was awakened and developed (Ezek. xliv, 23). Before they entered the tabernacle the priests were to wash their hands and their feet (Exod. xxx, 17–21; xl, 30–32). During the time of their ministration they were to drink no wine or strong drink (Lev. x, 9; Ezek. xliv, 21). Their function was to be more to them than the ties of friendship or of blood, and, except in the case of the nearest relationships (six degrees are specified, Lev. xxi, 1–5; Ezek. xliv, 25), they were to make no mourning for the dead. The high-priest, as carrying the consecrated life to its highest point, was to be above the disturbing power of human sorrow even in these instances. Public calamities seem to have been an exception, for Joacim the high-priest, and the priests, in such circumstances, ministered in sackcloth with ashes on their mitres (Judith iv, 14, 15; comp. Joel i, 13). Customs which appear to have been common in other priesthoods were (probably for that reason) forbidden them. They were not to shave their heads. They were to go through their ministrations with the serenity of a reverential awe, not with the orgiastic wildness which led the priests of Baal, in their despair, to make cuttings in their flesh (Lev. xix, 28; 1 Kings xviii, 28), and carried those of whom Atys was a type to a more terrible mutilation (Deut. xxiii, 1). The same thought found expression in two other forms affecting the priests of Israel. The priest was to be one who, as the representative of other men, was to be physically as well as liturgically perfect. The idea of the perfect body, as symbolizing the holy soul, was, as might be expected, wide-spread among the religions of heathenism. "Sacerdos non integri corporis quasi mali ominis res vitanda est" (Seneca, *Controv.* iv, 2). As the victim was to be without blemish, so also was the sacrificer (comp. Bähr, *Symbol.* vol. ii, ch. ii, § 3). The law specified in broad outlines the excluding defects (Lev. xxi, 17–21), and these were such as impaired the purity, or at least the dignity, of the minister. The morbid casuistry of the later rabbins drew up a list of not less than 144 faults or infirmities which involved permanent, and of twenty-two which involved temporary deprivation from the priestly office (Carpzov. *App. Crit.* p. 92, 93; Ugolino, xii, 54; xiii, 903); and the original symbolism of the principle (Philo, *De Vict.* and *De Monarch.* ii, 5) was lost in the prurient minuteness which, here as elsewhere, often makes the study of rabbinic literature a

somewhat repulsive task. If the Christian Church has sometimes seemed to approximate, in the conditions it laid down for the priestly character, to the rules of Judaism, it was yet careful to reject the Jewish principles, and to rest its regulations simply on the grounds of expediency (*Constt. Apost.* 77, 78). The marriages of the sons of Aaron were, in like manner, hedged round with special rules. There is, indeed, no evidence for what has sometimes been asserted, that either the high-priest (Philo, *De Monarch.* ii, 11; ii, 229, ed. Mang.; Ewald, *Alterth.* p. 302) or the other sons of Aaron (Ugolino, xii, 52) were limited in their choice to the women of their own tribe, and we have some distinct instances to the contrary. It is probable, however, that the priestly families frequently intermarried, and it is certain that they were forbidden to marry an unchaste woman, or one who had been divorced, or the widow of any but a priest (Lev. xxi, 7, 14; Ezek. xliv, 22). The prohibition of marriage with one of an alien race was assumed, though not enacted in the law; and hence the reforming zeal of a later time compelled all who had contracted such marriages to put away their strange wives (Ezra x, 18), and counted the offspring of a priest and a woman taken captive in war as illegitimate (Josephus, *Ant.* iii, 10; xi, 4; *c. Apion.* i, 7), even though the priest himself did not thereby lose his function (Ugolino, xii, 924). The high-priest was to carry the same idea to a yet higher point, and was to marry none but a virgin in the first freshness of her youth (Lev. xxi, 13). Later casuistry fixed the age within the narrow limits of twelve and twelve and a half (Carpzov. *App. Crit.* p. 88). It followed, as a matter of necessity, from these regulations that the legitimacy of every priest depended on his genealogy. A single missing or faulty link would vitiate the whole succession. To those genealogies, accordingly, extending back unbroken for 2000 years, the priests could point, up to the time of the destruction of the Temple (Josephus, *c. Apion.* i, 7). In later times, wherever the priest might live—Egypt, Babylon, Greece—he was to send the register of all marriages in his family to Jerusalem (*ibid.*). They could be referred to in any doubtful or disputed case (Ezra ii, 62; Neh. vii, 64). In them was registered the name of every mother as well as of every father (*ibid.*; comp. also the story already referred to in Suidas, s. v. Ἰησοῦς). It was the distinguishing mark of a priest, not of the Aaronic line, that he was ἀπάτωρ, ἀμήτωρ, ἀγενεαλόγητος (Heb. vii, 3), with no father or mother named as the ground of his title.

The age at which the sons of Aaron might enter upon their duties was not defined by the law, as that of the Levites was. Their office did not call for the same degree of physical strength; and if twenty-five in the ritual of the Tabernacle (Numb. viii, 24) and twenty in that of the Temple (1 Chron. xxiii, 27) was the appointed age for the latter, the former were not likely to be kept waiting till a later period. In one remarkable instance, indeed, we have an example of a yet earlier age. The boy Aristobulus at the age of seventeen ministered in the Temple in his pontifical robes, the admired of all observers, and thus stirred the treacherous jealousy of Herod to remove so dangerous a rival (Josephus, *Ant.* xv, 3, 3). This may have been exceptional, but the language of the rabbins indicates that the special consecration of the priest's life began with the opening years of manhood. As soon as the down appeared on his cheek the young candidate presented himself before the Council of the Sanhedrim, and his genealogy was carefully inspected. If it failed to satisfy his judges, he left the Temple clad in black, and had to seek another calling; if all was right so far, another ordeal awaited him. A careful inspection was to determine whether he was subject to any one of the 144 defects which would invalidate his priestly acts. If he was found free from all blemish, he was clad in the white linen of the priests, and entered on his ministrations. If the result of the examination was not satisfactory, he was relegated to the half-menial office of separating the sound wood for the altar from that which was decayed and worm-eaten, but was not deprived of the emoluments of his office (Lightfoot, *Temple Service*, ch. vi).

4. *Functions.*—The work of the priesthood of Israel was, from its very nature, more stereotyped by the Mosaic institutions than any other element of the national life. The functions of the Levites—less defined, and therefore more capable of expansion—altered, as has been shown [see LEVITE], from age to age; but those of the priests continued throughout substantially the same, whatever changes might be brought about in their social position and organization. The duties described in Exodus and Leviticus are the same as those recognised in the books of Chronicles, and those which the prophet-priest Ezekiel sees in his vision of the Temple of the future. They, assisting the high-priest, were to watch over the fire on the altar of burnt-offerings, and to keep it burning evermore both by day and night (Lev. vi, 12; 2 Chron. xiii, 11); to feed the golden lamp outside the vail with oil (Exod. xxvii, 20, 21; Lev. xxiv, 2); to offer the morning and evening sacrifices, each accompanied with a meal-offering and a drink-offering, at the door of the tabernacle (Exod. xxix, 38–44). These were the fixed, invariable duties; but their chief function was that of being always at hand to do the priest's office for any guilty, or penitent, or rejoicing Israelite. The worshipper might come at any time. If he were rich and brought a bullock, it was the priest's duty to slay the victim, to place the wood upon the altar, to light the fire, to sprinkle the altar with the blood (Lev. i, 5). If he were poor and brought a pigeon, the priest was to wring its neck (i, 15). In either case he was to burn the meal-offering and the peace-offering which accompanied the sacrifice (ii, 2, 9; iii, 11). After the birth of every child, the mother was to come with her sacrifice of turtle-doves or pigeons (Lev. xii, 6; Luke ii, 22–24), and was thus to be purified from her uncleanness. A husband who suspected his wife of unfaithfulness might bring her to the priest, and it belonged to him to give her the water of jealousy as an ordeal, and to pronounce the formula of execration (Numb. v, 11–31). Lepers were to come, day by day, to submit themselves to the priest's inspection, that he might judge whether they were clean or unclean, and when they were healed perform for them the ritual of purification (Lev. xiii, xiv; comp. Mark i, 44). All the numerous accidents which the law looked upon as defilements or sins of ignorance had to be expiated by a sacrifice, which the priest of course had to offer (Lev. xv, 1–33). As they thus acted as mediators for those who were laboring under the sense of guilt, so they were to help others who were striving to attain, if only for a season, the higher standard of a consecrated life. The Nazarite was to come to them with his sacrifice and his wave-offering (Numb. vi, 1–21). In the final establishments at Jerusalem it belonged to the priests to act as sentinels over the holy place, as to the Levites to guard the wider area of the precincts of the Temple (Ugolino, xiii, 1052).

Other duties of a higher and more ethical character are hinted at, but were not, and probably could not be, the subject of a special regulation. They were to teach the children of Israel the statutes of the Lord (Lev. x, 11; Deut. xxxiii, 10; 2 Chron. xv, 3; Ezek. xliv, 23, 24). The "priest's lips" (in the language of the last prophet looking back upon the ideal of the order) were to "keep knowledge" (Mal. ii, 7). Through the whole history, with the exception of the periods of national apostasy, these acts, and others like them, formed the daily life of the priests who were on duty. The three great festivals of the year were, however, their seasons of busiest employment. The pilgrims who came up by tens of thousands to keep the feast came each with his sacrifice and oblation. The work at such times was, on some occasions at least, beyond the strength of the priests in attendance, and the Levites had to be called

in to help them (2 Chron. xxix, 34; xxxv, 14). Other acts of the priests of Israel, significant as they were, were less distinctively sacerdotal. They were to bless the people at every solemn meeting, and that this part of their office might never fall into disuse, a special formula of benediction was provided (Numb. vi, 22–27). During the journeys in the wilderness it belonged to them to cover the ark and all the vessels of the sanctuary with a purple or scarlet cloth before the Levites might approach them (iv, 5–15). As the people started on each day's march they were to blow "an alarm" with long silver trumpets (x, 1–8)—with two if the whole multitude were to be assembled, with one if there was to be a special council of the elders and princes of Israel. With the same instruments they were to proclaim the commencement of all the solemn days, and days of gladness (x, 10); and throughout all the changes in the religious history of Israel this adhered to them as a characteristic mark. Other instruments of music might be used by the more highly trained Levites and the schools of the prophets, but the trumpets belonged only to the priests. They blew them (but in that case the trumpets were of rams' horns) in the solemn march round Jericho (Josh. vi, 4), in the religious war which Judah waged against Jeroboam (2 Chron. xiii, 12), when they summoned the people to a solemn penitential fast (Joel ii, 1, 15). In the service of the second Temple there were never to be less than twenty-one or more than eighty-four blowers of trumpets present in the Temple daily (Ugolino, xiii, 1011). The presence of the priests on the field of battle for this purpose, often in large numbers, armed for war, and sharing in the actual contest (1 Chron. xii, 23, 27; 2 Chron. xx, 21, 22), led, in the later periods of Jewish history, to the special appointment at such times of a war-priest, deputed by the Sanhedrim to be the representative of the high-priest, and standing next but one to him in the order of precedence (comp. Ugolino, xii, 1031 [*De Sacerdote Castrensi*]; xiii, 871). Jost (*Judenth.* i, 153) regards the war-priest as belonging to the ideal system of the later rabbins, not to the historical constitution of Israel. Deuteronomy xx, 2, however, supplies the germ out of which such an office might naturally grow. Judas Maccabæus, in his wars, does what the war-priest was said to do (1 Macc. iii, 56).

Other functions are intimated in Deuteronomy which might have given them greater influence as the educators and civilizers of the people. They were to act (whether individually or collectively does not distinctly appear) as a court of appeal in the more difficult controversies in criminal or civil cases (Deut. xvii, 8–13). A special reference was to be made to them in cases of undetected murder, and they were thus to check the vindictive blood-feuds which it would otherwise have been likely to occasion (xxi, 5). It must remain doubtful, however, how far this order kept its ground during the storms and changes that followed. The judicial and the teaching functions of the priesthood remained probably for the most part in abeyance through the ignorance and vices of the priests. Zealous reformers kept this before them as an ideal (2 Chron. xvii, 7–9; xix, 8–10; Ezek. xliv, 24), but the special stress laid on the attempts to realize it shows that they were exceptional. The teaching functions of the priest have probably been unduly magnified by writers like Michaelis, who aim at bringing the institutions of Israel to the standard of modern expediency (*Comm. on Laws of Moses*, i, 35–52), as they have been unduly depreciated by Saalschütz and Jahn.

At first Aaron was to burn incense on the golden altar every morning when he dressed the lamps, and every evening when he lighted them, but in later times the common priest performed this duty (Luke i, 8, 9); to offer, as the Jews understand it, daily, morning and evening, the peculiar meal-offering he offered on the day of his consecration (Exod. xxix); to perform the ceremonies of the great day of expiation (Lev. xvi); to arrange the shewbread every Sabbath, and to eat it in the holy place (xxiv, 9); but he must abstain from the holy things during his uncleanness (xxii, 1–3); also if he became leprous, or contracted uncleanness (ver. 4–7). If he committed a sin of ignorance, he must offer a sin-offering for it (iv, 3–13); and so for the people (ver. 12–22). He was to eat the remainder of the people's meal-offerings with the inferior priests in the holy place (vi, 16); to judge of the leprosy in the human body or garments (xiii, 2–59); to adjudicate legal questions (Deut. xvii, 12). Indeed, when there was no divinely inspired judge, the high-priest was the supreme ruler till the time of David, and again after the Captivity. He must be present at the appointment of a new ruler or leader (Numb. xxvii, 19), and ask counsel of the Lord for the ruler (ver. 21). Eleazar, with others, distributes the spoils taken from the Midianites (Numb. xxi, 21, 26). To the high-priest also belonged the appointment of a maintenance from the funds of the sanctuary to an incapacitated priest (1 Sam. ii, 36, margin). Besides these duties, peculiar to himself, he had others in common with the inferior priests. Thus, when the camp set forward, "Aaron and his sons" were to take the tabernacle to pieces, to cover the various portions of it in cloths of various colors (iv, 5–15), and to appoint the Levites to their services in carrying them; to bless the people in the form prescribed (vi, 23–27), to be responsible for all official errors and negligences (xviii, 1), and to have the general charge of the sanctuary (ver. 5).

5. *Maintenance.*—Functions such as these were clearly incompatible with the common activities of men. At first the small number of the priests must have made the work almost unintermittent, and, even when the system of rotation had been adopted, the periodical absences from home could not fail to be disturbing and injurious, had the priests been dependent on their own labors. The serenity of the priestly character would have been disturbed had they had to look for support to the lower industries. It may have been intended (see above) that their time, when not liturgically employed, should be given to the study of the law, or to instructing others in it. On these grounds, therefore, a distinct provision was made for them. The later rabbins enumerate no less than twenty-four sources of emolument. Of these the chief only are given here (Ugolino, xiii, 1124). They consisted, (1) of one tenth of the tithes which the people paid to the Levites—i. e. one per cent. on the whole produce of the country (Numb. xviii, 26–28). (2.) Of a special tithe every third year (Deut. xiv, 28; xxvi, 12). (3.) Of the redemption-money, paid at the fixed rate of five shekels a head, for the first-born of man or beast (Numb. xviii, 14–19). It is to be noticed that the law, by recognising the substitution of the Levites for the first-born, and ordering payment only for the small number of the latter, in excess of the former, deprived Aaron and his sons of a large sum which would otherwise have accrued to them (Numb. iii, 44–51). (4.) Of the redemption-money paid in like manner for men or things specially dedicated to the Lord (Lev. xxvii). (5.) Of spoil, captives, cattle, and the like, taken in war (Numb. xxxi, 25–47). (6.) Of what may be described as the perquisites of their sacrificial functions, the shewbread, the flesh of the burnt-offerings, peace-offerings, trespass-offerings (Numb. xviii, 8–14; Lev. vi, 26, 29; vii, 6–10), and, in particular, the heave-shoulder and the wave-breast (Lev. x, 12–15). (7.) Of an undefined amount of the first-fruits of corn, wine, and oil (Exod. xxiii, 19; Lev. ii, 14; Deut. xxvi, 1–10). Of some of these, as "most holy," none but the priests were to partake (Lev. vi, 29). It was lawful for their sons and daughters (x, 14), and even in some cases for their home-born slaves, to eat of others (xxii, 11). The stranger and the hired servant were in all cases excluded (xxii, 10). (8.) On their settlement in Canaan the priestly families had thirteen cities assigned them, with "suburbs" or pasture-grounds for their flocks (Josh. xxi, 13–19.) While the Levites were scattered over all the

conquered country, the cities of the priests were within the tribes of Judah, Simeon, and Benjamin, and this concentration was not without its influence on their subsequent history. See LEVITE. These provisions were obviously intended to secure the religion of Israel against the dangers of a caste of pauper-priests, needy and dependent, and unable to bear their witness to the true faith. They were, on the other hand, as far as possible removed from the condition of a wealthy order. Even in the ideal state contemplated by the book of Deuteronomy, the Levite (here probably used generically, so as to include the priests) is repeatedly marked out as an object of charity, along with the stranger and the widow (Deut. xii, 12, 19; xiv, 27–29). During the long periods of national apostasy, tithes were probably paid with even less regularity than they were in the more orthodox period that followed the return from the Captivity (Neh. xiii, 10; Mal. iii, 8–10). The standard of a priest's income, even in the earliest days after the settlement in Canaan, was miserably low (Judg. xvii, 10). Large portions of the priesthood fell, under the kingdom, into a state of abject poverty (comp. 1 Sam. ii, 36). The clinging evil throughout their history was not that they were too powerful and rich, but that they sank into the state from which the law was intended to preserve them, and so came to "teach for hire" (Mic. iii, 11; comp. Saalschütz, *Archäologie der Hebräer*, ii, 344–355).

It will be noticed that neither the high-priest nor common priests received "any inheritance" at the distribution of Canaan among the several tribes (Numb. xviii, 20; Deut. xviii, 1, 2), but were maintained, with their families, upon certain fees, dues, perquisites, etc., arising from the public services, which they enjoyed as a common fund. Perhaps the only distinct prerogative of the high-priest was a tenth part of the tithes assigned to the Levites (xviii, 28; comp. Neh. x, 38); but Josephus represents this also as a common fund (*Ant.* iv, 4, 4).

6. *Classification and Statistics.*—The earliest historical trace of any division of the priesthood and corresponding cycle of services belongs to the time of David. Jewish tradition indeed recognises an earlier division, even during the life of Aaron, into eight houses (Gem. Hieros. *Taanith*, in Ugolino, xiii, 873), augmented during the period of the Shiloh-worship to sixteen, the two families of Eleazar and Ithamar standing in both cases on an equality. It is hardly conceivable, however, that there could have been any rotation of service while the number of priests was so small as it must have been during the forty years of sojourn in the wilderness, if we believe Aaron and his lineal descendants to have been the only priests officiating. The difficulty of realizing in what way the single family of Aaron were able to sustain all the burden of the worship of the tabernacle and the sacrifices of individual Israelites may, it is true, suggest the thought that possibly in this, as in other instances, the Hebrew idea of sonship by adoption may have extended the title of the "Sons of Aaron" beyond the limits of lineal descent, and, in this case, there may be some foundation for the Jewish tradition. Nowhere in the later history do we find any disproportion like that of three priests to 20,000 Levites. The office of supervision over those that "kept the charge of the sanctuary," intrusted to Eleazar (Numb. iii, 32), implies that some others were subject to it besides Ithamar and his children, while these very keepers of the sanctuary are identified in ver. 38 with the sons of Aaron who are encamped with Moses and Aaron on the east side of the tabernacle. The allotment of not less than thirteen cities to those who bore the name, within little more than forty years from the Exodus, tends to the same conclusion, and at any rate indicates that the priesthood were not intended to be always in attendance at the tabernacle, but were to have homes of their own, and therefore, as a necessary consequence, fixed periods only of service. Some notion may be formed of the number on the accession of David from the facts (1) that not less than 3700 tendered their allegiance to him while he was as yet reigning at Hebron over Judah only (1 Chron. xii, 27), and (2) that one twenty-fourth part were sufficient for all the services of the statelier and more frequented worship which he established. To this reign belonged, accordingly, the division of the priesthood into the four-and-twenty "courses" or orders מַחְלְקוֹת (Sept. *διαιρέσεις*, *ἐφημερίαι*, 1 Chron. xxiv, 1–19; 2 Chron. xxiii, 8; Luke i, 5), each of which was to serve in rotation for one week, while the further assignment of special services during the week was determined by lot (Luke i, 9) under a subordinate prefect (2 Kings xi, 5, 7), but all attended at the great festivals (2 Chron. v. 11). The first of these courses was that which had Jehoiarib at the head of it. It was reckoned the most honorable. Josephus values himself on his descent from it (*Life*, § 1). Mattathias, the father of the Maccabees, descended from it (1 Macc. ii, 1). Abijah was the head of the eighth course, to which Zacharias, the father of the Baptist, belonged (Luke i, 5). Each course appears to have commenced its work on the Sabbath, the outgoing priests taking the morning sacrifice, and leaving that of the evening to their successors (2 Chron. xxiii, 8; Ugolino, xiii, 319). In this division, however, the two great priestly houses did not stand on an equality. The descendants of Ithamar were found to have fewer representatives than those of Eleazar (a diminution that may have been caused partly by the slaughter of the priests who accompanied Hophni and Phinehas [Psa. lxxviii, 64], partly by the massacre at Nob), and sixteen courses accordingly were assigned to the latter, eight only to the former (1 Chron. xxiv, 4; comp. Carpzov. *App. Crit.* p. 98). The division thus instituted was confirmed by Solomon, and continued to be recognised as the typical number of the priesthood. It is to be noted, however, that this arrangement was to some extent elastic. Any priest might be present at any time, and even perform priestly acts, so long as he did not interfere with the functions of those who were officiating in their course (Ugolino, xiii, 881), and at the great solemnities of the year, as well as on special occasions like the opening of the Temple, they were present in great numbers. On the return from the Captivity there were found but four courses out of the twenty-four, each containing, in round numbers, about a thousand (Ezra ii, 36–39). The causes of this great reduction are not stated, but large numbers must have perished in the siege and storm of Jerusalem (Lam. iv, 16), and many may have preferred remaining in Babylon. Out of these returning exiles, however, to revive, at least, the idea of the old organization, the four-and-twenty courses were reconstituted, bearing the same names as before, and so continued till the destruction of Jerusalem (Josephus, *Ant.* vii, 14, 7). If we may accept the numbers given by Jewish writers as at all trustworthy, the proportion of the priesthood to the population of Palestine during the last century of their existence as an order must have been far greater than that of the clergy has ever been in any Christian nation. Over and above those that were scattered in the country and took their turn, there were not fewer than 24,000 stationed permanently at Jerusalem and 12,000 at Jericho (Gemar. Hieros. *Taanith*, fol. 67, in Carpzov. *App. Crit.* p. 100). It was a Jewish tradition that it had never fallen to the lot of any priest to offer incense twice (Ugolino, xii, 18). Oriental statistics are, however, always open to some suspicion, those of the Talmud not least so; and there is, probably, more truth in the computation of Josephus, who estimates the total number of the four houses of the priesthood, referring apparently to Ezra ii, 36, at about 20,000 (*c. Apion.* ii, 7). Another indication of number is found in the fact that a "great multitude" could attach themselves to the "sect of the Nazarenes" (Acts vi, 7), and so have cut themselves off, sooner or later, from the Temple ser-

vices, without any perceptible effect upon its ritual. It was almost inevitable that the great mass of the order, under such circumstances, should sink in character and reputation. Poor and ignorant, despised and oppressed by the more powerful members of their own body, often robbed of their scanty maintenance by the rapacity of the high-priests, they must have been to Palestine what the clergy of a later period has been to Southern Italy—a dead weight on its industry and strength, not compensating for their unproductive lives by any services rendered to the higher interests of the people. The rabbinic classification of the priesthood, though belonging to a somewhat later date, reflects the contempt into which the order had fallen. There were (1) the heads of the twenty-four courses, known sometimes as ἀρχιερεῖς; (2) the large number of reputable officiating but inferior priests; (3) the *plebeii*, or (to use the extremest formula of rabbinic scorn) the "priests of the people of the earth," ignorant and unlettered; (4) those that, through physical disqualifications or other causes, were non-efficient members of the order, though entitled to receive their tithes (Ugolino, xii, 18; Jost, *Judenth.* i, 156).

Prideaux (*Connection*, i, 129), following the Jewish tradition, affirms that only four of the courses returned from Babylon—Jedaiah, Immer, Pashur, and Harim (for which last, however, the Babylonian Talmud has Joiarib)—because these four only are enumerated in Ezra ii, 36–39; Neh. vii, 39–42. He accounts for the mention of other courses, as of Joiarib (1 Macc. ii, 1) and Abiah (Luke i, 5), by saying that those four courses were subdivided into six each, so as to keep up the old number of twenty-four, which took the names of the original courses, though not really descended from them. But this is probably an invention of the Jews, to account for the mention of only these four families of priests in the list of Ezra ii and Neh. vii. However difficult it may be to say with certainty why only those four courses are mentioned in that particular list, we have the positive authority of 1 Chron. ix, 10, and Neh. xi, 10, for asserting that Joiarib did return; and we have two other lists of courses, one of the time of Nehemiah (Neh. x, 2–8), the other of Zerubbabel (xii, 1–7); the former enumerating twenty-one, the latter twenty-two courses; and the latter naming Joiarib as one of them, and adding, at ver. 19, the name of the chief of the course of Joiarib in the days of Joiakim. Thus there can be no reasonable doubt that Joiarib did return. The notion of the Jews does not receive any confirmation from the statement in the Latin version of Josephus (*c. Apion.* ii, 8) that there were four courses of priests, as it is a manifest corruption of the text for twenty-four, as Whiston and others have shown (note to *Life of Josephus*, § 1). The preceding table gives the three lists of courses which returned, with the original list in David's time to compare them by. The courses which cannot be identified with the original ones, but which are enumerated as existing after the return, are as follows:

Neh. x.	Neh. xii.	Neh. xi; 1 Chron. ix.
Seraiah.	Seraiah.	Seraiah (?).
Azariah.	Ezra.	Azariah.
Jeremiah.	Jeremiah.	—
Pashur.	—	—
Hattush.	Hattush.	—
Malluch.	Malluch.	—
Obadiah.	Iddo.	Adaiah (?).
Daniel.	—	—
Ginnethon.	Ginnetho.	—
Baruch.	—	—
Meshullam.	—	—
Shemaiah.	Shemaiah.	—
	Sallu.	
	Amok.	
	Hilkiah.	
	Jedaiah (2).	

For some account of the courses, see Lewis, *Orig. Hebr.* bk. ii, ch. vii.

COURSES OF PRIESTS.

In David's reign, 1 Chron. xxiv.	In list in Ezra ii; Neh. vii.	In Nehemiah's time, Neh. x.	In Zerubbabel's time, Neh. xii.
1. Jehoiarib, 1 Chr. ix, 10. Neh. xi, 10.	—	—	Joiarib.
2. Jedaiah.	Children of Jedaiah.	—	Jedaiah.
3. Harim.	Children of Harim.	Harim.	Rehum (Harim, v. 15).
4. Seorim.	—	—	—
5. Malchijah.	Children of Pashur, 1 Chr. ix, 12.	Malchijah.	—
6. Mijamin.	—	Mijamin.	Miamin (Miniamin, v. 17).
7. Hakkoz.	—	Meremoth, son of Hakkoz, Neh. iii, 4.	Meremoth.
8. Abijah.	—	Abijah.	Abijah.
9. Jeshuah.	House of Jeshua (?), Ezra ii, 36; Neh. vii, 39.	—	—
10. Shecaniah.	—	Shebaniah.	Shechaniah (Shebaniah, ver. 14).
11. Eliashib.	—	—	—
12. Jakim.	—	—	—
13. Huppah.	—	—	—
14. Jeshebeab.	—	—	—
15. Bilgah.	—	Bilgai.	Bilgah.
16. Immer.	Children of Immer.	Amariah.	Amariah.
17. Hezir.	—	—	—
18. Aphses.	—	—	—
19. Pethahiah.	—	—	—
20. Jehezekel.	—	—	—
21. Jachin, Neh. xi, 10; 1 Chr. ix, 10.	—	—	—
22. Gamul.	—	—	—
23. Delaiah.	—	—	—
24. Maaziah.	—	Maaziah.	Maadiah (Moadiah, v. 17).

III. *Historical Review of the Hebrew Priesthood.*—1. *In Patriarchal Times.*—(1.) We accede to the Jewish opinion that Adam was the first priest. The divine institution of sacrifices, immediately after the fall, seems connected with the event that "the Lord God made coats of skins to Adam and his wife, and clothed them" (Gen. iii, 21)—that is, with the skins of animals which had been offered in sacrifice, for the permission to eat animal food was not given till after the Deluge (comp. i, 29; ix, 3)—expressive of their faith in the promise of the victorious yet suffering "seed of the woman" (ver. 15); and judging from the known custom of his immediate descendants, we infer that Adam, now also become the head and ruler of the woman (ver. 16), officiated in offering the sacrifice as well on her behalf as his own. Judging from the same analogy, it seems further probable that Adam acted in the same capacity on behalf of his sons, Cain and Abel (and possibly of their children), who are each said to have "brought" his respective offering, but not to have personally presented it (iv, 3–5). The *place* evidently thus indicated would seem to have been the situation of "the cherubim," at the east of the garden of Eden (iii, 24), called "the face" (iv, 14), and "the presence of the Lord" (ver. 16; comp. Hebrew of Exod. xxxiv, 24; Lev. ix, 5), and from which Jehovah conferred with Cain (Gen. iv, 9): circumstances which, together with the name of their offering, מִנְחָה, which, sometimes at least, included bloody sacrifices in after-times (1 Sam. ii, 17; xxvi, 19; Mal. i, 13, 14), and the appropriation of the skins to the offerer (comp. Lev. vii, 8), would seem like the rudiments of the future Tabernacle and its services, and when viewed in connection with many circumstances incidentally disclosed in the brief fragmentary account of things before the Exodus—such as the Sabbath (Gen. ii, 2, 3), the distinction observed by Noah, and his burnt-offerings upon the altar of clean and unclean beasts (viii, 20), the prohibition of blood (ix, 4), tithes (xiv, 20), priestly blessing (ver. 19), consecration with oil, and vows (xxviii, 18–22), the Levirate law (xxxviii,

8), weeks (xxix, 27), distinction of the Hebrews by their families (Exod. ii, 1), the office of elder during the bondage in Egypt (iii, 16), and a place of meeting with Jehovah (v, 22; comp. xxv, 22)—would favor the supposition that the Mosaic dispensation, as it is called, was but an authoritative re-arrangement of a patriarchal Church instituted at the fall. The fact that Noah officiated as the priest of his family, upon the cessation of the Deluge, is clearly recorded in Gen. viii, 20, where we have an altar built, the ceremonial distinctions in the offerings already mentioned, and their propitiatory effect, "the sweet savor," all described in the words of Leviticus (comp. i, 9; xi, 47). These acts of Noah, which seem like the resumption rather than the institution of an ordinance, were doubtless continued by his sons and their descendants, as *heads of their respective families*. Following our arrangement, the next glimpse of the subject is afforded by the instance of Job, who "sent and sanctified his children" after a feast they had held, and offered burnt-offerings, עֹלוֹת, "according to the number of them all," and "who did this continually," either constantly or after every feast (i, 5). A direct reference, possibly to priests, is lost in our translation of xii, 19, "he leadeth *princes* (כֹּהֲנִים; Sept. ἱερεῖς; Vulg. *sacerdotes;* a sense adopted in Dr. Lee's *Translation* [Lond. 1837]) away spoiled." May not the difficult passage, Job xxxiii, 23, contain an allusion to priestly duties? A case is there supposed of a person divinely chastised in order to improve him (xix, 22): "If then there be a *messenger* (מַלְאָךְ, which means priest, Eccles. v, 6; Mal. ii, 6) with him," "an interpreter" (מֵלִיץ, or mediator generally, 2 Chron. xxxii, 31; Isa. xliii, 27, one among a thousand, or of a family, Judg. vi, 15, "my family," literally "my thousand," comp. Numb. i, 16, "to show to man his uprightness," or, rather, "duty," Prov. xiv, 2, part of the priest's office *in such a case*, Mal. ii, 7; comp. Deut. xxiv, 8), then such an individual "is gracious," or, rather, will supplicate for him, and *saith*, "Deliver him from going down into the pit," or grave, for "I have found a ransom," a cause or ground in him for favorable treatment, namely, the penitence of the sufferer, who consequently recovers (xxv, 29). The case of Abraham and Abimelech is very similar (Gen. xx, 3–17), as also that of Job himself, and his three misjudging friends, whom the Lord commands to avert chastisement from themselves by taking to him bullocks and rams, which he was to offer for them as a burnt-offering, and to *pray* for them (xlii, 8). The instance of Abram occurs next in historical order, who, upon his first entrance into Canaan, attended by his family, "built an altar, and called upon the name of the Lord" (Gen. xii, 7, 8). Upon returning victorious from the battle of the kings, he is congratulated by Melchizedek, the Canaanitish king of Salem, and "priest of the most high God" (xiv, 18). For the ancient union of the royal and sacerdotal offices, in Egypt and other countries, see Wilkinson's *Manners and Customs of the Ancient Egyptians* (Lond. 1842), i, 245. Abram next appears entering into covenant with God as the head and representative of his seed; on which occasion those creatures only are slain which were appointed for sacrifice under the law (Gen. xv, 9–21). Isaac builds an altar, evidently as the head of his family (xxvi, 25); his *younger* son Jacob offers a *sacrifice*, זֶבַח (xxxi, 54), and "calls his brethren to eat of it" (comp. Lev. vii, 15); builds an altar at Shalem (Gen. xxxiii, 20), makes another by *divine command*, and evidently as the head of his household, at Bethel (xxxv, 1–7), and pours a *drink-offering*, נֶסֶךְ (comp. Numb. xv, 7, etc.), upon a pillar (ver. 14).

(2.) We next find Jethro, priest of Midian, the father-in-law of Moses, probably a priest of the true God (Exod. iii, 1), and possibly his father also (ii, 16), in the same capacity. In Exod. v, 1, 3, the whole nation of the Israelites is represented as wishing to sacrifice and to hold a feast to the Lord. The first step, though very remote, towards the formation of the Mosaic system of priesthood was the consecration of the first-born, in memory of the destruction of the first-born of Egypt (xiii, 2, 14–16); for, instead of these, God afterwards took the Levites to attend upon him (Numb. iii, 12). As to the popular idea, both among Jews and Christians, that the right of priesthood was thus transferred from the first-born generally to the tribe of Levi, or, rather, to one family of that tribe, we consider, with Patrick, that it is utterly groundless (*Commentary on Exod. xix*, 22; Numb. iii, 12; see Vitringa, *Observationes Sacræ*, ii, 33; Outram, *De Sacrificiis*, i, 4). The substance of the objections is that Aaron and his sons were consecrated *before* the exchange of the Levites for the first-born; that the Levites were *afterwards* given to minister unto them, but had nothing to do with the priesthood; and that the peculiar right of God in the first-born originated in the Exodus. The last altar, before the giving of the law, was built by Moses, probably for a memorial purpose only (Exod. xvii, 15; comp. Josh. xxii, 26, 27). At this period the office of priest was so well understood, and so highly valued, that Jehovah promises as an inducement to the Israelites to keep his covenant, that they should be to him "a kingdom of priests" (Exod. xix, 6), which, among other honorable appellations and distinctions originally belonging to the Jews, is transferred to Christians (1 Pet. ii, 9). The first introduction of the word *priests*, in this part of the history, is truly remarkable. It occurs just previous to the giving of the law, when, as part of the cautions against the too eager curiosity of the people, lest they should "break through unto the Lord and gaze" (Exod. xix, 21), it is added, "and let *the priests which come near unto the Lord* sanctify themselves, lest the Lord break through upon them" (ver. 22). Here, then, priests are incontestably spoken of as an already existing order, which was now about to be remodified. Nor is this the last reference to these ante-Sinaitic priests. Selden observes that the phrases "the priests the Levites" (Deut. xvii, 9) and "the priests the sons of Levi" (xxi, 5), and even the phrase "the Levites alone" (xviii, 6; comp. 1), are used to include all others who had been priests before God took the sons of Aaron peculiarly to serve him in this office (*De Synedr.* ii, 8, p. 2, 3). Aaron is summoned at this juncture to go up with Moses unto the Lord on Mount Sinai (Exod. xix, 24). Another remarkable circumstance is then recorded. Moses, now acting as "mediator," and endued with an extraordinary commission, builds an altar under the hill, and sends "young men of the children of Israel, who offered burnt-offerings, and sacrificed peace-offerings of oxen unto the Lord" (xxiv, 5). Various interpretations are given to the phrase "young men;" but, upon a view of all the circumstances, we incline to think that they were young *laymen*, purposely selected by Moses for this act, in order to form a complete break between the former priesthood and the new, and that the recommencement and re-arrangement of the priesthood under divine authority might be made more palpably distinct. In the same light we consider the many priestly acts performed by Moses himself, at this particular time, as in xxix, 25; xl, 25, 27, 29; like those of Gideon (Judg. vi, 25–27), of Samuel (1 Sam. vii, 9), and of David (1 Chron. xxi, 26). Yet these especial permissions, upon emergencies and extraordinary occasions, had their limits, as may be seen in the fate of "the men of Bethshemesh" (1 Sam. vi, 19), and of Uzzah (2 Sam. vi, 7).

2. *The Aaronic Priesthood.*—(1.) *Early Period.*—The next event in the history of the subject is the public consecration of Aaron and his sons, according to the preceding regulations (Lev. viii). At their first sacerdotal performances (ix) the divine approbation was intimated by a supernatural fire which consumed their burnt-offering (ver. 24). The general satisfaction of the people with these events was, however, soon dashed

by the miraculous destruction of the two elder sons of Aaron, Nadab and Abihu, for offering strange fire (x, 1), probably under the influence of too much wine, since the prohibition of it to the priests when about to enter the Tabernacle seems to have originated in this event (ver. 9). Moses forbade Aaron and his sons to uncover their heads, or to rend their clothes on this occasion; but the whole house of Israel were permitted to bewail the visitation (ver. 6). The inward grief, however, of Eleazar and Ithamar caused an irregularity in their sacerdotal duties, which was forgiven on account of the occasion (ver. 16–20). Aaron now appears associated with Moses and the leading men of the several tribes in taking the national census (Numb. i, 3, etc.), and on other grand state occasions (xxvi, 2, 3; xxxi, 13–26; xxxii, 2; xxxiv, 17). The high-priest appears ever after as a person of the highest consequence. The dignity of the priesthood soon excited the emulation of the ambitious; hence the penalty of death was denounced against the assumption of it by any one not belonging to the Aaronic family (ver. 10), and it was soon after miraculously inflicted for this crime. This instance proves that the Aaronic line did not establish itself without a struggle. The rebellion of Korah, at the head of a portion of the Levites as representatives of the first-born, with Dathan and Abiram as leaders of the tribe of the first-born son of Jacob (Numb. xvi, 1), showed that some looked back to the old patriarchal order rather than forward to the new, and it needed the witness of "Aaron's rod that budded" to teach the people that the latter had in it a vitality and strength which had departed from the former. It may be that the exclusion of all but the sons of Aaron from the service of the Tabernacle drove those who would not resign their claim to priestly functions of some kind to the worship (possibly with a rival tabernacle) of Moloch and Chiun (Amos v, 25, 26; Ezek. xx, 16). The death of Aaron introduces the installation of his successor, which appears to have simply consisted in arraying him in his father's pontifical garments (Numb. xx, 28). Thus also Jonathan the Asmonæan contented himself with putting on the high-priest's habit, in order to take possession of the dignity (1 Macc. x, 21; comp. Josephus, *Ant.* xiii, 2, 3). The high esteem in which the priesthood was held may be gathered from the fact that it was promised in perpetuity to Phinehas and his family as a reward for his zeal (Numb. xxv, 13). Prominent as was the part taken by the priests in the daily march of the host of Israel (Numb. x, 8), in the passage of the Jordan (Josh. iii, 14, 15), in the destruction of Jericho (vi, 12–16), the history of Micah shows that within that century there was a strong tendency to relapse into the system of a household instead of an hereditary priesthood (Judg. xvii). The frequent invasions and conquests during the period of the Judges must have interfered (as stated above) with the payment of tithes, with the maintenance of worship, with the observance of all festivals, and with this the influence of the priesthood must have been kept in the background. If the descendants of Aaron, at some unrecorded crisis in the history of Israel, rose, under Eli, into the position of national defenders, it was only to sink in his sons into the lowest depth of sacerdotal corruption. For a time the prerogative of the line of Aaron was in abeyance. The capture of the ark, the removal of the Tabernacle from Shiloh, threw everything into confusion, and Samuel, a Levite, but not within the priestly family [see SAMUEL], sacrifices, and "comes near" to the Lord; his training under Eli, his Nazaritish life, his prophetic office, being regarded apparently as a special consecration (comp. Augustine, *c. Faust.* xii, 83; *De Civ. Dei*, xvii, 4). For the priesthood, as for the people generally, the time of Samuel must have been one of a great moral reformation; while the expansion, if not the foundation, of the schools of the prophets at once gave to it the support of an independent order, and acted as a check on its corruptions and excesses, a perpetual safeguard against the development from it of any Egyptian or Brahminic caste-system (Ewald, *Gesch. Isr.* ii, 185), standing to it in much the same relation as the monastic and mendicant orders stood, each in its turn, to the secular clergy of the Christian Church. Though Shiloh had become a deserted sanctuary, Nob (1 Sam. xxi, 1) was made for a time the centre of national worship, and the symbolic ritual of Israel was thus kept from being forgotten. The reverence which the people feel for the priests, and which compels Saul to have recourse to one of alien blood (Doeg the *Edomite*) to carry his murderous counsel into act, shows that there must have been a great step upwards since the time when the sons of Eli "made men to abhor the offerings of the Lord" (1 Sam. xxii, 17, 18). The reign of Saul was, however, a time of suffering for them. He had manifested a disposition to usurp the priest's office (xiii, 9). The massacre of the priests at Nob showed how insecure their lives were against any unguarded or savage impulse. (It is to be noticed that while the Hebrew text gives eighty-five as the number of priests slain, the Sept. increases it to 305, Josephus [*Ant.* vi, 12] to 385.) They could but wait in silence for the coming of a deliverer in David. One at least among them shared his exile, and, so far as it was possible, lived in his priestly character, performing priestly acts, among the wild company of Adullam (1 Sam. xxiii, 6, 9). Others probably were sheltered by their remoteness, or found refuge in Hebron as the largest and strongest of the priestly cities. When the death of Saul set them free, they came in large numbers to the camp of David, prepared apparently not only to testify their allegiance, but also to support him, armed for battle, against all rivals (1 Chron. xii, 27). They were summoned from their cities to the great restoration of the worship of Israel, when the ark was brought up to the new capital of the kingdom (xv, 4). For a time, however (another proof of the strange confusion into which the religious life of the people had fallen), the ark was not the chief centre of worship; and while the newer ritual of psalms and minstrelsy gathered round it under the ministration of the Levites, headed by Benaiah and Jahaziel as priests (xvi, 5, 6), the older order of sacrifices was carried on by the priests in the Tabernacle on the high-place at Gibeon (xvi, 37–39; xxi, 29; 2 Chron. i, 3). We cannot wonder that first David and then Solomon should have sought to guard against the evils incidental to this separation of the two orders, and to unite in one great temple priests and Levites, the symbolic worship of sacrifice and the spiritual offering of praise.

The reigns of these two kings were naturally the culminating period of the glory of the Jewish priesthood. They had a king whose heart was with them, and who joined in their services dressed as they were (1 Chron. xv, 27), while he yet scrupulously abstained from all interference with their functions. The name which they bore was accepted (whatever explanation may be given of the fact) as the highest title of honor that could be borne by the king's sons (2 Sam. viii, 18). They occupied high places in the king's council (1 Kings iv, 2, 4), and might even take their places, as in the case of Benaiah, at the head of his armies (1 Chron. xii, 27; xxvii, 5), or be recognised, as Zabud the son of Nathan was, as the "king's friends," the keepers of the king's conscience (1 Kings iv, 5; Ewald, *Gesch.* iii, 334).

The account here given has been based on the belief that the books of the Old Test. give a trustworthy statement of the origin and history of the priesthood of Israel. Those who question their authority have done so, for the most part, on the strength of some preconceived theory. Such a hierarchy as the Pentateuch prescribes is thought impossible in the earlier stages of national life, and therefore the reigns of David and Solomon are looked upon, not as the restoration, but as the starting-point of the order (Von Bohlen, *Die Genesis*, Einl. § 16). It is alleged that there could have been no tribe like that of Levi, for the consecration of a

whole tribe is without a parallel in history (Vatke, *Bibl. Theol.* i, 222). Deuteronomy, assumed for once to be older than the three books which precede it, represents the titles of the priest and Levite as standing on the same footing, and the distinction between them is therefore the work of a later period (George, *Die älteren Jüd. Feste*, p. 45, 51; comp. Bähr, *Symbolik*, bk. ii, ch. i, § 1, whence these references are taken). It is hardly necessary here to do more than state these theories.

(2.) *Middle Period.*—The position of the priests under the monarchy of Judah deserves a closer examination than it has yet received. The system which has been described above gave them for every week of service in the Temple twenty-three weeks in which they had no appointed work. Was it intended that they should be idle during this period? Were they actually idle? They had no territorial possessions to cultivate. The cities assigned to them and to the Levites gave but scanty pasturage to their flocks. To what employment could they turn? 1. The more devout and thoughtful found, probably, in the schools of the prophets that which satisfied them. The history of the Jews presents numerous instances of the union of the two offices. See Levite. They became teaching-priests (2 Chron. xv, 3), students, and interpreters of the divine law. From such as these, men might be chosen by the more zealous kings to instruct the people (xvii, 8), or to administer justice (xix, 8). 2. Some, perhaps, as stated above, served in the king's army. We have no ground for transferring our modern conceptions of the peacefulness of the priestly life to the remote past of the Jewish people. Priests, as we have seen, were with David at Hebron as men of war. They were the trumpeters of Abijah's army (xiii, 12). The Temple itself was a great armory (xxiii, 9). The heroic struggles of the Maccabees were sustained chiefly by their kindred of the same family (2 Macc. vii, 1). 3. A few chosen ones might enter more deeply into the divine life, and so receive, like Zechariah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, a special call to the office of a prophet. 4. We can hardly escape the conclusion that many did their work in the Temple of Jehovah with a divided allegiance, and acted at other times as priests of the high-places (Ewald, *Gesch.* iii, 704). Not only do we read of no protests against the sins of the idolatrous kings, except from prophets who stood forth, alone and unsupported, to bear their witness, but the priests themselves were sharers in the worship of Baal (Jer. ii, 8), of the sun and moon, and of the host of heaven (viii, 1, 2). In the very Temple itself they "ministered before their idols" (Ezek. xliv, 12), and allowed others, "uncircumcised in heart and uncircumcised in flesh," to join them (ibid. 7). They ate of unclean things and polluted the Sabbaths. There could be no other result of this departure from the true idea of the priesthood than a general degradation. Those who ceased to be true shepherds of the people found nothing in their ritual to sustain or elevate them. They became as sensual, covetous, and tyrannical as ever the clergy of the Christian Church became in its darkest periods; conspicuous as drunkards and adulterers (Isa. xxviii, 7, 8; lvi, 10–12). The prophetic order, instead of acting as a check, became sharers in their corruption (Jer. v, 31; Lam. iv, 13; Zeph. iii, 4). For the most part, the few efforts after better things are not the result of a spontaneous reformation, but of conformity to the wishes of a reforming king. In the one instance in which they do act spontaneously—their resistance to the usurpation of the priest's functions by Uzziah—their protest, however right in itself, was yet only too compatible with a wrong use of the office which they claimed as belonging exclusively to themselves (2 Chron. xxvi, 17). The discipline of the Captivity, however, was not without its fruits. A large proportion of the priests had either perished or were content to remain in the land of their exile; but those who did return were active in the work of restoration. Under Ezra they submitted to the stern duty of repudiating their heathen wives (Ezra x, 18, 19). They took part—though here the Levites were the more prominent—in the instruction of the people (iii, 2; Neh. viii, 9–13). The root-evils, however, soon reappeared. The work of the priesthood was made the instrument of covetousness. The priests of the time of Malachi required payment for every ministerial act, and would not even "shut the doors" or "kindle fire" for naught (Mal. i, 10). They "corrupted the covenant of Levi" (ii, 8). The idea of the priest as the angel, the messenger, of the Lord of Hosts was forgotten (ibid. 7; comp. Eccles. v, 6). The inevitable result was that they again lost their influence. They became "base and contemptible before all the people" (Mal. ii, 9). The office of the scribe rose in repute as that of the priest declined (Jost, *Judenth.* i, 37, 148). The sects that multiplied during the last three centuries of the national life of Judaism were proofs that the established order had failed to do its work in maintaining the religious life of the people. No great changes affected the outward position of the priests under the Persian government. When that monarchy fell before the power of Alexander they were ready enough to transfer their allegiance. Both the Persian government and Alexander had, however, respected the religion of their subjects, and the former had conferred on the priests immunities from taxation (Ezra vi, 8, 9; vii, 24; Josephus, *Ant.* xi, 8). The degree to which this recognition was carried by the immediate successors of Alexander is shown by the work of restoration accomplished by Simon the son of Onias (Ecclus. l, 12–20); and the position which they thus occupied in the eyes of the people, not less than the devotion with which his zeal inspired them, prepared them doubtless for the great struggle which was coming, and in which, under the priestly Maccabees, they were the chief defenders of their country's freedom. Some, indeed, at that crisis were found among the apostates. Under the guidance of Jason (the heathenized form of Joshua) they forsook the customs of their fathers; and they who as priests were to be patterns of a self-respecting purity left their work in the Temple to run naked in the circus which the Syrian king had opened in Jerusalem (2 Macc. iv, 13, 14). Some, at an earlier period, had joined the schismatic Onias in establishing a rival worship (Josephus, *Ant.* xii, 3, 4). The majority, however, were true-hearted; and the Maccabæan struggle which left the government of the country in the hands of their own order, and, until the Roman conquest, with a certain measure of independence, must have given to the higher members of the order a position of security and influence. The martyr-spirit showed itself again in the calmness with which they carried on the ministrations in the Temple, when Jerusalem was besieged by Pompey, till they were slain even in the act of sacrificing (Josephus, *Ant.* xiv, 4, 3; *War*, i, 7, 5). The reign of Herod, on the other hand, in which the high-priesthood was kept in abeyance, or transferred from one to another at the will of one who was an alien by birth and half a heathen in character, must have tended to depress them.

(3.) *Closing Period.*—It will be interesting to bring together the few facts that indicate the position of the priests in the New-Test. period of their history. The division into four-and-twenty courses is still maintained (Luke i, 5; Josephus, *Life*, 1), and the heads of these courses, together with those who have held the high-priesthood (the office no longer lasting for life), are "chief priests" (ἀρχιερεῖς) by courtesy (Carpzov. *App. Crit.* p. 102), and take their place in the Sanhedrim. The number scattered throughout Palestine was, as has been stated, very large. Of these the greater number were poor and ignorant, despised by the more powerful members of their own order, not gaining the respect or affection of the people. The picture of cowardly selfishness in the priest of the parable of Luke x, 31 can hardly be thought of as other than a representative one, indicating the estimate commonly and truly formed of the

character of the class. The priestly order, like the nation, was divided between contending sects. The influence of Hyrcanus, himself in the latter part of his life a Sadducee (Josephus, *Ant.* xiii, 10, 6), had probably made the tenets of that party popular among the wealthier and more powerful members, and the chief-priests of the Gospels and the Acts, the whole ἀρχιερατικὸν γένος (Acts iv, 1, 6; v, 17), were apparently consistent Sadducees, sometimes combining with the Pharisees in the Sanhedrim, sometimes thwarted by them, in persecuting the followers of Jesus because they preached the resurrection of the dead. The great multitude (ὄχλος), on the other hand, who received that testimony (vi, 7) must have been free from or must have overcome Sadducean prejudices. It was not strange that those who did not welcome the truth which would have raised them to a higher life should sink lower and lower into an ignorant and ferocious fanaticism. Few stranger contrasts meet us in the history of religion than that presented in the life of the priesthood in the last half-century of the Temple—now going through the solemn sacrificial rites and joining in the noblest hymns, now raising a fierce clamor at anything which seemed to them a profanation of the sanctuary, and rushing to dash out the brains of the bold or incautious intruder, or of one of their own order who might enter while under some ceremonial defilement, or with a half-humorous cruelty setting fire to the clothes of the Levites who were found sleeping when they ought to have been watching at their posts (Lightfoot, *Temple Service*, ch. i). The rivalry which led the Levites to claim privileges which had hitherto belonged to the priests has already been noticed. See LEVITE. In the scenes of the last tragedy of Jewish history the order passes away, without honor, "dying as a fool dieth." The high-priesthood is given to the lowest and vilest of the adherents of the frenzied Zealots (Josephus, *War*, iv, 3, 6). Other priests appear as deserting to the enemy (*ibid.* vi, 6, 1). It is from a priest that Titus receives the lamps, and gems, and costly raiment of the sanctuary (*ibid.* vi, 8, 3). Priests report to their conquerors the terrible utterance "Let us depart" on the last Pentecost ever celebrated in the Temple (*ibid.* vi, 5, 3). It is a priest who fills up the degradation of his order by dwelling on the fall of his country with a cold-blooded satisfaction, and finding in Titus the fulfilment of the Messianic prophecies of the Old Test. (*ibid.* vi, 5, 4). The destruction of Jerusalem deprived the order at one blow of all but an honorary distinction. Their occupation was gone. Many families must have altogether lost their genealogies. Those who still prided themselves on their descent were no longer safe against the claims of pretenders. The jealousies of the lettered class, which had been kept under some restraint as long as the Temple stood, now had full play, and the influence of the rabbins increased with the fall of the priesthood. The position of the priests in mediæval and modern Judaism has never risen above that of complimentary recognition. Those who claim to take their place among the sons of Aaron are entitled to receive the redemption-money of the first-born, to take the law from its chest, and to pronounce the benediction in the synagogues (Ugolino, xii, 48).

IV. *Relation of the Jewish Priesthood to the Christian Ministry.*—The language of the New-Test. writers in relation to the priesthood ought not to be passed over. They recognise in Christ the first-born, the king, the Anointed, the representative of the true primeval priesthood after the order of Melchizedek (Heb. vii, viii), from which that of Aaron, however necessary for the time, is now seen to have been a deflection. But there is no trace of an order in the new Christian society bearing the name and exercising functions like those of the priests of the older Covenant. The synagogue, and not the Temple, furnishes the pattern for the organization of the Church. The idea which pervades the teaching of the Epistles is that of a universal priesthood. All true believers are made kings and priests (Rev. i, 6; 1 Pet. ii, 9), offer spiritual sacrifices (Rom. xii, 1), may *draw near*, may enter into the holiest (Heb. x, 19–22), as having received a true priestly consecration. They, too, have been washed and sprinkled as the sons of Aaron were (x, 22). It was the thought of a succeeding age that the old classification of the high-priest, priests, and Levites was reproduced in the bishops, priests, and deacons of the Christian Church. The history of language presents few stranger facts than those connected with these words. *Priest*, our only equivalent for ἱερεύς, comes to us from the word which was chosen because it excluded the idea of a sacerdotal character. *Bishop* has narrowly escaped a like perversion, occurring as it does constantly in Wiclif's version as the translation of ἀρχιερεύς (e. g. John xviii, 15; Heb. viii, 1). The idea which was thus expressed rested, it is true, on the broad analogy of a threefold gradation, and the terms "priest," "altar," "sacrifice," might be used without involving more than a legitimate symbolism; but they brought with them the inevitable danger of reproducing and perpetuating in the history of the Christian Church many of the feelings which belonged to Judaism, and ought to have been left behind with it. If the evil has not proved so fatal to the life of Christendom as it might have done, it is because no bishop or pope, however much he might exaggerate the harmony of the two systems, has ever dreamed of making the Christian priesthood hereditary. We have perhaps reason to be thankful that two errors tend to neutralize each other, and that the age which witnessed the most extravagant sacerdotalism was one in which the celibacy of the clergy was first exalted, then urged, and at last enforced.

V. *Literature.*—For the similarity in the religion of ancient Greece, see Potter, *Archæologia* (Lond. 1775), i, 202; of ancient Rome, Adam, *Antiquities* (Edinb. 1791), p. 293, § Ministri Sacrorum. For the resemblances between the religious customs of the ancient Egyptians and those of the Jews, we refer especially to Kitto, *Pictorial History of Palestine* (Lond. 1844). On the Hebrew priesthood in general, see Küper, *Das Priesterthum des Alten Bundes* (Berl. 1865). For particular topics, see Kiesling, *De Legibus Mos. circa Sacerd. Vitio Corporis laborantes;* Kall, *De Morbis Sacerdot. V. T. ex Ministerii eor. Conditione oriundis* (Hafn. 1745); Jablonskii *Pantheon*, Proleg. § 29, 41, 43; Munch, *De Matrimonio Sacerd. V. T. cum Filiab. Sacer.* (Norimb. 1747); Kohl, *De Ætate*, etc. (Lips. 1735); Rechenberg, *id.* (ibid. 1760); Stiebritz, *De Sacerdotum Vitiis Corpore* (Hal. 1742); Curtiss, *The Levitical Priests* (Lond. 1877). For the theology of the subject, see Dr. J. P. Smith, *Discourses on the Sacrifice and Priesthood of Christ* (Lond. 1842); Jardine, *Christian Sacerdotalism* (ibid. 1871). See also the works cited by Danz, *Wörterbuch*, s. v. Priester; Darling, *Cyclopædia Bibliographica*, vol. i, col. 1812.

PRIEST is a contraction of the word *presbyter* (Greek πρεσβύτερος), and is derived probably from the old French or Norman *prestre*. It was in the Saxon, first *preost*, later *prest*. The German and Dutch words are *priester;* the modern French, *prêtre;* the Italian, *prete;* but the Spanish is most like the original form—it is *presbitero*. In its most general signification, the word is the title of a minister of public worship, but is specially applied to the minister of sacrifice or other mediatorial offices. In the early history of mankind, the functions of the priest seem to have commonly been discharged by the head of each family; but, on the expansion of the family into the state, the office of priest became a public one, which absorbed the duties as well as the privileges which before belonged to the heads of the separate families or communities. It thus came to pass that in many instances the priestly office was associated with that of the sovereign, whatever might be the particular form of sovereignty. But in many religious and political bodies, also, the orders were maintained in complete independence, and the priests formed

a distinct, and, generally speaking, a privileged class. See Egypt; Hinduism. The priestly order, in most of the ancient religions, included a graduated hierarchy; and to the chief, whatever was his title, were assigned the most solemn of the religious offices intrusted to the body. Compare the preceding article.

In the Christian Church the word has been used in place of the two Greek words (1) πρεσβύτερος, which really signifies an *elder*, and (2) ἱερεύς, which corresponds to the Latin *sacerdos*, i. e. one who offers sacrifice—words which are exceedingly dissimilar in meaning, but, used in this indiscriminate manner, convey a false idea as to the respective offices of *priest* and *preacher*. The Christian preacher or minister answers rather to the ancient prophet than to the Old-Testament priest. As ἱερεύς means *one who offers sacrifices*, and as sacrifices have been abolished since the offering of the one perfect and all-sufficient Sacrifice, it follows that, in the strict and official sense, there are no "sacrificers" under the New-Testament or Christian dispensation. If, therefore, the claims of the ministers of the Church are made to rest upon a precise analogy to those founded upon the priestly functions of an abrogated dispensation, it surely becomes the advocates of such claims to prove from the Christian Institute that the conceived analogy exists. But where is the proof? There is not a single passage in "the book" of apostles and evangelists to support the assumption. Nowhere are the ministers of the Gospel represented as "sacrificers;" nowhere is provision made for such a succession, as in any respect similar to the Levitical, and still less the Aaronical priesthood. To the prophets, and rulers of the synagogues, it is admitted that there are allusions descriptive of ministerial duties; for the work of instruction was the appropriate business of these ecclesiastical functionaries, and not performing the services of a prescribed ritual. But sacerdotal dignities are nowhere ascribed to Christian presbyters.

The priesthood, as a religious order, perished with Judaism. The priesthood was the shadow, and disappeared when the substance came. As a mediator, Jesus Christ is the only priest; as a servant of God, whose duty it is to consecrate his full time and energies and thoughts to the divine service, every Christian is a "priest unto God." The New Testament, therefore, contains no hint of any priest, nor of any officer answering to a priest, in the early Church; and, on the contrary, contains many passages which teach more or less directly and distinctly that the priesthood of the class is merged in the priestly character of Jesus Christ and that of the whole discipleship (comp. Heb. ii, 17; iii, 1; iv, 14; v, 5-10; vii, 27, 28; x, 11, 12; Rev. v, 10). It is very clear that the apostles, when they so plainly assert the abolition of sacrifices since the offering of the one perfect and all-sufficient Sacrifice, could never intend to institute such an office as a *sacrificing* priest. When they use the term, they apply it to Christ alone. The office of a Christian pastor is not to atone, but to preach the atonement. In Rom. xv, 16 the application of the term by the apostle Paul is figurative. The modern minister answers rather to the ancient prophet than to the ancient priest. At least this is the universal opinion of nearly all Protestant Christendom, though some relics of the old priestly idea of a special sacerdotal order, with peculiar privileges and prerogatives, and possessing peculiar holiness, still linger in the Church.

The advocates of hierarchical claims, whether Romish, Greek, or Protestant Christians, assume that ministers are entitled to be regarded as succeeding to the same relation to the Church with that which was sustained by the priesthood under the Jewish economy. Hence the terms and offices peculiar to the ancient priests are conceived to be analogous to the functions and designations of the Christian ministry. On this assumption, it is contended that the duties performed and the authority exercised under the direct sanction of the Most High are now transferred to those who are duly qualified, by a certain order of succession, to discharge the offices of the ministry under the present dispensation. In the grades of the hierarchy the priesthood is second in order only to that of bishop. Bishops and priests possess the same priestly authority, but the bishop has the power of transmitting it to others, which an ordinary priest cannot do. The priest is regarded as the ordinary minister of the Eucharist, whether as a sacrament or as a sacrifice; of baptism, penance, and extreme unction; and although the contracting parties are held in the modern schools to be themselves the ministers of marriage, the priest is regarded by all schools of Roman divines as at least the normal and official witness of its celebration. The priest is also officially charged with the instruction of the people and the direction of their spiritual concerns, and, by long-established use, special districts, called parishes (q. v.), are assigned to priests, within which they are intrusted with the care and supervision of the spiritual wants of all the inhabitants. The holy order of priesthood can only be conferred by a bishop, and he is ordinarily assisted by two or more priests, who, in common with the bishop, impose hands on the candidate. The rest of the ceremonial of ordination consists in investing the candidate with the sacred instruments and ornaments of his order, anointing his hands, and reciting certain prayers significant of the gifts and the duties of the office. Dens defines the priesthood as "a sacred order and sacrament, in which power is conferred of consecrating the body of Christ, of remitting sins, and of administering certain other sacraments." Accordingly, at the consecration of a priest, after unction and prayer, the chalice, with wine and water, and the paten upon it with the host, are given to him, with these awful words, "Receive power to offer the sacrifice of God, and to celebrate mass for the living and the dead." Moreover, he receives formally the power to forgive sins. The distinguishing vestment of the priest is the *chasuble* (Lat. *planeta*). In Roman Catholic countries, priests wear even in public a distinctive dress.

Habit of a Roman Catholic Priest.

In some portions of the Episcopal Church the idea is maintained that the modern clergyman is the successor of the ancient priest, because this term is used in the

Prayer-book to designate the clerical office. Says Fluyder: "The Greek and Latin words which we translate '*priest*' are derived from words that signify holy; and so the word priest, according to the etymology, signifies him whose mere charge and function are about holy things, and therefore seems to be a most proper word to him who is set apart to the holy public service and worship of God, especially when he is in the actual ministration of holy things. If it be objected that, according to the usual acceptation of the word, it signifies him that offers up a *sacrifice*, and therefore cannot be allowed to a minister of the Gospel, who hath no sacrifice to offer, it is answered that the ministers of the Gospel have sacrifices to offer (1 Pet. ii, 5): 'Ye are built up a spiritual house, an holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices of prayer, praises, thanksgiving,' etc. In respect of these, the ministers of the Gospel may safely, in a metaphorical sense, be called priests; and in a more eminent manner than other Christians, because they are taken from among men to offer up these sacrifices for others. But besides these spiritual sacrifices mentioned, the ministers of the Gospel have another sacrifice to offer, viz. the unbloody sacrifice, as it was anciently called, the commemorative sacrifice of the blood of Christ, which does as really and truly show forth the death of Christ as those sacrifices under the law did; and in respect of this sacrifice of the Eucharist, the ancients have usually called those that offer it up priests." See Killen, *Ancient Church*, p. 644; Martensen, *Dogmatics;* Fairbairn, *Typology;* Calvin, *Institutes;* Coleman, *Manual on Prelacy and Ritualism*, p. 167 sq.; Stratten, *Book of the Priesthood;* Howitt, *On Priestcraft;* Dwight, *Theology;* Schaff, *Hist. of the Apost. Church;* Elliott, *Delineation of Romanism* (see Index); Sumner, *Principles at Stake* (Lond. 1868, 8vo), ch. iii; *Christian Quar.* April, 1873, art. iv; *Meth. Quar. Rev.* July, 1873, art. ii; *Studien u. Kritiken*, 1862, No. 1; *Bapt. Quar.* Oct. 1870; *Christian Monthly*, Feb. 1865, p. 188. See Bishop; Clergy; Preacher.

Priestley, Joseph, LL.D., one of the most noted of the English deists of the 18th century, and a scientist of great celebrity, was born of humble but honorable parentage at Fieldhead, March 13, 1733, old style. His mother dying when he was six years of age, he was adopted by a paternal aunt, Mrs. Keighley, by whom he was sent to a free grammar-school in the neighborhood, where he was taught the Latin language and the elements of the Greek. His vacations were devoted to the study of Hebrew under a dissenting minister; and when he had acquired some proficiency in this language he commenced and made considerable progress in the Chaldee, Syriac, and Arabic. Ill-health, however, led him to abandon for a while his classical studies, and he gave himself to mercantile pursuits. Though obliged to leave school, he yet continued his studies. Without the aid of a master, he acquired some knowledge of French, Italian, and German. At the age of nineteen (1752) he resumed work as a theological student in the dissenting academy at Daventry. His parents, who were both of the Calvinistic persuasion, as well as his aunt, had omitted no opportunity of inculcating the importance of the Calvinistic doctrine. At the academy he found both the professors and students greatly agitated upon most theological questions which were deemed of much importance, such as liberty and necessity, the sleep of the soul, etc., and kindred articles of orthodoxy and heresy. These were the topics of animated and frequent discussion. The spirit of controversy thus excited was in some measure fostered by the plan for regulating their studies, drawn up by Dr. Doddridge. It specified certain works on both sides of every question which the students were required to peruse and form an abridgment of for their future use. Before the lapse of many months Priestley conceived himself called upon to renounce the greater number of the theological and metaphysical opinions which he had imbibed in early youth, and thus, he himself observes, "I came to embrace what is generally called the heterodox side of the question; . . . but notwithstanding the great freedom of our debates, the extreme of heresy among us was Arianism, and all of us, I believe, left the academy with a belief, more or less qualified, of the doctrine of the Atonement." His waywardness did not interfere with his graduation, and in 1755 he became assistant minister to an Independent congregation at Needham-Market, in Suffolk. Here he made himself unpopular by renouncing the doctrine of the Atonement, and in three years left, in rather bad repute because of his heresy. He found a temporary engagement at Nantwich, in Cheshire, but was again unpopular, and next engaged in teaching with some success, and was finally chosen professor of belles-lettres in Warrington Academy. During the ten years following he produced half a dozen thoughtful works on widely varying subjects—works which of themselves would have given him enduring fame. He busied himself in politics, too, and became known as a vigorous lecturer. He was still poor, but by dint of strict economy he had secured an air-pump and an electrical machine, and had already begun his scientific researches.

While at Needham he composed his work entitled *The Scripture Doctrine of Remission, which shows that the Death of Christ is no proper Sacrifice nor Satisfaction for Sin; but that Pardon is dispensed solely on account of a Personal Repentance of the Sinner.* It was published in 1761. He seems to have rejected all theological dogmas which appeared to him to rest solely upon the interpretation put upon certain passages of the Bible by ecclesiastical authority. It does not, however, appear that these doctrinal errors produced any morally evil results. A visit to the metropolis was the occasion of his introduction to our own celebrated countryman, Dr. Franklin, Dr. Price, and others. To the first of these he communicated his idea of writing a historical account of electrical discoveries, if provided with the requisite books. These Dr. Franklin undertook to procure, and before the end of the year in which Priestley submitted to him the plan of the work he sent him a copy of it in print, though five hours of every day had been occupied in public or private teaching, besides which he had kept up an active philosophical correspondence. The title of this work is *The History and Present State of Electricity, with Original Experiments* (1767; 3d ed. 1775). By his devotion to learning and his persistent scrutiny of nature, Priestley now unravelled many a tangled web of science, and it was his to make the most valuable discovery in science of the last century; but as he drew nearer natural truth, he became more and more, though perhaps unconsciously, estranged from revealed truth, and by a hot temper and hasty utterances alienated his best friends. A disagreement between the trustees and professors of the academy led to his relinquishing the appointment at Warrington in 1767. His next engagement was with a large congregation at Mill-Hill Chapel, Leeds, where his theological inquiries were resumed, and several works of the kind composed, chiefly of a controversial character. The vicinity of his dwelling to a public brewery was the occasion of his attention being directed to pneumatic chemistry, the consideration of which he commenced in 1768, and subsequently prosecuted with great success. His first publication on this subject was a pamphlet on *Impregnating Water with Fixed Air* (1772); the same year he communicated to the Royal Society his *Observations on Different Kinds of Air*, to which the Copley medal was awarded in 1773. He originated other modes of investigation now pursued, and, indeed, nearly all that is known of the gases has its foundation in the discoveries he made. He discovered oxygen gas, nitrous gas, nitrous-oxide gas, nitrous vapor, carbonic-oxide gas, sulphurous-oxide gas, fluoric-acid gas, muriatic gas, and ammoniacal gas. The discovery of oxygen alone rivalled in importance the great discovery of gravitation by Newton in the preceding century. The pneumatic trough, a vessel by means of which chemists col-

lect gas, was also in good part invented by Priestley. He experimented untiringly, and gave to the world a detailed account of almost every observation he made. For a time he was the idol of men of science. All Europe did him honor. At the height of his reputation he became companion to the earl of Shelburne, with whom he travelled extensively on the Continent. He remained with that nobleman seven years, at the end of which, in 1789, receiving a pension, he settled in Birmingham, where he proceeded actively with his philosophical and theological researches, and was also appointed pastor to a dissenting congregation. Having been told by certain Parisian savans that he was the only man they had ever known, of any understanding, who believed in Christianity, he wrote, in reply, the *Letters to a Philosophical Unbeliever* (1780), and various other works containing criticisms on the doctrines of Hume and others.

His public position was now rather a hard one; for while laughed at in Paris as a believer, at home he was branded as an atheist. To escape the odium arising from the latter imputation, he published his *Disquisition relating to Matter and Spirit*. In this work, while he partly materializes spirit, he at the same time partly spiritualizes matter. He holds, however, that our hopes of resurrection must rest solely on the truth of the Christian revelation, and that scientifically they have no demonstration whatever. The doctrines of a Revelation and a Resurrection appear with him to have supported one another. He believed in a Revelation, because it declared a Resurrection; and he believed in a Resurrection, because he found it declared in the Revelation. Yet in his *Introductory Dissertation to Hartley's Observations on Man* he expressed doubts again concerning the immateriality of the sentient principle in man; and in the *Doctrine of Necessity*—another elucidation of Hartley (q. v.)—published about the same time, largely denied the Christian doctrine of Revelation. But among the many points of Church dogma called in question or altogether repudiated, Dr. Priestley thus far had not openly touched the doctrine of the Trinity. In 1782 he published his *History of the Corruptions of Christianity* (2 vols. 8vo). A refutation of the arguments contained in this work was proposed for one of the Hague prize essays; and in 1785 the work itself was burned by the common hangman in the city of Dort. Next came a *History of Early Opinions concerning Jesus Christ* (1786, 4 vols. 8vo), but it failed to make any impression in the literary or theological world. His previous writings, however, gave rise to a lively literary warfare between Priestley and Dr. Horsley. The principal subjects discussed were the doctrines of Free Will, Materialism, and Unitarianism. The victory in this controversy will probably be awarded by most men in accordance with their own preconceived views on the questions at issue. In a letter to Dr. Price, dated Jan. 27, 1791, Priestley says: "With respect to the Church, with which you have meddled but little, I have long since drawn the sword and thrown away the scabbard, and am very easy about the consequences." While it was a source of wonder to the savans of the Continent that such a man could believe in a God at all, his want of belief shocked the better class of his countrymen, who, although at the time sadly lax in morals, were scrupulous in their adherence to orthodoxy. But he did not confine himself to dealing with churchmen: his object was to obtain for the dissenters what he considered to be their rights, and in the pursuit of which he published about twenty volumes. He attacked certain positions relating to the dissenters in Blackstone's *Commentaries* with a vigor and acrimony which seems to have surprised his adversary. At the same time he was avowedly partial to the French Revolution, and as he was a man of strong speech and stinging pen, he soon excited the hatred of the High-Church and Tory party. The agitation of the populace had already found vent in riots, and in the month of July Dr. Priestley's house, library, manuscripts, and costly apparatus were committed to the flames by an angry mob. His papers, torn in scraps, carpeted the roads around his desolated home, and he was exposed to great personal danger. He quitted Birmingham for Hackney, where he became the successor of his deceased friend Dr. Price (q. v.), and so far as money could restore what he had lost, it was liberally given. But his sentiments were unchanged, and he was none the less outspoken because of misuse; and at last, conceiving himself to be insecure against popular rage, he embarked for America.

In the United States he was received with enthusiasm as a martyr to republican principles. He was offered a professor's chair in Philadelphia, which, however, he declined—for, notwithstanding his unparalleled attainments, he modestly felt the want of an early systematic training in the sciences—and, retiring to Northumberland, he was soon again absorbed in his studies. But even here before long he was in the midst of bitter controversy. He had contemplated no difficulty in forming a Unitarian congregation in America; but in this he was greatly disappointed. He found that the majority disregarded religion, and those who paid any attention to it were more afraid of his doctrines than desirous of hearing them. By the American government, the former democratic spirit of which had subsided, he was looked upon as a spy in the interest of France. The democracy he espoused was unpalatably French, the inconsistency of his religious doctrines laid him open to ridicule, and, as he could not long remain silent, a host of critics was soon arrayed against him. His later writings were mostly in defence of his doctrines and discoveries, and his experiments in America did not prove as successful as those of his earlier years. To the day of his death he continued to pursue his literary and scientific pursuits with as much ardor as he had shown at any period of his active life. He died Feb. 6, 1804, expressing the satisfaction he derived from the consciousness of having led a useful life and the confidence he felt in a future state in a happy immortality. When his death became known in Paris, his *éloge* was read by Cuvier before the National Institute.

Priestley has given us his autobiography down to March 24, 1795. He was a man of irreproachable moral and domestic character, remarkable for zeal, for truth, patience, and in his maturer years for serenity of temper. He appears to have been fearless in proclaiming his convictions, whether theological, political, or scientific. Few men in modern times have written so much, or with such facility; yet he seldom spent more than six or eight hours a day in any labor which required much mental exertion. A habit of regularity extended itself to all his studies. He never read a book without determining in his own mind when he would finish it; and at the beginning of every year he arranged the plan of his literary pursuits and scientific researches. He labored under a great defect, which, however, was not a very considerable impediment to his progress. He sometimes lost all ideas both of persons and things with which he had been conversant. He always did immediately what he had to perform. Though he rose early and despatched his more serious pursuits in the morning, yet he was as well qualified for mental exertion at one time of the day as at another. All seasons were equal to him, early or late, before dinner or after. He could also write without inconvenience by the parlor fire, with his wife and children about him, and occasionally talking to them. In his family he ever maintained the worship of God. See the *Memoirs*, continued by his son, with observations by T. Cooper; also *Life* by John Corry (1805); and by Rutt (1832).

Rarely has a man been more variously estimated than Priestley. In *Blackwood* (1835) he was characterized as "a shallow scholar, an empirical philosopher—who stumbled on his discoveries and lacked the logical capacity to usefully apply them—a malcontent politician, and a heretical religionist." Dr. Parr, on the contrary, speaks of Priestley's attainments as numerous without a parallel, his talents as superlatively great, and his

morals as correct without austerity and exemplary without ostentation. These estimates are certainly diverse, but possibly they are equally near the truth. Priestley was much more of an experimentalist than a philosopher. In religion as well as in science he sought novelties. Facts, and facts only, could satisfy him. But his caprice was as noticeable as his positiveness, and his logical inconsistencies were gross. A queer instance of this is found in his adherence to the theory of "phlogiston" — the supposed principle of inflammability, or the matter of fire in composition with other bodies— the absurdity of which was shown by his own discovery of oxygen. In theology, as we have seen, while maintaining the immortality of the soul, he denied its immateriality. He was never widely trusted as a religious leader; although, because of his ability and unimpeachable morality, and his eminence in science, his pulpit services were eagerly sought. His fame rests principally on his pneumatic inquiries. But he was encyclopedic in the range of his writings, which extend to between seventy and eighty volumes. Among them are works on general and ecclesiastical history and biography, on language, on oratory and criticism, on religion and metaphysics. Although many of his opinions were fanciful and manifestly erroneous, there was hardly a subject touched by his pen that was not the brighter and shapelier because of his genius. It is not now, however, for the first time remarked that the minds best fitted for prosecuting the labors of experimental philosophy are by no means those from which we expect light to be cast into the more obscure region of metaphysical analysis. "Priestley's mind was objective to an extreme; he could fix his faith upon nothing which had not the evidence of sense in some way or other impressed upon it. Science, morals, politics, philosophy, religion, all came to him under the type of the sensational. The most spiritual ideas were obliged to be cast into a material mould before they could commend themselves to his judgment or conscience. His intellect was rapid to an extraordinary degree; he saw the bearings of a question according to its principles at a glance, and embodied his thoughts in volumes, while many other men would hardly have sketched out their plan. All this, though admirable in the man of action, was not the temperament to form the solid metaphysician; nay, it was precisely opposed to that deep, reflective habit, that sinking into one's own inmost consciousness, from which alone speculative philosophy can obtain light and advancement." As a man of science, he has left his mark upon the intellectual history of the century; but besides being a man of science, he aimed at being a metaphysician, a theologian, a politician, a classical scholar, and a historian. With an amazing intrepidity he plunged into tasks the effective performance of which would have demanded the labors of a lifetime. With the charge of thirty youths on his hands, he proposes to write an ecclesiastical history, and soon afterwards observes that a fresh translation of the Old Test. would "not be a very formidable task" (Rutt, *Life*, I, 42). He carried on all manner of controversies upon their own ground with Horsley and Badcock, with his friend Price, with Beattie and the Scotch philosophers, with Gibbon and the sceptics, and yet often labored for hours a day at his chemical experiments. So discursive a thinker could hardly do much thorough work, nor really work out or co-ordinate his own opinions. It would be in vain, therefore, to anticipate any great force or originality in Priestley's speculations. At best he was a quick reflector of the current opinions of his time and class, and able to run up hasty theories of sufficient apparent stability to afford a temporary refuge amid the storm of conflicting elements. With such tendencies of mind, therefore, and living in an age the whole bearing of which was away from the ideal to the sensational, it is not surprising that Priestley entered with energy into those principles of Hartley from which he hoped to reduce all mental science to a branch of physical investigation.

The metaphysical position he assumed may be fully seen in his *Examination of Reid, Beattie, and Oswald:* in fact, it is summed up in one extraordinary sentence, where he affirms that "something has been done in the field of knowledge by Descartes, very much by Mr. Locke, but most of all by Hartley, who has thrown more useful light upon the theory of the mind than Newton did upon the theory of the natural world." Priestley rested the truth of materialism upon two deductions. The first was that thought and sensation are essentially the same thing—that the whole variety of our ideas, however abstract and refined they may become, are, nevertheless, but modifications of the sensational faculty. This doctrine had been more fully maintained in France by Condillac, and is a crude anticipation of the positive view. The second deduction was that all sensation, and, consequently, all thought, arises from the affections of our material organization, and, therefore, consists entirely in the motion of the material particles of which the nerves and brain are composed. It is but justice, however, here to add that Priestley did not push his materialism so far as to evolve any conclusions contrary to the fundamental principles of man's natural religion, or to invalidate the evidence of a future state; for in the full conviction of these truths he both lived and died. And instead of distinctly inferring with modern positivists that we can show nothing of the ultimate nature either of mind or body, Priestley adopted the view that the soul is itself material. According to his quaint illustration, it resembles a razor. The power of thought inheres in it as the power of cutting in the razor. The razor dissolved in acids is annihilated; and, the body destroyed by putrefaction, the power of thinking ceases. But the particles remain in each case; and the soul, like the razor, may again be put together (Price and Priestley *On Materialism*, p. 82). The advantage of this doctrine, according to Priestley, was that it confirmed bishop Law's theory of the seat of the soul. The soul being, in fact, a piece of mechanism, is taken to pieces at death, and though it may afterwards be put together again by divine power, there is no ground for the superstitions embodied in the doctrine of purgatory. Moreover, it strikingly confirms the Socinian doctrine by removing all pretext for a belief in the pre-existence of Christ. To sum up, then, the precise influence of Priestley upon the progress of sensationalism in a few words, we may say that he succeeded in cutting the last tie which had held Hartley to the poor remains of spiritualism; that he reduced the whole phenomena of mind to organic processes—the mind itself to a material organization, and mental philosophy to a physical science. The whole existing order of things being an elaborate piece of mechanism, we infer the Almighty mechanist by the familiar watch argument (*Disquisitions*, i, 187). Indeed, the Deity himself becomes almost phenomenal, and Priestley has considerable trouble in saving him from materiality. He denies that a belief in his immateriality would increase our reverence for him (*ibid.* i, 185), and declares that he must be in some sense extended, and have some common property with the matter upon which he acts. It would seem, indeed, that God is rather matter of a different kind from the ordinary than in any strict sense immaterial.

Priestley's *History of the Corruptions of Christianity* led to the most exciting controversy in the latter half of the 18th century. His position may be easily defined. He writes as a Protestant, and, charging the papacy with corrupting tendencies, he pushes one step farther the arguments already familiar in the great controversy of the Protestant world of Christianity with Rome. He is by no means original in his position. Zwicker and Episcopius had anticipated his main theory. There is but a question of degree between Priestley and other Protestant writers upon the early ages of Christianity. He endeavors to draw the limits of the supernatural still more closely than his predecessors. All Protestants admitted that at some early period

Christianity has been corrupted. Priestley includes among the corruptions the Trinitarian doctrines, which, as he argues, showed themselves, though in a comparatively undeveloped state, among the earliest of the post-apostolic writers. He continues the attack upon the authority of the Church fathers, as begun by Daillé, and which had then been recently carried on by Middleton and Jortin. He makes Christ a mere man, and places the writers of the New Test. on the same level with Thucydides or Tacitus, while he still believes in the miracles, and quotes texts after the old unhistorical fashion. He is compelled, moreover, to accept the Protestant theory that there was in the earliest ages a body of absolutely sound doctrine, though, in the effort to identify this with Unitarianism he is driven to great straits, and forced to discover it in obscure sects, and to make inferences from the negative argument of silence rather than from positive assertions. Though he makes free with the reasoning of the apostles, he cannot give up their authority; and, accepting without question the authenticity of the Gospels, labors to interpret them in the Unitarian sense. He did not see that the real difficulty is the admission of supernatural agency, and that to call a miracle a very little one is only to encounter the whole weight of rationalistic and of orthodox hostility. His aim, as he explains in his Preface, is to show "what circumstances in the state of things" (notice this slipshod style), "and especially of other prevailing opinions and prejudices," favored the introduction of new doctrines. He hopes that this "historical method will be found to be one of the most satisfactory modes of argumentation" (*Corruptions*, vol. i, Preface, p. xiv).

Priestley asserts that corruptions appeared, but in practice seems to attribute them to perverse chances rather than to the influence of contemporary opinion, which he professes to trace. Thus in discussing theories of grace, he says, "It is not easy to imagine *a priori* what could have led men into such a train of thinking" (*ibid.* i, 284), as is exhibited in the speculations about grace, free will, and predestination. After some vague handling of the problem, he remembers that the "principal parts" of the system "were first suggested in the heat of controversy" (*ibid.* p. 285)—an explanation which seems to him to throw some light upon the question. Obviously, a writer thus incompetent to appreciate the bearings of the most vital doctrines of Christianity was not a very competent historian of thought. Priestley, however, perceives, what was indeed sufficiently palpable, that Platonism had played a great part in the development of Christian dogma. The Platonists, he tells us, "pretended to be no more than the expositors of a more ancient doctrine;" which he traces through Parmenides, the Pythagoreans, and Orpheus, to "the secret lore of the Egyptian priests." Another stream of tradition had reached the Romans from "their Trojan ancestors," who had received it from Phrygia, where it had been planted by Dardanus "as early as the 9th century after Noah's flood." Dardanus brought it from Samothrace, where the "Three Mighty Ones" were worshipped under the name of the Cabirim. Thus the Platonic Trinity, and the Roman Jupiter, Juno, and Minerva, were shown to be simply faint reflections of an early revelation communicated to the patriarchs before the days of Moses (Horsley, *Tracts*, p. 43–45). See, besides the works above referred to, Brougham, *Lives of Philosophers of the Time of George III*, p. 83 sq.; De Quincey, *Philosophical Writers*, ii, 262; Mackintosh, *Miscell. Works*, iii, 170; *Lond. Gentleman's Magazine*, April, 1804, p. 375 sq.; *Edinb. Rev.* 1806, p. 136 sq.; Norton, *Views of Christian Truth, Piety, and Morality* (Lond. 12mo); *Lond. Qu. Rev.* Dec. 1812, p. 430; Lindsey, *Vindiciæ Priestleianæ* (1788, 2 vols. 8vo); *Christian Examiner*, xii, 257 sq.; Stevens, *Hist. of English Thought in the 18th Century*, i, 429 sq.; Leckey, *Hist. of Rationalism*, and his *Hist. of the 18th Century;* Morell, *Hist. of Modern Philosophy*, p. 101 sq.; Taylor, *Retrospect of Religious Life in England* (1845); Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrines*, ii, 441 sq.; *N. Y. Christian Advocate*, 1877; Perry, *Hist. of the Church of England*, iii, 432–434; Blakey, *Hist. of the Philosophy of Mind*, iii, 230 sq., 302 sq.; Cousin, *Hist. of Modern Philosophy*, lect. xiii, xiv.

Priestley, Thomas, an English divine of the Independent body, flourished near the close of the last century. He was the brother of Joseph Priestley (q.v.), but their theological tenets differed widely. Thomas was the editor of the *Christian Magazine*, and published, *Evangelical Bible, or Paraphrase, Exposition, and Commentary, with copious Notes and suitable Reflections* (1791, fol.):—*Rev. Mr. Scott's Life and Death* (1791, 8vo):—a *Funeral Sermon* (1791, 8vo):—*Family Exercises* (1792, 8vo; 1793, 8vo).

Priests, Marriage of. The obligation of perpetual virginity imposed by the Church of Rome upon those who receive higher orders has been spoken of in another article. See Celibacy. In the ancient Church married men (but no bigamists) were sometimes received into priesthood, without dissolution of their matrimony; but it was never allowed to one who had received higher orders to marry. If such a case occurred, the service of the Church had to be renounced. In the West we find, in the middle of the 10th century (*Conc. August.* can. 1), the ordinance that the bishops, priests, deacons, and subdeacons who contract marriage are to be deposed from their functions. Hence it would seem plain that the orders were not then considered as an impediment to marriage, while the solemn vow was considered as such (*Conc. Troisliens*, cap. i, a, 909). The Lateran Council of 1123 declares the matrimony contracted by a priest, etc., as one to be dissolved (*disjungi*, can. 21); that of 1139 declares it not existing at all (*matrimonium non esse censemus*, can. 7). The Council of Trent (sess. xxiv, can. 9) repeated the same declaration, and, in virtue of the powers of the Church (can. 4, l. c.), puts the orders again into the number of the dissolving impediments to matrimony. The same council decreed, further, that sons of clergymen cannot discharge a clerical function in a place where their father is or was in office (sess. xxv, cap. 15, *De ref.*). The Greek Church imposes celibacy on the higher dignitaries—the bishops—but not on the priests and lower functionaries of the Church. The latter cannot, it is true, marry after receiving the orders, but are allowed to continue in the matrimonial relations contracted before ordination. But no second marriage is tolerated. The Russian Church, however, refuses ordination to her priests as long as they are unmarried, i. e. ordains only married men. If the priest becomes a widower, he retires to monastic life. In the Greek Oriental Church there are unmarried priests: they remain in office after the death of their wives, unless they prefer to marry again. In Greece married priests are distinguished from the unmarried ones by their head-gear: the former wear very low round hats. See Lea, *Sacerdotal Celibacy* (Index, under Marriage).

Priests' Rooms. The chaplains in Great Britain frequently had chambers over porches or sacristies, as at St. Peter's-in-the-East, Oxford; in Ireland, over the vault of the church, as at Cashel, Mellifont, Holy Cross, and Kilkenny; in Scotland, at Iona, over the aisles.

Prileszky, John Baptist, a learned Hungarian Jesuit, was born at Priless March 16, 1709, and, after attaining to the doctorate in philosophy and theology, taught in several colleges of his order. He was for five years chancellor of the University of Tyrnau. He died after 1773. He wrote, *Acta Sanctorum Hungariæ* (Tyrnau, 1743–44, 8vo):—*Notitia Sanctorum Patrum trium priorum Sæculorum* (ibid. 1759):—*Acta et Scripta S. Cypriani* (ibid. 1761, fol.):—*Acta et Scripta S. Theophili, Patriarchæ Antiocheni et Minutii Felicis* (Vienna, 1764, 8vo):—*Acta et Scripta S. Irenæi* (Kaschau, 1765, 8vo):—*Acta et Scripta S. Gregorii Neo-Cæsariensis, Dou-*

yeii Alexandrini et Methodii Lycii (ibid. 1766, 8vo).—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.

Primacy is the office held (1) by him who is the pope of Rome, and therefore highest in the Christian Church, according to those who accept the assertions of the papacy; and (2) by him who is next in rank to the patriarch (q. v.). See PRIMATE.

The *primacy of Peter*, as the pope's office is sometimes styled, Romanists claim to be of divine appointment. They assert that the apostle Peter, by Christ's authority, had a primacy or sovereign authority and jurisdiction over the other apostles. Since the God-man Jesus the Christ, they say, has himself willed the continuance of the Church and her fundamental unity, Peter and his successors were also established by the will of God. The power to bind and to loose [see KEYS, POWER OF THE] was given to the apostles in a body (Matt. xviii, 8); but, in order to preserve their power and unity, Peter was put at their head and endowed with higher honors (Matt. xvi, 16–18; xvii, 4, etc.). He became the *primus inter pares*, not so much for his own sake as for a precedent; "for it would be unreasonable," says Sauter, "to consider the primacy he held to have died with him, in view of the end for which Christ had appointed him to it. It appears, on the contrary, that Christ instituted the primacy more in view of the future than to meet the requirements of the apostolic times, when the personal purity of each of the apostles rendered such a measure less necessary" (*Fundamenta juris ecclesiastici Catholicorum* [3d ed. Rotwilæ, 1825], § 62; see also *Zeitschrift für Phil. und kath. Theologie* [Cologne, 1832], iv, 121, 122). By the example of Peter, Christ showed, in a general way, that some one of the bishops was always to be considered as primate by the others; but, add those who put a liberal interpretation on the Romish assertion of supremacy, it is by no means clear from the writings of the primitive fathers that the primacy was attached to a particular bishopric. Circumstances favored Rome, whose bishop was acknowledged by the other bishops as the successor of Peter (in the primacy). The bishops of Rome cannot have the primacy by divine appointment, but in a mediate manner, so that, when the good of the Church demands it, it can be transferred to another of the bishops (Sauter, § 63, 64). But the Ultramontanes maintain that by the same authority by which Peter was set apart for the supremacy his own successors were also established. Peter, it is true, founded different communities and provided them with bishops, yet no other can be considered as his true successor than he who succeeded him after his death, and this is the bishop of Rome. The Roman bishop had, by his Roman episcopal dignity, a right similar to that in virtue of which the next relation succeeds in worldly principalities, and the Ultramontanes assert that Peter himself chose for his successor, in all his dignities, the same Linus mentioned by Paul in his Second Epistle to Timothy, iv, 21 (Phillips, *Kirchenrecht*, i, 146). This system of ideas, so simple in appearance, has only by degrees developed itself and obtained dogmatical sanction in the Latin Church. It is based on facts which have been variously appreciated, and on decisions which have by no means received the same interpretation at all hands. The whole deduction is founded on arbitrary declarations, inasmuch as the bishops were, and are still, party and judge in the same cause; they, whose title is in question, claim the exclusive right of explaining words and facts, and consider any one who doubts their assertions as being disobedient to Christ and to God. Impartial thinkers of the Roman Church itself cannot help acknowledging that before the middle of the 3d century there was no primacy perceptible in the Church (see Möhler, *Die Einheit der Kirche, oder das Prinzip des Katholicismus, dargestellt im Geiste der Kirchenverfassung der drei ersten Jahrhunderte* [2d ed. Tübingen, 1843]); while others, by arbitrary arrangement of historical facts, arrive at the conclusion "that the Roman bishops not only claimed the highest authority in all ecclesiastical matters since the first times of Christianity, but that these pretensions, founded on Christ's declarations, were acknowledged by the whole Church, especially by the episcopate" (see Phillips, *Kirchenrecht*, p. 156). This is not the place to show, by the history of the Roman bishops of the first centuries, how indefensible such an assumption must appear: we must leave this to the special articles of this work, contenting ourselves with calling the attention of the reader to the principal features of the development of the primacy.

Among the numerous works written on the subject, we mention in favor of it: *Bibliotheca maxima Pontificia, in qua authores melioris notæ qui hactenus pro S. Romana Sede scripserunt, fere omnes continentur*, promovente Fr. H. Tom. de Roceaberti (Romæ, 1689, 21 vols. fol.); A. Daude, *Majestas Hierarchiæ cul. Summi Pontificis* (Bamb. 1761, 2 vols. 4to); Pet. Ballerini, *De Vi ac Ratione Primatus, etc.* (Augsb. 1770, 2 vols. 4to; ed. nov. by Westhoff); J. Roskovany, *De Primatu Romani Pontificis ejusque Juribus* (ibid. 1834, 8vo); Rothensee, *Der Primat des Papstes in allen Jahrhunderten, herausgegeben von Räss und Weiss* (Mainz, 1836, 4 vols. 8vo). Against it: Ellendorf, *Der Primat der römischen Päpste* (Darmst. 1841 and 1846, 2 vols. 8vo); Barruel, *Du Pape et ses Droits religieux* (Paris, 1803); Le Maistre, *Du Pape* (ibid. 1820); Gosselin, *Pouvoir du Pape au Moyen Âge* (Louvain, 1845, 2 vols. 8vo). These and other works have been extensively used by Phillips in his *Canon Law*, the fifth volume of which (Ratisbon, 1857) is entirely devoted to the subject of primacy.

Generally the testimony of Irenæus (d. 202) and of Cyprian (d. 258) are specially invoked to show that the primacy of the Roman bishops was accepted in the 2d century. But the former (*Adversus Hæres.* lib. iii, cap. iii), in order to demonstrate the truth of the Catholic doctrine, appeals to the tradition of all the sees founded by the apostles; for Italy and the West, he names especially Rome as being the only Occidental see of undisputed apostolic foundation. The *potior principalitas* mentioned by Irenæus designates the political situation of the city, which could not fail to enhance its ecclesiastical importance. In the same way, Constantinople, at a later period, took the second place in the hierarchy, as being a second Rome (*Concil. Constantinop.* ann. 381, can. 3; comp. Bickell, *Geschichte des Kirchenrechts*, i, 209 sq.). The ideas of Cyprian about the unity of the Church logically led to primacy, yet the relations he himself maintained to the Roman bishop do not imply the acknowledgment of a prerogative like that which is supposed to be advocated in his book *De Unitate Ecclesiæ*, and in his letters in favor of Rome. Its foundation by an apostle, and the authority of the first metropolis of the Roman empire, gave at an early period a great importance to the see of Rome; but the same importance is attributed to the bishop of Alexandria and of Antioch, in the 3d canon of the Council of Nice, in 325. At that council the Roman bishop did not exercise a higher authority than the other bishops. This is clearly shown by the acts of the council, signed by two presbyters, "instead of our pope," i. e. bishop (see *Analecta Nicæna*—fragments relating to the Council of Nice—by Harris Cowpers [London and Edinburgh, 1857]). It was at a later period attempted to give can. 6 Nic. Conc. another form than the primitive by adding at the beginning the words "Quod ecclesia Romana semper habuit primatum" (see Gieseler, *Kirchengeschichte*, i, § 91). The struggle for the maintenance of the orthodox doctrine was extremely advantageous to the bishops of Rome, and the Council of Sardica (343) emphasized most decidedly the pre-eminence of the Roman see in the Western Church: the Oriental bishops on that occasion protested and left the assembly. The resolutions of Sardica were not at once accepted even in the Western Church. At the request of the bishop Damasus, and of a Roman

synod of 378, the emperor Gratian issued a rescript in favor of Rome (Gieseler, *l. c.* § 92, n. i). In 445 an edict of Valentinian III proclaims the primacy of the bishop of Rome over the whole Church—a primacy which, besides the higher rank over the bishops, includes a supremé ecclesiastical legislation and jurisdiction. The emperor founds this preference on the primacy of Peter ("sedis apostolicæ primatum, sancti Petri meritum, qui princeps est episcopalis coronæ"), on the political importance of Rome ("Romanæ dignitas civitatis"), and on the Synod of Sardica ("sacræ synodi auctoritas") (comp. Richter, *Kirchenrecht* [6th ed.], § 22, n. 3). But the Church of the East was by no means subordinated to the Roman see; the Council of Chalcedon, 451, in can. 28, declares that the see of Constantinople has the same privileges in the Eastern Church which in the Western Church belong to Rome (*τὰ ἴσα πρεσβεῖα ἀπέμειναν τῷ τῆς νέας Ῥώμης ἁγιωτάτῳ θρόνῳ*). If, in later times, the first place in the Roman empire is acknowledged to belong to Rome (c. 7, pr. c. 8, *C. de Summa Trinitate* [i, 1]; Justinian, a. 533, No. ix, cxxxi, c. 2, a. 535, 545, etc.), this was only a distinction of honor without any practical consequences; for the patriarch of Constantinople was also the highest instance (c. 29, *C. de Episcop. Audientia* [i, 4], a. 530, No. cxxxvii, c. 5, a. 564, etc.). The ecclesiastical authority of Rome was not contested after that, but its relation to the worldly powers passed through many vicissitudes. Its connection with the newly founded Germanic churches was at first prevented by their Arianism, but became the closer after their conversion to the orthodox faith. The Roman principles about the relations of the Church to the apostolic see prevailed in the Frankish empire by the exertions of Boniface, although their practical consequences were impeded by the independent exercise of the rights of the State in Church matters. With Charlemagne the pope was nothing but the first metropolitan, over whom the emperor had jurisdiction. The king is the supreme judge and legislator, a protector and ruler given to the Church by God, who corrects or approves the resolutions of the synods, and issues himself ecclesiastical ordinances, after taking the advice of the clergy. The proof of this is afforded by a large number of capitularies. Under the weak successors of the great emperor there was a change, which the decretals of Pseudo-Isidore turned to the advantage of Rome. It was in conformity with these principles that Nicholas I administered the Church (from 858). The German kings of the house of Saxony regained the lost power, and the Roman bishops were again reduced to the primacy of honor. We see the German bishops, under Otto I, appointed by the emperor himself, governing their dioceses independently, and the episcopate, in their synods, presided over by the emperor, exercise jurisdiction over the Roman bishop (deposition of John XII, in 963, by the Roman council). These principles were in force until the middle of the 11th century. The bishop of Rome was then subordinated to the emperor and to the body of the episcopate (in 1046, at the Synod of Sutri, by which Benedict VIII, Sylvester III, and Gregory VI were deposed). Under Gregory VII a reaction took place, and the papacy was enabled to obtain the whole extent of authority which Pseudo-Isidore claimed as its own. The hierarchical system of papacy was completed by this Gregory and his successors—Alexander III (1159–1181), Innocent III (1198–1216), Gregory IX (1227–1241), Innocent IV (1243–1254), and Boniface VIII (1294–1303). The so-called *Dictatus Hildebrandini*, the authenticity of which is proved by the regests of Gregory VII (comp. Gieseler, *Kirchengesch.* II, i, § 47, n. *d*; Giesebrecht, *De Gregorii VII registro emendando* [Regimont. 1858], p. 5), and the decretals of the popes mentioned, contain the propositions peculiar to this system, the most essential of which are: The bishop of Rome is the vicar of Christ on earth ("Romanus Pontifex vicarius Jesu Christi, quod non puri hominis, sed veri Dei vicem gerit in terris" [Innoc. III, in c. 2, 3, x, *De Translat. Episcop.* i, 7]), the universal bishop ("solus universalis" [*Gregorii Dict.* No. 2]), to whom alone belongs the title of pope ("quod unicum est nomen in mundo" [*ibid.* c. 11]). He is possessed of full powers, and he grants parts of them to the rest of the clergy, as his assistants ("Quia diversitatem corporum diversitas sæpe sequitur animorum, ne plenitudo ecclesiasticæ jurisdictionis in plures dispensata vilesceret, sed in uno potius collata vigeret, apostolicæ sedi Dominus in B. Petro universam ecclesiarum et cunctorum Christi fidelium magistrium contulit et primatum, quæ, retenta sibi plenitudine potestatis, ad implendum laudabilius officium pastorale, quod omnibus eam constituit debitricem, multos in partem sollicitudinis evocavit, sic suum dispensans onus et honorem in alios, ut nihil suo juri subtraheret, nec jurisdictionem suam in aliquo minoraret" [Innoc. III, in c. 5, x, *De Concess. Prœbendæ*, iii, 8]). It is, of course, his own business how he chooses his assistants; the rights of appointing, deposing, permuting bishops belong to him exclusively; he can draw every cause before the apostolic see, judge it himself, or take it back from the judge he had appointed, and give it to another one, especially to his personal lieutenant, a legate, who, of course, has pre-eminence over all other dignitaries ("Quod ille solus possit deponere episcopos vel reconciliare.—Quod legatus ejus omnibus episcopis præsit in concilio, etiam inferioris gradus, et adversus eos sententiam depositionis possit dare.—Quod illi liceat de sede ad sedem necessitate cogente episcopos transmutare.—Quod de omni ecclesia, quacunque voluerit, clericum valeat ordinare.—Quod majores causæ cujuscunque ecclesiæ ad sedem apostolicam referri debeant" [*Dictatus Gregorii VII*, Nos. 3, 4, 13, 14, 21, 25, etc.]). The Roman bishop is the legislator of the Church ("Quod illi soli licet pro temporis necessitate novas leges condere," etc. [*l. c.* No. 7]). Without his consent, no synod can take place ("Quod nulla synodus absque præcepto ejus debet generalis vocari" [*l. c.* 16]). He is infallible, and decides what is true ("Quod nullum capitulum nullusque liber canonicus habeatur absque illius auctoritate.—Quod Romana ecclesia nunquam erravit, nec in perpetuum, scriptura testante, errabit" [*l. c.* 17, 22]). He recognises no authority, while all are subordinated to his authority ("Quod sententia illius a nullo debeat retractari, et ipse omnium solus retractare possit.—Quod a nemine ipse judicari debeat.—Quod nullus audeat condemnare apostolicam sedem appellantem" [*l. c.* 18–20]).

The papal system, a product of feudalism, according to which all authority rests in the sovereign, involves, in its last consequence, the political domination. The *Dictatus Gregorii* contain the following declarations: "Quod solus Papa possit uti imperialibus insigniis" (No. 8); "Quod solius Papæ pedes omnes principes deosculentur (No. 9); "Quod illi libeat imperatores deponere" (No. 12); "Quod a fidelitate iniquorum subjectos possit absolvere" (No. 27). Boniface VIII, trying to act up to these principles, involved himself in a terrible conflict with France, which ended in the defeat of the Roman see. Now people began to bethink themselves again of the principles which had prevailed before Gregory VII, on the relations of the Church, and the council which represents her, to the bishop of Rome, and the old principles were reinstated in vigor. The result of the war which has since been waged, with many interruptions and vicissitudes, between the pope and the bishops is a modification and practical attenuation of the strict papal or curial system; yet the latter has been victorious, and is now generally acknowledged. The consequences of this system in regard to the relations of the Roman Catholic Church to the State, the right of granting royal titles (Phillips, *l. c.* v, 684 sq.), and other prerogatives, by which the rights of sovereigns were limited or even denied, have long disappeared from practice; yet the pope never retracted the

principle, and never failed to avail himself of such circumstances as allowed him to proclaim it and to apply it to special cases (see A. de Roskovany, *Monumenta Catholica pro Independentia Potestatis Ecclesiasticæ ab Imperio Civili* [*Quinque Ecclesiis*, 1847], vol. ii). The *Austrian Concordat* of Aug. 18, 1855, art. ii, says: "Cum Romanus pontifex primatum tam honoris quam jurisdictionis in universam, qua late patet, ecclesiam jure divino obtineat, episcoporum, cleri, et populi mutuo cum Sancta Sede communicatio in rebus spiritualibus et negotiis ecclesiasticis nulli placetum regium obtinendi necessitas suberit, sed prorsus libera erit;" and the allocution of Pius IX, at the publication of the *Concordat*, says: "Cum Romanus pontifex Christi his in terris vicarius et beatissimi apostolorum principis successor primatum . . . divino obtineat jure, tum Catholicum hoc dogma in ipsa conventione luculentissimis fuit verbis expressum, ac propterea simul de medio sublata et radicitus evulsa peccatusque deleta falsa perversa illa et funestissima opinio eidem divino primatui ejusque juribus plane adversa et ab hac Apostolica Sede semper damnata atque proscripta, de habenda scilicet a civili gubernio venia, vel executione eorum, quæ res spirituales et ecclesiastica negotia respiciunt." The principle is also saved in those cases where it is allowed to the State, only in consideration of the circumstances (*temporum ratione habita*), to decide by worldly procedure, in merely civil affairs of the clergy, or even in criminal matters in which they are involved (*Austr. Conc.* art. xii, etc.).

The papal rights relate to the supreme government of the Roman Catholic Church, and to the honors derived from it. Distinction is made between rights essential to the existence of the primacy (*jura essentialia, primigenia, naturalia*) and those which have been gradually added to the others, but are not absolutely indispensable to the primacy (*jura accidentalia, acquisita, secundaria*) (Sauter, § 466; Droste-Hülshoff, *Grundsätze des gemeinen Kirchenrechts*, ii, pt. i, § 132 sq.; Eichhorn, *Kirchenrecht*, i, 579 sq.; Roskovany, *De Primatu Pontificis Romani* [Augustæ Vindelicor. 1834], § 44 sq.; § 54 sq.). As essentials we find, first, the primacy of honor and of jurisdiction, of the highest consideration and of general government, including discipline, the right of legislation, devolution, and protection. Among the additional rights or privileges are the jurisdiction in *causæ arduæ ac majores*, the decision in last resort of the reserved cases, etc. The primacy of the papal jurisdiction comprises—

(1.) *The Representation of the Roman Catholic Church.* —As the representative head, the pope has, partly in proper person, partly in co-operation with the cardinals, to defend the general interests and special concerns of the Church with the exterior powers. He has to make conventions with the different states concerning the clerical institutions existing in them and directly subordinated to the papal see.

(2.) *The Supreme Ecclesiastical Legislation.* — The pope issues decrees as well about subjects of discipline as of doctrine, and secures the approbation of the Church by the convocation of a council or by other means. The necessity of the approbation of the council is not recognised by the pope. As the pope, speaking *ex cathedra*, cannot err according to the doctrine of the Church, all members of the Catholic Church are bound in such case to submit to the decision of the sovereign pontiff. This principle was solemnly recognised at the proclamation of the dogma of the immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary. But the papal infallibility does not extend to matters of fact. Bellarmine himself says (*De Romano Pontifice*, lib. iv, cap. 2), "Conveniunt omnes posse Pontificem, et cum cœtu consiliorum vel cum generali concilio, errare in controversiis facti particularibus, quæ ex informatione testimoniisque hominum præcipue pendent." Appeals from *Pontifice male informato ad melius informandum* have always been in use. In virtue of his legislative powers, the pope can dispensate and authentically interpret; and in virtue of the same he orders the resolutions of the provincial synods to be re-examined and approved by the Congregatio Concilii (Benedict XIV, *De Synodo Diœcesana*, lib. xiii, cap. 3, No. 6).

(3.) *The Highest Ecclesiastical Supervision.*—Reports from all dioceses are regularly sent to the pope. The bishops, by the oath they have to take before their consecration, are bound to appear in person ("Limina apostolorum singulis annis aut per me aut per certum nuntium visitabo, nisi—absolvar"); but the *visitatio liminum* can be replaced by a *relatio status diœceseos*, which must take place in conformity with an instruction of Benedict XIV (*De Synodo Diœcesana*, lib. xiii, cap. 7 sq.).

(4.) *The Highest Ecclesiastical Administration* (Regimen Ecclesiæ).—It comprises the decision in the *causæ arduæ ac majores*. To these belong the *causæ episcoporum*—namely, the confirmation of elected, the admission of postulated bishops; the consecration, permutation, deposition; acceptation of resignations; appointment of coadjutors; foundation, division, fusion of dioceses; collation of the pallium; confirmation and suppression of clerical orders and ecclesiastical institutions; beatification and canonization; the acknowledgment of relics; the establishment and abrogation of general religious feasts; the right of decision in reserved cases. In virtue of his supremacy, the pope has also a right, in case of insufficient, faulty administration of the clerical dignitaries, to take the government in his own hands, and do everywhere what is wanted. On the right of administration is also founded the right of imposing ecclesiastical taxes.

II. *Primacy of Honor.*—(1.) The pope has not only preeminence over the clerical dignitaries, but is traditionally recognised even by the worldly powers. The political authorities, in their conventions with him, allow his name to stand first. (2.) The title and the qualifications connected with it underwent some changes. The name of *pope* belongs, since Gregory VII's time, exclusively to the bishop of Rome; likewise the designation of Summus Pontifex. Pontifex Maximus was only at a later period reserved for him. Gregory I declined the title of Patriarcha Universalis (see cap. 4, 5, dist. xcix), and preferred being called Servus Servorum Dei, a designation which has since become official (comp. Thomassin, *Vetus ac Nova Ecclesiæ Disciplina*, lib. i, pt. i, cap. 4, 50, No. 14; Ferraris, *Bibliotheca Canonica*, s. v.; *Papa*, art. ii, No. 33-35; Phillips, *l. c.* v. 599 sq.). The qualification of *sanctus* is also, in early times, specially applied to the Roman bishops. In the *Dictatus Gregorii VII*, No. 23, we read, "Quod Romanus Pontifex, si canonice fuerit ordinatus, meritis B. Petri indubitanter efficitur sanctus, testante S. Ennodio Papiensi Episcopo, ei multis SS. Patribus faventibus, sicut in decretis B. Symmachi P. continetur." Therefore the usual address is "sanctissime pater" (holy father). (For the homage formerly paid him and his pastoral ensigns, see the art. Pope; for the supremacy of the pope over councils, see Supremacy; for the relation of the papacy to temporal possessions, see Temporal Power of the Pope; see also Romanism.)

In answer to the Roman Catholic doctrine of the primacy we here subjoin the heads of Barrow's famous argument against it in his treatise *On the Supremacy* (*Works* [Lond. 1841], vol. iii). He says there may be "a primacy of worth or personal excellency; a primacy of reputation; a primacy of order or bare dignity and precedence; a primacy of power and jurisdiction. 1. The first—a primacy of worth—we may well grant to Peter, for probably he did exceed the rest of his brethren in personal endowments and capacities. 2. A primacy of repute, which Paul means when he speaks of those who had a special reputation, of those who seemed to be pillars of the supereminent apostles (Gal. ii, 6, 9; 2 Cor. xi. 5; xii, 11). [This advantage cannot be refused him, being a necessary consequence of those eminent qualities resplendent

in him, and of the illustrious performances achieved by him beyond the rest. This may be inferred from that renown which he has had from the beginning; and likewise from his being so constantly ranked in the first place before the rest of his brethren.] 3. As to a primacy of order or bare dignity, importing that commonly, in all meetings and proceedings, the other apostles did yield him the precedence, it may be questioned; for this does not seem suitable to the gravity of such persons, or their condition and circumstances, to stand upon ceremonies of respect; for our Lord's rules seem to exclude all semblance of ambition, all kind of inequality and distance between his apostles. [But yet this primacy may be granted as probable upon divers accounts of use and convenience; it might be useful to preserve order, and to promote expedition, or to prevent confusion, distraction, and dilatory obstruction in the management of things.] 4. As to a primacy importing a superiority in command, power, or jurisdiction, this we have great reason to deny upon the following considerations: (1.) For such a power it was needful that a commission from God, its founder, should be granted in absolute and perspicuous terms; but no such commission is extant in Scripture. (2.) If so illustrious an office was instituted by our Saviour, it is strange that nowhere in the evangelical or apostolical history there should be any express mention of that institution. (3.) If Peter had been instituted sovereign of the apostolical senate, his office and state had been in nature and kind very distinct from the common office of the other apostles, as the office of a king from the office of any subject [and probably would have been dignified by some distinct name, as that of arch-apostle, arch-pastor, the vicar of Christ, or the like; but no such name or title was assumed by him, or was by the rest attributed to him]. (4.) There was no office above that of an apostle known to the apostles or primitive Church (Ephes. iv, 11; 1 Cor. xii, 28). (5.) Our Lord himself declared against this kind of primacy, prohibiting his apostles to affect, to seek, to assume, or admit a superiority of power, one above another (Luke xxii, 14–24; Mark ix, 35). (6.) We do not find any peculiar administration committed to Peter, nor any privilege conferred on him which was not also granted to the other apostles (Matt. xx, 23; Mark xvi, 15). (7.) When Peter wrote two catholic epistles, there does not appear in either of them any intimation or any pretence to this arch-apostolical power. (8.) In all relations which occur in Scripture about controversies incident to doctrine or practice, there is no appeal made to Peter's judgment or allegation of it as decisive, no argument is built on his authority. (9.) Peter nowhere appears intermeddling as a judge or governor paramount in such cases [yet where he does himself deal with heretics and disorderly persons, he proceeds not as a pope, decreeing, but as an apostle, warning, arguing, and persuading against them]. (10.) The consideration of the apostles proceeding in the conversion of people, in the foundation of churches, and in administration of their spiritual affairs will exclude any probability of Peter's jurisdiction over them. [They went about their business, not by order or license from Peter, but according to special direction of God's Spirit.] (11.) The nature of the apostolic ministry—their not being fixed in one place of residence, but continually moving about the world—the state of things at that time, and the manner of Peter's life, render it unlikely that he had such a jurisdiction over the apostles as some assign him. (12.) It was indeed most requisite that every apostle should have a complete, absolute, independent authority in managing the duties and concerns of the office, that he might not anywise be obstructed in the discharge of them, not clogged with a need to consult others, not hampered with orders from those who were at a distance. (13.) The discourse and behavior of Paul towards Peter are evidence that he did not acknowledge any dependence on him, or any subjection to him (Gal. ii, 11). (14.) If Peter had been appointed sovereign of the Church, it seems that it should have been requisite that he should have outlived all the apostles; for otherwise the Church would have wanted a head, or there must have been an inextricable controversy who that head was. But Peter died long before John, as all agree, and perhaps before divers others of the apostles."

From these arguments we must see what little ground the Church of Rome has to derive the supremacy of the pope from the supposed primacy of Peter. See POPE.

Primas. See PRIMATE.

Primat, CLAUDE-FRANÇOIS-MARIE, a French prelate, was born at Lyons July 26, 1747. He studied, at the expense of the Chapter of St. John, at Lyons, and entered the brotherhood of the Oratorians. From the college at Marseilles he went to that of Dijon, where he became professor of rhetoric and theology. At the age of twenty-eight he was ordained a priest, and became a successful preacher. In 1786 he was made curate of St. James at Douai. During the revolutionary agitation he gave his support to the republican cause by taking the required oath. He was made constitutional bishop of the North March 27, 1791, and established the seat of his episcopacy at Cambray. He resigned office Nov. 13, 1793, and had even the weakness to return to the convention his letters of priesthood. But this step did not prevent him from presiding over a diocesan synod held at Lille in 1797. He assisted at the council held at Paris at the end of that year, and was transferred by his associates to the bishopric of Rhone and Loire Feb. 1798. At this time he composed a paper to justify his oath of hatred to royalty, which was found in the actions of that council. After the Concordat, he was chosen, April 9, 1802, archbishop of Toulouse, where by his mild measures he triumphed over all obstacles. As primate he was present at the coronation of Napoleon I, and the pallium was conferred upon him Jan. 16, 1805. He was finally chosen senator and count of the empire May 19, 1806; and during the Hundred Days he was called to a seat in the Chamber of Peers, June 4, 1815. He died at Toulouse Oct. 10, 1816. — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.

Primate (Lat. *primus;* Fr. *primat*, first) is the title of a grade in the hierarchy immediately below the rank of patriarch (q. v.). In point of jurisdiction the primacy was, historically, developed out of the episcopate by papal communication of primatial rights. The primates, in this sense of the word, are more particularly an institution of the West; for although the Greek denomination ἔξαρχος is generally translated by *primas*, there are unmistakable differences. The exarchs of the East were subordinated to no patriarch, and were, so far as rights are concerned, their equals in their dioceses, and only in rank were they their inferiors. Such relations were out of the question in the Western Church, where the patriarchate was held by the papal primate in the person of the bishop of Rome, who was recognised as possessing universal supreme jurisdiction. The primates, as such, were metropolitans who enjoyed a pre-eminence of jurisdiction over the other bishops of a country. This pre-eminence was founded on their right of consecrating the other metropolitans and bishops, of convoking national councils, of receiving appeals, etc. Originally this dignity was connected with the nomination to a pontifical vicariate, as was the case with the bishop of Arles, and it rested, in general, on an explicit appointment by the pope. There was one exception to that in the person of the bishop of Carthage, who, though not assuming the primatial title, exerted all the rights implied by it in Africa. The relation in which the primacy almost everywhere stood to the national interests, which obliged its bearers, as the first bishops of the State, to take some share in the political concerns, exercised a detrimental influence, and led some of them to assert overbearing pretensions contrary to the authority of the head of the Church. The importance of the primacy has melted away in the course of time, and in

most cases nothing remains of it but some exterior distinctions. The chief primatial sees of the West were: in Spain—Seville and Tarragona (afterwards united in Toledo); in France—Arles, Rheims, Lyons, and Rouen (among whom the archbishop of Lyons claims the title of *primat des primats*, "primate of the primates"); in England—Canterbury; in Germany—Mainz, Salzburg, and Trier; in Ireland—Armagh, and for the Pale, Dublin; in Scotland—St. Andrews; in Hungary—Gran; in Poland—Gnesen; and in the Northern kingdoms—Lund.

In the Church of England the archbishop of Canterbury is styled primate of all England; the archbishop of York, primate of England. In Ireland, the archbishop of Armagh is primate of all Ireland, and the archbishop of Dublin, primate of Ireland. The title of primate in England and Ireland confers no jurisdiction beyond that of archbishop. The name *primus* is applied in the Scottish Episcopal Church to the presiding bishop. He is chosen by the bishops out of their own number, without their being bound to give effect to seniority of consecration or precedency of diocese.

Prime (Lat. *prima*, the first—i. e. hour), the first of the so-called "lesser hours" of the Roman Breviary (q. v.). It may be called the public morning prayer of that Church, and corresponds in substance with the morning service of the other ancient liturgies, allowance being made for Latin peculiarities. Prime commences with the beautiful hymn of Prudentius, *Jam lucis orto sidere*, which is followed by three and occasionally four psalms (xxii, xxvi, liv, cxviii); but the last portion consists of the opening verses of the 118th (in the A. V. the cxix, 1–32) psalm, which is continued throughout the rest of the "lesser hours." Prime concludes with prayers appropriate to the beginning of a Christian's day. See Procter, *Commentary on the Book of Common Prayer*, p. 187. See Canonical Hours.

Prime, Ebenezer, a Presbyterian minister, was born at Milford, Conn., July 21, 1700, graduated at Yale College in 1718, and at the age of nineteen was assistant of the Rev. Eliphalet Jones, pastor at Huntington, L. I., whose colleague he became four years after. He remained in charge of this congregation until his death, Sept. 25, 1779 (according to another account, Oct. 3). For a period of nearly seven years, from 1766 to 1773, he had an assistant, but during the troubled times of the Revolution the whole charge rested with him, and he was even obliged at one time to flee from his dwelling, and live in retirement for a season in a solitary neighborhood of his congregation. He is the progenitor of a family of eminent Presbyterian divines. Mr. Prime published a *Discourse on the Nature of Ordination*. See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, iii, 30 sq.

Prime, John, an English divine of some note, flourished in the second half of the 16th century. He was educated at Oxford University, and held at one time a fellowship. He published, *The Sacraments* (Lond. 1582, 8vo):—*Nature and Grace* (ibid. 1583, 8vo):—*Sermons* (Oxon. 1585, 8vo):—*Exposition and Observations upon St. Paul to the Galatians* (Lond. 1587, 8vo):—*The Consolations of David*, a sermon on Psa. xxiii, 4 (ibid. 1588, 8vo):—*Sermons* (ibid. 1588, 8vo).

Prime, Nathaniel Scudder, D.D., an American divine, was born at Huntington, L. I., April 21, 1785, and educated at Princeton, where he graduated in 1804. He was licensed to preach in the following year in the Presbyterian Church, and was subsequently stationed at Sag Harbor, Freshpond, Smithtown, Cambridge, New York, and other places. He also acted as principal of literary institutions at Cambridge, Sing Sing, and Newburgh, and gained distinction as a teacher. He died suddenly at Mamaroneck, N. J., March 27, 1856. Dr. Prime published three single *Sermons* (1811, 1817, 1825), an *Address* (1815), and a *Charge to the Rev. Samuel Irenæus Prime* (1837), many statistical and other articles in periodicals, and the two following works, *Familiar Illustration of Christian Baptism* (1818, 12mo), in which he defends infant baptism:—*A History of Long Island from its first Settlement by the Europeans to the Year* 1845 (N. Y. and Pittsburgh, 1845, 12mo). "He had a mind of uncommon force and discrimination, a noble and generous spirit, simple and engaging manners, an invincible firmness in adhering to his own convictions, an earnest devotion to the best interests of his fellowmen, an excellent talent for the pulpit, great tact at public business, and a remarkably graceful facility at mingling in a deliberative body."—Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, iii, 32; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s. v.

Primer, King's, is an English ecclesiastical document published in 1545, containing the Calendar, the Ten Commandments, the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, the Salutation of the Virgin, the seven penitential psalms, a litany, and prayers for various occasions. It was edited by the authority of King Henry VIII, and hence derives its title. A prefatory admonition to the reader complains of several books calculated to mislead the people in their application to the saints, and to set God and his creatures on the same level. Though many divines had made a special distinction between λατρεία and δουλεία, and appropriated the first only to God, yet in practice this distinction was too often forgotten.

Besides the King's Primer, there is also the *Goodly Prymer* of 1535, drawn up by Marshal, archdeacon of Nottingham, and the *Manual of Prayers*, or the Primer in English, of 1539. Primer means first book, and was used often as analogous to the term prayer-book, though it contained selections of services made according to the discretion of the compiler. The *Prymer of Salisbury Use* bears the date of various years, the first edition being published in 1527.—Eadie, s. v. See Collier, *Eccles. Hist.* pt. ii, bk. ii; Procter, *Commentary on the Book of Common Prayer*, p. 12, 75; Wheatly, *On the Book of Common Prayer*, p. 23.

Primerose, Gilbert, D.D., a Scotch divine, flourished in the first half of the 17th century, first as minister of the French Church in London, later as chaplain to James I, and still later as canon of Windsor. He died in 1642. His works are, *La Trompette de Sion, etc., en XVIII Sermons* (Berger, 1610, 8vo; and in Latin by Joan Anchoranum Dantis, 1631, 8vo):—*Le Vœu de Jacob opposé aux Vœux de Moines* (ibid. 1610, 4 vols. 8vo; in English by John Bulteel, Lond. 1617, fol.):—*La Défense de la Religion réformée contre M. François Blovin* (Berger, 1619, 8vo):—*Panégyrique au très-grand Prince Charles, Prince de Galles* (Paris, 1624, 8vo):—*Nine Sermons on Psa. xxxiv*, 19 (Lond. 1625, 4to):—*Two Sermons on Matt. v*, 4, *and Luke vi*, 21 (1625, 8vo).

Primicerius, i. e. *the chief of his order* (from Lat. *primus*, first, and *cera*, wax), one whose name was first inscribed on the tablet of the church, which was covered with wax. The word does not always signify priority of power or jurisdiction; sometimes only priority of time, or precedency of honor or dignity in respect of place. Augustine calls Stephen *primicerius martyrum*. Bernard calls many *primiceria virginitatis*. The word is frequently met with in mediæval Latin, and designates an officer in monasteries. In the *Liber Romani Ordinis* the duties of the office are thus described: *Primicerius sciat se esse sub archidiacono*, etc.: "The primicerius must understand that he is subordinate to the archdeacon; and to his office it specially belongs to preside over the deacons during the time that they are communicating instruction; to maintain proper discipline, as one who must render account to God; to furnish the deacons with subjects on which they must discourse," etc. Du Cange gives various meanings of the term, dependent on the word with which it happens to be connected; as *primicerius subdiaconorum, notariorum, lectorum*, etc. But in a more restricted sense, primicerius designates the holder of a chapter dignity, and

is employed with this specific meaning in Chrodegang's rule, and in the statutes of Amalarius, confirmed by the Synod of Aix-la-Chapelle in 817, where the primicerius appears at the head of the capitulary register, immediately after the archdeacon and archpresbyter. The functions of the primicerius were specially to instruct the deacons, subdeacons, and minorists in the choral song (hence his name of *Præcentor; De consuet.* i, 4), in the liturgy, and in the functions of the Church; to inform the canons of the order of the office in the choir; to explain to the younger ones the management of the Breviary, etc. There is a very circumstantial enumeration of the duties of the primicerius in the *Epistola Isidori Spal. ad Landefredum Cordub.*, "De omnibus eccl. gradibus" (comp. c. 1, § 13, Dist. xxv, and the fragment of the *Ordo Romanus in c. un. x*, "De off. primicerii," i, 25). When the archdeacons, in the progressive extension of their importance, obtained the lower jurisdiction over the priests and archpriests, the primicerius obtained also the full disciplinary power over the minorists. His situation in the chapter was therefore one of importance; it is sometimes called a *dignity* (*De consuet.* i, 4), sometimes a *personale* (*De constit.* i, 2), sometimes it is put simply among the offices (*officia nuda*). There was, in general, no uniform distribution of ranks in the different chapters. When the institution of the Minorites was suppressed, the office of the primicerius was also extinguished.

Primitiæ, Premices. Primitiæ is, with the ancient pagans, the name given to the first-fruits of the fields and gardens, which were annually brought as offerings to the temples or abodes of the priests. We find this custom among almost all nations of antiquity, and also among the Israelites. Like many other religious customs and institutions of the Jews, this kind of exterior worship, considered as a tribute of gratitude for God's blessings, was adopted by the Christian Church, and urgently recommended by the fathers, the kind and quantity of the gifts being left to be determined by the pious feelings of the individual: "Non erant speciali nomine diffinitæ, sed offerentium arbitrio derelictæ" (*De decim. et prim.* iii, 30). They certainly bore the character of free offerings, while the tithe—with the Jews always, since Moses's time; with the Christians at least since Charlemagne's time—represents a strict right; for, that the premices should not remain below the sixtieth part, and not exceed a fortieth of the complete harvest, is only an approximate indication, to be found in Jerome, *Comment. in Ezech.* c. xlvi. With the more general and stricter execution of the laws about the tithe, in the Carlovingian age, the premices disappeared, little by little, or were preserved only in part, and in a changed form.

Primitive Christianity is the religion of the New Testament as first exemplified after the establishment of the new faith by that ecclesiastical organization called the Church, under State patronage. See PRIMITIVE CHURCH. In distinction from this, we have apostolic Christianity, the period that immediately succeeded the labors of the founder of the New-Testament dispensation. See APOSTOLIC CHURCH; CHRISTIANITY.

Primitive Church. An expression used to denote the condition of the Church, as respects doctrine and discipline, in the *early stages* of its history. Though this term is employed with little precision by ecclesiastical writers, it most frequently refers to the Church of the first three centuries. See CHURCH.

Primitive Doctrine. It is the opinion of some persons that there is a "primitive doctrine," independent of Scripture, "always to be found somewhere in the Catholic traditions;" by which language, apparently, they mean to teach that the whole doctrine of the Church is not to be found in the Scriptures, nor yet in the writings of the early fathers; but they seem to suppose that some part of the oral teaching of the apostles might, though in an *unwritten* form, be yet in the possession of the Church, so that the Church might at any time declare a doctrine not opposed to Scripture, on what is called the unanimous consent of antiquity, to have come down by successive oral delivery from the apostles. The opponents of such views consider that they are incapable of abiding the test of sober examination, because it is not possible for us, at this distance of time from the days of the apostles, to know what they did or did not teach orally, or how far what they really did teach may not since have been corrupted. They contend, therefore, that to the ancient apostolical *writings* alone can we look for that which is without doubt to be regarded as *ancient* apostolical *teaching*. See DOCTRINE; TRADITION.

Primitive Methodist Connection is the name of a Wesleyan body of believers principally in England and the British colonies.

During the first decade of the present century stirring reports floated across the Atlantic of the power of God marvellously displayed in the camp-meetings of America. The practice of holding religious services in the open air had much declined among British Methodists, as in all the large towns and many of the villages they now had commodious chapels, and the tidings of pentecostal gatherings in Western forests renewed the memory of the days of Wesley and Whitefield. This renewed interest was increased by the visits of Lorenzo Dow to England and Ireland. On the threshold of this period, a young man of studious habits, named Hugh Bourne, was suffering intensely through an agonizing conviction of sin. From his sixth to his twenty-sixth year, he seldom went to bed without a dread of being in hell before morning; and morning brought him no relief, for he thought he would be in hell before night. He pursued his studies, year after year, with intense zeal, but nowhere in his learning did he find *saving* knowledge. In 1799, when twenty-seven years of age, there fell in his way a volume containing the *Life of Fletcher*, some of Wesley's *Sermons*, Alleine's *Alarm*, and Baxter's *Call to the Unconverted*. In one of Wesley's sermons he found "more real light than in anything else he had ever read." It taught him that "opinion is not religion; . . . even right opinion is as distant from religion as east is from west." The time of his redemption drew nigh. As he read Fletcher's letters on the manifestation of the Son of God, light flooded his soul. He rapturously tells us, "I was born in an instant; yea, passed from death unto life. . . . I was filled with joy, love, and glory, which made full amends for the twenty years' suffering." Soon after his conversion he joined the Wesleyans, and zealously sought the salvation of the rough lumbermen who were in his employment. On May 31, 1807, Mr. Bourne, assisted by Messrs. William Clowes, Thomas Cotton, and others afterwards prominent in the Primitive Methodist Connection, held a camp-meeting at Mow Cap, a mountain on the border-line between Staffordshire and Cheshire. Though the Connection did not really exist till three years later, this is looked upon as the initial point in its history, and its annalists delight to quote the lines,

> "The little cloud increases still
> Which first began upon Mow Hill."

The immediate spiritual results of this meeting more than equalled the hopes of its founders, and during the following summer several meetings of a like character were held in the same neighborhood. The novelty of these proceedings roused much opposition among the Wesleyan Methodists, who feared the rise of a fanaticism that might throw ridicule on true religion; and the preachers of the surrounding circuits issued handbills disclaiming all connection with the movement. At the next session of the Wesleyan Methodist Conference the following resolution was passed: "It is our judgment that, even supposing such meetings to be allowed in America, they are highly improper in England, and

likely to be productive of considerable mischief; and we disclaim all connection with them." This declared judgment of the conference had naturally much weight with the societies in general, and most of the leading Methodists held aloof from the camp-meeting movement. Bourne and a few others, however, held on firmly, having their meetings recognised by civil authority, and taking precautions for preserving order.

Matters now came to a crisis. The Church authorities felt they could no longer bear with such contumacy, and Bourne and Clowes were expelled from the Connection. The untrammelling of these men from Church bonds, so far from silencing them, had rather the effect of increasing their active zeal. At this time there lived in Cheshire an old man, named James Crawfoot, "noted as a man of extraordinary piety and faith." He believed himself called to the ministry, and had prayed and watched for the leading of Providence. In 1809 Hugh Bourne and his brother James hired him to preach in neglected places, for three months, at a salary of ten shillings a week. "This is generally looked upon as the commencement of the Primitive Methodist ministry." In the spring of 1810 several persons were converted in meetings held by Hugh Bourne, and formed into a class. "This class was offered to the Burslem Circuit (Wesleyan); but as they declined to accept them unless they pledged to sever their connection with Hugh Bourne, and as they respectfully declined acceding to this demand, their application was refused." Bourne then took it under his charge as a distinct society, and the formation of this class may be considered the birth of the Connection. The camp-meeting agency was now more extensively employed, and numerous societies were formed. In September, 1810, there were 10 preachers, 13 preaching places, and 136 members. Next year the first general meeting was held, composed probably of preachers and leaders. This conference resolved that money should in future be regularly collected in the societies, in order to meet the necessary expenses; "and if this should prove insufficient, recourse should again be had to the benevolence of private individuals. The two travelling preachers, Messrs. Crawfoot and Clowes, were to receive their salaries from the societies, and Mr. James Steele was appointed the circuit steward, the first officer of that kind in the Connection." In 1812 the Connection, then employing 23 preachers, formally took the title of Primitive Methodist, and two years later a comprehensive body of rules was for the first time adopted. From that time till the present the increase of the denomination has been very rapid, being from 1851 to 1872, in the 108 towns of Great Britain, over 108 per cent.

The three following extracts, from John Angell James, Dr. Beaumont, and Dr. Campbell, respectively, explain the peculiar genius of this denomination:

"In cottages, in barns, and in theatres; in public houses, in market-places, in streets, in lanes, and in fields, they (Primitive Methodist preachers) held meetings for prayer and exhortation. They were assailed by personal violence, and put in peril of their lives; but they persevered, in meekness and in gentleness, and have conquered by their passive power."

"The Primitive Methodists are a *laborious*, and not an *idle* community; they are a *plain*, and not an *artificial* community; they are a *useful* community."

"Every day serves but to confirm us that it is less talents, less culture, less intelligence that is required than a thorough knowledge of the Gospel—a perfect acquaintance with the Word of God—simplicity, affection, fervor, activity, tact, and flexibility, facility in adapting actions to circumstances, and such other things as these imply."

The latest statistics of the Connection are, 17,000 ministers and local preachers, 10,000 class-leaders, 59,000 Sunday-school teachers, and 180,000 Church members. They publish several periodicals.

The doctrine of the Connection may be said to be identical with that of other Methodist churches. The form of Church government is substantially Presbyterian, but with a larger mixture of the lay element than is found in Presbyterian or in other Methodist denominations. The official business is transacted by the leaders' meeting, composed of the class-leaders, the society steward, and the travelling preachers of the circuit. No such meeting "can be legally held without the presence of the minister or travelling preacher, extraordinary cases excepted." As in other Methodist bodies, there are travelling and local preachers. The latter usually follow some worldly occupation for a maintenance, "and preach on the Sabbath as opportunities permit, but receive no pecuniary remuneration for their services. They are chosen to their office by the representatives of the united societies to which they minister; and should their labors prove unacceptable to the people generally, their services are discontinued." "In the transaction of the business of the circuit's quarterly meeting, travelling and local preachers are equal." Between the quarterly meetings, the ordinary business of the circuit is transacted by the "circuit committee," composed of such local preachers, class-leaders, or stewards as are appointed by the preceding quarterly meeting to represent the respective societies. The travelling preachers are *ex-officio* members of this court. Circuits are sometimes divided into branches, each having its own officials and its regular meetings for business, but subordinate to the quarterly meeting. "Places visited through missionary labors, and united in one station, are called a 'mission,'" most of which are under the control of the general missionary committee. A "district" consists of a number of circuits, branches, and missions. Its court, called a "district meeting," has an annual session. It is composed of one delegate from each circuit, the circuits sending a travelling preacher one year and a layman the two following years, so as to secure, as nearly as possible, two laymen to one travelling preacher. This meeting receives statistical reports of all the circuits, inquires into the state of each, and stations the travelling preachers within the district, "subject, however, to appeals from the stations or preachers, and to alterations at conference."

"The 'conference' is a yearly meeting of delegates from all the districts in the Connection, of twelve permanent members, and of four persons appointed at the preceding conference, in the proportion of two laymen to one travelling preacher. This is the highest court in the Connection, from whose decisions there is no appeal."

A "general committee," composed of ministers and laymen, holding its sessions in London, is appointed to transact the business of the Connection in the intervals of the sessions of conference. A district committee, subordinate to the general committee, is appointed for each district, and adjudicates on certain cases submitted to its examination by the stations within the district.

The Connection is represented in the United States by two Conferences, Eastern and Western, having, for the last six years, only fraternal relations with the parent Conference in Great Britain. There are also separate conferences in Canada, Australia, and New Zealand, strictly associated with England. The statistics for the American Conferences for 1876 are as follows:

	Members.	On Trial.	Ministers.	Local Preachers.	Churches, etc.	Sunday-Schools.	Value of Church Property.
Eastern.....	1124	384	16	92	44	33	$131,700
Western....	1452	112	15	97	77	44	56,750
Total....	2576	496	31	189	121	77	$188,450

The Connection has its full share of Methodistic zeal in foreign missions. From the report of 1876 we glean the following statistics:

	Missionaries.	Members.
Canada.....	75	(No returns.)
Australia.....	24	1466
New Zealand.....	10	642
Queensland.....	6	317
New South Wales.....	17	939
Africa.....	4	104
Native Missionaries.....	3	...

The foreign work is chiefly in British colonies and among English-speaking people. The missionary income for the year was £45,234. The most striking peculiarities of the Connection are—1st, the vast amount of unpaid labor performed by laymen; 2d, the influence of the laity in Church government; 3d, the devoted and zealous attention paid to the lower classes. In the United States, also, the Primitive Methodist Connection has established itself, and has, especially near the borders of Canada and in the Eastern States, gained a strong footing, so that the American Church is about of equal strength with the Canadian. They support a paper called the *Primitive Methodist* and the *Christian Patriot*, a semi-monthly journal. See Petty, *History of the Primitive Methodist Connection;* Church, *History of the Primitive Methodists* (3d ed., revised and enlarged); Herod, *Sketches of Primitive Methodist Preachers: Memorial of the Centenary of Hugh Bourne;* Barran, *Gallery of Deceased Ministers; Articles* by Rev. W. H. Yarrow, in *Primitive Methodist Record* for 1877.

Primitive Wesleyan Methodist Church of Ireland. This body was formed in 1816, and was the result of a division in the Wesleyan Methodist Connection in Ireland. In that year the Irish Conference, by a majority of thirty-six in a house of eighty-eight, resolved to authorize the preachers of the Connection to administer the sacraments. As a result of this decision, most of the minority separated from the parent body, and, being followed by a large section of the lay members, organized the Primitive Wesleyan Methodist Connection. Until a few years ago they did not assume to be a Church, but merely a society composed of members of the Established Church of Ireland. The great changes produced by the disendowment and disestablishment of this Church in 1870, together with an increasing desire in the society for the administration of the sacraments at the hands of their own preachers, led to a complete change in the constitution of the body, and the members have now the option of partaking of the ordinances from their own ministers in their churches. The statistics printed in the Conference minutes of 1876 are, 58 effective ministers, 13 superannuates, 144 churches, and 7518 members of society. An annual missionary income of $70,000 in gold is now devoted to the support of the ministers on the poorer circuits. Over $75,000 in gold is invested as a fund for the support of superannuated ministers. Negotiations are at present in progress to effect a union with the Wesleyan Methodist Church of Ireland, the constitution of the two churches being now almost identical.

Primogeniture (denoted in Heb. by בְּכוֹרָה; Sept. *πρωτοτόκια*, Gen. xxv, 31, 34; xxvii, 26; Deut. xxi, 17; 1 Chron. v, 1; in the New Test. only in Heb. xii, 16; A. V. "birthright"). Πρωτότοκος, always rendered "first-born" in the English version, is found in the Sept. in Gen. iv, 4; Deut. xxi, 17, and several other passages of the Old Test., as the representative of the Hebrew בְּכוֹר, signifying "one who openeth the womb," whether an only child, or whether other children follow. "Primogenitus est, non post quem alii, sed ante quem nullus alius genitus" (Pareus). Πρωτότοκος is found nine times in the New Test.—viz. Matt. i, 25 (if the passage be genuine, and not introduced from the parallel passage in Luke); Luke ii, 7; Rom. viii, 29; Col. i, 15, 18; Heb. i, 6; xi, 28; xii, 23; Rev. i, 5. Except in the Gospels, and Heb. xi, 28, the word always bears a metaphorical sense in the New Test., being generally synonymous with *heir* or *lord*, and having, in Heb. i, 6, an especial reference to our Lord's Messianic dignity. In Heb. xii, 23, "the assembly of the first-born," it seems to be synonymous with "elect," or "dearly beloved," in which sense it is also used on one occasion in the Old Test. (Jer. xxxi, 9). In the 4th century, Helvidius among the Latins, and Eunomius among the Greeks, wished to attach a signification to πρωτότοκος, in Matt. i and Luke ii, different from the Old-Test. usage, maintaining, in order to support their hypothesis—viz. that Joseph and Mary had children after the birth of our Lord—that the word πρωτότοκος, by reason of its etymology, could not be applied to an *only child*. Jerome replied to the former by appealing to the usage of the word in the Old Test. (*Adv. Helvid. in Matt. i*, 9). The assertion of Eunomius was equally refuted by the Greek fathers Basil (*Hom. in Nat.*), Theophylact (*in Luc.* ii), and Damascenus (*De Fid. Orthod.* l. iv). In reference to this controversy, Drusius (*Ad difficiliora loca Num.* c. 6) observes: "Sic sane Christus vocatur Πρωτότοκος, licet mater ejus nullos alios postea liberos habuerit. Notet hoc juventus propter Helvidium, qui ex eâ voce inferebat Mariam ex Josepho post Christum natum plures filios suscepisse." "Those entitled to the prerogative" (viz. of birthright), observes Campbell (*On the Gospels*), "were invariably denominated the first-born, whether the parents had issue afterwards or not." Eunomius further maintains, from Col. i, 15, that our Lord was "a creature;" but his arguments were replied to by Basil and Theophylact. Some of the fathers referred this passage to Christ's pre-existence, others to his baptism. In Isa. xiv, 30, the "first-born of the poor" signifies the poorest of all: and in Job xviii, 13, the "first-born of death" means the most terrible of deaths. It is noteworthy that in our Lord's genealogy the line is frequently carried through a younger son (Seth, Shem, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Judah, David, Solomon, Nathan, etc.). See First-born.

Primum Mobĭlè, the primitive movable element, is, in its proper signification, the original matter of the world (*prima materia*). The ancients understood by it the exterior hollow sphere which was supposed to include and put in motion the remainder of the universe (fixed stars and planets): a quite arbitrary supposition. Primal mover would be the principle of all motion, or the first moving cause. According to Aristotle, this cause is God, who, while motionless himself, puts all the rest in motion, and is therefore called by the philosopher *τὸ πρῶτον κινοῦν*. See Aristotle, *Phys.* viii, 5; *De generat. et corrupt.* i, 7: ii, 7.

Prince is the rendering of several Heb. and Gr. words in the A. V.

1. *Sar*, שַׂר (from שָׂרַר, *to rule, to have dominion;* Sept. *ἄρχων*; Vulg. *princeps*), *the chief of any class, the master of a company, a prince* or *noble;* used of Pharaoh's chief butler and baker (Gen. xl, 2 sq.); of the taskmasters set over the Israelites in Egypt (Exod. i, 11); even of chief herdsmen (Gen. xlvii, 6). It is frequently used for military commanders (Exod. xviii, 21 ["rulers"]; 2 Kings i, 9 ["captain"]; Isa. iii, 3, etc.), and for princes both supreme and subordinate (1 Sam. xxix, 3; Job xxix, 1, 9; Isa. xlix, 7; Jer. li, 59, etc.). In Dan. viii, 11 God is called שַׂר הַצָּבָא (*Sar hatstsabâ*), Prince of the host; and in ver. 25 the title שַׂר שָׂרִים (*Sar sarîm*), Prince of princes, is applied to the Messiah. The "princes of the provinces" (שָׂרֵי הַמְּדִינוֹת, *sarey ham-medinôth*, 1 Kings xx, 14) were probably the district magistrates who had taken refuge in Samaria during the invasion of Benhadad, and their "young men" were their attendants, *παιδάρια*, *pedissequi* (Thenius, Ewald, *Gesch.* iii, 495). Josephus says, *υἱοὶ τῶν ἡγεμόνων* (*Ant.* viii, 14, 2). There is a peculiar sense in which the term "prince" is used by the prophet Daniel: thus, "Prince of the kingdom of Persia" (x, 13), "Michael your prince" (ver. 21). In these passages the term probably means a tutelary angel; and the doctrine of tutelary angels of different countries seems to be countenanced by several passages of Scripture (Zech. iii, 1; vi, 5; Jude 9; Rev. xii, 7). Michael and Gabriel were probably the tutelary angels of the

Jews. These names do not occur in any books of the Old Test. that were written before the captivity; and it is suggested by some that they were borrowed from the Chaldæans, with whom and the Persians the doctrine of the general administration and superintendence of angels over empires and provinces was commonly received. See ANGEL.

2. *Nagid*, נָגִיד (from נָגַד, *to be in front, to precede*; Sept. ἄρχων or ἡγούμενος; Vulg. *dux*), *one who has the precedence, a leader*, or *chief*, used of persons set over any undertaking, superintending any trust, or invested with supreme power (1 Kings xiv, 7; Psa. lxxvi, 13; 1 Chron. xxvi, 24 ["ruler"]; 1 Sam. ix, 16 ["captain"], etc.). In Dan. ix, 25 it is applied to the Messiah; and in xi, 22 to Ptolemy Philometor, king of Egypt.

3. *Nadîb*, נָדִיב (from נָדַב, which in Hithp. signifies *to volunteer, to offer voluntarily* or *spontaneously*; chiefly in poetry; Sept. ἄρχων; Vulg. *princeps*), *generous, noble-minded, noble by birth* (1 Sam. ii, 8; Psa. xlvii, 10; cvii, 40; cxiii, 8; cxviii, 9; Prov. xxvii, 7, etc.). This word is the converse of the preceding; נָגִיד means primarily a chief, and derivatively what is morally noble, excellent (viii, 6); נדיב means primarily what is morally noble, and derivatively one who is noble by birth or position.

4. *Nasi*, נָשִׂיא (from נָשָׂא, *to lift up*, Niph. *to be elevated*; Sept. ἄρχων, ἡγούμενος, ἡγεμών, βασιλεύς; Vulg. *princeps, dux*), *one exalted*; used as a general term for princes, including kings (1 Kings xi, 24; Ezek. xii, 10, etc.), heads of tribes or families (Numb. i, 44; iii, 24 [A. V. "chief"]; vii, 10; xxxiv, 18; Gen. xvii, 20; 1 Chron. vii, 40, etc.). In the A. V. it is often rendered "ruler" or "captain." In Gen. xxiii, 6 Abraham is addressed by the sons of Heth as נָשִׂיא אֱלֹהִים (*nasi Elohîm*), a prince of God, i. e. constituted, and consequently protected, by God [A. V. "mighty prince"]. This word appears on the coins of Judas Maccabæus (Gesenius, *Thesaur.* p. 917).

5. *Nasik*, נָסִיךְ (from נָסַךְ, *to pour out, anoint*; Sept. ἄρχων; Vulg. *princeps*; Psa. lxxxiii, 11; Ezek. xxxii, 30; Dan. xi, 5; "duke," Josh. xiii, 8; "principal," Mic. v, 5).

6. *Katsîn*, קָצִין (from קָצָה, *to cut, to decide*; Sept. ἀρχηγός, ἄρχων; Vulg. *princeps*; Prov. xxv, 15; Dan. xi, 18; Mic. iii, 1, 9; elsewhere "captain," "guide," "ruler").

7. *Rab*, רַב (usually an adj. "great; Sept. ἄρχων, ἡγεμών; Vulg. *optimus*); only occasional; but used in compounds, e. g. Rab-mag, Rab-saris (q. v.). So its Chald. reduplicature *Rabrebân*, רַבְרְבָן, in the plur. (Dan. v, 2, 3; elsewhere "lords").

8. *Rozên*, רוֹזֵן (participle of רָזַן, *to rule*; Sept. σατράπης, δυνάστης; Vulg. *princeps, legum conditor*), a poetical word (Judg. v, 3; Prov. viii, 15; xxxi, 4; Isa. xl, 23; Hab. i, 10; "ruler," Psa. ii, 2).

9. *Shalîsh*, שָׁלִישׁ (apparently from שָׁלוֹשׁ, *three*; only Ezek. xxiii, 13; elsewhere "captain" [q. v.]).

10. *Achashdarpenayâ* (Chald. plur. אֲחַשְׁדַּרְפְּנַיָּא, Dan. iii, 2, 3, 27; vi, 1–7; Sept. ὕπατοι), a Persian word. Those mentioned in Dan. vi, 1 (see Esth. i, 1) were the predecessors, either in fact or in place, of the satraps of Darius Hystaspis (Herod. iii, 89). See SATRAP.

11. *Chashmannîm*, חַשְׁמַנִּים (plur. literally *rich*, only in Psa. lxviii, 13).

12. *Ségen*, סֶגֶן (a Persian word, used only in the plur. Isa. xi, 25; elsewhere "rulers").

13. *Partemîm*, only in the plur. פַּרְתְּמִים (another Persian word, Dan. i, 3; elsewhere "rulers").

14. Ἄρχων, which in the Sept. appears as the rendering of all the Hebrew words above cited, in the New Test. is used of earthly princes (Matt. xx, 25; 1 Cor. ii, 6), of Jesus Christ (Rev. i, 5), and of Satan (Matt. ix, 34; xii, 24; Mark iii, 22; John xii, 31; xiv, 30; xvi, 11; Eph. ii, 2). On the phrase "prince of the power of the air" in this last passage, see AIR.

15. Ἀρχηγός, which in Theodotion is the rendering of נָשִׂיא (Numb. xiii, 3; xvi, 2); and in the Sept. is the rendering of שַׂר (Judg. v, 15; Neh. ii, 9; Isa. xxx, 4), in the New Test. is applied only to our Lord (Acts iii, 15; v, 31; Heb. ii, 10 [A. V. "captain"]; xii, 2 [A. V. "author"]).

16. Ἡγεμών is used (Matt. ii, 6) in a general sense for *a chief* or *ruler*. See GOVERNOR; KING; RULER.

Prince, John (1), an English divine, was born at Axminster, Devonshire, in 1643; was educated at Brazenose College, Oxford, and became successively curate of Bideford, minister of St. Martin's Church, Exeter, vicar of Totnes, and vicar of Berry-Pomeroy. He died in 1723. He published, *Sermons* (Lond. 1674, 4to):—*The Beauty of God's House, a Discourse on Psa. lxxxiv*, 1 (1710, 4to):—*Dammonii Orientales Illustres* (1810, 4to):—*Sermons on Psa. cxxxvi*, 1 (1722, 8vo).

Prince, John (2), an American minister of the Congregational Church, was born at Boston, Mass., in 1751; was educated at Harvard College, where he graduated in 1776; was ordained minister of the Congregational Church in Salem, Mass., in 1779, and retained that post until his death in 1836. He published, *Fast Sermon* (Salem, 1798):—*Sermon before a Charitable Society* (1806):—*Sermon on the Death of Dr. Barnard* (1814):—*Sermon before the Bible Society* (1816). See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, viii, 128 sq.; and for other references, Allibone, *Dict. Brit. and Amer. Auth.* s. v.

Prince, Nathan, an American clergyman of the Church of England, was a native of Massachusetts, and was born about the beginning of the last century. He was educated at Harvard College, where he graduated in 1719, in 1723 was made a tutor in his alma mater, in 1727 fellow, and held that honor until 1742. Subsequently he took orders in the Church of England, was sent as a missionary to the Mosquitos, and died in the island of Ruatan, Bay of Honduras, in 1748. Dr. Chauncey, in his *Sketches of Eminent Men in New England*, says that "Prince deserves a place among the great men in this country." He is the author of an *Essay to Solve the Difficulties attending the several Accounts given of the Resurrection*, etc. (Boston, 1734, 4to). See Elliot, *Biog. Dict.* p. 393, n.; *Report of the Mass. Hist. Society*, x, 165; Pierce, *Hist. of Harvard University*, p. 191–196; Allibone, *Dict. Brit. and Amer. Auth.* s. v.

Prince, Thomas (1), an American Congregational minister, was born May 15, 1687, at Sandwich, Mass. He graduated at Harvard College in 1707, and after travelling for some years in Europe, during which time he preached in England and was invited to take a station, he returned home in 1717, and was ordained, Oct. 1, 1718, colleague pastor of the Rev. Joseph Sewall at the Old South Church, Boston, where he remained until his death, Oct. 22, 1758. He was an eminent preacher, for his sermons were rich in thought, perspicuous, and devotional, and he inculcated the doctrines and duties of religion as one who felt their importance. In private life he was amiable and exemplary. It was his constant endeavor to imitate the perfect example of his Master and Lord. He was ready to forgive injuries and return good for evil. He published, *An Account of the First Appearance of the Aurora Borealis:—A Chronological History of New England in the Form of Annals* (1736):—*Ditto*, vol. ii, Nos. 1, 2, 3 (1755):—*Account of the English Ministers on Martha's Vineyard* (1749):—*An Improvement of the Doctrine of Earthquakes, containing an Historical Summary of the most remarkable Earthquakes of New England* (1755):—*The New England Psalm-book, revised and improved* (1756):—and a number of occasional *Sermons*; besides which

there were six *Sermons* published from his MSS. by Dr. Erskine, of Edinburgh (1785); and twenty-nine single *Sermons* which Prince published from 1717 to 1756. For an extended notice of his publications, see Sewall, *Funeral Discourse*. A large portion of his most valuable library is now in the Boston Public Library. See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, i, 304; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s. v.

Prince, Thomas (2), an American writer and editor, son of the preceding, was born in 1722, and was educated at Harvard College, where he graduated in 1740. He edited the earliest American periodical, *The Christian History, containing Accounts of the Revival and Propagation of Religion in Great Britain and America for* 1743 (Boston, 1744–45, 2 vols. 8vo), which was published weekly. He died in 1748. See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s. v.

Princeps Sacerdōtum (*chief of priests*). This is a title sometimes applied by Tertullian, Augustine, and others to a bishop, but used in the same sense as *archiepiscopus, pontifex maximus*, that is, high-priest. See Bishop; Priest.

Princess (שָׂרָה, *sarâh*) occurs but seldom in the Scriptures (1 Kings xi, 3; Lam. i, 1; elsewhere "lady." See also Sarah); but the persons to whom it alludes, the daughters of kings, are frequently mentioned, and often with some reference to the splendor of their apparel. Thus we read of Tamar's "garment of divers colors" (2 Sam. xiii, 18), and the dress of the Egyptian princess, the wife of Solomon, is described as "raiment of needlework," and "clothing of wrought gold" (Psa. xlv, 13, 14). See Embroidery.

Princeton Theology. See Presbyterianism; Theology.

Principalities and Powers. See Power.

Pringle, Francis, a minister of the Associate Presbyterian Church, was a native of Ireland, and was born about the year 1750. He came to this country some time near the close of the last century, and died in New York City in 1833. He preached a *Sermon on the Qualifications and Duties of the Ministers of Christ* before the Associate Synod of Ireland (1796), which was published in Ireland and America; and a sermon of his on *Prayer for the Prosperity of Zion* appeared in the *Religious Monitor* after his death. See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, ix, 64 sq.

Pringle, *Sir* John, a Scotch philosopher and physician, was born in Roxburghshire in 1707. He settled in Edinburgh about 1734, and after 1748 resided in London, where he distinguished himself greatly, and became president of the Royal Society in 1773. He was for a time professor of pneumatology and ethical philosophy in Edinburgh University. He died in 1782. He divided pneumatics into the following parts: 1. A physical inquiry into the nature of such subtle and material substances as are imperceptible to the senses, and known only from their operations. 2. The nature of immaterial substances connected with matter, in which is demonstrated, by natural evidence, the immortality of the human soul. 3. The nature of immaterial created beings not connected with matter. 4. Natural theology, or the existence and attributes of God demonstrated from the light of nature. Ethics, or moral philosophy, he divided into the theoretical and practical parts, in treating of which the authors he chiefly uses are Cicero, Marcus Antonius, Puffendorf, and lord Bacon. Carlyle describes him as "an agreeable lecturer, though no master of the science he taught." "His lectures were chiefly a compilation from lord Bacon's works; and had it not been for Puffendorf's small book, which he made his text, we should not have been instructed in the rudiments of the science." Nevertheless, we see that he discussed topics which must issue, sooner or later, in a scientific jurisprudence and political economy. See M'Cosh, *Scottish Philosophy*, p. 109.

Pringle, William, a Presbyterian minister, was born in Perth, Scotland, in 1790. His parents paid great attention to his early culture, and, after a successful study at the best schools and at the Academy in Perth, he finished his collegiate studies at the University of Edinburgh. He then studied medicine, and, as soon as admitted to practice, emigrated to Canada; but, concluding not to practice, he returned to Scotland, studied theology in Glasgow under the Rev. John Dick, D.D., was licensed April 15, 1823, and entered upon his labors as a probationer, and as such preached for some time in Scotland, when he again left his native land, and came to the United States in the year 1827, and soon after joined the Associate Presbytery of Cambridge. In June, 1830, he was ordained and installed pastor of the Associate Congregation of Ryegate, Vt. He labored faithfully in behalf of this his only charge, and when his health failed him he resigned, June 21, 1852, after a ministry of twenty-two years. He died Dec. 14, 1858. Mr. Pringle was a good writer, and some of his sermons bear marks of scholarly attainments. He was engaged during the last few years of his life upon a work called *The Cosmography of Scripture*. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1860, p. 159. (J. L. S.)

Prior, Prioress, are, according to the constitution of several ecclesiastical orders, the heads of their monasteries and nunneries. The prior is either the first or sole authority in the monastery, or he is subordinated, as second leader, to a higher officer of the same monastery, the abbot (q. v.). The latter case happens when the abbot makes use of his right to appoint in his place an assistant, a temporary vicar (q. v.), who is trusted with part of the prelate's attributes. Sometimes the statutes of the order prescribe that the prior shall be, as the second head of the monastery, elected by the members, they assigning him a power of his own, more or less independent (*De Stat. Monast.* iii, 35). In other orders, as in that of the Benedictines, and even in some regular congregations, we find only one, or a few, principal monasteries—the mother abbeys, to which the others owe their origin, or whose subsequent reform they have adopted—subject to the direction of abbots or prelates, i. e. local superiors of the first rank, while the inferior monasteries are administered by priors: the latter exercise the regular jurisdiction over the monks, and are bound only in important matters to obtain the consent of the prelate of the mother abbey. The same distinction subsists in the nunneries.—Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* s. v.

Prior, Matthew, an English poet, writer of verse both sacred and profane, whose period of authorship was contemporary with the last years of Dryden and the earliest stage of Pope, was possessed of little vigor or originality, but was remarkable for his skill in versification and his gay and easy grace of imagery and diction. His occasional epigrams, and his lively but indecent tales, are his best productions; though there is merit, also, in his semi-metaphysical poem *Alma, or the Progress of the Soul*, and in his attempt at religious poetry in *Solomon*, a work which has been compared to Pope's *Essay on Man*. It was greatly preferred to Pope's poem by John Wesley, because more consistent with the orthodox theory of human corruption. The design is certainly more poetical, because less tending to the argumentative; though the inferior execution has prevented Prior from attaining the occasional success which redeems parts of Pope's poem from oblivion. Prior's poems were only the recreations of a man actively engaged in public life. He was born July 21, 1664, and was the son of a joiner in London. Accident having directed the attention of lord Dorset to the boy's studious habits, education was procured for him; and, on leaving Oxford, he distinguished himself, under the government of king William, as a dexterous diplomatist in several foreign missions. Deserting his political party, like so many men of higher rank in that slippery time, he

shared, in the latter part of his life, the vicissitudes and danger of the Tories. He died Sept. 18, 1721. See the excellent article in Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s. v., and the references there given. (J. H. W.)

Priory is a religious house occupied by a society of monks or nuns, the chief of whom is termed a prior (q. v.) or prioress; and of these there are two sorts: first, where the prior is chosen by the convent, and governs as independently as any abbot in his abbey; such were the cathedral priors, and most of those of the Augustine order. Secondly, where the priory is a cell subordinate to some great abbey, and the prior is placed or displaced at the will of the abbot. There was a considerable difference in the regulation of these cells in the mediæval times; for some were altogether subject to their respective abbots, who sent what officers and monks they pleased, and took their revenues into the common stock of the abbeys; while others consisted of a stated number of monks, under a prior sent to them from the superior abbey; and those priories paid a pension yearly, as an acknowledgment of their subjection, but acted in other matters as independent bodies, and had the rest of the revenues for their own use. The priories or cells were always of the same order as the abbeys on which they depended, though sometimes their inmates were of a different sex; it being usual, after the Norman Conquest, for the great abbeys to build nunneries on some of their manors, which should be subject to their visitation.

Alien priories were cells, or small religious houses, in one country dependent on large foreign monasteries. When manors or tithes were given to distant religious houses, the monks, either to increase the authority of their own order, or perhaps rather to have faithful stewards of their revenues, built convenient houses for the reception of small fraternities of their body, who were deputed to reside at and govern those cells.—Hook, s. v. In the fourth year of Henry V, during the war with France, all the alien priories (that is, those cells of the religious houses in England which belonged to foreign monasteries) which were not conventual were dissolved by act of Parliament and granted to the crown. About the year 1540 the cathedrals founded for priories were turned into deaneries and prebends.

Pris'ca (2 Tim. iv, 19). See PRISCILLA.

Priscil'la (Πρίσκιλλα, dim. from *Prisca*, Lat. *ancient*), the wife of Aquila, and probably, like Phœbe, a deaconess. She shared the travels, labors, and dangers of her husband, and is always named along with him (Rom. xvi, 3; 1 Cor. xvi, 19; 2 Tim. iv, 19), A.D. 55–64. The name is Prisca (Πρίσκα) in 2 Tim. iv, 19, and (according to the true reading) in Rom. xvi, 3, and also (according to some of the best MSS.) in 1 Cor. xvi, 19. Such variation in a Roman name is by no means unusual. We find that the name of the wife is placed before that of the husband in Rom. xvi, 3; 2 Tim. iv, 19, and (according to some of the best MSS.) in Acts xviii, 26. It is only in Acts xviii, 2 and 1 Cor. xvi, 19 that Aquila has unequivocally the first place. Hence we should be disposed to conclude that Priscilla was the more energetic character of the two; and it is particularly to be noticed that she took part, not only in her husband's exercise of hospitality, but likewise in the theological instruction of Apollos. Yet we observe that the husband and the wife are always mentioned together. In fact, we may say that Priscilla is the example of what the married woman may do, for the general service of the Church, in conjunction with home duties, as Phœbe is the type of the unmarried servant of the Church, or deaconess. Such female ministration was of essential importance in the state of society in the midst of which the early Christian communities were formed. The remarks of archdeacon Evans on the position of Timothy at Ephesus are very just. "In his dealings with the female part of his flock, which, in that time and country, required peculiar delicacy and discretion, the counsel of the experienced Priscilla would be invaluable. Where, for instance, could he obtain more prudent and faithful advice than hers in the selection of widows to be placed upon the eleemosynary list of the Church, and of deaconesses for the ministry?" (*Script. Biog.* ii, 298). It seems more to our purpose to lay stress on this than on the theological learning of Priscilla. Yet Winer mentions a monograph *De Priscilla, Aquilæ uxore, tamquam feminarum e gente Judaicâ eruditarum specimine*, by G. G. Zeltner (Altorf, 1709). See AQUILA.

Priscillian, the noted originator or propagator of a heretical body of Christians who bore his name, was the first heretic who was executed after the establishment of Christianity by the Roman state. He was a native of the Iberian peninsula, and of noble birth. He flourished in the second half of the 4th century, possessed much wealth, had great reputation for learning, and was generally revered for his severe austerity. What his early occupation was is not known. He first figures in history as the propagator of the heretical dogmas which a certain Egyptian called Marcus, from Memphis, came to Spain to teach there. Priscillian, by his personal influence, succeeded in spreading the heresy of Marcus all over Spain, making a number of proselytes of the female sex, convincing many priests, and even some bishops; among others, two bishops, Instantius and Salvianus, who became zealous defenders of the imported doctrines, which were substantially those of the *Manichæans* (q. v.). He taught expressly the Dualism and the Docetism of that sect, and it is charged that he adopted the strictest ascetic austerities in regard to celibacy, etc., by which they had rendered themselves obnoxious even to the civil authorities in the East and in Africa. There is some doubt as to the precise doctrines which Priscillian taught. As reported, his dogmas are a strange mixture of Gnostic and Manichæan absurdities combined with allegorical interpretations and mystical rhapsodies. He was also Sabellian in tendency in his rejection of a personal distinction in the Godhead, for he denied the reality of Christ's birth and incarnation. Among other things, he maintained that the visible universe was not the production of the Supreme Deity, but of some demon or malignant principle who derived his origin from chaos or darkness; he adopted the doctrine of æons, or emanations from the divine nature; he considered human bodies as compounded according to the twelve signs of the zodiac, and as prisons formed by the author of evil to enslave the mind; he also condemned marriage, and denied the resurrection of the body. The rule of life and manners which the Priscillianists adopted was so rigid and severe that the charges of dissolute conduct brought against them by their enemies appear to be groundless. That they were guilty of dissimulation, and deceived their adversaries by cunning stratagems in order to accomplish what they deemed a sacred purpose, is true. Their doctrine was, according to St. Augustine, that deception is allowed to hide one's faith, and to simulate Catholic belief ("jura, perjura, secretum prodere noli"). Neander (*Ch. Hist.* ii, 711) observes that the reproach of immorality rests on insufficient proofs. It is, however, a fact that at least a part of the Priscillianists were addicted to unnatural turpitudes, to which such a system must logically lead; but there is no evidence that they avowed that lying and perjury were lawful under all circumstances.

The bishop Hyginus of Cordova was the first to enter the lists against this heresy, and he strove, although without success, to gain back to the orthodox Church the bishops Instantius and Salvianus. Hyginus apprised Idacius, the bishop of Merida, of the Priscillianic disorders; but the hot-blooded zeal of this prelate was still more unsuccessful, and so were the efforts of all the other Catholic bishops. The boldness of the heretics increased every day, and bishop Hyginus himself, displeased with the severe measures inaugurated against them, became their protector. To arrest their progress,

a synod was held in October, 380, at Saragossa, to which Instantius, Salvianus, Elpidius, and Priscillian were also invited. The heresiarchs failed to appear. The synod condemned their doctrines and resolved upon measures to stop their expansion. Catholic women were prohibited from attending the Priscillianist meetings; fasting on Sundays was interdicted; the anathema was launched against such as stayed from Church during the forty days of Lent and the three weeks of Epiphany, or received the Eucharist in the Church without partaking at once of the sacrament: the same penalty was pronounced against those who should assume the name and functions of teachers without episcopal approbation; and every clerk who should, out of pride and vanity, clothe himself in the monastical garment, was put under ban. The execution of the decrees against Priscillianists was committed to the bishop Ithacius of Sosuba. No worse choice could possibly have been made. He was a mere voluptuary, and utterly destitute of all sense for spiritual things.

Excluded from the Church, the Priscillianists now took more decided measures for establishing themselves, and they had the boldness even to cause the consecration of Priscillian as their bishop of Avilla by the bishops Instantius and Salvianus. Of course, by this step the Spanish Catholic prelates were greatly imbittered, and the Idacius above mentioned, together with Ithacius, bishop of Ossonova, who is represented by Sulpicius Severus as a troublesome zealot, were despatched to the emperor Gratian for the purpose of obtaining an order of banishment against Priscillian, Instantius, and Salvianus. Gratian having issued the rescript thus demanded, the three heresiarchs repaired to Rome, in order to vindicate themselves before pope Damasus. But the pope refused to justify them. Salvianus died at Rome, and his two companions went to Milan, where they tried, as unsuccessfully, to persuade St. Ambrose of their innocence. However, they succeeded in bribing an influential functionary (magister officiorum) named Macedonius, who obtained for them an imperial decree which allowed them to return to Spain and take possession of their sees, and ordered Volventius, vicar of Spain, to examine further into the matter. Priscillian and Instantius returned to Spain, as in triumph; and Ithacius, now in turn accused as a disturber of the public peace, was driven out of Spain. The latter was even on the very point of being arrested in Treves, where he had established himself, and of being transported back to the peninsula for trial, when things assumed, under the usurping emperor Maximus, a different aspect. As soon as this new Cæsar arrived at Treves, Ithacius appeared before him against the Priscillianists. Maximus, who desired the whole matter to be disposed of as a purely ecclesiastical affair, ordered a synod to be held, in 384, at Bordeaux, to which the heresiarchs were summoned. Instantius was deposed by the vote of the assembly, and Priscillian, foreseeing a similar fate, tried to prevent it by appealing to the emperor. This step was the cause of his ruin. The emperor now took the matter in hand: Priscillian and his associates were brought to Treves, where Maximus resided at the time, and the most violent adversaries of the sect, Idacius and Ithacius, appeared as accusers. The latter of these two prelates, if Sulpicius Severus is to be trusted, suspected of Priscillianism any man whom he saw studying and fasting much; and, against all precedents, appeared as an impassioned accuser, before a worldly tribunal, in a religious affair. St. Martin, bishop of Tours, a truly pious man, also at the time at the imperial court, held it to be an unspiritual innovation that an ecclesiastical matter should be tried by a secular court—that heretics should become liable to punishment with torture and death—and besought the emperor to leave the affair in the hands of the bishop, or, at least, to decide it without bloodshed. As long as Martin was present, the trial was delayed; on his departure, Maximus promised there should be no bloodshed, but he was induced by Ithacius and two other Spanish bishops, Rufus and Magnus, to break his word. The prefect who tried the case probably employed tortures to obtain avowals. Priscillian, the rich widow Euchrocia, and several others were accused of criminal disorders, and condemned not only as false teachers, but also as violators of the civil laws. They were either beheaded or punished with confiscation and exile (365).

The execution of Priscillian by the sword, and of several of his associates, did not ruin the sect, but seemed rather to give it new life and vigor. The Priscillianists got possession of the bodies of their dead, and brought them to Spain, where Priscillian was honored as a martyr. People swore by his name. The most distinguished bishops, Martin of Tours, St. Ambrose, Theognistus, and pope Siricius, sternly blamed the cruelty with which Ithacius and his friends had treated the heretics, and marked their abhorrence of the cruelty by separating from the communion of Ithacius and the other bishops who had approved the death penalty for heresy in the Christian Church. But the emperor Maximus went on until his death (387) persecuting the Priscillianists as criminal Manichæans, and was even on the point of sending to Spain a military commission with unlimited powers to pursue the accused and punish the guilty with confiscation and death; and only abandoned this project by intercession of St. Martin.

The gravity of the measures adopted for the punishment of heresy at the time to which we here refer obliges us to turn aside to remark (1) that heresy was declared against by the State for the first time under Theodosius the Great, the first emperor who was baptized in the Nicene faith. He was determined to put an end to the Arian interregnum, and therefore proclaimed the exclusive authority of the Nicene Creed, and at the same time enacted the first rigid penalties not only against the pagan idolatry, the practice of which was thenceforth a capital crime in the empire, but also against all Christian heresies and sects. The ruling principle of his public life was the unity of the empire and of the orthodox Church. In the course of fifteen years this emperor issued at least fifteen penal laws against heretics (comp. *Cod. Theodos.* xvi, tit. v, leg. 6–33), by which he gradually deprived them of all right to the exercise of their religion, excluded them from all civil offices, and threatened them with fines, confiscation, banishment, and in some cases (as the Manichæans, the Audians, and even the Quartodecimanians) with death. From Theodosius, therefore, dates the State-Church theory of the persecution of heretics and the embodiment of it in legislation. His primary design, it is true, was rather to terrify and convert than to punish the refractory subjects (so Sozomen asserts, *Hist. Eccles.* lib. vii, c. 12). From the theory, however, to the practice was a single step; and this step his rival and colleague, Maximus, took when he inflicted capital punishment on Priscillian and some of his followers. This was the first shedding of the blood of heretics by a Christian prince for religious opinions. (2.) We wish to note also that, while the execution of the Priscillianists is the only instance of the *bloody* punishment of heretics in this period, as it is the first in the history of Christianity, the propriety of violent measures against heresy was thenceforth vindicated even by the best fathers of the Church (see on this point Augustine's position as marked out by Neander, *Ch. Hist.* ii, 217 sq.; Schaff, *Ch. Hist.* ii, 144, 145), and soon none but the persecuted parties were heard to protest against religious persecution. We need hardly add that in due time the Church of Rome, with Leo the Great as its first and clearest representative, became the advocate and executioner of the death penalty for heresy. See Heresy; Inquisition; Romanism.

After the death of Maximus, the emperor Theodosius ordered a synod to be held in 389, to settle the difficulties that had arisen among the bishops of Gaul,

Spain, and Italy on account of Ithacius. The latter and bishop Idacius were deposed by that assembly. But the disputes which had been called up by them continued in some parts of Spain, fostered especially by the Priscillianists, who were still numerous. In the year 400 the sect appears in a decaying condition. At the synod held in that year at Toledo, several Priscillianist bishops, among others Symphosius and Dictinnius, returned to the Church. The latter wrote a work entitled the *Scules*, in which the principles of the Priscillianists are expounded, but as he was an apostate he can hardly be regarded as a safe expositor of Priscillianism. The sect revived in the middle of the 5th century, especially in Gallicia. The active exertions of bishop Turibius, of Astorga, succeeded in extinguishing it gradually. He punished and imprisoned heretics, etc., but he was also busy in their instruction, both orally and by his writings. The same bishop sent to Leo the Great a refutation of Priscillianism, which Leo honored with an answer, praising his zeal and recommending the holding of a Spanish synod, which was consequently convened in Gallicia in 448. Leo's letter is important for the refutation of Priscillianism contained in it. Among the most noteworthy literary attacks upon Priscillianism in the first half of the 5th century, we may mention here, besides, *Ad Paulum Orosium contra Priscillianistas et Origenistas* (411); *Contra mendacium*, addressed to Consentius (420); and in part the 190th Epistle (alias Ep. 157), to the bishop Optatus, on the origin of the soul (418), and two other letters, in which he refutes erroneous views on the nature of the soul, the limitation of future punishments, and the lawfulness of fraud for supposed good purposes. The Priscillianists, notwithstanding the severest measures inaugurated against them and the polemics that were written against them, continued to exist, and at all times during the mediæval period we find their traces under various names and forms, especially in the north of Spain, Languedoc (France), and Northern Italy. The Synod of Braga, in 563, condemned several Priscillian errors, about which we owe to this assembly most interesting information. See Sulp. Severus, *Hist. Sacra*, ii, 46–51; *Dial.* iii, 11 sq.; Orosius *Commonitorium de Errore Priscillianistarum*, etc.; Leonis Magni *Ep.* 15, *ad Turibium;* Walch, *Ketzerhistorie*, iii, 378 sq.; Alex. Natalis, *Hist. Eccles.;* Fleury, *Hist. Ecclés.;* Van Fries, *Dissertatio Critica de Priscill.* (Ultraj. 1745); Lübkert, *De Hæresi Priscill.* (Havn. 1840); Mandernach, *Gesch. des Priscillianismus* (Treves, 1851); Hefele, *Conciliengesch.* i, 719; ii, 27 sq.; iii, 13 sq.; Milman, *Lat. Christianity*, i, 276–78; Pusey, *Hist. of the Councils* A.D. 51–381 (1875); Alzog, *Kirchengesch.* i, 372 sq.; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* ii, 710, 718.

Prison is represented in the A. V. by the following Heb. and Gr. words: 1. אֱסוּר, Aramaic for אֱסוּר, "a chain," is joined with בֵּית, and rendered a prison (Sept. *οἶκος δεσμῶν*; Vulg. *carcer*). 2. כֶּלֶא, כְּלוּא, and כְּלִיא, with בֵּית (Sept. *οἶκος φυλακῆς*; Jer. xxxvii, 15). 3. מַהְפֶּכֶת, from הָפַךְ, "turn," or "twist," the stocks (xx, 2). 4. מַטָּרָה and מַטָּרָא; *φυλακή*; *carcer* (Gesenius, *Thesaur.* p. 879). 5. מַסְגֵּר; *δεσμωτήριον*; *carcer.* 6. מִשְׁמָר; *φυλακή*; *custodia;* also intens. מִשְׁמֶרֶת; A. V. "hard." 7. עֲצֶר; *angustia; ταπείνωσις* (Gesenius, p. 1059). 8. פְּקַח־קוֹחַ (Isa. lxi, 1), more properly written in one word; *ἀνάβλεψις*; *apertio* (Gesenius, p. 1121). 9. סֹהַר; *ὀχύρωμα*; *carcer:* properly a tower. 10. בֵּית־הַפְּקֻדֹת; *οἰκία μύλωνος*; *domus carceris.* בַּיִת is also sometimes "prison" in the A. V., as Gen. xxxix, 20. 11. צִינֹק; *καταῤῥάκτης*; *carcer;* probably "the stocks" (as in the A. V.) or some such instrument of confinement; perhaps understood by the Sept. as a sewer or underground passage. 12. In the N. T. *δεσμωτήριον, οἴκημα, τήρησις*, usually *φυλακή*.

In Egypt it is plain both that special places were used as prisons, and that they were under the custody of a military officer (Gen. xl, 3; xlii, 17). During the wandering in the desert we read on two occasions of confinement "in ward" (Lev. xxiv, 12; Numb. xv, 34); but as imprisonment was not directed by the law, so we hear of none till the time of the kings, when the prison appears as an appendage to the palace, or a special part of it (1 Kings xxii, 27). Later still it is distinctly described as being in the king's house (Jer. xxxii, 2; xxxvii, 21; Neh. iii, 25). This was the case also at Babylon (2 Kings xxv, 27). But private houses were sometimes used as places of confinement (Jer. xxxvii, 15), probably much as Chardin describes Persian prisons in his day, viz. houses kept by private speculators for prisoners to be maintained there at their own cost (*Voy.* vi, 100). Public prisons other than these, though in use by the Canaanitish nations (Judg. xvi, 21, 25), were unknown in Judæa previous to the captivity. Under the Herods we hear again of royal prisons attached to the palace, or in royal fortresses (Luke iii, 20; Acts xii, 4, 10; Josephus, *Ant.* xviii, 5, 2; Machærus). By the Romans Antonia was used as a prison at Jerusalem (Acts xxiii, 10), and at Cæsarea the prætorium of Herod (ver. 35). The sacerdotal authorities also had a prison under the superintendence of special officers, *δεσμοφύλακες* (Acts v, 18–23; viii, 3; xxvi, 10). The royal prisons in those days were doubtless managed after the Roman fashion, and chains, fetters, and stocks were used as means of confinement (see xvi, 24, and Job xiii, 27). One of the readiest places for confinement was a dry, or partially dry, well or pit (see Gen. xxxvii, 24, and Jer. xxxviii, 6–11); but the usual place appears, in the time of Jeremiah, and in general, to have been accessible to visitors (Jer. xxxvi, 5; Matt. xi, 2; xxv, 36, 39; Acts xxiv, 23).—Smith. From the instance of the Mamertine Prison at Rome (q. v.), in which the apostle Paul (q. v.) is said to have been confined, many have rashly assumed that the Roman prisons generally were subterranean; but at Thessalonica at least, even "the inner prison" (Acts xvi, 24) seems to have been on the ground-floor ("doors," ver. 26; "sprang in," ver. 29). See DUNGEON.

PRISON, ECCLESIASTICAL. A bishop was required to have one or more prisons for criminous clerks in 1261. That of the bishop of Chichester remains over his palace gate; and the bishop of London's gate-house stood at the west side of Westminster Abbey. The south-western tower of Clugny was used as a prison. There were various names for prisons: 1, Little Ease, in which the prisoner could neither sit, lie, nor stand; 2, Bocardo, as over the gate near St. Michael's at Oxford; 3, Hell, as at Ely; and, 4, the Lying House at Durham. At Durham, Berne, and Norwich the conventual cells adjoined the chapter-house; at Durham the term of imprisonment lasted sometimes during a year, and was often attended with chains, food being let down by a rope through a trap-door. In all cases solitary confinement was practiced, and in some cases the guilty were immured after the pronunciation of the sentence *Vade in pace*, "Go in peace." At Thornton the skeleton of abbot De Multon (cir. 1445), with a candlestick, chair, and table, was found built up within a recess in the wall; and a cell, with a loop-hole looking towards the high-altar, remains at the Temple, in which William le Bachelor, grand preceptor of Ireland, died. At Clugny the prison had no stair, no door, and no window. At Hirschau the prisoner could barely lie down; at St. Martin-des-Champs the cell was subterranean; at St. Gabriel, Calvados, under a tower. The prisons remain at St. Gabriel, Calvados, Rebais, St. Peter-sur-Dives, and St. Benet-sur-Loire; at Caen, near the great gate; and over it at Tewkesbury, Binham, Hexham, Bridlington, and Malling. The prison was under the charge of the master of the infirmary. "Criminous priests" were imprisoned in 740 in England, and in 1351 their meagre fare was prescribed.—Walcott, *Sacred Archæology*, s. v.

Prison Reform. Prison discipline has in recent times become a matter of so much moment that its consideration is forced upon every philanthropist, especially the believer of the new dispensation—the law of love. Under the silent influences of Christianity, torture, exposure in the pillory, and other like dedications of the offender to public vengeance have long been abandoned as barbarous practices. Death-punishment has been much narrowed in its application; and transportation, apart from any question of effectiveness, has been rendered impracticable, except within a very narrow compass.

The movement for the alleviation of the horrors of imprisonment by physical and moral improvement of the conditions of prisoners may be said to be not only Christian, but modern. We get nothing from the practice of the times anterior to Christianity, nor yet from the Middle Ages, that accounts for much in the modern systems of prison discipline. In Greece and Rome punishments were inflicted in other ways. It must be borne in mind that among the ancients the institution of slavery rendered the prison system unnecessary. It kept the functions of punishing ordinary criminals from the public administration of the affairs of a state, and placed it in private hands. Hence there was no criminal law, properly speaking. The *corpus juris*, so full of minute regulations in all matters of civic right [see JUSTINIAN], has very little criminal law, because the criminals became slaves, and ceased to be objects of the attention of the law. In the Roman empire there were houses, called *ergastula*, for the incarceration of criminal and refractory slaves. The feudal barons had towers in their castles, called *donjons* (whence our word *dungeon*), for the confinement of their captive foes or refractory retainers. Sometimes the prison vaults were cut in the solid rock below the surface of the earth.

When imprisonment became a function of the State in the administration of justice, it was often carelessly, and hence tyrannically, exercised, because the practice of awarding it as a punishment arose more rapidly than the organization for controlling its use. In the 15th and 16th centuries the Society of the Brothers of Mercy in Italy paid much attention to the incarcerated unfortunate trespassers of society, and so greatly alleviated their forlorn condition that many of the Brothers of Mercy are reverently spoken of to this day. St. Carlo Borromeo and St. Vincent de Paul are to be especially mentioned. But the earliest instance of a prison managed on any principles of policy and humanity seems to be that of the Penitentiary at Amsterdam in 1595, an example which was soon followed by some of the German towns, especially Hamburg and Bremen. In England, on several occasions, grave abuses have been exposed by parliamentary inquiries and otherwise in the practice of prison discipline. It is well known that the real impulse to prison improvement was first communicated by the celebrated Howard (q. v.), whose sufferings, when taken by a privateer and imprisoned at Brest, during the Seven Years' War are said to have first directed his attention to this subject. The fruits of his observations in his repeated visits to most of the prisons of Europe were given to the world partly in his publications and partly on examination before Parliament. Howard's exertions, and those of Mrs. Fry and other investigators, awakened in the public mind the question whether any practice in which the public interest was so much involved should be left to something like mere chance—to the negligence of local authorities and the personal disposition of jailers. As in other reform movements, so in this, our own country has been most progressive, and Europe has willingly taken lessons from America. The reports made of our prison systems by the French visitors, Messrs. Beaumont and De Tocqueville (in 1834), De Metz and Blouet (in 1837), Dr. Juliers (sent from Prussia), and Mr. Crawford (from England), have certainly contributed very largely to the present state of public opinion on the subject. In 1834, inspectors were appointed to report annually on the state of English and Scottish prisons—a measure which had been earlier adopted with reference to Ireland; and their reports may be consulted with advantage.

"The tendency lately has been to regulate prison discipline with extreme care. The public sometimes complain that too much pains is bestowed on it—that criminals are not worthy of having clean, well-ventilated apartments, wholesome food, skilful medical attendance, industrial training, and education, as they now have in this country. There are many arguments in favor of criminals being so treated, and the objections urged against such treatment are held by those who are best acquainted with the subject to be invalid; for it has never been maintained by any one that a course of crime has been commenced and pursued for the purpose of enjoying the advantages of imprisonment. Perhaps those who chiefly promoted the several prominent systems expected from them greater results, in the shape of the reformation of criminals, than have been obtained. If they have been disappointed in this, it can, at all events, be said that any prison in the now recognised system is no longer like the older prisons, an institution in which the young criminals advance into the rank of proficients, and the old improve each other's skill by mutual communication. The system now received is that of separation, so far as it is practicable. Two other systems were tried—the silent system and the solitary system. The former imposed entire silence among the prisoners even when assembled together; the latter endeavored to accomplish their complete isolation from sight of or communication with their race. By the separate system, the criminals are prohibited from communicating with each other; but they are visited by persons whose intercourse is more likely to elevate than to debase—as chaplains, teachers, Scripture-readers, the superior officers of the prison, and those who have the external control over it." See PENITENTIARY.

The Prison Association in the State of New York is regarded as the most perfect organization of the kind in the world. According to the annual report, the objects of this society are threefold: 1. Humane attention to persons arrested, protecting them from legal sharpers, and securing their impartial trial. 2. Encouragement and aid of discharged convicts. 3. Careful study of prison discipline, observation of the causes of crime, and inquiry as to the proper means of its prevention. The last is considered the most important of its objects. The statistics of the work of the society during the quarter of a century just ended show the following figures under the first object named above: 93,560 friendless persons visited in the detention prisons of New York and Brooklyn, all of them counselled, and many of them assisted; 25,290 complaints carefully examined; 6148 complaints withdrawn at the instance of the society as trivial, or founded on mistake or passion; 7922 persons discharged by the courts on recommendation of the society, who were young, innocent, committed their offences under mitigating circumstances, or were evidently penitent; a total of 133,922 cases in which relief of some kind has been offered by the association. During the last twenty-five years the assistance given to discharged convicts is summed up as follows: 18,309 persons of this class aided with board, clothing, tools, railroad tickets, or money; 4139 provided with permanent situations; a total of 22,448. Aid has also been extended to thousands of persons connected with the families of the prisoners. For some years a few hundred dollars have been annually distributed on New-year's-day among indigent families. By its act of incorporation it is made the duty of the Prison Association to "visit, inspect, and examine all the prisons of the State of New York, and annually report to the Legislature their condition." In 1876 the fourth National Prison Reform Congress was held in New York City, and very advanced ground was taken. Those especially interested in this subject will do well to consult the minutes of these proceedings, and the annual reports

of the New York State Prison Association; also those of the *Boston Prison Discipline Society*, an organization to which is due the introduction of religious exercises into American prisons, as well as the appointment of chaplains. Prison congresses have been held in Europe since 1845. In 1872 an international congress was held in London, likewise in 1877.

While the principle of prison reform is universally recognised, it is found in practice to work with different results in different cases. This comes from the impossibility of having uniformity in the actual management of the prisons, personal tact and influence having much to do in the case. The prison at Columbus, O., has the reputation of being one of the best in the country for this reason; it enjoys superior supervision, and is wholly free from political interference. The movers in reform hope to achieve still better results in all the institutions. Their principal business is with the criminal after he is caught—to reform him, restore his manhood, and return him to society a new individual. The question how to prevent crime in the first instance is another and more important question. See the excellent article on *Prisons and Prison Discipline* in the *Amer. Cyclop.* xiv, 6, 17, and the literature there quoted. See also *Revue Chrétienne*, Aug. 1873, art. i; Robin, *La Question Penitentiaire* (Paris, 1873); *Edinb. Rev.* liv, 159 sq.; *Meth. Quar. Rev.* July, 1873, art. v; *New-Engl.* Jan. 1873, art. iv; *Christian Union*, May 31, 1876; *New York Evening Post*, 1878.

Prisoner (אָסִיר, *assîr*, δέσμιος). Imprisonment does not appear to have been imposed by Moses as a punishment among the Hebrews, though he describes it as in use among the Egyptians (Gen. xxxix, 20, 21; xl, 1–4). He seems to have used it merely for the purpose of keeping the culprit safe until judgment was given (Lev. xxiv, 12). As execution immediately followed the sentence, there was little occasion for incarceration. The great variety in the names of prisons in the Hebrew would lead us to imagine that they were more frequently used in the latter than in the earlier periods of the Hebrew nation; and that they were not only used in the detention of criminals, but as a means of punishment and correction (2 Chron. xvi, 10; 1 Kings xxii, 27; 2 Kings xxv, 29; Jer. xxxvii, 15, 21; lii, 31; Isa. xxiv, 22; xlii, 7; Matt. iv, 12; Acts xii, 4). Prisoners were often confined in stocks, or with chains (Job xii, 27; xxxiii, 11; Jer. xl, 4); and the keepers of the prisons often had a discretionary power to treat their prisoners as they pleased. The torture was often applied to extort a confession from the accused. In later periods the Jews confined those in prison who failed in the payment of their debts. They had the liberty to punish the debtor with stripes (Wisd. ii, 19; Matt. v, 26; xviii, 28–34). The Romans, in some instances, fastened their criminals by one or both hands to a soldier: such appear to have remained in their own houses (Acts xxviii, 16). It was not unfrequently the case that the keepers of prisons, when those who were committed to their charge had escaped, were subjected to the same punishment which had been intended for the prisoners (xii, 19; xvi, 27). See PRISON.

Pritchard, Martin, a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church of some standing, was born in Ohio April 23, 1827; was converted and joined the Church at the age of seventeen. He obtained a good elementary education, and for a number of years was engaged as a school-teacher. He was licensed as an exhorter when about twenty-three, and as a local preacher at the age of twenty-five. He joined the Nebraska Conference in 1857, and at once entered upon his duties as an itinerant with that energy and devotion to his work which so signally characterized his whole career as a minister, and the fruits of his labor gave abundant proof that he was indeed called of God. He preached successively at Mount Pleasant, Peru, Belleview, Platte Valley, Pawnee City, Falls City, and a second time at Peru. In 1870 he was appointed presiding elder of the Lincoln district, and at the next annual conference he was appointed presiding elder of the Nebraska district. At the Conference of 1875 he was appointed presiding elder of the Lincoln district, where he continued his earnest and faithful labors until about ten days before his death, which occurred on March 24, 1877. He was a member of the Book Committee four years, and was twice elected reserve delegate to the General Conference. See *Minutes of the Annual Conferences*, 1877, p. 142; *N. Y. Christian Advocate*, April 19, 1877.

Pritchard, Samuel, a Wesleyan missionary, was born in the first quarter of our century. He was converted in 1843, and feeling called of God to preach the glad tidings, he entered the itinerant ranks in 1852, and was sent to Biabou Circuit, in the island of St. Vincent. He was there only two years when he was seized with malignant yellow fever, and died Feb. 28, 1853. During the brief period of his ministerial labors he gained the affectionate regard of the community in which he resided. See *Wesleyan Mag.* 1853, p. 872.

Prithu is the name of several legendary kings of ancient India. It is, however, especially one king of this name who is the favorite hero of the *Purânas*. His father was Vena, an embodiment of the Hindû divinity Vishnu (q. v.). Vishnu perished through his wickedness; for when he was inaugurated monarch of the earth, he caused it to be everywhere proclaimed that no worship should be performed, no oblations offered, and no gifts bestowed upon the Brahmins. The Rishis, or Saints, hearing of this proclamation, entreated the king to revoke it, but in vain; hence they fell upon him and slew him. But the kingdom now being without a king, as Vena had left no offspring, and the people being without protection, the sages assembled, and consulted how to produce a son from the body of the dead king. First, then, they rubbed his thigh; from it, thus rubbed, came forth a being called Nishâda; and by this means the wickedness of Vena having been expelled, they proceeded to rub the right arm of the dead king, and by this friction engendered Prithu, who came forth resplendent in person, and in his right hand appeared the mark of the discus of Vishnu, which proved him to be a universal emperor, one whose power would be invincible even by the gods. The mighty Prithu soon removed the grievances of the people; he protected the earth, performed many sacrifices, and gave liberal gifts to the Brahmins. On being informed that in the interval in which the earth was without a king all vegetable products had been withheld, and that consequently the people had perished, he in great wrath marched forward to assail the earth. The earth, assuming the figure of a cow, fled before him, but seeing no escape from the power of the king, at last submitted to him, and promised to renew her fertility, provided he made all places level. Prithu therefore uprooted mountains, levelled the surface of the earth, established boundaries of towns and villages, and induced his subjects to take up their abode where the ground was made level. Then Prithu caused the earth to appear before his throne in the shape she had assumed, and commanded that any one who should apply to her with a wish, and bring a calf with him to milk her, should be granted his wish. This is the celebrated wonder-cow, about which the Brahmins and the Kshatrias fought such tremendous battles that the gods found it necessary to intervene. Now the earth resumed her former liberality, the people were relieved of their want, and the young god, presented by Vishnu and Shiva with never-missing weapons, by the sun-god with an all-illuminating crown, by the sea-god with a parasol trimmed with pearls, walked through the world a conqueror in every battle, bestowing rain or sunshine at his will. He now prepared for invading the empire of Indra, and for that purpose offered ninety-nine great sacrifices of horses; but when he was going to offer the hundredth, Indra managed to steal

the horse, as the last performance would have secured victory. Prithu's son pursued the robber, who could not otherwise escape him than by changing himself into the form of a penitent strewed with ashes and hung all round with bones. Indra succeeded in stealing the horse a second time, and only escaped the unerring weapons of his foe by the intervention of Brahm. Prithu resigned power in favor of his son, and retired to a solitude, where he was absorbed by the divinity. The legend of Prithu evidently records some historical fact regarding the civilizing influences exerted by a great king of Hindû antiquity.

Pritz, Johann Georg, a German theologian, was born at Leipsic in 1662. After having been an evangelical minister at Leipsic and at Zerbst, he became superintendent at Schleitz. He was made professor of theology at Greifswalde, and in 1711 was called to Frankfort-on-the-Main as senior minister. He died in the year 1732. Among his numerous writings we cite the following: *De contemptu divitiarum apud antiquos philosophos* (Leipsic, 1693, 4to):—*De prærogativa sexus masculini præ fœmineo* (4to):—*De immortalitate hominis, contra Asgilium* (ibid. 1702, 4to):—*Proben der Beredtsamkeit* (noted for eloquence) (ibid. 1702, 8vo):—*Introductio in Novum Testamentum* (ibid. 1709, 8vo). He also edited a work of opuscules of St. Macaire, and translated some of the writings of Burnet and other English authors.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.

Private Baptism. The Church, even in her most ritualistic periods, has always held that, in case of danger or sickness, baptism might be administered at any time or in any place. In Thessaly, when baptism was restricted to Easter, many died without it, and in consequence the old prohibitions were mitigated, the font being hallowed at Easter and Pentecost for occasional use. Children, if in danger, might be baptized on the day of their birth, by a decree of the councils of Gerona, 517, and Winchester, 1071; and the Constitutions of Othobon, 1268. According to Roman Catholic teachings, the vessels in which any have been baptized are to be carried to church and there applied to some necessary use, and not to any common purpose, out of reverence to the sacrament (Langton's *Constitutions*, 1223); and the water with which baptism was ministered was to be thrown into the fire, or carried to the church to be put into the font. The vessel, Lyndwood says, was to be large enough to permit immersion, and was to be "burned or deputed to the use of the Church," by Edmund's Constitutions of 1236; that is, as Lyndwood explains, "for washing the church linen." Wooden vessels were burned. In England, in the Anglo-Saxon period, children, if sick, were brought to the priest, by Ælfric's Canons, 957, who was to baptize them, from whose district soever they were brought, without delay.

Private Confession. See Confession.

Private Judgment is the right the Protestants claimed in the Reformatory movement of the 16th century, and has since become the corner-stone of Protestantism (q. v.). The term signifies the right of man to read the Bible for himself and form his own judgment of its meaning under the enlightenment of the Holy Spirit. In the view of Protestantism, man does not only enjoy this privilege, but is bound to exercise it. But, on the other hand, the Romish Church steadfastly denies this right to any man, and holds the Church alone authority and guide in Scripture interpretation. On this point the Council of Trent thus decrees: "In order to restrain petulant minds, the council further decrees that in matters of faith and morals, and whatever relates to the maintenance of Christian doctrine, no one, confiding in his own judgment, shall dare to wrest the Sacred Scriptures to his own sense of them, contrary to that which hath been held, and still is held, by holy mother Church, whose right it is to judge of the true meaning and interpretation of Sacred Writ, or contrary to the unanimous consent of the fathers, even though such interpretation should never be published. If any disobey, let them be denounced by the ordinaries, and punished according to law." From the terms of this decree, it is plain that Romanists hold that their Church alone is entitled to judge of the true meaning and interpretation of Sacred Scripture. To the same effect the creed of pope Pius IV declares: "I also admit the Holy Scriptures according to that sense which our holy mother the Church has held, and does hold, to which it belongs to judge of the true sense and interpretation of the Scriptures. Neither will I ever take and interpret them otherwise than according to the unanimous consent of the fathers." In opposition to such doctrines as these, the Word of God explicitly teaches that every man is bound to judge for himself of the true meaning of Scripture. Thus 1 Thess. v, 21, "Prove all things; hold fast that which is good." Acts xvii, 11, "These were more noble than those in Thessalonica, in that they received the Word with all readiness of mind, and searched the Scriptures daily, whether those things were so." Mark xii, 24, "And Jesus answering said unto them, Do ye not therefore err, because ye know not the Scriptures, neither the power of God?" Luke xvi, 29, "Abraham saith unto him, They have Moses and the prophets; let them hear them." Isa. viii, 20, "To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them."

The popish theory goes to destroy individual responsibility; but in alleging herself to be the appointed interpreter of Scripture the Church of Rome is obliged to concede the right of private judgment so far as to enable us to determine for ourselves from the Divine Word that we are bound to submit our understandings to her guidance in spiritual things. But by any concession of the exercise of private judgment to any extent whatever, her theory falls to the ground. Dr. Whately shows this in a very striking manner in a passage which we extract from his *Cautions for the Times*: "A man who resolves to place himself under a certain guide to be implicitly followed, and decides that such and such a Church is the appointed infallible guide, does decide, on his own private judgment, that one most important point which includes in it all other decisions relative to religion. Thus, by his own showing, he is unfit to judge at all, and can have no ground for confidence that he has decided rightly in that. If, accordingly, he will not trust himself to judge even on this point, but resolves to consult his priest, or some other friends, and be led entirely by their judgment thereupon, still he does in thus resolving exercise his own judgment as to the counsellors he so relies on. The responsibility of forming some judgment is one which, however unfit we may deem ourselves to bear it, we cannot possibly get rid of, in any matter about which we really feel an anxious care. It is laid upon us by God, and we cannot shake it off. Before a man can rationally judge that he should submit his judgment in other things to the Church of Rome, he must first have judged, 1, that there is a God; 2, that Christianity comes from God; 3, that Christ has promised to give an infallible authority in the Church; 4, that such authority resides in the Church of Rome. Now, to say that men who are competent to form sound judgments upon these points are quite incompetent to form sound judgments about any other matters in religion is very like saying that men may have sound judgments of their own before they enter the Church of Rome, but that they lose all sound judgment entirely from the moment they enter it." See Elliott, *Delineation of Romanism; North Brit. Rev.* xxxiv, 260; Daubigné, *Hist. of the Ref.* i, 281; *Congreg. Quar.* viii, 2, 66; Lee, *Right and Responsibility of Private Judgment* (N. Y. 1855); Rogers, *Reason and Faith.*

Privatio Communionis (*deprival of the Communion*), one of the punishments inflicted on offending members of the clerical body during the earlier centu-

ries. Those punishments included suspension, degradation, *privatio communionis*, or deprivation, corporal chastisement, and excommunication. *Privatio* was of two kinds, namely, a restriction to *communio peregrina*, or to *communio laica*. The former had reference to the mode in which strangers were treated who did not bring with them letters testimonial, by which they might be ascertained to be members of some Christian Church: they were looked upon with suspicion, and till they could clear themselves were not allowed to come to the Lord's table, nor to receive any temporal support from the Church funds. In this way delinquent clergymen were treated even in their own Church: they were deprived of means of support, and prevented from officiating or being present at the Lord's Supper. *Communio laica* was a punishment which required a clergyman to communicate as a layman, and among the lay members of the Church. See COMMUNIO LAICA and COMMUNIO PEREGRINA.

Privation is a philosophical term which, according to Plato, is limitation, imperfection, the inherent condition of all finite existence, and the necessary cause of evil. Leibnitz (*Causa Dei*, § 69, 72; *Essai sur la bonté de Dieu*, 1ière partie, § 29, 31; 3ième partie, § 378), after Augustine, Aquinas, and others, held similar views.

PRIVATION, ECCLESIASTICAL, is one of the vindictive, i. e. positive, penalties (in opposition to the censures) which the ecclesiastical laws inflict in the Church of Rome on prebendaries for grave and repeated offences against the discipline of the Church. It is the suspension of an ecclesiastic from his office and prebend. It differs from the disciplinary transfer by which the delinquent receives, in place of the prebend which is taken from him, another, though inferior one; it also differs from absolute deposition, by which an ecclesiastic is deprived forever of his office and official income, and declared unfit for any further employment, while the privation does not forbid him the hope of getting some time another prebend. The privation, as long as it lasts, deprives its object of the power of performing the ecclesiastical functions of consecration or jurisdiction, without unfitting him for life for any further employment. This penalty—even because it is a positive penalty—cannot be inflicted for merely administrative reasons, like the transfer, for instance; or for delinquencies which remained secret, and are only known to the bishop, like the suspension; but only in consequence of canonic examination and by judiciary sentence. The canons name among the transgressions which, if proved, are punished with privation: continued negligence in the performance of the official duties (c. 4, Dist. xci), addiction to lucre (c. 8, x, *Ne cler. vel monach.* iii, 50), repeated infringements of the law of residence (*Conc. Trid.* sess. xxiv, c. 12, *De ref.*), immoral and scandalous conduct, etc.; if admonitions and gradual corrections have proved unavailing (*id.* sess. xxi, c. 6, *De ref.*; c. 13, x, *De vit. et hon. cler.* iii, 1). There are, of course, other transgressions and vices, which can be visited with indefinite suspension; drunkenness, for instance.—Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, s. v. See PRIVATIO COMMUNIONIS.

Privilege (Lat. *privilegium*, from *privata lex*, a private law), in general, is a special ordinance or regulation in virtue of which an individual or a class enjoys certain immunities or rights from or beyond the common provisions of the general law of the community. In ancient and mediæval legislation, the law of privilege formed an important branch; and, in truth, the condition of the so-called "privileged classes" was in all respects different, socially, civilly, and even religiously, from that of the non-privileged.

In canon law, there were two privileges enjoyed by the clergy, which deserve especial notice, from the frequency of the historical reference to them—the "privilege of the canon" (*privilegium canonis*) and the "privilege of the forum" (*privilegium fori*). By the former, the person of the clergyman, of whatever degree, was protected from violence by the penalty of excommunication against the offender; by the latter—in England called "benefit of clergy" (q. v.)—the clergyman was exempted from the ordinary civil tribunals, and could only be tried in the ecclesiastical court.—Chambers, s. v. This privilege from the civil power is now generally abrogated, or at least modified. It comprehended the independent jurisdiction of the clergy (*privilegium fori*), according to which not only all litigious concerns among the clergy themselves, but all personal, and most of the real complaints of laymen against clerks, were brought before, and decided by, ecclesiastical courts; likewise, not only their official transgressions, as functionaries of the Church, but also their civil crimes, were tried and punished by clerical tribunals. To the same class of privileges belongs *the benefit of competence*, in consequence of which, in matters of debts and subhastation, the clerical person must be left the means of living according to his station. Finally, the clergy obtained at an early period a number of immunities, which were gradually increased. They were, in consideration of the spiritual pursuits to which they have to devote themselves, exempted from the administration of governmental or communal functions, from tutorships and guardianships, from military and other services to which all other citizens of the State are bound (*immunitas personalis*). With these was connected the immunity from extraordinary taxes (*immunitas realis*); from prestations for the building of roads, bridges, channels; from lodging soldiers; from purveyances in times of war (*immunitas mixta*). Many of these immunities were granted to the clergy by the emperors Theodosius (*Cod. Theodos.* 2, 3, 11, 14–17, 24, 36, *De episc. eccl. et cler.* xvi, 2) and Justinian (i, 1, 2, 6, 52, *Cod. De episc. et cler.* i, 3) in the times of the Roman empire; afterwards by the Frankish kings (*Capp. Regg. Francc.* lib. vii, c. 185, 290, 467); consolidated by the ecclesiastical legislation (c. 69, c. xii, qu. 2; c. 40, c. xvi, qu. 1; c. 4, 7, x, *De immun. eccl.* iii, 49; Sextus, c. 1, 3, cod. iii, 23; Sextus, c. 4, *De censibus*, iii, 20; Clem. c. 3, cod. iii, 13, etc.), and urgently recommended by the Council of Trent to the worldly rulers (*Conc. Trid.* sess. xxv, c. 20, *De ref.*). In our times most of the civil legislations impose the same regular taxes on all citizens, without exception, and regardless of former immunities. But in many European states the clergy are unconditionally exempted from communal functions, guardianships, and personal prestations, and are also exempted from military service. —Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*.

Privileged Days, those signalized by peculiar ceremonies or commemorating particular events: the first, fourth, and fifth Saturdays in Lent, and Easter Eve, Ash-Wednesday, first and fourth Sundays in Lent, Palm-Sunday, Good-Friday, and Holy Week.—Walcott, *Sacred Archæology*, s. v.

Privileged Sundays, those on which, in some churches of mediæval times, "histories" (lessons from Holy Writ) were read.

Privilegium Altāris is a privilege granted by the pope that masses for the dead said before a certain altar may procure an indulgence to the deceased. Forever and for all days (*privilegium perpetuum et quotidianum*) this privilege has been granted by Benedict XIII (de dat. 20 Julii, 1724, "omnium saluti") to all patriarchal, metropolitan, and cathedral churches for the high-altar. Generally it is granted for seven years only (*septennium*), running from the day of the grant. The indulgence can be obtained for the dead if a mass of requiem (called sometimes a black mass) be said before the privileged altar; but if the rite do not allow of a votive mass, nor, in consequence, of a requiem (f. e. *in fest. duplici, coram exposito*, etc.), the *application* or *intention* "pro defuncto" is sufficient, as in such a case no mass of requiem can be said even at the privileged altar. On the Day of All-Souls all priests before altars can use

this privilege (*Decret. Congreg. Sacr. Indulg.* 19 Maii, 1761).—Aschbach, *Kirchen-Lex.* s. v. See ASYLUM.

Privilegium Canōnis. (1.) Certain exemptions of the clergy from the State. See PRIVILEGE. (2.) That privilege of ecclesiastics which makes a *real* injury to a member of the clergy punishable by excommunication, this taking place *de ipso facto*. After several former canons had established the principle that such real injuries must, after examination, be punished with excommunication (for instance, can. *Si quis deinceps*, 22; *De presbyterorum*, 23, c. 17, qu. 4), the heresy of Arnold di Brescia gave occasion to the Council of Rheims, in 1131, to sanction that extreme penalty. The canon then decreed, commencing with "Si quis suadente diabolo," was made by Innocent II, in 1139, a general law of the Church; and this is the reason why the privilege mentioned above is called Privilegium canonis. In Gratian's decree this ecclesiastical law is given as can. 29, c. 17, qu. 4. It contains some further dispositions, for it states that it is applicable also to *real* injuries perpetrated against monks, and that absolution, except in the dying hour, can only be obtained if the excommunicated person applies for it personally in Rome. This canon has received in the course of time an enlarged interpretation for some cases and a restricted one for others. As a matter of course, the term "ecclesiastic" includes all those who received the tonsure; but the term "monk" has also a very extensive signification, as it includes every member of an order approved by the Church, even the novice. The law is, moreover, applicable to cases where the dead body of a clergyman has been the object of some wanton outrage. On the other side, there are cases where a person, though belonging to the clergy, has no share in the privilege; for instance, the ecclesiastic who is degraded *actû*, especially when he is sentenced to hard labor; the clergyman who dresses in worldly clothes, or persists in a sinful way of life. The canon *Si quis suadente* speaks only of that kind of *real* injury which consists in "assault upon an ecclesiastic," but we have, of course, to take a more extensive view of the case: not only he who strikes, etc., the clergyman is to be punished by excommunication, but also the intellectual originator of such an outrage, or he in whose name it is committed, and who approves of it, or he who, being a witness to it, fails to do what is in his power to prevent it. It is necessary that the delinquent should have acted with the intention of injuring a clergyman; he who, *animo injuriandi*, strikes another person, ignorant that he is a member of the clergy, is not excommunicated; but he is who strikes a layman whom he mistakes for a member of the clergy. If the quarrel originated with the ecclesiastic, the law cannot be applied to the person who is in the case of legitimate defence against him; this is also admitted in favor of a woman who defends her chastity against the assaults of a clergyman. An exception is also admitted in favor of the husband, son, father, or brother of a woman found in criminal conversation with an ecclesiastic. The rule that absolution must be personally applied for in Rome has been restricted in some cases: it is not applicable to women, to monks, and other clerks living in community, when they have assaulted each other, or to sick and ailing persons. A report sent to Rome is sufficient in such cases. Sometimes, when the injury is a trifling one (*levis percussio*), the bishop may grant a dispensation. In general the modern practice has become milder: it imposes the voyage to Rome as a penance only for injuries against the offender's own curate or bishop; absolution is bestowed on his return by the bishop.—Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, s. v.

Prize (*βραβεῖον*, 1 Cor. ix, 24) signifies the honorary reward bestowed on victors in the public games of the Greeks, such as a wreath, chaplet, garland, etc., and is metaphorically used of the rewards of a future life: "I press," says the apostle, "towards the mark, for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus" (Philip. iii, 14). See GAME.

Proast, JONAS, an English divine, flourished in the closing half of the 17th and the early part of the 18th century. He is noted as a controversialist, and wrote, among other things, *Letters on Toleration* (1690–91, and since). There is nothing accessible regarding his personal history. Leckey (*Hist. of Rationalism*, ii, 87) is the only writer of note who has considered Proast; neither Leslie Stephen (*Hist. of English Thought in the 18th Century*) nor Tulloch (*Rational Theology in the 18th Century*) mentions him.

Probabilionists are those who oppose the doctrine of Probabilism and assert that man is obliged, on pain of sinning, always to take the more probable side. The Jansenists and the Port-Royalists are of this class. See PROBABILISM.

Probabilism. The Roman Catholic Church recognises no standard of ethics except that of her own construction. Protestants look to the Bible as the source of all doctrines of morality. The Church of Rome accords authority also to tradition, and to the writers of her own communion who have kept within the list of the faithful ones. See MORAL THEOLOGY. The expressed opinion of a Church doctor forms a sufficient basis for a legitimate moral decision. The eternal and objective foundations of the moral law are thus exchanged for the subjective view of individual persons of eminence (see Wuttke, *Christian Ethics*, i, 261–263). Not only is the deciding element the individual, instead of the Church, but that individual whose decision best suits the inquirer (see Sanchez, *Op. Mor.* i, 9, n. 12 sq., n. 24; Laymann, *Theol. Mor.* [1625] i, 11). Probabilism is a term used in philosophic parlance, as we may see in the article PROBABLE, but in Christian theology it has become synonymous with Roman Catholic ethics. Though its principal source and advocacy are in the Order of the Jesuits, the whole Church of Rome has by its tacit acceptance of this doctrine become identified with it.

Definition.—Probabilism designates, in the domain of morals, an object so comprehensive, and including so many different branches, that we shall scarcely be able to delineate it here, even in its fundamental features. In order to define it we must depart from that moral idea which is the centre of the domain in which it moves: this centre is the *certitude* and firm conviction of the moral subject about the legitimacy of his acts. It is the opposite of this subjective consciousness which forms the object of all probabilistic questions. As the ground of the doctrine, it is assumed, then, that in human actions absolute certainty is not always attainable as to their lawfulness or unlawfulness. Short of this certainty, the intellect passes through the stages of "doubt" and of "probability." Probability is a state of consciousness intermediate between certitude and incertitude, but approaching more or less to certitude, without reaching it entirely. Consciousness, in the state of probability, has risen above incertitude. Doubt is a wavering state between two judgments, between negation and affirmation of the goodness or permissibility of an action; it excludes every positive approbation, every positive consent, every permanent decision in favor of either term of the moral antithesis. Probability has passed this uncertain wavering; it does not move hesitatingly to and fro; it has found a point of support, though the latter may not be absolutely trustworthy. In consequence, a more or less positive decision in favor of one or the other term of the question is possible. Such a decision must not originate in any subjective whim; it must be founded on sufficient objective reasons. This gives us the true idea of the *probable conscience:* "Probabile est id quod probari potest, hoc est, quod rationibus nititur." We may, then, define probability in matters of conscience thus: it is the decision or consent of conscience in regard to the moral permis-

sibility of an action, a decision founded on sufficient reasons, but not excluding all misgivings to the contrary. To the *probable conscience*, then, corresponds, as its foundation, the *probable opinion* (*opinio probabilis*). An opinion as to the legitimacy or illegitimacy of an action is the more probable the stronger the reasons on which it rests. These reasons are either *intrinsic*, a part of the thing itself and its objective nature, or *extrinsic*, owing their weight to human authorities. The extrinsic probability of an opinion contents itself with the repute and confidence enjoyed by the authorities which support it, while the intrinsic probability endeavors to conceive the rational foundation of the opinion in question. But whichever of these forms probability may assume, it can never be at variance with the decisions and doctrines of the Church. Absence of intrinsic and extrinsic contradictions is the negative condition of probability. To establish true and real probability (*probabilitas vera*), a positive element is required, to wit, a more or less evident accord with the objective law, either with its spirit or with its more or less clearly expressed dispositions. It results from the nature of opinion that a variety and diversity of opinions be conceived, which, in regard to their legitimacy, are of equal or unequal value. Moreover, in the conflict of views another element will arise as to their comparative "safety;" that is, the greater or less danger of moral culpability which they involve; and this greater or less moral "safety" of a view may or may not coincide with its greater or less "probability." Hence the gradual scale of probable opinions, the highest degree being the *opinio probabilissima*, but the *opinio tenuiter probabilis* being entirely excluded. The ascending degrees of the concurrent probable opinions are marked by the *opinio mere probabilis*, *æque probabilis*, and *probabilior*.

The doctrine of probabilism is founded upon these distinctions. It is taught, with some variations, by four different schools, all of which agree in professing that it is lawful, in certain cases, to act upon opinions which are merely probable. These four schools of probabilism are called: *Probabilism Simple*, *Æquiprobabilism*, *Probabiliorism* (from *probabilior*, more probable), and *Tutiorism* (from *tutior*, more safe). The first holds that it is lawful to act upon any probable opinion, no matter how slight its probability. The second requires that the opinion shall be "solidly probable," but holds that, provided it be really probable, it is lawful to act upon it, even though the conflicting opinion should be equally probable. The third narrows much more the limits of what is allowed in the conflict of probable opinions, and only permits action on the more probable of the two; but permits this even when the less probable adverse opinion is the "more safe." The fourth requires that in all cases the more safe opinion shall be followed, even when the less safe opinion is much the more probable. The extreme rigorism which the last class requires has caused its division into *absolute* and *mollified* tutiorism. "By the *certainty* of an opinion," says Fuchs, "we are to understand the more or less considerable remoteness of the danger of sin, or of error, or of encroachment on other persons' rights. The more an opinion removes him who chooses it for his guide from the danger of actual sin, the more certain it is. The *opinio tutior* is that which declares that an action is not allowed; the *opinio minus tuta* is that which asserts the legitimacy of the action in question. As the being allowed and the not being allowed of an action stand together in the same relation as liberty and law, it may be said that in the first case liberty, in the second law, is favored (libertati favet, legi favet)."

To these probabilistic systems is opposed a system espoused by the more consistent of Romish theologians of the Old Catholic type. It is called *Antiprobabilism*, and in its austere severity does not allow any influence on man's actions, even to the most probable opinion. It requires that an opinion shall be absolutely morally certain, in order that it may be lawful for a man to act upon it in the light of Christian truth. But this system has been rejected by papal authority, declaring erroneous the assertion "Non licet sequi opinionem vel inter probabiles probabilissimam."

History of Probabilism.—It is commonly said that the system of probabilism is modern; but this is only true of the discussions regarding it, for the doctrine itself, in some of its forms, is as old as the study of ethics, even considered as a moral science. The disputes regarding it arose with the science of casuistry, when men, in the 16th and 17th centuries, began to reduce morals to a system. It formed a leading subject of the controversy between the Jesuits and the Jansenists; but even in its modern form probabilism dates back to the close of the scholastic period. At the Council of Constance, in A.D. 1415, a debate had arisen on the subject of the murder of the duke of Orleans, assassinated in Paris Nov. 23, 1407, at the instigation of his political rival, the duke of Burgundy. The Franciscan Jean Petit had endeavored to justify this crime in an assembly of French noblemen held at Paris March 8, 1408; but his proposition had been condemned, at the request of chancellor Gerson, by the university and the bishop of Paris. When the matter was brought before the council, Martin Porrée, bishop of Arras, speaking in behalf of the duke of Burgundy, tried to prevent any conclusions unfavorable to Jean Petit, asserting that several authorities were in favor of Petit, and that, in consequence, his opinion was at least probable, and ought not to be peremptorily disposed of by way of rejection and condemnation. Gerson defended a contrary view of the matter, and the council condemned as heretical the doctrine of the legitimacy of murder committed on the persons of tyrants, and stamped with the name of heretic all those who should pertinaciously maintain it (comp. Mansi, *Coll. Conc.* xxvii, 705, and xxviii, 868). This resolution left probabilism untouched, and condemned only a false application of its principles in a particular case.

The Dominican Bartolomeo de Medina is considered as the founder of probabilism in its usual signification. Through his commentary on the theological *Summa* of St. Thomas de Aquinas it entered the schools: "Si est opinio probabilis," he says (quæst. 19, art. 6, concl. 3), "licitum est eam sequi, licet opposita probabilior." Many Thomist theologians adopted this proposition; among them, Bannez, Alvarez, Ledesma, Martinez, and Lopez. Among the Jesuits, the celebrated Vasquez was the first who (1598) positively took sides with the probabilists, and a number of members of his order followed in his footsteps. From this time forth the Jesuits did much for the expansion of the probabilistic doctrines, and the aberrations to which they led. Probabilism came to be synonymous with Jesuitism, so largely were the Jesuits identified with the advocacy of this pernicious dogma. This is, however, easily accounted for. The Jesuits had come on the stage at a time when the Church of Rome was in danger of being broken up, if not of being entirely dismembered. The Reformation had struck her heavy blows, and in some countries she was felled to the ground. Loyola's order aimed at her recovery and restoration. The bride of Christ they saw endangered, and their mission was the salvation of the Romish Church at any price. In a struggle of life and death, as has been aptly said, one is not very careful in the use of measures; and in all warfare the sentiment holds good, though involving manifold violations of ordinary right, that the end sanctifies the means. The Jesuits were well aware that they were an essentially new phenomenon of the churchly life—that they stood upon purely human invention and power; it need not surprise us, therefore, that they felt called by their fundamental principles to the development of a special system of morality—a system the highest end of which is the glory of God through the exaltation of the visible Church, which, of course, is to them the

Romish Church. The purpose—zealously pursued by the Jesuits in the interest of Romish domination—of becoming soul-guarding fathers and conscience-counsellors, especially for men and women of eminence, required, on the other hand, that the Jesuits should acquire for themselves the highest possible repute in ethics—and hence it was requisite that they should become the literary representatives thereof; and, on the other, that this ethics should be moulded in adaptation to this end—should make itself not disagreeable and burdensome, but should become as elastic as possible in view of different wants—should be a "golden net for catching souls," as the Jesuits themselves were wont to call their own pliableness. The more ramified and complex the net-work of casuistic ethics became, so much the more indispensable were the practiced conscience-counsellors, or, more properly, conscience-advocates; the more stairways and back doors they were able to turn attention to in conscience affairs, so much the more prized and influential they became. This explains the great compass and the peculiar character of Jesuitic ethics. They were but too well aware that it did not harmonize with the moral consciousness of the ancient Church, and they hesitated not to admit that they did not recognise earlier Church tradition as a criterion for morality, but wished rather to lay the foundations for a new tradition. The sophistical artifices in the doctrine of right and morality were not then first thought out and invented by Jesuitism; but it learned them by listening to weak, corrupt human nature, as others had here and there done before it. Jesuitism, moreover, was the *first* to set up these sophisms as rules; first brought them into an organized system of doctrine, and formed them as methods of the Christian doctrine of morals; first scientifically constituted, authorized, and sanctioned them as leading principles of Catholic morality; and—what is not to be overlooked—has first applied them to the allotment of the moral life to the natural weaknesses of the different ranks and classes, in order that "the kingdom of heaven henceforth may suffer no violence."

We will not forget, however, that after the Theatines, in a general assembly of their order, in 1598, had formally renounced probabilism, several members of the Society of Jesus likewise raised their voice against the abuses of the system: we mention among them the Portuguese Ferdinand Rebelle and the Italian Comitolus. A short time afterwards the general of the order, Mutius Vileteschi, expressed similar opinions in a series of writings. We read in one of them: "Nonnullorum ex societate sententiæ, in rebus præsertim ad mores spectantibus, plus nimio liberæ non modo periculum est ne ipsam evertant, sed ne ecclesiæ etiam Dei universæ insignia afferant detrimenta. Omni itaque studio perficiant ut qui docent scribuntne minime hac regula et norma in delectu sententiarum utantur: *Tueri quis potest, probabilis est, auctore non caret.* Verum ad eas sententias accedant quæ tutiores, quæ graviores majorisque nominis doctorum suffragiis sunt frequentatæ; quæ bonis moribus conducunt magis; quæ denique pietatem alere et prodesse queunt, non vastare, non perdere." The Sorbonne, too, opened fire upon the probabilistic aberrations with the condemnation of the *Magnus director curatorum, vicariorum, et confessariorum* of P. Milhard, and the clergy of France continued the battle with praiseworthy zeal. The University of Louvain made similar declarations. In 1653 the Dominicans, in a general chapter held at Rome, joined their voice to these authorities. Again, some Jesuits, among others Candidus Philalethes (André Leblanc), censured those of their order who were advocates of probabilism. Yet these antagonistic elements within Jesuitism were the exceptions, not the rule. The rank and file of the Society of Jesus were wedded to their new idols; and as the Jesuits were the chief representatives of Romish ethics in the 16th and 17th centuries, those who chose to attack Romanism levelled their guns directly at probabilism; while those who favored Romanism, or were themselves its supporters, but desired the downfall of Jesuitism, directly charged on this particular body of probabilists. Thus, e. g., Jansenism lifted up its voice against probabilism in order to destroy by this détour their enemies the Jesuits. Pascal, the great, if not immortal, advocate of the Port-Royalists, adopted this method. In his *Lettres Provinciales* he puts together these aberrations of members of the Jesuitic Order; and as he represents the doctrine of probability, it is a curious perversion of the principle of authority—the application of it to legitimatize doubt and license. He stigmatized probabilism as the "morals of the Jesuits." The great publicity which the *Provincial Letters* owed to the splendid talent of their author became, especially among the educated classes, an inflexible opinion against Jesuits, which continues to this day. A number of refutations of the *Provincial Letters* appeared, some of them very awkward. The Jesuit Pirot, in his *Apologie pour les Casuistes* (Paris, 1657), made the following assertion: If an opinion is probable, it is sure, and can be followed; surety has no degrees, but is indivisible, so far as the moral action connected with a probable opinion is concerned; in consequence, a less probable opinion is as sure as a more probable (*Apol.* p. 46). Similar opinions were sustained by the Jesuits Matthew de Moya, Honoré Lefèvre, and Étienne des Champs (*Quæstio Facti de Sententia Theologorum Societatis circa Opiniones probabiles*, Paris, 1659). The ablest refutation, *Réponse aux Lettres provinciales de L. de Montalte; ou Entretiens de Cléandre et Eudoxe*, is due to the Jesuit Daniel, the well-known French historian, who gives a very elaborate account of probabilism. He observes that, according to the doctrine of the Jesuits, two conditions are required for the probability of an opinion: first, it can contradict neither the dogmas and truths taught by the Church, nor any evident reason; secondly, it must be founded on sound judgment, and not set up wantonly against the prevailing doctrine of the competent teachers.

Among these tumultuous contests in the domain of Catholic morals, the Apostolic See could not remain silent. The pope condemned the *Provincial Letters* (Sept. 6, 1657) on one side, and Pirot's *Apology* on the other (August, 1659). Pope Alexander VII declared against the dangerous excrescences of probabilism in a decree of Sept. 24, 1665; and his successor, Innocent XI, strictly defined its limits by his bull of 1679. The first-mentioned decree commences with these memorable words: "Our most holy father has heard, not without great sorrow, that several opinions, which weaken Christian discipline and prepare destruction to the souls, have been partly revived and partly started for the first time, and that the unbridled license of some extravagant minds increases every day, whereby a way of thinking has crept into the Church which is altogether at variance with Christian simplicity and the doctrine of the holy fathers, and which, should the believers make it the rule of their life, would produce a great moral corruption." Among the moral propositions censured by these two papal decrees, the following concern probabilism: from the first decree, *Prop.* 27—"Si liber sit alicujus junioris et moderni, debet opinio censeri probabilis, dum non constet rejectam esse a Sede apostolica tanquam improbabilem;" from the latter, *Prop.* 1—"Non est illicitum in sacramentis conferendis sequi opinionem probabilem de valore sacramenti, relicta tutiore, nisi id vetet lex, conventio aut periculum gravis damni incurrendi. Hinc sententia probabili tantum utendum non est in collatione baptismi, ordinis sacerdotalis aut episcopalis." *Prop.* 2—"Probabiliter existimo judicem posse judicare juxta opinionem etiam minus probabilem." *Prop.* 3—"Generatim, dum probabilitate sive intrinseca sive extrinseca, quantumvis tenui, modo a probabilitatis finibus non exeatur, confisi aliquid agimus, semper prudenter agimus." *Prop.* 4—"Ab infidelitate excusabitur infidelis non credens, ductus opinione

minus probabili." The antiprobabilistic extreme, represented by the rigorism of the Jansenists, was met by pope Alexander VIII with the condemnation of the proposition referred to above, a condemnation which is contained in the decree of 1690.

The first consequence of the papal declarations was a sharper separation of the parties. Probabilism found its most redoubtable adversaries in the Carmelite Henry of St. Ignatius, the two Dominicans Daniel Concina (*Della Storia del Probabilismo*) and Vincent Patuzzi, and in Franzoja and Pet. Ballerini. But all these efforts did not annihilate probabilism whether inside or outside the Order of the Jesuits, though it had to submit to many restrictions. In their fifth general assembly the Jesuits only protested against making probabilism the doctrine of their order. Oliva, the general of the order (in a letter of Feb. 3, 1669), speaks plainly enough in favor of probabilism; and while he declares *certainly and truly probable* opinions fit to engender a *certain conscience* (conscientia certa), he asserts, on the other side, that the requirement "sequendi semper in omnibus probabiliorem partem" would be too heavy a burden upon mankind. It was shown, however, much more clearly how deeply probabilism was rooted in the Jesuitic Order when the Spaniard Gonzalez, the general of the order, took with great decision, in 1694, the defence of the opposite system. In his work he dissents from the principle that man, in moral matters, must suffer himself to be guided by a sincere love of truth. Hence he draws the inference that we must always choose what we think to be nearest to truth; if objective truth cannot be obtained, we must at least cling to that which, according to our subjective conviction, is nighest to it. For that reason we can follow even the less sure opinion, if we are convinced of its greater probability. The work written from this stand-point, and which the author meant to dedicate to the general of the order, Oliva, found its way into publicity only after many years. Perhaps Gonzalez would not have ventured, even while general of the order, to publish it if the same work which the casuists of the order wished to suppress had not been greatly approved of by pope Innocent XI. Many of the Jesuits claimed that Gonzalez had, by his disapproval of probabilism, made himself unworthy of his place, and pronounced him self-deposed. Only the protection of the pope saved him (see Wolf, *Gesch. der Jesuiten*, i, 173). In his *Fundamentum Theologiæ Moralis* (Rome, 1684) Gonzalez put in the background the authority system hitherto so predominant by giving the preference to the ethical province as the more appropriate judgment-seat of the appellate court. Two other theologians followed in his footsteps, Gisbert and Camargo, representing the probabilioristic tendency. Gisbert, professor at Toulouse, did not in his work attack the principle of probabilism, only its vulgar form. He asserts that we are certain not to sin if we stick to the absolute probability either of law or of liberty; if we judge sensibly that something is allowed, after examining it sufficiently, taking the circumstances into account, and satisfying ourselves of the soundness of our judgment. While Gisbert treated the subject in a more speculative way, Camargo, professor at Salamanca, in his treatise *De Regula Honestatis Moralis* (Naples, 1702), takes a more historical view of the matter, and shows that modern probabilism has not the testimony of antiquity in its favor, and that since its first appearance the most considerable authorities were against it.

While the probabilists continued in their attempts to again turn the scales—we shall only mention the *Tractatus Probabilitatis* by Gabriel Gualdus (under the assumed name of Nicolaus Peguletus, Louvain, 1708) and the "Criticisms" of Cardenas (*Opp. Carden.* Ven. 1710)—and while the party of the probabiliorists grew in strength every day, mediating tendencies appeared. Among the works written in this spirit, the *Sententia Media* of Alfonzo de Liguori is the best. This distinguished Romanist developed a system of morals which may be described as a kind of *practical* probabiliorism, in which, by the use of what are called reflex principles, an opinion which *objectively* is but probable is made *subjectively* the basis of a certain and safe practical judgment. Liguori teaches that we are bound to keep our actions, as much as possible, in accordance with truth; or at least, as in the case of a more probable opinion, as near to truth as possible. If it should appear that of two opinions one is more favorable to liberty, the other to law, the latter being at the same time more probable, it must be admitted without hesitation. Liguori, in the case where equally strong reasons speak for law and liberty, professes a somewhat different opinion from Gisbert and the rigid probabiliorists—he decides for liberty. Liguori starts in his demonstration from the proposition that a doubtful law is not binding ("lex dubia non obligat"). A dubious law, he further says, is an uncertain law, and a law of this description cannot engender any obligation ("lex incerta non potest certam inducere obligationem"); for in this case of doubt, of uncertainty, liberty is in possession, and in consequence has the right on its side, according to the axiom "In dubio melior est conditio possidentis." This is the strongest point of Liguori's argumentation, but also the point with which it stands and falls; here it has to fight a decisive battle against probabiliorism, or against refined tutiorism. Rassler, in his *Norma Recti* (Ingold. 1713), takes a similar stand-point between the contending parties, while Charles Emanuel Pallavicini, in his letters on the administration of the sacrament of penitence, claims for the confessors the right to choose between probabilism or probabiliorism, both with proper restrictions.

The maxims of the Jesuits disseminated themselves, like an infectious disease, far beyond the circle of their own order, as is shown by the comprehensive works of the Sicilian Antony Diana (*Resolutiones Morales*, Antv. 1629–37, 4 vols. fol.; Lugd. 1667; Venet. 1728), who taught, under the express approval of his ecclesiastical superiors, and also of the Jesuits, the doctrine of probabilism in its worst forms. One may act according to a probable opinion, and disregard the more probable one; man is not under obligation to follow the more perfect and the more certain, but it suffices to follow the simply certain and perfect; it would be an unendurable burden were one required to hunt out the more probable opinions (*Res. Mor.* [Antv. 1637] vol. ii, tract. 13; vol. iv, tract. 3; *Summa* [1652], p. 214). The most of the Jesuits taught the same thing. In relation to murder, Diana teaches like Escobar: I am at liberty to kill even him who assails my honor if my honor cannot otherwise be rescued (*Res. Mor.* iii, 5, 90; *Summa*, p. 210, 212). When some one has resolved upon a great sin, then one is at liberty to recommend to him a lesser one, because such advice does not relate absolutely to an evil, but to a good, namely, the avoiding of the worse; for example, if I cannot otherwise dissuade a person from an intended adultery than by recommending to him fornication instead thereof, then it is allowable to recommend this to him; not, however, in so far as it is a sin, but in so far as it prevents the sin of adultery. Diana appeals in this connection to many like-judging Jesuit doctors (*Res. Mor.* [Antv. 1637] vol. iii, tract. 5, 37). If a priest commissions Peter to kill Caius, who is weaker than Peter, but nevertheless Peter comes out second best and gets killed himself, still the priest incurs no guilt, and may continue in the administration of his office (*ibid.* vol. iii, tract. 15, 17). He who resolves upon committing all possible venial sins does not therebo involve himself in any mortal sin (*ibid.* vol. iii, tract. 6, 24). He who, *ex aliqua justa causa*, rents a house to another for purposes of prostitution commits no sin (*ibid.* vol. iii, tract. 6, 45). To eat human flesh, in case of necessity, he holds, with the majority of the Jesuits, as allowable (*ibid.* tract. 6, 48). He who, in virtue of a promise of marriage, induces a maiden to yield to him is not bound by his promise in case he is of higher

rank or richer than she, or in case he can persuade himself that she will not take his promise in serious earnest (*ibid.* [Antv.] vol. iii, tract. 6, 81; in the spirit of Sanchez and Less). Marriage between brother and sister can be made legitimate by papal dispensation (*ibid.* vol. iv, tract. 4, 94; sanctioned by several Jesuits). In such moral perversity of view Diana seems only to have been surpassed by the Spanish Netherlander Cistercian Lobkowitz (*Theol. Mor.* 1645, 1652; comp. Perrault, i, 331 sq.), who, in his scepticism, entirely breaks down the moral consciousness, and declares that nothing is evil *per se*, but only because it is positively forbidden; hence God can dispense even with all the commandments (comp. the views of Duns Scotus, p. 34) (*ibid.* 1626); can, e. g., allow whoredom and other like sins, for none of these are evils *per se*. Monks and priests are at liberty to kill the female misused by them when they fear, on her account, for their honor. This writer declares himself expressly and decidedly in favor of the views of the Jesuits. Also the Franciscan Order became infected with the maxims of the Jesuits, as is proved by the very voluminous work of Barthol. Mastrius de Mandula (*ibid.* 1626), which was published under the express sanction of the officers of the order, and who justifies *restrictiones mentales* even in oaths (*Disp.* xi, 52, 171, 172, 183, ed. Ven. 1723), and also the murder of tyrants (*ibid.* viii, 27), the murder of the slanderers of an important person, castration, and similar things (*ibid.* viii, 25, 28; xi, 110 sq.), as well as probabilism.

The moral system of the Jesuits is, we grant, not, strictly speaking, that of the Romish Church; many of their more extreme maxims the Church has condemned, and the more recent Jesuits themselves find it advisable no longer fully to avow their former principles. Nevertheless Jesuitism, together with its system of morals, is, as has been well said by Wuttke (i, 271, 272), "the ultimate consequential goal of the Church in its turning aside from the Gospel, just as (though in other respects widely different therefrom) Talmudism was the necessary goal of Judaism in its rejection of the Saviour. The error consists in the placing of human discretion and authority in the stead of the unconditionally valid, revealed will of God. Even as earlier Catholicism had intensified the divine command by self-invented, ascetic work-holiness into a seemingly greater severity—had aimed at a higher moral perfection than that required by God—so Jesuitism, with like presumption, lowered the moral law, out of consideration to temporal relations, to a merest minimum requirement; contented itself with a much lower moral perfection than the divine law calls for, and sought out cunning means for lightening even this minimum."

Probabilism, moreover, is not a merely fortuitously discovered expedient, but it is in fact an almost inevitable consequence of the historical essence of Jesuitism. The order itself arose neither on the basis of Scripture nor of ancient Church tradition, but sprang absolutely from the daring inventive power of a single man breaking through the limits of ecclesiastical actuality. It is not therefore at all unnatural that it should make the authority of a single spiritually pre-eminent man its highest determining power, and subordinate to this the historical objective form of the moral consciousness. This, then, is the distinguishing characteristic of Jesuitical ethics—that in the place of the eternal objective ground and criterion of the moral it substitutes subjective opinion, and in the place of an unconditional eternal end a merely conditionally valid one, viz. the defending of the actual, visible Church against all forms of opposition—that in the place of the moral conscience it substitutes the human calculating of circumstantial and fortuitous adaptation to the promotion of this its highest end; that it attempts to realize what is *per se* and absolutely valid by a wide-reaching isolating of the means, and by so doing subordinates morality to the discretion of the single subject. "Though the ethics of the Jesuits are lax and quite too indulgent towards worldly, sinful proclivities and fashions, yet this is only one phase of the matter. A merely worldly-lax moral system, in the usual sense, seems but little applicable to the members of a brotherhood the first rule of which is a perfect renunciation of personal will and personal opinion and self-determination, in a word, unconditional obedience to every command of superiors, and which has actually accomplished in the missionary field the grandest of deeds, and numbers among its members multitudes of heroic martyrs. This lack of strictness in one direction rests by no means on mere worldliness, on pleasure in the delights of this life, but follows, on the one hand, of necessity (as well as does also the rigor of obedience), from the subjectively arbitrary presupposition of the entire order, from the lack of an objective, unshaken foundation, and rests, on the other hand, strictly on calculation; is itself a cunningly devised means to the end; is intended to awaken, especially in the great and mighty of the earth (and the masses of the people are such under some circumstances), a love to the Church, to the mild, friendly, indulgent mother."

Jesuitical ethics is the opposite pole of monastic ethics; where the latter requires too much, the former exacts too little. Monastic morality strives to win God for the sinful world, Jesuitical morality seeks to win the sinful world, not indeed for God, but at least for the Church. Monasticism says to God, though not in an evangelical sense, "If I have only thee, then I ask for nothing else in heaven or earth." Jesuitism says about the same thing, but says it to the world, and particularly to the distinguished and powerful. The former turns away in indignant contempt from the worldly life because the world is immersed in sin; the latter generously receives the same into itself, and turns attention away from guilt by denying it. It is true the Jesuits represent also a monastic order, but this order is also a means to an end, and resembles the other nobler orders about as much as wily Reynard resembles the pious pilgrim; and the well-known hostility of the older orders to this brilliantly rising new one was not mere jealousy, but a very natural, and, for the most part, moral protest against the spirit of the same. See Wuttke, *Christian Ethics* (transl. by Prof. J. P. Lacroix, N. Y. 1874, 2 vols. 12mo), i, 255–272; Stäudlin, *Gesch. der Sittenlehre Jesu* (Götting. 1799), i, 441; Schröckh, *Kirchengesch.* ix, 343 sq.; Cotta, *De Prob. Morali* (Jena, 1728); Rachel, *Examen Prob. Jes.* (Helmst. 1664, 4to); De Wette, *Christl. Sittenlehre*, II, ii, 334 sq.; Perrault, *Morale des Jesuites* (1667, 3 vols.); Ellendorf, *Die Moral u. Politik der Jesuiten* (1840); *Pragmatische Gesch. der Mönchsorden* (1770), vols. ix and x; *Deutsches Kirchenblatt*, 1875 (review of Gury's *Compendium Theologiæ Moralis*, new ed. Ratisbon, 1874; one of the worst probabilistic advocates); Mosheim, *Eccles. Hist.* iv, 230; v, 190; *Christian Remembrancer*, July, 1852, p. 191 sq.; *Amer. Quar. Rev.* xi, 473; *Edinb. Rev.* xxiii, 320; xcii, art. i.

Probable (Lat. *probabilis*), a barbarous technical word which serves to designate the philosophic dogma that anything which does not admit of demonstration may admit the *probable* as proof, if such a course does not involve absurdity or contradiction. "As demonstration," says Locke, "is the showing the agreement or disagreement of two ideas, by the intervention of one or more proofs, which have a constant, immutable, and visible connection one with another; so *probability* is nothing but the appearance of such an agreement or disagreement by the intervention of proofs whose connection is not constant and immutable, or at least is not perceived to be so, but is, or appears for the most part to be so, and is enough to induce the mind to judge the proposition to be true or false, rather than the contrary. . . . The entertainment the mind gives this sort of propositions is called belief, assent, or opinion, which is admitting or receiving any proposition as true upon arguments or proofs that are found to persuade us to

receive it as true, without certain knowledge that it is so. And herein lies the difference between *probability* and *certainty*, faith and knowledge, that in all the parts of knowledge there is intuition; each immediate idea, each step, has its visible and certain connection; in belief not so. That which makes us believe is something extraneous to the thing we believe; something not evidently joined on both sides to, and so not manifestly showing the agreement or disagreement of, those ideas that are under consideration" (*Essay on the Human Understanding*, bk. iv, ch. xv; comp. Reid, *Intell. Powers*, essay vii, ch. iii). "The word *probable*," says Mr. Stewart, "does not imply any deficiency in the proof, but only marks the particular nature of that proof, as contradistinguished from another species of evidence. It is opposed not to what is certain, but to what admits of being demonstrated after the manner of the mathematicians. This differs widely from the meaning annexed to the same word in popular discourse; according to which, whatever event is said to be probable is understood to be expected with some degree of doubt. . . . But although, in philosophical language, the epithet probable be applied to events which are acknowledged to be certain, it is also applied to events which are called probable by the vulgar. The philosophical meaning of the word, therefore, is more comprehensive than the popular; the former denoting that particular *species* of evidence of which contingent truths admit; the latter being confined to such degrees of this evidence as fall short of the highest. These different degrees of probability the philosopher considers as a series, beginning with bare possibility, and terminating in that apprehended infallibility with which the phrase moral certainty is synonymous. To this last term of the series the word probable is, in its ordinary acceptation, plainly inapplicable" (*Elements*, pt. ii, ch. ii, § 4).

Archbishop Butler, in his treatment of the evidences of Christianity, has had frequent recourse to this theory of the probable, and in consequence has at times laid himself open to severe attacks from the deistical and infidel schools of philosophy. By dwelling exclusively upon the absence of direct contradiction, and sinking the absence of confirmation, the learned author of the *Analogy* not unfrequently converts absolute ignorance into the likeness of some degree of positive knowledge. So Campbell, who borrowed from Butler, constructed most ingenious arguments on this paradox. Both these English thinkers seem to have had a confused notion that the improbability is an actual thing which still exists. Thus Campbell, after Butler, says, e. g., "The chances that a comet will not appear at a given instant in a given place are infinite. The presumption against the statement is therefore as strong as experience can afford; and yet when an astronomer announces the appearance of the comet you unhesitatingly believe him." The object in this statement is to prove that we must depend largely upon testimony built up from experience, and that therefore knowledge is built upon the *probable*. The result is, of course, a *delusive* appearance of independent scientific grounds for what is really a purely *a priori* deduction. Like methods are now adopted in scientific circles, and what Hume and consorts once condemned the theologians for, the latter now have to contend with in the application of scientific queryings to the positive in divine laws and institutions. See Ueberweg, *Hist. of Philos.* (Index in vol. ii); *The* (*Lond.*) *Quar. Rev.* Jan. 1875, p. 31 sq.; *London Academy*, Nov. 15, 1873, p. 435, col. 1; Stephen, *Religious Thought in England in the 18th Century*, vol. i.

Probation, Ecclesiastical, in the Methodist Episcopal Church and other Methodist bodies, is the period, usually six months, for the candidate for Church membership to determine whether the organization is such as is likely to aid him in his Christian life, and for the Church to determine whether he is a proper person to be received.

PROBATION, Ministerial, signifies among some English dissenters the state of a student or minister while supplying a vacant church, with a view, on their approval of his character and talents, to his taking the pastoral oversight of them.

PROBATION, Monastic, is the year of a novitiate, which a *religieux* must pass in a convent to prove his virtue and vocation, and whether he can bear the severities of the rule.

PROBATION, Moral, is a term used in Christian morals to denote that state of man in which his character is formed and developed in action preparatory to judgment (q. v.). It is the state antecedent to a state of *retribution* (q. v.). "More strictly speaking, moral probation is that experimental trial which lays the foundation for approbation or disapprobation, praise or blame, reward or punishment. It involves obligations to obedience, exposure to temptations, commands and prohibitions; promises, on the one hand, to encourage to duty; threatenings, on the other, to deter from sin; with a certainty of final retributions according to the character produced under these various means, and visibly proved by the course of action pursued by the individual. This is the state which is denominated moral probation; and in such a state is mankind under the law of God and the mediatorial reign of Christ; or, in the customary language of the New Test., under the kingdom of heaven (Matt. xiii, 10-52)." It is the principal or rather essential doctrine in the independent system of those Christian moralists who wish to prove metaphysically the truth of Christian ethics. It is the favorite basis of Butler in his *Analogy*. See Butler, *Works*, i, 109, 128 sq., 382; *Christian Rev.* xvi, 541; Harlan, *Ethics* (see Index). The question whether there be a period of probation after death is more properly a part of the articles Future Punishment and Purgatory. Comp. the *Meth. Quar. Rev.* April, 1876, p. 355 sq., 357 sq.

Probationer is, in the Church of Scotland, a student in divinity, who, bringing a certificate from a professor in a university of his good morals, and his having performed his exercises to approbation, is admitted to undergo several trials before the presbytery, and upon his acquitting himself properly in these, receives a license to preach. See also Probation.

Probity; honesty, sincerity, or veracity. "It consists in the habit of actions useful to society, and in the constant observance of the laws which justice and conscience impose upon us. The man who obeys all the laws of society with an exact punctuality is not, therefore, a man of probity; laws can only respect the external and definite parts of human conduct; but probity respects our more private actions, and such as it is impossible in all cases to define; and it appears to be in morals what charity is in religion. Probity teaches us to perform in society those actions which no external power can oblige us to perform, and is that quality in the human mind from which we claim the performance of the rights commonly called imperfect."

Probst. See Spreng.

Probus, a Christian martyr under Diocletian and Maximian, in the beginning of the 4th century, was born at Sida, in Pamphylia. He was repeatedly called up before Maximus, the governor of Cilicia, and commanded to sacrifice to the heathen deities. But he invariably refused, and his conduct was marked by the strongest decision. He was on one occasion scourged, both on his back and belly, which only called forth from the intrepid man the remark, "The more my body suffers and loses blood, the more my soul will grow vigorous and be a gainer." After an ineffectual attempt to destroy him by means of wild beasts, he was finally slain by a sword, rejoicing to suffer persecution for righteousness' sake. See Fox, *Book of Martyrs*, p. 43.

Probus Lector, an Irish monastic, flourished in

the Monastery of Slane, Ireland, A.D. 949. His original name was *Ceanchair*, but, like many Irish scholars and missionaries of that period, he Latinized it. He wrote the first *Life* of St. Patrick about 600 years after the saint's death. Piacre had previously written some verses on the saint, and Muirchu had alluded to him in another work, but the first *Life* of St. Patrick was from the pen of Probus. He gives no authorities for his statements in this *Life*, and we know of none then extant that he could have given. He wrote in a dark period, the midnight of the Dark Ages. He seems to have written from his own fancy, viewing the ecclesiastical affairs of the infant Church of Ireland in the 5th century through the medium of his own times. Bishop Lanigan, the Roman Catholic historian, admits that his facts cannot be distinguished from his fancies. He became a devotee and a high ritualist, and was esteemed in his day a very holy and learned man. When the pagan Danes set fire to the Monastery of Slane, he refused to be separated from the precious MSS. and relics in it, and rushed into the flames and perished with them. His *Life* of St. Patrick, and still more that of Jocelin, who wrote about 150 years after him, have ever since been the store-house from which the material of every Roman Catholic *Life* of the Irish saint has been drawn. Jocelin lived in an age of fiction in regard to Ireland, and seems to have written according to the liveliness of his fancy or to the supposed credulity of his readers. He asserted many things about St. Patrick which had never been heard of before and for which he gives no authority, and which intelligent Catholics now indignantly reject. Dr. Colgan, the Irish antiquarian, says that the fable of the expulsion of the venomous serpents from Ireland was for the first time put forth by Jocelin. This and similar fabrications being thus boldly and dogmatically asserted in a dark age, and remaining for centuries uncontradicted, thousands afterwards received them as historical facts. Dr. Johnson says somewhere, "One may tell a bona-fide lie, and if he shall tell it over ten times, and no one shall contradict him, he will begin to believe it himself." This has been really true in regard to Ireland. Fables and monstrosities remaining thus uncontradicted have been credited by thousands, while others who could not receive them have foolishly and sceptically thrown aside well-attested truths and regarded nearly all Irish history as fabulous. Perhaps the real life and character of no one, so long and so thoroughly incorporated in history, are so little known as those of St. Patrick. See Moore, *Hist. of Ireland;* Usher, *Religion of the Early Irish.* (D. D.)

Procaccini, Camillo, an Italian painter who contributed to sacred art, was born in 1546. He received his first instruction in the school of his father, and afterwards visited Rome, where some biographers say that he studied the works of Michael Angelo and Raphael. Procaccini wrought uninterruptedly, and produced paintings at such a rate that his works, though they charm the eye by the simplicity and spirit which characterize them, are greatly deficient in the higher power of impressing the mind and moving the affections. His *St. Roch Administering to the Sick of the Plague*, which is at Dresden, is one of his best works. He died in 1626.

Procaccini, Ercole, *the elder*, was the head of the celebrated family of artists of that name. He was born in 1520 at Bologna, where the greater number of his works still exist. He died about 1591. Authors are divided in opinion respecting his merit: Baldinucci and Malvasia call him a painter of moderate talent, while Lontazzo esteems him to be a happy imitator of the coloring and grace of Correggio. His design is too minute and his coloring too languid, but he possessed far more taste than most of his contemporaries, and precision free from mannerism, which eminently qualified him for an instructor of youth. Several eminent artists, among whom were Sammacchini, Sabbatini, Bertoja, and his own three sons, were his disciples. — *English Cyclop.* s. v. Those interested in his works may consult Spooner, *Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts*, vol. ii.

Procaccini, Giulio Cesare, the best artist of the family, was born in 1548. He renounced sculpture, in which he had made considerable progress, for painting, which he studied in the school of the Caracci. The works of Correggio were the principal object of his studies, and many judges are of opinion that no painter ever approached nearer to the style of that great artist. In some of his easel pictures and works of confined composition he has been mistaken for Correggio. A *Madonna* of his at San Luigi de' Francesi has been engraved as the work of that master; and some paintings still more closely approximating to this style are in the palace of Sanvitali at Rome and in that of Carrega at Genoa. Of his altar-pieces, that in the church of Santa Afra in Brescia is perhaps most like the style of Correggio: it represents the *Virgin and Child amid a smiling group of saints and angels*, in which dignity seems as much sacrificed to grace as in the mutual smile of the *Virgin and the Angel* in the Nunziata at San Antonio of Milan. He is sometimes blamable for extravagance of attitude, as in the *Executioner* of San Nazario, which is otherwise a picture full of beauties. Notwithstanding the number and extent of his works, his design is correct, his forms and draperies select, his invention varied, and the whole together has a certain grandeur and breadth which he either acquired from the Caracci, or, like them, derived from Correggio. He died in 1626. There are many of his works in Milan.

Procedure, Ecclesiastical, or the rules to be followed in the Church of Rome in disciplinary actions. They owe their regulation to pope Innocent III. Previous to his time, it is true, the official vindication had assumed a more definite form in the synodal jurisdiction of the archdeacon. But he perfected them, and there are now in the Romish Church five kinds of penal procedures in use: the trial may be instituted in consequence of accusation, inquisition, denunciation, exception, and on account of notoriety. The first and last had existed at a much earlier period. There was no need of a formal accusation in the case of notorious transgressions, and the bishop punished them in virtue of his office; of course, after the matter had been sufficiently proved and avowed. The proceedings were of a more formal kind when there was an accusation. Here the proceedings of the Roman law were taken for models. The inquisition or official examination took place when an ecclesiastic was accused of a transgression by a public and plausible rumor, which acted, as it were, as accusator. To complete the official examination, the judge could, if he thought fit, exact the oath of purgation (*purgatio canonica*). The former custom of purgation by ordeals now came into disuse. If a plausible denunciation was made, an official examination must take place. If the fault was avowed, the penalty was only the imposition of a penance. Cases of exception were those where a man who was on the point of appearing as a witness or accuser, or a person who applied for ordination or for an ecclesiastical office, was stopped by an accusation, which, if proved, unfitted him for bearing witness or office. This was also an occasion for canonical purgation. In these cases punishment was out of the question, and there could only follow an exclusion from the witness-stand, from the right to accuse, from the orders or the function in question. In those parts where the Church is still possessed of a penal jurisdiction, she has to conform to the laws and customs which regulate the penal procedure of the country. See Biener, *Beit. zur Gesch. des Inquisitions-processes* (Leips. 1827); Hildenbrand, *Die Purgatio Canonica und Civilis* (Munich, 1841); Walter, *Kirchenrecht*, § 200; Richter, *Kirchenrecht*, § 211.—Aschbach, *Kirchen-Lex.* s. v.

Process, the formal act, instrument, bull, or edict of *canonization* (q. v.) in the Romish Church.

Procession, the Hebrew term חֲלִיכָה, *halikâh*, rendered "going" in Psa. lxxviii, 25, means a religious procession, as described in the context, headed by the phylarchs, who preceded the sacred ark, while the instrumental musicians followed it, and a line of females with timbrels accompanied it on either side. On the general subject see the monographs in Volbeding, *Index Programmatum*, p. 159. See PROCESSIONS.

Procession of the Holy Ghost, that doctrine regarding the Third Person of the Blessed Trinity which teaches that as the Son proceeds (or is born) from the Father, so the Holy Ghost proceeds (or emanates) from the Father and from the Son, but as from one principle. The subject has been fully discussed in its historical relations in the art. FILIOQUE CONTROVERSY, and as a theological question in the art. HOLY GHOST. But since the writing of those articles the subject has been revived and taken a new historical form—the formation of a new religious body from the ranks of the Romish Church, now known as the *Old Catholics* (q. v.). At their second annual conference or synod held in Bonn, Germany, in 1875, preparations were made for a "Union Conference" of the Old Catholic, Oriental, and Anglican churches, and such a conference accordingly convened at Bonn on Aug. 12 of that year and lasted five days. (Those interested in the character and nationality of its distinguished attendants will do well to consult the *Methodist Quar.* Oct. 1875, p. 673–675.) In the last session of that conference a common formula was adopted respecting the doctrine of the Procession, which Westerns and Orientals alike agreed to; and though it did not finally settle the question, and the controversy is still alive as we write, it is yet a very hopeful sign of an early union of different branches of the Church of Christ which have so little at variance and so much in common. The discussions regarding the subject were long and animated, and for some time the Orientals held out against the adoption of ¶ 3, but by their final adoption of it an enormous step towards completer understanding has been made. The following are the resolutions:

"PRELIMINARY RESOLUTIONS.

"1. We agree together in receiving the œcumenical symbols and the doctrinal decisions of the ancient undivided Church.

"2. We agree together in acknowledging that the addition of the *Filioque* to the Creed did not take place in an ecclesiastically regular manner.

"3. We acknowledge on all sides the representation of the doctrine of the Holy Ghost, as it is set forth by the Fathers of the undivided Church.

"4. We reject every proposition and every method of expression in which in any way the acknowledgment of two principles or ἀρχαί or αἰτίαι in the Trinity may be contained.

"ON THE PROCESSION OF THE HOLY GHOST.

"We accept the teaching of St. John of Damascus respecting the Holy Ghost, as the same is expressed in the following paragraphs, in the sense of the teaching of the ancient undivided Church:

"1. The Holy Ghost goes forth out of the Father (ἐκ τοῦ πατρός) as the Beginning (ἀρχή), the Cause (αἰτία), the Source (πηγή) of the Godhead (*De recta Sententia*, n. 1; *Contra Manich.* n. 4).

"2. The Holy Ghost goes not forth out of the Son (ἐκ τοῦ υἱοῦ), because there is in the Godhead but one Beginning (ἀρχή), one Cause (αἰτία), through which all that is in the Godhead is produced (*De Fide orthod.* i, 8: ἐκ τοῦ υἱοῦ δὲ τὸ πνεῦμα οὐ λέγομεν, πνεῦμα δὲ υἱοῦ ὀνομάζομεν).

"3. The Holy Ghost goes forth out of the Father through the Son (*De Fide orthod.* i, 12: τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἐκφαντορικὴ τοῦ κρυφίου τῆς Θεότητος δύναμις τοῦ πατρός, ἐκ πατρὸς μὲν δι' υἱοῦ ἐκπορευομένη. *Ibid.*: υἱοῦ δὲ πνεῦμα, οὐχ ὡς ἐξ αὐτοῦ, ἀλλ' ὡς δι' αὐτοῦ ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον. *C. Manich.* n. 5: διὰ τοῦ λόγου αὐτοῦ ἐξ αὐτοῦ τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτοῦ ἐκπορευόμενον. *De Hymno Trisag.* n. 28: πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς διὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ λόγου προϊόν. *Hom. in Sabb.* 8. n. 4: τοῦτ' ἡμῖν ἔστι τὸ λατρευόμενον . . . πνεῦμα ἅγιον τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ πατρός, ὡς ἐξ αὐτοῦ ἐκπορευόμενον, ὅπερ καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ λέγεται, ὡς δι' αὐτοῦ φανερούμενον καὶ τῇ κτίσει μεταδιδόμενον, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐξ αὐτοῦ ἔχον τὴν ὕπαρξιν).

"4. The Holy Ghost is the Image of the Son, who is the Image of the Father (*De Fide orthod.* i, 13: εἰκὼν τοῦ πατρὸς ὁ υἱός, καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ τὸ πνεῦμα), going forth out of the Father and resting in the Son as the force beaming forth from Him (*ibid.* i, 7: τοῦ πατρὸς προερχομένην καὶ ἐν τῷ λόγῳ ἀναπαυομένην καὶ αὐτοῦ οὖσαν ἐκφαντικὴν δύναμιν. *Ibid.* i, 12: πατὴρ . . . διὰ λόγου προβολεὺς ἐκφαντορικοῦ πνεύματος).

"5. The Holy Ghost is the personal Production out of the Father, belonging to the Son, but not out of the Son, because he is the Spirit of the Mouth of the Godhead, which speaks forth the Word (*De Hymno Trisag.* n. 28: τὸ πνεῦμα ἐνυπόστατον ἐκπόρευμα καὶ πρόβλημα ἐκ πατρὸς μέν, υἱοῦ δέ, καὶ μὴ ἐξ υἱοῦ, ὡς πνεῦμα στόματος Θεοῦ, λόγον ἐξαγγελτικόν).

"6. The Holy Ghost forms the mediation between the Father and the Son, and is bound together to the Father through the Son (*De Fide orthod.* i, 13: μέσον τοῦ ἀγεννήτου καὶ γεννητοῦ καὶ δι' υἱοῦ τῷ πατρὶ συναπτόμενον).

"N. B.—It is to be noted here that the German preposition *aus* (out of) equals ἐκ or *ex*, as denoting out of a cause or origin; whereas the word *von* (from) is equivalent to ἀπό or *ab*; while *durch* (through) denotes διά or *per*, through the instrumentality of."

Since that conference the *Filioque* question has been much agitated in England, and it has been asserted, by High-Churchmen especially, that the exclusion of the *Filioque* from the Creed was granted by Dr. Döllinger and canon Liddon at Bonn. What the conference did may be stated as follows: It declared, as bishop Pearson had already admitted, that the *Filioque* was inserted in an œcumenical creed by an inadequate authority, and therefore irregularly. It formulated certain propositions which might serve to show that when the Latins accept and the Easterns reject the *Filioque* they do not differ, as has been too generally supposed; since the Latins reject any assertion of two principles or causes in the Godhead, and the Easterns admit a *μεσιτεία* of the Son, in the eternal procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father. Whatever may have been the hopes and fears of individual members of the conference, no proposition was brought forward respecting the exclusion of the *Filioque* from the Creed of the Western Church. See Schaff, *Creeds* (Index in vol. iii); Forbes, *Nicene Creed;* Neale, *Eastern Church* (Introd.), 1095–1168; Stanley, *Eastern Church;* Haag, *Hist. des Dogmes* (Index in vol. ii); Martensen, *Dogmatics* (see Index); *Meth. Quar.* Jan. and April, 1876; *New-Englander*, July, 1870. See also Pusey's Letter to Liddon *On the Clause "And the Son"* (Lond. 1876, 8vo).

Processional (Lat. *processionale*), the service-book which contains the prayers, hymns, and general ceremonial of the different processions. Many ancient books of this class have been preserved. The processional approved for common use is that of Rome, of which many editions have been published.

Processional Cross, or CROSS OF THE STATION (*crux gestatoria*, or *stationaria*), is the cross carried in the ecclesiastical processions spoken of under PROCESSIONS. It was carried as early as the 4th century and in the 5th century both in the East and in the West. It is mentioned by Socrates, Nicephorus, Cassiodorus, in the *Life* of St. Porphyry by Durand, and by Baronius under the year 401, and in the *Canons* of Cleveshoe in 747, when regulating the rogations. A cross made of ash, silver-plated, engraved or enamelled, without a crucifix, was at an early date, after the introduction of the labarum of Constantine, carried in processions by the staurophoros. The evangelistic symbols were usually set at the ends of the arms, which terminated in fleurs-de-lys. In the 4th century it had short handles, and candles were attached to the arms. Charlemagne gave such a cross, of pure gold, to the church of Constantine at Rome. In the 12th century at Rome a subdeacon (*regionarius*) carried down the cross, inclined so that the faithful might kiss it, from the altar to the porch, where he held it upright in his hands during the processions. In England, at Durham, the chief cross was of gold, with a silver staff, and the cross used on ordinary days was of crystal. A novice followed it, carrying a benitier. A cross of the 15th century is still preserved in St. John's Lateran; another, of the time of St. Louis, is at St. Denis; a

third, of silver and beautiful designs, with statues and evangelistic symbols, at Conques; and another at Burgos. In England, no doubt, many were destroyed during the War of the Roses and at the Reformation. At Chichester the ambry for the cross remains. In England, from Easter to Ascension, the cross was of crystal or beryl, but in Lent of wood, painted blood-red. No parish could carry its cross into a monastic church; and in funerals, in a collegiate church, the cross of the latter only is set before the bier. We append an illustration of the cross now usually carried by Romanists in their processions.



Processional Cross, and Part of its Staff.

Processional Path (*spatium* vel *via processionum a retro altaris; latus pone chorum;* Fr. *partour de chœur*, i. e. *behind a choir*). The transverse aisle in square-ended churches is commonly doubled, as at Lichfield, or even tripled, as at Winchester and at St. Mary Overge, in order to provide room for chapels as well as a passage for processions. At Hereford this aisle resembles a low transept. The eastern screens at Fountains, the Lady chapel of Hexham, and the Nine Altars of Durham seem to have been further developments of the same idea, which appears also in the longitudinal new walk of Peterborough. At Canterbury, pilgrims to the martyrdom passed up the south aisle of the nave, and through the passage under the platform of the crossing.

Processions. These, as solemn and religious rites, are of very great antiquity, but evidently of pagan origin. With the Greeks and Romans, they took place chiefly on the festivals of Diana, Bacchus, Ceres, and other deities; also before the beginning of the games in the Circus; and in spring, when the fields were sprinkled with holy water to increase their fertility. The priests used to head them, carrying images of the gods and goddesses to be propitiated, and either started from certain temples or from the Capitol. The Romans, when the empire was distressed, or after some victory, used constantly to order processions, for several days together, to be made to the temples, to beg the assistance of the gods or to return them thanks. Among the Jews, processions were introduced for public prayers when the faithful people went in order to implore the divine help (Josh. vi, 15; 2 Sam. vi, 15; Ezra ii, 12–30; 1 Kings viii, 45; Numb. x, 33-36), with a form at setting out and when halting; or when rendering thanks to God (2 Chron. xx, 21, 27, 28; Matt. xxi, 9). Certain processions around the altar were (and still are to a certain extent) usual on the Feast of Tabernacles; and from them the Mohammedans have adopted their mode of encompassing the sanctuary seven times at Mecca (q. v.). Processions form a prominent part of the Buddhist worship. See PROCESSION.

In the Christian Church the practice was early introduced and has maintained itself to this day among the Romanists. In the earliest ecclesiastical phraseology the word *processio* denotes merely *the act of frequenting a religious assembly, and taking part in public worship.* It is distinguished from private offices of devotion, and includes the idea of *social* worship, but without any additional idea of public ceremony, pomp, or the like. *Procedere* then meant *to go to church*, and is, in short, synonymous with *sacris interesse, sacra frequentare.* This was the meaning given to the word by Tertullian (*Ad Uxor.* lib. ii, c. 4) and Jerome (*Commentar. in Ep.* 1 *ad Cor.* c. 11). In many canons and other ecclesiastical writings we also find the word procession, without any explanation or addition, used in the sense of a *religious assembly* (conventus et cœtus populi in ecclesia). The Greek word *σύναξις* (as well as *συναγωγή, σύλλογος*, conf. Suiceri *Thesaur.*) is translated sometimes by *collecta*, sometimes by *conventus*, and sometimes by *processio.* When Christian worship began to be conducted openly, and churches were publicly frequented, the meaning of the word *processio* was exactly equivalent to our term *church-going.* After the 4th century, especially in later mediæval times, the word was applied to processions usual at funerals, marriages, baptisms, as well as to the line of communicants at the Lord's Supper. Processions at festivals and on other occasions were, in course of time, quite common. Laws to protect such processions from interruption were passed, and any persons found guilty of disturbing them were subject to severe punishment. The first processions mentioned in ecclesiastical history are those set on foot at Constantinople, in the time of Chrysostom. The Arians of that city being forced to hold their meetings without the town, went thither night and morning, singing anthems. Chrysostom, to prevent their perverting the Catholics, adopted counter-processions, in which the clergy and people marched by night, singing hymns, and carrying crosses and torches. From this period the custom of processions was introduced both into the Eastern and Western churches (Chrysost. *Or. contr. lud. et theatr.*; Basil, *Ep.* 207, al. 63; Ambrose, *Ep.* 40 *ad Theodos.* n. 14; Augustine, *De Civ. Dei*, i, 22, c. 8; Rufin. *Hist. Eccl.* i, 2, c. 33). Even during the persecutions of the emperors there were at least some funeral processions (*Act. S. Cypr.* ap. Rom. *Act. S. Bonifac.*).

Various ceremonies were observed, according to the objects for which these processions were instituted, the spirit of the times in which they were celebrated, and the countries wherein they took place. The clergy usually attended: if the occasion was one of joy or thanksgiving, they were attired in the most splendid vestments. The laity put on their best attire, and were adorned with garlands and other ornaments; and the sound of bells and music was heard through the whole line. On occasions of mourning or penitence, the procession was distinguished by plain vestments, bare feet, deep silence, or sounds of lamentation and prayer, and sometimes by the exercise of flagellation. Men and women walked apart; and the line of procession was ranged with reference to the various ranks and classes of the persons who composed it. Lighted wax tapers were often carried in procession, especially on the festival of the Purification of the Virgin Mary, which was hence called *festum* or *missa candelarum* (see CANDLEMAS). Litanies composed for the occasion were sung in Latin as the procession moved. The penitential psalms and the psalms of degrees were employed on the occasion, as well as many Latin hymns.

These processions have always been more common in the Western than in the Eastern Church. The Reformation greatly lessened them even in the Roman Catholic Church, and, especially in mixed countries, processions are less frequent or popular nowadays. They are there either supplicatory processions or cross processions, and are either directed to a certain distant place, to some miraculous image or object, or they are confined to the streets of the cities and the churches. Banners, crosses, and images are generally carried in front; the clergy follow; and the people make up the rear, singing hymns or reciting prayers. In some Protestant states they are still permitted, under certain restrictions. The Protestants themselves rarely practice them, excepting the Ritualists (q. v.).

In the mediæval Church the name procession was given to the ritual march, at the time of the celebration of the host, of the celebrant, and especially the bishop and his assistants, from the church door or the sacristy to the altar. In a narrower sense, the procession is now a ritual walk, the purpose of which is thanksgiving or supplication, or an honor paid to a person either living or dead. For the walks of the first kind alone, the purpose of which is thanksgiving, the term "procession" is employed without any more special determination; those of the second kind are usually called by Romanists "litaniæ," "rogationes," "supplicationes," and also "exomologeses," "stationes," which were their former names. Among the walks of the third kind we mention the solemn entrance, attended with ecclesiastical ceremonies, of a bishop, pope, or sovereign into a place; the funeral, and even the bridal procession. Another distinction between different processions is this, that in some of them the host is carried about, in others it is not; the former are called *theophoric* processions (θεός and φορέω). All these processions are either prescribed on certain days of the year and on certain occasions, or simply allowed in certain circumstances. Among the prescribed processions, the most important are the Corpus-Christi procession, Candlemas-day, the procession on Palm-Sunday, the litany of St. Mark's Day, the litany on the three days of the Week of Prayer, and, finally, the funeral procession. Curates or ecclesiastics of a higher rank may organize processions on the harvest-festival, in great distresses, etc.

Each procession has (and here we depend on Roman Catholic writers) a leader, who is either a priest or a bishop. The priestly leader wears the chasuble and stole, and often the pluvial besides; his head is covered with a barret. The episcopal leader wears chasuble, stole, and pluvial; his head is covered with the mitre; he holds the pastoral staff in his left hand, with his right hand he blesses the people before whom the procession passes. The color of the stole, pluvial, and mitre is suited to the purpose of the procession. If (as is the case in the theophoric processions and when a particle of the cross is carried about for public veneration) the head must be uncovered, the bishop has the staff carried in front of him and the mitre behind him. In theophoric processions the blessing with the right hand is also omitted. In this case the leader carries the venerabile thus: he holds the ostensorium with both hands before his face, while his hands are covered with the vellum hanging down from both his shoulders. The organization of the Catholic Church, as a community presided over by the clergy, requires this leadership by ecclesiastics. If the leader wears the chasuble and stole, he declares by his dress that unceasing efforts to attain purity of heart (*alba*) and a childlike trust in the merits of Jesus Christ (*stola*) are the festive robes which every Christian, but more especially every priest, should wear in and outside of the house of God. If, besides, the bishop carries the staff and wears the mitre, it is for the purpose of reminding the Christians that he is their highest pastor, whose care surrounds and whose benediction follows them everywhere. If the leader (unless prevented by his veneration of the body of Christ or his reverence for the beam of the cross) have his head covered, this is a hint given to the faithful that it is their duty to revere the priest as their father in Christ. If the priest cover with a vellum the hands that hold the ostensorium, he confesses therewith his unworthiness of carrying, under the form of the bread, the body of him who created heaven and earth. The leader of the procession has generally *assistants* and a suite of honor. If the leader be a priest, he is assisted, if possible, by two levites, one walking to his right, the other to the left, and dressed, according to the color of the leader, as deacon and subdeacon, or at least by two acolytes. If the leader be a bishop, a few canons of his cathedral, at least, should walk before him, dressed in the pluvial. If the procession be theophoric, two acolytes, walking immediately before the leader, incense the venerabile uninterruptedly with their censers; in this case, also, a baldachin is generally extended over the leader, and borne by four, six, or eight laymen of distinction. It seldom happens that the leader of a non-theophoric procession walks beneath the baldachin: it is then a personal honor, only bestowed on bishops on extraordinary occasions, as on their solemn entrance into a church. In countries where the custom has hitherto existed, it is allowable to spread the baldachin over particles of the cross or other instruments of Christ's passion. The faithful who participate in the procession walk two by two. This may find an analogy in Christ's sending out his disciples two by two to preach the Gospel. Gregory the Great (*Hom.* 17 *in Evang.*) declares this to be a symbol of the two commandments of love—the love of God and the love of our fellow-man. Though the non-observance of this prescription is attended with much inconvenience, it is neglected in many processions in the cities and country. Mabillon saw even in Rome a procession where the faithful walked partly two by two, partly three by three, and even in larger numbers (*Iter Ital.* v. 152). The faithful who participate in the procession (monks who are not bound by their rule to entire seclusion can be compelled by the bishops to attendance) are disposed with respect to the class and sex they belong to. This is a requirement of good order. We find this arrangement mentioned by the oldest writers. St. Augustine speaks of a procession which took place near Hippo, where the bishop walked in the middle, the people before and after him (*De Civ. Dei*, i, 22, c. 8, n. 11). Porphyry of Gaza made the people precede, and followed himself with his clergy (*Sur.* 26 Feb.). The great procession held by Gregory the Great indicated seven different churches, as starting-points for seven different classes of people (clerks, monks, female servants of God, married women, widows, poor, and children).

In our times the procession is generally (the custom is not the same everywhere) opened by the children: they are put, as it were, in the first line of battle, in order that God may be moved by their innocence to listen favorably to the prayers of the community. The children are followed by the clergy, with the chanters and musicians; among the clergy the leader of the procession walks the last, behind him the men, the prominent citizens taking the lead, followed by the women. The promiscuous walking of persons of both sexes is nowhere allowed. The order, as described, places the leader, as pastor of the community, in the middle of the procession: he is the shepherd of the children as well as of the adults, of the innocent as well as of the penitent, of the married people as well as of the unmarried: he must always in life be near to all of them. If brotherhoods, societies of mechanics, and members of religious orders are present, the two first mentioned open the cortége, the latter walk before the chanters and musicians. In front of the procession and between its different divisions, crosses or crucifixes, flags, and, if the procession is a very solemn one, images, relics, statues, etc., are carried. The bearer of the principal crucifix has

two acolytes—one to his right, the other to his left—each with a lighted taper in his hand. The carrying of the images, statues, etc., is committed to the care of the brotherhoods, associations, and partly to the young men and girls of the community; the relics are carried by the clergymen, or, if the procession is held in honor of the relics, by the leader of the procession. The principal crucifix (see PROCESSIONAL CROSS) is generally carried (if possible) by a subdeacon; subdeacons also carry the crucifixes before the chapters, the archbishops, and the pope. The crosses are carried before the pope and archbishops in such a way that the image of the crucified one is turned towards those dignitaries. The principal crucifix opens the procession, unless a flag has been preferred, in which case the crucifix follows at some distance. Brotherhoods and corporations are in the habit of having flags carried before them. The most important of these customs are very old. Sozomen (*Hist. Eccl.* i, 8, c. 8) and the biographer of St. Cæsarius of Arles (*Sur.* 27 Aug.) knew already of the carrying of crosses or crucifixes (during many centuries naked crosses were alone in use) and of lighted tapers. In former times the book of the Gospels was sometimes carried along with the cross (*Vit. S. Porphyr. Ep. Sur.* 26 Feb.). Flags, which, it must be observed, are not prescribed, but only allowed, are mentioned by Gregory of Tours (*Hist. Franc.* i, 5, c. 4). Gregory the Great ordered an image of Mary to be carried about as early as 590 (Baron. *Annal.* ad a. 590). In the 4th century, we find processions held for the purpose of transferring relics solemnly to the churches (Socrat. *Hist. Eccl.* i, 3, c. 16; Augustine, *Confess.* i, 9, c. 7). The Synod of Braga in 572 (*ibid.* c. 6) calls this a solemn custom (see *Conc. Clovesh.* a. 747, c. 16). The faithful walk (*ibid.* c. 6) quietly and devoutly. Idle talk, forward looking around, laughing, showy suits, luxury of dress, etc., shock the pious mind. The men walk bareheaded; the clergy and magistrates alone are, with some restrictions, allowed to cover their heads. The clerks wear the chasuble; only on most sacred occasions, as at the procession of the Corpus Christi, we find the custom that at least some of the subdeacons wear the tunica, some of the deacons the dalmatica, several priests the planeta, and the ecclesiastics of higher rank the pluvial. The subdeacons who carry the crosses wear the tunica, besides the amictus, alba, and cingulum. For the laymen there are no longer any rules in this respect. Sozomen (*Hist. Eccl.* i, 8, c. 8) speaks of all the faithful bearing burning tapers; we hear of them in other places appearing barefooted, in sack and ashes (*Conc. Mogunt.* a. 813, c. 33); Charlemagne himself, according to the narrative of a monk of St. Gall, set the example of walking barefooted in procession at Ratisbon (Mart. *De Ant. Eccles. Rit.* i, 4, c. 27, a. 7); but these are things of the past. The purport of the prayers is in accordance with the purpose of the procession. Yet the Church has given some rules. At theophoric processions, especially that of the Corpus Christi, the hymns in honor of the Eucharist must be sung in preference (*Pange lingua, Sacris solemniis, Verbum supernum prodiens*); special songs are also prescribed for the procession at Candlemas and on Palm-Sunday; for the litanies of St. Mark's Day and of the Week of Prayer, the litany of All-saints' and the versicles and orations which follow it in the breviary are prescribed. At the funeral procession of full-grown persons, prayers of intercession; at the funerals of children, thanksgiving prayers are in use.

As extraordinary processions are generally undertaken for a purpose that must be submitted to God in special prayers, regulations have been made for these cases too. The Roman ritual mentions expressly the *processio ad petendam pluviam*, the *processio ad postulandam serenitatem*, the procession in time of famine, in time of epidemic and plague, in time of war, in any other great distress, the thanksgiving procession, and, finally, that for the translation of relics. Originally the people sang psalms on such occasions (Jerome, *Ep.* 108, al. 27; Gregor. Nazianz. *Or.* 10; *Vit. S. Porphyr. Ep. Sur.* 26 Feb.); only when the purpose of the procession was to obtain some favor from God, it was an early custom to exclaim quite frequently, "Kyrie eleison," or recite other prayers of penitence (Chrysost. *Orat. contr. lud. et theatr.*). This is the way the litany of All-saints' has been little by little composed. The common Roman Ordo says: "Omnes in commune 'Kyrie eleison' decantent, et cum contritione cordis Dei misericordiam exorent pro peccatis, pro pace, pro peste, pro conservatione frugum et pro cæteris necessitatibus." Mabillon (*Comment. in Ord. Rom.* p. 34) saw an old Roman ritual according to which a hundred "Kyrie eleison," a hundred "Christe eleison," and again a hundred "Kyrie eleison" were to be said kneeling, in such a propitiatory procession. As the psalms ceased little by little to be known by heart, rosary-praying, which has become of so general use in our day, took their place. The procession comes out of a place of worship, and, its walk performed, returns to it. If (as at funerals) not all the participants, the clergy, at least, with the chanters and the bearer of the principal cross, always return. Even if a bishop or pope is received outside of the doors of the city, it is customary for the clergy to start from the church and return thither with that high personage. The procession on Candlemas-day and Palm-Sunday starts at the call of the leader, "Procedamus in pace" (the choir answering, "In nomine Christi, amen"). In theophoric processions the leader or the chanters give the signal by commencing the hymn *Pange lingua;* if it is a supplication, the assembly kneel down a few minutes praying, the chanters commence to sing the litany of All-saints', and the procession starts, singing the hymn *Sancta Maria*, which is a part of that litany. If in supplications (which is often the case in rural communities) the litany of All-saints' is not recited in Latin, the procession commences thus: the ecclesiastic leader kneels on the lowest step of the high-altar, begins to say the rosary aloud, rises at the first Ave of the first decade, and therewith gives the signal for starting. The litany procession stops frequently at one, or two, or even more places of worship. The clergy (or at least the superiors) of the church where it stops receive it in chasuble and stole, with two acolytes, at the gate of the churchyard, or at the portal of the church, and offer holy water to the clerks and distinguished laymen of the procession. In such places of worship it is customary to sing an antiphony, and a versicle and oration in honor of the patron of the church; sometimes a high-mass, with or without sermon, is held in one of them. The laymen like at such occasions to sing three times the song of triumph and the little doxology. This stopping, which, especially in Milan, is so extensively in use during the rogations celebrated there in the week that follows Ascension that the procession stops on the first day at twelve, on the second at nine, and on the third at eleven churches (comp. Mabill. *Lit. Gallic.* p. 153), is a custom of great antiquity. The Gallican liturgy mentions it as a well-known matter (*Missale Gothic.; Missale Gallic. Vet.; Cod.* 306). Gregory of Tours speaks of it as an established custom (*Hist. Franc.* i, 9, c. 6). The seven-bodied procession of Gregory the Great started from seven churches and stopped at the Church of Our Lady (Greg. Tur. *Hist. Franc.* i, 10, c. 1). The reception by the clergy of the church where the procession stops is also a very old custom (Leo III in *Libr. Pontif.*); it was called "Occurrere." As processions in such cases, especially in the country, have often to walk an hour or more before they reach another place of worship, the Church has found it necessary, from time to time, to warn the faithful not to make of these intervals an occasion for feasting and tippling (*Rit. Rom.;* comp. *Conc. Clovesh.* a. 747, c. 16). When the procession walks inside of the places of worship, or in their immediate neighborhood, the bells of the steeple are rung. This reminds one of the procession which followed the body of St. Anastasius, and at which a noise was produced by

striking on consecrated woods (*Conc. Nicæn.* a. 787, act. 4). Processions of less importance move only inside the walls of the house of worship. Such is the case with all processions in countries where the Catholic religion does not enjoy complete freedom of worship. According to the rules, processions should precede the high-mass, but this is practically the case with very few (comp. the *Rit. Rom.*, the *Cærem. epp.*, and the Rubricists).—Aschbach, *Kirchen-Lex.* s. v.

The origin of processions may have been an imitation of the motion of the heavenly spheres, the courses of the stars, and the revolutions of seasons, and more immediately of ancient religious dances. They were always accompanied by singers, and generally by musicians. Procession is progression, says Durand, when a multitude, headed by the clergy, goes forth in regular order and ranks to implore the divine grace. It represents the pilgrimage of man upon earth on his way to the better land, from the cradle to the grave, as St. Paul says that we are pilgrims and sojourners in this world. Processions round cloisters and cemeteries still more vividly brought before the mind the thought of the last home to which man must come at length, as waters, after the most devious course, are lost in the great sea. In a procession to the altar, in reverse order to that of the recession, first went the verger, the cross-bearer, attended on either side by acolytes carrying candlesticks and lighted tapers; then came the censers, or thurifers, the chanters in copes and carrying batons, the subdeacon, deacon, and celebrant; then choir boys, clerks of the second grade, and the more honorable following. In the cathedral the precentor, the sub-chanter of canons (*prechantre*), and the succentor of vicars (*souschantre*), each with his chanter's baton, preceded the bishop, carrying his cross, or staff. In the middle of the 15th century the capitular tenants went in procession on St. Peter's Eve at Exeter, preceded by the choristers carrying painted shields of arms.

In England processions were made with litanies and prayers, (1) for the prosperity of the king; (2) for the wealth of the realm; (3) for pureness of the air; (4) for the increase of the fruits of the earth. Two processions for the good success of a king were made on Sundays about the church and churchyard, by English canons, in 1359 and 1398. On Ash-Wednesday, after confession in church, there was a solemn procession for ejecting the penitents, who were not readmitted until Maundy-Thursday. On Easter-day was a grand procession in memory of the disciples going to meet our Lord in Galilee, and in imitation of it there was a humbler procession on every Sunday. The other great procession was annual, on Palm-Sunday. Bishops were also met with processions of the chapter and vicars, or a convent, at the west door of the church and the cemetery gate, by decree of Honorius III, 1221. In 1471 all curates of the diocese were required to visit the high-altar of Lincoln Cathedral in procession, and make their offerings. In the nave the great processions were arranged. At Canterbury two parallel lines, and at Fountains, Lincoln, Chichester, and York two rows of circular processional stones were arranged at proper intervals, and specifically allotted. At Exeter the antiphon was sung daily at the screen, and the procession passed through the north gate of the choir to the vestibule of the Lady Chapel, and then by the south gate of the choir near the throne to the high-altar. It afterwards traversed the nave and cloisters, concluding before the rood-loft; and if there was no sermon, the procession returned to the altar. Carpets were strewn along the way on great festivals. Bishop Edyngdon desired to be buried at Winchester, where the monks stood in procession on Sundays and holydays. These monks, being aggrieved by a bishop, on one occasion went round their cloisters from west to east, out of their usual manner, in order to show that all things were out of order. At Chichester at Epiphany an image "of the Spirit" was carried round the church by the dean or senior canon and two vicars. On Whitsun-Monday the parishioners in the diocese often came to blows about right of precedence, so that bishop Storey made injunctions (1478) for order on this occasion, when the shrine of St. Richard was visited annually. Crosses and banners were permitted, but the long painted rods with which the contending parties had hitherto belabored each other were proscribed, as well as laughing, crowding, and noise. The pilgrims entered by the great south porch and assembled in the choir at 10 A. M. and left the building by it, having duly visited "the chancel and church." In 1364 the primate forbade such dangerous contentions throughout England. As late as 1551 the city companies of London went in procession—the Fishmongers' to St. Michael's, Cornhill, with three crosses, a hundred priests, and the parishioners and members of the guild carrying white rods; and the parish of St. Clement Danes displayed eighty banners and streamers, and was preceded by the city waits. On Easter-Monday at Kinnersley and Wellington the parishioners, adult and children, joined hand-in-hand, surrounded the church and touched it with a general simultaneous embrace, called "clipping the church." They afterwards attended divine service. The procession at Wolverhampton on Monday and Tuesday in Rogation week, in which the children bore poles dressed with flowers and the clergy chanted the Benedicite, only ceased in 1765. Some of the Gospel trees or holy oaks where the stations were formed still remain.—Walcott, *Sacred Archæol.* s. v. See Middleton, *Letters from Rome;* Willet, *Synops. Pap.;* Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon,* viii, 803–809; Martigny, *Dict. des Antiquités Chrét.* s. v.; Siegel, *Christliche Alterthümer;* Riddle, *Christian Antiquities,* p. 757, 758, 771–774, 833; Barnum, *Romanism,* p. 468.

Prochazka, Francis Faustin, a Bohemian monastic, noted as a writer, was born at Neupaka, Bohemia, Jan. 13, 1749. He studied with the Jesuits of Gischin and at the University of Prague. In 1767 he entered the Order of Barnabites, where he had for his master the celebrated Durich, who taught him Hebrew and encouraged him in his predilections for the Slavonic literature. When the Barnabites were suppressed in Bohemia (1788), he became successively theological censor, professor and director of the Gymnasium at Prague, and librarian of the university of that city. He published the New Testament in Bohemian with commentaries, an edition of the Bible in that dialect, a reprint of the *Chronique de Bunzlau:—Commentarius de Secularibus Artium Liberalium in Moravia Fatis* (1782):—*Mélanges de Littérature Bohéme* (Prague, 1784, 8vo). This religious man also assisted on the Barnabite Bible, and at the moment of his death was occupied on the valuable *Bibliotheca Slavica* of Durich. Prochazka died at Prague in 1809.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale,* s. v.

Prochet, Matteo, a noted modern Italian Protestant theologian, was born in Piedmont in 1836. He was afforded by his Waldensian parents all the educational and religious advantages that might properly fit him for Church service, but on the outbreak of the Franco-Italian-Austrian war in 1859 he took up arms for his country's freedom and greatly distinguished himself by his bravery. After his return from the field of battle he continued his theological studies, and in 1862 was ordained minister in the Church of the Vaudois. He soon rose to positions of distinction, and was repeatedly honored by his ecclesiastical associates in missions to the sister churches of the Continent and of England, Scotland, and Ireland. He finally became the president of the Waldensian missions in Italy, and in 1873 was sent to represent his Church in the Evangelical World Alliance at New York. While in this country he spoke frequently and greatly impressed that distinguished body by his learning and wisdom. He was at the time pastor in Geneva and also professor of theology. On his return voyage from this country he was accompanied

by the much-lamented Carrasco, the Spanish convert to Protestantism, who was one of his most intimate friends, and with whom he had planned several important polemical treatises against Romanism and her relations to the State. Prochet has a fine, commanding presence—tall in figure, broad-chested, quick in movement and speech, like most of the sons of the South; keen in perception, and accurate in his scholarship. His influence is great not only in Italian Protestantism, but in evangelical Christianity. See *Report of the Alliance*, (1873). (J. H. W.)

Proch'orus (Πρόχορος), one of the seven deacons, being the third on the list, and named next after Stephen and Philip (Acts vi, 5), A.D. 30. No further mention of him is made in the N. T. There is a tradition that he was consecrated by St. Peter bishop of Nicomedia (Baron. i, 292). In the *Magna Bibliotheca Patrum* (Colon. Agripp. 1618, i, 49–69) will be found a fabulous "Historia Prochori, Christi Discipuli, de Vita B. Joannis Apostoli."

Proclamation (קוֹל, רָנָה, etc., or some form of שָׁמַע, as in 1 Kings xv, 22; Jer. l, 29), the edict of any governing power, published in a solemn manner. The laws of Moses, as well as the temporary edicts of Joshua, were communicated to the people by means of the genealogists, or "officers," as in the English version; but the laws and edicts of those who subsequently held the office of kings were proclaimed publicly by criers (Jer. xxxiv, 8, 9; Jonah iii, 5–7), a class of persons mentioned by Daniel (iii, 4; v, 29), under the word כָּרוֹזָא, *kerozâ*, which our translators have rendered "herald" (q. v.).

Proclamations, Royal. These documents in former times were almost equal in authority to an act of the constitutional legislature. They often interfered with religion, and dealt largely in reformation of manners. In 1529 king Henry VII issued a proclamation "for resisting and withstanding of most dampnable heresyes sowen within the realme by the discyples of Luther and other heretykes, perverters of Christes relygyon." In June, 1530, this was followed by the proclamation "for dampning (or condemning) of erronious bokes and heresies, and prohibitinge the havinge of holy scripture translated into the vulgar tonges of englishe, frenche, or dutche." "And that having respect to the malignity of this present tyme, with the inclination of people to erronious opinions, the translation of the newe testament and the old into the vulgar tonge of englysshe, shulde rather be the occasion of contynuance or increase of errours amonge the said people, than any benefit or commodite towards the weale of their soules." It was therefore determined that the Scriptures should only be expounded to the people as heretofore, and that these books "be clerely extermynate and exiled out of this realme of Englande for ever." Under Edward VI there is a proclamation against such "as innovate any ceremony," and who are described as "certain private preachers and other laiemen, who rashly attempt of their own and singular wit and mind, not only to persuade the people from the old and accustomed rites and ceremonies, but also themselves bring in new and strange orders according to their phantasies. The which, as it is an evident token of pride and arrogancy, so it tendeth both to confusion and disorder." There is a proclamation also to abstain from flesh on Fridays and Saturdays; enforced on the principle, not only that "men should abstain on those days, and forbear the pleasures and the meats wherein they have more delight, to the intent to subdue their bodies to the soul and spirit, but also for worldly policy." Charles II issued a proclamation against "vicious, debauched, and profane persons!" i. e. "a sort of men of whom we have heard much, and are sufficiently ashamed; who spend their time in taverns, tippling-houses, and debauchery; giving no other evidence of their affection to us but in drinking our health, and inveighing against all others who are not of their own dissolute temper; and who, in truth, have more discredited our cause, by the license of their manners and lives, than they could ever advance it by their affection or courage. We hope all persons of honor, or in place and authority, will so far assist us in discountenancing such men, that their discretion and shame will persuade them to reform what their conscience would not; and that the displeasure of good men towards them may supply what the laws have not, and, it may be, cannot well provide against; there being by the license and corruption of the times, and the depraved nature of man, many enormities, scandals, and impieties in practice and manners, which laws cannot well describe, and consequently not enough provide against, which may, by the example and severity of virtuous men, be easily discountenanced, and by degrees suppressed." Some parties in Scotland who had no objection to national fasts, or even to the royal recommendation of them, yet objected to royal command and dictation as worded in the usual form, they being charged to keep the fast "as they tender the favor of Almighty God, and would avoid his wrath and indignation." According to counsel learned in the law, obedience to such mandate is not imperative, for it is affirmed —"1. That in England, where by statute the sovereign is head of the Church as well as of the State, that headship applies only to the clergy and members of the National Church, and does not include those who are not of her communion. 2. That in Scotland—where seceding or dissenting churches (except it be the nonjurors) stand not upon any statute of toleration, but upon the free basis and constitution of the country—no such relation exists, but is excluded by the act of 1690 (c. 5), ratifying the Confession of Faith; whereby an antagonistic principle is established, it being declared that 'there is no other Head of the Church but the Lord Jesus Christ,' and that he, 'as King and Head of the Church, hath therein appointed a government in the hand of church-officers distinct from the civil magistrate,' who 'may not assume to himself the administration of the Word and sacrament, or the keys of the kingdom of heaven.' 3. That, in point of fact, proclamations for the observance of national fasts and thanksgivings in Scotland were, for a considerable period after the date of that act, and until the union between England and Scotland, passed by the three estates of the Scottish Parliament, and not by the sovereign alone. And, 4. That no statute can be found authorizing such proclamations in Scotland; and the phraseology used in them seems to have grown out of the practice in England, or to be founded on what appears to be an unwarranted extension of the two statutes cited in the proclamation of June, 1857, which refer exclusively to prayers for royal personages, and apply at most to ministers and preachers of two denominations."

Proclianites (or **Proclianists**) is the name of the followers of Proclus (q. v.). They were extreme Montanists (q. v.), and were spread more especially in Phrygia, where, about the close of the 4th century, they formed a most dangerous sect, and greatly disturbed the peace of the churches.

Proclus, surnamed Διάδοχος, i. e. *the Successor*, because he replaced Syrianus (q. v.) as the head of that Athenian school of philosophers who were Neo-Platonists, has been called "the Scholastic among the Greek philosophers." Indeed, according to M. Cousin, Proclus is *the* Greek philosopher; the flower and crown of all its schools; in whom, says the learned Frenchman, "are combined, and from whom shine forth, in no irregular or uncertain rays, Orpheus, Pythagoras, Plato, Aristotle, Zeno, Plotinus, Porphyry, and Jamblichus," and who "had so comprehended all religions in his mind, and paid them such equal reverence, that he was, as it were, the priest of the whole universe!" This is

a compliment, but a compliment ill warranted and bestowed only because M. Cousin perceived in this Neo-Platonist more of kinship with that extravagant class of philosophizers, of whom Cousin himself is one, whose method consists in putting forth strings of brilliant propositions, careless about either their consistency or coherence. Indeed, Cousin's adoration for Proclus shows, if we may use the words of one of their own class, "what things men will worship in their extreme need!" (Thomas Carlyle).

With the beginning of Christianity in its aggressive movements, the heathen world saw itself faced with immediate danger of a prostration that could only end in death. Philo the Jew, anxious to revive the power of the old dispensation, rallied all extraneous forces, determined to build, by the aid of what antiquity had shaped, a structure that should rival, if not outshine, the simple edifice the Son of the Carpenter of Nazareth and the fishermen of Galilee had reared. What Philo failed to accomplish, Ammonius Saccas, also of Alexandria (near the beginning of the 3d century), and aided by Plotinus his pupil, attempted to effect. See PLOTINUS. But both master and pupil left their work ere it was fairly begun, and though Porphyry (q. v.) zealously applied himself to bring out the mystical rationalism of Plotinus, the six *Enneades* in which these teachings were set forth failed to show even a marked *progress* in the work so long attempted, and it remained for Jamblichus (q. v.) in the 4th and Proclus in the 5th century to give any appearance whatsoever to the edifice the Neo-Platonists had been so long in constructing. If we wish to see Neo-Platonism in its incipiency, we must go to Philo the Jew. But if we wish to see it in its ripest growth, we must study it in the writings of Proclus the Athenian. The Neo-Platonism he presents to us is no longer the outgrowth of Judaism intermixed with Hellenism, but paganism illumined by the spirit and light of the Gospel of Christ—that very religion with which it was struggling for the empire of the world (see Ullmann, *Der Einfluss des Christenthums*, in *Studien u. Kritiken*, 1832, No. 2).

The bewildering conflict of philosophical theories which these five centuries had been fostering had resulted in the growth of scepticism, and left no resting-place for minds of a religious turn. The Neo-Platonists of the 4th and 5th centuries most naturally took their refuge in mysticism, where feeling and intuition supersede the slow and doubtful process of the intellect (comp. Fisher, *Beginnings of Christianity*, p. 178, 179). Plotinus was the first to take this refuge. So did from this time forth all the successors of the Platonists, of whom Gibbon sneeringly says that "Plato would have blushed to acknowledge them." They discarded philosophy, though they claimed to be philosophers. They played upon the superstitious tendencies of their age rather than upon the intellectual strength that still remained. They sought to persuade by the aid of magic rather than by the clear force of logic. They turned prophets and seers. Though they took part in the higher discussions and conclusions of philosophy, they nevertheless stood opposed to all philosophy, since they did not even profess to rest upon careful inquiries into eternal laws of the Spirit, but claimed to have a revelation from God. Thus exalted above all such investigations, Neo-Platonism became the poetry as well as the religion of philosophy. It was attached more especially to the system of Plato, and was professed to be an explanation and a development of his views, but it was aimed to bring together the fundamental principles of all philosophical schools, and the ideas which constitute the basis of all popular religions. It was the work of man, and, however ambitious the scheme, it failed absolutely in its mission. Superstition was the centre and support; magic and sorcery the basis and top-stone of the new structure. It had both philosophy and religion in its composition, and yet it was neither the one nor the other. "The divinity which it presents is exalted above all human apprehension, and was called simply the Self-sufficient One (*τὸ ἕν*). From his overflowing fulness proceeded the Divine Intelligence, and from this the World-soul, by which the material universe is pervaded with divine life. Evil is only that which is imperfect, and is the most distant reflection of Deity upon matter. The human soul which had been produced by the Divine Intelligence fell, in consequence of its longing after earthly things, from its original divine life to its present temporal existence. It therefore belongs to the sensual as well as to the intellectual world. But the souls of the good and wise, even in this world, are in their happiest moments reunited with the Deity, and death is to such a complete restoration to their home. From a pious veneration for an ancestry far back in antiquity, the Grecian gods especially were regarded as the personal manifestations of the divine life in nature. Some of them were celestial beings, and some ruled here on earth. These earthly powers were the national gods (*μερικοί, ἐθνάρκαι*), subordinate to the Deity, and exalted above all passion. The myths were therefore, of course, to be explained allegorically. The arts of divination and magic were justified on the ground of the necessary connection of all phenomena by virtue of the unity of the world-principle" (Hase, *Church Hist.* § 50). While, then, Neo-Platonism was a new power, it was nevertheless a reformation of the old faith. Though it extended itself over the whole Roman empire, it embraced within itself contradictory elements, and could maintain its existence only long enough to witness and embellish the downfall of heathenism. The last school to minister to Neo-Platonism in these her last hours was that founded by Proclus.

Life.—Proclus was of Lycian origin, and was born in Constantinople in 412. He received his first instruction at Xanthus, in Lycia (whence his surname "Lycius"). His philosophic training he enjoyed at Alexandria, where he studied under Arion, Leonaras, Hero, and especially under Olympiodorus, with whom he applied himself chiefly to Aristotelian and Platonic philosophy. Thence he went to Athens, where a certain Plutarch, a philosopher, and his daughter, and later Syrianus, became his instructors. Asclepigieneia, a priestess of Eleusis, instructed him chiefly in theurgic mysteries. The vivid imagination and enthusiastic temperament which in his childhood had led him to believe in apparitions of Minerva and Apollo, naturally convinced him, when all the influences of the Mysteries (q. v.) were brought to bear upon him, still more of his immediate and direct intercommunication with the gods; and he distinctly believed himself to be one of those through whom divine revelation reaches mankind. His soul, he thought, had once lived in Nicomachus the Pythagorean, and, like him, he had the power to command the elements to a certain extent, to produce rain, to temper the sun's heat, etc. The Orphic poems, the writings of Hermes, and all that strangely mystical literature with which the age abounded, were to him the only source of true philosophy, and he considered them all more or less in the light of divine revelations. That same cosmopolitan spirit in religious matters which pervaded Rome towards her end had spread throughout all the civilized "pagan" world of those days, and Proclus distinctly laid it down as an axiom that a true philosopher must also be a hierophant of the whole world. Acquainted with all the creeds and rites of the ancient Pantheons of the different nations, he not only philosophized upon them in an allegorizing and symbolizing spirit, as many of his contemporaries did, but practiced all the ceremonies, however hard and painful. More especially the practice of fasting in honor of Egyptian deities, while on the one hand it fitted him more and more for his hallucinations and dreams of divine intercourse, on the other hand more than once endangered his life. Of an impulsive piety, and eager to win disciples from Christianity itself, he made himself obnoxious to the Christian

authorities at Athens, who, in accordance with the spirit of religious intolerance and fanaticism which then began to animate the new and successful religion against which Proclus waged constant war, banished him from that city. On being permitted to return, he acted with somewhat more prudence and circumspection, and only allowed his most approved disciples to take part in the nightly assemblies in which he propounded his doctrines. He died in 485, in his full vigor, and in the entire possession of all his mental powers, for which he was no less remarkable than for his personal beauty and strength. As a philosopher he enjoyed the highest celebrity among his contemporaries and successors. Marinus does not scruple to call Proclus absolutely inspired, and to affirm that when he uttered his profound dogmas his countenance shone with a preternatural light. Besides his other philosophical attainments, he was a distinguished mathematician, astronomer, and grammarian. In style Proclus is much more perspicuous and intelligible than his predecessor Plotinus; indeed, he is on the whole a good writer, and occasionally is almost eloquent. But the matter of his works has not much to recommend it: his propensity to allegorize everything, even the plainest and simplest expressions in the authors on whom he comments, must deduct largely from his merits as an expounder of other men's thoughts; and but for the interest which attaches to him as the last of a school of philosophy, it is not much to be regretted that his works have slumbered so long in the dust of libraries, and have been either wholly neglected or imperfectly edited.

His Philosophical System.—In the writings of Proclus there is collated, arranged, and dialectically elaborated the whole body of transmitted philosophy, augmented by large additions, and the whole combined into a sort of system, to which he succeeded in giving the appearance of strict logical connection. He professed that his design was not to bring forward views of his own, but simply to expound Plato, in doing which he proceeded on the idea that everything in Plato must be brought into accordance with the mystical theology of Orpheus. He looked upon the Orphic poems and Chaldæan oracles, which he had diligently studied, as divine revelations, and capable of becoming instrumental to philosophy by means of an allegorical exposition. He therefore wrote a separate work on the coincidence of the doctrines of Orpheus, Pythagoras, and Plato. It was in much the same spirit that he attempted to blend together the logical method of Aristotle and the fanciful speculations of Neo-Platonic mysticism. He called himself, as we have already had occasion to say, the last link of the Hermaic chain, that is, the last of men consecrated by Hermes, in whom, by perpetual tradition, was preserved the occult knowledge of the Mysteries. Where reasoning fails him, he takes refuge in the πίστις of Plotinus, which is superior to knowledge. He conducts us to the operations of theurgy, which transcends all human wisdom, and comprises within itself all the advantages of divinations, purifications, initiations, and all the activities of divine inspiration. Through it we are united with the primeval unity, in which every motion and energy of our souls comes to rest. It is this principle which unites not only men with gods, but the gods with each other, and with the one—the good, which is of all things the most credible.

Proclus "held, in all its leading features, the doctrine of emanations from one ultimate, primeval principle of all things, the absolute unity, towards union with which again all things strive. This union he did not, like Plotinus, conceive to be effected by means of pure reason, as even things destitute of reason and energy participate in it, purely as the result of their subsistence (ὕπαρξις, *Theol. Plat.* i, 25; ii, 1, 4). In some unaccountable way, therefore, he must have conceived the πιστις, by which he represents this union as being effected, as something which did not involve rational or thinking activity. All inferior existences are connected with the highest only through the intermediate ones, and can return to the higher only through that which is intermediate. Every multitude, in a certain way, partakes of unity, and everything which becomes *one*, becomes so by partaking of the one (*Inst. Theol.* c. 3). Every object is a union of the one and the many: that which unites the one and the many is nothing else than the pure, absolute one—the essential *one*, which makes everything else partake of unity. Proclus argued that there is either one principium, or many principia. If the latter, the principia must be either finite or infinite in number. If infinite, what is derived from them must be infinite, so that we should have a double infinite, or else finite. But the finite can be derived only from the finite, so that the principia must be finite in number. There would then be a definite number of them. But number presupposes unity. Unity (ἑνάς) is consequently the principium of principia, and the cause of the finite multiplicity and of the being of all things (*Theol. Plat.* ii, 1). There is therefore *one* principium which is incorporeal, for the corporeal consists of parts. It is immovable and unchangeable, for everything that moves, moves towards some object or end, which it seeks after. If the principium were movable it must be in want of the good, and there must be something desirable outside of it. But this is impossible, for the principium has need of nothing, and is itself the end towards which everything else strives. The principium, or first cause of all things, is superior to all actual being (οὐσία), and separated from it, and cannot even have it as an attribute (*l. c.*). The absolutely one is not an object of cognition to any existing thing, nor can it be named (*l. c.* p. 95). But in contemplating the emanation of things from the one and their return into it we arrive at two words, the *good*, and the *one*, of which the first is analogical and positive, the latter negative only (*l. c.* p. 96). The absolutely one has produced not only earth and heaven, but all the gods which are above the world and in the world: it is the god of all gods, the unity of all unities (*l. c.* ii, 110). Everything which is perfect strives to produce something else; the full seeks to impart its fulness. Still more must this be the case with the absolute good, though in connection with that we must not conceive of any creative power or energy, for that would be to make the one imperfect and not simple, not fruitful through its very perfection (*l. c.* p. 101). Every emanation is less perfect than that from which it emanates (*Inst. Theol.* c. 7), but has a certain similarity with it, and, so far as this similarity goes, remains in it, departing from it so far as it is unlike, but as far as possible being one with it, and remaining in it (*ibid.* 31). What is produced from the absolutely one is produced as unity, or of the nature of unity. Thus the first produced things are independent unities (αὐτοτελεῖς ἑνάδες). Of these independent unities some are simple, others more composite. The nearer the unities are to the absolute unity the simpler they are, but the greater is the sphere of their operation and their productive power. Thus out of unity there arise a multitude of things which depart further and further from the simplicity of the absolute one; and as the producing power diminishes, it introduces more and more conditions into things, while it diminishes their universality and simplicity. His whole system of emanations seems, in fact, to be a *realization* of the logical subordination of ideas. The simplest ideas which are contained in those which are composite being regarded by him as the principles of *things*."

The emanations proceeded in a curious triadic manner. That which precedes all power, and emanates immediately from the primal cause of all things, is limit. Unity, duality, he considered as identical with limitation (πέρας) and boundlessness (ἀπειρία), and from the mixed compound of these two principia arises a third, a compound of the two—*substance* (as a sort of genus of all substances), that which in itself is abso-

lutely an existing thing and nothing more (*Theol. Plat.* iii, 133 sq.). Everything, according to Proclus, contains in itself being (*οὐσία*), life (*ζωή*), and intelligence (*νοῦς*). The life is the centre of the thing, for it is both an object of thought and exists. The intelligence is the limit of the thing, for the intellect (*νοῦς*) is in that which is the object of intellect (*νοητόν*), and the latter in the former; but the intellect or thought exists in the thing thought of objectively, and the thing thought of exists in the intellect productively (*νοερῶς*). This accordingly is the first triad—limit, infinitude, and the compound of the two. Proclus distinguished the divinities (making these also descend from unity and give birth to triads) into intelligible and intelligent, supernatural and natural; attributed a supernatural efficacy to the *name* of the Supreme Being, and, like his predecessors, exalted theurgy above philosophy. The first triad—viz. the limit—Proclus taught, is the deity who advances to the extreme verge of the conceivable from the inconceivable, primal deity, measuring and defining all things, and establishes the paternal, concatenating, and immaculate race of gods. The infinite is the inexhaustible power of this deity. The "mixed" is the first and highest world of gods, which in a concealed manner comprehends everything within itself. Out of this first triad springs the second. As the first of the unities produces the highest existing thing, the intermediate unity produces the intermediate existent thing, in which there is something first—unity, divinity, reality; something intermediate — power; and something last—the existence in the second grade, conceivable life (*νοητὴ ζωή*); for there is in everything which is the object of thought being (*τὸ εἶναι*), life (*τὸ ζῆν*), and thought (*τὸ νοεῖν*). The third of the unities, the "mixed," produces the third triad, in which the intelligence or thinking power (*νοῦς*) attains to its subsistence. This thinking power is the limit and completion of everything which can be the object of thought. The first triad contains the principle of union; the second of multiplicity and increase by means of continuous motion or life, for motion is a species of life; the third, the principle of the separation of the manifold, and of formation by means of limit.

In his treatise on *Providence and Fate*, Proclus seeks to explain the difference between the two, and to show that the second is subordinate to the first in such a manner that freedom is consistent with it. Both providence and fate are causes—the first the cause of all good, the second the cause of all connection (and connection as cause and effect). There are three sorts of things—some whose operation is as eternal as their substance, others whose substance does not exist, but is perpetually coming into existence, and, between these, things whose substance is eternal, but whose operation takes place in time. Proclus names these three kinds *intellectual, animal,* and *corporeal.* The last alone are subjected to fate, which is identical with nature, and is itself subject to providence, which is nothing else than the deity himself. The corporeal part of man is entirely subject to fate. The soul, as regards its substance, is superior to fate; as regards its operation, sometimes (referring to those operations which require corporeal organs and motions) beneath, sometimes superior to fate, and so forms the bond of connection between intellectual and corporeal existence. The freedom of the soul consists in its living according to virtue, for this alone does not involve servitude. Wickedness, on the other hand, is want of power, and by it the soul is subjected to fate, and is compelled to serve all that ministers to or hinders the gratification of the desires. Proclus strongly distinguished the soul from that which is material, pointing out its reflective power as a mark of difference; the corporeal not being able to turn back in that way upon itself, owing to its consisting of separable parts. He founded on this also an argument for the immortality of the soul (*Inst. Theol.* c. 15). The human soul he considered wrapped up in various more or less dense veils, according to the degree of perfection attained; and he further assumed a certain sort of solidarity between the souls of those who naturally, or by certain immutable circumstances, were linked together, such as children and parents, rulers and subjects; and he carried this doctrine so far as to assert that the children must naturally participate in their parents' faults. Faith alone, he further held, was essential to the attainment of theurgy, which, comprising mantic and supernatural inspiration, is preferable to all human wisdom; and in this he chiefly differs from Plotinus (q. v.). Some of the topics touched upon in this treatise are carried out still further in the essay on *Ten Questions about Providence.* In the treatise on the *Origin of Evil* (*Περὶ τῆς τῶν κακῶν ὑποστάσεως*), Proclus endeavors to show that evil does not originate with God, or with the dæmons, or with matter. Evil is the consequence of a weakness, the absence of some power. As with the total absence of all power activity would be annihilated, there cannot be any total, unmixed evil. The good has one definite, eternal, universally operating cause—namely, God. The causes of evil are manifold, indefinite, and not subject to rule. Evil has not an original, but only a derivative existence.

His Works.—The following of Proclus's writings are still extant: (1.) *Εἰς τὴν Πλάτωνος Θεολογίαν*, in six books. (2.) *Στοιχείωσις Θεολογική* (*Institutio Theologica*). This treatise was first published in the Latin translation of Franciscus Patricius. The Greek text, with the translation of Æm. Portus, is appended to the edition of the last-mentioned work (Hamb. 1618). (3.) A commentary on the *First Alcibiades* of Plato. (4.) A commentary on the *Timæus* of Plato. Of this commentary on the *Timæus* five books remain, but they only treat of about a third of the dialogue. It is appended to the first Basle edition of Plato. (5.) Various notes on the *Πολιτεία* of Plato, printed in the same edition of Plato as the last-mentioned work. (6.) A commentary on the *Parmenides* of Plato, published in Stallbaum's edition of that dialogue. (7.) Portions of a commentary on the *Cratylus* of Plato, edited by Boissonade (Leips. 1820). (8.) A paraphrase of various difficult passages in the *Τετράβιβλος σύνταξις* of Ptolemæus: first published, with a preface, by Melancthon (Basle, 1554). (9.) A treatise on motion (*Περὶ κινήσεως*), a sort of compendium of the last five books of Aristotle's treatise *Περὶ φυσικῆς ἀκροάσεως.* (10.) *Ὑποτύπωσις τῶν ἀστρονομικῶν ὑποθέσεων* (ibid. 1520). (11.) *Σφαῖρα*, frequently appended to the works of the ancient astronomers. There are also several separate editions of it. (12.) A commentary on the first book of Euclid's *Elements* (attached to various editions of the text of Euclid). (13.) A commentary on the *Ἔργα καὶ ἡμέραι* of Hesiod, in a somewhat mutilated form (*Ὑπόμνημα εἰς τὰ Ἡσιόδου ἔργα καὶ ἡμέρας*) (first published at Venice in 1537). A better edition is that by Heinsius (Leyden, 1603). (14.) *Χρηστομάθεια γραμματική*, or, rather, some portions of it preserved by Photius (cod. 239), treating of poetry and the lives of various celebrated poets. The short life of Homer which passes under the name of Proclus was probably taken from this work. (15.) *Ἐπιχειρήματα ἢ κατὰ Χριστιανῶν.* The object of this work was to maintain the eternity of the universe against the Christian doctrine on the subject. The work of Proclus has not come down to us in a separate form, but we still possess his arguments in the refutation of them by Joannes Philoponus (*De Æternitate Mundi*). (16.) *De Providentia et Fato*, addressed to Theodorus, a mechanician. (17.) *Decem Dubitationes circa Providentiam* (*Περὶ τῶν δέκα πρὸς τὴν Πρόνοιαν ἀπορημάτων*). (18.) *De Malorum Subsistentia* (*Περὶ τῆς τῶν κακῶν ὑποστάσεως*). This and the two preceding treatises only exist in the Latin translation of Gulielmus de Morbeka. They are printed entire by Fabricius in his *Bibliotheca Græca*, ix, 373, etc. (19.) A little astrological treatise on the effect of eclipses, in a Latin translation. (20.) A treatise on po-

etry, also in a Latin translation, printed together with a treatise by Chœroboscus (Paris, 1615). (21.) Five hymns. (22.) Some scholia on Homer.

The following works have perished: (1.) A commentary on the *Philebus* of Plato (Procl. *in Tim.* p. 53, 222). (2.) A commentary on the *Phædrus* of Plato (Procl. *l. c.* p. 329). (3.) A defence of the *Timæus* of Plato against the Ἀντιῤῥήσεις of Aristotle (ibid. p. 226: Βιβλίον ἰδιᾳ ἐκδεδωκὼς οἶδα τῶν πρὸς τὸν Τίμαιον Ἀριστοτέλους ἀντιῤῥήσεων ἐπισκέψεις ποιουμένων). (4.) Καθαρτικὸς τῶν δογμάτων τοῦ Πλάτωνος, against Domninus (Suid. s. v. Δομνῖνος). (5.) A commentary on the *Theætetus* of Plato (Marinus, *l. c.* cap. ult.). (6.) Νόμοι, a commentary apparently on the *Laws* of Plato (Procl. *in Tim.* p. 178). (7.) Notes on the Ἐννεάδες of Plotinus. (8.) Μητρωακὴ βίβλος, on the mother of the gods (Suid. s. v. Προκλ.). (9.) Εἰς τὴν Ὀρφέως Θεολογίαν (Suid. *l. c.*; Marin. c. 27). (10.) Περὶ τὰ λόγια, in ten books (Suid. Marin. c. 26). (11.) A commentary on Homer (Suid.). (12.) Περὶ τῶν παρ' Ὁμήρῳ θεῶν (ibid.). (13.) Συμφωνία Ὀρφέως, Πυθαγόρου καὶ Πλάτωνος (Suid. Marin. c. 22). (14.) On the three ἑνάδες νοηταί—namely, ἀλήθεια, καλλονή, and συμμετρία (Procl. *in Polit.* p. 433). (15.) Εἰς τὸν λόγον τῆς Διοτίμας περὶ τῆς τῶν κακῶν ὑποστάσεως. (16.) Περὶ ἀγωγῆς, on the theurgic discipline, in two books (Suid.). (17.) Various hymns and epigrams.

There is no complete edition of the extant works of Proclus. The edition of Cousin (Paris, 1820–27, 6 vols. 8vo) contains the treatises on *Providence and Fate*, on the *Ten Doubts about Providence*, and on the *Nature of Evil*, the commentary on the *Alcibiades*, and the commentary on the *Parmenides*. This learned Frenchman has since brought out *Procli Philos. Platonici opera inedita* (Paris, 1864). There are English translations of the commentaries on the *Timæus*, the six books on the *Theology of Plato*, the commentaries on the first book of Euclid, and the *Theological Elements*, and the five *Hymns*, by Thomas Taylor. See Fabricius, *Bibl. Græc.* ix, 363-445; Brucker, *Historia Critica Philosophiæ*, ii, 319–336; Tennemann, *Geschichte der Philosophie*, vol. vi; Ritter, *Geschichte der Philosophie*, bk. xiii, c. 3, vol. iv, 699, etc.; Dr. Burigny, *Life of Proclus*, in *Memoirs of the Academy of Inscriptions*, vol. xxxi; Marinus, *Vita Procli* (Gr. and Lat. ed. by Fabricius [Hamb. 1740, 4to]; ed. by Boissonade [Leips. 1814, 8vo]); Baur, *Christl. Jahrbücher* (Tübing. 1846, p. 29–72); Cudworth, *Intell. Universe* (see Index); Hunt, *Pantheism*, p. 117 sq.; Lewes, *Hist. of Philos.* vol. ii; Simon, *Ecole Alex.* vol. ii; Tennemann, *Man. of Philos.* p. 190 sq.; Gibbon, *Decline and Fall*, c. xx, § 12; Hase, *Ch. Hist.* p. 48 etc.; Ueberweg, *Hist. of Philos.* i, 255–258; Smith, *Dict. of Greek and Roman Biog. and Mythol.* s. v. (from which a part of the above has been taken); Kingsley, *Alexandria*, p. 116–124, 128; Alzog, *Patrol.* § 57; Nourisson, *Pensées Humaines*, p. 161 sq.

Proclus, Sr., an Eastern ecclesiastic of the 5th century. He was at a very early age appointed reader in the church at Constantinople. He was also engaged as secretary or amanuensis to St. Chrysostom, and was employed in a similar capacity by Atticus (who succeeded Arsacius as patriarch of Constantinople), by whom he was invested successively with the orders of deacon and presbyter. He was raised to the rank of bishop of Cyzicus by Sisinnius, the successor of Atticus, but did not exercise the functions of his office, the people of Cyzicus choosing another in his place. On the death of Sisinnius (A.D. 427) there was a general expression of feeling in favor of Proclus as his successor, but Nestorius was appointed. Proclus contended zealously against the heresies which the latter strove to introduce into the Church, combating them even in a sermon preached before Nestorius himself. On the deposition of Nestorius, Proclus was again proposed as his successor; but his elevation was again opposed, though on what grounds does not appear very clearly ascertained. But on the death of Maximianus, who was appointed instead, Proclus was at last created patriarch. In A.D. 438 Proclus gained a great deal of honor by having the body of St. Chrysostom brought to Constantinople. There is still extant a fragment of a Latin translation of a eulogy on St. Chrysostom, by Proclus, delivered probably about this time. It was in the time of Proclus that the custom of chanting the *Trisagion* was introduced into the Church. While in office, Proclus conducted himself with great prudence and mildness. For further details respecting his ecclesiastical career, the reader is referred to Tillemont's *Mémoires Ecclésiastiques* (xiv, 704–718). His extant writings are enumerated by Fabricius (*B. G.* ix, 505–512). One of the most celebrated of his letters (Περὶ πιστεως) was written in A.D. 435, when the bishops of Armenia applied to him for his opinion on certain propositions which had been disseminated in their dioceses, and were attributed to Theodorus of Mopsuestia. The discussion that ensued with respect to these propositions made a considerable stir in the East. Proclus bestowed a great deal of pains upon his style, which is terse and sententious, but is crowded with antitheses and rhetorical points, and betrays a labored endeavor to reiterate the same sentiment in every possible variety of form. From the quotations of subsequent authors, it appears that several of the writings of Proclus are lost. The *Platonic Theology* of Proclus Diadochus has sometimes been erroneously described as a theological work of St. Proclus. The 24th of October is the day consecrated to the memory of St. Proclus by the Greek Church. See Smith, *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. and Mythol.* s. v.; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* ii, 496 sq.; Riddle, *Hist. of the Papacy*, i, 160 sq., 170 sq.

Proconsul. The Greek word ἀνθύπατος, for which this is the true equivalent, is rendered uniformly "deputy" in the A. V. of Acts xiii, 7, 8, 12; xix, 38, and the derived verb ἀνθυπατεύω in Acts xviii, 12 is translated "to be deputy." At the division of the Roman provinces by Augustus, in the year B.C. 27, into senatorial and imperial, the emperor assigned to the senate such portions of territory as were peaceable and could be held without force of arms (Sueton. *Oct.* 47; Strabo, xvii, 840; Dio Cass. liii, 12), an arrangement which remained with frequent alterations till the 3d century. Over these senatorial provinces the senate appointed by lot yearly an officer who was called "proconsul" (ibid. 13), who exercised purely civil functions, had no power over life and death, and was attended by one or more legates (ibid. 14). He was neither girt with the sword nor wore the military dress (ibid. 13). He was chosen out of the body of the senate; and it was customary, when any one's consulate expired, to send him as a proconsul into some province. He enjoyed the same honor with the consuls, but was allowed only six lictors with the fasces before him. Such provinces were in consequence called "proconsular." With the exception of Africa and Asia, which were assigned to men who had passed the office of consul, the senatorial provinces were given to those who had been prætors, and were divided by lot each year among those who had held this office five years previously. Their term of office was one year. The proconsuls decided cases of equity and justice, either privately in their palaces, where they received petitions, heard complaints, and granted writs under their seals; or publicly in the common hall, with the formalities generally observed in the courts at Rome. These duties were, however, more frequently delegated to their assessors, or other judges of their own appointment. As the proconsuls had also the direction of justice, of war, and of the revenues, these departments were administered by their lieutenants, or *legati*, who were usually nominated by the senate. The expense of their journeys to and from their provinces was defrayed by the public. Livy (viii and xxvi) mentions two other classes of proconsuls—those who, being consuls, had their office continued beyond the time appointed by law; and those who, being previ-

ously in a private station, were invested with this honor, either for the government of provinces or to command in war. Some were created proconsuls by the senate without being appointed to any province, merely to command in the army, and to take charge of the military discipline; others were allowed to enter upon their proconsular office before being admitted to the consulship, but having that honor in reserve.

Among the senatorial provinces in the first arrangement by Augustus were Cyprus, Achaia, and Asia within the Halys and Taurus (Strabo, xvii, 840). The first and last of these are alluded to in Acts xiii, 7, 8, 12; xix, 38, as under the government of proconsuls. Achaia became an imperial province in the second year of Tiberius, A.D. 16, and was governed by a procurator (Tacit. *Ann.* i, 76), but was restored to the senate by Claudius (Sueton. *Claud.* 25), and therefore Gallio, before whom St. Paul was brought, is rightly termed "proconsul" in Acts xviii, 12. See GALLIO. Cyprus also, after the battle of Actium, was first made an imperial province (Dio Cass. liii, 12), but five years afterwards (B.C. 22) it was given to the senate, and is reckoned by Strabo (xvii, 840) ninth among the provinces of the people governed by *στρατηγοί*, as Achaia is the seventh. These *στρατηγοί*, or proprætors, had the title of proconsul. Cyprus and Narbonese Gaul were given to the senate in exchange for Dalmatia, and thus, says Dio Cassius (liv, 4), proconsuls (*ἀνθύπατοι*) began to be sent to those nations. In Böckh's *Corpus Inscriptionum*, No. 2631, is the following relating to Cyprus: *ἡ πόλις Κοΐντον Ἰούλιον Κόρδον ἀνθύπατον ἀγνείας*. This Quintus Julius Cordus appears to have been proconsul of Cyprus before the twelfth year of Claudius. He is mentioned in the next inscription (No. 2632) as the predecessor of another proconsul, Lucius Annius Bassus. The date of this last inscription is the twelfth year of Claudius, A.D. 52. The name of another proconsul of Cyprus in the time of Claudius occurs on a copper coin, of which an engraving is given under CYPRUS. A coin of Ephesus (q. v.) illustrates the usage of the word *ἀνθύπατος* in Acts xix, 38.

Procop, ANDREW (also known as *Procop the greater, the elder,* or *the holy,* or *the shaven,* in allusion to his having received the tonsure in early life), was one of the greatest of the Hussite leaders, and ranks only second to Ziska, whose successor he was among the Taborites. Procop was born of a noble family towards the close of the 14th century. He owed his education to an uncle, a nobleman of Prague. After having travelled for some years through France and Spain, Procop returned to his native country just as the religious wars were breaking out. He had taken holy orders, but instead of entering the ministry he joined the ranks of the insurgent Hussites, and, by his military genius, rapidly rose to the first rank. In 1424 Ziska died, and the Taborites elected Procop as their leader. Palacky, in comparing the two great Hussites, says of Procop that if he did not equal Ziska in warlike ability, he surpassed his predecessor in mind and political farsightedness. Procop's history from this time till 1427 presents an almost unbroken series of daring attacks upon the Austrians. At the same time, a larger body of Taborites, who called themselves Orphans, and had been overrunning Lausitz and had burned Lauban, under the leadership of a man subsequently known as Procop the lesser (or younger), now, in concert with the more distinguished Procop, attacked Silesia, and took part in those internal feuds of the Hussite factions by which Bohemia was almost wholly ruined. The threatened approach of three German armies, which had been levied by the neighboring states to carry on an exterminating crusade against the heretics, was alone able to restore unanimity to the divided Hussites, who, under the leadership of the two Procops, offered a desperate and successful resistance to the larger numbers of the Germans, subsequently pursuing their enemies with fire and sword through Silesia, Moravia, and Hungary as far as Presburg. In 1429 Procop made inroads into the German states as far as Magdeburg, and returned to Bohemia laden with spoil, and followed by a numerous band of captive nobles and knights; and in the following year, at the head of 50,000 men-at-arms, and half as many horsemen, he again broke into Misnia, Franconia, and Bavaria, and after having burned 100 castles and towns, destroyed 1400 villages and hamlets, and carried off a vast amount of treasure, turned his arms against Moravia and Silesia. The emperor Sigismund at this crisis offered to treat with him, but the imperial demand, that the Hussites should submit to the decision of a council, afforded Procop a pretext for breaking off all negotiations with the imperial court. A second German crusading army now advanced in 1431, but was thoroughly defeated at Riesenburg. These successes, which were followed by others of nearly equal importance in Silesia, Hungary, and Saxony, where the princes had to purchase peace at the hands of the two Procops on humiliating terms, induced the Council of Basle to propose a meeting between the Hussite leaders and ten learned Catholic doctors. The meeting lasted fifty days, but was productive of no good result. Procop himself went before that learned body, and defended, with much spirit, the creed of his party. But failing to receive such treatment as he felt himself entitled to, he finally refused further to attend the council, and returned to Bohemia, where, combining his forces with those of Procop the lesser, he laid siege to Pilsen. The Calixtines, who came here in force, had offended Procop by the peace treaty they had made with a delegation of the Council of Basle. The council, on this, passed an act known as the Basle Compact, by which the Hussites were allowed the use of the cup in the Lord's Supper, and the Bohemians were designated by the title of the *First Sons of the Catholic Church.* The Taborites and Orphans, under the leadership of the two Procops, refused, however, to have anything to do with the pope, and hence dissensions arose between them and the more moderate of the Hussites. After many lesser encounters between these factions, a decisive battle was fought near Lipau in 1434, in which Procop was induced, by a feint of the enemy, to leave his intrenchments. His followers at first fought desperately against the troops of the Bohemian nobles, who were commanded by Meinhard of Neuhaus; but at length, under the influence of a sudden panic, they gave way, and took to flight. Procop, after vainly striving to re-form their broken lines, threw himself into the midst of the enemy, and was killed. Procop the lesser, following in his steps, was also slain, and with these two brave Hussite leaders the cause of the Taborites perished. Milman says, "with Procop fell the military glory, the religious inflexibility, of Bohemia." See Gillett, *Life and Times of John Huss,* vol. ii, ch. xvii sq.; *Leben des Procop* (Prague, 1789); Milman, *Hist. of Latin Christianity,* vii, 545–568; Palacky, *Gesch. von Böhmen,* iii, 91 sq.

Procop *the Younger.* See PROCOP, ANDREW.

Procopius OF CÆSAREA, a noted character in the history of the East in the 6th century, is especially distinguished as the writer of a history in which he dwells at large on the ecclesiastical condition of the periods of which he treats. He was born at Cæsarea, in Palestine, about the end of the 5th or beginning of the 6th century. After studying rhetoric in his native country, he went to Constantinople, where he gave lessons in rhetoric, and appears to have been also a lawyer. His reputation for learning and ability reached the court; and the emperor Justin the elder, in the last year of his reign, appointed him assessor (*συγκάθεδρος*) to Belisarius, who was about that time sent as governor to Dara, on the frontiers of Armenia. Procopius afterwards accompanied that commander in his first war against the Persians (530), afterwards in that against the Vandals in

Africa (533 535), and lastly against the Goths in Italy (536–539). During these campaigns he appears to have rendered himself very useful by his ability and activity, and to have been intrusted by Belisarius with important commissions connected with the service of the army. In his capacity of assessor, he was the general's legal adviser, and he was also his private secretary. In 538 he assisted Antonina, the wife of Belisarius, in raising troops in Campania, and in sending some by sea to Rome, which was then besieged. On his return to Constantinople, about 540, the emperor Justinian made him a senator, as a reward for his services. In 562 he was made prefect of Constantinople, unless perhaps it was another of the name who obtained this dignity in that year. He died in that city at an advanced age, but the precise year of his death is not ascertained. It was during his extensive travels that he gathered the materials for the *History of his Own Times* (in eight books), translated into Latin by Claude Mattret, a Jesuit, under the title *Procopii Cæsariensis Historiarum sui Temporis Libri Octo* (Paris, 1662, fol.; with the Greek text in English, Lond. 1653, fol.). His descriptions of the manners of the various barbarous nations which invaded the Roman empire are vivid and interesting. The first two books of his history concern the Persian wars. He begins his narrative with the death of Arcadius, and briefly relates the wars between the Romans and Persians under Theodosius the younger, Anastasius, and Justinus, and lastly Justinian. As he comes down to contemporary times, his history is more diffuse. He closes with the twenty-third year of Justinian's reign (A.D. 550). Books iii and iv treat of the wars of the Vandals in Africa, and the reconquest of that province by Belisarius. The 5th, 6th, and 7th books are concerned with the history of the Gothic kingdom in Italy founded by Theodoric, and the expedition of Belisarius against Totilas. The 8th book is of a mixed character; it resumes the account of the Persian wars, then speaks of the affairs of the Roman empire in other quarters — in Africa, on the Rhine, and in Thrace — and at last resumes the narrative of the Gothic war in Italy, the expedition of Narses, the defeat and death of Teia, and the final overthrow of the Gothic kingdom.—*English Cyclop.* s. v. As a historian, Procopius took Herodotus for his pattern, and even resembles his master's fatalism in the material conception of history. Procopius assumes the *rôle* of a sceptic, and as such regards himself as above all positive religion and dogmatic disputes. On account of the cold, unsympathetic manner in which he writes of Christianity, some have not believed him a Christian, but a deist, Jew, or even a heathen. He was, however, at least in outward confession, a Christian, as appears from his second work, Περὶ κτισμάτων, *De Ædificiis*, which contains a history of all churches, convents, and other public buildings reared under Justinian at the public expense in the Roman empire. Another of his writings, entitled Ἀνέκδοτα, or *Secret History*, in thirty chapters, is a sort of complement to the books *De Bellis*. Justinian and Theodora are here painted in the darkest colors. Procopius says that he wrote it because in his first work he could not, through fear of torture and death, speak of living persons as they deserved. Some grossly obscene passages concerning Theodora, who was evidently a very bad woman, have been expunged in most editions. There seems little doubt that Procopius is the author of the work. The Paris edition of Procopius, already quoted, is enriched with copious historical notes, prefaces, and an index. The works of Procopius, with valuable notes, are included in the Bonn edition of the Byzantine historians (1833–38, 3 vols. 8vo), which is, of course, the best. See Fabricius, *Bibl. Græca*, vii, 555 sq.; Hanke, *De Scriptor. Byz.* p. 145 sq.; Tueffel, in Schmidt's *Allgem. Zeitschrift für Gesch.* viii, 38–79; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* s. v.; Smith, *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. and Mythol.* s. v.; Piper, *Mon. Theol.* § 204; Dahn, *Procopius v. Cæsarea* (Berl. 1865).

Procopius OF GAZA, a very respectable Greek sophist of the 6th century, and the first who suffered martyrdom in Palestine, under the reign of Diocletian. The precise time of his birth or death is not recorded. He wrote commentaries on the Octoteuch (ed. C. Clauser, Tigur. 1555, fol.), the books of Kings, the Chronicles (ed. J. Meursius, Lugd. Bat. 1620, 4to), Isaiah (ed. J. Curterius, Paris, 1580, fol.), etc., and opened among the Greeks the list of the Catenic writers. See Mosheim, *Eccles. Hist.* (Index in vol. iii); Alzog, *Patrologie*, § 76.

Procopius, Friedrich P., a Roman Catholic monastic noted especially for his valuable contributions to Christian song, was born in the year 1608, of Protestant parents, at Templin, in Brandenburg. At a very early age he joined the Roman Catholic Church, and when eighteen years old he entered the Order of the Capuchins of the Austro-Bohemian province. Having completed his studies, he visited many cities as a preacher and missionary. He soon became known as a famous pulpit orator, but more so by his poetical productions, which gave him the name of "Catholic Meistersinger." Procopius died at Linz in 1680. He wrote, *Der Gross-Wunderthätigen Mutter Gottes Mariae Hülff Lob-Gesang* (Passow, 1659):—*Hertzen-Freud und Seelen-Trost* (ibid. 1660, 1661):—*Mariale Concianotorium rythmo-melodicum* (2d ed. Salzburg, 1667), a collection of sermons on St. Mary:—*Triemale Dominicale primum* (ibid. 1676), sermons for the Christian year:—*Catechismale* (ibid. 1674). Comp. Bernardus a Bononia, *Bibliotheca Script. Capucinorum*, p. 217–219; Brühl, *Geschichte der Literatur des Kathol. Deutschlands*, p. 20 sq.; Kehrein, *Geschichte der Kathol. Kanzelberedsamkeit der Deutschen* (Regensburg, 1843), vol. i, § 36; Schletterer, *Uebersichtliche Darstellung der Geschichte der kirchlichen Dichtung u. geistlichen Musik* (Nördlingen, 1866), p. 217 sq.; and the notice of the latter work in Hauck's *Theolog. Jahresbericht*, ii, 1866, p. 191 sq. (B. P.)

Procopovitsch See PROKOPOVITCH.

Procrastination, the postponement of a matter from one day to another; according to the maxim of the lazy and of the men of pleasure, "Seria in crastinum (diem or tempus)." Generally, in such cases, time wears on, and things are not done, at least not in the right time or in the right way: "Cras, cras et semper cras, et sic dilabitur ætas." The system of procrastination, therefore, is to be commended in no respect; but least of all in moral, or, better, religious matters. Every day lost in our moral amendment is an irreparable loss, a loss for eternity, as reformation becomes the more difficult the more it is delayed.

Proctor (formed by a contraction from the Latin *procurator*) designates an officer commissioned to take care of another person's cause in ecclesiastical courts, in the stead of the party whom he represents. It corresponds to attorney or solicitor in the other courts. In the Church of Rome there are extra-proctors, a class who settle in the name of another a legal business of no litigious character; a more accurate title is *mandatary*. The title of proctor has been preserved only in some kinds of procurations concerning ecclesiastical affairs. These proctors may act instead of, 1, *Bride and bridegroom* for the conclusion of the betrothal. For not only the acts which prepare the betrothal (*tractatus sponsalitii*), and the suit (*pactum de ineundis sponsalibus*), which, after its acceptation, takes the lawful nature of a betrothal, but the betrothal itself, or the actual contract about the future matrimony, can be performed by the parties either in person or by procuration (*sponsalia per procuratorem*). Only the proctor must have special powers for the conclusion of a promise of marriage with a determined person (*fr.* 34, *Dig. De Rit. Rupt.* xxiii, 2). 2. *Either party at the marriage act itself* (*matrimonium per procuratorem*). Should the powers given to the mandatary have been recalled before the copulation, the marriage-act would be void, even if the proctor at that time had no knowledge of

the revocation. The mandatary must be present in person, and cannot be represented by a substitute (Sext. c. 9, *De Procur.* i, 19); and the bride and bridegroom thus united must afterwards give their consent in person. These dispositions of canon law are preserved in the Austrian and Bavarian legislation. Protestant matrimonial law rejects marriage by procuration, but admits an exception in favor of royal persons. 3. *Godfathers and godmothers*, in baptisms or confirmation, may, if sick or otherwise prevented, choose third persons for their representatives at the holy ceremony (*procurator patrini*). As, according to the decision of the Council of Trent, the person to be baptized must have a godfather and a godmother (*unus et una*), each of the parties can make choice of a substitute, either male or female, but both mandataries cannot belong to the same sex. The real godfather, not his representative, contracts in this case the *cognatio spiritualis*, and the prohibition of marriage founded on it (*Duclar. S. Congr. Conc. Trid.* May 16, 1630, Aug. 23 and Sept. 1, 1721). 4. *Absent electors*, if they can sufficiently justify their absence, and are prepared to swear to it (c. 42, § 1, x, *De Elect.* i, 6), cannot declare their vote by writing, but may give their mandate to a colleague. Ecclesiastics are prohibited from being proctors in strictly secular affairs. In the English ecclesiastical constitution, proctors are those clergymen who are chosen in each diocese to represent their brethren in convocation.

In the universities the name refers to those officers who, as representatives of the whole body of masters of arts, maintain the discipline of the university. The proctors are chosen out of the several colleges by turn. The pro-proctors are the deputies of the proctors.

Proctor, David C., a Presbyterian minister, was born in New Hampshire in 1792. He graduated at Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H., in 1818, studied divinity in the Andover Theological Seminary, Mass., was licensed by a Congregational association, and in 1822 was ordained by a Congregational council, and went West under the auspices of the Connecticut Home Missionary Society. His first field of labor was Indianapolis, Ind.; subsequently he moved to Kentucky, and took charge of the Church in Springfield and Lebanon. In 1826 he was temporarily called to the presidency of Centre College, Danville, Ky., after which he was without charge for a number of years. He died Jan. 18, 1865. Mr. Proctor was an able preacher, and had considerable reputation as a scholar. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1866, p. 167. (J. L. S.)

Procuration. Different meanings have been applied to this word. 1. An entertainment given to the archdeacon with provision for seven horses and six men. 2. An equivalent in money; according to Lyndwood, 7*s.* 6*d.* to the archdeacon and 1*s.* to each of the other six at his visitation, to commute for the provision or entertainment which was formerly expected to be provided at the time of visitation. 3. An entertainment made at a visitation for a bishop. In 1336 a money composition was permitted to be offered by pope Benedict XII, but only one procuration could be demanded if several churches were visited in one day. The amount varied in different countries. In England an archbishop received 220 turons, a bishop 150, an archdeacon 50, and an archpriest or rural dean 10. See Synodal.

Procurator. This word does not occur in the Vulgate or in the A. V., nor is its accurate Greek equivalent, ἐπίτροπος (though used by Philo, *Leg. ad Caium*, and by Josephus, *Ant.* xx, 6, 2, 8, 5; comp. xx, 5, 1; his office is called ἐπιτροπή [*ibid.* xx, 5, 1]), found in this sense in the Greek Testament, where it is represented by the vaguer term ἡγεμών, rendered by our translators "governor" (Luke ii, 2; Matt. xxvii, 2; xxviii, 14, etc.). Ἡγεμών also occurs in a perfectly general sense (Matt. x, 18; 1 Pet. ii, 14). In Matt. ii, 6 it is rendered "prince," and corresponds to the Hebrew אַלּוּף. "Governor" in the A. V. is also used for ἐθνάρχης (2 Cor. xi, 32). Διοικητής is another Greek term for procurator. The word ἡγεμών, or procurator, is generally applied, both in the original and in our version, to the procurators of Judæa, Pontius Pilate (Matt. xxvii, etc.), Felix (Acts xxiii), and Festus (xxvi, 30); but it is also used of Cyrenius (Quirinus), who held the more responsible and distinguished office of *præses* or *legatus Cæsaris* over the province of Syria (Luke ii, 2). Procurators were chiefly despatched to the imperial, and not to the senatorial provinces. See Province. The revenues of the latter flowed into the ærarium, or exchequer, while those of the former belonged to the fiscus, or privy purse. The *procuratores Cæsaris* were specially intrusted with the interests of the fiscus, and therefore managed the various taxes and imposts, performing similar duties to those exercised by the quæstors in the provinces administered by the senate. Procurators were, however, sometimes sent as well as quæstors to the senatorial provinces (Tacit. *Ann.* xiii, 1; Dio Cass. liii, 15); but these were doubtless offices of less dignity, though bearing the same title. *Procurator* is also used for steward (Plautus, *Pseud.* 2, 2, 14), attorney (Ulpian, *Dig.* 3, 3), regent (Cæsar, *B. C.* iii, 112), etc. They were selected from among men who had been consuls or prætors, and sometimes from the inferior senators (Dio Cass. liii, 13–15). They were attended by six lictors, used the military dress, and wore the sword (ibid. 13). No quæstor came into the emperor's provinces, but the property and revenues of the imperial treasury were administered by the *rationales*, *procuratores*, and *actores* of the emperor, who were chosen from among his freedmen, or from among the knights (Tacit. *Hist.* v, 9; Dio Cass. liii, 15). Sometimes the procurators were invested with the dignity of *legati*, or *procuratores cum jure gladii* (τῇ ἐπὶ πᾶσιν ἐξουσίᾳ, Josephus, *War*, ii, 8, 1), and this was the case with the procurators of Judæa, which had been made a sub-province of Syria (προσθήκη τῆς Συρίας; id. *Ant.* xiii, 1, 1) since the deposition of the ethnarch Archelaus, A.D. 6. There is therefore no inaccuracy in the use of ἡγεμών in the New Test., since we find from inscriptions that præses and procurator were often interchangeable (Gruter, p. 493, b). In one respect, indeed, the ἡγεμόνες were even more powerful than the proconsuls themselves (ἀνθύπατοι); for, being regarded as the immediate emissaries and representatives of the Cæsar, by whom they were appointed to an indefinite tenure of office (Dio Cass. liii, 13–15), they had the power of inflicting capital punishment at their own discretion (John xix, 10; Josephus, *War*, ii, 8, 1). They also governed the province when the proconsul was dead or absent, "vice proconsulum," as we see from many inscriptions (Murat. p. 907, 4, etc.). In a turbulent and seditious province like Judæa, their most frequent functions were of a military or judicial character. The first procurator was Coponius, who was sent out with Quirinus to take a census of the property of the Jews and to confiscate that of Archelaus (Josephus, *Ant.* xviii, 1, 1). His successor was Marcus Ambivius, then Annius Rufus, in whose time the emperor Augustus died. Tiberius sent Valerius Gratus, who was procurator for eleven years, and was succeeded by Pontius Pilate (*ibid.* 2, 2), who is called by Josephus (*ibid.* 3, 1) ἡγεμών, as he is in the New Test. He was subject to the governor (*præses*) of Syria, for the council of the Samaritans denounced Pilate to Vitellius, who sent him to Rome and put one of his own friends, Marcellus, in his place (*ibid.* 4, 2). The headquarters of the procurator were at Cæsarea (Josephus, *War*, ii, 9, 2; Acts xxiii, 23), where he had a judgment-seat (xxv, 6) in the audience-chamber (ver. 23), and was assisted by a council (ver. 12) whom he consulted in cases of difficulty, the *assessores* (Sueton. *Galb.* 14), or ἡγεμόνες, who are mentioned by Josephus (*War*, ii, 16, 1) as having been consulted by Cestius, the governor of Syria, when certain charges were made

against Florus, the procurator of Judæa. More important cases were laid before the emperor (Acts xxv, 12; comp. Josephus, *Ant.* xx, 6, 2). The procurator, as the representative of the emperor, had the power of life and death over his subjects (Dio Cass. liii, 14; Matt. xxvii, 26), which was denied to the proconsul. In the New Test. we see the procurator only in his judicial capacity. Thus Christ is brought before Pontius Pilate as a political offender (Matt. xxvii, 2, 11), and the accusation is heard by the procurator, who is seated on the judgment-seat (ver. 19). Felix heard St. Paul's accusation and defence from the judgment-seat at Cæsarea (Acts xxiv), which was in the open air in the great stadium (Josephus, *War*, ii, 9, 2), and St. Paul calls him "judge" (Acts xxiv, 10), as if this term described his chief functions. The procurator (*ἡγεμών*) is again alluded to in his judicial capacity in 1 Pet. ii, 14. He was attended by a cohort as body-guard (Matt. xxvii, 27), and apparently went up to Jerusalem at the time of the high festivals, and there resided in the palace of Herod (Josephus, *War*, ii, 14, 3; Philo, *De Leg. ad Caium*, § 37, ii, 589, ed. Mang.), in which was the *prætorium*, or "judgment-hall," as it is rendered in the A. V. (Matt. xxvii, 27; Mark xv, 16; comp. Acts xxiii, 35). Sometimes, it appears, Jerusalem was made his winter quarters (Josephus, *Ant.* xviii, 3, 1). The high-priest was appointed and removed at the will of the procurator (*ibid.* 2, 2). Of the oppression and extortion practiced by one of these officers, Gessius Florus, which resulted in open rebellion, we have an account in Josephus (*Ant.* xx, 11, 1; *War*, ii, 14, 2). The same laws held both for the governors of the imperial and senatorial provinces, that they could not raise a levy or exact more than an appointed sum of money from their subjects, and that when their successors came they were to return to Rome within three months (Dio Cass. liii, 15). The pomp and dignity of the procurators may be inferred from the narrative of these trials, and from the titles of "most excellent" and "most noble" (*κράτιστε*), applied to them by such different lips as those of Claudius Lysias, Tertullian, and St. Paul; yet they were usually chosen from no higher rank than that of the equites, or even the freedmen of the emperor; and the "most noble Felix," in particular, was a mere manumitted slave (Tacit. *Hist.* v, 9; *Ann.* xii, 54; Sueton. *Claud.* 28). It is satisfactory to find that even in the minutest details the glimpses of their position afforded to us by the New Test. are corroborated by the statements of heathen writers. The violence (Luke xiii, 1), the venality (Acts xxiv, 26), the insolence (John xix, 22), and the gross injustice (Acts xxiv, 27), which we see exemplified in their conduct towards our Lord and his apostles, are amply illustrated by contemporary historians (Josephus, *Ant.* xviii, 3, 1; *War*, ii, 9; Cicero, *In Verrem*, passim); and they weighed so heavily on the mind of the emperor Trajan that he called the extortions of provincial governors "the spleen of the empire" (comp. Aurel. Vict. *Epit.* 42). Vespasian (*more suo*) took a more humorous view of the matter, and said that the procurators were like sponges (Sueton. *Vesp.* 16). The presence of the wives of Pilate (Matt. xxvii, 19) and Felix (Acts xxiv, 24) reminds us of the famous debate on the proposition of Cæcina to forbid the proconsuls and procurators to be accompanied by their wives (Tacit. *Ann.* iii, 33, 34). This had been the old and perhaps the wise regulation of earlier days, since the cruelty, ambition, and luxury of these ladies were often more formidable to the provincials than those of the governors themselves. But the rule had often been violated, and had of late been deliberately abandoned. We see, too, in the ready handing-over of the prisoner from one authority to another (*ἀνέπεμψεν, remisit*, Luke xxiii, 7; Acts xxvi, 32), some trace of that salutary dread of being denounced after their term of office was over, which alone acted as a check upon the lawlessness of even the most unscrupulous governors. Even the mention made of things at first sight so trivial as the tribunal (*βῆμα*), and the tessellated pavement (*λιθόστρωτον*) on which it was elevated, derives an interest and importance from the fact that they were conventional symbols of wealth and dignity, and that Julius Cæsar thought it worth while to carry one about with him from place to place (Sueton. *Jul.* c. 46). See Sibranda, *De Statu Judææ Provinc.* (Franc. 1698; also in Iken, *Thes. Nov.* ii, 529); Deyling, *Observat.* ii, 429; Grossmann, *De Procuratore* (Lips. 1823); Langen, in the *Theol. Quartalschr.* (1862) iii; *Bible Educator*, iii, 180. See GOVERNOR.

Prodicians, a body of Antinomian Gnostic heretics, took their name from their founder, Prodicus, a heretic of the 2d century, who instituted the sect of the Adamites. Prodicus maintained that he and his followers were the sons of the most high God, a royal race (*εὐγενεῖς*), and therefore, in crazy self-conceit, thought themselves bound by no laws. They rejected the Sabbath; dispensed with prayer and all ordinances of external worship, which they considered to be necessary only for those who were under the power of the Demiurge. They indulged in open profligacy, calling themselves Adamites, because they professed to imitate the condition of bodily life which marked our first parents before their fall. Their maxim was that they were restored by Christ to a state of innocence equal to that which characterized Adam before his transgression; and that, therefore, whenever they appeared together, they should not be ashamed to appear as Adam did in the time of his innocence. They were in the habit of appealing to the authority of certain apocryphal books which were attributed to Zoroaster. Prodicus is placed by Baronius in A.D. 120, before Valentinus. His followers are sometimes identified with the *Adamites*, and sometimes with the *Origenists*. See Clement Alex. *Strom.* i, 304; iii, 438; vii, 722; Theodoret, *Fab. Hæret.* i, 6; Farrar, *Eccles. Dict.* s. v.; Neander, *Church Hist.* i, 451.

Prodĭcus (1), an Athenian philosopher of the school of the Sophists, was a contemporary of Socrates, and forerunner of the latter in the domain of philosophy, inasmuch as he prepared the way for the logical and ethical efforts of Socrates. Prodicus was a native of Sulis, in the island of Ceos. He went frequently to Athens for the purpose of transacting business on behalf of his native city, and even attracted admiration in the senate as an orator (Plato, *Hipp. Maj.* p. 282; comp. Philost. *Vit. Soph.* i, 12), although his voice was deep and apt to fall (Plato, *Protag.* p. 316, a; Philost. *l. c.*). Plutarch describes him as slender and weak (Plut. *an seni ger. sit Resp.* c. 15); and Plato speaks of a degree of effeminacy which resulted therefrom (*Protag.* p. 315, d). Philostratus is the first who taxes him with luxury and avarice (*l. c.*; comp. Welcker, *Kleine Schriften*, ii, 513, etc.). In the *Protagoras* of Plato, which points to the eighty-seventh Olympiad (any more exact determination is disputable) as the time at which the dialogue is supposed to take place, Prodicus is mentioned as having previously arrived in Athens. Still later, when Isocrates (born Ol. 86, 1) is mentioned as his disciple (see Welcker, *Prodikos von Keos, Vorgänger des Socrates*, published first in the *Rheinisches Museum der Philologie*, von Welcker and Näke, i, 1–39, 533–545, afterwards in Welcker's *Kleine Schriften*, ii, 392–541), and in the year of the death of Socrates, Prodicus was still living (Plato, *Apol.* p. 19, c). The dates of his birth and death cannot be determined. The statement of Suidas (s. v.; comp. Schol. on Plato *De Rep.* x, 600, c) that he was condemned to the hemlock cup as a corrupter of the youth in Athens sounds very suspicious (comp. Welcker, p. 582). According to the statement of Philostratus (p. 483 — comp. p. 496, ed. Olearius), on which little more reliance can be placed, he delivered his lecture on virtue and vice in Thebes and Sparta also. The *Apology* of Plato unites him with Gorgias and Hippias in the statement that into whatever city they might come, they were competent to instruct

the youth. Lucian (*Vit. Herod.* c. 3) mentions him among those who had held lectures at Olympia. In the dialogues of Plato he is mentioned or introduced, not indeed without irony, though, as compared with the other Sophists, with a certain degree of esteem (*Hipp. Maj.* p. 282; *Theæt.* p. 151, b; *Phædo*, 60; *Protag.* p. 341, a; *Charmid.* p. 163, d; *Meno*, p. 96; *Cratyl.* p. 384, b; *Symp.* p. 177; *Euthyd.* p. 305). Aristophanes, in the *Clouds* (l. 360), deals more indulgently with him than with Socrates; and the Xenophontic Socrates, for the purpose of combating the voluptuousness of Aristippus, borrows from the book of the wise Prodicus (Πρόδ. ὁ σοφός) the story of the choice of Hercules (*Memor.* ii, 1, § 21, etc.). This separation of Prodicus from the other Sophists has been pointed out by Welcker in the above-quoted treatise (p. 400, etc.). Like Protagoras and others, Prodicus delivered lectures in return for the payment of contributions (ἐπιδείκνυται—Xenoph. *Mem.* ii, 1, § 21; comp. Philost. p. 482; Diog. Laert. ix, 50; ἠρανίζοντο—τιμή, Plato, *Prot.* 314, b) of from half a drachma to fifty drachmæ, probably according as the hearers limited themselves to a single lecture, or entered into an agreement for a more complete course (*Axioch.* 6; *Cratyl.* p. 384, b; Aristot. *Rhet.* iii, 14, § 9; Suid. s. v.; comp. Welcker, p. 414). Prodicus is said to have amassed a great amount of money (*Hipp. Maj.* p. 282, d; Xenoph. *Symp.* iv, 62; i, 5; on the practice of paying for instruction and lectures, comp. again Welcker, *l. c.* p. 412, etc.).

As Prodicus and others maintained with regard to themselves that they stood equally on the confines of philosophy and politics (*Euthyd.* p. 305, c), so Plato represents his instructions as chiefly ethical (*Meno*, p. 96, d; comp. *De Rep.* x, p. 600, e), and gives the preference to his distinction of ideas—as of those of courage, rashness, boldness—over similar attempts of other Sophists (*Lach.* p. 197, c). What pertained to this point was probably only contained in individual show-orations (Diog. Laert., Philost. *ll. cc.*), which he usually declined (Philost. p. 482). Though known to Callimachus, they do not appear to have been much longer preserved (Welcker, p. 465, etc.). In contrast with Gorgias and others, who boasted of possessing the art of making the small appear great, the great small, and of expatiating in long or short speeches, Prodicus required that the speech should be neither long nor short, but of the proper measure (Plato, *Phæd.* p. 267, a; comp. *Gorg.* p. 449, c; *Prot.* p. 334, e, 335, b, 338, d; Aristot. *Rhet.* iii, 17), and it is only as associated with other Sophists that he is charged with endeavoring to make the weaker cause strong by means of his rhetoric (Cicero. *Brut.* c. 8). He paid especial attention to the correct use of words (Plato, *Euthyd.* p. 187, e; *Cratyl.* p. 384, b; comp. Galen, *In Hippocr. de Articul.* iv, p. 461, l), and the distinction of expressions related in sense (*Lach.* p. 197, d; *Prot.* p. 340, a, 341, a; *Charmid.* p. 163, d; *Meno*, p. 75, c; comp. Themist. *Orat.* iv, p. 113). But he deserves greater remembrance for his parenetical discourses on moral subjects, among which one of the best known is *Hercules at the Cross Roads* (Philost. p. 496; Xenophon, *Mem.* ii, 1, § 21, only quotes the σύγγραμμα περὶ τοῦ Ἡρακλέους). It was entitled Ὧραι (Suid. s. v. Ὧραι and Πρόδ.; Schol. ad Aristoph. *Nub.* l. 360. Respecting the different explanations of this title, see Welcker, p. 466, etc., who refers it to the youthful bloom of Hercules). To Hercules, as he was on the point, at his entrance on the age of youth, of deciding for one of the two paths of life—that of virtue and that of vice—there appear two women, the one of dignified beauty, adorned with purity, modesty, and discretion, the other of a voluptuous form and meretricious look and dress. The latter promises to lead him by the shortest road, without any toil, to the enjoyment of every pleasure. The other, while she reminds him of his progenitors and his noble nature, does not conceal from him that the gods have not granted what is really beautiful and good apart from trouble and careful striving. The one seeks to deter him from the path of virtue by urging the difficulty of it; the other calls attention to the unnatural character of enjoyment which anticipates the need of it, its want of the highest joy, that arising from noble deeds, and the consequences of a life of voluptuousness, and how she herself, honored by gods and men, leads to all noble works, and to true well-being in all circumstances of life. Hercules decides for virtue. This outline in Xenophon probably represents, in a very abbreviated form, and with the omission of all collateral references, the leading ideas of the original, of which no fragments remain (comp. Welcker, p. 469, etc., who also shows that the amplifications in Dio Chysostomus and Themistius belong to these rhetoricians, and are not derived from the *Horæ* of Prodicus, p. 488, etc. Respecting the numerous imitations of this narrative in poets, philosophers, rhetoricians, and in works of art, see, in like manner, Welcker, p. 467, etc.). In another speech, which treated of riches, and the substance of which is reproduced in the dialogue *Eryxias*, Prodicus undertook to show that the value of external goods depends simply upon the use which is made of them, and that virtue must be learned. (Welcker endeavors to point out the coincidence of the former doctrine with that of Socrates and Antisthenes, p. 493, etc.) Similar sentiments were expressed in Prodicus's *Praise of Agriculture* (Themist. *Orat.* 30, p. 349; comp. Welcker, p. 496, etc.). His views respecting the worthlessness of earthly life in different ages and callings, and how we must long after freedom from connection with the body in the heavenly and cognate æther, are found represented in the dialogue *Axiochus*, from a lecture by Prodicus; as also his doctrine that death is not to be feared, as it affects neither the living nor the departed (comp. Stob. *Serm.* xx, 35). Whether the appended arguments for immortality are borrowed from him, as Welcker (p. 500) endeavors to show, is doubtful. The gods he regarded as personifications of the sun, moon, rivers, fountains, and whatever else contributes to the comfort of our life (Sext. Emp. *Adv. Math.* i, 52; Cicero, *De Nat. Deor.* i, 42), and he is therefore, though hastily, charged with atheism (ibid. 55). Prodicus declared death to be desirable as an escape from the evils of life. His moral consciousness therefore certainly lacked philosophical basis and depth. See, besides the authorities already quoted, Hummel, *De Prodico Sophista* (Leyden, 1847); Cougny, *De Prodico Ceio, Socratis magistro* (Paris, 1858); Diemer, *De Prod. Ceio* (Corbach, 1859); Krämer, *Die Allegorie des Prodikos u. der Traum des Lukianos*, in the *Neue Jahrbücher für Phil. u. Pädagogik*, xciv (1866), 439–443; Blass, *Die alte Beredsamkeit* (Leips. 1868), p. 29 sq.; Ueberweg, *Hist. of Philosophy*, i, 78; Smith, *Dict. of Greek and Roman Biog. and Mythol.* s. v.

Prodicus (2). See PRODICIANS.

Prodigies. Wonderful appearances which were supposed among the ancient heathens to betoken some impending misfortune or calamity. These being regarded as marks of the anger of the gods, they were considered as calling for prayers and sacrifices. Whenever prodigies were seen, the pontifices, or priests, proceeded to perform certain public rites by way of expiation. The fall of meteoric stones was accounted a prodigy, and almost all the others might be explained by peculiar natural phenomena which in those ancient times were not understood.

Prodymna (or *Pradymea* or *Pradyumna*) was, in the Indian mythology, an avatar of Kama (q. v.), the love-god.

Proedri (πρόεδροι, Lat. *præsides, præsidentes*) is one of the titles which were given in the ancient Church to the bishops, and was used in close connection with the word πρεσβύτερος. See PRESBYTER. It is de-

rived from the *προεδρία*, the elevated seat which the bishop occupied in the synod and in the religious assemblies of the people. See Coleman, *Ancient Christianity Exemplified* (Phila. 1856, 8vo), p. 131, and the references quoted on p. 601; Siegel, *Christliche Alterthümer* (see Index in vol. iv); Riddle, *Christ. Antiquities*, p. 211.

Proedrosia, sacrifices, or, as some allege, a festival offered to Demeter or Ceres at seed-time, with the view of securing a bountiful harvest.—Gardner, *Faiths of the World*, s. v.

Proestos (*προεστώς*), one of the names by which the early Church distinguished the teachers or preachers from the "brethren" (1 Tim. v, 17). Justin Martyr uses the term as synonymous with *ἱεράρχης*, when he speaks of the *προεστώς* as the person whose duty it is to consecrate the elements in the administration of the Lord's Supper (*Apolog.* ii, 67), a duty subsequently performed only by the bishop except in his absence. (Pepin's decree, A.D. 755, is as follows: "Nullus presbyter præsumat missas celebrare sine jussione episcopi in cujus parochia est." The Council of Arles laid similar restrictions upon deacons [canon 15].) The title *Proestos* was translated into Latin by *Præpositus*, whence the English word *Provost* (q. v.). See Coleman, *Ancient Christianity Exemplified*, p. 102 et al.; Siegel, *Christl. Alterthümer* (see Index in vol. iv); Riddle, *Christ. Antiquities*, p. 211.

Profane (חָנֵף, *chanáph*, Jer. xxiii, 11; *βέβηλος*, Heb. xii, 16). To profane is to put holy things to vile or common uses; as the money-changers did the Temple, by converting a part of it into a place of business (Matt. xxi, 12), and as those do who allow secular occupations to engross any part of the Sabbath under the old, or of the Lord's day under the new dispensation (Exod. xx, 8–10). Esau, for despising his birthright and its privileges, is styled by the apostle "a profane person" (Heb. xii, 16). The term is also used in opposition to holy. Thus the general history of ancient nations is styled profane, as distinguished from that contained in the Bible; profane writings are such as have been composed by heathens, in contradistinction from the sacred books of Scripture, and the writings of Christian authors on sacred subjects.

Professio Fidei TRIDENTINÆ is the form of the Roman Catholic profession of faith in which it took shape at the Council of Trent and in which it was afterwards published by pope Pius IV, so that it is sometimes called the *Creed of Pius IV* (q. v.). The general Christian confession of faith had been renewed in the third session of the Council of Trent on Feb. 3, 1546 (*decretum de symbolo fidei*), but there was need of something for general use in the Church at large, so that all its members might become obligated to the Church and its teachings, not only for their own faithfulness, but for their arrayal against heretics. Hence Pius IV in 1556 ordered to be prepared a *Formula Christianæ et Catholicæ Fidei*, and on Sept. 4, 1560, presented it for consideration to the cardinal college. In 1564 it was finally promulgated, and persons on becoming members of the Church of Rome are expected to recite the creed. This profession of faith runs as follows:

"I most steadfastly admit and embrace apostolical and ecclesiastical traditions, and all other observances and constitutions of the same Church.

"I also admit the holy Scriptures, according to that sense which our holy mother the Church has held and does hold, to which it belongs to judge of the true sense and interpretation of the Scriptures: neither will I ever take and interpret them otherwise than according to the unanimous consent of the fathers.

"I also profess that there are truly and properly seven sacraments of the new law, instituted by Jesus Christ our Lord, and necessary for the salvation of mankind, though not all for every one—to wit: baptism, confirmation, the Eucharist, penance,* extreme unction, holy orders,† and matrimony: and that they confer grace; and that of these, baptism, confirmation, and order cannot be reiterated without sacrilege. I also receive and admit the received and approved ceremonies of the Catholic Church, used in the solemn administration of the aforesaid sacraments.

"I embrace and receive all and every one of the things which have been defined and declared in the holy Council of Trent concerning original sin and justification.

"I profess, likewise, that in the mass there is offered to God a true, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead; and that in the most holy sacrament of the Eucharist there is truly, really, and substantially the body and blood, together with the soul and divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ; and that there is made a change of the whole substance of the bread into the body, and of the whole substance of the wine into the blood, which change the Catholic Church calls *transubstantiation*. I also confess that under either kind alone Christ is received whole and entire, and a true sacrament.

"I firmly hold that there is a *purgatory*, and that the souls therein detained are helped by the suffrages of the faithful.

"Likewise, that the saints reigning with Christ are to be honored and invocated, and that they offer up prayers to God for us; and that their relics are to be had in veneration.

"I most firmly assert that the images of Christ, of the mother of God, and also of other saints, ought to be had and retained, and that due honor and veneration are to be given them.

"I also affirm that the power of indulgences was left by Christ in the Church, and that the use of them is most wholesome to Christian people.

"I acknowledge the holy Catholic Apostolic Roman Church for the mother and mistress of all churches: and I promise true obedience to the bishop of Rome, successor to St. Peter, prince of the apostles, and vicar of Jesus Christ."

Then follow clauses condemnatory of all contrary doctrines, and expressive of adhesion to all the definitions of the Council of Trent.

It is obvious that the *Confessio Fidei Tridentinæ* was framed in accordance to the decrees of that council, and has chiefly in view the opinions of those who followed the Reformation. See Möhler, *Symbolics;* Köllner, *Die Symbolik der römischen Kirche*, p. 141 sq.; Schaff, *Creeds of Christendom* (see Index in vol. iii); Fisher, *Hist. of the Reformation*, p. 402.

Profession. Among the ceremonies of baptism in the early Church, one of great importance was the profession of faith and vow of obedience. The catechumens first renounced the devil, and then professed to live in obedience to the laws of Christ. See PACTUM.

Christians are required to make a profession of their faith — 1, boldly (Rom. i, 16); 2, explicitly (Matt. v, 16); 3, constantly (Heb. x, 23); 4, yet not ostentatiously, but with humility and meekness.

Among the Romanists, *profession* denotes the entering into a religious order, whereby a person offers himself to God by a vow of inviolably observing obedience, chastity, and poverty.

Professor, a term commonly used in the religious world to denote any person who makes an open acknowledgment of the religion of Christ, or who outwardly manifests his attachment to Christianity. All real Christians are professors, but all professors are not real Christians. In this, as in all other things of worth and importance, we find counterfeits. There are many who become professors, not from principle, from investigation, from love to the truth, but from interested motives, prejudice of education, custom, influence of connections, novelty, etc., as Saul, Jehu, Judas, Demas, the foolish virgins, etc. See CHRISTIAN.

Profesti Dies. Days without any special service, in distinction from solemn or officiating days, which include stations, litanies, fasts, and feast-days or festivals.

---

* Under penance is included confession, as the Catholic sacrament of penance consists of three parts—contrition or sorrow, confession, and satisfaction.

† The clerical orders of the Catholic Church are divided into two classes, *sacred* and *minor* orders. The first consists of subdeacons, deacons, and priests, who are bound to celibacy, and the daily recitation of the *Breviary*, or collection of psalms and prayers, occupying a considerable time. The minor orders are four in number, and are preceded by the *tonsure*, an ecclesiastical ceremony in which the hair is shorn, initiatory to the ecclesiastical state.

Profiat Duran, whose Jewish name was *Isaac ben-Moses* (surnamed *Ephodæus* from his principal work מעשה אפוד), is noted as a gifted poet, philosopher, and astronomer. He flourished between 1360 and 1412. In the bitter persecution of 1391 he was driven outwardly to embrace Christianity to save his life. In order to throw off the mask of a religion which in the name of love nearly exterminated all his co-religionists, Profiat and a friend, who had become an apostate for like reasons, concluded to go to Palestine to confess Judaism. Profiat Duran left first and went to a seaplace in the south of France, awaiting the arrival of his friend. Meanwhile Ben-Giorno met with Paul of Burgos (q. v.), who persuaded him to remain steadfastly in his Christian faith. Ben-Giorno wrote a letter to Duran in full praise of the bishop of Burgos, expounding his religious belief and exhorting him at the same time to be also true to Christianity. This imbittered Duran not only against his friend, but especially against the bishop of Burgos, and he answered in a polemical epistle, full of bitter sarcasm and irony, entitled אל תהי כאבותיך (*Be not like thy Fathers*), called by Christians *Alteca Boteca*, who, misunderstanding its purpose, took it as a defence of Christianity, while in reality aimed against it. The whole letter was equivocal. It was believed at first reading that it was an exhortation to stand fast in the religion he had embraced, but the mystery was easily discovered, and it appeared by an attentive consideration that Duran meant to oblige his friend to return to Judaism. This celebrated work was first published at Constantinople in 1577 in a collection of other treatises. It was then republished by A. Günzburg in the collection קבץ וכוחים (Breslau, 1844). Geiger published a German translation in his *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift*, iv, 452–458 (Stuttgard, 1839), and an English translation was published in the *Jewish Messenger* (N. Y. Sept. 12, 1873). Besides, Duran wrote כלימת הגוים (*The Reproach of the Gentiles*), in 12 chapters, which has not as yet been published. An extract of it, as well as the contents of the chapters, is given in the *Catalogue* of Michael's Library, p. 364, 365 (Hamb. 1848):—מעשה אפוד (*The Work of Ephod*), a Hebrew grammar, divided into 32 chapters, with an interesting and elaborate introduction. Endowed with remarkable grammatical tact, he was the first to demonstrate the reflexive or reciprocal instead of the passive meaning of Niphal. His important grammar, which he finished in 1403, of which fragments are printed in the notes to Goldberg's edition of Ibn-Ganach's (q. v.) *Sepher Harikmah* (Frankfort-on-the-Main, 1856), in Filipowski's edition of Menachem Ibn-Saruk's *Hebrew und Chaldee Lexicon*, p. 76 (Lond. 1854), and by Jacob C. Chajim in his *Introduction to the Rabbinic Bible*, p. 42, 43 (ed. Ginsburg, Lond. 1865), has lately been published by Dr. Jonath. Friedländer and J. Kohn, with an introduction, notes, and elucidations (Vienna, 1865):—a *Commentary* on two sections of Ibn-Ezra's commentary on the Pentateuch (De Rossi, No. 835):—a *Commentary* on Ibn-Ezra's enigma on the quiescent letters:—*Comment* on *The Guide of the Perplexed*:—and חשב האפד on astronomy, in 29 chapters. See Fürst, *Bibl. Jud.* i, 215; Steinschneider, *Catalogus Librorum Hebr. in Biblioth. Bodlej.* col. 2112–2119; De Rossi, *Dizionario Storico degli Autori Ebrei*, p. 260 sq. (Germ. trans. by Hamberger); Ginsburg in Kitto's *Cyclop.* s. v.; Grätz, *Gesch. der Juden*, viii, 94, 403, etc. (Leips. 1864, p. 86–89; ibid. 1875, p. 381 sq.); Basnage, *Histoire des Juifs*, p. 690 (Taylor's transl.); Lindo, *History of the Jews*, p. 195; Finn, *Sephardim*, p. 386; Kalisch, *Hebrew Grammar*, ii, 31; Geiger, *Jüdische Zeitschrift* (1866), p. 212; Steinschneider, *Jewish Literature*, p. 127, 137 sq.; Etheridge, *Introduction to Hebrew Literature*, p. 268; Jost, *Gesch. des Judenth. u. s. Sekten*, iii, 100; Gronemann, *De Profiatii Durani* (*Efodali*) *vita ac studiis cum in alias literas tum in grammaticam collatis* (Breslau, 1869). (B. P.)

Profitt, George Marion, a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born in Yancey County, N. C., about 1835. He professed religion and joined the Church in 1849. He was admitted into the Holston Conference in 1858. His first appointment was to the Cleveland circuit as junior preacher; his second year was spent on Spencer mission; his third, on Sulphur Springs circuit; his fourth, on Newport circuit. His health having failed, he went to Florida, where he died on Sunday, June 5, 1864. He led an exemplary and pious life.

Prognosticator. The phrase "monthly prognosticators" occurs in the A. V. as a rendering of מוֹדִיעִים לַחֳדָשִׁים, *making known as to the months*, in Isa. xlvii, 13, where the prophet is enumerating the astrological superstitions of the Chaldæans. It is known that the Chaldæan astrologers professed to divine future events by the positions, aspects, and appearances of the stars, which they regarded as having great influence on the affairs of men and kingdoms; and it would seem, from the present text, that they put forth accounts of the events which might be expected to occur from month to month, like our old almanac-makers. Some carry the analogy further, and suppose that they also gave monthly tables of the weather; but *such* prognostications are only cared for in climates where the weather is uncertain and variable; while in Chaldæa, where (as we know from actual experience) the seasons are remarkably regular in their duration and recurrence, and where variations of the usual course of the weather are all but unknown, no prognosticator would gain much honor by foretelling what every peasant knows. See Astrology; Divination.

Pro-Hegoumenos, the ex-superior of a Greek convent who has completed his term of office, which is two years, and retires divested of nothing but his authority.—Gardner, *Faiths of the World*, s. v.

Pröhle, Heinrich Andreas, *Dr.*, a Lutheran minister, who died April 19, 1875, at Hornhausen, near Oschersleben, in Germany, is best known by his writings in the department of homiletics, liturgy, and pædagogics. He published, *Materialien zu Homilien in katechetischer Form* (Halberstadt, 1846):—*Die körperliche, christliche und bürgerliche Schulerziehung* (Magdeburg, 1846):—*Leitfaden bei dem Konfirmanden-Unterrichte, mit einem Vorworte von Claus Harms* (q. v.) (Halberstadt, 1851): *Liturgischer Festring* (Wernigerode, 1856):—*Predigt-Entwürfe über die Evangelien u. Episteln*, etc. (ibid. 1856):—*Das Halberstädtische Kirchen- und Haus-Gesangbuch in seiner erneueten Gestalt* (Oschersleben, 1856):—*Kirchliche Sitten. Ein Bild aus dem Leben evangelischer Gemeinen* (Berlin, 1858). This latter work is the most important of his writings. See Zuchold, *Bibliotheca Theologica*, iii, 1015; *Literarischer Handweiser* (1875), p. 222; Hauck, *Theol. Jahresbericht* (1866), ii, 734. (B. P.)

Proistameni (προιστάμενοι) is only another title which was given to the preacher of the early Church. See Proestos.

Prokiměnon (προκειμένον, *something that lies before*) is, in the Greek liturgy, the short anthem pronounced previous to the reading of the epistle from the Holy Scriptures, consisting of verse and response usually taken from the Psalms. The purpose is to give a hint as to the way in which the day ought to be celebrated. Such phrases are, for instance, "Praise ye the Lord," "Give ear to my prayer, O Lord," "Thy mercy, O Lord," "God help me through thy name," "My help comes from the Lord," "O Lord, thou art my protector." Previous to the calling-out of the *prokimenon* the deacon exclaims, "Let us listen!"—Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* s. v.

Prokopovitch, Teophan, a Russian prelate of

great renown, especially as a pulpit orator, and therefore called the Chrysostom of the Russo-Greek Church, was born at Kief June 8, 1681. Baptized *Eleazar*, he exchanged it for *Elisha*, with the dress of St. Basil, in a United Greek monastery of that order in Lithuania. He was sent to Rome to finish his studies, and there had remained three years when he suddenly removed, by force of circumstances not known, and went to Potcherif, in Volhynia, where he renounced his faith, and was transferred, under the new name of *father Samuel*, to the chair of rhetoric in the Academy of Kief. When Peter I passed through the city, after the victory at Pultava, the duty of complimenting him was confided to Prokopovitch. He accompanied the czar in his unlucky campaign on the Pruth, and was made abbot of the monastery of Kief. In 1715 he was promoted to the seat of Pskopf, although he avowed that he had expressed heretical doctrines at the court and in his writings. The doctors of the Sorbonne, wishing to profit by the visit Peter I had paid to them in 1717, attempted to enter into friendly relations with the Russian Church. Appointed to reply to their address to the czar, Prokopovitch frustrated this attempt; and, yielding himself to all the views of the despot, he composed an ecclesiastical constitution which made of the Church a civil institution, and the clergy servants employed by the State—a condition which remains unaltered in the Russian Church to this day. He also, at the emperor's instigation, consented to the sequestration of the Church domains, and apportioned to the clergy a share of the income proportionate to their several ranks. He received from Catharine, whom he had crowned empress, the presidency of the synod and the archbishopric of Novgorod, founded by Theodosius. Prokopovitch crowned Peter II, whose right to the throne he had attacked in a work condemned by a ukase of July 26, 1727, by the then empress Anna, and encouraged the latter to commit in 1730 the stroke of policy from the effects of which Russia yet suffers the most deplorable consequences. He died at St. Petersburg Sept. 8, 1736. He left a great number of panegyrics and expositions of all sorts, some in impure Russian, some in Latin Oustrailif admits that the works of this prelate were specimens of the basest adulation.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v. See Tchistovitch, *Théophane Prokopovitch et Théophilacte Lopatinski* (St. Petersb. 1861); Otto, *Russ. Litt.* s. v.; *Meth. Quar. Rev.* July, 1873, p. 499.

Prolocutor, the chairman or president of convocation in England. See CONVOCATION.

Promater. See SPONSOR.

Promise (some form of אָמַר, *to say*, or דָּבַר, *to speak*; ἐπαγγελία) is a solemn asseveration, by which one pledges his veracity that he will perform, or cause to be performed, for the benefit of another, the thing which he mentions. A promise, in the scriptural sense of the term, is a declaration or assurance of the divine will, in which God signifies what particular blessings or good things he will freely bestow, as well as the evils which he will remove. Promises differ from the commands of God, inasmuch as the former are significations of the divine will concerning a duty enjoined to be performed, while the promises relate to mercy to be received. The "exceeding great and precious promises" are applicable to all believers; they appertain to the present and the future life (2 Pet. i, 4). Some particular promises are predictions, as the promise of the Messiah, and the blessings of the Gospel (Rom. iv, 13, 14; Gal. iii, 14–29). Hence the Hebrews were called the "children of the promise" (Rom. ix, 8). So all the true believers in the Lord Jesus Christ are called "children" and "heirs of the promise" (Gal. iv, 20; Heb. vi, 12, 17). There are four classes of promises mentioned in the Scriptures, particularly in the New Test.: 1, promises relating to the Messiah; 2, promises relating to the Church; 3, promises of blessings, both temporal and spiritual, to the pious; and, 4, promises encouraging the exercise of the several graces and duties that compose the Christian character. The first two of these classes, indeed, are many of them predictions as well as promises. See PROPHECY. The consideration of the others should prove, 1, an antidote to despair; 2, a motive to patience under affliction; 3, an incentive to perseverance in well-doing; 4, a call for prayer.

PROMISE is a solemn asseveration by which one pledges his veracity that he shall perform, or cause to be performed, the thing which he mentions. The obligation of promises arises from the necessity of the well-being and existence of society. "Virtue requires," as Dr. Doddridge observes, "that promises be fulfilled. The promisee, i. e. the person to whom the promise is made, acquires a property in virtue of the promise. The uncertainty of property would evidently be attended with great inconvenience. By failing to fulfil my promise, I either show that I was not sincere in making it, or that I have little constancy or resolution, and either way injure my character, and consequently my usefulness in life. Promises, however, are not binding, 1, if they were made by us before we came to such exercise of reason as to be fit to transact affairs of moment; or if by any distemper or sudden surprise we are deprived of the exercise of our reason at the time when the promise is made; 2, if the promise was made on a false presumption, in which the promiser, after the most diligent inquiry, was imposed upon, especially if he were deceived by the fraud of the promisee; 3, if the thing itself be vicious, for virtue cannot require that vice should be committed; 4, if the accomplishment of the promise be so hard and intolerable that there is reason to believe that, had it been foreseen, it would not have been an accepted case; 5, if the promise be not accepted, or if it depend on conditions not performed." But really this question concerning the *validity* and obligation of a promise given or obtained under false views is a matter that falls within the *Casuistry of Ethics*—a very uncertain ground. See Grotius, *De Jure*, lib. ii, cap. xi; Paley, *Moral Philosophy*, vol. i, ch. v; Grove, *Moral Philosophy*, vol. ii. ch. xii, p. 2; Watts, *Sermons*, ser. 20; Dymond, *Essays;* Verplanck, *On Contracts.* See OBLIGATION; PROBABILISM.

PROMISES OF GOD are the kind declarations of his Word, in which he hath assured us he will bestow blessings upon his people. The promises contained in the sacred Scriptures may be considered, 1, divine as to their origin; 2, suitable as to their nature; 3, abundant as to their number; 4, clear as to their expression; 5, certain as to their accomplishment. The consideration of them should, 1, prove an antidote to despair; 2, a motive to patience; 3, a call for prayer; 4, a spur to perseverance. See Clark, *On the Promises;* Buck, *Sermons*, ser. 11.

Promissum. See PACTUM.

Promotio per saltum is, in the Church of Rome, the intentional disregard of the legal scale of the different orders. It is the collation or the obtention of a higher order by way of skipping one or several other orders, which, according to rule, ought to precede. In consequence, he who has been ordained *per saltum* cannot perform the functions of the order thus unlawfully bestowed until the next inferior order has been subsequently obtained also (*c. un. Dist.* lii); this inferior degree the bishop can confer on him, and allow him at once to perform the duties of the higher degree (*Conc. Trid.* sess. xxiii, c. 14, *De Ref.*). But if the promoted ecclesiastic officiates according to the higher order thus *illicitly* conferred on him without the episcopal dispensation, he becomes irregular, and needs papal dispensation (*c. un. x, De Cler. per salt. prom.* v, 29). The consecration of a bishop, with omission of the presbyterate, would not only be illicit, but utterly void (*Arg. c.* 10, *fin.* x, *De excess. præl.* v, 31).—Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, s. v.

Prompsault, Jean Henri Romain, a French ecclesiastical writer, was born April 7, 1798, at Montalembert. He was the eldest of twelve children. After he had finished his classical studies in the little seminary, he was received into the large seminary of Valence, and was admitted to the priesthood two years before the required age, Nov. 5, 1821. At first employed to do curate's duty in the office of his parish, he taught dogmatic theology in the great seminary of Valence, and ended in doing parochial duty. Having been appointed in 1827 to the chair of philosophy in the College of Tournon, he refused, without being authorized by his bishop, to take the oath required by the professors by the ordinance of 1828, and was deposed. At the end of 1829 he went to Paris, and was attached to M. de Croi, then head chaplain to the hospital of Quinze Vingt, in the capacity of chaplain. He saved that establishment from downfall in 1831. In this humble position the abbé Prompsault, although scrupulously fulfilling the obligations of priest and chaplain, had yet considerable time to give to study. He put aside the largest share of the receipts of his publications and of his literary pension to buy books, and he formed an ecclesiastical library of 25,000 volumes. He began his literary career by publishing a critical edition of the works of Villon in 1832, and in 1835 he published a criticism of an edition of French literature published by Crapelet. This last work engaged him in a lively controversy with Crapelet, in which he defended himself with a calm and witty sarcasm which was afterwards the characteristic of his polemical writings. He occupied himself for many years with the Latin and Romance languages. In 1837 he published many translations of ascetic works. His principal study was canon law and the civil and ecclesiastical jurisprudence of France. Himself a thorough Gallican, he discarded the ultramontane tendencies of the French episcopacy, and advocated the liberties of the Gallican Church. In this spirit he attacked the encyclical of pope Pius IX, and brought such odium upon himself that he was led to retract much that he had uttered against ultra-Romanism, though at heart he always felt his first course to have been the true and proper one. His last years were imbittered by remorse, and he died Jan. 7, 1858, neglected by those for whom he had sacrificed his honor.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v. See *Christian Remembrancer*, xliv, 340; Vapereau, *Dict. des Contemporains*, s. v.

Promulgation or **Publication**, i. e. proclamation—usually of a law by the competent legislative power—is, in the Church of Rome, an absolute condition of its binding character ("lex non promulgata non obligat," c. i, 9; *Cod. De Legib.* i, 14). In consequence, an ecclesiastical law, like any civil law, in order to become obligatory *in foro externo* must be promulgated in the customary way by the competent authorities of the Church. The binding power of the law rests entirely on the will of the legislator publicly expressed, and begins at the very moment of the promulgation ("lex promulgata statim obligat," c. 1, x; *De post. præl.* i, 5), unless some future period is expressly indicated when it shall be enforced (f. inst. *Sext.* c. 32; *De Præb.* iii, 4; *Conc. Trid.* sess. xxiv, c. 1, *fin. De Ref. Matrim.*). A law has generally no retroactive power ("lex non retro agit," c. 2, x; *De Constit.* i, 2), unless it be merely an explanation or reiteration of a former disposition, or unless retroactive power be expressly given to it. From the moment of the promulgation takes effect also the juridical presumption of the general knowledge of the law, which excludes every excuse of *ignorantia legis* (*Sext.* c. 13; *De R. T.* v, 13), unless the legislator subordinates the validity of the ordinance to the observation of a certain form of promulgation, and this form has not been observed. Every one whom the law may concern is bound to conform to it as soon as he has obtained, no matter by what means, a knowledge of it. The diocesan ordinances of archbishops and bishops are, as a rule, communicated to the deaconries, and through them, by circular letters, to the curates, etc., who publish them from the pulpit, or by placards at the church doors. The papal see used in former times to address its ordinances to the chief ecclesiastical dignitaries of the countries, provinces, or dioceses which they concerned, and had them communicated by them to the subordinate clerical authorities, for further publication, by way of synods and circular letters. Afterwards the custom prevailed of publishing the general prescriptions of the papal see only at Rome, *in acie campi Floræ*, and of posting them at the door of the Vatican. Thus the principle was adopted, *publicatio Urbi et Orbi*, which was acknowledged without contest until the 17th century. It was only after the times of De Marca (*De Concordiâ Sacerdotii et Imperii*, lib. ii, c. 15) and Van Espen (*De Promulgatione Legum Eccl.*, etc., Lovan. 1712) that the necessity of a more special promulgation was from many quarters insisted upon. But the passages of the Roman and canon law quoted to support these views are all of them misunderstood or purposely distorted (Seitz, *Zeitschrift für Kirchenrecht u. Pastoral-Wissenschaft*, vol. i, § 1, No. 5, p. 90 sq.). It must strike every one that a really universal publication, which would be sure not only to reach every individual, but to be intelligible to him, is utterly impossible, and could not be obtained even by inserting the law in all official and local papers. The binding power of the law cannot depend on that circumstance that it was really made known in all places and to every individual, but on this sole condition that the legislator have publicly expressed his will in the customary way. This act of the legislator must not be confounded with the means and ways that are resorted to in order to insure the widest publicity to the law promulgated by the legislative authority. The latter is no concern of the legislator, but of the executive authorities; and it is not the power of the law that depends on it, but this other and quite different question, to be decided by the judge, whether in a given concrete case transgression of the law may be charged or not. However, the different modern civil legislations insist on a special publication of the ecclesiastical statutes as a condition of their validity, and subordinate this publication to the previous approbation of the civil power. If the Church is content to submit to the worldly governments her ordinances, so far as they affect in some way the civil and political relations of her members, it would be only fair if such papal and episcopal decrees which concern exclusively the dogma and the dogmatic side of the discipline should be independent of the civil placet, and left to the clerical functionaries for free publication.—Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, s. v.

Pronaos is the *ante-temple* of Greek churches, and corresponds to the *narthex* (q. v.).

Prone (*præconium*) is the publication in the pulpit of banns of marriage, pastoral letters, coming fasts and feasts, and a sermon (the dominicale, or homily for Sunday) after the Gospel, in the Romish Church.

Prono, an idol of the ancient Sclavonians, worshipped at Altenburg, in Germany. It was a statue erected on a column, holding in one hand a ploughshare, and in the other a spear and a standard. Its head was crowned, its ears prominent, and under one of its feet was suspended a little bell. Gerold, Christian bishop of Altenburg, destroyed this idol with his own hand, and cut down the grove in which it was worshipped.

Pronŭba, a surname of *Juno* (q. v.) among the Romans of antiquity, because she was the goddess who presided over marriage.

Propaganda is a name appropriate to any institution intended for the propagation of a doctrine, but it is especially applied in ecclesiastical language to an institution for the propagation of the Roman Catholic faith. The chief institution of this kind is at Rome, and it consists of a congregation and a college. Its

full title is *De Propagandâ Fide*, i. e. "concerning the propagation of the faith." Its object is to direct and forward the propagation of the Roman Catholic religion, especially among the heathen. Gregory XIII (1572–1584), one of the popes who exerted themselves most zealously for the expansion of the Christian faith, had directed that a number of cardinals should be intrusted with the direction of the Oriental missions, and caused catechisms and other religious books to be printed for the use of Oriental Christians. But as the resources required for such a purpose were wanting, the matter could not have its proper development. Pope Gregory XV, desirous that this good work, so well begun, should be continued, established, by a bull of June 22, 1622, a congregation of cardinals, under the name above mentioned, and intrusted to it the direction of the whole Catholic missionary system. Every month they assembled once in the Vatican, and twice at the residence of the eldest. Besides some stipends of less importance, the pope presented the new institution with the 500 ducats which at the death of a cardinal accrue to the pontifical treasure. His successor, Urban VIII (1623–1644), increased its privileges and income, and founded the *Seminarium* (or *Collegium*) *de Propagandâ Fide*, to which young men from all nations are brought at an early age and gratuitously instructed and fitted out for the missionary work. This college was subordinated entirely to the Congregation, and a splendid palace was built for both institutions. Through the provident care of the popes, and pious foundations made by the cardinals and other benefactors, the seminary grew to a most flourishing condition; and even in our days, when the income and foundations which support it have been considerably diminished by the State, under the new order of things, it entertains, instructs, and trains for missionary life nearly 200 young men from all quarters of the world. The alumni pledge themselves to serve the Church among the heathen, and are consecrated to this function. All rites actually subsisting in the Catholic Church (besides the Latin rite, the Armenian, Greek-Melchitic, Syrian, Coptic, Maronitic, and Chaldaic rites) are represented in the seminary by alumni from the corresponding provinces, and present every year, at the feast of Epiphany (Jan. 6), an imposing spectacle, called the *Feast of the Languages*. This feast is celebrated by an exhibition of exceeding interest and curiosity, in which are delivered recitations in every language represented in the college or its missions, amounting often to fifty or sixty. Of this festival the celebrated cardinal Mezzofanti (q. v.) used to be the guiding spirit, as well as to strangers its chief centre of attraction. It continues to be one of the chief literary sights of the Roman winter. In 1873 the college at Rome was deprived of its landed estate and made dependent upon private contributions.

With the congregation and college are connected, 1, a library rich in precious works, especially translations of all kinds of important works in Chinese and Oriental manuscripts; 2, a printing-office (richer formerly than it is now), in which the books required by the missionaries and the missionary work are printed in all foreign languages ("Ha questa congregazione una famosa stamperia co' caratteri di tutte le nazione; ne si troverà altra stamperia che nella varietà di tanti caratteri l' agguagli," says Zaccaria, in his book *Della Corte di Roma* [Rome, 1774]); 3, a remarkable museum, filled with a great variety of objects and monuments, mostly from countries visited and converted by the missionaries. The congregation, which answers somewhat to a Protestant missionary board, consists of a president, managing secretary (all of cardinal's rank), an apostolic prothonotary, twenty-four cardinals appointed for life, one of whom is prefect, and who are assisted by a number of consulters (partly monastics and partly clergy), clerks (*minutanti*), and other officials. Originally their meetings were held weekly, and in the presence of the pope; now they are monthly, there being, however, weekly conferences (*congressi*) of the prefect, secretary, and consulters; and all important business is submitted to the pope in person by the prefect or the secretary. This congregation conducts the affairs not only of the missionary countries, properly so called, but also of those—as England, the northern kingdoms, the United States, Canada, South America, etc.—in which the hierarchical organization is not, or has not been, full and formal. To the Propaganda no small part of the aggressive power of the Church of Rome is due. It has complete military power, under the pope, over the whole missionary field, not only to send missionaries wherever it is the interest of the Church to send them, but to give them special training adapted to their special work. There are nowhere to be found better modern maps of the newly settled states of the United States than in the college of the Propaganda, and nowhere men better informed as to the probable points of future importance than the cardinals who compose the congregation of the Propaganda. The work of this congregation is greatly aided by several subordinate associations for the propagation of the faith, among the most important of which are those at Lyons (France), Vienna, and Bavaria. It supports, besides, another similar institution for the Chinese at Naples. The founder of this seminary was a prelate of the house of Urban VIII, Ion. Vives, born in Spain. It is part of the duties of the pope to superintend this vast and complicated work, and to invite all nations to the communion of the Church. See *Erectio S. Congregationis de Fide Cath. Propagandâ* (*Bullar.* iii, 441 sq.); *Bullar. Pontif. S. Congr. de Prop. Fide* (Rome, 1839–41, 5 vols. 4to); Boyer, *Congr. de Prop. Fide* (Regiom. 1721, 4to); Mejer, *Die Propaganda* (Götting. 1852–53, 2 vols. 8vo; a most valuable treatise); Hase, *Church Hist.* p. 470; Alzog, *Kirchengesch.* ii, 410, 429, 574; *Church Rev.* vol. vii; Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* s. v.; Aschbach, *Kirchen-Lex.* s. v.; Barnum, *Romanism* (see Index); Marsden, *Hist. of Christ. Churches and Sects*, ii, 202. (J. H. W.)

Propagation of the Faith, Associations for, Roman Catholic. The earliest and the highest in dignity of these has been already described under the head Propaganda (q. v.); but the present century has produced several private associations, the resources of which arise entirely from voluntary annual contributions, and the organization of which is most complete and most extensive. The first of these is that founded at Lyons in 1822, under the title "Œuvre de la Propagation de la Foi," with a branch at Paris, and subordinate branches in the other Catholic kingdoms. It is under the direction of a council, which communicates as well with the local associations through which the funds are supplied by small weekly, monthly, or yearly contributions, as with the missions to the aid of which the fund so raised is applied, by an apportionment regulated according to the necessities of each. The piety of contributors is stimulated by the exhortations of the popes, and the granting of indulgences to those who, with the other requisite dispositions, shall aid in the work. The journal of the society, entitled *Annales de la Propagation de la Foi*, is a very interesting bimonthly collection of letters and reports from the different missions connected with the central body. The receipts of this association for the year 1863 were 4,788,496 fr. 86 c. Of this sum, by far the largest proportion was raised in France—3,307,248 fr. Italy came next, though at a long interval, contributing 420,653 fr.; Belgium gave 271,597 fr.; Germany, 251,873 fr.; the British islands, 127,000 fr. Spain, once the great propagator of the Gospel in the New World, contributed but 12,549 fr.; but it is to be observed that Spain maintains for her own missionary enterprises a large and liberal establishment in connection with the mission of the Philippines and the South Sea. Another association of somewhat later date is the "Leopoldiner Verein," established at Vienna in 1829, the chief object of which is to assist the missions of German origin, especially in America.

This association also has its own journal, entitled *Berichte der Leopoldiner Stiftung*. It is under the presidency of the archbishop of Vienna. A third is that established in Bavaria as an offshoot of the Lyons association, under the name "Ludwigs Missions-Verein." Like that of Vienna, its chief, although not exclusive, object is the support of German missions. The Ludwigs Verein is conducted under the auspices of the archbishop of Munich. All these associations, although quite independent in their management and direction, nevertheless maintain close relations with the Propaganda of Rome, and are often guided by the recommendations of the cardinal prefect in the distribution of their funds to particular missions.

Propater. See GODFATHER.

Proper Names, *chiefly of the Old Testament.* It is interesting, as well as useful, to know the original signification of proper names. The chief use which accrues from an accurate knowledge of them is that we are by their means enabled to attain a more lively apprehension of the truth of ancient history; for in ancient, especially Scriptural, times they were employed with greater discrimination than they are at present.

I. *Form of Proper Names.*—The first fact that strikes us, on a general view of them all, is that the ancient Hebrews always retained the greatest simplicity in the use of names. In reality there is always only one single name which distinguishes a person. Where it is necessary, the name of the father is added; sometimes that of the mother instead, in case she happens to be more celebrated (thus the three heroic brothers, Joab, Abishai, and Asael, are always called after their mother Zerûjah [1 Chron. ii, 16]); or the line of descent is traced further back, often to the fourth generation, or even further. Mere epithets, like "David the king," "Isaiah the prophet," always express the actual and significant dignity of a man. The instances in which a person receives two names alternately, as Jacob-Israel, Gideon-Jerubbaal (Judg. vi–ix), are casual and rare, and are not to be ascribed to a general custom of the people.

1. The *simple* names exist in great abundance; and their signification, as to the mere word itself, is generally evident: as דָּן, *Dan*, "judge;" יָמִין, *Jamin*, the Latin *dexter*, an ancient name, according to Gen. xlvi, 10; 1 Chron. ii, 27; שָׁאוּל, *Saul*, "desired," also an ancient name, according to Gen. xlvi, 10; comp. xxxvi, 37; גֶּבֶר, *Geber*, "hero" (1 Kings iv, 19). Thus most of them express an honorable sense; although examples are not wanting of the direct contrary, as עִקֵּשׁ, *Ikkesh*, "crooked" (2 Sam. xxiii, 26). With what ease also feminine words become names for men is shown by cases like אַיָּה, *Aiah*, "vulture" (iii, 7; xxi, 8; comp. Gen. xxxvi, 24); יוֹנָה, *Jonah*, "dove," which are just as applicable to men as the masculine שׁוּעָל, *Shual*, "fox" (1 Chron. vii, 36). Diminutives, which are so frequently used as proper names by the Arabs, are rare among the Hebrews; but are by no means wanting, as is proved by זְבוּלֹן or זְבוּלֻן, *Zebulun*, the name of the son of Jacob, and יְדוּתוּן or יְדִיתוּן, *Jedithun*, the name of the singer of David. All those names which are formed with a prefixed *yod* are to be considered as especially ancient, because this nominal formation became entirely obsolete in the language, and recurs almost only in proper names, as is shown not only by the well-known names יעקב, *Jacob*, יוסף, *Joseph*, יהודה, *Judah*, יצחק, *Isaac*, but also by a number of less common ones, as יָשׁוּב, *Jashub* (Numb. xxvi, 24); יָרִיב, *Jarib* (1 Chron. iv, 24); יַמְלֶךְ, *Jamlech* (ver. 34); יַעְכָּן, *Jachan* (v, 13); יִצְהָר, *Izhar* (Exod. vi, 18); יִבְחָר, *Ibhar* (2 Sam. v, 15); יְפֻנֶּה, *Jephunneh* (Numb. xiii, 6; 1 Chron. vii, 38); יְרַחְמ, *Jeroham* (1 Sam. i, 1; 1 Chron. viii, 27); and others. There is an ancient adjective-ending, that in *âm* or *ôm*, which has fixed itself most firmly in proper names, as אֲחֻזָּם, *Ahuzzam* (1 Chron. iv, 6); גַּזָּם, *Gazzam* (Ezra ii, 48); מִרְיָם, *Miriam*, the sister of Moses, and גֵּרְשׁוֹם, *Gershom*, his son; כִּמְהָם, *Chimham* (2 Sam. xix, 38), which not only exists also in the form כִּמְהוֹם, *Chimhom* (Jer. xlii, 17), but in כִּמְהָן, *Chimhan* (2 Sam. xix, 40), according to customary changes.

2. The *compound* names, however, are more important for history, because they express more complete and distinct ideas than the simple names. Some of them are altogether isolated, as פִּינְחָס, *Phinehas*, properly "serpent's mouth," the grandson of Aaron; יִשָּׂשכָר, *Issachar*, the son of Jacob; *Oholiab* (Exod. xxxi, 6), "father's tent," a name resembling the Greek Patroclus. But most of them bear a general resemblance to each other, and follow in shoals certain dominant opinions and customs; and these last are what we must particularly consider here.

A great number of them owe their origin to the relations of the house, as the sense of the first word of the compound shows. Most of these have the word אַבִי, *abi*, "father," for their first member, as *Abiezer*, *Abital*, *Abigail*. Fürst (*Handwörterbuch*, p. 7, 50) regards these words as names for the Divine Being, rendering such a name as *Abimelek*, *Ab* (i. e. God) *is king*; *Abidan*, *Ab* (God) *is judge*; and so *Achitub*, *Ach* (God) *is good*. Others deny any reference to the Deity in these words, but cannot agree whether they are to be taken literally or figuratively. The Easterns use the word *ab* (*father*), etc., to express the possession of any quality. The *fox* is *abu 'lhusain* ("father of the little fort," i. e. the burrower). The *mosquito* is *abu 'lfa's* ("father of the axe"), from its sharp instrument of incision. The *camel* is *abu ayyub* ("father of Job"), from his patience. Many therefore think that such a name as Abinoam ("father of kindness") means merely *very kind*. Others, as Ewald, regard the words *ab*, *ach*, *ben*, etc., as at least at one time expressive of real relationship, and think such names exhibit an approach to our family names. It sometimes happens that a person appears with the name both in its simple as well as its compound state. For example, Nadab, as well as Abinadab, Ezer and Abiezer, and Abner ("father of Ner") was son of Ner. This seems to imply that something like the present Arabic practice had begun to prevail among the Hebrews. Certain names become hereditary in a family, and a man is expected to name his son by the traditional name. To such an extent is this custom carried that a man whose son should have been called "Yusuf" is styled "Abu Yusuf," even if he has no son; and a woman who is childless rejoices in the name *Umm Mûsa* ("Mother of Moses"), because, had she had a son, he would have borne the name "Mûsa." In all likelihood these words, *ab*, etc., have not always the same meaning; the connective vowel *i* is not always a sign of the genitive, but merely of the construct or state of composition. We could more easily admit a metaphorical sense in the compounds with *son*, since בֵּן is really often used in a highly metaphorical sense. Bath-shéba' is certainly not the daughter of a man named Shéba' (2 Sam. xi, 3). Such compound names with *son*, however, are, on the whole, rare, and are only found in some frequency in 1 Kings iv, 7 sq. See AB-; BEN-.

Under this class we may also include אִישׁ, *Ish*, "man," with which several names are compounded. Another, but a smaller, class consists of names compounded with עַם, *Am*, "people," resembling the many Greek compositions with λαός and δῆμος; and just as in Greek δῆμος is placed first or last (Demosthenes, Aristodemos), so also *Am* is at one time found in the first, and at another in the last place; only that, according to the laws of the Shemitic language, the sense of one of these positions is exactly the reverse of the

other. As all these compounds must be conceived to be in the state construct, so likewise we are probably to take the names יָרָבְעָם, *Jeroboam*, properly "people's increaser," a suitable name for a prince, and יָשָׁבְעָם, *Jashobeam*, "people's turner" or "leader;" for, as was observed above, the simple names are often formed with a prefixed *jod;* and we actually find יָשׁוּב, *Jashub*, as a simple name in Numb. xxvi, 29; 1 Chron. vii, 1.

Many compound names endeavor to express a religious sense, and therefore contain the divine name. Here we at the same time find a new law of formation: as these compounds are intended to express a complete thought, such as the religious sentiment requires, a name may consist of an entire proposition with a verb, but of course in as brief a compass as possible; and indeed shorter compounds are made with a verb than with a passive participle, as נְתַנְאֵל, *Nathanael* (in the New Test. Ναθαναήλ, properly "God-gave," i. e. whom God gave, given by God, Θεόδοτος or Θεόδωρος), sounds shorter than נְתוּנִיאֵל, *Nethuniel*, with the participle, which would certainly express the same sense. But since the finite verb, as also any other predicate, can just as well precede as follow, accordingly a great freedom in the position of the divine name has prevailed in this class; and this peculiarity is preserved, in the same case, in the following period: but indeed the Greeks use Δωροθεός as well as Θεόδωρος. Thus נְתַנְאֵל, *Nethaneel* (1 Chron. ii, 14), or אֶלְנָתָן, *Elnathan* (Jer. xxxvi, 12). The two names are there generally assigned to two different persons; nevertheless, both combinations may form names for the same person, as עַמִּיאֵל, *Ammiel* (1 Chron. iii, 5), and אֶלִיעָם, *Eliam* (2 Sam. xi, 3), belong to the same individual.

3. Lastly, many proper names have assumed the derivative syllable *-î*, or *-ai* (which appears to be only dialectically different from *-î*, and is chiefly frequent in the later periods); and we must certainly consider that, in some cases, this syllable may possibly form mere adjectives, and therewith simple names, as אֲמִתַּי, *Amittai*, "trueman," from אֱמֶת, *Emeth*, "truth," and *Barzillai*, "Iron," or "Ironman," the name of a celebrated Gileadite family (Ezra ii, 61; 2 Sam. xvii, 27); or that it is derived from a place, as בְּאֵרִי, *Beeri* (Hos. i, 1; 1 Chron. vii, 36), "he of the well," or he of a place known as the well. But it undoubtedly very often also expresses a genealogical relation, like the Greek ending *-ιδης*, and presupposes a previous proper name from which it is derived; thus the name חוּרִי, *Huri* (1 Chron. v, 14), as surely presupposes the above-mentioned *Chûr*, as the Greek Philippides does Philippos, and as *Ketûbai* (ii, 9), one of the descendants of Judah, is connected with the Ketûb in iv, 11. It is remarkable that the genealogical relation appears to be sometimes expressed by the mere ־ָה of motion, as יַעֲקֹבָה, *Jacobah* (ver. 36), which would be equivalently expressed by a German name, *Zu-Jacob;* יִשְׂרְאֵלָה, *Isharelah, De Israel* (xxv, 14; comp. ver. 2); and most distinctly in חַשְׁבַּדְנָה, *Hashbadanah*, "reckoned to Dan" (Neh. viii, 4; comp. יָשְׁבְקָשָׁה, *Joshbekashah*, in 1 Chron. xxv, 4).

Among the names of women, the oldest as well as the simplest which are found are actually only suited for women, as *Rachel*, "Ewe;" *Deborah*, "Bee;" *Tamar*, "Palm-tree;" *Hannah*, "Favor," the mother of Samuel. Those which express such a delicate and endearing sense as *Qéren Happûk*, "box of eye-ointment" (Job xlii, 14), and חֶפְצִיבָה, *Hephzibah*, "my delight is in her" (2 Kings xxi, 1), betray that they were generally formed in much later times. It appears indeed to have been customary, at an early period, to form names for women from those of men, by means of the feminine termination; as חַגִּית, *Haggith* (2 Sam. iii, 4), besides חַגִּי, *Haggi* (Numb. xxvi, 15); מְשֻׁלֶּמֶת, *Meshullemeth*, i. e. *Pia* (2 Kings xxi, 19), besides מְשֻׁלָּם, *Meshullam*, *Pius* (1 Chron. v, 13; viii, 17), and שְׁלֹמִית, *Shelomith*, *Friederike* (Numb. xxiv, 11), besides שְׁלֹמֹה, *Shelomoh*, *Friederich*. But we must not overlook the fact that all these are instances of simple names; or of those also in which the *masculine* has already dropped the second member; for Chananî and Zabdî, as is shown below, are shortened from Chananjah, Zabdijah: no single example occurs from a compound man's name. As the same compound names, however, are sometimes used both for men and women, and as even those very names are applied to women which could not originally have been applicable to any but men, as *Abigail, Achinoam*, accordingly we must assume that the plastic power of the language had already exhausted itself in this remote province, and that, for that reason, the distinction of the feminine was omitted.

II. *Symbolical Import of Proper Names.*—As the name was the "sign" of the thing, it expressed as nearly as possible its character; it was the expression of the impression which was produced by the thing named on the beholder. The truer the expression was to the impression, and the truer the impression was to the object, the more nearly did the name represent the thing named. Hence the name in Hebrew is used to signify the collected attributes or characteristics of the object named. This is particularly the case with the divine name. "The Lord descended in the cloud and proclaimed the *name* of the Lord. And the Lord passed by him and proclaimed, The Lord, the Lord God, merciful and gracious," etc. (Exod. xxxiv), where all these terms furnish but the exegesis of the word *name*. The use is similar in the New Test. Our Lord says, "I have manifested thy *name* unto the men which thou gavest me out of the world" (John xvii, 6); where *name* embraces the whole divine nature revealed by the Son, who hath "declared" the Father. In general the name was the result of an effort to embody in language as nearly as possible the nature of objects. When the whole nature could not be taken in, the chief characteristic was seized upon—what struck the eye or any of the senses mainly—and hence arose such names as Esau ("hairy"). When there was no outstanding attribute to seize and embody, some incident was laid hold of connected with the object named, e. g. Moses ("drawn out" of the water); or some feeling in the mind of the namer at the moment of imposing the name, as Benoni ("my son of sorrow"). Even the names of natural objects are full of meaning, often full of poetry, often having reminiscences of ancient times and deeds floating about them. The river names are very suggestive. The Jordan (*Yarden, yarad*, "to come down" [comp. Ganges, Rhenus]) is the two rapids, one into the Sea of Galilee, and one into the Dead Sea. The Arnon is the stream that "sings" (*ranan*, to "make a tremulous sound") among the mountains. Jabbok, that which "belches" ("byoks") through the rocky gorge. The Cherith, that which "cuts" its way. So are the names of mountains. Lebanon is the Mont Blanc of Syria, but perhaps named less from its snowy mantle than its bare white ribs of naked stone. Sirion, the "breastplate" of rock. The whole land is full of *Abels* (grassy meads), *Beers* (wells), *Ayins* (fountains); and in the evening the maidens danced in the meads, and called them Abel-meholah (Judg. vii, 22); and the kids around the fountain, and it was named En-gedi (Josh. xv, 62); and the scorpions basked in the sunny slopes, and their haunts were named Akrabbim; and the gazelles bounded across the heights, and men called their favorite resorts Ajalon. See each of the above terms in its place.

For the philological questions involved in the above examination, see the Hebrew lexicons. More special treatises are the following: Redslob, *Die alttestam. Namen* (Hamb. 1846); Farrar, *Proper Names of the Bible*

(Lond. 1844); Jones, *Names in the Old Test.* (ibid. 1856); Wilkinson, *Names in the Bible* (ibid. 1865). See NAME.

Proper Psalms, i. e. psalms adapted by their contents to the subjects of particular Sundays or festivals and holydays. St. Chrysostom refers to ancient prescription in this matter, and St. Augustine mentions as an old custom the use of Psa. xxii on Good Friday. Cassian informs us that Psa. lxiii was sung at matins, and the 141st at evensong. St. Athanasius and St. Augustine appointed special psalms on certain occasions.

Prophecies is the name given to the Biblical texts which are read in the Church of Rome on the day before Easter-Sunday, after the consecration of the paschal taper. They are the following: Gen. i, 1; ii, 2; v, 31; viii, 21; xxii, 1–19; Exod. xiv, 24; xv, 1; Isa. liv, 17; lv, 11; Bar. iii, 9–38; Ezek. xxxvii, 1–14; Isa. iv; Exod. xii, 1–11; Jon. iii; Deut. xxxi, 22–30; Dan. iii, 1–24. They are called *prophecies*, inasmuch as they are symbols of the redemption of mankind through Jesus Christ, and have a direct bearing upon the mysteries which the Church is at that period solemnly commemorating. The first prophecy relates the creation of the world: we are to remember here that Christ, by his death on the cross, became the originator of a new, spiritual creation. The second prophecy is about the flood, about Noah saved with his family in the ark: it must remind the faithful that the Redeemer saves through the waters of baptism all those who believe in him. The third prophecy brings before our eyes Abraham, whose faith was as firm as a rock, and invites to similar confidence in our Lord. The fourth prophecy relates the exodus from Egypt and the passage through the Red Sea, showing how Christians should leave the bondage of sin and follow their own god-sent leader. The fifth and sixth prophecies recommend constancy in our purpose, teaching—the former—that the Lord bestows eternal bliss upon such as follow him; the latter, that ruin awaits the sinner. To give us the necessary forces for the struggle we are to go through, God sends us the Holy Ghost: this is what we are reminded of by the vision of Ezekiel in the seventh prophecy. The eighth prophecy points out the eternal glory which awaits those who fight under the cross. The ninth prophecy is about the Jewish passover, the tenth about Jonah's preaching in Nineveh, the eleventh about the respect to be paid to the Pentateuch, and the twelfth about the three young men in the oven. The custom of extraordinary readings on Saturday before Easter is very ancient; it was made necessary by another custom which consisted in spending several hours of the Easter-night in the place of worship, more especially to await midnight there. Gregory of Nyssa (*Orat.* ii, *De Resurr. Christi*) speaks of these readings, only their number was not the same at all times. The *Ordo Rom.* i speaks of four lections, each of which was read in Latin and in Greek. According to Beleth (c. 106), there were at Rome twelve Greek and as many Latin lections; in other places twelve, or only seven. William Durand (l. 6, c. 81) knows of four, six, twelve, and fourteen of them. In some churches five were read, in others eight.—Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* s. v. See Siegel, *Christliche Alterthümer* (Index in vol. iv); Riddle, *Christian Antiquities* (see Index).

Prophecy. Under this head we propose to treat of certain general aspects of the subject of permanent interest, reserving for the head of PROPHET what relates more *personally* to the organs or media of true prophecy, as found in the Bible. In doing so we combine the Biblical elements with the best results of modern criticism and discussion.

I. *Design of Prophecy.*—In this respect we would define prophecy as "God's communication to the Church, to be her light and comfort in time of trouble and perplexity." Vitringa defines it as "a prediction of some contingent circumstance or event in the future received by immediate or direct revelation." Dr. Pye Smith speaks of it "as a declaration made by a creature under the inspiration and commission of the omniscient God relating to an event or series of events, which have not taken place at the time the prophecy is uttered, and which could not have been certainly foreknown by any science or wisdom of man." Other writers say, "Prophecy is nothing but the history of events before they come to pass." Dean Magee dissents from this popular but erroneous view. In a lecture on the uses of prophecy he defines a prophet as "the religious teacher of his age, whose aim is the religious education of those whom he addresses." To have received a call and message direct from God, and to deliver it, is the essence of prophetism. The Jewish lawgiver in delivering moral and ceremonial precepts received from God, and our blessed Lord in the Sermon on the Mount, were prophets just as much as when they predicted the future of Israel (M'Caul, *Aids to Faith*). As a reaction from the general body of writers on prophecy, who exalt the predictive and neglect the moral element of God's communication to man, there have arisen in Germany, and to some extent in our own land, writers who speak exclusively of the moral stream of light flowing through prophecy, and deny altogether its predictive character. Both errors will be avoided by bearing in mind that the word of prophecy was profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction, to the first recipients of the message, as well as for succeeding ages.

The usual view of prophecy as anticipated history virtually excludes from the roll the great Prophet who was its theme and author, Moses his distinguished prototype, John the Baptist his eminent forerunner, Elijah, Samuel, under the old covenant, as well as the apostles and prophets under the new. According to this view, prophecy is virtually limited to what the Spirit saith unto the churches in the four hundred years between Hosea and Malachi, and by the beloved John, the writer of the Apocalypse. But if we agree to regard the prophet as the forthteller, possessing the *munus prædicandi*—rather than the foreteller, possessing only the *munus prædicendi*—we see at once how the very highest place is assigned to our Lord and to Moses; how John the Baptist was more than a prophet, as he stood within the actual dawn of the day of Christ, and as a religious teacher did really more for the religious training of those whom he addressed than any of the prophets of the old covenant. We see, too, how naturally and clearly the earlier prophets were subordinate to Moses, so that the test of their commission was conformity to the lawgiver; and how appropriately the term is applied to the apostles of our Lord and Saviour, as charged by Christ with the whole ordering and establishing of the Church in its institutions, government, and progress. In fact, students of prophecy perpetually use the word in a *non-natural* sense. Hence the variety and discordancy of their interpretations. Our attention must be rigidly fixed on the natural and proper sense of the terms, if we would gain any satisfactory results.

In all communications from God to man two elements may be traced, the moral and the predictive. Neither element must be pressed or insisted on, so as to depress and exclude the other. Yet the moral element is the fundamental, to which the predictive is always subsidiary. The moral element occupies the highest place in the communications made by our Lord, by Moses, by the apostles; the predictive element prevails in those who had the more ordinary gifts, as all their announcements appealed to the revelations made by Moses and by Christ. The testimony of Jesus as the author, and the testimony borne to Jesus as the theme, is the spirit of prophecy. According to this view prophecy is always didactic; the moral element is fundamental, the predictive is entirely subsidiary. All who bore testimony to Jesus before his incarnation were preachers of righteousness, and all who testify that Jesus is come in the flesh exercise the prophetical function.

II. *Value of Prophecy as Evidence of the Truth of Revelation.*—Davison, in his *Discourses on Prophecy*, fixes a "Criterion of Prophecy," and in accordance with it he describes "the conditions which would confer cogency of evidence on single examples of prophecy" in the following manner: first, "the known promulgation of the prophecy prior to the event; secondly, the clear and palpable fulfilment of it; lastly, the nature of the event itself—if, when the prediction of it was given, it lay remote from human view, and was such as could not be foreseen by any supposable effort of reason, or be deduced upon principles of calculation derived from probability and experience" (*Disc.* viii, 378). Applying his test, the learned writer finds that the establishment of the Christian religion and the person of its Founder were predicted when neither reason nor experience could have anticipated them; and that the predictions respecting them have been clearly fulfilled in history. Here, then, is an adequate proof of an inspired prescience in the prophets who predicted these things. He applies his test to the prophecies recorded of the Jewish people, and their actual state, to the prediction of the great apostasy and to the actual state of corrupted Christianity, and finally to the prophecies relating to Nineveh, Babylon, Tyre, Egypt, the Ishmaelites, and the Four Empires, and to the events which have befallen them; and in each of these cases he finds proof of the existence of the predictive element in the prophets.

In the book of Kings we find Micaiah, the son of Imlah, uttering a challenge, by which his predictive powers were to be judged. He had pronounced, by the word of the Lord, that Ahab should fall at Ramoth-Gilead. Ahab, in return, commanded him to be shut up in prison until he came back in peace. "And Micaiah said, If thou return at all in peace" (that is, if the event do not verify my words), "the Lord hath not spoken by me" (that is, I am no prophet capable of predicting the future) (1 Kings xxii, 28). The test is sound as a negative test, and so it is laid down in the law (Deut. xviii, 22); but as a positive test it would not be sufficient. Ahab's death at Ramoth-Gilead did not prove Micaiah's predictive powers, though his escape would have disproved them. But here we must notice a very important difference between single prophecies and a series of prophecy. The fulfilment of a single prophecy does not prove the prophetical power of the prophet, but the fulfilment of a long series of prophecies by a series or number of events does in itself constitute a proof that the prophecies were intended to predict the events, and, consequently, that predictive power resided in the prophet or prophets. We may see this in the so far parallel cases of satirical writings. We know for certain that Aristophanes refers to Cleon, Pericles, Nicias (and we should be equally sure of it were his satire more concealed than it is), simply from the fact of a number of satirical hits converging together on the object of his satire. One, two, or three strokes might be intended for more persons than one, but the addition of each stroke makes the aim more apparent; and when we have a sufficient number before us, we can no longer possibly doubt his design. The same may be said of fables, and still more of allegories. The fact of a *complicated* lock being opened by a key shows that the lock and key were meant for each other. Now the Messianic picture drawn by the prophets as a body contains at least as many traits as these: That salvation should come through the family of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Judah, David; that at the time of the final absorption of the Jewish power, Shiloh (the tranquillizer) should gather the nations under his rule; that there should be a great Prophet, typified by Moses; a King descended from David; a Priest forever, typified by Melchizedek; that there should be born into the world a child to be called Mighty God, Eternal Father, Prince of Peace; that there should be a Righteous Servant of God on whom the Lord would lay the iniquity of all; that Messiah the Prince should be cut off, but not for himself; that an everlasting kingdom should be given by the Ancient of Days to one like the Son of man. It seems impossible to harmonize so many apparent contradictions. Nevertheless, it is an undoubted fact that at the time seemingly pointed out by one or more of these predictions there was born into the world a child of the house of David, and therefore of the family of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and Judah, who claimed to be the object of these and other predictions; who is acknowledged as Prophet, Priest, and King, as Mighty God and yet as God's Righteous Servant who bears the iniquity of all; who was cut off, and whose death is acknowledged not to have been for his own, but for others' good; who has instituted a spiritual kingdom on earth, which kingdom is of a nature to continue forever, if there is any continuance beyond this world and this life; and in whose doings and sufferings on earth a number of specific predictions were minutely fulfilled. Then we may say that we have here a series of prophecies which are so applicable to the person and earthly life of Jesus Christ as to be thereby shown to have been designed to apply to him. If they were designed to apply to him, prophetical prediction is proved.

Objections have been urged: (*a.*) *Vagueness.*—It has been said that the prophecies are too darkly and vaguely worded to be proved predictive by the events which they are alleged to foretell. This objection is stated with clearness and force by Ammon. He says, "Such simple sentences as the following: Israel has not to expect a king, but a teacher; this teacher will be born at Bethlehem during the reign of Herod; he will lay down his life under Tiberius, in attestation of the truth of his religion; through the destruction of Jerusalem, and the complete extinction of the Jewish state, he will spread his doctrine in every quarter of the world—a few sentences like these, expressed in plain historical prose, would not only bear the character of true predictions, but, when once their genuineness was proved, they would be of incomparably greater worth to us than all the oracles of the Old Test. taken together" (*Christology*, p. 12). But to this it might be answered, and has been in effect answered by Hengstenberg: 1. That God never forces men to believe, but that there is such a union of definiteness and vagueness in the prophecies as to enable those who are willing to discover the truth, while the wilfully blind are not forcibly constrained to see it. 2. That, had the prophecies been couched in the form of direct declarations, their fulfilment would have thereby been rendered impossible, or, at least, capable of frustration. 3. That the effect of prophecy (e. g. with reference to the time of the Messiah's coming) would have been far less beneficial to believers, as being less adapted to keep them in a state of constant expectation. 4. That the Messiah of Revelation could not be so clearly portrayed in his varied character as God and Man, as Prophet, Priest, and King, if he had been the mere "teacher" which is all that Ammon acknowledges him to be. 5. That the state of the prophets, at the time of receiving the divine revelation, was (as we shall presently show) such as necessarily to make their predictions fragmentary, figurative, and abstracted from the relations of time. 6. That some portions of the prophecies were intended to be of double application, and some portions to be understood only on their fulfilment (comp. John xiv, 29; Ezek. xxxvi, 33).

(*b.*) *Obscurity of a Part or Parts of a Prophecy otherwise Clear.*—The objection drawn from "the unintelligibleness of one part of a prophecy, as invalidating the proof of foresight arising from the evident completion of those parts which are understood" is akin to that drawn from the vagueness of the whole of it. It may be answered with the same arguments, to which we may add the consideration urged by Butler that it is, for the argument in hand, the same as if the parts not understood were written in cipher, or not written at all: "Suppose a writing, partly in cipher and partly in plain words at length; and that in the part one understood

there appeared mention of several known facts — it would never come into any man's thought to imagine that, if he understood the whole, perhaps he might find that these facts were not in reality known by the writer" (*Analogy*, pt. ii, ch. vii). Furthermore, if it be true that prophecies relating to the first coming of the Messiah refer also to his second coming, some part of those prophecies must *necessarily* be as yet not fully understood.

It would appear from these considerations that Davison's second "condition," above quoted, "the *clear* and *palpable* fulfilment of the prophecy," should be so far modified as to take into account the necessary difficulty, more or less great, in recognising the fulfilment of a prophecy which results from the necessary vagueness and obscurity of the prophecy itself.

(*c.*) *Application of the Several Prophecies to a more Immediate Subject.*—It has been the task of many Biblical critics to examine the different passages which are alleged to be predictions of Christ, and to show that they were delivered in reference to some person or thing contemporary with, or shortly subsequent to, the time of the writer. The conclusion is then drawn, sometimes scornfully, sometimes as an inference not to be resisted, that the passages in question have nothing to do with the Messiah. We have here to distinguish carefully between the conclusion proved and the corollary drawn from it. Let it be granted that it may be proved of all the predictions of the Messiah (it certainly may be proved of many) that they primarily apply to some historical and present fact: in that case a certain law, under which God vouchsafes his prophetical revelations, is discovered; but there is no semblance of disproof of the further Messianic interpretation of the passages under consideration. That some such law does exist has been argued at length by Mr. Davison. He believes, however, that "it obtains only in some of the more distinguished monuments of prophecy," such as the prophecies founded on, and having primary reference to, the kingdom of David, the restoration of the Jews, the destruction of Jerusalem (*On Prophecy*, disc. v). Dr. Lee thinks that Davison "exhibits too great reserve in the application of this important principle" (*On Inspiration*, lect. iv). He considers it to be of universal application; and upon it he founds the doctrine of the "double sense of prophecy," according to which a prediction is fulfilled in two or even more distinct but analogous subjects: first in type, then in antitype; and after that perhaps awaits a still further and more complete fulfilment. This view of the fulfilment of prophecy seems necessary for the explanation of our Lord's prediction on the Mount, relating at once to the fall of Jerusalem and to the end of the Christian dispensation. It is on this principle that Pearson writes: "Many are the prophecies which concern him, many the promises which are made of him; but yet some of them very obscure. . . . Wheresoever he is spoken of as the anointed, it may well be *first* understood of some other person; except one place in Daniel, where Messiah is foretold 'to be cut off'" (*On the Creed*, art. ii).

Whether it can be proved by an investigation of Holy Scripture that this relation between divine announcements for the future and certain present events does so exist as to constitute a law, and whether, if the law is proved to exist, it is of universal or only of partial application, we do not pause to determine. But it is manifest that the existence of a primary sense cannot exclude the possibility of a secondary sense. The question, therefore, really is, whether the prophecies are applicable to Christ: if they are so applicable, the previous application of each of them to some historical event would not invalidate the proof that they were designed as a whole to find their full completion in him. Nay, even if it could be shown that the prophets had in their thoughts nothing beyond the primary completion of their words (a thing which we at present leave undetermined), no inference could thence be drawn against their secondary application; for such an inference would assume what no believer in inspiration will grant — viz. that the prophets are the sole authors of their prophecies. The rule *Nihil in scripto quod non prius in scriptore* is sound; but the question is, who is to be regarded as the true author of the prophecies—the human instrument or the divine author? See Hengstenberg, *Christology*, appendix vi, p. 433. See Double Sense.

(*d.*) *Miraculous Character.*—It is probable that this lies at the root of the many and various efforts made to disprove the predictive power of the prophets. There is no question that if miracles are, either physically or morally, impossible, then prediction is impossible; and those passages which have ever been accounted predictive must be explained away as being vague, as being obscure, as applying only to something in the writer's lifetime, or on some other hypothesis. This is only saying that belief in prediction is not compatible with the theory of atheism, or with the philosophy which rejects the overruling providence of a Personal God. See Maitland, *Argument from Prophecy* (Lond. 1877); Row, *Bampton Lecture* for 1877, p. 219. See Miracle.

For a copious list of treatises on Scripture prophecy in general, see Darling, *Cyclopædia Bibliographica*, col. 1785 sq.; and Malcolm, *Theological Index*, s. v. Comp. Kurtz, *Gesch. d. Alten Bundes*, ii, 513 sq.; Hardwick, *Christ and other Masters*, vol. i, ch. iii, esp. p. 135 sq.; Smith, (*Bampton Lecture*) *On Prophecy* (Bost. 1870, 12mo); *Brit. and For. Ev. Rev.* 1863, art. viii; *Bibl. Repos.* p. 11, 138, 217; *Westm. Rev.* Jan. 1868, p. 106; Kitto, *Journ. of Sac. Lit.* xxx, 1 sq., April, 1853, p. 35; *Aids to Faith*, essay iii; *Engl. Rev.* viii, 181; Fisher, *The Beginnings of Christianity*, p. 8, et al.; Stanley, *Lectures on the Jewish Church*, 1st series, lect. xviii–xx; Fairbairn, *Prophecy Viewed in respect to its Distinctive Nature, its Special Function, and Proper Interpretation* (Edinb. 1856); and for the vast field of German literature on the subject, see Keil, *Introd. to the Old Test.* (ibid. 1869), i, 265 sq.

PROPHECY, Jewish Interpretation of. The Hebrew and the Christian alike recognise the reality of the predictive element in the chosen oracles of the great *I am*. The two religionists, however, differ widely in their manner and sense of interpretation and in the application of the oracular utterances. This difference regarding a portion of Scripture accepted alike by both is easily accounted for. The divergence is in the two religions themselves, and is called out by the question whether the predictions for a Messiahship to the "chosen race" have ever been fulfilled. Upon this query all turns. The Israelite, refusing to recognise in Christ the long-promised divine messenger, either declares it a vain attempt to decipher the prophetic images, if he be a rationalist; or, if he be more faithfully wedded to the canon of the synagogue, patiently sits back, awaiting the final solution of the problem of God's salvation of his people. See Jews; Messiah; Pharisee; Rationalism.

In the early and mediæval days of Christianity, the Jews did not deny the facts of the Christian miracles, but explained them away, and so nothing remained for settlement but the verity of the prophecies and the question of their fulfilment. The first of these the Jew conceded to the Christian, but on the last point a somewhat rich literature of polemics is preserved to us. It begins with the New Test. itself. Paul and other apostles were frequently called upon to argue the Messiahship of Christ. We have the same phase of the contest in the apology of Justin Martyr (q. v.) against Trypho, to which a new kind of objection expressive of prejudice is added in the discourse which Celsus, as preserved in Origen (*Contr. Cels.* bk. i and ii), puts into the mouth of the Jew whom he introduces. (In reference to this contest, these Church fathers, and especially Semisch's work on Justin Martyr and the works on the Jewish Talmudic literature and philosophy, may be consulted. See also, for later continuations of this con-

test, Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctr.* i, § 144, and the art. POLEMICS, JEWISH.)

The Jew contends with the Christian not only for a special spiritual elevation in the prophet—an intenser degree of the same divine intuition which God gives to all who worship him in love and reverence—but for a gift of light vouchsafed to him different from any ordinary endowment. Maimonides remains the chief of the Jewish hermeneutists. "This sage of mediæval Judaism thus teaches: Prophecy signifies the communication of verities to the human mind from God by the medium of the active reason, with or without the power to foretell future events or to perform miracles. The first point is essential, the other is merely accidental. Prophecy is a capacity of the human mind. All possess it more or less. Like other human capacities, it may remain dormant in this or that mind, or be developed partially or perfectly. In the development of this capacity, it is necessary, in the first place, to cultivate and purify the imagination, i. e. the ability of beholding internally, clearly, and truly things external and distant, either in space or time, and to place the imagination under the control of mental judgment. In the second place, the moral nature of the individual must be trained to purity, goodness, love of the true and the sublime, and the desire to understand the voice of the eternal Deity. This cannot be done outside of society, but within it and in its active service. It cannot be done by asceticism and the renunciation of the world and its charms; it must be done in gladness and joy, by chastity, temperance, and a life of moderation, governing and controlling the lower passions and developing the nobler, finer, and higher ones to a harmonious moral character. Passionate, immoral, and wicked persons bewilder their imagination, pervert their judgment, and benight their reason. In the third place, reason must be fully developed to control all other powers of the individual, without weakening them or disturbing the harmony of the soul, and to elevate him to universal reason, which Maimonides calls the 'active reason,' which enables him to grasp universal truth and to depict it clearly to himself or others by the power of his imagination. Man so prepared, so developed and trained, is a prophet, although he still may receive no special messages from on high, either because his age requires none, or outer influences, climatical or social, disturb the mind. But the man so prepared, and he only, can be a prophet of the Lord. So the ancient prophets were prepared for their messages and their missions. Others, also, may conceive original ideas and prophecies; but if the reason predominates over the imagination, they cannot realize or reproduce their own internal visions. If the imagination predominates, they produce phantasmagorias—wild, disconnected, and confused images. If the moral character supports not both, falsehood, deception, imposition, and even self-delusion spring from reason's light and imagination's vision. If one profess to be a prophet of the Lord, says Maimonides, we would first be obliged to investigate whether his education, his learning, his character, and his antecedents warrant such a presumption. If this be not the case—if he be a vulgar, uncultivated, or an impious man, but maintains that God or an angel spoke to him this or that, we should be bound to declare him a deluded fantast or a wilful impostor. The genuine prophets, Maimonides further maintains, are not all of the same category. They are as different as are their natural capacities and the development thereof. With the one reason and with the other imagination may predominate, and another, again, may be influenced by moral deficiencies. Therefore, while one prophet, like Moses, is always ready and prepared to receive prophecies in a sound, waking, and clear state of mind, and in words perfectly prosaic and perfectly definite and accurate, others can receive visions in a state of dream, in eccentric agitation, or hallucination only. Then they see phantasms which are expounded to them or which they themselves must expound; or they see an angel or a person—in themselves, of course—who speaks to them; or they hear a voice without seeing any vision, in which they suppose they have heard God speak. Therefore the prophetical style varies so much with the various writers of Scriptures, and the oracles of some are announced in different poetical forms. The prophet knows how to distinguish divine visions from vulgar ones by the profound impression which the former make upon him, carrying conviction into his mind, and we must know it by the test of reason to which the matter revealed is subjected. All visions recorded in the Bible, Maimonides advances, were subjective, psychological processes. Wherever it is said God appeared, an angel appeared, this or that vision was seen, it must always be understood to have appeared so in the prophet's imagination. Only one prophet received his revelations through and to reason directly, without poetical garbs or visionary assistance, and that was Moses. Only one divine manifestation of this nature did actually come to pass, and that was the revelation on Mount Sinai, and this, also, Maimonides rationalizes in his own way. In all these rational expositions of prophecy, Maimonides refers to the Bible and the Talmud for support" (comp. his *Yesodai Haftorah*, which forms the *Introd.* to his *Yad-Hachazakah*). See MAIMONIDES.

Another sage, whose authority the ultra-orthodox prefer to depend upon, is Joseph Albo (q. v.). He has expressed his opinion on the various grades of prophets in his book on *Principles* (*Sepher Ikkarim*, ch. x, § 3). It differs materially from that of Maimonides. Albo has four grades of prophets; the first class consists of prophets with whom the understanding has no dominion over the phantasy. They receive the prophetical vision in a state of slumber and dream, after an attack of pain and terror. The second class consists of prophets in whom the understanding and the phantasy are well balanced; they receive the prophetical visions without pain or terror, in quiet dreams. The third class consists of prophets with whom the understanding predominates over the phantasy; they see no imaginary visions, as the above two classes do, which must be expounded; they see real objects in their visions, and hear them speak intelligible words; there is neither pain nor terror, nor doubtful visions in the prophetical ecstasy of this class. The fourth class consists of prophets with whom phantasy has no influence whatever upon the understanding; they see no visions, no symbols whatever, but hear prophetical words addressed to them, not in a dream or vision—not merely sometimes and in a state of ecstasy—but waking, intelligent, and whenever they wish. Albo adds, "If a man has elevated himself to this high state of mind, he should no longer be called man—he should be called angel. None of us mortals has ever reached this perfection, except our teacher Moses." See Dr. Wise, *Lectures on the Philosophy and Philosophers of the Jews* as reported in the *Israelite* (Cincinnati, 1873); Rothschild (Miss), *Hist. and Lit. of the Israelites*, vol. ii; Geiger, *Judaism*, vol. i; M'Caul, *Old Paths*. (J. H. W.)

Prophesyings. Religious exercises of the Puritan clergy in the reign of queen Elizabeth, instituted for the purpose of promoting knowledge and piety. The ministers of a particular division, at a set time, met together in some church of a market or other large town, and there each in his order explained, according to his ability, some portion of Scripture previously allotted to him. This done, a moderator made his observations on what had been said, and determined the true sense of the place, a certain space of time being fixed for despatching the whole. These institutions, borrowed evidently from the *Conventicles* (q. v.) of Scotland, like all others, however, it seems, were in England soon marked by irregularity, disputations, and divisions. Archbishop Grindal endeavored to regulate the prophesyings and cover them from the objections which the court made against them, by enjoining the ministers to

observe decency and order, by forbidding them to meddle with politics and Church government, and by prohibiting all nonconformist ministers and laymen from being speakers. The queen, however, seeing that they spread the religious notions of the Puritans and estranged the people from all Romanistic tendency, was resolved to suppress them; and having sent for the archbishop, told him she was informed that the rites and ceremonies of the Church were not duly observed in these prophesyings: that persons not lawfully called to be ministers exercised in them; that the assemblies themselves were illegal, not being allowed by public authority; that the laity neglected their secular affairs by repairing to these meetings, which filled their heads with notions, and might occasion disputes and sedition in the State; that it was good for the Church to have but few preachers, three or four in a county being sufficient. She further declared her dislike of the number of these exercises, and therefore commanded him peremptorily to put them down. The archbishop, however, instead of obeying the commands of his royal mistress, thought that she had made some infringement upon his office, and wrote the queen a long and earnest letter, declaring that his conscience would not suffer him to comply with her commands. The queen was so inflamed with this letter that the archbishop was sequestered from his office, and he never afterwards recovered the queen's favor. Thus ended the prophesyings. See Neal, *Hist. of the Puritans*.

Prophet, a person who acts as the organ of divine communication with men, especially with regard to the future. He differs from a *priest* in representing the *divine* side of this mediation, while the priest rather acts from the human side. The following article therefore discusses chiefly the *personal* relations of the prophet himself. See PROPHECY.

I. *The Title in Scripture.*—The ordinary Hebrew word for prophet is נָבִיא (*nabî*), derived from the verb נָבָא, connected by Gesenius with נָבַע, "to bubble forth," like a fountain. If this etymology be correct, the substantive would signify either a person who, as it were, involuntarily bursts forth with spiritual utterances under the divine influence (comp. Psa. xlv, 1, "My heart is *bubbling up* of a good matter"), or simply one who pours forth words. The analogy of the word נָטַף (*natâph*), which has the force of "dropping" as honey, and is used by Micah (ii, 6, 11), Ezekiel (xxi, 2), and Amos (vii, 16) in the sense of prophesying, points to the last signification. The verb נָבָא is found only in the *niphal* and *hithpaēl*, a peculiarity which it shares with many other words expressive of speech (comp. *loqui, fari, vociferari, concionari*, φθέγγομαι, as well as *μαντεύομαι* and *vaticinari*). Bunsen (*Gott in Geschichte*, p. 141) and Davidson (*Intr. Old Test.* ii, 430) suppose *nabî* to signify the man *to whom announcements are made* by God, i. e. inspired. Exod. iv, 1–17 is the classical passage as to the meaning of this word. There God says to Moses, "Aaron shall be thy נָבִיא (*nabî*) unto the people, and thou shalt be unto him instead of God." The sense is, "Aaron shall speak what thou shalt communicate to him." This appellation implies, then, the prophet's relation to God: he speaks not of his own accord, but what the Spirit puts into his mouth. Thus נָבִיא (*nabî*) is an adjective of passive signification: he who has been divinely inspired, who has received from God the revelations which he proclaims. But it is more in accordance with the usage of the word to regard it as signifying (actively) one *who announces* or *pours forth* the declarations of God. The latter signification is preferred by Ewald, Hävernick, Oehler, Hengstenberg, Bleek, Lee, Pusey, M'Caul, and the great majority of Biblical critics. We have the word in Barnabas (בַּר נְבִיא), which is rendered *υἱὸς παρακλήσεως* (Acts iv, 36), one whom God has qualified to impart consolation, light, and strength to others. Augustine says, "The prophet of God is nothing else *nisi enunciator verborum Dei hominibus*. So Heidegger, "*Nabî* is properly every utterer of the words of another, not from his own, but from another's influence and will."

Two other Hebrew words are used to designate a prophet—רֹאֶה (*röēh*) and חוֹזֶה (*chozéh*)—both signifying *one who sees*. They are rendered in the A. V. by "seer;" in the Sept. usually by *βλέπων* or *ὁρῶν*, sometimes by *προφήτης* (1 Chron. xxvi, 28; 2 Chron. xvi, 7, 10). The three words seem to be contrasted with each other in 1 Chron. xxix, 29. "The acts of David the king, first and last, behold they are written in the book of Samuel the seer (*röēh*), and in the book of Nathan the prophet (*nabî*), and in the book of Gad the seer (*chozéh*)." *Röēh* is a title almost appropriated to Samuel. It is only used ten times, and in seven of these it is applied to Samuel (1 Sam. ix, 9, 11, 18, 19; 1 Chron. ix, 22; xxvi, 28; xxix, 29). On two other occasions it is applied to Hanani (2 Chron. xvi, 7, 10). Once it is used by Isaiah (xxx, 10) with no reference to any particular person. It was superseded in general use by the word *nabî*, which Samuel (himself entitled *nabî* as well as *röēh* [1 Sam. iii, 20; 2 Chron. xxxv, 18]) appears to have revived after a period of desuetude (1 Sam. ix, 9), and to have applied to the prophets organized by him. The verb רָאָה, from which it is derived, is the common prose word signifying "to see:" חָזָה—whence the substantive חֹזֶה (*chozéh*) is derived—is more poetical, q. d. "to gaze." *Chozéh* is rarely found except in the books of the Chronicles, but חָזוֹן is the word constantly used for the prophetical vision. It is found in the Pentateuch, in Samuel, in the Chronicles, in Job, and in most of the prophets. In 1 Sam. ix, 9 we read, "He that is now called a prophet (*nabî*) was beforetime called a seer (*röēh*);" from whence Stanley (*Lect. on Jewish Church*) has concluded that *röēh* was "the oldest designation of the prophetic office," "superseded by *nabî* shortly after Samuel's time, when *nabî first came into use*" (*ibid.* xviii, xix). This seems opposed to the fact that *nabî* is the word commonly used in the Pentateuch, whereas *röēh* does not appear until the days of Samuel. The passage in the book of Samuel is clearly a parenthetical insertion, perhaps made by the *nabî* Nathan (or whoever was the original author of the book), perhaps added at a later date, with the view of explaining how it was that Samuel bore the title of *röēh*, instead of the now usual appellation of *nabî*. To the writer the days of Samuel were "beforetime," and he explains that in those ancient days—that is, the days of Samuel—the word used for prophet was *röēh*, not *nabî*. But that does not imply that *röēh* was the primitive word, and that *nabî* first came into use subsequently to Samuel (see Hengstenberg, *Beiträge zur Einleitung ins A. T.* iii, 335). Stanley represents *chozéh* as "another *antique* title;" but on no sufficient grounds. *Chozéh* is first found in 2 Sam. xxiv, 11; so that it does not seem to have come into use until *röēh* had almost disappeared. It is also found in the books of Kings (2 Kings, xvii, 13) and Chronicles (frequently), in Amos (vii, 12), Isaiah (xxix, 10), Micah (iii, 7), and the derivatives of the verb *chazâh* are used by the prophets to designate their visions down to the Captivity (comp. Isa. i, 1; Dan. viii, 1; Zech. xiii, 4). The derivatives of *râăh* are rarer, and, as being prose words, are chiefly used by Daniel (comp. Ezek. i, 1; Dan. x, 7). On examination we find that *nabî* existed before and after and alongside of *röēh* and *chozéh*, but that *chozéh* was somewhat more modern than *röēh*.

Whether there is any difference in the usage of these three words, and, if any, what that difference is, has been much debated (see Witsius, *Miscell. Sacra*, i, 1, § 19; Carpzovius, *Introd. ad Libros Canon. V. T.* iii, 1, § 2; Winer, *Real-Wörterbuch*, art. "Propheten"). Hä-

vernick (*Einleitung*, Th. i; *Abth.* i, § 56) considers *nabî* to express the title of those who officially belonged to the prophetic order, while *röëh* and *chozéh* denote those who received a prophetical revelation. Dr. Lee (*Inspiration of Holy Scripture*, p. 543) agrees with Hävernick in his explanation of *nabî*, but he identifies *röëh* in meaning rather with *nabî* than with *chozéh*. He further throws out a suggestion that *chozéh* is the special designation of the prophet attached to the royal household. In 2 Sam. xxiv, 11, Gad is described as "the prophet (*nabî*) Gad, David's seer (*chozéh*)," and elsewhere he is called "David's seer (*chozéh*)" (1 Chron. xxi, 9), "the king's seer (*chozéh*)" (2 Chron. xxix, 25). "The case of Gad," Dr. Lee thinks, "affords the clew to the difficulty, as it clearly indicates that attached to the royal establishment there was usually an individual styled 'the king's seer,' who might at the same time be a *nabî*." The suggestion is ingenious (see, in addition to places quoted above, 1 Chron. xxv, 5; xxix, 29; 2 Chron. xxix, 30; xxxv, 15), but it was only David (possibly also Manasseh, 2 Chron. xxxiii, 18) who, so far as we read, had this seer attached to his person; and in any case there is nothing in the word *chozéh* to denote the relation of the prophet to the king, but only in the connection in which it stands with the word king. On the whole, it would seem that the same persons are designated by the three words *nabî*, *röëh*, and *chozéh*—the last two titles being derived from the prophets' power of seeing the visions presented to them by God; the first from their function of revealing and proclaiming God's truth to men. When Gregory Naz. (*Or.* 28) calls Ezekiel *ὁ τῶν μεγάλων ἐπόπτης καὶ ἐξηγητὴς μυστηρίων*, he gives a sufficiently exact translation of the two titles *chozéh* or *röëh*, and *nabî*.

Sometimes the prophets are called צוֹפִים (*tsophîim*), i. e. those who espy, explore for the people, a "watchman" (Jer. vi, 17; Ezek. iii, 17; xxxiii, 7). Such also is the usage of שׁוֹמֵר (*shomêr*), i. e. "a watchman" (Isa. xxi, 11; lxii, 6); and *roïim*, i. e. shepherds (Zech. xi, 5; viii, 16), in reference to the spiritual care and religious nurture of the people. Other names, as "man of God," "servant of Jehovah," and now and then "angel," or "messenger of Jehovah," etc., do not belong to the prophets as such, but only in so far as they are of the number of servants and instruments of God. The phrase "man of the Spirit" (רוּחַ, Hos. ix, 7) explains the agency by which the communication came. In the appointment of the seventy elders the Lord says to Moses, "I will take of the Spirit which is upon thee, and will put it on them" (Numb. xi, 17). So with regard to Eldad and Medad, "the Spirit rested upon them, . . . and they prophesied in the camp." The resting of the Spirit upon them was equivalent to the gift of prophecy (see 2 Pet. i, 21).

The word *nabî* is uniformly translated in the Sept. by *προφήτης*, and in the A. V. by "prophet." In classical Greek, *προφήτης* signifies *one who speaks for another*, specially *one who speaks for a god*, and so interprets his will to man (Liddell and Scott, s. v.). Hence its essential meaning is "an interpreter." Thus Apollo is a *προφήτης*, as being the interpreter of Zeus (Æschylus, *Eum.* 19). Poets are the Prophets of the Muses, as being their interpreters (Plato, *Phædr.* 262 d). The *προφῆται* attached to heathen temples are so named from their interpreting the oracles delivered by the inspired and unconscious *μάντεις* (Plato, *Tim.* 72 b; Herod. vii, 111, note [ed. Bähr]). We have Plato's authority for deriving *μάντις* from *μαίνομαι* (*l. c.*). The use of the word *προφήτης* in its modern sense is post-classical, and is derived from the Sept.

From the mediæval use of the word *προφητεία*, *prophecy* passed into the English language in the sense of *prediction*, and this sense it has retained as its popular meaning (see Richardson, s. v.). The larger sense of *interpretation* has not, however, been lost. Thus we find in Bacon, "An exercise commonly called *prophesying*, which was this: that the ministers within a precinct did meet upon a week-day in some principal town, where there was some ancient grave minister that was president, and an auditory admitted of gentlemen or other persons of leisure. Then every minister successively, beginning with the youngest, did handle one and the same part of Scripture, spending severally some quarter of an hour or better, and in the whole some two hours. And so the exercise being begun and concluded with prayer, and the president giving a text for the next meeting, the assembly was dissolved" (*Pacification of the Church*). This meaning of the word is made further familiar to us by the title of Jeremy Taylor's treatise *On Liberty of Prophesying*. Nor was there any risk of the title of a book published in our own days, *On the Prophetical Office of the Church* (Oxf. 1838), being misunderstood. In fact, the English word prophet, like the word *inspiration*, has always been used in a larger and in a closer sense. In the larger sense our Lord Jesus Christ is a "prophet," Moses is a "prophet," Mohammed is a "prophet." The expression means that they proclaimed and published a new religious dispensation. In a similar, though not identical sense, the Church is said to have a "prophetical," i. e. an expository and interpretative, office. But in its closer sense the word, according to usage, though not according to etymology, involves the idea of foresight. This is and always has been its more usual acceptation. The different meanings, or shades of meaning, in which the abstract noun is employed in Scripture have been drawn out by Locke as follows: "Prophecy comprehends three things: prediction; singing by the dictate of the Spirit; and understanding and explaining the mysterious, hidden sense of Scripture by an immediate illumination and motion of the Spirit" (*Paraphrase of* 1 *Cor.* xii, note, p. 121 [Lond. 1742]). It is in virtue of this last signification of the word that the prophets of the New Test. are so called (1 Cor. xii); by virtue of the second that the sons of Asaph, etc., are said to have "prophesied with a harp" (xxv, 3), and Miriam and Deborah are termed "prophetesses." That the idea of potential if not actual prediction enters into the conception expressed by the word prophecy, when that word is used to designate the function of the Hebrew prophets, seems to be proved by the following passages of Scripture: Deut. xviii, 22; Jer. xxviii, 9; Acts ii, 30; iii, 18–21; 1 Pet. i, 10; 2 Pet. i, 19, 20; iii, 2. Etymologically, however, it is certain that neither prescience nor prediction is implied by the term used in the Hebrew language. But it seems to be incorrect to say that the English word was "originally" used in the wider sense of "preaching," and that it became "limited" to the meaning of "predicting" in the 17th century, in consequence of "an etymological mistake" (Stanley, *Lect.* xix, xx). The word entered into the English language in its sense of predicting. It could not have been otherwise, for at the time of the formation of the English language the word *προφητεία* had, by usage, assumed popularly the meaning of prediction. We find it ordinarily employed by early as well as by late writers in this sense (see Polydore Virgil, *Hist. of England*, iv, 161 [Camden ed. 1846]; *Coventry Mysteries*, p. 65 [Shakespeare Soc. ed. 1841]). It is probable that the meaning was "limited" to "prediction" as much and as little before the 17th century as it has been since.

II. *The Prophetical Order.*—1. *Its Historical Development.*—Generally speaking, every one was a prophet to whom God communicated his mind in this peculiar manner. Thus, e. g. Abraham is called a prophet (Gen. xx, 7), not, as is commonly thought, on account of general revelations granted him by God, but because such as he received were in the special form described; as, indeed, in chap. xv it is expressly stated that divine communications were made to him in *visions* and *dreams*. The patriarchs as a class are in the same manner called prophets (Psa. cv, 15). Moses is more specifically a prophet, as being a proclaimer of a new dispensation, a

revealer of God's will, and in virtue of his divinely inspired songs (Exod. xv; Deut. xxxii, xxxiii; Psa. xc); but his main work was not prophetical, and he is therefore formally distinguished from prophets (Numb. xii, 6) as well as classed with them (Deut. xviii, 15; xxxiv, 10). Aaron is the prophet of Moses (Exod. vii, 1); Miriam (xv, 20) is a prophetess; and we find the prophetic gift in the elders who "prophesied" when "the Spirit of the Lord rested upon them," and in Eldad and Medad, who "prophesied in the camp" (Numb. xi, 27). At the time of the sedition of Miriam, the possible existence of prophets is recognised (xii, 6).

When the Mosaic economy had been established, a new element was introduced. The sacerdotal caste then became the instrument by which the members of the Jewish theocracy were taught and governed in things spiritual. Feast and fast, sacrifice and offering, rite and ceremony, constituted a varied and ever-recurring system of training and teaching by type and symbol. To the priests, too, was intrusted the work of "teaching the children of Israel all the statutes which the Lord hath spoken unto them by the hand of Moses" (Lev. x, 11). Teaching by act and teaching by word were alike their task. This office they adequately fulfilled for some hundred or more years after the giving of the law at Mount Sinai. But during the time of the Judges the priesthood sank into a state of degeneracy, and the people were no longer affected by the acted lessons of the ceremonial service. They required less enigmatic warnings and exhortations. Under these circumstances a new moral power was evoked — the regular Prophetic Line. Special functionaries of this kind had from time to time already appeared. In the days of the Judges we find that Deborah (Judg. iv, 4) was a prophetess; a prophet (vi, 8) rebuked and exhorted the Israelites when oppressed by the Midianites; and in Samuel's childhood "a man of God" predicted to Eli the death of his two sons, and the curse that was to fall on his descendants (1 Sam. ii, 27). But it was now time for a more formal institution of the prophetic order. Samuel, himself a Levite, of the family of Kohath (1 Chron. vi, 28), and certainly acting as a priest, was the instrument used at once for effecting a reform in the sacerdotal order (ix, 22), and for giving to the prophets a position of influence which they had never before held. So important was the work wrought by him that he is classed in Holy Scripture with Moses (Jer. xv, 1; Psa. xcix, 6; Acts iii, 24), Samuel being the great religious reformer and organizer of the prophetical order, as Moses was the great legislator and founder of the priestly rule. Nevertheless, it is not to be supposed that Samuel created the prophetic order as a new thing before unknown. The germs both of the prophetic and of the regal order are found in the law as given to the Israelites by Moses (Deut. xiii, 1; xviii, 20; xvii, 18), but they were not yet developed, because there was not yet the demand for them. Samuel, who evolved the one, himself saw the evolution of the other. It is a vulgar error respecting Jewish history to suppose that there was an antagonism between the prophets and the priests. There is not a trace of such antagonism. Isaiah may denounce a wicked hierarchy (i, 10), but it is because it is wicked, not because it is a hierarchy. Malachi "sharply reproves" the priests (ii, 1), but it is in order to support the priesthood (comp. i, 14). Mr. F. W. Newman even designates Ezekiel's writings as "hard sacerdotalism," "tedious and unedifying as Leviticus itself" (*Hebr. Monarch.* p. 330). The prophetical order was, in truth, supplemental, not antagonistic, to the sacerdotal. See SAMUEL.

Samuel took measures to make his work of restoration permanent as well as effective for the moment. For this purpose he instituted companies, or colleges of prophets. One we find in his lifetime at Ramah (1 Sam. xix, 19, 20); others afterwards at Bethel (2 Kings ii, 3), Jericho (ii, 5), Gilgal (iv, 38), and elsewhere (vi, 1). Their constitution and object were similar to those of theological colleges. Into them were gathered promising students, and here they were trained for the office which they were afterwards destined to fulfil. So successful were these institutions that from the time of Samuel to the closing of the Canon of the Old Test. there seems never to have been wanting a due supply of men to keep up the line of official prophets. There appears to be no sufficient ground for the common statement that after the schism the colleges existed only in the Israelitish kingdom, or for Knobel's supposition that they ceased with Elisha (*Prophetismus*, ii, 39), nor again for Bishop Lowth's statement that "they existed from the earliest times of the Hebrew republic" (*Sacred Poetry*, lect. xviii), or for M. Nicolas's assertion that their previous establishment can be inferred from 1 Sam. viii, ix, x (*Études Critiques sur la Bible*, p. 365). We have, however, no actual *proof* of their existence except in the days of Samuel and of Elijah and Elisha. The apocryphal books of the Maccabees (1, iv, 46; ix, 27; xiv, 41) and of Ecclesiasticus (xxxvi, 15) represent them as extinct. The colleges appear to have consisted of students differing in number. Sometimes they were very numerous (1 Kings xviii, 4; xxii, 6; 2 Kings ii, 16). One elderly, or leading prophet, presided over them (1 Sam. xix, 20), called their father (x, 12), or master (2 Kings ii, 3), who was apparently admitted to his office by the ceremony of anointing (1 Kings xix, 16; Isa. lxi, 1; Psa. cv, 15). They were called his sons. Their chief subject of study was, no doubt, the law and its interpretation; oral, as distinct from symbolical, teaching being henceforward tacitly transferred from the priestly to the prophetical order. Subsidiary subjects of instruction were music and sacred poetry, both of which had been connected with prophecy from the time of Moses (Exod. xv, 20) and the Judges (Judg. iv, 4; v, 1). The prophets that meet Saul "came down from the high place with a psaltery and a tabret, and a pipe and a harp before them" (1 Sam. x, 5). Elijah calls a minstrel to evoke the prophetic gift in himself (2 Kings iii, 15). David "separates to the service of the sons of Asaph and of Heman and of Jeduthun, who should *prophesy* with harps and with psalteries and with cymbals. . . . All these were under the hands of their father for song in the house of the Lord with cymbals, psalteries, and harps for the service of the house of God" (1 Chron. xxv, 16). Hymns, or sacred songs, are found in the books of Jonah (ii, 2), Isaiah (xii, 1; xxvi, 1), Habakkuk (iii, 2). It was probably the duty of the prophetical students to compose verses to be sung in the Temple (see Lowth, *Sacred Poetry of the Hebrews*, lect. xviii). Having been themselves trained and taught, the prophets, whether still residing within their college or having left its precincts, had the task of teaching others. From the question addressed to the Shunamite by her husband, "Wherefore wilt thou go to him to-day? It is neither new moon nor Sabbath" (2 Kings iv, 23), it appears that weekly and monthly religious meetings were held as an ordinary practice by the prophets (see Patrick, *Comm.* ad loc.). Thus we find that "Elisha sat in his house" engaged in his official occupation (comp. Ezek. viii, 1; xiv, 1; xx, 1), "and the elders sat with him" (2 Kings vi, 32), when the king of Israel sent to slay him. It was at these meetings, probably, that many of the warnings and exhortations on morality and spiritual religion were addressed by the prophets to their countrymen. See PROPHETS, SCHOOLS OF.

The schools of the prophets were thus engaged in what we may call pastoral functions, rather than in the disclosure of things to come; their office was to bring home to men's business and bosoms the announcements already made. Selected from the Levitical and priestly classes, they performed services chiefly of a priestly character (1 Sam. ix, 13), but presided over devotional exercises and gave spiritual instruction. We may regard Elijah as the type of the whole prophetical order at this period; "a man of heroic energy in action, rather than of prolific thought or excellent discourse. Power was given him to smite the earth with plagues (Rev. xi, 6).

When an impression had been made by these extraordinary displays of power, a still small voice was heard to quicken the people to newness of life." If we pass on to the religious teachers who are associated with the name and age of David—Nathan, Solomon, and others, who composed the Psalms—we shall see that these aimed at the religious education of their contemporaries by a pure stream of didactic and devotional poetry. Their object was to advance the members of the ancient economy to the highest degree of light and purity which was attainable in that state of minority. The predictive element crops out most distinctly in the Messianic psalms, which point to the ultimate completion of the kingdom in David's Lord, and the universal reign of righteousness, truth, and peace. When these efforts failed to stem the tide of corruption and to rescue the chosen people from disorder, ancient prophecy assumed the form of specific prediction. The moral element is chiefly seen in denouncing the iniquity and unrighteousness of the age, but the distinctive characteristic is that, in exposing the evils which prevailed, they directed the eye to the future. This band of religious teachers who are popularly spoken of as "the prophets" commenced with Hosea soon after the ministry of Elijah and Elisha. Hosea's labors commenced in the days of Uzziah, king of Judah, and Jeroboam II, king of Israel, and were prolonged to the time of Hezekiah, comprising more than sixty years, so that with him were contemporary Amos, Jonah, Joel, Obadiah, Isaiah, Micah, Nahum. Next to these in order of time came Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, Habakkuk, Zephaniah. The last three were Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi. From these we derive our amplest materials for comparing the anticipations of prophecy with the subsequent events of history. Thus the prophets of the Old Covenant form a regular succession; they are members of an unbroken continuous chain, of which one perpetually reaches forth the hand to the other. See PROPHETS, MAJOR, and MINOR.

In the first book of the Maccabees (ix, 17) the discontinuance of the prophetic calling is considered as forming an important æra in Jewish history (see Stemann, *De Termino Prophetarum* [Rost. 1723]), while at the same time an expectation of the renewal in future ages of prophetic gifts is avowed (1 Macc. iv, 46; xiv, 41). After the Babylonian exile the sacred writings were collected, which enabled every one to find the way of salvation; but the immediate revelations to the people of Israel were to cease for a while, in order to raise a stronger longing for the appearance of the Messiah, and to prepare for him a welcome reception. For the same reason the ark of the covenant had been taken away from the people. The danger of a complete apostasy, which in earlier times might have been incurred by this withdrawal, was not now to be apprehended. The external worship of the Lord was so firmly established that no extraordinary helps were wanted. Taking also into consideration the altered character of the people, we may add that the time after the exile was more fit to produce men learned in the law than prophets. Before this period, the faithful and the unbelieving were strongly opposed to each other, which excited the former to great exertions. These relaxed when the opposition ceased, and pious priests now took the place of prophets. The time after the exile is characterized by weakness and dependence; the people looked up to the past as to a height which they could not gain; the earlier writings obtained unconditional authority, and the disposition for receiving prophetic gifts was lost. About a hundred years after the return from the Babylonian exile, the prophetic profession ceased. The Jewish tradition uniformly states that after Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi no prophet arose among the Jews till John the Baptist woke afresh the echoes of a long-lost inspiration as the prelude to a new dispensation. For its resumption under the New-Test. economy, see § x below.

2. *Manner of Life of the Prophets.*—The prophets went about poorly and coarsely dressed (2 Kings i, 8), not as a mere piece of asceticism, but that their very apparel might teach what the people ought to do; it was a "sermo propheticus realis." Comp. 1 Kings xxi, 27, where Ahab does penance in the manner figured by the prophet: "And it came to pass, when Ahab heard these words, that he rent his clothes, and put sackcloth upon his flesh and fasted" (see Nicolai, *De Prophetarum Vestitu* [Magdeb. 1746]; Zachariä, *De Prophetarum Habitu* [Sodin, 1756]). The general appearance and life of the prophet were very similar to those of the Eastern dervish at the present day. His dress was a hairy garment, girt with a leathern girdle (Isa. xx, 2; Zech. xiii, 4; Matt. iii, 4). He was married or unmarried as he chose; but his manner of life and diet were stern and austere (2 Kings iv, 10, 38; 1 Kings xix, 6; Matt. iii, 4). Generally the prophets were not anxious to attract notice by ostentatious display; nor did they seek worldly wealth, most of them living in poverty and even want (1 Kings xiv, 3; 2 Kings iv, 1, 38, 42; vi, 5). The decay of the congregation of God deeply chagrined them (comp. Micah vii, 1, and many passages in Jeremiah). Insult, persecution, imprisonment, and death were often the reward of their godly life. The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews says (ch. xi, 37): "They were stoned, they were sawn asunder, were tempted, were slain with the sword; they wandered about in sheep-skins and goat-skins, being destitute, afflicted, tormented" (comp. Christ's speech, Matt. xxiii, 29 sq.; 2 Chron. xxiv, 17 sq.). The condition of the prophets, in their temporal humiliation, is vividly represented in the lives of Elijah and Elisha in the books of the Kings; and Jeremiah concludes the description of his sufferings in the 20th chapter by cursing the day of his birth. Repudiated by the world in which they were aliens, they typified the life of him whose appearance they announced, and whose spirit dwelt in them. They figured him, however, not only in his lowness, but in his elevation. The Lord stood by them, gave evidence in their favor by fulfilling their predictions, frequently proved by miracles that they were his own messengers, or retaliated on their enemies the injury done them. The prophets addressed the people of both kingdoms: they were not confined to particular places, but prophesied where it was required. For this reason they were most numerous in capital towns, especially in Jerusalem, where they generally spoke in the Temple. Sometimes their advice was asked, and then their prophecies take the form of answers to questions submitted to them (Isa. xxxvii; Ezek. xx; Zech. vii). But much more frequently they felt themselves inwardly moved to address the people without their advice having been asked, and they were not afraid to stand forward in places where their appearance, perhaps, produced indignation and terror. Whatever lay within or around the sphere of religion and morals formed the object of their care. They strenuously opposed the worship of false gods (Isa. i, 10 sq.), as well as the finery of women (iii, 16 sq.). Priests, princes, kings, all must hear them—must, however reluctantly, allow them to perform their calling as long as they spoke in the name of the true God, and as long as the result did not disprove their pretensions to be the servants of the invisible King of Israel (Jer. xxxvii, 15–21).

As seen above, there were institutions for training prophets; the senior members instructed a number of pupils and directed them. These schools had been first established by Samuel (1 Sam. x, 8; xix, 19); and at a later time there were such institutions in different places, as Bethel and Gilgal (2 Kings ii, 3; iv, 38; vi, 1). The pupils of the prophets lived in fellowship united, and were called "sons of the prophets;" while the senior or experienced prophets were considered as their spiritual parents, and were styled fathers (comp. 2 Kings ii, 12; vi, 21). Samuel, Elijah, and Elisha are

mentioned as principals of such institutions. From them the Lord generally chose his instruments. Amos relates of himself (vii, 14, 15), as a thing uncommon, that he had been trained in no school of prophets, but was a herdsman, when the Lord took him to prophesy unto the people of Israel. At the same time, this example shows that the bestowal of prophetic gifts was not limited to the school of the prophets. Women also might come forward as prophetesses, as instanced in Miriam, Deborah, and Huldah, though such cases are of comparatively rare occurrence. We should also observe that only as regards the kingdom of Israel we have express accounts of the continuance of the schools of prophets. What is recorded of them is not directly applicable to the kingdom of Judah, especially since, as stated above, prophecy had in it an essentially different position. We cannot assume that the organization and regulations of the schools of the prophets in the kingdom of Judah were as settled and established as in the kingdom of Israel. In the latter, the schools of the prophets had a kind of monastic constitution: they were not institutions of general education, but missionary stations; which explains the circumstance that they were established exactly in places which were the chief seats of superstition. The spiritual fathers travelled about to visit the training-schools; the pupils had their common board and dwelling, and those who married and left ceased not on that account to be connected with their colleges, but remained members of them. The widow of such a pupil of the schools of prophets who is mentioned in 2 Kings iv, 1 sq., considered Elisha as the person bound to care for her. The offerings which, by the Mosaic law, were to be given to the Levites were by the pious of the kingdom of Israel brought to the schools of the prophets (iv, 42). The prophets of the kingdom of Israel thus in some sort stood in a hostile position to the priests. These points of difference in the situation of the prophets of the two kingdoms must not be lost sight of; and we further add that prophecy in the kingdom of Israel was much more connected with extraordinary events than in the kingdom of Judah: the history of the latter offers no prophetical deeds equalling those of Elijah and Elisha. Prophecy in the kingdom of Israel not being grounded on a hierarchy venerable for its antiquity, consecrated by divine miracles, and constantly flavored with divine protection, it needed to be supported more powerfully, and to be legitimized more evidently. In conclusion, it may be observed that the expression "schools of the prophets" is not exactly suited to their nature, as general instruction was not their object. The so-called prophets' schools were associations of men endowed with the spirit of God, for the purpose of carrying on their work, the feeble powers of junior members being directed and strengthened by those of a higher class. To those who entered these unions the Divine Spirit had already been imparted, which was the imperative condition of their reception. See PROPHETS, SONS OF.

III. *The Prophetic Functions.* — These have already been in part glanced at, but the importance of the subject demands a fuller exposition. To belong to the prophetic order and to possess the prophetic gift are not convertible terms. There might be members of the prophetic order to whom the gift of prophecy was not vouchsafed. There might be inspired prophets who did not belong to the prophetic order. As we have seen above, the inspired prophet generally came from the college of the prophets, and belonged to the prophetic order; but this was not always the case. In the instance of the prophet Amos, the rule and the exception are both manifested. When Amaziah, the idolatrous Israelitish priest, threatens the prophet and desires him to "flee away into the land of Judah, and there eat bread and prophesy there, but not to prophesy again any more at Bethel," Amos in reply says, "I was no prophet, neither was I a prophet's son; but I was an herdsman, and a gatherer of sycamore fruit: and the Lord took me as I followed the flock, and the Lord said unto me, Go prophesy unto my people Israel" (Amos vii, 14). That is, though called to the prophetic *office*, he did not belong to the prophetic *order*, and had not been trained in the prophetical colleges; and this, he indicates, was an unusual occurrence (see J. Smith *On Prophecy*, ch. ix).

1. In a general way, we may indicate that the sphere of action of the prophets was absolutely limited to Israelites, and there is only one case of a prophet going to the heathen to preach among them—that of Jonah sent to Nineveh. He goes, however, to Nineveh to shame the Hebrews by the reception which he meets with there, and acting upon his own nation was thus even in this case the prophet's ultimate object. Many predictions of the Old Test. concern, indeed, the events of foreign nations, but they are always uttered and written with reference to Israel, and the prophets thought not of publishing them among the heathens themselves. The conversion of the pagans to the worship of the true God was indeed a favorite idea of the prophets; but the Divine Spirit told them that it was not to be effected by their exertions, as it was connected with extensive future changes, which they might not forestall.

That the Lord would send such prophets was promised to the people by Moses, who by a special law (Deut. xviii, 1) secured them authority and safety. As his ordinary servants and teachers, God appointed the priests: the characteristic mark which distinguished the prophets from them was inspiration; and this explains the circumstance that, in times of great moral and religious corruption, when the ordinary means no longer sufficed to reclaim the people, the number of prophets increased. The regular religious instruction of the people was no part of the business of the prophets: their proper duty was only to rouse and excite. The contrary—viz. that a part of the regular duty of the prophets was to instruct the people—is often argued from 2 Kings iv, 23, where it is said that the Shunamitess on the sabbaths and days of new moon used to go to the prophet Elisha; but this passage applies only to the kingdom of Israel, and admits of no inference with respect to the kingdom of Judah. As regards the latter, there is no proof that prophets held meetings for instruction and edification on sacred days. Their position was here quite different from that of the prophets in the kingdom of Israel. The agency of the prophets in the kingdom of Judah was only of a subsidiary kind. These extraordinary messengers of the Lord only filled there the gaps left by the regular servants of God, the priests and the Levites: the priesthood never became there utterly degenerate, and each lapse was followed by a revival of which the prophets were the vigorous agents. The divine election always vindicated itself, and in the purity of the origin of the priesthood lay the certainty of its continued renewal. On the contrary, the priesthood in the kingdom of Israel had no divine sanction, no promise; it was corrupt in its very source: to reform itself would have been to dissolve itself. The priests there were the mercenary servants of the king, and had a brand upon their own consciences. Hence in the kingdom of Israel the prophets were the regular ministers of God: with their office all stood or fell, and hence they were required to do many things besides what the original conception of the office of a prophet implied—a circumstance from the oversight of which many erroneous notions on the nature of prophecy have sprung. This led to another difference, to which we shall revert below, viz. that in the kingdom of Judah the prophetic office did not, as in Israel, possess a fixed organization and complete construction.

In their labors, as respected their own times, the prophets were strictly bound to the Mosaic law, and not allowed to add to it or to diminish aught from it. What was said in this respect to the whole people (Deut. iv, 2; xiii, 1) applied also to them. We find, therefore, prophecy always takes its ground on the Mosaic law,

to which it refers, from which it derives its sanction, and with which it is fully impressed and saturated. There is no chapter in the prophets in which there are not several references to the law. The business of the prophets was to explain it, to lay it to the hearts of the people, and to preserve vital its spirit. It was, indeed, also their duty to point to future reforms, when the ever-living spirit of the law would break its hitherto imperfect form, and make for itself another: thus Jeremiah (iii, 16) foretells days when the ark of the covenant shall be no more, and (xxxi, 31) days when a new covenant will be made with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah. But for their own times they never once dreamed of altering any, even the minutest and least essential precept, even as to its form; how much less as to its spirit, which even the Lord himself declares (Matt. v, 18) to be immutable and eternal! The passages which some interpreters have alleged as opposed to sacrifices as instituted by the Mosaic law have been misunderstood; they do not denounce sacrifices generally, but only those of the Canaanites, with whom sacrifice was not even a form of true worship, but opposed to the genuine and spiritual service of God.

2. More specifically, the sixteen prophets whose books are in the Canon have that place of honor because they were endowed with the *prophetic gift* as well as ordinarily (so far as we know) belonging to the *prophetic order*. There were hundreds of prophets contemporary with each of these sixteen prophets; and no doubt numberless compositions in sacred poetry and numberless moral exhortations were issued from the sevéral schools, but only sixteen books find their place in the Canon. Why is this? Because these sixteen had what their brother collegians had not—the divine call to the office of prophet, and the divine illumination to enlighten them. It was not sufficient to have been taught and trained in preparation for a future call. Teaching and training served as a preparation only. When the schoolmaster's work was done, then, if the instrument was worthy, God's work began. Moses had an external call at the burning bush (Exod. iii, 2). The Lord called Samuel, so that Eli perceived, and Samuel learned, that it was the Lord who called him (1 Sam. iii, 10). Isaiah (vi, 8), Jeremiah (i, 5), Ezekiel (ii, 4), Amos (vii, 15), declare their special mission. Nor was it sufficient for this call to have been made once for all. Each prophetical utterance is the result of a communication of the divine to the human spirit, received either by "vision" (Isa. vi, 1) or by "the word of the Lord" (Jer. ii, 1). (See *Aids to Faith*, essay iii, "On Prophecy.") What, then, are the characteristics of the sixteen prophets thus called and commissioned, and intrusted with the messages of God to his people?

(1.) They were the national poets of Judæa. We have already shown that music and poetry, chants and hymns, were a main part of the studies of the class from which, generally speaking, they were derived. As is natural, we find not only the songs previously specified, but the rest of their compositions, poetical, or breathing the spirit of poetry. Bishop Lowth "esteems the whole book of Isaiah poetical, a few passages excepted, which, if brought together, would not at most exceed the bulk of five or six chapters," "half of the book of Jeremiah," "the greater part of Ezekiel." The rest of the prophets are mainly poetical, but Haggai is "prosaic," and Jonah and Daniel are plain prose (*Sacred Poetry*, lect. xxi). The prophetical style differs from that of books properly called poetical, whose sublimity it all but outvies, only in being less restrained by those external forms which distinguish poetical language from prose, and in introducing more frequently than prose does plays upon words and thoughts. This peculiarity may be explained by the practical tendency of prophetical addresses, which avoid all that is unintelligible, and studiously introduce what is best calculated for the moment to strike the hearers. The same appears from many other circumstances, e. g. the union of *music* with prophesying, the demeanor of Saul when among the prophets (1 Sam. x, 5), Balaam's description of himself (Numb. xxiv, 3) as a man whose eyes were opened, who saw the vision of the Almighty, and heard the words of God, the established phraseology to denote the inspiring impulse, viz. "the hand of the Lord was strong upon him" (Ezek. iii, 14; comp. Isa. viii, 11; 2 Kings iii, 15), etc. (See § vi, below.)

(2.) They were annalists and historians. A great portion of Isaiah, of Jeremiah, of Daniel, of Jonah, of Haggai, is direct or indirect history.

(3.) They were preachers of patriotism; their patriotism being founded on the religious motive. To the subject of the theocracy, the enemy of his nation was the enemy of God, the traitor to the public weal was a traitor to his God: a denunciation of an enemy was a denunciation of a representative of evil; an exhortation in behalf of Jerusalem was an exhortation in behalf of God's kingdom on earth, "the city of our God, the mountain of holiness, beautiful for situation, the joy of the whole earth, the city of the great King" (Psa. xlviii, 1, 2).

(4.) They were preachers of morals and of spiritual religion. The symbolical teaching of the law had lost much of its effect. Instead of learning the necessity of purity by the legal washings, the majority came to rest in the outward act as in itself sufficient. It was the work, then, of the prophets to hold up before the eyes of their countrymen a high and pure morality, not veiled in symbols and acts, but such as none could profess to misunderstand. Thus, in his first chapter, Isaiah contrasts ceremonial observances with spiritual morality: "Your new moons and your appointed feasts my soul hateth: they are a trouble unto me; I am weary to bear them. . . . Wash ye, make you clean; put away the evil of your doings from before mine eyes; cease to do evil; learn to do well; seek judgment; relieve the oppressed, judge the fatherless, plead for the widow" (i, 14–17). He proceeds to denounce God's judgments on the oppression and covetousness of the rulers, the pride of the women (ch. iii), on grasping, profligacy, iniquity, injustice (ch. v), and so on throughout. The system of morals put forward by the prophets, if not higher or sterner or purer than that of the law, is more plainly declared, and with greater, because now more needed, vehemence of diction. "Magna fides et grandis audacia prophetarum," says St. Jerome (*In Ezek.*). This was their general characteristic, but that gifts and graces might be dissevered is proved by the cases of Balaam, Jonah, Caiaphas, and the disobedient prophet of Judah.

(5.) They were extraordinary, but yet authorized, exponents of the law. As an instance of this we may take Isaiah's description of a true fast (lviii, 3–7); Ezekiel's explanation of the sins of the father being visited on the children (ch. xviii); Micah's preference of "doing justly, loving mercy, and walking humbly with God," to "thousands of rams and ten thousands of rivers of oil" (vi, 6–8). In these, as in other similar cases (comp. Hos. vi, 6; Amos v, 21), it was the task of the prophets to restore the balance which had been overthrown by the Jews and their teachers dwelling on one side or on the outer covering of a truth or of a duty, and leaving the other side or the inner meaning out of sight.

(6.) They held, as we have shown above, a pastoral or quasi-pastoral office.

(7.) They were a political power in the state. Strong in the safeguard of their religious character, they were able to serve as a counterpoise to the royal authority when wielded even by an Ahab.

(8.) But the prophets were something more than national poets and annalists, preachers of patriotism, moral teachers, exponents of the law, pastors, and politicians. We have not yet touched upon their most essential characteristic, which is that they were instruments of revealing God's will to man; as in other ways, so, specially, by predicting future events, and, in par-

ticular, by foretelling the incarnation of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the redemption effected by him. There are two chief ways of exhibiting this fact—one is suitable when discoursing with Christians, the other when arguing with unbelievers. To the Christian it is enough to show that the truth of the New Testament and the truthfulness of its authors, and of the Lord himself, are bound up with the truth of the existence of this predictive element in the prophets. To the unbeliever it is necessary to show that facts have verified their predictions.

(*a.*) In Matthew's Gospel, the first chapter, we find a quotation from the prophet Isaiah, "Behold a virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his name Emmanuel;" and, at the same time, we find a statement that the birth of Christ took place as it did "that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet," in those words (i, 22, 23). This means that the prophecy was the declaration of God's purpose, and that the circumstances of the birth of Christ were the fulfilment of that purpose. Then, either the predictive element exists in the book of the prophet Isaiah, or the authority of the evangelist Matthew must be given up. The same evangelist testifies to the same prophet having "spoken of" John the Baptist (iii, 3) in words which he quotes from Isa. xl, 3. He says (iv, 13–15) that Jesus came and dwelt in Capernaum "that" other words "spoken by" the same prophet (ix, 1) "might be fulfilled." He says (viii, 17) that Jesus did certain acts "that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Esaias the prophet" (Isa. liii, 4). He says (xii, 17) that Jesus acted in a particular manner "that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Esaias the prophet" in words quoted from xlii, 1. Then, if we believe Matthew, we must believe that in the pages of the prophet Isaiah there was predicted that which Jesus some seven hundred years afterwards fulfilled. This conclusion cannot be escaped by pressing the words ἵνα πληρωθῇ, for if they do not mean that certain things were done in order that the divine predestination might be accomplished, which predestination was already declared by the prophet, they must mean that Jesus Christ knowingly moulded his acts so as to be in accordance with what was said in an ancient book which in reality had no reference to him, a thing which is entirely at variance with the character drawn of him by Matthew, and which would make him a conscious impostor, inasmuch as he himself appeals to the prophecies. Further, it would imply (as in Matt. i, 22) that God himself contrived certain events (as those connected with the birth of Christ), not in order that they might be in accordance with his will, but in order that they might be agreeable to the declarations of a certain book—than which nothing could well be more absurd.

But, further, we have not only the evidence of the evangelist; we have the evidence of the Lord himself. He declares (Matt. xiii, 14) that in the Jews of his age "is fulfilled the prophecy of Esaias, which saith—" (Isa. vi, 9). He says (Matt. xv, 7), "Esaias well prophesied of them" (Isa. xix, 13). Then, if we believe our Lord's sayings and the record of them, we must believe in prediction as existing in the prophet Isaiah. This prophet, who is cited between fifty and sixty times, may be taken as a sample; but the same argument might be brought forward with respect to Jeremiah (Matt. ii, 18; Heb. viii, 8), Daniel (Matt. xxiv, 15), Hosea (Matt. ii, 15; Rom. ix, 25), Joel (Acts ii, 17), Amos (Acts vii, 42; xv, 16), Jonah (Matt. xii, 40), Micah (Matt. xii, 7), Habakkuk (Acts xiii, 41), Haggai (Heb. xii, 26), Zechariah (Matt. xxi, 5; Mark xiv, 27; John xix, 37), Malachi (Matt. xi, 10; Mark i, 2; Luke vii, 27). With this evidence for so many of the prophets, it would be idle to cavil with respect to Ezekiel, Obadiah, Nahum, Zephaniah; the more so as "the prophets" are frequently spoken of together (Matt. ii, 23; Acts xiii, 40; xv, 15) as authoritative. The Psalms are quoted no less than seventy times, and very frequently as being predictive.

(*b.*) The argument with the unbeliever does not admit of being brought to an issue so concisely. Here it is necessary [1] to point out the existence of certain declarations as to future events, the probability of which was not discernible by human sagacity at the time that the declarations were made; [2] to show that certain events did afterwards take place corresponding with those declarations; [3] to show that a chance coincidence is not an adequate hypothesis on which to account for that correspondence. See PROPHECY.

Dr. Davidson pronounces it as "now commonly admitted that the essential part of Biblical prophecy does not lie in predicting contingent events, but in divining the essentially religious in the course of history. . . . In no prophecy can it be shown that the literal predicting of distant historical events is contained. . . . In conformity with the analogy of prophecy generally, special predictions concerning Christ do not appear in the Old Testament." Dr. Davidson must mean that this is "now commonly admitted" by writers like himself, who, following Eichhorn, resolve "the prophet's delineations of the future" into, "in essence, *nothing but forebodings*—efforts *of the spiritual eye* to bring up before itself the distinct form of the future. The prevision of the prophet is intensified presentiment." Of course, if the powers of the prophets were simply "forebodings" and "presentiments" of the human spirit in "its preconscious region," they could not do more than make indefinite guesses about the future. But this is not the Jewish nor the Christian theory of prophecy. See Basil (*In Esai.* c. iii), Chrysostom (*Hom.* xxii, t. v, 137, ed. 1612), Clem. Alex. (*Strom.* lib. ii), Eusebius (*Dem. Evang.* v, 132, ed. 1544), and Justin Martyr (*Dial. cum Tryph.* p. 224, ed. 1636). See Suicer, s. v. προφήτης.

The view commonly taken of the prophets is, indeed, that they were mere predictors of future events; but this view is one-sided and too narrow; though, on the other hand, we must beware of expanding too much the acceptation of the term prophet. Not to mention those who, like Hendewerk, in the introduction to his *Commentary on the Prophet Isaiah*, identify the notion of a prophet with that of an honest and pious man, yet we see from the above considerations that the conception of those is likewise too wide who place the essential feature of a prophet in his divine inspiration. That this does not meet the whole subject appears from Numb. xii, 6 sq., where Moses, who enjoyed divine inspiration in its highest grade, is represented as differing from those called prophets in a stricter sense, and as standing in contrast with them. Divine inspiration is only the general basis of the prophetic office, to which other elements must be added, especially the gift of that inspiration in a formal manner and for a specific purpose. This will become still more clear from the considerations adduced under the next heads.

IV. *Test of the Prophetic Character.*—As Moses had foretold, a host of false prophets arose in later times among the people, who promised prosperity without repentance, and preached the Gospel without the law. The writings of the prophets are full of complaints of the mischief done by these impostors. Jeremiah significantly calls them "prophets of the deceit of their own heart"—i. e. men who followed the suggestions of their own fancy in prophesying (Jer. xxiii, 26; comp. ver. 16, and ch. xiv, 14). All their practices prove the great influence which true prophetism had acquired among the people of Israel. But how were the people to distinguish between true and false prophets? This is decided partly by positive or negative criteria, and partly by certain general marks.

1. In the law concerning prophets (Deut. xviii, 20; comp. xiii, 7–9) the following enactments are contained:

(1.) The prophet *who speaks in the name of other*

gods—i. e. professes to have his revelations from a god different from Jehovah—is to be considered as false, and to be punished capitally; and this even though his predictions should come to pass.

(2.) The same punishment is to be inflicted on him who speaks in the name of the true God, but *whose predictions are not accomplished.*

These enactments established a peculiar right of the prophets. He who prophesied in the name of the true God was, even when he foretold calamity, entitled to be tolerated, until it happened that a prediction of his failed of accomplishment. He might then be imprisoned, but could not be put to death, as instanced in Jeremiah (xxvi, 8–16), who is apprehended and arraigned, but acquitted: "Then, said the princes and the people unto the priests and the prophets, This man is not worthy to die, for he has spoken to us in the name of the Lord our God." Ahab is by false prophets encouraged to attack Ramoth-gilead, but Micaiah prophesied him no good; on which the king becomes angry, and orders the prophet to be confined (1 Kings xxii, 1–27): "Take Micaiah and put him in prison, and feed him with bread of affliction, and with water of affliction, until I come in peace." Micaiah answers (ver. 28), "If thou return at all in peace, the Lord has not spoken by me." Until the safe return of the king, Micaiah is to remain in prison; after that, he shall be put to death. The prophet agrees to it, and the king goes up to Ramoth-gilead, but is slain in the battle.

(3.) From the above two criteria of a true prophet flows the third, that *his addresses must be in strict accordance with the law.* Whoever departs from it cannot be a true prophet, for it is impossible that the Lord should contradict himself.

(4.) In the above is also founded the fourth criterion, that *a true prophet must not promise prosperity without repentance;* and that he is a false prophet, "of the deceit of his own heart," who does not reprove the sins of the people, and who does not inculcate on them the doctrines of divine justice and retribution.

2. In addition to these negative criteria there were positive ones to procure authority to true prophets. First of all, it must be assumed that the prophets themselves received, along with the divine revelations, assurance that these were really divine. Any true communion with the Holy Spirit affords the assurance of its divine nature, and the prophets could, therefore, satisfy *themselves* of their divine mission. There was nothing to mislead and delude them in this respect, for temporal goods were not bestowed upon them with the gift of prophesying. Their own native disposition was often much averse to this calling, and could be only conquered by the Lord forcibly impelling them, as appears from Jer. xx, 8, 9: "Since I spake, the word of the Lord was made a reproach unto me, and a derision daily. Then I said, I will not make mention of him, nor speak any more in his name, but his word was in mine heart as a burning fire shut up in my bones, and I was weary with forbearing, and I could not stay." Now, when the prophets themselves were convinced of their divine mission, they could in various ways prove it to others whom they were called on to enlighten.

(1.) To those who had any sense of truth, the Spirit of God gave evidence that the prophecies were divinely inspired. This *testimonium Spiritus Sancti* is the chief argument for the reality of a divine revelation; and he who is susceptible of it does not, indeed, disregard the other proofs suiting the wants of unimproved minds, but lays less stress on them.

(2.) The prophets themselves utter their firm conviction that they act and speak by divine authority, not of their own accord (comp. the often recurring phrase נְאֻם יְהוָה, "a prophecy of Jehovah," Jer. xxvi, 12, etc.). Their pious life bore testimony to their being worthy of a nearer communion with God, and defended them from the suspicion of intentional deception; their sobriety of mind distinguished them from all fanatics, and defended them from the suspicion of self-delusion; their fortitude in suffering for truth proved that they had their commission from no human authority.

(3.) Part of the predictions of the prophets referred to proximate events, and their accomplishment was divine evidence of their divine origin. Whoever had been once favored with such a testimonial, his authority was established for his whole life, as instanced in Samuel. Of him it is said (1 Sam. iii, 19): "The Lord was with him, and let none of his words fall to the ground (i. e. fulfilled them); and all Israel knew (from this) that Samuel was established to be a prophet of the Lord." Of the divine mission of Isaiah no doubt could be entertained after, for instance, his prophecies of the overthrow of Sennacherib before Jerusalem had been fulfilled. The credentials of the divine mission of Ezekiel were certified when his prediction was accomplished, that Zedekiah should be brought to Babylon, but should not see it, for the king was made prisoner and blinded (Ezek. xii, 12, 13); they were further confirmed by the fulfilment of his prediction concerning the destruction of the city (ch. xxiv). Jeremiah's claims were authenticated by the fulfilment of his prediction that Shallum, the son of Josiah, king of Judah, should die in his prison, and see his native country no more (Jer. xxii, 11, 12).

(4.) Sometimes the divine mission of the prophets was also proved by miracles; but this occurred only at important crises, when the existence of the kingdom of Israel was in jeopardy, as in the age of Elijah and Elisha. Miracles are mentioned as criteria of true prophets (Deut. xiii, 2), still with this caution, that they should not be trusted alone, but that the people should inquire whether the negative criteria were extant.

(5.) Those prophets whose divine commission had been sufficiently proved bore testimony to the divine mission of others. It has been observed above that there was a certain gradation among the prophets; the principals of the colleges of prophets procured authority to the "sons" of prophets. Thus the deeds of Elijah and Elisha at the same time authenticated the hundreds of prophets whose superiors they were. Concerning the relation of the true prophets to each other, the passage 2 Kings ii, 9 is remarkable; Elisha says to Elijah, "I pray thee, let a double portion of thy spirit be upon me." Here Elisha, as the first-born of Elijah in a spiritual sense, and standing to him in the same relation as Joshua to Moses, asks for a double portion of his spiritual inheritance, alluding to the law concerning the hereditary right of the lawfully begotten first-born son (Deut. xxi, 17). This case supposes that other prophets also of the kingdom of Israel took portions of the fulness of the spirit of Elijah. It is plain, then, that only a few prophets stood in immediate communion with God, while that of the remaining was formed by mediation. The latter were spiritually incorporated in the former, and, on the ground of this relation, actions performed by Elisha, or through the instrumentality of one of his pupils, are at once ascribed to Elijah, e. g. the anointing of Hazael to be king over Syria (1 Kings xix, 15; comp. 2 Kings viii, 13); the anointing of Jehu to be king over Israel (1 Kings xix, 16; comp. 2 Kings ix, 1 sq.); the writing of the letter to Joram, etc. Thus in a certain sense it may be affirmed that Elijah was in his time the only prophet of the kingdom of Israel. Similarly of Moses it is recorded, during his passage through the desert, that a portion of his spirit was conveyed to the seventy elders (Numb. xi, 17). The history of the Christian Church itself offers analogies; look, e. g. at the relation of the second-class Reformers to Luther and Calvin.

(6.) It hardly needs to be mentioned that before a man could be a prophet he must be converted. This clearly appears in the case of Isaiah, "whose iniquity was taken away and his sin purged" previous to his entering on his mission to the people of the covenant.

For a single momentary inspiration, however, the mere beginning of spiritual life sufficed, as instanced in Balaam and Saul.

3. As to prophecy in its circumscribed sense, or the foretelling of future events by the prophets, some expositors would explain all predictions of special events; while others assert that no prediction contains anything but general promises or threatenings, and that the prophets knew nothing of the particular manner in which their predictions might be realized. Both these classes deviate from the correct view of prophecy: the former often resort to the most arbitrary interpretations, and the latter are opposed by a mass of facts against which they are unable successfully to contend: e. g. when Ezekiel foretells (xii, 12) that Zedekiah would try to break through the walls of the city and to escape, but that he would be seized, blinded, and taken to Babylon. The frailty of the people, under the Old Test., required external evidence of the real connection of the prophets with God, and the predictions of particular forthcoming events were to them σημεῖα, signs. These were the more indispensable to them, because the ancients generally, and the Orientals in particular, showed the greatest tendency towards the exploration of futurity, which tended to foster superstition and forward idolatry. All other methods of knowing future events by necromancy, conjuration, passing through the fire, etc., having been strictly forbidden (Deut. xviii, 10, 11), it might be expected that the deep-rooted craving for the knowledge of forthcoming events would be gratified in some other and nobler manner. The success of a prophet depended on the gift of special knowledge of futurity; this, it is true, was granted comparatively to only few, but in the authority thus obtained all those shared who were likewise invested with the prophetic character. It was the seal impressed on true prophecy, as opposed to false. From 1 Sam. ix, 6, it appears that, to inspire uncultivated minds with the sense of divine truths, the prophets stooped occasionally to disclose things of common life, using this as the means to reach a higher mark. On the same footing with definite predictions stand miracles and tokens, which prophets of the highest rank, as Elijah and Isaiah, volunteered or granted. These also were requisite to confirm the feeble faith of the people; but Ewald justly remarks that with the true prophets they never appear as the chief point; they only assist and accompany prophecy, but are not its object, not the truth itself, which supersedes them as soon as it gains sufficient strength and influence.

Some interpreters, misunderstanding passages like Jer. xviii, 8; xxvi, 13, have asserted, with Dr. Köster, (p. 226 sq.), that all prophecies were conditional; and have even maintained that their revocability distinguished the true predictions (*Weissagung*) from soothsaying (*Wahrsagung*). But beyond all doubt, when the prophet denounces the divine judgments, he proceeds on the assumption that the people will not repent, an assumption which he knows from God to be true. Were the people to repent, the prediction would fail; but because they will not, it is uttered *absolutely*. It does not follow, however, that the prophet's warnings and exhortations are useless. These serve "for a witness against them;" and besides, amid the ruin of the mass, individuals might be saved. Viewing prophecies as conditional predictions nullifies them. The Mosaic criterion (Deut. xviii, 22), that he was a false prophet who predicted "things which followed not nor came to pass," would then be of no value, since recourse might always be had to the excuse that the case had been altered by the fulfilment of the condition. The fear of introducing fatalism, if the prophecies are not taken in a conditional sense, is unfounded; for God's omniscience, his foreknowledge, does not establish fatalism, and from divine omniscience simply is the prescience of the prophets to be derived. The prophets feel themselves so closely united to God that the words of Jehovah are given as their own, and that to them is often ascribed what God does, as slaying and reviving (Hos. vi, 5), rooting out nations and restoring them (Jer. i, 10; xviii, 7; Ezek. xxxii, 18; xliii, 3); which proves their own consciousness to have been entirely absorbed into that of God.

V. *The Prophetic State of Inspiration.*—We learn from Holy Scripture that it was by the agency of the Spirit of God that the prophets received the divine communication. Thus, on the appointment of the seventy elders, "The Lord said, I will take of the Spirit which is upon thee, and will put it upon them. . . . And the Lord . . . took of the Spirit that was upon him, and gave it unto the seventy elders; and it came to pass that when the Spirit rested upon them, they prophesied and did not cease. . . . And Moses said, Would God that all the Lord's people were prophets, and that the Lord would put his Spirit upon them" (Numb. xi, 17, 25, 29). Here we see that what made the seventy prophesy was their being endued with the Lord's Spirit by the Lord himself. So it is the Spirit of the Lord which made Saul (1 Sam. x, 6) and his messengers (xix, 20) prophesy. Thus Peter assures us that "prophecy came not in old time by the will of man, but holy men of God spake, moved (φερόμενοι) by the Holy Ghost" (2 Pet. i, 21), while false prophets are described as those "who speak a vision of their own heart, and not out of the mouth of the Lord" (Jer. xxiii, 16), "who prophesy out of their own hearts, . . . who follow their own spirit, and have seen nothing" (Ezek. xiii, 2, 3). Hence the emphatic declarations of the Great Prophet of the Church that he did not speak of himself (John vii, 17, etc.). The prophet held an intermediate position in communication between God and man. God communicated with him by his Spirit, and he, having received this communication, was "the spokesman" of God to man (comp. Exod. vii, 1, and iv, 16). But the means by which the Divine Spirit communicated with the human spirit, and the conditions of the human spirit under which the divine communications were received, have not been clearly declared to us. They are, however, indicated. On the occasion of the sedition of Miriam and Aaron, we read, "And the Lord said, Hear now my words: If there be a prophet among you, I the Lord will make myself known unto him in a vision, and will speak unto him in a dream. My servant Moses is not so, who is faithful in all mine house: with him will I speak mouth to mouth, even apparently, and not in dark speeches, and the similitude of the Lord shall he behold" (Numb. xii. 6–8). Here we have an exhaustive division of the different ways in which the revelations of God are made to man: 1. Direct declaration and manifestation—"I will speak mouth to mouth, apparently, and the similitude of the Lord shall he behold;" 2. Vision; 3. Dream. It is indicated that, at least at this time, the vision and the dream were the special means of conveying a revelation to a prophet, while the higher form of direct declaration and manifestation was reserved for the more highly favored Moses. Joel's prophecy appears to make the same division, "Your old men shall dream dreams, and your young men shall see visions," these being the two methods in which the promise, "your sons and your daughters shall prophesy," is to be carried out (ii, 28). Of Daniel we are told that "he had understanding in all visions and dreams" (Dan. i, 17). Can these phases of the prophetic state be distinguished from each other? and in what did they consist?

According to the theory of Philo and the Alexandrian school, the prophet was in a state of entire unconsciousness at the time that he was under the influence of divine inspiration, "for the human understanding," says Philo, "takes its departure on the arrival of the Divine Spirit, and on the removal of the latter again returns to its home, for the mortal must not dwell with the immortal" (*Quis Rer. Div. Hær.* i, 511). Balaam is described by him as an unconscious instrument through

whom God spoke (*De Vitâ Mosis*, lib. i, vol. ii, p. 124). Josephus makes Balaam excuse himself to Balak on the same principle: "When the Spirit of God seizes us, it utters whatsoever sounds and words it pleases, without any knowledge on our part, . . . for when it has come into us, there is nothing in us which remains our own" (*Ant.* iv, 6, 5). This theory identifies Jewish prophecy in all essential points with the heathen *μαντική*, or divination, as distinct from *προφητεία*, or interpretation. Montanism adopted the same view: "Defendimus, in causa novæ prophetiæ, gratiæ exstasin, id est amentiam, convenire. In spiritu enim homo constitutus, præsertim cum gloriam Dei conspicit, vel cum per ipsum Deus loquitur, necesse est excidat sensu, obumbratus scilicet virtute divina; de quo inter nos et Psychicos (catholicos) quæstio est" (Tertullian, *Adv. Marcion.* iv, 22). According to the belief, then, of the heathen, of the Alexandrian Jews, and of the Montanists, the vision of the prophet was seen while he was in a state of ecstatic unconsciousness, and the enunciation of the vision was made by him in the same state. The fathers of the Church opposed the Montanist theory with great unanimity. In Eusebius's *History* (v, 17) we read that Miltiades wrote a book Περὶ τοῦ μὴ δεῖν προφήτην ἐν ἐκστάσει λαλεῖν. St. Jerome writes: "Non loquitur propheta ἐν ἐκστάσει, ut Montanus et Prisca Maximillaque delirant, sed quod prophetat liber est visionis intelligentis universa quæ loquitur" (*Prolog. in Nahum*). Again: "Neque vero ut Montanus cum insanis fœminis somniat, prophetæ in ecstasi locuti sunt ut nescierint quid loquerentur, et cum alios erudirent ipsi ignorarent quid dicerent" (*Prolog. in Esai.*). Origen (*Contr. Celsum*, vii, 4) and St. Basil (*Commentary on Isaiah*, Proœm. c. 5) contrast the prophet with the soothsayer, on the ground of the latter being deprived of his senses. St. Chrysostom draws out the contrast: Τοῦτο γὰρ μάντεως ἴδιον, τὸ ἐξεστηκέναι, τὸ ἀνάγχην ὑπομένειν, τὸ ὠθεῖσθαι, τὸ ἕλκεσθαι, τὸ σύρεσθαι ὥσπερ μαινόμενον. Ὁ δὲ προφήτης οὐχ οὕτως, ἀλλὰ μετὰ διανοίας νηφούσης καὶ σωφρονούσης καταστάσεως, καὶ εἰδὼς ἃ φθέγγεται, φησὶν ἅπαντα· ὥστε καὶ πρὸ τῆς ἐκβάσεως κάντεῦθην γνώριζε τὸν μάντιν καὶ τὸν προφήτην (*Hom. xxix in Epist. ad Corinth.*). At the same time, while drawing the distinction sharply between heathen soothsaying and Montanist prophesying on the one side, and Hebrew prophecy on the other, the fathers use expressions so strong as almost to represent the prophets to be passive instruments acted on by the Spirit of God. Thus it is that they describe them as musical instruments—the pipe (Athenagoras, *Leg. pro Christianis*, c. ix; Clem. Alex. *Cohort. ad Gent.* c. i), the lyre (Justin Martyr, *Cohort. ad Græc.* c. viii; Ephraem Syr. *Rhythm.* xxix; Chrysostom, *Ad Pop. Antioch.* Hom. i, t. ii), or as pens (St. Greg. Magn. *Præf. in Mor. in Job*). Expressions such as these (many of which are quoted by Dr. Lee, *On Inspiration*, Appendix G) must be set against the passages which were directed against the Montanists. Nevertheless, there is a very appreciable difference between their view and that of Tertullian and Philo. Which is most in accordance with the indications of Holy Scripture?

It does not seem possible to draw any very precise distinction between the prophetic "dream" and the prophetic "vision." In the case of Abraham (Gen. xv, 1) and of Daniel (Dan. vii, 1), they seem to melt into each other. In both the external senses are at rest, reflection is quiescent, and intuition energizes. The action of the ordinary faculties is suspended in the one case by natural, in the other by supernatural or extraordinary causes (see Lee, *Inspiration*, p. 173). The state into which the prophet was, occasionally, at least, thrown by the ecstasy, or vision, or trance, is described poetically in the book of Job (iv, 13–16; xxxiii, 15), and more plainly in the book of Daniel. In the case of Daniel, we find first a deep sleep (viii, 18; x, 9) accompanied by terror (viii, 17; x, 8). Then he is raised upright (viii, 18) on his hands and knees, and then on his feet (x, 10, 11). He then receives the divine revelation (viii, 19; x, 12). After this he falls to the ground in a swoon (x, 15, 17); he is faint, sick, and astonished (viii, 27). Here, then, is an instance of the ecstatic state; nor is it confined to the Old Test., though we do not find it in the New Test. accompanied by such violent effects upon the body. At the Transfiguration, the disciples fell on their face, being overpowered by the divine glory, and were restored, like Daniel, by the touch of Jesus' hand. Peter fell into a trance (*ἔκστασις*) before he received his vision, instructing him as to the admission of the Gentiles (Acts x, 10; xi, 5). Paul was in a trance (*ἐν ἐκστάσει*) when he was commanded to devote himself to the conversion of the Gentiles (xxii, 17), and when he was caught up into the third heaven (2 Cor. xii, 1). John was probably in the same state (*ἐν πνεύματι*) when he received the message to the seven churches (Rev. i, 10). The prophetic trance, then, must be acknowledged as a scriptural account of the state in which the prophets and other inspired persons, sometimes, at least, received divine revelations. It would seem, in such particular cases, to have been of the following nature: (1.) The bodily senses were closed to external objects as in deep sleep; (2.) The reflective and discursive faculty was still and inactive; (3.) The spiritual faculty (*πνεῦμα*) was awakened to the highest state of energy. Hence it is that revelations in trances are described by the prophets as "seen" or "heard" by them, for the spiritual faculty energizes by immediate perception on the part of the inward sense, not by inference and thought. Thus Isaiah "*saw* the Lord sitting" (Isa. vi, 1). Zechariah "lifted up his eyes and *saw*" (Zech. ii, 1); "the word of the Lord which Micah *saw*" (Mic. i, 1); "the wonder which Habakkuk did *see*" (Hab. i, 1). "Peter *saw* heaven opened . . . and there came a *voice* to him" (Acts x, 11). Paul was "in a trance, and *saw* him *saying*" (xxii, 18). John "*heard* a great voice . . . and *saw* seven golden candlesticks" (Rev. i, 12). Hence it is, too, that the prophets' visions are unconnected and fragmentary, inasmuch as they are not the subject of the reflective, but of the perceptive faculty. They described what they saw and heard, not what they had themselves thought out and systematized. Hence, too, succession in time is disregarded or unnoticed. The subjects of the vision being, to the prophets' sight, in juxtaposition or enfolding each other, some in the foreground, some in the background, are necessarily abstracted from the relations of time. Hence, too, the imagery with which the prophetic writings are colored, and the dramatic cast in which they are moulded; these peculiarities resulting, as we have already said, in a necessary obscurity and difficulty of interpretation.

But though it must be allowed that Scripture language seems to point out the state of dream and of trance, or ecstasy, as a condition in which the human instrument occasionally received the divine communications, it does not follow that all the prophetic revelations were thus made. We must acknowledge the state of trance in such passages as Isa. vi (called ordinarily the vision of Isaiah), as Ezek. i (called the vision of Ezekiel), as Dan. vii, viii, x, xi, xii (called the visions of Daniel), as Zech. i, iv, v, vi (called the visions of Zechariah), as Acts x (called the vision of St. Peter), as 2 Cor. xii (called the vision of St. Paul), and similar instances, which are indicated by the language used. But it does not seem true to say, with Hengstenberg, that "the difference between these prophecies and the rest is a vanishing one, and if we but possess the power and the ability to look more deeply into them, the marks of the vision may be discerned" (*Christology*, iv, 417). This view is advocated also by Velthusen (*De Opticâ Rerum Futurarum Descriptione*), Jahn (*Einleit. in die göttlichen Bücher des A. B.*), Tholuck (*Die Propheten und ihre Weissagungen*). St. Paul distinguishes "revelations" from "visions" (2 Cor. xii, 1). In the books of Moses "speaking mouth to mouth" is contrasted with

"visions and dreams" (Numb. xii, 8). It is true that in this last-quoted passage "visions and dreams" alone appear to be attributed to the prophet, while "speaking mouth to mouth" is reserved for Moses. But when Moses was dead, the cause of this difference would cease. During the æra of prophecy there were none nearer to God, none with whom he would, we may suppose, communicate more openly than the prophets. We should expect, then, that they would be the recipients, not only of visions in the state of dream or ecstasy, but also of the direct revelations which are called speaking mouth to mouth. The greater part of the divine communications we may suppose to have been thus made to the prophets in their waking and ordinary state, while the visions were exhibited to them either in the state of sleep or in the state of ecstasy. "The more ordinary mode through which the word of the Lord, as far as we can trace, came, was through a divine impulse given to the prophet's own thoughts" (Stanley, p. 426). Hence it follows that, while the fathers in their opposition to Montanism and *μανία* were pushed somewhat too far in their denial of the ecstatic state, they were yet perfectly exact in their descriptions of the condition under which the greater part of the prophetic revelations were received and promulgated. No truer description has been given of them than that of Hippolytus and that of St. Basil: *Οὐ γὰρ ἐξ ἰδίας δυνάμεως ἐφθέγγοντο, οὐδὲ ἅπερ αὐτοὶ ἐβούλοντο ταῦτα ἐκήρυττον, ἀλλὰ πρῶτον μὲν διὰ τοῦ Λόγου ἐσοφίζοντο ὀρθῶς, ἔπειτα δι' ὁραμάτων προεδιδάσκοντο τὰ μέλλοντα καλῶς· εἶθ' οὕτω πεπεισμένοι ἔλεγον ταῦτα ἅπερ αὐτοῖς ἦν μόνοις ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀποκεκρυμμένα* (Hippol. *De Antichristo*, c. ii). *Πῶς προεφήτευον αἱ καθαραὶ καὶ διαυγεῖς ψυχαί; οἱονεὶ κάτοπτρα γινόμενα τῆς Θείας ἐνεργείας, τὴν ἔμφασιν ῥαγὴν καὶ ἀσύγχυτον καὶ οὐδὲν ἐπιθολουμένην ἐκ τῶν παθῶν τῆς σαρκὸς ἐπεδείκνυντο· πᾶσι μὲν γὰρ πάρεστι τὸ Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα* (St. Basil, *Comm. in Esai.* Procem.). The state of ecstasy, though ranking high above the ordinary sensual existence, is still not the highest, as appears from Numb. xii, and the example of Christ, whom we never find in an ecstatical state. To the prophets, however, it was indispensable, on account of the frailty of themselves and the people. The forcible working upon them by the Spirit of God would not have been required, if their general life had already been altogether holy; for which reason we also find ecstasy to manifest itself the stronger the more the general life was ungodly; as, for instance, in Balaam, when the Spirit of God came upon him (Numb. xxiv, 4, 16), and in Saul, who throws himself on the ground, tearing his clothes from his body. With a prophet whose spiritual attainments were those of an Isaiah, such results are not to be expected. As regards the people, their spiritual obtuseness must be considered as very great to have rendered necessary such vehement excitations as the addresses of the prophets caused.

Had the prophets a full knowledge of that which they predicted? It follows from what we have already said that in many cases they had not, and could not have. They were the "spokesmen" of God (Exod. vii, 1), the "mouth" by which his words were uttered, or they were enabled to view, and empowered to describe, pictures presented to their spiritual intuition; but there are no grounds for believing that, contemporaneously with this miracle, there was wrought another miracle enlarging the understanding of the prophet so as to grasp the whole of the divine counsels which he was gazing into, or which he was the instrument of enunciating. We should not expect it beforehand; and we have the testimony of the prophets themselves (Dan. xii, 8; Zech. iv, 5), and of St. Peter (1 Pet. i, 10) to the fact that they frequently did not fully comprehend them. The passage in Peter's epistle is very instructive: "Of which salvation the prophets have inquired and searched diligently, who prophesied of the grace that should come unto you: searching what, or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow. Unto whom it was revealed, that not unto themselves, but unto us they did minister the things which are now reported unto you by them that have preached the gospel unto you with the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven." It is here declared (1) that the Holy Ghost through the prophet, or the prophet by the Holy Ghost, testified of Christ's sufferings and ascension, and of the institution of Christianity; (2) that after having uttered predictions on those subjects, the minds of the prophets occupied themselves in searching into the full meaning of the words that they had uttered; (3) that they were then divinely informed that their predictions were not to find their completion until the last days, and that they themselves were instruments for declaring good things that should come not to their own but to a future generation. This is exactly what the prophetic state above described would lead us to expect. While the divine communication is received, the human instrument is simply passive. He sees or hears by his spiritual intuition or perception, and declares what he has seen or heard. Then the reflective faculty, which had been quiescent but never so overpowered as to be destroyed, awakens to the consideration of the message or vision received, and it strives earnestly to understand it, and more especially to look at the revelation as *in* instead of *out* of time. The result is a comparative failure; but this failure is softened by the divine intimation that the time is not yet. The two questions, What did the prophet understand by this prophecy? and What was the meaning of this prophecy? are somewhat different in the ultimate estimation of every one who believes that "the Holy Ghost spake by the prophets," or who considers it possible that he did so speak. It is on this principle rather than as it is explained by Dr. M'Caul (*Aids to Faith*) that the prophecy of Hosea xi, 1 is to be interpreted. Hosea, we may well believe, understood in his own words no more than a reference to the historical fact that the children of Israel came out of Egypt. But Hosea was not the author of the prophecy—he was the instrument by which it was promulgated. The Holy Spirit intended something further, and what this something was he informs us by the evangelist Matthew (Matt. ii, 15). The two facts of the Israelites being led out of Egypt and of Christ's return from Egypt appear to Prof. Jowett so distinct that the reference by Matthew to the prophet is to him inexplicable except on the hypothesis of a mistake on the part of the evangelist (see Jowett, *Essay on the Interpretation of Scripture*). A deeper insight into Scripture shows that "the Jewish people themselves, their history, their ritual, their government, all present one grand prophecy of the future Redeemer" (Lee, p. 107). Consequently "Israel" is one of the *forms* naturally taken in the prophetic vision by the *idea* "*Messiah*." It does not follow from the above, however, that the prophets had no intelligent comprehension of their ordinary vaticinations. These, so far at least as the *primary* reference is concerned, were plain to their own mind, although the future and full significance was of necessity dim and imperfectly apprehended. Time, in the order of providence, is God's own best expounder of prophecy.

While the prophets were under the influence of inspiration, the scenery might produce deep, absorbing, or elevated emotion, which would sometimes greatly affect their physical system (Gen. xv, 12; Numb. xxiv, 16; Dan. x, 8; Ezek. i, 28; Rev. i, 17). Still they had an intelligent consciousness of what they were describing; they retained their distinct mental faculties; they did not utter frantic ravings like the prophets of Baal. Undoubtedly, as the prophecies are a revelation from God, the prophets well understood, at least in a general way, the predictions they uttered; but they did not necessarily testify or know anything respecting the *time*

when the events predicted should happen (Dan. xii, 8, 9; 1 Pet. i, 10–12). Occasionally even this was revealed to them (Jer. ii, 10). The symbols which were often exhibited to the prophets they described as they came before them in succession, and in some instances they were subsequently favored with a more full and particular explanation of the scenery which passed before them (Ezek. xxxvii, 11). Though the prophetic office was generally permanent, it need not, and should not, be supposed that *at all times* and on all occasions the prophets spoke and acted under the special aid and guidance of the Holy Spirit. So much was not true of even the apostles of Christ. It is enough that at all due times, and in appropriate circumstances, they were specially guided and aided by the Spirit of God. Nor is it necessary to assume that all the prophets were endowed with *miraculous powers*. Such was not the case even with Christian prophets (1 Cor. xii, 10). See INSPIRATION.

VI. *Form and Peculiarities of the Prophetic Utterances.*—1. *Verbal Modes of Delivery.*—Usually the prophets promulgated their visions and announcements in public places before the congregated people. Still some portions of the prophetic books, as the entire second part of Isaiah and the description of the new Temple (Ezek. xl–xlviii), probably were never communicated orally. In other cases the prophetic addresses first delivered orally were next, when committed to writing, revised and improved. Especially the books of the lesser prophets consist, for the greater part, not of separate predictions, independent of each other, but form, as they now are, a whole—that is, they give the quintessence of the prophetic labors of their authors. In this case it is certain that the authors themselves caused the collection to be made. But it is so likewise in some cases where their books really consist of single declarations, and in others it is at least highly probable. Further particulars concerning the manner in which prophetic rolls were collected and published we have only respecting Jeremiah, who, being in prison, called Baruch "to write from his mouth his predictions, and to read them in the ears of the people" (Jer. xxxviii, 4–14). There is evidence that the later prophets sedulously read the writings of the earlier, and that a prophetic canon existed before the present was formed. The predictions of Jeremiah throughout rest on the writings of earlier prophets, as Küper has established (in his *Jeremias Librorum Sacrorum Interpres atque Vindex*, Berlin, 1837). Zechariah explicitly alludes to writings of former prophets; "to the words which the Lord has spoken to earlier prophets, when Jerusalem was inhabited and in prosperity" (Zech. i, 4; vii, 7, 12). In all probability we have complete those predictions which were committed to writing; at least the proofs which Ewald gives (p. 43 sq.) for his opinion, of prophecies having been lost, do not stand trial. The words "as the Lord hath said," in Joel ii, 32, refer to the predictions of Joel himself. In Isa. ii and Mic. iv nothing is introduced from a lost prophetic roll, but Isaiah borrows from Micah. Hosea alludes (viii, 12), not to some unknown work, but to the Pentateuch. In Isa. xv and xvi the prophet repeats, not another's prediction, but his own, previously delivered, to which he adds a supplement. Obadiah and Jeremiah do not avail themselves of the written address of a former prophet, but Jeremiah makes the prophecy of Obadiah the groundwork of his own. The opinion that in Isa. lvi, 10; lvii, 11, there was inserted, unaltered, a long remnant of an older roll is founded on erroneous views respecting the time of its composition. The same holds good of Isa. xxiv, where Ewald would find remnants of several older rolls. The very circumstance that in the prophets there nowhere occurs a tenable ground for maintaining that they referred to rolls lost and unknown to us, but that they often allude to writings which we know and possess, clearly proves that there is no reason for supposing, with Ewald, that a *great number* of prophetic compositions have been lost, "and that of a large tree, only a few blossoms have reached our time." In consequence of the prophets being considered as organs of God, much care was bestowed on the preservation of their publications. Ewald himself cannot refrain from observing (p. 56), "We have in Jer. xxvi, 1–19 a clear proof of the exact knowledge which the better classes of the people had of all that had, a hundred years before, happened to a prophet—of his words, misfortunes, and accidents."

2. *Symbolic Actions.*—In the midst of the prophetic declarations symbolic actions are often mentioned which the prophets had to perform. The opinions of interpreters on these are divided. Most interpreters hold that they always, at least generally, were really done; others assert that they had existence only in the mind of the prophets, and formed part of their visions. See HOSEA. Another symbolic action of Jeremiah prefigures the people's destruction. He says (xiii, 1–10) he had been by the Lord directed to get a linen girdle, to put it on his loins, to undertake a long tour to the Euphrates, and to hide the girdle there in a hole of the rock. He does so, returns, and after many days the Lord again orders him to take the girdle from the place where it was hidden, but "the girdle was marred and good for nothing." In predicting the destruction of Babylon and a general war (xxv, 12–38), he receives from the Lord a wine-cup, to cause a number of kings of various nations, among whom the sword would be sent, to drink from it till they should be overcome. He then goes with this cup to the kings of Egypt, Arabia, Persia, Media, and many other countries. When the prophet Ezekiel receives his commission and instructions to prophesy against the rebellious people of Israel, a roll of a book is presented to him, which he eats by the direction of the Lord (Ezek. ii, 9; iii, 2, 3). He is next ordered to lie before the city of Jerusalem on his left side three hundred and ninety days; and when he had accomplished them, on his right side forty days. He must not turn from one side to the other, and he is ordered to bake with dung of man the bread which he eats during this time (iv, 4, 8, 12). Isaiah is ordered to walk naked and barefoot, for a sign upon Egypt and Ethiopia (Isa. xx, 2, 3). But, however we may understand these directions, we cannot refer all symbolic actions to internal intuition; at least, of a false prophet we have a sure example of an externally performed symbolic action (1 Kings xxii, 11), and the false prophets always aped the true ones (comp. Jer. xix, 1 sq.). These undoubted instances of a literal action warrant the presumption that in the other cases likewise there was a substantial fact as the basis of a spiritual symbolism. See VISION.

In the case of visions the scenery passed before their mind, something like a panoramic view of a landscape, gradually unfolding, in symbolical imagery, forms of glory or of gloom; accompanied with actions of a corresponding character, not unfrequently exhibiting, as in actual occurrence, the future and distant events. The prophets occasionally beheld themselves as actors in the symbolical scenery. In the visionary pageant many objects would appear to be grouped, or lying near together, which were in fact separated by considerable intervals of time; so that it is not to be expected that the prophets would describe what they saw in their connections and relations. See SYMBOL.

3. *Prophetic Style and Diction.*—The idea of prophecy as anticipated history has given rise to many erroneous views of prophetic language. No prophecy can be rightly interpreted which does not illustrate the name of God in the elements of his character, the principles of his government, his purposes of mercy and judgment towards men. The human race presents the only proper object of moral treatment. When judgments or blessings are announced upon states and kingdoms, to have respect to the territory rather than the inhabitants is to merge the spiritual in the natural. The

promises which are associated with Mount Zion, and the threatenings uttered against Edom, belong not to the locality, but to the people, and to all who imbibe their spirit and walk in their steps.

The mission of the prophets was the religious education of the Jewish people. They were raised up, according to the exigencies of the times, to preserve them from error, and to prepare their minds for the future development of the kingdom of God. Their object was twofold—to maintain the Church in due allegiance to prescribed rites, institutions, ordinances, and yet to prepare the people for a further manifestation of the blessings of the new covenant. By their writings they designed to impart to future ages an explanation of the vanishing-away of the system under which they lived, and to confirm the divine origin and authority of the new order of things. The prophetic style and diction exactly accords with this view of their design. This will account for the various hues of light and shade which streak the scroll of prophecy.

If the future course of events had been clearly marked out and formally laid down, all motives to present duty would have been obliterated; no room would have been left for the exercise of faith, of hope, of fear, and love; all thoughts, all feelings, all desires, would have been absorbed in the overpowering sense of expectation. But enough is revealed to support faith and animate hope. The remoter future is seen afar off in promises indistinct yet glorious. Confidence is bespoken for these distant predictions, by the clear and precise terms which portray some nearer event, fulfilled in that generation as a sign and token that all shall be accomplished in its season. Heathen divination, when it refers to any event which is near at hand, uses language remarkable for its ambiguity, but speaks distinctly of those matters which are reserved for the distant future. Those who spake in the name of Jehovah pursue the directly opposite course. Their language is much more express, distinct, and clear when they speak of events in the nearer future than in describing what shall take place in the latter days. Prophecy of this nature would not raise its voice at all times, lest that voice from its familiarity should be unheeded; but at every critical and eventful period prophecy led them on —"a pillar of cloud in the brighter daylight of their purer and better times; a pillar of fire gleaming in the darker night of their calamity or sin" (Dean Magee).

The moral results of prophecy would have been lost if the historical element had been clear prior to the occurrence of the prefigured events. A certain veil must necessarily hang over the scene until its predictions passed into realities. The best form in which a prophecy can be delivered is to leave the main circumstances unintelligible before the fulfilment, yet so clear as to be easily recognised after the event. It was necessary as a touchstone for the faith and patience of the Church that a certain disguise should veil the coming events till they become facts in providence. "Whatever private information the prophet might enjoy, the Spirit of God would never permit him to disclose the ultimate intent and particular meaning of the prophecy" (Bishop Horsley).

4. *Prophetical Language.*—This takes its hue and coloring from the political condition of the kingdom, from the local standpoint of the writer, from the position of those to whom the message was delivered.

To say that prophetical language is *figurative* is simply to say that it is used for a spiritual purpose, and directed to spiritual ends. Our ordinary language in reference to mental and moral subjects is founded on analogy or resemblance. In early times language is nearly all figure; natural symbols are employed to denote common facts. It is the necessity of man's state that scarcely any fact connected with the mind or with spiritual truth can be described but in language borrowed from material things. The visible world is the dial-plate of the invisible. God has stamped his own image on natural things, which he employs to describe and illustrate his own nature and his dealings with the Church. The Author of the spiritual kingdom is also the Author of the natural kingdom, and both kingdoms develop themselves after the same laws. Nature is a witness for the kingdom of God. Whatever exists in the earthly is found also in the heavenly kingdom. The religious teachers of the Hebrew nation might adopt the apostle's language, "We see through a glass;" we consider, we contemplate by means of a mirror in a dark saying (1 Cor. xiii, 12). All who held the prophetical office could in a measure adopt the language of our Lord, "I will open my mouth in similitudes; I will give vent to things kept secret from the foundation of the world" (Matt. xiii, 35).

While prophecy frequently employed natural objects and scenery as the means of impressing the memory, instructing the judgment, interesting the heart, and charming the imagination, it made large use of the present and past condition of the nation, of the Levitical institutions and ceremonies, as symbols in representing good things to come. Thus we may observe—

(1.) The future is described in terms of the past. The known is made use of to give shape and form to the unknown. We have a striking instance of this in Hos. (viii, 13; ix, 3): "They shall return to Egypt." "Ephraim shall return to Egypt, and shall eat unclean things in Assyria." The old state of bondage and oppression should come back upon them. The covenant whereby it was promised that the people should not return was virtually cancelled. They had made themselves as the heathen; they should be in the condition of the heathen. For in Hos. xi, 5 we read: "He shall not return into the land of Egypt, but the Assyrian shall be his king; because they refused to return." They would not have God for their king; therefore the Assyrian should be their king, and a worse captivity than that of Egypt should befall them. In accordance with this, the teachers of false doctrine and the abetters of corruption in the Asiatic churches are spoken of as a resuscitation of Jezebel and Balaam (Rev. ii, 14, 20).

(2.) Prophecy made great use of the present, and especially of the standpoint and personal circumstances of the agent, to illustrate the future. Ezekiel describes the coming glory of the Church under the gorgeous and elaborate description of a temple. All the images in the nine concluding chapters are taken from this one analogy. He sums up his minute and precise representation with the significant hint, "The name of the city from that day shall be, The Lord is there." The Apocalyptic seer, living when the Temple was laid waste, and all its rites and institutions were superseded, describes the glory of the new Jerusalem in language that seems to be directly contradictory (Rev. xxi, 22), "I saw no temple therein;" but in entire harmony with Ezek. xlviii, 35, the Spirit testifies, "the Lord God Almighty and the Lamb are the temple of it." Both Ezekiel and John speak of the same glorious future in language and imagery perfectly natural and appropriate to the times and circumstances in which they were placed.

(3.) Frequently the prophetic style received its complexion and coloring from the diversified circumstances of the parties addressed, as well as from the standpoint of the prophet. This is peculiarly the case with the language of Daniel, which presents such an approximation to the style of history that some have rashly assigned his writings to a date long posterior to the captivity of Babylon. The specific form which a portion of his prophecies assumes may be accounted for by considering the great feebleness and depression of the people on resuming their residence in Judæa; the anomalous and shattered condition of the theocratic constitution when the ark of the covenant, the Urim and Thummim, the kingly rule and government, were gone, when the vision was sealed, and no one of the prophetic order remained. This is the time selected for setting forth the external aspect of God's kingdom to one who

was well conversant with political revolutions, who stood at the centre of the world's power and glory when earthly monarchies began to aspire after universal dominion. The visions granted to Daniel (viii, ix), though plain to us who read them after the event, were far from being clear to himself or to others (viii, 27; xii, 4, 8, 9). In the symbols he employs we have a reflection of his own peculiar position and political experience; and in the detailed exhibition of the coming future, in the explicit predictions of the changes and vicissitudes which were at hand, the children of faith felt that the God of their fathers was still in the midst of them. Prophecy is always a revelation of specific events, when the events spoken of are to be fulfilled in the nearer future. The picture presented to the Church was minutely portrayed in a historical dress whenever the hope of the faithful required special and immediate support. (See § viii, below.)

(4.) The divine impulse under which the prophets spoke, though it was supernatural, acted in harmony with personal characteristics and native susceptibilities. The supernatural ever bases itself upon the natural. Constitutional tendencies are moulded by the plastic influence of divine grace, but are never entirely obliterated. The prophets never lost personal consciousness, or any distinctive characteristic of thought and feeling, even when they were raised into an ecstatical condition. Extraordinary impressions of divine light and influence affected the rational as well as the imaginative power. The false lights which pretended to prophecy were impressions made on the imagination exclusively, "whose conceptions ran only in a secular channel, as the sect of diviners, enchanters, dreamers, and soothsayers" (J. Smith). The lowest degree of prophecy is when the imaginative power is most predominant, and the scene becomes too turbulent for the rational faculty to discern clearly the mystical sense. The highest is where all imagination ceases—as with Moses, "whom God knew face to face"—where truth is revealed to the reason and understanding.

(5.) The poetical element of prophecy arises from the ecstatical condition of the prophet, from the action of spiritual influences on constitutional tendencies. But as the primary aim of the religious teachers of the Hebrews was to influence the heart and conscience, the poetical element, though never entirely suppressed, was held in restraint, to further the higher ends of spiritual instruction. Hence, as Ewald remarks, "Prophetical discourse has a form and impress of its own, too elevated to sink to simple prose, too practical in its aim to assume the highest form of poetry." Of the two ideas involved in *vates*, the prophetical ruled the poetical. The distinction between the poet and the prophet may be thus expressed: as the prophet's aim was to work upon others in the most direct and impressive manner, he was at liberty to adopt any form or method of representation; but as the immediate aim of the poet is to satisfy himself and the requirements of his art, he cannot vary his definite manner, and change his mode of address at pleasure, in order to work upon others. The poetical elevation appears most vividly in the idealistic and imaginative form, when the patriarchal heads of the Jewish nation, their several families, Zion, Jerusalem, their religious and political centre, are addressed as living personalities present to the mind and eye of the prophet. A vivid instance of this personification occurs in Jer. xxxi, 15, Rachel weeping for her children, refusing to be comforted. It was at Ramah that the Chaldæan conqueror assembled the last band of captives (xl, 1): the prospect of perpetual exile lay before them. On their departure the last hope of Israel's existence seemed to expire. In the bold freedom of Eastern imagery, the ancestral mother of the tribe is conceived of as present at the scene, and as raising a loud wail of distress. This scene was substantially repeated in the massacre at Bethlehem. The cruel Edomite who then held the government of Judæa aimed what was meant to be a fatal blow against the real hope of Israel. "Though it was but a handful of children that actually perished, yet as among these the Child of Promise was supposed to be included, it might well seem as if all were lost" (Fairbairn). See POETRY.

VII. *Interpretation of Predictions.*—In addition to the hints given above and below, we here have only space for a few rules, deduced from the account which we have given of the nature of prophecy. They are, (1.) Interpose distances of time according as history may show them to be necessary with respect to the past, or inference may show them to be likely in respect to the future, because, as we have seen, the prophetic visions are abstracted from relations in time. (2.) Distinguish the *form* from the *idea*. Thus Isaiah (xi, 15) represents the *idea* of the removal of all obstacles from before God's people in the *form* of the Lord's destroying the tongue of the Egyptian sea, and smiting the river into seven streams. (3.) Distinguish in like manner figure from what is represented by it, e. g. in the verse previous to that quoted do not understand literally "They shall *fly upon the shoulders* of the Philistines" (ver. 14). (4.) Make allowance for the imagery of the prophetic visions, and for the poetical diction in which they are expressed. (5.) In respect to things past, interpret by the apparent meaning, checked by reference to events; in respect to things future, interpret by the apparent meaning, checked by reference to the analogy of the faith. (6.) Interpret according to the principle which may be deduced from the examples of visions explained in the Old Test. (7.) Interpret according to the principle which may be deduced from the examples of prophecies interpreted in the New Test. See INTERPRETATION.

VIII. *Use of Prophecy.*—Predictions are at once a part and an evidence of revelation: at the time that they are delivered, and until their fulfilment, a part; after they have been fulfilled, an evidence. An apostle (2 Pet. i, 19) describes prophecy as "a light shining in a dark place," or "a taper glimmering where there is nothing to reflect its rays," that is, throwing some light, but only a feeble light as compared with what is shed from the Gospel history. To this light, feeble as it is, "you do well," says the apostle, "to take heed." And he warns them not to be offended at the feebleness of the light, because it is of the nature of prophecy until its fulfilment (in the case of Messianic predictions, of which he is speaking, described as "until the day dawn, and the day star arise in your hearts") to shed only a feeble light. Nay, he continues, even the prophecies are not to be limited to a single and narrow interpretation, "for the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man," i. e. the prophets were not affected by personal considerations in their predictions, "but holy men of old spake by the impulse (*φερόμενοι*) of the Holy Ghost." This is in entire keeping with the above views (§ vi) of the character of the prophetic utterances, and was the use of prophecy before its fulfilment—to act as a feeble light in the midst of darkness, which it did not dispel, but through which it threw its rays in such a way as to enable a true-hearted believer to direct his steps and guide his anticipations (comp. Acts xiii, 27). But after fulfilment, Peter says, "the word of prophecy" becomes "more sure" than it was before, that is, it is no longer merely a feeble light to guide, but it is a firm ground of confidence, and, combined with the apostolic testimony, serves as a trustworthy evidence of the faith; so trustworthy that even after he and his brother apostles are dead, those whom he addressed will feel secure that they "had not followed cunningly devised fables," but the truth.

As an evidence, fulfilled prophecy is as satisfactory as anything can be, for who can know the future except the Ruler who disposes future events; and from whom can come prediction except from him who knows the future? After all that has been said and unsaid, prophecy and miracles, each resting on their own evi-

dence, must always be the chief and direct evidences of the truth of the divine character of a religion. Where they exist, a divine power is proved. Nevertheless, they should never be rested on alone, but in combination with the general character of the whole scheme to which they belong. Its miracles, its prophecies, its morals, its propagation, and its adaptation to human needs, are the chief evidences of Christianity. None of these must be taken separately. The fact of their conspiring together is the strongest evidence of all. That one object with which predictions are delivered is to serve in an after-age as an evidence on which faith may reasonably rest is stated by our Lord himself: "And now I have told you before it come to pass, *that when it is come to pass, ye might believe*" (John xiv, 29). See PROPHECY.

As prophecy came πολυμερῶς καὶ πολυτρόπως, in many portions and in many modes (Heb. i, 1), we need not be surprised to find a relative disregard of time in its announcements. The seers beheld things to come much as we look upon a starry sky. To the natural eye all the orbs that bespangle the firmament seem to be at the same distance from the earth. Though the monarchies of Daniel are successive, yet in a certain way they are described as co-existent; for it is only on the establishment of the last that they seem to disappear. As the precise time of individual events is not revealed, prophecy describes them as continuous. The representation is rather in space than in time; the whole appears foreshortened; perspective is regarded rather than actual distance; as a common observer would describe the stars, grouping them as they appear, and not according to their true positions. Prof. Payne Smith well observes, "The prophets are called seers, and their writings visions. They describe events passing before their mental eye as simple facts, without the idea of time. A picture may represent the past, the present, or the future; this we may know from its accessories by the inference of the judgment, but not by the sight as such. If time is revealed, as in the seventy weeks of Daniel, time is the idea impressed upon the mind. But where time is not itself the thing revealed, the facts of revelation are not described as connected with or growing out of one another, as in the pages of history, but are narrated as facts merely, which future ages must arrange in their proper place, as one by one they are fulfilled." The first conquest and the complete destruction of Babylon are spoken of together (Jer. l, 41), though nearly a thousand years elapsed between them. Zechariah connects the spiritual salvation of the Church in the distant future with the temporal deliverance of the Jews under Alexander and the Maccabees. In the description which is given of the humiliation and glory of the Messiah, notice is seldom taken of the interval which is to elapse before the full and final establishment of his kingdom. So Paul in the fulness of his faith, which realized the object of his hope, and brought vividly before the eye of his mind the consummation of all things, has used language respecting the coming of Christ which some have misinterpreted as implying that he expected the day of Christ to arrive in his lifetime. Occasionally the precise time was revealed, as in the case of the sojourn of Abraham and his posterity in Egypt (Gen. xv, 13); the disruption of Ephraim (Isa. vii, 8), and the captivity in Babylon (Jer. xxix, 10). But usually the prophets were entirely ignorant of the time, and only ascertained, after careful inquiry, that they spoke of the distant future (1 Pet. i, 10–12). At evening-time it shall be light (Zech. xiv, 7). The faithful in the land will discern the period when the events are upon the eve of fulfilment. See ESCHATOLOGY.

IX. *Development of Messianic Prophecy.*—Prediction, in the shape of promise and threatening, begins with the book of Genesis. Immediately upon the fall, hopes of recovery and salvation are held out, but the manner in which this salvation is to be effected is left altogether indefinite. All that is at first declared is that it shall come through a child of woman (Gen. iii, 15). By degrees the area is limited: it is to come through the family of Shem (ix, 26), through the family of Abraham (xii, 3), of Isaac (xxii, 18), of Jacob (xxviii, 14), of Judah (xlix, 10). Balaam seems to say that it will be wrought by a warlike Israelitish King (Numb. xxiv, 17); Jacob, by a peaceful Ruler of the earth (Gen. xlix, 10); Moses, by a Prophet like himself, i. e. a revealer of a new religious dispensation (Deut. xviii, 15). Nathan's announcement (2 Sam. vii, 16) determines further that the salvation is to come through the house of David, and through a descendant of David who shall be himself a king. This promise is developed by David himself in the Messianic Psalms. Psalms xviii and lxi are founded on the promise communicated by Nathan, and do not go beyond the announcement made by Nathan. The same may be said of Psa. lxxxix, which was composed by a later writer. Psalms ii and cx rest upon the same promise as their foundation, but add new features to it. The Son of David is to be the Son of God (ii, 7), the anointed of the Lord (ver. 2), not only the King of Zion (ver. 6; cx, 1), but the inheritor and lord of the whole earth (ii, 8; cx, 6), and, besides this, a Priest forever after the order of Melchizedek (cx, 4). At the same time he is, as typified by his progenitor, to be full of suffering and affliction (Psa. xxii, lxxi, cii, cix): brought down to the grave, yet raised to life without seeing corruption (Psa. xvi). In Psa. xlv, lxxii, the sons of Korah and Solomon describe his peaceful reign. Between Solomon and Hezekiah intervened some 200 years, during which the voice of prophecy was silent. The Messianic conception entertained at this time by the Jews might have been that of a King of the royal house of David who would arise, and gather under his peaceful sceptre his own people and strangers. Sufficient allusion to his prophetical and priestly offices had been made to create thoughtful consideration, but as yet there was no clear delineation of him in these characters. It was reserved for the prophets to bring out these features more distinctly.

The sixteen prophets may be divided into four groups: the Prophets of the Northern Kingdom — Hosea, Amos, Joel, Jonah; the Prophets of the Southern Kingdom — Isaiah, Jeremiah, Obadiah, Micah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah; the Prophets of the Captivity — Ezekiel and Daniel; the Prophets of the Return—Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi. In this great period of prophetism there is no longer any chronological development of Messianic prophecy, as in the earlier period previous to Solomon. Each prophet adds a feature, one more, another less clearly: combine the features, and we have the portrait; but it does not grow gradually and perceptibly under the hands of the several artists. Here, therefore, the task of tracing the chronological *progress* of the revelation of the Messiah comes to an end: its *culminating* point is found in the prophecy contained in Isa. lii, 13–15, and liii. We here read that there should be a Servant of God, lowly and despised, full of grief and suffering, oppressed, condemned as a malefactor, and put to death. But his sufferings, it is said, are not for his own sake, for he had never been guilty of fraud or violence: they are spontaneously taken, patiently borne, vicarious in their character; and, by God's appointment, they have an atoning, reconciling, and justifying efficacy. The result of his sacrificial offering is to be his exaltation and triumph. By the path of humiliation and expiatory suffering, he is to reach that state of glory foreshown by David and Solomon. The prophetic character of the Messiah is drawn out by Isaiah in other parts of his book as the atoning work here. By the time of Hezekiah therefore (for Hengstenberg, *Christology*, vol. ii, has satisfactorily disproved the theory of a Deutero-Isaiah of the days of the captivity) the portrait of the Θεάνθρωπος—at once King, Priest, Prophet, and Redeemer—was drawn in all its essential features. The contemporary and later prophets (comp.

Mic. v, 2; Dan. vii, 9; Zech. vi, 13; Mal. iv, 2) added some particulars and details, and so the conception was left to await its realization after an interval of some 400 years from the date of the last Hebrew prophet.

The modern Jews, in opposition to their ancient exposition, have been driven to a non-Messianic interpretation of Isa. liii. Among Christians the non-Messianic interpretation commenced with Grotius. He applies the chapter to Jeremiah. According to Döderlein, Schuster, Stephani, Eichhorn, Rosenmüller, Hitzig, Handewerk, Köster (after the Jewish expositors Jarchi, Aben-Ezra, Kimchi, Abarbanel, Lipmann), the subject of the prophecy is the Israelitish people. According to Eckermann, Ewald, Bleek, it is the ideal Israelitish people. According to Paulus, Ammon, Maurer, Thenius, Knobel, it is the godly portion of the Israelitish people. According to De Wette, Gesenius, Schenkel, Umbreit, Hofmann, it is the prophetical body. Augusti refers it to king Uzziah; Konynenburg and Bahrdt to Hezekiah; Stäudlin to Isaiah himself; Bolten to the house of David. Ewald thinks that no historical person was intended, but that the author of the chapter has misled his readers by inserting a passage from an older book, in which a martyr was spoken of. "This," he says, "quite spontaneously suggested itself, and has impressed itself on my mind more and more;" and he thinks that "controversy on ch. liii will never cease until this truth is acknowledged" (*Propheten*, vol. ii, p. 407). Hengstenberg gives the following list of German commentators who have maintained the Messianic explanation: Dathe, Hensler, Kocher, Koppe, Michaelis, Schmieder, Storr, Hansi, Krüger, Jahn, Steudel, Sack, Reinke, Tholuck, Hävernick, Stier. Hengstenberg's own exposition, and criticism of the expositions of others, is well worth consultation (*Christology*, vol. ii). Riehm has given a very good outline of these prophecies in their origin, historical character, and relation to New-Test. fulfilment in the *Studien und Kritiken* for 1865 and 1869 (transl. by Jefferson, *Messianic Prophecy*, Edinb. 1876, 12mo). Drummond's work on *The Jewish Messiah* is a semi-rationalistic view drawn chiefly from apocryphal literature (Lond. 1877, 8vo). Prebendary Row has shown (*Bampton Lecture* for 1877, p. 234 sq.) the insufficiency of the Messianic elements of the Old Test. as an ideal model for the delineation of the Christ of the New Test. See MESSIAH.

X. *Prophets of the New Testament.*—So far as their predictive powers are concerned, the Old-Test. prophets find their New-Test. counterpart in the writer of the Apocalypse; but in their general character, as specially illumined revealers of God's will, their counterpart will rather be found, first in the Great Prophet of the Church, and his forerunner John the Baptist, and next in all those persons who were endowed with the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit in the apostolic age, the speakers with tongues and the interpreters of tongues, the prophets and the discerners of spirits, the teachers and workers of miracles (1 Cor. xii, 10, 28). The connecting link between the Old-Test. prophet and the speaker with tongues is the state of ecstasy in which the former at times received his visions and in which the latter uttered his words. The Old-Test. prophet, however, was his own interpreter: he did not speak in the state of ecstasy: he saw his visions in the ecstatic, and declared them in the ordinary state. The New-Test. discerner of spirits has his prototype in such as Micaiah, the son of Imlah (1 Kings xxii, 22), the worker of miracles in Elijah and Elisha, the teacher in each and all of the prophets. The prophets of the New Test. represented their namesakes of the Old Test. as being expounders of divine truth and interpreters of the divine will to their auditors.

That predictive powers did occasionally exist in the New-Test. prophets is proved by the case of Agabus (Acts xi, 28), but this was not their characteristic. They were not an order, like apostles, bishops or presbyters, and deacons, but they were men or women (xxi, 9) who had the *χάρισμα προφητείας* vouchsafed them. If men, they might at the same time be apostles (1 Cor. xiv); and there was nothing to hinder the different *χαρίσματα* of wisdom, knowledge, faith, teaching, miracles, prophecy, discernment, tongues, and interpretation (ch. xii) being all accumulated on one person, and this person might or might not be a presbyter. Paul describes prophecy as being effective for the conversion, apparently the sudden and immediate conversion, of unbelievers (xiv, 24), and for the instruction and consolation of believers (ver. 31). This shows its nature. It was a spiritual gift which enabled men to understand and to teach the truths of Christianity, especially as veiled in the Old Test., and to exhort and warn with authority and effect greater than human (see Locke, *Paraphrase*, note on 1 Cor. xii, and Conybeare and Howson, i, 461). The prophets of the New Test. were supernaturally illuminated expounders and preachers.

XI. *Literature.*—On the general subject of prophecy no comprehensive or altogether satisfactory treatise has yet been produced. Among the old works we may mention Augustine, *De Civitate Dei*, lib. xviii, cap. 27 sq. (*Op.* vii, 508, Paris, 1685); Carpzov, *Introd. ad Libros Canonicos* (Lips. 1757). Some good remarks will be found in the essay of John Smith, *On Prophecy* (*Select Discourses*, disc. vi, p. 181, Lond. 1821, 8vo), which was translated into Latin and reprinted at the end of Le Clerc's *Commentary on the Prophets* (Amsterd. 1731). It contains interesting passages on the nature of the predictions in the Old Test., extracted from Jewish authors, of whom Maimonides is the most distinguished. Of less importance is the essay of Hermann Witsius, *De Prophetia et Prophetis* (in vol. i of his *Miscellan. Sacra* [Utrecht, 1692], p. 1–392): he digresses too much and needlessly from the main question, and says little applicable to the point; but he still supplies some useful materials. The same remark also applies in substance to Knibbe's *History of the Prophets*. Some valuable remarks, but much more that is arbitrary and untenable, will be found in Crusius's *Hypomnemata ad Theologiam Prophet.* (Lips. 1764, 3 vols.). In the *Treatise on Prophecy* inserted by Jahn in his *Introduction to the Old Testament*, he endeavors to refute the views of the Rationalists, but does not sift the subject to the bottom. Kleuker's work, *De Nexu Proph. inter utrumque Fœdus*, possesses more of a genuine theological character. The leader of the Rationalists is Eichhorn, *Die Hebräischen Propheten* (Götting. 1816); also in his *Introduction to the Old Testament*, and in his dissertation *De Prophet. Pœs. Hebr.* Their views on this subject are most fully explained by Knobel in his *Prophetismus der Hebräer vollständig dargestellt* (Breslau, 1837, 2 vols.): the work contains, however, little original research, and is valuable only as a compilation of what the Rationalists assert concerning prophecy. The work of Köster, *Die Propheten des A. und N. T.* (Leipsic, 1838), bears a higher character: on many points he approaches to sounder views; but he is inconsistent and wavering, and therefore cannot be said to have essentially advanced the knowledge of this subject. Of considerable eminence is the treatise by Ewald on prophecy, prefixed to his *Propheten des Alten Bundes* (Stuttg. 1840; 1867, 3 vols.). But to the important question, whether the prophets enjoyed supernatural assistance or not, an explicit answer will there be sought for in vain. His view of the subject is in the main that of the Rationalists, though he endeavors to veil it: the Spirit of God influencing the prophets is, in fact, only their own mind worked up by circumstances; their enthusiasm and ecstasy are made to explain all. Finally, the work of Hoffmann, *Weissagung und Erfüllung im A. und N. T.* (Nördlingen, 1841, vol. i), is chargeable with spurious and affected originality: his views are often in their very details forced and strained, and it is to be regretted that the subject has by this work gained less than from the author's talent might have been expected. Many of the elements of prophecy have been very ably and

soundly discussed by Hengstenberg, *Christology of the Old Testament*, in T. T. Clark's transl. (Edinb. 1854). Other German works of importance on the subject are those of Umbreit, *Die Propheten des A. Test.* (in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1833, p. 1043 sq.); Tholuck, *Die Propheten und ihre Weissagungen* (1860; transl. in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, 1833, p. 361 sq.). The subject is likewise discussed more or less fully in all the introductions (q. v.) to the Old Test. See also *Bible Educator* (Index, s. v.). One of the latest and most specious productions of the Rationalistic school is that of Prof. Kuenen (of the University of Leyden), *The Prophets and Prophecy in Israel* (transl. by Milroy, Lond. 1877, 8vo); it reiterates with ingenious array all the difficulties, contradictions, and failures alleged by hostile writers, and refuted or explained again and again by orthodox scholars. Comp. SEER.

Among writers in English we may especially name the following: Sherlock, *Discourses on the Use and Intent of Prophecy* (1755, 8vo); Hurd, *Introd. to the Study of the Prophecies*, etc. (1772, 8vo); Apthorp, *Discourses on Prophecy* (1786, 2 vols. 8vo); Davison, *Discourses on Prophecy* (1821, 8vo); Smith (J. Pye), *Principles of Interpretation as applied to the Prophecies of Holy Scripture* (1829, 8vo); Brooks, *Elements of Prophetical Interpretation* (1837, 12mo); Alexander, *Connection of the Old and New Testaments* (1841, 8vo), lect. iv–vii, p. 168–382; Lowth, *De Sacra Pœsi Hebræorum* (Oxon. 1821, and transl. by Gregory, Lond. 1835); Horsley, *Biblical Criticism* (Lond. 1820); Horne, *Introduction to Holy Scripture* (Lond. 1828), ch. iv, § 3; Van Mildert, *Boyle Lectures* (Lond. 1831), § xxii; Fairbairn, *Prophecy: its Nature, Functions, and Interpretation* (Edinb. 1856); M'Caul, *Aids to Faith* (Lond. 1861); Smith (R. Payne), *Messianic Interpretation of the Prophecies of Isaiah* (Oxf. 1862); Davidson, *Introduction to the Old Testament* (Lond. 1862), ii, 422; Stanley, *Lectures on the Jewish Church* (Lond. 1863); Maurice, *The Prophets and Kings of the Old Testament* (rep. Bost. 1853); Stuart, *Hints on the Interpretation of Prophecy* (Andover, 1844); Arnold, *On the Interpretation of Prophecy* (in his *Works*, Lond. 1845, i, 373 sq.); Taylor, *Spirit of Hebrew Poetry* (rep. N. Y. 1862). See also *Journ. Sacred Literature*, Oct. 1862; *Meth. Quar. Rev.* April, 1862; Alford, *Greek Test.* (note on "Acts" xiii, 41); the monographs cited by Volbeding, *Index Programmatum*, p. 22, 43, 44; by Hase, *Leben Jesu*, p. 103; by Danz, *Wörterb.* p. 793; by Darling, *Cyclopœdia Bibliographica*, col. 1785 sq.; and under the art. PROPHETS, MAJOR AND MINOR.

Prophetess (נְבִיאָה, *nebiâh*, προφῆτις, Exod. xv, 20; Luke ii, 36). Among the remarkable women who appear to have exercised the gift of prophecy, we find Miriam (Exod. xv, 20); Deborah; Hannah (1 Sam. ii, 1); Huldah (2 Kings xxii, 14); the wife of Isaiah (Isa. viii, 3); Anna (Luke ii, 36); and the four daughters of Philip (Acts xxi, 8, 9). Miriam, Deborah, Huldah, and others were called prophetesses, not because they were supposed to be gifted with a knowledge of futurity, like the seers, but because they possessed a poetical inspiration; and inspired (especially sacred) poetry was always deemed of supernatural and divine origin. See PROPHET.

Prophets, False. As Moses had foretold, a host of false prophets arose in later times among the Hebrews, who promised prosperity without repentance, and predicted after "the deceit of their own hearts" (Deut. xiii, 1–5; Jer. xiv, 14–16; xxiii, 9–27). According to Deut. xviii, 20–22, a false prophet was punished capitally, being stoned to death. There were two cases in which a person was held convicted of the crime, and consequently liable to its punishment: 1. If a prophet spoke in the name of Jehovah, he was tolerated, so long as he remained unconvicted of imposture, even though he threatened calamity to the state. He might be imprisoned (Jer. xxvi, 8–16; 1 Kings xxii, 1–28), but could not legally be put to death, unless a prediction of his failed of accomplishment; then he was regarded as an impostor, and stoned. 2. If a person prophesied in the name of any other god, whether his prediction was accomplished or not, he was, at all events, considered a false prophet, and, as such, capitally punished. In the kingdom of Israel, Ahab could muster four hundred prophets of Baal at a time (1 Kings xxii, 6). In still later times false prophets, uttering the suggestions of their own imagination, abounded in the Church, and did much mischief (Matt. vii, 15; xxiv, 11; Mark xiii, 22; Luke vi, 26; 2 Pet. ii, 1; 1 John iv, 1). See MESSIAHS, FALSE.

Prophets, French. See CAMISARD.

Prophets, Major and Minor. We have in the Old Testament the writings of sixteen prophets; that is, of four greater and twelve lesser prophets. The four greater prophets are Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Daniel. The Jews do not properly place Daniel among the prophets, because (they say) he lived in the splendor of temporal dignities, and led a kind of life different from other prophets. The twelve lesser prophets are Hosea, Joel, Amos, Obadiah, Jonah, Micah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi. The collectors of the canon arranged the prophets chronologically, but considered the whole of the twelve lesser prophets as one work, which they placed after Jeremiah and Ezekiel, inasmuch as the last three lesser prophets lived later than they. Daniel, as above observed, was placed in the Hagiographa, because he had not filled the prophetic office. The collection of the lesser prophets themselves was again intended to be chronologically disposed; still Hosea is, on account of the extent of his work, allowed precedence before those lesser prophets who, generally, were his contemporaries, and also before those who flourished at a somewhat earlier period. It is the opinion of Hengstenberg (*Christology*, iv, 235) and of Pusey (*Minor Prophets*, pt. i, introd.) that the writings of the Minor Prophets are actually placed chronologically. Accordingly, the former arranges the list of the prophets as follows: Hosea, Joel, Amos, Obadiah, Jonah, Micah, Isaiah ("the principal prophetical figure in the first or Assyrian period of canonical prophetism"), Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Jeremiah ("the principal prophetical figure in the second or Babylonian period of canonical prophetism"), Ezekiel, Daniel, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi. Calmet (*Dict. Bibl.* s. v. "Prophet") as follows: Hosea, Amos, Isaiah, Jonah, Micah, Nahum, Jeremiah, Zephaniah, Joel, Daniel, Ezekiel, Habakkuk, Obadiah, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi. Stanley (*Lect.* xix) in the following order: Joel, Jonah, Hosea, Amos, Isaiah, Micah, Nahum, Zechariah, Zephaniah, Habakkuk, Obadiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Isaiah, Daniel, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi. Hence it appears that Stanley recognises two Isaiahs and two Zechariahs, unless "the author of Isa. xl–lxvi is regarded as the older Isaiah transported into a style and position later than his own time" (p. 423). Obadiah is generally considered to have lived at a later date than is compatible with a chronological arrangement of the canon, in consequence of his reference to the capture of Jerusalem. But such an inference is not necessary, for the prophet might have thrown himself in imagination forward to the date of his prophecy (Hengstenberg), or the words which, as translated by the A. V., are a remonstrance as to the past, may be really but an imperative as to the future (Pusey). For the various questions relating to each person and book, see the several names in their alphabetical places. See also BIBLE.

Commentaries.—The following are the special exegetical helps on the prophets in general: Jerome, *Commentarii* (in *Opp.* vol. v, ed. Basil.); Abrabanel, פֵּרוּשׁ (written in 1497, and frequently printed and translated in various forms and portions); Kimchi, David (first printed in the Rabbinical Bible, Ven. 1548, fol.); Œcolampadius, *Commentarii* (Basil. 1558, 2 vols. fol.); Pey-

ron, *Commentaire* (Par. 1673, 12mo); Lowth, *Commentary* (Lond. 1714, 4 vols. 4to; embraced in the commentary of Patrick, Lowth, etc.); Van Til, *Commentaria* (L. B. 1744, 3 vols. 4to); Vogel, *Umschreibung* (Halle, 1771–73, 4 vols. 8vo); Weitenauer, *Metaphrasis* (Aug. Vind. 1768, 8vo); Dathe, *Notæ* [on Maj. Proph. only] (Halle, 1779, 1785, 8vo); Smith (J.), *Explanation* [chiefly compiled] (Edinb. 1787, 1840, 12mo); Vaupel, *Erklärung* (Dresd. 1798–80, 2 vols. 8vo); Eichhorn, *Erklärung* (Götting. 1816–19, 3 vols. 8vo); Agier, *Des Explications* (Par. 1820–22, 10 vols. 8vo); Cole, *Commentary* [includ. N. T.] (Lond. 1826, 2 vols. 8vo); Hengstenberg, *Christologie* (Berlin, 1829–35, 1854–57, 3 vols. 8vo; transl. N. Y. 1853–59, Edinb. 1854–58, 3 vols. 8vo; abridgm. Lond. 1847, 8vo); Rückert, *Erläut.* [on certain parts] (Leips. 1831, 8vo); Tegg's ed. *Notes* [chiefly compiled] (Lond. 1836, 5 vols. 8vo); Hoffmann, *Auslegung* [on the Maj. Proph., compiled] (Stuttg. 1839, 8vo); Stephenson, *Christology* (Lond. 1839, 2 vols. 8vo); Ewald, *Erklärung* (Stuttg. 1840–42, Götting. 1867–69, 2 vols. 8vo); Maurer, *Commentarius* (Lips. 1841, 8vo); Herxheimer, פְּרוּשׁ [includ. the Hagiog.] (Berl. 1841–44, in parts, 8vo); Delitzsch and Caspari, *Exeg. Handb.* (Leips. 1842, 8vo); Umbreit, *Commentar* (Hamb. 1842–46, 5 vols. 8vo); Noyes, *Translation* (Bost. 1843, N. Y. 1849, 3 vols. 12mo); Hitzig, *Uebersetz.* (Leips. 1854, 8vo); Smith (G. V.), *Prophecies relating to Assyria* (Lond. 1857, 12mo); Williams, *Prophets during the Assyrian Empire* (ibid. 1866, 8vo). See OLD TESTAMENT.

The following are exclusively on the Minor Prophets: Cyril of Alexandria, *Commentarii* (in *Opp.* iii, 1–870; also Ingolst. 1607, fol.); Theodoret, *Interpretatio* (in *Opp.* II, ii); Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Commentarii* (in Mai's *Nov. Collectio*, I, i, 41–104); Remigius Antissiod. *Enarrationes* (in *Bibl. Max. Patr.* vol. xvi); Rupertus Tuitiensis, *Commentarii* (in *Opp.* i, 651); Albertus Magnus, *Commentarii* (Basil. 1525, fol.); Tarnon, *Commentarius* (Rost. 1522, 4to; Lips. 1688, 1706, 4to); Lambert, *Commentarii* (Argent. 1525–26, 5 vols. 8vo; Francf. 1589, 1605, 3 vols. 8vo); Calvin, *Prælectiones* (Genev. 1559, 1581, 1612, fol.; in *Opp.* vol. ix; in French, ibid. 1560, etc., 4to; transl. by Owen, Edinb. 1846–49, 5 vols. 8vo); Forer, *Commentarii* (Ven. 1565, 8vo); Wigand, *Explicatio* (Francf. 1566, 8vo); Hemming, *Explanationes* (Lips. 1568, 4to); Strigel, *Scholia* (ibid. 1561, 1570, 1571, 8vo); Montanus [Rom. Cath.], *Commentarius* (Antw. 1571, fol., 1582, 4to); De Ribera [Rom. Cath.], *Commentarii* (ibid. 1511 and often, fol.); Gualter, *Commentarii* (Tigur. 1572, fol.); P. de Palacio [Rom. Cath.], *Commentarius* (Colon. 1583, 1588, 8vo); Danæus, *Commentaria* (Genev. 1586, 1594, 8vo; transl. by Stockwood, Lond. 1594, 4to); Livelie, *Annotationes* [on a part only] (Lond. 1587, 8vo; also in the *Critici Sacri*, vol. iv); Heilbrunn, *Loci communes* (Lauing. 1588, 8vo); M. de Palacio [Rom. Cath.], *Explanationes* (Salam. 1593, fol.); Alscheich, מְרָאוֹת, etc. (Venice, 1595 and later, fol.); A Messana [Rom. Cath.], *Paraphrasis* (Antw. 1597, 4to); Winckelmann, *Commentarius* (Francof. 1603, 1620, 2 vols. 8vo); Thuan and Rittenhaus, *Metaphrasis* (Amberg. 1604, 8vo); Maldonatus, *Commentarius* (Colon. 1611, fol.); A Castro [Rom. Cath.], *Commentarii* (Lugd. 1615, Magunt. 1617, fol.); A Figeiro [Rom. Cath.], *Commentarii* (in his *Opp.* Lugd. 1615, fol.); Wolder, *Disputationes* (Wittemb. 1617, 4to); Sanctius [Rom. Cath.], *Commentarius* (Lugd. 1621, fol.); A Lapide, *Commentarius* (Antw. 1625, fol.); Drusius, *Commentarius* (Amst. 1627, 4to; also in the *Critici Sacri*); Philippæus [Rom. Cath.], *Commentarii* (Par. 1633, 4 vols. fol.); Fabricius, *Conciones* (Bern. 1641, fol.); Lightfoot, *Versiones* (in *Works*, x, 453); Colona [Rom. Cath.], *Commentaria* (Panorm. 1644, fol.); Macorps [Rom. Cath.], *Paraphrase* (Par. 1644, 1645, 2 vols. 12mo); Cocceius, *Commentarius* (L. B. 1652, fol.); Hutcheson, *Exposition* (Lond. 1655, 3 vols. 8vo; 1657, fol.); Stokes, *Explication* (ibid. 1659, 8vo); Kunad, *Commentarius* (Dresd. 1677, 4to); De Veil, *Explicatio* (Lond. 1680, 8vo); Schmid and Baldwin, *Commentarius* (Lips. 1685, 1698, 4to); Pocock, *Commentaries* [on a part] (Oxf. 1685, fol.; also in *Works*); Mercer, *Commentarii* [on the first five only] (Giess. 1695, 4to); Marck, *Commentarius* (Amst. 1696–1701, 5 vols. 4to; Tübing. 1734, 2 vols. fol.); Tauler, *Predigten* (Ulm, 1699, 4to); Lyser, *Prælectiones* (Goslar, 1709, 4to); Perterslen, *Erklärung* (F. ad M. 1723, 4to); Gebhard, *Erklärung* (at various places, 1723–28, 10 pts. 4to; Brunsw. 1737, 4to); Almosino, פְּרוּשִׁים (in Frankfürter's Rabbin. Bible, Amst. 1724–27, fol.); Patronus [Rom. Cath.], *Commentarii* (Neap. 1743, fol.); Burke, *Gnomon* (Heidelb. 1753, 4to); Atschul, מְצוּדַת, etc. [includ. the Hagiogr.] (Leghorn, 1753 and later, 8vo); Vogel, *Umschreib.* (Hal. 1773, 8vo); Struensee, *Uebersetz.* (Halberst. 1777, 8vo); Walther, *Uebersetz.* (Steud. 1777, 8vo); Vollborth, *Anmerk.* (Götting. 1783, 8vo); Newcome, *Notes* (Lond. 1785, 4to; 1836, 8vo); Bauer, *Erklär.* (Leips. 1786, 8vo); Stäudlin, *Erläut.* [on parts] (Stuttg. 1786, 8vo); Heusler, *Animadversions* [on passages] (Kilon. 1786, 4to); Moldenhauer, *Erklär.* [includ. Dan.] (Quedl. 1787, 4to); Vampel, *Erklär.* (Dresd. 1793, 8vo); Dahl, *Observations* [on passages] (Neostr. 1793, 8vo); Wolf (of Dessau), מִנְחָה, etc. (Dessau, 1805, 8vo, and later); Vater, *Observationes* [on passages] (Hal. 1815, 4to); Schröder, *Erläut.* (Leips. 1823, 8vo); Rosenmüller, *Scholia* (Lips. 1827, 4 vols. 8vo); Ackermann, *Annotationes* (Viennæ, 1830, 8vo); Zadel, *Annotationes* (Hal. 1830, 8vo); Scholz, *Erklär.* (F. ad M. 1833, 8vo); Pick, *Translation* (2d ed. Lond. 1835, 12mo); Jeitteles, פְּרוּשׁ (Vienna, 1835, 8vo); Rieger, *Betrachtungen* (Stuttg. 1835, 8vo); Hesselberg, *Auslegung* (Königsb. 1838, 8vo); Henderson, *Commentary* (Lond. 1845, Andover, 1866, 8vo), Hitzig, *Erklär.* (Leips. 1852, 8vo); Schregg [Rom. Cath.], *Erklär.* (Regensb. 1854, 8vo); Pusey, *Commentary* (Lond. 1860, 4to); Köhler, *Die nachexil. Propheten* (Erlang. 1861, 8vo); Schlier, *Predigten* (Stuttg. 1861, 8vo); Whish, *Paraphrase* (Lond. 1864, 12mo); Shrewsbury, *Notes* (Edinb. 1865, 8vo); Cowles, *Notes* (N. Y. 1867, 12mo); Keil and Delitzsch, *Commentar* (Leips. 1866, 8vo; transl. Edinb. 1868, 2 vols. 8vo); Kelly, *Lectures* (Lond. 1871, 8vo). See COMMENTARY.

PROPHETS, SCHOOLS OF THE. These were places where young men were educated under the care of a master, who was commonly, if not always, an inspired prophet. Godwin observes that for the propagation of learning colleges and schools were in divers places erected for the prophets. The first intimation we have in Scripture of these schools is in 1 Sam. x, 5, where we read of "a company of prophets coming down from the high place with a psaltery, and a tabret, and a pipe, and a harp before them; and they shall prophesy." They are supposed to be the students in a college of prophets at Gibeah of God, or, as we render it, "the hill of God," which is another name for Gibeah of Benjamin (1 Sam. xiii, 15; xi, 4). This place seems to have been reckoned among the ancient sanctuaries of Palestine. We afterwards read of such another company of the prophets at Naioth in Ramah "prophesying, and Samuel standing as appointed over them" (1 Sam. xix, 19, 20). The students in these colleges were called "sons of the prophets." We read of the "sons of the prophets that were at Bethel;" and of another school at Jericho; and of the sons of the prophets at Gilgal (2 Kings ii, 3–5; iv, 38). It appears that these sons of the prophets were very numerous; for of this sort were probably the prophets of the Lord whom Jezebel cut off; "but Obadiah took a hundred of them, and hid them by fifty in a cave" (1 Kings xviii, 4). In these schools young men were educated under a proper master in the knowledge of religion and sacred music (1 Sam. x, 5; xix, 20), and were thereby qualified to be public preachers, which seems to have been part of the business of the prophets on the Sabbath-days and festivals (2 Kings iv, 23). It would seem that God gen-

erally chose the prophets whom he inspired out of these schools. Amos, therefore, speaks of it as an extraordinary case that though he was not one of the sons of the prophets, but a herdsman, "yet the Lord took him as he followed the flock, and said unto him, Go, prophesy unto my people Israel" (Amos vii, 14, 15). That it was usual for some of these schools, or at least for their tutors, to be endued with a prophetic spirit, appears from the relation of the prophecies concerning the ascent of Elijah, delivered to Elisha by the sons of the prophets, both at Jericho and at Bethel (2 Kings ii, 3, 5). See *Bible Educator*, iii, 64. See PÆDAGOGICS; SCHOOL.

PROPHETS, SONS OF THE. The disciples, or scholars, of the prophets were thus called, agreeably to the Hebrew idiom; they were instructed in the knowledge of religion and in sacred music, and were thus qualified to become public teachers (1 Sam. x, 11). See PROPHET.

PROPHETS, TOMBS OF THE. "The excavations commonly known under this name," Professor Robinson observes, "are situated on the western declivity of the Mount of Olives, a little south of the footpath leading over from St. Stephen's gate to Bethany. Pococke describes them as 'very large, having many cells to deposit bodies in; the farther end of them they call the Labyrinth, which extends a great way; I could not find the end of it;' this part seems to have been a quarry. Doubdan compares them with the tombs of the judges and kings; but says the chambers are not square, as in these, but consist of two large and high galleries, cut strictly one within the other in a continued curve; the holes or niches for the bodies being on a level with the floor" (*Bibl. Res.* i, 529; comp. *Later Res.* p. 233). See De Saulcy, *Dead Sea*, ii, 107; Williams, *Holy City*, ii, 215. See OLIVET. It is ordinarily supposed (but with no good reason) that it is of these tombs our Lord speaks when he says: "Woe unto you! for ye build the sepulchres of the prophets, and your fathers killed them" (Luke xi, 47). See TOMB.

Propitiation. The Greek word ἱλαστήριον (or ἱλασμός), rendered *propitiation* (Rom. iii, 25; 1 John ii, 2; iv, 10) and *mercy seat* (Heb. ix, 5), is used in the Septuagint as the translation of the Hebrew word כַּפֹּרֶת, i. e. *covering*, properly the *lid* or *cover* of the ark of the covenant in the most holy place, which was overlaid with pure gold, over which the cherubim stretched out their wings, and where Jehovah communed with the representatives of his people (Exod. xxv, 17–22; xxxvii; in the Sept. Exod. xxxviii, 6–9). Into the holy place the high-priest entered but once a year, when he sprinkled upon the mercy seat or *covering* of the ark the blood of an expiatory victim, in order to make propitiation for the sins of the people (Lev. xvi, 11–15). In the common Greek idiom, ἱλαστήριον properly designates an *expiatory* or *propitiatory victim* [see PROPITIATORY SACRIFICES]; and in Rom. iii, 25; 1 John ii, 2; iv, 10, Christ is represented as the propitiatory sacrifice for the sin of the world. His blood alone atones for and *covers* our guilt. When faith is exercised in the blood of this sacrifice, its propitiatory effect is produced. In other words, Christ makes expiation which is effectual for such, and only such, as trust or put confidence in his atoning blood. The idea of the legal *reconciliation* of God and all sinners who cordially receive the Gospel plan of salvation is presented under two aspects. 1. *Expiation:* this denotes the doing of something which shall furnish a *just ground* or *reason* in a judicial administration for pardoning a convicted offender. 2. *Propitiation:* anything which shall have the property of disposing, inclining, or causing the judicial authority to *admit* the expiation—i. e. to assent to it as a valid reason for pardoning the offender. Expiation, therefore, regards the condition of the offender; propitiation, that of the judge or sovereign. "We can conceive cases," says Dr. J. Pye Smith, "in which an expiation, good and reasonable in its kind, might be offered, and yet a wise and good government might not be willing to accept it—i. e. might not be *propitious* to the offender and to the proposal for his being forgiven. We can also conceive of a wise and good government being cordially disposed and greatly desirous to pardon an offender, but unable to gratify this gracious disposition because it can find *no just grounds* for such an act, and it is aware that a pardon arbitrary and destitute of unexceptionable reason would relax the obligations of law, bring dishonor upon public justice, and prove of pernicious example. It is also obvious that the same thing may be, and is most naturally fit and likely to be, both an expiation and a propitiation; i. e. both a valid *reason* for pardoning, and a determining *motive* to the will of the competent authority to admit and act upon that reason." See ATONEMENT.

Now, in applying these terms to the great and awful case of ourselves, the whole world of justly condemned sinners, and our judge, the infinitely perfect God, there are some cautions of great importance to be observed. Nothing can be admitted that would contradict incontrovertible first principles. But there are two such principles which are often violated by inconsiderate advocates of the doctrine of salvation by the mediation of Christ; and the violation of them has afforded the advantage of all the plausible arguments urged against that doctrine by its adversaries. The first is the immutability of God. His moral principles—that is, his rectitude, wisdom, and goodness, as expressed by his blessed and holy *will*—can undergo no alteration; for to admit such a supposition would be destructive of the *absolute perfection* of the divine nature, as it would imply either an improvement or a deterioration in the subject of the supposed change. We cannot, therefore, hear or read without unspeakable disapprobation and regret representations of the Deity as first actuated by the passions of wrath and fury towards sinful men, and as afterwards turned, by the presentation of the Saviour's sacrifice, into a different temper—a disposition of calmness, kindness, and grace. The second foundation principle is that the adorable God is, from eternity and in all the glorious constancy of his nature, gracious and merciful. He wants no extraneous motive to induce him to pity and relieve our miserable world. No change in God is necessary or desirable, even if it were possible. This is abundantly evident from many parts of the divine Word (Exod. xxxiv, 6, 7; John iii, 16; vi, 39; x, 17; Eph. i, 3–10; 2 Cor. v, 18, 19). The question whether sinners shall be pardoned is not one that can be referred to arbitrary will or absolute power. It is a question of law and government, and it is to be solved by the dictates of wisdom, goodness, justice, and consistency. God's disposition to show mercy is original and unchangeable: in this sense nothing is needed to *render* him propitious. But the way and manner in which it will be suitable to all the other considerations proper to be taken into the account that he should show mercy, none but himself is qualified to determine. "God is the righteous judge, and God is angry [with the wicked] every day." But this anger is not a commotion or a mutable passion: it is the calm, dignified, unchangeable, and eternal majesty of the *judge;* it is his *necessary* love of righteousness and hatred of iniquity. Pardon, when on any consideration it takes place, brings the true and just idea of a *change;* but that change, in the great case before us, is not in the mind or character of the Supreme Ruler, but it is in the administration of his government, and in those outward acts by which that administration is indicated. This change is, in the order of moral right, the effect of an adequate *cause*. This cause lies in the whole mediatorial work of Christ, but most particularly and essentially in his sufferings and death, and these have constituted the expiation. See ATONEMENT, DAY OF; MEDIATION.

The Romish Church believes the mass (q. v.) to be a sacrifice of propitiation for the living and dead; while the Reformed churches, justified by the express decla-

rations of Scripture, allow of no propitiation but that one offered by Jesus on the cross, whereby divine justice is appeased and our sins atoned for (Rom. iii, 20; 1 John ii, 2). See SACRIFICE.

Propitiatory Sacrifices include both trespass-offering and sin-offering. See SACRIFICE. In this place we are to examine the disputed question what the Israelites held before them as their object in offering their beasts of sacrifice; that is, whether they wished merely to offer a gift to the offended Deity (Welker, p. 288), or (as Michaelis, *Mos. Rit.* p. 64, urges) it was considered as a municipal penalty, a kind of fine; or, finally, as a substitute for the sinners presenting it, who had themselves properly deserved death. The last is the view of many rabbins (see Outram, *De Sacrific.* p. 251 sq.) and Church fathers (Theodor. *Quæst.* 61 *ad Exod.*; Euseb. *Dem. Ev.* i, 10, etc.), and lately of Bauer (*Theol. d. N. T.* iv, 124 sq.), De Wette (*Bibl. Theol.* p. 98 sq.; comp. *Opusc.* p. 23 sq.), Gesenius (*Zu Is.* ii, 189), Hengstenberg (*Christol.* i, 265), Scholl (in Klaiber's *Stud.* etc. V, ii, 143 sq.), and Tholuck (2. *Beit. z. Brief. a. d. Hebr.* p. 78 sq.; comp. Cölln's *Bibl. Theol.* i, 270 sq., for many others). This meaning of the sin-offerings seems at first view the most natural, significant, and most accordant with ancient testimonies. Yet Klaiber (*Studien der Würtemb. Geistl.* VIII, ii, 10 sq.) has recently combated it with acuteness, and Bähr (*Symbol.* ii, 277 sq.) has offered several objections to it. Many other interpretations, some very monstrous, but offered with philosophical pretension, are referred to by Scholl (*op. cit.* p. 133 sq.). Early opposition to the usual view is found in Sykes (*Vers. üb. die Opfer*, p. 128 sq.) and Steudel (*Glaubenslehre*, p. 256 sq.). Certainly some of the grounds on which it is often based are of no weight. The formula in Lev. iv, 20, "And the priest shall make an atonement for them, and it shall be forgiven them," repeated in xxvi, 5, 10, or that in Lev. v, 13, "And the priest shall make an atonement for him as touching his sin that he hath sinned in one of these, and it shall be forgiven him," or the similar words in the 18th verse, do not make it certain that a substitution is to be thought of in the case of the sin-offering. The laying of the hand on the animal, too, though on the day of atonement (Lev. xvi, 21) it certainly implies the laying of guilt upon it, does not in general determine this point, since it was also customary in other sacrifices. Further, that the sin-offering was considered unclean, which would only be possible in case the uncleanness of sin were considered to have passed over to it, is not to be inferred from Exod. xxix, 14; Lev. xvi, 28, etc. (as Klaiber has well shown), but would seem to contradict Lev. iv, 12; vi, 27 (see below). On the other hand,

(1.) Lev. xvii, 11, unless it be interpreted in a very forced manner, can scarcely be understood to mean anything else than that the life of the sacrifice, which is in the blood, and is poured out with the blood, was offered instead of the life of him who presented it. It is not necessary to lay stress upon the rendering of כִּפֶּר (*kippêr, to expiate, to atone*); but the parallelism between the *néphesh* or "life of the flesh" and the *néphesh* or soul for which it is given as an atonement is certainly not without force.

(2.) The sprinkling of the blood of the sin-offering shows that the mere death of the sacrifice, and the burning of pieces of its flesh on the altar, were not the object here as in other sacrifices. What other meaning could the sprinkling have than that in the blood the life is sprinkled, scattered, and so utterly destroyed? The pouring-out of the blood was not in this case, as elsewhere, merely a means of killing the animal, but was the real object in view. But it could only become an object when the sprinkling of the blood symbolizes the substitution of the sacrifice for the offerer, who has forfeited his life by sin.

(3.) The idea that one man could suffer as a substitute for another (and hence, according to the Israelitish view, even be punished by God in his stead) is not only expressed by 2 Sam. xii, 15 sq.; xxiv, 10 sq.; Isa. liii, 4 sq. (not Prov. xxi, 18), but the representation of a transmission of guilt appears in Deut. xxi, especially verse 8; in the symbolic meaning of the covenant-sacrifice (Jer. xxxiv, 18 sq.; comp. Gen. xv, 17), and in the ritual service with the scapegoat (Lev. xvi, 21). See especially also Isa. xliii, 3, where, too, the word כֹּפֶר (*kôpher, ransom*), so common where the sin-offerings are mentioned, is used. (Klaiber is right in saying that כִּפֶּר, *kippêr*, from כָּפַר, *kaphár*, properly means *cover;* and hence points out the removal of guilt, without determining the method. Yet it remains noteworthy that this word *képher* [*covering over*], elsewhere only used in the sense of expiation, is used here when the subject is penal substitution. Was it so easy and natural for the Israelites to view expiation as an act of substitution?) Nor must we omit to remark that חִטֵּא (*chitté́h* [Gen. xxxi, 39], meaning properly *to atone for*) is used for *making compensation*, and Klaiber's explanation of the passage is awkward.

(4.) There can be no doubt that the representation of expiatory substitution by sacrifices was prominent among other ancient nations (Herod. ii, 39; Cæsar, *Bell. Gal.* vi, 16; Ovid, *Fast.* vi, 160; Porphyr. *Abstin.* iv, 15). The remark of De Wette, Tholuck, and Scholl that the remnants of the sin-offerings were accounted unclean seems to have no great weight, since the eating of pieces of flesh from most of sin-offerings might be urged for the contrary view; and certainly that idea did not appear in the case of the trespass-offerings (see Bähr, *op. cit.* p. 393 sq.).

On the offering of men for propitiation, in case of public misfortune (2 Kings iii, 37) among the Greeks, comp. *Schol.* in Aristoph. *Plut.* 454; Wachsmuth, *Hell. Alterth.* ii, 550 sq. The self-offerings of the Romans belong here too. Kindred is the illegal hanging of the children of Saul (2 Sam. xxi, 6 sq., comp. Lassaulx, *Die Sühnopfer der Griechen und Römer* [Würzburg, 1841]).

(5.) Lastly, a circumstance which speaks strongly for the common explanation of these sin-offerings is that all others which have been suggested are far less natural, simple, and appropriate. We need not refer especially to the homely interpretation of Michaelis. The idea that blood passed for the principle of sensuality, and hence of sin, and that thus the shedding of blood became the symbol of the putting-away of sins, does not appear in the Old Test., nor, indeed, in the New. Steudel's supposition is that the gracious acceptance by God of the offering of reconciliation was the essential element, and that the various forms of sacrifice were only intended to impress on the mind the abominable nature of sin and to lead to a true repentance; but this view is strangely barren. Klaiber supposes that clean animals without blemish were to awaken in the worshipper the sense of the law's requirement from him and of his imperfection. But this leaves out of sight all the peculiar forms appropriated to the sin-offering, and dwells on a single circumstance which was common to all the other sacrifices, and not even confined to sacrifices. It is impossible to sacrifice the common view, which is quite satisfactory, in favor of such schemes as these. The interpretation of Menken has been sufficiently answered by Bähr (*op. cit.* p. 292 sq.). See PROPITIATION.

Proportion of Faith. See ANALOGY (*of Faith*).

Propositiōnes Damnātæ is, in theological language, every thesis which contains either a dogmatical assertion or one intimately related to dogma, in the form of an authoritative reprobation, supported by the usual arguments afforded by Scripture, tradition, decisions of the Church, etc. The doctrinal opinions of those who diverge in any way from the belief of the Romish Church are also called propositions, and the de-

gree of divergence is indicated by corresponding qualifications. If the authorities of the Church (general councils, or the pope himself) positively reject those propositions, they are condemned propositions, i. e. *propositiones damnatæ*. The doctrines expounded, especially in writings, can be rejected summarily (*in globo*) without specification, or with special mention of each single proposition. In the latter case each condemned proposition is described by an adjective, which indicates its relation to the belief of the Church: heretical, bordering on heresy, erroneous, false, blasphemous, dangerous, immoral, etc. Such sentences have been pronounced, since the Reformation, among others, against the works of Luther, M. Bajus, Jansenius, Quesnel, etc. See HERESY; INDEX EXPURGATORIUS.

Proproctors are assistants of *proctors* (q. v.).

Prorowit, a Slavic deity, was represented with four heads on a common trunk. He carried a fifth head on his chest, and held it in such a way that his eyes could see through the intervals of the fingers. Many explanations of this extraordinary figure have been proposed, but none that is at all concordant with the spirit of the Slavic religions: all these surmises are based on the similitude of the image with that of *Janus quadrifrons*.

Prosar is the service-book containing the form of the *prose* (q. v.).

Prosbol or **Prozbul** (פרוזבול or פרוסבול) is the name of a legal enactment instituted by Hillel I, or the Great (q. v.). Whether the word is equivalent to the Greek *προβουλή* or *προσβολή*, or, as Sachs prefers, *πρὸς βουλῇ πρεσβευτῶν*, which latter is preferred by Jost and Grätz, cannot be decided. The reason for this curious legal provision, which, though contrary to the law of Moses, was necessitated by the time, and on the whole a very wholesome one, was that because, according to the law (Deut. xv), the claiming of debts was unlawful during the Sabbatical year, the rich would not lend to the poor during that year, which seriously impeded commercial and social intercourse. Hillel found that under these circumstances the warning contained in Deut. xv, 9 was disregarded, and in order to do away with this evil he introduced the prosbol or prozbul, i. e. a declaration made before the court of justice at the time of lending not to remit the debt in the Sabbatical year. The formula of this legal declaration was as follows: מוסרנין לכם פלוני דיינין שבמקום פלוני שכל חוב שיש לי אצל פלוני שאגבנו כל זמן שארצה—i. e. "I, A B, deliver to you, the judges of the district C, the declaration that I may call in at any time I like all debts due to me;" and it was signed either by the judges or witnesses. Comp. Jost, *Geschichte d. Judenth. u. s. Secten*, i, 265 sq.; Grätz, *Geschichte der Juden*, iii, 172; Edersheim, *Hist. of the Jewish Nation*, p. 395; Frankel, *Hodegetica in Mishnam* (Leips. 1859), p. 39; Weiss, *Zur Geschichte der jüd. Tradition* (Wien, 1872), i, 172; Sachs, *Beiträge zur Sprach- u. Alterthumsforschung* (Berlin, 1854), No. 2, p. 70; Mishna, *Shebiith*, x, 1–5; *Gittin*, iv, 3; *Peah*, iii, 6; Schürer, *Lehrbuch der neutestamentlichen Zeitgeschichte* (Leips. 1874), p. 457 sq.; Buxtorfii *Lexicon Talmudicum et Chaldaicum*, col. 1806 (revised edition by B. Fischer [Leips. 1869–74], col. 898); Derenbourg, *Essai sur l'Histoire et la Géographie de la Palestine* (Paris, 1867), p. 188 sq.; Löw, *Beiträge zur jüdischen Alterthumskunde* (Leips. 1871), vol. i, pt. ii, p. 88 sq. (B. P.)

Prose (Lat. *Prosa*), the French name for the *Sequence*. (1.) The prayer sung in the Mass after the Gradual and before the Gospel on great festivals. It required the license of the diocesan or the superior of a monastery before it could be used. (2.) A canticle in which no metre is defined. An expression, in loose measure, of the principal circumstances of a festival to be added to the pneuma or adapted to its notes. St. Cæsarius of Arles required the laity in the diocese to sing proses and antiphons in church—some in Greek and some in Latin—aloud like the clergy, in order to introduce among the people a love of psalmody and hymns. These compositions, called *prosæ*, are in rhyme, but ignore the law of measure and quantity established by the ancient Greeks and Romans. As they were sung after the Gradual or Introits, they were likewise called *Sequatio* (q. v.). The use of prosing began near the close of the 9th century. Notker, abbot of St. Gall, cir. 880, composed and favored the use of proses, but certainly did not invent them. He says that he found one in an antiphonar brought from a Benedictine abbey near Rome, which had been burned by the Normans in 841. Pope Nicholas first authorized their use. Proses in the Middle Ages were written in the vulgar tongue for the edification of the people. These proses, having become exceedingly numerous, and in some places even ridiculous, were retrenched by the Council of Cologne in 1536, and of Rheims in 1564. The four proses used since the time of Pius V are *Victimæ Paschali Laudes*, for Easter; *Veni Creator Spiritus*, appointed by pope Innocent III, at Whitsuntide; *Lauda Sion Salvatorem*, for Corpus Christi Day, written either by Bonaventura or St. Thomas Aquinas; and the *Dies Iræ*, *Dies Illa*, used in the commemorations of the dead, and attributed to Thomas de Cellano, or Salerno, a Franciscan, cir. 1230, cardinal Ursin (who died 1204), cardinal D'Aquasporta (who died 1302), Humbert, general of the Dominicans (who died 1277), Augustus Buzellensis, or Bonaventura. The *Stabat Mater Dolorosa*, written by pope Innocent III, or Giacomo da Toda, a Minorite, in the 14th century, is a prose. Possibly the chants used by St. Aldhelm, bishop of Sherborne, sitting on the bridge of Malmesbury, to win the attention of the passers-by, were of the nature of proses. In the 12th, 13th, and 14th centuries rhythmical chants were sung at the end of a banquet which the pope gave to his clergy. At Sens, Lyons, Paris, and Rouen proses were in frequent use (unlike the Roman custom), but they were mere rhapsodies, as we have in one instance preserved to us "Alle—necnon et perenne celeste—luia." After the prose, the Mass-book is removed from the Epistle to the Gospel side, to represent the translation of authority from the Aaronitish to the apostolical priesthood. — Walcott, *Sacred Archæology*, s. v.; Burney, *Hist. of Music*, s. v.

Proselyte (*προσήλυτος*, one who has *joined* a new faith) occurs only in the A. V. of the New Test. (Matt. xxiii, 15; Acts ii, 10; vi, 5; xiii, 43); but the Greek word is occasionally used in the Sept. (1 Chron. xxii, 22, etc.) as a rendering of the Heb. גֵּר, *gêr* (a *stranger*, as usually rendered; sometimes Græcized in the Sept. *γειώρας* [Exod. ii, 19] from the Aramaic form גִּיּוֹרָא). (The following article is substantially based upon Leyrer's treatment of the subject in Herzog's *Real-Encyklopädie*, with additions from other sources.) See ALIEN.

I. *Historical Development of this Class.*—The existence, through all stages of the history of the Israelites, of a body of men, not of the same race, but holding the same faith and adopting the same ritual, is a fact which, from its very nature, requires to be dealt with historically.

1. *During the Patriarchal Age.*—The position of the family of Israel as a distinct nation, with a special religious character, appears at a very early period to have exercised a power of attraction over neighboring races. The slaves and soldiers of the tribe of which Abraham was the head (Gen. xvii, 27), who were included with him in the covenant of circumcision, can hardly perhaps be classed as proselytes in the later sense. The case of the Shechemites, however (ch. xxxiv), presents a more distinct instance. The converts were swayed partly by passion, partly by interest. The sons of Jacob then, as afterwards, required circumcision as an in-

dispensable condition (xxxiv, 14). This, and apparently this only, was required of proselytes in the pre-Mosaic period.

2. *From the Exodus to the Monarchy.*—The life of Israel under the law, from the very first, presupposes and provides for the incorporation of men of other races. The "mixed multitude" of Exod. xii, 38 implies the presence of proselytes more or less complete. It is recognised in the earliest rules for the celebration of the Passover (xii, 19). The "stranger" of this and other laws in the A. V. answers to the word which distinctly means "proselyte," and is so translated in the Sept., and the prominence of the class may be estimated by the frequency with which the word recurs: nine times in Exodus, twenty in Leviticus, eleven in Numbers, nineteen in Deuteronomy. The laws clearly point to the position of a convert. The "stranger" is bound by the law of the Sabbath (גֵּר, 10; xxiii, 12; Deut. v, 14). Circumcision is the condition of any fellowship with him (Exod. xii, 48; Numb. ix, 14). He is to be present at the Passover (Exod. xii, 19), the Feast of Weeks (Deut. xvi, 11), the Feast of Tabernacles (ver. 14), the Day of Atonement (Lev. xvi, 29). The laws of prohibited marriages (xviii, 26) and abstinence from blood (xvii, 10) are binding upon him. He is liable to the same punishment for Molech-worship (xx, 2) and for blasphemy (xxiv, 16); may claim the same right of asylum as the Israelites in the cities of refuge (Numb. xxxv, 15; Josh. xx, 9). On the other side he is subjected to some drawbacks. He cannot hold land (Lev. xix, 10). He has no *jus connubii* with the descendants of Aaron (xxi, 14). His condition is assumed to be, for the most part, one of poverty (xxiii, 22), often of servitude (Deut. xxix, 11). For this reason he is placed under the special protection of the law (x, 18). He is to share in the right of gleaning (Lev. xix, 10), is placed in the same category as the fatherless and the widow (Deut. xxiv, 17, 19; xxvi, 12; xxvii, 19), is joined with the Levite as entitled to the tithe of every third year's produce (xiv, 29; xxvi, 12). Among the proselytes of this period the *Kenites* (q. v.), who under Hobab accompanied the Israelites in their wanderings, and ultimately settled in Canaan, were probably the most conspicuous (Judg. i, 16). The presence of the class was recognised in the solemn declaration of blessings and curses from Ebal and Gerizim (Josh. viii, 33).

The period after the conquest of Canaan was not favorable to the admission of proselytes. The people had no strong faith, no commanding position. The Gibeonites (ch. ix) furnish the only instance of a conversion, and their condition is rather that of slaves compelled to conform than that of free proselytes. See NETHINIM.

3. *The Period of the Monarchy.*—With the introduction of royalty, and the consequent fame and influence of the people, there was more to attract stragglers from the neighboring nations, and we meet accordingly with many names which suggest the presence of men of another race conforming to the faith of Israel. Doeg the Edomite (1 Sam. xxi, 7), Uriah the Hittite (2 Sam. xi, 3), Araunah the Jebusite (xxiv, 23), Zelek the Ammonite (xxiii, 37), Ithmah the Moabite (1 Chron. xi, 46)—these two in spite of an express law to the contrary (Deut. xxiii, 3)—and at a later period Shebnah the scribe (probably; comp. Alexander on Isa. xxii, 15), and Ebed-Melech the Ethiopian (Jer. xxxviii, 7), are examples that such proselytes might rise even to high offices about the person of the king. The *Cherethites* and *Pelethites* (q. v.) consisted probably of foreigners who had been attracted to the service of David, and were content for it to adopt the religion of their master (Ewald, *Gesch.* i, 330; iii, 183). The vision in Psa. lxxxvii of a time in which men of Tyre, Egypt, Ethiopia, Philistia, should all be registered among the citizens of Zion, can hardly fail to have had its starting-point in some admission of proselytes within the memory of the writer (Ewald and De Wette, *ad loc.*). A convert of another kind, the type, as it has been thought, of the later proselytes of the gate (see below), is found in Naaman the Syrian (2 Kings v, 15, 18) recognising Jehovah as his God, yet not binding himself to any rigorous observance of the law.

The position of the proselytes during this period appears to have undergone considerable changes. On the one hand, men rose, as we have seen, to power and fortune. The case for which the law provided (Lev. xxv, 47) might actually occur, and they might be the creditors of Israelites as debtors, the masters of Israelites as slaves. It might well be a sign of the times in the later days of the monarchy that they became "very high," the "head" and not the "tail" of the people (Deut. xxviii, 43, 44). The picture had, however, another side. They were treated by David and Solomon as a subject class, brought (like Perioeci, almost like Helots) under a system of compulsory labor from which others were exempted (1 Chron. xxii, 2; 2 Chron. ii, 17, 18). The statistics of this period, taken probably for that purpose, give their number (i. e. apparently the number of adult working males) at 153,600 (ibid.). They were subject at other times to wanton insolence and outrage (Psa. xciv, 6). As some compensation for their sufferings they became the special objects of the care and sympathy of the prophets. One after another of the "goodly fellowship" pleads the cause of the proselytes as warmly as that of the widow and the fatherless (Jer. vii, 6; xxii, 3; Ezek. xxii, 7, 29; Zech. vii, 10; Mal. iii, 5). A large accession of converts enters into all their hopes of the divine kingdom (Isa. ii, 2; xi, 10; lvi, 3–6; Mic. iv, 1). The sympathy of one of them goes still further. He sees, in the far future, the vision of a time when the last remnant of inferiority shall be removed, and the proselytes, completely emancipated, shall be able to hold and inherit land even as the Israelites (Ezek. xlvii, 22).

4. *From the Babylonian Captivity to the Destruction of Jerusalem.*—The proselytism of this period assumed a different character. It was for the most part the conformity, not of a subject race, but of willing adherents. Even as early as the return from Babylon we have traces of those who were drawn to a faith which they recognised as holier than their own, and had "separated themselves" unto the law of Jehovah (Neh. x, 28). The presence of many foreign names among the Nethinim (vii, 46–59) leads us to believe that many of the new converts dedicated themselves specially to the service of the new Temple. With the conquests of Alexander, the wars between Egypt and Syria, the struggle under the Maccabees, the expansion of the Roman empire, the Jews became more widely known, and their power to proselytize increased. They had suffered for their religion in the persecution of Antiochus, and the spirit of martyrdom was followed naturally by propagandism. Their monotheism was rigid and unbending. Scattered through the East and West, a marvel and a portent, wondered at and scorned, attracting and repelling, they presented, in an age of shattered creeds and corroding doubts, the spectacle of a faith, or at least a dogma, which remained unshaken. The influence was sometimes obtained well, and exercised for good. In most of the great cities of the empire there were men who had been rescued from idolatry and its attendant debasements, and brought under the power of a higher moral law. It is possible that in some cases the purity of Jewish life may have contributed to this result, and attracted men or women who shrank from the unutterable contamination in the midst of which they lived. The converts who were thus attracted joined, with varying strictness (see below), in the worship of the Jews. They were present in their synagogues (Acts xiii, 42, 43, 50; xvii, 4; xviii, 7). They came up as pilgrims to the great feasts at Jerusalem (ii, 10). In Palestine itself the influence was often stronger and better. Even Roman centurions learned to love the conquered nation,

built synagogues for them (Luke vii, 5), fasted and prayed, and gave alms, after the pattern of the strictest Jews (Acts x, 2, 30), and became preachers of the new faith to the soldiers under them (ver. 7). Such men, drawn by what was best in Judaism, were naturally among the readiest receivers of the new truth which rose out of it, and became in many cases the nucleus of a Gentile church.

Proselytism had, however, its darker side. The Jews of Palestine were eager to spread their faith by the same weapons as those with which they had defended it. Had not the power of the empire stood in the way, the religion of Moses, stripped of its higher elements, might have been propagated far and wide by force, as was afterwards the religion of Mohammed. As it was, the Idumæans had the alternative offered them by John Hyrcanus of death, exile, or circumcision (Josephus, *Ant.* xiii, 9, 3). The Ituræans were converted in the same way by Aristobulus (*ibid.* xiii, 11, 3). In the more frenzied fanaticism of a later period, the Jews under Josephus could hardly be restrained from seizing and circumcising two chiefs of Trachonitis who had come as envoys (Josephus, *Life*, 23). They compelled a Roman centurion, whom they had taken prisoner, to purchase his life by accepting the sign of the covenant (Josephus, *War*, ii, 11, 10). Where force was not in their power (the "veluti Judæi, cogemus" of Horace, *Sat.* i, 4, 142, implies that they sometimes ventured on it even at Rome), they obtained their ends by the most unscrupulous fraud. They appeared as soothsayers, diviners, exorcists, and addressed themselves especially to the fears and superstitions of women. Their influence over these became the subject of indignant satire (Juvenal, *Sat.* vi, 543–547). They persuaded noble matrons to send money and purple to the Temple (Josephus, *Ant.* xviii, 3, 5). At Damascus the wives of nearly half the population were supposed to be tainted with Judaism (Josephus, *War*, ii, 10, 2). At Rome they numbered in their ranks, in the person of Poppæa, even an imperial concubine (Josephus, *Ant.* xx, 7, 11). The converts thus made cast off all ties of kindred and affection (Tacitus, *Hist.* v, 9). Those who were most active in proselytizing were precisely those from whose teaching all that was most true and living had departed. The vices of the Jew were ingrafted on the vices of the heathen. A repulsive casuistry released the convert from obligations which he had before recognised, while in other things he was bound hand and foot to an unhealthy superstition. The Law of the Corban may serve as one instance (Matt. xv, 4–6). Another is found in the rabbinic teaching as to marriage. Circumcision, like a new birth, cancelled all previous relationships, and unions within the nearest degrees of blood were therefore no longer incestuous (Maimon. *ex Jebam.* p. 982; Selden, *De Jure Nat. et Gent.* ii, 4; *Uxor Hebr.* ii, 18). It was no wonder that the proselyte became "twofold more the child of Gehenna" (Matt. xxiii, 15) than the Pharisees themselves.

The position of such proselytes was indeed every way pitiable. At Rome, and in other large cities, they became the butts of popular scurrility. The words "curtus," "verpes," met them at every corner (Horace, *Sat.* i, 4, 142; Martial, vii, 29, 34, 81; xi, 95; xii, 37). They had to share the fortunes of the people with whom they had cast in their lot, might be banished from Italy (Acts xviii, 2; Suet. *Claud.* 25), or sent to die of malaria in the most unhealthy stations of the empire (Tacitus, *Ann.* ii, 85). At a later time, they were bound to make a public profession of their conversion, and to pay a special tax (Sueton. *Domit.* xii). If they failed to do this and were suspected, they might be subject to the most degrading examination to ascertain the fact of their being proselytes (*ibid.*) Among the Jews themselves their case was not much better. For the most part, the convert gained but little honor even from those who gloried in having brought him over to their sect and party. The popular Jewish feeling about them was like the popular Christian feeling about a converted Jew. They were regarded (by a strange rabbinic perversion of Isa. xiv, 1) as the leprosy of Israel, "cleaving" to the house of Jacob (*Jebam.* xlvii, 4; *Kiddush.* lxx, 6). An opprobrious proverb coupled them with the vilest profligates ("proselyti et pæderastæ") as hindering the coming of the Messiah (Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb.* in Matt. xxiii, 5). It became a recognised maxim that no wise man would trust a proselyte even to the twenty-fourth generation (*Jalkuth Ruth*, f. 163 *a*).

The better rabbins did their best to guard against these evils. Anxious to exclude all unworthy converts, they grouped them, according to their motives, with a somewhat quaint classification:

"1. Love-proselytes, where they were drawn by the hope of gaining the beloved one. (The story of Syllæus and Salome [Josephus, *Ant.* xvi, 7, § 6] is an example of a half-finished conversion of this kind.)
"2. Man-for-woman, or Woman-for-man proselytes, where the husband followed the religion of the wife, or conversely.
"3. Esther-proselytes, where conformity was assumed to escape danger, as in the original Purim (Esth. viii, 17).
"4. King's-table proselytes, who were led by the hope of court favor and promotion, like the converts under David and Solomon.
"5. Lion-proselytes, where the conversion originated in a superstitious dread of a divine judgment, as with the Samaritans of 2 Kings xvii, 26"

(Gemara Hieros. *Kiddush.* lxv, 6; Jost, *Judenth.* i, 448). None of these were regarded as fit for admission within the covenant. When they met with one with whose motives they were satisfied, he was put to a yet further ordeal. He was warned that in becoming a Jew he was attaching himself to a persecuted people, that in this life he was to expect only suffering, and to look for his reward in the next. Sometimes these cautions were in their turn carried to an extreme and amounted to a policy of exclusion. A protest against them on the part of a disciple of the Great Hillel is recorded, which throws across the dreary rubbish of rabbinism the momentary gleam of a noble thought. "Our wise men teach," said Simon ben-Gamaliel, "that when a heathen comes to enter into the covenant, our part is to stretch out our hand to him and to bring him under the wings of God" (Jost, *Judenth.* i, 447).

Another mode of meeting the difficulties of the case was characteristic of the period. Whether we may transfer to it the full formal distinction between proselytes of the gate and proselytes of righteousness (see below) may be doubtful enough, but we find two distinct modes of thought, two distinct policies in dealing with converts. The history of Helena, queen of Adiabene, and her son Izates, presents the two in collision with each other. They had been converted by a Jewish merchant, Ananias, but the queen feared lest the circumcision of her son should disquiet and alarm her subjects. Ananias assured her that it was not necessary. Her son might worship God, study the law, keep the commandments without it. Soon, however, a stricter teacher came—Eleazar of Galilee. Finding Izates reading the law, he told him sternly that it was of little use to study that which he disobeyed, and so worked upon his fears that the young devotee was eager to secure the safety of which his uncircumcision had deprived him (Josephus, *Ant.* xx, 2, 5; comp. Jost, *Judenth.* i, 341). On the part of some, therefore, there was a disposition to dispense with what others looked upon as indispensable. The centurions of Luke vii (probably) and Acts x—possibly the Hellenes of John xii, 20 and Acts xiii, 42—are instances of men admitted on the former footing. The phrases οἱ σεβόμενοι προσήλυτοι (Acts xiii, 43), οἱ σεβόμενοι (xvii, 4, 17; Josephus, *Ant.* xiv, 7, 2), ἄνδρες εὐλαβεῖς (Acts ii, 5; vii, 2), are often, but inaccurately, supposed to describe the same class—the proselytes of the gate (see Cremer, *Wörterb. der neutest. Gräcität*, ii, 476). The probability is either that the terms were used generally of all

converts, or, if with a specific meaning, were applied to the full proselytes of righteousness (comp. a full examination of the passages in question by N. Lardner, *On the Decree of Acts xv*, in *Works*, xi, 305). The two tendencies were, at all events, at work, and the battle between them was renewed afterwards on holier ground and on a wider scale. Ananias and Eleazar were represented in the two parties of the Council of Jerusalem. The germ of truth had been quickened into a new life, and was emancipating itself from the old thraldom. The decrees of the council were the solemn assertion of the principle that believers in Christ were to stand on the footing of proselytes of the gate, not of proselytes of righteousness. The teaching of St. Paul as to righteousness and its conditions, its dependence on faith, its independence of circumcision, stands out in sharp, clear contrast with the teachers who taught that that rite was necessary to salvation, and confined the term "righteousness" to the circumcised convert.

5. *From the Destruction of Jerusalem downwards.*—The teachers who carried on the rabbinical succession consoled themselves, as they saw the new order waxing and their own glory waning, by developing the decaying system with an almost microscopic minuteness. They would at least transmit to future generations the full measure of the religion of their fathers. In proportion as they ceased to have any power to proselytize, they dwelt with exhaustive fulness on the question how proselytes were to be made. To this period accordingly belong the rules and decisions which are often carried back to an earlier age, and which may now be conveniently discussed. The precepts of the Talmud may indicate the practices and opinions of the Jews from the second to the fifth century. They are very untrustworthy as to any earlier time.

II. *Debatable Questions.*—The points of interest which present themselves for inquiry are the following:

1. *The Classification of Proselytes.*—The whole Jewish state was considered as composed of the two classes —Jews, and strangers within their gates, or proselytes. In later years this distinction was observed even to the second generation; a child of pure Jewish descent on both sides being designated Ἑβραῖος ἐξ Ἑβραίων, a "Hebrew of the Hebrews" (Phil. iii, 5), while the son of a proselyte was denominated בֶּן־גֵּר, *ben-ger*, "son of a stranger;" and if both parents were proselytes, he was styled by the rabbins בגבג, a contraction for בן־גר ובן־גרה (*Pirke Aboth*, c. 5). Subordinate to this, however, was a division which has been in part anticipated, and was recognised by the Talmudic rabbins, but received its full expansion at the hands of Maimonides (*Hilc. Mel.* i, 6). They claimed for it a remote antiquity, a divine authority.

(1.) The term *Proselytes of the Gate* (גֵּרֵי הַשַּׁעַר) was derived from the frequently occurring description in the law, "the stranger (גֵּר) that is within thy gates" (Exod. xx, 10, etc.). They were known also as the sojourners (גֵּרֵי תוֹשָׁב), with a reference to Lev. xxv, 47, etc. To them were referred the greater part of the precepts of the law as to the "stranger." The Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan give this as the equivalent in Deut. xxiv, 21. Converts of this class were not bound by circumcision and the other special laws of the Mosaic code. It was enough for them to observe the seven precepts of Noah (Otho, *Lex. Rabb.* s. v. Noachida; Selden, *De Jur. Nat. et Gent.* i, 10), i. e. the six supposed to have been given to Adam—(1) against idolatry, (2) against blaspheming, (3) against bloodshed, (4) against uncleanness, (5) against theft, (6) of obedience, with (7) the prohibition of "flesh with the blood thereof" given to Noah. The proselyte was not to claim the privileges of an Israelite, might not redeem his first-born, or pay the half-shekel. He was forbidden to study the law under pain of death (Otho, *l. c.*) The later rabbins, when Jerusalem had passed into other hands, held that it was unlawful for him to reside within the holy city (Maimon. *Beth-haccher.* vii, 14). In return they allowed him to offer whole burnt-offerings for the priest to sacrifice, and to contribute money to the Corban of the Temple. They held out to him the hope of a place in the paradise of the world to come (Leyrer). They insisted that the profession of his faith should be made solemnly in the presence of three witnesses (Maimon. *Hilc. Mel.* viii, 10). The Jubilee was the proper season for his admission (Müller, *De Pros.* in Ugolino, xxii, 841).

All this seems so full and precise that we cannot wonder that it has led many writers to look on it as representing a reality, and most commentators accordingly have seen these proselytes of the gate in the σεβόμενοι, εὐλαβεῖς, φοβούμενοι τὸν Θεόν of the Acts. It remains doubtful, however, whether it was ever more than a paper scheme of what ought to be, disguising itself as having actually been. The writers who are most full, who claim for the distinction the highest antiquity, confess that there had been no proselytes of the gate since the two tribes and a half had been carried away into captivity (Maimonides, *Hilc. Mel.* i, 6). They could only be admitted at the jubilee, and there had since then been no jubilee celebrated (Müller, *l. c.*). All that can be said therefore is, that in the time of the New Test. we have independent evidence (*ut supra*) of the existence of converts of two degrees, and that the Talmudic division is the formal systematizing of an earlier fact. The words "proselytes" and οἱ σεβόμενοι τὸν Θεόν were, however, in all probability limited to the circumcised.

(2.) In contrast with these were the *Proselytes of Righteousness* (גֵּרֵי הַצֶּדֶק), known also as Proselytes of the Covenant, perfect Israelites. By some writers the Talmudic phrase *proselyti tracti* (גְּרוּרִים) is applied to them as *drawn* to the covenant by spontaneous conviction (Buxtorf, *Lex.* s. v.), while others (Kimchi) refer it to those who were constrained to conformity, like the Gibeonites. Here also we must receive what we find with the same limitation as before. That there were, in later times especially, many among the Jews who had renounced the grosser parts of heathenism without having come over entirely to Judaism, is beyond all doubt; but that these were ever counted *proselytes* admits of question. Certain it is that the proselytes mentioned in the New Test. were all persons who had received circumcision, and entered the pale of the Jewish community; they were persons who, according to the phraseology of the Old Test. had become Jews (מִתְיַהֲדִים, *joined*, Esth. viii, 17). It is probable that the distinction above mentioned was introduced by the later rabbins for the sake of including among the conquests of their religion those who, though indebted probably to the Jewish Scriptures for their improved faith, were yet not inclined to submit to the ritual of Judaism, or to become incorporated with the Jewish nation. That this, however, was not the ancient view is clearly apparent from a passage in the Babylonian Gemara, quoted by Lightfoot (*Hor. Heb. et Talm. in Matt. iii*, 6), where it is said expressly that "no one is a proselyte until such time as he has been circumcised." Fürst, himself a Jew, confirms our suggestion; for in a note upon the word גֵּר, in his *Concordantiæ Libb. V. T.*, he says: "The Jews, interpreting dogmatically rather than historically, refer the word to him who has abandoned heathen superstitions." Maimonides, indeed, speaks of such a distinction, but the lateness of the period at which he flourished (A.D. 1160), and the absence of any scriptural authority, require us to consider his assertions as referring to a time much later than that of the apostles. "According to my idea," says bishop Tomline, "proselytes were those, and those only, who took upon themselves the obligation of the whole Mosaic law, but retained that name till they

were admitted into the congregation of the Lord as adopted children. Gentiles were allowed to worship and offer sacrifices to the God of Israel in the outer court of the Temple; and some of them, persuaded of the sole and universal sovereignty of the Lord Jehovah, might renounce idolatry without embracing the Mosaic law; but such persons appear to me never to be called proselytes in Scripture, or in any ancient Christian writer" (*Elements of Christian Theology*, i, 266, 267). Dr. Lardner has remarked that the notion of two sorts of proselytes is not to be found in any Christian writer before the *fourteenth* century (*Works*, vi, 522–533, 8vo, and xi, 313–324; see also Jennings, *Jewish Antiquities*, bk. i, ch. iii). The arguments on the other side are ably stated in Townsend, *Chronological Arrangements of the New Testament*, ii, 115, etc., Lond. ed.

2. *Ceremonies of Admission.*—Here all seems at first clear and definite enough. The proselyte was first catechised as to his motives (Maimonides, *ut sup.*). If these were satisfactory, he was first instructed as to the divine protection of the Jewish people, and then circumcised. In the case of a convert already circumcised (a Midianite, e. g., or an Egyptian), it was still necessary to draw a few drops of "the blood of the covenant" (Gem. Bab. *Shabb.* f. 135 *a*). A special prayer was appointed to accompany the act of circumcision. Often the proselyte took a new name, opening the Hebrew Bible and accepting the first that came (Leyrer, *ut sup.*).

All this, however, was not enough. The convert was still a "stranger." His children would be counted as bastards, i. e. aliens. Baptism was required to complete his admission. When the wound caused by circumcision was healed, he was stripped of all his clothes, in the presence of the three witnesses who had acted as his teachers, and who now acted as his sponsors, the "fathers" of the proselyte (*Ketubh.* xi; *Erubh.* xv, 1), and led into the tank or pool. As he stood there, up to his neck in water, they repeated the great commandments of the law. These he promised and vowed to keep, and then, with an accompanying benediction, he plunged under the water. To leave one hand-breadth of his body unsubmerged would have vitiated the whole rite (Otho, *Lex. Rabb.* s. v. Baptismus; Reisk. *De Bapt. Pros.* in Ugolino, vol. xxii). Strange as it seems, this part of the ceremony occupied, in the eyes of the later rabbins, a co-ordinate place with circumcision. The latter was incomplete without it, for baptism also was of the fathers (Gem. Bab. *Jebam.* f. 461, 2). One rabbin appears to have been bold enough to declare baptism to have been sufficient by itself (*ibid.*); but, for the most part, both were reckoned as alike indispensable. They carried back the origin of the baptism to a remote antiquity, finding it in the command of Jacob (Gen. xxxv, 2) and of Moses (Exod. xix, 10). The Targum of the pseudo-Jonathan inserts the word "Thou shalt circumcise and *baptize*" in Exod. xii, 44. Even in the Ethiopic version of Matt. xxiii, 15 we find "compass sea and land to *baptize* one proselyte." Language foreshadowing, or caricaturing, a higher truth was used of this baptism. It was a new birth (*Jebam.* f. 62, 1; 92, 1; Maimonides, *Issur. Bick.* c. 14; Lightfoot, *Harm. of the Gospels*, iii, 14; *Exerc. on John iii*). The proselyte became a little child. This thought probably had its starting-point in the language of Psa. lxxxvii. There also the proselytes of Babylon and Egypt are registered as "born" in Zion. See REGENERATION. The new convert received the Holy Spirit (*Jebam.* f. 22 *a*, 48 *b*). All natural relationships, as we have seen, were cancelled.

The baptism was followed, as long as the Temple stood, by the offering or corban. It consisted, like the offerings after a birth (the analogy apparently being carried on), of two turtle-doves or pigeons (Lev. xii, 18). When the destruction of Jerusalem made the sacrifice impossible, a vow to offer it as soon as the Temple should be rebuilt was substituted. For women-proselytes, there were only baptism and the corban, or, in later times, baptism by itself. The Galilæan female proselytes were said to have objected to this, as causing barrenness.

3. *Antiquity of these Practices.*—Was this ritual observed as early as the commencement of the 1st century? If so, was the baptism of John or that of the Christian Church in any way derived from or connected with the baptism of proselytes? If not, was the latter in any way borrowed from the former? This point has been somewhat discussed above, but it will be enough to sum up the conclusions which seem fairly to be drawn from the extant information on the subject, especially the question of the baptism of proselytes.

(1.) There is no *direct* evidence of the practice being in use before the destruction of Jerusalem. The statements of the Talmud as to its having come from the fathers, and their exegesis of the Old Test. in connection with it, are alike destitute of authority.

(2.) The negative argument drawn from the silence of the Old Test., of the Apocrypha, of Philo, and of Josephus, is almost decisive against the belief that there was in their time a baptism of proselytes with *as much* importance attached to it as we find in the Talmudists.

(3.) It remains probable, however, that there was *a* baptism in use at a period considerably earlier than that for which we have direct evidence. The symbol was in itself natural and fit. It fell in with the disposition of the Pharisees and others to multiply and discuss "washings" (*βαπτισμοί*, Mark vii, 4) of all kinds. The tendency of the later rabbins was rather to heap together the customs and traditions of the past than to invent new ones. If there had not been a baptism, there would have been no initiatory rite at all for female proselytes. The custom of baptizing proselytes thus arose gradually out of the habit which the Jews had of purifying by ablution whatever they deemed unclean, and came to be raised for the first time to the importance of an initiatory ordinance after the destruction of the Temple service, and when, in consequence of imperial edicts, it became difficult to circumcise converts. This latter opinion is that of Schneckenburger (*Ueb. das Alter d. jüd. Proselyten-Taufe* [Berlin, 1828]), and has been espoused by several eminent German scholars. To us, however, it appears exceedingly unsatisfactory. The single fact adduced in support of it, viz. the difficulty of circumcising converts in consequence of the imperial edicts against proselytism, is a singularly infelicitous piece of evidence; for, as the question to be solved is, How came the later rabbins to prescribe *both* baptism and circumcision as initiatory rites for proselytes? it is manifestly absurd to reply that it was because they could only baptize and could not circumcise: such an answer is a contradiction, not a solution of the question. Besides, this hypothesis suggests a source of proselyte baptism which is equally available for that which it is designed to supersede; for, if the practice of baptizing proselytes on their introduction into Judaism had its rise in the Jewish habit of ablution, why might not this have operated in the way suggested two hundred years before Christ as well as two hundred years after Christ? In fine, this hypothesis still leaves unremoved the master difficulty of that side of the question which it is designed to support, viz. the great improbability of the Jews adopting for the first time subsequently to the death of Christ a religious rite which was well known to be the initiatory rite of Christianity. Assuming that they practiced that rite before, we can account for their not giving it up simply because the Christians had adopted it; but, trace it as we please to Jewish customs and rites, it seems utterly incredible that *after* it had become the symbol and badge of the religious party which of all others, perhaps, the Jews most bitterly hated, any consideration whatever should have induced them to *begin* to practice it. On the other hand we have, in favor of the hypothesis that proselyte baptism was practiced anterior to the time of our Lord, some strongly corrobora-

tive evidence. 1. We have, in the first place, the unanimous tradition of the Jewish rabbins, who impute to the practice an antiquity commensurate almost with that of their nation. 2. We have the fact that the baptism of John the Baptist was not regarded by the people as aught of a novelty, nor was represented by him as resting for its authority upon any special divine revelation. 3. We have the fact that the Pharisees looked upon the baptism both of John and Jesus as a mode of proselyting men to their religious views (John iv, 1–3), and that the dispute between the Jews and some of John's disciples about purifying was apparently a dispute as to the competing claims of John and Jesus to make proselytes (iii, 25 sq.). 4. We have the fact that on the day of Pentecost Peter addressed to a multitude of persons collected from several different and distant countries, Jews and proselytes, an exhortation to "repent and be baptized" (Acts ii, 38), from which it may be fairly inferred that they all knew what baptism meant, and also its connection with repentance or a change of religious views. 5. We have the fact that, according to Josephus, the Essenes were accustomed, before admitting a new convert into their society, solemnly and ritually to purify him with waters of cleansing (*War*, ii, 8, 7), a statement which cannot be understood of their ordinary ablutions before meals (as Stuart proposes in his *Essay on the Mode of Baptism*, p. 67); for Josephus expressly adds that even after this lustration two years had to elapse before the neophyte enjoyed the privilege of living with the proficients. 6. We have the mode in which Josephus speaks of the baptism of John, when, after referring to John's having exhorted the people to virtue, righteousness, and godliness, as preparatory to baptism, he adds, "For it appeared to him that baptism was admissible not when they used it for obtaining forgiveness of some sins, but for the purification of the body when the soul had been already cleansed by righteousness" (*Ant.* xviii, 5, 2); which seems to indicate the conviction of the historian that John did not *introduce* this rite, but only gave to it a peculiar meaning. Yet John's proceeding was not an act of initiation into any new system of faith, much less comparable to a conversion from paganism; for the subjects were Jews already. It was rather a general ablution, in token of wiping off a long-accumulated score of offences. See John the Baptist.

(4.) The history of the New Test. itself suggests the existence of such a custom. A sign is seldom chosen unless it already has a meaning for those to whom it is addressed. The fitness of the sign in this case would be in proportion to the associations already connected with it. It would bear witness on the assumption of the previous existence of the proselyte-baptism that the change from the then condition of Judaism to the kingdom of God was as great as that from idolatry to Judaism. The question of the priests and Levites, "Why baptizest thou then?" (John i, 25), implies that they wondered, not at the thing itself, but at its being done for Israelites by one who disclaimed the names which, in their eyes, would have justified the introduction of a new order. In like manner the words of Christ to Nicodemus (iii, 10) imply the existence of a teaching as to baptism like that above referred to. He, "the teacher of Israel," had been familiar with "these things"—the new birth, the gift of the Spirit—as words and phrases applied to heathen proselytes. He failed to grasp the deeper truth which lay beneath them, and to see that they had a wider, a universal application. See Regeneration by Water.

(5.) That the Jews directly borrowed this custom from the Christians is an opinion which, though supported by De Wette (in his *De Morte Christi expiatoriâ*), cannot be for a moment admitted by any who reflect on the implacable hatred with which the Jews for many centuries regarded Christianity, its ordinances, and its professors. It is, however, not improbable that there may have been a reflex action in this matter from the Christian upon the Jewish Church. The rabbins saw the new society, in proportion as the Gentile element in it became predominant, throwing off circumcision, relying on baptism only. They could not ignore the reverence which men had for the outward sign, their belief that it was all but identical with the thing signified. There was everything to lead them to give a fresh prominence to what had been before subordinate. If the Nazarenes attracted men by their baptism, they would show that they had baptism as well as circumcision. The necessary absence of the corban after the destruction of the Temple would also tend to give more importance to the remaining rite. The reader will find the whole subject amply discussed in the following works: Selden, *De Jure Nat. et Gent.* ii, 2; Otho, *Lex. Rabb.* p. 65; Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb. et Talm. in Matt. iii*, 6; Danz in Meuschenii *Nov. Test. ex Talm. Illust.* p. 233 sq., 287 sq.; Witsius, *Œcon. Fœd.* iv, 15; Kuinöl, *Comm. in Libros N. T. Histor.* ap. Matt. iii, 6; and Dr. Halley's recent volume on the *Sacraments* (Lond. 1844), p. 114 sq., all of whom contend for the antiquity of Jewish proselyte-baptism, while the following take the opposite side: Wernsdorff, *Controv. de Bapt. Recent.* § 18; Carpzov, *Apparat.* p. 47 sq.; Paulus, *Comment.* i, 279; Bauer, *Gottesdienstl. Verfassung der Alten Heb.* ii, 392; Schneckenburger, *Lib. sub. cit.*; and Moses Stuart, in the *American Bib. Rep.* No. 10. See also *Bible Educator*, ii, 38 sq. See Baptism.

4. Two facts of some interest remain to be noticed in this connection. (1.) It formed part of the rabbinic hopes of the kingdom of the Messiah that then there should be no more proselytes. The distinctive name, with its brand of inferiority, should be laid aside, and all, even the Nethinim and the Mamzerim (children of mixed marriages), should be counted pure (Schöttgen, *Hor. Heb.* ii, 614). (2.) Partly, perhaps, as connected with this feeling, partly in consequence of the ill-repute into which the word had fallen, there is, throughout the New Test., a sedulous avoidance of it. The Christian convert from heathenism is not a proselyte, but a *νεόφυτος* (1 Tim. iii, 6).

III. *Literature.*—In addition to the works cited above, see, in general, Buxtorf, *Lex. Talm. et Rabb.* s. v. גר; Otho, *Lex. Rabb.* p. 65; Bodenschatz, *Kirchl. Verfass. der Juden*, iv, 70 sq.; Schröder, *Satzungen und Gebräuche des talm.-rabb. Judenth.*; the archæologies of Jahn (iii, 215 sq.), De Wette (p. 348 sq.), Keil (i, 316 sq.), Carpzov, Lewis, and Bauer; Saalschütz, *Mosaisches Recht*, ii, 690 sq., 704 sq., 730 sq.; Leusden, *Phil. Hebr. Misc.* p. 142 sq.; the monographs by Slevogt, Alting, and Müller, in Ugolini *Thesaur.*; those cited by Danz, *Wörterb.* p. 797 sq.; append. p. 88; by Winer, *Realwörterb.* s. v.; by Fürst, *Biblioth. Jud.* i, 146; iii, 345, 392, 459, 471, 488, 555; and by Volbeding, *Index Programmatum*, p. 22; and those written by Zorn (Lips. 1703) and Wöhner (Götting. 1743); also Lübkert in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1835, p. 681 sq.; and Schneckenburger, *Jüd. Proselyten-Taufe* (Berl. 1828).

PROSELYTES. This word is employed in modern language to designate such individuals as have abandoned their faith and embraced another, and who, in general, devote all their energy to the expansion of their new creed. The endeavor to gain others to one's own convictions, either by licit or illicit means, is called *proselytism*. Biblical representatives of this unfair system are the Pharisees, to whom Christ said, "Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye compass sea and land to make one proselyte; and when he is made, ye make him twofold more the child of hell than yourselves." Every religion that believes in itself must feel impelled to propagate its creed; the followers of a doctrine to whom it is indifferent whether the number of those who share it with them increases or decreases have no true faith. The Christians are especially active in winning converts to their religion, but this spirit is due entirely not to a selfish desire to en-

large their borders and increase their numbers, but to give to all the world the great truths to establish which Christ came into the world in the form of man and suffered death upon the cross. It is, moreover, because of the direct command given by the Saviour of mankind that Christians feel impelled to make converts of all non-believers. See CHRISTIANITY; MISSIONS. A very different thing it is, however, for anybody, or for bodies of men, to *force* conversion upon their fellows. The Jews were the chosen people of God. They had a right to consider themselves the armor-bearers of divine truth, and if they felt impelled to carry "the law and the prophets" to the strangers (גֵּרִים), it was only a reasonable consequence of the divine revelation which they had enjoyed. But it was by the fair means employed that they could best indicate the moral sublimity of divine teachings over philosophic schemes and heathenish systems of religion. When, therefore, the Jews, after the establishment of Maccabæan rule, compelled, under Hyrcanus, the Idumæans, and, under Aristobulus, the Iturians, to embrace the Jewish faith and to subject themselves to circumcision, there was an adoption of measures for which the Old-Test. dispensation furnished no warrant; and though it may be conceded that their object was probably to advance the interests of true religion, they yet, by the adoption of unauthorized measures, evinced an unrighteous zeal which must have been underlaid by a selfish purpose. Thus the Roman Catholics have constantly striven for the propagation of the Christian faith by measures wholly unwarranted and not in uniformity with the lofty state of its ethics.

The Jesuit Sambuga says, in defence of the Jesuitic proselytism: "The mania of proselytism in priests is no mania, but a holy zeal." The prince-cardinal von Hohenlohe approves of this defence in his *Lichtblicke und Erlebnisse aus der Welt und dem Priesterleben* (Ratisbon, 1836, 8vo), p. xxxix. But this defence is, after all, a simple Jesuitic sophism. The mania of proselytism *is* a mania, and because priests are subject to it, it does not become therefore a *holy zeal;* or else we must admit that anything done by avaricious and ambitious priests of all persuasions (Christians and pagans) was holy, or was the result of a holy zeal, and therefore not blameworthy, but, on the contrary, praiseworthy and commendable. When proselytes are gained in such a wily or violent manner as that resorted to by Jesuits; when the means employed are money and promotions on one side, threats and persecutions on the other, we perceive in it the evidence of a most unholy zeal, against which the founder of Christianity pronounced his anathema in his condemnation of the priests of his time, the doctors of the law, and Pharisees. For this very reason Christ called them "children of hell." See ROMANISM. It is a curious fact worth remembering that one of the main features of the times of the Messiah was to be, according to Jewish tradition, the utter abolition of proselytism, and the entire ceasing of all distinctions of an opprobrious nature among men. The evil repute into which the term *proselyte* had fallen in the times of Christ also caused the early converts to Christianity to adopt the name of Neophytes (*newly planted*) instead. See NEOPHYTE. (J. H. W.)

Proseucha (*προσευχή*), a word signifying "*prayer*," and always so translated in the A. V. It is, however, applied, *per meton.*, to a place of prayer—a place where assemblies for prayer were held, whether a building or not. In this sense some hold it to be mentioned in Luke vi, 12, where it is said that our Saviour went up into a mountain to pray, and continued all night *in the proseucha of God* (*ἐν τῇ προσευχῇ τοῦ Θεοῦ*), which can very well bear the sense our translators have put upon it—"in prayer to God." Yet Whitby and others infer, from the use of parallel phrases, such as "the mount of God," "the bread of God," "the altar of God," "the lamp of God," etc., which were all things consecrated or appropriated to the service of God, that this phrase might here signify "an oratory of God," or a place that was devoted to his service, especially for prayer. In this sense the word must certainly be understood in Acts xvi, 13, where we are informed that Paul and his companions, on the Sabbath day, went out of the city, by the river side, *οὗ ἐνομίζετο προσευχὴ εἶναι*, which the A. V. renders "where prayer was wont to be made." But the Syriac here has, "because there was perceived to be *a house of prayer;*" and the Arabic, "a certain place which was supposed to be *a place of prayer.*" In both these versions due stress is laid upon *οὗ ἐνομίζετο*, where there was taken, or supposed to be —or where, according to received custom, there was, or where there was allowed by law—a proseucha, oratory, or chapel; and where, therefore, they expected to meet an assembly of people. Bos contends (*Exercit. Philol.* ad loc.), however, that the word *ἐνομίζετο* is redundant, and that the passage ought simply to be, "where there was a proseucha;" but in this he is ably opposed by Elsner (*Observ. Sacr.* ad loc.). See PHILIPPI.

That there really were such places of devotion among the Jews is unquestionable. They were mostly outside those towns in which there were no synagogues, because the laws or their administrators would not admit any. This was, perhaps, particularly the case in Roman cities and colonies (and Philippi, where this circumstance occurred, was a colony); for Juvenal (*Sat.* iii, 296) speaks of proseuchæ, not synagogues, at Rome. They appear to have been usually situated near a river or the seashore, for the convenience of ablution (Josephus, *Ant.* xiv, 10, 23). Josephus repeatedly mentions proseuchæ in his *Life*, and speaks of the people being gathered into the proseucha (44, 46). Sometimes the proseucha was a large building, as that at Tiberias (*l. c.* 54), so that the name was sometimes applied even to synagogues (Vitringa, *Synag. Vet.* p. 119). Proseuchæ are frequently mentioned as buildings by Philo, particularly in his oration against Flaccus, where he complains that the proseuchæ of the Jews were pulled down, and that no place was left them in which to worship God and pray for Cæsar (Philo, *in Flacc. in Op.* p. 752). But, for the most part, the proseuchæ appear to have been places in the open air, in a grove, or in shrubberies, or even under a tree, although always, as we may presume, near water, for the convenience of those ablutions which with the Jews always preceded prayer, as, indeed, they did among the pagans, and as they do among the Moslems at the present day. The usages of the latter exhibit something answering to the Jewish proseuchæ in the shape of small oratories, with a niche indicating the direction of Mecca, which is often seen in Moslem countries by the side of a spring, a reservoir, or a large water-jar, which is daily replenished for the use of travellers (Whitby, De Dieu, Wetstein, Kuinöl, on Acts xvi, 13; Jennings, *Jewish Antiquities*, p. 379–382; Prideaux, *Connection*, ii, 556).—Kitto.

"Questions have been raised," says the late Dr. M'Farlan, of Renfrew, "as to the origin of these, and their being or not being the same with the synagogue. Philo and Josephus certainly speak of them and the synagogues as if they were substantially one. The former expressly declares that they were places of instruction. 'The places dedicated to devotion,' says he, 'and which are commonly called proseuchæ, what are they but schools in which prudence, fortitude, temperance, righteousness, piety, holiness, and every virtue are taught—everything necessary for the discharge of duty, whether human or divine?' As the writer's observations were chiefly confined to the Jews of Alexandria and other parts of Egypt, this description will chiefly apply to these. But there is no doubt, on the other hand, that where synagogues existed, and especially in Judea, they did to some extent differ. We are therefore very much disposed to concur in the opinion that the oratory was substantially and in effect a synagogue. But the latter was the more perfect form,

and required, for its erection and support, special means. There was in every synagogue a local court, deriving its authority, at least in Judea, from the Sanhedrim; and there were office-bearers to be maintained; whereas in the oratory there does not seem to have been any very fixed or necessary form of procedure. These might, for aught that appears, have been all or substantially all which belonged to the synagogue, or it might be little more than what we would call a prayer-meeting. Hence, perhaps, the reason of the prevalence of the one—the synagogue—in Judæa, and of the other in Egypt and other countries not subject to Jewish laws."

It is highly probable that *proseuchæ* existed long before synagogues. "It is remarkable," continues Dr. M'Farlan, "that the only places where Daniel is said to have been favored with visions, during the day, were by the sides of rivers (Dan. viii, 2, 16; also x, 4; xii, 5, 7; and ix, 21), the very places where oratories were wont to be. Ezekiel also received his commission by one of the rivers of Babylon, and when 'among the captives' of Israel (Ezek. i, 1). And he afterwards mentions his having received visions in the same circumstances (iii, 15, 16). And Ezra, also, when leading back Israel to the land of their fathers, proclaimed and observed a fast with them by the way; and, as if to keep up the same tender associations, he assembled them by the river Ahava, where they remained three days (Ezra viii, 15, 32). But the very finest illustration which occurs is that contained in the 137th Psalm — 'By the rivers of Babylon, there we sat down; yea, we wept, when we remembered Zion. We hanged our harps upon the willows in the midst thereof. For there they that carried us away captive required of us a song; and they that wasted us required of us mirth, saying, Sing us one of the songs of Zion' (1–3). The people of Israel were accustomed, in after-times, to make choice of the banks of rivers for their oratories, and this point of agreement is one of the grounds on which we are proceeding. But it will hold equally good, whether the Israelitish captives followed, in this, the example of their fathers, or whether, as is more probable, their circumstances in Babylon led to this choice. It is not unlikely that this led to a similar choice in after-times, and particularly in foreign countries. The poor captives of Babylon had perhaps no other covering or even enclosure than the willows of the brook; and thus may they have been driven, when seeking to worship the God of their fathers, into the woody margins of Babylon's many rivers. Meeting in such places, as they had been accustomed to do in the oratories of their native land, it is not wonderful that many tender associations should be renewed."

After the return of the Jews from the Babylonian captivity, synagogue worship was much enlarged and improved, while oratories gradually diminished in number and importance. Hence, in later times, oratories were chiefly found in countries beyond the land of Israel. Under the Roman government synagogues were discountenanced, but oratories, or places of meeting for devotional exercises, were generally permitted all over the empire. Dr. Lardner thinks that the synagogue mentioned in Acts vi, 9 was really an oratory; and Josephus speaks of a very large one in the city of Tiberias. But it was chiefly in foreign parts that *proseuchæ* in later times were found. Josephus, in detailing the decree passed in favor of the Jews at Halicarnassus, says, "We have decreed that as many men and women of the Jews as are willing so to do may celebrate their Sabbaths and perform their holy offices according to the Jewish laws; and may make their *proseuchæ* at the sea-side, according to the custom of their forefathers." See Riddle, *Christian Antiquities* (see Index); Stillingfleet, *Works*, vol. i; and the monographs cited by Volbeding, *Index Programmatum*, p. 76. See CHAPEL; ORATORY.

Prosper, ST., surnamed *Aquitanus* or *Aquitanius*, from the country of his nativity, was a distinguished theologian of Gaul, and flourished in the first half of the 5th century. He settled as a young man in Provence, and there became the intimate companion of a certain Hilary, who on this account is called Hilarius Prosperianus. The two friends studied and wrote together in defence of orthodox Christianity in general, and of Augustinianism in particular. Yet, although a stanch defender of the doctrines and person of St. Augustine, he was no priest, still less a bishop, as has been frequently asserted since the 7th century, but a married layman, pious and well versed in divine lore, who had been impelled by the miseries of his time to devote himself to an austere way of life (see Sirmondi, not. ad viii, ep. 15; Sidon. Apol. and Bolland. ad 25 Jun. in comment. præv. § 1, ad vit. s. Prosperi episc. in Æmilia). Constant readers and zealous disciples of St. Augustine, especially in the doctrine of grace, Prosper and Hilary displayed great zeal in defending his doctrines against the attacks of the Semi-Pelagians [see PELAGIANISM]; but finding that they were making very little headway against the heretics, who had largely weakened orthodoxy in Southern Gaul, Prosper wrote, about 427 or 428, a letter entitled *Epistola ad Augustinum de Reliquiis Pelagianæ Hæreseos in Gallia* (considered of importance in affording material for the history of Semi-Pelagianism), in which he informed the illustrious bishop of Hippo that a number of priests and monks at Marseilles asserted, contrary to the Augustinian theory, that man must himself take the first step towards his justification and salvation (ep. 225 and 226 inter *Ep. Aug.*). Thus Prosper not only himself acted as defender of the catholic doctrine against the Semi-Pelagians, but gave occasion to St. Augustine to write his two works on the predestination of the saints and on the gift of constancy (*De Prædestinatione Sanctorum*, and *De Dono Perseverantiæ*). But not all those whom Prosper names as adversaries of St. Augustine were, like Cassian, Semi-Pelagians. The heresies of this Cassian Prosper exposed in a work which he subsequently (about A.D. 430) composed: *De Gratia Dei et Libero Arbitrio contra Collatorem*. Prosper, still before St. Augustine's death, wrote several works against the Pelagians, and especially the Semi-Pelagians. To these works of controversy belong his poem *De Ingratis*, so highly admired by the Jansenists, and a letter to a certain Rufinus. After the death of St. Augustine, his master and friend, Prosper resumed with increased ardor his struggle against the Semi-Pelagians and the defence of Augustine. For this purpose he wrote *Responsiones ad capitula calumniantium* (*i. e. Augustinum*) *Gallorum; Responsiones ad capitula objectionum Vincentianarum*, and *Pro Augustino Responsiones ad Excerpta quæ de Genuensi Civitate sunt missa*. In 431 Prosper, with his friend Hilary, made a journey to Rome, where they saw pope Celestine I, and complained that several priests at Marseilles taught erroneous doctrines without being rebuked by the Gallican bishops, whereupon the pontiff addressed his well-known letter of censure to those dignitaries (*Epistola ad Episcopos Gallorum*), praising highly the doctrine of St. Augustine, and denouncing the heresy of Cassian, as well as those who should either favor it by adoption or by suffering its propagation. Armed with this authority, Prosper and Hilary returned home, and from the numerous controversial tracts which they issued about this time, it appears that they must have been constantly watchful and active in defence of orthodoxy. Nothing very definite is known of Prosper after his return from Rome with Hilary, except that we encounter controversial tracts of which he was the author. Among these are *De Gratia Dei et Libero Arbitrio Liber*, in reply to the doctrines of Cassian respecting free-will, as laid down in the thirteenth of his *Collationes Patrum*, whence the piece is frequently entitled *De Gratia Dei adversus Collatorem*, written about A.D. 432:—*Psalmorum a C usque ad CL Expositio*, assigned by the Bene-

dictine editors to A.D. 433, but placed by Schönemann and others before A.D. 424:—*Sententiarum ex Operibus S. Augustini delibatarum Liber unus*, compiled about A.D. 451. He is commemorated by the Church of Rome on June 25. The whole of the above will be found in the Benedictine edition of the works of Augustine; the epistle is numbered ccxxv, and is placed immediately before another upon the same subject by Hilary; the remaining tracts are all included in the appendix to vol. x. If we believe Gennadius (*De Vir. Illust.* c. 84), Prosper was, after 440, called to Rome by pope Leo I, and became the secretary of that pontiff. We have no positive knowledge of the year of his death: it falls between 455 and 463. There are other writings of Prosper, among which we mention 106 small poems (*epigrammata*), in which an equal number of moral and other passages of St. Augustine are poetically developed; a universal history, which reaches to the year 455, and of which we find the best and most complete reproduction and explanation in *Lect. Antiq. Basnag. Canis.* vol. i, etc. The treatise *De Vocatione Gentium* belongs probably to those works which have been erroneously attributed to Prosper: it gives a milder color to the hard assertions of Augustine and Prosper. For a list and description of the character of these spurious writings, see Smith, *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. and Mythol.* s. v. The best edition of Prosper's works is the Benedictine by Lebrun de Marette and Mangeant (Par. 1711, fol.). For a record of the time when Prosper's different monographs first appeared in print, see also Smith's *Dictionary*. Full information with regard to the interminable controversies arising out of the works of Prosper is contained in the notes and dissertations of the Benedictines, in the dissertations of Quesnel and the Ballerini in their respective editions of the works of Leo the Great, and in a rare volume, *De Viris Operibus SS. Patrum Leonis Magni et Prosperi Aquitani Dissertationes criticæ*, etc. (Par. 1689, 4to), by Josephus Antelmius, to which Quesnel put forth a reply in the *Ephemerides Parisienses*, vol. viii and xv (August, 1639), and Antelmius a reply in two *Epistolæ Duabus Epistolæ P. Quesnelli Partibus Responsoriæ* (Par. 1690, 4to). See Tillemont, *Mém.* vol. xvi; Oudin, *De Script. Eccl.*; Schröckh, *Kirchengesch.* vol. xv–xviii; Fleury, *Hist. Eccl.*; Döllinger, *Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte*; Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrines* (see Index); Neander, *Ch. Hist.* ii, 630 sq.; *Hist. of Dogmas*, ii, 375 sq.; Gieseler, *Ch. Hist.* i, 226 sq.; Schaff, *Ch. Hist.* iii, 859 sq.; Bähr, *Die christl.-römische Theol.* p. 366 sq.; Wiggers, *Aug. et Pelag.* ii, 136 sq. (J. H. W.)

Prosperity, the state wherein things succeed according to our wishes, and are productive of affluence and ease. However desirable prosperity be, it has its manifest disadvantages. It too often alienates the soul from God, excites pride, exposes to temptation, hardens the heart, occasions idleness, promotes effeminacy, damps zeal and energy, and in general has a baneful relative influence. It is no wonder, therefore, that the Almighty in general withholds it from his children, and that adversity should be their lot rather than prosperity. Indeed, adversity seems more beneficial on the whole, although it be so unpleasant to our feelings. "The advantages of prosperity," says Bacon, "are to be wished, but the advantages of adversity are to be admired. The principal virtue of prosperity is temperance; the principal virtue of adversity is fortitude, which in morality is allowed to be the most heroical virtue. Prosperity best discovers vice; adversity best discovers virtue, which is like those perfumes which are most fragrant when burned or bruised." It is not, however, to be understood that prosperity in itself is unlawful. The world, with all its various productions, was formed by the Almighty for the happiness of man, and designed to endear him to us, and to lead our minds up to him. What, however, God often gives us as a blessing, by our own folly we pervert and turn into a curse. Where prosperity is given, there religion is absolutely necessary to enable us to act under it as we ought. Where this divine principle influences the mind, prosperity may be enjoyed and become a blessing; for "while bad men snatch the pleasures of the world as by stealth, without countenance from God, the proprietor of the world, the righteous sit openly down to the feast of life, under the smile of heaven. No guilty fears damp their joys. The blessing of God rests upon all they possess. Their piety reflects sunshine from heaven upon the prosperity of the world; unites in one point of view the smiling aspect both of the powers above and of the objects below. Not only have they as full a relish as others of the innocent pleasures of life, but, moreover, in them they hold communion with God. In all that is good or fair they trace his hand. From the beauties of nature, from the improvements of art, from the enjoyments of social life, they raise their affections to the source of all the happiness which surrounds them, and thus widen the sphere of their pleasures by adding intellectual and spiritual to earthly joys."

Spiritual prosperity consists in the continual progress of the mind in knowledge, purity, and joy. It arises from the participation of the divine blessing; and evidences itself by frequency in prayer, love to God's Word, delight in his people, attendance on his ordinances, zeal in his cause, submission to his will, usefulness in his Church, and increasing abhorrence of everything that is derogatory to his glory (3 John ii). See Blair, *Sermons*, vol. i, ser. 3; Bates, *Works*, p. 297.

Prosphŏra (Gr. *προσφορά*, i. e. *an oblation*), one of the words by which some of the early ecclesiastical writers designate the Lord's Supper. The literal meaning of the word is a sacrificial offering, and especially the matter for a sacrifice: it has this signification in the Epistle to the Hebrews. In Christian antiquity it is used principally for the elements or "species" in the Lord's Supper. Later Greek writers use the word *ἀναφορά* as synonymous with *προσφορά*, and rather in a moral and spiritual than in a physical sense, and with allusion to the exhortation, "Lift up your hearts." The Latin word *offertorium*, which means a gift brought as an offering, was formerly applied to the consecrated bread. The words *ἀναφορά* and *προσφορά* were introduced by Justin Martyr, and brought into common use by Irenæus. Irenæus contends that the Eucharist should be regarded as a sacrifice; he did, however, distinguish it from the Mosaic sacrifices, and speaks of a symbolical presence of Christ in the elements. See Coleman, *Primitive Christianity*, p. 414; Riddle, *Christian Antiquities*, p. 546.

Prosser, Lorenzo D., a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was a native of New York State, and was born in 1805. He was early converted, and joined the Church as a mere youth. In 1827 he was received into the Pittsburgh Conference, and successively appointed to the following circuits, namely: Butler, Grand River, Mercer, Hartford, Twinsburg, Windsor, and Columbiana. In 1836, when the Erie Conference was formed, he fell into its bounds, and received from it his appointment to the following fields of labor, namely: Ellsworth, Cleveland, Harmonsburg, M'Kean, Wesleyville, Chardon, Chagrin Falls, Wesleyville, Edinborough Mission, M'Kean, Albion, and Springfield. This last appointment he held in 1862. The next year he became superannuated, and continued in that relation until his death, April 13, 1869. He was of a nervous temperament, and his burning zeal led him often to exert himself beyond his strength. His preaching was with power, and at times his exhortations were overwhelming. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 1869.

Prostitute, (*a*) female, in Hebrew זוֹנָה, זָרָה, קְדֵשָׁה, נָכְרִיָּה (on the last see Gesen. *Thes.* iii, 1197); (*b*) male, in Hebrew קָדֵשׁ. While all sexual intercourse between others than married persons was for-

bidden by the Mosaic law, especial prohibition was laid upon Israelitish women from hiring themselves as prostitutes (Lev. xix, 29; comp. xxi, 9); and, with special reference to the Phœnicians, they were forbidden to abandon themselves to the use of men (Deut. xxiii, 17). The "hire of a whore" (אֶתְנַן זוֹנָה; comp. also Ezek. xvi, 33, and Rosenmüller, *ad loc.*) must not be accepted by the priests as the subject of a vow, or a gift of devotion in the Temple (Deut. xxiii, 18); this hire, consisting in a piece of money or a kid (Gen. xxxviii, 17), if presented at the Temple for a sacrifice, and received as among other ancient nations, would have seemed to allow prostitution (comp. Mishna, *Terumoth*, vi, 2; Movers, *Phönic.* i, 680). In Paphos, a kid was offered to the goddess of love (Tacitus, *Hist.* ii, 3). The Hetæræ used to bring to Aphrodite Pandemos the sacrifice of a goat (Lucian, *Dial. Meret.* vii, 1). The trade of prostitution was sometimes very profitable among the ancients (Herod. i, 93). In spite of all prohibitions, there were always public prostitutes among the Hebrews—who, probably, as among the Arabs and Persians, practiced dancing and music (Baruch vi, 8, 43; Wisd. ix, 4; 1 Kings iii, 16; Prov. vi, 26 sq.; vii, 10 sq., 23, 27; Amos ii, 7; vii, 17; Hosea i, 2), and may have been in part foreigners (Movers, *Phönic.* i, 53), as Phœnicians and Syrians (Judg. xvi, 1). Syrian harlots travelled in the time of the Roman empire, and were called *Ambubajæ* (Sueton. *Nero*, 27; Horace, *Sat.* i, 2, 1), because they were sometimes skilled in playing on the harp (see Heindorf, on *Horace*, l. c.; comp. Apuleius, *Metam.* viii, p. 182, ed. Bip.). But the Hebrew name נָכְרִיָּה perhaps means, not a stranger, but *the strange women*, like זָרָה; hence, *adulteress*.

The harlots walked in public, adorned and veiled (Gen. xxxviii, 14; Petron. *Satyr.* xvi; but see Pococke, *East*, i, 76), or seated themselves by the wayside, and, with seductive gestures, strove to lead aside travellers (Gen. xxxviii, 14; Baruch vi, 43; comp. Dougtæi *Analect.* i, p. 42 sq.). We may well suppose that the harlots could be in some way recognised in dress, gait, etc., even when they put on a show of modest behavior (comp. Hartmann, *Hebr.* ii, 495 sq.). It is not probable that the *veiling* ever distinguished the harlots from chaste women. See Veil. (Comp. Buckingham, *Mesop.* p. 55.) In the brothels the girls bore peculiar names which had become by some chance attached to them (Senec. *Controv.* i, 2, p. 84, ed. Bip.). Some would interpret in allusion to this the words in Rev. xvii, 5, but see Ewald, *ad loc.* At the time of the division of the Hebrew kingdom, whoredom was practiced, especially among the ten tribes, under the Syrian influences then pouring in (comp. Numb. xxv, 1 sq.), often even in service of the gods, especially of Astarte (Hosea iv, 14; 1 Kings xiv, 24; xv, 12; xxii, 47; 2 Kings xxiii, 7; comp. Baruch vi, 43; Herod. i, 199; Justin, xviii, 5; Strabo, viii, 378; xii, 559; Val. Max. ii, 6, 15; Augustine, *Civ. Dei.* iv, 10; Heyne, *in Commentat. Soc. Götting.* xvi, and see Gesen. *on Isa. ii*, 339 sq.). The law did not establish municipal and police penalties against notorious harlots, and the toleration of those from abroad (which certainly was not the design of the law-giver, though it is easily explicable among an Oriental people when polygamy was allowed) seems to have been unconditional (see Porter, *Greek Antiquities*, i, 354; Wachsmuth, *Hellen. Alterth.* II, ii, 48). The existence of companies of prostitutes in the sacred groves and high-places of the ancient Jews may serve to account for the rendering which the Sept. gives to the expression "high-places" in Ezek. xvi, 39, by a term which in Greek denotes a place of indecent resort. The *Sukkoth benoth*, literally "tabernacles of daughters," which the men of Babylon are mentioned in 2 Kings xvii, 30 as having made, are probably places of the same kind, being haunts of wickedness. According to Josephus (*Ant.* iv, 8, 23), all intercourse with a prostitute was illegal, which is natural, since even the sons of public harlots could never attain citizen's rights among the Jews (Deut. xxiii, 2), and had no claim to share in their father's inheritance (comp. Judg. xi, 1).

Among the Greeks and Romans, at the time of the appearance of Christianity, prostitution had become a great public evil. The cause of this lay by no means alone in the excessive worship of certain divinities (Wisd. xiv, 26 sq.), but in the frivolity of the times and the general decay of morals. In Rome harlots were legally tolerated (Zimmerm. *Röm. Rechtsalterth.* I, ii, 489; comp. Schöttgen, *Hor. Hebr.* i, 468 sq.). The laxer the principles of men in general were on this subject in its various forms, and the more boldly they avowed it (comp. Terence, *Adelph.* i, 2, 21 sq.; *Eunuch.* iii, 5, 35 sq.), the more vigorously were the apostles compelled to oppose unchastity where it had entered the Christian Church (1 Cor. v, 1 sq.; 2 Cor. xii, 21; 1 Thess. iv, 3; 1 Tim. i, 10). The apostolic decree in Acts xv, 20, 29 (comp. xxi, 25), which has often been denounced as not genuine (Deyling, *Observ.* ii, 469 sq.; Kuinöl, *Comment.* p. 521 sq.), was sufficiently called for by the character of the times (comp. Tholuck, in Neander's *Denkwürd.* i, 143 sq.). The practice of prostitution was then prevalent, too, among the Jews, especially the higher classes (Rom. ii, 22; John viii, 7; see in general Michaelis, *Mos. Recht*, v, 281 sq.). Among the Romans, the abominable practice of combining immorality with the worship of the gods appears to have continued down to the days of Constantine, as is evident from a passage in his life, written by Eusebius, where he mentions it in connection with the temple of Venus at Apheca on Mount Libanus. Sacred prostitution forms a part in the religious rites of heathen nations both in ancient and modern times. Among the Phœnicians, Babylonians, and other Eastern nations, it was the custom to erect adjoining the temples of their gods residences for courtesans, who were supposed to be pleasing to the deities. Strabo says that no fewer than 1000 of these abandoned females were attached to the temple of Aphrodite in Corinth, and were considered as an indispensable part of the retinue of the goddess. Among the Hindûs we have the Linga worship (q. v.). See also Adultery; Fornication; Harlot; Sodomite.

Prostration. See Attitude.

Prostration in Prayer. See Posture.

Protagŏras (Πρωταγόρας), the first of that class of Greek philosophers who took the name of *Sophists* (q. v.), flourished near the opening of the 5th century B.C. He was a native of Abdera, according to the concurrent testimony of Plato and several other writers (*Protag.* p. 309, c; *De Rep.* x, p. 606, c; Heraclides Pont. *ap.* Diog. Laert. ix, 55; Cicero, *De Nat. Deor.* i, 23, etc.). There seems to be no ground for the story that he was in early life employed in manual labor, nor for the supposition that he was a disciple of Democritus, with whom in point of doctrine he had absolutely nothing in common. Protagoras must have been older than Democritus, as it is certain that Protagoras was older than Socrates, who was born B.C. 468 (Plato, *Protag.* p. 317, c; 314, b; 361, e; comp. Diog. Laert. ix, 42, 56), and died before him at the age of nearly seventy (Plato, *Meno*, p. 91, e; comp. *Theæt.* p. 171, d; 164, e; *Euthyd.* p. 286, c), after he had practiced the sophistic art for forty years in various Greek cities, especially at Athens. Frei places the death of Protagoras in B.C. 411, assuming that Pythodorus accused him of teaching atheism during the government of the Four Hundred (*Quæst. Protag.* p. 64), and accordingly assigns about B.C. 480 as the date of his birth.

That Protagoras had already acquired fame during his residence in Abdera cannot be inferred from the doubtful statement that he was termed by the Abderites λόγος, and by Democritus φιλοσοφία or σοφία (Ælian. *Var. Hist.* iv, 20; comp. Suid. s. vv. Πρωταγ. Δημόκρ., etc. Phavorinus, in Diog. Laert. ix, 50, gives to Protagoras the designation of σοφία). He was the first

who called himself a sophist and taught for pay (Plato, *Protag.* p. 349, a; Diog. Laert. ix, 52). He must have come to Athens before B.C. 445, since, according to the statement of Heraclides Ponticus (Diog. Laert. ix, 50), he gave laws to the Thurians, or, what is more probable, adapted for the use of the new colonists, who left Athens for the first time in that year, the laws which had been drawn up at an earlier period by Charondas for the use of the Chalcidic colonies (for, according to Diod. xii, 11, 3 and others, these laws were in force at Thurii likewise). Whether he himself removed to Thurii, we do not learn, but at the time of the plague we find him again in Athens, as he could scarcely have mentioned the strength of mind displayed by Pericles at the death of his sons in the way he does (in a fragment still extant, Plutarch, *De Consol. ad Apoll.* c. xxxiii, p. 118, d) had he not been an eye-witness. He had also, as it appears, returned to Athens, after a long absence (Plato, *Protag.* p. 301, c), at a time when the sons of Pericles were still alive (*ibid.* p. 314, e; 329, a). A somewhat intimate relation between Protagoras and Pericles is intimated also elsewhere (Plut. *Pericles*, c. xxxvi, p. 172, a). His activity, however, was by no means restricted to Athens. He had spent some time in Sicily, and acquired fame there (Plato, *Hipp. Maj.* p. 282, d), and brought with him to Athens many admirers out of other Greek cities through which he had passed (Plato, *Protag.* p. 315, a). He was accused of atheism by one of his scholars, and was consequently impeached for what he had written in his book *On the Gods*, which began with the statement, "Respecting the gods, I am unable to know whether they exist or do not exist" (Diog. Laert. ix, 51, etc.). The impeachment was followed by his banishment (*ibid.* ix, 52; Cicero, *De Nat. Deor.* i, 23; Euseb. *Præp. Evang.* xiv, 19, etc.), or, as others affirm, only by the burning of his book (Philost. *Vit. Soph.* l. c.; Josephus, *C. Apion.* ii, 37; Sext. Emp. *Adv. Math.* ix, 56; Cicero, *Diog. Laert.* ll. cc.). Ueberweg says that it would seem Protagoras left for Sicily after his condemnation and was lost at sea (*Hist. of Philos.* i, 74).

Writings.—From the list of the writings of Protagoras, which Diogenes Laertius (ix, 55) doubtless borrowed from one of his Alexandrine authorities (he describes them as still extant, ἐστὶ τὰ σωζόμενα αὐτοῦ βιβλία ταῦτα: comp. Welcker's account of Prodicus, in his *Kleine Schriften*, ii, 447, 465), and which he gives probably with his accustomed negligence, one may see that they comprised very different subjects: *ethics* (Περὶ ἀρετῶν and Περὶ τῶν οὐκ ὀρθῶς τοῖς ἀνθρώποις πρασσομένων, Περὶ φιλοτιμίας); *politics* (Περὶ πολιτείας, Περὶ τῆς ἐν ἀρχῇ καταστάσεως: comp. Frei, p. 182, etc.); *rhetoric* (Ἀντιλογιῶν δύο, τέχνη ἐριστικῶν), and other subjects of different kinds (Προστακτικός, Περὶ μαθημάτων, Περὶ πάλης, Περὶ τῶν ἐν Ἅιδου). The works which, in all probability, were the most important of those which Protagoras composed—*Truth* (Ἀλήθεια), and *On the Gods* (Περὶ Θεῶν)—are omitted in that list, although in another passage (ix, 51) Diogenes Laertius refers to them. The first contained the theory refuted by Plato in the *Theætetus* (p. 161, c; 162, a; 166, c; 170, e), and was probably identical with the work on the Existent (Περὶ τοῦ ὄντος), attributed to Protagoras by Porphyry (in Euseb. *Præp. Evang.* x, 3, p. 468, Viger). This work was directed against the Eleatics (Πρὸς τοὺς ἓν τὸ ὂν λέγοντας), and was still extant in the time of Porphyry, who describes the argumentation of the book as similar to that of Plato, though without adding any more exact statements.

Doctrines.—With the peculiar philosophical opinions of Protagoras we obtain the most complete acquaintance from the *Theætetus* of Plato, which was designed to refute it, and the fidelity of the quotations in which is confirmed by the much more scanty notices of Sextus Empiricus and others. The sophist started from the fundamental presupposition of Heraclitus that everything is motion, and nothing besides or beyond it, and that out of it everything comes into existence; that nothing at any time *exists*, but that everything is perpetually *becoming* (Plato, *Theæt.* p. 156, 152: Sextus Empiricus inaccurately attributes to him matter in a perpetual state of flux, ὕλη ῥευστή, *Pyrrhon. Hyp.* i, 217, 218). He then distinguished two principal kinds of the infinitely manifold motions, an active and a passive; but premised that the motion which in one concurrence manifested itself actively will in another appear as passive, so that the difference is, as it were, a fluctuating, not a permanent one (*Theæt.* p. 156, 157). From the concurrence of two such motions arise sensation or perception, and that which is felt or perceived, according to the different velocity of the motion; and that in such a way that where there is homogeneity in what thus meets, as between seeing and color, hearing and sound (*ibid.* p. 156), the definiteness of the color and the seeing, of the perception and that which is perceived, is produced by the concurrence of corresponding motions (*ibid.* 156, d; comp. 159, c). Consequently, we can never speak of Being and Becoming in themselves, but only for something (τινί), or of something (τινός), or to something (πρός τι, p. 160, b; 156, c; 152, d; Arist. *Metaph.* ix, 3; Sext. Emp. *Hyp.* i, 216, 218). Therefore there *is* or exists for each only that of which he has a sensation, and only that which he perceives is true for him (*Theæt.* p. 152, a; comp. *Cratyl.* p. 386; Aristocles, *in Euseb. Præp. Evang.* xiv, 20; Cicero, *Acad.* ii, 46; Sext. Emp. *l. c.* and *Adv. Math.* vii, 63, 369, 388, etc.); so that as sensation, like its objects, is engaged in a perpetual change of motion (*Theæt* p. 152, b; Sext. Emp. *Hyp.* i, p. 217, fol.), opposite as sertions might exist, according to the difference of the perception respecting each several object (Arist. *Metaph.* iv, 5; Diog. Laert. ix, 5; Clem. Alex. *Strom.* v, 674, a; Senec. *Epist.* 88). The conclusions hitherto discussed, which he drew from the Heraclitean doctrine of eternal *becoming*, Protagoras summed up in the well-known proposition: The man is the measure of all things; of the existent, that they exist; of the non-existent, that they do not exist (*Theæt.* p. 152, a; 160, d; *Cratyl.* p. 385, e; Arist. *Metaph.* x, 1; xi, 6; Sext. Emp. *Adv. Math.* vii, 60; *Pyrrhon. Hyp.* i, 216; Aristocles, *in Euseb. Præp. Evang.* xiv, 20; Diog. Laert. ix, 51); and understood by the *man*, the perceiving or sensation-receiving subject. He was compelled, therefore, likewise to admit that confutation was impossible, since every affirmation, if resting upon sensation or perception, is equally justifiable (Plato, *Euthyd.* p. 185, d, etc.; Isocr. *Helenæ Enc.* p. 231, Bekk.; Diog. Laert. ix, 53); but, notwithstanding the equal truth and justifiableness of opposite affirmations, he endeavored to establish a distinction of better and worse, referring them to the better or worse condition of the percipient subject, and promised to give directions for improving this condition, i. e. for attaining to higher activity (*Theæt.* p. 167; comp. Sext. Emp. *Hyp.* i, 218). Already, before Plato and Aristotle (*Metaph.* iv, 4; comp. the previously quoted passages), Democritus had applied himself to the confutation of this sensualism of Protagoras, which annihilated existence, knowledge, and all understanding (Plutarch, *Adv. Colot.* p. 1109, a; Sext. Emp. *Adv. Math.* vii, 389).

It is not every pleasure, but only pleasure in the beautiful, to which Protagoras, in the dialogue which bears his name (p. 351, b), allows moral worth; and he refers virtue to a certain sense of shame (αἰδώς) implanted in man by nature, and a certain conscious feeling of justice (δίκη), which are to serve the purpose of securing the bonds of connection in private and political life (*ibid.* p. 322, c, etc.); and, accordingly, explains how they are developed by means of education, instruction, and laws (p. 325, c, etc.; comp. 340, c). He is not able, however, to define more exactly the difference between the beautiful and the pleasant, and at last again contents himself with affirming that pleasure or enjoyment is the proper aim of *the good* (p. 354, etc.). In just as confused a manner does he express himself

with respect to the virtues, of which he admits five (holiness, ὁσιώτης—and four others), and with regard to which he maintains that they are distinguished from each other in the same way as the parts of the countenance (*ibid.* p. 349, b; 329, c, etc.). As in these ethical opinions of Protagoras we see a want of scientific perception, so do we perceive in his conception of the Heraclitean doctrine of the eternal flow of all things, and the way in which he carries it out, a sophistical endeavor to establish, freed from the fetters of science, his subjective notions, setting aside the Heraclitean assumption of a higher cognition and a community of rational activity (ξυνὸς λόγος) by means of rhetorical art. That he was master of this in a high degree, the testimonies of the ancients leave indubitable. His endeavors, moreover, were mainly directed to the communication of this art by means of instruction (Plato, *Protag.* p. 312, c), to render men capable of acting and speaking with readiness in domestic and political affairs (*ibid.* p. 318, e). He would teach how to make the weaker cause the stronger (τὸν ἥττω λόγον κρείττω ποιεῖν, Aristot. *Rhet.* ii, 24; A. Gellius, *N. A.* v, 3; Eudoxus, *in Steph. Byz.* s. v. Ἄβδηρα: comp. Aristoph. *Nub.* 113, etc., 245, etc., 873, 874, 879, etc.). By way of practice in the art he was accustomed to make his pupils discuss theses (*communes loci*) on opposite sides (antinomically) (Diog. Laert. ix, 52, etc.; comp. Suid. s. v.; Dionys. of Halic., Isocr., Timon, in Diog. Laert. ix, 52; Sext. Emp. *Adv. Math.* ix, 57; Cicero, *Brut.* 12); an exercise which is also recommended by Cicero (*Ad Att.* ix, 4), and Quintilian (x, 5, § 10). The method of doing so was probably unfolded in his *Art of Dispute* (τέχνη ἐριστικῶν; see above). But he also directed his attention to language, endeavored to explain difficult passages in the poets, though not always with the best success (Plato, *Protag.* p. 388, c, etc.; comp. respecting his and the opposed Platonic exposition of the well-known lines of Simonides, Frei, p. 122, etc.). See Plato, *Hipp. Maj.* p. 282, c; *Meno*, p. 91, d; *Theæt.* p. 161, a; 179, a; Quintilian, iii, 1, § 10; Diogenes Laertius, ix, 52, 50, etc.; Zeller, *Philos. der Griechen*, i, 244 sq.; Fisher, *Beginnings of Christianity*, p. 117; Butler, *Hist. of Ancient Philos.* (see Index in vol. ii); Smith, *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. and Mythol.* s. v., which we have principally used; Ueberweg, *Hist. of Philos.* i, 73 sq.; Geist, *De Protagora Sophista* (Giessen, 1827); Sprengel, in his Συναγωγὴ τεχνῶν (Stuttg. 1828), p. 152 sq.; Herbst, *Protagoras* in "Philos.-hist. Studien" (Hamb. 1832), p. 88 sq.; Krische, *Forschungen*, i, 130 sq.; Frei, *Quæstiones Protagoreæ* (Bonn, 1845); Weber, *Quæst. Prot.* (Marb. 1850); Bernays, in *Rhein. Mus. f. Phil.* 1850 (vii), p. 464 sq.; Vitringa, *De Prot. Vita et Phil.* (Gron. 1853); Grote, *Plato* (Lond. 1865, 3 vols.); and his *Hist. of Greece*, ch. lxvii; Mallet, *Études Philosophiques*, vol. ii; and the literature under *Sophists*, especially Schanz, *Vorsokratische Philosophie* (Götting. 1867).

Protais and Gervais, Sts., flourished in the first century of the Christian æra, and were martyred at Milan towards the year 68. These two brothers were sons of St. Vital and St. Valeria, and their martyrdom appears to have taken place in the last years of the reign of Nero. Their memory was forgotten, until a vision revealed the place of their sepulture to St. Ambrose, when about to dedicate the Cathedral of Milan. The two martyrs were buried in the Church of St. Nabor and St. Felix, and upon the representations of St. Ambrose their coffins were discovered. Their names were plainly inscribed upon them, as St. Ambrose announced only what he had learned by revelation. The bones were transferred to the Basilica, and legends report many miracles done by them during their transfer, which from the 5th century was celebrated at Milan and in the African Church. The worship of these two saints spread rapidly, and in the 6th century a church was built and dedicated to them at Paris. This church has been several times restored, and exists yet in that city. The feast of St. Gervais and of St. Protais is celebrated on the 19th of June.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v. See Bollandus, *Acta Sanctorum*, Jun.; Tillemont, *Mémoires Ecclésiastiques;* Baillet, *Vies des Saints*, 19 Juin. See Gervaise.

Protasof, Ambrose, a Russian prelate, distinguished by a talent of oratory unusual in the Russian Church, was born in 1769 at Moscow. He became a monastic at twenty-five, and was made archimandrite of a monastery near St. Petersburg; subsequently rector of the seminary of that capital, and in 1804 was elevated to the episcopal see of Seula, from whence he was transferred in 1807 to Kazan and Smirsk. He died in 1830 in Tver. His sermons evince a tolerant spirit. Some have been published in *Le Messager de l'Europe*, others in *Le Fils de la Patrie*, but have never been collected in separate form.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v. See Otto, *Hist. of Russian Literature*, s. v.

Protection of the Church, a sort of right of asylum within or near sacred precincts, which prevailed in 1064 in England from Advent to the octave of Epiphany, from Septuagesima to the octave of Easter, from Ascension to the octave of Pentecost, in Ember weeks, throughout Sunday, on the vigils and feasts of apostles and saints which were bidden on the previous Sunday, All-Saints', the dedication-day of a church, in going to synods, chapters, on pilgrimage, to a consecration, or to church.

Protectōres Cardināles. Every Roman Catholic state of first rank enjoys the right of being represented in the College of Cardinals at Rome by one or several members who have been exalted to that high dignity as natives or naturalized citizens of that state. At the time of the universal domination of the popes, when the Roman see was mixed in all the political concerns of the European states, and before the permanent office of the nuncio had become the regular channel of communication between Rome and the Catholic rulers, the cardinals were the natural representatives of the ecclesiastical and political interests of their respective countries, and their position was, of course, one of considerable importance. But even in recent times their influence has not entirely vanished; for as they are supposed to be best acquainted with the institutions, manners, customs, and language of the nations they represent, and therefore more capable of giving the necessary information about the ecclesiastical situation of those nations, they are still, in the different congregations of which they are members, intrusted with the revision of all accounts and reports on the religious affairs of their provinces, but especially of the references about the worthiness of the elected or nominated archbishops and bishops. Hence their name *protectores nationum.* With these must not be confounded the *clerici nationales*, or prelates, who occupy in the College of Cardinals the situation of secretaries, and must be alternately French, Spaniards, Germans; nor the *crown-cardinals*, i. e. the archbishops and bishops who are proposed for the cardinalate by the ruler of their country, nominated by the pope, and who received the red baret from the hand of their Catholic sovereign, but must go to Rome to receive the red hat out of the pope's own hands. The *cardinal-protectors* reside in their metropolitanate, but have a right, on the decease of the pope, to give their vote in the election of his successor, and are themselves eligible to the papacy. As not every country has one of its natives in the College, one cardinal frequently unites in his hands the protectorate of several countries.—Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* s. v.

Proterius (also called *Bertares*—probably his name, but euphonized into the name by which he is better known), an Eastern prelate of some note because he provoked a schism which continues to the present day in the sects known as the *Jacobites* (q. v.) and *Melchites* (q. v.). He flourished about the middle of the 6th century, and suffered martyrdom for the Church. He

had been made a priest by Cyril, bishop of Alexandria, who was well acquainted with his virtues. On the death of Cyril, the see of Alexandria was filled by Dioscorus, who, knowing the reputation of Proterius, did all in his power to gain his confidence and interest, that he might, through him, accomplish his designs. But Proterius was not to be corrupted; the welfare of the Church was next his heart, and no worldly preferment could bribe him to forego his duty. Dioscorus, being condemned by the Council of Chalcedon for having embraced the errors of Eutyches, was deposed, and Proterius was chosen to fill the vacant see, and approved by the emperor. This occasioned a dangerous insurrection, and the city was divided into two factions. Much mischief was done on both sides, and Proterius was brought into the most imminent danger. The civil authority was set at naught, violence was resorted to, nor was peace restored until a detachment of two thousand men was despatched by the emperor to quell the sedition. The discontented party, however, still beheld Proterius with an eye of resentment; the attendance of a guard became necessary; and, although of a mild temper, he was compelled to procure the banishment of several from the city. Upon the emperor Marcian's death, the exiles returned to Alexandria, and seemed resolved to be revenged for what they had suffered in the last reign. Timothy, the head of the conspirators against him, in the absence of Dionysius, seized on the great Church, and was uncanonically consecrated to the see by two bishops of his faction, who had been deposed for heresy. On the return of Dionysius, the incendiary Timothy was driven from the city, which so enraged the Eutychians that they assaulted the house of Proterius, who fled to the neighboring church and took refuge in the baptistery, thinking that the holiness of the place and of the season (for it was Good-Friday) would protect him. But he was pursued to the church, treated with every indignity, murdered in cold blood, and his body was dragged about the city, torn in pieces, burned, and the ashes scattered in the sea. Proterius was so highly esteemed that his writings were collected at once and recommended as profitable for study to the clergy. His memory is celebrated on Feb. 28; possibly on that day, says Neale, because his name was then restored to the diptychs. See Neale, *Hist. of the East. Ch.* (*Patriarchate of Alex.*), ii, 5–13; Fox, *Book of Martyrs*, p. 77. (J. H. W.)

Protestant Church of Jerusalem. See JERUSALEM.

Protestant Confessions. See CONFESSIONS.

Protestant Episcopal Church. This is the legal title of one portion of the Church of Christ which has its local habitation in the United States of America. The first part indicates its position relatively to the Roman Catholic Church, as protesting against the errors and repudiating the claims of that Church to supremacy in doctrine, discipline, and worship; the second part of the title expresses its attitude towards other Christian bodies who have rejected episcopacy on the ground that it is not of divine origin, and, therefore, not of universal and permanent obligation. The history of the Protestant Episcopal Church is consequently of more than ordinary interest, since, on the one hand, it has been compelled to resist the Roman Catholics and their progress, and, on the other, has been forced to maintain its position among Protestants, without being able to form any union or engage in any concert of action with them. In the present article it will be the writer's aim to give a tolerably full account of the history and progress of this Church, together with some supplementary statements and remarks in regard to its peculiar claims and adaptedness for the great work of evangelizing our country and helping to make the Gospel known throughout the dark places of the earth where heathenism prevails.

I. *History.*—Here a natural division suggests itself at once, viz.: (1.) History of the period during colonial times to the close of the Revolutionary war. This period covers rather more than a century and a half, and during it Church people looked directly to the mother country for ministerial supply and religious privileges in general. (2.) The period after the Revolution, when efforts were successfully made to obtain the episcopal succession from England, the Protestant Episcopal Church was duly organized, its liturgy, articles, constitution, etc., were adopted, and its bishops and clergy in different parts of the country were brought into union as one body, with the General Convention as its central legislative power. This period covers the years 1783 to about 1808. (3.) The later history of the Church, marking its growth, increase in wealth and numbers, educational efforts, missionary labors, and the like, with as full and accurate statistics as can be obtained of its present position and work.

1. *Early and Colonial History.*—In the latter part of the 16th century, Sir Humphrey Gilbert left England to endeavor to form a settlement in America. Among the motives avowed as influencing him were "the honor of God, compassion of poore infidels captivated by the devil (it seeming probable that God hath reserved these Gentiles to be reduced into Christian civility by the English nation), advancement of his honest and well-disposed countrymen willing to accompany him in such honorable actions, and reliefe of sundry people within this realme distressed." Though Gilbert met with no success and was lost at sea, other efforts were made by his half-brother, Sir Walter Raleigh, in 1584, in Carolina and Virginia. These too, though in the main unsuccessful, were not wholly without fruit. In 1606 the Virginia Company obtained its charter, and in 1607 the settlement at Jamestown was begun. Among the articles and order of the charter it was expressly required that "the presidents, councils, and ministers should provide that the true word and service of God be preached, planted, and used, according to the rites and doctrine of the Church of England, not only in the said colonies, but also as much as might be among the savages bordering upon them." A clergyman of the English Church, Rev. R. Hunt, accompanied the expedition, and with unwearied zeal, and with piety and devotion worthy the highest praise, labored in his vocation to the end of his life. Other godly men followed, especially Rev. A. Whitaker, who has been honored with the title "Apostle of Virginia." Through his agency the Indian maiden Pocahontas was converted and baptized, and proved herself of great service to the colony. "As the first colonists of Virginia were exclusively members of the Church of England, the legislature of the colony decreed a provision for the clergy, at the rate of fifteen hundred pounds of tobacco and sixteen barrels of flour annually for each clergyman. As each new borough was formed, it was ordered that a portion of glebe land should be set apart for the use of the incumbent. Tithes were afterwards instituted. Discipline was enforced by laws which, it must be admitted, were unjustifiably severe; and a peremptory enactment was passed that none but ministers episcopally ordained should be allowed to officiate in the colony" (Hawkins). Early efforts were made to provide for the education of English and Indian youth by founding a college, and ten thousand acres of land were set apart, and large sums of money collected. In 1619, when Sir Thomas Yeardley became governor of Virginia, the legislature manifested commendable zeal in the same direction. The officers and agents of the Company were urged to train up the people in true religion and virtue, and also "to employ their utmost care to advance all things appertaining to the order and administration of divine service according to the form and discipline of the Church of England, carefully avoiding all factious and needless novelties, which only tend to the disturbance of peace and unity." The most earnest desire was shown to convert the Indians to the

faith of Christ, and to educate them in accordance with this faith. Mr. G. Thorpe, a man of good parts and breeding, was appointed head of the new institution, and it was confidently hoped and expected that the red men would ere long become Christians and members of a civilized community; but a rude shock was given to this hope by the Indians, who, hating and fearing the intruders, as they considered the whites to be, resorted, in 1622, to a bloody massacre; this, it may be noted, would have been complete extermination, had not a Christian Indian disclosed the plot the night before, and thus prevented its entire fulfilment. The deplorable result was, the imbittering the feelings of all towards the Indians and a fierce war of retaliation; so that, for the time, the college, missionary labors, and Christian education were abandoned. In 1625 Virginia became a royal colony, and though its religious concerns were not so zealously looked after as under the charter, yet the people as a whole remained steadfast in their attachment to the Church of England, and their determination to sustain it in every way in their power. Virginia, too, where many cavaliers sought refuge, was loyal to the exiled monarchy when Cromwell came into power, while New England, on the other hand, sympathized heartily with the "lord protector" and his work. After the Restoration, in 1660, the colonial legislature, under Berkeley, the royal governor, gave early attention to the repairs and building of churches, the canonical performance of the liturgy, the ministration of God's word, the baptizing and Christian education of the young, etc. It is, however, sadly true that religion had greatly declined among the people; violent contests occurred between the governors and the assembly of the people; the ruling party was intolerant; popular discontent increased; and rebellion actually broke out. So injurious were these disturbances and the wicked passions to which they gave rise that almost of necessity piety and godly life and conversation declined; and the Church became weakened to such an extent that, it is recorded, out of fifty parishes, nearly all were destitute of glebe, parsonage, church, and minister, and there were not more than ten in holy orders left. In 1685 Rev. James Blair came as missionary to Virginia. Four years later he was appointed commissary of the bishop of London, a position of great responsibility and trust, especially with regard to discipline of both clergy and laity. He also held a seat in the council, and continued at his post as commissary for more than half a century, exercising a most beneficial influence in every way, and particularly in restoring and enlarging the good work of the Church. It was through his energetic efforts and well-directed zeal that the College of William and Mary was chartered in 1692. Its design was "that the Church in Virginia may be furnished with a seminary of ministers of the Gospel; that the youth may be piously educated in good letters and manners; and that the Christian faith may be propagated among the Western Indians, to the glory of Almighty God." Blair became president of this the second college founded in America, and lived to a very advanced age.

The neighboring colony of Maryland, founded in 1633 by lord Baltimore, a Roman Catholic, with some two hundred families and two or more priests of that Church, was noted for freely opening its doors to "every person professing to believe in Jesus Christ." The colonial assembly in 1639 declared, in the words of Magna Charta, that "Holy Church within this province shall have all her rights and privileges." Whether by this term was meant the Church of England or not, it is certain that the influence and membership of that Church were largely extended. The general progress of the colony was so successful that at lord Baltimore's death, in 1676, there were in Maryland ten counties and about sixteen thousand inhabitants, the largest part of whom were Protestants. At this date a letter was addressed to the archbishop of Canterbury by a clergyman named Yeo, complaining of the low state of morals in the colony, and of the fact that the clergy of the Church of England had no settled incomes like their brethren in Virginia, and that consequently their position was neither so respectable nor so well calculated to effect good as it ought to be. Efforts were made to induce the proprietary to provide maintenance for the Church; this, however, he wholly refused. Seditious movements thereupon were set on foot against him as being a "papist," and it was maliciously rumored that the Roman Catholics, in complicity with the Indians, were purposing to massacre the Protestants. On the accession of William of Orange in 1688, a so-called "Protestant revolution" took place, and for three years the government was in the hands of the insurgents. Lord Baltimore having been deprived of his rights as proprietary, a royal governor was sent into Maryland, and in 1692 the Church of England was established by law; the province was divided into thirty parishes, and tithes were imposed for support of the clergy upon every inhabitant, no matter what might be his religious opinions. The Roman Catholics and Quakers opposed this with all their might, and with more or less success. In 1696 new laws were made, which still, however, recognised the Church of England as by law established as entitled to all its rights, privileges, and freedom. The clergy, feeling the need of aid from home, begged the bishop of London to send them a commissary at least (since they were not allowed to have a bishop), "to redress what was amiss and supply what was wanting in the Church." Dr. Thomas Bray, a very estimable and truly godly man, was the one chosen to fill this important position. At great personal sacrifice he accepted it. He secured as many pious and devoted clergymen as he could to go with him to America, and was soon enabled to increase the number of those laboring in Maryland from three to sixteen. He began the formation of colonial libraries, and as one step led to another, and as he perceived how great was the need and how important was the result of combined action on the part of the members of the Church, he conceived the noble idea of founding the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, and that for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts. The latter was chartered in June, 1701, the former in 1698. Early in March, 1700, Dr. Bray arrived in Maryland, and entered at once with zeal and diligence upon his work. He assembled the clergy, delivered charges, administered discipline, and was active in having a bill passed by the legislature for the settlement and maintenance of the parochial clergy. By this bill it was provided "that the Book of Common Prayer and administration of the sacraments, with the rites and ceremonies of the Church, according to the use of the Church of England, the Psalter and Psalms of David, and morning and evening prayer, therein contained, be solemnly read by all and every minister or reader in every church or other place of public worship within this province." Despite some opposition, the king gave the enactment his consent, and it became law. Although Dr. Bray's stay in Maryland was terminated in 1701, he never ceased his efforts in behalf of the Church there; and it is on record that out of some thirty thousand inhabitants in Maryland at this date, the majority were in communion with the Church of England.

The Carolinas and Georgia were among the later colonies in the southern part of America. Several ineffectual efforts had been made from 1630–60 to found settlements in the region of Albemarle Sound; but it was not till after the restoration of Charles II that a body of noblemen (Clarendon, Albemarle, etc.) undertook the task, and met with success. "Being excited," as they declared, "by a laudable and pious zeal for the propagation of the Gospel, they begged a certain country in the parts of America not yet cultivated and planted, and only inhabited by some barbarous people who have no knowledge of God." The charter allowed

entire freedom of religious opinion, and no one was to be disturbed on these matters by the public authorities. We are sorry to say, however, that, notwithstanding the pious and proper language quoted above, the noble proprietaries made no provision for the spiritual interests of the colonists or for the conversion of the Indians. The famous John Locke's "grand model" of government (1670) turned out to be a grand failure, and was abolished in 1693. George Fox, the founder of the Quaker denomination, visited Carolina and gave quite an impulse to the peculiar notions in religion which he entertained. The religious condition of the colony at the close of the century was on the whole very unsatisfactory, and ungodliness prevailed to a lamentable extent. Early in the 18th century the majority of the colonists were dissenters, yet acts were passed in 1704–6, establishing the Church of England as the religion of the province. This produced trouble and resistance of course, and was of no real advantage to the Church. The Society for Propagating the Gospel sent missionaries into the Carolinas, and some, though mostly ineffectual, struggles were made to stay the floods of ungodliness, fanaticism, and semi-heathenism; it was a hard and almost hopeless contest during the greater part of the century. Georgia owed its origin to Oglethorpe's benevolent designs and efforts from 1732 onward. Religious privileges were freely accorded. The German Lutherans and Moravians were early in the field. A small company of Jews came also; and a body of Scotch Highlanders founded New Inverness in 1736. At this date, too, John and Charles Wesley were in Georgia. John Wesley was parish minister in Savannah, and for a while matters went on very well and satisfactorily; but ere long the strictness of Wesley in enforcing the rubrics, and the dissatisfaction of the colonists who were very restive under Church discipline, led to dissension and irreconcilabel differences; so that Wesley "shook off the dust of his feet," as he phrases it, and left Georgia in disgust. George Whitefield soon after came to Georgia, and though he was continually itinerating to and from England and through the northern colonies, stirring up great excitement by his fiery zeal and energy, yet his labors in Georgia as a clergyman of the Church of England met with fair success. The same statement may here be made as in the case of the Carolinas, that missionaries of the Society for Propagating the Gospel did what they could in behalf of religion and the Church; but they were far too few and ill-supported to accomplish much.

Turning our attention from the southern colonies, where, as in Virginia, the Church of England was planted at the date of the earliest settlement in America, and where it flourished despite the fact of being deprived of an essential element in the life and growth of the Church, viz. episcopal presence and supervision, we may next glance at the more northerly portion of the continent. New York (formerly New Netherland) was first colonized by the Dutch in 1615 onward, and of course was in its religious character presbyterian, like the Hollanders at home. In 1664 it was seized by the English, and became a part of the colonial empire of England. After a time the Church of England obtained precedence, and for a while was supported by public tax. Trinity Church was founded in New York city in 1696; the Rev. W. Vesey was its first rector, and was also for fifty years commissary of the bishop of London; it is probably the wealthiest church corporation in the United States. New Jersey (New Sweden), in like manner, and the banks of the Delaware from the mouth inland, were settled by Swedes in 1638. Later (1676), the Quakers came in as colonists, and though in religious profession the inhabitants were principally Presbyterians and Quakers, yet there was open toleration to all other Christian believers. Missionaries of the Society for Propagating the Gospel were at an early day earnestly and zealously at work, at several points in New Jersey, and besides the names of Talbot, Beach, and others, that of Dr. T. B. Chandler, of Elizabethtown, must ever be held in grateful memory by churchmen. The Protestant Episcopal Church has always been comparatively strong in New Jersey. Pennsylvania was founded by William Penn in 1681–82, and, so far as religion was concerned, was tolerant to all of every name. It deserves to be mentioned, too, that, as in the early history of Virginia, kindness and gentleness were displayed towards the native tribes, and no Quaker blood was ever shed by the Indians. The first Episcopal Church founded in Pennsylvania was Christ's Church, Philadelphia, in 1695; and at various points the missionaries of the Society for Propagating the Gospel were, during the early part of the 18th century, actively engaged in preaching the Gospel. Great ungodliness prevailed in all directions, and fanaticism, in its most offensive, hurtful form, displayed itself; but the clergy labored on, amid every discouragement, and their labors were blessed to a large extent.

In all the colonial enterprises thus far, as we have seen, the Church of England was allowed a reasonably fair and just privilege of ministering to the wants of its own people, and extending its boundaries and influence, as best it could in accordance with the rights of others. But when we look at New England, and see what treatment the Church met with there, the contrast is striking indeed. Here, as is well known, the first settlers were those called in the ecclesiastical history of the time Puritans. They were men who had been engaged in long and fierce contentions with the established Church in England. They were men also of stern and unyielding natures, and among them, the leading ones at least, for good reasons, as they held, hated the Church with as nearly a perfect hatred as is possible for man to attain. There was no term in the vocabulary of reproach which they did not heap upon the Church and its clergy and members, as well as its liturgy and services. They refused to allow two clergymen of the Church, who were in New England in 1623–24, to preach and labor in any way in their vocation; and the brothers Browne, two of the original patentees of the Massachusetts Bay Company, who desired to enjoy the services of the Church of England, and that too only in a private dwelling, were shipped off in 1629, without ceremony, by Endicott, the governor, on the ground that they were "factious and evil-conditioned." Thus was begun that series of oppressive actions and intolerant disregard of the rights of others which resulted later in the judicial murder of the Quakers. In a letter, dated April 7, 1630, when a large body of Puritans were embarking from England under Winthrop and Saltonstall, they spoke of themselves as men "who esteem it an honor to call the Church of England, whence we rise, our dear mother; and we cannot part from our native country, where she specially resideth, without much sadness of heart, and many tears in our eyes; ever acknowledging that such hope and part as we have obtained in the common salvation we have received in her bosom, and sucked it from her breasts." Yet these same men and their successors, with strange and painful disregard of the plain meaning of their words, resolved upon and put in practice intolerance in its most vengeful form. They had suffered, as they averred, bitter persecution and grievous wrong in England from the "lord bishops" in authority there, who gave no heed to their conscientious scruples in Church matters; but, so far from showing forth love and gentleness and kindness and liberality as regards other people's consciences, they seem, when the power fell into their hands, to have become, in all matters relating to religion, harder than the granite rock; and, with a spirit as unpitying and hateful as that of the Inquisition itself, they determined that no man, woman, or child, where they had strength to stop it, should ever hold any opinion or have any religious faith which they, the "lord brethren" of New England, did not approve. They fined, imprisoned, or banished

recusants of all sorts. "God forbid," said they, through Endicott, an impersonation of bigotry, "that our love of truth should be so cold that we should tolerate errors!" They allowed no one who differed from them to live among them. Convicted Anabaptists were "whipped unmercifully." Quakers, who with fanatical violence defied the magistrates and ministers, were sentenced, after the first conviction, to lose one ear; after the second, another; after the third, to have the tongue bored through with a red hot-iron; and several of them were put to death; but in 1661 Charles II, by a peremptory order, forbade further outrage of this kind. As to the Indians, though the colonists were under chartered obligation to treat them well and endeavor to convert them to Christianity, these were looked upon as having no rights to be respected, as wolves, savages, heathen, and doomed, like the Canaanites of old, to utter excision as speedily as possible. It was only such men as Roger Williams in Rhode Island, and the estimable John Eliot, the Apostle to the Indians, and the comparatively few who sympathized with them, that helped to relieve New England bigotry and intolerance from being denounced as utterly detestable. The Puritans, in carrying out their principles, organized what they called churches on the same plan of independency as that employed in civil matters. They looked upon themselves as under no restraint, and as owing no obligation or courtesy to their "dear mother, the Church of England," and they thought and acted as if they could just as readily have—to use a pet phrase of later days—a church without a bishop as a state without a king. Of course, under such a condition of affairs, and with such antagonism and prejudice against the Church and all appertaining to it, it could make little or no progress in New England; and it is a fact to be noted that for some sixty years after the landing on Plymouth rock there was not a single Episcopal church in all that part of the country. It was not till the year 1679 that Charles II, on the earnest representation of some of the inhabitants through the bishop of London, caused a church to be built in Boston. William of Orange subsequently settled an annual bounty of £100 for endowment.

From this time onward, however, owing to the unwearied and judicious efforts of the Society for Propagating the Gospel, something began to be accomplished, in despite of penal enactments and bitter, uncompromising hatred. Missionaries were sent out to various points in New England, as well as the other colonies (except Virginia and Maryland); and as they were honest, faithful men, abounding in labors, travelling over large districts, and ministering the Gospel to all whom they met with, they deserve all honor, and their labors were not without fruit. Had the Church of England listened to that supplication for bishops which went up continually and earnestly, and had she been permitted to send out worthy men for the episcopal office, the growth and prosperity of the Church in America would have been vastly greater and more secure; but the ungodliness of men in power, the hampered condition of the Established Church, and the active opposition of the Puritans in New England and of the dissenters in England as well as their special friends in America, always succeeded in overpowering the cry of the destitute and the numerous and powerful remonstrances of the Society for Propagating the Gospel. At one time there were two nonjuring bishops in America, viz. Dr. R. Welton and Dr. J. Talbot (1722), the former in Philadelphia, the latter in Burlington, N. J.; but they were not allowed to exercise episcopal functions except by stealth, and the government soon after interfered and put an entire stop to all action on their part. As early as 1704, a missionary of the society took up his residence in Newport, R. I., and continued there nearly half a century. During his ministry, and that of several helpers in the work, he could not but note the depressing effects of schism and heresy, there being then quite as many denominations in Rhode Island as there have been in subsequent days. Bishop Berkeley deserves to be named in this connection for his noble disinterestedness and zeal. In 1725 he entered upon his great philanthropic and Christian enterprise of erecting a college at Bermuda, to serve as an institution for educating the children of the planters, and suitable ones from among the natives as missionaries in order to convert the savages to Christianity. In 1728 Berkeley was in Rhode Island, and had not the government of Walpole kept him out of the £20,000 voted, he would probably have accomplished his benevolent design. The next year he returned to England, and reluctantly gave up his cherished plan. Some eighteen years later he caused to be sent as a gift to the library of Harvard College a very valuable collection of books, containing such authors as Hooker, Pearson, Barrow, Hammond, Clarendon, etc., and these no doubt helped to leaven the minds of some in New England, who, weary of the despotism of independency, and grieved and distressed at there being multitudinous sects of all kinds and characters, were disposed to seek, and did seek, refuge in the sober, staid, and godly ways of the Church of England. It is also worthy of note here that early in the 18th century, about thirty-five years before Berkeley's donation to Harvard College, a library of books, similar in character and value to those just named, had been sent to Yale College, which was now established in New Haven. At this date there was not a single Episcopal Church in Connecticut, and very few families of Church people. There were, however, in this region, several earnest seekers after truth, dissatisfied and cheerless in their then position, among whom may be named especially Timothy Cutler, an accomplished scholar, and president of Yale College; Daniel Brown, one of the tutors; and Samuel Johnson, a Congregational preacher at West Haven. These, in company with others in like condition of mind, set to work to examine into the important subject of the ministry and doctrines of the apostolic and early Church. The result was, rather to the astonishment and alarm of most of their associates, a thorough conviction on their part that there was no valid ministry except through the laying-on of the hands of a bishop, and that the doctrines set forth in the Prayer-book are the true and full expression of the truth of the Gospel. Of course, Messrs. Cutler and Brown could not stay any longer in Yale College, which neither recognised nor tolerated the Church of England in any shape, but, in common with Congregationalists generally, as we are gravely told, "entertained fears lest the introduction of Episcopal worship into the colony should have a tendency gradually to undermine the foundations of civil and religious liberty." Accordingly these gentlemen resigned their positions, and, accompanied by Mr. Johnson, they sailed for England in November, 1722, were ordained to the ministry, and (except Mr. Brown, who died of small-pox) returned to America as missionaries of the society the following year. Dr. Cutler became rector of Christ's Church, Boston, and Dr. Johnson was settled at Stratford, Conn. Both of them were among the foremost men in the colonial Church, and were of especial service in defending its claims, warding off attacks, and promoting its growth and welfare. Both, too, lived till nearly the close of the colonial period, Dr. Cutler dying in 1765, Dr. Johnson in 1772. In fact, the Church in Connecticut was more than ordinarily blessed, and we find that, prior to the Revolution, it was comparatively vigorous and zealous in good works. The names of Beach, Seabury, Jarvis, Hubbard, and others abundantly evince this. Without attempting to go into details, it may here be stated that down to the outbreak of the Revolution, the Society for Propagating the Gospel maintained, on an average, thirty clergymen in the New England states, and about fifty in the other colonies. One list of churches which was sent home by a missionary in 1748 makes the number in New Hamp-

shire two, in Rhode Island five, in Massachusetts twelve, in Connecticut seventeen—total, thirty-six. It must be borne in mind, too, that each missionary was placed in the centre of an extensive district, and supplied as far as possible the spiritual wants of the people, whom oftimes he could reach only by long and even dangerous journeys to and from distant settlements. The Society did all that its means allowed in sending missionaries in all practicable directions, and it may justly and properly be noted of its work that when it began its operations in the colonies, it found but five churches; and when compelled by the revolt of the colonies to close its labors, it left the country with some two hundred and fifty churches.

The Church of England in America was peculiarly unhappy in its position just before and at the period of the Revolution. It had no popular favor to fall back upon in those days of trial. It was small in proportion to other Christian bodies, especially in the north, and it was hated and despised by the ill-informed multitude, who regarded it as virtually identical with priestcraft and tyranny. A considerable number of its clergy, particularly those who were English-born, felt compelled by their ordination vows to adhere to the cause of the king. This was sure to bring distress and trouble upon them and the Church likewise; for when the disputes with the mother country reached that crisis which culminated in the war of the Revolution, there could be no longer any hesitation as to the side which every man must take. Then it became a necessity for a man to side with his country or with the king's party; he must be a patriot, heart and soul, or he must be ranked with and suffer with the odious Tories. The result was the abandonment of their fields of labor by most of the clergy in the employ of the Society for Propagating the Gospel, who found their only safety in flight to England or the British provinces; the closing of nearly all the churches; and, worse than all, the disgraceful ruin and defilement heaped upon many church edifices. It was none the less hard and unjust to American churchmen to be forced to bear all this in addition to the trials of war, inasmuch as it is only simple justice to put it on record, to the perpetual honor of the Church and the vindication of its members against the freely circulated charge of lack of patriotism in the great struggle against the tyranny of the English government, that the commander-in-chief of our army was a churchman, and the first chaplain of Congress was William White, a clergyman of the Protestant Episcopal Church.

2. *History subsequent to the Revolution*, including the full organization and entrance on its work of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States.—When, at last, the war was over, and the independence of the United States was acknowledged (1783), it became a matter of immediate concern to those who had heretofore been dependent on England for ordination of clergy, and for efficient and steady help from the Society for Propagating the Gospel, to ascertain what was now to be done. Here they were, few in numbers comparatively; cut off from all direct connection with the English Church; having not even the small comfort of being considered as any longer in the diocese of London; with no means of helping themselves; no bishops, few clergy, and these scattered over a large surface of country; in great perplexity as to the proper course to be pursued; and reduced pretty nearly to the condition of hopeless uncertainty. In Virginia, for instance, at the beginning of the Revolution, there were 164 churches and chapels and 91 clergymen, at the close of the great struggle a large number of these churches had been destroyed; 95 parishes were extinct or forsaken; of the remaining 72, there were 34 without ministerial services; while of the 91 clergy only 28 remained. But, bad and distressing as was the state of affairs, it was not altogether desperate. The great Head of the Church did not abandon his people in their trouble. Those brave and honest men who had tried for years and years to induce the government and Church of England to allow them to have a bishop—were thoroughly conscious that they must not now give up in despair. The mean and paltry reasons of state, and the venomous prejudice that had been stirred up from this side of the water against the continuous supplication for a bishop during nearly a century just past—these could certainly no longer have any force; for now there was a new nation in the world, in no wise hampered by any union of Church and State; now it could not be pretended that there was any danger to public liberty from the Episcopal Church having and enjoying what it regards as essential to its very life and growth. To us, at this day, when a century of existence has been granted to the United States, and the Protestant Episcopal Church has proved its right to be what it has now become, it seems almost incredible that it could ever have been seriously urged against that Church that its having bishops of its own was (in some strange, unaccountable way) hurtful and dangerous to liberty and true patriotism. However singular it may appear that such an opinion should prevail among fair-minded, intelligent persons, the fact is indisputable; this opinion did prevail, and did cause great trial and suffering to the Church in America. All that can be said is, that as prejudice is usually utterly unreasoning, and will listen to nothing which militates against its preconceived conclusions, so we have no alternative but to attribute some, at least, of the opposition to the Episcopal Church to this hard, stony prejudice; while it is almost certain that a large part of the opposition arose from settled hatred towards the Church and a determination to prevent its growth and influence. Bishop White's testimony is instructive in this connection. Writing in 1836, he says, "What a wonderful change has the author lived to witness in reference to American episcopacy! He remembers the ante-revolutionary times, when the presses profusely emitted pamphlets and newspaper disquisitions on the question whether an American bishop were to be endured; and when threats were thrown out of throwing such a person, if sent among us, into the river, although his agency was advocated for the sole purpose of a communion submitting itself to his spiritual jurisdiction.... The order has existed among us for nearly the half of a century, and not a single complaint has been heard, either of usurpation to the injury of any other denomination, or of arbitrary government within our own." Organization and union, as far as practicable, were now of first importance. It was no new thing for the clergy to meet in their several districts from year to year. This had been done at intervals all through the 18th century, up to the end of the colonial period. In Virginia and Maryland, where the Church of England was established by law, meetings, consisting of a large number of the clergy and laity, were held in the spring of 1784–85. In Virginia, the chief effort was to rid the Church of State control, to obtain liberty to act freely in ecclesiastical matters, and to have the Episcopal Church incorporated in accordance with the laws of the state, so as to hold and retain its rights of property in churches, glebe lands, etc. A general willingness was expressed of uniting with Episcopal churches in other states; but ground was taken in regard to bishops and their office and position which alarmed the Northern churches. The Virginia notion was to reduce a bishop to the lowest possible point, to use him simply for ordaining and confirming, to make him serve as a parish minister, and be amenable to the convention, etc. In Maryland, a special effort was made to secure a bill of rights for the Episcopal Church, for objects similar to those just named in the case of Virginia; "a declaration of certain fundamental rights and liberties of the Protestant Episcopal Church of Maryland" was set forth; and Dr. William Smith was chosen to go to England for the purpose of obtaining epis-

copal orders. It may be mentioned here that, for various and sufficient reasons, Dr. Smith did not obtain the proper papers, and was never consecrated. Farther south, a convention, consisting of a small number of clergy and laity, was held in Charleston, S. C., in 1785–86. The feeling against the Church of England was very bitter in that part of the country, which had suffered greatly from the ravages of the British armies. This convention, acknowledging the need of the three orders in the ministry, was willing to go so far as a general approval of union, but stipulated that there was to be no bishop settled in that state without the consent of the Church there. In January, 1784, Dr. Beach, of New Brunswick, N. J., made a suggestion to Dr. White, of Philadelphia, and Dr. Provoost, of New York, that a conference of as many of the clergy as could be conveniently got together be held, to take into consideration the condition of Church affairs. Previously to this, in August, 1782, before the recognition of American independence, and when it seemed as if the ministry of the Church were almost annihilated, Dr. White had issued a pamphlet, entitled "The Case of the Episcopal Churches in the United States Considered." In this pamphlet, which excited considerable attention, the writer, apprehending the possibility of the Church being compelled to go forward without obtaining the succession from England, advocated the formation of a new body, without bishops in the regular line—in fact, a new presbyterian denomination. This, however, was only in case absolute necessity required such a course, and, as bishop White himself subsequently stated, it was suggested only for such a possible state of affairs. The writer was, in reality, too good a churchman not to embrace joyfully the opportunity which was offered three years later of obtaining the succession in the English line. A meeting of several clergymen from New York, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey, members of the Corporation for the Relief of Widows and Children of Clergymen, was held in New Brunswick, May 11, 1784. At this meeting a number of laymen were also present, and another meeting was appointed for October in the same year in New York. Accordingly, Oct. 6, 1784, some fifteen clergymen from New England, New York, New Jersey, Delaware, and Maryland, and eleven laymen from the same states, assembled in New York. The principal result was the making of several important recommendations, such as, that there be a General Convention of the Episcopal Church; that each state send clerical and lay deputies; that the doctrines held by the Church of England be adhered to; that the Prayer-book be altered only in so far as civil changes demand; that in any state having a bishop, he be, *ex officio*, a member of the convention; that the clergy and laity deliberate together, but vote separately; that the first meeting of a general convention be held in Philadelphia on Tuesday before the Feast of St. Michael, in 1785, etc. Probably the most important benefit secured by the action of this body was a recognition of the value and need of lay representation as not only right in itself, but also in admirable harmony with the constitution of a republican form of government. The New England feeling was quite strong against the having a lay element in Church councils, and for a few years it appeared as if serious discord might arise, and hinder the union of the churches in the several states; but, happily, the point was conceded, though with some reluctance, by the Connecticut bishop and clergy in 1789. One other point of difference existed at the time. The Connecticut sentiment was decidedly in favor of securing a bishop first, and then proceeding to act as a fully organized Church, in passing laws, revising the liturgy, etc., and such was the course adopted in that state. Dr. Samuel Seabury, bishop-elect, meeting with annoying difficulties and delays in England, was consecrated by Scotch bishops, in November, 1784, and, on his return home early in the summer of 1785, entered at once upon his duties as bishop of Connecticut. The churches in the middle and more southerly portions of the country held an opposite opinion to that entertained in Connecticut and Massachusetts, and in accordance therewith went forward, and took various steps antecedent to the obtaining of the succession from England.

The first meeting of clergy and laity which can properly be considered as approaching to a general convention was held in Philadelphia in September and October, 1785. Seven states were represented by 16 clergymen and 26 laymen. It was hoped that bishop Seabury and some of the New England clergy might be present; but, as they were not satisfied as yet on several points, they declined attending. Dr. White was chosen president, and Dr. Griffith, of Virginia, secretary, and the convention proceeded promptly to the work of organization and revision. A plan for obtaining the episcopal succession, and an address to the archbishops and bishops of the Church of England were discussed and agreed upon. These papers were mainly the production of Dr. White, and were manly and dignified in tone and statement. A draft of alterations of the liturgy, in order to adapt it to the existing condition of civil affairs, and to get rid of certain offensive features, was submitted, as was also an "Ecclesiastical Constitution;" and the work went on vigorously till the close of the session, Oct. 7. The committee on altering and improving the Prayer-book were Drs. White, W. Smith, and Wharton. They were authorized to make changes of various kinds, "but in such a manner that nothing in form or substance be altered;" to accompany the volume with "a proper preface or address, setting forth the reason and expediency of the alterations;" and to publish the work for the use of Episcopal churches. The result of their labors was the "Proposed Book," as it is known in Church history. The major part of the alterations were made by Dr. Smith; and these alterations, both as to matter and spirit, deserve the attention of every student of our history. Besides a large number of verbal changes, the article "He descended into hell," in the Apostles' Creed, and the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds, were ejected; the "Articles of Religion" were reduced to twenty; a calendar and table of holydays were set forth; a long preface (the basis of the preface to the Book of Common Prayer as it now is) was added, etc. The volume proved to be quite unsatisfactory. Its changes were looked upon as too radical by many of the clergy and conventions; and hardly had the book been issued before it became evident that the Church was not ready or willing to accept it. From every quarter, when state conventions met, amendments were proposed and urged upon the attention of the Church; and nowhere was the book adopted, except in a few churches for temporary use. Bishop White says it was "a great error" to print the book at all in its then condition, and still more to print a large edition in hope of getting, by its sale, pecuniary returns to be used for charitable purposes. It was a crude and ill-digested affair, and it never received the first sanction of the Church. Subsequent general conventions ignored it altogether, and it will ever remain as the "Proposed Book," not the Book of Common Prayer which was later adopted, and is the Church's permanent heritage.

At the meeting of the next convention in Philadelphia, June 20, 1786, ten clergy and eleven laymen were present. The prospect was by no means encouraging. Indeed, as bishop White states, "the convention assembled under circumstances which bore strong appearances of a dissolution of the union in this early stage of it." The correspondence with the archbishops and bishops in England made it evident that there was an apprehension existing in their minds that the American Episcopal Church was scarcely sound in the faith, and they answered cautiously and with reserve in regard to the application for the episcopate. This was quite natural, and it need occasion no surprise that they objected to many of the alterations in the Prayer-book

and to various features in the "Ecclesiastical Constitution," as it was then arranged. Renewed and distinct assurances were expected from the American Church that there was no intention whatever on its part of departing from the Church of England in doctrine, or in discipline and worship, except in so far as changed civil relations made it necessary, before the venerable prelates were willing to act as they were asked to do. There was also considerable unpleasant feeling excited by an expressed determination of several members of the convention (Provoost and R. Smith especially) to throw doubt upon the validity of bishop Seabury's orders, obtained from the line of the Scotch nonjuring bishops. The convention showed its good sense and discretion by refusing to take any action inimical to the bishop of Connecticut or his position; a resolution simply was passed advising the churches then represented in convention not to receive ministers ordained by any bishop in America, during the application pending to the English bishops for episcopal consecration. "A General Constitution of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States," freed from some serious former objections, was agreed upon, as also an answer to the letter from the archbishops and bishops of the Church of England. This latter, with the constitution, it was hoped and expected would give entire satisfaction. At an adjourned meeting held in Wilmington, Del., in October, 1786, the letter just before received from the archbishops and bishops, with forms of testimonials and the act of parliament authorizing the consecration of bishops for foreign countries, were read, and appropriate action was taken. A declaratory "Act of the General Convention of Clerical and Lay Deputies of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the States of New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, and South Carolina" was passed; and it was determined, in accordance with the earnest recommendation of the archbishops and bishops, to restore the omitted article (descent into hell) in the Apostles' Creed, and to put back in its proper place in the Prayer-book the Nicene Creed. At the same time it was resolved that the Athanasian Creed be omitted altogether, only one clergyman voting in its favor. Testimonials were signed in behalf of Dr. White, Dr. Provoost, and Dr. Griffith, bishops elect respectively of Pennsylvania, New York, and Virginia. The convention refused to give a like testimonial in favor of Dr. W. Smith, bishop elect of Maryland. On Nov. 2, 1786, Drs. White and Provoost embarked for England, and arrived on the 20th; Dr. Griffith, for personal reasons, was unable to accompany them. When they reached London, they were introduced to the archbishop by the American minister, John Adams, who, as bishop White says, in his *Memoirs*, "in this particular, and in every instance in which his personal attentions could be either of use or as an evidence of his respect and kindness, continued to manifest his concern for the interests of a Church of which he was not a member." After some little delay, owing to Parliament not being in session, the consecration took place, Sunday, Feb. 4, 1787, in Lambeth chapel. The two archbishops, and the bishops of Bath and Wells and of Peterborough, united in the solemn act of giving the apostolic succession to the American Church.* The new bishops very soon left England for home, and, after a long voyage of some seven weeks, arrived in New York on the afternoon of Easter-day, April 7. Thus, at last, was secured for the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States the long and earnestly sought-for privilege of having its organization rendered complete; thus, too, from this date it took its place as a distinct national branch of the Church of Christ, with all the privileges and duties and responsibilities thereunto attached.

* This was certainly a connection by ordination with the Established Church of England, but whether it was truly an "*apostolic* succession," is a very different question, which we do not think this the proper place to discuss.—Ed.

The General Convention of 1789 assembled, July 28, in Philadelphia, bishop White presiding; bishop Provoost was absent. There were seventeen clergymen and sixteen laymen present from seven states, including South Carolina; but none came from New England. An application was made by the clergy of Massachusetts and New Hampshire, asking for the consecration of the Rev. Edward Bass as bishop. This application was placed on the ground that there were now three bishops (the proper canonical number) in America, and that consequently they were fully able to act in the premises. A resolution was unanimously passed "that, in the opinion of this convention, the consecration of the Right Rev. Dr. Seabury to the episcopal office is valid," and the general sentiment was strongly in favor of compliance with the request of the Massachusetts clergy. There was, however, an obstacle which hindered this compliance at this time, viz., the obligation which bishops White and Provoost felt themselves to lie under to the English bishops, not to consecrate any to the episcopal office until there were three in the English line in the United States. Dr. Griffith, in May, 1789, relinquished his appointment as bishop elect of Virginia, and died in Philadelphia during the session. Hence, it was thought best not to act at present upon the application from Massachusetts. A body of canons, ten in number, was adopted; a General Constitution of the Church was agreed upon in substance; an appropriate address was prepared, thanking the archbishops of Canterbury and York for their good offices in regard to the episcopate; also, an address was sent to the President of the United States, which was courteously answered by Washington; and the convention adjourned, August 8, to meet again in the same place, Sept. 29. An important part of the object of this adjourned session was to secure the union of the churches in New England with those already joined together. This was now happily accomplished. Bishop Seabury appeared, and took his place as a member of the convention, as did also deputies from Connecticut, Massachusetts, and New Hampshire. The third article of the constitution was modified so as to secure to the bishops the right to assemble and act as a separate house, in originating measures, etc.; they also were to have from this time a negative on the action of the lower house, unless adhered to by a four-fifths vote. The bishops then withdrew and organized as a house. Bishop Provoost being absent on account of illness, bishop Seabury took the chair. From this date there have been two houses, whose concurrent action is necessary to the adoption of any legislation, the bishops also (since 1808) having the full negative on the action of the other house. The convention now entered upon its most important work, which was to provide and place on a firm foundation the Book of Common Prayer for the American Church. The English liturgy was made the basis, and though entire independence of action was claimed by the House of Deputies, as if there were no book of any authority or obligation now in existence, yet there was, after all, a sense of the propriety and fitness of varying as little as possible from the Book of Common Prayer of the Church of England. Five committees were appointed, to whom were assigned different portions of the work, and they discharged their duties with as much expedition as was practicable. The result, as soon as agreed upon by the house, was sent to the bishops for their action. The alterations were principally verbal, and for the purpose of adapting the services to the needs and uses of a Church situate as the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States was and is. An office of Visitation of Prisoners, a service for Thanksgiving Day, and an order of Family Prayer were added, as also Selections of Psalms to be used instead of those for the day, Tate and Brady's version of the Psalms, and some hymns in metre. One noticeable change was made in the Communion Office, i. e. putting in their proper place the oblation and the invo-

cation of the Holy Spirit, as found in the first Prayer-book of Edward VI, and also in the Scotch Communion Service. This was due mainly to bishop Seabury, who was under something of a pledge to the Scottish bishops to secure this change, if possible. The meekness and wisdom of bishop White were clearly evident in this matter, as in everything. He was always ready to yield where principle was not violated, and he puts it on record that his discussions with bishop Seabury were entirely amicable and satisfactory to both parties. "To this day," he says, "there are recollected with satisfaction the hours which were spent with bishop Seabury on the important subjects which came before them, and especially the Christian temper which he manifested all along." The Apostles' and Nicene Creeds were adopted with hearty assent by the convention. A rubric was prefixed to the former, as follows: "And any churches may omit the words 'he descended into hell,' or may, instead of them, use the words 'he went into the place of departed spirits,' which are considered as words of the same meaning in the Creed." Bishop Seabury desired much to have the Athanasian Creed inserted, not as obligatory on all, as in the Church of England, but as permissory for those wishing to use it; but, as bishop White states, the House of Deputies "would not allow of the creed in any shape." The consideration of the "Articles of Religion" was postponed to a subsequent convention. The Book of Common Prayer was formally ratified by the bishops, clergy, and laity in convention, Oct. 16, 1789: "This Convention having, in their present session, set forth *A Book of Common Prayer, and Administration of the Sacraments, and other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church*, do hereby establish the said Book; and they declare it to be the Liturgy of this Church, and require that it be received as such by all the members of the same; and this Book shall be in use from and after the first day of October, in the year of our Lord one thousand seven hundred and ninety." A number of canons were passed in regard to episcopal visitations, publishing a list of the clergy, observance of the Lord's day, etc. The consecration of Dr. Bass was deferred. Dr. Madison, of Virginia, was consecrated bishop in England, Sept. 19, 1790; and thus the full number of bishops was secured through the English line. Two years later the consecration of Dr. Claggett as bishop of Maryland united both lines in the American episcopate, bishop Seabury being present and joining in the solemn act.

The convention of 1792 met in New York Sept. 11. There were five bishops, nineteen clerical and fourteen lay deputies in attendance, and the session lasted seven days. The Ordinal was revised and set forth, the alterations being few. An alternate form at the ordination of priests was furnished; instead of "Receive the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a priest in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands; whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven; and whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained. And be thou," etc.; the bishop ordering is allowed to say, "Take thou authority to execute the office of a priest in the Church of God, now committed to thee by the imposition of our hands. And be thou," etc. The consideration of the Articles was further postponed. An act was passed "for supporting missionaries to preach the Gospel on the frontiers of the United States," in which it was recommended that annual sermons be preached in all the churches, that collections be made, and missionaries be sent out as soon as may be, these being under the canonical jurisdiction of the bishop of Pennsylvania. "Agreeably to the requirement of a canon adopted at the last convention, a list of the clergy of the Church is printed in the appendix to the journal. Including the bishops, the number given is one hundred and eighty-four, no lists having been handed in from New Hampshire and Massachusetts, and there being no mention of the number of clergymen at that time in North Carolina and on the Western frontiers. With every allowance there could not have been more than two hundred, the representatives of nearly two thousand who, with English orders, had labored on the American continent since its earliest attempted settlement, two hundred and fifty years before" (Perry). One other matter deserves to be put on record here, not only because of the importance of the object had in view, both as regards one of the most influential denominations in the United States and the Protestant Episcopal Church, but also because of the entire failure at that date of so earnest and truly catholic a movement. We give it in the language of bishop White: "Bishop Madison had communicated to the author, on their journey from Philadelphia to New York, a design which he had much at heart—that of effecting a reunion with the Methodists; and he was so sanguine as to believe that by an accommodation to them in a few instances, they would be induced to give up their peculiar discipline, and conform to the leading parts of the doctrine, the worship, and the discipline of the Episcopal Church. It is to be noted that he had no idea of comprehending them, on the condition of their continuing embodied, as at present. On this there was communicated to him an intercourse held with Dr. Coke, one of the superintendents of that society which might have shown to bishop Madison how hopeless all endeavors for such a junction must prove. Nevertheless, he persisted in his well-meant design. The result of this was his introducing into the House of Bishops a proposition, which his brethren, after some modifications, approving of the motive, but expecting little as the result of it, consented to send to the other house." The proposition (as given by bishop White) was placed on a broad and liberal basis, leaving most of matters to future discussion and settlement at a subsequent convention. "On the reading of this in the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, they were astonished, and considered it as altogether preposterous; tending to produce distrust of the stability of the system of the Episcopal Church, without the least prospect of embracing any other religious body. The members generally stated, as a matter of indulgence, that they would permit the withdrawing of the paper, and no notice to be taken of it. A few gentlemen, however, who had got some slight intimations of the correspondence between Dr. Coke and the author, who would have been gratified by an accommodation with the Methodists, and who thought that the paper sent was a step in measures to be taken to that effect, spoke in favor of the proposition. But it was not to be endured; and the bishops silently withdrew it, agreeably to leave given." Bishop White gives, in addition, the letter of Dr. Coke, and an account of several interviews had with him. The letter is an instructive one in many respects, and shows what Dr. Coke thought of his supposed "episcopal" character, derived from John Wesley; bishop White's remarks and statements also are worthy of grave consideration. The subject has been more than once agitated, and sometimes men have become sanguine of being able to effect the end desired; but as the question of ordination still holds the place which it did in Dr. Coke's day, and the Methodist ministers almost certainly cannot be brought to acknowledge the obligation of being ordained by our bishops in order to officiate in our churches, we apprehend that there never has been any real probability of bringing the Methodists to a sense of the duty and propriety of becoming reunited to the Church at whose altars John Wesley always ministered, and which he at least was never willing to abandon.

Owing to the prevalence of epidemic disease in Philadelphia and its vicinity, the convention of 1795 was but thinly attended, and from the same cause no convention was held in 1798. A special convention, however, met in Philadelphia, June 11, 1799. Eight states were represented, nineteen clerical and ten lay deputies being present. Bishop Seabury, who had died in 1796,

was succeeded by bishop Jarvis, consecrated Sept. 18, 1797. Dr. R. Smith was made bishop of South Carolina in 1795, and Dr. Bass of Massachusetts in 1797. At this convention an attempt was made to obtain its approval of Dr. U. Ogden, bishop elect of New Jersey; but it failed entirely, and Dr. Ogden a few years later joined the Presbyterians. A proposition was made to hold General Convention every five years; a form of consecration of a church or chapel was set forth; and seventeen articles were reported and read. These were ordered to be laid over, and printed in the journal. The clergy-list gives seven bishops and two hundred and twelve clergymen. At the convention of 1801, held at Trenton, N. J., Sept. 8, it was announced that bishop Provoost had resigned his jurisdiction as bishop of New York. Under the circumstances it was deemed right to consecrate Dr. Benjamin Moore as his assistant, the principle being distinctly stated that bishop Provoost was bishop during his life, and that bishop Moore was simply assistant or coadjutor, competent to all episcopal duty, but still to act in concurrence with bishop Provoost. The principal work of the convention was the final settlement of the question as to articles of religion. The printing of the seventeen articles, in the journal of 1799, produced one good result, viz., showing how difficult it was and would be to agree upon a new set of articles for the Protestant Episcopal Church, and leading the minds of the convention to a ready acceptance of the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England. It was bishop White's view that these articles were really "the acknowledged faith of the Church" all along, and that the safest and most satisfactory course was to make certain necessary changes, arising out of the actual condition of affairs, and then to adopt the Thirty-nine entire. This was accordingly done, and, as bishop White states, the articles "were adopted by the two houses of convention, without their altering even the obsolete diction in them; but with notices of such changes as change of situation had rendered necessary." Article VIII was amended by leaving out the Athanasian Creed. Article XXI, on general councils, was omitted, the reason being given in a note, "because it is partly of a local and civil nature, and is provided for, as to the remaining parts of it, in other articles." The XXXVth Article, on the homilies, was retained, with a note added suspending "the order for the reading of said homilies in churches until revision of them may conveniently be made, for the clearing of them, as well from obsolete words and phrases as from the local references." Article XXXVI was altered in so far as to set forth that the ordinal of 1792 contained the Church's views and principles on this important point. Article XXXVII in the English Prayer-book was omitted, and a new one substituted, "Of the Power of the Civil Magistrate." The articles as a whole were then ratified by both houses of convention, and they have ever since held their place in the Prayer-book and standards of the Church. Bishop White's remarks, in this connection, deserve to be quoted: "The object kept in view, in all the consultations held, and the determinations formed, was the perpetuating of the Episcopal Church on the ground of the general principles which she had inherited from the Church of England; and of not separating from them, except so far as either local circumstances required, or some very important cause rendered proper. To those acquainted with the system of the Church of England, it must be evident that the object here stated was accomplished on the ratification of the Articles."

3. *History of the Protestant Episcopal Church since the beginning of the century.* — The standards of the Church having thus been adopted and secured, in the final setting-forth of the Book of Common Prayer, its history and progress since that date are those of a completely organized branch of the Catholic Church. That it did not at once expand itself and cover the land is sadly true, and that it has had in later years its times of sore trial and despondency is equally true. There was unhappily in the early part of the century a lack of thorough education in Church principles; there were the prevalence of sectarianism, jealousy felt by the various Protestant denominations, the sleepless enmity of the Roman Church towards the Protestant Episcopal Church, and wide-spread ungodliness on every hand, resulting in spiritual torpor and almost death. For a time it seemed (as Dr. Hawks says of Virginia) as if naught but "gloomy darkness" enveloped the Church. By a strange combination of circumstances, the act of the legislature of Virginia confiscating the glebes and Church property, which was resisted on the ground of being clearly illegal, became law by the death of the presiding judge in the court of appeals the night before he was to deliver the decision, all written out, securing to the Church its just rights. The effect upon the Church in Virginia was fearful and well-nigh disastrous, especially in the ruin and utter abandonment of church edifices and the dying-out of religion in every shape among the people. Even when, in 1814, a brighter day began to dawn, "the journals of the convention by which bishop R. C. Moore was elected show the presence of but seven clergymen and seventeen laymen. We look back upon the past, and are struck with the contrast. Seven clergymen were all that could be convened to transact the most important measure which our conventions are ever called upon to perform, and this in a territory where once more than ten times seven regularly served at the altar. We look back still farther, and find the Church, after the lapse of two hundred years, numbering about as many ministers as she possessed at the close of the first eight years of her existence" (Hawks). In Maryland and its neighbor Delaware, matters were hardly any better. "In 1803 there was a spirit of indifference to religion and the Church too extensively prevalent in the parishes; nearly one half of them were vacant; in some, all ministerial support had ceased. Some few of the clergy had deserted their stations; and of the residue, several, disheartened and embarrassed by inadequate means of living, had sought subsistence in other states. Infidelity and fanaticism were increasing; and, on the whole, there never was a time when ministers were more needed, or when it was more difficult to obtain them" (Hawks). Such was the state of things in general at the South in the early part of the 19th century. Further North, in New York, New Jersey, Connecticut, and much of New England, the prospects were more cheering. The consecration of John Henry Hobart as assistant to bishop B. Moore of New York, May 29, 1811, and of Alexander Viets Griswold for the eastern diocese (i. e. Massachusetts, Rhode Island, New Hampshire, and Vermont) at the same date, were indications of healthy growth. The former became especially prominent, during his episcopate of nearly twenty years, as the representative of what are called "High-Churchmen"* in the Protestant Episcopal Church, and his influence on the character, claims, and position of the Church in the United States, in the estimate of his own people as well as the various Christian bodies among whom he lived, can hardly be overvalued. No one could possibly, or did, misunderstand him, and he was so resolute withal in the open avowal of his principles and convictions, and so ready to defend them on all occasions, even that "unchurching" dogma, as many like to call it, that it may be doubted if any bishop or clergyman of the Protestant Episcopal Church

* Perhaps it may be well to say here that the terms or appellations "High-Churchman," "Low-Churchman," "evangelical," "ritualist or ritualistic," etc., are used simply for convenience, and to save repeated periphrases. The writer of these pages neither affirms nor denies the applicability of the words to or about those specially concerned. No disrespect is meant to any one, on the one hand, by the use of terms, nor, on the other, is any claim of superiority made in behalf of those to whom the word is applied.

has ever done so much as John Henry Hobart in defining the position and claims, and educating, so to speak, the whole Church to the adoption of fixed and settled views on this important subject. Bishop Hobart's personal character and devotion to his work, his unquestioned purity of purpose in all that he did, his lifelong free and cordial correspondence with bishop White (whom no one ever charged with being a High-Churchman), strengthened, undoubtedly, his influence; and even those who differed with him, and represented what are called "Low-Church" views and principles, could not but respect a high-toned, conscientious advocate of principles to which they were, with equal conscientiousness, totally opposed. It is not, probably, too much to affirm that the steadfast adherence of the Protestant Episcopal Church to its standards of doctrine, discipline, and worship, and its fixed and often expressed determination (through the General Convention and its action), never to recede from its attitude towards either Rome or Protestants of various names, are due in great measure to the labors, teaching, and publications of bishop Hobart, and the large number of clergymen and laymen who have been educated in the Church principles with which his name is associated.

The action of the General Convention, from this time onward, has been devoted to legislating for the best interests of the Church, and as far as possible to taking such steps as are calculated, under God's blessing, to promote the increase of faith and holy obedience, to guard against the intrusion of error and unsound doctrine, and to place various matters of doubt or difference of opinion on such a footing that the largest toleration be allowed, in these respects, consistent with preserving the faith once delivered to the saints and the maintenance of apostolic truth and order. In 1804 a "Course of Ecclesiastical Studies" was set forth by the bishops, and it still remains in its original shape, notwithstanding that many and valuable works, in the several departments of theology, have since been published, and are in use in our seminaries and schools of divinity. The General Convention of 1871, in its canon on examinations for orders, says: "In all these examinations reference shall be had, as closely as possible, to the course of study established by the House of Bishops, and to the books therein recommended, or equivalent works of more recent date." In 1808 the bishops, in a message to the House of Deputies, who had asked for the enactment of the English canon concerning marriages, expressed their doubts as to the propriety of entering upon the question; and at a later date (1841) there were two reports of committees presented on this subject, the majority adverse to legislation, the minority in favor of enacting the canon. Thus the matter stands, the civil law being supreme, except in regard to marriage of divorced persons, which is as follows: "No minister of this Church shall knowingly, after due inquiry, solemnize the marriage of any person who has a divorced husband or wife still living, if such husband or wife has been put away for any cause arising after marriage; but this canon shall not be held to apply to the innocent party in a divorce for the cause of adultery, or to parties once divorced seeking to be united again" (see Hoffman, *Law of the Protestant Episcopal Church*, p. 71–84). The words of bishop White ought to be quoted in this connection: "On a retrospect of the transactions of this convention there is entertained the trust that it did not end without a general tendency to consolidate the communion; although, in the course of the business, there had been displayed, more than in any other convention, the influence of some notions leading far wide of that rational devotion which this Church has inherited from the Church of England. The spirit here complained of was rather moderated than raised higher during the session. But it being liable to be combined with schemes of personal consequence, there is no foreseeing to what lengths it may extend in future."—In 1814 the subject of a theological seminary was discussed, and the need of such an institution began to be evident. Three years later its organization was resolved upon, and initiatory measures were adopted. Its officers, course of study, etc., were finally agreed upon in 1820, and it began its work. The seminary was removed from New Haven to New York, and the next year it was finally established as "The General Theological Seminary of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States." By this action, however, it was distinctly understood that there was to be no hindrance to any state or diocese establishing a seminary of its own. Time has shown the wisdom of this policy of non-interference; for, in consequence of the vast extent of territory of the United States, it is found to be simply impossible to gather all the candidates for orders in the Church within the walls of the seminary in New York. We may mention here that there are divinity schools or seminaries in Massachusetts, Connecticut, Pennsylvania, Virginia, Ohio, Wisconsin, and other Western states and dioceses.—At this convention the identity of the Protestant Episcopal Church with the Church of England was declared in the following terms: "It having been credibly stated to the House of Bishops that on questions in reference to property devised, before the Revolution, to congregations belonging to the 'Church of England,' and to uses connected with that name, some doubts have been entertained in regard to the identity of the body to which the two names have been applied, the House think it expedient to make the declaration, and to request the concurrence of the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies therein, that 'The Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America' is the same body heretofore known in these states by the name of 'The Church of England;' the change of name, although not of religious principle in doctrine, or in worship, or in discipline, being induced by a characteristic of the Church of England, supposing the independence of Christian churches, under the different sovereignties to which, respectively, their allegiance in civil concerns belongs. But that, when the severance alluded to took place, and ever since, the Church conceives of herself as professing and acting on the principles of the Church of England is evident from the organizations of our conventions, and from their subsequent proceedings as recorded in the journals. to which, accordingly, this convention refer for satisfaction in the premises. But it would be contrary to fact were any one to infer that the discipline exercised in this Church, or that any proceedings therein, are at all dependent on the will of the civil or of the ecclesiastical authority of any foreign country." The result of this declaration was, some twelve years later in Vermont, where the Society for Propagating the Gospel had formerly owned lands, "that all the material points of law were settled in favor of the Church."—At this session also the constitution of the Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society of the Church was perfected, and the American Church has since done much—though not so much as it might and ought to have done—in preaching the Gospel in the waste places in our own land, and in sending the light of Christian truth and power to heathen lands and peoples. From this date the Church seems to have experienced more fully than before the goodness and mercy of God in sending his grace upon it, and to have given plain indications of healthy increase in the various parts of our country.—Following the uniform plan, adopted under bishop White's gentle but firm guidance and influence, of keeping clear of entanglements, the convention, in 1820, refused to allow the officiating of persons not regularly ordained; and such is the law at the present day: "No minister in charge of any congregation of this Church, or, in case of vacancy or absence, no churchwardens, vestrymen, or trustees of the congregation, shall permit any person to officiate therein without sufficient evidence of his being duly licensed or ordained to minister in this Church." Hence, whatever individual

clergymen may venture to do in such cases in the way of inviting ministers of various sorts into their churches, it is always to be borne in mind that they do it of their own will and pleasure, and in violation of the canon which they have promised to obey. As a further illustration of the Church's policy, it may be noted that, in 1823, an offer was made by the Colonization Society that the Episcopal Church should send a delegate to act with that society in its benevolent plans. It was deemed inexpedient to accept the offer, the bishops holding that the objects of this society were "more of a political than religious nature."—At the convention of 1826 bishop Hobart presented a plan for shortening the morning service, in respect to the Psalter, the Lessons, Litany, etc., and also for improving and rendering more effective the confirmation service in the Prayer-book. Quite unexpectedly, considerable excitement followed this proposal, and three years later, when the sense of the state conventions became known as adverse to any changes in the services, the plan was quietly dismissed from all further consideration. So strong is the conservative element in the councils of the Church, and so great is the unwillingness to make any—even the least—changes in the Prayer-book, that daily morning and evening prayer, with all that belong to them, have continued to be, and are, obligatory in their entire fulness. It is tolerably certain, however, that some, if not many, of the wisest and most devoted among the clergy would gladly welcome a permissory use of a shorter form of daily service for certain occasions, and under certain circumstances, where it would tend to greater edification and obviate some of the vulgar objections against liturgical forms and services. Something looking to this result was accomplished by an expression of the views of the bishops, at the General Convention of 1856; but at the next convention (1859) it was evident, from the course of debate on the "Memorial," as it was called, and the general sense of the House of Deputies, that the Church was not then, nor has it since been, ready to make any ventures in the direction of liturgical relaxation and Church comprehension.

In the "Great West," as it used to be called, it became plain at this date that the Protestant Episcopal Church had a work of no ordinary interest and importance to perform. The rapid filling-up of the states west of the Alleghanies, and the sad fact that, in the race for life and increase of wealth and power, religion, in any and every form, was almost wholly ignored, caused no little anxiety and concern to thoughtful men in the older states; for it was too certain not to be clearly seen that if the West were to be abandoned to chance efforts and the zeal of a few religious men here and there, the result would be that that portion of the country would grow up into might and wealth virtually heathen or infidel, and would be without the restraining bonds of Christian faith and morals, and the civilizing and elevating influences of the Gospel of Christ. In the good providence of God, there was a man, named Philander Chase, whose heart was turned in this direction. After considerable experience in missionary labors in various quarters, Chase set out for Ohio in 1817, determined to give himself to the work of an evangelist in that part of the United States. His labors were blessed, and he seemed to be the very man for the work to be done; hence, in 1819 he was consecrated bishop of Ohio. Every kind of labor and toil came upon him, but he bore up under it all. Yet the deep consciousness that, if the Gospel was to be preached, there must be men to do it—men, too, educated and trained for this special work, in a new country and among new settlers—pressed heavily upon his mind, and caused him to revolve anxiously what he was to do in such a state of affairs. He concluded to visit England, and to beg for means to found a college and seminary in Ohio for the education of young men for the ministry. The voyage was undertaken (though its expediency was doubted by many), and bishop Chase obtained in all some thirty to forty thousand dollars in aid of his much-cherished object. He returned home in July, 1824, and during the next two years was busily engaged in laying the foundation of Kenyon College and the Theological Seminary at Gambier (both names being derived from prominent donors to the cause). In due time the college went into operation, bishop Chase assuming the presidency. Not long after, however, there arose differences of opinion between him and the professors as to the extent of the bishop's powers in this office. The convention of the diocese sustained the professors, which led to an immediate resignation by the sturdy old man, not only as president of the college, but also as bishop of Ohio. This was in September, 1831, and the case of his resignation of the diocese came before the General Convention of 1832. The House of Bishops pointedly censured abandonment of the diocese under such circumstances; but, in order that the Church should not suffer harm, the bishops united with the other House in approving the election of Dr. C. P. McIlvaine, who was consecrated bishop of Ohio, Oct. 31, 1832. Bishop Chase, we may mention here, continued his course westward, and was elected to the episcopate of Illinois in 1835. He visited England again, received further liberal donations in aid of the cause of Christian education, and founded another institution, which he called Jubilee College. For this he obtained, in 1847, a charter to his mind on the point of the bishop's control in its affairs. Since those days, headed by the venerable Jackson Kemper, missionary bishop of the North-west, sent out in 1835, the Protestant Episcopal Church has not been altogether unmindful of its duty and privilege; and all through that vast field beyond the Mississippi, even to the Pacific Ocean, there are heralds of the cross engaged in their sacred vocation. The episcopate, since 1859, has been coextensive with the boundaries of the United States; and the Church, in its complete organization, has been, and is, striving to bring men to the obedience of the faith of Christ.

The venerable William White, in the fiftieth year of his episcopate, was called away to his rest, July 17, 1836. His name will ever be held in grateful memory by the Church in America, as well for the long-continued and earnest labors in its behalf which he was permitted to perform, as for the wisdom and judgment of his course on all occasions during a life extended far beyond the ordinary limit allotted to man. Meekness and gentleness, a large-hearted liberality, a spirit of genuine toleration, a willingness to yield for peace' sake in all matters where principle was not, in his judgment, clearly involved—these and the like qualities fitted him admirably for the station he was called upon, in God's providence, to fill; and we may with reverent thankfulness trace the indications of God's goodness and mercy to his Church in America, that such a man was raised up to take large share in its early struggles and history, and to live to so great an age as to see the "little one become a thousand," and the grain of mustard-seed grow up, and become a tree, and shoot out great branches. Bishop White's biographer and intimate friend, Dr. B. Wilson, classes him among "the Low-Church divines, as they were called in England, of the established Church in that country," and the good bishop has been claimed as representing that portion of the clergy in the Protestant Episcopal Church to whom the same title has been applied. Doubtless, bishop White was not what is termed a "High-Churchman;" for, though he was on terms of great intimacy with bishop Hobart (of whom we have before spoken), and entertained for him warm affection and sincere respect, yet he was never willing to express his assent to all the views of bishop Hobart on the subject of the ministry, and the necessity of the apostolic succession in order to constitute a lawful ministry in the Church. He held episcopacy to be of divine origin, and therefore, of course, the best form and mode of Church government; but, in view of the condition of the Protestant

world, he did not consider it to be absolutely necessary, or that those who depart from or reject it are guilty of causing and perpetuating schism in the body of Christ. On the other hand, he was not at all a "Low-Churchman," in the sense of undervaluing episcopal organization and responsibility, or looking upon it as a matter of little or no moment. This was very evident by his steadfast adherence to the Church's ways and course in all matters where it was needful to take a stand in regard to other Christian bodies. His courtesy and kindness of heart, and his truly charitable estimate of the views held by pious people not connected with the Protestant Episcopal Church, and of the sincerity of their motives and aims, naturally led him to look with favor upon what might be proposed where it is usually thought Christians of all names can work together for the common good; but, practically, in all such matters he maintained his ground as stoutly as any High-Churchman ever did. He held steadily to the opinion that the Protestant Episcopal Church was much better off by keeping to itself in all ecclesiastical affairs, and that it was entirely inexpedient to form unions or alliances of any kind, or to "exchange pulpits," as the phrase is, or, in fine, to run the risk of any sort of possible entanglements with other denominations. This was the result of settled conviction on bishop White's part, and it was well understood to be so on all hands. It did not, however, prevent his having and preserving personal intercourse with Christians of every name; it did not lead him to indulge in denunciations of or interference with others, however far they may, in his judgment, have wandered from the true path; and it did not produce any ill feeling towards him by those who might have complained, in his case as well as that of others, of what is often termed "exclusiveness," or "bigotry," on the part of the Protestant Episcopal Church. If ever there have been any who have gone down to their graves without a single enemy, or without even a whisper against their characters for purity and integrity of life, bishop White certainly deserves to be ranked among these. Since the venerable patriarch passed away, the Protestant Episcopal Church has continued to go forward, increasing in numbers year by year, and growing, it is trusted, in grace and deeper and truer devotion to the Lord and Master of us all. It has had its seasons of controversy and earnest struggles (as what Church has not?) between men of differing views, conscientiously and sincerely held on both sides; and it has seemed at times as if controversy were eating into the very heart of the Church, and arousing passions and tempers far from accordance with the spirit of the Gospel. Some notice of these must here be given, not only as a part of the history of the Protestant Episcopal Church, but also as illustrating its present position and its probable future in the great work of evangelizing this nation.

The Oxford Tract movement (begun at the University in 1833, culminating in Tract No. XC in 1841, and extending over some ten years in addition) was one which was warmly, even hotly, debated, and produced for the time a controversy of no small magnitude and bitterness. The excitement in England, and the results flowing from the movement there, were transferred to America. Party spirit lifted its head on high. Energetic supporters of the tracts and their teaching entered the arena, and equally energetic opponents ranged themselves against the tracts and all who favored them. On the one side it was urged that the tracts taught nothing more than the well-established High-Church doctrines of the old English divines, and it was claimed that this teaching was legitimately within the limits allowed by the standards of the Church of England. It was also said that there was great need of rousing the minds of Church people to the importance of doctrines which had fallen greatly, if not quite, out of sight, such as the apostolic succession, the value and obligation of the holy sacraments, the real presence in the Lord's Supper, the importance of priestly absolution, the necessity of securing a return to the unity of the primitive Church, etc. On the other side, the whole movement and the entire teaching of the tracts were fiercely denounced as tending directly to Romanizing and unprotestantizing the Church. When in England numerous perversions to Rome took place at this time, and especially when John Henry Newman, the coryphæus of the whole undertaking, gave in his adhesion to the Roman Church (1845), it was triumphantly affirmed that a similar result would happen in the Protestant Episcopal Church, and thus prove to the world how pernicious was the teaching of these tracts, No. XC last and worst of all. Quite a number of persons did abandon the communion of the Church, and submit themselves to Rome; but there was not anything like the exodus which had been predicted, since between 1842 and 1852, including one bishop only (Ives, of North Carolina, in 1852), there were less than thirty who left the Church's ministry for the sake of Roman Catholic inducements, and these, with two or three exceptions, were men of little or no influence in the Church or community. See OXFORD TRACTS. In connection with the Oxford Tract movement, and more or less infected with the unhappy spirit of discord existing at the time, there occurred what is ordinarily known as "the Carey Ordination." Arthur Carey was a student in the General Theological Seminary, a young man of excellent character and good ability. He graduated in 1843. It was thought and generally understood that he was strongly inclined to the ultra teaching of the tracts in the direction of Romanism; and Drs. Hugh Smith and Henry Anthon, both of New York, who took some pains to ascertain Carey's views and sentiments, deemed him to be unfit for ordination in the Protestant Episcopal Church. The bishop of New York, however (B. T. Onderdonk), after an examination of the young man, held by six presbyters in conjunction with Drs. Smith and Anthon, decided that he was worthy to obtain orders. Drs. Smith and Anthon publicly protested in the church at the time of the ordination, but bishop Onderdonk went forward and ordained Mr. Carey, July 2, 1843. (He died in March, 1844.) As was to be expected, this action of the bishop of New York gave offence in various parts of the Church. It was much discussed in religious journals and in pamphlets, and bishops Chase, McIlvaine, and Hopkins commented upon it in public, and with much severity of language. In January, 1844, bishop Onderdonk addressed a pastoral letter to his diocese, in which he protested against the course adopted by the above bishops, and called for a trial, if they saw fit to initiate it. A trial, accordingly, was begun at the close of the year; but it was based, as we shall see, on charges entirely diverse from theological unsoundness. Meanwhile, the General Convention of 1844 met in Philadelphia in October. Twenty-four bishops were present, and ninety-three clerical and eighty-four lay deputies. In addition to its other labors, the whole matter of the Oxford Tract movement, and its effects upon the American Church, came up for consideration. Several days were spent in the discussion of the general subject of errors in doctrine and practice in the Church, and an earnest effort was made to obtain from the convention a distinct and positive condemnation of the error and false teaching which, it was charged, were rife in the Church. We need not go into details. In the lower house resolutions were offered asking the bishops to "promulgate a clear and distinct expression of the opinions entertained by this convention respecting the rule of faith, the justification of man, the nature, design, and efficacy of the sacraments," etc. It was also stated, in an amendment, that "the minds of many of the members of this Church throughout its union are sorely grieved and perplexed by the alleged introduction among them of serious errors in doctrine and practice, having their origin in certain writings emanating chiefly from members of the University of Oxford in England;" and, further, that

"it is exceedingly desirable that the minds of such persons should be calmed, their anxieties allayed, and the Church disabused of the charge of holding, in her Articles and Offices, doctrines and practices consistent with all the views and opinions expressed in said Oxford writings, and should thus be freed from a responsibility which does not properly belong to her." But the house did not agree to any of the resolutions offered in this shape. It was, however, finally "*Resolved*, That the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies consider the Liturgy, Offices, and Articles of the Church sufficient exponents of her sense of the essential doctrines of Holy Scripture; and that the canons of the Church afford ample means of discipline and correction for all who depart from her standards; and, further, that the General Convention is not a suitable tribunal for the trial and censure of, and that the Church is not responsible for, the errors of individuals, whether they are members of this Church or otherwise." Thus the house disposed of the question; and the bishops, on their part, in compliance with certain memorials sent to them, gave expression to their godly counsel and warning in the pastoral letter which was soon after issued. In December, 1844, bishops Meade, Otey, and Elliott made a formal presentment against bishop Onderdonk, of New York, "as being guilty of immorality and impurity." The trial was held in the city of New York. There were seventeen bishops present, constituting the court, viz. P. Chase, Brownell, Ives, Hopkins, Smith, McIlvaine, Doane, Kemper, Polk, Delancey, Gadsden, Whittingham, Lee, Johns, Eastburn, Henshaw, Freeman; also the three presenters, and bishop Onderdonk as respondent. The trial began December 10, and was continued from day to day till January 3, 1845, when bishop Onderdonk was pronounced guilty by eleven votes, and sentenced to suspension from the office of a bishop and from all the functions of the sacred ministry. Bishop Onderdonk protested in the strongest terms his innocence, and published a *Statement of Facts and Circumstances* in regard to his trial. It may be mentioned that the condemned bishop never acknowledged himself to be in any wise guilty (died 1861). The "Prayer of the Diocese of New York to the House of Bishops for relief from sufferings consequent upon the sentence of the Episcopal Court, January, 1845," was made September 25, 1850; but this and all other efforts put forth to have him restored failed; and a new canon having been adopted applicable to the case of a diocese with a suspended bishop, Dr. J. M. Wainwright was consecrated provisional bishop of New York, in November, 1852. During these years, since the General Convention of 1844, the tractarian controversy gradually subsided. Both sides became weary of the struggle. Nearly everything had been said which could be said. A number of eminent men in the Church had put their views into written shape (as Jarvis, Seabury, Hawks, McIlvaine, Hopkins, Stone, and others); and after a while, the storm was lulled, the atmosphere became purified, and the Church was gladdened with a return of sunshine and comparative peace and quiet.

The disturbed condition of the country, in consequence of the secession from the Union of several of the Southern States, caused no little anxiety to the hearts of many of the Church's members, lest the Protestant Episcopal Church too should suffer harm in the great and terrible struggle which had been begun in 1860–61, and was to be fought out to the bitter end. It was but natural that the bishops in the southern dioceses should begin to meet and act separately, as if the dismemberment of the United States were a completed fact. They did so by organizing a council, framing a constitution and canons, etc.; and for a time there was grave apprehension lest the Church should be deprived of its union and communion as heretofore. The General Convention of 1862 met in New York, with much reduced numbers, of course; and this subject came before the convention, and was fully debated. Resolutions pledging support to the government were adopted; and a day of fasting, humiliation, and prayer was observed, October 8, 1862, in view "of the present afflictive condition of the country." At the next convention, however, held in Philadelphia, October, 1865, the Church was entirely reunited; harmony and concert of action were restored; and those who for some years had been acting apart gladly joined again in combined efforts for the good of the whole Church in the United States. There was held a service of thanksgiving to Almighty God for the restoration of peace to the country and unity to the Church. At this convention resolutions were adopted, urging that Christian parents, in the discharge of their bounden duty, should not only train their children in the ways of truth and godliness; should not only furnish them with sound, healthful reading and education in the Church's schools and colleges; but should also strive, by prayer and spiritual culture, to form in their sons a desire to serve God in the sacred ministry. In the House of Deputies it was also "*Resolved*, That, in the judgment of this house, there has never been a time in the history of our Church when the demand for missionary effort, at home and abroad, was so urgent and imperative as at the present moment; and that we earnestly call upon our constituents, in every diocese of this Church, to arouse themselves to realize the exigencies of the hour, and to labor and give and pray with a freer heart and more fervent zeal." Further resolutions advocated a system of itinerancy, and the due use of lay aid in carrying forward the work of the Church.

The most recent controversy through which the Protestant Episcopal Church has been called upon to pass, or, perhaps, more exactly speaking, is still passing, is that which is familiarly known as "ritualism." The question took a definite shape as early as the General Convention of 1868. Two reports, a majority and minority, were made in the House of Deputies, on the conduct of public worship. The former pleaded for "liberty in things indifferent or unessential, so long as unity can be maintained, and spiritual edification promoted, in any other way;" it also deprecated "the enactment of any canon on the subject of ritual as unwise and inexpedient at the present time." The minority report urged strongly "the maintenance of our wonted uniformity and simplicity in public worship," and denounced "all innovations on the common order of the Church which wound the consciences of many of its true and loving members," such as, "the burning of lights in the order for the Holy Communion, the burning of incense, reverences to the holy table or the elements thereon, the elevation of the elements," etc. After much debate, the action of the convention resulted in referring all matters of doubt in these respects to the godly counsel and judgment of the bishops in their respective dioceses, and the appointment of a committee of five bishops (viz. bishops A. Lee, Williams, Clark, Odenheimer, Kerfoot), to consider whether any additional provision for uniformity in matters of ritual, by canon or otherwise, is practicable and expedient, and to report to the next General Convention. In October, 1871, the convention again came together, on this occasion in Baltimore, Md. The attendance was very full; distinguished visitors from England and from some of the colonial churches were present; and a spirit of forbearance and good-will seemed to prevail, notwithstanding so exciting a subject as "ritualism" was before the convention. A very elaborate report was presented by the committee of five, in which, after much sound reasoning on the importance and value of uniformity in the public services of the Church, and the statement of the fact that "diversities of use" had grown and spread, the committee urged that some legislation was certainly necessary. They specified the various additions in the way of ornaments in the Church and novel practices, such as having a crucifix or carrying a cross in procession, bowings, prostrations, mixing wine and water for the Holy Communion, solitary communions, surpliced

choirs, additional vestments freely used in some churches, and such like; and they recommended the appointment of a joint committee of three bishops, three presbyters, and three laymen to consider and report upon these matters to the convention then in session. Such a committee, consisting of able and well-tried men, was appointed, and, through bishop Whittingham and Dr. W. C. Mead on behalf of the committee, reported a "canon of ritual." In this proposed law it was affirmed that "this Church recognises no other law of ritual than such as it shall itself have accepted or provided;" and the provisions for ritual in this Church were stated to be (1) the Book of Common Prayer, with the offices and ordinal thereto appended; (2) the laws of the Church of England in use in the American provinces before 1789, and not subsequently superseded, altered, or repealed by legislation, general or diocesan, of this Church; (3) the legislative or judicial action or decisions of this Church in its conventions, general or diocesan, or by its duly constituted authorities. Animated discussions followed in the House of Deputies. Amendments and substitutes were proposed again and again, and though the House of Bishops passed the canon reported by the joint committee, the lower house did not succeed in coming to any agreement as to this canon. It was attempted to postpone indefinitely the whole matter, but without success. The favorers of ritualism endeavored to get the convention committed to some action in accordance with their views; the opponents of ritualism were equally urgent in seeking to obtain legislation directly condemnatory of numerous acts and observances peculiar to the ritualistic party. A very prominent advocate of the system (Dr. De Koven, of Wisconsin) made a speech against the canon as adopted by the House of Bishops. He used strange and even offensive language in support of his sentiments and opinions, and challenged any one who pleased so to do to present him for trial, he having boldly adopted and uttered as his own the words of one of the most ultra-ritualists in England: "I believe in the real, actual presence of our Lord, under the form of bread and wine, upon the altars of our churches. I myself adore, and would, if it were necessary or my duty, teach my people to adore, Christ present in the elements under the form of bread and wine." The discussions, though exciting and continued from day to day, were conducted with good temper and general fairness. As, on the whole, where neither side in a controversy is willing to yield, it is usually found to be the easiest way to get out of present difficulty to pass some comprehensive resolutions, which may mean more or less according to the mode of looking at them by different parties, such was the course now adopted. It was finally "*Resolved*, the House of Bishops concurring, That this convention hereby expresses its decided condemnation of all ceremonies, observances, and practices which are fitted to express a doctrine foreign to that set forth in the authorized standards of this Church. *Resolved*, That, in the judgment of this house, the paternal counsel and advice of the right reverend fathers, the bishops of the Church, are deemed sufficient, at this time, to secure the suppression of all that is irregular and unseemly, and to promote greater uniformity in conducting the public worship of the Church and in the administration of the holy sacraments." Thus, as we have intimated above, the real question at issue was postponed rather than adjudicated. Ritualism went on its course with additional vigor and confidence, and its opponents became more and more dissatisfied with the existing state of things. Consequently the struggle, as was to be expected, was renewed again when the General Convention met in New York in October, 1874. Memorials were presented from various quarters on this subject, resolutions were introduced bearing directly upon it, and legislation was earnestly called for in order to restrain what was termed excess of ritual in the public service of the Church. In the House of Deputies the question of confirmation of the bishop elect (Dr. G. F. Seymour) of Illinois came up. He was charged with being an active member of the advanced ritualistic party; his case was discussed for a whole week in secret session, and, though Dr. Seymour energetically denied the imputations cast upon him, after a long struggle confirmation was refused by a close vote—viz. nineteen to twenty-two clerical, thirteen to twenty-seven lay. (Four years later Dr. S. was elected to the episcopate, and is now [1878] bishop of the diocese of Springfield, Ill.) This result in the Seymour case was looked upon as virtually a victory of the anti-ritualists, and after much debate in both houses agreement was had to the following effect. A canon was passed, almost unanimously (tit. i. can. 22), requiring every bishop to summon the standing committee as a council of advice, in case complaint is made to him in writing, by two or more presbyters, that ceremonies or practices not authorized by the Book of Common Prayer, and symbolizing erroneous or doubtful doctrines, have been introduced into any Church, specifying, in regard to the Holy Communion, "the elevation of the elements in such manner as to expose them to the view of the people as objects towards which adoration is to be made; any act of adoration of or towards the elements in the Holy Communion, such as bowings, prostrations, or genuflections; and all other like acts not authorized by the rubrics of the Book of Common Prayer;" further, if after investigation it is found that such practices have been introduced, the bishop shall admonish, in writing, the offending minister to discontinue such practices or ceremonies; and if he disregard such admonition, it shall be the duty of the standing committee to cause him to be tried for a breach of his ordination vow. Every minister charged with violation of this canon is to have opportunity to be heard in his own defence; the charges and findings are to be in writing, and a record is to be kept by the bishop and the standing committee of the proceedings in the case. Such was the latest direct action of the highest legislative authority of the Church on this subject. The opponents of ritualism have apparently settled down in the conviction that the present canon is sufficient to enable the bishops effectually to repress, when necessary, all unseemly practices in this direction. The favorers of ritualism, on the other hand (at least, the more outspoken of them), have treated with scant courtesy the action of the convention of 1874, and affirm that "the canon is flagrantly unconstitutional, and that no bishop has ever dared to put it in use, and none ever will." At the General Convention of 1877 the matter was hardly at all alluded to. This the anti-ritualists interpret as in their favor, in the confidence that the Church has become weary of the dispute, and is disposed for the future to adhere to the old-fashioned, simpler, less ornate ways of conducting public services. The ritualists hold the opposite view, and it was rather exultingly proclaimed in a letter to the *New York Tribune*, by Dr. John Henry Hopkins (just after the convention of 1877 had adjourned), that the result of the war against the system, of which he is one of the ablest advocates, "is victory all along the line for the ritualistic advance, and that this victory is so complete that the renewal of hostilities hereafter is hopeless." As a party, it is certain that the ritualists have shown themselves to be bold, confident, energetic, and full of zeal in behalf of the cause which they have undertaken to maintain. In the American Church they are probably not so numerous in proportion as in the Church of England; but, as an offset to this, it is to be noted that they have enlisted in their ranks numbers of the younger clergy, and, in view of what they have already accomplished, they not unnaturally look forward to ultimate and complete success. The bishops, to whom are committed the oversight and regulation of this whole matter under the canon, are in a rather difficult and delicate position. As, on the one hand, they are compelled to tolerate much that is regarded as defective and in violation of the plain meaning of the rubrics and canons, so,

on the other, they may reasonably be expected to shrink from pressing too severely upon those who carry ritualistic practices to more or less of excess. The opinion may here be expressed—simply as an opinion, without reference to the merits of the questions at issue—that ritualism has had its day, and that, while it may be admitted that considerable, perhaps even great, good has resulted and may yet further result from this movement, it will not be likely again to assume any special prominence in the history of the Protestant Episcopal Church.

The bringing of this topic before the reader in continuous order, from its rise to the present time, has necessarily led to the omission of a number of interesting historical facts and incidents in the progress of the Church of late years: these are herewith succinctly presented in their proper sequence and connection. On a previous page has been noted the action of the General Convention on the subject of liturgical relaxation and Church comprehension. This was in 1856 and 1859. At the convention of 1868 various "memorials" were presented pleading for larger latitude in the use of the Prayer-book. This was reported against by the House of Bishops, and the following resolution was unanimously adopted: "*Resolved*, That, in the opinion of this house, such latitude in the use of the Book of Common Prayer as the memorialists ask could not be allowed with safety, or with proper regard to the rights of our congregations." In 1874 the question of shortened services came up, but no definite action was had. The convention expressed its sense by resolution simply, "That nothing in the present order of Common Prayer prohibits the separation, when desirable, of the Morning Prayer, the Litany, and the Order for the Administration of the Lord's Supper into distinct services, which may be used independently of each other, and either of them without the others: *provided* that when used together they be used in the same order as that in which they have commonly been used and in which they stand in the Book of Common Prayer." At the next convention (October, 1877), the committee on canons in the House of Deputies reported in favor of an "order concerning divine service," more especially for shorter services on other days than Sundays and the greater festivals and fasts. To this the bishops declined to agree, and by general consent a joint committee was appointed to sit during the recess on the matter of providing shortened services, by rubric or otherwise, this committee to report in 1880.—In a country such as ours, where the laws regulating marriage and divorce differ considerably in different states, this subject must necessarily cause much perplexity and annoyance to the clergy, unless they have some law of the Church to guide and control their action. This was long felt throughout the Protestant Episcopal Church, and in hope of some remedy or aid the matter was brought before the General Convention of 1868. A canon was enacted forbidding a clergyman to solemnize matrimony where there is a divorced wife or husband of either party still living, with a proviso in favor of the innocent party in a divorce for the cause of adultery. In 1877 the canon was put in its present shape, as follows: "No minister, knowingly after due inquiry, shall solemnize the marriage of any person who has a divorced husband or wife still living, if such husband or wife has been put away for any cause arising after marriage; but this canon shall not be held to apply to the innocent party in a divorce for the cause of adultery, or to parties once divorced seeking to be united again. If any minister of this Church shall have reasonable cause to doubt whether a person desirous of being admitted to holy baptism, or to confirmation, or to the holy communion, has been married otherwise than as the Word of God and discipline of this Church allow, such minister, before receiving such person to these ordinances, shall refer the case to the bishop for his godly judgment thereupon: *provided, however*, that no minister shall, in any case, refuse the sacraments to a penitent person in imminent danger of death." Questions touching the facts of any case named in the former part of the canon are to be referred to the bishop, and he is required to make inquiry such as he deems expedient, and to deliver his judgment in the premises. At the same convention (1877), an effort was made to have the Table of Prohibited Degrees, contained in the English Prayer-book, inserted in the American Book of Common Prayer, but it did not meet the approval of the convention.—Some extravagant and unwarranted assertions having been made at various times as to the meaning of "regeneration," and its effects, etc., in the offices for infant baptism, there was issued, at the General Convention of 1871, the following "declaration of the bishops in council:" "We, the subscribers, bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, being asked, in order to the quieting of the consciences of sundry members of the said Church, to declare our conviction as to the meaning of the word *regenerate* in the offices for the ministration of baptism of infants, do declare that, in our opinion, the word *regenerate* is not there so used as to determine that a moral change in the subject of baptism is wrought in the sacrament" (signed by all the bishops present, forty-eight in number).

The movement begun in Germany in 1870–71 by Dr. Döllinger and others has been watched by the Protestant Episcopal Church with deep interest and earnest hope that it may tend ultimately to solid reform in the Continental churches now in communion with Rome. In the convention of 1871, the bishops recorded their hearty sympathy with the heroic struggle then being made for religious liberty on the part of the Old-Catholic Congress recently assembled in Munich; and in 1874 it was "*Resolved*, That this house, with renewed confidence, reiterates the expression of its sympathy with the bishop and synod of the Old-Catholic communion in Germany, and the promise of its prayers for the divine blessing and direction on their work; also, that three bishops be appointed a commission of this house to keep up fraternal correspondence with the bishop and synod, for exchange of information and consideration of overtures for reconciliation and intercommunion between sundered churches."

The course pursued by the highest legislative authority on the subject of churches or congregations established in foreign lands in communion with the Protestant Episcopal Church illustrates the views and principles on which this Church deems it right to act. Twenty years ago, the Rev. W. O. Lamson began services in Paris, specially for the benefit of Church people sojourning in or visiting that city. The General Convention of 1859 recognised the propriety and lawfulness of having Protestant Episcopal churches abroad. Congregations accordingly have been organized during the interim since 1859 in Rome, Florence, Dresden, Geneva, and Nice, making six in all at this date (1878). At the General Convention of 1877 the matter was carefully regulated by canon, which says, "It shall be lawful, under the conditions hereinafter stated, to organize a church or congregation in any foreign country (other than Great Britain and Ireland, and the colonies and dependencies thereof), and not within the limits of any foreign missionary bishop of this Church." In order to secure proper and legitimate action, and also suitable control over these foreign churches or congregations, the canon goes on to state fully the mode in which they may be organized and conducted—viz. they must recognise their allegiance to the constitution of the American Church; must produce proper certificates; must be in canonical submission to a bishop, who is in charge of all such churches and is aided by a standing committee duly appointed; and they must conform to the provisions laid down for discipline, in case it become necessary. The bishop in charge at this date (1878) is the Rt. Rev. Dr. Littlejohn, of Long Island.

An association taking its rise in Europe, and calling itself the "Evangelical Alliance," held its sixth General

Conference in New York, Oct. 2–12, 1873. "It was composed of delegates from various Protestant denominations, foreign as well as American, who claim to be considered "evangelical" in the proper and precise sense of that word. Among its delegates from abroad was the Very Rev. R. Payne Smith, D.D., dean of Canterbury, who brought with him a letter of sympathy from his grace, Dr. Tait, archbishop of Canterbury. The dean took part in the work of the Alliance, as did also a very few of the American Episcopal clergy; having fraternized with the Presbyterians at a public communion service, he was called to account by Dr. Tozer (recently an English missionary bishop in Africa, and just then on a visit to New York), and was censured through the papers of the day. The assistant bishop of Kentucky, Dr. Cummins, likewise joined in this irregular service, and thereby foreshadowed what soon after took place —viz. the commencement of the schism to which his name has been attached. He had become greatly dissatisfied with the state of affairs in the Protestant Episcopal Church; he was impressed with the fact, as he esteemed it, that this Church is too exclusive and in continual danger of going over to Rome, and so he made up his mind to abandon it to its fate and set up a new organization of his own, a sort of half-and-half Episcopal and Presbyterian arrangement. Under date of Nov. 10, 1873, he addressed a letter to bishop Smith, his diocesan, in which he enumerated various reasons or causes for the course he had resolved upon. He declared that his conscience was burdened with being compelled to officiate as bishop in ritualistic churches in Kentucky; that he had lost all hope of seeing eradicated from the Church's standards and services sacerdotalism and ritualism; that he was much hurt at being blamed for sharing in the service above alluded to in a Presbyterian place of worship, and that, consequently, he had determined to transfer his "work and office" to another sphere. Dr. Cummins was entirely right in abandoning the Church if he could not stay in it with a clear conscience, and labor in it in accordance with his solemn vows at ordination, one of which was especially, "with all faithful diligence to banish and drive away from the Church all erroneous and strange doctrine contrary to God's Word." Inasmuch, however, as he had abandoned his post, and was soon after degraded from the ministry, he had no "office" to carry with him, though he assumed that he had, and undertook to act as a bishop when he was no longer a bishop. Bishop Smith of Kentucky (who was also senior bishop), on receiving Dr. Cummins's letter, immediately instituted proceedings in accordance with the canon; Dr. Cummins was at once suspended from all exercise of the ministry; and the six months of grace allowed for retraction having passed away, the formal deposition took place June 24, 1874 (ratified afterwards in full House of Bishops at General Convention in October, 1874). See Reformed Episcopal Church.

The "Cheney case," as it has been called, may properly be dealt with in this connection, especially as Mr. Cheney has become quite prominent in the schismatical body which Dr. Cummins originated. The case, in substance, is as follows: The Rev. C. E. Cheney, of Christ's Church, Chicago, Ill., having mutilated the service for public baptism by omitting the words *regenerate* and *regeneration* wherever they occur, was brought to trial and suspended by bishop Whitehouse, February 18, 1871, the suspension to last until he should repent and amend. Mr. Cheney refused obedience; and the vestry of Christ's Church having invited him to continue with them, despite the sentence, he acceded to their wish. The result was that he was tried by an ecclesiastical court for contumacy, and, on the 2d of June, was finally degraded. But the vestry continuing to hold on to the property of Christ's Church, contrary to law and justice, Mr. Cheney remained where he was, until he joined the followers of Dr. Cummins and his movement. The question of the right to the property being a very serious one, as involving the whole subject of the right of religious bodies to hold property and prevent its alienation, the case of Christ's Church, Chicago, was carried into the courts, where, in accordance with precedent in like cases, it was decided in favor of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the diocese of Illinois. Not satisfied with this, the parties interested in getting possession of the church had the case taken by appeal to the Supreme Court of the state, where, early in 1878, singularly enough, the decision of the lower court was reversed, and judgment was given in favor of the vestry and congregation as against the diocese. So far as this particular piece of property is concerned, the matter is of no great importance; but the principle involved is of the gravest consequence. It has been decided, over and over again, that all ecclesiastical organizations shall possess the power to be governed by their own laws, so long as those laws do not interfere with the established law of the land; and, consequently, that all property belongs, of right, to those who adhere to and sustain the laws and principles of their respective organizations. If church property, by the action of vestries and congregations, can be legally diverted from its rightful ownership, in the way in which this in Chicago has been taken away from the Church, then there is no tenure of property anywhere which is safe. The subject has aroused attention among other Christian bodies, who are quite as much interested as the Protestant Episcopal Church can be in the fundamental question at issue. It is to be hoped that the Supreme Court of the United States will be called upon to interpose, and settle fully and clearly a point of so great moment to all Christians or religious associations of every name.

In regard to the "provincial system," so called, we may briefly state that, as early as 1850, a motion was made in the House of Bishops by bishop Delancey to appoint a committee of five bishops, five clergymen, and five laymen, "to report to the next triennial General Convention on the expediency of arranging the dioceses, according to geographical position, into four provinces, to be designated the Eastern, Northern, Southern, and Western Provinces, and to be united under a General Convention or Council of the Provinces, having exclusive control over the Prayer-book, Articles, Offices, and Homilies of this Church, to be held once every twenty years." In 1853 no action was had, but the committee was continued, and the matter handed over to the next convention. It came up in 1856, but was indefinitely postponed by the bishops. The subject was brought up again in 1874, was warmly discussed, and again indefinitely postponed. In 1877 a preamble and resolution were offered in the House of Deputies expressing a desire to obtain "an authoritative recognition of the provincial system," and referring to the committee on canons "to inquire into the expediency of repealing the prohibition against suffragan bishops, and making such canonical provisions as will enable dioceses (just before described) to give the name and style of provincial or comprovincial bishops to all such bishops who may be elected and consecrated to assigned districts within their respective jurisdictions." The resolution was adopted; but in the House of Bishops the entire subject was again committed to a special committee, to report at the convention of 1880. There the matter stands for the present. It remains to be seen whether the Church will deem it best to adopt this system, or to continue under the arrangement now in existence. A canon was adopted in 1868 authorizing federate councils, as follows: "It is hereby declared lawful for the dioceses now existing, or hereafter to exist, within the limits of any state or commonwealth, to establish for themselves a federate convention, or council, representing such dioceses, which may deliberate and decide upon the common interests of the Church within the limits aforesaid; but before any determinate action of such convention, or council, shall be had, the powers proposed to be exercised thereby shall be submitted to

the General Convention for its approval. Nothing in this canon shall be construed as forbidding any federate council from taking such action as they may deem necessary to secure such legislative enactments as the common interests of the Church in the state may require." No definite action under this canon has as yet been carried into effect in any state. The subject has been discussed quite largely, and the various propositions connected with it now rest with the same committee who have the provincial system in hand and are to report in 1880.

An earnest and interesting communication to the presiding bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church was made, in 1871, by bishop Wilberforce, of Winchester, in relation to the work then commenced in England for the revision of the authorized version of the Holy Scriptures. At the General Convention held the same year, it was, in the House of Bishops, "*Resolved*, That the Rt. Rev. the Presiding Bishop be, and hereby is, requested to return to the Rt. Rev. the Lord Bishop of Winchester a courteous and brotherly acknowledgment of his communication relating to a revision of the English of the Holy Scriptures, stating that this house, having had no part in originating or organizing the said work of revision, is not at present in a condition to deliver any judgment respecting it, and at the same time expressing the disposition of this house to consider with candor the work undertaken by the Convocation of Canterbury, whenever it shall have been completed and its results laid before them." The attitude thus taken by the bishops in behalf of the Church is one of cautious reserve, but perhaps not too much so, considering the importance of the subject.

The Protestant Episcopal Church having made considerable progress in Hayti (numbering eleven clergy in 1874), and needing episcopal supervision and aid, was supplied with a bishop, under the arrangement of a "Covenant" entered into with the Church in that republic, and the Rev. Dr. J. T. Holly was consecrated as first bishop, in November, 1874. The terms of the covenant made it the duty of the Church in the United States to extend its nursing care to the Church in Hayti during its early growth and development; and four bishops, with the bishop of Hayti, were constituted a commission to take episcopal charge of the Church in Hayti, and secure its maintenance of the doctrine, worship, and discipline of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, until such time as there should be three bishops resident in Hayti, and exercising jurisdiction in the Church there. When that time arrives, this Church will cease from all further charge or care of the Haytian Church.

The General Convention of 1877 met in Boston, Mass., on Oct. 3 for the first time that it met in that city since its organization after the civil war. It was very largely attended, and was marked by a spirit of good-will and earnest effort to promote in every way the interests of Christ's kingdom here on earth. There were no specially exciting topics on hand (as ritualism, etc.); and the action of the convention, so far as our present purpose is concerned, can be summed up in brief space. Probably the most important step taken was the reorganization of the Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society. Heretofore there had been a Board of Missions (a very large and rather cumbrous body), appointed triennially, and acting in the respective departments at home and abroad. After much discussion, the following canon was adopted: "Constitution of the Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America, as established in 1820, and since amended at various times.

"ART. I. This society shall be denominated," etc.

"ART. II. This society shall be considered as comprehending all persons who are members of this Church.

"ART. III. There shall be a Board of Missions of such society, composed of the bishops of this Church, and the members for the time being of the House of Deputies of this Church, bishops and deputies sitting apart as in General Convention, or together when they shall so decide. The Board of Missions thus constituted shall convene on the third day of the session of the General Convention, and shall sit from time to time as the business of the board shall demand.

"ART. IV. There shall be a Board of Managers, comprising all the bishops as members *ex officio*, and fifteen presbyters and fifteen laymen, to be appointed by the Board of Missions at every triennial meeting of the General Convention, who shall have the management of the general missions of this Church, and shall remain in office until their successors are chosen, and shall have power to fill any vacancies that may occur in their number. Eight clerical and eight lay members shall constitute a quorum. This board shall, during the recess of the convention, exercise all the corporate powers of the Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society. The Board of Managers shall report to the General Convention, constituted as a Board of Missions, on or before the third day of the session of the General Convention.

"ART. V. The Board of Managers is authorized to form, from its own members, a committee for domestic missions and a committee for foreign missions, and such other committees as it may deem desirable to promote special missionary work, and is also authorized to appoint such officers as shall be needful for carrying on the work.

"ART. VI. The Board of Managers is intrusted with power to establish and regulate such missions as are not placed under episcopal supervision, and to enact all by-laws which it may deem necessary for its own government and for the government of its committees: *provided always* that, in relation to organized dioceses and missionary jurisdictions having bishops, the appropriations shall be made in gross to such dioceses and missionary jurisdictions, to be disbursed by the local authorities thereof. The board shall notify to the several bishops the gross sum so appropriated, and those bishops shall regulate the number of mission stations, appoint the missionaries, and assign to them their stipends, with the approval of the Board of Managers.

"ART. VII. No person shall be appointed a missionary who is not at the time a minister of the Protestant Episcopal Church of regular standing; but nothing in this section precludes the committees from making pecuniary appropriations in aid of missions under the care of other churches in communion with this Church, or of employing laymen or women, members of this Church, to do missionary work.

"ART. VIII. The Board of Managers is authorized to promote the formation of auxiliary missionary associations, whose contributions, as well as those specially appropriated by individuals, shall be received and paid in accordance with the wish of the donors, when expressed in writing. It shall be the duty of the Board of Managers to arrange for public missionary meetings, to be held at the same time and place as the General Convention, and at such other times and places as may be determined upon, to which all auxiliaries approved by the Board of Managers may send one clerical and one lay delegate.

"ART. IX. This constitution may be altered or amended at any time by the General Convention of this Church. All canons, and all action by or under the authority of the General Convention, so far as inconsistent with the provisions of this canon and such amended constitution, are hereby repealed: *provided always* that nothing herein shall in any manner impair or affect any corporate rights of the said society, or any vested right whatever. This canon shall take effect immediately."

The principal and immediate effect of this reorganization was, on the part of the Board of Managers, a resolution to reduce central expenses connected with the mission work. Thus the department of home missions to colored people was assigned to the care of the committee on domestic missions; a very considerable reduction of expenses was made in carrying on the work among the Indians; several officers were dispensed with, and a general reduction of salaries took place, the result being a saving of some $12,000 per annum. It deserves also to be stated here that the American Church Missionary Society, the especial agency of those of the clergy and laity who declined in former years to act in conjunction with the Board of Missions, now acceded to the wish long before expressed by the board. The society continued its organization as a society; the work in Mexico, which had been very largely sustained by it, was handed over to the foreign committee; and it was resolved that, in general, its members should hereafter act in concert with the Board of Managers of the newly organized Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society of the Protestant Episcopal Church. This was deemed a happy resolve on their part, and excellent results are expected to follow in consequence.

For some years past there has been a growing desire to add greater effectiveness to the labors of godly and devoted women in the Church. The matter was brought up at the General Convention of 1874, but no action was obtained. In 1877 it came again before the convention, and a canon of "Deaconesses or Sisters" was proposed. After much discussion, however, the convention, apparently not feeling quite sure of its ground, refused to pass the proposed canon, and the following resolution was adopted: "That it be referred to a joint committee of three bishops, three clerical and three lay deputies, to inquire and report to the next General Convention what legislation may be necessary and expedient for the authorization and regulation of women working in this Church under the name of deaconess or sister." Thus the matter lies over till 1880.

As the Church of England recently adopted a new Lectionary, it was deemed advisable by the convention of 1877 to place this revised Table of Lessons for Sundays and holydays before the Protestant Episcopal Church. Accordingly, it was formally resolved by both houses that the Lectionary be permitted to be used until the next General Convention. This Table, therefore, not only of Lessons for Sundays and holydays, but also of Daily Lessons, and Lessons for Lent and for Ember Days and Rogation Days, is allowed to be used by any clergyman in place of those in the calendar in the Prayer-book, and a copy has been sent to every clergyman of the Protestant Episcopal Church. Whether it will be found to be so great an improvement upon the existing Table of Lessons as has been supposed by many may be doubted. The trial, however, of three years will lead to some settled agreement upon a matter so largely affecting the question of how to obtain the greatest edification in the reading of Holy Scripture in the public worship of the Church.

At the close of the convention of 1877 a joint resolution was adopted, which is worthy of being quoted in this connection, inasmuch as it shows the spirit and desire of this Church in regard to the very important as well as difficult subject of public-school education:

"*Resolved*, That it is the solemn conviction of this General Convention, in both houses, that it is the duty of the clergy and laity of the Church to take, so far as the opportunity is afforded them, an active interest in the public schools provided by the state for the purpose of extending the important benefits of a secular education to all our citizens, and of diffusing side by side with these as much of religious influence and instruction as is possible; to supplement them with thorough Christian teaching elsewhere, and to add proper Church schools and institutions for the whole, and more complete work of education, wherever they are needed and the means for their support can be commanded;

"*Resolved*, That, with the concurrence of the House of Deputies, a joint committee, consisting of two bishops, two presbyters, and two laymen, be appointed to consider this whole matter during the recess of the convention, to collect facts and prepare suggestions for the next General Convention, and to promote, by any means deemed advisable, the general work of Christian education."

II. *Fundamental Principles, Constitution, Government, etc.* — From what has already been stated, it is clear that the Protestant Episcopal Church, while holding in common with other Christians evangelical doctrines—as the incarnation, the divinity of our Lord, the atonement, the inspiration of Holy Scripture, salvation through faith in Christ, and all such like—at the same time takes the ground that it is the American branch of the "one holy Catholic Church" spoken of in the Nicene Creed. It was planted on these Western shores, under God's good providence, to be what it aims to be—the National Church of the United States. It is a historical Church. It traces its lineage through the Church of England directly back to the apostles of our Lord; and it gives, as its deliberate judgment, that "it is evident unto all men, diligently reading Holy Scripture and ancient authors, that from the apostles' time there have been these orders of ministers in Christ's Church—bishops, priests, and deacons." It is not a new or recently formed denomination, and in this respect differs from the great bulk of Protestant Christian bodies, whatever titles they may give to their respective organizations. Its creed is the same creed which has been in use substantially in the same form since the very beginning—viz. that which is commonly called the Apostles' Creed and the Nicene Creed as finally set forth by the General Councils in the 4th century, and received everywhere and by all throughout the Catholic Church. Its liturgy is the very concentration of the deep piety, soundness in the faith, earnestness, zeal, and fervor of the wise and holy and good of all the early as well as later ages; and its services of prayer and praise, combining the use of this liturgy with the continual and frequent reading of Holy Scripture in men's ears, are in the truest and highest sense of the word evangelical, and calculated to meet all the longings of the pious soul for spiritual communion with God our Father, through our Lord Jesus Christ, and through the quickening energy of the Holy Ghost.*

The position of the Protestant Episcopal Church relatively to Protestantism, on the one hand, and Romanism, on the other, is somewhat peculiar, but yet clearly marked out and defined. It cannot, consistently at least, recognise the validity of the ministry of the great body of Protestant denominations, whether Presbyterian or Congregational, for it distinctly enunciates that the only lawful ministry is that in the three orders. Hence it cannot have communion with them, or interchange of services, or union of action in undertaking to spread the Gospel throughout the world. It recognises, it is true, the validity of the episcopate in the Roman Catholic Church, but at the same time it positively and unqualifiedly repudiates the errors in doctrine and worship of that corrupt Church, not only in its own proper home in Italy, but also wherever, in violation of the ancient canons, it has spread itself. The Protestant Episcopal Church has no sympathy with, but is in direct antagonism to, the claims of Rome in regard to the denial of the sufficiency of Holy Scripture for salvation, transubstantiation, sacrifice of the mass, purgatory, celibacy of the clergy, elevation of the Virgin Mary into a sort of goddess to be worshipped, the absolute supremacy of the pope by divine right over all the world in civil as well as religious matters, etc. Hence it cannot act in any concert with the Roman Church, or further its plans and purposes in any wise.

The constitution, framed for the purpose of uniting the Church in working together as one body, we give in full. It was adopted in October, 1789, and has remained the same ever since, with the exception of a few alterations which became necessary in consequence of the growth of the Church, the increase of the episcopate, and the formation of several dioceses within the limits of the larger and more populous states.

"ART. I. There shall be a General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America on the first Wednesday in October in every third year, from the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and forty-one, and in such place as shall be determined by the convention; and in case there shall be an epidemic disease, or any other good cause to render it necessary to alter the place fixed on for any such meeting of the convention, the presiding bishop shall have it in his power to appoint another convenient place (as near as may be to the place so fixed on) for the holding of such convention: and special meetings may be called at other times, in the manner hereafter to be provided for; and this Church, in a majority of the dioceses which shall have adopted this Constitution, shall be represented before they shall proceed to business, except that the representation from two dioceses shall be sufficient to adjourn; and in all business of the convention freedom of debate shall be allowed.

"ART. II. The Church in each diocese shall be entitled to a representation of both the clergy and the laity. Such representation shall consist of not more than four clergymen and four laymen, communicants in this Church, residents in the diocese, and chosen in the manner prescribed by the convention thereof; and in all questions, when required by the clerical or lay representation from any diocese, each order shall have one vote; and the ma-

* This statement of course represents our contributor's opinion; but the paragraph contains several points upon which much might be said on both sides.—ED.

jority of suffrages by dioceses shall be conclusive in each order, provided such majority comprehend a majority of the dioceses represented in that order. The concurrence of both orders shall be necessary to constitute a vote of the convention. If the convention of any diocese should neglect or decline to appoint clerical deputies, or if they should neglect or decline to appoint lay deputies, or if any of those of either order appointed should neglect to attend, or be prevented by sickness or any other accident, such diocese shall nevertheless be considered as duly represented by such deputy or deputies as may attend, whether lay or clerical. And if, through the neglect of the convention of any of the churches which shall have adopted, or may hereafter adopt, this Constitution, no deputies, either lay or clerical, should attend at any General Convention, the Church in such diocese shall nevertheless be bound by the acts of such convention.

"ART. III. The bishops of this Church, when there shall be three or more, shall, whenever general conventions are held, form a separate house, with a right to originate and propose acts for the concurrence of the House of Deputies, composed of clergy and laity; and when any proposed act shall have passed the House of Deputies, the same shall be transmitted to the House of Bishops, who shall have a negative thereupon; and all acts of the convention shall be authenticated by both houses. And in all cases, the House of Bishops shall signify to the convention their approbation or disapprobation (the latter with their reasons in writing) within three days after the proposed act shall have been reported to them for concurrence; and in failure thereof, it shall have the operation of a law. But until there shall be three or more bishops, as aforesaid, any bishop attending a General Convention shall be a member *ex officio*, and shall vote with the clerical deputies of the diocese to which he belongs; and a bishop shall then preside.

"ART. IV. The bishop or bishops in every diocese shall be chosen agreeably to such rules as shall be fixed by the convention of that diocese; and every bishop of this Church shall confine the exercise of his episcopal office to his proper diocese, unless requested to ordain, or confirm, or perform any other act of the episcopal office, by any Church destitute of a bishop.

"ART. V. A Protestant Episcopal Church in any of the United States, or any territory thereof, not now represented, may, at any time hereafter, be admitted on acceding to this Constitution; and a new diocese, to be formed from one or more existing dioceses, may be admitted under the following restrictions, viz.:

"No new diocese shall be formed or erected within the limits of any other diocese, nor shall any diocese be formed by the junction of two or more dioceses, or parts of dioceses, unless with the consent of the bishop and convention of each of the dioceses concerned, as well as of the General Convention; and such consent shall not be given by the General Convention until it has satisfactory assurance of a suitable provision for the support of the episcopate in the contemplated new diocese.

"No such new diocese shall be formed which shall contain less than six parishes, or less than six presbyters who have been for at least one year canonically resident within the bounds of such new diocese, regularly settled in a parish or congregation, and qualified to vote for a bishop. Nor shall such new diocese be formed, if thereby any existing diocese shall be so reduced as to contain less than twelve parishes, or less than twelve presbyters who have been residing therein, and settled and qualified as above mentioned: *provided* that no city shall form more than one diocese.

"In case one diocese shall be divided into two or more dioceses, the diocesan of the diocese divided may elect the one to which he will be attached, and shall thereupon become the diocesan thereof; and the assistant bishop, if there be one, may elect the one to which he will be attached; and if it be not the one elected by the bishop, he shall be the diocesan thereof.

"Whenever the division of a diocese into two or more dioceses shall be ratified by the General Convention, each of the dioceses shall be subject to the constitution and canons of the diocese so divided, except as local circumstances may prevent, until the same may be altered in either diocese by the convention thereof. And whenever a diocese shall be formed out of two or more existing dioceses, the new diocese shall be subject to the constitution and canons of that one of the said existing dioceses to which the greater number of clergymen shall have belonged prior to the erection of such new diocese, until the same may be altered by the convention of the new diocese.

"ART. VI. The mode of trying bishops shall be provided by the General Convention. The court appointed for that purpose shall be composed of bishops only. In every diocese, the mode of trying presbyters and deacons may be instituted by the convention of the diocese. None but a bishop shall pronounce sentence of admonition, suspension, or degradation from the ministry, on any clergyman, whether bishop, presbyter, or deacon.

"ART. VII. No person shall be admitted to holy orders until he shall have been examined by the bishop and by two presbyters, and shall have exhibited such testimonials and other requisites as the canons in that case provided may direct. Nor shall any person be ordained until he shall have subscribed the following declaration:

"'I do believe the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments to be the Word of God, and to contain all things necessary to salvation; and I do solemnly engage to conform to the doctrines and worship of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States.'

"No person ordained by a foreign bishop shall be permitted to officiate as a minister of this Church until he shall have complied with the canon or canons in that case provided, and have also subscribed the aforesaid declaration.

"ART. VIII. A Book of Common Prayer, administration of the sacraments, and other rites and ceremonies of the Church, articles of religion, and a form and manner of making, ordaining, and consecrating bishops, priests, and deacons, when established by this or a future General Convention, shall be used in the Protestant Episcopal Church in those dioceses which shall have adopted this Constitution. No alteration or addition shall be made in the Book of Common Prayer, or other offices of the Church, or the articles of religion, unless the same shall be proposed in one General Convention, and by a resolve thereof made known to the convention of every diocese, and adopted at the subsequent General Convention. *Provided, however*, that the General Convention shall have power, from time to time, to amend the Lectionary; but no act for this purpose shall be valid which is not voted for by a majority of the whole number of bishops entitled to seats in the House of Bishops, and by a majority of all the dioceses entitled to representation in the House of Deputies.

"ART. IX. This Constitution shall be unalterable, unless in General Convention, by the Church, in a majority of the dioceses which may have adopted the same; and all alterations shall be first proposed in one General Convention, and made known to the several diocesan conventions, before they shall be finally agreed to or ratified in the ensuing General Convention.

"ART. X. Bishops for foreign countries, on due application therefrom, may be consecrated, with the approbation of the bishops of this Church, or a majority of them, signified to the presiding bishop, he thereupon taking order for the same, and they being satisfied that the person designated for the office has been duly chosen and properly qualified; the Order of Consecration to be conformed, as nearly as may be, in the judgment of the bishops, to the one used in this Church. Such bishops, so consecrated, shall not be eligible to the office of diocesan or assistant bishop in any diocese in the United States, nor be entitled to a seat in the House of Bishops, nor exercise any episcopal authority in said states."

From the constitution just given it is evident that the General Convention is the highest legislative authority in the Church, and its legislation is for the benefit of the whole Church throughout the United States. There is as yet no Court of Appeals, although it is felt that there is need of such a court. It is believed that it will ere long be constituted, so as to adjudicate upon all those matters which a body, made up as the General Convention is, cannot adequately judge or act upon. Each diocese, whether a whole state or a portion of a state, is independent of all control except that of the general laws of the Church enacted by the General Convention. Each bishop, and the clergy and laity under his jurisdiction, meet in annual convention and legislate upon all subjects which specially concern the diocese and the preaching of the Gospel within its limits. Each parish also, consisting of its rector, vestry, and congregation, is independent in its sphere of labor, subject only to the canons of the diocese and of the whole Church, and to a visitation, at least yearly, of the bishop of the diocese. Thus freedom of thought and action is secured to all, with a due and proper subordination to higher authority in all cases where higher authority must needs supervene.

The laws which regulate Church affairs are contained in the "Digest of the Canons for the Government of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States," as passed and adopted in the general conventions from 1859 to 1877. The canons are arranged in the most methodical and approved style of legal enactments; they have been prepared by some of the ablest canonists and lawyers in the communion of the Protestant Episcopal Church, and they cover the entire ground respecting which the Church can legislate as a whole or united body. They are distributed into Four Titles, Canons of each Title, and Sections of Canons. Historical notes as

to dates are added, so that any particular canon upon any subject legislated upon by the Church may be traced from its origin through all its modifications to the present time. Title I is "Of the Orders in the Ministry and of the Doctrine and Worship of the Church." There are twenty-four canons under this Title, and they cover fully and explicitly all questions relating to candidates for orders, examinations, ordination of deacons, ordination of priests, general regulation of ministers and their duties, qualifications, consecration and work of bishops, domestic and foreign missionary bishops, mode of securing an accurate view of the Church, the use of the Book of Common Prayer, etc. Title II is "Of Discipline." There are thirteen canons under this Title, relating to offences for which ministers may be tried and punished, dissolution of pastoral connection, renunciation of the ministry, abandonment of the communion of the Church by a bishop, the trial of a bishop, judicial sentences, regulations respecting the laity, etc. Title III is "Of the Organized Bodies and Officers of the Church." There are nine canons under this Title, having reference to meetings of General Convention, standing committees, trustees of the General Theological Seminary, congregations and parishes, organization of new dioceses, etc. Title IV relates to "Miscellaneous Provisions." It has four canons, in reference to repealed canons, enactment, etc., of canons, time when new canons take effect. Our limits do not admit of printing these canons in full, nor is it necessary, inasmuch as they are readily accessible to all interested in their contents.

III. *Statistics.*—As showing the steady increase and spread of the Protestant Episcopal Church, we give the bishops, clergy, and dioceses by decades since 1820, as follows:

Years.	Bishops.	Presbyters and Deacons.	Total.	Dioceses.
1820.....	9	301	310	15
1830.....	11	514	525	20
1840.....	19	1040	1059	27
1850.....	32	1557	1589	29
1860.....	43	2113	2156	33
1870.....	52	2786	2838	39
1890.....	72	4028	4100	51

From the *Church Almanac*, we learn that in 1889 there were nearly 3800 parishes, with churches and chapels, in the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States.

Baptisms during the year (infant and adult).	58,536
Confirmations during the year.....	38,868
Marriages " " "	15,830
Sunday-school teachers.....	41,325
Sunday-school scholars.....	376,710
Communicants.....	484,059
Contributions for missionary and church purposes.....	$11,468,341

Home missionary bishops nine, exercising jurisdiction in the great territories as well as several of the Western states, in Texas, and on the Pacific coast. Their salaries and travelling expenses (amounting to at least $30,000 per annum) are paid by the domestic committee. There are over 200 missionaries at work in these fields. Foreign missionary bishops three—one in China, one in Japan, one in Africa (to which add bishop in Hayti). There are in these jurisdictions, in addition to the bishops, thirty-five other clergymen (foreign and native), together with about 200 assistants, mostly native catechists, lay readers, and teachers. The missionary work in Greece is simply educational, and is conducted by one lady, assisted by 12 native teachers. In the Mexican Church there are at work the Rev. H. C. Riley, D.D., and P. G. Hernandez (bishops elect), with four other presbyters, two ladies, and 79 lay readers. The number of communicants in foreign fields is about 4000. There are also 31 day-schools with 1800 scholars, and 18 Sunday-schools with 861 scholars.

Theological seminaries and schools (in 15 dioceses and 1 missionary jurisdiction).....	16
Church colleges (in 12 dioceses and 2 missionary jurisdictions).....	14
Academic institutions (in 26 dioceses and 6 missionary jurisdictions).....	81
Other educational institutions (in 13 dioceses).....	32
Church hospitals (in 20 dioceses and 2 missionary jurisdictions).....	27
Church orphan asylums (in 20 dioceses and 2 missionary jurisdictions).....	30
Church homes (in 21 dioceses).....	34

Periodicals devoted to the interests, support, and defence of the Protestant Episcopal Church: *The Churchman* (weekly), New York; *The Southern Churchman* (weekly), Alexandria, Va.; *The Episcopal Register* (weekly), Philadelphia, Pa.; *The Standard of the Cross* (weekly), Cleveland, O.; *The Western Church* (weekly), Milwaukee, Wis.; *The Pacific Churchman* (weekly), San Francisco, Cal.; *Our Dioceses* (weekly), Detroit, Mich.; *The Spirit of Missions* (monthly), New York; *The Church Magazine* (monthly), Brooklyn, N. Y.; *The Church Eclectic* (monthly), Utica, N. Y.; *The American Church Review* (quarterly), New York.

IV. *Authorities.*—Works used in the preparation of the present article: White [Bp.], *Memoirs of the Protestant Episcopal Church* (1836, 8vo); Wilson, *Life of Bishop White* (1839, 8vo); Wilberforce [Bp.], *History of the Protestant Episcopal Church* (1849, 12mo); Anderson, *History of the Church of England in the Colonies* (1856, 3 vols. 12mo); Hawkins, *Missions of the Church of England in the North American Colonies* (1845, 8vo); Hawks, *Contributions to the Ecclesiastical History of the United States* (1836, vol. i, 8vo, *Virginia*; 1839, vol. ii, 8vo, *Maryland*); id. *Constitution and Canons of the Protestant Episcopal Church* (1841, 8vo); Sprague, *Annals of the American Pulpit* [*Episcopalian*] (1859, vol. v, 8vo); Coit, *Puritanism* (1845, 12mo); Hoffman [Murray], *Law of the Protestant Episcopal Church* (1850, 8vo); id. *Ecclesiastical Law in the State of New York* (1868, 8vo), and *The Ritualistic Law of the Church* (1872, 8vo); Vinton, *Canon Law and the Constitution of the Protestant Episcopal Church* (1870, 8vo); Perry [Bp.], *Handbook of the General Conventions*, 1785–1877 (1877, 12mo); Hawks and Perry, *Journals of General Convention from* 1785 *to* 1853 (1861, vol. i, 8vo, with notes).*

Protestant Episcopal Church of Ireland.

Until 1871 this body formed an integral part of the United Church of England and Ireland. It is still called by a majority of its members the *Church of Ireland*. Its official title is "*The Irish Church*."

Of the first introduction of Christianity into Ireland we have written under the article IRELAND (q. v.). It has been shown there that the Roman Catholic Church succeeded in establishing her hierarchical power in the 12th century, and that even after the Reformation in England the Irish Church remained attached to Rome, and only by the influence of the bishop of Rome, first felt in the island through the Danes, who made their earliest settlements on the east coast at the close of the 8th century. Bishop Malachy, who filled successively several sees in Ireland, and who was full of enthusiasm for papal authority, strove hard to induce the Irish bishops to accept palls from the pope. But it was not till after his death, in 1152, that, at the Synod of Kells, the four archbishops received these honors, which, though ostensibly marks of distinction, were in reality badges of servitude, binding Ireland to the footstool of the papacy. Three years later, pope Adrian IV, the only Englishman who ever wore the triple crown, sent Henry II of England a bull, authorizing him to invade Ireland. What the papal see then thought of the religious condition of the Church of Ireland may be learned

* The above article was originally written for our pages by the Rev. J. A. SPENCER, D.D., of New York city, and was afterwards reprinted by its author, from advance proofs, in another work which he was then editing. We have slightly modified one or two expressions to which many of our readers might take exception.—ED.

from a bull published in 1172, confirming that of 1155. The pope states the object of permitting the invasion of Ireland to be that "the filthy practices of the land may be abolished, and the barbarous nation which is called by the Christian name may, through your clemency, attain unto some decency of manners; and that when the Church of that country, which has hitherto been in a disordered state, shall have been reduced to better order, that people may by your means possess for the future the reality as well as the name of the Christian profession."

In the reign of Henry VIII., papal supremacy was abolished in Ireland, the bishops and clergy all accepting the king as head of the Church. Queen Mary reestablished the pope's authority, but Elizabeth's reign gave a distinctively Reformed character to the Church. Many rebellions occurring among the native Irish during this reign, and Rome astutely throwing all her weight against England, the Reformation came to be regarded as essentially English, though the leading clergy of the time assented to the change. The pope took advantage of the anti-English feeling by sending to the island multitudes of missionary bishops and priests, who succeeded in holding the native Irish within the pale of Roman Catholicism. During the two following centuries, the Protestant Episcopal Church (to which we now give this name, as during this period the Presbyterian Church of Ireland rose to importance), suffered many vicissitudes; but by the Revolution of 1688 and the battle of the Boyne it was placed in a position of assured stability as a Protestant body. Still, the very intimate connection between the Church and the government, necessitated by the hostile elements with which both had been surrounded, had exercised upon the former a very unwholesome influence. The Church had been treated as little more than a mere department of government. "Many of the bishops, during this period, seem to have held High-Church views; and, with some bright exceptions, a general deadness in religious matters prevailed, and along with it an indisposition to tolerate dissent in any shape whatever. This deadness of religious life characterized all the churches in the reigns of Anne and the Georges, though bright examples may be cited of the contrary spirit. The names of Richardson, Atkins, and Brown may be mentioned with honor as those of clergymen who, in the early part of the 18th century, took an active interest in the work of evangelizing the native Irish through the medium of their own language. Archbishop Boulter, bishop Berkeley, and others may be noted among the members of the Episcopal bench who exhibited an earnest spirit of devotion and practical godliness. Wesley and his followers among the Methodists did much by their labors, first inside and then outside the Church, to awaken evangelical life among all ranks of the national clergy. But English influence was, during this period, too often used in a wrong direction. English clergymen were frequently thrust into the best Church livings in Ireland, and Irish bishoprics were filled with Englishmen, while the earnest parochial clergymen of the land were neglected and despised. Dean Swift's witty description of the honest clergymen nominated to Irish bishoprics being waylaid and murdered by highwaymen on Hounslow Heath, who then seized on their 'letters patent,' came to Ireland, and got consecrated in their room, shows what was thought, in some quarters, of many of the men who, at this dark æra, bore spiritual rule in the Church of Ireland" (Wright's *Lecture on the Church of Ireland*).

Perhaps no other Church in Christendom was so much influenced by the Wesleyan revival of religion. The evangelical leaven imparted at that time, assisted by an intense antipathy to Romanism, has spread through the whole Church, so that ritualistic and Broad-Church elements are almost unknown within its bounds. This fact is the more striking as some of the most influential prelates have been, and are, Englishmen of High-Church tendencies.

By Gladstone's disendowment act, known as the "Irish Church Act, 1869," it was provided that on and after Jan. 1, 1871, the "Church of Ireland" should cease to be established by law. A corporate body, named "The Commissioners of Church Temporalities in Ireland," was appointed, to which body were intrusted all the temporal affairs of the Church, until such time as the representative body of the Church should supersede them. This corporation was endowed with extensive powers for carrying out the purposes of the act. They were freed from all restraints of the courts of law, and received all the powers and privileges of the High Court of Chancery. The Commissioners were ordered to ascertain the amount of yearly income which any person, lay or clerical, derived from the Church, and "to pay each year to every such holder an annuity equal to the amount of yearly income so ascertained." This annuity was to continue, even though the annuitant should become disabled from attending to the duties of his office, "by age, sickness, or permanent infirmity, or by any cause other than his own wilful default." All laws were repealed which would hamper the Church in exercising the utmost freedom in self-government. The ecclesiastical laws existing at the time of the disestablishment, including "articles, doctrines, rites, rules, discipline, and ordinances," were to continue binding on the members of the Church, as if subsisting "by contract;" except that nothing in these laws "should be construed to confer on any bishop, etc., any coercive jurisdiction whatsoever." It was also provided that no change should be made in the laws of the Church, so as to deprive any person of his annuity.

By a convention of bishops and representatives of the Church, held in Dublin in 1870, a constitution was agreed upon. The preamble asserts a belief in the inspiration of the Bible, and a determination to preserve the "three orders of bishops, priests or presbyters, and deacons in the sacred ministry." It contains also a protest "against all those innovations in doctrine and worship which, at the Reformation, this Church did disown and reject."

The supreme court of the Church is the *General Synod*. It consists of three orders, viz., bishops, clergy, and laity. It is also divided into two houses, viz., the House of Bishops and the House of Representatives; the former consisting of all archbishops and bishops, the latter of 208 representatives of the clergy and 416 representatives of the laity, all these to be elected for three years. "The bishops shall vote separately from the representatives; and no question shall be deemed to have been carried, unless there be in its favor a majority of the bishops present, if they desire to vote, and a majority of the clerical and lay representatives present, voting conjointly or by orders; provided always that if a question affirmed by a majority of the clerical or lay representatives, voting conjointly or by orders, but rejected by a majority of the bishops, shall be reaffirmed at the next ordinary session of the General Synod by not less than two thirds of the clerical and lay representatives, it shall be deemed to be carried, unless it be negatived by not less than two-thirds of the then entire existing order of bishops." The General Synod has power to alter, abrogate, or enact canons, and to control any regulation made by a diocesan synod, so far as may be necessary to provide against the admission of any principle inexpedient for the common interest of the Church.

The *Diocesan Synod* consists of the bishop, of the beneficed and licensed clergymen of the diocese, and at least one layman, called synodsman, for each parish in the diocese. The bishop, clergy, and laity sit and debate and vote together; but six members of either order may call, upon any question, for a vote by orders. If the bishop dissent from the other two orders with respect to any proposed act of the synod, all action there-

upon is suspended until the next annual meeting of the synod; and should such act be then reaffirmed by two thirds of each of the other orders, and the bishop still dissent, it is submitted to the General Synod, whose decision is final.

The representative body consists of the archbishops and bishops, of one clerical and two lay members for each diocese, and of such number of other persons elected as shall be equal to the number of dioceses. This body is a Board of Trustees, holding the temporalities of the Church.

There is a Committee of Patronage in each diocese, consisting of the bishop, one lay and two clerical members. In each parish there are three persons named parochial nominators. When an incumbent is to be appointed, the Committee of Patronage and the parochial nominators form a Board of Nomination, presided over by the bishop, who has an independent and also a casting vote. This board nominates a clergyman to the bishop, who, if he decline to institute the nominee, must give him, if so required, his reasons in writing for so declining. Bishops are nominated by the diocesan synods, and confirmed by the Bench of Bishops.

The disestablished Church has already taken advantage of its freedom to revise carefully the Book of Common Prayer. Some extracts from the preface to the Revised Prayer-book, to be printed during this year (1878), will show the object and animus of the revision: "When this Church of Ireland ceased to be established by law, and thereupon some alteration in our public liturgy became needful, it was earnestly desired by many that occasion should be taken for considering what changes the lapse of years or exigency of our present times and circumstances might have rendered expedient." "We now afresh declare that the posture of kneeling prescribed to all communicants is not appointed for any purpose of adoration of Christ's body and blood under the veils of bread and wine, but only for a signification of our humble and grateful acknowledgment, and for the avoiding of such profanation and disorder as might ensue if some such reverent and uniform posture were not enjoined." "In the Office for Visitation of the Sick we have deemed it fitting that absolution should be pronounced to penitents in the form appointed in the Office for the Holy Communion." The portions of the Apocrypha which were in the Table of Lessons have been expunged, and the rubric has been omitted which directed the use on certain days of the Athanasian Creed.

The following are the numerical statistics of the Irish Protestant Episcopal Church as compared with other religious denominations in the island. The total number of clergymen is about 1900.

PROVINCES.	RELIGIOUS PROFESSIONS.									
	Roman Catholics.		Protestant Episcopal.		Non-Episcopal Protestants.		Other Christian Persuasions.		Jews.	
	1861.	1871.	1861.	1871.	1861.	1871.	1861.	1871.	1861.	1871.
Leinster	1,252,553	1,141,401	180,587	170,879	21,550	20,291	2,607	3,210	338	185
Munster	1,420,076	1,302,475	80,360	77,366	10,056	9,622	2,564	929	2	10
Ulster	966,613	894,525	391,315	398,705	543,421	522,774	12,835	14,331	52	63
Connaught	866,023	803,532	40,595	36,345	6,127	5,551	389	565	1	...
Total	4,505,265	4,141,933	693,857	683,295	581,154	558,238	18,395	19,035	393	258
Rate per cent.	Decrease, 363,332 8.06		Decrease, 10,062 1.45		Decrease, 22,916 3.94		Increase, 640 2.47		Decrease, 135 34.35	

The only divinity school in Ireland available for theological students of the Protestant Episcopal Church is that of Trinity College. The Church has no official voice in the management of this school, but until very lately no one could obtain a theological degree from it without signing the Thirty-nine Articles. In Nov., 1876, a statute was passed by the senate of the university abolishing this test and admitting even laymen to degrees. The board of Trinity College has also lately provided that any Christian Church of the land may establish a theological faculty alongside that of the Protestant Episcopal Church.

The act of disestablishment technically decreed also disendowment, but by far the greater part of the endowment of the Church was absorbed by the compensations granted. Most of those who were entitled to annuities commuted their income, or compounded with the ecclesiastical commissioners for a fixed sum, so arranged as to leave a large capital sum for church endowment, and this endowment was augmented by large donations, amounting, in the first five years of disestablishment, to £1,180,108. As an example of composition, the bishop of Derry was entitled to an annual income of £13,781. Upon compounding, he received £101,493, leaving a balance to the Endowment Fund of the Church of £100,288. The present endowment of the Church is upwards of £7,000,000.

See Dr. Todd, *St. Patrick;* Killen, *Ecclesiastical History of Ireland;* King, *Church History of Ireland;* Froude, *History of England;* Godkin, *Ireland and her Churches;* pamphlets by Dr. C. H. H. Wright, on *The Divinity School of Trinity College*, *The Church of Ireland*, etc.; *The Irish Ecclesiastical Gazette, from* 1871 *to* 1878; *The Irish Church Directory;* Lanigan, *Ecclesiastical History of Ireland.* (G. C. J.)

Protestant Episcopal Free-Church Association. This body, formed in 1875 within the pale of the Protestant Episcopal Church, advocates the free-seat system for houses of worship, and has grown to such large proportions in the short time of its existence that it now goes beyond its originally intended mission and assumes the work of Church extension also, i. e. it affords help to feeble churches, provided they do not rent or sell pews. The secretary of the society reported at its third annual meeting (May 13, 1878) 285 clerical, 13 life, and 126 annual contributors. Twenty-one of the bishops of the Church are patrons.

Protestant Friends. See FREE CONGREGATIONS; RATIONALISM.

Protestant Methodists. See METHODISM; METHODIST PROTESTANTS.

Protestant Union of Germany is a body composed of the members of the Evangelical Protestant Church. It has been in existence since 1863. Its aim is the complete separation of the Church from the State; a synodical Church system for all Protestant Germany; the union of religion and intellectual culture, faith and science, i. e. the advancement of the Christian religion in harmony with free investigations and ever-advancing intellectual culture, and the warring against everything hierarchical as well as against the radical denials of religion. It was projected in 1863 in the duchy of Baden, and in 1864 its headquarters were established at Heidelberg, where the annual meetings of the Union, called the *Protestantentag*, were held and all business of the body was transacted. At present the headquarters of the Union are at Berlin, and since the unification of Germany the purpose is to organize a German National Church, for which the State shall apportion a tax upon every member and recognise the organism by collecting the tax so obtained. Every person belonging to this Church of the nation is to enjoy liberty of thought and utterance, giving even greater breadth of freedom than the members of the Anglican communion enjoy. See Dr. Lindsay's *Letter from Germany* in *Zion's Herald*, Boston, Oct. 5, 1876. See also PRUSSIA. (J. H. W.)

Protestantentag. See PROTESTANT UNION OF GERMANY.

Protestantism is the advocacy of the authority of the Sacred Scriptures above and without any other. The Romanist and Jew hold to *tradition* (q. v.) as having the warrant of authority, but the Protestants refuse to yield to any arguments not clearly and directly drawn from the sacred Word of God. There arise, of course, various questions as to what this Word is, and how it is to be interpreted. In regard to the former, the Protestant holds that the Holy Bible is composed only of the canonical writings of the Old and New Testament [see CANON], while the Roman Catholics also ascribe canonical authority to the so-called Apocrypha of the Old Testament. See APOCRYPHA. The right of interpretation the Roman Catholic Church claims to be hers alone, while the Protestant Church concedes this right in a stricter sense to every one who possesses the requisite gifts and attainments, but in a more comprehensive sense to every Christian who seeks after salvation, proceeding upon the principle that Scripture is its own interpreter according to the *analogia fidei*. See INTERPRETATION. With this is connected the assumption of the Roman Catholic Church that the Vulgate version, which it sanctions, is to be preferred to all other versions as the authentic one, and is thus to a certain extent of equal importance with the original, while Protestants regard the original only as authentic.

The object of Protestant Christianity is freedom from that ecclesiasticism which the primitive Church was unacquainted with, and which owes its origin and development to the mediæval Church. "The Reformation, viewed in its most general character," says Ullmann (*Reformers before the Reformation*, i, 13), "was the reaction of Christianity as Gospel against Christianity as law." It is therefore inconsistent for Anglican High-Churchmen and their followers on this side of the Atlantic to assert that Protestantism is simply *negative*. It is positive as well, for it not only discards one interpretation of Christianity, but espouses another. It denies the right of the Church to stand in authority of the individual, but it gives a circumscribed and well-defined liberty to the individual—not absolute license. "The liberty which the Reformers prized first and chiefly," says Prof. Fisher (*Hist. of the Ref.* p. 9), "was not the abstract right to choose one's creed without constraint, but a liberty that flows from the enforced appropriation by the soul of truth in harmony with its inmost nature and its conscious necessities." The nature of Protestantism, the essence of Protestantism, the principle of Protestantism, is freedom, but freedom only from the restraints of man, from a tyranny of conscience, from all systems which had previous to the great Reformation been imposed upon man without any divine warrant. It is freedom on the basis of obedience to God and to his holy Word. It is that freedom which consists in the cheerful and ready obedience to the divine Word and to the divine Will. It is the freedom of the republic, and not the license of the commune; it is the liberty of common-sense, and not the enthusiasm of the idealist. "The principle of Protestantism," says Dr. Schaff, "is evangelical freedom in Christ, its aim to bring every soul into direct relation to Christ. Romanism puts the Church first and Christ next; Protestantism reverses the order. Romanism says, Where the Church is (meaning thereby the papal organization), there is Christ; Protestantism says, Where Christ is, there is the Church; Romanism says, Where the Catholic tradition is, there is the Bible and the infallible rule of faith; Protestantism says, Where the Bible is, there is the true tradition and the infallible rule of faith; Romanism says, Where good works are, there are faith and justification; Protestantism says, Where faith is, there are justification and good works. Romanism throws Mary and the saints between Christ and the believer; Protestantism goes directly to the Saviour. Romanism proceeds from the visible Church (the papacy) to the invisible Church; Protestantism from the invisible Church (the true body of Christ) to the visible; Romanism works from without, and from the general to the particular; Protestantism from within, and from the individual to the general. Protestantism is a protest against the tyranny of man on the basis of the authority of God. It proclaims the Bible to be the only infallible rule of Christian faith and practice, and teaches justification by grace alone, as apprehended by a living faith. It holds up Christ as all in all, whose word is all-sufficient to teach, whose grace is all-sufficient to save. Its mission is to realize the universal priesthood and kingship of all believers by bringing them all into direct union and fellowship with Christ" (*Christian Intelligencer*, Jan. 14, 1869). Dr. Hagenbach objects to this reduction of Protestantism to one fundamental principle, and offers *three* as its basis — viz. (1) the *real* principle, living faith in Christ; (2) the *formal* principle, the authority of the Scriptures as a rule of faith; (3) the *social* principle, forming a community, of which Christ is the individual head, and of which all the members are priests unto God (see *Theol. Studien u. Kritiken*, January, 1854, art. i). In this division every essential characteristic of Protestantism seems to have been considered by this master theologian.

Romanists charge against Protestantism that its resistance of dogmatism makes it synonymous with scepticism (q. v.) and unbelief. This is very unfair. Protestantism reposes implicitly on what it believes to be the divine authority of the inspired writers of the books of Holy Scripture; whereas scepticism and unbelief acknowledge no authority external to the mind, no communication superior to reason and science. Protestantism, although by its attitude of independence it seems similar to the other two systems, is really separated by a difference of kind, and not merely of degree. "The spiritual earnestness which characterized the Reformation," says Farrar (*Crit. Hist. of Free Thought*, p. 7), "prevented the changes in religious belief from developing into scepticism proper; and the theology of the Reformation is accordingly an example of defence and reconstruction as well as of revulsion." Protestantism was a form of free thought, but only in the sense of a return from human authority to that of Scripture. It was equally a reliance on a historic religion, equally an appeal to the immemorial doctrine of the Church with Roman Catholicism, but it conceived that the New Testament itself contained a truer source than tradition for ascertaining the apostolic declaration of it.

Some writers—Romanists, and even some within the Protestant fold, but hardly of the faith—have declared "Protestantism a failure." They have attempted to show that its territory is principally within the limits it acquired in the period of the great Reformation, and that its prospects for extension are lessening every day. Macaulay has treated this question in a spirited essay, in which with certain reasons which are pertinent and valuable is coupled a singular denial that the knowledge of religion is progressive, or at all dependent upon the general enlightenment of the human mind. Apart from his paradoxical speculation on this last point, his statement of the grounds of the arrest of the progress of Protestantism, though eloquent and valuable, is quite incomplete. The principal causes of this arrest have been thus ably pointed out by Prof. Fisher (*Hist. of the Ref.* p. 415 sq.): (1.) The ferment that attended the rise of Protestantism led to a crystallizing of parties, and thus incited to raise a *barrier* in the way of its further progress. (2.) The political arrangements which were adopted in different countries, in consequence of the religious division, all tended to confine Protestantism within the limits which it had early attained. (3.) The want of the spirit of propagandism. Romanism is always aggressive; Protestantism, generally speaking, maintains only that which comes within its sphere. (4.) The counter-reformation of the Romish Church and its avowed determination to remove gross abuses have stayed

but too often the step of aggression from the Protestants. (5.) The disjointed condition of Protestantism; its constant warfarings of brother with brother; the absence of a tolerant spirit for difference of opinion in non-essentials, have facilitated the advance of their common enemy, still further strengthened by perfect organization. (6.) The inability of Protestantism to turn to the best account the wide diversity of talents and character which is constantly developing in evangelical Christianity. In Romanism Ignatius and Bellarmine can labor side by side. In Protestantism Wesley and Whitefield must become the founders of new sects. (7.) The disposition of races. Montesquieu, in his *Esprit des Lois*, remarks that Protestantism is prevalent in Northern, Catholicism in Southern Europe, and explains most judiciously, "C'est que les peuples du nord ont et auront toujours un esprit d'indépendance et de liberté, que n'ont pas les peuples du midi."

If Protestantism be a failure, it has its failure in its *successes*. These are well set forth in the following extract from Prof. Fisher's address at the Evangelical Alliance Congress in 1874:

"(1.) Its whole character is favorable to civil and religious freedom and the promotion of the multiplied advantages which freedom brings in its train. Under Roman Catholicism man was deprived of his personal rights; under Protestantism he regained them. The progress of civilization, in the long course of history, is marked by the growing respect paid to the rights of the individual, and the ampler room afforded for the unfolding of his powers, and for the realizing of his aspirations. There was something imposing in those huge despotisms—Egypt, Assyria, Babylon, Persia—in which a multitude of human beings were welded together under an absolute master. Such empires were an advance upon a primitive state of things, where every man's hand was against his neighbor. Yet they were a crude form of crystallization, and they were intrinsically weak. The little cities of Greece, with their freer political life, and the larger scope which they allowed for the activity and the culture of the individual—communities of citizens—proved more than a match for the colossal might of the East. Among the Greeks and Romans, however, although governments of law had supplanted naked force, the State was supreme, and to the State the individual must yield an exclusive allegiance. It was a great gain when the Christian Church arose, and when the individual became conscious of an allegiance of the soul to a higher kingdom—an allegiance which did not supersede his loyalty to the civil authority, but limited while it sanctioned this obligation. But the Church itself at length erected a supremacy over the individual inconsistent with the free action of reason and conscience, and even stretched that supremacy so far as to dwarf and overshadow civil society. It reared a theocracy, and subjected everything to its unlimited sway. The Reformation gave back to the individual his proper autonomy. The result is a self-respect, an intellectual activity, a development of inventive capacity and of energy of character, which give rise to such achievements in science, in the field of political action, and in every work where self-reliance and personal force are called for, as would be impossible under the opposite system. In the period immediately following the Reformation signal proofs were afforded of this truth. The little states of Holland, for example, proved their ability to cope with the Spanish empire, to gain their independence, and to acquire an opulence and a culture which recalled the best days of the Grecian republics. They beat back their invaders from their soil, and sent forth their victorious navies upon every sea, while at home they were educating the common people, fostering science and learning, and building up universities famous throughout Europe. England, in the age of Elizabeth, proved that the native vigor of her people was reinforced in a remarkable degree by the stimulus derived from the peculiar genius of the Protestant religion. It was the period when she was acquiring her naval ascendency; the period, likewise, of Shakespeare, Bacon, and Raleigh. Who can doubt that the United States of America are, not indeed wholly, but in great part, indebted for their position, as contrasted with that of Mexico and the political communities of South America, to this expansion of the power of the individual, which is the uniform and legitimate fruit of Protestant principles?

"(2.) The spirit of Protestantism favors universal education. The lay Christian, who is to read and interpret the Scriptures, and to take part in the administration of government in the Church, must not be an illiterate person. Knowledge, mental enlightenment, under the Protestant system, are indispensable. The weight of personal responsibility for the culture of his intellectual and spiritual nature which rests on every individual makes education a matter of universal concern. Far more has been done in Protestant than in Roman Catholic countries for the instruction of the whole people. It is enough to refer to the common-school system of Holland and of New England, and to Protestant Germany, to show how natural it is for the disciples of the Reformation to provide for this great interest of society.

"The free circulation of the Bible in Protestant lands has disseminated an instrument of intellectual as well as of religious improvement, the good effect of which is immeasurable. As a repository of history, biography, poetry, ethics, as well as a monitor to the conscience and a guide to heaven, the Bible has exerted an influence on the common mind, in all Protestant nations, which it would be difficult to exaggerate. The practice of interpreting the Bible and of exploring its pages for fresh truth affords a mental discipline of a very high order. How often have the Scriptures carried into the cottage of the peasant a breadth and refinement of intellect which otherwise would never have existed, and which no agency employed by the Roman Catholic system, in relation to the same social class, has ever been able to engender!

"(3.) That Protestantism should be more friendly to civil and religious liberty than the Roman Catholic system would seem to follow unavoidably from the nature of the two forms of faith. Protestantism involves, as a vital element, an assertion of personal rights with respect to religion, the highest concern of man. Moreover, Protestantism casts off the yoke of priestly rule, and puts ecclesiastical government, in due measure, into the hands of the laity. As we have already said, it is a revolt of the laity against a usurped ecclesiastical authority. The Church of Rome teaches men that their first and most binding duty is to bow with unquestioning docility and obedience to their heaven-appointed superiors. How is it possible that Protestantism should not foster a habit of mind which is incompatible with a patient endurance of tyranny at the hands of the civil power? How can Protestantism, inspiring a lively sense of personal rights, fail to bring with it, eventually at least, a corresponding respect for the rights of others, and a disposition to secure their rights in forms of goverment and in legislation? How can men who are accustomed to judge for themselves and act independently in Church affairs manifest a slavish spirit in the political sphere? On the contrary, the habit of mind which the Roman Catholic nurture tends to beget leads to servility in the subject towards the ruler as long as an alliance is kept up between sovereign and priest. It is true that the Church of Rome can accommodate itself to any of the various types of political society. Her doctors have at times preached an extreme theory of popular rights and of the sovereignty of the people. While the State is subordinate to the Church any form of government may be tolerated; and there may be an interest on the part of the priesthood in inculcating political theories which operate, in their judgment, to weaken the obligations of loyalty towards the civil magistrate, and to exalt by contrast the divine authority of the Church. When the civil magistracy presumes to exercise prerogatives, or to ordain measures, which are deemed hurtful to the ecclesiastical interest, a radical doctrine of revolution, even a doctrine of tyrannicide, has been heard from the pulpits of the most conservative of religious bodies. Generally speaking, however, the Church of Rome is the natural ally and supporter of arbitrary principles of government. The prevailing sentiment, the instinctive feeling, in that Church is that the body of the people are incapable of self-guidance, and that to give them the reins in civil affairs would imperil the stability of ecclesiastical control. To this reasoning it is often replied by advocates of the Roman Catholic system that Protestantism opens a door to boundless tyranny by leaving the temporal power without any check from the ecclesiastical. The State, it is said, proves omnipotent; the civil magistrate is delivered from the wholesome dread of ecclesiastical censure, and is left free to exercise all kinds of tyranny, without the powerful restraint to which he was subject under the mediæval system. He may even violate the rights of conscience with impunity. The State, it is sometimes said, when released from its subordinate relation to the Church, is a godless institution. It becomes, like the pagan states of antiquity, absolute in the province of religion as in secular affairs, and an irresistible engine of oppression. It must be admitted that Protestant rulers have been guilty of tyranny; that, in many instances, they cannot be cleared of the charge of unwarrantably interfering with the rights of conscience, and of attempting to govern the belief and regulate the forms of worship of their subjects in a manner destructive of true liberty. The question is, whether these instances of misgovernment are the proper fruit of the Protestant spirit, or something at variance with it, and therefore an evil of a temporary and exceptional character. The imputation that the State, as constituted under Protestantism, is heathen depends on the false assumption that the Church and the priesthood, as established in the Roman Catholic system, are identical, or so nearly identical that one cannot subsist without the other. It is assumed that when the supervision and control which the Church of Rome aspires to exercise over the civil authority are shaken off, nothing is left but an unchristian or an-

tichristian institution. The fact that a layman can be as good a Christian as a priest is overlooked. The Christian laity who make up a commonwealth, and the Christian magistrates who are set over them, are quite as able to discern and quite as likely to respect personal rights, and to act for the common weal, as if they were subject to an organized priesthood. Since the Reformation a layman has been the head of the English Church and State, and civil magistrates in England have borne a part in ecclesiastical government. Without entering into the question of the righteousness or expediency of establishments, or broaching any of the controverted topics connected with this subject, we simply assert here that the civil government of England is not to be branded as unchristian or antichristian on account of this arrangement. As far as the administration of public affairs in that country has been characterized by justice and by a regard for the well-being of all orders of people, the government has been Christian—as truly Christian, to say the least, as if the supremacy had been virtually lodged with the pope, or with an aristocracy of priests.

"History verifies the proposition that Protestantism is favorable to civil and religious freedom. The long and successful struggle for independence in the Netherlands, the conflict which established English liberty against the despotic influence of the house of Stuart, the growth and establishment of the Republic of the United States, are events so intimately connected with Protestantism, and so dependent upon it, that we may point to them as monuments of the true spirit and tendency of the Reformed religion. That religious persecution has darkened the annals of the Protestant faith, and that the earliest leaders in the Reformation failed to recognise distinctly the principle of liberty of conscience, must be admitted. But Protestantism, as is claimed at the present day both by its friends and foes, was illogical, inconsistent with its own genius and principles, whenever it attempted to coerce conscience by punishing religious dissent with the sword and the fagot. Protestants illustrate the real character and tendency of their system by deploring whatever acts of religious persecution the predecessors who bore their name were guilty of, and by the open and sincere advocacy of religious liberty. Liberty of thought and freedom of speech and of the press, however restricted they may have been by Protestants in times past, it is the tendency of Protestantism to uphold."

See Schenkel, *Das Wesen des Protestantismus* (2d ed. Schaffh. 1862); Frank, *Gesch. der prot. Theol.* (Leips. 1862–65, 2 vols.); Wylie, *Hist. of Prot.* (Lond. 1874 sq.); Gieseler, *Eccles. Hist.* iv, 131 sq.; Hase, *Ch. Hist.* p. 437 sq.; Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctr.* (see Index).

Protestants is a collective name for all genuine believers in evangelical Christianity—those who protest against the errors and renounce the communion of the Romish Church. It was originally applicable to the followers of Luther, but is now generally applied to all Christians not embraced in the Roman Catholic, Greek, or Oriental churches. See REFORMATION.

At first those who, in consequence of the religious innovations of Luther and his consorts in Germany and Switzerland, stepped out of the Catholic community were designated by no general name; they were called Lutherans, Zwinglians, Anabaptists, etc., etc. They received their collective name only in 1529 at the second Diet of Spires. The first Diet of Spires had been held in 1526. There it had been resolved, "Let every state of the empire conduct its affairs in such a way as it thinks justifiable before God and the emperor." It was an edict of tolerance, with reservation of the imperial rights. The Roman Catholic party had been compelled to make concessions by the ambiguous attitude of the house of Wittelsbach. As soon, however, as the Bavarian dukes embraced more unequivocally the Catholic cause, and had made a close alliance with the ecclesiastical princes, the emperor Charles V, in order to satisfy the Romanists, resolved upon more energetic measures against the innovators. In the spring of 1527, the Romanists had already formed a secret league at Breslau, yet until the emperor was successful in Italy no overt measures could be thought of. After he had gained a complete victory in Italy, the policy of repression was boldly avowed, and in March, 1529, the second Diet of Spires was convoked for this purpose by the emperor. Ostensibly it was called to secure aid from the German princes against the Turks, and to devise the most effectual means by which to allay the religious disputes. Its real object, however, appeared when Ferdinand, archduke of Austria, and other popish princes, decreed that in the countries which had embraced the new religion it should be lawful to continue in it till the meeting of a council, but that no Roman Catholic should be allowed to turn Lutheran, and that the reformers should deliver nothing in their sermons contrary to the received doctrine of the Church. It was furthermore specially decreed, (1) that it shall be forbidden nowhere in Germany to say or attend mass; (2) the preaching of the doctrine of Zwingli about the Eucharist shall be prohibited; (3) the Anabaptists shall not be tolerated; (4) libels against religious parties and about religious matters are interdicted. These articles did not meet the pretensions of Luther's followers. The Lutheran states asserted that in matters of faith a majority of votes was not decisive, and that the resolutions of 1526, unanimously voted, could only be abrogated by a unanimous vote. They, in consequence, protested against the resolutions of the diet, and it was thus that the followers of the Reformation were in derision called *Protestants*. They declared their readiness to obey the emperor and the diet in all "dutiful and possible matters," but against any order considered by them repugnant to "God and his holy Word, to their soul's salvation, and their good conscience," they appealed to the emperor, to the free council, and to all impartial Christian judges. The essential principles involved in the protest against this decree and in the arguments on which it was grounded were (1) that the Catholic Church cannot be the judge of the Reformed churches, which are no longer in communion with her; (2) that the authority of the Bible is supreme, and above that of councils and bishops; (3) that the Bible is not to be interpreted and used according to tradition, or use, and wont, but to be explained by means of itself, its own language, and connection. As this doctrine—that the Bible, explained independently of all external tradition, is the sole authority in all matters of faith and discipline—is really the foundation-stone of the Reformation, the term Protestant was extended from those who signed the Spires protest to all who embraced the fundamental principle involved in it.

The protesting parties were as follows: John, the elector of Saxony, the landgrave of Hesse, the margrave of Brandenburg-Bayreuth, a duke of Brunswick-Lüneburg, a prince of Anhalt, a number of Frankish and Suabian imperial cities—Nuremberg, Ulm, Kempten, Nördlingen, Heilbronn, Reutlingen, Isny, St. Gall, Weissenburg, Windsheim, Strasburg, Constance, Lindau, and Memmingen. The four last named had joined the protest on account of the interdiction of Zwingli's doctrine, which interdiction met with the entire approval of Luther and his zealous followers. The latter also accepted the article against the Anabaptists, and, while Luther approved of the protest, he exhorted at the same time the Protestant powers to destroy the impious Anabaptists with fire and sword, and accept the resolutions of the diet in this respect. Now, the new doctrines being in possession of a name which indicated their common hostile relation to the Roman Church, the schism became less curable, and reconciliation was thenceforth less practicable than ever. See REFORMATION.

The term Protestant, which thus came to be synonymous with non-Romanist, was applied, first, as a convenient historical term designating collectively all who deny the usurped supremacy of the pope; secondly, as a term of controversy implying (1) a condemnation of alleged Romish errors and superstitions, and sometimes (2) a yet further assertion of certain tenets supposed to be of the essence of Protestantism. This essential principle of Protestantism is the sufficiency and authority of the Scriptures as a religious rule of faith and practice. Those, on the one hand, who deny its sufficiency are not in principle Protestants. The former include not only the Roman Catholics, but all those who maintain the *authority* of the Church to speak for God, either in adding to the doctrines of the Bible or in giving them a

binding and authoritative interpretation; and those, on the other hand, who deny its divine authority are not properly Protestants; and the latter embrace all those who hold that man's unaided reason is the all-sufficient guide and standard in religious faith and practice, and that the Bible is only to be used like other books—as a light, but not as an authority. In 1659 it was stated in Milton's *Treatise of Civil Power in Ecclesiastical Cases:* "It is the general consent of all sound Protestant writers that neither traditions, councils, nor canons of any visible Church, much less edicts of any magistrate or civil session, but the Scripture only, can be the final judge or rule in matters of religion, and that only in the conscience of every Christian to himself. . . . With the name of Protestant hath ever been received this doctrine, which prefers the Scripture before the Church, and acknowledges none but the Scripture sole interpreter of itself to the conscience. If by the Protestant doctrine we believe the Scripture—not for the Church's saying, but for its own as the Word of God—then ought we to believe what in our conscience we apprehend the Scripture to say, though the visible Church with all her doctors gainsay. . . . To interpret the Scripture convincingly to his own conscience none is able but himself, guided by the Holy Spirit; and not so guided, none than he to himself can be a worse deceiver. . . . This is not the doctrine of the Church of England. If the Church have authority in controversies of faith, it is a matter of conscience to submit one's private judgment to that authority. There coexist in the Church of God two authorities mutually corroborative of each other, and, so far as individual interpretation of each, mutually corrective of each other—the inspired Word and the inspired Church; the inspired Word receiving its canonicity, its interpretation, from the inspired Church, and the inspired Church tested in its development by the inspired Word" (Bishop Forbes, on *Thirty-nine Art.* p. 95). Of course, since Protestantism recognises the right of private judgment in the interpretation of Scripture, it allows a wide divergence of theological views, and such a divergence actually exists. At the same time, the differences in the belief of the various Protestant sects generally relate to minor points, as of worship, ceremonial, and form of ecclesiastical government, nearly all the great Protestant denominations being substantially agreed respecting the fundamental points of doctrine as taught by the Word of God. Mr. Chillingworth, addressing himself to a writer in favor of the Church of Rome, speaks of the religion of the Protestants in the following excellent terms:

"Know then, sir, that when I say the religion of Protestants is in prudence to be preferred before yours, on the one side, I do not understand by your religion the doctrine of Bellarmine, or Baronius, or any other private man among you, nor the doctrine of the Sorbonne, of the Jesuits, or of the Dominicans, or of any other particular company among you, but that wherein you all agree, or profess to agree, the doctrine of the Council of Trent; so, accordingly, on the other side, by the religion of Protestants, I do not understand the doctrine of Luther, or Calvin, or Melancthon, nor the Confession of Augsburg, or Geneva, nor the Catechism of Heidelberg, nor the Articles of the Church of England—no, nor the harmony of Protestant confessions; but that in which they all agree, and which they all subscribe with a greater harmony, as a perfect rule of faith and action—that is, the Bible. The Bible, I say—the Bible only—is the religion of Protestants. Whatsoever else they believe beside it, and the plain, irrefragable, indubitable consequences of it, well may they hold it as a matter of opinion; but as a matter of faith and religion, neither can they with coherence to their own grounds believe it themselves, nor require belief of it of others, without most high and most schismatical presumption. I, for my part, after a long, and, as I verily believe and hope, impartial, search of the true way to eternal happiness, do profess plainly that I cannot find any rest for the sole of my foot but upon this rock only. I see plainly, and with my own eyes, that there are popes against popes and councils against councils; some fathers against other fathers, the same fathers against themselves; a consent of fathers of one age against a consent of fathers of another age; traditive interpretations of Scripture are pretended, but there are few or none to be found; no tradition but that of Scripture can derive itself from the fountain, but may be plainly proved either to have been brought in in such an age after Christ, or that in such an age it was not in. In a word, there is no sufficient certainty but of Scripture only for any considering man to build upon. This, therefore, and this only, I have reason to believe. This I will profess; according to this I will live; and for this, if there be occasion, I will not only willingly, but even gladly, lose my life, though I should be sorry that Christians should take it from me. Propose me anything out of this book, and require whether I believe or no, and, seem it never so incomprehensible to human reason, I will subscribe it with hand and heart, as knowing no demonstration can be stronger than this—God hath said so, therefore it is true. In other things, I will take no man's liberty of judging from him; neither shall any man take mine from me."

The body of Protestants consists, generally speaking, of Sweden, Denmark, and Norway — all Lutheran; the larger half of the population of the Netherlands; about half of the population of Switzerland, including the cantons of Aargau, Zurich, Berne, most of Vaud—all Calvinistic; the English, Irish, and Scottish churches, with their colonial and American daughters; the Scottish Presbyterians; the large bodies of Lutherans, Calvinists, Huguenots, in the other countries of Europe; the English and Irish Nonconformists and their descendants in the United States and the colonies.

Of the chief of these Protestant denominations we give here a brief narrative of the process of their separate formation, referring the reader for fuller information to the separate articles under their respective titles. "The Lutherans took the name and accepted the teachings of Luther, who, while maintaining the doctrine of justification by faith alone, and the authority and sufficiency of the Scriptures, also maintained, in a modified form, the doctrine of the real presence of Christ in the communion, and allowed the use of images and pictures in the churches. Zwingli, the Swiss reformer, denied that the Lord's Supper was anything more than a commemorative ordinance. Many of the Reformers in other countries shared his views, and out of the controversy between him and Luther sprang the Reformed churches of Germany and Holland. Meanwhile John Calvin had commenced his labors as the organizer of the Reformation. The product of his literary labor was the *Institutes;* of his executive labor, the Presbyterian form of government. For both he found, eventually, a free field in Geneva, and his labors there not only gave to the Reformed churches of Switzerland their final character—a character which they bear to this day—but furnished the model of doctrine and government which the Presbyterian churches of Great Britain and the United States have since largely adopted. This, also, is substantially the form of government of the Reformed Church of France. Certain tenets peculiar to this form of theology were repudiated by other leaders among the Reformers. Arminius, in Holland, denied that the Scriptures taught the doctrine of predestination and others connected intimately, if not necessarily, with it. From him sprang the Arminians, who, as a sect, are reduced to an insignificant number, but whose doctrines are accepted in the main by the Methodists, by most of the Episcopalians, and by many in other denominations. The Socinians denied that the doctrines of the Trinity, the atonement, and the proper deity of Jesus Christ were to be found in the Bible. They thus revived the views of the earlier Arians, while at the same time they carried their denials much further. Their views have found expression in one wing of the Unitarian and Universalist churches of the present day. Their most general acceptance is in New England and in parts of Great Britain; but there are Socinian churches in nearly if not quite all Protestant communities. The Reformation in England was partly religious, partly political. Henry VIII did not intend to modify the doctrine of the Church, but only its government, and its government only so far as to secure its independence of the papacy. The movement was too deep and popular for him to control; but the royal and ecclesiastical influence combined to retain the Episcopal form of government and

the union of Church and State. Both are still preserved in the Church of England, and the former in the Episcopal Church of this country. Its symbols of doctrine allow equal liberty to Arminians and to Calvinists. The civil and religious controversies which, a few centuries later, plunged England into civil war, gave impetus and organization, though not birth, to the idea of absolute ecclesiastical independence. The result was the organization of churches which were mainly Calvinistic in belief, but in which the absolute right of the people of each Church to manage their own affairs was maintained. In England they took the name of Independents, in the United States that of Congregationalists. As early as the days of Luther, the Reformers were divided on the question of baptism; those who maintained that baptism should be administered only by immersion and to adults took the name of Baptists, which they retain to this day. The 18th century witnessed a general revival of religious spirit, especially in England and the United States, differing from that which characterized the Reformation in that it was less a battle against error in doctrine, and more a simple awakening of Christian zeal to use for the redemption of the masses the truths which the Reformation had brought to light. Out of this awakening grew Methodism, which is substantially Arminian in doctrine and Episcopal in government, and differs from the Episcopal Church, from which it came out, rather in the spirit and character of its adherents than in theology. These churches represent the chief forms of Protestantism. There is also a large number of minor denominations, but most of them are offshoots from these great branches."

The total Protestant population of the world is estimated in 1890 to be more than 120,000,000, a little more than half the Roman Catholic population. It is thus divided:

United States	38,000,000
British America	3,000,000
Mexico	9,000
South America	70,000
Dutch American possessions	35,000
Danish and Swedish possessions	55,000
Hayti	12,000
Spain	9,000
Portugal	11,000
France	2,000,000
Austria	3,400,000
Prussia	18,249,539
Rest of Germany proper	11,134,440
Italy	103,000
Switzerland	1,667,109
Holland	2,831,539
Belgium	15,000
Great Britain and Ireland	24,500,000
Denmark	2,089,000
Sweden and Norway	6,589,000
Russia	4,000,000
Turkey	15,000
Greece	2,000
Asiatic Russia	45,000
China	34,555
Japan	30,000
East and Farther India	400,000
Archipelago	55,000
Persia	1,500
Arabia	2,000
English African possessions	1,000,000
Algeria	9,000
Egypt	3,500
Liberia	50,000
Madagascar	100,000
Australia and Polynesia	2,000,000

The population connected with or under the influence of Protestant churches at the close of 1874 was about as follows:

Divisions.	Protestants.	Total Population.
America	33,000,000	84,500,000
Europe	71,800,000	301,600,000
Asia	1,800,000	798,000,000
Africa	1,200,000	202,500,000
Australia and Polynesia	2,200,000	4,400,000
Total	110,000,000	1,391,000,000

See PROTESTANTISM; REFORMATION.

Protesters. See RESOLUTIONERS; SCOTLAND, CHURCHES IN.

Protevangelium, a spurious gospel ascribed to James, containing an account of the birth of Mary and of Christ. It is supposed to have been originally composed in Hebrew. Postellius brought the MS. of this gospel from the Levant, translated it into Latin, and sent it to Oporinus, a printer at Basle, where Bibliander, a Protestant divine, and the professor of divinity at Zurich, caused it to be printed in 1552. Postellius asserts that it was publicly read as canonical in the Eastern churches. See GOSPELS, SPURIOUS.

Prothade, St., a French prelate who flourished near the opening of the 7th century; he died before 625. He has been called son of the patrician Prothade, but without proof. It is at least certain that he was the successor of St. Nicet in the metropolitan see of Besançon. He compiled a ritual for the use of the two cathedral churches at Besançon—St. Étienne and St. Jean, which has not reached us without interpolations; it has recently been published by the abbé Richard.

Prother, AMOS SUMMERS, a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Clarke County, Ind., April 17, 1832. He went to Iowa when quite young, and with his parents settled near Libertyville, Jefferson County. He was converted in 1846, and at once joined the Methodist Episcopal Church. His convictions of duty pointed him to the ministry as a life-work, and, the better to fit himself for the sacred office, he entered the Mount-Pleasant Collegiate Institute, afterwards the Iowa Wesleyan University, in 1852, where he continued his studies until 1857, when he graduated. He was licensed to preach while at college. After graduating he was immediately employed on the Dodgeville Circuit by the presiding elder, and in 1857 joined the Iowa Conference. His appointments were Denmark, Wapello, Dodgeville, Grand View, Crawfordsville, New London, Kossuth, Montezuma, New Sharon, and Birmingham. At the last-named place he died, April 1, 1873, greatly respected by his own people and the Church generally.

Prothĕsis (1), a small altar in Greek churches corresponding to the credence table. The name is taken from the shew-bread, which was called *ἡ πρόθεσις τῶν ἄρτων*—the setting-out of the loaves. (2.) A small side-altar in a Clugniac church, on the epistle side, at which the ministers of the altar, on Sundays and festivals, partook of both kinds, using a silver calamus to drink of the chalice.

Prothonotary, a word that has a different signification in the Greek Church from what it has in the Latin; for in the first it is the name of one of the great officers of the Church of Constantinople, who takes rank next to the patriarch, and writes all despatches he sends to the grand seignior; besides which he is empowered to have an inspection over the professors of the law, into purchases, wills, and the liberty given to slaves; but in the Roman Church they were formerly called prothonotaries who had the charge of writing the acts of the martyrs and circumstances of their death, a title of honor whereunto are ascribed many privileges, as legitimizing bastards, making apostolic notaries [see PROTONOTARIUS APOSTOLICUS], doctors of divinity and of the canon and civil law: they are twelve in number.

Proto (*first*). This adjective is prefixed to the name of several officers in the Greek Church, denoting that he who holds it is the chief of his class—such as *prothonotary, protopapas, protopsaltes, protosyncellus.*

Protodiacon. The protodiacon, or archdeacon, holds the first rank among the deacons employed in the Episcopal Church to assist the bishop during worship and in the exercise of his pontificalia. He is constantly near the person of the bishop or archbishop, and stands at his side while he is performing the liturgical rites or conferring holy orders. The splendor of the episcopal

dignity reflected on this office, and the influence which the archdeacons in all times exercised upon the bishops, made of the proto- or arch-deacon, in the Greek-Russian Church, a very important person. In larger parishes several deacons are employed, but only the first deacon of an episcopal church is distinguished by the honorary title of archi- or proto-diaconus.

Protonotarius Apostolĭcus is a notary appointed by the papal see. The qualification of *πρῶτος* (primus) is but honorary. In the apostolic chancery-rules the word "prothonotary" is regularly employed, but the papal bulls and rescripts call the same functionary "notarius apostolicus." The papal notaries appointed in the city of Rome (*in curia*), and forming, twelve in number, a special college of prelates, are distinguished by the addition [Notarii] "de numero participantium" from those appointed abroad (*extra curiam*), who are simply notarii or protonotarii, sometimes with the specification "extra numerum." The former are the regular and paid, the latter the extraordinary and titular notaries. The origin of the papal notariate is assigned to the 1st century, for pope Clement I is said to have employed seven of them in noting the memorabilia of the Church, and composing trustworthy accounts of the various manners in which the martyrs were brought to death. In later times it became the business of the prothonotaries to write the biographies of the popes, to draw up authentic minutes of the debate in the Consistory of Cardinals, especially in cases of beatification, canonization, etc. Their college was increased to twelve members and endowed with great privileges by pope Sixtus V. They precede in the papal chapel at different solemnities the Auditores S. Rotæ, all cameral ecclesiastics and lower prelates, and the generals of orders. Formerly they even enjoyed precedence over bishops, but Paul II decreed that at Rome and abroad they should step after the episcopate. Only in public consistories and in processional cavalcades four prothonotaries take their place immediately after the assistant bishops of the pontifical chapel, and consequently in front of the episcopate. They are, moreover, not subject to the jurisdiction of the ordinaries, but are placed under the immediate protection of the pope; they can freely dispose by testament even of their beneficial fortune to the amount of 2000 ducats; they receive all messages and graces of the pope free of tax and stamp; they have free access to the papal chancery, to the public consistories, and to the cardinal consistories, debating cases of beatification or canonization. They are entitled, under certain restrictions, to use portable altars in saying mass, and at certain festivals to wear the pontifical badges (comp. Sixt. V, *Constt.* "Romanus Pontifex" and "Laudabilis"). They have also the peculiar privilege of creating annually six doctors, who enjoy all the rights of regularly graduated doctors; but only residents of Rome can be thus promoted (Bened. XIV, *Const. Inter Conspicuos*, d. iv Cal. Septbr. 1744). These distinctions belong exclusively to the regular prothonotaries appointed by the pope himself. Those "extra statum," and the titular notaries, who can be appointed not only by the pope, but also by his legate *a latere*, and, with some restrictions, by the college of real prothonotaries, occupy in the scale of rank the degree next to the canons of a cathedral, and only if they are themselves provided with a canonry have they precedence over the other members of chapters. They wear the violet talarium, with the mantlet of the same color. In the performance of Church functions they are permitted the ring, but without jewel.—Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, s. v.

Protopapas is the archpriest in the Greek Church who stands on the left hand of the patriarch (q. v.). His dignity is entirely ecclesiastical: he administers the holy sacrament to the patriarch at all high and solemn masses, and receives it from him. He is the head ecclesiastical dignitary, not only with respect to his peculiar privileges, but to his right and title to precedence.

Protopresbyter (*πρῶτος ἱερεύς*, usually called *protopope*) is in the Russo-Greek Church an intermediate degree between the bishop and the simple priests. The situation and functions of the protopresbyter are essentially the same as those of the former archpriests of the episcopal cathedrals, and of the deans in the country. Each cathedral has its protopresbyter, but the same dignity exists in other important churches of large cities where several popes are employed. This title belongs also to such popes of the first rank as exercise some rights of supervision and administration over several surrounding parishes; for every diocese or eparchy in Russia is divided into several protopopates (as in the Roman Catholic Church into deaneries). This class of dignitaries forms, in litigious and disciplinary matters of ecclesiastical resort, the first instance in the diocese. In important cities the protopopes are generally employed as counsellors, assessors, or secretaries in the episcopal consistories or other ecclesiastical colleges. The distinguishing garment of the protopopes is the so-called *epigonaticon*. The protopresbyterate is the most influential of the lower clerical functions, and the highest degree open to a secular ecclesiastic; for in the Greek Church the episcopate, and the still higher dignities, can only be occupied by unmarried priests, or such as are separated from their wives by death or voluntary renunciation, and who belong to the monastical order, mostly archimandrites (abbots) and hegemons (priors).—Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, s. v.

Protopsaltes is the chief singer or master of the choir in Greek churches.

Protosyncellus is the vicar or assistant of a Greek patriarch, who generally resides along with him in his palace.

Protothrŏnus is, in the Greek Church, the name of the first bishop of an ecclesiastical province; he holds the first rank after the patriarch or after the metropolitan. At the death of either of these latter dignitaries, the protothronus assumes his jurisdiction until a successor is installed.

Prototype is a term used in theology to designate the original *type* (q. v.) or form of anything, and especially in the following dogma: The prototypal form in which Adam was created was the image of God; in Christ that image is restored; and it is the hope of the Christian that this form will be his also when he wakes up after God's likeness and is satisfied (Psa. xv, 17). It is a term, therefore, that has an anthropological, Christological, and an eschatological character, as referring to Adam, to the Redeemer, and to the redeemed. Now, in what does that likeness consist? Not surely in outward form, but in spiritual attributes, for God is Spirit. But those attributes pertain to the soul invested in body, which God has not; therefore the likeness of God must be restricted to such divine attributes as are reflected in man independently of his material nature, such as a love for all that is good and holy, right, reason, and free-will, which constitute in him the "likeness and glory" of God (1 Cor. xi, 7; see GLORY), and exclusive of other attributes that serve only to mark the imperfection of the creature. When Irenæus, therefore (*c. Hær.* v, 6), speaks of the image of God as being *suâ naturâ* of a bodily character, he may express correctly the philosophical notion of the Deity, and therefore of the divine likeness, as derived from ancient schools, but he hardly speaks with the authority of Catholic antiquity on a point which had as yet received but little consideration. Our only safe guide is the apostle, who expresses himself with sufficient explicitness. With him Christ is the very "image of God" (2 Cor. iv, 4), "in the form of God" (Phil. ii, 6), and "the express image of his Person," as well as "the brightness of his glory" (Heb. i, 3),

"the image of the invisible God" (Col. i, 15). He is now to us as the prototypal form in which Adam was created full of grace and truth; and man's hope of having that form restored in him hereafter depends on the genuineness with which some few rays of that glory are reflected in his soul now. So it has been decreed from everlasting that all who are called according to God's sanctifying purpose should be "conformed to the image of his Son" (Rom. viii, 29); that "as we have borne the image of the earthy," we may also "bear the image of the heavenly" (1 Cor. xv, 49); that having his high exemplar before us, and "beholding as in a glass the glory of the Lord," by a continually progressive, sanctifying process, we "may be changed into the same image from glory to glory as by the Spirit of the Lord" (2 Cor. iii, 18). It is of this "renewing in the spirit of our mind," according to the prototypal likeness of Christ, that the apostle speaks when he exhorts his charge to "put on the new man, which is renewed in knowledge after the image" of the Creator (Col. iii, 10), and "after God (כרמות) is created in righteousness and in the holiness of truth" (Eph. iv, 24). According to Roman Catholic doctrine, original righteousness was not this prototypal likeness, but a superadded gift conferred after the act of creation was complete. So the Tridentine Catechism says, "Quod ad animam pertinet, eam ad imaginem et similitudinem suam formavit Deus, liberumque ei tribuit arbitrium; omnes præterea motus animi atque appetitiones ita in eo temperavit, ut rationis imperio nunquam non parerent. Tum originalis justitiæ admirabile donum addidit," etc. (ed. Colon. 1565, p. 63). The council purposed, in the first instance, to express its meaning as "justitiam et sanctitatem in qua Adam conditus fuerat," but accepted the correction of Paceco, and wrote "constitutus fuerat" (Pallavicini, *Hist. Conc. Trid.* vii, 9). For the teaching of the schools on this point, see SCHOLASTIC THEOLOGY; for the whimsical notions of Judaism, see CABALA.

Protracted Meetings. See REVIVAL.

Proud, JOSEPH, an English minister of the New Jerusalem Church, who was born in the second half of the last century, is noted as the author of several of the ablest polemics ever issued by the Church of which he was a much esteemed member. He died about 1860. His works are: *Reply to Dr. Priestley's Letters on Swedenborg* (1792, 8vo):—*Hymns for the New Church* (12mo):—*Jehovah's Mercy*, a poem (8vo):—*Unitarian Doctrine Refuted* (Lond. 1806, 8vo):—*Letters on the Fundamental Doctrines of the Unitarian Religion* (1808, 8vo):—*The Aged Minister's Last Legacy to the New Church* (Birm. 12mo; 2d ed. Lond. 1855). See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, ix, 67.

Proudfit, Alexander Moncrief, D.D., an American divine of much celebrity, was born at Pequa, Pa., in 1770, and was educated at Columbia College, New York (class of 1792). He entered the ministry of the Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church, and was made pastor of the congregation at Salem, N. Y., in 1795, where he lived until 1835, when he became agent of the American Colonization Society. He resigned that post in 1842, and died in 1843. He published: *Discourses on the Ruin and Recovery of Man* (Salem, 1806, 12mo; again, 1813, 12mo):—*Discourses on the Leading Doctrines and Duties of Christianity* (1815, 4 vols. 12mo):—a work on the *Parables* (1820, 12mo):—and a number of single *Sermons, Tracts*, etc. (1798–1836). See *Memoir of the late A. M. Proudfit, D.D.*, etc., by John Forsyth, D.D., minister of the Union Church, Newburgh, N. Y. (12mo), reviewed in the *Meth. Quar. Rev.* vi, 358, by R. W. Dickinson; Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, ix, 67; *Memorial Volume A. B. C. F. M.* 1862, p. 114; *Princet. Rev.* Oct. 1846, p. 609.

Proudfit, John Wilbur, D.D., son of the preceding, was born at Salem, N. Y., Sept. 22, 1803, graduated at Union College in 1821, and at Princeton Theological Seminary in 1826. After a brief pastorate at Newburyport, Mass., he was elected professor of ancient languages in the University of the City of New York, where he remained from 1833 until 1838. He then spent some time in Europe, and in 1841 accepted the professorship of Latin and Greek literature in Rutgers College. In 1854 his chair was confined to Greek literature alone. He resigned in 1861, and transferred his ecclesiastical relation in 1864 to the Presbyterian Church. After a second protracted residence in Europe, he enlisted in the service of his country, and during the war was an exceedingly devoted and useful chaplain to the soldiers of the U.S. Army, being located on Bedloe's Island, in New York Harbor. After his return from the war he lived in New York City. He was a sincere and devout believer in the religion which he preached. His daily walk seemed to be "close with God," until, at last, "God took him." He died of pneumonia, March 9, 1870, after a very short illness, perfectly submissive to the will of the Lord and happy in the prospect of heaven. Dr. Proudfit was an eminent classical scholar and divine. His mind was highly cultivated, his tastes were refined, and his public life was distinguished by his devotion to literary and theological pursuits. He was a frequent contributor to religious newspapers, and to the *Princeton Review* and other serial publications. For some time he was editor of the *New Brunswick Quarterly Review*. In these periodicals he was actively engaged in the discussion of the exciting controversies connected with what is known as "Mercersburg theology." He edited an edition of Plautus and other classical works. His scholarship was far greater than his ability as a practical teacher of youth. His sermons were always carefully elaborated in style, elegant in expression, and evangelical in spirit, but his quiet delivery failed to give them the power to which their real merits entitled them. Some of these were published by request, among which is *A Baccalaureate Discourse to the Graduating Class of* 1841 *in Rutgers College*, one of the best specimens of his pulpit efforts. Dr. Proudfit was unusually tall and slender, dignified in appearance, with an intellectual head, benevolent face, and polished manners. He excelled as a conversationalist, being full of anecdote and illustration, and happily interweaving his reminiscences of public men and incidents of travel in foreign lands. He took a deep interest in the evangelization of the papal nations of Europe, and was familiar with the great religious questions of those lands. (W. J. R. T.)

Proudfit, Robert, D.D., an eminent American divine and educator, was born at Hopewell, Pa., June 6, 1777, and graduated at Dickinson College, Pa., in 1798. In 1801 he was ordained, and installed as pastor of the Associate Reformed Church at Broadalbin, N. Y., in which charge he continued until 1818, when he accepted an invitation to the professorship of Greek and Latin at Union College, Schenectady, which situation he filled with distinguished ability until 1849, when, by an act passed by the board of trustees of that college, he was relieved from active duty, and assumed the title of emeritus professor in the same institution. During the whole time he was in active duty as professor, Dr. Proudfit did not neglect the call of his sacred profession, and, while his health permitted, he ceased not to preach the Gospel whenever he had opportunity. The zeal and earnestness with which he labored for the Master's cause gained many souls to the Church, and Dr. Proudfit's memory is in the hearts of many made happy by his agency. He died at Schenectady, N. Y., Feb. 11, 1862. See Wilson, *Presbyt. Hist. Almanac* (1862), p. 306.

Proudhon, PIERRE JOSEPH, a noted French socialist, was born of humble parents, July 15, 1809, at Besançon. After a rudimentary education, he engaged in printing, and soon became an author—especially of an *Essai de Grammaire Générale*, for which he received a

pension. In 1840 he published his work entitled *Qu'est-ce que la Propriété*, which eventually became infamous from the answer which it gave to that question—"*La Propriété, c'est le Vol!*" and caused him the loss of his pension. During the Revolution he edited an inflammatory paper, which was soon suppressed, but gave him such popularity that he was elected to the Assembly. His notorious principles of anarchy prevented his being heard in the debates, and the papers which he issued in revenge were suppressed for their scurrility. In 1849 he started a *Banque du Peuple* to carry out his communistic ideas, but it was closed by the authorities, and he fled to Geneva, but on his return to Paris he was imprisoned. During his three years of incarceration he married, and issued several remarkable political works. He died in obscurity at Paris, Jan. 19, 1865. His social theories are of the most extravagant and dangerous character, greatly resembling the radical and immoral principles of the communistic revolutionists who are now agitating Europe and this country. See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.

Provender (מִסְפּוֹא, *mispô*), fodder for cattle (Gen. xxiv, 25, 32). In the account of king Solomon's stables, in 1 Kings iv, 28, we read, "Barley, also, and straw for the horses and dromedaries, brought they unto the place where the officers were, every man according to his charge." Harmer remarks upon this passage: "Besides provisions for themselves, the Orientals are obliged to carry food for the beasts on which they ride or carry their goods. That food is of different kinds. They make little or no hay in these countries, and are therefore very careful of their straw, which they cut into small bits, by an instrument which at the same time threshes out the corn; this chopped straw, with barley, beans, and balls made of bean and barley meal, or of the pounded kernels of dates, are what they are wont to feed them with. The officers of Solomon are accordingly said to have brought, every man in his month, barley and straw for the horses and dromedaries; not straw to litter them with, there is reason to think, for it is not now used in those countries for that purpose, but chopped straw for them to eat, either alone or with their barley. The litter they use for them is their own dung, dried in the sun, and bruised between their hands, which they heap up again in the morning, sprinkling it in summer with fresh water, to keep it from corrupting. In some other places we read of provender and straw, not barley and straw; because it may be other things were used for their food anciently, as well as now, besides barley and chopped straw. בָּלִיל, *belîl*, one of the words used for provender (Isa. xxx, 24), implies something of mixture, and the participle of the verb from which it is derived is used for the mingling of flour with oil; so the verb in Judges xix, 21 may be as well translated 'he mingled [food] for the asses' as 'he gave them provender,' signifying that he mixed some chopped straw and barley together for the asses. Thus also barley and chopped straw, as it is just after reaping, unseparated in the field, might naturally be expressed by the Hebrew word we translate provender, which signifies barley and straw that had been mingled together, and accordingly seems to be so. 'They reap every one his corn in the field' (Job xxiv, 6), '*Hebrew*, mingled corn or dredge,' says the margin. What ideas are usually affixed to secondary translation I do not know, but Job apparently alludes to the provender, or heap of chopped straw, lying mingled together in the field, after having passed under the threshing instrument, to which he compared the spoils that were taken from passengers so early as his time by those that lived somewhat after the present manner of the wild Arabs, which spoils are to them what the harvest and vintage were to others. With this agrees that other passage of Job where this word occurs (vi, 5), 'Will the ox low in complaints over his provender?' or 'fodder,' as it is translated in our version, when he has not only straw enough, but mixed with barley." Travellers in the East, wherever they mention the subject, use much the same terms as Walpole, who, in his *Journal*, remarks, "Neither hay nor oats are known to the Turks; nor has any nation in the East ever used them for their horses." See FODDER.

Provenzale, DAVID BEN-ABRAHAM, who flourished in the 16th century, was a preacher at Mantua, and was so eloquent that he was styled ראש הדרשנים שבדורו, i. e. the prince of preachers in his generation. He wrote: צִיר דָּוִד, a commentary on the Pentateuch from an archæological point of view:—שיר השירים באור, a commentary on the Song of Songs:—דור חפלגה, a comparative lexicon, Hebrew, Latin, Greek, and Italian:—and מגדל דוד, a Hebrew grammar. See Fürst, *Bibl. Jud.* iii, 123; De Rossi, *Dizionario Storico degli Autori Ebrei*, p. 272 (Germ. transl. by Hamberger); Etheridge, *Introduction to Hebrew Literature*, p. 288, Steinschneider, *Jewish Literature*, p. 239. (B. P.)

Proverb. מָשָׁל, *mashâl*, rendered in the A. V. "by-word," "parable," "proverb" (*παραβολή*, *παροιμία*), expresses all and even more than is conveyed by these its English representatives. It is derived from a root מָשַׁל, *mashâl*, "to be like" (Arab. *mathala*, to "resemble"), and the primary idea involved in it is that of likeness, comparison. This form of comparison would very naturally be taken by the short, pithy sentences which passed into use as popular sayings and proverbs, especially when employed in mockery and sarcasm, as in Mic. ii, 4; Hab. ii, 6, and even in the more developed taunting song of triumph for the fall of Babylon in Isa. xiv, 4. Probably all proverbial sayings were at first of the nature of similes, but the term *mashâl* soon acquired a more extended significance. It was applied to denote such short, pointed sayings as do not involve a comparison directly, but still convey their meaning by the help of a figure, as in 1 Sam. x, 12; Ezek. xii, 22, 23; xvii, 2, 3 (comp. *παραβολή*, Luke iv, 23). From this stage of its application it passed to that of sententious maxims generally, as in Prov. i, 1; x, 1; xxv, 1; xxvi, 7, 9; Eccles. xii, 9; Job xiii, 12, many of which, however, still involve a comparison (Prov. xxv, 3, 11, 12, 13, 14, etc.; xxvi, 1, 2, 3, etc.). Such comparisons are either expressed, or the things compared are placed side by side, and the comparison left for the hearer or reader to supply. Next we find it used of those larger pieces in which a single idea is no longer exhausted in a sentence, but forms the germ of the whole, and is worked out into a didactic poem. Many instances of this kind occur in the first section of the book of Proverbs; others are found in Job xxvii and xxix, in both which chapters Job takes up his *mashâl*, or "parable," as it is rendered in the A. V. The "parable" of Balaam, in Numb. xxiii, 7–10; xxiv, 3–9, 15–19, 20, 21–22, 23–24, are prophecies conveyed in figures; but *mashâl* also denotes the "parable" proper, as in Ezek. xvii, 2; xx, 49 (xxi, 5); xxiv, 3. Lowth, in his notes on Isa. xiv, 4, speaking of *mashâl*, says: "I take this to be the general name for poetic style among the Hebrews, including every sort of it, as ranging under one, or other, or all of the characters, sententious, figurative, and sublime; which are all contained in the original notion, or in the use and application of the word *mashâl*. Parables or proverbs, such as those of Solomon, are always expressed in short, pointed sentences; frequently figurative, being formed on some comparison, both in the matter and the form. Such, in general, is the style of the Hebrew poetry. Balaam's first prophecy (Numb. xxiii, 7–10) is called his *mashâl*, although it has hardly anything figurative in it; but it is beautifully sententious, and, from the very form and manner of it, has great spirit, force, and energy. Thus Job's last speeches, in answer to the three friends (ch. xxvii–

xxxi), are called *mashâls*, from no one particular character which discriminates them from the rest of the poem, but from the sublime, the figurative, the sententious manner which equally prevails through the whole poem, and makes it one of the first and most eminent examples extant of the truly great and beautiful in poetic style." Sir W. Jones says, "The moralists of the East have in general chosen to deliver their precepts in short, sententious maxims, to illustrate them by sprightly comparisons, or to inculcate them in the very ancient forms of agreeable apologues: there are, indeed, both in Arabic and Persian, philosophical tracts on ethics written with sound ratiocination and elegant perspicuity. But in every part of the Eastern world, from Pekin to Damascus, the popular teachers of moral wisdom have immemorially been poets, and there would be no end of enumerating their works, which are still extant in the five principal languages of Asia." See PARABLE. Our Lord frequently employed proverbs in his public instructions; and the illustration of these proverbs has occupied many learned men, who proceed partly by the aid of similar passages from the Old Test., and partly from the ancient writings of the Jews, especially from the Talmud, whence it appears how much they were in use among that people, and that they were applied by Christ and his apostles agreeably to common usage. The proverbs contained in the Old and New Tests. are collected and illustrated by Drusius and Andreas Schottus, whose works are comprised in the ninth volume of the *Critici Sacri*, and also by Joachim Zehner, who elucidated them by parallel passages from the fathers, as well as from heathen writers, in a treatise published at Leipsic in 1601. The proverbs which are found in the New Test. have been illustrated by Vorstius and Visir, as well as by Lightfoot and Schöttgen in their *Horæ Hebraicæ et Talmudicæ*, and by Buxtorf in his *Lexicon Chaldaicum Talmudicum et Rabbinicum*, from which last-mentioned works Rosenmüller, Kuinöl, Dr. Whitby, Dr. Adam Clarke, and other commentators, have derived their illustrations of the Jewish parables and proverbs. See Kelly, *Proverbs of all Nations* (Lond. 1859, 8vo); Sterling, *Literature of Proverbs* (ibid. 1860, 8vo); Bohn, *Book of Proverbs*. See PROVERBS, BOOK OF.

Proverbs, BOOK OF, the 20th book of the Old Test., according to the arrangement of the English Bible, where it is placed between the Psalms and Ecclesiastes, doubtless from its presumed relation to the other works of Solomon; and in the Hebrew Bible it likewise follows the Psalms as part of the Kethubim, or Hagiographa. In the German MSS. of the Hebrew Old Test. the Proverbs are placed between the Psalms and Job, while in the Spanish MSS., which follow the Masorah, the order is Psalms, Job, Proverbs. This latter is the order observed in the Alexandrian MS. of the Sept. Melito, following another Greek MS., arranges the Hagiographa thus: Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs, Job, as in the list made out by the Council of Laodicea; and the same order is given by Origen, except that the book of Job is separated from the others by the prophets Isaiah, Jeremiah, Daniel, and Ezekiel. But our present arrangement existed in the time of Jerome (see *Præf. in Libr. Regum*, iii: "Tertius ordo ἀγιώγραφα possidet. Et primus liber incipit ab Job. Secundus a David. . . . Tertius est Solomon, tres libros habens: Proverbia, quæ illi parabolas, id est Masaloth appellant: Ecclesiastes, id est, Coeleth: Canticum Canticorum, quem titulo Sir Asirim prænotant"). In the Peshito Syriac, Job is placed before Joshua, while Proverbs and Ecclesiastes follow the Psalms, and are separated from the Song of Songs by the book of Ruth. Gregory of Nazianzum, apparently from the exigencies of his verse, arranges the writings of Solomon in this order: Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs, Proverbs. Pseudo-Epiphanius places Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and Song of Songs between the 1st and 2d books of Kings and the minor prophets. The following article treats of the book both from an internal and an external point of view. See BIBLE.

I. *Title.*—As in the Pentateuch, the book of Proverbs takes its Hebrew title from its opening words—מִשְׁלֵי שְׁלֹמֹה, or מִשְׁלֵי, *mishléy*, simply. From this are directly derived the titles it bears in the Sept. (παροιμίαι Σαλομῶντος) and Vulgate (*Liber Proverbiorum quem Hebræi "Misle" appellant*), and the name by which it is universally known in English. Another title, perhaps more appropriate to the book as a whole, is derived from its chief subject, "*Wisdom.*" In the *Tosaphoth* to *Baba Bathra* (fol. 14 *b*), we find Proverbs and Ecclesiastes combined under the name סֵפֶר חָכְמָה, "the book of wisdom," and this title appears to have passed thence into the early Church. Clemens Roman. (*Ep. ad Cor.* i, 57) when quoting i, 23–31 says, οὕτως λέγει ἡ πανάρετος σοφία, a name which, according to Eusebius (*H. E.* iv, 22), was adopted by Hegesippus, Irenæus, and "the whole band of the ancients," following the unwritten Jewish tradition, and by Clem. Alex. (*Strom.* ii, § 22). It is styled by Gregory Naz. (*Orat.* xi) παιδαγωγικὴ σοφία, and by Dion. Alex. σοφὴ βίβλος. In the catalogue of canonical books compiled by Melito of Sardis preserved by Eusebius (*H. E.* iv, 26), we find Παρ. Σαλομ. ἡ καὶ Σοφία, a name which, as well as *Sapientia*, is of frequent occurrence in the early fathers (see Cotelerius in Clem. Rom. *l. c.*; Vales. ad Euseb. *l. c.*), though by no means restricted to the book of Proverbs, being equally used, as Cotelerius proves, of "Ecclesiasticus" and "The Wisdom of Solomon," a circumstance from which some confusion has arisen.

The word מָשָׁל, *mashâl*, by which the so-called "Proverbs" of Solomon are designated (Prov. i, 1, 6; x, 1; xxv, 1; and 1 Kings iv, 32 [v, 12]), is more appropriately translated in the Vulgate "parabola." It is akin to the verb מָשַׁל, corresponding with the Arabic *mathala* and the Syriac *methal*, "to be like," and primarily signifies "a comparison," "similitude," "parable" (Ezek. xvii, 2; xxiv, 3); whence it easily passed to those pithy, sententious maxims so often in the East appearing in the form of a terse comparison, of which many are to be found in the book before us—e. g. xxvi, 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 14, 17—and then to "proverbs" in general, whether containing a similitude or not (1 Sam. x, 12; xxiv, 13 [14]; Eccles. xii, 9). Its scope was still further enlarged by its application to longer compositions of a poetical and figurative character—e. g. that of Balaam (Numb. xxiii, 7, 18, etc., and Job xxvii, 1; comp. Psa. xlix, 5; lxxviii, 2), and particularly to taunting songs of triumph over fallen enemies—e. g. against the king of Babylon (Isa. xiv, 4), the Chaldeans (Hab. ii, 6; comp. also Mic. ii, 4; Deut. xxviii, 37; 1 Kings ix, 7). See PROVERB.

But the book of Proverbs, according to the introductory verses which describe its character, contains, besides several varieties of the *mashâl*, sententious sayings of other kinds, mentioned in i, 6. The first of these is the חִידָה, *chidâh*, rendered in the A. V. "dark saying," "dark speech," "hard question," "riddle," and once (Hab. ii, 6) "proverb." It is applied to Samson's riddle (Judg. xiv), to the hard questions with which the queen of Sheba plied Solomon (1 Kings x. 1; 2 Chron. ix, 1), and is used almost synonymously with *mashâl* in Ezek. xvii, 2, and in Psa. xlix, 4 (5); lxxviii, 2, in which last passages the poetical character of both is indicated. The word appears to denote a knotty, intricate saying, the solution of which demanded experience and skill: that it was obscure is evident from Numb. xii, 8. In addition to the *chidâh* was the מְלִיצָה, *melitsâh* (Prov. i, 6, A. V. "the interpretation," marg. "an eloquent speech"), which occurs in Hab. ii, 6 in connection both with *chidâh* and *mashâl*. It has been variously explained as a mocking, taunting speech (Ewald); or a speech dark and involved, such as needed a *melits*, or interpreter (comp. Gen. xlii, 23; 2 Chron.

xxxii, 31; Job xxxiii, 23; Isa. xliii, 27); or again, as by Delitzsch (*Der Prophet Habakuk*, p. 59), a brilliant or splendid saying ("*Glanz- oder Wohlrede, oratio splendida, elegans, luminibus ornata*"). This last interpretation is based upon the usage of the word in modern Hebrew, but it certainly does not appear appropriate to the Proverbs; and the first explanation, which Ewald adopts, is as little to the point. It is better to understand it as a dark, enigmatical saying, which, like the *mashâl*, might assume the character of sarcasm and irony, though not essential to it. See PARABLE.

As might be expected from the nature of the work contemplated, the proverbs before us almost exclusively bear reference to the affairs of this life; but while a future existence is not formally brought to view, yet the consciousness of such an existence runs throughout, and forms the basis on which many of the strongest, most decisive, and oft-repeated declarations are made. For example, ch. xi, 7 has no meaning except on the supposition that the writer believed in a future life, where, if not here, the hope and expectation of good men should be realized. If death were, in his judgment, annihilation, it would be equally the overthrow of the expectation of the righteous as of the wicked. See also, as affording similar indication, ch. xiv, 32; xxiii, 17, 18. See IMMORTALITY.

II. *Canonicity.*—The canonical authority of the book of Proverbs has never been called in question, except among the Jews themselves. We learn from the Talmud (*Shabbath*, fol. 30 *b*) that the school of Shammai, thus early adopting the principle of the free handling of Scripture, was led by some apparent contradictions in the book (e. g. Prov. xxvi, 4, 5) to question its inspiration, and to propose to cast it out of the canon. It is indeed certain, if we credit the Jewish tradition, that it did not at once take its place on a level with the other canonical Scriptures, but, like the Antilegomena of the New Test., remained for a time in suspense. According to Wolf (*Bibl. Hebr.* ii, 119) and Zunz (*Gott. Vorträg.* p. 14), it was not till the period of the Persian rule that "the men of the great synagogue" admitted it to an equal rank with the other Hagiographa. In the remarkable passage of the Talmud, however, which contains the most ancient opinion of the Jews on the formation of the Old-Test. canon (*Baba Bathra*, p. 14, apud Westcott, *Bible in the Church*, p. 36), its recognition is fixed earlier: the Proverbs ("Meshalim") being included with Isaiah, Canticles ("Shir Hashirim"), and Ecclesiastes ("Koheleth") in the memorial word Jamshak, specifying the books "written"—i. e. reduced to writing—by Hezekiah and his learned men. With the trifling exception mentioned above, its right to a place in the canon has never been questioned since its admission into it, and there is no book of Holy Scripture whose authority is more unshaken. The amount of inspiration in the book has been a matter of speculation since the days of Theodore of Mopsuestia, who believed that the wisdom contained in it was that of Solomon only, not of the Spirit of God; even as some of the rabbins found in Ecclesiastes no divine wisdom, but merely that of Solomon. Leaving such vain and impracticable distinctions, the canonical authority of the book is attested to us by the frequent use of it in the New Test. The following is a list of the principal passages:

Prov. i, 16	Rom. iii, 10, 15.
iii, 7	Rom. xii, 16.
*iii, 11, 12	Heb. xii, 5, 6; Rev. iii, 19.
*iii, 34	James iv, 6.
x, 12	1 Pet. iv, 8.
*xi, 31	1 Pet. iv, 18.
xvii, 13	Rom. xii, 17; 1 Thess. v, 15; 1 Pet. iii, 9.
xvii, 27	James i, 19.
xx, 9	1 John i, 8.
xx, 20	Matt. xv, 4; Mark vii, 10.
xxii, 8 (Sept.)	2 Cor. ix, 7.
*xxv, 21, 22	Rom. xii, 20.
*xxvi, 11	2 Pet. ii, 22.
xxvii, 1	James iv, 13, 14, 16.

Of these only those marked with an asterisk are actual quotations; in the others there is a more or less direct allusion. See WISDOM PERSONIFIED.

III. *Divisions.*—The thirty-one chapters of the book of Proverbs may be roughly divided into four sections: 1. The hortatory introduction (i–ix); 2. The first collection of "the Proverbs of Solomon," properly so called, with its appendices (x–xxiv); 3. The second collection, compiled by Hezekiah's scribes (xxv–xxix); 4. An appendix by different writers.

1. The first of these sections has no continuous connection, and is hardly capable of any very accurate subdivision. The separate chapters form in some instances a connected whole (e. g. ii, v, vii, viii, ix); sometimes the connection does not extend beyond a few verses (e. g. iii, 1–10, 13–26; iv, 14–19; vi, 1–5, 6–11). There is little coherence between the separate chapters, and little unity beyond that of the general subject or the mode of treating it; so that if one chapter were to be removed, the organization of the whole would not be affected, and it would hardly be missed. Ewald, however, who, somewhat in defiance of the internal evidence, looks on this portion as "an original whole, thoroughly connected, and cast, as it were, at one gush," after the general introduction (i, 1–7) discovers three subdivisions, marked as well by the contents as by the position of the imperative verb at the beginning of the sections (e. g. i, 8; iv, 1; vi, 20); while in the smaller divisions "my son" stands before the verb (e. g. i, 10, 15; ii, 1; iii, 1, 11, 20; iv, 21, etc.). Ewald's subdivisions are—(1) a general admonition to the pursuit of wisdom, not fully completed, but running off into particulars (i, 8–iii); (2) an exhaustive enumeration of the particular points of his admonition (iv, 1–vi, 29), until (3) the discourse, gradually rising in power and grandeur, at last attains an almost lyrical flight (vi, 20–ix). According to Delitzsch (in Herzog's *Encyklop.*) this section is divisible into fifteen separate strains—(1) i, 7–19; (2) i, 20–33; (3) ii, (4) iii, 1–18; (5) iii, 19–26; (6) iii, 27–35; (7) iv, 1–v, 6; (8) v, 7–23; (9) vi, 1–5; (10) vi, 6–11, (11) vi, 12–19; (12) vi, 20–35; (13) vii; (14) viii; (15) ix.

2. The second section (x–xxiv) evidently contains three subdivisions—(*a*) the collection of unconnected proverbs or gnomes (x, 1–xxii, 16); (*b*) "the words of the wise" (comp. i, 6; Eccles. ix, 7, xii, 11), consisting of a more connected series of maxims, with a hortatory preface recalling the style of the first section (xxii, 17–xxiv, 22); (*c*) a shorter appendix of proverbial sayings, with the title "these also belong to the wise," ending with a description of a sluggard (xxiv, 23–34).

3. The third section is a continuous series of gnomic sayings without any subdivision (xxv–xxix).

4. The fourth section, like the second, separates into three parts—(*a*) "the words of Agur," a collection of proverbial and enigmatical sayings (xxx), (*b*) "the words of king Lemuel" (xxxi, 1–9); and (*c*) a short alphabetical poem in praise of a virtuous woman (xxxi, 10–31).

IV. *History of the Text.*—The variations from the existing Masoretic text of the book of Proverbs presented by the versions of the Sept., the Peshito-Syriac, the Targum, and to some extent by the Vulgate, bear witness to the former existence of copies differing in many and not unimportant points from that which has become the authoritative text. The text, as preserved in these ancient versions, differs from that of our Hebrew Bibles both in excess and defect. They contain clauses, verses, and sometimes paragraphs not to be found in our extant copies, for the existence of which it is difficult to account, unless they formed part of the book which was before the translators; while other portions are wanting, for the absence of which no sufficient account can be given, except that they were not read in the ancient Hebrew MSS. they employed. The very large number of minor discrepancies, both in language and arrangement, which we meet with, all tend to confirm this view, and it well deserves consideration what

influence these variations, which every student knows are not confined to this book, should have on the ordinarily received hypothesis of the integrity and purity of the present Hebrew text. This, however, is not the place for the prosecution of this investigation. We shall content ourselves with pointing out the principal points of variation.

1. To commence with the Sept., the earliest of the existing versions. The translation of this book, like that of Job, proves a more competent acquaintance with the Greek language and literature than is usual with the Alexandrine translators. The rendering is more free than literal, giving what the writer conceived to be the general spirit of the passage without strict adherence to the actual words. Bertheau remarks that the version of this book appears to have been undertaken rather with a literary than a religious object, as it was not read in the synagogues or required for their internal regulation. It is to this freedom of rendering that not a few of the apparent discrepancies are due, while there are others which are attributable to carelessness, misconception of the writer's meaning, or even possibly to arbitrary alterations on the part of the translators. In some cases, also, we find two incompatible translations fused into one—e. g. vi, 25; xvi, 26; xxiii, 31. Of the majority, however, of the variations no explanation can be offered but that they represent a different original, and therefore deserve consideration for the history of the text.

In the first division (i–ix) these variations are less considerable than in the second. Two verses appended to ch. iv remove the abruptness of the close and complete the sense. To the simile of the ant (vi, 8), that of the bee is added. The insertion after viii, 21 seems out of place, and disturbs the continuity. In ch. ix there are two considerable additions to the discription of the wise and foolish women, which seem to complete the sense in a very desirable manner. The variations are much more considerable in the section x–xxiv. A large number of verses are wanting (xi, 4; xiii, 6; xvi, 1–4; xviii, 23, 24; xix, 1, 2; xx, 14–19; xxi, 5; xxii, 6; xxiii, 23—which comes in very awkwardly in the Hebrew text; xxiv, 8); the arrangement of others is dislocated—e. g. ch. xv closes with ver. 29, vers. 30, 32, 33 standing at the beginning of ch. xvi, while a verse very similar to ver. 31 is found after xvi, 17; xix, 3 stands as the last verse of ch. xviii; in ch. xx vers. 20–22 come between vers. 9 and 10. The most extraordinary dislocation, hardly to be ascribed to anything but an error of the scribe, appears in ch. xxiv. After ver. 22 is introduced xxix, 27, to which succeed four distichs descriptive of the wrath of a king and urging attention to the writer's words, not found in the Hebrew. We then find xxx–xxxi, 9 (i. e. the prophecy of Agur and of Lemuel), with the remainder of ch. xxiv, foisted in between vers. 14, 15 of ch. xxx. The remainder of ch. xxxi, the acrostic on a virtuous woman, stands in its right place at the end of the book. The additions in this section are also numerous and important. We find proverbs intercalated between the following verses: x, 4, 5; xi, 16, 17 (by which a very imperfect antithesis in the Hebrew is rectified); xii, 11, 12; 13, 14, xiii, 9, 10; 13, 14 (found in the Vulgate, xiv, 15, 16); xiv, 22, 23; xv, 5, 6; 18, 19; 27, 28; 28, 29; xvii, 6, 7; 16, 17; xviii, 22, 23; xix, 7, 8, xxii, 8, 9 (found with slight variations 2 Cor. ix, 7); 9, 10; 14, 15. In the dislocated ch. xvi five or perhaps six new proverbs appear. Intercalated proverbs are also found in the section xxv–xxix —e. g. xxv, 10, 11; 20, 21; xxvi, 11, 12 (found also in Eccles. iv, 21), xxvii, 20, 21; 21, 22; xxix, 25, 26. Besides these, a careful scrutiny will discover a large number of smaller interpolations throughout, many of which are only explanatory clauses.

To specify the words and clauses which vary from the Hebrew would carry us far beyond our limits. For these and the comparison of the two versions generally, the student may be referred to Jäger, *Observ. in Prov. Salom. vers. Alex.*, and Schleusner, *Opusc. Critic.* In many of these cases the Sept. has probably preserved the true reading (e. g. x, 10, b); but, on the whole, Ewald and Bertheau agree that the Masoretic text is the better and purer.

2. The Peshito-Syriac version, like the Sept., while it agrees with the Hebrew text generally, presents remarkable deviations in words and clauses, and contains whole verses of which there is no trace in the Hebrew. Some of the variations only prove a different interpretation of the text, but others are plainly referable to a difference in the text itself (e. g. vii, 22 sq.; xv, 4–15; xix, 20; xxi, 16; xxii, 21, etc.), and thus confirm the view that at the time the version was executed—i. e. anterior to the 4th century—the present Hebrew text was not universally recognised.

3. The Vulgate translation of Proverbs, hastily executed by Jerome in three days (together with Ecclesiastes and Canticles), offers largely the same phenomena as the Sept. version. Many of the additions of the Sept. are to be found in it—e. g. x, 4; xii, 11, 13; xv, 5, 27 (comp. xvi, 6); xvi, 5, etc.; and in one or two instances it has independent additions—e. g. xiv, 21; xviii, 8. There can be little doubt that in these points it preserves an authentic record of the state of the text at a period anterior to any existing Hebrew MS.

4. We may conclude this hasty review with the Targum. That on the Proverbs is considered by Zunz (p. 64), on linguistic grounds, to be nearly contemporaneous with those on the Psalms and Job, and is assigned by Bertheau to the latter half of the 7th century, though it is not quoted before the 12th. The version is close, and on the whole follows the original text very faithfully, though with some remarkable deviations (the following are quoted by Bertheau—vii, 22; x, 3; xiv, 14; xxv, 1, 20, etc.). Its similarity to the Peshito is too remarkable to be accidental (i, 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 10, 12, 13; ii, 9, 10, 13–15; iii, 2–9, etc.), and is probably to be accounted for by the supposition of a subsequent recension of the text, which is very corrupt, based upon that version. See Wolf, *Biblioth. Heb.* ii, 1176; Dathe, *De Rat. Consens. vers. Chald. et Syr. Prov. Salom.*; Zunz, *Gottesdienst. Vorträg.*

V. *Form and Style.*—1. The difference of style and structure between the first and second divisions is apparent on the most cursory perusal. Instead of the detached gnomes of the latter, we find a succession of hortatory addresses, varying in length and differing in subject, though for the most part on the same plan and with the same general object, in which the writer does not so much define wisdom as enlarge upon the blessings to be derived from its possession, and the lasting misery which is the consequence of the violation of its precepts, and in the most powerful and moving language urge the young to the earnest pursuit of it as the best of all good things. Whether originally written as a proem or introduction or not, it is certainly well fitted to occupy its present place, and prepare the mind of the reader for the careful consideration of the moral and practical precepts which follow. The style is of a much higher and more dignified character than in the succeeding portions, the language is more rhetorical; it abounds in bold personifications and vivid imagery. The concluding chapters (viii, ix) are cast in the grandest mould of poetry, and are surpassed in true sublimity by few portions of Holy Scripture. At the same time, when this portion is viewed as a whole, a want of artistic skill is discoverable. The style is sometimes diffuse and the repetitions wearisome. The writer returns continually on his steps, treating of the same topic again and again, without any apparent plan or regular development of the subject.

As regards the form, we find but little regularity of structure. The paragraphs consist sometimes of no more than two or three verses (i, 8–9; iii, 11–12; vi, 1–5, 6–11, 12–15, 16–19); sometimes the same thought is carried through a long succession of verses, or even

an entire chapter (ii, 1–22; v, 1–20; vi, 20–35; vii, viii, ix). A very favorite arrangement is a paragraph of ten verses (i, 10–19; iii, 1–10; 11–20; iv, 10–19; viii, 12–21; 22–31), a form which, if we may trust the Sept. version, existed also in the copies employed by them in iv, 20–27; v, 6–11; and, according to the Peshito-Syriac, in iv, 1–9. The parallelism of members is sometimes maintained, but frequently neglected. The parallels are usually synonymous (e. g. i, 8–9, 11, 12, etc.). The antithetical parallels found in iii, 32–35 belong to a series of gnomes which disturb the harmony of the passage, and appear scarcely in their appropriate place. It may be remarked that the name "Elohim" occurs only six times in the whole book, and thrice in this section (ii, 5–17; iii, 4). The other places are, xxv, 2; xxx, 5–9. Other unusual words are חָכְמוֹת, "wisdoms," for wisdom in the abstract (i, 20; ix, 1; found also in xxiv, 7); זָרָה, "the strange woman," which occurs repeatedly (e. g. ii, 16; v, 3, 20, etc., found nowhere else save in xxii, 14; xxiii, 23); and נָכְרִיָּה, "the stranger" (ii, 16; vii, 5, etc.; found also in xx, 16; xxiii, 27; xxvii, 13); i. e. the foreign prostitute, then as now lurking at the dark corners of the streets, taken as the representative of the harlot sense seducing the young and inexperienced from true wisdom. Ewald also notices the unusual construction of שָׁפָחִים, a dual fem. with a verb in the masc. plur. (v, 2); while in the next verse it has properly a fem. plur., and the unusual plur. אִישִׁים (viii, 4).

2. In the second division, "the Proverbs of Solomon," which form the kernel of the book, (x–xxii, 17), we find a striking similarity of structure throughout. Every verse (reckoned by Delitzsch at 375) in its normal form consists of two members, each containing three, four, or more rarely five short words. (The one exception to this rule [xix, 7] is probably due to the loss of a member, which is supplied by the Sept.) Every verse is independent, with no necessary connection with those that precede or follow, and, generally speaking, no attempt at arrangement. Ewald's theory of a continuous thread of connection running through this collection in its original form, and binding together the scattered sayings, has absolutely no evidence in its favor, and can only be sustained by supposing an almost total dismemberment of this portion of the book. It is true there are cases in which the same subject recurs in two or three successive verses (e. g. x, 2–5; 18–21; xi, 4–8; 24–26), but these are the exceptions, and only occur, as Ewald elsewhere allows, when, from the studied brevity of the proverbial form, a thought cannot be expressed in all its fulness in a single verse. The cases in which the same characteristic word or words recur in successive proverbs are more frequent (e. g. x, 6, 7; 8, 10; xi, 5, 6; 10, 11, etc.). But in every instance each verse gives a single definite idea, nor do we ever meet with two verses so connected that the latter contains the reason of the counsel, or the application of the illustration given in the former.

Nearly the whole of the proverbs in the earlier part of this division are *antithetical;* but after the middle of ch. xv this characteristic gradually disappears, and is almost entirely lost in the concluding chapters. A large number are *synonymous* (e. g. xi, 7, 25, 30; xii, 14, 28; xiv, 13, 17, 19, etc.), some *aphoristic* (e. g. xi, 31; xiii, 14), especially with the comparative and מִן (e. g. xii, 9; xv, 16, 17; xvi, 8, 9, etc.), or אַף כִּי, "much more" (e. g. xi, 31; xv, 11; xvii, 7). Others are *synthetic* (x, 18; xi, 29; xiv, 17, etc.); only two are *parabolic* (x, 26; xi, 22).

The style is lower and more prosaic than in the former section. Ewald regards it as an example of the most ancient and simplest poetical style, full of primeval terseness, and bearing the visible stamp of antiquity in its language and imagery without any trace of later coloring. He remarks very justly that the proverbs in this collection are not to be looked upon as a collection of popular sayings, embodying mere prudential wisdom, but that they belong to the higher life, and are as broad in their grasp of truth as in their range of thought. The germ of many of them may have been found in popular sayings; but the skill and delicacy with which they have been fashioned into their present shape, though of the simplest kind, display the hand of a master.

Ewald remarks the following peculiar phrases as occurring in this section. "Fountain of life," x, 11; xiii, 14; xiv, 27; xvi, 22 (comp. Psa. xxxvi, 9 [10]): "tree of life," iii, 18; xi, 30; xiii, 12; xv, 4: "snares of death," xiii, 14; xiv, 27 (comp. Psa. xviii, 5 [6]): and the following favorite words—מַרְפֵּא, "healing," in various similes and applications, xii, 18; xiii, 17; xvi, 24 (but this also occurs in the former section, iv, 22; vi, 15): מְחִתָּה, "destruction," x, 14, 15, 29; xiii, 3; xiv, 28; xviii, 7; xxi, 15; and only in four other places in the whole Bible: נָפִיחַ, part. from פּוּחַ, "to blow," xii, 17; xiv, 5, 25; xix, 5–9 (comp. vi, 19; Psa. xii, 6; xxvii, 11): the unfrequent roots סֶלֶף, "perverseness," xi, 3; xv, 4, and the verb סָלַף, "to pervert," "destroy," xiii, 6; xix, 3; xxi, 12; xxii, 12: the phrase לֹא יִנָּקֶה, "shall not go unpunished," xi, 21; xvi, 5; xvii, 5 (comp. xxviii, 20; vi, 29): רָדַף, "he that pursueth," xi, 19; xii, 11; xiii, 21; xv, 9; xix, 7 (comp. xxviii, 19), and nowhere else. Ewald instances also as archaic phrases not met with elsewhere, צַר אַרְגִּיעָה, "but for a moment," xii, 19: יָד לְיָד, "hand join in hand," xi, 21; xvi, 5: הִתְגַּלַּע, "meddled with," xvii, 14; xviii, 1; xx, 3: נִרְגָּן, "whisperer," "talebearer," xvi, 28; xviii, 8 (comp. xxvi, 20–22). The word יֵשׁ, "there is," though frequent elsewhere, scarcely occurs in Proverbs, save in this section, xi, 24; xii, 18; xiii, 7, 23; xiv, 12, etc.

3. With xxii, 17, "the words of the wise" (comp. i, 6), we are carried back to the style and language of the proem (ch. i–ix), of which we are also reminded by the continued address in the second person singular, and the use of "my son." There is, however, a difference in the phraseology and language; and, as Maurer remarks, the diction is not unfrequently rugged and awkward, and somewhat labored. Parallelism is neglected. The moral precepts are longer than those of ch. x–xxii, but not so diffuse as those of the first section. We find examples of the distich, xxii, 28; xxiii, 9; xxiv, 7–10: the tristich, xxii, 29; xxiv, 29: but the tetrastich is the most frequent, the favorite form being that in which the second member gives the ground of the first, xxii, 22, 23; 24, 25; 26, 27, etc. We also find proverbs of five members, xxiii, 4, 5; xxiv, 3, 4: several of six, xxiii, 1–3, 12–14, 19–21; xxiv, 11, 12: and one of seven, xxviii, 6–8. We have a longer strain, xxiii, 29–35, against drunkenness.

4. The short appendix, xxiv, 23–34, comprising more "words of the wise," can hardly be distinguished in style or form from the preceding. It closes with a "proverb-lay" of five verses on the evils of sloth.

5. The second collection of "the Proverbs of Solomon" (ch. xxv–xxix), transcribed (הֶעְתִּיקוּ, Sept. ἐξεγράψαντο, Aq. μετῆραν; Gr. Ven. μετήνεγκαν; comp. Pusey, *Daniel*, p. 322 note) by the scribes of Hezekiah, closely resembles the former one. They are, according to Pusey, "identical in language." It has, however, some very decided points of difference. The "parabolic" proverb is much more frequent than the "antithetical," the two members of the comparison being sometimes set side by side without any connecting link (e. g. xxv, 12, 13), which is in other cases given merely by וְ, "and," or כֵּן, "so" (xxvi, 1, 2, 18–19; xxvii, 8, etc.). The parallelism is sometimes strict, sometimes lax and free. There is a want of the sententious brev-

ity of the former collection, and the construction is looser and weaker. The proverbs are not always completed in a single verse (xxv, 6, 7; 9, 10; 21, 22; xxvi, 18, 19); and more frequently than in the former section we have series of proverbs with an internal connection of subject (xxvi, 23–25; xxvii, 15, 16, 23–27), and others in which the same key-word recurs (xxv, 8–10; xxvi, 3–12; 13–16). This is not found so often after xxvii, 5; but a close examination of the text suggests the idea that this may be due to a disturbance of the original order (comp. xxvii, 7, 9; xxviii, 4, 7, 9; xxix, 8, 10, etc.). Ewald discovers a want of the figurative expressions of the earlier collection, and a difference of language and phraseology, while Rosenmüller remarks that the meaning of the proverbs is more obscure and enigmatical. The greater part of them are moral precepts. "The earlier collection may be called 'a book for youth;' this 'a book for the people'" (Delitzsch); "the wisdom of Solomon in the days of Hezekiah" (Stier).

6. The three supplemental writings with which the book closes (ch. xxx, xxxi) are separated from the other portions and from one another no less by style and form than by authorship. Ewald somewhat arbitrarily divides ch. xxx after ver. 14 (a division, however, sanctioned by the Sept.), and thinks it not improbable that ch. xxx and xxxi, 1–9 are from the same pen. He also regards the opening verses of ch. xxx as a dialogue, vers. 2–4 being the words of an ignorant disciple of Agur, to which the teacher replies. The difference between the enigmatical sayings of Agur (which find a counterpart in the collections of Oriental proverbs) and the simple admonitions of Lemuel's mother is very great if we assign them to one author. In ch. xxx we have, in Ewald's words, instead of moral aphorisms, a succession of elegant little pictures illustrative of moral truths, evidencing a decay of creative power, the skill of the author being applied to a novel and striking presentation of an old truth. The ancient terse proverbial form is entirely lost sight of, and the style rises to a height and dignity warranting the use of the term מַשָּׂא (comp. Isa. xiii, 1; Hab. i, 1, etc.) applied to both. In "the words of king Lemuel" we find much greater regularity. The parallelism is synonymous, and is maintained throughout. The alphabetical ode in praise of a virtuous woman—"a golden A B C for women" (Döderlein)—has all its verses of about the same compass. The parallelism is very similar to that of the Psalms, especially those in which the same alphabetical arrangement is found.

VI. *Authorship and Date.*—On these points the most various opinions have been entertained, from that of the rabbins and the earlier school of commentators, with whom some modern writers (e. g. Keil) agree, who attribute the whole book to Solomon (even ch. xxx, xxxi are assigned to him by Rashi and his school), to those of Hitzig and other representatives of the advanced critical school, who, however widely at variance with one another, agree in reducing to a minimum the wise king of Israel's share in the book which from the remotest antiquity has borne his name. In the face of such wide discrepancies, where the same data lead careful investigators (e. g. Ewald and Hitzig) to exactly opposite conclusions, a satisfactory decision of the question of authorship and date is hardly to be hoped for. It may rather be doubted whether the evidence at present before us is such as to admit of an absolute determination of the question at issue. Where so much indefiniteness exists, all we can do is to balance probabilities and to abstain from dogmatic decisions.

The evidence in favor of a composite origin of the book appears, we must confess, irresistible. No unprejudiced person, we think, accustomed to the consideration of such questions, could read the book for the first time, even in English, without seeing in it the traces of several different authors, or at least editors. Irrespective of the two concluding chapters, the express reference to other sages (חֲכָמִים, in xxii, 17; xxiv, 23; comp. i, 6) indicates a diversity of authorship, while the difference of style between various divisions of the work strengthens the hypothesis. Indeed, a careful observer will find at the very outset an indication of the composite character of the book in the introductory verses which profess to give the contents and character (i, 1–7). These prepare us to find in it, not merely "proverbs" and "eloquent speeches" (margin, A. V.: "interpretation"), but also such "words of the wise" as those we have just referred to, and "dark sayings" like those of Agur.

Are we, then, to discard the title, "the Proverbs of Solomon," and to consider that the designation has been given to the book erroneously? To us this appears rash in the extreme. We know from historical sources that Solomon was the author of a very large number of proverbs; and nothing but that restlessness of speculation which discards old beliefs simply, as it would seem, because they are old, and seeks to unsettle all that has hitherto been held certain, can discover any sufficient reason for questioning that Solomon was the composer of the greater part of those contained in our present book, especially in the sections x–xxii, 16; xxv–xxix. However much these collections may have been modified in successive redactions, though too much has probably been conceded to this hypothesis, of which there is no definite trace, and by which a work may be made to assume any form that may suit the theory to be supported, we have no sufficient reason for doubting that Solomon was the originator of the peculiar style of poetry in which they are composed, and that, even if they are not *all* to be referred to him, the mass are his, and that they are all pervaded with his spirit, and may be assigned to his epoch. Even those attributed to "the ancients" may have been found by Solomon already floating in a semi-gnomic form, and recast by him in a more distinctly proverbial dress. Eichhorn finds in them no trace of language or thought subsequent to the time of Solomon. Even Ewald, who insists most on the collection as we have it having suffered from abbreviations, transpositions, and unauthorized additions, remarks that the proverbs all breathe the happy peace and growing civilization of Solomon's age; nor is there any epoch either earlier or later to which we could preferably assign them.

The proverbs in the later collection (ch. xxv–xxix), though they present some diversities, do not differ so essentially from the earlier ones as to give any sufficient grounds for questioning the accuracy of the superscription (xxv, 1). The title itself informs us that the compilation was not made till four centuries after Solomon, and the differences are not greater than might be looked for in sayings that had been so long floating about among the common people, and thereby subjected to disfigurement and change. The indications of an altered state of society and a decrease of confidence in the rulers, in which Ewald discovers such unmistakable proofs of a later date, are hardly so evident to others as to himself. We know too little of the internal economy of Solomon's reign to enable us to pronounce authoritatively that such and such expressions are inconsistent with the state of the people and tone of thought at that period.

The objection brought by Eichhorn and others against assigning the proverbs in the two collections to Solomon, that the genius of no one man, not even one as divinely gifted with wisdom as Solomon, is sufficient for the production of so large a number, is puerile in the extreme. Those we possess are but a portion of the three thousand ascribed to him (1 Kings iv, 32), and scarcely give twenty for each of the forty years of his reign.

The general didactic tone of the book is asserted to be more consistent with the character of a prophet or priest than that of a king (Davidson). To this it is replied

that this is true of kings in general, but not of such a king as Solomon, to whom God gave a wise and understanding heart, whose proverbs are eminently didactic, and who has in 1 Kings viii discoursed on the divine economy towards man in a way that no prophet or priest could well surpass. The praises of monogamy, and the strict injunctions against adultery, are urged by Bertholdt as reasons why Solomon, a polygamist himself, and Bathsheba's son, could not be the author of this section. It is, however, a remarkable feature of the Old Test. in general, and not peculiar to this place, that polygamy, however generally practiced, is never praised; that invariably where the married state is spoken of in terms of praise it is the union of one man to one woman that is held up to honor. Besides, the force of this objection is considerably modified by the reflection that precepts are here given for the mass of men, with whom monogamy is the general rule, though polygamy may be common among the richer classes (Wilkinson's *Egypt*, ii, 62); and also that the contrast here drawn (Prov. v, 18, etc.) is not between monogamy and polygamy, but between the marriage tie and adulterous connection. As to the supposition that the repeated warnings against adultery could not come from one whose own mother fell into that sin, no great weight can be attached to it; for a moral and religious teacher must disregard considerations which would influence other men. The allusions to deeds of violence (i, 11–19; ii, 12, etc.) are supposed by Ewald to indicate a state of confusion inconsistent with that state of peace and social security which marked the reign of Solomon (1 Kings iv, 25). To this it is replied that a condition of great private wealth, such as was the condition of Solomon's times, always tempts needy and unprincipled men to acts of unlawful violence; and that nothing beyond crimes which now are committed in the most civilized and best-regulated countries are referred to in the passages in question. Besides, Judæa always afforded in its caverns and wildernesses peculiar facilities for robbers (Judg. vi, 2; 1 Sam. xxiv, 1). From a supposed degeneracy of style, Ewald attributes this section to the earlier part of the 7th century B.C. But other critics do not see this. Davidson thinks it indicates a flourishing state of Hebrew literature, and refers it probably to the 9th century B.C., an opinion in which he coincides with Hitzig. The grounds on which Ewald relies for his alleged degeneracy of style seem weak. Thus, he asserts that the plural *ishim* (Prov. viii, 4) is so unusual as to indicate a very late date. It is certainly very unusual, for it occurs only three times (Fürst). From these, however, we cannot argue as to the date, as one of them is in Isaiah, another in Psa. cxli, 3, attributed to David, and the third in the passage above referred to.

Similar and equally futile objections have been based, by Bertholdt and others, on the familiarity displayed in the proverbs with circumstances and conditions in life with which it is supposed that Solomon as a king could have had no experimental acquaintance. For example, it is maintained that x, 5; xii, 10, 11; xiv, 4; xx, 4, must have been written by a landowner or husbandman: x, 15, by a poor man: xi, 14; xiv, 19, by a citizen of a well-ordered state: xi, 26, by a tradesman: xii, 4, by one who was not a polygamist: xiv, 1; xv, 25: xvi, 11; xvii, 2; xix, 13, 14; xx, 10, 14, 23, by an ordinary citizen: xxv, 2–7, not by a king, but by one who had lived some time at a court: xxvii, 11, by a teacher of youth: xvii, 23–27, by a sage who lived a nomadic life: xxviii, 16, by one free from those errors which weakened Solomon's throne, and robbed his son of his kingdom. It is needless to point out the weakness of these fancied arguments which would affect no one who had not a theory of his own to support. They are akin to those which have been used with as little success to prove that no one man could have written the plays of Shakespeare, and they display the most marvellous ignorance of that many-sidedness and keenness of perception and insight which are characteristic of the highly gifted among mankind.

As little weight is to be assigned to the objections drawn from the repetitions. It is true that we find the same idea, and even the same words, recurring not only in the two collections (e. g. xxi, 9, xxv, 24; xviii, 8, xxvi, 22; xxii, 3, xxvii, 12; xxii, 13, xxvi, 13; xix, 24, xxvi, 15; xix, 1, xxviii, 6), but in the same collection (e. g. xiv, 12, xvi, 25; x, 1, xv, 20; xvi, 2, xxi, 2; x, 2, xi, 4; xiii, 14, xiv, 27; xxvi, 12, xxix, 20). This latter is, however, no more, as Umbreit remarks, than is natural in such a compilation, in the formation of which one is very apt to forget what had already been set down; while the former class of repetitions is easily to be accounted for by the anxiety of the collectors to lose nothing which had the stamp of Solomon's authorship, even though the same idea had already been expressed in the earlier collection; and it goes far to confirm the view that Solomon was the composer of the whole.

The internal evidence—derived from language, construction, ideas, historic background, and the like—varies with every successive critic, and is entirely inadequate to warrant any decisive verdict. Its precariousness is proved by the opposite results to which the same data lead various commentators. Keil maintains that every part of the book, with the exception of the last two chapters, corresponds to the epoch of Solomon, and that only. Eichhorn agrees with this to a certain extent, but limits the correspondence to ch. i–xxiv; while Ewald, Hitzig, and Bertheau, and other minor critics, arrive at conclusions expressed with equal confidence and at variance with these and with one another. There is, however, one evidence which speaks strongly in favor of an early date—the entire absence of all reference to idolatry. The form of religion appearing throughout is purely Jehovistic (as we have noticed above, Elohim occurs only four times in the body of the work), and false gods and foreign faiths are not even referred to.

The above remarks refer chiefly to the collection of proverbs properly so called, which we have no difficulty in ascribing, on the whole, to Solomon as their ultimate author. We may, if we choose, suppose that the men of Hezekiah made a collection of unwritten proverbs current among the people, and by them supposed, truly or not, to have come down from Solomon; but the men of Hezekiah, or whoever wrote the superscription of xxv, 1, declare those they put forth to have been copied from written records. Assuming this to be the correct view, the difference between these proverbs and those which went before is, that whereas in Solomon's time the latter were arranged as we have them, the former were in Hezekiah's time selected from more ancient written records and added to the existing collection. It gives us the idea, which is itself an extremely probable one, that voluminous records were made in Solomon's time of the wise king's sayings, either by himself or by scribes. This idea derives considerable confirmation from the notice in 1 Kings iv, 30–34, where we are told of the accurate account taken of his compositions and sayings, and even of the precise number of his proverbs and songs. We are led to suppose, then, that in Solomon's time a selection (x–xxii, 16) was made by himself, or under his immediate supervision, while in Hezekiah's time a further selection was made, and an exact transcript taken. A comparison of the proverbs in these two collections lends strong confirmation to this view. In selecting or arranging a collection in Solomon's time, and under his inspection, the choice would naturally fall upon the most perfect, and as alterations might be freely made by their actual author, these would tend to bring them into a still more finished form. Accordingly, we find in the more ancient collection a certain tastefulness and polish which the others do not possess. In the former each verse contains its own perfect sense, and this usually comprised in a certain number of words,

varying from seven to nine, beyond which they very rarely extend. In the latter, while the sense is generally contained in one verse, it not unfrequently runs through two or more verses. Examples from these might easily be produced as concise and perfect in form as the others (e. g. xxv, 2, 3, 14); but very commonly the sense is brought out in a much more diffuse manner (e. g. xxv, 6, 7, 9, 10, 21, 22; xxvi, 18, 20; xxvii, 15, 16, 23–27). In the individual verses also we find occasionally a far greater number of words than are ever admitted into those of the older collection (e. g. xxv, 7, 20); and the parallelism, which never fails in the verses of the earlier, is often wanting in those of the later division (xxv, 8, 21, 22; xxvi, 10; xxvii, 1). This agrees with the idea which we think warranted by a comparison of xxv, 1 with 1 Kings iv, 32, 33, that the proverbs in this collection are probably much as they fell from Solomon's lips, and were first committed to writing by himself or others under him; and that while the former collection received his own final corrections, the men of Hezekiah simply copied from the text before them, but did not venture upon any alteration in the form.

The case is somewhat different with regard to the introductory chapters (i–ix), and there is more ground for the diversity of opinion as to their date and authorship. It is certainly quite possible that the whole or a considerable portion of this section may have been written by Solomon. The differences of style, of which Ewald makes much, are, as Bertheau has shown, somewhat exaggerated by him, and are not perhaps greater than may be accounted for by the different nature of the compositions. The terse simplicity of a proverb would be out of place in a series of hortatory addresses such as those which characterize this section. Ewald dwells with emphasis on the internal evidence of a late date afforded by the state of society, and the tone of feeling as portrayed here. But we repeat our former remark, that we know too little of the internal history of Judæa at this time to allow us to speak with so much confidence on these points, and express our conviction that the conclusions drawn by Ewald are not warranted by the premises. The imagery all points to a large and profligate city, such as Jerusalem may well have become during the middle of Solomon's prosperous reign; and the vivid representation of the habits of the foreign prostitutes and lawless freebooters who roamed its streets is hardly more than could have been attained by one who, like Harûn Alraschid, was fond of laying aside his kingly state and visiting his city in disguise.

It is evident, from what we have remarked in a former section, that we regard the proem (ch. i–ix) in its present form as a composite work, though very possibly proceeding from one pen. The similarity of style, subject, and treatment, is strongly in favor of unity of authorship, while the internal evidence favors the view that it is compiled of various unconnected members, collected and arranged subsequently to the time of their composition. The date of this compilation it is impossible to fix. The evidence on this point is faint and untrustworthy, and has led different investigators to very opposite conclusions. Ewald places it in the 7th, Hitzig in the 9th century B.C., while Keil, as we have seen, ascribes it to the time of Solomon. The resemblance that may be traced in this portion of the work to the spirit and teaching of the book of Job, and the recurrence of some of the words and images found there, is employed both by Hitzig and Ewald to aid in determining the date of this section (comp. Job xv, 7 with Prov. viii, 25; Job xxi, 17, Prov. xiii, 9; Job xxviii, 18, Prov. viii, 16; Job v, 17, Prov. iii, 11; see Pusey, *Daniel*, p. 323, note 7). But as there is no unanimity as to the date of the composition of Job, little help is to be expected from this source, nor can we be surprised at the diversity of opinion among those who have employed it: Ewald maintaining that the writer of Proverbs had read and made use of Job: Hitzig, on the contrary, believing that the former is the earlier work, and that the author of Job borrowed from Proverbs. The adoption of such expedients proves most forcibly the complete want of any decisive testimony which will enable us to arrive at any trustworthy conclusion as to the date of this section. In the midst of this uncertainty, the above solution is as probable as any other—namely, that it is due to Solomon's authorship out of materials existing at his time.

The similarity in style between i–ix and the appendix to the first collection of proverbs (xxii, 17–xxiv) appears to favor the view that this supplement is due to the same person by whom the proem was prefixed to the book. Ewald enumerates several reasons for ascribing the two to the same writer (p. 42), but finally decides against the unity of authorship. The proverbs themselves, designated as "words of the wise," are evidently distinguished from those of Solomon, and are probably to be regarded as the adages of other sages, which the compiler of the work thought too valuable to be lost, and therefore appended to his larger collection. The short supplement (xxiv, 23–34) is accounted for by Umbreit on the supposition that the compiler had laid aside his work for a time, and took it up again on the discovery of fresh sayings worthy of preservation. He renders לַחֲכָמִים, "*for*," not "*of* the wise," and regards them as directed to the compiler's scholars. Ewald, Bertheau, Delitzsch, etc., defend the received translation.

It only remains for us to speak of the threefold supplement (xxx, xxxi), with regard to the authorship and date of which again nothing can be determined. It would be hardly profitable to discus the marvellous fabric of fanciful history and biography which has been evolved from the scantiest materials by Hitzig, Bunsen, and Bertheau. Those who desire it may refer to their works to see the grounds on which "Massa" (A. V. "the prophecy") is identified with a district in Arabia (Gen. x, 30; xxv, 14; 1 Chron. i, 30) of which Lemuel was king, and Agur with a descendant of the Simeonites, who in the reign of Hezekiah drove out the Amalekites from Mount Seir (1 Chron. iv, 42); or, again, on which it is sought to prove that Agur and Lemuel were brothers, sons of the reigning queen of Massa. We would rather commend to our reader Eichhorn's sensible words that "Agur should remain Agur, and belong to the wise men of the old world of whom history gives us no further information," and with him deprecate "spinning a long thread of tedious conjectures about a name, which do not advance us an inch in our insight into the literature of the old world, or any profitable learning." As little to the purpose is the fancy of Döderlein that the opening part of ch. xxx is a dialogue: that Ithiel is a heathen; Agur a much valued servant of Ithiel, to whom, as his master, his prayer (v, 7–9) is addressed. Many are content with saying that Agur was an unknown Hebrew sage, the teacher of Ithiel and Ucal—names from which, also, many unprofitable speculations have been built—and that he lived subsequently to the reign of Hezekiah. Still more probable do we regard the view which identifies him with Solomon himself under a fanciful name. See Agur; Massa.

Lemuel—"to God," "devoted to God," after the analogy of לְאֵל, Numb. iii, 24 (Pusey)—may certainly be regarded as a figurative name descriptive of an ideal king, "a monarch as he should be" (Ewald; Eichhorn; comp. Pusey, *Lect. on Daniel*, p. xiii, note 1, p. 323, note 5). See Lemuel.

The alphabetical lay which concludes the whole has usually been thought to belong to the latest period of Hebrew poetry, and hardly to be placed higher than the 7th century. Its style and language seem to distinguish it from the words of Lemuel, with which it has sometimes been confounded; but we are again warned against the precariousness of such grounds of argument as to authorship.

The results of our inquiry may be thus summed up. The nucleus of the book is the larger collection of proverbs (x–xxii, 16). These may safely be regarded as really what they profess to be, "the proverbs of Solomon." Whether they were arranged as we now have them and published by him, there is not sufficient evidence to determine. It is probable, however, that the collection was either contemporaneous with or not long subsequent to him. The greater part of the hortatory introduction (i–ix) may also be, with great probability, ascribed originally to Solomon, though we incline to the belief that its present form is due to a later compiler, who collected the admonitions of the wise king, and prefixed them to his book of proverbs. The same author also appears to have added the appendix (xxii, 17; xxiv, 22), containing proverbs of which Solomon was not the proper author, but perhaps only the earliest collector, and after this from similar sources were supplied the few supplementary sayings (xxiv, 23–34). The time when this was done cannot be fixed, but there are cogent arguments in favor of a late date. The second collection, as its name declares, was formed by the scribes of Hezekiah, cir. B.C. 725. The last two chapters contain compositions of the dates and authors of which nothing certain can now be known. They, too, may have been in some important sense due to Solomon, but were probably inserted by a later editor.

It will not be worth while to enumerate the many and widely varying theories of recent critics as to the dates of the composition of the different parts of this book, and the time when it assumed its present form. One or two of the most characteristic may be specified. Suffice it to say that Ewald would place the publication of x–xxii, 16 about two centuries after Solomon, and i–ix in the first half of the 7th century. Not much later the second collection of proverbs (xxv–xxix) was added, the sections xxii, 17–xxiv being due to the same compiler. Hitzig, on the contrary, views i–ix as the earliest part of the book; x–xxii, 16 and xxviii, 17–xxix being added about B.C. 750. Twenty-five years later Hezekiah's collection followed; the gaps being filled up and the volume completed by some unknown compiler at a later period. The theory of Delitzsch (Herzog, *Encyklop.*, s. v. Sprüche) is marked by more calm sense, but even this is in parts not a little fanciful or conjectural. Rightly regarding x–xxii, 16 as the kernel of the book, and mainly composed by Solomon, he divides the whole into two portions—(1) i–xxiv, 22 put forth in the time of Jehoshaphat; the introduction (i–ix) and appendix (xxii, 16–xxiv, 22) being written by the compiler, whom he regards as "a highly gifted didactic poet, and an instrument of the spirit of revelation;" and (2) xxiv, 23–xxxi, published in the reign of Hezekiah; the introductory and closing portions (xxiv, 23–34, and xxx, xxxi) being set on either side of the collection of Solomon's proverbs to serve as a kind of foil.

The two periods which are generally selected in opposition to the above views of the Solomonic authorship for the composition of various parts of the book are the reign of Hezekiah and the times subsequent to the captivity. Neither of these periods seems to suit the general character of Proverbs at all so well as the reign of Solomon. Hezekiah found his kingdom in great domestic misery—immersed in idolatry and subject to foreign rule. At home his pre-eminent character was that of a social and religious reformer, struggling against the sins and evils of his times; abroad the most active period of his reign was distinguished by a series of wars, during some of which his kingdom was reduced to the verge of ruin, the whole land overrun by hostile armies, its fenced cities taken, and the king forced to submission. The terror of an Assyrian invasion also hung over the land for years. The later period of his reign, indeed, was peaceful; but the evils of preceding reigns were far from being eradicated, and he had before him the certain prospect, conveyed by prophecy, of the utter prostration of his kingdom. His chief works seem to have been the making a pool and conduit to bring water to Jerusalem. On his death Judah relapsed into idolatry. The times subsequent to the captivity were marked by equally strong characteristics, and chiefly of a mournful kind—a feeble, struggling, and too often languid and depressed remnant, striving amid many difficulties to maintain their ground and bear up amid manifold discouragements. With neither of these periods does the general character of Proverbs agree. Royalty marks it throughout, sharply distinguishing it from any period subsequent to the captivity; as by other marked features it bears the impress of a time different from Hezekiah's. Its warnings are not against the public sins which disgraced that period, nor are its consolations suited to the public trials which were threatening to bring both king and kingdom to the ground. Its pointed allusions to a powerful monarchy, a numerous and wealthy people, and such sins as readily spring up in a time of plenty; its fine linens of Egypt, its high places thronged, its roads covered with travellers, its gates and cities crowded and rejoicing, its precious stones and fine gold and architectural illustrations, its people living beneath the eye of their monarch and dependent on his good-will, all seem to mark a reign when an absolute monarch ruled over a great and wealthy people, who lived at ease at home, and had no dreaded enemy on their borders; who traded to distant lands and brought their products into common use; when the worship of Jehovah prevailed through the land, and men had leisure for learning; when wisdom sat on the throne, personified in Solomon, and the evils which must ever exist while man is a fallen being were evils inseparable from any condition of humanity, and especially from one abounding with the elements of material prosperity. See Solomon.

VII. *Commentaries.* — The following are the special exegetical helps on the whole book; a few of the most important of them are designated by an asterisk: Origen, *Commentarii* (in *Opp.* vol. iii); also *Scholia* (in *Bibl. Patr.* Gallandii, vol. xiv); Basil, *Commentarii* (in *Opp.* II, i); Bede, *Expositio* (in *Opp.* vol. iv; also in *Works*, vol. ix); Honorius, *Commentarius* (in *Opp.* p. 1140); Ralbag [Levi ben-Gershon], פֵּרוּשׁ [with Ben-Meira's commentary], by Bañoles (Leiria, 1492, fol.; afterwards in the Rab. Bibles; also [with Aben-Ezra, etc.] in Latin by Ghiggheo, Amst. 1638, 4to); Arama, יַד אַבְשָׁלוֹם (Constantinop. s. a. 4to; with notes by Berlin, Leips. 1859, 8vo); Imm. ben-Salomo, פֵּרוּשׁ [with Kimchi on Psa.] (Naples, 1486, fol.); Shalom ben-Abraham, קֶבֶ וְנָקִי (Salonica, 1522, fol.; also in Frankfürter's Bible); Melancthon, *Explicatio* (Hag. 1525, and elsewhere later, 8vo); Munster, *Adnotationes* (Basil. 1525, 8vo); Jos. ibn-Jachja, פֵּרוּשׁ [with Job, etc.] (Bologna, 1538, fol.; also in Frankfürter's Bible); Cajetan [Rom. Cath.], *Enarratio* (Lugd. 1545, fol.); Fobian, תַּרְגּוּם (Constantinop. 1548, 4to); Arboreus [Rom. Cath.], *Commentarius* (Par. 1549, fol.); Malvenda [Rom. Cath.], *Explicatio* (in *Opp.* Lugd. 1550, fol.); Bayne, *Commentarii* (Par. 1555, fol.; also in the *Critici Sacri*, vol. iii); Lavater, *Commentarii* (Tigur. 1562, 4to, 1565, 1572, 1586, fol.); Strigel, *Scholia* (Lips. 1565, Neost. 1571, 8vo); Jansenius [Rom. Cath.], *Adnotationes* (Lovan. 1568, 8vo, and elsewhere later, with Psa., etc.); Sidonius [Rom. Cath.], *Commentarii* (Mog. 1570, fol.); Mercer, *Commentarii* (Genev. 1573, fol.; also [with Job] Amst. 1651, fol.); Cope, *Exposition* (transl. by Outrerd, Lond. 1580, 4to); Mard. ben-Jakob, מִשְׁלֵי (Cracow, 1582, 4to); Is. ben-Mose, תְּמִים דֵּחָדִיר (Lublin, 1592, 4to); Drabit, *Auslegung* (Erf. 1595, 8vo); Musset, *Commentaire* (Lond. 1596, 8vo); Wilcocks, *Commentary* (in *Works*); Alspach, רֹב פְּנִינִים (Ven. 1601, 4to; and later elsewhere, fol.); Cleaver, *Explanation* (Lond. 1608, 1615, 4to); Dod, *Exposition* [on ch. ix–xvii] (Lond.

1609, 4to); Agell [Rom. Cath.], *Commentarius* (Par. 1611, fol.); Cartwright, *Commentarii* (L. B. 1617, and later elsewhere, 4to); Imninus, *Expositio* (Par. 1619, 2 vols. fol.); De Salazar [Rom. Cath.], *Expositio* (ibid. 1619–21, and elsewhere later, 2 vols. fol.); Jizchaki, פֵּרוּשׁ [with Aben-Ezra's and others] (in Latin by Ghiggheo, Mail. 1620, 4to; by Breithaupt, Gotha, 1714, 4to); Duran, חֶשֶׁק שְׁלֹמֹה (Ven. 1623, 4to); Egard, *Christenthum*, etc. [on ch. i–ix] (Lub. 1624, 8vo); Guillebert [Rom. Cath.], *Paraphrasis* (Par. 1626, 1637, 8vo); A Lapide, *Commentarius* (Antw. 1635, fol.); Jermin, *Commentary* (Lond. 1638, fol.); Bohl, *Commentarius* (Rost. 1640, 4to); Maldonatus [Rom. Cath.], *Commentarius* [includ. Psa., etc.] (Par. 1643, fol.); Geier, *Cura* (Lips. 1653 and later, 4to); Gorse [Rom. Cath.], *Explication* (Par. 1654, 12mo); Taylor, *Exposition* [on ch. i–ix] (Lond. 1655–57, 2 vols. 4to); Leigh, *Annotations* [includ. Job, etc.] (ibid. 1657, fol.); Deckey, *Handbuch* (Magdeb. 1667, 4to); Anon. [Rom. Cath.], *Recueil* [patristic] (Par. 1677, 1704, 8vo; also in Germ., Chemn. 1707, 12mo; Dresd. 1720, 8vo); David ben-Mose, מָגֵן דָּוִד (Amst. 1683, 4to); Bossuet [Rom. Cath.], *Notæ* [includ. Eccles., etc.] (Par. 1693, 8vo; also in *Œuvres*, vol. xxi); Oier, *Verklaaring* [on ch. i–ix] (Amst. 1698, 4to); Anon. [Rom. Cath.], *Analyse* [with Eccles.] (Par. 1702, 12mo); Du Hamel [Rom. Cath.], *Adnotationes* (ibid. 1703, 12mo); Goldschmidt, אַבְנֵי צְדָק (Wilmersd. 1714, 8vo); also מִשְׁלֵי (F. a. M. 1713, 12mo); Pinto, כֶּסֶת צְרוּפָה (Amst. 1714, 1735, 8vo); C. B. Michaelis, *Adnotationes* (Hal. 1720, 4to; also in *Comment. in Hagiog.* vol. i); Meiri, פֵּרוּשׁ (first in Frankfürter's Bible, Amst. 1724–27; separately, Fürth, 1844, 8vo); Wolle, *Auslegung* (Leips. 1729, 8vo); Is. ben-Elija, מִשְׁלֵי (Wandsb. 1731, 8vo); Kortum, *Auflösung* (Görlitz 1735, 4to); Grey, *Notes* (Lond. 1738, 8vo); Hansen, *Betrachtungen* (Lüb. 1746, 4to); *Schultens, *Commentarius* (L. B. 1748, 4to; abridged, with additions by Vogel and Seller, Hal. 1768, 8vo); Gavison, עֵמֶק הַשְׁבָּחָה (Legh. 1752, 4to); Lösner, *Observationes* (Lips. 1761, 4to; also in Velth. and Kuinöl's *Commentt.* ii, 270); De Witt, *Dissertationes* (Amst. 1762, 8vo); Dathe, *Prolusio* (Lips. 1764, 8vo; Lond. 1838, 18mo; also in *Opusc.* Lips. 1796); Judetnes, שְׁנוֹת חֲרִים [with Eccles.] (Amst. 1765, 4to); Vogel, *Umschreibung* (Leips. 1767, 8vo); Hirt, *Erklärung* (Jen. 1768, 4to); Durel, *Remarks* [includ. Job, etc.] (Oxf. 1772, 4to); Hunt, *Observations* (ibid. 1775, 4to); Schnurrer, *Observationes* (Tübing. 1776, 4to; also in *Dissert.* Goth. 1790); Bode, *Versio* [includ. Eccles. and Cant.] (Helmst. 1777, 4to; also in Germ., Quedlinb. 1791, 8vo); Moldenhauer, *Erläut.* [with Eccles. and Cant.] (ibid. 1777, 4to); J. D. Michaelis, *Anmerk.* (Gött. 1778, 8vo; also in *Bibliothek*, vii, 168); Döderlein, *Anmerk.* (Altd. 1778 and later, 4to); also his *Scholia* [on poet. books] (Hal. 1779, 4to); Reiske, *Conjecturæ* [with Job] (Lips. 1779, 8vo); Zinck, *Commentarius* [includ. other books] (Augsb. 1780, 4to); Arnold, *Anmerk.* (Frckft. and Leips. 1781, 8vo); Schleusner, *Collatio* (Lips. 1782, 4to); also *Commentarii* (ibid. 1790–94, 4to); Troschel, *Salomon's Moral* (Berl. 1782, 8vo); Struensee, *Erläut.* [includ. Psa.] (Hal. 1783, 8vo); Schönherder, *Erklär.* (from the Danish by Wolff, Flensb. 1784, 8vo); De Villoisin, *Versio* [from the Veneto-Greek, includ. other books] (Argent. 1784, 8vo); also Dahler's *Animadversiones* [on the same] (ibid. 1788, 8vo); Knös, *De Usu Prov.* (Giess. 1787, 4to); Hodgson, *Notes* (Oxf. 1788, 4to); Jäger, *Observationes* [on the Sept.] (Meld. and Lips. 1788, 8vo); Euchel, תַּרְגּוּם (Berl. 1789, and later elsewhere, 8vo); Reichard, *Erklär.* (Hal. 1790, 8vo); Ziegler, *Erläut.* (Leips. 1791, 8vo); reviewed by Hasse (in the latter's *Biblioth.*, Regensb. 1793, No. 5); Castalio, *Notæ* (Havn. 1793, 8vo); Hensler, *Erläut.* [includ. 1 Sam.] (Hamb. and Kiel, 1795, 8vo); Hammond, *Paraphrase* [on ch. i–ix] (in *Works*, vol. iv); Wilna, פֵּרוּשׁ (Sklov, 1798, and later elsewhere, 4to; Königsb. 1857, 8vo); Rhode, *De Poet. Gnomica* (Havn. 1800, 8vo); Tingstadt, *Variæ Lectt.* (Upsal. 1800, 4to); Wistinitz, זֶרַע יַעֲקֹב (Wilna, 1800, 4to); Muntinghe, *Anmerk.* (from the Dutch by Scholl, F. a. M. 1800–2, 3 vols. 8vo); Schelling, *Notæ* [includ. other books] (Stuttg. 1806, 8vo); Dahler, *Uebersetz.* [from the Sept.] (Strasb. 1810, 8vo); Mard. Kohen, מְאִירַ (Grodno, 1811, 4to); Kelle, *Anmerk.* (Freyb. 1815, 8vo); Holden, *Notes* (Liverp. 1819, 8vo); Melsheimer, *Anmerk.* (Mannh. 1821, 8vo); Lawson, *Exposition* (Edinb. 1821, 1855, 2 vols. 12mo); Case, *Commentary* (Lond. 1822, 12mo); *Umbreit, *Commentar* (Heidelb. 1826, 8vo); *Gramberg, *Anmerk.* (Leips. 1828, 8vo); *Rosenmüller, *Scholia* (Lips. 1829, 8vo); Böckel, *Erläut.* (Hamb. 1829, 8vo); Bridges, *Exposition* (Lond. 1830 and later, 2 vols. 8vo); French and Skinner, *Notes* (ibid. 1831, 8vo); Stern, בְּאוּר (Pressb. 1833, 8vo); Löwenstein, *Erklär.* (Frckft. 1838, 8vo); Freund, מוּסַר אָב (Vien. 1839, 8vo); Newman, *Version* (Lond. 1839, 18mo); Maurer, *Commentarius* (Lips. 1841, 8vo); Nichols, *Explanation* (Lond. 1842, 12mo); Noyes, *Translation* [includ. Eccles. and Cant.] (Bost. 1846, 1867, 8vo); *Bertheau, *Erklär.* (Leips. 1847, 8vo); Binney, *Lectures* (Lond. 1851, 18mo); *Stuart, *Commentary* (N. Y. 1852, 8vo); Gaussen, *Réflexions* (Toulouse, 1857, 8vo); *Hitzig, *Auslegung* (Zür. 1858, 8vo); Elster, *Commentar* (Gött. 1858, 8vo); Stein, *Bearbeit.* (Brilon, 1860, 8vo); Anon., *Exposition* (Lond. 1860, 12mo); Schulze, *Biblische Sprüchwörte* (Gött. 1860, 8vo); Brooks, *Arrangement* (Lond. 1860, 12mo); Wardlaw, *Lectures* (ibid. 1861, 3 vols. 8vo); Diedrich, *Erklär.* [includ. other books] (Neu-Rupp. 1665, 8vo); Münscher, *Version* (Gambier, O., 1866, 12mo); Conant, *Translation* (N. Y. 1872, 4to); Miller, *Commentary* (Lond. 1874, 8vo). See OLD TESTAMENT.

Providence (Lat. *providentia;* Gr. πρόνοια; both signifying *foresight*), a term importing the wisdom and power which God continually exercises in the preservation and government of the world, for the ends which he proposes to accomplish.

I. *The Doctrine Proved.* — 1. *From Reason.* — (1.) From the existence of a Supreme Creator. If there be a Supreme Being who created all things, it is reasonable to infer that he upholds and governs all things; hence, nearly all men concur in the belief of a superintending providence.

(2.) From the perfections of the Supreme Creator, viz., knowledge, power, wisdom, goodness, justice, and righteousness, all of which reason teaches us to ascribe to him in infinite measure. All things being known to him, and all things being possible to him (if not essentially contradictory), and he being able to discern the best plan, and preinclined to execute that plan, a providence becomes the natural and proper sphere for the activity of his attributes. Moreover, being just and righteous, his government of his rational creatures will necessarily be by the principles of justice and righteousness; for the end and perfection of these attributes consist in their exercise. Hence power must uphold, wisdom direct, goodness bestow, righteousness discriminate, and justice adjudge; and this constitutes a providence.

(3.) From the dependence of God's creatures. That which is not self-existent is contingent. The contingent may cease to be, there being nothing in the nature of things to insure its continuance; therefore, the perpetuity of the contingent is dependent upon the will of the self-existent. The Supreme Creator alone is self-existent; hence, upon his will the existence of the created depends; and that will, *in exercise*, implies a providence.

(4.) From the order, harmony, and regularity observable in the course of nature. The course of nature is that wise adjustment and counterpoise of natural forces by which the planets swing in their orbits, the seasons revolve with the year, the tides ebb and flow in their

intervals, the currents of the atmosphere shift to their ever-changing conditions, the endless procession of life keeps pace with the dead-march of decay, and all the varied phenomena of the universe appear. Viewing these wonderful complications in the light of their necessary dependence upon the self-existent, God's handiwork is plainly evident in the complexities of their multiform evolutions, the equipoise of their contending forces, and the continuity of adjustment, which proclaim unceasing watchfulness and care.

(5.) From the moral faculties of men. Conscience, which utters its authoritative "*ought*" or "*ought not*" concerning suggested actions, must be delusive, if there be no providence to note its verdict. But if our sense of responsibility be false, and we must hence discredit the affirmations of our highest faculties concerning ourselves, then is all truth visionary and all knowledge misleading.

Further, we have a faculty the legitimate expression of which is worship; hence all nations have their forms of devotion. But to stand in awe of the Creator's justice, to trust in his goodness, to submit to his will, to pray to him for the supply of our wants, to depend upon his wisdom for direction—all these acts of worship are not only unauthorized but absurd, and our noblest instincts are false to fact if there be no superintending providence by which his responses may be indicated.

(6.) From the system of compensations which prevails, embracing recompense for suffering, compensation for loss, and retribution for wrong. In this system, the recompense includes the natural benefits of discipline, and such compensative provisions of grace as the reason recognizes as matters of fact in present human experience. The compensation comprises the reparative processes by which loss in one direction is made up by increased efficiency in another, as in the added keenness of the senses of hearing and touch attending the loss of sight. The retribution comprehends not only the natural operation of the law, "As a man soweth, so also shall he reap," but all those special illustrations of that law in marked and mysterious judgments upon wrong-doing which occasionally occur, and which bear such likeness to the sin that men agree to call them retributive. In all these a providence is implied. The doctrine is further proven—

2. *From the Scriptures.*—(1.) By a class of passages which declare in general his preserving power (Gen. xlviii, 15; Neh. ix, 6; Job vii, 20; x, 12; xxxiii, 18; Psa. xvi, 5; xxxvi, 6; lxvi, 9; Isa. xlvi, 3-4; Matt. x, 29; Luke xii, 6; Acts xvii, 28; Col. i, 17).

(2.) By a class of passages which assert God's control of the regular operations of nature (Exod. ix, 18; xxiii, 26; 1 Kings xviii, 1; Job v, 10; ix, 5-6; xxviii, 24-27; xxxvi, 29-32; xxxvii, 6-16; xxxviii, 25; Psa. lxxiv, 17; lxxxix, 9; civ, 10, 13-15, 19-21, 24-30; cv, 32; cxxxv, 6-7; cxxxvi, 25; cxlv, 15-16; cxlvii, 8-9, 18; cxlviii, 8; Isa. xlv, 7; l, 3; Jer. v, 22-24; x, 13; xiv, 22; xxxi, 35; xxxiii, 20, 25; li, 16; Ezek. xxxii, 7-8; xxxviii, 22; Joel ii, 23; Amos iv, 6-10, 13; Zech. x, 1; Matt. vi, 26, 28-32; Acts xiv, 17).

(3.) By a class of passages which specifically declare his sovereignty over *birth* (Gen. xxxiii, 5; xlviii, 9; Josh. xxiv, 3, 4; 1 Sam. i, 27; Job x, 18; Psa. lxxi, 6; cxxxix, 15-16; Isa. xlvi, 3); *life* (Josh. xiv, 10; 2 Sam. xii, 22; Job vii, 1; xiv, 5; Psa. lxvi, 8-9; xci, 3-16; Isa. xxxviii, 1-5; Phil. ii, 27; James v, 14-15); *disease* (Exod. ix, 15; xxiii, 25; Job ii, 10; v, 6, 17-18; Psa. xxxix, 9, 13; John ix, 3); *death* (1 Sam. ii, 6; xxv, 29; Job i, 21; xii, 10; xiv, 5-6; xxxiv, 14-15; Psa. lxviii, 20; xc, 3; civ, 29; cxviii, 18); *afflictions* (Deut. viii, 5; Job v, 17; x, 17; Psa. lxvi, 10-12; lxix, 26; xciv, 12-13; cxix, 75; Prov. iii, 12; Isa. xxvi, 16; xlviii, 10; Jer. ii, 30; Lam. i, 12-14; iii, 1, 32-33; Amos viii, 10; Heb. xii, 5-6); *prosperity* (Deut. viii, 18; 1 Sam. ii, 7-8; 2 Sam. vii, 8-9; xii, 7-8; 1 Chron. xvii, 7-8; xxix, 12, 16; Ezra v, 5; Job i, 10; xxxiv, 24; Psa. xxx, 7; lxxv, 6-8; cxiii, 7-8; Prov. xxix, 26; Eccles. ix, 11, compared with Prov. xvi, 3, 33; Luke i, 52-53; 1 Cor. xvi, 2).

(4.) By a class which aver his government of chance and accident (Exod. xxi, 12-13, compared with Deut. xix, 4-5; 1 Kings xxii, 34, 38, compared with xxi, 19; Prov. xvi, 33).

(5.) By a class which proclaim his use of noxious animals for the purposes of his government (Exod. xxiii, 28; Lev. xxvi, 21-22; Deut. vii, 20; Josh. xxiv, 12; Job v, 23; Jer. v, 6; Hos. ii, 18; Joel ii, 25; Amos iv, 9; vii, 1).

(6.) By a class which affirm his righteous retributions (Lev. x, 1-3; xxvi, 14-39; Deut. xxv, 17-19; xxviii, 23-24; 2 Sam. iii, 39; 2 Kings ix, 30-37; xix, 25-28; 2 Chron. vi, 26-27; Job v, 13; x, 14; xxxiv, 11; Psa. xxxv, 6-8; lxxv, 6-8; lxxxix, 30-32; xciv, 23; cvii, 33-34; Isa. v, 11-16, 22-25; ix, 13-14; xiii, 11; xxviii, 15. Comp. xxix, 6; Jer. xxii, 21-22; Ezek. xi, 21; xxvi, 2-21; xxxv, 1-15; Dan. v, 18-30; Amos iv; v; Obad. 10-15; Zeph. i, 17; ii, 8-10; Hag. i, 10-11).

(7.) By a class which ascribe deliverances to God (Josh. xxiv, 5-11; 2 Kings v, 1; Ezek. xxxiv, 12, 16, 30; xxxvi, 22-24; xxxvii, 21-23).

(8.) By a class which declare his supreme authority over men (Psa. vii, 8; ix, 8; x, 16; xxii, 28; xlvii, 2, 7, 8; lxxv, 7; lxxvi, 10; xcvi, 10, 13; xcvii, 1; ciii, 19; cxxxix, 9-10; Eccl. ix, 1; Isa. x, 15; xiv, 26-27; Ezek. xviii, 4; Dan. iv, 35; Rom. ix, 19-21).

(9.) By a class which affirm his dominion over national prosperity and adversity (Exod. xvii, 14; xxiii, 25-30; Deut. vii, 13; 2 Sam. xxii, 15; Ezra v, 12; Psa. xviii, 13, 14; Isa. v, 3-30; xiii, 1, 6, 9-22; xlv, 7; Jer. xxvii, 2-8, 12, 13; xlix, 36; Dan. ii, 20, 21, 25, 37, 38; v, 21; Amos iii, 6; Obad. 1-4; Hag. ii, 17; Zeph. i, 14-18; ii, 1-15; iii, 14-20; Acts xvii, 26).

(10.) By a class which declare that he sends bad laws and base rulers, stirs up adversaries, and sends adversity (Judg. ix, 22, 23; 1 Kings xi, 14, 23; xix, 15; 2 Kings viii, 12; xviii, 25; xix, 25; xxiv, 20; 2 Chron. xv, 5-6; Psa. cv, 25; Isa. xxii, 17-19; xxxvii, 26, 27; Jer. xxvii, 6, 7; xxviii, 14; xlviii, 11, 12; lii, 3; Lam. ii, 7; Ezek. xx, 24-26; Dan. iv, 17; Hos. xiii, 11; Mic. i, 12).

The teaching of the more than five hundred passages cited might be confirmed, were it necessary, by nearly as many thousands more, showing with what emphasis the Scriptures proclaim the doctrine of divine providence.

II. *The Doctrine Explained.*—1. *As Preservation*, or that by which all things are kept in being, with their several essences and faculties, and are enabled to act according to their respective natures (Heb. i, 3).

2. *As Government*, or the control of all things in their several spheres of being and acting, and directing them to the ends which he proposed to himself in their creation. This government is—

(1.) Immediate; as in the direct control of the material universe by those modes of operation called forces of nature, such as gravitation, electricity, etc.

(2.) Mediate; as (*a*) in the vegetable world, by the laws which regulate the germination, growth, and decay of its organizations; (*b*) in the animal kingdom, by their controlling instincts; (*c*) in intelligent and moral creatures, by means of motives. This last is evidently the most important, as well as the most incomprehensible field of divine providence.

The motives which a righteous and benevolent Being places before his creatures can be only those which will directly tend to secure their holiness and happiness. But, as freedom of the will, in the sense of possible alternative moral action, is one of the endowments of such creatures, and as preservation secures the functional activity of such will, whatever may result; hence it follows that those holy motives may be disregarded, and, in such an event, moral government must be abandoned, or punitive and reformatory measures must be instituted that will originate a different class

of motives to reinforce those which have proved insufficient. Hence, the system of *natural evil* is placed over against creature-freedom, both as a check and a corrective, and is in itself no arraignment of God's goodness, since it is a necessary means to a higher good. But the problem of God's concurrence in moral evil is the vexed question of the ages; yet, in point of principle, it is settled in the fact of the *creation* of intelligent beings with a capacity to sin and liability to become sinners. Hence the vindication of the divine character is legitimately the work of *Theodicy*, while the doctrine of providence need only explain God's conduct.

All moral evil consists in a wrong determination of a free will. God's purpose to preserve his creatures pledges his concurrence in such action of the will only so far as such concurrence may be necessary to enable the will to act according to its freedom. The moral character of the determination is fixed by the creature and he alone is responsible for it. But when the choice is made, the moral character of the determination is complete; and neither the occurrence nor non-occurrence of a resulting outward action can change, add to, or take from the moral quality of the original volition wherein the sin originated and was completed. As soon, however, as the execution of a determination is attempted, the creature steps outside of his own independent and responsible sphere, and enters the realm of God's providence, where *he* assumes the control of all events. The actions of men (in distinction from their determinations), his control of the Church and of nations, special providences, the course of nature, and the works of grace are all included under the general term *events*, for which God takes the absolute responsibility. Hence it will be seen that the distinction often drawn between the permissive and active providences of God is of no practical value; and if any such distinction be allowed, it must be by confining the word "permissive" strictly to the free volitions of the will, and extending the word "active" to all *events*, as explained above.

In this way alone can the emphatic statements of the Scriptures, as classified above, be explained in harmony with other passages which distinctly deny his complicity with evil, i. e. in the sense of moral wrong. We first bring fully into view the seeming impeachment of his attributes contained in the classes of passages above referred to, which may be epitomized, in principle, as follows: Exod. iv, 21; vii, 13; x, 1, 20; xiv, 7; Deut. ii, 30; xiii, 1–3; Josh. xi, 20; 1 Sam. xvi, 14; xviii, 10; xix, 9; 1 Kings xii, 15; xxii, 20–22; 2 Chron. xviii, 22; xxv, 20; Psa. lxxviii, 49; cv, 25; Isa. vi, 9, 10; xix, 14; xliv, 18; lxvi, 4; Jer. vi, 21; Ezek. iii, 20; xiv, 9; Amos iii, 6; Zech. viii, 10; 2 Thess. ii, 11, 12; 1 Pet. ii, 8; Rev. xvii, 17. In striking contrast with these stands the revelation of his character and works in the following: Lev. xi, 45; Deut. xxxii, 4; 1 Sam. vi, 20; Job viii, 3; xxxiv, 10, 12, 23; xxxvi, 3; Psa. v, 4; xi, 7; xxxiii, 5; lxxxix, 14; xcii, 15; xcvii, 2; cxix, 137; Isa. v, 16; Ezek. xviii, 29; Hab. i, 13; Zeph. iii, 5; Rom. ii, 2, 5, 6; James i, 13; 1 Pet. i, 15, 16; Rev. xvi, 7.

Truth cannot be inharmonious, much less contradictory; therefore, there must be some possible reconciliation of these apparently conflicting statements. We find that reconciliation in the divided sovereignty which allows man to be supreme within the sphere of his volition, and attributes all outside of the mere mental fact of free-will determinations to the will and operation or co-operation of God. Upon any other hypothesis it is not possible to draw the dividing line between divine and human responsibility; and therefore, if this be denied, the hope of constructing any consistent doctrine of divine providence must be abandoned.

III. *Some Objections Considered.—Objection* 1. If providence be the care exercised over his creatures by a God of infinite goodness and purity, he cannot be implicated in the wicked actions of men. *Answer.* As a matter of fact, he is concerned in them, else they could not exist; for, were he to refuse the concurrence of his upholding power, men would drop into non-existence. Again, the objection is destroyed by considering that *actions* have no *moral character whatever*, as between the creature and the Creator, such character being vested entirely in the volitions of the will from which the actions result. Therefore, God can use the wicked actions of men as he does any other indifferent thing, provided that his own *purpose* in using them be right, which no one disputes.

Objection 2. God's majesty is degraded by the assumption contained in the doctrine of providence, viz. that he is interested in all the minutiæ of nature. *Answer.* If he has created faculties or forces, nothing that they can evolve can be unworthy of his care; besides, things which seem to men most insignificant are often causatively linked with stupendous results. Again, the revelations of the microscope prove that the infinitesimal are embraced within the sweep of the same laws that pervade the infinite, and hence are under the same benign care. Further, the impression of the grandeur of the Infinite Intelligence, comprehensive as it may be, from the contemplation of the rolling spheres and interlocking systems of the universe, is, after all, less profound than that which results from tracing his handiwork in the conformation of the beautifully wrought shells of the animalcula, and their exquisite life-appliances and adjustments, which only the most powerful glasses can reveal to human sight.

Objection 3. The prosperity of the wicked and the afflictions of the righteous are inconsistent with the supposition of a just and holy providence. *Answer.* The equal dispensation which the objection assumes to be necessary under the government of God is an impossibility; for the affections and interests of men are so interlocked that exact justice could rarely, if ever, be meted to the transgressor without involving consequences to others which would be undeserved. Again, the prosperity of the wicked, if they continue in their evil courses, is always a curse to them in the end; and God's processes should not be condemned until their final issue is known. On the other hand, the adversities of the righteous have attending or following compensations which satisfy *them* that all is right; and if those who are chiefly interested are content, the objection of the mere observer should be esteemed of little weight.

Objection 4. It is alleged that the laws of nature sufficiently account for the order of nature; therefore, a providence is not necessary. *Answer.* The laws of nature are only the regular order which is found to subsist, termed laws because of the uniformity of the changes which occur, and signify certain results of power, but not power itself—effects, but not their causes. These uniformities are, therefore, only modes in which the self-existent controls the contingent, the manner in which God manipulates his material creation.

IV. *History of the Doctrine.*—The idea of a superintending or controlling Providence has appeared under various forms, sometimes scarcely recognisable, depending largely upon the culture of the age and the state of philosophical speculation at the time.

1. The primitive view, held during the childhood of superstition, identified the gods with the elements of nature. Thus Zeus, or Dis, originally meant *sky*, and was worshipped as a god, afterwards known as Jupiter, or Jove, and by the Canaanites and Babylonians called Baal, Bel, or Belus. The *earth* was also worshipped as Demeter and Cybele, called by the Anglo-Saxons Hertha; the *sea* as Neptune; the *sun* as Phœbus, or Apollo; the *moon* as Diana; *light* as Indra. Fire as Agni and summer heat as Dormer, or Thor, are other instances, in various localities, of the worship paid to the elements or forces of nature as gods, each being accredited a providence of its own. In the childhood of Occidental philosophy also, the Ionian philosophical physicists of Greece, in their search for the principle whose

existence should give a rational explanation of all things (called the Beginning, or First Cause), identified it with some elements of nature, as the "Water" of Thales and Hippo of Samos; the "Air" of Anaximenes; the "Air-Intelligence" of Diogenes of Apollonia and Idæus of Himera. Her mathematical philosophers, the Pythagoreans, looked for this first cause in incorporeal elements, as in the "Numbers" of Pythagoras and the "Infinite" of Anaximander. The Eleatics—metaphysical philosophers—regarded the *world* as the manifestation of God, as in the "Sphere" of Xenophanes, Parmenides, and Zeno; while the dualism of the "Fire-ether" of Heraclitus, and the "Love-mingler" of Empedocles and Anaxagoras, and the materialism of the "Atoms" of Leucippus and Democritus were similar in their pantheistic notions, and contained the idea of a providence in but a very crude and unsatisfactory form. The Stoics taught that the working force in the universe is God; the consciousness of the universe is Deity; the human soul is a part of the Deity, or an emanation from him.

2. When the distinction between irregular and fortuitous "phenomena and the uniformities of nature became clear, the last were regarded as independent processes, broken in upon by the interferences of the gods, who were *endowed* with *human passions;* such interferences being the chances, accidents, irregularities, etc., of nature." Thus Minerva was the goddess of wisdom; Mars, the god of war; Mercury, the god of eloquence and traffic; Pan, the god of terror; Laverna, the goddess of thieves; Venus the goddess of beauty; Cupid, the god of love; Nemesis, of vengeance, etc.

3. The next advance was to the conception of one supreme God, infinite in his perfections and works; a sovereign Ruler bestowing rewards and inflicting penalties by using nature as the instrument of his will, he being a power above nature, and interfering with its processes at his pleasure. This seems to have been in part the view of Socrates, and was the Judaical notion modified into special or general providences according to personal interest in the event. That the Christian Church adopted this view in the main is evident from the fact that the Apostles' Creed, and the confessions of faith of Irenæus and Tertullian, and the Nicæno-Constantinopolitan symbol (A.D. 325 and 381, the only general confession covering the whole field of systematic divinity during 1500 years), contain no restatement of the doctrine.

The Catholic Church added to this view the dogma of Church infallibility, for which the Protestants substituted that of the infallibility of the Scriptures, both presupposing special providential watchfulness.

4. The doctrine of determinate *concursus* advocated by John Scotus Erigena in the middle of the 9th century holds that there are two causes in all effects, the first being *in* and not merely with the second, so that the first cause, and not the second, makes the act what it is. Augustine, the Schoolmen, the Thomists, and Dominicans in the Latin Church, the Lutherans, Reformed, and most Calvinistic divines in the Protestant Church have supported it, but in such sense that the moral quality of a sinful act is referred to the creature, and the effectual cause of the act only to God. *General concursus* is a modification of the foregoing view, and holds that God sustains creatures and their powers, and excites them to act according to their nature. The Franciscans and Jesuits, among the Romanists, and the Remonstrants and later Arminians, among the Protestants, have advocated this theory.

5. Cartesius, Malebranche, and Bayle developed the concursus into the *occasionalism* of philosophers, which represents God as the sole actor, the creature only furnishing him an occasion to act, and being merely the instrument by which he absolutely and irresistibly accomplishes his own designs. The dependence of the creature upon the Creator, superseding all efficiency of second causes, as held by Schleiermacher and the school to which he belongs, Schweizer and Dr. Emmons, classifies them practically with the Occasionalists.

6. Leibnitz rejected the concursus and Cartesian views, and propounded the theory of *Pre-established Harmony*, somewhat akin in its radical idea to the "Anima Mundi" of Pythagoras, Plato, and the Alexandrian School; the "Archæus" of Cornelius Agrippa, Paracelsus, and Von Helmont; the "principium hylarchicum" of Henry More; the "plastic nature" of Cudworth, and the "unconscious organizing intelligence" lately advocated by Dr. Laycock and Mr. Murphy. This theory holds that there are two worlds, matter and mind, each incapable of acting upon the other, yet both so adjusted to each other by a divinely pre-arranged harmony that volition and muscular contraction are contemporaneous. The volition would exist just the same without the contraction, and the muscular movement would take place just the same without the volition, each being moved by a force within, but the prearranged harmony secures that they shall seemingly stand related as cause and effect. God is a being of infinite perfections, and the imperfections of creation are accounted for by the nature of the monads of which souls and bodies are composed.

7. Durandus, in the 14th century, proposed the *mechanical* theory, which affirms the independent activity of God's creatures in the use of powers given to them at their creation—like a wound-up clock which goes of itself. It has been advocated by Scotus, Richard Baxter, and others. Closely akin to this is the theory of such writers as Prof. Tyndall, Dr. H. Bence Jones, and Dr. Bastian, concerning "molecular attractions and repulsions communicated to matter at the creation." Its extreme pantheistic development is found in the "self-evolving powers of nature" of Owen, Huxley, and Baden Powell.

8. Another view represents God as an all-perfect being, the upholder of all things, but denies his interference with the laws of nature in miracles, and maintains that his only interposition is by using natural causes to effect his purposes. Thus providence is law, and no interpositions are possible unless provided for in the nature of the uniformities. Thus Hippocrates, the contemporary of Socrates, regarded all phenomena as both divine and scientifically determinable. Anaxagoras, in his "Arranging Intelligence," held substantially to this view. Duncanson (*Providence of God*) is a strong modern advocate of this theory.

9. The Mind-efficiency Theory denies that there are any physical forces apart from mind, either divine or created. The only efficiency in the material universe is the ever-operating will of God. Dr. Samuel Clarke, Dugald Stewart, John Wesley, Nitzsch, Müller, Chalmers, Harris, Young, Whedon, Channing, Martineau, Hedge, Whewell, Bascom. Prof. Tulloch, Sir John Herschel, the duke of Argyll, Mr. Wallace, Proctor, Crocker, and many among the ablest recent writers have defended this view.

10. The true doctrine represents God as a being of infinite perfections, upholding all things by a direct exercise of his potency; the uniformities of nature as his *ordinary* method of working; its *irregularities* his method upon occasional conditions; its *interferences*, his method under the pressure of a higher law, which law is the necessary manifestation of his own nature. It thus adopts the Judaic view of God's perfections, and the complete subservience of nature to his will; admits the *general concursus*, especially as relates to the freedom of the finite will, accepts the Law theory in its application to miracles, and sustains the Mind-efficiency theory, with the distinct disclaimer of pantheistic leanings in the admission of the separate existence of material substance.

V. *Special or Particular Providence.*—Providence has been defined as the wisdom and power which God continually exercises in the preservation and government of the world for the ends which he proposes to

accomplish. Special providence consists in such particular exhibitions of his wisdom and power in emergencies as are calculated to awaken the conviction of his interest in and guardianship over his creatures.

1. *Proof.*—The doctrine in question is proved by the following considerations: (1.) It is necessarily included in the general providence already established. (See above.) The whole is made up of parts. If God has no care of the whole, he has none of the parts. If he has for the whole, the parts are included. Further—the *end* which he proposes to accomplish in providence is the revelation of himself as infinitely worthy of the love of his creatures. This needs a special providence. Moreover, a God who does not care for us as individuals is tantamount to no God.

(2.) Special providence is implied in the doctrine of prayer. Prayer is an instinct. The Scriptures direct that instinct by coupling with the encouragement to pray the announcement of a special providence that watches over the very hairs of our heads, thus making special providence the complement of prayer. Prayer without a special providence to note and reward would be a mere mockery of our impotence. Moreover, the enlarged charter of prayer-privilege given to believers under the Gospel dispensation is a *personal application* of the Old-Test. doctrine of special providence over the Jewish *nation.* That providence had relation to the covenant detailed in Deut. xxvi–xxx; this privilege is conveyed in such promises as Matt. vii, 7–11; xviii, 19; xxi, 22; Mark xi, 24; John xv, 7; Heb. iv, 16; James v, 15; 1 John v, 14, 15; and, being such, it necessarily implies such special watch-care as was involved in the Mosaic covenant cited above. See PRAYER.

(3.) The same doctrine is inferred from the fatherhood of God. The denial of his fatherhood changes him into a desolate abstraction, the contemplation of which pours an ice-floe over the tide of human trusts, and causes us to feel that we are "orphaned children in a godless world." But "As a father pitieth his children, so the Lord pitieth them that fear him" comes to us genial with the warmth of a sympathy and care that we can appreciate and confide in.

(4.) It is involved in the atonement of Christ. The propitiatory sacrifice—as prefigured in the separate sacrifices for each—was for men, not *en masse*, but as individuals, thus furnishing the greatest possible evidence of care in the interests of utmost moment to the soul. The agency by which this sacrifice is conveyed to the mind—the Holy Spirit—is likewise personal in his ministry of impression, and as personal in his communication of the remedial efficacy of the one atonement, thus demonstrating in appeal and in succor the loving care of God.

(5.) It is revealed in the Scriptures as clearly as the biographies of its noted characters, such as Joseph, Samuel, Elijah, Ruth, Esther, Daniel, etc., can illustrate it, and proclaimed as strongly as such texts as Luke xii, 6–7, 22–31 can express it, and enforced as powerfully as such prayer-examples as *The friend seeking bread* and *The unjust judge* can impress it.

(6.) It is illustrated in the experiences of Christians of every age, until George Neumark's hymn—

> "Leave God to order all thy ways,
> And hope in him, whate'er betide;
> Thou'lt find him in the evil days
> An all-sufficient strength and guide.
> Who trusts in God's unchanging love,
> Builds on the rock that naught can move"—

has become a type of a distinct class of literature both in verse and prose that is inexpressibly sweet to the experienced believer, and of untold value to those who are weak in faith.

2. The moral *uses* of the doctrine are—(1.) It deters from sin. Theon of Alexandria taught that "a full persuasion of God's seeing everything we do is the strongest incentive to virtue;" and he advised the civil magistrate to place the inscription at the corners of the streets—

> "God seeth thee, O sinner!"

A full belief in special providence places that inscription not upon the corners of the streets, but within the chambers of the memory.

(2.) It excites watchfulness for his interpositions. Abraham, after Mount Moriah; the three Hebrews, after the fiery furnace; Daniel, after the lions' den; Elijah, after Cherith's cave, never failed to look for other deliverances in the time of need.

(3.) It gives the assurance that all is right in our present circumstances, in view of the discipline needed, and the final adjustment of rewards and penalties.

(4.) It leads to cheerful *trust* in all trials, and thus sweetens the bitter draughts of life.

(5.) It inspires with hope in emergencies, and thus enables the believer to meet unforeseen exigencies with all his resources of mind and faith at hand, confident, buoyant, and if possible conquering.

(6.) It imparts a patience that outlasts adversities, a fortitude that yields to no disaster, and a confidence that emerges unscathed from all furnaces of trial.

VII. *Literature.*—We cite in alphabetical order a portion only of the very numerous works extant on this subject: Aquinas, *Summa Theol.* p. i, q. 15, art. iii; Backerus, *De Dei Providentia circa Mal.*; Bairus, *De Prov. Dei circa Peccata Hominum*; Beza, *De Prov. Dei circa Res Temporales*; Bormann, *Lehre der Vorsehung*; the same, *Betrachtungen über die wichtigsten Warheiten der Religion*; Chrysostom, *De Providentia Dei*; Clement, *Strom.* vi, 17, p. 821 sq.; De Marée, *Gottesvertheidigung über die Zulassung des Bösen*; De Vries, *Exercitationes Rationales*; Feldmann, *Moira oder über die göttliche Vorsehung*; *Für Anbeter Gottes* (Lond. 1780); Gomari *Conciliatio Doct. Orthodoxæ de Providentia*; Hugo of St. Victor, *De Sacram.* c. 19–21; Jacobi, *Betrachtungen über die weisen Absichten Gottes*; Jerome, *Comment. in Abacuc*, c. 1; Junilius, *De Partibus Legis Divinæ*, bk. ii, c. 3 sq.; Köppen, *Die Bibel ein Werk der göttlichen Weisheit*; Lactantius, *De Via Dei*, c. 13; the same, *De Opificio Dei, vel Formatione Hominis*, c. 5–17; Leibnitz, *Essais de Theodicée*; Martinii *Com. de Gubernatione Mundi*; Müller, *Briefe über das Studium der Wissenschaften, besonders der Geschichte* (Zürich, 1798); Nemesius, *De Natura Hominis*, c. 42 sq.; Plutarch, *De Sera Numinis Vindicta*; Rechenbergius, *De Prov. Dei circa Minima*; Salvianus Massiliensis, *De Gubernatione Dei sive de Prov.*; Sanders, *Ueber die Vorsehung*; Schröckh, *Disp. Historica circa Providentiam Divinam, quando et quam clare loquatur* (Vitembergæ, 1776); Seneca, *De Providentia, De Beneficiis*; Theodoret, *Sermones de Providentia*; Turrettini *Dissertationes*, diss. 4, 5, 6; Twisse, *Vindicatio Providentiæ Dei*; Viret, *De la Providence*; Weismannus, *De Prov. Dei contra Malum*; Zollikofer, *Betrachtungen über das Uebel in der Welt.* (S. H. P.)

Providence, Nuns of, a community of young women at Paris, established about the year 1647 by Madame Polaillon for the reception of poor virgins who might otherwise be exposed, through poverty, to the temptations of the world. This pious lady, having formed the design, was discouraged from prosecuting it by several persons, who represented to her that she had not a fund sufficient to carry it on; to whom she replied that *Providence* should be her fund; and accordingly, having succeeded in her undertaking, she gave to her community the name of *The Nuns of Providence.*

Province, properly an outlying portion of an extended empire, such as the Persian or Roman. It is not intended here to do more than indicate the points of contact which this word presents with Biblical history and literature.

1. (מְדִינָה, *medinâh*; Sept. χώρα; Vulg. *provincia.*) In the Old Test. this term first appears in connection with the wars between Ahab and Ben-hadad (1 Kings xx, 14, 15, 19). The victory of the former was gained chiefly "by the young men of the princes of the provinces," i. e. probably of the chiefs of tribes in the Gilead

country, recognising the supremacy of Ahab, and having a common interest with the Israelites in resisting the attacks of Syria. They are specially distinguished in ver. 15 from "the children of Israel." Not the hosts of Ahab, but the youngest warriors ("armor-bearers," Keil, *ad loc.*) of the land of Jephthah and Elijah, fighting with a fearless faith, were to carry off the glory of the battle (comp. Ewald, *Gesch.* iii, 492).

More commonly the word is used of the divisions of the Chaldæan (Dan. ii, 49; iii, 1, 30) and the Persian kingdom (Ezra ii, 1; Neh. vii, 6; Esth. i, 1, 22; ii, 3, etc.). The occurrence of the word in Eccles. ii, 8; v, 8, has been noted as an indication of the later date now frequently ascribed to that book. The facts as to the administration of the Persian provinces which come within our view in these passages are chiefly these: Each province had its own governor, who communicated more or less regularly with the central authority for instructions (Ezra iv and v). Thus Tatnai, governor of the provinces on the right bank of the Euphrates, applied to Darius to know how he was to act as to the conflicting claims of the Apharsachites and the Jews (Ezra v). Each province had its own system of finance, subject to the king's direction (Herod. iii, 89). The "treasurer" was ordered to spend a given amount upon the Israelites (Ezra vii, 22), and to exempt them from all taxes (vii, 24). See TAX. The total number of the provinces is given at 127 (Esth. i, 1; viii, 9). Through the whole extent of the kingdom there was carried something like a postal system. The king's couriers (*βιβλιόφοροι*, the *ἄγγαροι* of Herod. viii, 98) conveyed his letters or decrees (Esth. i, 22; iii, 13). From all provinces concubines were collected for his harem (ii, 3). Horses, mules, or dromedaries were employed on this service (viii, 10). (Comp. Herod. viii, 98; Xenoph. *Cyrop.* viii, 6; Heeren's *Persians*, ch. ii.) The word is used, it must be remembered, of the smaller sections of a satrapy rather than of the satrapy itself. While the provinces are 127, the satrapies are only 20 (Herod. iii, 89). The Jews who returned from Babylon are described as "children of the province" (Ezra ii, 1; Neh. vii, 6), and had a separate governor [see TIRSHATHA] of their own race (Ezra ii, 63; Neh. v, 14; viii, 9); while they were subject to the satrap (פַּחַת) of the whole province west of the Euphrates (Ezra v, 7; vi, 6).

2. (*Ἐπαρχία.*) In the New Test. we are brought into contact with the administration of the provinces of the Roman empire. The classification given by Strabo (xvii, p. 840) of provinces (*ἐπαρχίαι*) supposed to need military control, and therefore placed under the immediate government of the Cæsar, and those still belonging theoretically to the republic, and administered by the senate, and of the latter again into proconsular (*ὑπατικαί*) and prætorian (*στρατηγικαί*), is recognised, more or less distinctly, in the Gospels and the Acts. See PROCURATOR. Cyrenius (Quirinus) was the *ἡγεμών* of Syria (Luke ii, 2), the word being in this case used for præses or proconsul. Pilate was the *ἡγεμών* of the sub-province of Judæa (Luke iii, 1; Matt. xxvii, 2, etc.), as procurator with the power of a legatus; and the same title is given to his successors, Felix and Festus (Acts xxiii, 24; xxv, 1; xxvi, 30). The governors of the senatorial provinces of Cyprus, Achaia, and Asia, on the other hand, are rightly described as *ἀνθύπατοι*, proconsuls (Acts xiii, 7; xviii, 12; xix, 38). In the two former cases the province had been originally an imperial one, but had been transferred—Cyprus by Augustus (Dio Cass. liv, 4), Achaia by Claudius (Sueton. *Claud.* 25)—to the senate. The *στρατηγοί* of Acts xvi, 22 (A. V. "magistrates"), on the other hand, were the *duumviri*, or prætors, of a Roman colony. The duty of the legati and other provincial governors to report special cases to the emperor is recognised in Acts xxv, 26, and furnished the groundwork for the spurious *Acta Pilati*. See PILATE. The right of any Roman citizen to appeal from a provincial governor to the emperor meets us as asserted by Paul (xxv, 11). In the council (*συμβούλιον*) of Acts xxv, 12 we recognise the assessors who were appointed to take part in the judicial functions of the governor. The authority of the legatus, proconsul, or procurator, extended, it need hardly be said, to capital punishment (subject, in the case of Roman citizens, to the right of appeal), and, in most cases, the power of inflicting it belonged to him exclusively. It was necessary for the Sanhedrim to gain Pilate's consent to the execution of our Lord (John xviii, 31). The strict letter of the law forbade governors of provinces to take their wives with them, but the cases of Pilate's wife (Matt. xxvii, 19) and Drusilla (Acts xxiv, 24) show that it had fallen into disuse. Tacitus (*Ann.* iii, 33, 34) records an unsuccessful attempt to revive the old practice. See PROCONSUL.

PROVINCE is, in ecclesiastical language, the jurisdiction of an archbishop. See DIOCESE.

Provincial. The local superior of the monasteries (abbot, guardian, prior, etc.) stands under the supervision of the district superiors, or *definitors;* these are subordinated to the superiors of the province, or *provincials*, who are themselves under the direction of the *general of the order*, the head of the whole community.

Provincial Councils is the name given to the synods held by the bishops of a single ecclesiastical province, and presided over by the metropolitan. The ecclesiastical superior of the province convokes the council. The resolutions of provincial councils in matters of discipline have legal force only within the limits of their own province. In respect to matters of faith, their resolutions, like those of the national councils, are decisive only when they have been confirmed by the pope and accepted by the whole Church.

Provincial Synod. See SYNOD.

Provisio Canonĭca. See PROVISION.

Provision (Lat. *provisio*) is, in canon law, the bestowal of an ecclesiastical *benefice* (q. v.).

I. *In the Roman Catholic Church* it involves the regular collation (q. v.) of the ecclesiastical functions. Any of its ecclesiastical offices can only be thus lawfully obtained from a competent superior.

1. *Extent and Classification.*—(1.) The "provision" includes three stages—(*a*) the designation of the person on whom the benefice is bestowed (*designatio personæ*); (*b*) the collation of the office itself (*collatio sive institutio canonica*), for higher offices by papal confirmation, for inferior functions by episcopal institution; and (*c*) the act of putting the nominee in possession of the office or the prebend, called, when he is bishop, *inthronization*, when he is a canon or other prebendary, *installation*. The election or designation confers on the candidate only a right of priority: the complete lawful possession can only be acquired by the canonic confirmation or institution.

(2.) There are an ordinary and an extraordinary, a free and an obligatory, a full and a partial provision. (*a*) When, as the rule requires, higher functions are conferred by the pope, lower ones by the bishop, this is called ordinary provision (*provisio ordinaria*); but if by some special lawful title, a third person, or by the law of devolution the next superior clerical functionary, or in consequence of special reservation the pope is possessed of the right of collation, this is an extraordinary provision (*provisio extraordinaria*). (*b*) If the ordinary collator is free and bound by no obligation as to the person of the nominee, the collation is free (*provisio sive collatio libera*); but if he is bound by the right of designation enjoyed by a third person, the provision is restricted, and inasmuch as the collator, if all canonic requirements are met, is held to admit the proposed person, it is an obligatory one (*provisio necessaria*). (*c*) If the collator is entitled to all three acts of a full collation, his right of provision is called a full one (*jus provisionis plenum*); but if he enjoys only one or the other

of these attributes, he has only a partial right (*jus provisionis minus plenum*).

2. *Requisites.*—An ecclesiastic function can only be bestowed on a person possessing certain qualities, and must be occupied within a certain period and in a canonic way.

(1.) In regard to the qualifications of the candidate, the canons require that he be capable and worthy (*idoneus et dignus*); that not only he have an untarnished reputation, but also the required age, the necessary orders, and the instruction demanded by the office. (*a*) The required age varies with the functions. It is an extraordinary rule which, in Hanover, even for simple canonries, requires thirty years of age. (*b*) The candidate must belong to the clergy, and, in consequence, must be at least tonsured, and be advanced enough to be able to get the necessary orders within a year (Clem. c. 2, "De Act. et Qual." i, 6; *Conc. Trid.* sess. xxii, c. 4, "De Ref."). In ancient law the candidate, if his office required higher orders than those of a subdeacon, could receive a dispensation for seven years, to give him time to complete his scientific education, and the benefice meanwhile might be administered by a vicar (Sext. c. 34, "De Elect." i, 6). The modern law reduces this term to one year, which runs from the day of possession fully obtained (Sext. c. 35, "De Elect." i, 6). If during this period the orders have not been conferred, the benefice is lost, if it is a curacy, *eo ipso* (Sext. c. 14, xxxv, "De Elect." i, 6), otherwise only after previous warning (c. 7, x, "De Elect." i, 6; Sext. c. 22, cod. i, 6); but in the latter case the bishop may grant a second dispensation of one year (*Conc. Trid.* sess. vii, c. 12, "De Ref."). To get into possession of a bishopric, the elected person or nominee must have obtained the subdeaconate six months before his election or nomination (*Conc. Trid.* sess. xii, c. 2, "De Ref."). Abbots, holders of dignities, and functions with which jurisdiction and charge of souls are connected must be priests (c. 9, x, "De Act. et Qual." i, 14), and especially in cathedral chapters half at least of the canons must be presbyters (*Conc. Trid.* sess. xxiv, c. 12, "De Ref."), although in the time of the Council of Trent already many chapters—for instance, those of Cologne, Treves, etc.—were exclusively composed of priests, which is now always the case. (*c*) The candidate must possess the scientific acquirements required by the office. The Tridentine rule decrees that the bishop must have shown his capacity at some university (or lyceum) as a teacher, or by degrees obtained in theology or canon law, or other academical testimonies (*Conc. Trid.* sess. xxii, c. 2, "De Ref."). The functions of cathedral scholastics, of penitentiaries, and in general of all dignities and half of the canonries, can only be bestowed upon graduates (*ibid.* sess. xxiii, c. 18, sess. xxiv, c. 8, 12, "De Ref."). For candidates to prebends implying charge of souls (curates, preachers) a trial is instituted, and held by the bishop or his vicar-general and at least three other examiners chosen by the diocesan synod and put under special oath (*Conc. Trid.* sess. xxiv, c. 18, "De Ref.;" comp. Pii V "In Conferendis," d. 18 Maj. 1566, and Benedicti XIV "Cum illud," d. 14 Dec. 1742). As the diocesan synods, after a long interruption, have only been revived of late, the papal see has conferred full powers on the bishop (*modo provisorio*), and, until the regular synods should be re-established, to nominate, himself, these synodal examiners and take their oath. Besides this examination required by the Church, most civil governments in Germany prescribe a similar examination for the candidates to the functions of curate or preacher.

(2.) In regard to the *time* and *manner* of the provision, the following principles prevail: (*a*) A newly established clerical function must first be endowed; an office subsisting already must be not only really, but lawfully vacant. Even to give *expectancies*, or promises of provision in case of vacancy, is prohibited. Every clerical office must be filled in a given period of time—higher offices within three months; inferior offices, the provision of which is left to the free collation of the bishops or chapters, six months (c. 2, x, "De Concess. Præb." iii, 8) from the day their vacancy was first known (c. 3, x, "De Suppl. Negl. Præl." i, 10). If the offices to be filled are patronal benefices, the lay patron is allowed a term of four months (c. 3, x, "De Jure Patron." iii, 38) for making his presentation, the clerical patron a term of six months; the latter being lawful even in cases where a layman has transferred his right of presentation to a church or ecclesiastical corporation (Sext. c. un. "De Jur. Patron." iii, 19), or where the patronate is mixed. However, the civil legislation of several countries disagrees in many cases with these rules. If the election, postulation, nomination, or presentation have not taken place within the allotted term, it is, for this case, lost to the patron, and devolves upon the superior clerical authority. (*b*) The benefice must be filled according to the canons; consequently, with complete independence both of the collator and the receiver (c. 2, x, "De his quæ Vi," i, 40), without diminution or heavier taxation of the prebend (c. un. x, "Ut Benef. sine Diminut." iii, 12), and without simony. The admission of the state, and often of individuals, to a share in the provision of ecclesiastical benefices gave rise in the mediæval Church to the contention for *investiture* (q. v.), and remains as yet unsettled. In some countries it was set at rest by concordat; in others it is still unregulated, though the right of final and complete provision is admitted to belong to the pope. In most Roman Catholic countries the crown elects to bishoprics, and the pope is bound to confirm the nominee of the crown, unless canonical cause of rejection should appear. In Germany, the contest with the papacy has on this account left vacant several important provisions.

3. *Form of the Provision.*—(1.) Concerning the ordinary collation (*a*) of higher offices. Archiepiscopal and episcopal sees, abbacies, and other prelatures are filled by election, postulation, or nomination. (*b*) The other clerical functions are disposed of by the bishop in the whole extent of his diocese. This right of filling the vacant places is either entirely free, or it is more or less circumscribed by the rights of third persons or by the peculiar situation of the chapter, especially by the right of presentation of the patrons. (2.) An extraordinary provision takes place (*a*) either *jure devoluto*, when the person entitled to fill the vacant office does not fulfil the canonic conditions of the provision, or (*b*) *jure reservato*, when the prebend is one of those the collation of whom is reserved to the pope.

4. *Institution or Installation.*—(1.) The lawful collation of the office in question by the competent clerical superior, which alone entitles to the possession of the office and to the exercise of the rights of consecration and jurisdiction connected with it, is made, for episcopates and prelatures, by the pope, by confirmation of the elected or postulated person or nominee; for other functions, by the bishop (c. 3, x, "De Instit." iii, 7; *Conc. Trid.* sess. xxiv, c. 13, "De Ref."), through canonic institution. The phrase *institutio canonica* appears in Sext. c. 1, "De Reg. Jur." v, 12, and has since prevailed; the expressions *collatio*, *institutio collativa*, *institutio verbalis*, *institutio auctorisabilis*, *investitura*, are somewhat erroneously employed as synonymous with it. *Collatio beneficii* ought to be used only for prebends freely conferred by the clerical superior, as here the collation of the office makes one with the *designatio personæ*, both being included in the decree of collation. If the office belongs to that class to which third persons (physically and morally qualified) have a right of election or presentation, then *institutio* is the right word, and, better, *institutio canonica*, to indicate that this institution made by the competent clerical superior is alone the lawful collation; or *institutio collativa*, to indicate that the office is really conferred only by the institution; *institutio verbalis*, to distinguish this verbal delivery of the office from the act of putting a person in possession of it (*installatio*). While the *libera collatio* was always, and is still, an ab-

solutely personal right of the bishop, neither the vicar-general (*sede plena*) can perform it without special powers, nor the chapter, nor the capitular vicar appointed by them (*sede vacante*). The *institutio canonica*, or *collativa*, or *verbalis*, was formerly a regular official right of the archdeacon (c. 6, x, "De Instit." iii, 7), and is still a right comprised in the general powers of the vicar-general. This right of institution to offices connected with no charge of souls can exceptionally belong even to other ecclesiastical persons or corporations, either in consequence of special favor or of prescription (c. 18, x, "De Præser." ii, 26; c. 2, § 2, "De Privil." v, 33). By this canonical institution the nominee obtains the full right to his office and to the attributes of jurisdiction and honorary distinctions connected with it, but no right to take charge of souls: for this he needs a special authorization, for which he must apply within a period of two months from the day when the decree of presentation or collation has been received (Pii V "In Conferendis," d. 8 Mart. 1867); and this is called the *institutio*, in a narrower sense, or *institutio auctorisabilis*, i. e. the special collation of the charge of souls. The collation of the *cura animarum* is, again, so exclusively a right of the bishop that neither the archdeacon nor formerly the vicar-general, unless specially empowered, could confer it (c. 4, x, "De Off. Archidiac." i, 23), nor, in general, any third person even possessed of the full right of provision. Now the *institutio auctorisabilis* goes regularly together with the *institutio collativa*, and is given at the episcopal residence after previous examination (*Conc. Trid.* sess. vii; c. 13, "De Ref.") and approbation, by means of symbolical performances, by dressing the candidate in the chasuble and barret (hence the name *investiture*), receiving his profession of faith and oath of obeisance, and delivering the beneficiary a deed thereof, called "letter of investiture." This *institutio auctorisabilis* can be made by the bishop himself or his vicar-general, who needs no longer a special mandate for it (Benedicti XIV "De Syn. Diœc." lib. ii, c. 8), and, *sede vacante*, the chapter, or the capitular vicar appointed by them (Sext. c. 1, "De Instit." iii, 6).

(2.) The *introduction* into the office and prebend, or putting into possession (*institutio corporalis*), is called (*a*) for the bishop *inthronization*, and consists in this, that the consecrated bishop, in his badges, takes solemn possession of his cathedral and assigned residence. It is combined, if the bishop be consecrated in his own church, into one act with the consecration; but if the consecration take place *extra diœcesin* — in the metropolitan church, or cathedral, of the consecrator delegated by the pope—then, according to the traditional custom, the bishop in pastoral habit, with crosier and mitre, is received at his arrival in the *banlieue* of his seat by the chapter and the clergy of the city and surrounding country, and escorted to some church situated in the neighborhood, where, after a short prayer, he is clothed in the pontifical robes and badges, hence to be led in solemn procession, all bells ringing, into his cathedral. Here he is greeted with the hymn *Ecce sacerdos magnus*, and while the clergy and the people sing the *Te Deum*, he takes his seat, gives the episcopal benediction, and is then escorted to his residence, the cross being carried before him. (*b*) The solemn admission of a canon of a cathedral or collegiate chapter is called *installation*. The beneficiary, in the house of the chapter, is clothed in the choir garments, and the capitular cross is appended to his neck, whereupon he recites the Credo and swears the capitular oath. He is then led to his seat in the chapter (*sedes in capitulo*), escorted to the church, and here, also, shown his place in the choir (*staltum in choro*, hence *installatio*). (*c*) With curates and other beneficiaries, the *institutio corporalis* (now also called *installatio*) is performed at the place of the prebend, the introduction into the office (*immissio in spiritualia beneficii*) by a legate of the bishop, and the putting in possession of the prebend (*immissio in temporalia*) by a commissary of the civil government.

In Austria, every ecclesiastic, upon getting into office, after receiving spiritual investiture at the hands of the bishop, has, before his installation, to sign a written declaration to the effect that he does not belong, nor will ever belong, to any secret society. The spiritual installation is performed, in the name of the ordinariate, by the vicar of the district or dean the first holyday after the arrival of the ecclesiastic at the place of his benefice; the worldly installation, in the name of the government, by a higher functionary commissioned thereto; in patronal prebends by the patron, according to the prevailing custom. In Prussia, the prebendary is generally put into possession by the archpriest (dean), in common with the patron or with the *Landrath*, if the curacy be one of those to which the government has the right of nomination. The deed of confirmation is read in the presence of the community, the curate is introduced, and put in possession of his residence with appurtenances. In Bavaria the oath is exacted, after which the dean proceeds to the spiritual performance in the church, where he introduces the new curate to his community. From the church he is led again to his residence, where he is introduced to the community by the royal commissary. Then the people are dismissed, and the same commissary, in the presence of the episcopal plenipotentiary and the civil functionaries and church trustees, delivers the keys of the house to the new curate. In Baden, the curate is put in possession, in the name of the grand-duke, by the grand-ducal dean and the functionaries of the district, but only mediately, by a written order of these officers; but a solemn *institutio corporalis* takes place in the church in the presence of the archiepiscopal dean. Similar dispositions prevail in Würtemberg, in the kingdom of Saxony, the grand-duchy of Hesse, and in Nassau.—Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* s. v.

II. *In the Church of England*, the bishop is nominally elected by the chapter; but, in reality, the members of the chapter are only permitted to name the particular person whom the crown presents to them for election with the *congé d'élire*. In the Roman Catholic Church of England and of Ireland, the parochial clergy, together with the canons, recommend three candidates, one of whom is commonly, although not necessarily, appointed by the pope.

III. *In the Russo-Greek Church*, the candidates are presented by the holy synod, and the czar names the bishop from among them. See Hardwick, *Hist. of the Reformation*, i, 350.

Provisor, (1) a chamberlain; (2) the Clugniac bailiff of the ville or manor and receiver of rents.—Walcott, *Sacred Archæology*, s. v.

Provisors, Statute of. Clement V, in the beginning of the 14th century, went beyond all his predecessors by declaring that the disposal of all ecclesiastical benefices belonged to the pope. The pope accordingly made reversionary grants, or *provisions*, as they were called, during the lives of the incumbents; and he reserved such benefices as he thought fit for his own peculiar patronage. England in particular suffered greatly from these papal encroachments during the reign of Henry III. The parliament assembled at Carlisle in the thirty-fifth year of Edward I sent a strong remonstrance to pope Clement V against the papal encroachments. But this remonstrance produced no effect. The first prince who was bold enough to assert the power of the legislature to restrain these encroachments was Edward III. After complaining ineffectually to Clement VI of the heinous abuse of papal reservations, he procured the famous statute of Provisors (25 Edw. III, stat. 6) to be passed (A.D. 1350). This act ordained that all elections and collations should be free according to law; and that in case any provision, collation, or reservation should be made by the court of Rome of any archbishopric, bishopric, dignity, or other benefice, the king

should for that turn have the collation of such archbishopric or other dignities elective. This statute was fortified by several others in this and the succeeding reigns down to the 3 Henry V, c. 4.

Provoost, Samuel, D.D., an American prelate of the Protestant Episcopal Church, was born in New York Feb. 26, 1742, and passed A.B. in King's College in 1758. Though educated in the Dutch Reformed Church, he early became a convert to Episcopacy, and, having entered Cambridge College, was ordained in 1766. On his return from England he became assistant minister of Trinity Church, also of St. George's and St. Paul's, New York. He subsequently retired to East Camp till the close of the Revolution, engaging chiefly in literary pursuits. In 1784 he was elected rector of Trinity Church, New York, and a regent of the university. He next acted as chaplain of Congress, and in 1786 was raised to the episcopate. He served also as chaplain to the United States, and died Sept. 6, 1815. He wrote a copious Index to the *Historia Plantarum* of John Bauhin. See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, v, 240; *Amer. Ch. Rev.* Jan. 1872, p. 35, 46; July, 1862, p. 668.

Provost (Lat. *præpositus*, set over) is, in ecclesiastical language, the chief dignitary of a cathedral or collegiate church, from which use the title has been transferred to the heads of other similar bodies, whether religious, literary, or administrative. Properly, however, the name is given to the highest dignitary in the metropolitan or diocesan chapter, and is often held conjointly with the archdeaconry. The provost is the next in dignity after the archbishop or bishop, a position which is also the right of the provost of a collegiate chapter. The name is also given to the superiors of certain religious houses of lesser rank, and the relation of which to the more important houses is analogous to that of the priory to the abbey. It was also given to certain lay officials, whose duties, in relation to the Church and the maintenance of its material condition, were similar to those of the modern churchwarden. In the Protestant Church in Germany, the name provost is sometimes used as synonymous with that of dean or archpriest; and occasionally, where several minor churches or chapels are attached to one chief church, the minister of the latter is called "provost." In England, the heads of several colleges in the University of Oxford, and the head of King's College, Cambridge, are designated provost. The head of Eton College is also so called.

Prowe, a divinity of the Wends and Northern Slaves, had the reputation of a wise but severe and terrible judge. He was the god of justice, and carried, as a symbol of wisdom, snakes on his breast; he held in his hand an iron shield, which in doubtful cases was made glowing for the fiery ordeal. His iron statue represents him in the shape of an old man clothed in a long, folding garment; he wears chains around his neck, and holds a sacrificial knife in his hand. He was more especially worshipped at Stargard: he had a temple in that city, and sacrifices were constantly offered to him. Around his sanctuary, and the wood consecrated to him, the people assembled every Monday: to penetrate into the holy forest itself was prohibited under penalty of death, a prohibition which among the Prussians secured likewise the solitude of the holy spots. The priests drank of the blood of the victims, and then, in the presence of the king and of the whole people, requested the advice of the idol. Sentences were then pronounced by the god, and orders given, which nobody could think of contradicting; animals and prisoners, in later times Christians, were immolated to him. On Fridays, according to the old chroniclers, women, children, and servants who brought offerings were allowed the entrance of the holy wood; a banquet was held in its surroundings, and merry dances were performed till an advanced hour of the night.

The same Prowe, it is believed, was also worshipped under a different form: he stands on a column, his nude form in a pair of boots; a bell lies at his feet. This is asserted by the chronicle of Botho, which calls the god *Prono*, and speaks of him as being the idol of Altenburg or Stargard. Botho may be mistaken in identifying this booted deity with Prowe: other idols besides the latter may have been worshipped at Stargard; perhaps the chroniclers mistook one of them for the god of justice. See Thorpe, *Northern Mythology* (see Index in vol. iii).

Prozymites (from Greek *πρό*, *for*, *ζύμη*, *leaven*, i. e. *for leavened bread*) is a term applied reproachfully by the Western Church to the adherents of the Greek Church because they contended for the use of leavened, or common, bread in the Eucharist. The Latin Church were *Azymites* (q. v.). See also Eucharist.

Prshemishl, the first fabulous duke of Bohemia, the husband of the celebrated Libussa. His name is synonymous with that of Prometheus: it means *he who thinks in advance*, probably because Prshemishl was a seer, a great prophet.

Prshipegala, a warlike divinity in Slavic mythology, sanguinary as were his priests and all the gods of the Slavonians. The Christian prisoners were beheaded in front of his image, and their blood was presented to him to drink.

Prudden, Nehemiah, a New England minister of the Gospel, flourished near the close of the last and the opening of this century. He was born about 1750, and was educated at Yale College. He became pastor of a church at Enfield, Conn. He died in 1815. He is the author of *Marrying a Sister of a Deceased Wife* (1811): —*Sermon to a Missionary Society* (1815). See Bacon, *Hist. Discourses*, p. 55 sq.

Prudence is the act of suiting words and actions according to the circumstances of things, or rules of right reason. Cicero thus defines it: "Est rerum expetendarum vel fugiendarum scientia"—the knowledge of what is to be desired or avoided. Grove thus: "Prudence is an ability of judging what is best in the choice both of ends and means." Mason thus: "Prudence is a conformity to the rules of reason, truth, and decency, at all times and in all circumstances. It differs from wisdom only in degree; wisdom being nothing but a more consummate habit of prudence, and prudence a lower degree or weaker habit of wisdom." It is divided into, 1, *Christian* prudence, which directs to the pursuit of that blessedness which the Gospel discovers by the use of Gospel means; 2, *moral* prudence, which has for its end peace and satisfaction of mind in this world, and the greatest happiness after death; 3, *civil* prudence, which is the knowledge of what ought to be done in order to secure the outward happiness of life, consisting in prosperity, liberty, etc.; 4, *monastic*, relating to any circumstances in which a man is not charged with the care of others; 5, *economical* prudence, which regards the conduct of a family; 6, *political*, which refers to the good government of a state. The idea of prudence, says one, includes due consultation—that is, concerning such things as demand consultation—in a right manner and for a competent time, that the resolution taken up may be neither too precipitate nor too slow; and a faculty of discerning proper means when they occur. To the perfection of prudence these three things are further required, viz. a natural sagacity; presence of mind, or a ready turn of thought; and experience. Plato styles prudence the leading virtue; and Cicero observes that "not one of the virtues can want prudence;" which is certainly most true, since, without prudence to guide them, piety would degenerate into superstition, zeal into bigotry, temperance into austerity, courage into rashness, and justice itself into folly. In a comparison of *prudence* and *morality*, the former has been called

the vowel, the latter the consonant. The latter cannot be uttered (reduced to practice) but by means of the former. See Watts, *Sermons*, ser. 28; Grove, *Moral Philos.* vol. ii, ch. ii; Mason, *Christian Morals*, vol. i, ser. 4; Evans, *Christian Temper*, ser. 38; Coleridge, *Aids to Reflection*, i, 13, 21 sq.

Prudentius, Sr., a French prelate of the 9th century, was a native of Spain. The name of his family was *Galindon*. He took the name of *Prudentius* in memory of the Christian poet, his compatriot. Taken when young to France, he passed several years at court, where it appears he occupied some important charge, until his election as bishop of Troyes in 846; then he subscribed, Feb. 14, 847, to the privilege accorded by the Council of Paris to Paschasius Radbertus, abbé of Corbie. People came from all parts to consult him, and he was called one of the most learned bishops of the Gallican Church. Hincmar, archbishop of Rheims, particularly wished to have advice how to treat Gottschalk, or Godeschalcus (q. v.), in the dispute about predestination raised by Gottschalk. At first Prudentius sided with Hincmar, but afterwards took a mediatory position. Towards the end of 849, or the beginning of 850, he, however, abandoned Hincmar and wrote in defence of Gottschalk, then a prisoner, and directed his work to Hincmar and his confederate Pardulus, bishop of Lyons. Prudentius begins with an encomium of St. Augustine, whose doctrines, he says, were also supported by Fulgentius and Prosper of Aquitanius. He then affirms a twofold predestination, one to damnation, the other to salvation. Yet God has not predestined the reprobate to guilt, but to punishment. Christ has given his blood only for the elect, for he says it is given *for many*. It follows that it is God's will not to call and save all men. These propositions Prudentius undertakes to support by the authority of the Scriptures, and of a number of fathers, especially of the Latin Church; the most recent of the latter authorities thus invoked is Beda. Ratramnus, a learned monk of Corbie, and Servatus Lupus, the accomplished abbot of Ferrières, sided with the bishop of Troyes. Rabanus Maurus speaks thus of this work, sent to him by Hincmar: "Prudentius's views converge sometimes with ours, when he asserts that God is not the author of evil, that the reward of the good is undeserved grace, and the punishment of the bad just expiation. But when he says that God, by his predestination, compels the sinner to go to ruin, it seems to me that the consequence of it is, according to the views of Gottschalk, a twofold predestination (see *Op. Sirmond.* ii, 1296)." Towards the close of 851 Scotus Erigena published his work on predestination against Gottschalk which he had composed at the request of Hincmar. This work, which undertook to solve the question from the philosophical standpoint, and argued for the unbiassed freedom of the will, only complicated the dispute. Erigena was charged with Semi-Pelagianism and other heresies. Wenilo, archbishop of Sens, extracted from it nineteen articles, and sent them to Prudentius for refutation. Prudentius replied in a writing addressed to Wenilo, and divided into nineteen chapters, followed by an epilogue (*Biblioth. Max. Patr.* xv, 467–597). This *Tractatus de Prædestinatione contra Joh. Scot. Erig.* was written in the year 852, and Gfrörer says of it: "Prudentius wrote against Erigena a ponderous book, in which the work of the philosopher was, with cutting sagacity and sturdy orthodoxy, so dealt with that nothing remained of it." This, it should be remembered, is the testimony of one who advocates predestination, and agrees with Erigena that evil is only a *μὴ ὄν*, condemnation, not a positive punishment on the part of God; that it only consists in the tormenting consciousness of having missed one's destiny. See Will. In the ensuing year (853) Hincmar held a national synod at Chiersy—the first had taken place in 849—where four articles (*Capitula Carisiaca*), embodying a moderate form of Augustinianism, were adopted against Gottschalk. Although Prudentius put his name to these "quatuor capitula," he soon afterwards endeavored to refute them by writing a *Tractoria Epistola adv. 4 Cap. Convent. Caris.* It is possible that he signed his name at Chiersy by demand of king Charles the Bald. In the later development of this contest, Prudentius seems to have given up his position. He died April 6, 861, and is revered as a saint in Troyes. The Bollandists do not recognise his title to sanctity. Although Prudentius held himself against opposing heresies, and particularly against the doctrines of the Pelagians and Semi-Pelagians, he was suspected by some authors to have concealed the truth in the prosecution of error, and *Les Annales de St. Berlin* accuse him of having written articles against the faith. From a letter of Servatus Lupus to Prudentius, we learn (*Ep.* 63) that these two men were sent by king Charles to visit and reform the monasteries of France. See *Gallia Christiana*, iii; Breyer (canon at Troyes), *Life of Prudentius* (1725); Gfrörer, *Gesch. der Carolinger* (1848), i, 210 sq.; Wenck, *Das Fränkische Reich nach dem Vertrag von Verdun* (1851), p. 382; Milman, *Hist. of Latin Christianity*, iii, 241 sq.; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* (see Index); Manguin, *Vett. Auctorum qui in Sec. IX de Prædest. scripserunt Opera et Fragm.* (Paris, 1650, 2 vols. 4to); Kurtz, *Ch. Hist. to the Reformation*, § 91, 4; Hardwick, *Ch. Hist.* (Middle Ages), p. 163 sq.; Hefele, *Conciliengesch.* iv, 124 sq.; *Jahrb. für deutsch. Theol.* 1859, art. by Weizsäcker; *Amer. Presb. Rev.* Jan. 1861, p. 200.

Prudentius, Aurelius Clemens, one of the earliest hymnists of the Latin Church, is greatly celebrated in ecclesiastical history, though generally overrated. Bentley calls him "the Horace and Virgil of the Christians," not even qualifying them as Latin Christians. There were certainly many hymnists previous to Prudentius, and they sang in the tongue of Homer, Plato, and the New Test. the very thoughts, and frequently in the very words, of evangelists and apostles. The hosannas of Ephraim the Syrian had the sound as well as the sense of those of the children of Jerusalem; and Clement of Alexandria, Gregory of Nazianzum, and the unknown earliest singers of the Oriental Church linked the passing hours with heaven by the sublimity of their language and the simplicity of their faith. As the truths of Christianity first flowed in Greek from inspired lips, so the songs of the Church came first in Greek. When, finally, the mighty new thought had been fitted to the comparatively stiff and narrow mould of Roman speech, it was not the tongue of Prudentius that gathered around it the spiritual and ecclesiastical associations of centuries. The rugged grandeur of expression, the calm and steady glow that wins for the majesty of heaven, came rather in the Latin hymns of Ambrose, Augustine, and Hilary of Poitiers. In the words of an eminent critic, "The fire of Revelation, in its strong and simple energy, by which, as it were, it rends the rock, and bursts the icy barriers of the human heart, predominates in those oldest pieces of the sacred Latin poesy which are comprised in the Ambrosian hymnology" (Fortlage).

Life.—Prudentius was born in A.D. 348, probably at Saragossa, in Spain. Nothing is known regarding him except what he has himself told in a poetical autobiography prefixed to his works. From this we learn that he received a liberal education, was admitted to the Roman bar, practiced as a pleader, and seems to have distinguished himself in his profession, as high civil offices were twice offered to him. He was even called upon to occupy a military post at the court of the emperor Theodosius I. He was already fifty years of age, when, like other prominent men of those troublous times, he was agitated by earnest misgivings as to "what all the honors and joys of this world might do for him in eternity. In them he could not find God to whom he belonged" (*Præf. Cathem.* v, 28–34). Hence the resolution: "Let the soul, at the boundaries of life,

renounce her folly and sin. Let her praise her God at least by her songs, as she cannot do it by her virtues. Let the day be spent in sacred hymns, and let not even night interrupt the praises of God. I will struggle against heresy, defend the catholic faith, annihilate the sacrifices of the pagans, destroy thy idols, O Rome. I will praise in my songs thy martyrs, glorify the apostles" (*l. c.* ver. 35–42). These words indicate all the different tendencies in his literary productions, which reflect them.

Works.—We have from Prudentius's pen between 385 and 388 poems, a number of which bear Greek titles. The principal are—1. *Cathemerinon Liber* (Book [i. e. of hymns] for Daily Use), being a series of twelve hymns, the first half of which were reckoned by the author suitable for devotional purposes at different parts of the day, and which the Latin Church has preserved in some of its collections. 2. *Apotheosis*, Ἀποθέωσις (a defence of the doctrine of the Trinity against heretics, with which are intermingled various discussions on the nature of the soul, on original sin, and on the resurrection). 3. *Hamartigeneia*, Ἁμαρτιγένεια (On the Origin of Evil, a polemic, in verse, against the Marcionites and Manichæans). 4. *Psychomachia*, Ψυχομάχια (The Combat of the Mind against the Passions, or the Triumph of the Christian Graces in the Soul of a Believer). 5. *Contra Symmachum, Liber* 1 (a polemic against the heathen gods). 6. *Contra Symmachum, Liber* 2 (a polemic against a petition of the Roman senator Symmachus for the restoration of the altar and statue of Victory cast down by Gratian). Prudentius supports in these two poems the arguments set forth by Ambrose against the proposition of Symmachus. The first book shows the shameful origin of the old idolatry, exposes the absurdity and abominations of the heathen mythology, the corruption resulting from the want of a moral check, and how happily Rome was inspired when it turned to Christianity. In the second book he examines the reasons alleged by his adversary, eloquently descants upon the cruel practice of gladiators' combats for the amusement of the people, and, in order to show their brutalizing influence, he instances a vestal attending in the amphitheatre, and witnessing the struggles and agonies of the fallen gladiators in the arena, exclaiming with joy that such sights were her delight, and giving without compunction the signal to despatch the fallen. Arnobius (bk. iv, towards the end) casts a similar reproach upon the vestals. As, in both books, the subject was of a nature to allow full scope to the genius of the poet, being eminently favorable to enthusiastic apology, this is the best of all his apologetical poems. 7. The *Enchiridion utriusque Testamenti s. Diptychon* (forty-eight poems of four verses each) is a historico-didactic work, of a uniform tenor, relating to some of the most remarkable events of the New and Old Test., as Adam and Eve, Abel and Cain, Joseph recognised by his brothers, the annunciation, the shepherds taught by the angels, etc. Gennadius counts this work with the other poems of Prudentius (*De Script. Eccles.* 13); but its authenticity has been questioned, chiefly because it is less abundant in ideas than the others. The following are decidedly authentic, and, besides, excellent compositions: 8. Fourteen poems, Περὶ Στεφάνων, *Peri Stephanon Liber*, in honor of the martyrs for the faith—Laurentius, Eulalia, Vincent, Hippolytus, Peter and Paul, Agnes, etc.; full of warm feeling and splendid narratives. To the Christian lyrical poetry belong, 9, the twelve songs Καθημερινῶν, mostly destined for the daily prayer-hours, which were exactly observed in olden times. The first relates to the dawning of the day ("ad galli cantum"); Christ, the rising light of the world, chases the dark powers of night. Let him banish them also from our heart and pour new light into our souls! The second is likewise a morning-song. The third and fourth are table-prayers. The fifth is to be recited at the lighting of the candles; the sixth upon retiring for the night; the seventh and eighth while and after fasting; the ninth, an encomium on the Saviour, at all hours. To these are added *Songs for Exequies* (on the Resurrection), on the feasts of Christmas ("octavo Calendas Januarias") and Epiphany. All these songs breathe an earnest, Christian spirit; they show the rich symbolism of the Christian life of old, and are therefore of great archæological importance. Several passages of them and of the hymns Περὶ Στεφάνων have been put into the Breviary among the Church hymns. Prudentius cultivated, as we have seen, the two fundamental kinds of Christian poetry, the didactico-panegyrical and the lyric, which were the necessary consequences of the historico-dogmatic and mystical character of Christianity, and borrowed their forms from the ancient Roman poetry, which is also chiefly didactico-parænetic or panegyric. The poetical form was employed at a very early period for the popular interpretation and defence of the Christian dogmas against pagans and heretics. Prudentius achieved in a short time a great reputation in the Church. Sidonius Apollinaris (*Ep.* ii, 9) compares him with Horace, who was his chief model in a formal point of view; yet Prudentius moves in the classical forms with incomparably greater ease than his predecessors, Juvencus and Victorinus: he borrows more than the latter writers from the ecclesiastical Latinity, to keep the expression of his thoughts free from all pagan coloring. His phrases, it is true, show the decay of letters and of good Latin, yet many parts of his poems display taste as well as delicacy; for instance, his stanzas, *Salvete, flores martyrum*, to be found in the Roman Breviary for the feast of the Holy Innocents. We are, however, at a loss to understand how any scholars of our critical age can bestow unqualified praise on Prudentius, and place him *first* in the list of Christian versifiers. Nor are we ready to shut our eyes wilfully to all the beauties of Prudentius's verse, and declare his hymns simply "didactic essays, loaded with moral precepts and doctrinal subtleties." His lyric style is good, and his hymns are good specimens of the best Christian song of the Latin Church in that early age. "The stanzas," says Milman (*Hist. of Latin Christianity*, viii, 309), "which the Latin Church has handed down in her services from Prudentius are but the flowers gathered from a wilderness of weeds." Prudentius, even in Germany, was the great popular author of the Middle Ages; no work but the Bible appears with so many glosses (interpretations or notes) in High German, which show that it was a book of popular instruction (comp. Raumer, *Einwirkung des Christenthums auf die Althochdeutsche Sprache*, p. 222). Had Ambrose lived earlier, Prudentius would not have been remembered at all; but as his contemporary he deserves a place beside that great Church father, whom he never excelled, but sometimes equalled as a hymnologist. The earliest edition of Prudentius's works is that of Deventer (1472). By far the best is that of Faustinus Arrevalus (Rome, 1788–89, 2 vols. 4to), but excellent editions are also those by Waitz (Hanover, 1613, 8vo); Chamillard (in usum Delphini, Paris, 1687, 4to); and Gallandius, *Bibl. Patr.* vol. viii. The newest and handiest is that by Obbarius (Tübing. 1844), whose Prolegomena embrace a large amount of information condensed into a small compass. See Gennadius, *De Viris Illustr.* 13; Ludwig, *Dissert. de Vita A. Prudentii* (Viteb. 1642, 4to); Le Clerque, *Vie de Prudence* (Amst. 1689); Middeldorpf, *Comment. de Prud. et Theol. Prud.* (Vratisl. 1823–27); Schaff, *Ch. Hist.* vol. iii; *Christian Life in Song*, p. 74 sq., 98, 110 sq.; Saunders, *Evenings with the Sacred Poets*, p. 34 sq.; Maittaire, *Poetæ Latini*, p. 1587 sq.; Daniel, *Thesaurus Hymnol.* ii, 102 sq.; Smith, *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog.* s. v.

Pruning-hook (מַזְמֵרָה, *mazmerâh*; Sept. δρέπανον; Isa. ii, 4; xviii, 5; Joel iv, 10; Mic. iv, 3), a knife for pruning the vine. The manner of trimming the vine (זָמַר, *zamár*), signifying clipping, and also

the singular instrument of the vine-dresser, were well known even in the time of Moses (Lev. xxv, 3, 4), and no doubt both were similar to those employed by the Egyptians. See KNIFE; VINE; VINEYARD.

Prussia (Ger. *Preussen*) is a kingdom of the new German Empire, virtually embracing within its own history the story of the whole empire, in which it is the guiding and ruling power. Before its recent aggrandizement, it consisted of two large tracts of land extending from Russia on the east to Holland and Belgium on the west, south of the Baltic and north of Saxony, Thuringia, Bavaria, etc., but separated from each other by the kingdom of Hanover, the duchies of Mecklenburg and Oldenburg, the electorate of Hesse-Cassel, duchy of Nassau, and some minor states. In 1866, Prussia received large accessions of territory, having annexed the kingdom of Hanover, the duchies of Hesse-Cassel, Nassau, and Sleswig and Holstein, the free city of Frankfort, and some districts of Bavaria and Hesse-Darmstadt. The area of Prussia was thus increased from 108,212 Eng. sq. miles to 137,066, and the population from 19,304,843 to 24,106,847, of whom 23,746,790 formed the civil population, and 310,055 the military, the average density of the population being 176 per Eng. sq. mile. The variation in density is considerable, the greatest being in the manufacturing district of Düsseldorf, in the Rhine province, where it is four times the average, and smallest in the district of Köslin, Pomerania, where it amounts to three fifths of the average. Prussia is now divided into eleven provinces and three annexes, with a population, according to the official census for 1885, as follows:

	Eng. sq. m.	Pop. Dec. 1885.
1. Prussia	24,880	3,367,704
2. Posen	11,330	1,715,618
3. Pomerania	12,130	1,505,575
4. Silesia	15,666	4,112,219
5. Brandenburg	15,505	2,342,411
6. Saxony	9,729	2,428,367
7. Westphalia	7,771	2,204,580
8. Rhine province	10,289	4,344,527
9. Hesse-Nassau	5,943	1,592,454
10. Hanover	14,846	2,172,702
11. Sleswig-Holstein	6,959	995,873
12. Principality of Hohenzollern	453	66,720
13. City of Berlin	5	1,315,287

About 88 per cent. of the population are Germans. Of the Slavonic tribes, the most numerous are Poles, numbering two and a quarter millions. In Brandenburg and Silesia there are about 85,000 Wends, and in East Prussia upwards of 147,000 Lithuanians; while Western Prussia has rather more than 10,000 Walloons using the French language, intermixed in its generally German population, and Silesia has nearly 59,000 Bohemians or Moravians—making in all two and a half millions who do not use the German language, or who employ it only as secondary to their native tongues. Three distinct classes are recognised in Prussia—namely, nobles, burghers, and peasants. To the first belong about 177,000 persons, including the high officials of the state, although that number does not comprise the various mediatized houses, of which sixteen are Prussian, and others belonging to different states, but connected with Prussia by still existing or former territorial possessions. The burgher class includes, in its higher branches, all public-office holders, professional men, artists, and merchants; while the peasantry—to which belong all persons engaged in agricultural pursuits—are divided into classes, depending on the number of horses employed on the land, etc.

I. *History and Religion.*—The lands bounded by the Baltic and now constituting East Prussia, and the adjoining territory on that side of the Oder, form the original home of the Prussians within the vast territory they now occupy. These lands were early occupied by Slavonic tribes, nearly allied to the Lithuanians (q. v.) and the Letts. It is conjectured that they were visited by Phœnician navigators in the 4th century B.C.; but beyond the fact of their having come into temporary conflict with the Goths and other Teutonic hordes prior to the great exodus of the latter from their northern homes, little is known of the people till the 10th century, when they first appear in history under the name of *Borussi*, or Prussians. They were then a small but vigorous people, and had made themselves a terror to their neighbors by bold inroads, when the race of the heroes and sea-kings arrived from Norway and Sweden. Scandinavian Goths settled in the country, and the southern shores of the Baltic sounded with the praise of the exploits of Starkodder and Ragnar Lodbrog.

1. *Mythological Period.*—In the oldest historic times, doubtless, the primitive inhabitants—Prussians, Lithuanians, Ulmarugians, Curlanders, Livonians, etc.—worshipped the sun, the moon, the stars, and the powers of nature generally. The Scandinavians, who were further advanced in the arts of war and of peace, better armed, and skilled in agriculture, then brought in new gods, among them the three supreme rulers, *Perkunos*, *Potrimpos*, *Pikollos*, and most probably all their other deities. Much has been written and argued on the question whether the three mentioned names, or the gods to whom they are said to have belonged, really existed, or whether they were mere inventions of some imaginative chroniclers. There are even writers who have discovered in them the three persons of the Holy Trinity. We shall not dwell on these speculations, but briefly state what we positively know of the ancient mythology of a people which occupies such a high rank among the nations of Europe. Besides the three mentioned, there was another important deity, called *Curcho*, the giver of food. His image stood at the foot of many a holy oak. There was one at the place where the city of Heiligenbeil was afterwards built. The apostle of the Prussians cut the venerable tree with a hatchet, and this circumstance gave the town its present name. There were spread over the whole country sacrificial stones, or altars, on which milk, mead, honey, beer, flour, meat, fish, etc., were offered to the god. Every year his image was made anew, out of wood, on the consecrated spots; it was clothed in goat-skins and crowned with herbs and ears. Then it was carried about amid the shouts of the populace; dances and sacrifices ensued. The inferior gods, in large number, have been divided, not, perhaps, very properly, into gods of the heavens, of earth, of the water, of men, of the cattle, of the lower world, into gods of labor, gods of trade, into good and bad gods. This was, no doubt, a kind of worship of nature, similar to that which we find among all half-civilized nations. The holiest place in the land was Romowe. Only a priest was allowed to approach it. There were but few exceptions. Thus, by special favor, a powerful ruler was permitted to come near the consecrated spot, and to speak to the Griwe, or high-priest. But not even those great personages were suffered to come near the sanctuary, the ever-verdant oak, and the gods that stood below it; for it was surrounded with a fence formed by long pieces of white linen, something like a most primitive tabernacle. To a great distance the land around the sanctuary, and the wood which encircled it, was consecrated. No one could enter this forest, which occupied many square miles; and if, unwittingly, some wretch put his foot into it, his life was forfeited to the offended deities. No tree was felled there, no wild animal chased. Besides this celebrated Romowe, there were other places of the same kind spread all over the country, and whose names, commencing with *Romas*, and partly preserved to our days, are expressive of calm and holiness. We find quite a number of such names in Lithuania. In Prussia the trees were held holy, as among the ancient Germans, the Anglo-Saxons, the Rugians, Holsteinians, and kindred peoples. There existed also single oaks and linden-trees which were held in particular veneration as being the seats of some divinity; they were approached with pious horror and deep reverence. The oak of

Heiligenbeil, with a circumference of forty feet and a diameter of nineteen, was the most celebrated. Some mountains enjoyed the same honors. The best-known of them was near Brandenburg, at a short distance from the Frische Haff. Near the holy woods and trees there were, as a rule, holy fields, which never were touched by the plough. We also find holy springs, from which no one could take water unless he previously offered a sacrifice: their water was believed to be a sure medicine against certain diseases. There were also holy lakes, either in a separate place or connected with the sanctuaries and forests: no one was allowed to fish in their waters.

The gods adored in those consecrated places were, besides those already named: *Okopirn*, the god of the air and of tempests; *Swaixtix*, the god of the stars—a most important god in the North, with its long winter nights; *Bankputtis*, the god of the sea; *Antrimpos*, the angry god, who excites the waves; *Wurskeite* and *Szwambxaite*, the protectors of cattle and poultry, worshipped extensively in the whole country; *Gardebis* and *Jantiubobis*, the protectors of oxen and sheep; *Perdoitos*, the god of trade, who made the sea propitious to the mariner, and was specially honored on the sea-coast; *Puskaitis*, the god of woods and trees, who lived under the foliage, and whose dwelling-places were held particularly holy. This god had, throughout the country, a number of sanctuaries, where he was attended by a multitude of strange, dwarf-like beings, which the imagination of the people had fitted out and ornamented in the most fantastical manner. *Pergubrius* gave fertility to the fields; *Zemberis* strewed the earth with seeds, and covered it with flowers and herbs; *Pelwitte* filled with riches the houses and the barns; *Ausweikis* was the god of health, resorted to by the sick and invalid. To these must be added quite a number of female deities. *Jawinna* watched over the germination and growth of corn; *Melletele* covered the meadows and gardens with herbs and grass; *Strutis* was the goddess of the flowers; *Gobjanja* was the goddess of riches and opulence; *Guze* led the wanderers through deserts and gloomy forests; *Swaigsdunoka*, the bride of the star-god, directed the heavenly bodies on their path; *Laima* was the obstetric goddess, and fixed the destinies of the new-born. The bad goddesses were, the sanguinary *Gittine*, who brought painful death; *Magila*, the wrathful deity, who visited cruel misfortunes upon those she disliked; *Laune*, who intervened in human affairs—now sportively, now malignantly, leading the wanderer astray by will-o'-the-wisps, seizing upon helpless children, etc. Besides these gods and goddesses, there were tutelary spirits—spirits of the woods, of the waters, of the earth, most of them servants of the god Puskaitis—men of the woods, dwarfs, elfs, called *barstucs*, or *perstiks*. Similar to these were the nightly spectres, who at twilight left their dark recesses to seek food. They were appeased by putting sacrificial meat in lonesome spots; thus they became guardians of house and barn, and the childish fancy shaped and ornamented them in the quaintest manner. The animal kingdom, also, held many objects for worship. The snake was the object of particular veneration, being the favorite of Potrimpos. Snakes were believed to be a blessing for the house and household, to be immortal, and to gain renewed youth with each change of skin. They were dutifully fed in the holes of old oak-trees, and gladly admitted into buildings and chambers. Barren women fed them with milk, imploring at the same time the blessings of Laima. Carelessness towards them was attended with misfortunes of all kinds. This regard for the snake continued in Prussia and in the neighboring countries till long after the introduction of Christianity. The horse, especially the white horse, was in great honor among all Northern peoples, as well as among the Germans, as a spirit of prophecy was said to dwell in him. All white horses were consecrated to the gods, and no one would have dared to mount a steed of that color. To beat or damage it was a capital crime. Among the birds, the owl enjoyed special regard, because it was believed that she predicted to her friends the coming mishaps.

The gods being so numerous, it was but natural that the priests should form a very large body. At their head stood the Griwe, almost a god himself, so great was the veneration in which he was held among all the nations of the North. The *waidlotes*, *griwaites*, *siggones*, *wurskaiti*, *pustones*, *saitones*, *burtones*, and *swakones* were the members of a powerful hierarchy, and exercised an unlimited influence upon those superstitious tribes. There was no lack of female priests either; and it would seem that female deities were attended exclusively by female priests, as male gods were worshipped only by male priests. Yet it is not likely that sacerdotal women were admitted into the Romowe, as the Griwe, as well as all other priests, had to remain in single blessedness. A transgression of this law was visited with capital punishment, the culprit being dragged away from the holy ground and burned alive. There is some contradiction between this stern enforcement of the law of virginity and the way in which the body of female *waidlotes* was recruited. If a woman had been sterile in marriage, and became, after the death of her husband, the mother of a son or of a daughter by an unmarried man, she was considered as holy, and was admitted to the number of the female priests. As far as the institutions of the ancient Prussians are known, they exacted from their priests a pure, pious, and holy life. Those only could be admitted among the superior priests, the *griwaites*, who, during many years, had shone by an exemplary life; and even the relations whom the Griwe wished to be received into the sacerdotal body had to prove that their conduct had been unblemished, or they were rejected. The priests were supported entirely by the people, for we do not find any mention of their being addicted to agriculture or any art or trade. The sacrifices and offerings were their principal income. They received beer, milk, fruits, animals, tissues for sacerdotal garments, etc. Libations were offered to the gods, and the liquid offering was drunk by the priest. Sometimes this sacrifice was attended with quaint ceremonies. At the great spring-festival, the priest filled a cup with beer, took it between his teeth without touching it with his hands, drained it, and then threw it over his head. Those behind him caught it, filled it with beer, and brought it back to him a second and a third time. The act of emptying three times the cup was intended in honor of the three great gods; the throwing of the cup was the sacrifice brought to them, which human hands durst not touch. After this ceremony the cup circulated from mouth to mouth. Each worshipper took it between his teeth, emptied it, and with his teeth the neighbor took it from him. Finally, the benediction was given to the people; a banquet ensued, in which intoxicating beverages were so plentifully tasted that the solemnity generally ended in bloody work, as is the case, even in our days, with Poles, Lithuanians, and other nations.

2. *Introduction of Christianity.* — We here substantially give the account found in Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, s. v.

"Several attempts to introduce the Christian religion into Prussia had been fruitless. St. Adalbert, bishop of Prague, died April 23, 997, a martyr to his faith, while endeavoring to convert the people to Christianity. Bruno, of the family of the Barons von Querfurt, who, after renouncing his canonry and entering the Benedictine congregation of Camaldoli, had repaired to Prussia in 1008, to preach there the Gospel and convert those pagan tribes, also suffered martyrdom (Feb. 11, 1008). The endeavors of the Polish princes to Christianize the Prussians by force were still more unsuccessful. As the acceptance of the Christian religion had been made a condition of peace by Boleslas, duke of Poland, about 1018, they considered the Christian communion as an obnoxious consequence of unhappy warfare, as a yoke imposed by the foe, and they shook it off every time when they felt strong enough to do so. Thus the disinclination to the new worship increased continually, until it reached the very pitch of

hatred and disgust. Meanwhile Otto, bishop of Bamberg (1124), preached with success in Pomerania, and Christianity by degrees reached the banks of the Vistula. The first Christian ruler in Pomerania, Subislas I, founded in 1170, near Dantzic, the monastery of Oliva, which became a seminary whence the seed of the Christian faith was in time to spread over Prussia's soil.

"Previous to the establishment of Oliva's monastery the Prussians, however, had succeeded (in 1161) in making a stand against Boleslas IV of Poland, and for a time maintained a rude and savage kind of independence, which the disturbed condition of Poland prevented its rulers from breaking down. The fear of losing their freedom if they adopted Christianity made the Prussians obstinately resist every effort for their conversion; and it was not till the middle of the 13th century, when the knights of the Teutonic Order entered upon their famous crusade against them, that the Christian faith was formally established among them. The aggressive inroads of the pagan Prussians on the territories of their Christian neighbors, and their advance into Pomerania, were the exciting causes of this important movement. Christianity was by the reverses of the Polish princes thrown so vastly upon the defensive that the Pomeranian duke Grimislas, of Stargard and Schurtz, called in 1198 some knights of St. John into his dominions, and delivered into their hands his castle of Stargard and some adjoining territories for operations against the Prussians. The intimate commercial relations between Brunen and Livonia facilitated the work of the missionaries, and gave easy access to the latter country. After the Christian religion had been introduced into Pomerania and Livonia, and an order of Christian knighthood had been founded for its aid and maintenance, the prospects in Prussia also seemed to brighten. Although the exertions of Gottfried, abbot of the monastery of Cistercians of Lukina (1207), in Poland, and of his fellow-monk Philip, who suffered martyrdom, were not attended with any enduring success, yet were two of the native princes converted. A few years afterwards appeared the man to whom was reserved the glorious achievement of introducing Christianity into Prussia. It was the Cistercian monk Christian, of the monastery of Oliva, a man distinguished by every virtue, and speaking fluently the German, Latin, Polish, and Prussian languages. In 1210 he obtained permission from pope Innocent III to go to Prussia with some chosen companions, and his efforts were crowned with such brilliant success that in the fall of 1214, or at the beginning of 1215, he was appointed bishop of Prussia, the new converts having hitherto been committed to the pastoral care of the archbishop of Gnesen. The number of the converted Prussians was considerable, and two of their princes, Warpodo, the ruler of the land of Lansania, and Suavobuno, who reigned in the land of Löbau, had made provisions for the maintenance of the bishop.

"This partial triumph of Christianity excited the anger of the heathenish Prussians, who were, besides, maddened by the expeditions of Conrad, duke of Masovia. Help from abroad was sorely needed. Crusades, however, could not afford any lasting protection. The Order of the Knights of Christ, called also Brother-knights of Dobrin, founded in Livonia in 1225 by bishop Christian, on the pattern of the Knights of the Sword, was no match for the savage fury of the Prussians: at the very beginning of the war all the knights, save five, were killed in battle near the spot where Strasburg was afterwards built. By bishop Christian's advice, the Teutonic Order was applied to for assistance (1226). The grand-master, Hermann von Salza, asked consent of Frederick II, who not only granted the request, but also promised his help, and confirmed the donations of land formally made to the order by duke Conrad of Masovia. After four years of negotiations, duke Conrad made a solemn grant to the order of the whole land of Culm, between the Vistula, Drewenz, and Ossa, with all the conquests they should add to it; while at the same time bishop Christian, and Günther, bishop of Plock, renounced in their favor all their possessions, revennes, and patronal rights in those countries, reserving only their episcopal jurisdiction and their pontificalia. At the same time the popes, Gregory IX, in 1234, and Innocent IV, in 1244, declared the present and future conquests of the order feuds of the papal see ('*in jus et proprietatem B. Petri suscipimus et eam sub speciali Sedis Apostolicæ protectione et defensione* perpetuo tempore permanere sancimus. . . . Te Conrade magister ejus domus annulo nostro *de terra investimus*, ita quod ipsa . . . nullius unquam subjiciatur dominio potestatis; quæ vero in futurum . . . de terra paganorum in eadem provincia vos contigerit adipisci, firma et illibata vobis vestrisque successoribus *sub jure et proprietate Sedis Apostolicæ* eo modo statuimus permanenda'). An annual tribute was promised to the Roman court. At the same time the pope stipulated that in the newly acquired territories churches should be built, bishops and prelates appointed at his will, that a portion of the land should be granted to the latter dignitaries, etc. The grand-master selected Hermann Balk to be the leader of the knights he intended to send to Prussia, and the administrator of the land given to the order by duke Conrad; Hermann, probably of Westphalian birth, was not only a distinguished warrior, but a man full of wisdom and experience in all worldly matters; a pious knight, too, who during a space of ten years had administered the possessions of the order in Germany, and gained by his remarkable aptitude the full confidence of the grand-master. All other high functions were intrusted to equally distinguished persons, who, with a few knights and a considerable body of cavalry, set out on their way to Prussia. They arrived in 1228 in the dominions of Conrad of Masovia. Numerous as was their host, yet the Prussians counted a thousand warriors where they counted one. Conrad could assist them, but hardly make them formidable, by the addition of his forces, his weakness being the very cause which had made their expedition desirable. Poland was torn by its unceasing troubles, and, besides, engaged in perpetual warfare with her neighbors. Pomerania itself offered no prospect of help, as duke Swantepolk entertained but hostile relations with Conrad, and with Poland in general. It was a heroic daring in the Teutonic Order to engage in their expedition under such unfavorable circumstances. They began the war without delay, assisted by bands of crusaders (1232), Gregory IX preaching the crusade against Prussia with unabating zeal. The land of Culm was occupied, with the help of Swantepolk of Pomerania, in spite of the desperate resistance of the Prussians. The order, at the same time that it constructed forts to insure the new conquests, helped German colonists in building cities in well-protected and fertile places. Thorn was reared first, soon afterwards Culm, both in 1232, and Marienwerder in 1233. The Prussians, dismayed by the large body of troops arrayed on their frontier, and knowing perhaps that the crusaders were engaged for the space of a year only, pretended to be unwilling to fight and inclined to receive baptism. Bishop Christian forthwith repaired to the district of Pomesania, in order to preach and to baptize. But a few days afterwards he was attacked by the pagans, his companions all killed, and the bishop himself led into captivity. The pope now recommended caution to the Dominicans in Prussia, and bade them beware of the wily stratagems of the heathens. A spell of cold weather having made the moorlands of Pomesania easy of access, the whole Christian army invaded that country at the beginning of 1234. The Pomesanians were defeated near the Sirgune River, in the neighborhood of a consecrated wood, after victory had been passing for several hours from host to host. The battle was a most bloody one, and the spot where it had raged was, long after the event, called 'The Field of the Dead.' As its final gain by the Christians was due to Swantepolk, an army of Pomesanians crossed the Vistula and laid waste the whole land of Pomerania. The monastery of Oliva, which had been recently put under papal protection, was stormed and reduced to ashes. To protect the land of Culm against the vengeance of the infuriated invaders, Hermann Balk erected the fort of Rheden in 1234, which was the origin of the city of Rheden. This kind of precaution was indispensable, as the crusaders dispersed after a year's service, and the knights had to hold the country with their sole resources. There came other difficulties: the order and bishop Christian could not agree; there were grievous dissensions between the order and duke Conrad; a contest arose between Swantepolk of Pomerania and Henry of Breslau, and cut off, for the knights, all prospect of help from those quarters. The pope, informed of this state of affairs, sent his legate, bishop William of Modena, with most extensive powers, especially for the constitution to be given to the churches and for the distribution of bishoprics in the northern countries; and he announced the arrival of his legate and the object of his mission to the Christians in Livonia, Prussia, Gothland, Finland, Esthonia, Semgallen, and Courland. The legate arrived in Prussia at the beginning of summer in 1234, and exerted himself at once in compounding the dispute between bishop Christian and the order. The bishop had made a division of the land, taking two thirds as his share, and left only one third to the order; he had further expressed the opinion that the countries recently conquered for the Church were lawfully his. The legate did not approve of these views: he decided, in conformity with his instructions, that of all territories occupied and still to be occupied, two thirds should go to the order, with all revenues connected with them—the dime, for instance; that the bishop should have only one third for his share, but with this additional stipulation, that in the two thirds which went to the order, such advantages as could be enjoyed only by a bishop should also accrue to the latter. The bishop was obliged to submit to the legate's decision. The difficulties between the order and duke Conrad could not be so easily removed. The Knights of Dobrin had joined the Teutonic Order, and the latter had taken possession of the fort of Dobrin, with all its dependencies, in spite of the protest of the duke. The pope, in a bull of April 19, 1235, approved the fusion of the Brothers of Dobrin with the Teutonic Order, mainly at the request of the bishop of Plock. The latter and the papal legate, after negotiating through the summer months, succeeded in October in restoring concord. The knights delivered to Conrad the castle of Dobrin, with its dependencies, and received in exchange

other territories, of which the most important was Slonzk, with its salt-mines. Gregory IX, in spite of his manifold Italian cares and troubles, endeavored with all his might to promote the enterprise of the order. The preaching of the crusade was not interrupted in Germany, and measures were taken to increase the number of the knights. Fresh troops of crusaders having arrived from Germany, the war was resumed. Pomesania and Pogesania were conquered: with the former of these provinces the whole eastern shore of the Vistula was in the power of the order. Those of the enemy who surrendered were spared, experienced mild treatment, and were immediately christened by the priests who followed the army. Hermann Balk and his knights endeavored to subdue by the influence of Christian meekness these savage spirits, whose faith in their gods was shaken by so great misfortunes. A chronicler says: 'Not like lords, but as fathers and brothers, they rode about the land, visited both the rich and the poor, invited the new Christians to their meals, took care of and nursed in their hospitals poor, sick Prussians, provided for widows and orphans whose husbands and fathers had perished in the war, and sent clever young men to Germany, especially to Magdeburg, to get well instructed in Christianity and in the German language, and to become afterwards teachers in Prussia.' It was at this time that Henry Monte, who became so distinguished afterwards, was brought up in the celebrated monastery school of Magdeburg. The expenses of these young men were paid with the alms gathered in Germany. The landmaster's humane measures did not fail to make their impression even on the unconverted part of the nation. All measures of coercion had been prohibited. Wherever the order established its authority churches were built: Thorn, Culm, Rheden, Marienwerder, had their churches. The city of Elbing built a church and a monastery in the first year of its existence. Even the open country had not been left without churches: we find in 1236 a mention of the parish of Postelin, in Pomerania. Some pious men exerted themselves in order to instruct the people in the Christian faith. The papal legate, William of Modena, preached with great success; he was powerfully assisted by the Dominicans, several of whom were masters of the Prussian language. The most distinguished among these monks was St. Hyacinth, who belonged to the house of the counts of Odrovanz, one of the oldest and most celebrated of the families of Silesia. His father was count of Konski, and his uncle chancellor of Poland and bishop of Cracow. Hyacinth was born in 1185 in the castle of Gross-Stein, district of Gross-Strelitz, in Upper Silesia, and studied at Cracow, Prague, and Bologna. In the latter city he received the title of doctor of laws and theology. On his return home he was promoted to a canonry at the cathedral of Cracow, and assisted the bishop in the administration of his diocese. When his uncle Ivo of Konski became bishop of Cracow, he went to Rome, and took along with him Hyacinth and his brother Ceslaus. In the year 1218, when St. Dominic was in Rome, both brothers entered the Dominican Order, and Hyacinth became one of the most active northern missionaries. Another powerful missionary was bishop Christian, but his dissensions with the order could only be detrimental to the cause of Christianity. In 1237 a pest-like disease spread over the dominions of the order, and caused many of the neophytes to waver in their new faith. On May 9, 1238, a treaty was concluded with Waldemar, king of Denmark, through the exertions of the papal legate: the king received the fort of Reval and the territories of Harrien and Wirland, while the order received the district of Ierwen; only no forts were to be built in the latter without the king's consent. The king promised not to put any obstacle in the way of the order in their work of conversion, but to help them where he could: two thirds of the conquests were to go to the king, one third was the order's share. Hermann Balk, thus assisted by the Danes, undertook an expedition against the Russians, who had invaded the diocese of Dorpat; but soon important events recalled him to Prussia. The knight Hermann von Altenburg, a pious man, but rigid and austere, whom the grand-master had intrusted with the administration of the dominions of the order during his absence, had not imitated the wise moderation and patient meekness of his superior. On hearing that a Prussian village had gone over to paganism again, he set fire to it, and priests and villagers perished in the flames. This created in the country bitter dissatisfaction, and the fruit of the restless labors and struggles of ten years seemed to be lost by one reckless act. Other misfortunes had come upon the order. Their old friend Swantepolk of Pomerania had become their foe: it was fortunate that the duke was threatened by other enemies, and found it prudent to make peace. Then Hermann Balk was recalled by the grand-master in 1238, and took his departure after providing for the good administration of the country; but he never saw it again. He died March 5, 1239. On March 20 the noble grand-master, Hermann von Salza, died also, and was succeeded by Conrad, landgrave of Thuringia. Henry of Wida was appointed land-master in Prussia. After protracted hostilities with the Prussians and duke Swantepolk of Pomerania, a treaty was concluded on Feb. 7, 1249, by which the provinces of Pomesania, Pogesania, Ermland, and Natangen submitted to the order and promised conversion. The neophytes obtained all civil rights, were allowed to enter the ecclesiastical state, and to become members of regular congregations. These civil and other rights were forfeited by their eventual apostasy. The legate having put the question as to what worldly laws the neophytes wished to have introduced, and what tribunals they would most willingly recognise, they declared for the legislation of the Poles: this they were granted by the order. On being taught by the legate that all men were equal, they promised to give up their heathenish customs as to the burial of the dead, and those various ceremonies in which the distinctions of rank were preserved even after death, and to bury their dead in Christian cemeteries. They also promised to renounce polygamy; that no one should in future sell his daughter to another man in matrimony, nor buy a wife for himself or his son: that nobody should henceforward marry his mother-in-law, or the widow of his brother, nor any person standing to him in a degree of relationship prohibited by the canon, without a license from the pope. No child should be admitted to inherit his or her parents' estate if the matrimony of the latter had not been of such a description as to satisfy the exigencies of the Church. The killing or exposing of children was prohibited; the baptism of the new-born, within a short period, was made obligatory. As it was a consequence of the want of ecclesiastics and of churches that many children had remained unchristened, the parents promised to present them all for baptism in the course of a month. Such as should infringe upon these prescriptions, or who refused baptism for themselves, were to have their goods confiscated, to be themselves covered with a slight garment, and expelled from the territory of the Christians. The Pomesanians promised to build thirteen churches from that time to the next Whitsuntide, the Warmians promised six, the Natangians three; each church to be properly fitted out with its ornaments, chalices, books, and other implements. It was agreed upon that if the neophytes failed to construct the churches promised by them, the knights should be empowered to levy a tax on their estates and build the churches themselves, even if it should be necessary to recur to violent means. They promised to attend worship, at least on Sundays and holydays. The order, in their turn, promised to furnish the churches with priests and estate in the course of a year. Most minute and careful provisions were made for the maintenance of the ecclesiastics. The neophytes further promised to keep the fasts prescribed by the Church, not to do any hard work on Sundays and holydays, to confess their sins at least once a year, to partake of the Lord's Supper at Easter, and, in general, to submit their conduct to the directions and teachings of the clergy. They pledged themselves to bring every year the dime into the granaries of the order; to defend the persons, honor, and rights of the order; to keep aloof from any treasonable practices against it, and to denounce such plots if they were known to them. The order had always, even during the excitement of the war, borne in mind the highest aim of their labors, the establishment and expansion of Christianity. Honorius III had committed to bishop Christian the care of establishing bishoprics, but he did not even succeed in fully organizing the bishopric of Culm. In 1236 Gregory II had enjoined on his legate to divide the new countries into dioceses, and to establish three bishops in them. In a bull of Oct. 1, 1243, the pope informed Christian that he had divided Prussia into four bishoprics, Culm being one of them. Christian was invited to make choice of one of these bishoprics, but to content himself, according to the treaty concluded with the order, with one third of the land. Bishop Christian died in 1243 or 1244. His death greatly facilitated the legate's discharge of his duties, who now had full powers to do as he deemed fit. The first diocese was to include the land of Culm, as far as it is bounded by the rivers Vistula, Drewenz, and Ossa, with the addition of the district of Löbau; the so-called Sassenland and the territory of Gilgenburg belonged also to the first diocese. The second diocese was bounded by the rivers Ossa and Vistula and the lake of Drausen, and reached upwards to the banks of the Passaluc or Passarge River; it comprised Quidin and Zanthis, and was called the diocese of Pomesania. The third diocese was bounded west by the Frische-Haff, north by the Pregel River, or the Lipza, south by the Drausen Lake and Passaluc River, and extended east to the boundaries of Lithuania. This was the diocese of Ermland. A fourth diocese was to comprise the yet independent countries bounded west by the Baltic Sea, north by the Memel, south by the Pregel, and east by Lithuania. This was subsequently called the diocese of Samland. The legate, on April 10, 1244, assembled at Thorn the most distinguished clergymen of the neighboring countries – the archbishop of Gnesen, the bishops of Breslau, Leszlau, and Plock, a number of Polish abbots, the most considerable of the Teutonic Knights, and other men of high standing—to take their advice on the constitution to be introduced into the new bishoprics. The Dominican Heidenreich (the faithful assistant of bishop Christian), who had been over ten years busy in

the work of confession, was selected for the diocese of Culm. The Dominican Ernest, from Torgau, a friend and companion of Heidenreich, who had, like him, worked many years for the expansion of Christianity, was selected to be the first bishop of Pomesania. A brother-priest of the Teutonic Order, Henry of Strateich, was appointed bishop of Ermland. The diocese of Samland received in 1255 its first bishop in the person of Henry of Strittberg, a brother-priest of the Teutonic Order. His successor, Christian von Mühlhausen, a man distinguished by his piety as well as by his knowledge, and who was also a priest of the order, did not arrive in Prussia until 1276. The chapter was established first at Schönewik, near Fischhausen, then (in 1285) at Königsberg. The bishops, owing to various impediments, did not occupy their sees at once. Bishop Heidenreich of Culm (whether the two others did the same cannot be ascertained) repaired to the papal court, and was consecrated by the pope himself at Lyons, probably in the course of the year 1245. By this time the legate, William of Modena, had arrived also at the court of Rome, and was soon promoted to the bishopric of Sabina. It was no easy matter to find a successor to a man who had played such a prominent part in the religious organization of the north—in Prussia, Livonia, Courland, and Esthonia, and displayed so much zeal, intelligence, and energy in most intricate affairs. The bishops of Prussia needed, above all, a man who had insight and influence enough to draw positive limits between the dioceses, and render final decisions in a number of concerns where no rules had as yet been agreed upon. In the year 1244, pope Innocent IV thought he had found such a man in the person of the administrator of the diocese of Lübeck, Ekbert—formerly archbishop of Armagh, in Ireland. The legate was at the same time appointed archbishop of Prussia, Livonia, and Esthonia. That the new archbishop might have an income proportioned to his dignity, the pope committed to him the bishopric of Chiemsee, which had just become vacant, and enjoined the archbishop of Salzburg to deliver into the hands of the archbishop of Prussia the administration of said diocese. Towards the end of April, 1246, the pope sent him the archiepiscopal pallium, and allowed him, at his request, to make use of it during his sojourn in Russia and in the church of Lübeck; but this right was not to be extended to his successors. At the same time Ekbert went to Russia, to promote the fusion of the Russian and the Roman Catholic Church; and pope Innocent IV recommended him to reward the zeal of the knights by appointing one of the priests of their order to one of the Prussian bishoprics. Bishop Heidenreich of Culm first took in hand the administration of his diocese. The country had been devastated and neglected, was scantily populated, and churches were rare and separated by large intervals. The bishop had to induce colonists to settle in his diocese, and he succeeded so well that after five or six years he could think of the establishment of a cathedral church. The cathedral was consecrated at Culm in 1251, and received the name of the Holy Trinity; at the same time a chapter was founded, under the rule of St. Augustine, and so richly endowed that, as soon as the revenue of the lands could be collected, forty canons might be held. Besides the churches, the number of which was continually increasing in cities and villages, the land of Culm had already several monasteries; for instance, a Dominican monastery at Culm, and a Franciscan monastery at Thorn.

"The history of the bishopric of Pomesania is little known in the first years of its existence: we only know that bishop Ernest had taken possession of his see in 1247. In 1255 he chose for his residence Marienwerder, and there the cathedral was erected. The first bishop of Ermland, Henry of Strateich, died in 1249 or 1250. His successor was another priest of the Teutonic Order, Anselm, who had had a considerable share in the work of conversion and in the victories of the order. The division of the land was made in 1255: the bishop chose the middle part, in which the city of Braunsberg was situated. Bishop Anselm displayed indefatigable activity in the discharge of his duties; took wise measures for the education of youth, for the erection of new churches, etc. The bishops of Prussia lived for a long time in very distressing circumstances, owing to the frequent wars and to the disinclination of the neophytes to pay the dime. Not being able to live on the produce of their own lands, they had to live abroad. The archbishop of Prussia consulted the pope in regard to these inconveniences, and the pope agreed that each of the three bishops of Prussia could accept for his subsistence an ecclesiastical feud, if it were transferred to him in a legal way; but he was to keep it only as long as the situation of the Prussian Church made it desirable. The popes displayed indefatigable vigor in assisting by all means in forming the Church. Their voice was continually heard exhorting priests and monks to repair to the new provinces and share in the work. In 1246 pope Innocent IV addressed a bull to the superiors of all monastic orders, in which he urged them to help the sister churches of Prussia, Livonia, and Esthonia, where books were wanted, with their superabundant wealth in this respect, or to have copies made for them. Honorius III and Innocent III had done much for the improvement of the schools. Honorius, in a special bull, had invited Christian contributions for the purpose of establishing boys' schools, in order to promote the work of conversion. The former legate, William of Modena, had greatly distinguished himself in these efforts: he had even learned the Prussian language, and translated Donatus for the Prussian schools. The bishops also exerted themselves strenuously for the establishment of public instruction. We find traces of country schools in Ermland as early as 1251. By an agreement between bishop Anselm and the order, the knights, in their own domains, were empowered to engage and to dismiss schoolmasters. We infer that schools for the education of the young must also have existed in the most important cities, as Thorn, Culm, Marienwerder, Elbing, Braunsberg, and Königsberg. But we have no historical data on this point, and we may well admit that the protracted and savage warfare which made everything unstable in those countries during so many years did not allow any regular development of public instruction. The work done in other countries by monastery schools was at that time of little importance in Prussia, the order not being favorable to the establishment of monasteries. Much was done by monasteries in cities, but their influence was shut up in the town walls, and, besides, their number and their means of influence were insufficient. Yet in the second half of the 13th century the necessity of providing the people with a Christian education was deeply felt. Not only were numerous churches built in the country, and priests called, but the cathedral chapters, as may be seen by the deed of foundation of the Pomesanian chapter, were established for the express purpose that the Catholic faith should be more thoroughly taught. In consequence, only men of education and abilities were received into the chapters. Libraries were founded for the use of the ecclesiastics in the chapters; bishops endeavored to increase by donations the number of books; the pope himself came to the rescue, as we have seen above. The archbishop of Prussia was, as we know, at the same time papal legate: in this capacity he had many a contest with the Teutonic Order, and in such cases both parties were apt to exceed the limits of their rights. While the archbishop violated acknowledged rights of the order, the order made violent inroads upon the privileges of the archbishop. The sad consequences of these hostile relations appeared in 1248, when the establishment of a solid ecclesiastical constitution in the recuperated countries made an active interference of the archbishop necessary. The three bishops of Prussia—Heidenreich of Culm, Ernest of Pomesania, and Henry of Ermland—together with the margrave Otto von Brandenburg, interposed their mediation in 1249, and promoted between the order and the legate mutual forgiveness for past wrongs and reconciliation for the future. The archbishop promised to assist the order by his preaching, and by every other means, as best he could, and to make no complaint, either at the papal court or before any other judge, as to the rights and privileges in dispute; while the knights, in their turn, promised to molest him no more, and pay him all due respect and veneration. At the same time the order pledged itself to pay 300 marks in silver at fixed times to the archbishop, while the latter engaged never to establish his residence in Prussia unless he had the express authorization therefor from the superior of the order. This convention was concluded Jan. 10, 1249. Yet the trouble was only temporarily removed. A complete reconciliation could only be brought about by the interference of papal authority; and the popes were just then otherwise engaged. The schism in the German empire was, as it were, repeated in the Teutonic Order: there was a double election. In such a time of discord, obligations and promises are easily forgotten, or at least neglected; and it sometimes becomes impossible, or at least difficult, to live up to one's engagements. The dispute began again between the order and archbishop Albert. But, as the inner dissensions of the order gave additional gravity to exterior troubles, the land-master, Dietrich von Grüningen, repaired to the papal court, and there represented the great disadvantages with which the missionary work would be attended if a good understanding could not be restored. Innocent summoned the land-master and the archbishop for the ensuing Easter. The archbishop appeared at the appointed time at Lyons, and the pope satisfied himself that he had exceeded his powers as a legate. In consequence, in September, 1250, the archbishop was forbidden to make any further use of his powers as legate, or to make any episcopal appointments in the future, either in Prussia, Livonia, or Esthonia. But his archiepiscopal relations to the order needed also positive regulation: the decision about these matters was given in 1251. The bishops Peter of Albano and William of Sabina (the former legate) and cardinal Giovanni di San Lorenzo were commissioned by the pope to make arrangements. They negotiated on the ground of the reconciliation prepared in 1249 by the bishops and margrave Otto. Thus the dispute was allayed, Feb. 24, 1251, and bishop Bruno of Olmütz was requested by the pope to see to the faithful observance of the articles agreed upon. But at the same time the seeds of new dissensions had been scattered. To give to the archiepiscopal dignity in

the countries of the Baltic a firmer support, bishop William of Sabina directed, in the pope's name, that the seat of the archbishop should be Riga, which was in many respects the most important and fittest city in those parts. After the decease of the actual bishop of Riga, or if his see should become vacant in any other way, the Church of Riga should become archiepiscopal, and be transferred to archbishop Albert. Meanwhile nothing should be altered in the situation of the bishop of Riga, and the archbishop should exercise in his diocese only his archiepiscopal jurisdiction. Nicolaus, bishop of Riga, died at the close of 1253, and Albert, in 1254, established himself in Livonia. He had already been empowered to exercise again the power of a legate in Prussia, Livonia, and Esthonia. But in Prussia, his ordinances in ecclesiastical matters, and the exercise of his power as a legate, met with some obstacles: there were the liberties and privileges granted to the order by the popes; there were the peculiar relations existing between the bishops and the order, for under Heidenreich's successor the chapter of Culm had adopted the rule of the Teutonic Order, and the chapters of Samland and Pomesania had in their origin been filled with brothers of the order. The archbishop submitted these difficulties to the pope, and expressed a wish to be relieved of his duties as a legate so far as Prussia was concerned, discharging the same only in Livonia, Esthonia, and Russia. The pope complied with this wish, reiterating the old injunctions not to do anything in the lands of the order against the will of the same. Albert assumed in 1254 the dignity of archbishop of Riga, and found himself, as such, in quite new relations with the order in Livonia. The troubles which arose out of them were again disposed of at the papal court, whither both parties had again betaken themselves, Dec. 12, 1254. In the ensuing year pope Alexander IV, by a bull, received the Church of Riga, with all its enumerated possessions, into the protection of the apostle Peter; subordinated to it the bishoprics of Oesel, Dorpat, Wierland, Courland, Culm, Ermland, Pomesania, Samland, and Russia; defined with accuracy the rights and liberties of the archbishop, and delineated in all its bearings his situation in regard to the clergy of those countries and to the Teutonic Order. Thus the hierarchical affairs were settled. The order enjoyed in their lands the patronal rights; the bishops and chapters enjoyed them in their own territories. In the lands of the order the bishop could pretend only to what must needs be done by a bishop ("salvis tamen episcopo in duabus fratrum partibus illis omnibus quæ non possunt nisi per episcopum exerceri"). Nothing now prevented the blessings of Christianity being poured over Prussia. But there were other obstacles in the way. The people had been converted under compulsion, and the true spirit of Christianity had poorly prospered in such a soil. The knights, to promote the knowledge of the German language, and bring about a gradual fusion of the Prussian and the German element, used to appoint German priests exclusively; the consequence was that the pastor could speak to his flock only through the ministry of an interpreter. With the exception of Ermland, all episcopal chapters were filled by brothers of the order, and thus the grand-master's will was decisive in all episcopal elections. This was afterwards felt, when the order had abated much of its strictly clerical spirit, to be a sore disadvantage. The order was often engaged in disputes with the bishops and the metropolitan, and by their refusal to heed the papal interdict which such conduct brought upon them they set a bad example. In a moral point of view also the knights were not always shining lights; and it is a sorrowful truth that a number of members of the higher and lower clergy were not their superiors in this respect. Even the most zealous of the archbishops could not change this unfortunate state of things, the metropolitan tie of Ermland, Samland, and Pomesania with Riga, and of Culm with Gnesen, being a very loose one. In the dominions of the order few monasteries were established, and not one could acquire might and influence by its wealth: the acquisition of real estate by ecclesiastical corporations, or even by individual priests, was subject to the agreement of the order, and this was usually withheld. The two Cistercian monasteries of Oliva and Pelplin were the only exceptions: under the protection and by the liberality of the old dukes of Pomerania they had acquired such extensive possessions that they were surpassed by no other monastery, either in Pomerania or in Prussia.

"The unhappy wars between the knights and the Poles and Lithuanians, together with the moral degeneracy of the order, led, in the 14th and 15th centuries, to the gradual decline of their supremacy. In 1454 the municipal and noble classes, with the co-operation of Poland, rose in open rebellion against the knights, who were finally compelled to seek peace at any rate, and obliged in 1466 to accept the terms offered to them by the treaty of Thorn, by which West Prussia and Ermland were ceded by them unconditionally to Poland, and the remainder of their territories declared to be fiefs of that kingdom. In 1511 the knights elected as their grand-master the margrave Albert of Anspach and Baireuth, a kinsman of the king of Poland, and a scion of the Frankish line of the Hohenzollern family. Although his election did not immediately result, as the knights had hoped, in securing them allies powerful enough to aid them in emancipating themselves from Polish domination, it was fraught with important consequences to Germany at large, no less than to the order itself." The state founded by the order had, through the peculiar relations in which it stood to the papal see, through its great privileges, and through the weakness of the German emperors, secured a most independent situation, which was still strengthened by the circumstance that the bishops, being members of the order which ruled the land, had more interest with this worldly power than with the papal see. The monasteries could put no check on the omnipotence of the order, for, as a consequence of the nature of things, they were few in number. This, and the political situation of the time, facilitated the entrance of the Reformation into Prussia. The grand-master of the Teutonic Order, margrave Albert von Brandenburg, endeavored in 1519 to shake off the feudal supremacy of the pope. The wish of suppressing, according to Luther's advice, "the foolish, nonsensical rule of the order," of taking a wife, and making of Prussia a worldly principality, induced him, after the peace of Cracow, in 1525, to accept Prussia from the crown of Poland as a secular, hereditary feud.

Foreseeing that an example so momentous to the ecclesiastical dignitaries of Germany could not but arraign many adversaries against him, duke Albert looked about for allies, married the daughter of the king of Denmark in 1526, and, by renouncing Roman Catholicism, entered into the closest relations with the Protestants of Germany. Under the protection of king Sigismund of Poland he could stand his ground, and the protestation of the pope and of the members of the orders spoiled of their rights was just as ineffectual as the "Acht" pronounced against him by the emperor. Charles V had been powerless against him; and Maximilian, who would have been powerfully supported by the German nobility, did not care to declare war against the house of Brandenburg, or to break the good understanding existing between himself and his brother-in-law, the king of Poland, especially as he lived in the hope that one of his sons would in time ascend the Polish throne. The duke's example of adopting the new faith was followed by many of the knights of Prussia, and Lutheranism, especially through many considerate as well as coercive measures, made rapid progress. Indeed, the whole country now began to improve and thrive. "Albert improved the mode of administering the laws, restored some order to the finances of the state, established schools, founded the University of Königsberg (1544), and caused the Bible to be translated into Polish, and several books of instruction to be printed in German, Polish, and Lithuanian. Upon his death, in 1568, Protestantism had so strengthened in Prussia that there remained not the least prospect of the Catholic Church getting the supremacy again. His son and successor, Albert Frederick, having become insane, a regency was appointed. Several of his kinsmen, in turn, enjoyed the dignity of regent, and finally his son-in-law, Johann Sigismund, elector of Brandenburg, after having held the administration of affairs in his hands for some years, was, on the death of the duke in 1618, recognised as his successor, both by the people and by the king of Poland, from whom he received the investiture of the duchy of Prussia, which, since that period, has been governed by the Hohenzollern-Brandenburg house.

"Here it will be necessary to retrace our steps in order briefly to consider the political and dynastic relations of the other parts of the Prussian state. In the 12th century the northern Mark, comprising probably the territory between the Elbe and the Oder as far as its confluence with the Spree, was held by the immediate descendants of Albert, the Bear of Luxemburg, its first hereditary margrave, who, during the next two or three centuries, extended their dominions eastward beyond the Oder into Farther Pomerania. On the extinction of this line, known as the Ascanian house, a remote kinsman, Frederick VI, count of Hohenzollern, and margrave of Nürnberg, became possessed—partly by purchase and partly by investiture from the emperor—of the Brandenburg lands, which, in his favor, were constituted into an electorate. This prince, known as the elector Frederick I, received his investiture in 1417. He united under his rule, in addition to his hereditary Franconian lands of Anspach and Baireuth, a territory of more than 11,000 square miles. His reign was disturbed by the insubordination of the nobles and the constant incursions of his Prussian and Polish neighbors, but by his firmness and resolution he restored order at home and enlarged his boundaries. It is said that he gained possession of the castles of his refractory nobles by the aid of a 24-pounder, known as the 'Faule Grete;' but even this unwonted auxiliary was of no avail in a long war which he waged against the Hussites, who devastated the land and razed many of his cities in revenge for the part which Frederick had taken in acting as commander-in-chief of the imperial army that had been sent against them.

"Under Frederick's successors the Brandenburg territory was augmented by the addition of many new acquisitions, although the system of granting appanages to the younger members of the reigning house, common at that

time, deprived the electorate of some of its original domains — as, for instance, the margravate of Anspach, which passed, on the death of the elector Albert Achilles, in 1486, as an independent state to his younger sons and their descendants. The most considerable addition to the electorate was the one to which reference has already been made, and which fell to the elector John Sigismund through his marriage (in 1609) with Anne, daughter and heiress of Albert Frederick, the Insane, duke of Prussia. In consequence of this alliance, the duchy of Cleves, the countships of Ravensberg, the Mark, and Limburg, and the extensive duchy of Prussia, now known as East Prussia, became incorporated with the Brandenburg territories, which were thus more than doubled in area.

"The reign of John Sigismund's successor, Georg Wilhelm (1619–40), was distracted by the miseries of the Thirty Years' War, and the country was alternately the prey of Swedish and imperial armies; and on the accession of Georg Wilhelm's son, the great elector Frederick William, in 1640, the electorate was sunk in the lowest depths of social misery and financial embarrassment. But so wise, prudent, and vigorous was the government of this prince that at his death, in 1688, he left a well-filled exchequer and a fairly equipped army of 38,000 men; while the electorate, which now possessed a population of one and a half million, and an area of 42,000 square miles, had been raised by his genius to the rank of a great European power" (Chambers). His successors, Frederick III (1688–1713) and Frederick William I (1713–40), each in his own way increased the power and credit of Prussia, which had been in 1701 raised to the rank of a kingdom — a most significant change not only in the secular, but also in the ecclesiastical history of that country. Sweden had sunk down from the eminence which it had held for a time as the leading Protestant power in the North; Prussia now rose to take the place from which Sweden was receding, and the apparently insignificant event of 1701 at Königsberg was followed by very grave consequences, both for Germany and Europe.

3. *Reformation Period.*—The religious history of this early period of Prussia's aggrandizement is as full of interest as the secular. Its people, among whom, even in the 16th century, heathenish customs maintained their place side by side with Christian usages, were among the first to look favorably upon the new Gospel movement. The German order they had learned to despise, and, looking upon Christianity and knighthood as synonymous, they had steadfastly opposed conversion. But now, when a gospel was preached discarding and opposing the papacy and all its agencies, the people became ready converts; and the princes, accepting this great popular movement as insurmountable, suffered themselves to be borne along with the tide. In Prussia the priests even favored the new departure. "From the success of the Reformation the princes expected the forfeited property of the Church, the priests expected wives, and the people freedom." So says Marx (*Ursachen der schnellen Verbreitung d. Ref.* [Mayence, 1834]). In Prussia, even the bishop of Samland, George of Polentz (q. v.), and soon afterwards Queis, bishop of Pomerania, favored the movement; and the former finally placed himself at the head of it, and proclaimed on Christmas-day, 1523, in the cathedral of Königsberg, with great joy, that the Saviour had been born once more for his people. In 1525 the progress of the new opinions was so great that when the country was converted into a secular dukedom the entire populace signified their cordial acquiescence, and rejoiced to rank themselves among the followers of Luther. A German liturgy was soon afterwards introduced, adhering as closely as might be to the ancient forms; the convents were changed into hospitals; and by the help of *postils* (q. v.), or expository discourses on the epistles and gospels, regularly sent from Wittenberg, the doctrines of the clergy were kept in general harmony with each other, and also with the tenets advocated in the Lutheran metropolis. The two bishops, together with three evangelical preachers Luther had sent — Briesmann, Sperat, and Poliander — had prepared a Church discipline (*Agenda*), and caused its adoption, under the title "Artikel der Ceremonien u. anderer Kirchenordnung," by Parliament (*Landtag*) in December, 1525. In 1540 the discipline was enlarged, and in 1544 still further augmented. In 1530 a confession of faith, consisting of eleven articles, was promulgated, under the title "Articuli Ceremoniarum e Germanico in Latinum Versi et nonnihil Locupletati," by a general synod at Königsberg. This was the first *corpus doctrinæ*. When the *Augsburg Confession* was published (1530–31), Albert sent for a copy and caused it to be introduced into the Prussian Church by episcopal decree. But in 1544 Albert determined upon the future independence of the Prussian Church from Wittenberg, and to this end endowed the University of Königsberg — a high school which was destined not only to play a great part in the history of Prussia and of Germany, but of Poland also; for from this university much Scriptural knowledge spread to Poland, and gave rise to a strong reformatory movement there (comp. Krasinski, *Hist. of the Ref. in Poland*, i, 158). But this university also became the source of a very serious theological controversy, which came very near destroying the Protestant Church of Prussia and seriously damaging the evangelical cause in all Germany. We refer to the *Osiander* (q. v.) controversy. It began in 1549. Osiander was that year lecturing at Königsberg *de lege et evangelio*, and next year *de justificatione*. He died in 1552, but his son-in-law, Funk, continued to espouse Osiander's views, and in the controversy which ensued so much bad blood was raised that in 1553 the leaders of opposition were obliged to quit the country; and when, later, the tide turned against the Osiandrians, Funk himself and two other leaders paid for their distinction with their lives, in 1566. See Funk, Johann; Mörlin, Joachim. Duke Albert then set about restoring the peace of the Church. He was not himself able to grapple with the far-reaching theological, anthropological, and soteriological questions which the Osiandrian controversy had raised. He had as suddenly turned from one side to the other as the prosperity of the Church seemed to demand. He had unsettled all and settled none, but he had, at least, the satisfaction of seeing one good result from the agitation. It made evident the need of a generally accepted "Confession," and he intrusted its preparation to Mörlin and Chemnitz, and in 1567 they brought out the *Corpus Doctrinæ Prutenicum*, also called *Repetitio Corporis Doctrinæ Christianæ*, which became the symbolical text-book of Prussia. Although it had been intended to abide, so far as the cultus was concerned, by the regulations of 1544, a revision was called for after the publication of the *Repetitio*, and in 1568 was brought out another *Kirchenordnung u. Ceremonien wie es in Uebung Gottes Worts u. Reichung der hochwürdigen Sakramente in den Kirchen des Herzogthums Preussen gehalten werden soll.* This finally established the evangelical cultus.

In 1548 the reforming party in Prussia was greatly strengthened by the arrival of multitudes of Bohemian brethren, who were ordered, under most severe penalties, to leave their country within forty-two days (May 4, 1548). Duke Albert offered them an asylum in his states, whither they migrated under the guidance of Mathias Sionius, the chief of the whole community.

Polish or West Prussia, together with the minor states of Courland and Livonia, gradually underwent a similar transformation, owing to many favorable influences. Luther's pamphlets, exposing the weaknesses of the papacy and of Romanism, had free entrance in these countries. The bishop of Ermland, Fabian, not only raised no opposition himself, but, as the Romanists claim, was even anxious that the reform movement should succeed. Then the government of the Polish sovereign, Sigismund Augustus, by granting plenary freedom of religion to the towns of Dantzic, Thorn, and Elbing, greatly facilitated the triumph of the Protestant opinions, which was effected about the year 1560. Germany, at last, had conquered for herself by the Reformation the valiant Prussians, and in the borders of Slavic and Roman influence had firmly planted the seed of German culture and German Protestantism, which was to germinate and spread so marvellously. The evangelical Church of Prussia, which was always after in closest intimacy and most active co-operation with German Prot-

estantism, to which it owed its origin, had nevertheless its own peculiar formation, and took for its development its own peculiar way. Most remarkable is the fact that the prince under whom the Prussian evangelical Church first established itself lived to see it rooted and grounded in doctrine, cultus, and discipline. Duke Albert died March 20, 1568.

4. *Modern Period.*—Frederick I was distinguished for his rigid economy of the public money and an extraordinary penchant for tall soldiers, and left to his son, the great Frederick II, a compact and prosperous state, a well-disciplined army, and a sum of nearly nine million thalers in his treasury. Frederick II (1740–86) dexterously availed himself of the extraordinary advantages of his position to raise Prussia to the rank of one of the great political powers of Europe. In the intervals between his great wars, he devoted all his energies to internal improvement, by encouraging agriculture, trade, and commerce, and reorganizing the military, financial, and judicial departments of the State. By his liberal views in regard to religion, science, and government, he inaugurated a system whose results reacted on the whole of Europe; and in Germany, more especially, he gave a new stimulus to thought, and roused the dormant patriotism of the people. Frederick was not over-scrupulous in his means of enlarging his dominions, as he proved by sharing in the first partition of Poland in 1772, when he obtained as his portion nearly all West Prussia and several other districts in East Prussia. His nephew and successor, Frederick William II (1786–97), aggrandized his kingdom by the second and third partitions of Poland in 1793 and 1795. Frederick William III (1797–1840), who had been educated under the direction of his grand-uncle Frederick the Great, succeeded his father in 1797, at a time of extreme difficulty, when Continental rulers had no choice beyond being the opponents, the tools, or the victims of French republican ambition. By endeavoring to maintain a neutral attitude, Prussia lost her political importance, and gained no real friends, but many covert enemies. But the calamities which this line of policy brought upon Prussia roused Frederick William from his apathy, and, with an energy, perseverance, and self-denial worthy of all praise, he devoted himself, with his minister, count Hardenberg, to the reorganization of the State. In the ten years which succeeded the battle of Waterloo, Prussia underwent a complete reorganization. Trade received a new impulse through the various commercial treaties made with the maritime nations of the world, the formation of excellent roads, the establishment of steam and sailing packets on the great rivers, and, at a later period, the organization of the customs treaty, known as the Zollverein, between Prussia and the other states of Northern Germany, and through the formation of an extended net-work of railways. The most ample and liberal provision was made for the diffusion of education over every part of the kingdom and to every class.

In like manner, the established Protestant Church was enriched by the newly inaugurated system of government supervention, churches were built, the emoluments of the clergy were raised, and their dwellings improved; but, not content with that, the king wished to legislate for the Church in accordance with a set plan, and determined to force a union of the Lutherans and the Reformed, whose unhappy separation was painful to the devoted king. This union scheme was not new. A union tendency had shown itself early in the German Church, and attempts were made to bridge over the gulf which began to deepen between the Lutherans and the Reformed in consequence of the differences on the doctrine of the Lord's Supper. The so-called *Concordia* of Wittenberg in 1536 and the *Augustana Variata* of 1540, with which also the Reformed Synod agreed, are prominent proofs of this. For nearly half a century, John Duræus (died 1680), an Anglican clergyman and an apostle of union, travelled about for the accomplishment of his great object; but each of the three great Protestant churches—Lutheran, Reformed, and Anglican—contended not only for a faith in the Christ revealed in the Scriptures, which was the only basis of union insisted upon by him, but for all those peculiarities which separated it from the others. An agreement for mutual ecclesiastical recognition (*tolerantia ecclesiastica*) was formed on the principles of Calixtus at the religious conference at Cassel in 1661, and resulted in the transfer of the University of Rinteln to the Reformed Church. But notwithstanding these concessions, which gave the appearance of a unionistic and tolerating tendency, the Lutheran divines, according to Tholuck, declared that they would rather hold communion with the papists, and regarded the hope that even Calvinists might be saved as a temptation of the devil (*Geist d. luth. Theol. Wittenbergs*, p. 115, 169, 211). Yet, after the Peace of Ryswick, when it became urgently important to have fraternal connections between the Protestant nations as a security against the dangerous exaltation of the Catholic powers, the house of Prussia took upon itself the task of adjusting the dissensions which prevailed, principally among the Lutherans, by a union of the two Protestant churches. The elector John Sigismund of Brandenburg, while accepting the Reformed creed in 1614, did nevertheless adhere to the Augsburg Confession—like the Brandenburg and Hessian theologians at the Leipsic colloquium in 1631—and his successors, the princes of Brandenburg and Prussia, who remained in the Reformed communion, always cherished a desire to bring their evangelical people to a better understanding, and, if possible, a union in the government and worship of the churches. The appointment of a few bishops constituted a part of the ceremonial at the coronation of the first king of Prussia (1700), but this suggested the idea of a *union* by the introduction of the form of government which prevailed in the Anglican Church. Temples of peace and union churches were, however, consecrated in vain. Leibnitz succeeded in breaking off the negotiations. There was, none the less, full confidence that the object would one day be brought of itself to a successful conclusion.

When the wars with France ended so favorably, the king thought the day auspicious for the consummation of the dream of his reigning ancestry, and by royal decree of Sept. 27, 1817 (the Jubilee of the Reformation), king Frederick William III declared the union effected. But the various Protestant churches refused to be joined in the Utopian union prescribed for them. New difficulties arose. The tendency to over-legislation was long the predominating evil feature of Prussian administration. The State, without regard to the incongruous elements of which it was composed, was divided and subdivided into governmental departments, which in their turn, under some head or other, brought every individual act under governmental supervision, to the utter annihilation of political or mental independence. The people, when they gradually began to comprehend the nature of this administrative machinery, saw that it made no provision for political and civil liberty, and demanded of the king the fulfilment of the promise he had given in 1815 of establishing a representative constitution for the whole kingdom. This demand was evasively met by the king, who professed to take high religious views of his duty as a sovereign, and its immediate fruits were strenuous efforts on his part to check the spirit of liberalism. Every measure taken by other sovereigns to put down political movements was vigorously abetted by him. Siding with the pietists of Germany, he introduced a sort of Jesuitical despotism. The *Landstände*, or provincial estates, organized in accordance with the system of the Middle Ages, were the sole and inadequate mode of representation granted to Prussia in that reign, notwithstanding the pledge made to the nation for a full and general representative government. A further attempt made forcibly to unite Lutheran and Reformed churches by royal decree of Feb.

28, 1834, excited universal indignation, while the imprisonment, at a later period, of the archbishops of Cologne and Gnesen for their conduct in regard to the vexed question of mixed marriages involved the king in a long and fruitless dispute with the pope. In his ecclesiastical regulations, the king was generally assisted by the gentle Altenstein, his minister for public worship, with whose preferences for the Hegelian philosophy in the Church and in the schools he was often displeased, but whom he never would quite abandon. When the civil power had absorbed all authorities peculiarly ecclesiastical, the king established (1817) provincial consistories, whose duties were confined to matters exclusively spiritual, and did not include the location of clergymen; district and provincial synods, composed only of clergymen, and restricted within a narrow circle of duties, but intended to be an introduction to an imperial synod; and a ministry for public worship, which was to be the organ through which the royal authority was exercised over the Church. The oath which the clergymen were to take bound them to be the servants of the State as well as of the Church. The development which had taken place in the principles of Protestantism, and the modes of speech occasioned by the new scientific and literary education of the people, next rendered some alteration of the language of the Church indispensable. New liturgies were therefore introduced into some established churches without attracting much attention. A common form of worship seemed to become necessary by the union which by the year 1821 had been *outwardly* effected. The theological commission appointed for composing such an instrument in Prussia accomplished nothing. The king then published an *Agenda* which had been adopted by his cabinet (1822) for the use of the court church, gave orders that it should be introduced into the garrison churches of his kingdom, and recommended it to all the congregations of the realm, instead of the conflicting and arbitrary forms which had previously been used in the different provinces. But it met with much opposition. The Reformed complained that it savored too much of the old ecclesiastical formula. They objected, too, to the burning of candles in broad daylight, and the kneeling and singing of the preacher before the altar, and the like, which seemed to them to betray a Roman Catholic spirit. The rigid Lutherans complained that it was not sufficiently orthodox, and was too much reformed. On the other hand, the adherents of the early theology of illuminism found it too orthodox, too much in sympathy with the old ecclesiasticism. They did not perceive in it their own theological opinions, but just the reverse; and it was from their standpoint that they very properly hesitated to make use of expressions and ceremonies with which they could connect no other sense than one contradictory to their convictions. Some, also, were displeased with a heterogeneous political element which they discovered in it. But no general opposition to it was apparent until the government took some steps to draw over the churches by various temptations or by coercion, and some authors contended that a strict conformity to the liturgy should be required by a law on the territorial system. In the midst of this confusion, no synodal constitution was carried into effect; for even the victorious political party took no pleasure in a measure which so forcibly reminded them of the promised representative system. It was only in Westphalia and the Rhenish provinces that a synodal form on the basis of ancient usages was introduced (1835), but even there the system left as much to be desired as it actually fulfilled. The appointment of general superintendents (1829), with means at command for a very extensive sphere of personal influence, was looked upon as a restoration of the titular bishops to their former prelatical position, and hence as the commencement of a Protestant episcopacy The controversy now became legal, and the jurists and theologians pronounced their different opinions in answering the question as to how far the king, as the prince of the country, was authorized in prescribing his ecclesiastical usages to the people and in foisting a particular service upon them. It was only after new negotiations and revisions, in which all possible consideration was shown for personal wishes and the traditions of the country, that the liturgy entered into full force (1830) as that of the *United Evangelical State Church*. By the union it was opposed even after this; and, as we have already seen, a second decree was necessary (1834) to give the stamp of the government anew to the effort. The result was a public outbreak. In Silesia, especially, there was much trouble, and the refractory spirit assumed an alarming form. Removals, military force, and emigration were the sad results; and finally there occurred a disunion among the Lutherans themselves—some yielding to the force of circumstances, others pushing their cause to the utmost, and still others going to ruin in sectarianism. See LUTHERANISM.

The accession of Frederick William IV, in 1840, seemed to open a better prospect to the friends of constitutional freedom, but the reality was scarcely equal to the expectations which had been warranted by the professions of the government. Still, new hopes and requirements had been excited, and a new life was infused into every department of the State. Every branch of science, art, and literature was understood to receive the attentive consideration of the sovereign, who professed to be actuated by a love of universal progress. He made similar professions in regard to religious toleration, but the pietistic tendencies of his government exerted a forced and prejudicial influence in public administration everywhere.

At an early period of his reign, the king had expressed his determination to allow the Church, over which the crown had acquired supreme power during the Reformation, freely to form for itself its own external organization. The transfer of a part of the ecclesiastic administration from the provincial governments to the consistories in 1845 might be construed as an expedient to get an easier control of the Church by the appointment of persons of a particular party. But when the provincial synods had assembled in 1844, composed of the superintendents of each of the six eastern provinces, and a clergyman chosen from each diocese, the king called a *General Synod* at Berlin—not of representatives, but of distinguished persons in the Church, thirty-seven of whom were clergymen and thirty-eight were laymen. Under the presidency of the minister for public worship, during a session continued from June 2 to Aug. 30, 1846, "this body," says Hase, "which made no pretensions to a legal authority, but had no restraint on the expression of its opinions, and acted on conclusions drawn from the proceedings of the provincial synods, presented its views of the existing wants of the Church. Its plan for a future ecclesiastical constitution combined the consistorial administration proceeding directly from the crown with the synods proceeding directly from the congregations in regularly ascending circles. The assembly had not been convened without some reference to its nature, and only a single voice was raised in it in behalf of undisguised rationalism. But as the great majority there, as well as in the previous provincial synods, declared itself against not only unconditional freedom of instruction, but the compulsory obligation of creeds, the party led by the *Evangelical Church Journal* found itself in a decided minority. The moral impossibility of compelling men to adhere to the old creeds was conceded; and yet it was thought indispensable to the completion of the union that a confession of faith should be formed, to serve as a formula for ordination. But the confession then composed expressed only those sentiments which are essential to Protestant Christianity in Scriptural language, and without the precision of theological science. The orthodox minority (fourteen to forty-eight), therefore, had reason to complain, notwithstanding all that was said for their satisfaction, that

the adoption of the new confession was a virtual abrogation of the old." The only concession to those congregations and patrons who were especially attached to the Lutheran or the Reformed type of doctrine or worship was the assurance given them that they should have full liberty, without endangering the development and existence of the union, to use their respective confessions, if they wished, in a regular manner, to bring those clergymen whom they called under obligation to some creed. But the orthodox opposition from without, in whose eyes such a body seemed a robber-synod, in which Christ was denied, was powerful enough, at least, to postpone the execution of these enactments, although the ecclesiastical authorities had given them a unanimous concurrence, and had pronounced them of urgent importance. The superior Consistory was the only court finally formed under them (January, 1848), but as this was not sustained by any contemporary synodal regulations, it was looked upon as a mere party authority.

While the government and the Church gained so little, the people became more and more restless. There was a general displeasure against the bureaucratic spirit of over-governing which characterized the administration and became daily more irksome to the nation. In the Church it resulted in the successful formation of free churches or Protestant communities espousing the interests of a rational Christianity. A contemporaneous excitement which had arisen in the Roman Catholic Church, as the result of the schismatic movement due to the stand taken by the chaplain Ronge on the exhibition of the so-called *holy coat* (q. v.) of Treves, further complicated the ecclesiastical relations. In the State, revolution ensued. The king and his advisers, underrating the importance of the movement of 1848 in Germany, thought they had satisfied the requirements of the hour by granting a few unimportant reforms and making equivocal promises of further concessions. When at length, however, the citizens and troops came into collision, and blood was shed, Frederick William came forward as the proposed regenerator of his country, offering to lay down his royal title and merge his kingdom in the common fatherland, for the salvation of which he recommended a cordial union of all German princes and people in one bond, and proposing himself as the leader and guide of this new Germany. His own subjects, and at first many Germans in other states, were carried away by these Utopian schemes. The publication of a political amnesty, the nomination of a liberal ministry, the recognition of a civic guard, the retirement of the prince of Prussia, the heir presumptive —with whom every arbitrary measure of government was believed to originate—and the summoning of a representative chamber to discuss the proposed constitution —all tended to allay the general discontent. But when the National Assembly at Frankfort-on-the-Main, in 1851, in disregard of the wishes of the Prussian king, declined to accept his proffered services, and elected the archduke of Austria as lieutenant-general of Germany, his ardor in the cause of the fatherland cooled, his pledges to his own subjects were evaded as long and as completely as the occasion permitted, and his policy became more strongly tinged than before with the jealousy of Austria. His powerful co-operation in putting down the insurrection in Poland and the democratic party in Baden gave, however, ample proof of his determined opposition to every popular demonstration against absolutism. The only exception during his reign is the action of the Prussians in the war of the Sleswig-Holstein duchies, when the Prussians, acting in concert with the disaffected against their sovereign, the king of Denmark, occupied the ducal provinces in the name and on behalf of the diet. But this was the work rather of him who is now emperor of Germany, and is capable of explanation even from an ultra-royalistic standpoint. The latter years of the reign of king Frederick William IV were characterized by great advance in the material prosperity and internal improvement of the country. Extensive lines of railway and post-roads were opened, the river navigation was greatly facilitated, treaties of commerce were formed with foreign countries, great expansion was given to the Prussian and North German Zollverein, the army was put upon a footing of hitherto unprecedented efficiency of arms and artillery, and the educational system of the country was still further developed. The political freedom of Prussia cannot, however, be said to have made equal advance. The Chambers which met for the discussion and framing of a constitutional mode of government were constantly interrupted and obstructed in the prosecution of their task; and the constitution, which is now established by law, was modified every year between 1850 and 1857, until it may be said to retain few of its original features.

In the Church also the great storm of 1848 wrought destructively. An ecclesiastical administration became odious, and count Schwerin, the minister for public worship, saw himself obliged to keep watch over the actions of the consistories, which finally so displeased him that he dissolved the superior consistory. He then appointed a committee to devise a synodal constitution, to be submitted to an imperial synod which should soon after be convened, that thus the Church might construct her future organization for herself. The outline of the electoral law for the appointment of synods was published, and defended by counsellors of the crown versed in ecclesiastical law. It proposed that the deputies should be elected by the congregations, but that the existing synods should be made use of in the western provinces, and that district and provincial synods should be arranged so as to serve for electoral bodies in the eastern. Before the appointed synod could have its meeting, the revolution was throttled, and the government again abandoned all these liberal measures. It even denounced the clamor for a synodal constitution as *an ill-concealed enmity to Christ* (!), and the whole scheme of an election by the people as *a denial of God* (!). The constitution of Jan. 31, 1850, retained, with respect to religion, the whole essential spirit of the German fundamental laws. A collegiate *supreme ecclesiastical council* to decide internal affairs of the Church was formed by order of the king from the evangelical portion of the ministry of public worship, and a system of rules for the regulation of congregational affairs was bestowed upon the six eastern provinces. The supreme ecclesiastical council from that period governed the Church in the king's name; and Von Raumer, the minister for public worship, in the presence of the Chambers, declared that the new doctrine was that the Evangelical Church exercises her constitutional right independently to regulate and administer her affairs, by entire separation from and consequent independence of the State, and by government according to her ancient constitution by the sovereign as her most prominent member. By this happy thought anxiety for the independence of the Church was tranquillized, and the Chambers succeeded in repelling all complaints about violations of those articles of the fundamental law of the State which relate to the independence of the Evangelical Church. The plan for congregational government, which was looked upon as the basis of true ecclesiastical freedom, contained a suspicious limitation of the power of choosing the vestries, and an extraordinary requisition that the private members should be bound by the three principal creeds, the confessions of the Reformation, and certain general laws for the Church which were yet unknown. In some of the eastern provinces this plan was protested against by parties opposed to each other, but it was at last gradually admitted into most of the congregations. The free congregations (numbering about forty in Prussia and the contiguous countries), which had in 1848, like almost all associations, taken some part in politics, and whose leaders had to some extent been involved in the movements of the day, had nearly all their houses of worship closed by the police under the new law against

political societies. These proceedings were partially confirmed by the judicial courts; but some measures of the police seemed so inconsistent with the freedom of conscience guaranteed by the fundamental laws that inquiries were instituted respecting them even in the Chambers (1852), where the government had avowed its determination to exterminate by every legal means the whole system of dissent. The supreme ecclesiastical council excommunicated all the free congregations, without reference to the various tendencies among them, and pronounced their baptisms invalid, while the civil courts punished every official act of their ministers as an invasion of the clerical office. Still there was conflict between civil and ecclesiastical authorities, and the crown saw itself perplexed daily with the disadvantages of dissent. By royal edicts of March 6, 1852, and July 12, 1853, the union movement was again given a new lease of life, the king having determined to do away with religious differences among all Protestants. The result was far from gratifying. In the very next fall (October, 1853) Dr. Rupp started a new congregation, in which the Bible was accepted as the original source of truth, and the imitation of Christ was made the supreme end of life. All ecclesiasticism was ignored. In 1856 (Nov. 4–Dec. 5) a general conference assembled to remedy these dissensions, but it failed to accomplish anything. The king remained *summus episcopus*, but the Protestants retained by the constitution of Jan. 31, 1850, tit. ii, art. 12, liberty of conscience, and the more recent immigrations from foreign lands have made Prussia the home of Protestants of all shades of religious opinion.

The obvious benefits of the presbyterial and synodal constitution in the Rhenish and Westphalian churches, the fuller co-operation there of ministers and elders, the greater activity of the laity, the room afforded for the exercise of discipline, the variety of home mission work, and the facility for checking rationalistic tendencies, which had given the Rhenish and Westphalian branch of the Prussian Church so great a power and influence, were so apparent that it would have been impossible for the leading authorities of the Prussian Church not to desire to extend this form of government, modified by the consistorial constitution, over all her old provinces. Consequently a royal order of June 29, 1850, introduced the institution of the general Church courts, and by another of Sept. 10, 1873, it became definitively the platform for the congregations and synods there, while an extraordinary general synod for these provinces was announced. This synod was appointed by royal decree, to consist of the eleven general superintendents, of twelve deputies of the theological and the juridical faculties, of thirty members to be elected by the king, and of 150 members of the eight provincial synods, who were to be composed of not less than one third laymen and one third ministers. This general synod met for the first time from Nov. 24 to Dec. 18, 1875. The new ecclesiastical constitution of Prussia provides for a regular meeting of this general body at the call of the king every six years. The king is represented in it by the president of the *Oberkirchenrath*, the highest Church tribunal in the state. The jurisdiction and competency of the general synod, as summarized by a correspondent of *The Central Christian Advocate*, are shown by the following, which indicates also the nature of the connection between Church and State:

"1. The general synod co-operates with the king's functionaries for promoting the interests of the State Church on the basis of the evangelical confessions of faith. 2. Laws enacted by the king, as head of the Church, must have its assent. It may also propose new measures, but these cannot be laid before the king for sanction until the cultus minister has examined them and found nothing incompatible with the interests of the State in them. 3. It legislates exclusively on: the amount of liberty of teaching within the Church; religious qualifications and ordination vows of the candidates of ministry; liturgies, hymnals, and catechisms; holy days to be introduced or abolished; and the form of discipline for refractory Church members and ministers. 4. It controls the funds which the *Oberkirchenrath* had, and also the expenditure of the appropriations for the Church from the national treasury, which was in the hands of the cultus minister heretofore. 5. Regular and periodical taxes upon the congregations for Church purposes can only be levied by its consent. 6. It can incite the king's functionaries (*Oberkirchenrath* and consistories) to greater activity by taking the initiative in proposing such new measures as are conducive to the Church's welfare. The *Oberkirchenrath* cannot reject them without giving its motives. 7. It preserves the union of the State Church interest by revoking any such resolutions of a prominent synod as may be incompatible with the Church at large."

The Advocate then continues as follows:

"The king, as *summus episcopus*, governs the Church indirectly through its consistories—one in each province—composed entirely of theologians, except the president, who must be a jurist, and directly through the *Oberkirchenrath*—the highest Church tribunal in the state—to whom the consistories are responsible."

Between the sessions of the general synod a cabinet, composed of seven members, carries out the measures of the general synod, and confers with the *Oberkirchenrath* respecting new measures.

It is not difficult for the members of the Lutheran and the comparatively few Reformed churches in Prussia to meet in the same synods, because the union movement has not only given rise to a common legislative and administrative basis, but prepared the members and congregations, notwithstanding all the value they assign to their particular creeds, to lay greater stress upon that which they have in common than upon that on which they differ. The Lutheran churches have the *Confessio Augustana Invariata* from June 25, 1530 (or the *Augustana Variata* from 1540), the *Apologia Confessionis Augustanæ*, the *Articuli Smalcalderi*, the *Catechismus Minor* and *Major Lutheri*, and the *Formula Concordiæ* (1577). The Reformed Church has the Heidelberg Catechism (1563), which it highly values. The authority of these creeds—the Minor Catechism and the *Confessio Augustana* perhaps excepted—is not binding in all the details; and in the ordination vow no declaration of allegiance to the symbols is expected from the young minister, so that some of the creeds have nearly disappeared. So thoroughly has the old spirit of division died out that there is no longer any opposition to communion of the two bodies in the same church. Nor is this practice confined to the United Church of Prussia; it is equally prevalent in the other union churches of Germany, in the former duchy of Nassau, in Anhalt-Bernburg, Dessau, Birkenfeld, Baden, in the former electorate of Hesse, in Saxe-Weimar, in Hildburghausen, Waldeck, Würtemberg, and in one part of the grand-duchy of Hesse. In East Friesland the union has extended only to the government, and not to worship or doctrine, in Rhenish Bavaria, in the union deed, stress is laid on the common scriptural ground of the churches.

With the accession of king William I, Prussia's most brilliant page of history opens. The civil and ecclesiastical affairs of that country now became the history of a united, prosperous, and powerful people. Though Bismarck, as premier, himself controls pretty much all the measures civil and ecclesiastical; though he at first indicated by his lines of action a policy of absolutism and bureaucracy, time has unfolded a liberal and practical tendency in the government, and the only severe opposition now encountered is from the low social democracy—in this country known as Communism—and from the ultra-Romish subjects, who wage war against the repressive measures adopted by the government against Ultramontanism and Jesuitism, because of the dangers they brood against the State. See ULTRAMONTANISM. The war of 1866 with Austria established the superiority of Prussia in Germany; the war with France in 1870 solidified the work of the intervening years, and gave to the little kingdom the imperial power on the 170th anniversary of the day when the elector of Brandenburg assumed the crown of Prussia.

II. *Religious Statistics.*—1. *General.*—According to the census of 1885, of the 28,318,470 inhabitants of

Prussia, 18,244,405 returned themselves as belonging to the Evangelical National Church; of these, 13,266,620 are of the United Church, 2,905,250 Lutherans, and 465,120 of the Reformed Church. Of those who are not of the National Church, there are 40,630 Lutherans, 35,080 Reformed, 4711 Moravians, 13,023 Irvingites and Baptists, 36,668 Mennonites, 4693 Anglicans, Methodists, etc., 9,620,326 Catholics, 1437 Greek Church, 10,360 German Catholics, 21,823 Freethinkers, etc., 366,575 Jews, and 2594 of various other beliefs. The Old Catholics are mentioned below. The Roman Catholic population of Prussia decreased so rapidly after the introduction of Protestantism that at the accession of Frederick II in 1740 there were only 50,000 Catholics in a population of 2,150,000 souls; the proportion of the Catholics to the Protestants was, in other words, one to forty-three. The kings did not recur to coercive measures, but the majority of the inhabitants of Prussia hated Romanism, and caused it to undergo heavy trials. When Prussia acquired Silesia, and after the division of Poland, it was less of a Protestant power. The number of the Catholics was so considerably increased, especially after the treaty of Lunéville (1801), that both communions were represented by nearly equal numbers. This was again changed by the treaty of Tilsit, the two treaties of Paris, and the congress of Vienna. At present the Evangelical Church constitutes a majority in the provinces of Schleswig-Holstein (99 per cent.), Pomerania (97), Brandenburg (95), Saxony (93), Hanover (87), Hesse-Nassau (70), and Prussia (70); the Roman Catholic Church in Hohenzollern (93 per cent.), the Rhine provinces (73), Posen (64), Westphalia (53), and Silesia (51). Of the Jews, fully one half live in the eastern (formerly Polish) provinces. The members of all churches recognised by the government enjoy equal civil rights. The Old Catholics (q. v.) have been recognised as a part of the Roman Catholic Church, and the bishop elected by them as a bishop of the Catholic Church. Other denominations (Baptists, Methodists, German Catholics, and Free Congregationalists) are barely tolerated, though the constitution guarantees full religious liberty. The Greek Church is also represented in Prussia. One of the Greek communities belongs to the *Philippins* (q. v.), a branch of the Greek Raskolniks, who seceded in the 17th century from the Orthodox Greek Church. Like the Mennonites, they refuse the military service. Their principal colony is at Alt-Ukta, in the kingdom of Poland. The Mennonites are tolerated, with some restrictions: they cannot increase their real estate, because the military service is in contradiction with their religious opinions. They are in consequence in a state of emigration, and their number decreases. Since 1830 they enjoy the same civil rights as all other Christian subjects. The Roman Catholic Church is directed by the two archbishops of Posen and Gnesen, and Cologne, under whom stand the four bishoprics of Culm, Münster, Paderborn, and Treves. The two episcopal sees of Breslau and Ermland are directly under the jurisdiction of the pope; while the district of Glatz, in Silesia, belongs to the archbishopric of Prague, and Katscher, in Upper Silesia, to that of Olmutz. In 1864 the Protestants had rather more than 9000 licensed places of worship, with 6500 ordained clergymen; and the Roman Catholic Church nearly 8000 churches and chapels, with upwards of 6000 priests. In 1867 there were 24,382 churches of all denominations, and 224 monastic or conventual establishments, with 5613 inmates, mostly devoted to purposes of education, or nursing the sick.

2. *Education.*—Education is compulsory in Prussia, and its management and direction are under the control of the State. In no country are better or ampler means supplied for the diffusion of knowledge among all classes of the community. Prussia has nine universities, viz. Königsberg, Berlin, Greifswald, Breslau, Halle, Bonn, Kiel, Göttingen, and Marburg, with 12,823 students, and two Catholic colleges at Braunsberg and Münster. At the close of 1889 there were in Prussia 37,000 schools and educational establishments of every kind, exclusive of the universities; and of these 787 were colleges or gymnasia, about 1000 classical private schools, 58 normal, about 700 art, trade, and industrial schools, and about 30,000 public elementary schools, with 45,000 teachers and about 4,000,000 scholars. (See below.) The management of the elementary national schools is in the hands of the local communities; but the State appoints the teachers, and in part pays their salaries, the remainder being supplied by the public. In addition to the libraries of the several universities, there is the Royal Library of Berlin, with 750,000 volumes and about 16,000 MSS. Among the numerous scientific, artistic, and literary schools and societies of Prussia, the following are some of the more distinguished: the Academy of Arts, founded in 1699; the Royal Museum of Arts; the Academy of Sciences; the Natural History, Geographical, and Polytechnic societies of Berlin; the Antiquarian Society of Stettin; the Breslau Natural History and Historical societies, etc.

3. *Charities.*—Prussia has a large number of benevolent institutions, towards the maintenance of which the State gives annually about £16,000 sterling. In 1861 there were about 1000 public civil and military infirmaries, in which upwards of 170,000 patients were under treatment, and between 7000 and 8000 poor- and almshouses; while 800,000 poor received support through these institutions or by extraneous relief. Prussia is supplied with asylums for the deaf and dumb, the blind and the maimed, and has good schools for training midwives, nurses, etc.

4. *Churches.*—We append a sketch of the principal German churches, because it will in some manner enrich the article, and will, besides, greatly add to what has been said in the article GERMANY. The sketch and the statistics are taken from the report of the Pan-Presbyterian Council in Edinburgh in 1877.

"I. *Constitution.*—Each German state and each free city has a Church of its own, in which the princes or the magistrates, by whose co-operation the churches were reformed, have to some extent, since the Diet of Speyer in 1526, enjoyed the supreme administrative power. This power they generally exercise by proxy, i. e. through the minister of worship (Prussia, Baden, Saxe-Altenburg, grand-duchy of Hesse, Mecklenburg, Würtemberg); in other cases through the Supreme Church Council, or *Oberkirchenrath* (Prussia, 1849, 1850; Mecklenburg-Schwerin, 1849; Baden); or through the general superintendents, the consistories, and superintendents. To some extent, likewise, for the last twenty-five or thirty years, the governments have shared the administration of the Church with the district, provincial, and general synods (Prussia, Würtemberg, Baden, Bavaria, Oldenburg). This form of Church government is called the *consistorial* (*Konsistorialverfassung*).

"The German churches have derived much benefit from the hands of the princes; but the fact that these exercise the right of control has often hindered the development of the energies, the liberality, and the practical sense of the lay element and the members of the congregations at large, as well as prevented the co-operation of the ministers and the people in Church work. Like the noble king Frederick William IV of Prussia, who longed to resign his episcopal functions into the proper hands, some of the best princes have felt the necessity of giving more self-government and liberty to the churches, and the presbyterial and synodal constitution in the newly developed form in which it has been given in Prussia is an endeavor in this direction.

"In some of the Reformed churches, as in the Palatinate, the mode of government is similar to that of the Lutheran churches; but in others the presbyterial and synodal constitution was developed.

"The presbyterial and synodal constitution was transplanted by fugitives, members of the French and Walloon congregations in London (which John à Lasco had organized according to the form he had set up in East Friesland), to the lower part of the Rhine, to the duchies of Jülich, Cleves, Berg, and Mark, which form now the northern half of Rhenish Prussia, and a part of Prussian Westphalia; it was recognised and developed by the Congress of Wesel (1568) and the Synod of Emden (1571), was introduced into the duchy of Nassau (Synod of Herborn, 1586), and with some modifications, at the end of the 17th century, adopted even by the Lutherans in the territories of Cleves and Mark.

"This form of Church government was in 1835 confirmed by the *Kirchenordnung* for the churches in Rhen-

ish Prussia and Westphalia. These churches, the Lutheran as well as the Reformed, are essentially Presbyterian, i. e., besides the ministers, each congregation has a body of elders and also of deacons. The duty of the elders is, along with the ministers, to take the oversight of the congregations, and further their well-being in all respects, especially by Christian discipline. The deacons serve the Church by works of love for the poor and afflicted. The ministers, elders, and deacons form the presbytery of the congregation (the Scottish Kirk session), the duty of which is to advance the edification of the Church, to promote whatever is good, and to discourage all that is evil. The members of this presbytery are elected for four years. Besides the presbytery there is, in larger congregations, a more numerous representative body (*die Representation*), the number of which varies according to the size of the congregation, and may amount to sixty, seventy, or more members. This body has to consult and decide in matters of greater importance, and especially when ministers or elders are to be elected. In the Reformed Calvinistic Lippe-Detmold, in 1851, such a representative body was instituted besides the presbytery.

"All the ministers and one deputy from each congregation form the *district synod* (the Scottish presbytery), which meets yearly under the superintendent, who is elected freely for six years by and from the members of the synod. His most important duties are—the oversight of the ministers and presbyteries, the administration of the property of the congregations in the district, the exercise of discipline, the information and encouragement of the members as to the home mission work of the district, and the preparation for the next provincial synod. The superintendents, along with deputies from the district synods (each of these sending one minister and one elder), form the *provincial synod*, the president of which is elected for six years, and which has for its special function to watch over the doctrine and the spiritual affairs of the Church. The proceedings of the synod require, however, to be confirmed by the competent authorities of the State. The provincial synod meets every third year, but on extraordinary occasions it may be convened by the president. The control of the affairs of the Rhenish and Westphalian Church is in the hands of the minister of worship, the Consistory of Rhenish Prussia, and that of Westphalia, and the government of the province. The general superintendents of Rhenish Prussia and Westphalia, who are appointed by the king, act along with the consistories, but are independent of them.

"In Baden similar provincial or diocesan and general synods have existed since the union in 1821. The diocesan synods are held every third year, the general every seventh. Two thirds of the body of the diocesan synods are ministers, and only one third laymen, who are not elected by the representatives of the congregations, but by electoral districts. To the general synod two dioceses send one minister, and the ruling elders (*Kirchengemeinderathe*) of four dioceses send one layman, who, however, must be a member of a representative body of the Church. The grand-duke nominates a president, a theological professor of the University of Heidelberg, and some lay and ministerial members, to the Supreme Church Council (*Oberkirchenrath*). The synod has a legislative, disciplinary, and consultative character, and it has the initiative in the government in the Church. Without its concurrence no law can be enacted bearing on the government, doctrine, and worship of the Church.

"In Würtemberg yearly diocesan synods were instituted by the edict of Nov. 18, 1854, to take care of the moral and spiritual welfare of the congregations and of the poor throughout the diocese, to control the ministers and the elders, and to consult on matters of importance. These are composed of all the ministers, and of as many elders of each congregation as it has ministers. These are to be elected by the representative body of the congregation, the so-called Church councillors. A select committee has in the interval the direction of the affairs of the dioceses.

"In Bavaria on the other side of the Rhine, according to the union deed of 1818, there are diocesan and general synods. The number of the lay deputies varies with the number of the evangelical inhabitants of the diocese, so that the lay element preponderates. The yearly diocesan synods have partly a function of oversight, and partly of consultation. The general synod meets every fourth year, and has the right of resolution, and expressing its wishes when there is a vacancy in the consistory.

"In Bavaria on this side of the Rhine yearly diocesan synods are held for consultation and for the election to the general synod. The whole of the ministers and an equal body of elders, elected by the officials of the congregation, take part. The general synod is composed of one ministerial deputy from each diocesan district, one elder from every two diocesan districts, and one deputy of the theological faculty of Erlangen. The general synod has only the right of advice, resolution, and protest.

"Similar district and general synods are in Lutheran Oldenburg, Hesse, and Mecklenburg. The Lutheran churches of the province of Hanover and of Nassau, though their territory belongs now to Prussia, have still synods for themselves.

"II. *Statistical Notices.*—(*A.*) *Churches.*—(1.) *Evangelical Church.*—(*a.*) *Prussia.*—On Dec. 1, 1885, the German empire had 46,855,704 inhabitants, of whom 29,369,847 were Evangelicals, 16,785,734 Catholics, and 563,172 Jews.

"In the eight old Prussian provinces were, in 1871, 12,275,272 Evangelicals, of a population of 20,246,671, and 5452 Evangelical parishes, 9412 Evangelical churches and chapels, and 6581 ministers. Rhenish Prussia alone (Hohenzollern included) had 908,633 Evangelicals out of 3,644,905,450 Evangelical parishes, 561 Evangelical churches and chapels, and 594 Evangelical ministers. Westphalia alone had 806,464 Evangelicals out of 1,755,175, 322 Evangelical parishes, 436 Evangelical churches, and 422 Evangelical ministers. On the average in the churches of the eight old Prussian provinces, there were 1304 persons to one church, 1365 to one minister; in Rhenish Prussia there were 1620, in Westphalia 1850, to one church, and 1530 in Rhenish Prussia and 1911 in Westphalia to one minister. In the old provinces there are 413 electoral districts (the army districts included), and 389 districts for synods; in Rhenish Prussia and Westphalia alone there are 20 superintendents.

"Of the new Prussian provinces, Hanover (in 1871) had 1,713,711; 943 Evangelical parishes, 1573 Evangelical churches, 1111 Evangelical ministers, and 102 superintendents. Each parish had an average of 1817, each church or chapel of 1100, each minister of 1400 persons. In the former electorate of Hesse were 988,041 Evangelicals, 652 Evangelical parishes, 1284 Evangelical churches, and 681 ministers; on an average, each parish 1515, each church 769, each minister 1450 persons. There are 30 superintendents.

"In Schleswig-Holstein there were, in 1871, 984,972 persons, 383 Evangelical parishes, 116 churches with 398 ministers; on the average, each parish had 2571, each church 2367, each minister 2475 persons. There are 27 superintendents.

"In each Prussian province there is a consistory; and the Evangelical churches in the eight old provinces are under the control of the *Oberkirchenrath*.

"(*b.*) *Other German States.*—Bavaria had, Dec. 1, 1875, 5,024,832 inhabitants, 1,340,218 Evangelicals, 1055 Evangelical parishes, 1584 Evangelical churches, 1332 Evangelical ministers; on the average, belong to each Evangelical parish 1348, to each church 848, to each minister 1102. There are 81 superintendents.

"In Würtemberg there are 1,881,505 inhabitants, 1,248,860 Evangelicals, 905 Evangelical parishes, 1235 Evangelical churches, 1116 Evangelical ministers; on the average each parish has 1380, each church 1010, each minister 1161 persons. There are 50 superintendents.

"Baden has 1,506,531 inhabitants, 491,008 Evangelicals, 363 Evangelical parishes, 466 Evangelical churches, 441 Evangelical ministers; each parish has on the average 1359, each church 1054, each minister 1113 persons. There are 24 superintendents.

"The grand-duchy of Hesse has 882,349 inhabitants, 589,399 Evangelicals, 410 Evangelical parishes, with 782 Evangelical churches, 464 Evangelical ministers; each parish has 7491, each church 7491, each minister 1209 persons. There are 23 superintendents.

"Saxe-Weimar has 275,492 Evangelicals, 283 Evangelical parishes, 536 Evangelical churches, 316 Evangelical ministers; each parish has 974, each church 514, each minister 869 persons. There are 27 superintendents.

"Anhalt has 198,107 Evangelicals, 140 Evangelical parishes, 206 Evangelical churches, 163 Evangelical ministers; on the average each parish has 1387, each church 961, each minister 1215 persons. There are 5 superintendents.

"(2.) *Catholic Church.*—(*a.*) *Roman Catholic.*—The Roman Catholic Church in Bavaria has 2826 parishes, 1022 benefices, 6157 priests, and 3,448,453 members; each parish has 1220, and each priest 560 people. The State paid in 1874–75 to the Catholic Church £59,450, to the Protestant consistories £16,903.

"The Catholic Church in Prussia has 3 Church provinces, 9 archdioceses and bishoprics, 2974 parishes and benefices, 6072 priests, 4 seminaries for priests. According to the Budget for 1874, the government paid for the Catholic Church £102,065; in Alsace and Lorraine for the Catholic worship there was paid, for 1876, £128,708.

"In the German empire Bavaria has 25 bishoprics, 10,353 parishes and benefices, 17,898 priests, and 13,903,026 members (in 1871).

"(*b.*) *Old Catholics.*—According to the report of the fourth Old-Catholic Synod, given in May, 1877, at Bonn, there are now in Prussia 35 Old-Catholic congregations with 6510 independent members; in Baden, 44 congregations with 5670 independent members; in Bavaria, 34 congregations with 3716 independent members; in Oldenburg, 2 congregations with 104 independent members; in Würtemberg, 1 congregation with 94 independent members; 56 ministers are connected with the Old Catholics; they have in Germany at least 121 congregations, and 16,557 independent members.

"In May, 1876, the same numbers of the congregations were reported, only in Bavaria the number had fallen to 31. Sixty ministers were at that time connected with them, 4 more than now. They numbered in May, 1876, in Prussia, children included, 20,504; in Baden, 17,203;

in Bavaria, 10,110; in Hesse, 1042; in Oldenburg, 249; in Würtemberg, 233.

"In May, 1875, there were in Prussia 32 congregations, 6030 independent members, and 18,765 persons; in Baden, 35 congregations, 4371 independent members, 14,993 persons; in Bavaria, 4245 independent members, 13,000 persons; in Germany, 15,000 independent members, 47,737 persons; 54 ministers.

"(*B.*) *Schools.*—(1.) *Universities.*—In the winter session of 1875–76 there studied theology at Leipsic 337; at Tübingen, 233; at Halle, 187; Berlin, 162; Erlangen, 134; Göttingen, 78; Jena, 64; Bonn, 51; Kiel, 50; Strasburg, 50; Marburg, 46; Königsberg, 44; Breslau, 39; Greifswald, 33; Rostock, 25; Giessen, 23; Heidelberg, 9—together, 1565; in the summer session of 1875 there were 1637 students of theology.

"In the German empire are 20 universities, which had, in 1889, 28,550 students; the polytechnic schools had 360 teachers and 4428 students.

"In the 9 Prussian universities, the academy at Münster, and the lyceum at Braunsberg, there were, in the winter session of 1876–77, 907 teachers and 8362 students; in Berlin alone, 2490; in Breslau, 1219; Göttingen, 991; Halle, 854; Bonn, 793; 654 studied Evangelical theology, 274 Catholic theology, 2455 law, 1338 medicine, 3644 philosophy; and besides the students, 2262 hearers attended the lectures.

"(2.) *High Schools.*—The kingdom of Prussia has, according to Dr. Wiese's historical-statistical work on the higher schools, 221 gymnasia (155 Evangelical, 50 Catholic, 16 mixed), 32 progymnasia, 92 Realschulen (in which languages, the arts, and sciences are taught—76 Evangelical, 16 Catholic), 22 higher middle-class schools, 27 provincial trade-schools, 91 seminaries for young teachers (61 Evangelical, 25 Catholic, 4 Jewish, 1 mixed), 267 higher schools for young ladies (the Germans call them schools for daughters), 35 institutions for the deaf and dumb, 14 for the blind, and 7 higher military schools. The number of scholars in these high schools amounted in 1874 to 128,000, that of the teachers to 6900; the cost was £1,020,750.

"The whole German empire has 330 gymnasia, 14 progymnasia, 484 other high schools for young men, with a total of 177,370 scholars.

"According to the list of the minister of worship, there were on Sept. 1, 1874, in all Prussian elementary schools, 35,191 places for teachers, 1436 of which were filled by Catholic female teachers without salary.

"The German empire has about 60,000 elementary schools with 6,000,000 scholars; for every 1000 inhabitants about 150 attend school. The elementary education is growing: in the year 1872–73, 4.58 per cent.; in the year 1873–74, 3.98 per cent.; and in 1875–76 not quite 3 per cent. of the recruits in Prussia could not read.

"(*C.*) *Christian Associations.*—(1.) *Mission to the Heathen.*—Germany has eight of the sixty-three Evangelical Mission Societies for the heathen, of which only the Moravian Mission stands in an immediate connection with the Church. Of the 1559 mission stations and 2132 missionaries, Germany supports 274 stations and 470 missionaries; Germany and German Switzerland, 502 missionaries. Germany contributed for mission purposes in one year, £107,000.

"In 1890 the German missions had—

Countries.	Stations.	Missionaries.	Communicants.	Scholars.
In West Africa	58	180	36,792	6,524
" South Africa	134	202	38,951	8,987
" English India	62	176	31,197	11,149
" Dutch India	11	11	738	70
" China	17	34	2,485	729
" Australia	10	28	305	292
" West Indies	48	53	38,216	12,129
" Esquimau Lands	19	72	3,073	621
" Orient	24	55	3,138	1,746

"This represents about 500 stations, 825 missionaries, 145,000 communicants, 128,600 members, 42,000 scholars, and £107,000 expenses.

"The Basle Mission (established 1815) has 209 missionaries and 45 principal stations in West Africa, East India, and China, 9803 Christians and 20,907 natives under its care, and 8513 children in the schools; expenses £36,000.

"The Rhenish Mission Society (established 1828 in Barmen) has 131 missionaries, 56 principal stations in Africa, China, and East India, and about £19,250 expenses.

"The Hermannsburg Mission (established 1849) has 70 missionaries, 66 stations in America, Africa, East India, Australia, New Zealand, and an income of £14,466.

"The Berlin Mission Society (established 1824) has 71 missionaries, 471 stations in Africa (Capeland, Orange, Free State, British Kaffirland, Natal, and the Transvaal Republic), with 10,218 baptized people, and an income of about £15,500.

"The Gossner Mission (established 1838 in Berlin) has 17 missionaries, 13 stations among the Khols and Hindûs, 36,500 persons under its care, and an income of about £8000.

"The North-German Mission (established 1836 in Bremen) has 9 missionaries, 3 stations in New Zealand and West Africa, with an income of £4500.

"The Moravian Mission (established 1732 in Berthelsdorf, near Herrnhut, kingdom of Saxony) has 286 missionaries, 92 stations in Greenland, Labrador, North America, West Indian Isles, South Africa, in the Alpine valleys of the Himalayas, and in Australia, with an income of £16,803.

"The Leipsic Mission (established 1836) has 24 missionaries, 23 stations in East India (Tamulaland), 14,014 Christians under its care, and an income of about £12,000.

"(2.) *Mission among the Jews.* — In Germany there are the Society of Friends of Israel in Basle, besides four Jewish missionary societies.

"The Berlin Society (established 1822) works at Berlin, has two ordained missionaries, one layman, one or two colporteurs, and an income of £800.

"The Rhenish-Westphalian Society for Israel (established 1844) works in Rhineland, Westphalia, Hesse, and the neighborhood; has one ordained missionary, one laymissionary, one colporteur, and an income of £780.

"The Evangelical Lutheran Central Association for Israel (established 1849) has one missionary, a house for proselytes, and is supported by the Lutheran Church of Saxony, Bavaria, Hesse, etc.

"The Society of Friends of Israel in Strasburg is small.

"(3.) *Home (Inner) Missions, etc.*—Space fails to name all the smaller or larger Home Mission associations which can be found in the different parts of Germany.

"It may only be mentioned that the 2700 deaconesses of the thirty-four German Deaconesses' institutes are not only employed in hospitals, but, at least in part, for the visitation of the sick and the poor, and for instruction in the numerous schools for little children, for which purpose the institutions at Nonnenweier, Kaiserswerth, and Hanover train deaconesses; that so many Sunday-schools have sprung up in the last ten or fifteen years in Prussia that a central committee is formed at Berlin; and that the Rhenish and Westphalian Sunday-school Union at Elberfeld and Barmen, the conferences of which are excellently attended, can organize particular district unions, in order to influence more vigorously the many Sunday-schools.

"We cannot speak of the associations and institutes in the different provinces of Prussia — viz. Saxe-Weimar, Würtemberg, Lippe-Detmold, and Alsace-Lorraine—which take care of and educate orphan children; nor can we describe the work of the many refuges for neglected children in all parts of Germany, nor that of the twenty institutions for fallen women, and partly for fallen men, nor that of the thirty-five associations and institutions for dismissed prisoners.

"Very important for protecting from evil young men who go to the towns are the Christian Homes, upwards of 100 in number, in which the young working-man finds cheap and clean lodgings and meals, a friendly Christian word, and very often the necessary work. The second Christian Home at Berlin (established in 1869), from Oct. 1, 1874, to Jan. 1, 1876, lodged 16,060 young men, on 39,000 nights. In these homes the numerous Young Men's Christian Associations have comfortable quarters. In Germany there are four large unions of Young Men's Christian Associations. The union of the Rhenish-Westphalian Young Men's Associations, which has its headquarters at Elberfeld, comprises about 120 associations; the Eastern Union, which has its centre at Berlin, has about 100 associations, with 3000 members; the union in the kingdom of Saxony has 16 associations, with 300 members; the South German Union has its 25 associations, with 500 members, chiefly in Würtemberg and Baden. Besides these, young clerks have formed two separate unions.

"In Germany, besides the Canstein Bible Institution, which does only the printing of the Bible, there are 25 Bible societies, the largest of which is the Prussian Principal Bible Society at Berlin, with 162 branch societies. Since its establishment in 1814 it has spread more than four million copies of the Bible. All the 25 Bible societies in 1875 distributed 186,000, and since their establishment more than 8,000,000 copies. The 35 or 40 small or larger Tract and Colportage societies have done and are doing much to promote the reading and understanding of the Bible.

"Great importance is now attached to the creation of a better popular literature and of a better daily press, and there are already five daily political papers with an earnest Christian tendency.

"It is encouraging that associations like those at Elberfeld and Barmen, for promoting a better Sunday's rest, begin to work, and it is a very hopeful sign that there are such societies as the Central Committee of the Home Mission in Prussia, which has been so long and so ably presided over by Dr. Wichern; the Evangelical Society for Germany, which has its centre at Elberfeld and Barmen; the Baden Colportage Society; and that the Rauhe Haus, near Hamburg, the John's Institution, near Berlin, the Barmen Mission-house, and the Crischona, near Basle, help to prepare earnest young men for the services of city missionaries, colporteurs, and evangelists; and that such societies as the Evangelical Society send out men who

visit the people from house to house, go to the poor and the sick, help the ministers in large parishes, hold Bible-classes, and conduct Sunday-schools and Young Men's Associations, and other meetings. The Evangelical Society has now 22 colporteurs and city missionaries, and some travelling preachers and evangelists. It has in the last year begun popular apologetical lectures in large towns with much success, and it is quite certain that much more can and must be done by it for Germany.

"It is encouraging to think that about 45 ordained ministers are at work in the German home-mission field; yet many more are wanted; many doors are open for a larger and freer distribution and proclamation of the Word of God.

"There is, besides, to be noticed the *Reformed Church in Bentheim and East Friesland*, consisting of 9 congregations, with 6 ministers. Its standard is the Heidelberg Catechism. The body was formed about thirty years ago, after failing to induce the Church authorities to make certain reforms which it earnestly desired. It has no connection with the State. It is understood to be in correspondence with the German Reformed Church in North America, with a special view to the formation of a college for training ministers.

"Another noteworthy movement to be mentioned here is the *Free Evangelical Church of Germany*. In June, 1860, a number of Christians in Breslau, capital of Silesia, in Prussia, formed themselves into a Church, Calvinistic in doctrine and Presbyterian in government, under the conviction that the National Protestant Church in that province was in many ways corrupt and unfaithful. They objected particularly to the Lutheran view of the sacraments, and to the altars, images, and candles which the Lutherans retain; to the prevalent neglect of the doctrines of grace, and to the recognition of the king as 'first bishop' of the Church. Not being prepared to join the Reformed Church of East Friesland, in consequence of their observing festivals, and for other points of difference, they formed themselves into the Free Evangelical Church of Germany. There are three ministers of this Church, who have just formed themselves into a presbytery. There are deacons and elders in the congregations, and an annual conference of elders. The conference has adopted the Westminster Shorter Catechism. The members of this Church aim at the conversion both of Jews and Gentiles. The Church has been fostered by one, himself a convert of the Jewish mission at Breslau, who takes a deep interest in Jewish missions."

III. *Literature.*—See Kux, *Organismus u. Statistik des preuss. Staates* (Leips. 1842, 2d ed.); Frantz, *Handb. des preuss. Staates* (Quedl. and Leips. 1854–55); Hase, *Church Hist.* § 288, 374, 453, 456; Hagenbach, *Church Hist. 18th and 19th Cent.* (see Index); Alzog, *Universal-Kirchengesch.* (see Index in vol. ii); *Scriptores Rerum Prussicarum* (Lips. 1863 sq.); Voigt, *Gesch. Preussens*, vol. i, iv; Bender, *De Veterum Prutenorum Diis* (Braunsb. 1865); *Beiträge z. Kirchengesch. des 19ten Jahrhunderts* (Augsb. 1835); Ellendorf, *Die kathol. Kirche Preussens* (Rudolfst. 1837); Ranke, *Memoirs of the House of Brandenburg and Hist. of Prussia* (Lond. 1849, 3 vols. 8vo); Krabbe, *Die evangel. Landeskirche Preussens* (Berl. 1849); Kurtz, *Church Hist.* ii, 56, 327, 401; Baur, *Religious Life in Germany* (Lond. 1870, 2 vols. 8vo); *Brit. and For. Ev. Rev.* Oct. 1875, art. iv; Dorner, *Hist. of Prot. Theol.* ii, 400 sq.; *Edinb. Rev.* April, 1874, art. iii; *Lond. Qu. Rev.* April, 1874, art. i; *Chambers's Cyclop.* s. v., which we have used in the treatment of secular history, though without accepting its extreme anti-Prussian expressions.

Prynne, William, famous in the history of English Puritanism, was born of a good family at Swanswick, in Somersetshire, 1600, and became a barrister-at-law and member of Lincoln's Inn at the time when Dr. Preston, a celebrated Puritan divine, was lecturer there. It was the period when the illegal operations of the Star-chamber and the courts of high commission had reduced England to a despotism equal to that of France, while the manners of the age were a scandal to religion and good morals. Marshal, Manton, Calamy, Burton, and other preachers in London kept alive the spirit of earnest piety and love of freedom which soon after produced the Commonwealth, when the mere sight of Burton, as Neale remarks, was a sermon against oppression. Prynne was a person of sour temper and austere practices, remarkable for his indefatigable devotion to his books. His name scarcely appears in the Law Reports of his time, and he never practiced at the bar to any considerable extent. He applied himself principally to the study of controversial divinity, and became a devoted follower of Dr. John Preston (q. v.). In accordance with the doctrines of the Puritans respecting Church government, he published, soon after he came to Lincoln's Inn, several tracts against Arminianism and against prelatical jurisdiction, by which, as well as by promoting and encouraging motions in the superior courts for prohibitions to the High Commission Court, he greatly exasperated archbishop Laud and the clergy against him. He was himself as ungentle as Laud. Prynne was as unspiritual in his religion, and as unsympathizing with the amenities of human nature. He tried all things by the dry logic which was to him all-sufficient. Sometimes he would find a terrible sin in the wearing of long curls—love-locks, as they were called—by men, sometimes in wrong opinions on the subject of predestination. In 1632 he suddenly made his appearance with a virulent treatise entitled *Histriomastix, or a Scourge of the Stage-players*, a tedious work of more than a thousand pages, full of learning and curious quotations, and written against plays, masks, dancing, and especially against women-actors. There was much room for the scourge of the satirist in the degraded state of the morals of the stage. Vile indecency tainted the highest dramatic efforts of the time, and even the noblest characters could not be introduced upon the stage unless they were smothered in a foul morass of seething corruption. But Prynne's work was too severe and too general in its sweeping denunciations to convince any one not convinced already. Bringing every charge under the sun against the players indiscriminately, he held them responsible for every sin which the pages of history revealed to have been committed by their predecessors in Greece or Rome; but all this could not have brought the sad consequences that followed. Some passages in this work were supposed to be levelled against the queen, who had acted in a pastoral performed at Somerset House; and the language of the book was certainly, like most others of that age, anything but refined and complimentary. The real cause of offence, in the eyes of archbishop Laud, who originated the prosecution against Prynne, was, of course, far other than this libellous matter—namely, the opposition of Prynne and his entire party to the Arminian system and the jurisdiction of the bishops. The information included both the aspersions of the author against the queen and the lords of the council for their share in the diversions of the age, and his commendation of "factious persons." The cause was tried before the Star-chamber, and the condemnation of Prynne was a matter of course. After a full hearing, he was sentenced to have his book burned by the common hangman, to be degraded from the bar and turned out of the society of Lincoln's Inn, to be degraded at Oxford, to stand twice in the pillory at Westminster and Cheapside, and to lose one of his ears at each place, to pay a fine of £5000, and then to be imprisoned for life. This must have been a moderate sentence in the eyes of some of the lords of the council, for the earl of Dorset addressed the prisoner in these words: "Mr. Prynne, I declare you to be a schismaker in the Church, a sedition-sower in the commonwealth, a wolf in sheep's clothing; in a word, *omnium malorum nequissimus*. I shall fine him £10,000, which is more than he is worth, yet less than he deserves. I will not set him at liberty, no more than a plagued man, or a mad dog, who, though he can't bite, will foam. He is so far from being a social soul that he is not a rational soul. He is fit to live in dens with such beasts of prey as wolves and tigers like himself; therefore, I condemn him to perpetual imprisonment; and for corporal punishment I should have him branded in the forehead, slit in the nose, and have his ears chopped off." Prynne's sentence, outrageous as it was, was not received with that general indignation which it would have called forth two or three years later. The Inns

of Court, who had been roused by his wholesale condemnation of the drama to spend thousands of pounds on a gorgeous mask, which they presented to the king, and some who afterwards took the foremost part in resistance to the court, joined now in approval of its measures. The prison with which Laud rewarded Prynne's enormous folio, however, in nowise tamed this most obstinate and narrow-minded of men. Three years afterwards, while in the Tower under the above sentence, he issued from its walls a new tract, attacking the bishops as devouring wolves and lords of Lucifer. It was entitled *News from Ipswich*, and sorely reflected upon Laud and the hierarchy generally. For this publication he was again prosecuted in the Star-chamber, and sentenced to pay a fine of £5000, to be set in the pillory, to be branded on both cheeks with the letters S and L (Seditious Libeller), to lose the remainder of his ears, and to be closely imprisoned for life in Caernarvon Castle. The usual consequence of undue severity appeared in the popular sympathy and party spirit which these outrageous sentences excited. The Puritan friends of Prynne flocked to Caernarvon Castle in such numbers that it was thought necessary to change the scene of his confinement; and after he had been at Caernarvon about ten weeks, he was illegally removed, by a warrant from the lords of the council, to the castle of the Mont Orgueil, in the island of Jersey. Here he remained until the beginning of the Long Parliament, in 1641, when, upon his petition to the House of Commons, he was released by a warrant from the Speaker, and resolutions were passed declaring, very truly, both the sentences against him in the Star-chamber to be contrary to law. Clarendon and Anthony Wood describe the extraordinary demonstrations of popular feeling in his favor on his landing at Southampton and on his journey to London (*History of the Rebellion*, i, 199; *Athenæ Oxonienses*, iii, 848). Soon afterwards he was returned as a member of Parliament for Newport, in Cornwall, and about the same time was made a bencher at Lincoln's Inn. Besides, Parliament voted him, and the famous preacher Burton, and the physician Bastwick, two Puritans who were included with Prynne, money in compensation; but this they never got, in consequence of the disturbed state of the times. One of the principal fruits of this high-handed proceeding of the law was the rousing of the nation to indignant protests against those in authority, and preparing the way for the changes of government that ensued; yet to the credit of Prynne be it said that, notwithstanding all the injustice with which he was treated, and the cruelty that was inflicted upon him, he took no part in the violent proceedings of the later years of the Long Parliament. Quite to the contrary, immediately before the king's trial Prynne was ordered into the custody of the sergeant-at-arms for "denying the supremacy of Parliament" in a pamphlet entitled *The Memento* (Rushworth, *Collections*, ii, 1389). On Dec. 6 he was arrested by the army, and, together with many of his party, ejected from the House of Commons. From this time he became a bitter enemy of Cromwell and the army party, and, in consequence of his writings against them, was again imprisoned for several years at Dunster Castle, in Somersetshire, and Pendennis Castle, in Cornwall. He was expressly disabled by Parliament "to officiate or be in any office concerning the administration of justice within the commonwealth." In the early part of the year 1660, having returned to his seat in the House of Commons as an excluded member, he is said, in a letter to General Monk (Winwood, *Memorials*, vol. iii), to have "exceedingly asserted the king's right," but with so much of his characteristic bitterness and imprudence that Monk sent for him and admonished him to be quiet. Upon the dissolution of the Parliament, in March, 1660, he was elected to serve in the new Parliament for the city of Bath. Soon after the Restoration he was appointed keeper of the records in the Tower, an office for which his habits of study peculiarly fitted him, and which furnished him with the opportunity of compiling his laborious and useful collections respecting constitutional and parliamentary history. He died in that office in 1669. Wood calculates that he wrote a sheet of MS. for every day of his lifetime after reaching man's estate. "His custom was, when he studied, to put on a long quilted cap, which came an inch over his eyes, serving as an umbrella, to defend them from too much light; and, seldom eating a dinner, would every three hours or more be munching a roll of bread, and would now and then refresh his exhausted spirits with ale. To this (says the editor of Neale) Butler seems to allude in his address to his muse:

> 'Thou that with ale or viler liquors
> Didst inspire Withers, Prynne, or Vicars,
> And teach them, though it were in spite
> Of nature and their stars, to write.'"

His works amount to forty volumes, folio and quarto. The most valuable, and a very useful performance, is his *Collection of Records*, in four large volumes. Prynne proposed to illustrate and prove in these the supremacy of the kings of England in all ecclesiastical affairs within the realm by records taken from the earliest periods of English history to the reign of Elizabeth. He only completed the design to the reign of Henry III. See *English Cyclop.* s. v.; Appleton, *Biog. Dict.* s. v.; Greene, *Short Hist. of the Engl. People*, p. 515 sq.; Gardiner, *Hist. of the Puritan Revol.* ch. v; Stoughton, *Eccles. Hist. of Engl.* i, 24, 43, 89, 121, 153, 455; Perry, *Hist. Engl. Ch.* vols. i and ii; Collier, *Eccles. Hist.*; Clarendon, *Hist. of the Rebellion*, bk. iii; D'Israeli, *Miscell.* p. 111 sq.; Knight, *Popular Hist. of England*, vol. iii, ch. xix; Hume, *Hist. of England*, ch. lii et al.; and the copious article in Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s. v. (J. H. W.)

Prytanēum (*πρυτανεῖον*) was the common house of an ancient Greek city or state in which a sacred fire was kept constantly burning in honor of *Vesta*. It was an appropriate building, where, in the name of the city or state, the magistrates, known as the Prytanes, brought suitable offerings to the venerated goddess. The fire-service observed in honor of Vesta was distinguished by the name of *Prytanistis*. The temple which was called prytaneum was of a round form, in order, as some have supposed, to represent the figure of the earth, and, according to others, to represent the centre of the universe. Plutarch thus speaks on the subject: "It is also said that Numa built the temple of Vesta, where the perpetual fire was to be kept, in an orbicular form, not intending to represent the figure of the earth, as if that was meant by Vesta, but the frame of the universe, in the centre of which the Pythagoreans place the element of fire, and give it the name of Vesta and Unity. The earth they suppose not to be without motion, nor situated in the centre of the world, but to make its revolution round the sphere of fire, being neither one of the most valuable nor principal parts of the great machine. Plato, too, in his old age, is reported to have been of the same opinion, assigning the earth a different situation from the centre, and leaving that, as the place of honor, to a nobler element." If the sacred fire in the prytaneum was accidentally extinguished, or even if it continued burning, the vestal virgins invariably renewed it every year on the calends of March by collecting the solar rays in a concave vessel of brass. From the fire which was kept burning in the prytaneum of the parent state, the sacred fire was supplied to each of its colonies or dependent states. Thucydides states that, before the time of Theseus, a prytaneum was to be found in every city or state of Attica. The prytaneum of Athens was originally built on the Acropolis, but afterwards it stood near the *agora*, or forum.

Psalm. See Psalmody; Psalms, Book of.

Psalmanazar, George, a remarkable impostor in the religious and literary world, was born, probably, in the year 1680, and was of French origin. He received

his education partly in a free school taught by two Franciscan monks, and afterwards in a college of Jesuits in an archiepiscopal city, the name of which, as also that of his birthplace and of his parents, remains unknown. Upon leaving the college, he was recommended as a tutor to a young gentleman, but soon fell into a mean, rambling kind of life that produced in him plenty of disappointments and misfortunes. The first pretence he took up with was that of being a sufferer for religion; and he procured a certificate that he was of Irish extraction, had left the country for the sake of the Roman Catholic religion, and was going on a pilgrimage to Rome. Not being in a condition to purchase a pilgrim's garb, he had observed, in a chapel dedicated to a miraculous saint, that such a one had been set up as a monument of gratitude by some wandering pilgrim; and he contrived to take both staff and cloak away at noonday. "Being thus accoutred," says he, "and furnished with a pass, I began, at all proper places, to beg my way in a fluent Latin, accosting only clergymen or persons of figure, by whom I could be understood, and found them mostly so generous and credulous that I might easily have saved money and put myself into a much better dress before I had gone through a score or two of miles." His next trick was to impose on men in the garb of a soldier, menial preceptor, beggar, or vagrant nondescript, living on his wits as he could, according to the whim or necessity of the hour. In the course of his wanderings, he was thrown into the companionship of a colonel Lauder at Sluys, to whom he gave himself out under the name by which he is so celebrated, representing himself as a Japanese convert to Christianity, and native of the island of Formosa. The chaplain of the regiment took Psalmanazar to England, and he instantly became the religious lion of the day, his patron (who was a man equally acute and unprincipled) skilfully availing himself of the connection to secure for himself preferment in the Church. Different ecclesiastical dignitaries contended for the honor of being serviceable to him; and through the influence of the bishop of Oxford, apartments were assigned him at the university, in order that he might prosecute his studies there. The talent, ingenuity, and resource which he displayed in keeping up the deception go far to account for what may seem to us the strange credulity with which his story was received. He published, in Latin, a fabulous account of the island of Formosa, the consistency and verisimilitude of which imposed upon the learned world. He also invented a language, compact and somewhat complex in structure, and was able, in virtue of a memory not less than astonishing, to defy the ordinary methods of detection. In the midst of his success, however, at the age of about thirty-two, he became the subject of religious impressions, and his conscience awoke to the ignominy of the deceit which he was practicing. Urged by what seems to have been a genuine feeling of penitence, he withdrew himself from public notice, and for the rest of his long life honorably earned his livelihood by literature, in which he had a moderate success. Besides much assiduous compilation for the booksellers, of history, geography, and the like, he published several works anonymously, one of which, *An Essay on Miracles, by a Layman*, was for some time exceedingly popular, and another a version of the Psalms. On his death in London in 1762, it was found that he had also busied himself in preparing for posthumous publication an account of his curious career, which, under the title *Memoirs of ——, commonly known as George Psalmanazar, a reputed native of Formosa, written by himself*, was some years after given to the world. See the art. in Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth.* s. v., and the references there given; *Chambers's Cyclop.* s. v.; *National Repository* (April, 1878), p. 376.

Psalmister (Lat. *Psalmista*) or **Psaltes** (*singer*), one of the inferior orders in the early Church, mentioned first by the Council of Laodicea. The form used in their designation was, according to the fourth Council of Carthage, "See that thou believest in thine heart what thou singest with thy mouth, and approve in works what thou believest in thy heart." See PRECENTOR. The psaltes went up into the *ambo*, or reading-desk, and sang out of a book. That such a mode of conducting public worship was only intended to be for a time is evident from the circumstance that several of the fathers of the Church mention this practice as existing in their time of the people singing all together. The order of psaltes, on their appointment to office, required no imposition of hands or solemn consecration, but simply received their office from a presbyter, who used the form of words as laid down by the Council of Carthage and given above.

Psalmody, ANCIENT. By this term we mean the singing of sacred songs as an act of worship; and in this article we shall speak only of its use in public worship, and we shall use the term in its most inclusive sense. In doing so, we substantially adopt the art. in Kitto's *Cyclopædia*.

The simple idea of psalmody is the expression of religious feeling in lyrical poetry and in musical cadence. Rhythmical song seems to be the instinctive utterance of all strong emotion. Savage nations express themselves in language of natural poetry, uttered in the cadence of a rude chant or musical recitative. In worship, the use of poetry and music is coeval with society (Plato, *De Legib.* lib. iii, c. 15; Lowth, *Heb. Poetry*, lect. 1). Homer wrote hymns to the gods; Orpheus was a priest-musician, the tamer and sanctifier by his lyre of whatever was rude and godless. The muses were chiefly employed in the service of the gods (Phurnutus, *De Natura Deorum*, p. 157, ed. Gale), from which some of them — e. g. Melpomene, Terpsichore, Polymnia — derived their names. Clemens Alexandrinus tells us that a chief part of the worship of the Egyptians consisted in singing hymns to their gods: "First, a singer goes before, bringing forth some one thing of the symbols of music; and they say that he ought to take two books out of those of Hermes, the one containing the hymns of the gods, the other the method of a royal life. . . . There are ten things which are suitable to the honor of their gods, and comprise the Egyptian religion, viz. sacrifices, first-fruits, hymns, prayers, shows, feasts, and such-like things" (*Stromata*, vi, 633, ed. Paris). Porphyry confirms this. The Egyptians, he says, devote "the day to the worship of their gods, in which, three or four times — viz. morning and evening, noon and sunsetting — they sing hymns unto them" (*De Abstinent.* iv, 8). Concerning the Indians, he says, "they spend the greatest part of the day and night in prayers and hymns to the gods" (*ibid.* 12, 18; see also *Vita Pythag.* p. 200, ed. Cantab.). A remarkable passage occurs in the writings of Arrianus, the Stoic philosopher. "If," says he, "we are intelligent creatures, what else should we do, both in public and private, than to sing a hymn to the Deity, to speak well of him, and give thanks unto him? Should we not, whether digging or ploughing or eating, sing a hymn to God?" etc. (Arrian, *Epictet.* i, 16; also iii, 26). Herodotus tells us that Homer got great credit for composing hymns to the gods (*De Vita Homeri*, c. 9). Rewards were given in the Pythian games to those who sang the best hymns to the gods (Pausanias in *Phocicis*, lib. x). The apostate Julian recommends that many of the excellent hymns to the gods be committed to memory, most of which, he says, were composed by the gods, some few by men inspired by a divine spirit (*Opera*, p. 551, ed. Paris). Sacred song, therefore, is no peculiarity of revealed religion. It rests upon deep instincts of human nature, perhaps of all intelligent moral nature; for at the creation "the morning stars sang together for joy," at the nativity angelic song was heard by the shepherds of Bethlehem, and in the final heaven both angels and redeemed men are represented as singing rapturous songs before the throne.

In defining sacred song as the utterance of strong

emotion, we do not restrict it to praise, although praise is the most natural and prominent form of it. Deep sorrow and earnest prayer may also find their fitting expression in musical song. Augustine thus defines the more technical and Christian conception of a hymn: "Hymnus est cantus cum laude Dei; si cantus est et non laudas Deum, non dicis hymnum; si laudas aliquid quod non pertinet ad laudem Dei, non dicis hymnum" (*Psa. cxlviii*). Church song is restricted to lyrical poetry, for this alone can express the consentaneous emotion of a congregation. It excludes, therefore, didactic poetry, which expounds doctrines or analyzes feelings or inculcates duties; and it excludes dramatic poetry, which expresses passion by action. It is also more than mere lyrical poetry: it is lyrical poetry which assumes the pure truth of God, and gives expression to the deep religious feeling which it excites. A hymn is an outburst of religious life.

In its form, worship-song may be either rhythmical or metrical; the former was its primitive and more uncultured form; the latter is its subsequent and more artistic form. The former is exemplified in the Hebrew psalms and the Greek Christian hymns; the latter in the Latin hymns of Ambrose and Gregory, and in the subsequent hymnology of the Western Church. Each of course requires a corresponding form of music—the rhythmical hymn, a musical and *ad libitum* recitative, closing with a cadence, technically known as a "chant;" the metrical hymn, a metrical tune. The anthem differs from both, in that it consists of certain rhythmical or metrical words set to specific music, which seeks to bring out their special emphasis, and is incapable of being used to any other. The anthem is, characteristically, the performance of choirs, and not the worship of the congregation. In public worship, sacred song may be either the singing of a choir to which the congregation are auditors, or the united act of the entire body of worshippers, the choir and organ simply leading and accompanying it. Without denying to the former the character of worship, it is obvious that it is worship only in a very restricted and imperfect sense. It is worship of a much higher and more catholic character for the whole congregation to unite in the utterance of religious feeling. Hence, as a rule, no composition should be allowed in congregational worship too artistic or too intricate for congregational use. On the other hand, every kind of composition is legitimate that a congregation can use, and through which it can express the emotions of its spiritual life. Neither rhythmical psalm nor metrical hymn has any natural or legislative prerogative or sacredness in the Church of God.

The manner of singing, again, whether unisonal, as in the early Church, or in part harmony, as in the modern Church; whether antiphonal, between choir and congregation, or between one part of the congregation and another, as in many of the Jewish psalms, or universal and continuous by the whole congregation, is immaterial, so long as the best expression of religious feeling is secured.

In the Bible, the use and importance of sacred song are fully recognised, and large provision for it is made. The earliest fragment of song in the Bible is not sacred. Lamech expresses himself in a snatch of song which has all the characteristics of later Temple poetry.

The Jews seem almost to have restricted their use of poetry and music to divine worship, probably because their theocracy so identified their national and their religious life as that the expression of the one was the expression of the other. Music and song were joined in holy marriage, and presented themselves hand in hand to worship before the Lord.

The first record of Hebrew worship-song is the great outburst of the newly liberated life of the people on the borders of the Red Sea, where Miriam provided for the expression of their praise in her magnificent song. This is the earliest specimen of choral song that the world possesses. It was probably sung antiphonally—Miriam and the women on the one side, answered by Moses and the men on the other.

We have minute accounts of the musical service of the Tabernacle and of the Temple, as arranged by David and Solomon; and especially of the great musical celebration at the dedication of the latter, when we are told that Jehovah especially responded to the invocation of worshipping song (2 Chron. v, 12–14).

Beyond all question the Temple service was the most magnificent choral worship that the world has seen. On great occasions the choir consisted of four thousand singers and players (1 Chron. xxiii, 5; xxv); the statements of Josephus (*Ant.* viii, 3) are evidently greatly exaggerated. Its psalmody would consist, first, of such compositions as had been written by Moses and others, with those of David, Asaph, etc. Some of David's early psalms seem to have been adapted for Temple use (comp. Psa. xviii with 2 Sam. xxii). Others were doubtless composed specially for it. Hence most of David's psalms, in the collection of Hebrew poetry so designated, are inscribed "To the chief musician." From time to time fresh contributions of sacred song would be made. As we possess it, the book of Psalms was certainly not the Temple psalter. It is a collection, or rather a combination of four or five separate collections, of Hebrew poetry, of long and gradual accumulation, containing the Temple psalms, but containing also many pieces neither meant nor fitting to be sung. Hence the ritual and religious absurdity of singing indiscriminately through the whole. Hippolytus, writing in the 3d century, assigns the various authorship of the collection as a reason why no author's name is affixed to it (Hippolytus *On the Psalms*, quoted by Bunsen, *Christianity and Mankind*, i, 458; see also *ibid.* ii, 176; Josephus, *Ant.* vii, 12, 3).

From the structure of some of the psalms, as well as from some expressions contained in them, it is certain that they were sung antiphonally, probably by two choirs responding to each other. Some of the psalms, the 24th, for instance, were evidently alternated between the priest and the people. Among the various suppositions concerning the meaning of the word "Selah," one is that it is the sign of a great chorus-shout of the people. See also 1 Sam. xviii, 6; Neh. ix; Ezra iii, 10; Isa. vi, 1–3; bishop Lowth *On Hebrew Poetry*, lect. xix; Wheatley *On the Common Prayer*, ch. iii, § 9.

From 1 Chron. xxv, 7 it appears that Church music was formally taught in the Jewish schools.

That Jewish song was celebrated throughout the East is implied in the ironical request of the Babylonians that their poor captives would "sing them one of the songs of Zion."

It is to be observed that the singing of the Temple was no part of the Levitical ritual; it was a fitting worship, independent of the specific economy with which it was connected. It has, therefore, a certain permanent authority as a scriptural precedent of worship-song.

Concerning the music used in the Jewish Temple we have no certain traditions. The very meaning of the musical accents in the book of Psalms is unknown. Carl Engel (*Music of the most Ancient Nations*, ch. vi) supposes that the musical system of the Hebrews, as indeed of all the East, was derived from the Assyrians, concerning whose musical knowledge, hitherto unsuspected, much interesting information has been derived from the sculptures discovered by Mr. Layard and Mr. Botta. It is probable that David, who was musician as well as poet, composed music for the use of his psalms in public worship. From the structure of Hebrew poetry this would necessarily be a musical recitative, or "chant;" and as adapted for the use of worshipping thousands, it would probably be very simple in character. Whether the Jews had any form of written music or not, or whether the music of their Temple psalms was learned by the ear, and traditionally handed down from generation to generation, is unknown. Certainly no trace of written music has come down to us. It is

to be presumed that the music originally set to David's psalms would be perpetuated from age to age; and that therefore the music to which our Lord and his disciples sang the lesser Hallel on the "night on which he was betrayed," and the music to which Paul and Silas sang their prison songs, would be the old traditional Temple music. The tradition is that the Peregrine Tone was the music to which the lesser Hallel was sung. All this, however, is pure conjecture. There is not a particle of historical proof to throw light upon it. Nor is this to be wondered at, considering the dispersions and the unparalleled sufferings of the Jews, and when it is remembered that we are equally ignorant of the music of the Greeks and the Romans.

At the dispersion, Temple-song ceased. Burney says, some Hebrew high-priest being his informant, "that all instrumental, and even vocal performances have been banished from the synagogue ever since the destruction of Jerusalem; that the little singing now in use there is an innovation and a modern license; for the Jews, from a passage in one of the prophets, think it unlawful, or at least unfit, to sing or rejoice before the coming of the Messiah, till when they are bound to mourn and repent in silence" (*Hist. of Music*, i, 251). It is probable, however, that although at the dispersion the Temple music was forever silenced, yet that synagogue worship would be speedily restored, and that, as far as possible, its services would be based upon the old Temple prayers and psalms, and that the traditional melodies of the latter would be sung to them.

The first recorded uninspired psalmody of the synagogue is not earlier than the 10th century, when Saadiah Gaon first introduced rhyme into Hebrew poetry. On this subject, see *Prayers of the Spanish and Portuguese Israelites, with English Translation*, by the Rev. D. A. de Sola; Steinschneider, *Jewish Lit.* (Lond. 1857); Charisi, *Jewish Lit. from the 8th to the 18th Century*, ch. xviii.

No existing Jewish melodies can be proved to be of any antiquity, compared with some Christian melodies. Purely traditional, their origin is unknown. The utmost that can be said is that for some four or five centuries they have been handed down *memoriter*. As we possess them they are unmistakably modern in their forms; but then it is possible that beneath these modern forms there may be a very ancient substance. The Rev. D. A. de Sola (*Ancient Melodies of the Liturgy of the Spanish and Portuguese Jews*) says that a tradition exists that the "Birchat Cohanim" is identical with the melody used in the Temple for the blessing of the priests (Numb. vi, 22–26), and that it is supported by great probability, almost amounting to direct proof. The "Song of Moses" is also supposed to be the melody sung by Miriam. But this is pure conjecture. See also Maimonides, ch. xiv, § 14; Lightfoot, *Temple Service;* Bingham, *Antiquities*, vol. xiv; Carl Engel, *Music of the most Ancient Nations*, ch. vi.

In the Sept. the word ὕμνος and its cognates are used as representing several Hebrew words; but in almost every case the reference is to songs of praise or thanksgiving to God. In the New Test. this is the invariable usage of the terms.

In the Christian Scriptures very little is said concerning sacred song. Matthew and Mark very touchingly record the conformity of our Lord, not to any divine command, but to a traditional custom, when he and his disciples, after the institution of the Supper, "sang a hymn" (ὑμνήσαντες) before they went out to the Mount of Olives (Matt. xxvi, 30; Mark xiv, 26). There is every reason to believe that what was sung on this occasion was the latter part of the Hallel, the usual Passover psalms of thanksgiving (Psa. cxv – cxviii). See HALLEL. When Paul and Silas were imprisoned at Philippi, "at midnight they prayed and sang praises unto God" (ὕμνουν τὸν θεόν, Acts xvi, 25). Whether what they sang were some of the ancient psalms or spontaneous utterances of adoration and worship we have no means of determining. See HYMN. In his epistles to the Ephesians (v, 19) and to the Colossians (iii, 16), the apostle Paul recognises and enjoins the use of sacred song. So does the apostle James (v, 13). Michaelis and others suppose that such passages as Acts iv, 24–30 are fragments of apostolic hymns. The Apocalypse contains some of the most magnificent bursts of worship-song. In the passages just cited of Ephesians and Colossians the apostle enjoins the use of hymns in the social worship of Christians, classing them with psalms and spiritual songs (ψαλμοῖς καὶ ὕμνοις καὶ ᾠδαῖς πνευματικαῖς). In what relation these stood to each other is a question which has occasioned considerable differences of opinion. According to some, the distinction between them was one of *subject;* according to others, it was merely one of *form*, having respect to the manner in which they were sung; while others contend that the *source* whence they were derived, and the *general character* of the composition, determined the difference between them. Under these leading opinions, endless differences of minor opinion have been advocated. Of those who adopt the first opinion is St. Jerome, who thinks that the hymn was devoted to the celebration of the divine majesty and goodness, that the psalm was occupied with themes of an ethical nature, and that the spiritual ode was occupied with things above, and the subtle discussion of the concert of the world, and the order and concord of creation (*Comment. in Eph. v*, 19). Others, again, who hold the same general view state the difference thus: The psalm belongs to ethics; the hymn, as setting forth the praises of God for redemption, to theology; and the ode, as celebrating the works of God in creation and providence, to natural science (Thomasius, *In Præfationibus*, p. 525). All this, however, is purely arbitrary. The second opinion was held by Augustine, Basil, Hilary, and others of the Christian fathers, and has been adopted by several in more recent times. By some who take this view, the distinction is supposed to lie in this, that the ψαλμοί were compositions which were chanted to the accompaniment of an instrument, the ψαλτήριον, the ὕμνοι songs of adoration uttered by the voice alone, and the ᾠδαί, short chants uttered also only by the voice (Augustine, *Enarrat. in Psa. iii;* Basil. Mag. *In Psa. xxix;* Greg. Nyss. *Tr. ii in Psalmos*, ch. iii, etc.); while others think that the distinction is to be determined by reference to the Hebrew terminology מִשְׁמוֹרִים, שִׁירִים, תְּהִלִּים, which is in fact determining nothing, as the distinction between these is itself entirely uncertain. The third opinion is that of Beza (*Nov. Test.* ad loc.) and Grotius (*Comment. ad Matt. xxvi*, 30, et h. l.); they think that by *psalms* are designated the sacred songs bearing that name collectively in the Old-Test. canon; by *hymns* such extemporary songs of praise as we have in the utterances of Deborah, Hannah, Zachariah, and Mary, and such as the apostle and his companion sang in the prison at Philippi; and by *odes* premeditated compositions of a more elaborate nature and stricter form than hymns. To this, in the general, most subsequent inquirers have given their consent; only some think that the term "psalms" should not be restricted to the compositions bearing that name in the Old Test., but should be extended to all of a similar character which might be composed for the use of the Church in later times; and that by "spiritual odes" are to be understood specifically all sacred songs, of whatever kind, composed by special inspiration of the Holy Ghost (θεοπνευστοί). The former of these modifications is rendered almost imperative by 1 Cor. xiv, 26; and the latter by the general sense of the adjective πνευματικός in the New Test. Not a few, despairing of satisfactorily discriminating these three kinds of sacred song, have contended that the apostle merely accumulates terms for the sake of force, and that no distinction between them is to be sought (Clem. Alex. *Pædag.* ii, 4, p. 565; Clericus, *In Not. apud Hammondii Annott.* ad loc., etc.); but this

otiose method of disposing of the difficulty has been repudiated by most.

As to the *form* in which these early hymns of the Church were composed, we have no means of even approaching a certain conclusion. Among the Jewish Christians the chanting of the psalms was familiar, and it would be easy for them to compose hymns that could be sung to their accustomed tunes; but with the Gentile converts it would be somewhat different. Among the Greeks and Romans poetry had fixed metrical forms, to which the tunes of the Hebrews could not be adapted. There is no reason, however, to believe that the early Gentile Christians followed these metrical forms in their sacred poetry. The earliest specimens of Christian song extant—the hymn to Christ, preserved by Clemens of Alexandria; the evening hymn, referred to by Basil as in his time very ancient, handed down from the fathers (*De Spir. Sanc.* c. 29); and the morning hymn, which has been incorporated with the liturgy of the Church of England—have no traces of a metrical character, but are, like the Biblical hymns, adapted only for being chanted in recitative with a few and simple cadences. ("Primitiva ecclesia ita psallebat ut modico flexu vocis faceret psallentem resonare, ita ut pronuntianti vicinior esset quam canenti," Isidor. Hispal. *De Eccl. Offic.* i, 5.) Such singing would no doubt be new to the Gentile converts, but it would be speedily learned; and as they probably had very little sacred music of their own, they would hail with delight this accession to their sources of enjoyment, which served at the same time as a vehicle of the devotional feeling that had been kindled within them. It has been suggested that in 1 Cor. xiii we have an apostolic hymn, and in Eph. v, 14; 1 Tim. iii, 16; James i, 17; Rev. i, 5, 6; xv, 3, etc., fragments of hymns sung in the apostolic churches; but this is mere conjecture, though not without some probability.

The early Christians used the Jewish psalms in their worship, which would almost certainly be sung to their traditional Temple music. G. B. Martini says (*Storia della Musica*, i, 351): "This is the Hebrew chant of the psalmodies which ever since the time of David and Solomon has been transmitted from one generation to another, and [therefore] goes beyond the first half of the first age of the Church. These have not materially varied, but have been substantially preserved by the Hebrew nation. Is it not, then, sufficient to convince us that the apostles—who were born Hebrews, brought up in the customs of their nation, wont to frequent the Temple and engage in the prayers and divine praises therein recited—should retain the same method and use the same chants with which the people used to respond to the Levitical choir." Förkel (*Geschichte der Musik*, ii, 188) says: "This mode of reading the Scriptures with cantilation or chant has been adopted in the Christian Church from the Temple, and is still preserved in the mode of chanting the collects, responses, etc." See also Dr. Saalschütz, *Geschichte und Würdigung der Musik bei den Hebräern*, § 61.

Thus, while the destruction of the Temple and the dispersion of the Jews suspended Jewish worship, the singing of the psalms and the traditions of their melodies would be preserved in the Christian Church. If, therefore, we possess any vestiges of Jewish music at all, they are to be found in the Ambrosian or Gregorian tones. The Rev. J. W. Blakesley (*Four Months in Algeria*, p. 36) visited a synagogue in Algiers, and was surprised to find that "the air to which the psalms were chanted coincided almost exactly with one of the Gregorian tones." Hardly can we suppose that the early Christians either originated a new music or adopted heathen music.

We have no record of the introduction into the Christian Church of uninspired hymnody. It would be only very gradually that Greek hymns, with corresponding music, would come into use. At first, probably, Christian hymns would be little more than centos of the Hebrew psalms, or evangelical imitations of them, or compositions after their model—the angels' song at the nativity, and the songs of Zacharias and Simeon leading the way. The earliest Christian hymns seem to have been simple glorifications of Christ.

Eusebius intimates that private individuals wrote hymns to Christ as God, which were generally sung (*H. E.* v, 38; vii, 24; ii, 17). In his letter to Trajan, Pliny says, "The Christians are accustomed to sing alternately between themselves, and to praise Christ as a god" (Pliny, *Epist.* lib. x, ep. 39), alluding probably to the *Gloria in Excelsis*, the morning hymn of the early Church.

The earliest extant fragment of Greek hymnody is found in the *Pædagoga* of Clemens Alexandrinus (*Opp.* p. 312, 313, Potter's ed.). Bunsen says, however, that this was never used in the public worship of the Church (*Christianity and Mankind*, ii, 156).

Three early Christian hymns are preserved in the venerable Alexandrian MS. as an appendix to the Old-Test. psalms. The first is the morning hymn of the primitive Church, commencing with the introductory verse of the nativity song of the angels, hence called the Angelical Doxology. It is found in the liturgy of the Greek Church, whence, about the year 380, it was transferred by Hilary to the communion service of the Latin Church; thence again to the communion service of the English Church.

The other two are another short morning hymn in which the verse occurs, "Vouchsafe, O Lord, to keep us this day without sin," afterwards incorporated in the *Te Deum;* and an evening psalm, consisting of a cento of verses of the Old-Test. psalms.

Besides these, there is an evening hymn of the Greek Christians, Ὕμνος τοῦ λυχνικοῦ, the "Hymn of the Kindling of the Lamp," corresponding to the "Ave Maria" hymns of Italy; concerning which Basil says, it is "so ancient that he knows not who is the author of it" (Bingham, bk. xiii, ch. v, § 5, 6).

The *Ter Sanctus*, or Seraphic Hymn, also belongs to the first three centuries, and is found in almost all the ancient liturgies. It is little more than the Trisagium of the seraphim in Isa. vi. See Palmer, *Origines Liturgicæ*, ii, 126.

These are the only fragments of Greek hymnody that have been preserved to us. Of course they are rhythmical, and would require a rhythmical tune or chant. Much of early Christian song was probably antiphonal (Socrates, *H. E.* vi, 8; Theodoret, *H. E.* ii, 24; as also Hahn, *Ueber den Gesang in der Syrischen Kirche*, p. 54).

The hymnody of the Syrian churches was much more copious. They had an ampler music and poets of higher inspiration. Its invention is attributed by Ephraem Syrus to the Gnostic Bardesanes (*Hom. ad Hæret.* 53, quoted by Dr. Burgess in his Introd. to the *Select Metrical Hymns and Homilies of Ephraem Syrus*, p. 30). Metres were called after his name. Next to him as an author of Syrian hymnody stands his son Harmonius, who is said to have invented new metres. Ephraem Syrus flourished in the 4th century. For an account of his contributions, see Burgess, *Metrical Hymns*, and Introduction. The Benedictine preface to the works of Ephraem Syrus, vol. v, says: "While the Greeks reduced their sacred hymnology to about eight tunes, and to this day confine themselves to these limits, the Syrians expatiate on 275, which their ecclesiastical books exhibit here and there, inscribing the proper tunes at the beginning of individual hymns." The Syrians are said to have possessed a hymnology of twelve or fourteen thousand hymns.

Great use was made of hymnody by the early heretics; by the Gnostic Bardesanes, who endeavored to supersede the Hebrew Psalter by one of his own, containing also 150 psalms (Theodoret, *Hæret. Fab.* 209); by Paul of Samosata, who largely beguiled the faithful by his captivating hymns and music (Eusebius, *H. E.* vii, 30); by the Donatists in Africa, who adapted their hymns to common airs of a wild and passionate charac-

ter, thereby inflaming the enthusiasm of the people as with a trumpet (Augustine, *Confess.*); and by Arius, who made the streets of Constantinople resound with ballads written to well-known and seductive melodies, sung in torchlight processions.

Patristic notices of early Christian hymnology are very numerous; our limits forbid more than mere reference to a few, in addition to those already given. Justin Martyr, *Apol.* ii; Tertullian, *Apol. contra Gent.* c. 39; *De Anima*, c. 3; *De Jejunio;* Cyprian, *Epist. ad Donat.;* Origen, *Contra Cels.* lib. viii, c. 67; Eusebius, *H. E.* lib. ii, c. 17; lib. v, c. 28; lib. vii, c. 24; lib. viii, c. 9; *Apost. Const.* lib. xx, c. 57; Athanasius, *Ep.* 7, *ad Læt.;* Basil *In Psalmos;* Gregory of Nyssa, *Psa. ii;* Jerome, *Comm. Eph.* lib. iii, c. 5; *Epist.* 17, *ad Marcell.; Epist. ad Uxorem*, lib. ii, c. 8; Ambrose, *Hexam.* lib. iii, c. 5; Augustine, *Confess.* lib. ix, sec. 14, 15, 31; lib. x, sec. 49, 50; Chrysostom, *On the 41st Psalm;* Hilary, quoted by Bingham, bk. xiii, ch. v, § 7. See also Neander, Kurtz, and other Church histories; Milman, *Hist. of Christianity*, vol. iii, bk. ii, ch. iii, iv. See also Deyling, *Hymni a Christianis decantandi, Obss. Sac.* iii, 430; Walch, *De Hymnis Eccl. Apostol.* (1737); Hilliger, *De Psal. Hymn. atque Odar. Sac. Discrimine* (Viteb. 1720); Gerbert, *De Cantu et Musica a Primo Eccl. Statu usque ad Præsens Tempus* (Bamb. et Frib. 1774, 2 vols. 4to); Bingham, *Antiquities*, bk. xiv, ch. ii; *Works*, iv, 447 sq.; Rheinwald, *Christl. Archäologie*, p. 262. For collections and specimens of ancient hymns, see *Poetæ Græci Christiani, una cum Homericis Centonibus ex Sanctor. Patr. Opp. collecti in usum Gymnas. Soc. Jesu* (Paris, 1609); Maggi, *Sacri Himni che si leggono in tutto anno nella Santa Chiesa* (Venet. 1567); *Hymni Ecclesiæ e Breviario Parisiensi* (Oxon. 1838); [Faber] *Hymns translated from the Parisian Breviary* (Lond. 1839); Daniel, *Thesaurus Hymnologicus* (Hal. et Lips. 1841-55, 3 vols.); Burgess, *Select Metrical Hymns and Homilies of Ephraem Syrus* (Lond. 1853); Trench, *Sacred Latin Poetry* (ibid. 1849); Mrs. Barrett Browning, *The Greek Christian Poets* (ibid. 1863). See HYMNOLOGY.

PSALMODY, CHRISTIAN. Those who refuse to accept the use of hymns in public worship interpret as sacred songs only the Psalms of David, and restrict the term to the singing of metrical versions of the Psalms to short, simple airs. They do this on the ground that psalm-singing alone was practiced in Jewish worship, and that among the earliest Christians the only sacred songs were the Psalms. Psalmody, thus interpreted, means the singing of metrical versions of the Psalms to short, simple airs.

The service of the primitive Christian Church usually began with reading, or with the singing of psalms. The charge of Pliny the Younger against the Christians was that they sang psalms to Christ "quasi Deo." No authentic record, however, exists of the kind of melodies sung to the psalms by those ancient Christians, nor are we to understand that their psalmody was performed in one course at the opening of the service, but rather that they afforded a most agreeable and delightful introduction to the service, through which they were interspersed, probably very much as hymns are in modern Christian service. Nor were the Psalms the only sacred songs employed in the service of the early Church. See HYMNOLOGY; MUSIC; POETRY. Psalmody was always esteemed a considerable part of devotion in the Christian Church. The service of the early Church usually opened with psalmody; but the author of the Apostolical Constitutions prescribes first the reading of the Old Test., and then the Psalms. The service was usually performed in the standing posture; and as to the manner of pronunciation, the plain song was sometimes used, being a gentle inflection of the voice, not much different from reading, like the chant in cathedrals; at other times more artificial compositions were used, like our anthems. As to the persons concerned in singing, sometimes a single person sang alone, but the most ancient and general practice of the Church was for the whole assembly to unite with one heart and voice in celebrating the praises of God. After a time alternate psalmody was introduced, when the congregation, dividing themselves into two parts, repeated the psalms by courses, verse for verse, one in response to another, and not, as formerly, all together. The mode of singing all together was called symphony, while the alternate mode was termed antiphony, and in the West *responsoria*, the singing by responsals. This latter manner of conducting the psalmody originated in the Eastern Church, and is attributed to bishop Ignatius of Antioch, who flourished in the early part of the 2d century. It passed into the Western in the time of Ambrose, bishop of Milan. But in a short time *antiphonal* (q. v.) singing became the general practice of the whole Church, and the ecclesiastical historian Socrates informs us that the emperor Theodosius the Younger and his sisters were accustomed to sing alternate hymns together every morning in the royal palace. Augustine was deeply affected on hearing the Ambrosian Chant at Milan, and describes his feelings in these words: "The voices flowed in at my ears, truth was distilled into my heart, and the affection of piety overflowed in sweet tears of joy." Eusebius tells us that Ambrose brought his famous melodies to Milan from Antioch. These Ambrosian melodies, and the mode of their performance by canonical singers, continued in the Western Church till the time of Gregory the Great, who was devotedly zealous in the cultivation of sacred music, having been the first to introduce singing-schools at Rome. Gregory separated the chanters from the clerical order, and exchanged the Ambrosian Chant for a style of singing named, after himself, the *Gregorian Chant* (q. v.), besides introducing musical notation by Roman letters.

It seems to be a point fully established that antiphonal singing, and, as Sir John Hawkins considers it, the commencement of Church music, originated in the churches of the East, particularly those of Antioch, Cæsarea, and Constantinople. The Greek fathers, Basil and Chrysostom, were the original instructors of the choral service in their respective churches. From the East Ambrose carried it to Milan, whence it was transferred to Rome, and afterwards passed into France, Germany, and Britain. Pope Damasus ordained the alternate singing of the Psalms, along with the *Gloria Patri* and *Hallelujah;* in A.D. 384, Siricius introduced the Anthem; in A.D. 507, Symmachus appointed the *Gloria in Excelsis* to be sung; and in A.D. 690 the Gregorian Chant was brought into use. When Gregory, in A.D. 620, sent his chant into Britain, such was the opposition manifested to its introduction into the Church that 1200 of the clergy fell in the tumult which ensued; and it was not until fifty years after, when pope Vitalian sent Theodore the Greek to fill the vacant see of Canterbury, that the British clergy were prevailed upon to admit the cathedral service in accordance with the Romish ritual. Besides the psalms, which had been used from the earliest times, and short doxologies and hymns consisting of verses from the Holy Scriptures, spiritual songs, especially those from Ambrose of Milan and Hilary of Poitiers, came to be used in public worship in the Western Church. The *Te Deum*, often styled "the Song of St. Ambrose," is generally supposed to have been composed jointly by him and St. Augustine early in the 4th century, though archbishop Usher ascribes it to Nicetius, and supposes it not to have been composed till about A.D. 500. Considerable opposition, it is true, was manifested to the introduction of such mere human compositions into divine worship, but the unobjectionable purity of their sentiments led to their adoption by many churches. The complaint, however, began to be raised that Church music had deviated from its ancient simplicity. It was especially objected that secular music, or an imitation of the light airs of the theatre, was introduced in the devotions of the Church. It was also objected that more regard was had to the sweetness of the composition than to the

sense and meaning; thereby pleasing the ear, without raising the affections of the soul. Thus the Egyptian abbot Pambo, in the 4th century, inveighed against the introduction of heathen melodies into the psalmody of the Church. About this time Church music began to be cultivated more according to rule. In addition to the Psalter and canonical singers, Church choristers were appointed, who sang sometimes alone, sometimes interchangeably with the choirs of the congregation. In the 4th century the custom began to be introduced into some churches of having a single person lead the psalmody, who began the verse, and the people joined him in the close. See Acrostics; Hypopsalma. This individual was called the *phonascus* or *precentor*, and he is mentioned by Athanasius as existing in his time in the Church of Alexandria. But difficulties and abuses arose from the growing neglect of musical cultivation; and, with a view of restoring public decency and order, the Council of Laodicea, in the year 363, considered it necessary to forbid the laity to sing in church at all, except in certain simple chants of a popular description. One principal reason was probably the adoption by the Arians of hymnology as a means of spreading their heresy. At first the difficulty had been overcome by providing similar compositions for the orthodox. Augustine himself made a psalm of many parts, in imitation of the 119th, to preserve his people from the errors of the Donatists. Hilary and Ambrose likewise made many hymns, which were sung in their respective churches. (A complete collection of all the ancient hymns, etc., in use in the different services of the Romish Church has been published by Hermann Adalbert Daniel, entitled *Thesaurus Hymnologicus*, etc. [Halle, 1841 sq.].)

Down to the Reformation, the music of the Church was thus pretty much surrendered to the clergy and trained musicians, and there were obstacles besides the mere ordinances of the Church. The words of the songs were in Latin, a tongue foreign to the people. The music was of a nature so elaborately complex that none could take part in it unless they had studied music as a science. Yet psalmody was not entirely lost during the dark ages. The study of sacred music received peculiar attention in the 6th century, schools for instruction in this important art having been established and patronized by Gregory the Great, under whom they obtained great celebrity. From these schools originated the famous Gregorian Chant, which the choir and people sang in unison. Such schools rapidly increased in number, and at length became common in various parts of Europe, particularly in France and Germany. The prior, or principal, of these schools was held in high estimation, and possessed extensive information. In the 8th century pope Adrian, in return for the services which he had rendered to Charlemagne in making him emperor of the West, stipulated for the introduction of the Gregorian Chant into the Gallic Church; and the emperor, having paid a visit to Rome, where he kept Easter with the pope, received from the hands of his holiness the Roman *Antiphonary*, which he promised to introduce into his dominions. About the end of this century all opposition to cathedral music ceased, and for several centuries thereafter Church music underwent little or no change in the Church of Rome. It is a remarkable fact, however, that from the 8th till the middle of the 13th century, not only was it considered a necessary part of clerical education to understand the principles of harmony and the rudiments of singing, but the clergy were generally proficients both in vocal and instrumental music.

In the Eastern Church, where sacred music, as we have seen, had its origin, there arose in the 8th century a remarkable man, John of Damascus (q. v.), who was not only a noted theologian, but a most accomplished musician. On account of his great skill in the art of vocal music, he was usually styled *Melodos*. To this noted master of music the Eastern Church is indebted for those beautiful airs to which the Psalms of David are sung in our day. The Greek word ψάλλω is applied among the Greeks of modern times exclusively to sacred music, which in the Eastern Church has never been any other than vocal, instrumental music being unknown in that Church, as it was in the primitive Church. Sir John Hawkins, following the Romish writers in his erudite work on the *History of Music*, makes pope Vitalian, in A.D. 660, the first who introduced organs into churches. But students of ecclesiastical archæology are generally agreed that instrumental music was not used in churches till a much later date; for Thomas Aquinas, A.D. 1250, has these remarkable words: "Our Church does not use musical instruments, as harps and psalteries, to praise God withal, that she may not seem to Judaize." From this passage we are surely warranted in concluding that there was no ecclesiastical use of organs in the time of Aquinas. It is alleged that Marinus Sanutus, who lived about A.D. 1290, was the first that brought the use of wind-organs into churches, and hence he received the name of *Torcellus*. In the East, the organ was in use in the emperor's courts, probably from the time of Julian, but never has either the organ or any other instrument been employed in public worship in Eastern churches; nor is mention of instrumental music found in all their liturgies, ancient or modern. Towards the time of the Reformation, a general partiality for sacred music prevailed throughout Europe, owing, as is generally supposed, to the encouragement which pope Leo X gave to the cultivation of art. It is no doubt true that Leo was himself a skilful musician, and attached a high importance to the art as lending interest, solemnity, and effect to the devotional services of the Romish Church. But to no single individual can be traced the prevailing love for sacred music in the 16th century, for, besides Leo X, we find Charles V in Germany, Francis I in France, and Henry VIII in England, all countenancing sacred music, and treating musicians at their court with peculiar favor.

At the Reformation a greater part of the services of the Romish Church was sung to musical notes, and on the occasion of great festivals the choral service was performed with great pomp by a numerous choir of men and boys. That abuses of the most flagrant kind had found their way into this department of Romish worship is beyond a doubt, as the Council of Trent found it necessary to issue a decree on the subject, in which they plainly state that in the celebration of the mass, hymns, some of a profane and others of a lascivious nature, had crept into the service, and given great scandal to professors of the truth. By this decree the council, while it arranged the choral service on a proper footing, freeing it from all extraneous matter, gave it also a sanction which it had hitherto wanted. From this time the Church of Rome began to display that profound veneration for choral music which she has continued to manifest down to the present day.

The Reformers, observing the excessive attention paid to musical services, endeavored to return to the plainness of apostolic times. There had previously been repeated efforts at such a transformation. "The Albigenses, during the hottest season of persecution, are stated to have solaced themselves, in the very prospect of death, with singing the psalms and hymns of their Church. Psalmody was cherished by the disciples of Wycliffe. The Bohemian Brethren published a hymn-book with musical notes, from which it appears that the melodies they used originated in the chants to which the ancient Latin hymns of the Western Church were sung" (Conder, *The Poet of the Sanctuary*, p. 6). That psalmody was cultivated by the persecuted ancient Vaudois is evident from the fact that a large manuscript collection of their psalms and hymns is preserved in the library of Geneva (Monastier, *Hist. de l'Église Vaudoise*, i, 124). But it was the Reformation in the 16th century which restored to the people their right to participate in this primitive and edifying part of public wor-

ship. Psalm-singing was taken up by the Reformers, first for private devotion, and soon as a part of the service of the Church, Luther and Calvin restoring to the people their share in the musical part of public worship, and furnishing them with the means of performing it. From the time that psalm-singing was adopted by the Reformers, it was discountenanced by the Roman Catholics, and soon came to be regarded as a badge of Protestantism. Metrical versions of the Psalms of David were executed in the principal vernacular languages of Europe; and some of the venerable Reformers are recorded as having applied themselves to the study of music in order that they might be enabled to compose plain and solemn tunes in which all would be able to join. Luther was peculiarly qualified for providing the first psalmody of the Reformation. Not only was he a great poet and musician, but he was full of fervid spiritual life. His hymnology, and that of his coadjutors—Hans Sachs, Michael Weiss, Johann Kugelmann, Johann Schop, Johann Crüger, Paul Speratus, Justus Jonas, Nicholas Decius, and other contemporary divines and Reformers—were characterized and illustrated by some dozen magnificent chorals, which excited great enthusiasm. But psalmody, in the more modern sense, began in the 16th century, when Clement Marot, the court-poet of Francis I of France, translated fifty-two of the Psalms into French verse, dedicating them both to his royal master—whom he likened to the Hebrew psalmist—and to the ladies of France. The sacred songbook, on its first appearance, not being accompanied by music, it became the practice to sing the psalms to favorite tunes—often those of popular ballads, and for a considerable time psalm-singing became a favorite fashion among the gay courtiers of Francis. Marot's collection was continued and concluded by Theodore Beza, whose psalms had the advantage of being set to music, Beza having in this the assistance of Calvin, who engaged the best composers of the day to unite his sacred songs with beautiful and simple airs of a devotional character. Luther and Calvin differed, however, in their ideal of psalmody: the former was favorable to harmony in parts, while the latter confined himself to the bare, unaccompanied melody. In 1529 Luther published his first *Hymn-book for the Congregation*, which was printed by Joseph Klug in Wittenberg, whence it was also called the *Klug'sche*. This collection contained most of Luther's hymns, which may be read in an English translation in *Luther as a Hymnist* (by the Rev. B. Pick, Phila. 1875).

Prior to Luther, the Moravian Brethren had published a collection of hymns (in 1504) compiled by their archbishop, Lucas—the first example of a hymn-book constructed of original compositions in the vernacular to be found in any Western nation which had once owned the supremacy of Rome. Some of its hymns, composed in the Bohemian and German languages, are of older date than the Reformation, and were highly commended by Luther himself for their scriptural and devotional character. In the renewed Church of the Brethren psalms and hymns continue to form an integral part of every religious service. Count Zinzendorf, who eminently contributed to its revival in 1722, was himself a Christian poet of no common order. The German hymn-book in general use among the churches of the Brethren was completed in 1778 by bishop Gregor, and has passed through numerous editions: it contains many hymns derived from the Lutheran Church, and some even from the primitive Christian Church. Some of the best hymns in this collection have been translated into English verse, and, with the addition of a number of English hymns, constitute the hymn-book now in use among the congregations of the Brethren in this country. The latest edition, comprising 1260 hymns, is entitled *Liturgy and Hymns of the Protestant Church of the Unitas Fratrum, or United Brethren* (Lond. 1849, 8vo).

In the Reformed Church, sacred songs were limited to the Psalms. As early as 1542 the *La Forme des Prières et Chantz ecclésiastiques ques avec la Manière*, etc., by Marot, was published. This collection contained only twenty-five psalms, to which Theodore Beza afterwards added the remaining psalms. To abridge the time devoted to singing was an object of their concern, when they could not banish it from their assemblies; and the Helvetic Confession contains a censure on the Gregorian Chant, and a commendation of its rejection by many of the Protestant churches. (See D'Israeli, *Curiosities of Literature* [Lond. 1858], ii, 474.) The first edition of the entire book of Psalms in verse appeared in France in 1561, with the royal privilege, and 10,000 copies were immediately dispersed. These were speedily set to music, and were generally sung in the Reformed churches of France, Geneva, and French Switzerland, notwithstanding their condemnation by the college of the Sorbonne. Some expressions having become obsolete, the task of retouching them was undertaken, first by Valentine Convart, the first secretary of the French Academy, and by one of the elders of the church at Charenton; and afterwards by the pastors of Geneva, who revised their undertaking, and almost recast the work of Marot and Beza. So dear, however, was the memory of these first two poets of the French Reformation that it was found necessary to preserve the very number of their stanzas and the quantity of syllables of their verses, and the ancient music of the 16th century is to this day adapted to the singing of the revised and corrected psalms (*Musée des Protestans Célèbres*, vol. ii, pt. ii, p. 11, 12). Of late years the Protestant churches in France have paid much attention to the improvement of their psalmody. To the metrical version of Marot and Beza they have added collections of hymns, with music, for various occasions. The French version of Marot and Beza was translated into Dutch metre by Peter Dathen, pastor of the first Reformed church at Frankfort-on-the-Main, about the year 1560, and adapted to the French tunes and measure. A new Flemish metrical version of the Psalms was executed by Philip de Marnix, lord of St. Aldegonde. A Bohemian version by Stryx, said to be of high merit, was published in 1590; and a Polish version by Bernard Woiewodka, of Cracow, was printed at Brecsz, in Lithuania, about the year 1565, under the auspices of prince Radzivil (Bayle, *Dictionnaire*, par Des Maizeaux, iv, 124; Milner, *Life of Dr. Isaac Watts*, p. 350, note). What Marot and Beza were to the Reformed Church of France and French Switzerland, Lobwasser was to the Reformed Church of Germany, German Switzerland, and Holland. None of the strictly Calvinistic communities have a hymn-book dating back to the Reformation. David's Psalter was the first hymn-book of the Reformed or Genevan Church. The book of Psalms became the only hymn-book of the Reformed churches in France, Switzerland, Holland, Italy, Germany, and Scotland, "adapted to grave and solemn music, in metrical translations, whose one aim and glory were to render into measure which could be sung the very words of the old Hebrew psalms."

England, in some measure a place of refuge, where both forms of the Reformation lived tranquilly side by side, but also a border land where both met and contended, was given the treasures of psalmody at the moment of her embracing the new doctrines. Probably in 1538, and certainly before 1539, the venerable confessor Myles Coverdale, bishop of Exeter, during the reign of king Edward VI, published a metrical version of thirteen *Goostly Psalmes and Spirituall Songes drawn out of the Holy Scripture*. The first verse of each psalm is accompanied by musical notes, which evidently show that they were designed to be sung (Coverdale's *Remains*, p. 533). The next attempt to versify the Psalms in English was made by Thomas Sternhold, a native of Hampshire, groom of the robes to king Henry VIII and to king Edward VI, who published nineteen psalms, most probably in 1549. This translation was at first discountenanced by many of the clergy, who looked

upon it as done in opposition to the practice of chanting the psalms in the cathedrals. It was increased to thirty-seven in 1551, with seven additional psalms translated by John Hopkins; to eighty-seven, most probably in 1561, by Sternhold and others; and in 1563 was published the entire book of Psalms, translated by Sternhold, Hopkins, and others. This version seems to have been authoritatively introduced into the service of the Reformed Church of England, being sanctioned both by the crown and convocation; and it soon became exceedingly popular.

Vocal psalmody was soon after introduced into the church service, the choral mode of singing being still retained in cathedrals and collegiate churches, and the liturgic hymns being retained in the Prayer-book. Public singing of psalms by the whole congregation was begun in the month of September, 1559, at the parish church of St. Antholin, in the city of London, whence it spread first into the neighboring churches, and from them into distant towns. Bishop Jewel, in a letter to Peter Martyr, dated March 5, 1560, says: "You may sometimes see at Paul's Cross, after the service, six thousand persons, old and young, of both sexes, all singing together and praising God" (*Zurich Letters*, p. 71). Although several metrical versions of the Psalms were published with the royal license, by archbishop Parker (1560), Henry Dod (1603), George Wither (1623), King James I (1631), and George Sandys (1631), the "old version" of Sternhold and Hopkins continued to be used in the churches until after the Restoration, notwithstanding the efforts made, during the rebellion, to recommend the introduction and adoption of the metrical versions of Barton and Rous. The version of Sternhold and Hopkins fell into disuse after the publication of *A New Version of the Psalms of David, fitted to the Tunes in Churches*, by Nahum Tate (poet-laureate under William III and Anne) and Dr. Nicholas Brady (Lond. 1696 [2d ed. 1698], 8vo). This version, less literal in its renderings than its predecessor, and somewhat commonplace as regards poetical character, was introduced to the public under the sanction of an order in council issued by king William III, of no legal force or authority whatever since his decease, and permitting it to be used "in all such churches and chapels and congregations as think fit to receive the same." In 1703, it being found necessary to have a supplement containing "the usual hymns, Creed, Lord's Prayer, etc., with the Church tunes, Messrs. Tate and Brady obtained a similar order in council for its adoption in such churches, etc., as should think fit to receive the same." Although the "new version," as it is now commonly termed, encountered much animadversion and opposition at its first publication, it is at present used in most churches and chapels in England and Ireland, as well as in the chapels of the Episcopal communion in Scotland and in the British colonies. This extensive use of the new version may be ascribed to its intelligibility as a whole, tame as the largest portion of it confessedly is, and to the fact that, almost ever since its first publication, the copyright property has been vested in the Stationers' Company, by whom, until of late years, it has almost exclusively been published. Modern hymns, selected according to the taste and at the will of the incumbent, have to a large extent taken in recent times the place of metrical psalms in the Church of England.

Of the psalm tunes which came into use, some have been attributed to Claude Goudimel, Claude Le Jeune, and Guillaume Franc, and a few owe their origin to Luther. The well-known 100th Psalm is an adaptation of Gregorian phrases by Guillaume Franc. The first important collection of psalm tunes for four voices published in England was made by Thomas Ravenscroft, Mus. Bac., and appeared in 1621; it was entitled "*The whole Booke of Psalms*, etc., composed into four parts by sundry authors, to such several tunes as have been and are usually sung in England, Scotland, Wales, Germany, Italy, France, and the Netherlands." In this collection were included contributions by Tallis, Morley, Dowland, and all the great masters of the day, as well as by Ravenscroft himself, who contributed the tunes *St. David's*, *Bangor*, and *Canterbury*. The name of John Milton, father of the poet, appears as composer of the tunes *York* and *Norwich*. According to the then prevalent usage, the subject, or air, was given to the tenor voice. This custom was first departed from in the *Whole Book of Psalms, in Three Parts*, published in 1671, compiled and arranged by John Playford — whom Sir J. Hawkins calls the "father of modern psalmody"—where we have the more proper practice, which has since obtained, of making the melody the soprano part. Croft, Courteville, Cary, the Bachs, and Handel have since that time contributed to the psalmody in use in Britain.

In 1603 was printed a Welsh translation of the Psalms, made by William Myddleton, a celebrated poet and navigator. Another version appeared about the commencement of the 17th century, from the pen of another eminent Welsh poet, Edmund Prys, archdeacon of Merioneth. A revised edition of this version, by the Rev. Peter Williams, is now in use throughout the principality of Wales. An entire version of the Psalms in the Erse, or native Irish language, made by the Rev. Dr. M'Leod, the Rev. F. H. Beamish, Mr. Thaddeus Connellan, and Mr. David Murphy, was published at London in 1836; and some portions of the Psalms have been translated into the Mohawk language by an unknown author (London, 1787, and Hamilton, Toronto, 1839), and into the language of the Munceys, a native tribe of North Americans, by the Rev. Richard Flood, a missionary to them from the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts.

Admirably as most of the psalms are adapted to general use in public worship, it was yet felt, in the English churches, that some other metrical expressions of those astonishing hopes and consoling promises which the new dispensation has given to man in the N. T. would not be altogether inappropriate. The great German Reformer had written hymns, and many of the other Continental divines of the revived faith in Christ had done likewise. Yet no English People's Hymn-book was brought out until the closing years of the 18th century, i. e. none that was placed on cottage tables beside the Bible, and none for use when Christians met and chanted beside the grave, although they had the *Te Deum* and *Magnificat* and the Psalms. Bishop Maltby published *A Selection of Psalms and Hymns* before his elevation to the episcopate. Various selections were made and published by various individuals, principally (as it appears) since the year 1770, and these selections are derived from Dr. Watts's *Imitation of the Psalms of David in the Language of the New Testament* (1707), and from his *Hymns* (1719); the *Hymns* of the Rev. Dr. Doddridge; those of the Rev. Messrs. John and Charles Wesley; the *Olney Hymns*, composed by William Cowper and John Newton; and the sacred compositions dispersed through the works of the British poets of the 18th century. The Wesleys, however—so it seems—were the first who really gave a People's Hymn-book to England, unless that of Dr. Watts, published about the beginning of the 18th century (in 1709), may be called so. "To Dr. Watts," says a modern biographer, "must be assigned the praise of beginning, in our language, a class of productions which have taken a decided hold upon the universal religious mind. On this account Christian worshippers of every denomination, and of every English-speaking land, owe him an incalculable debt of gratitude. Mason, Baxter, and others had preceded Watts as hymn-writers; but their hymns were not used in public worship. Prejudice prevented the use of anything beyond the Psalms, and those not yet in their Christian rendering; but Watts made the Christian hymn part of modern public worship." As a supplement to Dr. Watts's hymns, Dr. Doddridge pub-

lished a collection entitled *Hymns Founded on Various Texts in the Holy Scriptures* (1755). After these singers came the two Wesleys, whose hymns are sung up to this day, and John Newton and Cowper, who produced the *Olney Hymn-book*.

Of the state of psalmody among the Puritans at the close of the 16th, and in the former part of the 17th century, we have no certain information. During the commonwealth, William Barton published a metrical version in 1644, reprinted in 1645 with the license of the Protector Cromwell. This version was received with much favor, and appears to have retained its popularity for many years. In 1646, Francis Rous, the Presbyterian provost of Eton College, published his version of the psalms, sanctioned by the imprimatur of the House of Commons, in pursuance of the recommendation of the Westminster assembly of divines. This version was subsequently revised by William Barton for the optional use of churches in England, but it never became popular. But the greatest improvement in psalmody, not merely among Protestant dissenters, but among all English congregations, was effected by the learned and Rev. Dr. Isaac Watts. For a just appreciation of the value of his publication the reader is necessarily referred to Mr. Conder's *Poet of the Sanctuary*, p. 48–105, in which work will be found notices of some eminent versifiers of psalms and hymns, both Episcopalian and Nonconformist, who preceded Dr. Watts. The best compositions of Dr. Watts, and of his learned and pious friend the Rev. Dr. Doddridge, are found in *every* selection of psalms and hymns which has been published since the year 1770. All the great bodies of dissenters from the Church of England now have denominational hymn-books, containing the best versions or imitations of the Psalms of David, together with hymns selected from the most eminent modern devotional poets.

A curious controversy on psalmody arose among the dissenters in the end of the 17th century. Whether singing in public worship had been partially discontinued during the times of persecution to avoid informers, or whether the miserable manner in which it was performed gave persons a distaste for it, it appears that, in 1691, Mr. Benjamin Keach published a tract entitled *The Breach Repaired in God's Worship; or, Psalms, Hymns, etc., proved to be a Holy Ordinance of Jesus Christ.* To us it may seem strange that such a point should be disputed; but Mr. Keach was obliged to labor earnestly, and with a great deal of prudence and caution, to obtain the consent of his people to sing a hymn at the conclusion of the Lord's Supper. After six years more, they agreed to sing on the thanksgiving-days; but it required still fourteen years more before he could persuade them to sing every Lord's-day, and then it was only after the last prayer, that those who chose might withdraw without joining in it! Nor did even this satisfy these scrupulous consciences; for, after all, a separation took place, and the inharmonious seceders formed a new church in May's Pond, where it was above twenty years longer before singing the praises of God could be endured. It is difficult at this period to believe it; but Mr. Ivimey quotes Mr. Crosby as saying that Mr. Keach's was the first church in which psalm-singing was introduced. This remark, however, must probably be confined to the Baptist churches. The Presbyterians, it seems, were not quite so unmusical; for the Directory of the Westminster divines distinctly stated that "it is the duty of Christians to praise God publicly by singing of psalms together in the congregation." And besides the old Scotch Psalms, Dr. John Patrick, of the Charter-house, made a version which was in very general use among dissenters, Presbyterians, and Independents before it was superseded by the far superior compositions of Dr. Watts. These Psalms, however, like those of the English and Scotch Establishment, were drawled out in notes of equal length, without accent or variety. Even the introduction of the triple-timed tunes, probably about the time of Dr. Watts's psalms, gave also great offence to some people, because it marked the accent of the measure. Old Mr. Thomas Bradbury used to call this time "a long leg and a short one." The beautiful compositions of Dr. Watts, the Wesleys, and others produced a revolution in modern psalmody. Better versions of the Psalms, and many excellent collections of hymns, are now in use, and may be considered as highly important gifts bestowed upon the modern Church of God.

In Scotland, the early Reformers, while they banished instrumental music from churches, paid great attention to singing. In John Knox's Psalter, arranged for use in churches, the metrical psalms are set to music in harmony of four parts. Several early translations of the Psalms were produced in North Britain, but that of Sternhold and Hopkins was used in worship from 1564 down to the middle of the 17th century. In 1632 an attempt made by Charles I to supersede it by king James's version was more resolutely and decidedly opposed than in England. During the Commonwealth, the commission of the General Assembly, in pursuance of a reference made to them in August, 1649, issued on the 23d of November following their decision in favor of the revised version of Francis Rous, a member of Cromwell's council, which Parliament had in vain endeavored to bring into general use in England. It was adopted in the main to be used as the only authorized metrical version of the Psalms for the Kirk of Scotland, not only in congregations, but also in families. Though somewhat rough and uncouth, it is sometimes expressive and forcible, and perhaps nearer the original than any other metrical translation of the Psalms. A few paraphrases and hymns have since been added, by authority of the General Assembly, and form together the psalmody in use in Presbyterian worship in Scotland. In 1706 the assembly commended the Scripture songs of Mr. Patrick Sympson for use in private families; and to prepare them for public use the act was renewed in the following year, and in 1708 the commission was authorized to compare the remarks of presbyteries on these songs. Thus matters passed on for years. In 1742 the assembly anew expressed a wish for an addition to the psalmody, and in 1751 forty-five paraphrases had been selected. In 1781, after many delays, a new and fuller collection was made, twenty-two being added to the previous forty-five selections. This collection, though never formally sanctioned by the assembly, is that now in use and printed along with the Psalms in Scottish Bibles. Some of the paraphrases have an Arminian tinge. In 1787 a committee of the General Assembly, duly empowered, published a selection of *Paraphrases in Verse of several Passages of Scripture . . . to be sung in Churches.* It retained, in substance, the translations which had been published in 1745, under the authority of the General Assembly, and which had been in use in several churches; and a considerable number of new paraphrases were added, chiefly from the psalms or hymns of Drs. Watts, Doddridge, and Blacklock, and Mr. Logan. In 1781 a faithful and beautiful version of the psalmody of the Church of Scotland, in the Gaelic language, was made by the Rev. John Smith, by whom it was revised and published in 1783. From 1807 to 1822 the subject of a revision of the metrical psalms was before every assembly. Sir Walter Scott, when applied to, was wisely against the project; "for the Psalms," said he, "often possessed a rude sort of majesty, which would be ill exchanged for mere elegance." In 1860 an addition to a collection of paraphrases was published by the General Assembly. The Relief Synod published a hymn-book for their churches in 1794, and enlarged it in 1832. The Burgher branch of the Secession had, in 1748, requested Ralph Erskine, the author of the *Gospel Sonnets*, to undertake the duty of enlarging the psalmody, but the proposal led to no result. The United Presbyterian Church, after some years' preparation,

published, in 1851, a hymn-book for the use of their churches. The most of the paraphrases are incorporated into it. In addition to what is stated in the previous portion of this article about psalmody in Scotland, it may be mentioned that there was published at the period of the Reformation a *Compendious Booke of Godly and Spirituall Songs*. Many of these are satires on the Romish clergy, and many are profane songs (*prophaine sangis*) metamorphosed. The Romish clergy published a canon against this book—such was its popularity—and the fifth Parliament of queen Mary passed an act against such rhymes.

The first song of praise to Almighty God in the English language, on our New-England coast, was raised by the Pilgrim fathers when they landed on Plymouth Rock. Cold, ice-bound, without a roof over their heads, they remembered their first Sabbath-day to keep it holy —"10 of December, on the Sabbath day, wee rested," is the simple and impressive record of their journal.

"Amid the storm they sang,
And the stars heard, and the sea,
And the sounding aisles of the dim woods rang
With the anthem of the free."

As the first book ever printed with movable metal types was the Bible, so, as if to keep up the sacred parallel on this continent, the first book printed here was a portion of the inspired volume "done into metre." The first press was put up at Cambridge in 1639, by Stephen Day. His first book was *The Psalms in Metre, faithfully translated for the use and edification of the saints in public and private, especially in New England* (printed at Cambridge in 1640). This version was made from the Hebrew by Thomas Welde, of Roxbury; Richard Mather, of Dorchester; and John Eliot, the Apostle of the Indians. They were a committee appointed by the Congregational or Independent churches as early as 1636. In their preface they say, "We have respected rather a plain translation than to smoothe our verses with the sweetness of any paraphrase, and so have attended to conscience rather than to elegance, and fidelity rather than poetry, in translating Hebrew words into English language and David's poetry into English metre." Three hundred acres of land were granted to Stephen Day, "being the first that set up printing." Eliot's Indian Bible, in the Nipmuck language, was printed at Cambridge in 1663, the whole of the type being set up by an Indian, and the Psalms "done in common metre"—of which the first verse from the 19th Psalm may suffice as a specimen—

"Kesuk kukootumusheaumon
God wussosumoonk
Mamahehekesuk wumatuhkon
Wutana kausnonk."

In 1718 Dr. Cotton Mather issued his *Psalterium Americanum; the Book of Psalms in a translation exactly conformed unto the original, but all in blank verse, fitted unto tunes commonly used in our churches.* From this curious book we extract a few lines, as printed:

"PSALM XXIII.—A PSALM OF DAVID.

"1. My Shepherd is th' ETERNAL God | I shall not be in [**any**] want:
"2. In pastures of a tender grass | He [**ever**] makes me to lie down: | To waters of tranquillities | He gently carries me [**along**]:
"3. My *feeble and my wandering soul* | He [**kindly**] does fetch back again; | In the plain paths of righteousness | He does lead [**and guide**] me along; | Because of the regard he has [**ever**] unto his glorious Name." |

In an *Admonition concerning the Tunes*, Dr. Mather states that "the director of psalmody need only say, 'Sing with the black letter,' or 'Sing without the black letter,' and the tune will be sufficiently directed" (see Belcher, *Historical Sketches of Hymns and Hymn-writers*, p. 47, 48—a work which contains much interesting information on the whole subject of Church psalmody, hymnology, and music). These and other primitive efforts to furnish an American psalmody and hymnal were not followed with success. Between the years 1755 and 1757 the version of the Psalms of 1640 was carefully revised by the Rev. Thomas Prince, M.A., and published in 1758. In 1783 Mr. Joel Barlow, an American statesman and poet, published a corrected and enlarged edition of Dr. Watts's version of the Psalms, and a collection of hymns, with the recommendation of the General Assembly of the Congregational Ministers of Connecticut, at whose request the work had been undertaken. Many of the psalms were altered, several were written anew, and several, which had been omitted by Dr. Watts, were supplied. This collection was in general use in that state until the bad character of the author (who died a wretched infidel) brought them into disrepute; and in the year 1800, the Rev. Timothy Dwight, D.D., president of Yale College, published a revised edition of Dr. Watts's version of the Psalms (in which he versified upwards of twenty psalms omitted by Watts), with the approbation of the General Assembly of Ministers in the state of Connecticut, at whose request it had originally been undertaken. This edition, with the contributions of Dr. Dwight, has never been adopted by the Congregationalists of this country. Many of the leading denominations in the United States of America now have their own separate psalm- and hymn-books.

In 1789 the new version of the Psalms by Messrs. Tate and Brady was adopted *entire* by the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America, with the addition of a few hymns. Since the year 1826 a collection of 212 hymns has been in use under the authority of the General Convention of that Church, composed of the House of Bishops and of clerical and lay delegates; and since October, 1832, under the same authority, 124 selections of entire psalms, or of portions of psalms, from the new version (with certain necessary alterations or corrections, and occasionally with the substitution of a better version) has been in use in all the churches of that communion.

The constitution of the Reformed Church in America declares that "No psalms or hymns may be publicly sung in the Reformed (Dutch) churches but such as are approved and recommended by the General Synod." The manifest reason of this prohibition is to be found in the vital relation that subsists between the psalmody and the theology of that Church. This is further illustrated by a rule of its General Synod which forbids the issue of any edition of the psalms and hymns of this Church without the Confession of Faith, the Catechisms, and the Liturgy. The history of the hymnology of this denomination, which dates back to the period of the Reformation, makes an interesting chapter of the general subject. From an elaborate report made to the General Synod of 1869 by the committee which prepared the "Hymns of the Church," we condense a brief narrative: "The *Church Orders* ratified by the National Synod of Dordrecht (A.D. 1618–19), which are still 'recognised' as containing the distinctive and fundamental principles of our Church government, declare that 'the one hundred and fifty psalms of David, the Ten Commandments, the Lord's Prayer, the Twelve Articles of the Christian faith, the songs of Mary, Zacharias, and Simeon, versified only, shall be sung in public worship.' The churches are left at liberty to adopt or omit that entitled *O thou, who art our Father, God!* All others are prohibited. This usage, prevailing in the Netherlands, was transferred to this country. Several copies of the psalm-books which the fathers brought with them are in the hands of the committee." They are invariably bound up with the Bible, or the New Testament at least, the Catechism, and Liturgy. These Psalms in Dutch are the version of Peter Dathe, the eminent Biblical scholar and critic, by whom they were translated; however, not from the original, but from the French. This was the *first* book in use in the Reformed Church in America. It contains, besides the Psalms, the Ten Commandments, the Song of Zacharias, the Song of the Virgin Mary, the Apostles' Creed, the Lord's Prayer, the Articles of the Christian faith (translated from the German by Jan Uytenhoven), the Morn-

ing Prayer, the Evening Prayer, the Prayer before Sermon, Prayer before Eating, Prayer after Eating, the Evening Prayer entitled *Christe qui Lux es et Dies*, and a translation by Abraham Van der Meer, from the Greek Bible, of the 151st Psalm of David. Every word of these psalms and creeds and prayers is set to music of a simple recitative character, in which all might join, by Cornelius De Leeuw. This book was in use in all the Dutch churches in this country, until the consistory of the Reformed Protestant Dutch Church of the city of New York found it necessary to have divine service performed in the English language; and on Nov. 9, 1767, approved and recommended for the use of their Church and schools an English psalm-book, published by their order, "which is greatly indebted to that of Dr. Brady and Mr. Tate, some of the psalms being transcribed verbatim from their version, and others altered so as to fit them to the music used in the Dutch Church" (prefatory note). This book contains, besides the Psalms of David, fifteen pages of "hymns"—viz. the Ten Commandments, the Song of Zacharias, the Song of the Virgin Mary, the Song of Simeon, the Creed, and the Lord's Prayer—all set to the simple music in which all the people joined, so that the compiler could truthfully say, "A great part of divine worship consists in harmonious singing." This first book in English was the *second book* in use in our churches. The "Articles of Union," adopted in 1771, make no mention of psalmody, but agree to "abide in all things" by the regulations of the Synod of Dort, hereinbefore quoted. In 1773 a new version of the psalms and hymns was compiled and adopted in the Netherlands, and was soon introduced into some of the Dutch churches in America, constituting the *third book* thus used. It differs from the preceding chiefly in the higher critical character of the psalms. In 1787 the General Synod appointed a committee to compile a psalm-book "out of other collections of English psalms in repute and received in the Reformed churches; no congregation, however, to be obliged thereto where that of the New-York consistory is in use." Additional instructions were given the next year to print "some well-composed spiritual hymns in connection with the psalms." After approval by the Synod of 1789, this book "was speedily published." It contains, besides the Psalms of David, a century of hymns, of which "1 to 52 are suited to the Heidelberg Catechism, 53 to 73 are adapted to the holy ordinance of the Lord's Supper, and Hymn 74, to the end, on miscellaneous subjects." Among these are such titles as "Christmas," "The Song of the Angels," "Resurrection," "Ascension," "Whitsuntide," "New Year," etc. This book, prepared by order of the General Synod, being the *fourth book* used in their churches, is without music, as have been all subsequent books until this time. This selection continued in use for full a quarter of a century, and is still an admirable one. In 1812, on petition of the Classis of New York, the General Synod requested the Rev. Dr. John H. Livingston to prepare an improved and enlarged selection of psalms and hymns. This was reported to the Synod of 1813, and by its order was "forthwith introduced into all our churches." Its use was recommended also "to all families and individuals in place of the book hitherto in use." No radical change has been made in the psalmody of the Reformed Church from that day to this—the *fifth book* sanctioned in the churches. It embraced 273 more hymns than the former collection. Additions, however, were made, in 1831, of 172 hymns, and published as Book II. Rev. Dr. Thomas De Witt was chairman of the committee which prepared it. This was the *sixth book*. In 1843 a book of *Sabbath-school and Social Hymns*, 331 in number, was published by order of the Synod. In 1845–46 a committee, of which Rev. Dr. Isaac Ferris was chairman, prepared, by authority of the Synod, a new arrangement of psalms and hymns, embracing 342 additional selections. This was soon published, and constituted the *seventh book* thus used in the Reformed Church in America—containing, in addition to the psalms, 788 hymns. An edition with music has been published within three or four years past, under the title of *The Book of Praise*. In 1862 the *Fulton Street Hymn-book*, which is used in the celebrated daily noon prayer-meeting which bears the name of that street, and numbering 326 hymns, was published, and "recommended to the churches" by the Synod.

In this chronological sketch no reference has been made to books in the French and German languages; but so long ago as 1792 the Synod approved and recommended, in the French language, the psalms and hymns compiled by Theodore de Beza and La Marot; and in the German language, the psalms and hymns, published at Marburg and Amsterdam, used in the Reformed churches in Germany, in the Netherlands, and Pennsylvania. In October, 1852, a valuable and large collection of hymns in the German language was printed by order of the General Synod, for use in the German churches of this denomination. It was compiled by the late Rev. John C. Guldin, of New York, Rev. Joseph F. Berg, D.D., and Rev. Abraham Berky. Since then a *German Hymn-book for Sunday-schools*, with music, has been issued. The General Synod of 1869 sanctioned a new volume, entitled *Hymns of the Church*, with tunes, which is now coming in use in many congregations. The full history of the preparation of this elegant volume is given in the *Report* of the Synod. In many respects it is the most admirable collection of hymns for public worship now in use among Protestant denominations. It numbers 1007 hymns, together with many chants, sentences, etc. The music, which is designed to promote congregational singing, is of a very high order. The wide range of topics, the rich selection from the most celebrated devotional lyrics of all ages, and its fine adaptation to the great purpose of the praises of God, entitle it to a foremost place among modern collections. The committee who made the compilation were Rev. John B. Thompson, Rev. Ashbel G. Vermilye, D.D., Rev. Alexander R. Thompson, D.D., with whom was associated, as a prominent co-laborer, the Rev. Zachary Eddy, D.D. This book and the previous one are now both in use in the Reformed Church in America. It has also been introduced into a number of churches of other denominations.

The hymn-books of the various other Christian denominations embrace a large proportion of the psalms and hymns which have become the property of the Church universal, and of these it is necessary only to give the titles, which we subjoin in a list of all hymn-books. But there are hymns and hymnals characteristic of the particular doctrines, ordinances, and spirit of the Methodists so distinctive in these respects that we append a history of their hymn-books, recognising thereby the general assertion that their hymns and tunes have been among the greatest instrumentalities of their immense successes.

The origin of the first collection of hymns in use among the *Methodists* of this country cannot be satisfactorily ascertained. In 1773 one of Wesley's publications, divided into three books—1, Hymns and Spiritual Songs; 2, Psalms and Hymns; 3, Redemption Hymns (16th ed. Bristol)—was reprinted by Isaac Collins, in Burlington, N. J. At the formation of the Methodist Episcopal Church in 1784, Wesley's abridgment of the Book of Common Prayer, with a "Collection of Psalms and Hymns" appended, was adopted by the new communion. It was not, however, long employed. There is extant a copy of the *Pocket Hymn-book* (9th ed. Phila. 1788). This contains 250 hymns. We may infer from the number of Methodists in the country that the first edition may have been published about 1785 or 1786. There is also an edition "revised and improved," copyrighted in 1802 by Ezekiel Cooper. This contains 320 hymns. In 1808 a supplement was added by bishop Asbury, containing 337 hymns, the whole being published in two books. This was revised under the su-

pervision of Nathan Bangs in the year 1820. To this again a supplement was added in 1836. The General Conference of 1848 appointed a committee to carefully revise the then existing book, and to "judiciously multiply the number of hymns." Their work was completed, and approved by the Book Committee, the editors of the Book Concern, and finally by the bishops, by whom it was commended to the Church in May, 1849. A revision of this hymn-book was undertaken in 1876 by order of that year's General Conference, and it is completed at our writing (1878). The Hymnal, so it is entitled, is to be the sole book containing songs of praise to be used hereafter in the Methodist Episcopal Church. The Methodist Episcopal Church, South, after the separation, in 1846 ordered the preparation of a collection specially designed for its members, which was in some respects a decided improvement on the book of 1820 with supplement. The various smaller bodies of Methodists have employed books prepared by themselves.

During the last twenty years nearly every religious organization has revised its "book of praise," and we append a list of these standard collections used in America and England:

A. England.

1. *Baptist.*—Psalms and Hymns for Public, Social, and Private Worship (1857).
   The New Hymn-book, published under the direction of the General Baptist Association (1851).
   Our Own Hymn-book, compiled by C. H. Spurgeon.
2. *Church of England.*—The Year of Praise, edited by Dean Alford (1867).
   Christian Psalmody, by E. Bickersteth (1833).
   Psalms and Hymns, by E. H. Bickersteth (1858; 6th ed. 1867).
   Psalms and Hymns for Public Worship, by Burgess and Money (10th ed. 1866).
   The Hymnal, by Chope (1858).
   Psalms and Hymns, by W. J. Hall (1836); sometimes called the "Mitre" Hymn-book.
   A Church Psalter and Hymnal, by Harland (1855, 1867).
   A Selection of Psalms and Hymns, by Kemble (1853).
   The Church Psalter and Hymn-book, by W. Mercer (1864).
   The People's Hymnal (1867).
   The Sarum Hymnal, by Nelson, Woodford, and Dayman (1868).
   The Choral Book for England (1865).
3. *Congregational.*—The Hymn-book, by A. Reed (1841).
   The Church and Home Metrical Psalter and Hymnal, by W. Windle.
   Psalms, Hymns, and Passages of Scripture for Christian Worship, compiled by the Congregational Ministers of Leeds (1853).
   The New Congregational Hymn-book, compiled by a Committee of the Congregational Union (1859). [This is one of the most comprehensive and excellent of modern English collections. It was compiled by a competent committee in London, who were occupied from 1855 to 1859 in its preparation. They met frequently, and had the assistance of numerous ministers and others in all parts of the country. It includes 1000 of the best psalms and hymns, of nearly 200 writers of almost every country and religious denomination, and of various ages of the world, from the time of David to our own. It was prepared upon the broadest basis of Christian catholicity, and the sale of nearly a million copies already evinces its usefulness and acceptability to the worshipping assemblies in English-speaking countries.]
4. *Methodist.*—Hymns for Divine Worship, compiled for the Use of the Methodist New Connection (1865).
   A Collection of Hymns for the Use of the People called Methodists, by J. Wesley, with a Supplement (1831).
   The Wesleyan Methodist Hymn-book, by J. Everett (1853).
5. *Presbyterian.*—Psalms and Hymns for Divine Worship for the Presbyterian Church in England (1867).
6. *Miscellaneous.*—Hymns for Christian Worship, by the Religious Tract Society (1866).
   Psalms and Hymns for Public Worship, by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.
   Hymnologia Christiana, or Psalms and Hymns, by B. H. Kennedy (1863).

B. America.

1. *Baptist.*—Baptist Praise-book, by Fuller, Levy, Phelps, Fish, etc.
   Songs for the Sanctuary.
   The Psalmist, by Baron Stow and S. F. Smith, with supplement by Richard Fuller and J. B. Jeter.
2. *Congregational.*—Songs for the Sanctuary.
   Plymouth Collection, by H. W. Beecher.
3. *Lutheran.*—A Collection of Hymns, and a Liturgy, for the Use of the Evangelical Lutheran Churches (1865).
   The Church-book.
4. *Methodist.*—Hymnal of the Methodist Episcopal Church (1878).
5. *Moravian.*—Liturgy and Hymns for the Use of the Protestant Church of the United Brethren, or Moravians (1872).
6. *Presbyterian.*—Songs for the Sanctuary.
   Church Hymn-book, by E. F. Hatfield.
   Hymns and Songs of Praise, by Hitchcock and others.
   Presbyterian Hymnal [official] (1874).
7. *Protestant Episcopal.*—Hymnal, according to the Use of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America.
   Hymns, Ancient and Modern (1869).
   Hymns for Church and Home, compiled by Burgess, Mühlenberg, Howe, Coxe, and Wharton.
8. *Undenominational.*—Hymns of the Church, by Thompson, Vermilye, and Eddy. The use of this book is required in all congregations of the Reformed Church in America.

C. German Hymn-books.

Germany is very rich in hymn-books, to enumerate which would fill pages. Each state, each province, has its own hymn-book. The following may be mentioned among the most complete collections at present extant, viz.: 1, The *Geistlicher Liederschatz*, containing 2020 hymns (Berl. 1832, 8vo); 2, Archdeacon Knapp's *Evangelischen Liederschatz für Kirche und Haus*, containing 3572 hymns (Stuttgard, 1837, 2 vols. 8vo); and, 3, The chevalier Christian Carl Josias Bunsen's *Allgemeines Evangelisches Gesang und Gebet Buch* (2d ed. Hamb. 1846, 8vo). This work is deservedly held in the highest estimation in Germany. Besides a selection of 440 of the choicest hymns of the Lutheran and Reformed churches, it contains a table of lessons from the Old and New Tests. for the whole of the ecclesiastical year, a series of formularies, and a collection of prayers adapted to ordinary public worship, to the festivals celebrated by the universal Christian Church, and to sacramental and other occasions. The following are the hymn-books used in this country in the different denominations:

1. *Baptist.* — Glaubensstimme der Gemeine des Herrn (Hamburg, 1860).
2. *Evangelical Association.* — Gesangbuch der evangelischen Gemeinschaft (Cleveland, 1877).
3. *Lutheran.*—Das gemeinschaftliche Gesangbuch.
   Lutherisches Gesangbuch.
4. *Methodist.* — Deutsches Gesangbuch der Bisch. Methodisten-Kirche (Cincinnati).
5. *Moravian.* — Gesangbuch zum Gebrauch der evangel. Bruedergemeinen (Bethlehem, Pa.).
6. *Reformed and German Presbyterian.* — Deutsches Gesangbuch, von Ph. Schaff. This is one of the best German hymn-books in this country.

During the American Civil War (1861–65) many new patriotic and Christian songs resounded through the camps of the contending armies. The religious services, the meetings for prayer, the labors of chaplains and army missionaries, and of the sanitary and Christian commissions, and other voluntary organizations for the temporal and spiritual welfare of the military and naval forces, and for hospital service, were all attended with the cheering influence of Christian song. Few of these new songs, whether patriotic or religious, survive the conflict. But the dear old hymns that resounded in the homes and churches of the soldiers in happier times rang out their inspiring strains, and stirred all the deepest sympathies and memories of peace and love. Two of these little soldiers' and sailors' hymn-books are before us as we write—one printed for the Union and the other for the Confederate army. Both of them contain a majority of the same familiar psalms and hymns, both end with "Lord, dismiss us with thy blessing," and, with perhaps the exception of only a single hymn, either collection could have been used with equal profit on both sides of the line, just as they used the same old English Bible. Was it not prophetic of the restoration of national and Christian union which is yet advancing to a blessed consummation? Not a few waifs from the sea of newspaper and periodical literature have found fit and permanent places in modern hymn-books, and in such exquisite collections as *The Changed Cross*, *The Shadow of the Rock*, *Drifted Snowflakes*, and similar popular volumes of the poetry of devotion and of affliction.

It may be proper here to allude to the large addition to our psalmody in consequence of the labors of evangelists, such as Bliss and Sankey. These have produced numerous books of hymns, chiefly with the music attached, which contain, along with much that is merely ephemeral, some songs and tunes which are destined to survive the occasions that have called them forth.

We close this article with a brief reference to the great increase of hymns and tunes for children, and especially for Sabbath and mission schools. It is the marvellous outgrowth of the city and home missionary and Sunday-school system of the times. Advantage has been taken of the demand to flood the market with books which are utterly unworthy of their authors and unfit for use—full of trashy verses, and of tunes that are no better. But a happy reaction has begun, which will soon result in elevating the standard, purifying the taste, and ennobling this delightful branch of Christian instruction and worship. The best poetical and musical talent of the country is now engaged in the work, and we may soon look for its ripe fruit. The songs of the children, like books and addresses for them, must not be childish nor weak, if they are to bear their part in the religious training of the rising race, and in an age like this. The hosannas which were sung to Jesus in the Temple by the youthful throng were in full unison and of equal grandeur with those of the multitudes that went before and that followed him, and spread their garments in the way, and cried, saying, "Hosanna to the Son of David!" "Hosanna in the highest!" See Sunday School.

In the preparation of this article we have freely used the labors of other reference books. We have also had valuable contributions in sections from the pens of eminent writers. Dr. W. J. R. Taylor has greatly enriched our treatment of American psalmody, especially that treating of the Reformed Church. The Rev. Dr. Pick has aided in the bibliography. Those desiring fuller information will consult the list of works quoted in the article Hymnology.

Psalms, Book of, one of the most important of the Biblical components, standing in the English Scriptures at the beginning of the practical or experimental books, and in the Hebrew Bible of the Kethubim, or Hagiographa. In the following accounts we follow the general line of the works on Biblical interpretation; but we have thrown some new light, we trust, especially upon the difficult questions connected with the titles of the several Psalms. See Bible.

I. *General Title of the Book.*—This collection of sacred poetry received its English name, *Psalms*, from the Greek of the Septuagint, Ψαλμοί, in consequence of the *lyrical* character of the pieces of which it consists, as intended to be sung to stringed and other instruments of music. The word (from ψάλλω, to *touch* or *strike* a chord) is aptly defined by Gregory of Nyssa (*Tract.* ii, *in Psalmos*, c. 3) as melody produced by a musical instrument. Another name, *Psalter*, was given to this book from the Greek ψαλτήριον, the *stringed instrument* to which its contents were originally sung. See Psaltery.

It does not appear how the Psalms were, as a whole, anciently designated. Their present Hebrew appellation is תְּהִלִּים, *Tehillim*, elsewhere rendered "Praises." But in the actual superscriptions of the psalms the word תְּהִלָּה is applied only to one, Psa. cxlv, which is indeed emphatically a praise-hymn. The Sept. (as above noted) entitled them Ψαλμοί, or "Psalms," using the word ψαλμός at the same time as the translation of מִזְמוֹר, *mizmôr*, which signifies strictly a rhythmical composition (Lowth, *Prælect.* iii), and which was probably applied in practice to any poem specially intended, by reason of its rhythm, for musical performance with instrumental accompaniment. But the Hebrew word is, in the Old Test., never used elsewhere in the plural; and in the superscriptions of even the Davidic psalms it is applied only to some, not to all; probably to those which had been composed most expressly for the harp. The Hebrew title, תְּהִלִּים (Rabbinic form, with ה elided, תלים or תלין, *tillim* or *tillin*), signifies *hymns* or *praises*, and was probably adopted on account of the use made of the collection in divine service, though only a part can be strictly called songs of praise, not a few being lamentations and prayers. There is evidently no proper correspondence between the titles in the two languages, though each is suitable. The word answering to תהלים is ὕμνοι, and not ψαλμοί, which rather (as above noted) corresponds to מִזְמוֹרִים, *mizmorîm, lyrical odes*—a name which, though so plainly appropriate, does not appear to have been generally given to the book, at least so far as the Hebrew usage can now be ascertained. This is the more singular, inasmuch as no fewer than sixty-five of the songs distinctly bear the title of מִזְמוֹר, while only one (Psa. cxlv, 1) is styled תְּהִלָּה. That the name מזמורים did, however, obtain in ancient times, rather than the present title, תהלים, may be presumed from the use of ψαλμοί in the Sept. and the New Test., and of *mizmera* in the Peshito. See Praise.

In Psa. lxxii, 20 we find all the preceding compositions (i–lxxii) styled *Prayers of David*, because many of them are strictly prayers, and all are pervaded by the spirit and tone of supplication. This notice has suggested that the Psalms may in the earliest times have been known as תְּפִלּוֹת, *tephillôth*, "Prayers;" and, in fact, "Prayer" is the title prefixed to the most ancient of all the psalms, that of Moses (Psa. xc). But the same designation is in the superscriptions applied to only three besides, Psa. xvii, lxxxvi, cii; nor have all the psalms the character of prayers. See Prayer.

The other special designations applied to particular psalms are the following: שִׁיר, *Shîr*, "Song," the outpouring of the soul in thanksgiving, used in the first instance of a hymn of private gratitude (Psa. xxx), afterwards of hymns of great national thanksgiving (Psa. xlvi, xlviii, lxv, etc.); מַשְׂכִּיל, *Maskil*, "Instruction" or "Homily" (Psa. xxxii, xlii, xliv, etc.; comp. the צשכילך, "I will instruct thee," in Psa. xxxii, 8); מִכְתָּם, *Miktâm*, "Private Memorial," if from the root כתם (perhaps also with an anagrammatical allusion to the root תמך, "to support," "maintain;" comp. Psa. xvi, 5) (Psa. xvi, lvi–lix); עֵדוּת, *Edûth*, "Testimony" (Psa. lx, lxxx); and שִׁגָּיוֹן, *Shiggayôn*, "Irregular or Dithyrambic Ode" (Psa. vii). The strict meaning of these terms is in general to be gathered from the earlier superscriptions. Once made familiar to the psalmists, they were afterwards employed by them more loosely. (See § iv, below.)

II. *Numeration of the Psalms.*—The Christian Church obviously received the Psalter from the Jews not only as a constituent portion of the sacred volume of Holy Scripture, but also as the liturgical hymn-book which the Jewish Church had regularly used in the Temple. The number of separate psalms contained in it is, by the concordant testimony of all ancient authorities, one hundred and fifty; the avowedly "supernumerary" psalm which appears at the end of the Greek and Syriac Psalters, "on David's victory over Goliath," being manifestly apocryphal. This total number commends itself by its internal probability as having proceeded from the last sacred collector and editor of the Psalter. In the details, however, of the numbering, both the Greek and Syriac Psalters differ from the Hebrew. The Greek translators joined together Psa. ix, x and Psa. cxiv, cxv, and then divided Psa. cxvi and Psa. cxlvii: this was perpetuated in the versions derived from the Greek, and among others in the Latin Vulgate. The Syriac

so far followed the Greek as to join together Psa. cxiv, cxv, and to divide Psa. cxlvii. Of the three divergent systems of numbering, the Hebrew (as followed in our A. V.) is, even on internal grounds, to be preferred. It is decisive against the Greek numbering that Psa. cxvi, being symmetrical in its construction, will not bear to be divided; and against the Syriac that it destroys the outward correspondence in numerical place between the three great triumphal psalms, Psa. xviii, lxviii, cxviii, as also between the two psalms containing the praise of the Law, Psa. xix, cxix. That Psa. xlii, xliii were originally one is evident from the continuation of the refrain. There are also some discrepancies in the versual numberings. That of our A. V. frequently differs from that of the Hebrew in consequence of the Jewish practice of reckoning the superscription as the first verse. See VERSE.

III. *Ancient Collection and Division. — When* the Psalms, as a whole, were collected, and *by whom*, are questions that cannot be confidently answered. The Talmudists most absurdly considered David the collector of them all (*Berakoth*, i, 9). It is certain that the book, as it now stands, could not have been formed before the building of the second Temple, for Psa. cxxvi was evidently composed at that period. In all probability it was formed by Ezra and his contemporaries, about B.C. 450 (Ewald, *Poet. Bücher*, ii, 205).

But in the arrangement of the book there is manifest proof of its gradual formation out of several smaller collections, each ending with a peculiar formula. The Psalter is divided in the Hebrew into five books (detailed below) and also in the Sept. version, which proves the division to be older than B.C. 200. Some have fancied that this fivefold division did not originally exist, but that it arose simply from a desire to have as many parts in the Psalms as there are in the law of Moses. But strong reasons demand the rejection of such a fancy. Why should this conformity to the Pentateuch be desired and effected in the Psalms, and not also in Proverbs or in the Prophets? The five books bear decided marks, both from tradition and internal evidence, of being not arbitrary divisions, but distinct and independent collections by various hands.

The *first book* (i–xli) consists wholly of David's songs (see Vriemoet, *Nomenclator Davidis ad solos Psalmos pertinet* [Rost. 1628]), his name being prefixed to all except i, ii, x, and xxxiii; nor do we find in it a trace of any but David's authorship. No such trace exists in the mention of the "Temple" (v, 7), for that word is even in 1 Sam. i, 9; iii, 3 applied to the Tabernacle; nor yet in the phrase "bringeth back the captivity" (xiv, 7), which is elsewhere used, idiomatically, with great latitude of meaning (Job xlii, 10; Hos. vi, 11; Ezra xvi, 53); nor yet in the acrosticism of Psa. xxv, etc., for that all acrostic psalms are of late date is a purely gratuitous assumption, and some even of the most sceptical critics admit the Davidic authorship of the partially acrostic Psa. ix, x. All the psalms of book i being thus Davidic, we may well believe that the compilation of the book was also David's work. In favor of this is the circumstance that it does not comprise all David's psalms, nor his latest, which yet would have been all included in it by any subsequent collector; also the circumstance that its two prefatory psalms, although not superscribed, are yet shown by internal evidence to have proceeded from David himself; and furthermore, that of the two recensions of the same hymn (Psa. xiv, liii), it prefers that which seems to have been more specially adapted by its royal author to the Temple service. Others with less reason assign this division to the time of Hezekiah, who is known to have ordered a collection of Solomon's proverbs (Prov. xxv, 1), and to have commanded the Levites to sing the words of David (2 Chron. xxix, 30).

The *second book* (xlii–lxxii) consists mainly of pieces by the sons of Korah (xlii–xlix), and by David (li–lxv), which may have been separate minor collections. At the end of this book is found the notice, "The prayers of David the son of Jesse are ended;" and hence some have thought that this was originally the close of a large collection comprising Psa. i–lxxii (Carpzov, *Introductio*, etc., ii, 107). But that the second was *originally* distinct from the first book is proved by the repetition of one or two pieces; thus Psa. liii is plainly the same as Psa. xiv, with only a notable variation in the divine name, אֱלֹהִים, *Elohim, God*, being used in the former wherever יְהוָה, *Jehovâh, Lord*, is found in the latter. So also Psa. lxx is but a repetition of Psa. xl, 13–17, with the same singular variation in the divine name. This division appears by the date of its latest psalm (Psa. xlvi) to have been compiled in the reign of king Hezekiah. It would naturally comprise, first, several or most of the Levitical psalms anterior to that date, and, secondly, the remainder of the psalms of David previously uncompiled. According to others, this collection was not made till the period of the captivity, on the ground that Psa. xliv refers to the days of Jeremiah.

The *third book* (lxxiii–lxxxix) consists chiefly of Asaph's psalms, but comprises apparently two smaller collections—the one Asaphitic (lxxiii–lxxxiii), the other mostly Korahitic (lxxxiv–lxxxix). The collector of this book had no intention to bring together songs written by David, and therefore he put the above notice at the end of the second book (see De Wette, *Psalmen, Einleitung*, p. 21). This book, the interest of which centres in the times of Hezekiah, stretches out, by its last two psalms, to the reign of Manasseh: it was probably compiled in the reign of Josiah. In the opinion of others, the date of this collection must be as late as the return from Babylon, on the supposition that Psa. lxxxv implies as much.

The *fourth book* (xc–cvi), containing the remainder of the psalms up to the date of the captivity; and the *fifth* (cvii–cl), comprising the psalms of the return, are made up chiefly of anonymous liturgic pieces, many of which were composed for the service of the second Temple. In the last book we have the Songs of Degrees (cxx–cxxxiv), which seem to have been originally a separate collection. There is nothing to distinguish these two books from each other in respect of outward decoration or arrangement, and they may have been compiled together in the days of Nehemiah.

The five books may, with some propriety, be thus distinguished: the first *Davidic*, the second *Korahitic*, the third *Asaphitic*, and the two remaining *liturgic*. (Comp. § v, below.)

The ancient Jewish tradition as to this division is preserved to us by the abundant testimonies of the Christian fathers. Of the indications which the sacred text itself contains of this division the most obvious are the doxologies which we find at the end of Psa. xli, lxxii, lxxxix, cvi, and which, having for the most part no special connection with the psalms to which they are attached, mark the several ends of the first four of the five books. It suggests itself at once that these books must have been originally formed at different periods.

This conclusion is by various further considerations rendered all but certain, while the few difficulties which stand in the way of admitting it vanish when closely examined. Thus there is a remarkable difference between the several books in their use of the divine names Jehovah and Elohim to designate Almighty God. In book i the former name prevails: it is found 272 times, while Elohim occurs but fifteen times. (We here take no account of the superscriptions or doxology, nor yet of the occurrences of Elohim when inflected with a possessive suffix.) On the other hand, in book ii Elohim is found more than five times as often as Jehovah. In book iii the preponderance of Elohim in the earlier is balanced by that of Jehovah in the later psalms of the book. In book iv the name Jehovah is exclusively employed; and so also, virtually, in book v, Elohim being

there found only in two passages incorporated from earlier psalms. Those who maintain, therefore, that the psalms were all collected and arranged at once, contend that the collector distributed the Psalms according to the divine names which they severally exhibited. But to this theory the existence of book iii, in which the preferential use of the Elohim gradually yields to that of the Jehovah, is fatal. The large appearance, in fact, of the name Elohim in books ii and iii depends in great measure on the period to which many of the psalms of those books belong—the period from the reign of Solomon to that of Hezekiah, when through certain causes the name Jehovah was exceptionally disused. The preference for the name Elohim in most of the Davidic psalms which are included in book ii is closely allied with that character of those psalms which induced David himself to exclude them from his own collection, book i; while, lastly, the sparing use of the Jehovah in Psa. lxviii, and the three introductory psalms which precede it, is designed to cause the name, when it occurs, and above all *Jah*, which is emphatic for Jehovah, to shine out with greater force and splendor.

IV. *Superscriptions.*—All the Psalms, except thirty-four, bear superscriptions. According to some, there are only twenty-five exceptions, as they reckon הַלְלוּיָהּ, *hallelujah*, a title in all the Psalms which commence with it. To each of these exceptions the Talmud (Babyl. Cod. *Aboda Sarah*, fol. 24, col. 2) gives the name מזמורא יתומא, *Orphan Psalm.* It is confessedly very difficult, if not impossible, to explain all the terms employed in the inscriptions; and hence critics have differed exceedingly in their conjectures. The difficulty, arising no doubt from ignorance of the Temple music, was felt, it would seem, as early as the age of the Sept.; and it was felt so much by the translators of our A. V. that they generally retained the Hebrew words, even though Luther had set the example of translating them to the best of his ability. It is worth observing that the difficulty appears to have determined Coverdale (1535) to *omit* nearly all except names of authors; thus in Psa. lx, which is lix in his version, he gives only *a Psalme of David.*

The *authority* of the titles is a matter of doubt. By most of the ancient critics they were considered genuine and of equal authority with the Psalms themselves, while most of the moderns reject them wholly or in part. They were wholly rejected at the close of the 4th century by Theodore of Mopsuestia, one of the ablest and most judicious of ancient interpreters (Rosenmüller, *Hist. Interpretationis Librorum Sacrorum*, iii, 256). On the other hand, it deserves to be noticed that they are received by Tholuck and Hengstenberg in their works on the Psalms. Of the *antiquity* of the inscriptions there can be no question, for they are found in the Sept. They are supposed to be even much older than this version, since they were no longer intelligible to the translator, who often makes no sense of them. Their obscurity might, however, have been owing not so much to their antiquity as to the translator's residence in Egypt, and consequent ignorance of the psalmody of the Temple service in Jerusalem. At any rate, the appearance of the titles in the Sept. can only prove them to be about as ancient as the days of Ezra. Then it is argued by many that they must be as old as the Psalms themselves, since it is customary for Oriental poets to prefix titles to their songs. Instances are found in Arabic poems, but these are very unlike the Hebrew inscriptions. Much more important traces of the custom appear in Isa. xxxviii, 9, in Hab. iii, 1, and in 2 Sam. i, 17, 18 (Tholuck, *Psalmen*, p. xxiv). The other instances commonly appealed to in Exod. xv, 1; Deut. xxxi, 30; Judg. v, 1; 2 Sam. xxii, 1, furnish no evidence, since they are not proper titles of the songs so much as brief statements connecting them with the narrative. But in 2 Sam. xxiii, 1 and Numb. xxiv, 3 there is strong proof of the usage, if, with Tholuck, we take the verses as inscriptions, and not as integral parts of the songs, which most hold them justly to be from their poetical form.

The following considerations seem to militate against the authority of the titles: (1.) The analogy between them and the *subscriptions* to the apostolical epistles. The latter are now universally rejected: why not the former? (2.) The Greek and Syriac versions exhibit them with great and numerous variations, often altering the Hebrew (as in Psa. xxvii), and sometimes giving a heading where the Hebrew has none (as in Psa. xciii–xcvii). Would the ancient translators have taken such liberties, or could such variations have arisen, if the titles had been considered sacred like the Psalms themselves? At any rate, the existence of these glaring variations is sufficient to induce a distrust of the titles in their present form, even though they had been once sanctioned by inspired authority. If ever Ezra settled them, the variations in versions and manuscripts (Eichhorn, *Einleitung*, iii, 490, 495) have tended since to make them doubtful. (3.) The inscriptions are occasionally thought to be at variance with the contents of the Psalms. Sometimes the author is believed to be incorrectly given, as when David is named over psalms referring to the captivity, as in Psa. xiv, 7; xxv, 22; li, 20, 21; lxix, 36. It is not unlikely, however, as Tholuck thinks, that these references to the exile were added during that period to the genuine text of the royal singer. Others, as Calvin and Hengstenberg, with far less probability, take these passages in a figurative or spiritual sense. Also Psa. cxxxix, it is supposed, cannot well be David's, for its style is not free from Chaldaisms. Then sometimes the occasion is incorrectly specified, as in Psa. xxx, unless, indeed, this refers to the dedication of the *site of the Temple* (1 Chron. xxii, 1), as Rosenmüller, Tholuck, and Hengstenberg think after Venema. The real solution of the controversy lies in the answer to this question: Do they, when individually sifted, approve themselves as so generally correct, and as so free from any single fatal objection to their credit, as to claim our universal confidence? This cannot be fully discussed here, although intimations are given below calculated to confirm the accuracy of the titles as found in the Hebrew and English Bible, especially as to authorship and occasion. We must simply avow our conviction, founded on thorough examination, that they are, when rightly interpreted, fully trustworthy, and that every separate objection that has been made to the correctness of any one of them can be fairly met. Moreover, some of the arguments of their assailants obviously recoil upon themselves. Thus when it is alleged that the contents of Psa. xxxiv have no connection with the occasion indicated in the superscription, we reply that the fact of the connection not being readily apparent renders it improbable that the superscription should have been prefixed by any but David himself.

Of the terms left *untranslated* or *obscure* in our Bible, it may be well to offer some explanation in this place, referring to them in alphabetical order for a fuller elucidation. On this subject most commentators offer instruction, but the reader may especially consult Rosenmüller, *Scholia in Comp. Redacta*, iii, 14–22; De Wette, *Commentar über die Psalmen*, p. 27–37; Ewald, *Poet. Bücher*, i, 169–180, 195. The following summary exhibits the literary and musical systems of notation found in the individual titles to the Psalms at one view, classified under the several terms and particles used to point out their bearing and significance:

I. With the prefix לְ, *le-* (*to* or *by*):

a. The *author:* namely,

1. *David:* iii–viii, xi–xxxii, xxxiv–xli, li, liii–lxv, lxviii–lxx, lxxxvi, ci, ciii, cviii–cx, cxxii, cxxiv, cxxxi, cxxxiii, cxxxviii–cxliv.

2. *Levites:* (1.) Korahites only: xlii, xliv–xlix, lxxxiv, lxxxv, lxxxvii.

(2.) Asaph[ites] specially, as a branch of the Korahites: l, lxxiii–lxxxiii.

(3.) Heman the [Ezraite, i. e.] Korahite individually: lxxxviii.

(4.) Ethan the [Ezraite, i. e.] Korahite individually: lxxxix.

3. *Moses:* xc.

4. *Solomon:* lxxii, cxxvii.

5. General terms: (1) "Man of God," xc: (2) "Jehovah's servant," xviii, xxxvi; (3) "an afflicted one," cii.

b. The person to whom the poem was *dedicated*, or by whom it was set to music, or under whose direction it was to be rendered:

1. לַמְנַצֵּחַ, *ham-menatstséach* (A. V. "the chief musician"), the musical *precentor* of the Temple for the time being: iv–vi, viii, xi–xiv, xviii–xxii, xxxi, xxxvi, xxxix–xlii, xliv–xlvii, xlix, li–lxii, lxiv–lxx, lxxv–lxxvii, lxxx, lxxxiv, lxxxv, lxxxviii, cix, cxxxix, cxl.

2. Jeduthun in particular: xxxix.

c. The *object* or special purpose of the writer:

1. הַזְכִּיר, *hazkir* (*to remind*, A.V. "to bring to remembrance"), as a memento of some special deliverance, etc.: xxxviii, lxx.

2. לַמֵּד, *lammêd* ("to teach"), perhaps to be publicly pronounced *memoriter:* lx.

3. עַנּוֹת, *annôth* (*to reply*, A.V. "Leannoth," q. v.), *responsive*, perhaps a note of the style of recitation: lxxxviii.

4. תּוֹדָה, *todâh* (*confession*, A. V. "to praise"), in *acknowledgment*, i. e. of God's mercy: ci.

5. Commemorative of the *Sabbath-day:* xcii.

II. With the prefix בְּ, *be-* (*with*):

a. To designate the orchestral *accompaniment:* only נְגִינוֹת, *neginôth* (q. v.), or *stringed instruments* in general: iv, vi, liv, lv, lxviii, lxxvi.

b. To designate the *occasion* of composition: iii, xxxiv, li, lii, lvi, lvii, lix, lx, lxiii, cxlii. The occasion is sometimes otherwise stated: vii, xviii, xxx.

III. With the preposition עַל, *al* (*upon*), to denote the musical style of *performance*, as indicated by:

a. The *instrument* employed by the leader:

1. שֹׁשַׁנִּים, *hash-shoshannîm* (*the lilies*, i. e. lily-shaped, A.V. "Shoshannim," q. v.), straight *trumpets:* xlv, lxix [שׁוֹשַׁנִּים], lx [שׁוּשָׁן, sing.].

2. מַחֲלַת, *machaláth* (the *smooth*-toned, A. V. "Mahalath," q. v.), probably a *lute* or light stringed instrument: liii, lxxxviii.

3. נְגִינַת, *neginâth*, a *stringed* instrument in general: lxi. See NEGINOTH.

4. הַגִּתִּית, *hag-gittîth, the Gittitish*, probably a peculiar form of lyre: viii; or perhaps on an *eight-stringed* lyre. See GITTITH.

b. The *pitch* of the singing:

1. הַשְּׁמִינִית, *hash-sheminîth* (*the eighth*), the *octave*, i. e. in a "tenor" voice: vi, xii. See SHEMINITH.

2. עֲלָמוֹת, *alamôth* (q. v.), (*virgins*), in a *female* key, i. e. "soprano:" xlvi.

c. After the style of some noted performer: only Jeduthun: lxii, lxxvii.

d. The *tune* or melody to be imitated:

1. מוּת לַבֵּן, *muth lab-bên* (q. v.) (*death to the son*), i. e. a ditty so beginning or thus entitled: ix, and end of xlviii.

2. אַיֶּלֶת הַשַּׁחַר, *ayyéleth hash-shâhar* (q. v.), (*hind of the dawn*), a popular song so called: xxii.

3. יוֹנַת אִלֶּם רְחֹקִים, *yonáth êlem rechokîm* (q. v.) (*dove of silence of distant* ones), an emblematic title of some well-known air: lvi.

4. (עַל omitted on account of the alliteration with אַל) אַל־תַּשְׁחֵת [or ־חֵת], *al-tashchîth* [or- *chêth*] (q. v.) (*thou mayest not destroy*), the symbolical designation of some familiar measure: lvii–lix, lxxv, lxxxi, lxxxiv.

IV. With the preposition אֶל (*el, towards*); in *imitation* of (French *à la*) some peculiar "quality" of tone (as we say, the *stop* of the organ):

1. הַנְּחִילוֹת, *han-nechilôth* (q. v.) (*the contracted*), the *flute* or continuous sound: v.

2. שֹׁשַׁנִּים, *shoshannîm* (q. v.) (*lilies*), the *trumpet* blast: lxxx.

V. The species of poetical *composition:*

1. שִׁיר, *shîr* (*song*), simply an *ode* or lyrical piece: xlvi, xlviii, lxv–lxviii, lxxv, lxxvi, lxxxiii, lxxxvii, lxxxviii, cviii. In some of these instances it is joined with the term following. In a certain series it is coupled with the expression הַמַּעֲלוֹת, *ham-maalôth* (*the steps*, A. V. "degrees," q. v.), i. e. *climactic* in construction of phrases: cxx–cxxxiv. In one case it is joined with the term יְדִידוֹת, *yedidôth* (i. e. "*loves*"), i. e. an *epithalamium:* xlv.

2. מִזְמוֹר, *mizmôr* (*playing* on an instrument), simply a *hymn*, to be sung with musical accompaniment: iii–vi, viii, xii, xiii, xv, xix–xxiv, xxix–xxxi, xxxviii–xli, xlvii–li, lxii–lxviii, lxxiii, lxxv–lxxvii, lxxix, lxxx, lxxxii–lxxxv, lxxxvii, lxxxviii, xcviii, c, ci, cviii–cx, cxxxix–cxli, cxliii.

3. מִכְתָּם, *miktâm* (*written*, "michtam," q. v.), perhaps i. q. a "set piece" or "mottet:" xvi, lvi–lx.

4. תְּפִלָּה, *tephillâh*, a "*prayer:*" xvii, lxxxvi, xc, cii, cxlii.

5. תְּהִלָּה, *tehillâh*, a "psalm" simply: cxlv.

6. מַשְׂכִּיל, *maskîl* (*instructive*, "maschil," q. v.), a *didactic* poem: xxii, xlii, xliv, xlv, lii–lv, lxxiv, lxxviii, lxxxviii, lxxxix, cxlii.

7. עֵדוּת, *edûth* (*precept*, "eduth," q. v.), an *ethical* poem: lx, lxxx.

8. שִׁגָּיוֹן, *shiggayôn* (*sighing*, "shiggaion," q. v.), an *elegiac* or plaintive song: vii.

V. *Original Authorship of the Psalms.*—Many of the ancients, both Jews and Christians, maintained that all the Psalms were written by David, which is one of the most striking proofs of their *uncritical* judgment. So the Talmudists (*Cod. Pesachim*, x, 117); Augustine, who is never a good critic (*De Civ. Dei*, xvii, 14); and Chrysostom (*Prol. ad Psalmos*). But Jerome, as might be expected, held the opinion which now universally prevails (*Epist. ad Sophronium*). The titles and the contents of the Psalms most clearly show that they were composed at different and remote periods by several poets, of whom David was only the largest and most eminent contributor.

1. *David*, "the sweet psalmist of Israel" (2 Sam. xxiii, 1). To him are ascribed seventy-three psalms in the Hebrew text (not seventy-four, as De Wette and Tholuck state; nor seventy-one, as most others have counted), and at least eleven others in the Sept.—namely, xxxiii, xliii, xci, xciv–xcix, civ, cxxxvii; to which may be added Psa. x, as it forms part of Psa. ix in that version.

To these psalms the collector, after properly appending the single psalm of Solomon, has affixed the notice that "the prayers of David the son of Jesse are ended" (Psa. lxxii, 20); evidently implying, at least on the *primâ facie* view, that no more compositions of the royal psalmist remained. How, then, do we find in the later books—iii, iv, v—further psalms yet marked with David's name? Some have sought to answer this question by a reference to the authorship assigned in the superscriptions of other psalms. If (as we shall presently see) in the times posterior to those of David the Levitical choirs prefixed to the psalms which they composed the names of Asaph, Heman, and Ethan, out of a feeling of veneration for their memories, how much more might the name of David be prefixed to the utterances of those who were not merely his descendants, but also the representatives for the time being, and so in some sort the pledges of the perpetual royalty of his lineage! The name David is used to denote, in other parts of Scripture, after the original David's death, the then head of the Davidic family; and so, in prophecy, the Messiah of the seed of David, who was to sit on David's throne (1 Kings xii, 16; Hos. iii, 5; Isa. lv, 3; Jer. xxx, 9; Ezra xxxiv, 23, 24). Thus some seek to explain the meaning of the later Davidic superscriptions in the Psalter. The psalms to which they belong are thought to have been written by Hezekiah, by Josiah, by Zerubbabel, or others of David's posterity. This view is supposed to be confirmed by various con-

siderations. In the later books, and even in book v taken alone, the psalms marked with David's name are not grouped all together. In some instances there is internal evidence of occasion: thus Psa. ci can ill be reconciled with the historical circumstances of any period of David's life, but suits exactly with those of the opening of the reign of Josiah. Some of these psalms —Psa. lxxxvi, cviii, cxliv—are compacted of passages from previous psalms of David. Lastly, the Hebrew text of many (see, above all, Psa. cxxxix) is marked by grammatical Chaldaisms, which are entirely unparalleled in Psa. i–lxxii, and which thus afford strong evidence of a comparatively recent date. They cannot, therefore, it is claimed, be David's own; yet it is held that the superscriptions are not on that account to be rejected as false, but must rather be properly interpreted, on the ground of the improbability that any would, carelessly or presumptuously, have prefixed David's name to various psalms *scattered* through a collection, while yet leaving the rest—at least in books iv, v —altogether unsuperscribed. Ingenious as is this explanation, we prefer to adhere to the simple and obvious meaning of the titles as ascribing the psalms in question to David himself, and we do not feel constrained to seek other authors by the nature of the contents.

When we consider David's eminence as a poet, and the delight he took in sacred song, we cannot wonder that he should be the author of so many of the Psalms —no fewer, in all likelihood, than half the collection: the wonder rather should be that we do not find more of his fine odes, for it is certain he wrote some which are not in this book; see in 2 Sam. i, 19–27 his lament over Saul and Jonathan, and in xxiii, 1–7 his last inspired effusion. His character and merit as the father of Hebrew melody and music—for it was in his hands and under his auspices that these flourished most—are thus set forth by the son of Sirach (xlvii, 8–10), "In all his work he gave thanks. To the Holy and Most High he sang songs with all his heart in words of praise (*ῥήματι δόξης*), and he loved his Maker. He set singers also before the altar, and from their music (*ἤχου*) sweet melody resounded. He gave splendor to the feasts, and adorned the solemn times unto perfection (*μέχρι συντελείας*), in that they praised his holy name, and the sanctuary pealed with music from early morn."

David's compositions are generally distinguished by sweetness, softness, and grace, but sometimes, as in Psa. xviii, they exhibit the sublime. His prevailing strain is plaintive, owing to his multiplied and sore trials, both before and after his occupation of the throne. How often was he beset with dangers, harassed by foes, and chastised of God! Under these circumstances, how was his spirit bowed down, and gave vent to its plaints and sorrows on the saddened chords of the lyre! But in the midst of all he generally found relief, and his sorrow gave place to calm confidence and joy in God. What wonder that a soul so susceptible and devout as his should manifest emotions so strong, so changeful, and so various, seeing that he passed through the greatest vicissitudes of life? God took him from the sheepfolds to feed Jacob his people and Israel his inheritance (Psa. lxxviii, 70, 71). See Herder, *Geist der ebr. Poesie*, ii, 297–301; and especially Tholuck (*Psalmen, Einleitung*, § 3), who gives a most admirable exhibition of the psalmist's history and services. See David.

The example and countenance of the king naturally led others to cultivate poetry and music. It appears from Amos vi, 5 that lovers of pleasure took David's compositions as a model for their worldly songs: how much more would the lovers of piety be induced to follow him by producing sacred songs and hymns! The fine psalm in Hab. iii is an exact imitation of his style as seen in Psa. xviii. The celebrated singers of his day were men, like himself, moved by the divine afflatus not only to excel in music, but also to indite hallowed poetry. Of these psalmists the names of several are preserved in the titles.

2. *Asaph* is named as the author of twelve psalms —viz. l, lxxiii–lxxxiii. He was one of David's chief musicians. All the poems bearing his name cannot be his, for in Psa. lxxiv, lxxix, and lxxx there are manifest allusions to very late events in the history of Israel. Either, then, the titles of these three psalms must be wholly rejected, or the name must be here taken for the "sons of Asaph;" which is not improbable, as the family continued for many generations in the choral service of the Temple. Asaph appears from Psa. l, lxxiii, and lxxviii to have been the greatest master of didactic poetry, excelling alike in sentiment and in diction. No critic whatever contends that *all* these eleven belong to the age of David, and, in real truth, internal evidence is in every single instance in favor of a later origin. They were composed, then, by the "sons of Asaph" (2 Chron. xxix, 13; xxxv, 15, etc.), the members, by hereditary descent, of the choir which Asaph founded. It was to be expected that these psalmists would, in superscribing their psalms, prefer honoring and perpetuating the memory of their ancestor to obtruding their own personal names on the Church—a consideration which both explains the present superscriptions and also renders it improbable that the person intended in them could, according to a frequent but now waning hypothesis, be any second Asaph of younger generation and of inferior fame. See Asaph.

3. The *sons of Korah* were another family of choristers, to whom eleven of the most beautiful psalms are ascribed. The authorship is assigned to the Korahites in general, not because many of them could have been engaged in composing one and the same song, but because the name of the particular writer was unknown or omitted. See Korah. However, in Psa. lxxxviii we find, besides the family designation, the name of the individual who wrote it—viz.:

4. *Heman* was another of David's chief singers (1 Chron. xv, 19): he is called the Ezraite, as being descended from some Ezra, who appears to have been a descendant of Korah; at least Heman is reckoned a Kohathite (1 Chron. vi, 33–38), and was therefore probably a Korahite, for the Kohathites were continued and counted in the line of Korah; see 1 Chron. vi, 22, 37, 38. Thus Heman was both an Ezraite and of the sons of Korah. That Psa. lxxxviii was written by him is not unlikely, though many question it, regarding this term likewise as a mere patronymic. See Heman.

5. *Ethan* is reputed the author of Psa. lxxxix. He also is called the Ezraite, but this is either a mistake, or he as well as Heman had an ancestor named Ezra, of whom nothing is known. The Ethan intended in the title is doubtless the Levite of Merari's family whom David made chief musician along with Asaph and Heman (1 Chron. vi, 44; xxv, 1, 6). See Ethan.

6. *Solomon* is given as the author of Psa. lxxii and cxxvii, and there is no decided internal evidence to the contrary, though most consider him to be the subject, and not the author, of Psa. lxxii. See Solomon.

7. *Moses* is reputed the writer of Psa. xc, and there is no strong reason to doubt the tradition; but the Talmudists, whom Origen, and even Jerome, follow, ascribe to him also the ten succeeding psalms (xci–c), on the principle that the anonymous productions belonged to the last-named author. This principle is manifestly false, since in several of these psalms we find evidence that Moses was not the author. In Psa. xcv the forty years' wandering in the wilderness is referred to as past; in Psa. xcvii, 8 mention is made of Zion and Judah, which proves that it cannot be dated earlier than the time of David; and in Psa. xcix, 6 the prophet Samuel is named, which also proves that Moses could not be the writer. See Moses.

Jeduthun is sometimes, without just ground, held to be named as the author of Psa. xxxix; the ascription there being merely a dedication to the leader of the Levitical orchestra. In the view of others, this, like the superscriptions of Psa. lxxxviii, lxxxix, "Maschil

of Heman," "Maschil of Ethan," have simply a conventional purport—the one psalm having been written, as, in fact, the rest of its superscription states, by the sons of Korah, the choir of which Heman was the founder; and the other correspondingly proceeding from the third Levitical choir, which owed its origin to Ethan or Jeduthun. See JEDUTHUN.

Many conjectures have been formed respecting other writers, especially of the anonymous psalms. The Sept. seemingly gives, as authors, Jeremiah (Psa. cxxxvii), and Haggai and Zechariah (Psa. cxxxviii). But these conjectures are too uncertain to call for further notice in this place. Hitzig (*Comment. über die Psalmen*) ascribes to Jeremiah a large number of the elegiac or plaintive psalms.

More particularly, the Psalms may be arranged, according to the intimations of authorship contained in the titles, as follows:

A. Exclusively Davidic.....i–xli.
(Only Psa. i, ii, x, xxxiii, are somewhat doubtful.)
B. Exclusively Levitical—
a. Korahites.....xlii–xlix.
b. Asaph.....l.
C. Chiefly Davidic—
a. David.....li–lxiv.
b. Uncertain.....lxv–lxvii.
c. David.....lxviii–lxx.
d. Uncertain.....lxxi.
e. David (for Solomon).....lxxii.
D. Chiefly Levitical—
a. Asaph.....lxxiii–lxxxiii.
b. Korahites.....lxxxiv–lxxxv.
c. David.....lxxxvi.
d. Korahites and Heman.....lxxxvii, lxxxviii.
e. Ethan.....lxxxix.
f. Moses.....xc.
g. Uncertain.....xci–c.
h. David.....ci.
i. Uncertain.....cii.
j. David.....ciii.
k. Uncertain.....civ–cvii.
l. David.....cviii–cx.
m. Uncertain.....cxi–cxix.
E. "Degrees"—
a. Uncertain.....cxx–cxxi.
b. David.....cxxii.
c. Uncertain.....cxxiii.
d. David.....cxxiv.
e. Uncertain.....cxxv, cxxvi.
f. Solomon.....cxxvii.
g. Uncertain.....cxxviii–cxxx.
h. David.....cxxxi.
i. Uncertain.....cxxxii.
j. David.....cxxxiii.
k. Uncertain.....cxxxiv.
F. Miscellaneous—
a. Uncertain.....cxxxv–cxxxvii.
b. David.....cxxxviii–cxlv.
c. Uncertain.....cxlvi–cl.

VI. *Dates and Occasions of the Psalms.*—The dates of the Psalms, as must be obvious from what has been stated respecting the authors, are very various, ranging from the time of Moses to that of the captivity—a period of nearly 1000 years. In the time of king Jehoshaphat (about B.C. 896) Psa. lxxxiii, setting forth the dangers of the nation, as we read in 2 Chron. xx, 1–25, was composed either by himself, as some suppose, or most likely, according to the title, by Jahaziel, "a Levite of the sons of Asaph," who was then an inspired teacher (see ver. 14). In the days of Hezekiah, who was himself a poet (Isa. xxxviii, 9–20), we may date, with great probability, the Korahitic Psalms xlvi and xlviii, which seem to celebrate the deliverance from Sennacherib (2 Kings xix, 35). In the period of the captivity were evidently written such laments as Psa. xliv, lxxix, cii, and cxxxvii; and after its close, when the captives returned, we must manifestly date Psa. lxxxv and cxxvi.

Some have maintained that several psalms, especially lxxiv, were written even in the days of the Maccabees; but this is contrary to every probability, for, according to all accounts, the Canon had been closed before that time. See CANON. Moreover, the hypothesis of a Maccabæan authorship of any portion of the Psalter can ill be reconciled with the history of the translation of the Septuagint. But the difficulties do not end here. How—for we shall not here discuss the theories of Hitzig and his followers Lengerke and Justus Olshausen, who would represent the greater part of the Psalter as Maccabæan—how is it that the psalms which one would most naturally assign to the Maccabæan period meet us not in the close, but in the middle (i. e. in the second and third books) of the Psalter? The three named by De Wette (*Einl. in das A. T.* § 270) as bearing apparently a Maccabæan impress are Psa. xliv, lx, lxxiv; and, in fact, these, together with Psa. lxxix, are perhaps all that would, when taken alone, seriously suggest the hypothesis of a Maccabæan date. Whence, then, arise the early places in the Psalter which these occupy? But even in the case of these the internal evidence, when more narrowly examined, proves to be in favor of an earlier date. In the first place, the superscription of Psa. lx cannot possibly have been invented from the historical books, inasmuch as it disagrees with them in its details. Then the mention by name in that psalm of the Israelitish tribes, and of Moab and Philistia, is unsuited to the Maccabæan epoch. In Psa. xliv the complaint is made that the tree of the nation of Israel was no longer spreading over the territory that God had assigned it. Is it conceivable that a Maccabæan psalmist should have held this language without making the slightest allusion to the Babylonian captivity, as if the tree's growth were now first seriously impeded by the wild stocks around, notwithstanding that it had once been entirely transplanted, and that, though restored to its place, it had been weakly ever since? In Psa. lxxiv it is complained that "there is no more any prophet." Would that be a natural complaint at a time when Jewish prophecy had ceased for more than two centuries? Lastly, in Psa. lxxix, the mention of "kingdoms" in ver. 6 ill suits the Maccabæan time; while the way in which the psalm is cited by the author of the first book of Maccabees (vii, 16, 17), who omits those words which are foreign to his purpose, is such as would have hardly been adopted in reference to a contemporary composition.

The superscriptions, and the places which the psalms themselves severally occupy in the Psalter, are thus the two guiding clews by which, in conjunction with the internal evidence, their various *occasions* are to be determined. In the critical results obtained on these points by those scholars who have recognised and used these helps there is, not indeed uniformity, but at least a visible tendency towards it. The same cannot be said for the results of the judgments of those, of whatever school, who have neglected or rejected them; nor, indeed, is it easily to be imagined that internal evidence alone should suffice to assign 150 devotional hymns, even approximately, to their several epochs. The table on the following pages exhibits all that can with probability be ascertained on this head as to each psalm.

VII. *Canonicity and Use.*—The inspiration and canonical authority of the Psalms are established by the most abundant and convincing evidence. They never were, and never can be, rejected, except by impious impugners of all divine revelation. Not to mention other ancient testimonies [see CANON], we find complete evidence in the N. T., where the book is quoted or referred to as divine by Christ and his apostles *at least seventy times*. No other writing is so frequently cited, Isaiah, the next in the scale of quotation, being cited only about fifty-five times. Twice (Luke xx, 42 and Acts i, 20) we find distinct mention of the *Book of Psalms* (Βίβλος Ψαλμῶν). Once, however (Luke xxiv, 44), the name *Psalms* is used, not simply for this book, but for the Hagiographa, or the whole of the third division of the Hebrew Scriptures [see HAGIOGRAPHA], because in it the Psalms are the first and chief part, or possibly, as Hävernick suggests (*Einleitung*, § xiv, p. 78), because the division consists mainly of *poetry*. It deserves notice that in Heb. iv, 7, where the quotation is taken from the anonymous Psa. xcv, the book is indicated by *David*, most likely because he was the largest and most

eminent contributor, and also the patron and model of the other psalmists. For the same reasons many ancient and modern authors often speak of the book as the *Psalms of David* (Carpzov, *Introd.* ii, 98), without intending to ascribe all the productions to him.

In every age of the Church, the Psalms have been extolled for their excellence and their use for godly edifying (Carpzov, *l. c.* p. 109–116). Indeed, if Paul's estimate of ancient inspired Scripture (2 Tim. iii, 15–17) can be justly applied to any single book, that book must be the Psalms. Even in the N. T. there is scarcely a work of equal practical utility. Basil the Great and Chrysostom, in their homilies (see Suiceri *Thes. Eccles.* s. v. ψαλμός), expatiate most eloquently, and yet judiciously, on its excellence. The close of Basil's eulogy is to this effect: "In it is found a perfect theology (ἐνταῦθα ἔνι θεολογία τελεία): prophecy of Christ's sojourn in the flesh, threatening of judgment, hope of resurrection, fear of retribution, promises of glory, revelations of mysteries — all things are treasured in the book of Psalms, as in some great and common storehouse." Among the early Christians it was customary to learn the book by heart, that psalmody might enliven their social hours, and soften the fatigues and soothe the sorrows of life. They employed the Psalms, not only in their religious assemblies, of which use we find probable mention in 1 Cor. xiv, 26, but also at their meals and before retiring to rest, as Clement of Alexandria testifies: θυσία τῷ θεῷ ψαλμοὶ καὶ ὕμνοι παρὰ τὴν ἑστίασιν, πρό τε τῆς κοίτης. Of their use at meals we find an example also in the institution of the Lord's Supper (Matt. xxvi, 30). For their *modern* liturgical use, see PSALMODY; PSALTER.

VIII. *Classification.* — Various classifications of the Psalms have been proposed (Carpzov, *Introd.* ii, 132–134). Tholuck would divide them, according to the matter, into songs of *praise*, of *thanksgiving*, of *complaint*, and of *instruction*. De Wette suggests another method of sorting them

Psalm.	Occasion.	Scripture.
i.	Unknown. (Probably Davidic.)	
ii.	Nathan's promise to David	2 Sam. vii, 1–29.
iii.	David's flight from Absalom	2 Sam. xvii, 1–29.
iv.	The sack of Ziklag by the Amalekites	1 Sam. xxx, 1–6.
v.	David's traducers at the court of Saul	1 Sam. xviii, 5–13.
vi.	Unknown. (Probably Davidic.)	
vii.	David's sparing Saul a second time	1 Sam. xxvi, 1–25.
viii.	David's tending sheep by night	1 Sam. xvi, 1–13.
ix. x.	David's conquest of the neighboring tribes	2 Sam. viii, 1–5.
xi.	David's first flight from Saul's court	1 Sam. xix, 1–3.
xii.	Corruption at Saul's court	1 Sam. xviii, 14–30.
xiii.	David's retreat to Ziklag	1 Sam. xxvii, 1.
xiv.	Unknown. (Apparently Davidic.)	(Comp. Psa. liii.)
xv.	Second removal of the ark	2 Sam. vi, 17.
xvi.	Nathan's promise to David	2 Sam. vii, 1–29.
xvii.	Jonathan's covenant with David	1 Sam. xxiii, 14–18.
xviii.	David's final conquest of the Philistines	(Comp. 2 Sam. xxii, 1–51.)
xix.	Unknown. (Apparently Davidic.)	
xx.	David's conquest of the Syrians	2 Sam. x, 1–14.
xxi.	David's conquest of the Ammonites	2 Sam. xii, 26–31.
xxii.	David's escape from Saul by the aid of his wife	1 Sam. xix, 4–11.
xxiii.	David's first introduction to Saul	1 Sam. xviii, 1–4.
xxiv.	Second removal of the ark	2 Sam. vi, 17.
xxv.	David's retreat with Samuel	1 Sam. xix, 18–24.
xxvi.	Jonathan's secret visit to David	1 Sam. xx, 1–42.
xxvii.	David's flight from Absalom	2 Sam. xvii, 27–29.
xxviii.	Absalom's rebellion	2 Sam. xvii, 1–29.
xxix.	After the three years' drought	2 Sam. xxi, 1–14.
xxx.	Dedication of Araunah's threshing-floor	2 Sam. xxiv, 10–30.
xxxi.	David's escape from Keilah	1 Sam. xxiii, 1–13.
xxxii.	David's penitence after his adultery	2 Sam. xii, 15–23.
xxxiii.	Unknown. (Apparently Davidic.)	
xxxiv.	David's escape from Gath	1 Sam. xxi, 1–15.
xxxv.	David's retreat to En-gedi	1 Sam. xxiii, 14–29.
xxxvi.	Unknown. (Apparently Davidic.)	
xxxvii.	Unknown. (Probably latter part of David's life.)	
xxxviii. xxxix. xl.	David's sin with Bathsheba	2 Sam. xii, 1–15.
xli. xlii. xliii.	Absalom's rebellion	2 Sam. xvii, 1–29.
xliv.	Sennacherib's invasion	2 Kings xix, 1.
xlv.	Solomon's marriage	1 Kings iii, 1.
xlvi. xlvii. xlviii.	Jehoshaphat's victory	(2 Chron. xx, 14–19. 2 Chron. xx, 20–21. 2 Chron. xx, 22–28.
xlix.	Conclusion to Ecclesiastes.	
l.	Idolatry of Ahaz	2 Chron. xxviii, 1–19.
li.	David's adultery	2 Sam. xii, 15–23.
lii.	Doeg's massacre of the priests	1 Sam. xxii, 6–23.
liii.	Identical with Psa. xiv.	
liv.	David's escape in Maon	1 Sam. xxiii, 19–28.
lv.	Absalom's rebellion	2 Sam. xvii, 1–29.
lvi.	David's escape from Achish	1 Sam. xxi, 1–15.
lvii.	David's retreat to En-gedi	1 Sam. xxiv, 1–22.
lviii.	David's expulsion from court	1 Sam. xx, 1–42.
lix.	David's deliverance by Michal	1 Sam. xix, 12–18.
lx.	David's subjugation of Edom	2 Sam. viii, 1–5.
lxi. lxii. lxiii.	Probably during Absalom's rebellion. (Davidic.)	2 Sam. xv, 28.
lxiv.	David's retreat to Hareth	1 Sam. xxii, 5.
lxv.	Return of rain after three years' drought	2 Sam. xxi, 1–14.
lxvi.	Jehoshaphat's victory	2 Chron. xx, 29, 30.
lxvii.	Unknown. (Davidic.)	
lxviii.	First removal of the ark	1 Chron. xiii, 1–6.
lxix. lxx. lxxi.	Absalom's rebellion	(2 Sam. xvii, 1–29. Identical with Psa. xl, 13–17. 2 Sam. xvii, 1–29.
lxxii.	Solomon's coronation	1 Chron. xxix, 1–22.
lxxiii.	Sennacherib's invasion	2 Kings xix, 8–19.
lxxiv.	Jerusalem's fall	2 Kings xxv, 2–18.
lxxv. lxxvi.	Sennacherib's invasion	(2 Kings xix, 20–34. 2 Chron. xxxii, 21–23.
lxxvii.	Asa's victory	2 Chron. xiv, 9–15.
lxxviii.	First removal of the ark	2 Sam. vi, 3–5.
lxxix.	Jerusalem's fall	2 Kings xxv, 2–18.
lxxx.	Assyrian captivity	2 Kings xvii, 3–23.
lxxxi.	Hezekiah's reformation	2 Chron. xxx, 1–27.
lxxxii.	Jehoshaphat's reformation	2 Chron. xix, 4–11.
lxxxiii.	Jehoshaphat's victory	2 Chron. xx, 1–13.
lxxxiv.	Unknown. (Probably Absalom's rebellion.)	
lxxxv.	Cyrus's decree	2 Chron. xxxvi, 22, 23.
lxxxvi.	Unknown. (Davidic.)	
lxxxvii.	Sennacherib's invasion	2 Chron. xix, 2–7.
lxxxviii. lxxxix. xc.	During the captivity.	
xci.	The wandering in the desert	Numb. xiv, 1–45.
xcii. xciii.	Unknown. (Davidic.)	
xciv.	Jerusalem's fall	2 Kings xxv, 2–18.
xcv.	Unknown. (Davidic.)	
xcvi.	Second removal of the ark	(Comp. 1 Chron. xvi, 23–33.)

Psalm.	Occasion.	Scripture.
xcvii. xcviii.	Second removal of the ark	(1 Chron. xv, 25–28. (Psa. xcviii, 7–9, is identical with 1 Chron. xvi, 32, 33.)
xcix. c.	Dedication of Solomon's Temple	2 Chron. vi, 1–6. 2 Chron. vi, 7–10.
ci.	David's capture of Jerusalem	1 Sam. v, 9–12.
cii.	Daniel's prayer for the restoration	Dan. ix, 1–27.
ciii. civ.	Unknown. (Davidic.)	
cv. cvi.	Second removal of the ark	(Comp. 1 Chron. xvi, 8–22.) 1 Chron. xv, 1–24.
cvii.	Return from Babylon	Ezra iii, 8–13.
cviii.	Identical with Psa. lvii, 7–11; lx, 5–12.	
cix.	Doeg's murder of the priests	1 Sam. xxii, 6–23.
cx.	Nathan's promise to David	2 Sam. vii, 1–29.
cxi. cxii. cxiii. cxiv.	Completion of the second Temple	Ezra vii, 14–22.
cxv.	Dedication of Solomon's Temple	2 Chron. v, 1–14.
cxvi. cxvii.	Completion of the second Temple	Ezra vii, 14–22.
cxviii.	Ver. 1–4, 29. Dedication of Solomon's Temple. Ver. 5–28. David's capture of Jerusalem	2 Chron. v, 1–14. 2 Sam. v, 6–9.
cxix.	Ezra's completion of the Jewish canon.	
cxx.	David's marriage with Abigail	1 Sam. xv, 1–44.
cxxi.	Unknown. (Probably Davidic.)	
cxxii.	David's restoration after Absalom's rebellion	2 Sam. xix, 9, 10.
cxxiii.	During the captivity.	
cxxiv.	Unknown. (Probably Davidic.)	
cxxv.	Opposition of the Samaritans	Ezra iv, 1–5.
cxxvi.	Cyrus's decree	Ezra i, 1–4.
cxxvii. cxxviii.	Construction of Solomon's Temple	1 Kings vi, 11–14.
cxxix.	Opposition of the Samaritans	Ezra iv, 6–24.
cxxx.	During the exile.	
cxxxi.	David's submission to the pestilence	1 Chron. xxi, 6–30.
cxxxii.	Dedication of Solomon's Temple	2 Chron. vi, 1–11.
cxxxiii.	Unknown. (Probably Davidic.)	
cxxxiv. cxxxv. cxxxvi.	Dedication of Solomon's Temple. A var. of Psa. cxxxiv, cxxxvi, and cxv... Dedication of Solomon's Temple	1 Kings viii, 1–11.
cxxxvii.	Jerusalem's fall	Jer. lii, 5–27.
cxxxviii. cxxxix.	Unknown. (Probably Davidic.)	
cxl.	Doeg's slaughter of the priests	1 Sam. xxii, 6–23.
cxli. cxlii.	David's retreat to Adullam	1 Sam. xxii, 1, 2. 1 Chron. xi, 15–19.
cxliii.	Absalom's rebellion	2 Sam. xvii, 1–29.
cxliv.	Close of David's wars	2 Sam. xxii, 1–51.
cxlv.	David's charge to Solomon	1 Chron. xxii, 1–19.
cxlvi.	Building of the second Temple	Ezra vi, 1–13.
cxlvii. cxlviii. cxlix. cl.	Dedication of the second Temple	Neh. xii, 27–43.

(*Einleitung*, p. 3), somewhat as below. It is obvious, however, that no very accurate classification can be made, since many are of diversified contents and uncertain tenor. The following distribution will, perhaps, best comprise them in their general import.

1. *Hymns* in praise of Jehovah — *tehillim*, in the proper sense. These are directed to Jehovah, from various motives and views, e. g. as the Creator of the universe and Lord of all (Psa. viii, xix, lxv, xciii, civ, cxlv, cxlvii); as the Protector and Helper of Israel (Psa. xx, xxix, xxxiii, xlvi, xlvii, xlviii, lxvi, lxvii, lxxv, lxxvi, cxxxv, cxxxvi); or as the Helper of individuals, with thanksgiving for deliverance (Psa. xviii, xxx, xxxiv, xl, cxxxviii); while others refer to them or especial attributes of Jehovah (Psa. xc, cxxxix). These psalms contain the most sublime thoughts respecting God, nature, the government of the world, etc.; they also furnish the sources of many doctrinal ideas.

2. *Temple hymns*, sung at the consecration of the Temple, the entrance of the ark, or intended for the Temple service (Psa. xv, xxiv, lxviii, lxxxi, lxxxvii, cxxxii, cxxxiv, cxxxv). So also *pilgrim songs*, sung by those who came to worship at the temple, etc. See DEGREES.

3. *Religious and moral psalms* of a general character, containing the poetical expression of emotions and feelings, and therefore *subjective*, e. g. confidence in God (Psa. xxiii, xli, xliii, lxii, xci, cxxi, cxxv, cxxvii, cxxviii); longing for the worship of the sanctuary (Psa. xlii, xliii); and prayers for the forgiveness of sin (Psa. li). So, also, didactic songs relating to religion, or the expression of some truth or maxim (Psa. i, xv, xxxii, xxxiv, l, cxxviii, cxxxiii). This is a numerous class.

4. *Elegiac psalms*, containing *complaints* under affliction and the persecution of enemies, and prayers for succor. This class, which comprises more than a third of the whole collection, has several subdivisions: (1.) The lamentations or complaints of particular individuals (Psa. vii, xvii, xxii, li, lii, lv, lvi, cix). (2.) National lamentations, mostly in a religious point of view (Psa. xliv, lxxiv, lxxix, lxxx, cxxxvii). Some are both individual and national lamentations (Psa. lxix, lxxvii, cii). Most of these psalms are of a late date. (3.) General psalms of complaint, reflections on the wickedness of the world (Psa. x, xii, xiv, xxxvi). Didactic psalms, respecting the goodness of God, the condition of the pious and of the godless (Psa. xxxvii, xlix, lxiii, lxxiii).

5. *Psalms relating to the king*, patriotic hymns, etc. (Psa. xx, xxi, xlv, cx).

6. *National psalms*, containing allusions to the ancient history of the Hebrews and of the relation of the people to Jehovah (Psa. lxxviii, cv, cvi, cxiv).

The *Messianic psalms* ought properly to constitute another separate class (Psa. ii, xvi, xxii, xl, lxxii, cx). Many of the prophetic psalms are distributed among the other classes, while the few which cannot be brought under any of the above classes and divisions either constitute new ones by themselves or possess an intermediate character.

IX. *Literary Features.* — The book has been styled by some moderns *the anthology of Hebrew lyric poetry*, as if it consisted of a selection of the most admired productions of the sacred muse; but the name is not altogether appropriate, since several pieces of the highest poetic merit are, to our knowledge, not included — namely, the songs of Moses, in Exod. xv and Deut. xxxii; the song of Deborah, in Judg. v; the prayer of Hannah, in 1 Sam. ii, 1–10; and even David's lament over Saul and Jonathan, in 2 Sam. i, 18–27. To these may be added the song of Hezekiah, in Isa. xxxviii, 9–20, and the prayers of Habakkuk, in Hab. iii, and Jonah, in Jon. ii. The truth seems to be, as Ewald and Tholuck maintain, *that the collection was made not so much with reference to the beauty of the pieces as to their adaptation for devotional use in public worship.* This view sufficiently accounts for omitting most of the above pieces and many others as being either too individual or too secular in their application. It may account for not including the lament over Jonathan, and for the fact that only two of Solomon's compositions (Psa. lxxii and cxxvii) are professedly given, though "his songs were a thousand and five" (1 Kings iv, 32, 33). His themes were secular, and therefore not suitable for this collection.

All the best judges, as Lowth, Herder, De Wette,

Ewald, Tholuck, and others, pronounce the poetry of the Psalms to be of the *lyric* order. "They are," says De Wette (*Einleitung in die Psalmen*, p. 2), "lyric in the proper sense; for among the Hebrews, as among the ancients generally, poetry, singing, and music were united, and the inscriptions to most of the Psalms determine their connection with music, though in a way not always intelligible to us. Also, as works of taste, these compositions deserve to be called lyric. The essence of lyric poetry is the immediate expression of feeling, and feeling is the sphere in which most of the Psalms move. Pain, grief, fear, hope, joy, trust, gratitude, submission to God—everything that moves and elevates the heart is expressed in these songs. Most of them are the lively effusions of the excited, susceptible heart, the fresh offspring of inspiration and elevation of thought; while only a few are spiritless imitations and compilations, or unpoetic forms of prayer, temple hymns, and collections of proverbs." For fuller information on this subject, see POETRY.

X. *Prophetic and Messianic Significance.*—The moral struggle between godliness and ungodliness, so vividly depicted in the Psalms, culminates, in Holy Scripture, in the life of the Incarnate Son of God upon earth. It only remains to show that the Psalms themselves definitely anticipated this culmination. Now, there are in the Psalter at least three psalms of which the interest evidently centres in a person distinct from the speaker, and which, since they cannot, without violence to the language, be interpreted of any but the Messiah, may be termed directly and exclusively Messianic. We refer to Psa. ii, xlv, cx, to which may, perhaps, be added Psa. lxxii.

It would be strange if these few psalms stood, in their prophetical significance, absolutely alone among the rest; the more so inasmuch as Psa. ii forms part of the preface to the first book of the Psalter, and would, as such, be entirely out of place, did not its general theme virtually extend itself over those that follow, in which the interest generally centres in the figure of the suppliant or worshipper himself. Hence the impossibility of viewing the psalms generally, notwithstanding the historical drapery in which they are outwardly clothed, as simply the past devotions of the historical David or the historical Israel. Other arguments to the same effect are furnished by the idealized representations which many of them present: by the outward points of contact between their language and the actual earthly career of our Saviour; by the frequent references made to them both by our Saviour himself and by the Evangelists; and by the view taken of them by the Jews, as evinced in several passages of the Targum. There is yet another circumstance well worthy of note in its bearing upon this subject. Alike in the earlier and in the later portions of the Psalter, all those psalms which are of a personal rather than of a national character are marked in the superscriptions with the name of David. It results from this that, while the Davidic psalms are partly personal, partly national, the Levitical psalms are uniformly national. Exceptions to this rule exist only in appearance: thus Psa. lxxiii, although couched in the first person singular, is really a prayer of the Jewish faithful against the Assyrian invaders; and in Psa. xlii, xliii, it is the feelings of an exiled company rather than of a single individual to which utterance is given. It thus follows that it was only those psalmists who were types of Christ by external office and lineage as well as by inward piety that were charged by the Holy Spirit to set forth beforehand, in Christ's own name and person, the sufferings that awaited him and the glory that should follow. The national hymns of Israel are, indeed, also prospective; but in general they anticipate rather the struggles and the triumphs of the Christian Church than those of Christ himself.

We annex a list of the chief passages in the Psalms which are in anywise quoted or embodied in the N. T., showing more or less clearly this anticipative character: Psa. ii, 1, 2, 7, 8, 9; iv, 4; v, 9; vi, 3, 8; viii, 2, 4–6; x, 7; xiv, 1–3; xvi, 8–11; xviii, 4, 49; xix, 4; xxii, 1, 8, 18, 22; xxiii, 6; xxiv, 1; xxxi, 5; xxxii, 1, 2; xxxiv, 8, 12–16, 20; xxxv, 9; xxxvi, 1; xxxvii, 11; xl, 6–8; xli, 9; xliv, 22; xlv, 6, 7; xlviii, 2; li, 4; lv, 22; lxviii, 18; lxix, 4, 9, 22, 23, 25; lxxv, 8; lxxviii, 2, 24; lxxxii, 6; lxxxvi, 9; lxxxix, 20; xc, 4; xci, 11, 12; xcii, 7; xciv, 11; xcv, 7–11; cii, 25–27; civ, 4; cix, 8; cx, 1, 4; cxii, 9; cxvi, 10; cxvii, 1; cxviii, 6, 22, 23, 25, 26; cxxv, 5; cxl, 3. See QUOTATIONS.

XI. *Moral Characteristics of the Psalms.*—The great doctrines and precepts embodied in the Psalms—what views they give of God and his government, of man and his sinfulness, of piety and morals, of a future state, and of the Messiah—are most ably set forth by Tholuck in his *Einleitung*, § 4.

Foremost among these meets us, undoubtedly, the universal recourse to communion with God. "My voice is unto God, and I will cry" (Psa. lxxvii, 1), might well stand as a motto to the whole of the Psalter; for, whether immersed in the depths, or blessed with greatness and comfort on every side, it is to God that the psalmist's voice seems ever to soar spontaneously aloft. Alike in the welcome of present deliverance or in the contemplation of past mercies, he addresses himself straight to God as the object of his praise. Alike in the persecutions of his enemies and in the desertions of his friends, in wretchedness of body and in the agonies of inward repentance, in the moment of impending danger and in the hour of apparent despair, it is direct to God that he utters forth his supplications. Despair, we say; for such, as far as the description goes, is the psalmist's state in Psa. lxxxviii. But meanwhile he is praying: the apparent impossibility of deliverance cannot restrain his Godward voice; and so the very force of communion with God carries him, almost unawares to himself, through the trial.

Connected with this is the faith by which he everywhere lives in God rather than in himself. God's mercies, God's greatness, form the sphere in which his thoughts are ever moving. Even when, through excess of affliction, reason is rendered powerless, the naked contemplation of God's wonders of old forms his effectual support (Psa. lxxvii).

It is of the essence of such faith that the psalmist's view of the perfections of God should be true and vivid. The Psalter describes God as he is; it glows with testimonies to his power and providence, his love and faithfulness, his holiness and righteousness. Correspondingly it testifies against every form of idol which men would substitute in the living God's place, whether it be the outward image, the work of men's hands (Psa. cxv), or whether it be the inward vanity of earthly comfort or prosperity, to be purchased at the cost of the honor which cometh from God alone (Psa. iv). The solemn "See that there is no idol-way (דֶּרֶךְ עֹצֶב) in me" of Psa. cxxxix—the striving of the heart after the very truth, and naught besides—is the exact anticipation of the "Little children, keep yourselves from idols" of the loved apostle in the N. T.

The Psalms not only set forth the perfections of God; they proclaim also the duty of worshipping him by the acknowledgment and adoration of his perfections. They encourage all outward rites and means of worship: new songs, use of musical instruments of all kinds, appearance in God's courts, lifting-up of hands, prostration at his footstool, holy apparel (A. V. "beauty of holiness"). Among these they recognise the ordinance of sacrifice (Psa. iv, v, xxvii, li) as an expression of the worshipper's consecration of himself to God's service. But not the less do they repudiate the outward rite when separated from that which it was designed to express (Psa. xl, lxix): a broken and contrite heart is, from erring man, the genuine sacrifice which God requires (Psa. li).

Similar depth is observable in the view taken by the

psalmists of human sin. It is to be traced not only in its outward manifestations, but also in the inward workings of the heart (Psa. xxxvi), and is to be primarily ascribed to man's innate corruption (Psa. li, lviii). It shows itself alike in deeds, in words (Psa. xvii, cxli), and in thoughts (Psa. cxxxix); nor is even the believer able to discern all its various ramifications (Psa. xix). Connected with this view of sin is, on the one hand, the picture of the utter corruption of the ungodly world (Psa. xiv); on the other, the encouragement to genuine repentance, the assurance of divine forgiveness (Psa. xxxii), and the trust in God as the source of complete redemption (Psa. cxxx).

With regard to the law, the psalmist, while warmly acknowledging its excellence, feels yet that it cannot so effectually guide his own unassisted exertions as to preserve him from error (Psa. xix). He needs an additional grace from above, the grace of God's Holy Spirit (Psa. li). But God's Spirit is also a free spirit (*ibid.*); led by this, he will discern the law, with all its precepts, to be no arbitrary rule of bondage, but rather a charter and instrument of liberty (Psa. cxix).

The Psalms bear repeated testimony to the duty of instructing others in the ways of holiness (Psa. xxxii, xxxiv, li). They also indirectly enforce the duty of love, even to our enemies (Psa. vii, 4; xxxv, 13; cix, 4). On the other hand, they denounce, in the strongest terms, the judgments of God on transgressors. We here particularly notice what are called the *vindictive* psalms — namely, those which contain expressions of wrath and imprecations against the enemies of God and his people, such as Psa. lix, lxix, lxxix, and which, in consequence, are apt to shock the feelings of some Christian readers. In order to obviate this offence, most of our pious commentators insist that the expressions are not maledictions or imprecations, but simple declarations of what will or may take place. But this is utterly inadmissible; for in several of the most startling passages the language in the original is plainly imperative, and not indicative (see Psa. lix, 14; lxix, 25, 28; lxxix, 6). The truth is that only a morbid benevolence, a mistaken philanthropy, takes offence at these psalms; for in reality they are not opposed to the spirit of the Gospel, or to that love of enemies which Christ enjoined. Resentment against evil-doers is so far from being sinful that we find it exemplified in the meek and spotless Redeemer himself (see Mark iii, 5). If the emotion and its utterance were essentially sinful, how could Paul (1 Cor. xvi, 22) wish the enemy of Christ to be accursed (*ἀνάθεμα*), or say of his own enemy, Alexander the coppersmith, "The Lord reward him according to his works" (2 Tim. iv, 14); and, especially, how could the spirits of the just in heaven call on God for vengeance? (Rev. vi, 10.) See a good article on this subject ("The Imprecations in the Scriptures") in the American *Bibliotheca Sacra* for February, 1844. Such imprecations in the Psalms, however, are usually levelled at transgressors as a body, and are uniformly uttered on the hypothesis of their wilful persistence in evil, in which case the overthrow of the sinner becomes a necessary part of the uprooting of sin. They are in nowise inconsistent with any efforts to lead sinners, individually, to repentance. See IMPRECATION.

This brings us to notice the faith of the psalmists in a righteous recompense to all men according to their deeds (Psa. xxxvii, etc.). They generally expected that men would receive such recompense, in great measure, during their own lifetime. Yet they felt withal that it was not then complete; it perpetuated itself to their children (Psa. xxxvii, 25; cix, 12, etc.); and thus we find set forth in the Psalms, with sufficient distinctness, though in an unmatured, and consequently imperfect, form, the doctrine of a retribution after death.

XII. *Commentaries.*—The following are the special exegetical helps on the whole book; we designate a few of the most important by an asterisk, and we omit many that are merely practical, homiletical, and liturgical: Origen, *Selecta* (in *Opp.* ii, 510); also *Scholia* (in Galland's *Bibl. Patr.* vol. xiv); Eusebius, *Commentarii* (Gr. and Lat. in Montfaucon's *Collectio Nova*, vol. i); Athanasius, *Expositiones;* also *Interpretatio*, etc. (all in *Opp.* vol. i and iii); Apollinarius, *Metaphrasis* (Lat. and Gr. in Galland, v, 359); Gregory Nyssen. *Inscriptiones* (in *Opp.* i, 257); Jerome, *Emendatio* and *De Virtute* (in *Opp.* [*Suppos.*], vol. xi); also *Breviarium* [spurious] (*ibid.* append.); Augustine, *Enarrationes* (in *Opp.;* transl. *Expositions*, Oxf. 1847, 6 vols. 8vo); Hilarius, *Commentarii* (in *Opp.* vol. i); Chrysostom, *Expositio* (in *Opp.* vol. v); Theodoret, *Commentarii* (Gr. and Lat. Padua, 1565, 4to; Halle, 1768, 8vo; also in *Opp.* vol. ii); Gregory Turonensis, *Commentarii* (in *Opp.* p. 1257); Arnobius, *Commentarium* (in *Bibl. Max. Patr.* vol. viii); Cassiodorus, *Expositio* (in *Opp.* vol. ii); Isidore, *Prologus* (in Mai's *Script. Vet.* vol. iii); Albert, *Commentarii* (in *Opp.* vol. vii); Bede, *Commentaria* (in *Opp.* vol. viii); Remigius, *Enarratio* (in *Bibl. Max. Patr.* vol. xvi); Bruno Herbip. *Expositio* (*ibid.* vol. xviii); Bruno Astensis, *Psalterium* (in *Opp.* vol. i); Rupert, *In Psalmos* (in *Opp.* vol. i); Euthymius Zigabenus, *Commentarii* (Gr. and Lat. in *Bibl. Max. Patr.* vol. xix; also Gr. Ven. 1530, fol.; Lat. Verona, 1530, fol.; Par. 1545, 4to; 1560, 8vo); Hugo à St. Vict. *Annotationes* (in *Opp.* vol. i); Gerhohus, *Commentarius* (in Pez, *Thesaur.* vol. v); Oddo, *Expositio* (in *Bibl. Max. Patr.* vol. xx); Bonaventura, *Expositio* (in *Opp.* vol. i); Kimchi, פֵּרוּשׁ (first published separately, s. l. 1477, 4to, and often later in various forms; Lat. ed. Janvier, Par. 1666, 4to; in English by M'Caul, Lond. 1850. 12mo); Turrecremata, *Expositio* (Rom. 1470, 4to, and later in various forms); Parez [Rom. Cath.], *Commentarius* (Valenc. 1493, fol., and often later elsewhere); Pelbart [Rom. Cath.], *Commentarius* (Hag. 1504, 1513, fol.); Ludolphus, *Expositio* (Par. 1506, fol.); Felix Pratensis, *Notæ* (Ven. 1515, 8vo; Hag. 1522, 4to; Basil. 1526, 16mo); Arnobius, *Commentarius* (Roterd. 1522, 4to); Bugenhagen, *Adnotationes* (Argent. 1524, 4to, and often later elsewhere in various forms); Ayguanus [Rom. Cath.], *Commentaria* (Complut. 1524, 2 vols. fol., and often later in various forms); Cajetan [Rom. Cath.], *Enarratio* (Ven. 1525; Par. 1532, 1540, fol.); Bucer, *Commentarii* (Argent. 1526, fol., and often; also in French, Geneva, 1555, 8vo); Titelmann [Rom. Cath.], *Elucidationes* (Antw. 1531, fol., and often later and elsewhere in various forms); Campensis [Rom. Cath.], *Interpretatio* [with Eccles.] (Par. 1534, 4to, and often later in various forms and at various places; also in French and English); Parmensis [Rom. Cath.], *Interpretatio* (Ven. 1537, 1559, 4to); Flaminius, *Explanatio* (Ven. 1545, fol.; ed. Wald, Hal. 1785, 8vo); Athias, פֵּרוּשׁ תְּהִלִּים [from Rashi, Kimchi, etc.] (Ven. 1549, fol.); Foleng [Rom. Cath.], *Commentaria* (Basil. 1549, 1557; Rom. 1585; Colon. 1594, fol.); Musculus, *Commentarius* (Basil. 1550, and often, fol.); Æpinus, *Enarrationes* (Francf. 1555–56, 2 vols. 8vo); *Calvin, *Commentarius* (Genev. 1557 and often, fol.; also in French, ibid. 1561 and often, fol.; in English, Lond. 1571, 2 vols. 4to; Oxf. 1840, 3 vols. 8vo; Edinb. 1845–49, 5 vols. 8vo); Vairlenius [Rom. Cath.], *Commentarius* (Lov. 1557, 3 vols. fol.); Marloratus, *Expositio* (Par. 1562 and often, fol.); Draconis, *Psalterium* (Vitemb. 1563, fol.); Forerius [Rom. Cath.], *Commentarius* (Ven. 1563, fol.); Strigel, *Hypomnemata* (Lips. 1563, fol. and 8vo; Neost. 1574, 8vo); Selnecker, *Auslegung* (Norib. 1566 and often, fol.); Del Pozo [Rom. Cath.], *Elucidationes* (Complut. 1567, fol.); Shoeib, נוֹרָא תְּהִלִּים (Salonica, 1569, 4to); Jansen [Rom. Cath.], *Paraphrasis* (Lov. 1569, 4to; Lugd. 1577, 1586, fol.); Jaabez, פֵּרוּשׁ (Salonica, 1571, 4to); Moller, *Commentarius* (Viteb. 1573, 8vo, and often in various forms); Genebrard [Rom. Cath.], *Commentarii* (Par. 1577, 8vo; and often later and elsewhere in various forms); Heshusius, *Commentarius* (Helmst. 1586, fol.); Arama, מְאִיר תְּהִלּוֹת (Ven. 1590, 4to; Germ. ed. by Bathysen,

Hanau, 1712, 12mo); Fischer, *Auslegung* (Ulz. 1590; Leips. 1601, fol.); Mencel, *Auslegung* (Leips. 1594, 1605, fol.); Palanther [Rom. Cath.], *Commentarius* (Brix. 1600; Ven. 1617, 4to); Dosma [Rom. Cath.], *Expositio* [includ. Cant.] (Madr. 1601, 4to); Nicholson, *Analysis* [Engl.] (Lond. 1602, fol.); Alscheich, רוממות אל (Ven. 1605, 4to; Amst. 1695, 4to; Jesnitz, 1721, fol.; Zolkiew, 1764, fol.); Gesner, *Commentationes* (Vitemb. 1605, 1609, 1629, 1665. fol.); Agelli [Rom. Cath.], *Commentarius* (Rom. 1606; Colon. 1607; Par. 1611 fol.); Bellarmine [Rom. Cath.], *Explanatio* (Rom. 1611, 4to, and often later elsewhere); Achselrad, בֶּן־הָעֵת (Hanau, 1616, 4to); Witweler [Rom. Cath.], *Commentarius* (Constance, 1617, 3 vols. 4to; in Germ., Cologne, 1643, 3 vols. 4to); Lorinus [Rom. Cath.], *Commentarii* (Lugd. 1617, 3 vols. fol., and often later); Cramer, *Auslegungen* (Gies. 1618, 4to); Top, *Commentarius* (Lond. 1619, fol.); Coppen, *Notæ* (Heidelb. 1619; Hanov. 1657, 4to); Schnepf, *Commentarius* (Lips. 1619, 1628, 1635, fol.); Dupin, *Notæ* (Par. 1691, 8vo); Ainsworth, *Annotations* [with Pent. and Cant.] (Lond. 1627, 1639, fol.; in Dutch, Leon. 1690, fol.); Crommius [Rom. Cath.], *Expositio* (Lov. 1628, 4to; Antw. 1652, 8vo); Pulsictius [Rom. Cath.], *Expositiones* (Ven. 1628, 4to); Marotte, [Rom. Cath.], *Commentarius* [includ. other passages] (Par. 1630, fol.); Wilcox, *Exposition* (in *Works*); Boys, *Exposition* (in *Works*); Borghesius [Rom. Cath.], *Commentaria* (Duaci, 1634, 1637, 8vo); Ginnasius [Rom. Cath.], *Interpretationes* (Rom. 1636, 2 vols. fol.); Viccaro, *Commentarius* [rabbinical] (Lond. 1639, 1655, fol.); Bohl, *Auflösung* (Rost. 1639, 12mo; 1709, 8vo); Maldonatus [Rom. Cath.], *Commentarii* [includ. other books] (Par. 1643, fol.); Gerschau, *Interpretatio* [ancient texts] (Rost. 1643, fol.); Dickson, *Explication* (Lond. 1645, 3 vols. 8vo; 1659, fol.; Glasg. 1834, 2 vols. 12mo); Ford, *Expositio* (Lond. 1646, 4to); Hulsius, *Annotationes* (Lugd. 1650, 4to); Bythner, *Lyre* [grammatical] (Lond. 1650, 4to, and often since in various forms); Mercado, פֵּרוּשׁ [includ. Eccles.] (Amst. 1653, 4to); Heser [Rom. Cath.], *Explanatio* (Ingolst. 1654, 8vo; enlarged, Monach. 1673, 2 vols. fol.); Leigh, *Annotations* [includ. other books] (Lond. 1657, fol.); Hammond, *Annotations* (ibid. 1659, fol.; also in *Works*, vol. iv); Price, *Adnotationes* (in *Critici Sacri*, vol. iii, ibid. 1660, fol.); Cocceius, *Commentarius* (L. B. 1660, fol.); Wright, *Expositio* (Lond. 1662, fol.); Amyraut, *Paraphrasis* (Salmur. 1662; Traj. 1762, 4to); Bake, *Commentarius* (Francf. 1665, 1683, fol.); Le Blanc [Rom. Cath.], *Commentarius* (Lugd. 1665–77; Colon. 1680–97, 6 vols. fol.); La Palisse [Rom. Cath.], *Expositio* (Toulouse, 1666, 2 vols. fol.); Geier, *Commentarius* (Dresd. 1668, 2 vols. 4to, and later); Heser, *Commentarius* (Monach. 1673, 2 vols. fol.); Bull, *Commentary* (Lond. 1675, 4to); Dauderstadt, *Labores* (Lips. 1679, fol.); Hamer, *Verklaaringe* (Roterd. 1681, 4to); Ferrand [Rom. Cath.], *Adnotationes* (Par. 1683, 4to); Groenwegen, *Verklaaringe* (Ench. 1687, 4to); Molderson, *Conciones* (Antw. 1691, 8vo); Baxter, *Paraphrase* (Lond. 1692, 8vo); Van Til, *Psalmen* (Dort, 1693 and later, 4to; in Germ., Cassel, 1697 and later, 4to); Clutterbuck, *Explanation* (Lond. 1702, 8vo); Frisch, *Harfe* (Stuttg. 1703, 8vo, and often later); Kortum, *Anmerkungen* (Frankf. 1706, 4to); J. Johnson, *Notes* (Lond. 1707, 8vo); De Carrières [Rom. Cath.], *Commentaire* (Par. 1709, 12mo); Arnold, *Betrachtungen* (Cassel, 1713, 8vo); Allix, *Argument* (Lond. 1717, 8vo); P. L. D. G. [Rom. Cath.], *Réflexions* (Par. 1717, 2 vols. 12mo); Petersen, *Aufschliessung* (Francf. 1719, 4to); H. Michaelis, *Adnotationes* (Hal. 1720, 4to); Du Hamel [Rom. Cath.], *Adnotationes* (Rothom. 1701, 12mo); Chasan, חוזה דוד (Amst. 1724, 4to); Zeibich, *Anmerk.* (Eilenb. 1724, 8vo); Merkerlibich, תהלים [from Kimchi] (Sulzb. 1728, 4to); Irhoven, *In Titulos* (Lugd. 1728, 4to); Francke, *Erklärung* (Hal. 1730–31, 2 vols. 4to); Zeysch, *Einleitung* (Leips. 1732, 8vo); Quesnel, *Réflexions* (Par. 1736, 3 vols. 12mo); Franke, *Notæ* (Hal. 1738, 1827, 8vo); A. Johnston, *Notæ* (Lond. 1741, 8vo); Foinard, *Traduction* (Par. 1742, 12mo); Mudge, *Version* (Lond. 1744, 4to); Van Bashuysen, *Notæ* (ed. Meintell, Suab. 1744, 8vo); Oetinger, *Einleitung* (Essling. 1748, 8vo); Marini, *Annotationes* (Bonon. 1748–50, 2 vols. 4to); Edwards, *Notes* (Lond. 1755, 1850, 8vo); Fenwick, *Notes* (ibid. 1759, 8vo); Burk, *Gnomon* (Stuttg. 1760, 2 vols. 4to); Green, *Notes* (Cambr. 1762, 8vo); Venema, *Commentarius* (Leov. 1762–67, 6 vols. 4to); Vatablus, *Annotationes* (ed. Grotius and Vogel, Hal. 1767, 8vo); Vogel, *Inscriptiones* (ibid. 1767, 4to); Merrick, *Annotations* (Reading, 1768, 4to); Resch, *Hypomnema* (Prag. 1769–77, 3 vols. 8vo); Serranus, *Metaphrasis* (ed. Okely, Gr. and Lat. Lond. 1770, 8vo); Horne, *Commentary* (Oxf. 1771, 2 vols. 4to, and often since in various forms); Zachariä, *Erklärung* (Gött. 1773, 8vo); Knapp, *Anmerk.* (Hal. 1773, 1789, 8vo); Masillon, *Paraphrase* [French] (Par. 1776, 2 vols. 12mo); Moldenhauer, *Erklär.* (Quedlinb. 1777, 4to); Struensee, *Uebers.* [with Prov.] (Hal. 1783, 8vo); Mendelssohn [Jewish], *Uebers.* (Berl. 1783, 1785, 8vo); Seiler, *Uebers.* (Erl. 1784, 1788, 8vo); Thenius, *Erläut.* (Dresd. 1785, 8vo); Berthier, *Réflexions* (Par. 1785, 8 vols. 8vo); Dathe, *Notæ* (Hal. 1787, 1792, 8vo); Boaretti, *Volgarizzamento* (Ven. 1788, 2 vols. 8vo); Cole, *Key* (Cambr. 1788, 8vo); Varisco, *Annotazioni* (Milan, 1788, 8vo); Löwe, באור (Berl. 1788, 8vo, and often); Briegleb, *Uebers.* (Amst. 1789–93, 5 vols. 8vo); Street, *Notes* (Lond. 1790, 2 vols. 8vo); Paulus, *Clavis* (Jen. 1791; Heidelb. 1815, 8vo); Dimock, *Notes* (Lond. 1791, 4to); Muntinghe, *Vertauld.* (Leyd. 1791–92, 2 vols. 8vo; in Germ. by Schöll, Halle, 1792 sq., 3 vols. 8vo); Wetzel, *Animadversiones* (Francf. 1792, 4to); Meïr, פרוש (ed. Satanow, Berl. 1794); Vien. 1816, 8vo; Travell, *Paraphrase* (Gloucester, 1794, 8vo); Redding, *Observationes* (Franec. 1796, 8vo); Jacobi, *Anmerk.* (Jena, 1796, 2 vols. 8vo); Hezel, *Uebers.* (Altenb. 1797, 8vo); Kühnöl, *Anmerk.* (Leips. 1799, 8vo); Asulai, יוסף תהלות (Leghorn, 1801, 4to); Kelle, *Auflösung* (Meissen, 1801, 8vo); Berlin, *Notæ* (Upsal. 1805, 8vo); Geddes, *Notes* (Lond. 1807, 8vo); Pinchas, מדרש חכמים (Minsk, 1809, 4to); Anon. *Explications* [French] (Par. 1809, 3 vols. 8vo); Agier, *Notes* [French] (ibid. 1809, 2 vols. 8vo); *De Wette, *Commentar* (Heidelb. 1811, 1823, 1829, 1836, 1850, 1856, 8vo); Stuhlmann, *Erläut.* (Hamb. 1812, 8vo); Schärer, *Anmerk.* (Berne, 1812, 1852, 8vo); Hacker, *Erklärung* (Leips. 1813, 8vo); Stolz, *Auslegung* (Zür. 1814, 8vo); Reinhard, *Erläut.* (Leips. 1814, 8vo); Horsley, *Notes* [on a part only] (Lond, 1815, 1820, 1833, 1848, 8vo); Goode, *Version* (ibid. 1816, 8vo); Sheriffe, *Reflections* (ibid. 1821, 2 vols. 12mo); Ewart, *Lectures* (ibid. 1822–26, 2 vols. 8vo); Mant, *Notes* (Oxf. 1824, 8vo); Boys, *Key* (Lond. 1825, 8vo); Parkhurst, *Translation* (ibid. 1825, 8vo); Anon. *Paraphrasis* (Argent. 1826, 2 vols. 8vo); Anon. *Illustration* (York, 1826, 2 vols. 12mo); Kaiser, *Erklär.* (Nürnb. 1827, 8vo); Goldwitzer, *Uebers.* (Sulzb. 1827, 8vo); Warner, *Illustrations* (Lond. 1828, 8vo); Gower, *Explanation* (ibid. 1831, 12mo); Clauss, *Beiträge* (Berl. 1831, 8vo); Noyes, *Translation* (Bost. 1831, 1833, 1837, 12mo); Slade, *Explanation* (Lond. 1832, 12mo); Morison, *Exposition* (ibid. 1832, 3 vols. 8vo); Rogers, *Arrangement* (Oxf. 1833, 2 vols. 12mo); French and Skinner, *Notes* (Lond. 1833, 1842, 8vo); Keil, *Auslegung* [on sixty psalms] (Leips. 1834–35, 2 vols. 8vo); Carpenter, *Reflections* (Lond. 1835, 1841, 18mo); Sachs, *Erläut.* (Berl. 1835, 8vo); *Hitzig, *Commentar* (Heidelb. 1835–37, 2 vols. 8vo); Fry, *Exposition* (Lond. 1836, 1842, 8vo); Stier, *Auslegung* [on seventy psalms] (Halle, 1836, 8vo); Walford, *Notes* (Lond. 1837, 8vo); Köster, *Anmerk.* (Königsb. 1837, 8vo); Krahmer, *Erklärung* (Leips. 1837–38, 2 vols. 8vo); Dargand, *Traduction* (Par. 1838, 8vo); Bush, *Commentary* (N. Y. 1838, 8vo); *Ewald, *Erklärung* (Gött. 1839, 1840, 1866, 8vo); Keble, *Metrical Version* (Oxf. 1839, 8vo); Reisenthal, *Versio* (Berl. 1840, 8vo); Wiener, *De Indole* (Erlang. 1840, 8vo); Tucker,

Notes (Lond. 1840, 12mo); Biesenthal, *Commentar* (Berl. 1841, 8vo); Anon. *Commentar* (ibid. 1842, 8vo); Deutsch, *Commentar* (Leips. 1842, 8vo); *Hengstenberg, *Commentar* (Berl. 1842–47, 1849–54; in Engl., Edinb. 1846–48, 3 vols. 8vo); Tholuck, *Auslegung* (Halle, 1843, 8vo; transl. by Mombert, Lond. 1856; N. Y. 1858, 8vo); Cresswell, *Notes* (Lond. 1843, 12mo); Cumming, *Paraphrase* (ibid. 1843, 12mo); *Vaihinger, *Erklärung* (Leips. 1845, 2 vols. 8vo); *Phillips, *Commentary* (Lond. 1846, 2 vols. 8vo); Jones, *Reflections* (ibid. 1846, 12mo); Jebb, *Translation* (ibid. 1846, 2 vols. 8vo); Lengerke, *Auslegung* (Leips. 1847, 2 vols. 8vo); Clowes, *Translation* (Lond. 1849, 8vo); Pridham, *Notes* (ibid. 1852, 12mo); Weiss, *Exposition* (Edinb. 1852, 8vo); Olshausen, *Erklärung* (Leips. 1853, 8vo); Ryland, *Commentary* (Lond. 1853, 12mo); *Alexander, *Notes* (N. Y. 1853–56, 3 vols. 12mo); Good, *Notes* (Lond. 1854, 8vo); *Hupfeld, *Auslegung* (Gotha, 1855-62, 1867-69, 4 vols. 8vo); Schegg, *Erklärung* (Mün. 1856, 8vo); Hawkins, *Notes* (Lond. 1857, 12mo); Rokach, פרוש (Leghorn, 1858, 8vo); Rendu, *Notes* [French] (Par. 1858, 8vo); Claude, *Notes* [French] (ibid. 1858, 8vo); Bonar, *Commentary* (Lond. 1859, 8vo); *Delitzsch, *Commentar* (Leips. 1859–60, 2 vols. 8vo; rewritten in the Commentary of Keil and Delitzsch); *Thrupp, *Introduction* (Lond. 1860, 2 vols. 8vo); Wilson, *Exposition* (ibid. 1860, 2 vols. 8vo); De Burgh, *Commentary* (Dubl. 1860, 8vo); Neale, *Commentary* [from primitive and mediæval sources] (Lond. 1860–71, 3 vols. 8vo); Hammer, *Erläut.* (Leips. 1861, 8vo); *Perowne, *Notes* (Lond. 1864–66, 1868–70, 2 vols. 8vo); Kay, *Notes* (Oxf. 1864, 8vo); Monrad, *Oversatt.* (Copenh. 1865, 8vo); Kurtz, *Zur Theologie* (Leips. 1865, 8vo); Plumer, *Studies* (Lond. 1867, 8vo); Barnes, *Notes* (N. Y. 1869, 3 vols. 8vo); Spurgeon, *Exposition* (Lond. 1870–72, 3 vols. 8vo); Linton, *Explanation* (ibid. 1871, 8vo); Burton, *Paraphrase* (ibid. 1871, 8vo); Conant, *Version* (N. Y. 1871, 4to); Cowles, *Notes* (ibid. 1872, 12mo); *Murphy, *Commentary* (Lond. 1875, 8vo); M'Lean, *Expositions* (ibid. 1875, 8vo); Heiligstedt, *Auslegung* (vol. i, Halle, 1876, 8vo). See Old Testament.

Psalter. This word is often used by ancient writers for the book of Psalms, considered as a separate book of Holy Scripture. It obtained among later Church writers a more technical meaning as the book in which the Psalms are arranged for the service of the Church. The Roman Catholic Psalter, for instance, does not follow the Scriptural order of the Psalms, but arranges them for the various services in a different manner. In the English Psalter, as it exists in the Book of Common Prayer, the Psalms are arranged in such a way as to give a reading for every day in the month, and there are also special selections to be used in the discretion of the minister. The translation is not that of the King James Version (i. e. our common Bible), but the earlier version of Cranmer's Bible, which accounts for the difference between the Psalms of the Prayer-book and those of the ordinary version of the Bible. The use of the Psalter as a system of psalmody seems to have been borrowed from the synagogue. The Psalter was always a favorite book, and one which obtained a most extensive use both in private and public. It was regarded as an epitome of the Bible, and as especially adapted to the use of youth and the people at large. The clergy were required to commit this book to memory. In later times, when the Bible as a whole was denied to the people, the Latin Psalter was left in their hands; and at the time of the Reformation the penitential psalms were in the hands and mouths of the people.

Sometimes the book, for the sake of convenience, was divided into five portions, to correspond with the Pentateuch; and again the Psalms were arranged in different classes according to their character, as hallelujah, baptismal, penitential, burial psalms, etc. In the time of St. Augustine and St. Chrysostom the burial psalms were xxiii, xlii, xliii, lix, ci; in the Roman Church they are xxiii, xxv, xxvii, and the seven penitentials; in the English Church, xxxiii, xc; in the Greek Church, xci, cxix; and for clerks, xxiv, lxxxiv. Beleth mentions Psa. cxiv and *Confitemini;* he says charcoal was placed in the grave to show that the ground could never again be occupied. *Psalms Graduul, Pilgrims' Songs,* or *Psalms of Degrees*, were Psa. cxx to cxxxiv, which were sung in ascending the fifteen steps of Solomon's Temple. *Hallelujah Psalms* were cxlvi to cl, each beginning with the words "Praise ye the Lord." *Psalms Lucernal* were those sung in the primitive Church at the lighting of the lamps the first hour of the night. The Clementine Constitutions, Cassian, and St. Chrysostom mention the office said at this time under the same appellation. *Psalms of Praise* (Hallel) were Psa. cxiii to cxviii, the hymn sung by Christ before his agony. *Psalms Penitential* were seven: St. Augustine, when dying and lying speechless on his bed, had the seven psalms painted on the walls of his chamber, that, looking towards them, he might resist any temptations of the devil (Psa. vi, xxxii, xxxviii, li [*Miserere*], cii, cxxx [*De Profundis*], cxliii). *Psalms Prostrate* were those during the saying of which seniors knelt in their stalls and the junior monks lay prostrate on the floor or forms. These were said after vespers and in Lent, before the Collects of the Hours and *Verba mea auribus percipe.* Twelve psalms, called the *Dicta*, were sung (with three lections and responsories and six anthems) on the nocturns of ordinary days, one for each hour of the night. Six, says Beleth, are sung at matins, lauds, and other hours, in memory of the six works of mercy; five at vespers, one for each of the senses; and four at compline, the number of perfection.

Psalter of Solomon. Under this title is extant in a Greek translation a collection of eighteen psalms or hymns, evidently modelled on the canonical psalms, breathing Messianic hopes, and forming a favorable specimen of the later popular Jewish literature. It was first edited by De la Cerda, according to an Augsburg manuscript, now no more extant, in his *Adversaria Sacra* (Lugd. 1626), and then again by Fabricius in his *Codex Pseudepigraphus Vet. Test.* (1722, 2d ed.), i, 914 sq. An English version is given by Whiston, *Authentic Records* (Lond. 1827), vol. i. Of late it has been edited by Hilgenfeld, who collated for this purpose a Vienna codex in his *Zeitschrift* (1868), p. 134–168, and in his *Messias Judæorum*, who was followed by Geiger and Fritzsche. Later transcribers have made Solomon the author of these psalms, but the psalms themselves are against this assumption; on the contrary, they are the best proof of their later origin. Some—as Ewald, Grimm, Oehler, Dillmann, Weiffenbach—assign these psalms to the time of Antiochus Epiphanes (q. v.); others—as Movers, Delitzsch, and Keim—to the time of Herod; but neither of these dates is correct. It is now generally held by critics like Langen, Hilgenfeld, Nöldeke, Hausrath, Geiger, Fritzsche, Wittichen, that they originated soon after the taking of Jerusalem by Pompey, and this opinion is corroborated by the tenor of especially the 2d, 8th, and 17th psalms. Looking at the circumstances of the time which is presupposed in these psalms, we find the following: A generation to which the rule over Israel had not been promised took possession of it by force (οἷς οὐκ ἐπηγγείλω μετὰ βίας ἀφείλοντο, xvii, 6). They did not give God the honor, but put on the royal crown and took possession of David's throne (xvii, 7, 8). In their time Israel sinned. The king was in transgression of the law (ἐν παρανομίᾳ), the judge was not in truth (οὐκ ἐν ἀληθείᾳ), and the people were in sin (καὶ ὁ λαὸς ἐν ἁμαρτίᾳ, xvii, 21, 22). But God put these princes down by raising against them a foreign man who did not belong to the tribe of Israel (xvii, 8, 9). From the ends of the world God brought a strong man, who made war with Jerusalem and the country. The princes of the land, in their infatuation, met him with joy, and said, "You are welcome; come hither; enter in peace." The doors were

opened to him, and he entered like a father in the house of his sons (viii, 15–20). Once in the city, he also took the castles and broke the walls of Jerusalem with the battering-rams (viii, 21; ii, 1). Jerusalem was trodden down by the heathen (ii, 20); even the altar of God was ascended by foreign people (ii, 2). The most prominent men and sages of the council were killed, and the blood of the inhabitants of Jerusalem was shed like the water of impurity (viii, 23). The inhabitants of the country were carried away as captives into the West, and the princes for a derision (xvii, 13, 14; ii, 6; viii, 24). At last, the dragon who took Jerusalem was killed at the mountain of Egypt on the sea (ii, 29). It hardly needs any further explanation that all these events fully agree with the history of Pompey. The princes who arrogated to themselves the throne of David are the Asmonæans (q. v.), who, since the time of Aristobulus I, called themselves kings. The last princes of this house, Alexander Jannæus and Aristobulus II, favored the Sadducees, and in the eyes of the Pharisaic author they are sinners and unlawful. The "foreign and strong man" whom God brings from the ends of the earth is Pompey. The princes who meet him are Aristobulus II and Hyrcanus II; the adherents of the latter admit Pompey into the city, and he soon takes the other part with force (ἐν κρίῳ, ii, 1), which was held by Aristobulus's party. All the other circumstances fully agree with what we know of Pompey's campaign in Palestine; and the fact that the 2d psalm speaks of the manner in which Pompey died, in B.C. 48, fully proves the assumption that it was written soon after this event, while the 8th and 17th psalms, as well as the greater part of the others, may have been written between 63 and 48.

The spirit which runs through these psalms is that of Pharisaic Judaism. They breathe an earnest moral tone and true piety; but the righteousness which they preach, and the absence of which they deplore, is the one which can only be attained by keeping the Pharisaic ordinances, the δικαιοσύνη προσταγμάτων (xiv, 1). After death man is judged according to his works. He is at liberty to choose between righteousness or unrighteousness (comp. especially ix, 7). By doing the former he will rise to eternal life (iii, 16); by doing the latter, eternal damnation is his destiny (xiii, 9 sq.; xiv, 2 sq.; xv). In opposition to the unlawfully arrogated reign of the Asmonæans, which is already overthrown by Pompey, the author looks for the Messianic king of the house of David who will bring Israel to the promised glory (xvii, 1, 5, 23–51; xviii, 6–10; comp. vii, 9; xi).

The hypothesis of Grätz (*Gesch. d. Juden* [2d ed.], iii, 439) that these psalms were written by a Christian author deserves no refutation. Nor are we justified in assuming Christian interpolations; for the sinlessness and holiness which the author ascribes to his expected Messiah (xvii, 41, 46) is not the sinlessness in the sense of Christian dogmatics, but merely the strict legality in the sense of Pharisaism. As to the original language of the psalms, it is now generally held against Hilgenfeld that it was Hebrew, because it is very Hebraizing, which would not be the case if Hilgenfeld were correct. Hence we are justified in the assumption that the psalms were not written at Alexandria, but in Palestine.

Literature.—Hilgenfeld, *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftl. Theologie* (1868), p. 134–168; (1871), p. 383–418; *Messias Judæorum Libris eorum paulo ante et paulo post Chr. nat. conscriptis illustratus* (Lips. 1869), p. 1–33; Geiger, *Der Psalter Salomo's* (Augs. 1871), and review of it in *Göttinger gel. Anzeigen* (1871), p. 841–850, and in Hauck, *Theol. Jahresbericht*, vi, 421 sq.; Fritzsche, *Libri Apocryphi Veteris Testamenti Græce* (Lips. 1871), p. 569–589; Wittichen, *Die Idee des Reiches Gottes*, p. 155–160; Ewald, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, iv, 392 sq.; Grimm, *Zu* 1. *Makkab.* p. xxvii; Oehler, art. "Messias" in Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* ix, 426 sq.; Dillmann, art. "Pseudepigraphen," *ibid.* xii, 305 sq.; Weiffenbach, *Quæ Jesu in Regno Cœlesti Dignitas sit Synopticorum Sententia exponitur* (Gissæ, 1868), p. 49 sq.; Movers, in Wetzer u. Welte's *Kirchen-Lexicon*, i, 340; Delitzsch, *Psalmen*, (1st ed.), ii, 381 sq.; Keim, *Geschichte Jesu von Nazara*, i, 243 (Engl. transl. [Lond. 1873], p. 313 sq.); Langen, *Das Judenthum in Palestina zur Zeit Christi* (1866), p. 64–70; Nöldeke, *Alttestamentl. Literatur* (1868), p. 141 sq.; Hausrath, *Zeitgeschichte*, i, 164 sq., 176; Carrière, *De Psalterio Salomonis* (Argentorati, 1870), p. 8, and Ewald's notice of it in *Göttinger gel. Anzeigen* (1873), p. 237–240; Anger, *Vorlesungen über die Geschichte der messiamischen Idee* (1873), p. 81 sq.; Schürer, *Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte* (Leips. 1874), p. 140 sq., 569 sq.; Stanley, *Hist. of the Jewish Church* (N. Y. 1877), iii, 335. (B. P.)

Psalterium Mariānum is the name by which the devotion of the rosary is sometimes indicated, because in it (excepting the initial prayers), instead of the 150 psalms of the Scripture, the *Ave Maria*, in honor of the Virgin Mary, is recited 150 times.

Psaltery, an Anglicism of the Greek ψαλτήριον, is used in the A. V. as the rendering of two Hebrew words, both of which signified stringed instruments of music to accompany the voice. In our treatment of them we observe a strictly archæological line of investigation. See Kitto's note on Psa. xcii, 3, in his *Pictorial Bible; Bible Educator*, i, 70, 215; and comp. Musical Instruments.

1. נֵבֶל, or נְבֶל, *nébel*, is so rendered in the A. V. in all passages where it occurs, except in Isa. v, 12; xiv, 11; xxii, 24 marg.; Amos v, 23; vi, 5, where it is translated *viol*, following the Geneva Version, which has *viole* in all cases except 2 Sam. vi, 5; 1 Kings x, 12 ("psaltery"); 2 Esd. x, 22; Ecclus. xl, 21 ("psalterion"); Isa. xxii, 24 ("musicke"); and Wisd. xix, 18 ("instrument of musike"). The ancient viol was a six-stringed guitar. "Viols had six strings, and the position of the fingers was marked on the finger-board by frets, as in the guitars of the present day" (Chappell, *Pop. Mus.* i, 246). In the Prayer-book version of the Psalms, the Hebrew word is rendered "lute." This instrument resembled the guitar, but was superior in tone, "being larger, and having a convex back, somewhat like the vertical section of a gourd, or more nearly resembling that of a pear. . . . It had virtually six strings, because, although the number was eleven or twelve, five, at least, were doubled; the first, or treble, being sometimes a single string. The head in which the pegs to turn the strings were inserted receded almost at a right angle" (Chappell, i, 102). These three instruments—the psaltery or sautry, the viol, and the lute—are frequently associated in the old English poets, and were clearly instruments resembling each other, though still different. Thus in Chaucer's *Flower and Leaf*, p. 337—

> "And before hem went minstreles many one,
> As harpes, pipes, *lutes*, and *sautry*;"

and again in Drayton's *Polyolbion*, iv, 356—

> "The trembling *lute* some touch, some strain the *viol* best."

The word *psaltery* in its present form appears to have been introduced about the end of the 16th century, for it occurs in the unmodified form *psalterion* in two passages of the Geneva Version (1560). Again, in North's Plutarch (*Them.* [ed. 1595], p. 124) we read that Themistocles, "being mocked . . . by some that had studied humanitie, and other liberall sciences, was driuen for reuenge and his owne defence, to aunswer with greate and stoute words, saying, that in deed he could no skill to tune a harpe, nor a violl, nor to play of a *psalterion*; but if they did put a citie into his hands that was of small name, weake, and litle, he knew wayes enough how to make it noble, strong, and great." The Greek ψαλτήριον, from which our word is derived, denotes an instrument played with the fingers instead of a plectrum or quill, the verb ψάλλειν being used (Eurip. *Bacch.* p. 784) of twanging the bowstring (comp. ψαλμοὶ τόξων, Eurip. *Ion*, p. 173). But it only occurs in the Sept. as the rendering of the Hebrew *nébel* in Neh. xii, 27 and

Isa. v, 12, and in all the passages of the Psalms, except Psa. lxxi, 22 (ψαλμός) and Psa. lxxxi, 2 (κιθάρα), while in Amos v, 23; vi, 5, the general term ὄργανον is employed. In all other cases νάβλα represents *nébel* or *nebel*. These various renderings are sufficient to show that at the time the translation of the Sept. was made there was no certain identification of the Hebrew instrument with any known to the translators. The rendering νάβλα commends itself on account of the similarity of the Greek word with the Hebrew. Josephus appears to have regarded them as equivalent, and his is the only direct evidence upon the point. He tells us (*Ant.* vii, 12, 3) that the difference between the κινύρα (Heb. כִּנּוֹר, *kinnôr*) and the νάβλα was that the former had ten strings and was played with the plectrum, the latter had twelve notes and was played with the hand. Forty thousand of these instruments, he adds (*Ant.* viii, 3, 8), were made of electrum by Solomon for the Temple choir. Rashi (on Isa. v, 12) says that the *nébel* had more strings and pegs than the *kinnôr*. That *nabla* was a foreign name is evident from Strabo (x, 471) and from Athenæus (iv, 175), where its origin is said to be Sidonian. Beyond this, and that it was a stringed instrument (Athen. iv, 175), played by the hand (Ovid, *Ars Am.* iii, 327), we know nothing of it; but in these facts we have strong presumptive evidence that *nabla* and *nébel* are the same; and that the *nabla* and *psalterion* are identical appears from the glossary of Philoxenus, where *nablio* = ψάλτης, and *nablizo* = ψάλλω, and from Suidas, who makes *psalterion* and *naula*, or *nabla*, synonymous. Of the psaltery among the Greeks there appear to have been two kinds—the πηκτίς, which was of Persian (Athen. xiv, 636) or Lydian (ibid. p. 635) origin, and the μαγάδις. The former had only two (ibid. iv, 183) or three (ibid.) strings; the latter as many as twenty (ibid. xiv, 634), though sometimes only five (ibid. p. 637). They are sometimes said to be the same, and were evidently of the same kind. Both Isidore (*De Origg.* iii, 21) and Cassiodorus (*Præf. in Psal.* c. 4) describe the psaltery as triangular in shape, like the Greek Δ, with the sounding-board above the strings, which were struck downwards. The latter adds that it was played with a plectrum, so that he contradicts Josephus if the psaltery and *nébel* are really the same. In this case Josephus is the rather to be trusted. St. Augustine (on Psa. xxxii [xxxiii]) makes the position of the sounding-board the point in which the cithara and psaltery differ; in the former it is below, in the latter above the strings. His language implies that both were played with the plectrum. The distinction between the cithara and psaltery is observed by Jerome (*Prol. in Psal.*). From these conflicting accounts it is impossible to say positively with what instrument the *nébel* of the Hebrew exactly corresponded. It was probably of various kinds, as Kimchi says in his note on Isa. xxii, 24, differing from each other both with regard to the position of the pegs and the number of the strings. In illustration of the descriptions of Isidorus and Cassiodorus reference may be made to the drawings from Egyptian musical instruments given by Sir Gard. Wilkinson (*Anc. Eg.* ii, 280, 287), some one of which may correspond to the Hebrew *nébel*. Munk (*Palestine*, pl. 16, figs. 12, 13) gives an engraving of an instrument which Niebuhr saw. Its form is that of an inverted Delta placed upon a round box of wood covered with skin. Abraham de Porta-Leone, the author of *Shilte Haggibborim* (c. 5), identifies the *nébel* with the Italian *liuto* (the lute), or rather with the particular kind called *liuto chitarronato* (the German *mandoline*), the thirteen strings of which were of gut or sinew, and were struck with a quill. See HARP.

Triangular Musical Instrument from Herculaneum.

The *nébel asôr* (Psa. xxxiii, 2; xcii, 3 [4]; cxliv, 9) appears to have been an instrument of the psaltery kind of a peculiar form or number of strings (Forkel, *Gesch. der Mus.* i, 133). Aben-Ezra (on Psa. cl, 3) says the *nébel* had ten *holes*; so that he must have considered it to be a kind of pipe. As the latter term signifies *ten*, and never occurs but in connection with the *nébel*, the conjecture is natural that the two instruments may have differed from each other only in the number of their strings, or the openings at the bottom. Hence we meet with the Sept. translation ἐν δεκαχόρδῳ, and in the Chaldee, Syriac, and Arabic words expressing an instrument of *ten* strings, which is also followed in the A. V. (Psa. xxxiii, 2; cxliv, 1). We see no reason to dissent from this conclusion. Pfeiffer was inclined to think that the *asôr* may have been the quadrangular lyre which is represented in different varieties in ancient monuments (figs. 1 and 2 of the accompanying cut), and which has usually ten strings, though sometimes more. See VIOL.



Miscellaneous Ancient Stringed Instruments.

From the fact that *nébel* in Hebrew also signifies a wine-bottle or skin, it has been conjectured that the term when applied to a musical instrument denotes a kind of bagpipe—the old English *cornamute*, French *cornemuse*; but it seems clear, whatever else may be obscure concerning it, that the *nébel* was a stringed instrument. In the Mishna (*Kelim*, xvi, 7) mention is made of a case (תֵּרֶק = θήκη) in which it was kept. See BOTTLE.

The first appearance of the *nébel* in the history of the Old Test. is in connection with the "string" of prophets who met Saul as they came down from the high place (1 Sam. x, 5). Here it is clearly used in a religious service, as again (2 Sam. vi, 5; 1 Chron. xiii, 8) when David brought the ark from Kirjath-jearim. In the Temple band organized by David were the players on psalteries (1 Chron. xv, 16, 20), who accompanied the ark from the house of Obed-edom (xv, 28). They played when the ark was brought into the Temple (? Chron. v, 12); at the thanksgiving for Jehoshaphat's

victory (xx, 28); at the restoration of the Temple under Hezekiah (xxix, 25), and the dedication of the walls of Jerusalem after they were rebuilt by Nehemiah (Neh. xii, 27). In all these cases, and in the passages in the Psalms where allusion is made to it, the psaltery is associated with religious services (comp. Amos v, 23; 2 Esd. x, 22). But it had its part also in private festivities, as is evident from Isa. v, 12; xiv, 11; xxii, 24; Amos vi, 5, where it is associated with banquets and luxurious indulgence. It appears (Isa. xiv, 11) to have had a soft, plaintive note. The psalteries of David were made of cypress (2 Sam. vi, 5), those of Solomon of algum or almug trees (2 Chron. ix, 11). See PSALMODY.

2. Among the instruments of the band which played before Nebuchadnezzar's golden image on the plains of Dura, we again meet with the "psaltery" (פְּסַנְתֵּרִין, Dan. iii, 5, 10, 15; פְּסַנְטֵרִין, *pesanterin*). The Chaldee word appears to be merely a modification of the Greek *ψαλτήριον*. Attention is called to the fact that the word is singular (see Gesenius, *Thesaur.* p. 1116), the termination ־ין corresponding to the Greek *-ιον*. This, in a more narrow and exact sense, denotes an instrument like the *cithara* (Lemprid. *Al Sever*), played with both hands, and called the *magadis*, *μαγάδις* (Athen. xiv, 636); but according to Jerome (*Proœm. in Psalm.*) it was the later Greek name for the *nabla* or *nébel* above. See MUSIC.

Psathyrians or **Psatyrians**, a sect of Arians, who were followers of Theoctistus, a zealous pastry-cook (*ψαθυροπώλης*) of Constantinople, who maintained the heresy of Arius in the form that the first person in the Trinity existed before the Son had a being; thus denying the eternal generation of Christ. Brought to trial in the Council of Antioch, A.D. 360, they maintained that the Son was not like the Father as to will; that he was taken from nothing, or made of nothing; and that in God generation was not to be distinguished from creation. They were also called Douleians and Cyrtiani. See Theodorus, *Hær. Fab.* vol. iv.

Psaume, NICHOLAS, a French prelate, was born in 1518 at Chaumont-sur-Aine, diocese of Verdun, of very humble parentage. He was educated by his uncle, François Psaume, abbé of St. Paul of Verdun, who sent him successively to the universities of Paris, Orleans, and Poitiers, and resigned the abbey in his favor in 1538. Soon after, Nicholas took the habit of the Premonstrants. In 1548 the cardinal Jean de Lorraine abdicated in his favor the bishopric of Verdun. He assisted at the Council of Trent in 1550 and in 1562, arguing against the abuse of the regular benefices, and made for himself some enemies. He died at Verdun, Aug. 10, 1575. He gave to the world *Collectio Actorum et Decretorum Concilii Tridentini* (Etival, 1725), a curious journal of all that was done at the council from Nov. 13, 1562, until its conclusion, which was published by P. Hugo, abbé d'Etival:—*Préservatif contre le Changement de Religion* (Verdun, 1563, 8vo):—an edition of the canons of the provincial council of Treves in 1548:—*Missale Virdunense* (1557):—*Portrait de l'Église* (1573), dedicated to the cardinal of Lorraine:—some other works relative to the Council of Trent, which he published in 1564.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.

Pseudepigrăpha (*ψευδεπίγραφα*) means those writings the title (*ἐπιγραφή*) of which names a false author instead of the true one. This designation is often applied to the Apocrypha, although there are many Apocrypha which name no author at all in their title. A number of Protestant theologians restrict the term *pseudepigrapha* to such writings of the O. T. as were composed in the Greek language shortly before or after Christ, and falsely attributed to the patriarchs and prophets of the Old Covenant, as, e. g. the testament of the twelve patriarchs, the book of Enoch, etc. They designate by the name of Apocrypha the writings falsely attributed to the apostles and disciples of Jesus. See APOCRYPHA.

Pseudodoxy (*ψευδοδοξία*, from *ψεῦδος*, *falsehood*, and *δόξα*, *opinion*) designates a false or deceptive opinion, and hence is employed for *superstition* and *error*. A synonymous expression is *pseudodidascaly* (from *διδασκαλία*, *instruction*), as he who holds erroneous opinions (*ψευδόδοξος*), if he communicates them, becomes a false teacher (*ψευδοδιδάσκαλος*). The opposite of these two expressions ought to be *orthodoxy* and *orthodidascaly*, but the latter two words are used in a somewhat different sense. See HETERODOX. The word *pseudoism* is of recent formation, and means a general inclination to the false, which shows itself in thoughts, words, and doctrines, as well as in acts and in the social intercourse of life.

Pseudolatry (*ψευδολατρεία*, from *ψεῦδος*, *falsehood*, and *λατρεία*, *service*) designates a *false worship*, of which the Christian writers, who seem to have first formed this word, accused the pagans, on account of their polytheism. Pseudolatry has also penetrated into the Christian Church; for where we find the worship of images (iconolatry, or idolatry), there is pseudolatry likewise.

Pseudology and **Pseudomancy** (*ψευδολογία*, *ψευδομαντεία*, from *λόγος*, *speech*, and *μαντεία*, *prediction*) are in the mutual relation of species and genus. The former refers to false and deceptive speaking in general; the latter to the foretelling of future events, in which, in this sense, there is neither truth nor wisdom. The same relation exists between the pseudologist and the pseudomantist, called also pseudo-prophet. See PROPHET. Comp. also Lucian's Pseudomantis, by which title he designates an impostor of his time called Alexander (Alexander Impostor). Pseudomania would be simulated folly (*μανία*); for mental diseases can be simulated as well as bodily. Both pretences are mean, the former still more than the latter; for he who pretends to be mentally diseased plays the part of a being deprived of reason and freedom. Criminals sometimes recur to this artifice to escape the responsibility of their actions; lawyers like, in desperate cases, to resort to the plea of insanity. The judge must, where such an excuse is attempted, take the advice of the physicians, who have to examine how far such a plea is warranted by the facts, else this mode of defence would lead to the impunity of all criminals, even the most dangerous. The words *ψευδομανία* and *ψευδομαντεία* are both unknown to antiquity, although *ψευδόμαντις* was employed. Instead of *ψευδολογία*, the ancients used also *ψευδομυθία* (from *μῦθος* = *λόγος*); hence it would be a mistake if we employed the latter word for false fables, although *myth* is synonymous with *fable*.

Psilanthropists are those who maintain the extreme form of Unitarian doctrine that Christ was merely (*ψιλός*) a man (*ἄνθρωπος*), and not God and man (*θεάνθρωπος*) in one person.

Psychĭci and **Pneumatĭci** (*ψυχικοί* and *πνευματικοί*, scil. *ἄνθρωποι*) are often contrasted in such a manner that the former word is employed in a lower sense, the second with a more refined and noble signification. The Montanists thus designated the orthodox, because they rejected the prophecies and pretended inspirations of their founder, and would not receive his rigid laws respecting fasting, etc. This was the term constantly used by Tertullian after he had fallen into the errors of the Montanists. He calls his own party *the spiritual*, and the orthodox *the carnal*. Tertullian, who ranged himself with the Pneumaticists, wrote a book *Contra Psychicos s. Orthodoxos*. But this meaning is very seldom given to these words in our times. See ORIGEN. The latter found in the Scriptures a somatic, psychical, and pneumatical meaning, because man is composed of body, soul, and mind. The name appears to have originated with the Valentinians, who styled themselves *the spiritual* and *the perfect*, and

said they had no need of abstinence and good works, which were unnecessary for them that were perfect.

Psychism (a new formation, from *ψυχή*, *soul*) is the opinion that everything is soul. The followers of this doctrine are called Psychists. Although poets put a soul in every inanimate object, they do not belong to this sect of philosophers; for they do not think in the least of suppressing all distinction between the somatic and the psychical nature. Michel Petöez, a Hungarian, published in 1833 (Pesth, 8vo) a book in which he attempts to prove that the so-called bodily world is composed of nothing but souls. He divides the souls into two classes, the living and the dead; the latter, in a state of aggregation, constitute the bodies. This opinion is not so new as it would appear at first sight. It bears a striking resemblance to Leibnitz's monadology, and may be a branch of that tree. Leibnitz considers the whole universe as composed of monads, which he divides into conscious and unconscious, or slumbering; he also holds bodies to be aggregations of the second kind of monads. If they are consistent, the strict idealists will likewise be compelled to consider all that exists as soul or spirit, as they hold the bodies to be mere representations or ideas, to which the thinking mind lends objective existence. M. Quesne (*Lettres sur le Psychisme* [Paris, 1852, 8vo]) teaches that there is a fluid diffused throughout all nature, animating equally all living and organized beings, and that the difference which appears in their actions comes of their particular organization. The fluid is general, the organization is individual. This opinion differs from that of Pythagoras (q. v.), who held that the soul of a man passed individually into the body of a brute. While M. Quesne holds that, though the body dies, the soul does not; the organization perishes, but not the psychal, or psychical, fluid. See Krug, *Philos. Wörterbuch*, s. v.

Psychology (from *ψυχή*, the *soul*, and λόγος, a *discourse*) is that branch of metaphysics which treats of the nature and relations of the human spirit. It has been divided into *rational*, or speculative, and *empirical*, or practical. (See Fleming and Krauth, *Vocab. of Philos.* s. v.)

Biblical Psychology is a term lately applied to the doctrines of the Holy Scriptures on the subject, especially as to the distinction between the rational and immortal *soul* in man (רוּחַ, *πνεῦμα*), and the animal, sensitive, and affectional *spirit* (נֶפֶשׁ, *ψυχή*). The subject has been treated with great acumen by Delitzsch (*Biblical Psychology*, tr. from the German, Edinb. 1867); but the results are rather curious than satisfactory. (See *Brit. Quar. Rev.* Jan. 1873, p. 162; *New-Englander*, July, 1873, art. iv.) In fact, the Bible has no scientific nomenclature, and the attempt to reduce its terms to the strict definitions of modern classification, especially on so obscure and abstract a subject, must necessarily prove abortive. See Mind.

Psychomancy (from *ψυχή*, *soul*, and *μαντεία*, *prediction*) is the pretended art of summoning the souls of the deceased, and learning the future by their communications; it is one of the branches of divination, or mantics. The ancients use only *ψυχόμαντις*, a sorcerer of this kind, and *ψυχομαντεῖον*, the place where such performances took place (*oraculum animarum*). The same art is called necromancy, and, in a more extensive sense, pneumatomancy. See Divination.

Psychometry (a new formation, from *ψυχή*, *soul*, and *μέτρον*, *measure*) is the art of *measuring souls*. It cannot give an account with mathematical exactitude of the powers of the soul and their effects; it must content itself with an approximative valuation, the soul being a quantity inapproachable to the senses, which cannot be measured like bodies. Ch. Jul. Sim. Portius, a teacher in Leipsic, invented an instrument of psychometry, which he thus describes: "The psychometer is an instrument which shows what a man is in respect to his temperament, mind, and heart. One hundred and ten different impressions can be made on the instrument. The impression made by the person whose soul is measured shows by which of the one hundred and ten qualities enumerated on a board"—and most arbitrarily and illogically, as to that—"this person is distinguished from others." We may ask, Only those by which he or she is distinguished from, not also those which he has in common with, other people? But, then, the instrument could not indicate any of those one hundred and ten qualities, as each of them must be held in common by several persons. See the description of this psychometer by its author (Leipsic, 1833, 8vo).

Psychopannychism (*ψυχή*, *soul*; *πᾶν*, *all*; and *νύξ*, *night*—the sleep of the soul) is the doctrine to which Luther, among divines, and Forney, among philosophers, were inclined, that at death the soul falls asleep, and does not awake till the resurrection of the body. Calvin wrote a treatise against this view in 1534, and there is much against it in Henry Mori's *Works*. Pagett says, in his *Heresiography*, written about 1638, that this "heresy" revived in his time through the publication of a work entitled *Man's Mortality*. See Soul-sleep.

Psychopneumŏnes were those who maintained the opinion that the souls of the good, after death, became angels, and the souls of the evil became devils. See Augustinus, *Hæres.* ch. lxxviii; Prædest. *Hæres.* ch. lxxviii.

Ptolemæ'us, or Ptolemy (Πτολεμαῖος, i. e. "the warlike," from *πτόλεμος* = *πόλεμος*), the dynastic name of the Greek kings of Egypt (A. V. "Ptol'emee" or "Ptoleme'us"), and hence employed also by many private persons. The name, which occurs in early legends (*Il.* iv, 228; Pausan. x, 5), appears first in the historic period in the time of Alexander the Great, and became


1. Ptolemæus I, Soter (son of Lagus), B.C. cir. 323-285.
Arsinoe to 2. Ptolemæus II, Philadelphus (B.C. 285-247), to 3. Arsinoe.
4. Ptolemæus III, Euergetes I (B.C. 247-222).
5. Berenice to Antiochus II.
6. Ptolemæus IV, Philopator (B.C. 222-205), to 7. Arsinoe.
8. Ptolemæus V, Epiphanes (B.C. 205-181), to Cleopatra (daughter of Antiochus Magnus).
9. Ptolemæus VI, Philometor (B.C. 181-146), to Cleopatra (11).
10. Ptolemæus VII, Euergetes II (Physcon), (B.C. 171-146-117)
to 11. Cleopatra, to (2) Cleopatra (14).
(12.) Cleopatra, to Alexander Balas. to Demetrius II.
13. Ptolemæus Eupator.
14. Cleopatra.
15. Ptolemæus VIII, Soter II (B.C. 117-81).

afterwards very frequent among the states which arose out of his conquests. For the following, which are the only persons of the name mentioned in the Scriptures (and these in the Apocrypha alone, although referred to in Daniel), we adopt the statements found in the standard authorities. For the civil history of the Ptolemies the student will find ample references to the original authorities in the articles in Smith's *Dict. of Classical Biography*, ii, 581, etc., and in Pauly's *Real-Encyklopädie*. The literature of the subject in its religious aspects has been noticed under ALEXANDRIA; DISPERSION. A curious account of the literary activity of Ptolemy Philadelphus is given (by Simon de Magistris) in the *Apologia sent. Pat. de LXX Vers.*, appended to *Daniel sec. LXX* (Romæ, 1772); but this is not always trustworthy. More complete details of the history of the Alexandrine libraries are given by Ritschl, *Die Alexandrinischen Bibliotheken* (Breslau, 1838); and Parthey, *Das Alexandr. Museum* (Berlin, 1838). The foregoing table gives the descent of the royal line as far as it is connected with Biblical history. See EGYPT.

1. PTOLEMY I, *Soter* (Σωτήρ, *savior*), known as the son of Lagus, a Macedonian of low rank, was generally supposed to be an illegitimate son of Philip. He distinguished himself greatly during the campaigns of Alexander; at whose death, foreseeing the necessary subdivision of the empire, he secured for himself the government of Egypt, where he proceeded at once to lay the foundations of a kingdom (B.C. 323). His policy during the wars of the succession was mainly directed towards the consolidation of his power, and not to wide conquests. He maintained himself against the attacks of Perdiccas (B.C. 321) and Demetrius (B.C. 312), and gained a precarious footing in Syria and Phœnicia. In B.C. 307 he suffered a very severe defeat at sea off Cyprus from Antigonus, but successfully defended Egypt against invasion. After the final defeat of Antigonus, B.C. 301, he was obliged to concede the debatable provinces of Phœnicia and Cœle-Syria to Seleucus; and during the remainder of his reign his only important achievement abroad was the recovery of Cyprus, which he permanently attached to the Egyptian monarchy (B.C. 295). He abdicated in favor of his youngest son, Ptolemy II Philadelphus, two years before his death, which took place in B.C. 283.

Ptolemy Soter is described very briefly in Daniel (xi, 5) as one of those who should receive part of the empire of Alexander when it was "divided towards the four winds of heaven." "*The king of the south* [Egypt in respect of Judæa] *shall be strong; and one of his princes* [Seleucus Nicator, shall be strong]; *and he* [Seleucus] *shall be strong above him* [Ptolemy], *and have dominion.*" Seleucus, who is here mentioned, fled from Babylon, where Antigonus sought his life, to Egypt in B.C. 316, and attached himself to Ptolemy. At last the decisive victory of Ipsus (B.C. 301), which was mainly gained by his services, gave him the command of an empire which was greater than any other held by Alexander's successors; and "*his dominion was a great dominion*" (Dan. *l. c.*). Jerome (*ad Dan.* l. c.) very strangely refers the latter clauses of the verse to Ptolemy Philadelphus, "whose empire surpassed that of his father." The whole tenor of the passage requires the contrast of the two kingdoms on which the fortunes of Judæa hung.

Pentadrachm of Ptolemy I.

Alexandrian talent. (*Obv.* Head of king, r. f., bound with fillet. *Rev.* ΠΤΟΛΕΜΑΙΟΥ ΚΑΙΤΗΡΟΣ. Eagle, l., on thunderbolt.) Struck at Tyre.

In one of his expeditions into Syria, probably B.C. 320, Ptolemy treacherously occupied Jerusalem on the Sabbath, a fact which arrested the attention of the heathen historian Agatharcidès (ap. Joseph. *C. Ap.* i, 22; *Ant.* xii, 1). He carried away many Jews and Samaritans captive to Alexandria; but, aware probably of the great importance of the good-will of the inhabitants of Palestine in the event of a Syrian war, he gave them the full privileges of citizenship in the new city. In the campaign of Gaza (B.C. 312) he reaped the fruits of his liberal policy; and many Jews voluntarily emigrated to Egypt, though the colony was from the first disturbed by internal dissensions (Josephus, as above; Hecat. ap. Joseph. *C. Ap.* l. c.).

2. PTOLEMY II, *Philadelphus* (Φιλάδελφος, i. e. *brother-loving*), the youngest son of Ptolemy I, was made king two years before his death, to confirm the irregular succession. The conflict between Egypt and Syria was renewed during his reign in consequence of the intrigue of his half-brother Magas. "*But in the end of years they* [the kings of Syria and Egypt] *joined themselves together* [in friendship]. *For the king's daughter of the south* [Berenice, the daughter of Ptolemy Philadelphus] *came* [as bride] *to the king of the north* [Antiochus II], *to make an agreement*" (Dan. xi, 6). The unhappy issue of this marriage has been noticed already [see ANTIOCHUS II]; and the political events of the reign of Ptolemy, who, however, retained possession of the disputed provinces of Phœnicia and Cœle-Syria, offer no further points of interest in connection with Jewish history.

In other respects, however, this reign was a critical epoch for the development of Judaism, as it was for the intellectual history of the ancient world. The liberal encouragement which Ptolemy bestowed on literature and science (following out in this the designs of his father) gave birth to a new school of writers and thinkers. The critical faculty was called forth in place of the creative, and learning, in some sense, supplied the place of original speculation. Eclecticism was the necessary result of the concurrence and comparison of dogmas; and it was impossible that the Jew, who was now become as true a citizen of the world as the Greek, should remain passive in the conflict of opinions. The origin and influence of the translation of the Sept. will be considered in another place. See SEPTUAGINT. It is enough now to observe the greatness of the consequences involved in the union of Greek language with Jewish thought. From this time the Jew was familiarized with the great types of Western literature, and in some degree aimed at imitating them. Ezechiel (ὁ τῶν Ἰουδαϊκῶν τραγῳδιῶν ποιητής, Clem. Alex. *Strom.* i, 23, § 155) wrote a drama on the subject of the Exodus, of which considerable fragments, in fair iambic verse, remain (Euseb. *Præp. Ev.* ix, 28, 29; Clem. Alex. *l. c.*), though he does not appear to have adhered strictly to the laws of classical composition. An elder Philo celebrated Jerusalem in a long hexameter poem—Eusebius quotes the 14th book—of which the few corrupt lines still preserved (Euseb. *Præp. Ev.* ix, 20, 24, 28) convey no satisfactory notion. Another epic poem, *On the Jews*, was written by Theodotus, and as the extant passages (*ibid.* ix, 22) treat of the history of Sichem, it has been conjectured that he was a Samaritan. The work of Aristobulus on the interpretation of the law was a still more important result of the combination of the old faith with Greek culture, as forming the groundwork of later allegories. While the Jews appropriated the fruits of Western science, the Greeks looked towards the East with a new curiosity. The histories of Berosus and Manetho and Hecatæus opened a world as wide and as novel as the conquests of Alexander. The legendary sibyls were taught to speak in the language of the prophets. The name of Orpheus, which was connected with the first rise of Greek polytheism,

gave sanction to verses which set forth nobler views of the Godhead (*ibid.* xiii, 12, etc.). Even the most famous poets were not free from interpolation (Ewald, *Gesch.* iv, 297, note). Everywhere the intellectual approximation of Jew and Gentile was growing closer, or at least more possible. The later specific forms of teaching to which this syncretism of East and West gave rise have already been noticed. See ALEXANDRIA. A second time, and in a new fashion, Egypt disciplined a people of God. It first impressed upon a nation the firm unity of a family, and then in due time reconnected a matured people with the world from which it had been called out.



Octodrachm of Ptolemy II.

Obv. ΑΔΕΛΦΩΝ. Busts of Ptolemy II and Arsinoe, r. *Rev.* ΘΕΩΝ. Busts of Ptolemy I and Berenice, r.

3. PTOLEMY III, *Euergĕtès* (Εὐεργέτης, i. e. *well-doer*), was the eldest son of Ptolemy Philadelphus, and brother of Berenice, the wife of Antiochus II. The repudiation and murder of his sister furnished him with an occasion for invading Syria (B.C. cir. 246). He "*stood up, a branch out of her stock* [sprung from the same parents] *in his* [father's] *estate; and set himself at* [the head of] *his army, and came against the fortresses of the king of the north* [Antiochus], *and dealt against them and prevailed*" (Dan. xi, 7). He extended his conquests as far as Antioch, and then eastward to Babylon, but was recalled to Egypt by tidings of seditions which had broken out there. His success was brilliant and complete. "*He carried captive into Egypt the gods* [of the conquered nations] *with their molten images, and with their precious vessels of silver and gold*" (ver. 8). This capture of sacred trophies, which included the recovery of images taken from Egypt by Cambyses (Jerome, *ad loc.*), earned for the king the name *Euergetes*—"Benefactor"—from the superstitious Egyptians, and was specially recorded in the inscriptions which he set up at Adule in memory of his achievements (Cosmas Ind. ap. Clinton, *F. H.* p. 382, n.). After his return to Egypt (B.C. cir. 243) he suffered a great part of the conquered provinces to fall again under the power of Seleucus. But the attempts which Seleucus made to attack Egypt terminated disastrously to himself. He first collected a fleet, which was almost totally destroyed by a storm; and then, "as if by some judicial infatuation," "*he came against the realm of the king of the south and* [being defeated] *returned to his own land* [to Antioch]" (Dan. xi, 9; Justin. xxvii, 2). After this Ptolemy "*desisted some years from* [attacking] *the king of the north*" (Dan. xi, 8), since the civil war between Seleucus and Antiochus Hierax, which he fomented, secured him from any further Syrian invasion. The remainder of the reign of Ptolemy seems to have been spent chiefly in developing the resources of the empire, which he raised to the highest pitch of its prosperity. His policy towards the Jews was similar to that of his predecessors, and on his occupation of Syria he "offered sacrifices, after the custom of the law, in acknowledgment of his success, in the Temple at Jerusalem, and added gifts worthy of his victory" (Joseph. *C. Ap.* ii, 5). The famous story of the manner in which Joseph, the son of Tobias, obtained from him the lease of the revenues of Judæa is a striking illustration both of the condition of the country and of the influence of individual Jews (id. *Ant.* xii, 4). See ONIAS.

Octodrachm of Ptolemy III.

Egyptian talent. (*Obv.* Bust of king, r., wearing radiate diadem, and carrying trident. *Rev.* ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΠΤΟΛΕΜΑΙΟΥ. Radiate cornucopia.)

4. PTOLEMY IV, *Philopător* (Φιλοπάτωρ, i. e. *father-loving*). After the death of Ptolemy Euergetes, the line of the Ptolemies rapidly degenerated (Strabo, xvi, 12, 13, p. 798). Ptolemy Philopator, his eldest son, who succeeded him, was, to the last degree, sensual, effeminate, and debased. But, externally, his kingdom retained its power and splendor; and when circumstances forced him to action, Ptolemy himself showed ability not unworthy of his race. The description of the campaign of Raphia (B.C. 217) in the book of Daniel gives a vivid description of his character. "The sons of Seleucus [Seleucus Ceraunus and Antiochus the Great] were *stirred up, and assembled a multitude of great forces; and one of them* [Antiochus] *came, and overflowed, and passed through* [even to Pelusium: Polyb. v, 62]; *and he returned* [from Seleucia, to which he had retired during a faithless truce: Polyb. v, 66]; *and they* [Antiochus and Ptolemy] *were stirred up* [in war] *even to his* [Antiochus's] *fortress. And the king of the south* [Ptolemy Philopator] *was moved with choler, and came forth and fought with him* [at Raphia]; *and he set forth a great multitude; and the multitude was given into his hand* [to lead to battle]. *And the multitude raised itself* [proudly for the conflict], *and his heart was lifted up, and he cast down ten thousands* (comp. Polyb. v, 86); *but he was not vigorous*" [to reap the fruits of his victory] (Dan. xi, 10–12; comp. 3 Macc. i, 1–5). After this decisive success, Ptolemy Philopator visited the neighboring cities of Syria, and, among others, Jerusalem. After offering sacrifices of thanksgiving in the Temple, he attempted to enter the sanctuary. A sudden paralysis hindered his design; but when he returned to Alexandria, he determined to inflict on the Alexandrian Jews the vengeance for his disappointment. In this, however, he was again hindered; and eventually he confirmed to them the full privileges which they had enjoyed before. See MACCABEES, THE THIRD BOOK OF. The recklessness of his reign was further marked by the first insurrection of the native Egyptians against their Greek rulers (Polyb. v, 107). This was put down, and Ptolemy, during the remainder of his life, gave himself up to unbridled excesses. He died B.C. 205, and was succeeded by his only child, Ptolemy V, Epiphanes, who was at the time only four or five years old (Jerome, *ad Dan.* xi, 10–12).

Tetradrachm of Ptolemy IV.

Egyptian talent. (*Obv.* Bust of king, r., bound with fillet. *Rev.* ΠΤΟΛΕΜΑΙΟΥ ΦΙΛΟΠΑΤΟΡΟΣ. Eagle, l., on thunderbolt.) Struck at Tyre.

5. PTOLEMY V, *Epiphănès* (Ἐπιφάνες, i. e. *illustrious*). The reign of Ptolemy Epiphanes was a critical epoch in the history of the Jews. The rivalry between the Syrian and Egyptian parties, which had for some time divided the people, came to an open rupture in the struggles which marked his minority. The Syrian faction openly declared for Antiochus the Great when he advanced on his second expedition against Egypt;

and the Jews, who remained faithful to the old alliance, fled to Egypt in great numbers, where Onias, the rightful successor to the high-priesthood, not long afterwards established the temple at Leontopolis. (Jerome [*ad Dan.* xi, 14] places the flight of Onias to Egypt and the foundation of the temple of Leontopolis in the reign of Ptolemy Epiphanes; but Onias was still a youth at the time of his father's death, B.C. cir. 171.) See ONIAS. In the strong language of Daniel, "*The robbers of the people exalted themselves to establish the vision*" (Dan. xi, 14) — to confirm by the issue of their attempt the truth of the prophetic word, and at the same time to forward unconsciously the establishment of the heavenly kingdom which they sought to anticipate. The accession of Ptolemy, and the confusion of a disputed regency furnished a favorable opportunity for foreign invasion. "*Many stood up against the king of the south,*" under Antiochus the Great and Philip III of Macedonia, who formed a league for the dismemberment of his kingdom. "*So the king of the north* [Antiochus] *came, and cast up a mount, and took the most fenced city* [Sidon, to which Scopas, the general of Ptolemy, had fled: Jerome, *ad loc.*], *and the arms of the south did not withstand*" [at Paneas, B.C. 198, where Antiochus gained a decisive victory] (Dan. xi, 14, 15). The interference of the Romans, to whom the regents had turned for help, checked Antiochus in his career; but in order to retain the provinces of Cœle-Syria, Phœnicia, and Judæa, which he had reconquered, really under his power, while he seemed to comply with the demands of the Romans, who required them to be surrendered to Ptolemy, "*he gave him* [Ptolemy, his daughter Cleopatra] *a young maiden*" [as his betrothed wife] (Dan. xi, 17). But in the end his policy only partially succeeded. After the marriage of Ptolemy and Cleopatra was consummated (B.C. 193), Cleopatra did "*not stand on his side,*" but supported her husband in maintaining the alliance with Rome. The disputed provinces, however, remained in the possession of Antiochus; and Ptolemy was poisoned at the time when he was preparing an expedition to recover them from Seleucus, the unworthy successor of Antiochus, B.C. 181.



Tetradrachm of Ptolemy V.

Egyptian talent. (*Obv.* Bust of king, r., bound with fillet adorned with ears of wheat. *Rev.* ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΠΤΟΛΕΜΑΙΟΥ. Eagle, l., on thunderbolt.)

6. PTOLEMY VI, *Philomĕtor* (Φιλομήτωρ, i. e. *mother-loving*). On the death of Ptolemy Epiphanes, his wife, Cleopatra, held the regency for her young son, Ptolemy Philometor, and preserved peace with Syria till she died, B.C. 173. The government then fell into unworthy hands, and an attempt was made to recover Syria (comp. 2 Macc. iv, 21). Antiochus Epiphanes seems to have made the claim a pretext for invading Egypt. The generals of Ptolemy were defeated near Pelusium, probably at the close of B.C. 171 (Clinton, *F. H.* iii, 319; 1 Macc. i, 16 sq.); and in the next year Antiochus, having secured the person of the young king, reduced almost the whole of Egypt (comp. 2 Macc. v, 1). Meanwhile Ptolemy Euergetes II, the younger brother of Ptolemy Philometor, assumed the supreme power at Alexandria; and Antiochus, under the pretext of recovering the crown for Philometor, besieged Alexandria in B.C. 169. By this time, however, his selfish designs were apparent: the brothers were reconciled, and Antiochus was obliged to acquiesce for the time in the arrangement which they made. But while doing so, he prepared for another invasion of Egypt, and was already approaching Alexandria, when he was met by the Roman embassy, led by C. Popillius Lænas, who, in the name of the Roman senate, insisted on his immediate retreat (B.C. 168), a command which the late victory at Pydna made it impossible to disobey. (Others reckon only three campaigns of Antiochus against Egypt in 171, 170, 168 [Grimm on 1 Macc. i, 18]. Yet the campaign of 169 seems clearly distinguished from those in the years before and after, though in the description of Daniel the campaigns of 170 and 169 are not noticed separately.)

Tetradrachm of Ptolemy VI.

Egyptian talent. (*Obv.* Head of king, r., bound with fillet. *Rev.* ΠΤΟΛΕΜΑΙΟΥ ΦΙΛΟΜΗΤΟΡΟΣ. Eagle, l., with palm-branch, on thunderbolt.)

These campaigns, which are intimately connected with the visits of Antiochus to Jerusalem in B.C. 170, 168, are briefly described in Dan. xi, 25–30: "*He* [Antiochus] *shall stir up his power and his courage against the king of the south with a great army; and the king of the south* [Ptolemy Philometor] *shall be stirred up to battle with a very great and mighty army; but he shall not stand: for they* [the ministers, as it appears, in whom he trusted] *shall forecast devices against him. Yea, they that feed of the portion of his meat shall destroy him, and his army shall melt away, and many shall fall down slain. And both these kings' hearts shall be to do mischief, and they shall speak lies at one table* [Antiochus shall profess falsely to maintain the cause of Philometor against his brother, and Philometor to trust in his good faith]; *but it shall not prosper* [the resistance of Alexandria shall preserve the independence of Egypt]; *for the end shall be at the time appointed. Then shall he* [Antiochus] *return into his land, and his heart shall be against the holy covenant; and he shall do exploits, and return to his own land. At the time appointed he shall return and come towards the south; but it shall not be as the former, so also the latter time.* [His career shall be checked at once.] *For the ships of Chittim* [comp. Numb. xxiv, 24: the Roman fleet] *shall come against him: therefore he shall be dismayed and return and have indignation against the holy covenant.*"

After the discomfiture of Antiochus, Philometor was for some time occupied in resisting the ambitious designs of his brother, who made two attempts to add Cyprus to the kingdom of Cyrene, which was allotted to him. Having effectually put down these attempts, he turned his attention again to Syria. During the brief reign of Antiochus Eupator he seems to have supported Philip against the regent Lysias (comp. 2 Macc. ix, 29). After the murder of Eupator by Demetrius I, Philometor espoused the cause of Alexander Balas, the rival claimant to the throne, because Demetrius had made an attempt on Cyprus; and when Alexander had defeated and slain his rival, he accepted the overtures which he made, and gave him his daughter Cleopatra in marriage (B.C. 150: 1 Macc. x, 51–58). Yet, according to 1 Macc. xi, 1, 10, etc., the alliance was not made in good faith, but only as a means towards securing possession of Syria. According to others, Alexander himself made a treacherous attempt on the life of Ptolemy (comp. 1 Macc. xi, 10), which caused him to transfer his support to Demetrius II, to whom also he gave his daughter, whom he had taken from Alexander. The whole of Syria was quickly subdued, and he was crowned at Antioch king of Egypt and Asia (1 Macc. xi, 13). Alexander made an effort to recover his crown,

but was defeated by the forces of Ptolemy and Demetrius, and shortly afterwards put to death in Arabia. But Ptolemy did not long enjoy his success. He fell from his horse in the battle, and died within a few days (1 Macc. xi, 18), B.C. 145.

Ptolemy Philometor is the last king of Egypt who is noticed in sacred history, and his reign was marked also by the erection of the temple at Leontopolis. The coincidence is worthy of notice, for the consecration of a new centre of worship placed a religious as well as a political barrier between the Alexandrian and Palestinian Jews. Henceforth the nation was again divided. The history of the temple itself is extremely obscure, but even in its origin it was a monument of civil strife. Onias, the son of Onias III (Josephus, in one place [*War*, vii, 10, 2], calls him "the son of Simon," and he appears under the same name in Jewish legends; but it seems certain that this was a mere error, occasioned by the patronymic of the most famous Onias [comp. Herzfeld, *Gesch. d. Judenth.* ii, 557]), who was murdered at Antioch B.C. 171, when he saw that he was excluded from the succession to the high-priesthood by mercenary intrigues, fled to Egypt, either shortly after his father's death or upon the transfer of the office to Alcimus, B.C. 162 (Josephus, *Ant.* xii, 9, 7). It is probable that his retirement must be placed at the later date, for he was a child, παῖς (Josephus, *Ant.* xii, 5), at the time of his father's death, and he is elsewhere mentioned as one of those who actively opposed the Syrian party in Jerusalem (Josephus, *War*, i, 1). In Egypt, he entered the service of the king, and rose, with another Jew, Dositheus, to the supreme command. In this office he rendered important services during the war which Ptolemy Physcon waged against his brother; and he pleaded these to induce the king to grant him a ruined temple of Diana (τῆς ἀγρίας Βουβάστεως) at Leontopolis as the site of a temple which he proposed to build "after the pattern of that at Jerusalem, and of the same dimensions." His alleged object was to unite the Jews in one body who were at the time "divided into hostile factions, even as the Egyptians were, from their differences in religious services" (Josephus, *Ant.* xiii, 3, 1). In defence of the locality which he chose, he quoted the words of Isaiah (Isa. xix, 18, 19), who spoke of "an altar to the Lord in the midst of the land of Egypt," and, according to one interpretation, mentioned "the city of the Sun" (עִיר הַהֶרֶס) by name. The site was granted and the temple built, but the original plan was not exactly carried out. The *Naos* rose "like a tower to the height of sixty cubits" (Josephus, *War*, vii, 10, 3, πύργῳ παραπλήσιον . . . εἰς ἑξήκοντα πήχεις ἀνεστηκότα). The altar and the offerings were similar to those at Jerusalem, but in place of the seven-branched candlestick was "a single lamp of gold suspended by a golden chain." The service was performed by priests and Levites of pure descent; and the temple possessed considerable revenues, which were devoted to their support and to the adequate celebration of the divine ritual (Josephus, *War*, vii, 10, 3; *Ant.* xiii, 3, 3). The object of Ptolemy Philometor in furthering the design of Onias was doubtless the same as that which led to the erection of the "golden calves" in Israel. The Jewish residents in Egypt were numerous and powerful; and when Jerusalem was in the hands of the Syrians, it became of the utmost importance to weaken their connection with their mother city. In this respect the position of the temple on the eastern border of the kingdom was peculiarly important (Jost, *Gesch. des Judenthums*, i, 117). On the other hand, it is probable that Onias saw no hope in the hellenized Judaism of a Syrian province; and the triumph of the Maccabees was still unachieved when the temple at Leontopolis was founded. The date of this event cannot, indeed, be exactly determined. Josephus says (*War*, vii, 10, 4) that the temple had existed "343 years" at the time of its destruction, A.D. cir. 71; but the text is manifestly corrupt. Eusebius (ap. Hieron. viii, p. 507, ed. Migne) notices the flight of Onias and the building of the temple under the same year (B.C. 162), possibly from the natural connection of the events without regard to the exact date of the latter. Some time at least must be allowed for the military service of Onias, and the building of the temple may, perhaps, be placed after the conclusion of the last war with Ptolemy Physcon (B.C. cir. 154), when Jonathan "began to judge the people at Machmas" (1 Macc. ix, 73). In Palestine the erection of this second temple was not condemned so strongly as might have been expected. A question, indeed, was raised in later times whether the service were not idolatrous (*Jerus. Joma*, 43 *d*, ap. Jost, *Gesch. des Judenthums*, i, 119); but the Mishna, embodying, without doubt, the old decisions, determines the point more favorably. "Priests who had served at Leontopolis were forbidden to serve at Jerusalem, but were not excluded from attending the public services." "A vow might be discharged rightly at Leontopolis as well as at Jerusalem, but it was not enough to discharge it at the former place only" (*Menach.* 109 *a*, ap. Jost, as above). The circumstances under which the new temple was erected were evidently accepted as in some degree an excuse for the irregular worship. The connection with Jerusalem, though weakened in popular estimation, was not broken; and the spiritual significance of the one Temple remained unchanged for the devout believer (Philo, *De Monarch.* ii, § 1, etc.). See ALEXANDRIA.

The Jewish colony in Egypt, of which Leontopolis was the immediate religious centre, was formed of various elements and at different times. The settlements which were made under the Greek sovereigns, though the most important, were by no means the first. In the later times of the kingdom of Judah many "trusted in Egypt," and took refuge there (Jer. xliii, 6, 7); and when Jeremiah was taken to Tahapanes, he spoke to "all the Jews which dwell in the land of Egypt, which dwell at Migdol and Tahapanes, and at Noph, and in the country of Pathros" (Jer. xliv, 1). This colony, formed against the command of God, was devoted to complete destruction (Jer. xliv, 27); but when the connection was once formed, it is probable that the Persians, acting on the same policy as the Ptolemies, encouraged the settlement of Jews in Egypt to keep in check the native population. After the Return, the spirit of commerce must have contributed to increase the number of emigrants; but the history of the Egyptian Jews is involved in the same deep obscurity as that of the Jews of Palestine till the invasion of Alexander. There cannot, however, be any reasonable doubt as to the power and influence of the colony; and the mere fact of its existence is an important consideration in estimating the possibility of Jewish ideas finding their way to the West. Judaism had secured, in old times, all the treasures of Egypt, and thus the first instalment of the debt was repaid. A preparation was already made for a great work when the founding of Alexandria opened a new era in the history of the Jews. Alexander, according to the policy of all great conquerors, incorporated the conquered in his armies. Samaritans (Josephus, *Ant.* xi, 8, 6) and Jews (Josephus, *Ant.* xi, 8, 5; Hecat. ap. Joseph. *C. Ap.* i, 22) are mentioned among his troops; and the tradition is probably true which reckons them among the first settlers at Alexandria (Josephus, *War*, ii, 18, 7; *C. Ap.* ii, 4). Ptolemy Soter increased the colony of the Jews in Egypt both by force and by policy; and their numbers in the next reign may be estimated by the statement (Josephus, *Ant.* xii, 2, 1) that Ptolemy Philadelphus gave freedom to one hundred and twenty thousand. The position occupied by Joseph (Josephus, *Ant.* xii, 4) at the court of Ptolemy Euergetes I implies that the Jews were not only numerous, but influential. As we go onward, the legendary accounts of the persecution of Ptolemy Philopator bear witness at least to the great number of Jewish residents in Egypt (3 Macc. iv, 15, 17), and to their dispersion throughout the

Delta. In the next reign many of the inhabitants of Palestine who remained faithful to the Egyptian alliance fled to Egypt to escape from the Syrian rule (comp. Jerome, *ad Dan.* xi, 14, who is, however, confused in his account). The consideration which their leaders must have thus gained accounts for the rank which a Jew, Aristobulus, is said to have held under Ptolemy Philometor as "tutor of the king" (διδάσκαλος, 2 Macc. i, 10). The later history of the Alexandrian Jews has already been noticed. See ALEXANDRIA. They retained their privileges under the Romans, though they were exposed to the illegal oppression of individual governors, and quietly acquiesced in the foreign dominion (Josephus, *War*, vii, 10, 1). An attempt which was made by some of the fugitives from Palestine to create a rising in Alexandria after the destruction of Jerusalem entirely failed; but the attempt gave the Romans an excuse for plundering, and afterwards (B.C. 71) for closing entirely, the temple at Leontopolis (Josephus, *War*, vii, 10).

7. "The son of Dorymenes" (1 Macc. iii, 38; 2 Macc. iv, 45; comp. Polyb. v, 61), a courtier who possessed great influence with Antiochus Epiphanes. He was induced by a bribe to support the cause of Menelaus (2 Macc. iv, 45–50), and afterwards took an active part in forcing the Jews to apostatize (2 Macc. vi, 8, according to the true reading). When Judas had successfully resisted the first assaults of the Syrians, Ptolemy took part in the great expedition which Lysias organized against him, which ended in the defeat at Emmaus (B.C. 166); but nothing is said of his personal fortunes in the campaign (1 Macc. iii, 38).

8. The son of Agesarchus (Ath. vi, p. 246 C), a Megalopolitan, surnamed Macron (2 Macc. x, 12), who was governor of Cyprus during the minority of Ptolemy Philometor. This office he discharged with singular fidelity (Polyb. xxvii, 12); but afterwards he deserted the Egyptian service to join Antiochus Epiphanes. He stood high in the favor of Antiochus, and received from him the government of Phœnicia and Cœle-Syria (2 Macc. viii, 8; x, 11, 12). On the accession of Antiochus Eupator, his conciliatory policy towards the Jews brought him into suspicion at court. He was deprived of his government, and in consequence of this disgrace he poisoned himself, B.C. cir. 164 (2 Macc. x, 13).

Ptolemy Macron is commonly identified with Ptolemy "the son of Dorymenes;" and it seems likely, from a comparison of 1 Macc. iii, 38 with 2 Macc. viii, 8, 9, that they were confused in the popular account of the war. But the testimony of Athenæus distinctly separates the governor of Cyprus from "the son of Dorymenes" by his parentage. It is also doubtful whether Ptolemy Macron had left Cyprus as early as B.C. 170, when "the son of Dorymenes" was at Tyre (2 Macc. iv, 45); though there is no authority for the common statement that he gave up the island into the hands of Antiochus, who did not gain it till B.C. 168.

9. The son of Abubus, who married the daughter of Simon the Maccabee. He was a man of great wealth, and, being invested with the government of the district of Jericho, formed the design of usurping the sovereignty of Judæa. With this view he treacherously murdered Simon and two of his sons (1 Macc. xvi, 11–16; Josephus, *Ant.* xiii, 7, 4; 8, 1, with some variations); but John Hyrcanus received timely intimation of his design, and escaped. Hyrcanus afterwards besieged him in his stronghold of Dôk; but in consequence of the occurrence of the Sabbatical year, Ptolemy was enabled to make his escape to Zeno Cotylas, prince of Philadelphia (Josephus, *Ant.* xiii, 8, 1).

10. A citizen of Jerusalem, father of Lysimachus, the Greek translator of Esther (Esth. xiii). Whether this is the same Ptolemy who is mentioned in the same verse as the carrier of the book to Egypt remains uncertain. See LYSIMACHUS, 1.

Ptolema'ïs (Πτολεμαΐς), the name of two places in Scripture.

1. The same as *Accho* (q. v.). The name is, in fact, an interpolation in the history of the place. The city which was called Accho in the earliest Jewish annals, and which is again the *Akka* or *St. Jean d'Acre* of crusading and modern times, was named Ptolemais in the Macedonian and Roman periods. In the former of these periods it was the most important town upon the coast, and it is prominently mentioned in the first book of Maccabees (v, 15, 55; x, 1, 58, 60; xii, 48). In the latter its eminence was far outdone by Herod's new city of Cæsarea. It is worthy of notice that Herod, on his return from Italy to Syria, landed at Ptolemais (Josephus, *Ant.* xiv, 15, 1). Still in the New Test. Ptolemais is a marked point in Paul's travels both by land and sea. He must have passed through it on all his journeys along the great coast road which connected Cæsarea and Antioch (Acts xi, 30; xii, 25; xv, 2, 30; xviii, 22); and the distances are given both in the Antonine and Jerusalem itineraries (Wesseling, *Itin.* p. 158, 584). But it is specifically mentioned in Acts xxi, 7 as containing a Christian community, visited for one day by Paul. On this occasion he came to Ptolemais by sea. He was then on his return voyage from the third missionary journey. The last harbor at which he had touched was Tyre (ver. 3). From Ptolemais he proceeded, apparently by land, to Cæsarea (ver. 8), and thence to Jerusalem (ver. 17). See PAUL.

2. A place described as ροσοφόρος, *rose-producing* (3 Macc. vii, 17), and supposed to be the ὄρος Πτολεμαΐς of Ptolemy (iv, 5, 57), in Central Egypt, in the Arsinoite nome, a district still abounding in roses (Mannert, *Geogr. der Griechen u. Romanen*, x, 1, p. 419; Ritter, *Erdkunde*, i, 795, 797).

Ptolemaïtes, a branch of the Gnostic sect of the 2d century, described by Irenæus as "a bud from the Valentinians," take their name from their leader Ptolemy (q. v.), who differed in opinion from Valentinian with respect to the number and nature of the æons, as well as the authorship and design of some portions of the Old Testament. See PTOLEMY.

Ptol'emee, Ptolomæ'us, Ptol'omee, forms of the name *Ptolemy* sometimes found in the Apocryphal books of Esther and Maccabees. See PTOLEMÆUS.

Ptol'emy. See PTOLEMÆUS.

Ptolemy was a Gnostic philosopher, in whom, according to St. Irenæus (*Præf.* ad lib. i, *Adv. Hær.*), the system of Valentinus reached its bloom. Irenæus gives a full exposition of it in his work *Adv. Hæreses*, lib. i, c. i, 8. Ptolemy is also named by Tertullian, but without any particulars of his history (*Contr. Valent.* c. xxxiii), and in a very few words by Philaster (*Hær.* c. xxxix), Augustine (*Hær.* c. xiii), Prædestinatus (*Hær.* c. xii), and the continuator of Tertullian (Pseudo-Tertullian, *Hær.* c. xii). St. Epiphanius, in his great work on heresies (*Hær.* lib. xxx, c. iii), communicates a letter of this Ptolemy to Flora, in which the former explains to the lady the fundamental features of his doctrine. The only difference between the Ptolemæans and the Valentinians in general appears to have been in respect to the number of æons which they invented for their respective systems, and the name of Ptolemy is associated particularly with that of Heracleon as regards a duplex system of four. See HERACLEONITES. In the year 1843 Mr. Stieren, who has since made himself more generally known by his recently commenced edition of the works of St. Irenæus, published a dissertation under the title *De Ptolemæi Gnostici ad Floram Epistola, etc.* (Jenæ, ap. C. Hochhausen), in which he endeavors to prove that the doctrine contained in the letter to Flora is at variance with the system of Ptolemy as known by the writings of St. Irenæus, and that, in consequence, the letter must be considered as apocryphal. Hefele, in the *Tübinger Quartalschrift*, 1845, p. 387–396, undertook to show that there is no real contradiction between the letter and the sys-

tem, and that neither the authenticity nor the integrity (except one marginal note in cap. 1, § 6) of the former can be questioned.—Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, s. v.

Pu'ä (Numb. xxvi, 23). See PHUVAH.

Pu'äh, the form in the A. V. of the name of two men and one woman, each different in the Hebrew.

1. (Heb. *Puvvah'*, פּוָּה, 1 Chron. vii, 1.) See PHUVAH.

2. (Heb. *Pu'âh*, פּוּעָה, thought by Gesenius and Fürst to be for רְפוּעָה, *splendid;* Sept. Φουά, Vulg. *Phua.*) The last named of the two midwives to whom Pharaoh gave instructions to kill the Hebrew male children at their birth (Exod. i, 15). B.C. cir. 1740. In the A. V. they are called "Hebrew midwives," a rendering which is not required by the original, and which is regarded by many as doubtful, both from the improbability that the king would have intrusted the execution of such a task to the women of the nation he was endeavoring to destroy, as well as from the answer of the women themselves in ver. 19, "for the Hebrew women are not like the Egyptian women;" from which we may infer that they were accustomed to attend upon the latter, and were themselves Egyptians. If we translate Exod. i, 18 in this way, "And the king of Egypt said to the women who acted as midwives to the Hebrew women," this difficulty is removed. The two, Shiphrah and Puah, are supposed to have been the chief and representatives of their profession; as Aben-Ezra says, "They were chiefs over all the midwives: for no doubt there were more than 500 midwives, but these two were chiefs over them to give tribute to the king of the hire." According to Jewish tradition, Shiphrah was Jochebed, and Puah Miriam; "because," says Rashi, "she *cried* and talked and murmured to the child, after the manner of the women that lull a weeping infant." The origin of all this is an imaginary play upon the name Puah, which is derived from a root signifying "to cry out," as in Isa. xlii, 14, and used in Rabbinical writers of the bleating of sheep.—Smith. Josephus (*Ant.* ii, 9, 9) intimates that these were Egyptian women: but when it is considered that no Egyptian woman was likely to pollute herself by rendering such offices to a Hebrew woman; that Puah and Shiphrah are described as fearing Jehovah (Exod. i, 17); that their names are Hebrew; and that though the words לַמְיַלֶּדֶת הָעִבְרִיֹת *may* be translated "midwives of the Hebrews," they more probably mean, as the A. V. gives them, "Hebrew midwives;" and that had Moses intended to convey the other meaning, he would have written לַמְ֫יַלְּדוֹת אֶת הָעִ֫בְרִיּוֹת, reason will be found for preferring the opinion that they were Hebrew women.

3. (Heb. *Pu'âh*, פּוּאָה, perhaps i. q. פֶּה, *mouth;* Sept. Φουά, Vulg. *Phua.*) The father of Tola, who was of the tribe of Issachar, and judge of Israel after Abimelech (Judg. x, 1). B.C. ante 1319. In the Vulg., instead of "the son of Dodo," he is called "the uncle of Abimelech;" and in the Sept. Tola is said to be "the son of Phua, the son (*viós*) of his father's brother;" both versions endeavoring to render "Dodo" as an appellative, while the latter introduces a remarkable genealogical difficulty.

Public Worship is the service of the different religious bodies open to all worshippers, and is so designated in distinction from minor services intended simply as auxiliaries to the devoted in their religious life. It is usually supposed to be a service under charge of clergy, though it need not be thus limited. It is at any rate supposed to embrace a public address in behalf of the truth espoused by the congregation convened. In the Christian Church the outward forms of religion tended in her very infancy to the imposing. From the ancient temples the incense and many customs of heathenism were transferred to the churches. By the use of tapers and perpetual lamps, the solemnity of nocturnal festivals was combined with the light of day. The people were called together by a piece of metal struck by a hammer, until this method led to the adoption of bells in the 7th century. Soon after the organ came into use, and added to the spectacular action of Christian worship. But notwithstanding this unwarranted tendency towards the dramatic, the expounding of Holy Scripture and prayer formed a principal part in early worship. In the Greek Church the principal part of public worship consisted in the sermon, though it was often only a rhetorical amusement rewarded by the clapping of hands. As the Church had been formed under the Roman empire, it retained many Roman usages. The first to protest against the peculiarities of the Romish clergy were the Christians of Britain, who worshipped in the simplicity of apostolic times. But no effectual check was put upon ecclesiastical usages [see IMAGE-WORSHIP] until the great Reformatory movement which resulted in restoring the beautiful and impressive order of the Saviour and his disciples. See WORSHIP. Nearly all Protestant churches have regulations regarding the form and order of public worship. In the Anglican service-book the *rubrics* (q. v.) present it. According to article xx, the Church has power to decree rites or ceremonies that are not contrary to God's Word; and according to article xxxiv "it is not necessary that traditions and ceremonies be in all places one, or utterly like; for all times they have been divers, and may be changed according to the diversity of countries, times, and men's manners; so that nothing be ordained against God's Word." But in this same article provision is also made against unscriptural (popish) innovations, as well as against the abandonment of those regulations instituted by the proper authority.

"Whosoever, through his private judgment, willingly and purposely doth openly break the traditions and ceremonies of the Church, which be not repugnant to the Word of God, and be ordained and approved by common authority, ought to be rebuked openly (that others may fear to do the like), as he that offends against the common order of the Church, and hurts the authority of the magistrate, and wounds the consciences of weak brethren. Every particular or national Church hath authority to ordain, change, and abolish the ceremonies or rites of the Church, ordained only by man's authority, so that all things be done to edifying."

Canon 6 provides: "Whoever shall affirm that the rites and ceremonies of the Church of England by law established are wicked, anti-Christian, or superstitious; or such as, being commanded by lawful authority, men who are zealously and godly affected may not with any good conscience approve them, use them, or, as occasion requireth, subscribe unto them; let him be excommunicated *ipso facto*, and not restored until he repent, and publicly revoke such his wicked errors."

Canon 80. "The churchwardens or questmen of every church and chapel shall, at the charge of the parish, provide the Book of Common Prayer, lately explained in some few points by his majesty's authority, according to the laws and his highness's prerogative in that behalf; and that with all convenient speed, but at the furthest within two months after the publishing of these our constitutions. Every dean, canon, or prebendary of every cathedral or collegiate church, and all masters and other heads, fellows, chaplains, and tutors of or in any college, hall, house of learning, or hospital, and every public professor and reader in either of the universities, or in every college elsewhere, and every parson, vicar, curate, lecturer, and every other person in holy orders, and every schoolmaster keeping any public or private school, and every person instructing or teaching any youth in any house or private family as tutor or schoolmaster, who shall be incumbent, or have possession of any deanery, canonry, prebend, mastership, headship, fellowship, professor's place or reader's place, parsonage, vicarage, or any other ecclesiastical dignity or promotion, or of any curate's place, lecture, or school, or shall instruct or teach any youth as tutor or schoolmaster, shall at or before his admission to be incumbent, or having possession aforesaid, subscribe the declaration following: 'I, A. B., do declare that I will conform to the liturgy of the Church of England, as it is now by law established' (13 and 14 Charles II, c. 4, s. 8, and 1 William, sess. 1, c. 8, s. 11). And no form or order of common prayers, administration of sacraments, rites, or ceremonies, shall be openly used in any church, chapel, or other place than that which is prescribed in the said book (§ 17)."

Canon 4. "Whosoever shall affirm that the form of God's worship in the Church of England, established by law, and contained in the Book of Common Prayer and Administration of Sacraments, is a corrupt, superstitious, or unlawful worship of God, or containeth anything in it that is repugnant to the Scriptures, let him be excommunicated *ipso facto*, and not restored but by the bishop of the place, or archbishop, after his repentance and public revocation of such his wicked errors."

Canon 38. "If any minister, after he hath subscribed to the Book of Common Prayer, shall omit to use the form of prayer, or any of the orders or ceremonies prescribed in the Communion Book, let him be suspended; and if after a month he do not reform and submit himself, let him be excommunicated; and then if he shall not submit himself within the space of another month, let him be deposed from the ministry."

Canon 18 requires that "no man shall cover his head in the church or chapel in the time of divine service, except he have some infirmity, in which case let him wear a nightcap or coif. All manner of persons then present shall reverently kneel upon their knees, when the general confession, litany, or other prayers are read; and shall stand up at the saying of the Belief, according to the rules in that behalf prescribed in the Book of Common Prayer. And likewise, when in time of divine service the Lord Jesus shall be mentioned, due and lowly reverence shall be done by all persons present, as it hath been accustomed; testifying by these outward ceremonies and gestures their inward humility, Christian resolution, and due acknowledgment that the Lord Jesus Christ, the true eternal Son of God, is the only Saviour of the world, in whom alone all the mercies, graces, and promises of God to mankind, for this life and the life to come, are fully and wholly comprised. And none, either man, woman, or child, of what calling soever, shall be otherwise at such times busied in the church than in quiet attendance to hear, mark, and understand that which is read, preached, or ministered: saying in their due places audibly, with the minister, the Confession, the Lord's Prayer, and the Creed, and making such other answers to the public prayers as are appointed in the Book of Common Prayer; neither shall they disturb the service or sermon by walking or talking, or any other way; nor depart out of the church during the time of divine service or sermon without some urgent or reasonable cause."

Canon 14. "The common prayer shall be said or sung distinctly and reverently, upon such days as are appointed to be kept holy by the Book of Common Prayer, and their eves, and at convenient and usual times of those days, and in such places of every church, as the bishop of the diocese or ecclesiastical ordinary of the place shall think meet for the largeness or straitness of the same, so as the people may be most edified. All ministers likewise shall observe the orders, rites, and ceremonies prescribed in the Book of Common Prayer, as well in reading the Holy Scriptures and saying of prayers as in the administration of the sacraments, without either diminishing in regard of preaching or in any other respect, or adding anything in the matter or form thereof."

Preface to the Book of Common Prayer: "All priests and deacons are to say daily the morning and evening prayer, either privately or openly, not being let by sickness or some other urgent cause. And the curate that ministereth in every parish church or chapel, being at home, and not being otherwise reasonably hindered, shall say the same in the parish church or chapel where he ministereth; and shall cause a bell to be tolled thereunto, a convenient time before he begin, that the people may come to hear God's Word, and to pray with him."

The American reviewers omitted from the Prayer-book the 45th canon of 1832, which enjoins that "every minister shall, before all sermons and lectures, and on all other occasions of public worship, use the Book of Common Prayer as the same is or may be established by the authority of the General Convention of this Church. And in performing said service, no other prayer shall be used than those prescribed by the said book."

The Westminster Directory enacts:

"Let all enter the assembly, not irreverently, but in a grave and seemly manner, taking their seats or places without adoration, or bowing themselves towards one place or other. The congregation being assembled, the minister, after solemn calling on them to the worshipping of the great name of God, is to begin with prayer. The public worship being begun, the people are wholly to attend upon it, forbearing to read anything except what the minister is then reading or citing; and abstaining much more from all private whisperings, conferences, salutations, or doing reverence to any person present, or coming in; as also from all gazing, sleeping, and other indecent behavior which may disturb the minister or people, or hinder themselves or others in the service of God. If any, through necessity, be hindered from being present at the beginning, they ought not, when they come into the congregation, to betake themselves to their private devotions, but reverently to compose themselves to join with the assembly in that ordinance of God which is then in hand."

This injunction to begin with prayer has been universally departed from in Scotland, and the reason assigned is this: "The reader or precentor began the service with reading a chapter, and gave out a psalm as the minister came into church—so that the minister, the psalm being sung, began with prayer. But the precentor's function has ceased since the middle or towards the end of last century, and the minister now begins with praise, doing himself what used to be done by his subordinate." See PRECENTOR; READER.

In most of the American churches the principal object of public worship is the expounding of the Word of God by the minister in a sermon. This is usually preceded by song and prayer and the reading of the Scriptures, and followed by prayer and song. The order of arrangement differs, being usually regarded as immaterial. See CHURCH; CLERGY; LITANY; PRAYER; WORSHIP.

Publican (τελώνης). The word thus translated belongs only, in the New Test., to the three Synoptic Gospels. The class designated by the Greek word were employed as collectors of the Roman revenue. The Latin word from which the English of the A. V. has been taken was applied to a higher order of men. It will be necessary to glance at the financial administration of the Roman provinces in order to understand the relation of the two classes to each other, and the grounds of the hatred and scorn which appear in the New Test. to have fallen on the former.

The Roman senate had found it convenient, at a period as early as, if not earlier than, the second Punic war, to farm out at public auction the *vectigalia* (direct taxes) and the *portoria* (customs, including the *octroi* on goods carried into or out of cities) to capitalists who undertook to pay a given sum into the treasury (*in publicum*), and so received the name of *publicani* (Livy, xxxii, 7). Contracts of this kind fell naturally into the hands of the *equites*, as the richest class of Romans. These *knights* were an order instituted as early as the time of Romulus, and composed of men of great consideration with the government—"the principal men of dignity in their several countries," who occupied a kind of middle rank between the senators and the people (Josephus, *Ant.* xii, 4). Although these officers were, according to Cicero, the ornament of the city and the strength of the commonwealth, they did not attain to great offices, nor enter the senate, so long as they continued in the order of knights. They were thus more capable of devoting their attention to the collection of the public revenue. Not unfrequently the sum bidden went beyond the means of any individual capitalist, and a joint-stock company (*societas*) was formed, with one of the partners, or an agent appointed by them, acting as managing director (*magister*; Cicero, *Ad Div.* xiii, 9). Under this officer, who commonly resided at Rome, transacting the business of the company, paying profits to the partners and the like, were the *submagistri*, living in the provinces. Under them, in like manner, were the *portitores*, the actual custom-house officers (*douaniers*), who examined each bale of goods exported or imported, assessed its value more or less arbitrarily, wrote out the ticket, and enforced payment. The latter were commonly natives of the province in which they were stationed, as being brought daily into contact with all classes of the population. The word τελῶναι, which etymologically might have been used of the *publicani* properly so called (τέλη, ὠνέομαι), was used popularly, and in the New Test. exclusively, of the *portitores*. The same practice prevailed in the East, from which an illustration of it has been preserved to us by Josephus. He tells us that on the marriage of Cleopatra to Ptolemy, the latter received from Antiochus as his daughter's dowry Cœle-Syria, Samaria, Judæa, and Phœnicia; that "upon the division of the taxes between the two kings, the principal men farmed the taxes of their several countries," paying to the kings the stipulated sum; and that "when the day came on which the king was to let the taxes of the cities to farm, and those that were the

principal men of dignity in their several countries were to bid for them, the sum of the taxes together of Cœle-Syria, and Phœnicia, and Judæa, and Samaria, as they were bidden for, came to eight thousand talents" (*Ant.* xii, 4, 1, 4). Those thus spoken of by the Jewish historian as "principal men of dignity" were the real *publicani* of antiquity. In the Roman empire especially they were persons of no small consequence; in times of trouble they advanced large sums of money to the State, and towards the close of the republic they were so generally members of the equestrian order that the words *equites* and *publicani* were sometimes used as synonymous (Smith, *Dict. Gr. and Rom. Antiq.* s. v.).

The *publicani* were thus an important section of the equestrian order. An orator wishing, for political purposes, to court that order, might describe them as "flos equitum Romanorum, ornamentum civitatis, firmamentum Reipublicæ" (Cicero, *Pro Planc.* 9). The system was, however, essentially a vicious one—the most detestable, perhaps, of all modes of managing a revenue (comp. Adam Smith, *Wealth of Nations*, vol. ii), and it bore its natural fruits. The *publicani* were banded together to support each other's interest, and at once resented and defied all interference (Livy, xxv, 3). They demanded severe laws, and put every such law into execution. Their agents, the *portitores*, were encouraged in the most vexatious or fraudulent exactions, and a remedy was all but impossible. The popular feeling ran strong even against the equestrian capitalists. The Macedonians complained, as soon as they were brought under Roman government, that "ubi publicanus est, ibi aut jus publicum vanum, aut libertas sociis nulla" (Livy, xlv, 18). Cicero, in writing to his brother (*Ad Quint.* i, 1, 11), speaks of the difficulty of keeping the *publicani* within bounds, and yet not offending them, as the hardest task of the governor of a province. Tacitus counted it as one bright feature of the ideal life of a people unlike his own that there "nec publicanus atterit" (*Germ.* 29). For a moment the capricious liberalism of Nero led him to entertain the thought of sweeping away the whole system of *portoria;* but the conservatism of the senate, servile as it was in all things else, rose in arms against it, and the scheme was dropped (Tacitus, *Ann.* xiii, 50), and the "immodestia publicanorum" (*ibid.*) remained unchecked.

If this was the case with the directors of the company, we may imagine how it stood with the underlings. They overcharged whenever they had an opportunity (Luke iii, 13). They brought false charges of smuggling in the hope of extorting hush-money (ibid. xix, 8). They detained and opened letters on mere suspicion (Terence, *Phorm.* i, 2, 99; Plautus, *Trinumm.* iii, 3, 64). The *injuriæ portitorum*, rather than the *portoria* themselves, were in most cases the subject of complaint (Cicero, *Ad Quint.* i, 1, 11). It was the basest of all livelihoods (Cicero, *De Off.* i, 42). They were the wolves and bears of human society (Stobæus, *Serm.* ii, 34). Πάντες τελῶναι, πάντες ἅρπαγες had become a proverb, even under an earlier régime, and it was truer than ever now (Xenoph. Comic. ap. Dicæarch. Meineke, *Frag. Com.* iv, 596). Of these subordinate officials there appear to have been two classes, both included by us under the general name *publican*—the ἀρχιτελῶναι, or "chief of the publicans," of whom we have an instance in Zacchæus; and the ordinary publicans (τελῶναι), the lowest class of servants engaged in the collection of the revenue, and of whom Levi, afterwards the apostle Matthew, is an example. The former, the ἀρχιτελῶναι, appear to have been managers under the *publicani* proper, or associations of publicans, already spoken of. They were intrusted with the supervision of a collecting district, and it was their duty to see that, in that district, the inferior officers were faithful, and that the various taxes were regularly gathered in. Their situation was thus one of much greater consequence than that of the ordinary "publican" of the Gospels. They seem to have possessed a much higher character, and many of them became wealthy men. Zacchæus is the only example of an ἀρχιτελώνης mentioned in the New Test., and it is the ordinary τελῶναι, neither the farmers of the revenues, nor the superintendents whom they employed, but a still lower class of servants, who most interest us. These were not the *publicani*, but the *portitores* of the Roman empire, who derived their name from their levying the taxes known as the *portoria*. The *portoria* included the duties upon imported and exported goods, and upon merchandise passing through the country—one important source of the wealth of Solomon: "Besides that, he had of the merchantmen, and of the traffic of the spice merchants" (1 Kings x, 15). They included also the tribute or head-money levied from individuals, and the various tolls which appear to have been exigible for the use of roads and bridges. They thus extended over a large number of particulars, and, however honorably and gently the function of the *portitor* had been discharged, it would have been impossible for him to avoid that odium which the tax-collector seldom escapes from the taxpayer. But the office, invidious enough in itself, was in the ancient world rendered still more hateful, as we have seen, by the inquisitorial proceedings and the unscrupulous exactions of those who discharged its duties. The frightful abuses practiced in conquered provinces by the governors who were sent to rule them are well known to all; but the same system of abuse marked the whole army of officials from the highest to the lowest, only that the lowest came in contact with the great mass of the people, and that their petty interferences and severities must have been felt, under one form or another, by almost all. To such an extent, indeed, did these exactions proceed, even in the very neighborhood of Rome, that at one time the Roman government, as the only means of introducing a remedy, abolished all the import and export duties in the ports of Italy (Smith, *Dict. Gr. and Rom. Antiq.* s. v. Portitores).

All this was enough to bring the class into ill-favor everywhere. In Judæa and Galilee there were special circumstances of aggravation. The employment brought out all the besetting vices of the Jewish character. The strong feeling of many Jews as to the absolute unlawfulness of paying tribute at all made matters worse. The Scribes who discussed the question (Matt. xxii, 15) for the most part answered it in the negative. The Galilæans or Herodians, the disciples of Judas the Gaulonite, were the most turbulent and rebellious (Acts v, 37). They thought it unlawful to pay tribute, and founded their refusal to do so on their being the people of the Lord, because a true Israelite was not permitted to acknowledge any other sovereign than God (Josephus, *Ant.* xviii, 2). The publicans were hated as the instruments by which the subjection of the Jews to the Roman emperor was perpetuated, and the paying of tribute was regarded as a virtual acknowledgment of his sovereignty. They were also noted for their imposition, rapine, and extortion, to which they were, perhaps, more especially prompted by having a share in the farm of the tribute, as they were thus tempted to oppress the people with illegal exactions that they might the more speedily enrich themselves. Theocritus considered the bear and the lion the most cruel among the beasts of the wilderness, and among the beasts of the city the publican and the parasite. In addition to their other faults, accordingly, the publicans of the New Test. were regarded as traitors and apostates, defiled by their frequent intercourse with the heathen, willing tools of the oppressor. They were classed with sinners (Matt. ix, 11; xi, 19), with harlots (xxi, 31, 32), with the heathen (xviii, 17). In Galilee they consisted probably of the least reputable members of the fisherman and peasant class. Left to themselves, men of decent lives holding aloof from them, their only friends or companions were found among those who, like themselves, were outcasts from the world's law. Scribes and people alike hated them.

The Gospels present us with some instances of this

feeling. To eat and drink "with publicans" seems to the Pharisaic mind incompatible with the character of a recognised rabbi (Matt. ix, 11). They spoke in their scorn of our Lord as the friend of publicans (xi, 19). Rabbinic writings furnish some curious illustrations of the same feeling. The Chaldee Targum and R. Solomon find in "the archers who sit by the waters" of Judg. v, 11, a description of the τελῶναι sitting on the banks of rivers or seas in ambush for the wayfarer. The casuistry of the Talmud enumerates three classes of men with whom promises need not be kept, and the three are murderers, thieves, and publicans (*Nedar.* iii, 4). No money known to come from them was received into the alms-box of the synagogue or the corban of the Temple (*Baba Kama*, x, 1). To write a publican's ticket, or even to carry the ink for it on the Sabbath-day, was a distinct breach of the commandment (*Shabb.* viii, 2). They were not fit to sit in judgment, or even to give testimony (*Sanhedr.* fol. 25, 2). Sometimes there is an exceptional notice in their favor. It was recorded as a special excellence in the father of a rabbi that, having been a publican for thirteen years, he had lessened instead of increasing the pressure of taxation (*ibid.*). The early Christian fathers take up the same complaint. "Publicanus ex officio peccator," exclaims Tertullian; and from the exhaustless vocabulary of Chrysostom they have heaped upon them every epithet of abuse. See the passages bearing upon this point in Wetstein's note on Matt. v, 46; also Suicer's *Thesaurus*, s. v. Τελώνης; Grotius, *Ad Matt.* xviii; Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb. ad Matt.* xviii.

The class thus practically excommunicated furnished some of the earliest disciples both of the Baptist and of our Lord. Like the outlying, so-called "dangerous classes" of other times, they were at least free from hypocrisy. Whatever morality they had was real, and not conventional. We may think of the Baptist's preaching as having been to them what Wesley's was to the colliers of Kingswood or the Cornish miners. The publican who cried in the bitterness of his spirit, "God be merciful to me a sinner" (Luke xviii, 13), may be taken as the representative of those who had come under this influence (Matt. xxi, 32). The Galilæan fishermen had probably learned, even before their Master taught them, to overcome their repugnance to the publicans who with them had been sharers in the same baptism. The publicans (Matthew perhaps among them) had probably gone back to their work learning to exact no more than what was appointed them (Luke iii, 13). However startling the choice of Matthew, the publican, to be of the number of the twelve may have seemed to the Pharisees, we have no trace of any perplexity or offence on the part of the disciples.

The position of Zacchæus as an ἀρχιτελώνης (Luke xix, 2) implies a position of some importance among the persons thus employed. Possibly the balsam trade, of which Jericho was the centre, may have brought larger profits; possibly he was one of the *submagistri* in immediate communication with the bureau at Rome. That it was possible for even a Jewish publican to attain considerable wealth we find from the history of John the τελώνης (Josephus, *War*, ii, 14, 4), who acts with the leading Jews and offers a bribe of eight talents to the procurator, Gessius Florus. The fact that Jericho was at this time a city of the priests—12,000 are said to have lived there—gives, it need hardly be said, a special significance to our Lord's preference of the house of Zacchæus. When Jesus visited the house of Zacchæus, who appears to have been eminently honest and upright, he was assured by him that he was ready to give one half of his goods to the poor, and if he had taken anything from any man by false accusation, to "restore him fourfold" (Luke xix, 8). This was in reference to the Roman law, which required that when any farmer was convicted of extortion he should return four times the value of what he had fraudulently obtained. There is no reason to suppose that either Zacchæus or Matthew had been guilty of unjust practices, or that there was any exception to their characters beyond that of being engaged in an odious employment. Some other examples of this occur. Suetonius (*Vesp.* 1) mentions the case of Sabinus, a collector of the fortieth penny in Asia, who had several statues erected to him by the cities of the province, with this inscription, "To the honest tax-farmer." See *Bible Educator*, iii, 193. For monographs on the publicans, see Volbeding, *Index Programmatum*, p. 52, 67. See Tax-Gatherer.

Publicāni, English Waldenses (q. v.), of whom Rapin, in relating the transactions of the councils of Henry II, gives the following account, on the authority of archbishop Usher: "Henry ordered a council to meet at Oxford in 1166, to examine the tenets of certain heretics, called *Publicani*. Very probably they were disciples of the Waldenses, who began then to appear. When they were asked in the council who they were, they answered they were Christians and followers of the apostles. After that, being questioned upon the Creed, their replies were very orthodox as to the Trinity and incarnation. But (says Rapin) if the historian is to be depended on, they rejected baptism, the Eucharist, marriage, and the communion of saints. They showed much modesty and meekness in their whole behavior. When they were threatened with death, in order to oblige them to renounce their tenets, they only said, 'Blessed are they that suffer for righteousness' sake.'" There is no difficulty in understanding what were their sentiments on these heretical points. When a monk says they rejected the Eucharist, it is to be understood they rejected the doctrine of transubstantiation; when he says they rejected marriage, he means that they denied it to be a sacrament, and maintained it to be a civil institution; when he says they rejected the communion of saints, nothing more is to be understood than that they refused to hold communion with the corrupt Church of Rome; and when he says that they rejected baptism, we understand by it that they rejected the baptism of infants. These were the errors for which they were branded with a hot iron in their foreheads. See Ivimey, *History of the Baptists*, i, 56 sq.

Publius (Græcized Πόπλιος), the chief man—probably the governor—of Melita, or Malta, who received and lodged Paul and his companions on the occasion of their being shipwrecked off that island (Acts xxviii, 7) A.D. 55. It soon appeared that he was entertaining an angel unawares, for Paul gave proof of his divine commission by miraculously healing the father of Publius of a fever, and afterwards working other cures on the sick who were brought to him. Publius possessed property in Melita: the distinctive title given to him is "the first (πρῶτος) of the island;" and two inscriptions—one in Greek, the other in Latin—have been found at Civita Vecchia, in which that apparently official title occurs. An inscription found in Malta designates the governor of the island by the same title. (See Lewin's *St. Paul*, ii, 209, where the originals are given, showing this to be the only natural interpretation.) Publius may perhaps have been the delegate of the Roman prætor of Sicily, to whose jurisdiction Melita, or Malta, belonged. The Roman martyrologies assert that he was the first bishop of the island, and that he was afterwards appointed to succeed Dionysius as bishop of Athens. Jerome records a tradition that he was crowned with martyrdom (*De Viris Illust.* xix; Baron, *Annal.* i, 554). See Walch, *De Publio πρώτῳ Melitensium* (Jen. 1755).

Pucci, Francesco (Lat. *Puccius*), an Italian theologian, noted as the founder of a heretical school, flourished in the 16th century. He was a native of Florence, and belonged to a noble and ancient family which produced three cardinals. He went to Lyons to engage in commerce, but having assisted in the religious disputes so

frequent at that epoch, he left his country to give himself to the study of theology. From Lyons he went to England, and in 1574 he took the degree of master of arts at Oxford. In adopting the greater part of the opinions of the Reformation, he expected to make ample use of that most precious conquest, liberty of search; he joined himself to no sect, or, rather, he took from each that which best accorded with his own mind, naturally bold and restless. This independence created for him enemies and disputes in all the countries which he visited; he led a wandering life, and instead of passing for a person of troubled mind in search of truth, he was loaded with invectives and charged with fanaticism. At Oxford, being a candidate for a chair, he was advised to write a thesis *De Fide in Deum quæ et qualis sit*, and raised the opposition of all his future colleagues, less by the scruples which he had shown of the method of comprehending God than because he had openly combated the dogmas of Calvinism. Pucci then went to Basle, and there made the acquaintance of Faustus Socinus, but a dispute that he had with him about the first man, and his ideas of universal mercy, exposed him anew to persecution. Exiled from Basle in 1578, he returned to London, where his opinions, too frankly expressed, caused him to be imprisoned. After his release, he took refuge in the Low Countries; but always studying, writing, and disputing, he did not find his halting-place until he reached Poland. At Cracow he encountered two Englishmen—John Dee and Edward Kelly, companions of John à Laski; they won Pucci to the study of occult science, and persuaded him that by familiar intercourse with spirits he would have the privilege of discovering much that was unknown. The attraction of the marvellous, and the novelty of the phenomena that John Dee seemed to control, were strong enough to attach Pucci for four years. The papal nuncio at Prague became acquainted with Pucci, and by his personal influence drew him into the bosom of the Romish Church in 1586. In 1592 Pucci wrote a book dedicated to pope Clement VIII, under the title *De Christi Salvatoris Efficacitate* (Gouda, 1592), in which he used new arguments in support of the doctrine of the universal atonement as follows: "Christ having made an atonement for all men by his death, no other means are now necessary for salvation than those which are provided by natural religion, and not only those who bear the name of the Saviour, but all honest men, can be saved, even in paganism." The doctrine thus espoused was not likely to please the pontiff, though he was honored by the dedication, and Pucci was made so uncomfortable that in 1595 there came from him a public retraction of his preceding opinions. He then received sacerdotal ordination, and became secretary of cardinal Pompey, with whom he passed the last years of his life in peace. He died in 1600. He had composed the following couplet to be engraved upon his tomb:

"Inveni portum: spes et fortuna, valete!
Nil mihi vobiscum, ludite nunc alios."

Some authors have asserted without proof that Pucci was sent to Rome and burned. See *Universalist Quarterly*, July, 1873, art. i; Ittig, *De Puccianismo;* Schmid, *Dr. F. Puccio in Naturalistis et Indifferentistis Redivivo* (Lips. 1712, 4to); Bayle, *Hist. Dict.* s. v. (J. H. W.)

Puccianites is the name of the followers of Francesco Pucci (q. v.), a class of Italian Universalists. See Universalism.

Pucelle, Abbé, a French ecclesiastic who flourished in the first half of the 18th century, is noted as one of the ablest defenders of the Gallican liberties. He was born at Paris in 1655, and was in Parliament in 1714 when the adoption and registration of the bull *Unigenitus*, which aimed at the destruction of the Jansenists (q. v.), was discussed, and he most vigorously opposed this act on the part of the French state. He was then one of the clerical counsellors of the "Grand Chamber." In 1730, also, after the archbishop of Paris, De Vintimille, attempted to enforce the *Unigenitus*, and the king had suffered the "lit de justice" to strengthen the papists, Pucelle stood strong, and caused the counsellors to keep their places and assert the independence and supremacy of the temporal power of France over Roman ecclesiasticism. They contended that it does not belong to ecclesiastics to define the limits between civil and spiritual authority; that the laws of the Church do not become laws of the State until they are sanctioned and promulgated by the sovereign; and that the ministers of the Church are accountable to the king and the Parliament for any offence against the statute law of the realm (see *Mémoires du Maréchal Duc de Richelieu*, iii, 203). It was the first step of the opposition of the clergy of France to the crown and the hierarchy. See France; Gallican Church. Of Pucelle's personal history nothing further is accessible to us than that he was obliged to go into exile after 1732, and returned only when peace was concluded between court and Parliament. He died at Paris Jan. 7, 1745. See Guettée, *Hist. de l'Église de France;* Jervis, *Hist. Ch. of France*, ii, 220, 231, 272. (J. H. W.)

Puchta, Christian Rudolph Heinrich, a Lutheran minister, was born Aug. 19, 1808, at Cadolzburg, in Middle Franconia. After having received his preparatory education, he entered the university in 1826, and studied at Erlangen and Berlin. In 1832 he was appointed vicar at Munich, in 1837 he went to Erlangen as private teacher, and in 1839 he was appointed professor of philosophy and religion at the newly founded lyceum in Speyer. Being mentally and physically broken down by too much work, he retired from his professorship until 1842, when he took charge of the small congregation at Eyb, not far from Anspach. Here he wrote his *Morgen- und Abendandachten* (Erlangen, 1843). For ten years he labored at Eyb, in the meantime restoring his broken health. In 1852 he was called as second pastor of St. James's to Augsburg, advanced in 1856 to the position of the first pastor, and died Sept. 12, 1858. Puchta was one of the most excellent of modern hymnists, his hymns being full of depth and richness of thought. Besides his *Morgen- und Abendandachten*, he also published *Der Hausaltar* (Frankfort-on-the-Main, 1857); *Handbuch der praktischen Katechese* (Stuttgart, 1854), 1st pt. His hymns are found in Knapp's *Liederschatz* and in some of our modern hymn-books. See Knapp, *Biography of Puchta*, printed in the preface to Puchta's hymns (Stuttgart, 1860), p. iv–xxiii; *Augsburger Allgemeine Zeitung*, 1858, No. 268; Koch, *Geschichte des deutschen Kirchenliedes*, vii, 277 sq.; Zuchold, *Bibliotheca Theologica*, ii, 1021; Hauck, *Theol. Jahresbericht*, 1865, p. 404 sq. (B. P.)

Pudari were, in the Indian mythology, gigantic beings with flaming hair and a number of arms, who were held in great honor as protectors of the cities. Temples were built in their honor outside of the places which stood under their guard. Sacrifices, even human victims, were offered to them.

Pudas, an Indian god whom we find frequently in the company of Ixora (one of the incarnations of Siva). Nothing is known as to his attributes. His appearance is strange and grotesque: he is small, with an enormous belly; his head is surrounded with snakes; another snake winds itself in many circles around his legs, chest, and arms; his right hand holds a staff.

Pu'dens (Græcized, Πούδης), a Christian friend of Timothy at Rome. St. Paul, writing about A.D. 64, says, "Eubulus greeteth thee, and Pudens, and Linus, and Claudia" (2 Tim. iv, 21). Pudens is commemorated in the Byzantine Church on April 14, in the Roman Church on May 19. He is included in the list of the seventy disciples given by Pseudo-Hippolytus. Papebroch, the Bollandist editor (*Acta Sanctorum*, Maii, iv, 296), while printing the legendary histories, distinguishes between two saints of this name, both Roman

senators—one the host of St. Peter and friend of St. Paul, martyred under Nero; the other the grandson of the former, living about A.D. 150, the father of Novatus, Timothy (who is said to have preached the Gospel in Britain), Praxedis, and Pudentiana, whose house, in the valley between the Viminal hill and the Esquiline, served, in his lifetime, for the assembly of Roman Christians, and afterwards gave place to a church, now the Church of Sta. Pudenziana, a short distance at the back of the Basilica of Sta. Maria Maggiore. Earlier writers (as Baronius, *Ann.* 44, § 61; 59, § 18; 162) are disposed to believe in the existence of one Pudens only. About the end of the 16th century it was observed (F. de Monceaux, *Eccl. Christianæ Veteris Britannicæ Incunabula*, Tournay, 1614; Estius, or his editor; Abp. Parker, *De Antiquit. Britann. Eccl.* 1605; M. Alford, *Annales Eccl. Brit.* 1663; Camden, *Britannia*, 1586) that Martial, the Spanish poet, who went to Rome A.D. 66 or earlier, in his twenty-third year, and dwelt there for nearly forty years, mentions two contemporaries, Pudens and Claudia, as husband and wife (*Epig.* iv, 13); that he mentions Pudens or Aulus Pudens in i, 32; iv, 29; v, 48; vi, 58; vii, 11, 97; Claudia or Claudia Rufina in viii, 60; xi, 53; and, it might be added, Linus, in i, 76; ii, 54; iv, 66; xi, 25; xii, 49. That Timothy and Martial should each have three friends bearing the same names at the same time and place is at least a very singular coincidence. The poet's Pudens was his intimate acquaintance, an admiring critic of his epigrams, an immoral man if judged by the Christian rule. He was an Umbrian and a soldier. First he appears as a centurion aspiring to become a primipilus; afterwards he is on military duty in the remote north, and the poet hopes that on his return thence he may be raised to equestrian rank. His wife Claudia is described as of British birth, of remarkable beauty and wit, and the mother of a flourishing family. A Latin inscription found in 1723 at Chichester connects a [Pud]ens with Britain and with the Claudian name. It is as follows, if we fill out the usual abbreviations: "[N]eptuno et Minervae templum [pr]o salute domus divinae auctoritate Tiberii Claudii [Co]gidubni regis legati Augusti in Brit., [colle]gium fabrorum et qui in eo [a sacris sunt] de suo dedicaverunt, donante aream [Pud]ente, Pudentini filio." A corner of the stone was broken off, and the letters within brackets have been inserted on conjecture. The inscription thus commemorates the erection of a temple by a guild of carpenters, with the sanction of king Tiberius Claudius Cogidubnus, the site being the gift of [Pud]ens, the son of Pudentinus. Cogidubnus was a native king, appointed and supported by Rome (Tacit. *Agricola*, 14). He reigned with delegated power probably from A.D. 52 to A.D. 76. If he had a daughter, she would inherit the name Claudia, and might, perhaps as a hostage, be educated at Rome. Another link seems to connect the Romanizing Britons of that time with Claudia Rufina and with Christianity (see Musgrave, quoted by Fabricius, *Lux Evangelii*, p. 702). The wife of Aulus Plautius, who commanded in Britain from A.D. 43 to A.D. 52, was Pomponia Græcina, and the Rufi were a branch of her house. She was accused at Rome, A.D. 57, on a capital charge of "foreign superstition;" was acquitted, and lived, for nearly forty years, in a state of austere and mysterious melancholy (Tacit. *Ann.* xiii, 32). We know from the Epistle to the Romans (xvi, 13) that the Rufi were well represented among the Roman Christians in A.D. 55. Modern researches among the Columbaria at Rome, appropriated to members of the imperial household, have brought to light an inscription in which the name of Pudens occurs as that of a servant of Tiberius or Claudius (*Journal of Classical and Sacred Philology*, iv, 76).

In certain ancient documents, called the *Acts of Pastor*, it is recorded that Pudens, after the death of his wife, desired that his house should be consecrated as a church, and that this was done; that subsequently, at his daughters' request, a baptistery was constructed there; that these daughters gathered together their slaves, both from the city and from their country possessions, and gave liberty to those who were Christians, and exhorted those who were not believers in the holy law of Christ, and that the act of manumission was celebrated in the *title* (church) established by Pudens; that there, also, in a time of persecution, Praxedis and Pudentiana sheltered those who through their instrumentality had become believers; and that afterwards, when the latter, and her brother Novatus also, were dead, his property, with the consent of Timotheus, passed into the hands of Praxedis, by whose request the *thermæ*, or baths, of Novatus, which are described as spacious and no longer in use, were consecrated as a church, in the name of Pudentiana, by Pius (bishop of the Church in Rome, A.D. 139–155). In this place, it is further reported, Pius also consecrated a baptistery. Here, moreover, afterwards, when a great persecution arose, numbers of Christians were concealed by Praxedis, and nourished with food and with the word of God. Pudens and his daughters, it is also narrated, were buried in the cemetery of Priscilla, on the Via Salaria. Anastasius, librarian of the Vatican in the 9th century, also asserts that Pius dedicated the *thermæ* of Novatus as a church in honor of Pudentiana. The same fact is said to be affirmed by Damasus in the latter part of the 4th century. These may be mere repetitions. The *Acts of Pastor* locate the house of Pudens in the Vicus Patricius, in which corresponds with the modern Via di Sta. Pudenziana. On this street still stands a church, which is reputed to be the oldest in Rome. It is named Sta. Pudenziana, and is supposed to be located where Pudens and his family once dwelt. The text of the *Acts of Pastor* is unsettled, and is not free from anachronisms. The documents cannot have come in their present form, or forms rather, from their reputed author, or from the 2d century. Since Tillemont's learned criticism, they have fallen into disrepute. The Bollandist writer in the *Acta Sanctorum* is compelled to propose alterations of the text without authority, and to suppose the existence of two persons, each named Pudens, one either the



Fac-simile of the Pudens Inscription at Chichester.

grandfather or the paternal uncle of the other. Nor does anything preserved in the interior of the present church of Pudentiana carry us back decisively to the first generations of Roman Christians; the older portions of the edifice, however, do contain such indications.

One of the priests of the Church of St. Pudentiana attended a Roman synod in the year 499, and was enrolled as "*Presbyter Tituli Pudentis*" (Presbyter of the Church of Pudens). The building was repaired or rebuilt under Adrian I (A.D. 772–795); but portions of an older structure remain. The north aisle runs back much beyond the choir and its apse. In its side towards the choir there is a slab with the inscription SIRICIVS EPISCOPVS. Siricius was bishop A.D. 384–398. It is thought that at this time, and in that of Innocent I (402–417), an old hall, or basilica, of a family mansion which had been used as a church, and was called "Titulus Pudentis," was taken down, and a new church constructed. One wall, however, was left standing—the one at the end of the north aisle and in the rear of the choir. It is now the outer end wall of the church. This, according to competent judges, is a construction of the 1st century, and a part of some great palace. Its large hall windows can be readily distinguished. Made in the 1st century, they are now filled up with brickwork of the 2d. At this time the hall seems to have been changed for some purpose distinct from its primary design. The present church stands in the original hall of the palace. Probably long before its construction the hall itself was a place of assembly for Christians in Rome. There are, also, some subterranean chambers, said to have been first opened in 1865. Here are three long, narrow, vaulted rooms, now opening into each other, but originally separated by brick walls. The walls are regarded as 1st-century work; but the openings which throw together the three chambers were evidently made subsequently, and apparently in the 2d century. This is indicated by the construction of the arches. In the original or 1st-century wall may still be seen hot-air flues, such as belong to *thermæ*. The cutting of the arches would have spoiled the baths. It secured an admirable arrangement for the meetings of a Christian Church in troublous times. The combined chambers made a spacious room, remote from the street and below its level. Its windows were apertures in the clear-story, and opened into an inner area. Worship could be conducted without attracting attention. The testimony of the walls and the bricks and the arches thus accords with the ancient tradition that the disused baths of Novatus, the son of Pudens, were dedicated about the middle of the 2d century as a Christian church. It is thought that in still another room of this subterranean portion of the traditional mansion of Pudens there was once a baptistery. Tradition may present another point of contact with these baths. In Justin Martyr's examination by the præfect of Rome (about A.D. 166), the following dialogue is reported:

"*Præfect.* Where do you assemble?

"*Justin.* Where each one chooses and can. . . . The God of the Christians is not circumscribed by place, but, being invisible, fills heaven and earth, and everywhere is worshipped and glorified by the faithful.

"*Præfect.* Say, where do you assemble, or into what place do you collect your disciples?

"*Justin.* I dwell above one Martin's, at the *Timotine Bath*. . . . I know of no other meeting than his.

"*Præfect.* Are you not, then, a Christian?

"*Justin.* Yes, I am a Christian."

In the Roman tradition, the house of Pudens was the place where Christians coming to Rome were freely entertained; and in the baths of Novatus or Timotheus were held, in Justin's time, Christian assemblies.

On the Via Salaria is a cemetery called after Priscilla, the traditional mother of Pudens, which bears unmistakable signs of having been used by persons of wealth and standing belonging to the earliest generations of Roman Christians. These evidences are sufficiently indicated in Northcote and Brownlow's *Roma Sotteranea*, and need not here be specified. It may be added, however, that, in the lower story of this catacomb, imprints have been found of the seal of a PVDENS FELIX upon the cement which closes a loculus or grave (De Rossi, *Images de la T. S. Vierge choisies dans les Catacombes de Rome* [Rome, 1863], p. 17). The cognomen suits exactly the tradition that the Pudens family belonged to the gens Cornelia (Cornelius Sulla being the first who took the surname Felix), and the further uniform tradition that this cemetery was their burial-place. The traditions are thus confirmed which represent a Pudens family of wealth and distinction to have been very early connected with the Christian Church in Rome. They increase so far the coincidences in favor of the identity of Martial's friends with the Pudens and Claudia of Paul's Epistle. The resemblance is one of family distinction, as well as of name, time, and place. See *The House of Pudens in Rome: a Lecture delivered to the Royal Archæological Institute*, June 2, 1871, by John Henry Parker, C.B., F.S.A., etc.; reprinted from the *Archæological Journal*.

On the whole, although the identity of St. Paul's Pudens with any legendary or heathen namesake is not absolutely proved, yet it is difficult to believe that these facts add nothing to our knowledge of the friend of Paul and Timothy. The identity is favored by Alford, Conybeare and Howson, and others. Objections to the details of the story do not seem to be insuperable. The difficulty is that so much is pure conjecture. In the *Acts of Pastor*, the wife of Pudens, and mother of his children, is named Savinilla. The Welsh legends are said to affirm Pudens's marriage with Gladys, the daughter or niece of Caractacus. The facts and arguments are treated at great length in a pamphlet entitled *Claudia and Pudens*, by archdeacon Williams (Llandovery, 1848), p. 58; and more briefly by dean Alford, *Greek Testament* (ed. 1856), iii, 104; and by Conybeare and Howson, *Life of St. Paul* (ed. 1858), ii, 594; also by Lewin, *St. Paul*, ii, 392 sq. They are ingeniously woven into a pleasing romance by a writer in the *Quarterly Review*, xcvii, 100–105. See Prof. Smyth in the *Biblioth. Sacra*, 1875, p. 174 sq.; also Usher, *Eccl. Brit. Antiquitates*, § 3, and Stillingfleet, *Antiquities*.

Pudentiāna, St. Among the Roman families who, in the 2d century, embraced the Christian faith, one of the most distinguished seems to have been that of the senator Pudens, his mother Priscilla, and his daughters Pudentiana and Praxedis. Pudens is frequently alleged to have been a disciple of the apostles Peter and Paul, and there is really a Pudens named in the second letter to Timothy; but this Pudens seems not to be identical with the father of Pudentiana and Praxedis. According to the Bollandists, our Pudens was converted by pope Pius I, who lived in the middle of the 2d century. After the death of his wife, the new convert had his house transformed into a church. He taught his two daughters the doctrines and all good works of Christianity, in which they soon distinguished themselves, converting to their new faith, with the assistance of the pope, who used to say mass in the now consecrated building, not only the members of their family and inmates of their house, but a large number of other pagans. We do not know when Pudens and his holy daughters died. Pudentiana, as well as Praxedis, had churches in Rome in the earliest times. See the Bollandists on May 19, where a learned commentary is given about Pudens and his two daughters, with the documents relating to them. See PUDENS.

Pudicitia (Αἰδώς), a personification of modesty, was worshipped both in Greece and at Rome. At Athens an altar was dedicated to her (Pausan. i, 17, § 1). At Rome two sanctuaries were dedicated to her, one under the name of *Pudicitia patricia*, and the other under that of *Pudicitia plebeia*. The former was in the Forum Boarium, near the temple of Hercules. When the patrician Virginia was driven from this sanctuary by the other patrician women, because she had married

the plebeian consul L. Volumnius, she built a separate sanctuary to *Pudicitia plebeia* in the Vicus Longus (Livy, x, 23; Festus, p. 242, ed. Müller). No woman who had married twice was allowed to touch her statue; and Pudicitia, moreover, was considered by some to be the same as Fortuna Muliebris. She is represented in works of art as a matron in modest attire. See Hirt, *Mythol. Bilderb.* p. 114, tab. 13.

Puer natus in Bethlehem. This joyous Christmas hymn, which belongs to the 14th century, of a beautiful simplicity, and absorbing easily so much theology in its poetry, continued long a great favorite in the Lutheran churches of Germany, well-nigh to this day. The original is given by Daniel, *Thesaurus*, i, 334; Trench, *Sacred Latin Poetry*, p. 97; Simrock, *Laudes Sion*, p. 42; Königsfeld, *Hymnen*, ii, 304. English translations are given in *Lyra Messianica*, p. 88; *Christian Life in Song*, p. 173; Schaff, *Christ in Song*, p. 50. German translations are given by Simrock and Königsfeld, and especially by Hoffmann von Fallersleben in his *Geschichte des deutsch. Kirchenliedes*, p. 340 sq. See also Trench, Daniel, and especially Wackernagel, who, in his *Das deutsche Kirchenlied*, i, 198–200, gives ten forms of this hymn. (B. P.)

Puĕri (*boys*), a name often given in the Latin Church to catechumens (q. v.). They were also called *Audientes, Incipientes, Novitii, Rudes, Tirones.*

Puĕris Simĭles (*like boys*) is a sect of Anabaptists mentioned by Bullinger in his treatise on Anabaptism (q. v.). They practiced childish tricks, under the notion that this was being childlike, as required by the Gospel precept of entering into the kingdom of heaven by becoming as a little child. Hence they would ride upon sticks and hobby-horses, and take off their clothes that they might practice the innocence of childhood; ending, of course, in extremely immoral excesses.

Puffer, Isaac, a well-known pioneer preacher of American Methodism, was born in Westminster County, Mass., in June, 1784. As a boy he came with his parents to Central New York. At fifteen he was converted. Ten years later he joined the New York Conference as a travelling preacher, and was appointed to the Otsego Circuit, then a far-reaching territory, which in the following year was incorporated in the Genesee Conference. That conference was then made to cover not only much of Northern and Western New York, but also the Upper and Lower Canadas. In this large field Puffer labored for full forty years with remarkable perseverance, and had the pleasure of seeing the most wonderful results that ever crowned the labor of any Methodist preacher. Though his early advantages must have been inconsiderable, he became one of the most useful, it might almost be said one of the most popular, preachers of his time. His great strength lay in the ease and skill with which he quoted the Scriptures. The Bible was the one book he *knew*, and he used it with most marvellous power and success. He was the sturdy opponent of Calvinism and Universalism, and combated them with such vigor that he was regarded as a worthy foeman for the best advocates of those forms of Christian dogma. After his superannuation in 1843 the venerable preacher contented himself with visiting his former charges, until, in 1848, he was attracted West, and lived chiefly in Wisconsin and Illinois. New associations, new scenes, and new calls to moral combat had a reinvigorating influence, and he again became active until 1853, when he suddenly died after a short illness. Puffer was of a large, muscular frame, and made therefore a striking appearance in public. He also attracted, aside from his religious earnestness, by a fine musical voice. He was an honest, devoted, childlike Christian, and blessed his generation by his life and his works. See *Memoir of the Rev. B. G. Paddock*, p. 341 sq.; Conable, *Hist. of the Genesee Conference*, ch. i, § 7; ch. ii, § 5.

Puffer, John M., a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Richford, Vt., Jan. 29, 1835. From a child he was noticeably correct in his habits, and thus well fitted for a life of self-reliance. His mother died when he was about six years of age, and his educational opportunities were limited to the district school and a few terms at the academy. He was converted in 1852, and united with the Methodists. He was licensed to preach in 1856. The following year he entered the Troy Conference, and filled the following appointments: Johnson and Hyde Park, under the presiding elder; Essex, Milton, and Pittsford, one year each; Essex, N. Y., two years. By a change of conference boundaries he went into Vermont Conference in 1862, and was stationed at Grand Isle two years; at St. Alban's Bay, one year; at Highgate, Waterbury Centre, Randolph, and Chelsea, two years each; and at Barre, his last appointment, which he served only the fraction of a year, when called from toil to reward. He died Jan. 7, 1874. Puffer labored with great acceptance, and almost literally "ceased at once to work and live." His last sermon was upon a funeral occasion, while ill himself, on the text, "If a man die, shall he live again?" —*Conference Minutes*, 1874, p. 96.

Puffer, Reuben, D.D., an American divine of note, was born at Sudbury, Mass., in 1756, and was educated at Harvard College, class of 1778. He then studied divinity, and became pastor of a Congregational church in Bolton (afterwards called Berlin), Mass. He held this place until his death, in 1829. He published: *Election Sermon* (1803):—*Dudleian Lecture in Harvard College* (1808):—*Convention Sermon* (1811):—*Two Sermons* (1826); and some secular addresses. See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, ii, 206 sq.

Puget, Pierre, called the Michael Angelo of France, on account of his ability in painting and architecture, as well as in sculpture, and perhaps also on account of a kindred enthusiasm and decision of character, was born in 1622 at Marseilles, where his father practiced as an architect and sculptor. It was from him that he received his first instructions in art, after which he was placed under a shipwright, or builder of galleys, to learn to carve the ornaments used in these vessels. Disgusted with the drudgery of such workmanship, he set out for Italy, and passed a considerable time at Florence, where he pursued his studies as a sculptor with great success. He next repaired to Rome, whither he was attracted by the fame of Pietro de Cortona. He became the pupil of that artist, but made such progress that he accompanied him to Florence as assistant to paint the ceilings of the Pitti palace. He suddenly resolved upon returning to France, when only twenty-one. But, commissioned to design a vessel of extraordinary magnificence, Puget proceeded a second time to Rome, and there spent between five and six years: what afterwards became of his valuable collection of drawings is not known. On his second return from Italy he painted; but excessive application so seriously affected his health that he confined himself thenceforth to architecture and sculpture. His talents met with employment at Toulon and Marseilles, and for the latter city he projected many embellishments, which established his reputation as an architect; and he further gave proof of great skill in engineering by different ingenious machines and inventions. He was sent by Fouquet to Genoa for the purpose of selecting marble for some of the works proposed to be executed at Marseilles; but that minister being shortly afterwards disgraced, instead of returning home, Puget preferred remaining at Genoa, where he produced some of his most noted pieces of sculpture, the two statues of *St. Sebastian* and *St. Ambrosius*, and the grand bas-relief of the *Assumption*, in the chapel of the Albergo de' Poveri, besides various architectural ornaments. At length he was recalled by Colbert, who obtained for him a pension of 1200 crowns, in consequence, it is said, of the earnest recommendation of Ber-

nini. That the patronage of the one and the recommendation of the other were not discredited is proved by his two celebrated performances at Versailles, the *Milo of Crotona* and the group of *Perseus and Andromeda*, the former of which is generally reckoned the *chef-d'œuvre* of his chisel, and a work that will bear comparison with the antique. He died at Marseilles, where he spent his last days, Dec. 2, 1694.—*Engl. Cyclop.* s. v.; Lenoir, *Musée des Monuments Français*, s. v.; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.

Pugillāris is a name for the reed of gold or silver, or ivory, used for drinking from the *chalice* (q. v.).

Pugin, Augustus Northmore Welby, one of the most distinguished of modern ecclesiastical architects, was the son of a French gentleman who fled to England at the period of the Revolution. He was born in 1811, and commenced his professional career as a scene-painter and decorator at the Theatre Royal, Covent Garden, and then devoted himself to decoration in furniture, etc. Joining the Roman Catholic Church, he determined thenceforth to devote his best energies to ecclesiology, and during the few years that he lived to practice his profession he was called upon to erect a larger number of Roman Catholic churches, chapels, convents, and schools than has probably fallen to the lot of any Englishman since the Reformation. The following list includes his chief works: the cathedral church of St. Marie at Derby, one of his earlier and more pleasing works; St. Chad's, Birmingham; three churches at Liverpool; St. Wilfred's, Manchester; church and convent at Edgehill; churches at Oxford, Cambridge, Reading, Kenilworth, Stockton-on-Tees, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Preston, Keightley, Rugby, Northampton, Stoke-upon-Trent, Brewood, Woolwich, Hammersmith, Fulham, Pontefract, St. Edward's near Ware, Buckingham, and St. Wilfred near Alton; a church, and a convent and chapel, at Nottingham; convents of the Sisters of Mercy at London, Birmingham, and Liverpool; a priory at Downside, near Bath; colleges at Radcliffe and Rugby; improvements at Maynooth; and cathedrals, with schools and priests' houses attached, at St. George's (Southwark), Killarney, and Enniscorthy. To these must be added the extensive and costly works executed for his great patron, the earl of Shrewsbury, consisting, besides the alterations made in the mansion, of a church, school-house, and monastery at Alton Towers; and a church at Cheadle, which has the most splendid interior of any of his churches. The very pretty gateway to Magdalen College, Oxford, is one of the very few works executed by him for any Protestant body; indeed, he is said to have refused to accept any commissions for Protestant places of worship. The list of works given above would in truth seem to have been more than sufficient to exhaust the time and energies of a man who ceased laboring at the age of forty; yet he was chiefly employed during his last years in designing and superintending the ornamentation of the New Palace of Westminster, which probably owes its somewhat extravagantly mediæval and ecclesiastical character to Pugin's idiosyncrasies. But, besides the practice of his profession, he found time to add to its literature a second and revised edition of his *Contrasts*:—a treatise on the *True Principles of Pointed or Christian Architecture* (1841):—*An Apology for the Revival of Christian Architecture* (1843):—a *Glossary of Ecclesiastical Ornament* (1844):—a treatise on *Floriated Ornaments* (1849):—and a treatise on *Chancel Screens* (1851). As he advanced in life his religious feelings took more and more entire possession of him. In 1850 he wrote and published *An Address to the Inhabitants of Ramsgate*: — *An Earnest Appeal for the Revival of the Ancient Plain Song*:—*The Present State of Public Worship among the Roman Catholics*; and other pamphlets of a religious character. At length, overtasked with all this excessive labor and excitement, his intellect began to give way, and in his fortieth year he was removed to a lunatic asylum. For a brief space his mental powers were so far restored that it became practicable for him to return to his home at Ramsgate; but he expired there Sept. 14, 1852, three days after his return. He was buried in a vault of his own church of St. Augustine, which he had built on his estates. Pugin was a man of extraordinary industry and energy, and he possessed a very unusual amount of knowledge and great ability. He attempted, however, too many things, and he worked too much and too fast to produce many great works, even had he been a man of original power. In truth, his was not a creative mind, and he lacked comprehensive thought.

Pu'hite (Heb. only as a collective, and with the art. *hap-Puthi'*, הַפּוּתִי, patronymic from some unknown primitive; Sept. Ἀφυθεῖν v. r. Μιφιθίμ; Vulg. *Aphuthei*), a designation of the second named of the "families of Kirjath-jearim" descended from Shobel (1 Chron. ii, 53). "There is a Jewish tradition, embodied in the Targum of R. Joseph, that these families of Kirjath-jearim were the sons of Moses whom Zipporah bare him, and that from them were descended the disciples of the prophets of Zorah and Eshtaol"

Pui, the name of a fraternity, partly religious, in honor of St. Mary, and partly literary, established in Picardy and Normandy, and translated to England about the beginning of the 14th century, deriving its name from the Virgin of the Cathedral of La Puy, to which pilgrims greatly resorted. They yearly elected a prince, who was crowned with garlands or circlets, like those still used on certain occasions by the city companies; the loving cup was gayly passed at the election, and the author of the best ballad royal was also crowned. They had a chaplain-priest to sing masses, maintained a grand feast annually, and kept a common hutch for the contributions of the brotherhood. There was a chapel of St. Mary de Pui at Westminster. No woman was admitted at their meetings. Perhaps *Puits*, another form, may allude to the Song of Solomon (iv, 15).

Pûk. See Paint.

Pul (Heb. *id.* פּוּל [for derivation, see below]), the name of a people and of a man.

1. (Sept. Φούδ v. r. Φούθ; Vulg. *Africa*.) A country or people located at a great distance from Judæa, and named once (Isa. lxvi, 19) between Tarshish and Lud: "The nations (הַגּוֹיִם), [to] Tarshish, Pul, and Lud, that draw the bow, [to] Tubal and Javan, [to] the isles afar off." Hitzig, Knobel, and some others suppose that the true reading is פּוּט, *Put*, which is elsewhere joined with Lud (Ezek. xxvii, 10; Jer. xlvi, 9; A. V. "Libyans"); and which is sometimes rendered in the Sept. Φούδ (Gen. x, 6; 1 Chron. i, 8), the same form which occurs here in that version; for this, however, there is no MS. authority, and we are therefore bound to receive the Masoretic reading as correct. Gesenius observes (*Thesaur.* s. v. פּוּל) that ΦΟΥΔ could be easily changed to ΦΟΥΔ by the error of a copyist. See Phul. If a Mizraite Lud (q. v.) be intended in this connection, Pul may be African. It has accordingly been compared by Bochart (*Phaleg*, iv, 26) and Michaelis (*Spicileg.* i, 256; ii, 114) with the island *Philæ*, called in Coptic *Pelak*, *Pilak*, *Pilakt*; the hieroglyphic name being *Eelek*, *P-eelek*, or *Eelekt* (Quatremère, *Mémoire sur l'Égypte*, i, 387 sq.). This island was inhabited jointly by Egyptians and Ethiopians (Strabo, xvii, 818; Diod. Sic. i, 22; Pliny, v, 10; Ptolemy, iv, 5, 74; comp. Mannert, X, i, 235 sq.), and Bochart supposes the name to be, like Elephantine, derived from a word meaning elephant (פִּילָא). But it must be kept in mind that the other names here mentioned are those of great countries, while Philæ is a very small island. Isaiah would scarcely speak of the Jewish people being driven to it. It seems much more probable that Pul was the name of some di-

tant province of Africa; and perhaps the suggestion of Gesenius (*Thesaur.* p. 1094) may be right, that we have a vestige of the old name in the word Πολο which appears on inscriptions (Champollion, *Grammaire*, p. 159). Hitzig (*Grabschrift des Darius*, p. 71) finds a Phul not far from Punicus. This only adds to the uncertainty. See EGYPT.

2. (Sept. Φούλ v. r. Φουλά, Φουά, Φαλώχ, Φαλώς; Vulg. *Phul.*) A king of Assyria, and the first of these monarchs who is mentioned in the Bible (2 Kings xv, 19, 20; 1 Chron. v, 26). Menahem, having succeeded in mounting the throne of Israel, proceeded to make himself master of the whole territory belonging to that kingdom. Setting forth from Tirzah, he attacked and took by storm Tiphsah, or Thapsacus, on the Euphrates, which had once more been made a border town of Israel by the conquests of Jeroboam II, whose victorious career had restored the ancient boundaries of the land in that direction as they had been in the days of Solomon (2 Kings xv, 16; xiv, 25, 28; 1 Kings iv, 24). He appears to have thus drawn on himself the notice of Pul, B.C. 769. Menahem is thought by some to have inherited a kingdom which was already included among the dependencies of Assyria; for as early as B.C. 880 Jehu gave tribute to Shalmaneser, according to the inscription on the black obelisk [see SHALMANESER]; and if Judæa was, as it seems to have been, a regular tributary from the beginning of the reign of Amaziah (B.C. 837), Samaria, which lay between Judæa and Assyria, can scarcely have been independent. Under the Assyrian system the monarchs of tributary kingdoms, on ascending the throne, applied for "confirmation in their kingdoms" to the lord paramount, and only became established on receiving it. We may gather from 2 Kings xv, 19, 20 that Menahem neglected to make any such application to his liege lord, Pul—a neglect which would have been regarded as a plain act of rebellion. Possibly, in the campaign against Tiphsah, we must regard Menahem as having attacked the Assyrians, and deprived them for a while of their dominion west of the Euphrates. However this may have been, it is evident that Pul looked upon Menahem as an enemy. He consequently marched an army into Palestine for the purpose of punishing his revolt, when Menahem hastened to make his submission, and having collected by means of a poll-tax the large sum of a thousand talents of gold, he paid it over to the Assyrian monarch, who consented thereupon to "confirm" him as king. See MENAHEM.

There is great difficulty in determining what Assyrian king is referred to under the name Pul. He must have ruled over Assyria as the immediate predecessor of Tiglath-pileser II, for this latter monarch, according to Sir H. Rawlinson (*Athenæum*, No. 1793), is recorded to have received tribute in his eighth year from Menahem, whose reign occupied only ten years. For some time Sir H. Rawlinson identified him with a king whose cuneiform name he has variously represented as *Iva-lush*, *Vul-lush*, and *Yama-zala-khus* (Oppert, *Hee-likh-khus*), and who reckoned among the countries tributary to himself that of Khumri or Samaria (Rawlinson, *Herodotus*, i, 467). [Smith revives this theory (*Assyrian Eponym Canon*, p. 187) of the identity of Pul with *Vul-nirari* (as he reads the name), who, according to his dates, invaded Damascus in B.C. 773.] This identification, however, Rawlinson gave up on ascertaining that the lately deciphered Assyrian canon interposed the reigns of three kings, comprising thirty-seven years, in addition to a probable interregnum of two or three years between this king and Tiglath-pileser (*Athenæum*, No. 1805). Subsequently he suggested that one and the same individual is denoted by the names Pul and Tiglath-pileser in the sacred narrative. His chief argument for this is that in 1 Chron. v, 26 the same event —namely, the deportation of the tribes beyond the Jordan—is attributed to the two kings associated together as if they were one and the same individual (*Athenæum*, No. 1869). But, as already remarked by Winer (*Realw.* ii, 259), the passage in 1 Chron. does not necessarily ascribe to the two kings the accomplishment of the same measure. Pul is mentioned in it as the first Assyrian king who came into collision with the Israelites, and thus prepared the way for the subsequent deportation of the transjordanic tribes. But that this measure is attributed solely to Tiglath-pileser, as in 2 Kings xx, 29, is manifest from the use of the singular וַיַּגְלֵם. Dr. Julius Oppert, who accepts the account of Ctesias, and takes it to refer to the subversion of the first Assyrian empire, supposes Pul to be the Babylonian *Belesys*. The eminent Assyriologist Dr. Hincks maintains that "Pul became king of Babylon, holding Assyria in subjection, in 787 B.C. Tiglath-pileser revolted from him and established an independent kingdom of Assyria in 768 B.C." (*Athenæum*, No. 1810). The main difference between this view and that of Dr. Oppert is that Dr. Hincks supposes a considerable interval to have elapsed between Belesys, the conqueror of Nineveh, and Pul. It certainly appears the most plausible opinion; and it seems safest to acquiesce in it until further discoveries of cuneiform students lead to a more exact determination. It is in accordance with the Scriptural chronology, and it falls in with what we can glean of Assyrian history from classical and monumental sources. The account of Ctesias, as found in Diodorus Siculus (*Hist.* ii), though rejected by Sir H. Rawlinson and his followers (comp. Prof. Rawlinson, *Anc. Mon.* ii, 521), has received the support of many eminent modern critics. It has been shown to be reconcilable with the narrative of Herodotus (*Hist.* i, 102, 106), which contains intimations that there had been a subversal of the Assyrian empire prior to its final overthrow alluded to by that historian (see Winer, *Realw.* i, 104). It is admitted that the Assyrian canon, in the period between Iva-lush IV and Tiglath-pileser II, gives indication "of troublous times, and of a disputed, or, at any rate, a disturbed succession" (Rawlinson, *Anc. Mon.* ii, 386). The writer last cited also asserts that the inscriptions of Tiglath-pileser II "support the notion of a revolution and change of dynasty in Assyria at this point of its history" (Rawlinson, *Herodotus*, i, 468). That Pul was a Babylonian holding rule in Assyria at this time is confirmed by the notice of Alexander Polyhistor (Euseb. *Chron.* i, 4): "Post hos ait exstitisse Chaldæorum regem, cui nomen Phulus erat;" and also by the form of the name. The name Pul, while having, according to Prof. Rawlinson, its counterpart among known Babylonian names, is wholly alien to the rules on which Assyrian names are formed. They are "always compounds, consisting of two, three, or more characters" (*Anc. Mon.* ii, 388, note). The name is probably the same as the Sanscrit *pala*, lofty, highest; hence lord, king; perhaps the same as *bel*, i. e. lord. The same syllable is found in the names Sardana*pal*us and Nabo*pol*assar. Pul is also mentioned in the extracts of Alexander Polyhistor, in Eusebius (*Chron. Arm.* i, 41), but not elsewhere. Eusebius adds, "Polyhistor says that Senecheribus was king after him," but this is not to be understood of immediate succession. See ASSYRIA.

Pulaha, a divinity of Indian mythology. Brahma created nine Brahmins from different parts of his body. At the same time Sunyambhu, Brahma's son, created the ten celebrated rishis, or forefathers, of all existing beings. These are identical with the nine Brahmins mentioned, and one of them is Pulaha. He was so pious that he could, by his prayers, create men, animals, and gods.

Pulcheria, ÆLIA, one of the most celebrated saints of the Greek Church, was an empress. She was the eldest daughter of the emperor Arcadius, and was born between 398 and 400. In early youth she showed rare intellectual gifts and a fervent piety. Her wisdom was an object of general admiration. She was about fifteen when she came to assist her younger brother Theodo-

sius II in the government. Pulcheria then made a vow of eternal chastity, prevailed upon her sisters to follow her example, and gave to the Byzantine court the purity which should prevail in a monastery. Some writers charge that this chastity was feigned from political reasons, Pulcheria desiring to prevent the marriage of her sisters, and thus avoid controversy on the claims to the throne. By her wisdom and piety the prosperity of the empire was certainly promoted: she seemed to be its good genius. She defended zealously the purity of the Christian faith against the doctrines of Nestorius and Eutyches, and her influence was most beneficial at the synods of Ephesus and Chalcedon. St. Cyril of Alexandria sent her his celebrated work *De Fide ad Pulcheriam*. She was in correspondence with the popes, especially with Leo I. This great pope, in many letters, praises her wisdom and kindness. He entreats her, in 449, to take measures against the heresy of Eutyches (Jaffé, *Reg. Pontif.* n. 203, 204, p. 37); rejoices at the vigor and energy of her faith (*ibid.* n. 226, p. 339), and praises her activity in suppressing Eutychianism (451; *ibid.* n. 237, p. 40). There are in all ten letters extant from Leo I to Pulcheria. The learned Theodoret, bishop of Cyrrhus, also praised her attachment to the Church, and interceded with her for his city, heavily burdened with taxes (Theod. *Ep.* 43; Baron. ad ann. 444). All her contemporaries praise her beneficent influence. She dissuaded her brother Theodosius from Nestorianism, and celebrated the victory of the orthodox creed over this heresy by building a splendid church in honor of the Virgin Mary (Niceph. *H. E.* xiv, 2; Baron. ad ann. 431). She sent valuable presents to Jerusalem, and built a number of new churches (Baron. ad ann. 439, 453). She was several times exposed to the plots of the courts, which tried to destroy her good understanding with her brother and his wife Eudocia. In 446 she retired entirely from the court; but her absence was soon felt. After the death of Theodosius, Pulcheria and Marcianus, who had been honored with the title of Augustus, and whom she had wedded, took the reins of the empire. She had married for the good of the empire, and with the stipulation that she should be allowed to keep her vow of virginity. After benefiting the Church in many ways as empress, and opposing Eutychianism with the same decision as she had previously Nestorianism, she died, Sept. 11, 453. Her saintship is recognised by the Latin as well as by the Greek Church. Baronius (ad ann. 453) and the Bollandists (vol. i, Jul.) erected literary memorials to her memory. Benedict XIV permitted, by decree of the Congregation of the Rites of Jan. 31, 1752, to the regular canons of St. Augustine in Portugal, and to some houses of Jesuits, the celebration of her feast on July 7, *sub ritu duplici:* soon afterwards, Feb. 11, the same year, this permission was extended to the whole company of Jesus. These decrees, with the office and mass of St. Pulcheria, are in the appendix of Benedict XIV's work *De Sanctorum Canonizatione.* The oration of the feast praises the chastity of the saint, and her zeal for the purity of the faith. See Smith, *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. and Mythol.* s. v.; Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, vol. xii, s. v.; Hefele, *Conciliengesch.* vol. ii; Alzog, *Kirchengesch.* i, 309; Milman, *Hist. of Latin Christianity*, ii, 243 sq.

Coin of Pulcheria.

Pulear, or **Ganesha,** a divinity of Indian mythology, was the son of the wife of Siva, Parwati. She formed him, without the co-operation of her husband, by shaping into the frame of a youth what was washed away from her body during her bath. Siva thought himself betrayed by Parwati, and in his wrath he struck off the head of the young god. When he found out his mistake, he wished to heal his victim; but the head had been carried away by the waters of the Ganges, and had been eaten by fishes. Siva solved this difficulty by telling the son of his wife to cut off the head of the first creature he should meet and put it on his shoulders: as misfortune would have it, this creature was an elephant. Therefore Ganesha is always represented with an elephant's trunk. Ganesha sits astride of a mouse, which is nothing else than the metamorphosed giant Gedjemuyashurim, vanquished by him while warring against the gods. Ganesha is incredibly strong, and therefore of great use to the gods in their perpetual warfare against the dæmons. He is a great eater, and would eat the whole world if he had his own way: it is only in the sea of sugar, in which he has a floating abode, that he can, in some measure, satisfy the cravings of his hunger. Being the favorite son of Siva, he is worshipped like that god himself, and invoked first before every sacrifice. The Indians believed that he could at his will accumulate or remove obstacles: all Indian books commence with a prayer to him. His image is frequently found painted on the house doors, and almost every family has his statue in bronze, marble, or clay. Pulear is his name as god of matrimony: it was the natural question of his father at his first appearance in the world — *Pulei-ar*, i. e. Whose son?

Figure of Pulear.

Pulgar, Isaac, a Jewish convert to Christianity, flourished at Avila, in Spain, about 1300 to 1349. He was a friend of Abner of Burgos, better known (after his baptism) as Alphonso of Valladolid, against whom he afterwards wrote a polemical work entitled סְ תשובות, "The Book of Answers." He also wrote, besides some other works which are still in MS., a work under the title וִיכּוּחַ הַתּוֹרָנִי עִם הַפִּילוֹסוֹף, "A Contest between an Orthodox and a Philosopher," wherein he endeavors to reconcile the difference between philosophy and faith, and which was reprinted after a Paris MS. in the עֵצֶם וְקַנִּים of E. Ashkenasi (Frankf. a. M. 1854), p. 12–19. Pulgar was the first to say that "the belief in the Messianic redemption is not an essential point of Judaism, with which it stands or falls, although many passages in the prophets speak of the coming of the Messiah." See Fürst, *Bibl. Jud.* iii, 110 sq.; De Rossi, *Dizionario Storico degli Autori Ebrei*, p. 266 (Germ. transl. by Hamberger); the same, *Bibliotheca Judaica Antichristiana*, p. 93; Grätz, *Geschichte der Juden*, vii, 337 sq., 485 sq. (2d ed. Leips. 1873); Wolf, *Bibl. Hebr.* i, 1259. (B. P.)

Puliahs, the lowest of all Indian castes, or, rather, the scum of the lowest, being still more despised than the Pariahs. They are not allowed to walk on the regu-

lar roads, but must, at the distance of a hundred paces, warn every wanderer of their vicinity by uttering a well-known yell. They are not even allowed to dwell in huts, but live at a great distance from all inhabited places, in dense forests, where they build their nests on trees, like monkeys.

Puller, Timothy, D.D., an English divine of some distinction, flourished in the second half of the 17th century. He was rector of Sacomb, Herts, in 1671, and of St. Mary le Bow in 1679. He died in 1693. He published *Moderation of the Church of England* (Lond. 1679, 8vo; new ed. by the Rev. Robert Eden, 1843, 8vo). See Fuller, *Tracts of Anglican Fathers*, iii, 309.

Pulleyn, Robert, an English Roman Catholic prelate of the 12th century, was born, according to Fuller, in the county of Oxford. After having studied in Paris, he returned to England in 1130, and found the University of Oxford devastated and almost ruined by the Danes, and he zealously contributed to restore it to its previously flourishing condition. In the reign of Henry I he was charged with the work of explaining the writings of, and commenting upon, Aristotle, and he acquitted himself in this double task to the great satisfaction of his scholars and the king, his constant patron. He received as recompense the archdeaconry of Rochester. After a short time he returned to Paris, and taught theology at the Sorbonne. In vain his bishop summoned him to return to England, and in order to compel him to do so, seized the revenues of his benefice. Pulleyn appealed against these proceedings to the pope, who decided in his favor. Such was his renown that Innocent II summoned him to Rome, and there received him with great honor. In 1144 Celestine II created him cardinal, and soon after Lucius II made him chancellor of the Roman Church. He died in 1150. Pulleyn wrote several works. The one which remains to us is the *Sententiarum Liber* (Paris, 1655). From it it is evident that he preferred the authority of the Bible and of reason to the testimony of the fathers or to the subtleties of the scholastics. Pulleyn belonged to the Abelard school of theology, and inclined to free dialectic discussion. He advocated the doctrine of free will, but did not admit *gratia irresistibilis*. "Through pride," he writes, "man fell; his salvation must proceed from the opposite quarter. The rational man, who was destined to rule over nature, must humble himself before the sensible elements to receive grace through them." But this was a lowering of the idea of humility to an outward act. He favored, strangely enough for one so liberal in many things, the withholding of the cup from the laity, in order, as he taught, "that the blood might not be spilled again," and supported the doctrine of indulgences (q. v.) in a most extreme manner. But the most eccentric of all his theological notions was the absurd question he raised as to the exact moment *at* which, and the manner *in* which, the union of the divine nature of the Son with the human assumed in the womb of Mary had taken place; and that on the cross only Christ's body had died, but not the whole man Christ. Pulleyn appears to have written also on the Apocalypse. There are still twenty of his sermons preserved among the Lambeth MSS. See Wright, *Biog. Brit.* ii, 183; Hardwick, *Church Hist. of the Middle Ages*, p. 263, 264; Neander, *Dogmas*, ii, 486, 521, 524 sq., et al.; Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrines*, ii, 14, 41, 65, et al.

Pulling, Alonzo B., a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born at Ridgefield, Conn., Nov. 28, 1818. He experienced religion in the summer of 1840. He was licensed to preach March 1, 1845, was received into the New York Conference in the following May, and appointed to Ponsett and Killingworth Circuit, which he served two years. He was admitted to full membership June 21, 1848, and ordained deacon. He was then appointed to West Granby, which charge he served two years; was ordained an elder at New Haven in May, 1850, and appointed to Pleasant Valley and New Hartford Mission, where he labored two years. He thenceforth served New Milford, Woodbury, and Berlin; was supernumerary one year, and was afterwards stationed at Southington and Forestville, Westport, Ansonia, Seymour, New Milford, Nichol's Farms, Roxbury, East Village, and Riverside. In 1876 failing health compelled him to take a superannuated relation. He died Jan. 12, 1878. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 1878, p. 50.

Pulolah is the name of the temple of the Grand Lama at Deshesho. It signifies "the temple with the golden roof." In this temple dwell, when the Dalaï Lama is present, 800 priests, exclusively employed in his service. In the interior, it is said, there is a multitude of statues, every one representing a woman with a child in her arms. These are probably the mothers of as many former dalaï lamas.

Pulpit (מִגְדּוֹל, *migdól*, Neh. viii, 4, properly *tower*), an elevated stage, whence Ezra read the law unto the congregation (comp. ix, 4). See *Bible Educator* ii, 263.

PULPIT (Lat. *pulpitum*; Fr. *chaire, pupitre* meaning a lectern, *lection* being a book-desk), an elevated place from which sermons are delivered. Ezra, when reading the law, stood on a pulpit of wood high above the people (Neh. viii, 4); and Solomon prayed on a brazen scaffold (2 Chron. vi, 13). In mediæval times the word designates the rood-loft. Becon uses it in its modern sense. It is said to remind the hearer of Christ going up on the mountain to preach his Sermon of Beatitudes. Originally, it would appear to have been used chiefly for the singing, chanting, or recitation which forms part of the public service, and was a kind of stage sufficiently large to accommodate two, or even more, chanters. For the convenience of the hearers, this stage began to be used by the bishop, priest, or deacon, in the delivery of the homily; and thus, by degrees, a tribune expressly suited to the latter use alone came to be introduced. The earliest pulpit was the ambo, tribune, or tribunal, as it is called by Prudentius. Epiphanius says that St. Chrysostom usually preached from the ambo; so did St. Ambrose and St. Augustine; and Nicephorus records that Macedonius, patriarch of Constantinople in 489, mounted the ambo when he desired to clear himself of a charge of heresy. In some of the older churches, the ambo, or *pulpitum*, is still used for the chanting of the Gospel and Epistles. The ambo was placed in the centre of the church by the Greeks; it is in the middle of the nave at St. Pancras's, at Rome, on the left side, but on the right at Milan and Ravenna. At St. Clement's, Rome, the Epistle desk is on the left, and that of the prophecies on the right. At Chartres, Bayeux, and Roiament the matin lections were sung on the left side of the choir-entrance, and the desk was called the legend at Chartres. At Bourges, an eagle stood in front of the matin altar. A pulpit at Orléans and Châlons-sur-Marne was used for reading the Epistle, Gradual, Tract, and Alleluia; the Gospel was sung on the west side of the jube at Chartres, Châlons, and Lyons, that for the lections facing the east. At Bayeux and Noyon there were several desks. At Lyons and Vienne, the Gospel was read in the lower part of the choir, and the Epistle from the ambo; but the latter was used at both times at Rheims, Cambrai, Tours, Rouen, Sens, Châlons, Laon, Soissons, Noyon, Amiens, Beauvais, Senlis, Orléans, Meaux, Tournay, Bayeux, and St. Denis. The desk for reading the Gospel was called the pulpit; the lectern held the choir-books. The former was movable, so as to be transferred from the one side to the other of the choir, and used by the subdeacon for reading the Epistle; whereas the lectern stood in the centre of the choir as a fixture, and was common to all the cantors in time of singing. Both, from their common ornament, the symbol of St. John Evangelist, were called the Eagle; and it appears on the ambones of Pis-

toja of the 13th century, and in three ancient churches at Rome. The deacon, taking the Book of the Gospels, richly bound in ivory, metal, and jewelry, carried it processionally, preceded by thurifers and taper-bearers, to the north side, where the pulpit stood. Fulk, abbot of Lobbes in the 9th century, made a wonderful eagle, on which burned four tapers in the form of a cross; a censer was contrived in its neck, which poured fragrant smoke from the beak and flaming eyes of the bird; and the head and wings were movable, for the convenience of turning the book. Often the other three evangelists were represented as writing the words sung by the deacon; at Messina there is one with the pelican, as the symbol of the Saviour, above all. At Narbonne, in the cathedral, there is a movable pulpit of the 14th century, consisting of two iron supports set saltierwise, and supporting a bookstand of supple leather. Those of St. Augustine's, Canterbury, and Bury St. Edmund's, mentioned in the 12th century, were movable until the 14th century. In Belgium, the ambo or a faldstool, set before the altar, served as a pulpit. According to John de Garlande, who wrote at the close of the 11th century, a pulpit is the ascent of steps to the lectern, upon which the chant- or reading-book was laid. The double pulpits of Milan, Narni, and Perugia connect the tradition with the ambones; those of Toledo are of bronze, and those at Seville are still used for singing the Gospel and Epistle. In three of the ancient churches at Rome, the Epistle ambo is square, and stands on the north; while that for the Gospel is round, and stands on the south side, with flights of stairs leading up to it. The ordinary pulpit also stood on the south side, as at Toledo, because the Gospel was preached from it. The jube for the gospeller and epistoler in large churches took the place of the ambo, and within two centuries was used by the preacher at Rouen; but in smaller churches a pulpit was used, yet there is no existing example or record of such furniture until the 13th century. Pulpits were formerly placed not only in churches, but also in the refectories of monasteries, as at Beverley, Shrewsbury, Chester, etc.; in the cloisters, as at St. Dié, in France; and occasionally in public thoroughfares, as on the north side of the church of Notre Dame; at St. Lô, in Normandy, and in the outer court of Magdalen College, Oxford. In France there are several overlooking cemeteries. In churches the pulpits were formerly always placed in the nave, attached to a wall, pillar, or screen, and the ecclesiastics and others who occupied the choir during the mass removed into the nave to hear the sermon: this custom was continued at Ely until quite recently.



Fotheringay, Northamptonshire.

The church pulpit is usually hexagonal or octagonal, and of wood, possibly in allusion to Christ's preaching from the boat (Luke v, 1). In Roman Catholic churches the pulpit is generally distinguished by some religious emblems, especially by the crucifix; and the pulpits of the Low Countries and of Germany are often masterpieces of wood-carving, the preaching-place in some of them forming part of a great artistic group, as of the *Conversion of St. Paul*, the *Vocation of Peter and Andrew*, the *Temptation of Adam and Eve*, and other similar subjects.



Beaulieu, Hants.

Early pulpits were, no doubt, movable, and kept in corners until required for use, like that still preserved at Hereford; and at Bury, the analogium, or pulpit, we know, was removed from the chapter-house into the church when it was necessary. This, no doubt, is the cause of their present rarity. There are fine examples of pulpits at King's Sutton, Kingsbury Episcopi, Wolvercot, North Kilworth, Dartmouth, and Frampton (which has images of saints). Those of Sudbury, Southwold, Hereford, and Winchester are of wood, and of the 16th century. The earliest Jacobean example is at Sopley (1606). There are stationary pulpits of stone at Wells of the 16th century, at Worcester (1504), Ripon, Combe, Nantwich, and Wolverhampton. The oldest wooden pulpit is at Fulbourne (cir. 1350). In Italy there are examples of the 13th and 14th centuries at Siena and St. Miniato, Florence; in Germany there are stone pulpits at Freiburg and Ulm of the latter part of the 15th century; at Avignon, in France; and Nieuport, in Belgium. There is a Byzantine pulpit, said to have been brought from St. Sophia's, Constantinople, at St. Mark's, Venice. Romanesque pulpits may be seen in St. Ambrose's, Milan; St. Mary's, Toscanella; and St. Sabino's, Canova. There is an octagonal pulpit, dated 1482, at Ratisbon; that of Kidrich is cir. 1491. An hexagonal pulpit is at St. Andrew's, Pistoja. The octago-

nal pulpit of Perugia is used for giving the benediction. There is a superb 13th-century pulpit on seven pillars in the baptistery at Pisa, with lecterns for the Gospel and Epistle on the stairs. Abbot Wygmore's pulpit, Gloucester, was on the north, and placed against the third pillar westward of the crossing. The south, or men's, side is the most common position, as at Wells, Chartres, Haarlem, Aix, and formerly at Winchester, Peterborough, Gloucester, and Worcester. In England the pulpits were copied from those of the refectory, and such as stood in the open air. In cathedral churches the pulpit was often large enough to contain several persons, as the bishop, when preaching, was accompanied by his two archdeacons. Gilding and color were not employed on pulpits until the 15th century. Many of these pulpits were highly enriched with carving; that of Worcester has the *New Jerusalem*, and one of stone at Newton Nottage has the *Scourging* sculptured upon it. One at Burnham Norton, of wood, is painted with the *Doctors of the Church*. In the 16th century stone pulpits were introduced. There are magnificent wooden pulpits at Strasburg (1481); Mayence, Antwerp, Faye la Vineuse, Nuremberg, Brussels (1699); and Vienna, from which John Capistran preached a Turkish crusade in 1451. At Durham there was an iron pulpit, or ambo, in the galilee, from which the Sunday sermon was preached to women. There is another on the north-west at San Gil, Burgos; and two like ambones, fitted with desks, of the 15th century, flank the screen of Zamora. The two pulpits of Milan are of metal, and circular. At Aix the choir pulpit is silvergilt and jewelled. At Lugo, one of the two metal ambones has an eagle on the south. The pulpit (in Arabic, *mimber*) forms one of the scanty appliances of Mohammedan worship.—Walcott, *Sacred Architecture*, s. v.; Parker, *Glossary of Architecture*, s. v.

Pulpit Eloquence. As pulpits in churches are constructed for the convenience of preachers and preaching, so the term *pulpit*, by a common form of metonymy, is often used to signify the collective body of the clergy or those who use the pulpit. By a slight variation of the same principle, the term is also made to signify the collective agency of preaching, as seen in the phrases "influence of the pulpit" and "power of the pulpit." In a signification which, to some extent, blends both the above meanings, the term pulpit is often used in the figure of personification, as in the expressions "Let the pulpit speak," "The voice of the pulpit must be heard." The word is thus used in the well-known passage of Cowper:

"I say the *pulpit* (in the sober use
Of its legitimate, peculiar powers)
Must stand acknowledged while the world shall stand,
The most important and effectual guard,
Support, and ornament of virtue's cause."

From such uses as a substantive, the same word derives its significance as an adjective; it being often used in the expressions "pulpit orator," "pulpit eloquence," and the like. The term *pulpit eloquence* has, in fact, come into general use as designating (1) the quality and character of the eloquence produced from the pulpit, and (2) the body of eloquent productions now in preservation as representing the utterances of preachers of the present and past generations.

No just treatment of eloquence in any of its phases can ignore the fact that its highest character and results can only be secured from the expression of the living speaker. There must be voice for the ear, action for the eye, and a certain projection of the sentiments, the sympathies, and the emotions of an animated soul upon the minds and hearts of others. Nor can it be denied that the sympathy of numbers in an audience reacts upon a speaker and augments within him the power of moving those whom he addresses. Hence, whether eloquence be considered subjectively as that subtle power which enables an orator to influence men by uttered language, or objectively in the effects produced upon those to whom he speaks, it needs to be heard and felt in order to be appreciated in its completeness. Nevertheless, this fullest realization of eloquence has its limitations, for when once heard and felt it is in that sense ended. It can thenceforward only be remembered as a thing of the past. It can neither be repeated nor transferred to other persons, times, or places. In view of this condition of eloquence in its highest realization, we can more fully appreciate the eloquence of written or printed language, which is to some extent independent both of speakers and hearers, and which may, in a partial but yet not wholly unsatisfactory degree, represent to persons distant, both in time and space, the utterances of eloquent men. To this end, writing and printing are conservative agencies of essential importance and of inestimable value. By means of them the orations and sermons of one age are handed down to ages following, and, so far as reading is substituted for hearing, the audiences of orators and preachers are multiplied without limit. It is therefore to what is preserved in books that any article upon the eloquence of the past must chiefly refer.

In order to rightly comprehend the character and relative importance of pulpit eloquence, reference must be made to preaching (q. v.) as a divinely appointed agency for the promotion of Christianity in the world. When it was so appointed by the Lord Jesus Christ (see Matt. xxviii, 19; Mark iii, 14; xvi, 15), a new and peculiar field was opened for eloquence. Indeed, a new dignity was conferred upon human speech in making it the chief agency for the spread of that truth which was designed to make men free from sin and to prepare them for the heavenly world. The very nature of this high appointment indicates that the pulpit, as representing the public utterances of Christian ministers, affords unrivalled opportunities for the production and employment of eloquence in its best forms. 1. It demands capacity, convictions, and moral power on the part of preachers, which should go very far towards making them eloquent men. 2. It furnishes them with ever-recurring and highly favorable occasions for addressing assemblies. For that object it avails itself of the consecrated time of the holy Sabbath and of the sanctuary as a hallowed place for the delivery of its message. 3. The themes which it appropriately discusses are all of an elevating and inspiring character, having an intrinsic importance superior to that of any earthly interest, being also invested with the authority of divinely revealed truth. It was in the light of such considerations that John Quincy Adams declared that "the pulpit is especially the throne of modern eloquence." Certainly, neither the bema of the Greeks nor the forum of the Romans ever afforded such an agency of power over human minds and hearts. Nor is this agency limited in its exercise to any narrow routine of forms or circumstances. It is as much in place and as full of power in the catacombs as in a cathedral; on the shores of Galilee as in the synagogues of the Jews; in the sequestered glens where persecuted worshippers gather as in churches where kings and magistrates assemble. Indeed, its greatest triumphs have often been in circumstances outwardly the most untoward and in which any earthly record was impossible. Hence, while the function of preaching has been in exercise for nearly nineteen centuries by countless thousands of preachers, but a very small proportion of the sermons that have been delivered have been, or could have been, preserved to the reading world; yet the combined literature of the ancient and modern pulpit is of immense extent.

It is by no means assumed that all printed sermons are eloquent in any superlative sense. Many, no doubt, are far less so than thousands that have vanished with the breath that uttered them, or have only lived in the memory and lives of those who heard them. Nevertheless, study and criticism are limited to those products of the pulpit which have been preserved from the oblivion of the past and made accessible to persons living in subsequent periods. But of these there is an

ever-increasing abundance, so that the task of the student is necessarily one of selection. A general or comprehensive view of pulpit eloquence can only be obtained by the study of the subject in chronological order, beginning with the apostolic age and descending to the present period, with proper attention to the characteristics of successive periods. The limits of the present article only admit of a summary outline.

I. *The Period of the Apostles and Early Fathers.*—Notwithstanding the brevity of its record, the New Testament is by no means silent as to the subject of preaching. The Gospels not only contain our Lord's Sermon on the Mount, but many fragments of the addresses or sermons which he delivered to his disciples and the multitudes. The Acts of the Apostles report in brief several of the discourses of Peter and Paul, while the Epistles may be understood to be summaries of the discussions and instructions which the different apostles were accustomed to give in their discourses as preachers. The specimens of preaching contained in the New Testament are, in fact, more full and satisfactory than any found in ecclesiastical history for several centuries after the close of the sacred canon. Indeed, our chief mode of forming any judgment of the preaching of those early centuries is from the fruits following. Even Eusebius, who wrote in the early part of the 4th century, acknowledges himself indebted to tradition for all that he knew of those successors of the apostles who had "spread the seeds of salvation and of the heavenly kingdom throughout the world far and wide."

During most, if not all, of this period, pulpits were not in existence, and even churches, as separate religious edifices, were unknown, or, at most, only beginning to exist. Worshippers, instead of assembling in large numbers, met by twos and threes wherever they could escape the surveillance of persecutors. Such circumstances would necessarily control, to no small extent, the form of address employed by Christian ministers and teachers for the propagation of the Gospel, making especially necessary personal address to individuals wherever a listener could be found. Moreover, as the New-Testament Scriptures only existed in fragmentary manuscripts, it would be necessary to employ a part of the time allotted to pastoral instruction in reciting and explaining such portions of them as were in the possession of the several pastors and teachers.

The prevailing form of ministerial address during the period referred to must, therefore, have been that of explanation and exhortation; but of its efficiency in the best result of eloquence—namely, that of persuading men to abandon error and embrace the truth—the progress of Christianity during that period of abounding paganism is the best possible proof. The power of the early preachers of Christianity, like that of the apostles themselves, must have consisted chiefly in a straightforward utterance of the truth—the direct witness of the Gospel and its appeal to the human heart. There is no reason to think that oratory was studied, or perhaps thought of; but the influence of Christian truth and life was in plain words brought to bear upon the thoughts and lives of others, as well as upon the errors and superstitions of heathenism.

II. *The Period of the Later Fathers, or the Oratorical Period of the Ancient Church.*—During and following the age of Constantine, Christian churches became common, and the canon of Scripture having been completed, copies were multiplied by transcription. But as manuscripts were costly, they could rarely be possessed by individuals, not always even by churches; hence a great part of the work of preachers was to expound consecutively portions of the sacred text. Thus homilies or familiar expositions of Scripture became the form of pulpit address which primarily characterized that period. Voluminous and valuable examples have come down to us in the homilies of Athanasius, Ephraem Syrus, Basil, the Gregories, the Cyrils, Hilary, Ambrose, Chrysostom, and Augustine.

The same period was also marked by the cultivation, among the more prominent preachers, of the Grecian style of oratory. Several of the most distinguished fathers having not only been students, but teachers of rhetoric, they did not neglect opportunities offered them for sacred orations and panegyrics. The latter style of address, in fact, became very common in commemoration of the martyrs and in celebrations of the great feasts of the Church.

The best specimens of the Christian oratory of this period have been much eulogized, and having been often pointed out as models for study and imitation, have exerted no little influence on the preaching of modern times, more particularly in France and on the continent of Europe. Even the historian Gibbon, in a paragraph which severely, but not without justice, censures certain serious errors into which many of the teachers of the Church had already fallen, says, "But the compositions of Gregory and Chrysostom have been compared with the most splendid models of Attic, or at least of Asiatic, eloquence."

That the mistakes of the preachers of the ancient Church came largely from ignorance, and that the tendency of education and enlightenment was to increase the influence of truth and the power of the pulpit, is sufficiently evident from the edict of the apostate emperor Julian, which prohibited the Christians from teaching or being taught the arts of grammar and rhetoric. The motives which prompted the edict are thus set forth by Gibbon: "Julian had reason to expect that (under the influence of his edict) in the space of a few years the Church would relapse into its primeval simplicity, and that the theologians who possessed an adequate share of the learning and eloquence of the age would be succeeded by a generation of blind and ignorant fanatics incapable of defending the truth of their own principles or of exposing the various follies of polytheism." Notwithstanding the early death of Julian and the restoration of the civil rights of the Christians, yet, through a series of untoward events, to which prevailing corruption in the Church greatly contributed, the evils of general ignorance and the degradation of preaching and of the clergy came only too soon and remained too long. From the first development of ceremonialism in the Church there was manifested a tendency to limit preaching to bishops only. This tendency grew with the multiplication of ceremonial observances, until it resulted in a general transposition of preaching from its primary design as an ever-active agency of evangelization into a ceremony itself, in which it was shorn even of its oratorical power. When the number of preachers was reduced to a minimum, the chances for the development of the talent of eloquence were correspondingly diminished, and the more so since an election to the office of bishop would do little towards conferring the gift of eloquence upon men previously unaccustomed to preach. Thus it may be seen that what has been called the oratorical period of the ancient Church derived that character from a comparatively few men of extraordinary ability, rather than from the general prevalence of preaching power among the clergy. Moreover, the latter part of that period witnessed a serious decline in the spirit and practice of preaching, which was destined to project itself forward into centuries following.

III. *The Period of the Middle Ages.*—The terms "Middle Ages" and "Dark Ages" have long been nearly synonymous; but historians have not often pointed out with sufficient clearness the extent to which the darkness of those ages was chargeable to the incompetence and unfaithfulness of those who, as Christian teachers, ought to have been the light of the world. The causes of the prevailing ignorance and degradation were numerous and complicated, but nothing would have more certainly or powerfully tended to remove them than true and zealous utterances from the clergy in the character of Christian preachers. Churches, and even cathedrals, existed in great numbers, but the idea of preach-

ing had fallen so low that postils came to be substituted for sermons. The term postil, primarily meaning a note upon a text or texts (*postilla*), came to designate a religious discourse following the reading (in Latin) of the Gospel and Epistle of the day at public mass. The term itself was diminutive, showing that preaching was regarded as of small account in comparison with the ceremonials of worship. The postil in its best form—that of a running comment on the verses of a Scripture lesson—resembled the homily. It continued in use, both among Roman Catholics and Protestants, for several generations after the dawn of the Reformation. Persons specially skilful in delivering postils were called postillists, or postillators. Specimens of the postil abound in the ecclesiastical literature of the period under consideration, but few of them are of much present value. The best sermons of the period that have come down to us are several discourses delivered by bishops in connection with the festivals of the Church, such as the Advent, Whitsuntide, Christmas, the Crucifixion, and the Ascension. As these topics involved Scripture narrations, they rose in character far above those treated in connection with the festivals of the saints, of which tradition furnished the staple material. The most tangible, though sinister, results of preaching in mediæval times were produced by the so-called preachers of the Crusades. Those results were not the peaceable fruits of righteousness, but passion, strife, and bloodshed. Peter the Hermit, a fanatical monk of the 11th century, was the preacher and prime instigator of the first Crusade. On this warlike mission he traversed Europe from country to country, enlisting high and low in his desperate scheme. He even induced pope Urban II to join him in haranguing a vast multitude assembled at Clermont, in the south of France, preparatory to the first great movement towards the Holy Land. It was under the hortations of Urban that the multitude cried out *Deus id vult*, and thus initiated the war-cry of all the Crusades. Bernard of Clairvaux, subsequently canonized as St. Bernard, preached the second Crusade. He was not only appointed by Louis VII, king of France, for that purpose, but commissioned by pope Eugenius III to offer plenary indulgence to those who would join the new Crusade. He also provided himself with badges in the form of a cross to be attached to the shoulders of all who would enlist. Whereas Peter stirred the lowest dregs of the populace, Bernard succeeded in enlisting kings, emperors, barons, and knights to attempt "to rescue the home and sanctuary of David from the hands of the Philistines." Parliaments and mass-meetings were held and addressed by Bernard from a lofty pulpit, and at these the response to his appeals was the reiterated shout *Deus id vult*. In such circumstances, and backed by such influences, it was said that the eloquence of Bernard "raised armies and depopulated cities." According to his own statement, towns were deserted so that the only people left in them were widows and orphans whose husbands and fathers were yet living. The third and fourth Crusades were set in motion by the ordinary influences of papal power and kingly authority, without any special co-operation of the pulpit. The fifth, however, was brought into action by a preacher named Fulk, a Frenchman. As a result of previous disasters, the spirit of crusading had so far declined that for two years the preaching of Fulk seemed unavailing. But at length it began to be said that miracles attested his exhortations, and soon after pope Innocent III sent to his aid numerous nuncios, who traversed Europe offering absolutions and indulgences to stimulate enlistments. Robert de Courçon, an Englishman by birth, was the preacher of the sixth Crusade. He had been an assistant to Fulk, under whom he had learned the art of exciting the people. Although inferior in talents to the earlier preachers of the Crusades, he was equal to any of them in zeal and fanaticism, and if history does not misrepresent him, he at length became so unscrupulous as to embezzle the alms of his followers. The seventh and eighth Crusades followed like receding waves of the sea, growing smaller and weaker as the impulses of fanaticism abated. They were without any preachers of distinction, and may be regarded as results of the earlier agitation.

The general decadence of preaching throughout the Roman Church became a pretext, during the latter part of the mediæval period, for the organization of several preaching orders of monks. Had these orders devoted themselves to intelligent activity in proclaiming the truths of God's Word and the practical duties of Christianity, the best of results might have been expected. But their zeal was devoted to very different objects. It was, in fact, absorbed in efforts to excite persecution against the Albigenses and other supposed heretics, together with general exertions to promote the schemes of the papacy and the inquisition. Hence it is not surprising that the preaching orders as such failed to make any valuable contributions to the eloquence of the pulpit or to stimulate activity in preaching among the clergy at large. Of the ecclesiastical celebrities of the mediæval period, few can be mentioned on account of distinguished ability as preachers. The two men who, perhaps, more than others deserve such mention were Antony of Padua, subsequently canonized as a saint, and the Jesuit Antonio Vieyra, both natives of Portugal. Of the former, it has been said that "his rare talents as a preacher caused him to be employed on unceasing missions through the north and centre of Italy, especially in the neighborhood of Bologna and Padua." "We have the most ample testimony to the popularity of his sermons. The churches where he was to preach were thronged from daybreak. Multitudes were unable to force their way in at the doors. Often it happened that the preacher had to come out of the building and address his auditors in the open air. Shops were closed, thoroughfares deserted. The crowds that flocked to sermon were sometimes calculated at thirty thousand persons. Nor were the effects less striking—Italian hatreds reconciled; men that had prepared the stiletto for an enemy hurrying into his embrace, a forgiving and a forgiven friend; women leaving off their ornaments, and selling them for the benefit of the poor; old, hardened sinners brought to immediate confession" (Neale, *Mediæval Preaching*). As in the case of many other popular preachers, Antony was greatly given to allegorizing, often introducing into his sermons animals, birds, and even fishes, and putting into their mouths quaint messages for human ears.

Vieyra was born in 1608, later than the usual limit of the period under consideration; nevertheless, from his style and general character, he has been usually called "the last of the mediæval preachers." The greater part of his life was spent in Brazil, though for a time he served as court preacher at Lisbon. During that period he visited various cities of Europe, and even preached at Rome in the Italian language. His labors as superior of the missions in Brazil were self-sacrificing, requiring him to travel thousands of leagues on foot through the wildest regions, and to traverse immense rivers in canoes; yet he was ever ready to preach to a few natives through an interpreter, or to persons of rank and influence in society. His great talent was satire, which he did not scruple to employ both in and out of the pulpit. At Maranham, one of the northern cities of Brazil, he preached a noted sermon "To the Fishes," after the method of Antony of Padua. It was based upon the text "Ye are the salt of the earth." In style and ingenuity it is not unlike his book entitled *The Art of Stealing*, which is regarded as a species of classic in the Portuguese language. Vieyra lived to an advanced age and died at the city of Bahia, having, in circumstances where printing was difficult, published not less than thirteen volumes of sermons, which were followed by two others after his death.

IV. *The Modern Period.*—The beginning of the great Reformation was characterized by a revival of preach-

ing. It was by preaching that the Reformers sought to expose the errors and corruptions into which the Church had fallen, as well as to set forth the doctrines of the Word of God. Thus Peter Waldo in the south of France, Wycliffe in England, Huss and Jerome of Prague in Bohemia, Savonarola in Italy, Luther and Melancthon in Germany, Zwingli in Switzerland, and Farel and Calvin in Switzerland and France, pursued similar courses and with similar success. Wherever such men were not overborne and crushed by opposition, they were sustained and followed by an ever-increasing number of preachers. Hence it may be said that since the Reformation preaching has been in all Protestant countries a universal accompaniment of public worship. It has not only been maintained at a single service on the Lord's-day, but usually twice or thrice in each church, and often at other times during the week. This custom has called into action a vast number of preachers, and developed the preaching talent of the Church more thoroughly than it had ever been previously cultivated subsequent to the apostolic age.

As attack prompts defence, so the zeal of Protestant preachers called out new activity and enlisted new talent among the preachers of the Roman Catholic Church. The preaching orders became greatly stimulated. Preaching ceased to be confined to bishops. Priests and curates began to preach, at least to the extent of endeavoring to antagonize Protestant influences. Thus in the two great sections of Christendom a new prominence was given to the preaching office. It is true that among Roman Catholics the mass still held the precedence and preaching did not universally become a part of Sabbath services. Nevertheless, in Protestant countries Roman Catholics came by degrees to maintain preaching in about as great frequency as the Protestants around them. Even the seating of churches and cathedrals for the convenience of auditors—a custom still unknown in Roman Catholic countries—has come to be common among the Roman Catholics of England and America.

It may thus be seen that the influence of the Reformation tended to increase in various ways the activity and power of the pulpit. It certainly secured for preaching a degree of prominence and frequency unknown to any previous period following the days of the apostles. While the impulse thus given to pulpit eloquence has never died out, its effects have been variable in different countries and at different periods. In Germany, for example, after the Reformation became so far established as to be incorporated into the political institutions of the people, the Protestant pulpit suffered a decline in its power from which it has not even yet fully recovered. The causes of that decline were numerous, involving the influence of Jesuitic opposition, false philosophy, scepticism in various forms, and, worst of all, a prevalent indifference to the power of religious truth and the necessity of a personal religious life.

In France the most celebrated epoch of pulpit eloquence occurred during the reign of Louis XIV, a monarch who, notwithstanding personal vices and official cruelties that have made his name detestable, was a zealous patron of preaching. Through his command and example, attendance upon court preaching was made fashionable in a dissolute age, and it cannot be doubted that the influence of his patronage greatly stimulated the study and practice of pulpit oratory among the Catholic clergy of his day. It is not less true that his influence fostered among the preachers that appeared before him a spirit of servility and adulation wholly unworthy of the ministerial office. The extent to which such truly great men as Bossuet, Massillon, and even Bourdaloue carried personal compliment, not to say flattery, in their sermons before the king and the aristocracy, is equally offensive and amazing to readers of the present day. When to the names just mentioned that of Fénelon is added, we have a representation of the highest phase of pulpit oratory known to the Catholic Church of France in any age. The Protestant Church of France, including Switzerland, has furnished many distinguished preachers. Calvin and Farel, of the period of the Reformation, were worthily succeeded by such men as Du Moulin, Faucheur, Daillé, Claude, Superville, Saurin, Vinet, Monod, and many others. The positions of these men were comparatively obscure, and their circumstances often greatly embarrassed by persecution; yet the specimens of printed sermons by which they are represented to succeeding generations compare favorably with any to be found in their own or other languages. During the current century, Roman Catholic preachers of great ability have been rare in France. Beyond Lacordaire, Ravignan, and Hyacinthe, few can be named as having attained a national reputation.

Great Britain may be said to be the home of modern pulpit eloquence. Taking England, including Wales, Scotland, and Ireland, into one view, it may be doubted if any country of the world has produced more or better sermons during the last three hundred years. Since the days of Wycliffe, preaching in Great Britain has been common among "all classes and conditions of men." Successive generations have been educated to appreciate it, so that not only has the pulpit been free to speak, but the masses of the people have been disposed to hear. The British pulpit, moreover, has been favored above that of any other European country in two auxiliary conditions of great importance, namely, the free use of the Word of God and the religious observance of the Lord's-day. Without the former, there is no valid basis for pulpit instruction or appeal, and hence the sermon usually degenerates into a mere oration. Without the latter, hearers are wanting, or at least irregular in attendance, a circumstance that deprives preachers of one of the most inspiring motives for diligent preparation and high effort. More truly than in any other country, unless possibly in the English-speaking portions of North America, the pulpit of Great Britain has been an exponent of the religious life and sentiments of the people. Its utterances have consequently been greatly diversified at different periods and in different circumstances. In times of religious indifference, and in those portions or branches of the Church in which religious sentiment has run low, preaching has declined to its lowest grade of influence; whereas in periods of religious awakening, and in the more evangelical sections of the Church, pulpit eloquence has attained its maximum power, not only in the sermons of a few men of extraordinary talent, but in the average ability and success of great numbers of preachers. England, having not only had a free pulpit, but also a free press, has furnished a body of sermon literature unsurpassed in quality and extent by that of any other country in the world.

The more distinguished preachers of Great Britain may be classified by epochs and religious associations. The names of Wycliffe, Latimer, Knox, and Jewell represent the great preachers of the Reformation. A similar selection for the 17th century would embrace the names of Jeremy Taylor, Barrow, Baxter, Bunyan, Howe, Charnock, Tillotson, South, and possibly many others. In the 18th century, Wesley and Whitefield, as preachers of extraordinary zeal and effectiveness, were instrumental in awakening a religious movement which extended not only throughout Great Britain, but, in fact, throughout the English-speaking world. One of its effects was to improve the tone and quality of preaching in all the churches. The number of great preachers who have adorned the British pulpit in the course of the 18th and 19th centuries is beyond enumeration. The following are representative names, and associated with volumes of published sermons: Cecil, Robert Hall, Chalmers, Wardlaw, Richard Watson, Robert Newton, Duff, Guthrie, F. W. Robertson, Stanley, Melville, Punshon, and Spurgeon. To this list might be added the names of a large number of other preachers of no less moral and intellectual worth, and of nearly equal though somewhat more local celebrity.

The freedom of the English pulpit, and, in fact, a greater freedom than was enjoyed in England at that day, came to America with the Pilgrim Fathers. Having been by them established on the Atlantic coast, it has been extended with the advance of civilization until the whole continent has felt its power. The pulpit in America, as in Great Britain, has been greatly aided in the accomplishment of its mission by the general observance of the Christian Sabbath and a free use of the Holy Scriptures. The importance of preaching has also been recognised from the first in the Church architecture of America. All edifices constructed as places of worship, from the log structures of the frontier to the great tabernacles of crowded cities and the Roman Catholic cathedrals, have been seated for auditors. In these and other conditions of society, not excepting that of all churches being alike thrown upon the voluntary system of self-support, the Christian pulpit has had in America one of its fairest and widest fields of effort. It would not have been creditable if in such circumstances pulpit eloquence had not been extensively and successfully cultivated. That it has been will appear from the long list of good and great preachers who have adorned the American Church, many of whom have given to the world volumes of published sermons. Probably in no country has the average grade of pulpit eloquence been higher than in the United States of America; and, owing in part to its vast extent, in no country is it more difficult to determine who may justly be said to have attained a national reputation as preachers. The truth is that each great denomination of Christians forms, in a certain sense, a world of itself, within which the principal preachers are far better known than in other similar worlds surrounding. Nevertheless, there have not been wanting a goodly number of men whose reputation for pulpit eloquence has transcended all denominational boundaries and become indeed national. Without attempting to make an arbitrary decision as to all whose names might be thought worthy of record in this category, it may be safe to designate a few both of the dead and the living. In so doing we purposely limit our list to a careful selection, preferring for the most part to consider living men as candidates for a similar list in future years. If our selection is judiciously made, it will be sufficient to append in chronological order, without title or classification, the names of the men who may be pronounced as, thus far, the representative preachers of America: e. g. Jonathan Edwards, Samuel Davies, Timothy Dwight, John M. Mason, John Summerfield, Edward Payson, John Newland Maffit, Lyman Beecher, William Ellery Channing, Francis Wayland, Stephen Olin, Henry B. Bascom, Charles P. M'Ilvaine, George W. Bethune, Stephen H. Tyng, and Matthew Simpson. No doubt the above list might be considerably increased even at the present time; but since there is no absolute standard of determination, it is deemed preferable to incur the risk of error by diminution rather than by excess.

In such a connection, it is only just to remark that in modern times the press serves as an important factor in the creation of public reputations, both local and national. Hence those preachers who have availed themselves of its agency as a means of giving their sermons to the public, and others whose friends have been zealous to do a similar office for them, have become much more widely known than many of equal and perhaps greater ability who have not been thus represented. But as mere publicity does not secure reputation, it is also true that the reputation of some men has been more damaged than helped by the publication of their sermons. It is, in fact, no uncommon thing that published sermons wholly fail to convey to readers the impression they produced upon their hearers when delivered. Hence, to form historic judgments of the ability of preachers, attention should be given both to the influence they exerted upon their auditors and to the matter they employed in their sermons, as tested by the established principles of criticism. It was not our intention to include among the preachers named above any who have not favorably passed the double test. That many others have already done so will no doubt be the opinion of some; but time, which tries all things, will enable readers at a future day better to determine.

Even a cursory survey of the varied character and results of pulpit eloquence during the nineteen centuries of its history is suggestive of important lessons. A few may be noted:

1. There are different kinds of pulpit eloquence. In order to be intelligently studied or judged, sermons must be classified. Some are didactic, having for their chief object instruction in Christian truth. Some are hortatory, having for their object the enforcement of truth already familiar. Some are exegetical, seeking to expound the meaning of the Scriptures. Some are illustrative, seeking to create an interest in Christian truth by exhibitions of its correspondences in nature, in human consciousness, and in the facts of history; while some are composite, seeking to blend two or more of the above characteristics into a harmonious whole. Each of these different kinds of pulpit address demands a style of language and discussion adapted to its special object. Inattention to this fact might lead to gross misjudgments on the part of critics, and equal mistakes on the part of preachers. A hortatory style of address might spoil a didactic discourse, while the coolness of didactic address would render an exhortation powerless. An essential element, therefore, in determining whether a given sermon is eloquent is a just consideration of its object. Accepting the etymological, and in fact the scriptural, idea of eloquence—namely, that of speaking well (Exod. iv, 14)—it must be conceded that a certain degree of eloquence must be recognised in sermons well adapted to the promotion of the most common and familiar objects of Christian discourse. But inasmuch as the higher and more difficult results of human effort challenge degrees of admiration not accorded to well-doing in more common matters, so it is customary to restrict the term eloquence to those higher and more unusual qualities of speech which excite emotions and control actions. In fact, one of the best definitions of eloquence states it to be the language of emotion. This definition implies that it is easier to instruct the mind and convince the judgment than to move the sensibilities of men. Nevertheless, instruction and conviction are essential conditions to the excitement of strong emotions. Few speakers accomplish the latter without the use of those conditions as antecedent agencies.

2. The natural temperament of speakers governs in a great measure the kind of eloquence in which they may excel. Sons of thunder and sons of consolation have each their mission; but for either to attempt the office or adopt the style of the other is to hazard failure. Nevertheless, mere natural endowments are insufficient to insure success without studious self-cultivation; whereas laborious efforts in right lines tend to the highly successful development of ordinary talents. An instance in point is that of Thomas Guthrie, the distinguished preacher of the Free Church of Scotland, than whom no man ever wielded the power of illustration more effectively. Yet, as shown in his biography, that power was acquired by diligent and continuous effort after his entrance into mature ministerial life, and as a result of personal experiences convincing him of its importance.

3. Successful pulpit address demands a wise choice of subjects, the vivid presentation of thought, and the use of language adapted to the comprehension of hearers. The character and influence of the Christian pulpit have at times been greatly lowered by the introduction of improper topics—topics either trivial in themselves or out of harmony with the spirit and truths of the Gospel. But even when the themes of discussion have been appropriate, the peculiar and more important objects of preaching have often been neutralized by languid ut-

terances, or by styles of expression ill adapted to the comprehension of the hearers addressed. The expression of the apostle Paul, "In the Church I had rather speak five words with my understanding, that by my voice I might teach others also, than ten thousand words in an unknown tongue" (1 Cor. xiv, 19), elucidates an important principle of all true eloquence. No matter how eloquent a man may be in his own estimation, if others fail to comprehend him his efforts will be to them either an enigma, or at best a vain show. In short, all genuine pulpit eloquence must be in harmony with those principles of human nature on which the success of secular eloquence depends. It was critically and justly shown by lord Brougham that the triumphs in eloquence secured by Demosthenes were won by his "handling in succession a variety of topics all calculated to strike his audience." So the successful proclamation of the Gospel depends largely upon the capacity of its preachers to present in striking forms, and in proper succession, the great truths of God's Word and providence.

4. The higher degrees of pulpit eloquence are not attained apart from deep religious feeling on the part of preachers. Men who are secular in their lives and low in the grade of their religious opinions and experience neither choose the themes that strike the deep chords of the human soul, nor are capable of treating them in the most affecting and moving manner. Whereas men who have a profound sense of the divine presence and authority, who have a vivid conception of the realities of eternity, the value of immortal souls, and the power of Christ as the Saviour of the perishing, they, and they only, have the proper moral basis for effective, and hence, in the most important sense, eloquent religious address to their fellow-men. "Out of the fulness of the heart the mouth speaketh." When, therefore, the heart is full of God's truth and love, it gives forth its sentiments in impressive utterances, and makes objective to others the eloquent feelings that glow within it. When the emotions of the speaker are not enlisted—in other words, when subjective eloquence is wanting on his part—the objective results of eloquence cannot be produced in the minds and hearts of hearers.

5. The higher effects of eloquence depend largely upon accessories favorable both to speakers and hearers. It is not sufficient that an orator realize in himself the qualities and conditions essential to eloquence. He also has need of all available agencies as helps in the task of transferring his thoughts and emotions to others. His first requisite is language, as a common medium for the expression and reception of thought. But the force of the best language may be greatly weakened by indistinct articulation, by feeble utterance, by uncouth gestures, and other faults of delivery. On the other hand, it may be greatly intensified by a corresponding physical expression, in which not only the tongue addresses the ear, but the eye, the countenance, the attitudes, and the action of an earnest speaker fix the gaze of his auditors and concentrate the magnetism of his presence and purposes upon the perception and sympathy of his hearers. That the full effect of such an address may be realized, the auditors need to be comfortably placed, and within easy range of his voice, since any form of discomfort, or any effort to understand, distracts their attention and weakens the impression they will receive. When, in circumstances like these, the thoughts and emotions of an eloquent man flow into the souls and kindle the emotions of a mass of hearers, their presence, in turn, reacts upon him, quickening his mental powers, and rousing his sensibilities to a degree unattainable in other circumstances. This mutuality of emotion rises with the increase of numbers and the unity of sentiment that pervades the mass. It may be said, therefore, that when speakers are equal to their task, large audiences are important, if not essential, to the higher effects of eloquence. Favorable expectancy on the part of hearers is also another condition greatly helpful to a speaker. It relieves him of the necessity of creating a bond of sympathy between himself and persons ignorant of him, or perhaps prejudiced against him. It is in this respect that a speaker's reputation may become to him an auxiliary of great value. While the conditions above specified, and others of like character, are not always within the control of ministers of the Gospel, and may sometimes be dependent on contingencies quite beyond their control, nevertheless a diligent discharge of ministerial and pastoral duty tends to create them. It was a precept of the ancient rhetoricians that the orator must be a good man, and a German writer has published a book to demonstrate that eloquence is a virtue. It is in accordance with principles thus sanctioned that extensive personal acquaintance, a high moral and religious character, and a reputation based on faithful labor and habits of doing good, all challenge sympathy, attract hearers, and awaken hopeful expectations.

6. The influence of the Holy Spirit is the crowning auxiliary of pulpit eloquence. Apart from this the preacher is like any other man. But, over and above all merely human aids, a Christian preacher of the right character and spirit is entitled to expect the influence of the Holy Ghost to give to the truths he may utter increased impressiveness, and to his hearers increased sensibility.

It is only under this last-named condition that pulpit eloquence can be hoped to attain its highest power. But this is a condition that no indolent man can reasonably hope to enjoy. It neither follows in the train of religious presumption, nor of an undue reliance upon genius or personal ability, but rather comes in answer to "the fervent, effectual prayer of a righteous man." He, therefore, who as a minister of the Gospel would, according to the apostolic injunction, study to show himself "approved, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed," should be equally diligent in the acquisition of sacred knowledge, and in the highest possible cultivation of his powers of expression, that he may with confidence ask for the unction of the Holy One as a means of rendering his utterances as a preacher of Christian truth in the highest degree efficacious. In view of this supreme object, the diligent study of pulpit eloquence, whether in its history, its principles, or its diversified illustrations, both in the published sermons and in the biographies of distinguished preachers, is of equal interest and importance.

Literature.—Bingham, *Christian Antiquities;* Smith, *Dictionary of Christian Antiquities;* Paniel, *Geschichte der christlichen Beredsamkeit und der Homiletik;* Villemain, *Tableau de l'Éloquence Chrétienne au IVe Siècle;* Moule, *Christian Oratory during the First Five Centuries* (Lond. 1859); Neale, *Mediæval Preaching* (ibid. 1856); Baring-Gould, *Post-Mediæval Preaching* (ibid. 1865); Vinet, *Histoire de la Prédication parmi les Réformés de France au Dix-septième Siècle* (Paris, 1860); Rogers, *The British Pulpit,* in the *Edinburgh Review,* 1840; Vaughan, *The Modern Pulpit* (Lond. 1842); Turnbull, *Pulpit Orators of France and Switzerland* (N. Y. 1848); Bungener, *The Preacher and the King, or Bourdaloue in the Court of Louis XIV* (Bost. 1855); Spring, *The Power of the Pulpit* (N. Y. 1854); Fish, *History and Repository of Pulpit Eloquence* (N. Y. 1856, 2 vols. 8vo); Sprague, *Annals of the American Pulpit* (ibid. 1850–60, 9 vols. 8vo); Potter, *Sacred Eloquence* (Dublin, 1868); Hall, *God's Word through Preaching* (N. Y. 1875); Taylor, *The Ministry of the Word* (ibid. 1876); Brooks, *Lectures on Preaching* (ibid. 1877); Dale, *Seven Lectures on Preaching* (ibid. 1878); Broadus, *Lectures on the History of Preaching* (ibid. 1876); Pettengill, *Homiletical Index* (ibid. 1878, 8vo). See HOMILETICS; SERMON. (D. P. K.)

Pulse (זֵרעִים, *zeroîm,* and זֵרעֹנִים, *zeronîm;* Sept. ὄσπρια; Theod. σπέρματα; Vulg. *leguminæ*) occurs only in the A. V. in Dan. i, 12, 16, as the translation of the

above plural nouns, the literal meaning of which is "seeds" of any kind. The food on which "the four children" thrived for ten days is perhaps not to be restricted to what we now understand by "pulse," i. e. the grains of leguminous vegetables: the term probably includes edible seeds in general. Gesenius translates the words "vegetables, herbs, such as are eaten in a half-fast, as opposed to flesh and more delicate food." Probably the term denotes uncooked grains of any kind, whether barley, wheat, millet, vetches, etc.

Our translators have also inserted in italics the word "pulse" as one of the "parched" sorts of provision which Barzillai brought to king David (2 Sam. xvii, 28). In this they are probably right. Leguminous seeds roasted are still used in the East; and in his commentary on Matt. xxi, 12 Jerome mentions roasted chick-pease, along with raisins and apples, as the small-wares in which the huckster fruiterers used to deal: "Frixum cicer, uvæque passæ, et poma diversi generis." Allusions in Plautus and Horace show that parched pease were a familiar article of diet among the poorer Romans.

Pulton, Andrew, a Roman Catholic divine of the Society of Jesus, flourished in the second half of the 17th century, and is noted as a zealous defender of his order and Church. He was quite a pulpit orator, but he was more successful still as a polemic. He published, *Remarks upon Dr. Tenison's Narrative*, etc. (Lond. 1687, 4to):—*Reply to a Challenge* (1688):—*Total Defeat of the Protestant Rule of Faith* (4to). See Oliver, *Biog. of English Jesuits;* Macaulay, *Hist. of England*, vol. ii, ch. vi.

Pumbaditha (פומבדיתא), a name celebrated in Jewish literature as the home of one of the great schools of Judaism, was located in Babylonia, and derived its name from its situation at the (*pum*) mouth of the *Baditha*, a canal between the Tigris and Euphrates. Its academy, except only that of Sora (q. v.), was the most enduring and influential of all the Rabbinic institutions in Babylonia. Founded towards the end of the 3d century by R. Jehudah ben-Jecheskel, one of the most distinguished disciples of Abba Areka, also called Rab (q. v.), it flourished until towards the beginning of the 11th century, thus moulding, shaping, and influencing the life and literature of the Jews. Many of the rectors of this academy acquired a great renown for their Rabbinic lore, some of whom have already been mentioned in this Cyclopædia, or will be treated in the succeeding volumes. The following list, giving the names of the famous teachers at that academy, prepared after a careful and diligent perusal of the best authorities, we hope will aid the student of Jewish literature, since it is not easy to bring the *membra disjecta* into a chronological order out of the *rudis indigestaque moles* of the different sources:

	A.D.
1. R. Jehudah ben-Jecheskel	297–299
2. Chasda of Kafri	299–309
3. Rabba ben-Nachman	309–330
4. Joseph ben-Chija, the Blind (q. v.)	330–333
5. Abaji ben-Cajlil	333–338
6. Rabba bar-Joseph bar-Chama	338–352
7. Nachman ben-Isaac	352–356
8. Chama of Nahardea	356–377
9. Zebid ben-Ushaja	377–385
10. Dimi ben-Chinena	385–388
11. Rafrem ben-Papa	388–400
12. R. Kahana	400–411
13. Mar Sutra	411–414
14. Acha ben-Rabba	414–419
15. Gebiha of Be-Katil	419–433
16. Rafrem II	433–443
17. Rachumai, or Nachumai	443–456
18. Sama ben-Rabba	456–471
19. R. José	471–520

At this time the final redaction of the Babylonian Talmud (q. v.) was made, and, according to Jewish tradition, to R. José, who forms the end of the Amoraim (*Soph Haraah*), the honor is assigned of "completing to write and of sealing the Gemara of Babylon, in the twenty-fourth year of his rectoral and magisterial dignity, in the year from the creation 4260, and 311 years from the sealing of the Mishna." After the death of R. José, the chronological chain is interrupted, and, with the exception of a few names which have come down to us, it is difficult to say who filled the space up to the year 670, for the probability is that, in the vicissitudes and persecutions of those times, the names of those famous teachers have been forgotten. With Mar Rabba, who belonged to the so-called Gaonastic period, the chronological order can again be followed down to the last of the heads of the academy of Pumbaditha, whose death sealed the closing of that famous academy forever. The following are the names:

	Circa A.D.
1. Mar Rabba	670–680
2. Mar Bussai, or Bostanai	680–689
3. Hunai Mari ben-Joseph	689–700
4. R. Chija of Mesene	700–710
5. Mar-Rabjah	710–719
6. Natronai ben-Nehemia, surnamed Mar Janka	719–730
7. Mar Jehudah	730–739
8. Mar Joseph ben-Chutanai	739–761
9. Samuel ben-Mari	
10. Mar Natroi Kahana ben-Emuna	
11. Abraham Kahana	
12. R. Dadai ben-Nachman	761–764
13. Chananja ben-Mesharshaja	764–771
14. Malka ben-Acha	771–773
15. Rabba ben-Dudai	773–782
16. R. Shinui	a few months
17. Chaninai ben-Abraham Kahana	782–786
18. Huna Mar Halevi ben-Isaac	786–788
19. Manasseh ben-Joseph	788–796
20. Isaiah ben-Abba	796–798
21. Joseph ben-Shila	798–804
22. Mar Kahana ben-Chaninai	804–810
23. Abumari ben-Abraham	810–814
24. Joseph ben-Abba	814–816
25. Mar Abraham ben-Sherira	816–828
R. Joseph ben-Chija anti-Gaon.	
26. R. Joseph ben-Chija *sole Gaon*	828–833
27. R. Joseph ben-Rabbi	833–842
28. Paltoj ben-Abaji	842–858
29. Menachem ben-Joseph ben-Chija	858–860
Mar Mattathias anti-Gaon.	
30. Mar Mattathias *sole Gaon*	860–869
31. Rabba ben-Ami	869–872
32. Mar Zemach i. ben-Paltoj	872–890
33. Hai ben-David	890–897
34. Kimoj ben-Achai	897–906
35. Mar Jehudai ben-Samuel	906–917
36. Mar Kohen Zedek ii. ben-Joseph	917–936
37. Zemach ben-Kafnai	936–938
38. Chaninai ben-Jehudai	938–943
39. Aaron Ibn Sargada	943–960
40. Nehemia ben-Kohen Zedek	960–968
41. Sherira ben-Chanania	968–998
42. Hai ben-Sherira	998–1038

Literature.— Pinner, *Compendium des hierosolymitanischen u. babylonischen Talmud* (Berlin, 1832), p. 117 sq.; *Monatsschrift für Gesch. u. Wissenschaft d. Judenthums*, i, 203 sq., 403 sq.; vii, 336 sq., 381 sq.; Grätz, *Gesch. der Juden*, vols. iv, v; Ginsburg, in Kitto's *Cyclopædia*, arts. "Education" and "Scribes;" Jost, *Gesch. der Judenth. u. s. Secten*, vol. ii (see Index in vol. iii); Cassel, *Leitfaden zur jüd. Gesch. u. Literatur* (Berlin, 1872), p. 48, 55; Etheridge, *Introd. to Hebrew Literature*, p. 161–220 (where names and dates are, however, very often incorrect); *Liber Juchassin sive Lexicon Biographicum et Historicum* (ed. H. Filipowski, Lond. 1857), p. 199 sq.; Worman, in Kiddle and Schem's *Cyclop. of Education*, art. "Hebrews, Education of." (B. P.)

Punchao was the greatest of the Peruvian gods, the lord of the day, the creator of light.

Pundeka (פונדקא), a village of the tribe of Dan mentioned in the Talmud (Schwarz, *Palest.* p. 144); now the village *Fundak*, about midway between Nablûs and the plain of Sharon towards Jaffa, on the south side of the road (Robinson, *Later Researches*, p. 135).—Van de Velde, *Memoir*, p. 340.

Püngel, Nicolaus, *Dr.*, a Roman Catholic divine, was born at Münster in 1802. Having completed his studies, he was ordained priest in 1825, and for several years labored as chaplain in Riesenbeck and Münster. From 1835 to 1846 he superintended the parish of Riesenbeck, in the meantime pursuing his studies. The

result was his work on Gerson's tract, *De Parvulis ad Christum Trahendis*, together with a *Vita Gersonis*, which he published in 1853, and thus became a *privat-docent* at the University of Münster. He soon became professor of pastoral theology, and died April 24, 1876, as senior of the chapter. — *Literarischer Handweiser*, 1876, p. 238.

Punishment (most properly expressed in Hebrew by some form of פָּקַד, *pakád*, strictly "to visit," and in Greek by κόλασις or τιμωρία, but frequently denoted by other terms). The following account is based upon the Scripture statements, with illustrations from ancient and modern sources. See CORPORAL INFLICTIONS.

I. *Historical Review of Bodily Inflictions among the Hebrews.* — The earliest theory of punishment current among mankind is doubtless the one of simple retaliation, "blood for blood" [see BLOOD REVENGE], a view which in a limited form appears even in the Mosaic law. Viewed historically, the first case of punishment for crime mentioned in Scripture, next to the fall itself, is that of Cain, the first murderer. His punishment, however, was a substitute for the retaliation which might have been looked for from the hand of man, and the mark set on him, whatever it was, served at once to designate, protect, and perhaps correct the criminal. That death was regarded as the fitting punishment for murder appears plain from the remark of Lamech (Gen. iv, 24). In the post-diluvian code, if we may so call it, retribution by the hand of man, even in the case of an offending animal, for blood shed, is clearly laid down (ix, 5, 6); but its terms give no sanction to that "wild justice" executed even to the present day by individuals and families on their own behalf by so many of the uncivilized races of mankind. The prevalence of a feeling of retribution due for blood shed may be remarked as arising among the brethren of Joseph in reference to their virtual fratricide (xlii, 21). The punishment of death appears among the legal powers of Judah, as the head of his family, and he ordered his daughter-in-law, Tamar, to be burned (xxxviii, 24). It is denounced by the king of the Philistines, Abimelech, against those of his people who should injure or insult Isaac or his wife (xxvi, 11, 29). Similar power seems to have been possessed by the reigning Pharaoh in the time of Joseph (xli, 13).

Passing onwards to Mosaic times, we find the sentence of capital punishment, in the case of murder, plainly laid down in the law. The murderer was to be put to death, even if he should have taken refuge at God's altar or in an asylum city, and the same principle was to be carried out even in the case of an animal (Exod. xxi, 12, 14, 28, 36; Lev. xxiv, 17, 21; Numb. xxxv, 31; Deut. xix, 11, 12; and see 1 Kings ii, 28, 34). Moses, however, did not allow parents to be put to death for their children, nor children for their parents (Deut. xxiv, 16), as did the Chaldæans (Dan. vi, 24) and the kings of Israel (comp. 1 Kings xxi; 2 Kings ix, 26).

The extensive prescription of capital punishment by the Mosaic law, which we cannot consider as a dead letter, may be accounted for by the peculiar circumstances of the people. They were a nation of newly emancipated slaves, and were by nature perhaps more than commonly intractable; and if we may judge by the laws enjoined on them, which Mr. Hume well remarks are a safe index to the manners and disposition of any people, we must infer that they had imbibed all the degrading influences of slavery among heathens. Their wanderings and isolation did not admit of penal settlements or remedial punishments. They were placed under immediate divine government and surveillance. Hence, wilful offences evinced an incorrigibleness which rendered death the only means of ridding the community of such transgressors, and this was ultimately resorted to in regard to all individuals above a certain age, in order that a better class might enter Canaan (Numb. xiv, 29, 32, 35). If capital punishment in Christian nations be defended from the Mosaic law, it ought in fairness to be extended to all the cases sanctioned by that law, and, among the rest, as Paley argues, to the doing of any work on the Sabbath day (*Mor. Phil.* b. v, c. 7).

II. *Capital Crimes under Mosaism.*—(*A.*) *Absolute.*—The following offences also are mentioned in the law as liable to the punishment of death:

1. Striking, or even reviling, a parent (Exod. xxi, 15, 17).
2. Blasphemy (Lev. xxiv, 14, 16, 23: see Philo, *V. M.* iii, 25; 1 Kings xxi, 10; Matt. xxvi, 65, 66).
3. Sabbath-breaking (Numb. xv, 32–36; Exod. xxxi, 14; xxxv, 2).
4. Witchcraft, and false pretension to prophecy (Exod. xxii, 18; Lev. xx, 27; Deut. xiii, 5; xviii, 20; 1 Sam. xxviii, 9).
5. Adultery (Lev. xx, 10; Deut. xxii, 22: see John viii, 5, and Josephus, *Ant.* iii, 12, 1).
6. Unchastity — *a.* Previous to marriage, but detected afterwards (Deut. xxii, 21). *b.* In a betrothed woman with some one not affianced to her (ibid. ver. 23). *c.* In a priest's daughter (Lev. xxi, 9).
7. Rape (Deut. xxii, 25).
8. Incestuous and unnatural connections (Lev. xx, 11, 14, 16; Exod. xxii, 19).
9. Man-stealing (Exod. xxi, 16; Deut. xxiv, 7).
10. Idolatry, actual or virtual, in any shape (Lev. xx, 2; Deut. xiii, 6, 10, 15; xvii, 2–7: see Josh. vii and xxii, 20, and Numb. xxv, 8).
11. False witness in certain cases (Deut. xix, 16, 19).

Some of the foregoing are mentioned as being in earlier times liable to capital or severe punishment by the hand either of God or of man, as (1) Gen. ix, 25; (5) Gen. xii, 17; xx, 7; xxxix, 19; (6) Gen. xxxviii, 24; (8) Gen. xix, xxxviii, 10.

(*B.*) *Relative.* — But there is a large number of offences — some of them included in this list — which are named in the law as involving the penalty of "cutting off (כָּרַת; Sept. ἐξολοθρεύω) from the people." On the meaning of this expression some controversy has arisen. There are all together thirty-six or thirty-seven cases in the Pentateuch in which this formula is used, which may be thus classified:

1. *Breach of Morals.*—Under this head we have the following:
   - Wilful sin in general (Numb. xv, 30, 31).
   - *Fifteen cases of incestuous or unclean connection (Lev. xviii, 29, and xx, 9–21).
2. *Breach of Covenant*, as follows:
   - *†Uncircumcision (Gen. xvii, 14; Exod. iv, 24).
   - Neglect of Passover (Numb. ix, 13).
   - *Sabbath-breaking (Exod. xxxi, 14).
   - Neglect of Atonement-day (Lev. xxiii, 29).
   - †Work done on that day (Lev. xxiii, 30).
   - *†Children offered to Molech (Lev. xx, 3).
   - *†Witchcraft (Lev. xx, 6).
   - Anointing a stranger with holy oil (Exod. xxx, 33).
3. *Breach of Ritual*, as follows:
   - Eating leavened bread during Passover (Exod. xii, 15, 19).
   - Eating fat of sacrifices (Lev. vii, 25).
   - Eating blood (Lev. vii, 27; xvii, 14).
   - *Eating sacrifice in an unclean condition (Lev. vii, 20, 21; xxii, 3, 4, 9).
   - Offering too late (Lev. xix, 8).
   - Making holy ointment for private use (Exod. xxx, 32, 33).
   - Making perfume for private use (Exod. xxx, 38).
   - Neglect of purification in general (Numb. xix, 13, 20).
   - Not bringing offering after slaying a beast for food (Lev. xvii, 9).
   - Not slaying the animal at the tabernacle door (Lev. xvii, 4).

Touching holy things illegally (Numb. iv, 15, 18, 20; and see 2 Sam. vi, 7; 2 Chron. xxvi, 21).

In the foregoing list, which, it will be seen, is classified according to the view supposed to be taken by the law of the principle of condemnation, the cases marked with * are (*a*) those which are expressly threatened or actually visited with death, as well as with cutting off. In those (*b*) marked †, the hand of God is expressly named as the instrument of execution. We thus find that of (*a*) there are in class 1 seven cases, all named in Lev. xx, 9–16; in class 2, four cases; in class 3, two cases; while of (*b*) we find in class 2 four cases, of which three belong also to (*a*), and in class 3 one case. The question to be determined is, whether the phrase "cut off" be likely to mean death in all cases; and to avoid that conclusion Le Clerc, Michaelis, and others have suggested that in some of them—the ceremonial ones—it was intended to be commuted for banishment or privation of civil rights (Michaelis, *Laws of Moses*, vol. iii, § 237, p. 436, trans.). Rabbinical writers explained "cutting off" to mean excommunication, and laid down three degrees of severity as belonging to it (Selden, *De Syn.* i, 6). See ANATHEMA. But most commentators agree that, in accordance with the *prima-facie* meaning of Heb. x, 28, the sentence of "cutting off" must be understood to be death-punishment of some sort. Saalschütz explains it to be premature death by God's hand, as if God took into his own hand such cases of ceremonial defilement as would create difficulty for human judges to decide. Knobel thinks death-punishment absolutely is meant; so Corn. à Lapide and Ewald. Jahn explains that when *God* is said to cut off, an act of divine providence is meant, which in the end destroys the family, but that "cutting off" in general means stoning to death, as the usual capital punishment of the law. Calmet thinks it means privation of all rights belonging to the Covenant. It may be remarked (*a*) that two instances are recorded in which violation of a ritual command took place without the actual infliction of a death-punishment: (1) that of the people eating with the blood (1 Sam. xiv, 32); (2) that of Uzziah (2 Chron. xxvi, 19, 21), and that in the latter case the offender was, in fact, excommunicated for life; (*b*) that there are also instances of the directly contrary course, viz. in which the offenders were punished with death for similar offences: Nadab and Abihu (Lev. x, 1, 2); Korah and his company (Numb. xvi, 10, 33), who "perished from the congregation;" Uzzah (2 Sam. vi, 7); and, further, that the leprosy inflicted on Uzziah might be regarded as a virtual death (Numb. xii, 12). To whichever side of the question this case may be thought to incline, we may perhaps conclude that the primary meaning of "cutting off" is a sentence of death to be executed, in some cases, without remission, but in others voidable (1) by immediate atonement on the offender's part; (2) by direct interposition of the Almighty, i. e. a sentence of death always "recorded," but not always executed. It is also probable that the severity of the sentence produced in practice an immediate recourse to the prescribed means of propitiation in almost every actual case of ceremonial defilement (Numb. xv, 27, 28). See Saalschütz, *Arch. Hebr.* x, 74, 75, vol. ii, 299; Knobel, Calmet, Corn. à Lapide *on Gen. xvii*, 13, 14; Keil, *Bibl. Arch.* vol. ii, p. 264, § 153; Ewald, *Gesch.* App. to vol. iii, p. 158; Jahn, *Arch. Bibl.* § 257.

III. *Penalties.*—Punishments, in themselves, are twofold, capital and secondary; and in the cases we are considering they were either native or foreign.

(*A.*) Of *capital* punishments, properly Hebrew, the following only are prescribed by the law.

1. *Stoning*, which was the ordinary mode of execution (Exod. xvii, 4; Luke xx, 6; John x, 31; Acts xiv, 5). We find it ordered in the cases which are marked in the lists above as punishable with death; and we may remark further that it is ordered also in the case of an offending animal (Exod. xix, 13; xxi, 29). The false witness, likewise, in a capital case would, by the law of retaliation, become liable to death (Deut. xix, 19; *Maccoth*, i, 1, 6). In the case of idolatry, and, it may be presumed, in other cases also, the witnesses, of whom there were to be at least two, were required to cast the first stone (Deut. xiii, 9; xvii, 7; John viii, 7; Acts vii, 58). The Rabbinical writers add that the first stone was cast by one of them on the chest of the convict, and if this failed to cause death, the bystanders proceeded to complete the sentence (*Sanhedr.* vi, 1, 3, 4; Goodwyn, *Moses and Aaron*, p. 121). The body was then to be suspended till sunset (Deut. xxi, 23; Josh. x, 26; Josephus, *Ant.* iv, 8, 24), and not buried in the family grave (*Sanhedr.* vi, 5).

2. *Hanging* is mentioned as a distinct punishment (Numb. xxv, 4; 2 Sam. xxi, 6, 9), but is generally, in the case of Jews, spoken of as following death by some other means. *Hanging alive* may have been a Canaanitish punishment, since it was practiced by the *Gibeonites* on the sons of Saul (2 Sam. xxi, 9).

3. *Burning*, in pre-Mosaic times, was the punishment for unchastity (Gen. xxxviii, 24). Under the law it is ordered in the case of a priest's daughter (Lev. xxi, 9), of which an instance is mentioned (*Sanhedr.* vii, 2); likewise in case of incest (Lev. xx, 14); but it is also mentioned as following death by other means (Josh. vii, 25), and some have thought it was never used excepting after death. Among the heathens this merciful preliminary was not always observed, as, for instance, in the case of Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego (Dan. iii). The Rabbinical account of burning by means of molten lead poured down the throat has no authority in Scripture.

4. *Death by the sword* or *spear* is named in the law (Exod. xix, 13; xxxii, 27; Numb. xxv, 7), although two of the cases may be regarded as exceptional; but it occurs frequently in regal and post-Babylonian times (Judg. ix, 5; 1 Sam. xv, 33; xxii, 18; 2 Sam. i, 15; iv, 12; xx, 22; 1 Kings ii, 25, 34; xix, 1; 2 Kings x, 7; 2 Chron. xxi, 4; Jer. xxvi, 23; Matt. xiv, 8, 10)—a list in which more than one case of assassination, either with or without legal forms, is included.

5. *Strangling* is said by the rabbins to have been regarded as the most common but least severe of the capital punishments, and to have been performed by immersing the convict in clay or mud, and then strangling him by a cloth twisted round the neck (Goodwyn, *M. and A.* p. 122; Otho, *Lex. Rab.* s. v. "Supplicia;" *Sanhedr.* vii, 3; Ker Porter, *Trav.* ii, 177; C. B. Michaelis, *De Judiciis*, ap. Pott, *Syll. Comm.* iv, § 10, 12). This Rabbinical opinion, founded, it is said, on oral tradition from Moses, has no Scripture authority.

(*B.*) Besides these ordinary capital punishments, we read of others, either of foreign introduction or of an irregular kind. Among the former,

1. *Crucifixion* (q. v.) is treated separately, to which article the following remark may be added, that the Jewish tradition of capital punishment, independent of the Roman governor, being interdicted for forty years previous to the Destruction, appears in fact, if not in time, to be justified (John xviii, 31, with De Wette, *Comment.*; Goodwyn, p. 121; Keil, ii, 264; Josephus, *Ant.* xx, 9, 1).

2. *Drowning*, though not ordered under the law, was practiced at Rome, and is said by St. Jerome to have been in use among the Jews (Cicero, *Pro Sext. Rosc. Am.* 25; Jerome, *Com. on Matt.* lib. iii, p. 138; Matt. xviii, 6; Mark ix, 42). Josephus records that the Galilæans, revolting from their commanders, drowned the partisans of Herod (*Ant.* xiv, 15, 20).

3. *Sawing asunder* or crushing beneath iron instruments. The former is said to have been practiced on Isaiah; the latter may, perhaps, not always have caused death, and thus have been a torture rather than a capital punishment (2 Sam. xii, 31, and perhaps Prov. xx, 26; Heb. xi, 37; Just. Mart. *Tryph.* 120). The process

of sawing asunder, as practiced in Barbary, is described by Shaw (*Trav.* p. 254).

4. *Pounding in a mortar* is alluded to in Prov. xxvii, 22, but not as a legal punishment. It is mentioned as a Cingalese punishment by Sir E. Tennant (*Ceylon*, ii, 88). Something similar to this, *beating to death* (τυμπανισμός), was a Greek punishment for slaves. It was inflicted on a wooden frame, which probably derived its name from resembling a drum or timbrel in form, on which the criminal was bound, and beaten to death (2 Macc. vi, 19, 28; comp. ver. 30). In Josephus (*De Macc.*) the same instrument is called τροχός, or "wheel" (5, 9). Hence, to beat upon the tympanum, to drum to death, is similar to "breaking on the wheel" (Heb. xi, 35). David inflicted this among other cruelties upon the inhabitants of Rabbath-ammon (1 Chron. xx, 3).

5. *Precipitation*, attempted in the case of our Lord at Nazareth, and carried out in that of captives from the Edomites, and of St. James, who is said to have been cast from "the pinnacle" of the Temple; also said to have been executed on some Jewish women by the Syrians (2 Chron. xxv, 12; 2 Macc. vi, 10; Luke iv, 29; Euseb. *H. E.* ii, 23). This punishment resembles that of the Tarpeian rock among the Romans.

6. The Persians had a singular punishment for great criminals. A high tower was filled a great way up with ashes, the criminal was thrown into it, and the ashes, by means of a wheel, were continually stirred up and raised about him till he was suffocated (2 Macc. xiii, 4–6).

Criminals executed by law were buried outside the city gates, and heaps of stones were flung upon their graves (Josh. vii, 25, 26; 2 Sam. xviii, 17; Jer. xxii, 19). Mohammedans, to this day, cast stones, in passing, at the supposed tomb of Absalom (Fabri *Evagatorium*, i, 409; Sandys, *Trav.* p. 189; Raumer, *Palästina*, p. 272).

(*C.*) *Of secondary punishments* among the Jews, the original principles were,

1. *Retaliation*, "eye for eye," etc. (Exod. xxi, 24, 25; see Gell. *Noct. Att.* xx, 1). Retaliation, the *lex talionis* of the Latins, and the ἀντιπεπονθός of the Greeks, is doubtless the most natural of all kinds of punishment, and would be the most just of all if it could be instantaneously and universally inflicted; but when delayed, it is apt to degenerate into revenge. Hence the desirableness that it should be regulated and modified by law. The one-eyed man mentioned by Diodorus Siculus (xii) complained that if he lost his remaining eye, he would then suffer more than his victim, who would still have one left. Phavorinus argues against this law, which was one of the twelve tables, as not admitting literal execution, because the same member was more valuable to one man than another; for instance, the right hand of a scribe or painter could not be so well spared as that of a singer. Hence that law, in later times, was administered with the modification, "Ni cum eo pacet," except the aggressor came to an agreement with the mutilated person, *de talione redimenda*, to redeem the punishment by making compensation. Moses, accordingly, adopted the principle, but lodged the application of it in the judge. "If a man blemish his neighbor, as he hath done, so shall it be done to him. Life for life, eye for eye, tooth for tooth, wound for wound, stripe for stripe, breach for breach" (Lev. xxiv, 19–22). He, however, makes wilful murder, even of a slave, always capital, as did the Egyptians. Roman masters had an absolute right over the lives of their slaves (Juvenal, vi, 219). The Egyptians doomed the false accuser to the same punishment which he endeavored to bring on his victim, as did Moses (Deut. xix, 19).

2. *Compensation*, identical (restitution) or analogous; payment for loss of time or of power (Exod. xxi, 18–36; Lev. xxiv, 18–21; Deut. xix, 21). The man who stole a sheep or an ox was required to restore four sheep for a sheep, and five oxen for an ox thus stolen (Exod. xxii, 1). The thief caught in the fact in a dwelling might even be killed or sold; or if a stolen animal were found alive, he might be compelled to restore double (Exod. xxii, 2–4). Damage done by an *animal* was to be fully compensated (ver. 5). *Fire* caused to a neighbor's corn was to be compensated (ver. 6). A *pledge* stolen, and found in the thief's possession, was to be compensated by double (ver. 7). All *trespass* was to pay double (ver. 9). A *pledge* lost or damaged was to be compensated (vers. 12, 13); a *pledge* withheld, to be restored with 20 per cent. of the value (Lev. vi, 4, 5). The "sevenfold" of Prov. vi, 31, by its notion of completeness, probably indicates servitude in default of full restitution (Exod. xxii, 2–4). *Slander* against a wife's honor was to be compensated to her parents by a fine of one hundred shekels, and the traducer himself to be punished with stripes (Deut. xxii, 18, 19).

3. *Stripes*, whose number was not to exceed forty (Deut. xxv, 3); whence the Jews took care not to exceed thirty-nine (2 Cor. xi, 24; Josephus, *Ant.* iv, 8, 21). This penalty was to be inflicted on the offender lying on the ground in the presence of a judge (Lev. xix, 20; Deut. xxii, 18). In later times, the convict was stripped to the waist and tied, in a bent position, to a low pillar, and the stripes, with a whip of three thongs, were inflicted on the back between the shoulders. A single stripe in excess subjected the executioner to punishment (*Maccoth*, iii, 1, 2, 3, 13, 14). It is remarkable that the Abyssinians use the same number (Wolff, *Trav.* ii, 276). We have abundant evidence that it was an ancient Egyptian punishment. Nor was it unusual for Egyptian superintendents to stimulate laborers to their work by the persuasive powers of the stick. Women received the stripes on the back, while sitting, from the hand of a man; and boys also, sometimes with their hands tied behind them. The modern inhabitants of the valley of the Nile retain the predilection of their forefathers for this punishment. The Moslems say, "The stick came down from heaven a blessing from God." Moses allowed corporal punishment of this kind by masters to servants or slaves of both sexes (Exod. xxi, 20). Scourging was common in after-times among the Jews, who associated with it no disgrace or inconvenience beyond the physical pain it occasioned, and from which no station was exempt (Prov. xvii, 26; comp. x, 13; Jer. xxxvii, 15–20). Hence it became the symbol for correction in general (Psa. lxxxix, 32). Solomon is a zealous advocate for its use in education (Prov. xiii, 24; xxiii, 13, 14; comp. Ecclus. xxx, 1). In his opinion, "the blueness of a wound cleanseth away evil, and stripes the inward parts of the belly" (Prov. xx, 30). It was inflicted for ecclesiastical offences in the synagogue (Matt. x, 17; Acts xxvi, 11). Among torturing or tedious penalties,

4. *Scourging* with thorns is mentioned (Judg. viii, 16). Reference to the scourge with scorpions, i. e. a whip or scourge armed with knots or thorns, occurs in 1 Kings xii, 11. So in Latin, *scorpio* means *a knotted* or *thorny switch*. The *stocks* are mentioned (Jer. xx, 2); *passing through fire* (2 Sam. xii, 31); *mutilation* (Judg. i, 6; 2 Macc. vii, 4; and see 2 Sam. iv, 12); *plucking out hair* (Isa. l, 6; Neh. xiii, 25); in later times, *imprisonment*, and *confiscation* or *exile* (Ezra vii, 26; Jer. xxxvii, 15; xxxviii, 6; Acts iv, 3; v, 18; xii, 4). Imprisonment, not as a punishment, but custody till the royal pleasure was known, appears among the Egyptians (Gen. xxxix, 20, 21). Moses adopted it for like purposes (Lev. xxvi, 12). It appears as a punishment inflicted by the kings of Judah and Israel (1 Kings xxii, 27; 2 Chron. xvi, 10; Jer. xxxvii, 21); and during the Christian æra, as in the instance of John (Matt. iv, 12) and Peter (Acts xii, 4). Murderers and debtors were also committed to prison, and the latter "tormented" till they paid (Matt. xviii, 30; Luke xxiii, 19). A common prison is mentioned (Acts v, 18); and also an inner prison, or dungeon, which was sometimes a pit (Jer. xxxviii, 6), in which were "stocks" (Jer. xx, 2; xxix, 26; Acts xvi, 24). Prisoners are alluded to

(Job iii, 18), and stocks (xiii, 27). Banishment was inflicted by the Romans on John (Rev. i, 9). As in earlier times imprisonment formed no part of the Jewish system, the sentences were executed at once (see Esth. vii, 8–10; Selden, *De Syn.* ii, c. 13, p. 888). Before death, a grain of frankincense in a cup of wine was given to the criminal to intoxicate him (*ibid.* 889). The command for witnesses to cast the first stone shows that the duty of execution did not belong to any special officer (Deut. xvii, 7).

(*D.*) Of punishments, especially non-capital, inflicted by other nations we have the following notices: In Egypt, the power of life and death and imprisonment rested with the king, and to some extent also with officers of high rank (Gen. xl, 3, 22; xlii, 20). Death might be commuted for slavery (xlii, 19; xliv, 9, 33). The law of retaliation was also in use in Egypt (Wilkinson, *Ancient Egyptians*, ii, 214, 215, 217). In Egypt, and also in Babylon, the chief of the executioners, *Rab-Tabbachim*, was a great officer of state (Gen. xxxvii, 36; xxxix; xl; Jer. xxxix, 13; xli, 10; xliii, 6; lii, 15, 16; Dan. ii, 14; Mark vi, 27; Michaelis, *Mos. Recht*, iii, 412; Josephus, *Ant.* x, 8, 5). He was sometimes a eunuch (Josephus, *Ant.* vii, 5, 4). See CHERETHITE.

Putting out the eyes of captives, and other cruelties, as flaying alive, burning, tearing out the tongue, etc., were practiced by Assyrian and Babylonian conquerors; and parallel instances of despotic cruelty are found in abundance in both ancient and modern times in Persian and other history. The execution of Haman and the story of Daniel are pictures of summary Oriental procedure (2 Kings xxv, 7; Esth. vii, 9, 10; Jer. xxix, 22; Dan. iii, 6; vi, 7, 24; comp. Herod. vii, 39; ix, 112, 113; see Chardin, *Voy.* vi, 21, 118; Layard, *Nineveh*, ii, 369, 374, 377; *Nin. and Bab.* p. 456, 457). The duty of counting the numbers of the victims, which is there represented, agrees with the story of Jehu (2 Kings x, 7), and with one recorded of Shah Abbas Mirza, by Ker Porter (*Travels*, ii, 524, 525; see also Burckhardt, *Syria*, p. 57; and Malcolm, *Sketches of Persia*, p. 47).

With the Romans, stripes and the stocks, *πεντεσύριγγον ξύλον*, *nervus* and *columbar*, were in use, and imprisonment with a chain attached to a soldier. There were also the *liberæ custodiæ* in private houses (Acts xvi, 23; xxii, 24; xxviii, 16; comp. Xenoph. *Hell.* iii, 3, 11; Herod. ix, 37; Plautus, *Rud.* iii, 6, 30, 34, 38, 50; Aristot. *Eq.* [ed. Bekker] 1044; Josephus, *Ant.* xviii, 6, 7; xix, 6, 1; Sallust, *Cat.* 47).

Exposure to wild beasts appears to be mentioned by St. Paul (1 Cor. xv, 32; 2 Tim. iv, 17), but not with any precision. *The lion's den* was a Babylonian punishment (Dan. vi), and is still customary in Fez and Morocco (see accounts of, by Hoest. c. ii, p. 77).

PUNISHMENT, FUTURE. The obvious fact that the sufferings of the wicked in this life are not in proportion to their sins has led even the heathen of all ages to the belief in a state of retribution after death. The Scriptures abundantly confirm this position, so that few in the present day deny its truth in some form. The only questions that arise are those relating to its *character* and its *duration*. The former of these points has been discussed under HELL PUNISHMENTS; the latter we will briefly consider here.

1. No one approaching the New Testament without preconceived opinions could get any other impression from its language on this subject than that the punishments of the wicked in hell are to be everlasting. (For special passages, see Matt. xii, 32; xxv; xxvi, 24; Mark iii, 29; ix, 43; Rev. xiv, 11; xx, 10.) Moreover, apart from special passages, the general tone of the New Testament indicates the final and irrevocable ruin of those who persist to the last in sin and in the rejection of Christ the Saviour.

2. In the ancient Church, the Alexandrian theologians were the first to teach that there could be an end to the punishments of hell. According to them discipline and reformation were the only ends of punishment, so that it could not be eternal; the final end is *ἀποκατάστασις*, the entire freedom from evil. Hence Clement says, "If in this life there are so many ways for purification and repentance, how much more should there be after death! The purification of souls, when separated from the body, will be easier. We can set no limits to the agency of the Redeemer; to redeem, to rescue, to discipline, is his work; and so will he continue to operate after this life" (*Stromata*, vi, 638). Clement did not deem it proper to express himself more fully respecting this doctrine, because he considered that it formed a part of the Gnosis. Hence he says, "As to the rest, I am silent, and praise the Lord" (*ibid.* vii, 706). Origen infers from the variety of ways and methods by which men are led to the faith in this life that there will be a diversity in the divine modes of discipline after death; notwithstanding this, however, he considers it extremely important that every one should in this life become a believer. Whoever neglects the Gospel, or after baptism commits grievous sins, will suffer so much heavier punishments after death (*In Joann.* vi, 267). The doctrine of a general restoration he found explicitly in 1 Cor. xv, 28. Yet he reckons this among the Gnostic (or esoteric) doctrines; for he says, "It would not be useful for all to have this knowledge; but it is well if at least fear of a material hell keep them back from sin" (*In Jerem. Hom.* xix). (See Neander, *Hist. of Dogmas*, i, 254.) "But, in opposition to these, the doctrine of the eternity of future punishments was affirmed by other equally distinguished teachers, e. g. Basil, John of Constantinople, among the Greeks, and, among the Latins, by Jerome, Augustine, and others." Gregory of Nyssa, however, defended the restorationism (*ἀποκατάστασις*) of Origen. Augustine, on the other hand, opposed it strenuously; the whole spirit of his system, and his full and strong conception of the justice of God, were fundamentally opposed to restorationism. "The doctrine of Origen was condemned by the Council of Alexandria, A.D. 399, and afterwards by many other councils, and the doctrine of the eternity of future punishments was established as the faith of the Church" (Knapp, *Theology*, § 158). The doctrine of purgatory soon grew up to take the place of the theory of restorationism. "The doctrine of the limited duration of future punishment fell into very ill repute in the Western Church, on account of its being professed by some of the enthusiastic and revolutionary parties in the 16th century (e. g. by the Anabaptists), and from its being intimately connected with their expectations and schemes. The mere profession of the doctrine came to be regarded as implying assent to the other extravagances of these parties, and as the signal for rebellion. Hence it is rejected in the symbolical books of the Lutheran Church as an Anabaptistical doctrine (*Augs. Confess.* art. xvii). In the form in which this doctrine was held by these sects it deserves the most unmingled disapprobation. Again, among the ill-famed Christian free-thinkers—e. g. the Socinians—there were some who professed it. In modern times it has been the same. This doctrine has been advocated in the Protestant Church both by men who have stood in suspicion of enthusiasm (e. g. Peterson, Lavater, and others) and by some of the free-thinkers in philosophy and theology, although for very different causes and on very different grounds by these two classes" (Knapp, *ut sup.*). See Burnet, *De Statu Mortuorum;* Cotta, *Historia Succincta Dogmatis de Pœnarum Infernalium Duratione* (Tübingen, 1774, 8vo); Dietelmair, *Antiq. Comment. Fanatici de ἀποκατάσεως πάντων* (Altorf, 1769, 8vo); Tillotson, *Sermons*, vol. ii; Lewis, *The Nature of Hell* (Lond. 1720, 8vo); Strong, *Doctrine of Eternal Misery* (Hartford, 1796, 8vo); Stuart, *Exegetical Essays on Future Punishment* (Andover, 1830, 12mo); Baumgarten, *Vindiciæ Pœnarum Æternarum* (Halle, 1742); *Meth. Quar. Rev.* April, 1861; *New-Englander*, 1861, p. 63; *Contemporary Rev.* April, 1872; *Presbyterian Rev.* Oct. 1872. See also the articles PURGATORY, RETRIBUTION, and UNIVERSALISM,

under which latter title the subject will be more fully treated.

Pu'nites (Heb. *Puni'*, פּוּנִי, a Gentile term, from *Puvvah*, פֻּוָּה; Sept. ὁ Φουᾶ δῆμος v. r. ὁ Φουαί), a collective term for the descendants of Phuvah or Pua (Numb. xxvi, 23). See PHUVAH.

Punjabî or Sikh Version. A version of the New Test. for the people inhabiting an extensive country of North-west Hindostan called Punjab was commenced in 1807 at Serampore, but the fonts of type were destroyed by fire. The loss, however, was soon replaced, and in 1813 the Gospels and Acts were announced as finished. In 1815 the entire New Test., in an edition of 1000 copies, was completed, and in 1832 a second edition was undertaken. The translation of the Old Test. was also undertaken, and in 1820 the Pentateuch and historical books were issued, and now the whole Bible, published by the Serampore Mission, is read in Punjabî, as the seventy-third report of the British and Foreign Bible Society (1877) shows. (B. P.)

Pu'non (Heb. *Punon'*, פּוּנֹן, *darkness* [Gesenius], *ore-pit* [Fürst]; Sept. Φινών v. r. Φινώ), a camp station of the Israelites on their journey to Canaan (Numb. xxxiii, 42), on the east side of the mountains of Edom, and perhaps belonging to that district, since a duke Pinon is mentioned (Gen. xxxvi, 41; 1 Chron. i, 52) among the chieftains of the Edomites. It lay next beyond Zalmonah, between it and Oboth, and three days' journey from the mountains of Abarim, which formed the boundary of Moab. By Eusebius and Jerome (*Onomasticon*, Φινών, "Fenon") it is identified with *Pinon*, the seat of the Edomitish tribe of that name, and, further, with *Phæno*, which contained the copper-mines so noted at that period, and was situated between Petra and Zoar. It is often mentioned by other Christian authors (see Gesenius, *Thesaur.* p. 1095). It is not to be identified with the modern Tufileh (Burckhardt, ii, 677; see Raumer, *Zug der Israel*, p. 46); but on the *Kalaat Phenân* of Seetzen (Zach's *Monatl. Corresp.* xvii, 137) we must await more particular intelligence. See EXODE.

Punti Version. The Punti, or Canton Colloquial, as it is sometimes called, is a dialect spoken by a large population which is to be found in and around Canton, in China. Into this dialect only portions of the Bible were translated, viz. Mark's Gospel, by the Rev. G. Piercy, and published in 1872, with the title *Ma kò fŭh yin chuen*. Luke's Gospel was translated in the Roman character by members of the Rhenish Mission, and published in 1867, with the title *Das Evangelium des Lucas in Volkesdialekte der Punti Chinesen*. John's Gospel was translated by the Rev. C. F. Preston, and published at Canton on wooden blocks, under the title *Yŏ han chuen fŭh yin shoo*. In 1872 St. Paul's Epistles—Galatians to Philemon—were published, under the title *Paou le tă hwuy seaou shoo*, as translated by Mr. Piercy; while the Acts of the Apostles were also published in the same year, with the title *She t'oô hing chuen*, in the translation of Mr. Preston. These are all the parts of the New Test. published in that dialect, of which St. Mark and St. Luke have been reprinted by the American Bible Society, changing the term for "God." Of the Old Test., the book of Genesis was translated by the Rev. G. Piercy, and published in 1873, under the title *K'éw yŏ chwang she k'e*, to which the book of Psalms must be added, which has been translated by the Rev. A. B. Hutchinson, of the Church Missionary Society, and was published in 1876. Comp. the annual reports of the British and Foreign Bible Society for 1872, 1873, 1874, and 1877. (B. P.)

Pupilla Oculi (*pupil of the eye*) is a clerical manual written by John de Burgh. It was very popular during the 15th and 16th centuries.

Puppet-plays (Lat. *pupa*, a girl; Fr. *poupée*, a doll) are exhibitions in which the parts of the different characters are taken by miniature figures worked by wires, while the dialogue is given by persons behind the scenes. These plays are of very ancient date, and, originally intended to gratify children, they ended in being a diversion for adults. In China and India puppets are still made to act dramas, either as movable figures or as shadows behind a curtain. In Italy and France puppet-plays were at one time carried to a considerable degree of artistic perfection; and even Lessing and Goethe, in Germany, thought the subject worth their serious attention. In England, they are mentioned under the name of *motions* by many of our early authors; and frequent allusions to them occur in the plays of Shakspeare, Ben Jonson, and the older dramatists. The earliest exhibitions of this kind consisted of representations of stories taken from the Old and New Testaments, or from the lives and legends of saints. They thus seem to have been the last remnant of the *moralities* of the 15th century. See MYSTERIES. We learn from Ben Jonson and his contemporaries that the most popular of these exhibitions at that time were the *Prodigal Son* and *Nineveh with Jonas and the Whale*. Even the Puritans, with all their hatred of the regular stage, did not object to be present at such representations. The most noted exhibitions of the kind were those of Robert Powel, in the beginning of the 18th century (see Chambers, *Book of Days*, ii, 167). So recently as the time of Goldsmith, scriptural "motions" were common; and in *She Stoops to Conquer* reference is made to the display of Solomon's Temple in one of these shows. The regular performances of the stage were also sometimes imitated; and Dr. Samuel Johnson has observed that puppets were so capable of representing even the plays of Shakspeare that *Macbeth* might be represented by them as well as by living actors. These exhibitions, however, much degenerated, and latterly consisted of a wretched display of wooden figures, barbarously formed, and decorated without the least degree of taste or propriety, while the dialogues were jumbles of absurdities and nonsense.

Purâna (literally, "old," from the Sanscrit *purâ*, before, past) is the name of that class of religious works which, besides the *Tantras* (q. v.), is the main foundation of the actual popular creed of the Brahminical Hindûs (q. v.). According to the popular belief, these works were compiled by Vyâsa (q. v.), the supposed arranger of the *Vedas* (q. v.), and the author of the *Mahabhârata* (q. v.), and possess an antiquity far beyond the reach of historical computation. A critical investigation, however, of the contents of the *existing* works leads to the conclusion that, in their present form, they do not only not belong to a remote age, but can barely claim an antiquity of a thousand years. The word *Purâna* occurs in some passages of the *Mahabhârata*, the law-books of Yajnavalkya and Manu (q. v.); it is even met with in some *Upanishads* and the great Brahmana portion of the *White-Yajur-Veda;* but it is easy to show that in all these ancient works it cannot refer to the existing Purâna, and therefore that no inference relative to the age of the ancient can be drawn from the modern. There are, however, several circumstances tending to show that there were a number of works called Purâna which preceded the existing, and were the source whence these probably derived a portion of their contents. The oldest known author of a Sanscrit vocabulary, Amara-Sinha, gives as a synonym of Purâna the word *Pancha-lakshana*, which means "that which has five (*panchan*) characteristic marks" (*lakshana*); and the scholiasts of that vocabulary agree in stating that these *lakshanas* are: 1. Primary creation, or cosmogony; 2. Secondary creation, or the destruction and renovation of worlds; 3. Genealogy of gods and patriarchs; 4. *Manwantaras*, or reigns of Manus; and, 5. The history of the princes of the solar and lunar races. Such, then, were the characteristic topics of a Purâna at the time, if not of Amara-Sinha himself—which is

probable — at least, of his oldest commentators. Yet the distinguished scholar most conversant with the existing Purânas, who, in his preface to the translation of the *Vishnu-Purâna*, gives a more or less detailed account of their chief contents (Prof. H. H. Wilson), observes, in regard to the quoted definition of the commentators on Amara-Sinha, that in no one instance do the actual Purânas conform to it exactly; that "to some of them it is utterly inapplicable; to others, it only partially applies." To the *Vishnu-Purâna*, he adds, it belongs more than to any other Purâna; but even in the case of this Purâna he shows that it cannot be supposed to be included in the term explained by the commentators. The age of Amara-Sinha is, according to Wilson, the last half of the century preceding the Christian era; others conjecture that it dates some centuries later. On the supposition, then, that Amara-Sinhâ himself implied by Pancha-lakshana the sense given to this term by his commentators, there would have been Purânas about 1900 years ago; but none of these has descended to our time in the shape it then possessed. Various passages in the actual Purânas furnish proof of the existence of such elder Purânas. The strongest evidence in this respect is that afforded by a general description given by the *Matsya-Purâna* of the extent of each of the Purânas (which are uniformly stated to be eighteen in number), including itself; for, leaving aside the exceptional case in which it may be doubtful whether we possess the complete work now going by the name of a special Purâna, Prof. Wilson, in quoting the description from the *Matsya-Purâna*, and in comparing with it the real extent of the great majority of Purânas, the completeness of which, in their actual state, does not admit of a reasonable doubt, has conclusively shown that the *Matsya-Purâna* speaks of works which are not those we now possess. We are, then, bound to infer that there have been Purânas older than those preserved, and that their number has been eighteen; whereas, on the contrary, it will be hereafter seen that it is very doubtful whether we are entitled to assign this number to the actual Purâna literature.

The modern age of this latter literature, in the form in which it is known to us, is borne out by the change which the religious and philosophical ideas taught in the epic poems and the philosophical Sûtras have undergone in it; by the legendary detail into which older legends and myths have expanded; by the numerous religious rites—not countenanced by the Vedic or epic works—which are taught; and, in some Purânas at least, by the historical or quasi-scientific instruction which is imparted in it. To divest that which, in these Purânas, is ancient, in idea or fact, from that which is of parasitical growth, is a task which Sanscrit philology has yet to fulfil; but even a superficial comparison of the contents of the present Purânas with the ancient lore of Hindû religion, philosophy, and science must convince every one that the picture of religion and life unfolded by them is a caricature of that afforded by the Vedic works, and that it was drawn by priestcraft, interested in submitting to its sway the popular mind, and unscrupulous in the use of the means which had to serve its ends. The plea on which the composition of the Purânas was justified, even by great Hindû authorities—probably because they did not feel equal to the task of destroying a system already deeply rooted in the national mind, or because they apprehended that the nation at large would remain without any religion at all, if, without possessing the Vedic creed, it likewise became deprived of that based on the Purânas—this plea is best illustrated by a quotation from Sâyana, the celebrated commentator on the three principal *Vedas*. He says (*Rigv.* ed. Müller, vol. i, p. 33): "Women and Sûdras, though they, too, are in want of knowledge, have no right to the Veda, for they are deprived of [the advantage of] reading it, in consequence of their not being invested with the sacred cord; but the knowledge of law [or duty] and that of the supreme spirit arises to them by means of the Purânas and other books [of this kind]." Yet, to enlighten the Hindû nation as to whether or not these books—which sometimes are even called a fifth Veda—teach that religion which is contained in the Vedas and Upanishads, there would be no better method than to initiate such a system of popular education as would reopen to the native mind those ancient works, now virtually closed to it.

Though the reason given by Sâyana, as clearly results from a comparison of the Purânas with the oldest works of Sanscrit literature, is but a poor justification of the origin of the former; and though it is likewise indubitable that, even at his time (the middle of the 15th century A.D.), they were, as they still are, not merely an authoritative source of religion for "women and Sûdras," but for the great majority of the males of other castes also, it nevertheless explains the great variety of matter of which the present Purânas are composed—so great and so multifarious, indeed, that, in the case of some of them, it imparts to them a kind of cyclopædical character. They became, as it seems, the source of all popular knowledge; a substitute to the masses of the nation not only for theological literature, but for scientific works, the study of which was gradually restricted to the leisure of the learned few. Thus, while the principal subjects taught by nearly all the Purânas are cosmogony, religion (including law), and the legendary matter which, to a Hindû, assumes the value of history, in some of them we meet with a description of places which gives to them something of the character of geography; and one, the *Agni-Purâna*, also pretends to teach archery, medicine, rhetoric, prosody, and grammar; though it is needless to add that its teaching has no real worth.

One purpose, however, and that a paramount one, is not included in the argument by which Sâyana endeavored to account for the composition of the Purânas; it is the purpose of establishing a sectarian creed. At the third phase of the Hindû religion, two gods of the Hindû pantheon especially engrossed the religious faith of the masses—Vishnu (q. v.) and Siva (q. v.), each being looked upon by his worshippers as the supreme deity, to whom the other, as well as the remaining gods, was subordinate. Moreover, when the power or energy of these gods had been raised to the rank of a separate deity, it was the female Sakti, or energy, of Siva who, as Durgâ, or the consort of this god, was held in peculiar awe by a numerous host of believers. Now, apart from the general reasons mentioned before, a principal object, and probably *the* principal one, of the Purânas was to establish, as the case might be, the supremacy of Vishnu or Siva, and, it may be likewise assumed, of the female energy of Siva, though the worship of the latter belongs more exclusively to the class of works known as Tantras. There are, accordingly, Vaishnava-Purânas, or those composed for the glory of Vishnu; Saiva-Purânas, or those which extol the worship of Siva; and one or two Purânas, perhaps, but merely as far as a portion of them is concerned, will be more consistently assigned to the Sakta worship, or that of Durgâ, than to that of Vishnu or Siva.

"The invariable form of the Purânas," says Prof. Wilson, in his preface to the *Vishnu-Purâna*, "is that of a dialogue, in which some person relates its contents in reply to the inquiries of another. This dialogue is interwoven with others, which are repeated as having been held on other occasions, between different individuals, in consequence of similar questions having been asked. The immediate narrator is commonly, though not constantly, Lomaharshana, or Romaharshana, the disciple of Vyâsa, who is supposed to communicate what was imparted to him by his preceptor as he had heard it from some other sage. . . . Lomaharshana is called Sûta, as if it were a proper name; but it is, more correctly, a title, and Lomaharshana was 'a Sûta,' that is, a bard or panegyrist, who was cre-

ated, according to the *Vishnu-Purâna*, to celebrate the exploits of princes, and who, according to the *Vâyu* and *Padma Purânas*, has a right, by birth and profession, to narrate the Purânas, in preference even to the Brahmins." The number of the actual Purânas is stated to be eighteen, and their names, in the order given, are the following: 1. *Brahma-*; 2. *Padma-*; 3. *Vishnu-*; 4. *Siva-*; 5. *Bhagavata-*; 6. *Naradiya-*; 7. *Markandeya-*; 8. *Agni-*; 9. *Bhavishya-*; 10. *Brahma-vaivarita-*; 11. *Linga-*; 12. *Varâha-*; 13. *Skanda-*; 14. *Vâmana-*; 15. *Kûrma-*; 16. *Matsya-*; 17. *Garuda-*; and 18. *Brahmanda-Purâna*. In other lists, the *Agni-Purâna* is omitted, and the *Vâyu-Purâna* inserted instead of it; or the *Garuda* and *Brahmanda* are omitted, and replaced by the *Vâyu* and *Nrisinha Purânas*. Of these Purânas, 2, 3, 5, 6, 10, 12, 17 and probably 1, are Purânas of the Vaishnava sect; 4, 8, 11, 13, 15, 16, of the Saiva sect; 7 is, in one portion of it, called Devimahâtmya, the text-book of the worshippers of Durgâ; otherwise, it has little of a sectarian spirit, and would, therefore, neither belong to the Vaishnava nor to the Saiva class; 14, as Prof. Wilson observes, "divides its homage between Siva and Vishnu with tolerable impartiality; it is not connected, therefore, with any sectarial principles, and may have preceded their introduction." The *Bhavishya-Purâna* (9), as described by the *Matsya-Purâna*, would be a book of prophecies; but the *Bhavishya-Purâna* known to Prof. Wilson consists of five books, four of which are dedicated to the gods Brahma, Vishnu, Siva, and Twashtri; and the same scholar doubts whether this work could have any claim to the name of a Purâna, as its first portion is merely a transcript of the words of the first chapter of Manu, and the rest is entirely a manual of religious rites and ceremonies. There are similar grounds for doubt regarding other works of the list.

If the entire number of works, nominally, at least, corresponding with those of the native list, were taken as a whole, their contents might be so defined as to embrace the five topics specified by the commentators on the glossary of Amara-Sinha; philosophical speculations on the nature of matter and soul, individual as well as supreme; small codes of law; descriptions of places of pilgrimage; a vast ritual relating to the modern worship of the gods; numerous legends; and, exceptionally, as in the *Agni-Purâna*, scientific tracts. If taken individually, however, the difference between most of them, both in style and contents, is so considerable that a general definition would become inaccurate. A short description of each Purâna has been given by the late Prof. H. H. Wilson in his preface to his translation of the *Vishnu-Purâna;* and to it, as well as to his detailed account of some Purânas in separate essays (collected in his works) we must therefore refer the reader who would wish to obtain a fuller knowledge of these works.

The age of the Purânas, though doubtless modern, is uncertain. The *Bhagavata*, on account of its being ascribed to the authorship of the grammarian Vopadeva, would appear to yield a safer computation of its age than the rest; for Vopadeva lived in the 12th century, or, as some hold, 13th century after Christ; but this authorship, though probable, is not proved to a certainty. As to the other Purânas, their age is supposed by Prof. Wilson to fall within the 12th and 17th centuries of the Christian æra, with the exception, though, of the *Markandeya-Purâna*, which, in consideration of its unsectarian character, he would place in the 9th or 10th century. But it must be borne in mind that all these dates are purely conjectural, and given as such by the scholar whose impressions they convey.

Besides these eighteen Purânas or great Purânas, there are minor or *Upapurânas*, "differing little in extent or subject from some of those to which the title of Purâna is ascribed." Their number is given by one Purâna as four; another, however, names the following eighteen: 1. *Sanatkumâra-*; 2. *Narasinha-*; 3. *Naradiya-*; 4. *Siva-*; 5. *Durvâsasa-*; 6. *Kâpila-*; 7. *Mânava-*; 8. *Ausanasa-*; 9. *Vâruna-*; 10. *Kalikâ-*; 11. *Samba-*; 12. *Nandi-*; 13. *Saura-*; 14. *Parâsara-*; 15. *Âditya-*; 16. *Maheswara-*; 17. *Bhagavata-* (probably, however, a misreading for *Bhârgava*); and 18. *Vâsishtha-Upapurâna*. Another list, differing from the latter, not in the number, but in the names of the Upapurânas, is likewise given in Prof. Wilson's preface to the *Vishnu-Purâna*. Many of these Upapurânas are, apparently, no longer procurable, while other works so called, but not included in either list, are sometimes met with; for instance, a *Mudgala-* and *Ganesa-Upapurâna*. The character of the Upapurânas is, like that of the Purânas, sectarian; the *Siva-Upapurâna*, for instance, inculcates the worship of Siva, the *Kâlika-Upapurâna* that of Durgâ or Devî.

Both Purânas and Upapurânas are for a considerable portion of their contents largely indebted to the two great epic works, the *Mahabhârata* (q. v.) and *Ramâyana* (q. v.), more especially to the former of them. Of the Purânas, the original text of three has already appeared in print: that of the *Bhagavata* in several native editions, published at Bombay, with the commentary of Sridharaswâmin, and partly in a Paris edition by Eugène Burnouf, which remained incomplete through the premature death of that distinguished scholar; that of the *Markandeya-Purâna*, edited at Calcutta in the *Bibliotheca Indica*, by the Rev. K. M. Banerjea; and that of the *Linga-Purâna*, edited at Bombay; for, regarding a fourth, the *Garuda-Purâna*, edited at Benares and Bombay, it seems doubtful whether that little work is the same as the Purâna spoken of in the native list. Besides these, small portions from the *Padma*, *Skanda*, *Bhavishyottara*, *Markandeya*, and other Purânas have been published in India and Europe. Of translations, we have only to name the excellent French translation by Burnouf of the first nine books of the *Bhagavata*, and the elegant translation of the whole *Vishnu-Purâna*, together with valuable notes, by the late Prof. H. H. Wilson, which is now in course of republication in his *Works*, in a new edition, amplified with numerous notes, by Prof. F. E. Hall. For general information on the character and contents of the Purânas, see especially Wilson's preface to his translation of the *Vishnu-Purâna* (*Works*, vol. vi, Lond. 1864); Burnouf's preface to his edition of the *Bhagavata* (Paris, 1840); Wilson, *Analysis of the Purânas* (*Works*, vol. iii, Lond. 1864, edited by Prof. R. Rost); Banerjea, *Introduction to the Markandeya* (Calcutta, 1862); and Muir, *Original Sanscrit Texts on the Origin and History of the People of India* (Lond. 1858–1863), vols. i–iv; Hardwick, *Christ and other Masters* (see Index in vol. ii); Müller, *Chips*, ii, 3, 75, 316; Clarke, *Ten Great Religions* (see Index).

Purasa was, according to the Indian mythology, the first man—the father of the human race; his wife, the first woman, Prakriti, gave birth to the ancestors of the Indian castes.

Purcell, Henry, an English composer of great note, celebrated especially as the author of church music, was born at Westminster in 1658. He was the son of a musician attached to the chapel of Charles II. At the age of six, having lost his father, he was admitted into the choir of boys at the royal chapel. His masters were Cooke, Pellham, Humphrey, and Dr. Blow. He was remarkable for precocity of talent, but, what was better, he seconded the liberality of nature by his zeal and diligence. His progress was so rapid that, while still a member of the choir, he produced several anthems of his own composition, which were eagerly sought for almost as soon as written; and at eighteen he received the fullest recognition of his ability, by being chosen organist of Westminster Abbey (1676) to succeed Dr. Christopher Gibbons. In 1682, Purcell was given the place of organist of the royal chapel, and this position he held until his death, in 1695. Purcell is the

first English composer who introduced the use of various instruments in the church to support the voice, which, until then, the organ had alone accompanied. The original character of his music, the variety of its forms, the majesty of style which governs all his works—principally his *Te Deum* and his *Jubilate*—extended the renown of Purcell throughout Great Britain. Although English writers are extravagant in their eulogies in comparing Purcell to Scarlati and to Keiser, yet he is doubtless the greatest composer England has produced. He has treated of all kinds of music, and upon all has impressed the seal of his greatness. One is astonished at the great fruitfulness of his genius, when it is considered how young he died. It is said of Purcell that "his anthems far exceed in number those of any other composer, and would alone have furnished sufficient employment for a moderately active mind and a life of average duration." It is to be regretted, however, that his ambition was boundless. He attempted dramatic music, for which the vividness of his imagination and the fertility of his invention remarkably fitted him; but he had been reared in the midst of religious influences, and if confined to ecclesiastical music would have stood out as its curator and propagator in the modern Church. His efforts in several directions weakened any one line he undertook to cover, and he failed to attain that perfection which alone entitles to enduring greatness. His own countrymen so greatly revered his memory that they buried him in the mausoleum of their greatest. He rests in the north transept of Westminster Abbey. His epitaph was composed by Dryden. A part of the music written for the theatre has been published in the collection of *Airs composed for the Theatre and on other Occasions*, by Henry Purcell (Lond. 1697). All his sacred works, which have retained their place to the present day, and include fifty anthems, besides the *Te Deum* and *Jubilate*, with orchestral accompaniments, a complete service, and a number of hymns and psalms, have been collected by M. Vincent Novello, who has published them in seventy-two numbers, under the title of *Purcell's Sacred Music* (Lond. 1826–36). This publication is preceded by a notice of the life and works of the composer and his portrait. See Ambros, *Gesch. der Musik* (Leips. 1878, 8vo), vol. iv.

Purchas, John, an Anglican divine, noted especially in the department of *belles-lettres*, was born at Cambridge in 1823, received his preparatory training at Rugby, and then studied at Christ's College, Cambridge, in 1840, graduating in 1844. Entering the Church of England, Mr. Purchas became curate of Ellsworth, Cambridge, in 1851, remaining there two years. In 1856 he was appointed curate of Orwell, in the same county, and remained until 1859. In 1861 he went to St. Paul's, in West Street, Brighton, and soon became notorious for his ritualistic proclivities. He was appointed perpetual curate in St. James's Chapel, Brighton, becoming incumbent in 1866. His mode of conducting public worship culminated in his trial in the Court of Arches, the case being subsequently carried by appeal before the judicial committee of the Privy Council. The final result of these trials was that Mr. Purchas was admonished to discontinue the use of certain vestments, lighted candles, incense, wafer bread, and the ceremonies he had practiced in the regular services. He failed to obey, however, and was in consequence suspended *ab officio* on Feb. 7, 1872, a sequestration being levied upon his lay property to defray the costs of the proceedings. He contemplated thereafter entering the Roman Catholic Church, but was probably prevented by his sudden illness and decease in October, 1872. Among the works published by him were the *Directorium Anglicanum*, which forms the text-book of Anglican ritualism. His other works are: *The Miser's Daughter*, a comedy and poems (1839):—*Poems and Ballads* (1846):—*Book of Feasts*, a series of sermons (1853):—*The Death of Ezekiel's Wife*:—and *Three Sermons*, preached at St. Paul's, West Street, Brighton (1866).

Purchas, Samuel, a learned English divine, and compiler of a valuable collection of travels, was born at Thaxstead, in Essex, in 1577, and educated at Cambridge. In 1604 he was instituted vicar of Eastwood, in Essex, but, leaving the cure of it to his brother, removed to London, the better to carry on the great work he had undertaken. He published the first volume in 1613, and the four last in 1625, under this title: *Purchas: his Pilgrimage, or Relations of the World, and the Religions observed in All Ages and Places discovered from the Creation unto this present.* In 1615 he was incorporated at Oxford, as he stood at Cambridge, bachelor of divinity, and a little before had been collated to the rectory of St. Martin's, Ludgate, in London. He was also chaplain to Abbott, archbishop of Canterbury. By the publishing of his books he brought himself into debt: however, he did not die in prison, as some have asserted, but in his own house, and about 1628. His *Pilgrimages*, and the learned Hackluyt's *Voyages*, led the way to all other collections of that kind, and have been justly valued and esteemed. Boissard says of Purchas that he was "a man exquisitely skilled in languages and all arts divine and human; a very great philosopher, historian, and divine; a faithful presbyter of the Church of England; very famous for many excellent writings, and especially for his vast volumes of the *East and West Indies*, written in his native tongue" (*in Biblioth. Joannis Boissardi*). See Wood, *Athenæ Oxonienses;* Hallam, *Lit. Hist. of Europe*, iii, 227; Allibone, *Dict. Brit. and Amer. Auth.* s. v.

Purdman, in Indian mythology, is an embodiment of Kamadewa, in which he was born as son of Krishna and Rukmani. The gigantic demon Samber caused him to be cast into the sea; he was swallowed by a fish, but the fish being caught, the child was saved and brought back to his parents.

Purgation, a clearing of an accused person from impeachment by oath of himself and others: this, in 696, was done at the altar. The number of witnesses, or consacramentals, varied; the common man had four. In Wales three hundred were required; and in 1194 the bishop of Ely purged himself with one hundred priests' hands. The practice was general among the Teutonic nations; in England it was called the *atha*. If the offence was alleged to have been committed in Lent or on a festival, a triple purgation was enjoined in 1018. See ORDEAL.

Purgatory (Lat. *purgatorium*, from *purgo*, I cleanse) is the name given in ecclesiastical language to the place of *durance* which the Church of Rome and the Eastern Church teach holds the departed souls until fitted for the divine presence. According to the teachings of these churches, the Protestant is wrong in declaring that Christ brings a full and perfect pardon for all the sins of man. Before man can be received into heaven, his soul must be purged by fire from all carnal impurities. Christ only affords a way whereby eternal punishment may be escaped, and though contrition (q. v.) secures forgiveness of sins, the ordinary experiences of penitence, attrition, must be supplemented by penance. In other words, it is necessary, according to Romish theology, to complete salvation and purification, that the soul should suffer a part of the penalty of its sins; and if these are not voluntarily borne in penances in this life, they will be inflicted in purgatory in the life to come, except when special suffering, inflicted by Divine Providence, serves the same purifying purpose. The doctrine of purgatory does not, therefore, involve the idea of the future redemption of the impenitent. "The souls who go to purgatory are only such as die in the state of grace, united to Jesus Christ. It is their imperfect works for which they are condemned to that place of suffering, and which must all be there consumed, and their stains purged away from them before they can go to heaven." The Council of Trent decides thus: "If any one say that after the grace of justifica-

tion received the fault is so pardoned to every penitent sinner, and the guilt of temporal punishment is so blotted out that there remains no guilt of temporal punishment to be done away in this world, or that which is to come in purgatory, before the passage can be opened into heaven, let him be accursed." Elsewhere it is said, "There is a purgatory, and the souls detained there are helped by the suffrages of the faithful, but principally by the sacrifices of the acceptable altar"—a statement obviously vague and indefinite. It leaves the most important inquiry undetermined—viz. whether the souls in purgatory are in a state of happiness or misery: they are "detained," but nothing more as *de fide* is stated. By referring, however, to the Catechism of the Council of Trent, drawn up by order of the fathers there assembled, we get a clearer and more explicit definition: "There is a purgatorial fire, where the souls of the righteous are purified by a temporary punishment [*ad definitum tempus cruciatæ expiantur*], that entrance may be given them into their eternal home, where nothing that is defiled can have a place. And of the truth of this doctrine, which holy councils declare to be confirmed by the testimony of Scripture and of apostolic tradition, the pastor will have to declare more diligently and frequently, because we are fallen on times in which men will not endure sound doctrine" (*Conc. Trident.* sess. vi, can. 30; sess. xxv, § 1; *Catech. Trident.* c. vi, qu. 3). Thus a definite meaning is given to the vague teaching of the council: there is a purgatorial *fire*, and the souls of the faithful are *punished* for a defined period till their sins are expiated. The almost universal belief prevailing among Roman Catholics—though they do not consider torment by *fire* as being *de fide*, but only the most probable opinion—is that purgatory is a place of suffering or punishment for imperfect Christians. Thus Dr. Vilmer, though he says that "in the Council of Trent all is contained that is necessary to be believed on this subject," yet afterwards defines purgatory "as a place of temporary *punishment*," which is not asserted by, and goes beyond, the decree of the council (*End of Controversy*, p. 173, 174). Bellarmine says, "Purgatory is a certain place in which, as in a prison, the souls are purged after this life which were not fully purged in this life—to wit, so that they may be able to enter into heaven, where no unclean thing can enter;" and elsewhere, "that the fathers *unanimously* [*sic*] teach that the pains of purgatory are most severe or terrible" (*De Purgatorio*, ii, 14).

The arguments advanced for purgatory are these: 1. Every sin, how slight soever, though no more than an idle word, as it is an offence to God, deserves punishment from him, and will be punished by him hereafter, if not cancelled by repentance here. 2. Such small sins do not deserve eternal punishment. 3. Few depart this life so pure as to be totally exempt from spots of this nature, and from every kind of debt due to God's justice. 4. Therefore, few will escape without suffering something from his justice for such debts as they have carried with them out of this world, according to the rule of divine justice, by which he treats every soul hereafter according to his works, and according to the state in which he finds it in death. From these positions, which the advocates of the doctrine of purgatory consider as so many self-evident truths, they infer that there must be some third place of punishment; for since the infinite holiness of God can admit nothing into heaven that is not clean and pure from all sin, both great and small, and his infinite justice can permit none to receive the reward of bliss who as yet are not out of debt, but have something in justice to suffer, there must, of necessity, be some place or state where souls departing this life, pardoned as to the eternal guilt of sin, yet obnoxious to some temporal penalty, or with the guilt of some mortal sins (*peccata mortalia*), or some venial faults (*peccata venalia*), are purged and purified before their admittance into heaven. Those in purgatory are relieved by the prayers of their fellow-members here on earth, also by alms and masses offered up to God for their souls. Such as have no relations or friends to pray for them, or give alms to procure masses for their relief, are remembered by the Church, which makes a general commemoration of all the faithful departed in every mass and in every one of the canonical hours of the divine office. Besides the above arguments, the following Bible passages are alleged by them in support of these views: 2 Macc. xii, 43–46 (on which they rely, on the supposition of its being inspired); Matt. v, 25 (the "prison" therein referred to being interpreted by them to mean purgatory); xii, 32; 1 Cor. iii, 11–15; xv, 29; Rev. xxi, 27; as well as on certain less decisive indications contained in the language of some of the Psalms, as xxxvii (in the A.V. xxxviii), 1; lxv, 12; Isa. iv, 4; xxii, 14; Mal. iii, 3. Respecting all these passages as containing the doctrine of a purgatory, arguments are drawn not alone from the words themselves, but from the interpretation of them by the fathers.

The direct testimonies cited by Roman Catholic writers from the fathers to the belief of their respective ages as to the existence of a purgatory are very numerous. We may instance among the Greeks, Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata*, vii, 12; Origen, *Hom.* xvi, c. 5, 6, *in Jeremiam;* vi, *Hom. in Exod.;* xiv, *Hom. in Levit.;* xxviii, *Hom. in Numb.;* Eusebius, *De Vita Constantini*, iv, 71; Athanasius, *Quæst.* xxxiv, *ad Antioch.;* Cyril of Jerusalem, *Cat. Mystag.* v, 9; Basil, *Hom. in Psalm.* v, 7; Gregory of Nazianzum, xli, *Orat. de Laude Athanasii;* Gregory of Nyssa, *Orat. de Bapt.;* as also Epiphanius, Ephraem, Theodoret, and others. Among the Latins, Tertullian, Cyprian, Arnobius, Lactantius, Hilary, Ambrose, and, above all, Augustine (from whom many passages are cited), Paulinus of Nola, and Gregory the Great, in whom the doctrine is found in all the fulness of its modern detail. The epitaphs of the catacombs, too, occasionally supply Romish controversialists with some testimonies to the belief of a purgatory, and of the value of the intercessory prayers of the living in obtaining not merely repose, but relief from suffering for the deceased; and the liturgies of the various rites are still more decisive and circumstantial. Beyond these two points, Romish faith, as defined by the Council of Trent, does not go. The council expressly prohibits the popular discussion of the "more difficult and subtle questions, and everything that tends to curiosity or superstition, or savors of filthy lucre."

Of the further questions as to the nature of purgatory, there is one of great historical importance, inasmuch as it constitutes one of the grounds of difference between the Greek and Latin churches. As to the existence of purgatory, both these churches are agreed, and they are further agreed that it is a place of suffering; but, while the Latins commonly hold that this suffering is "by fire," the Greeks do not determine the manner of the suffering, but are content to regard it as "through tribulation." The decree of union in the Council of Florence (1439) left this point free for discussion. Equally free are the questions as to the situation of purgatory; as to the duration of the purgatorial suffering; as to the probable number of its inmates; as to whether they have, while there detained, *a certainty* of their ultimate salvation; and whether a "particular judgment" takes place on each individual case immediately after death. Throughout the Eastern liturgies there is no express mention of the purgatorial suffering of souls in the intermediate state. In the apostolical constitutions and in the liturgy of St. Chrysostom, the Church prays for those who rest in faith (*ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐν πίστει ἀναπαυσαμένων δεηθῶμεν*, lib. viii, c. 13). In other liturgies, as of St. James, St. Mark, and St. Basil, there is prayer for the rest and forgiveness of the departed (*τὰς ψυχὰς ἀνάπαυσον*: St. Mark). Even in the Roman canon there is only a prayer for those resting in Christ, and a common inscription in the catacombs over the departed is *In pace*. Such statements are not, indeed, necessarily inconsistent with the departed Christian being

in a state of suffering; for even then he would rest from the sorrows and trials of life, and have the assured hope of eternal life. Still, where there is no direct allusion (as in the Mozarabic and Gallican missals) to the suffering of the departed, we cannot fairly and reasonably suppose that a state of suffering is implied when the faithful departed are said to be at rest. Such an expression must be taken in its ordinary meaning as denoting a more or less perfect happiness. (The theory of the early Church, which may be called the "Judgment-day Purgatory," we treat of below.) See Bellarmine, *De Purgatorio;* Suaresius, *De Purgatorio;* and on the Greek portion of the subject, Leo Allatius, *De Utriusque Ecclesiæ in Dogmate de Purgatorio Perpetuâ Consensione.*

The mediæval doctrine and practice regarding purgatory were among the leading grounds of the protest of the Waldenses and other sects of that age. The Reformers as a body rejected the doctrine.

In the modern Romish Church the doctrine of purgatory has led to others more directly injurious and corrupting. By the terror which it inspires it gives the priesthood power to impose penances; it leads to indulgences (q. v.) and prayers for the dead, for it is held that the sufferings in purgatory may be greatly mitigated and shortened by the prayers, the services, the masses, the charities, and other works of supererogation of their friends upon the earth. The extent to which this doctrine has been employed in increasing the income of the Church receives a significant illustration in one singular fact. There exists a purgatorial insurance company which, for a certain premium paid annually, insures the payor a given number of masses for his soul in the event of his death, and the certificates of this insurance company may be seen hung up on the walls in hundreds of rooms in the tenement-houses of our great cities, especially of New York.

Protestantism, in rejecting the doctrine of purgatory, takes the ground that it is inadmissible to depend upon any authority outside of the Bible and not in harmony therewith. It not only, however, refuses to admit the authority of tradition or the testimonies of the fathers, but, at the same time, alleges that most, if not all, of the passages quoted from the fathers as in favor of purgatory are in themselves insufficient to prove that they held any such doctrine as that now taught by the Roman Catholic Church, some of them properly relating only to the subject of prayer for the dead (q. v.), and others to the doctrine of Limbo (q. v.). That the doctrine of purgatory is the fair development of that which maintains that prayer ought to be made for the dead, Protestants generally acknowledge, but refuse to admit that the fathers carried out their views to any such consequence. For Origen says, "We, after the labors and strivings of this present life, hope to be in the highest heavens," not in purgatory. So Chrysostom, "Those that truly follow virtue, after they are changed from this life, are truly freed from their fightings, and loosed from their bonds. For death, to such as live honestly, is a change from worse things to better, from this transitory to an eternal and immortal life that hath no end." Macarius, speaking of the faithful, says, "When they go out of their bodies, the choirs of angels receive their souls into their proper places, to the pure world, and so lead them to the Lord." Hence Athanasius says, "To the righteous it is not death, but only a change, for they are changed from this world to an eternal rest. And as a man comes out of prison, so do the saints go from this troublesome life to the good things prepared for them." Certainly, these fathers were no purgatorians, since they unanimously affirmed that the souls of the saints go directly from earth to heaven, never touching upon purgatory. To these we may add Gennadius, who assures us that, "after the ascension of the Lord to heaven, the souls of all the saints are with Christ, and, going out of the body, go to Christ, expecting the resurrection of their body." Prosper tells us: "According to the language of the Scriptures, the whole life of man upon earth is a temptation or trial. Temptation is to be avoided until the fight is ended; and the fight is to be ended when, after this life, secure victory succeeds the fight; so that when all the soldiers of Christ, being helped by God, have to the end of this present life unwearily resisted their enemies, their wearisome travail being ended, they may reign happily in their country." Evidently they do not, according to Prosper, go from one fight here to another in purgatory, but immediately from the Church militant on earth to the Church triumphant in heaven. But whatever the views of some Church fathers on the subject, as a doctrine it was unknown in the Christian Church for the first 600 years, and it does not appear to have been made an article of faith until the 10th century, when "the clergy," says Mosheim, "finding these superstitious terrors admirably adapted to increase their authority and promote their interest, used every method to augment them; and by the most pathetic discourses, accompanied with monstrous fables and fictitious miracles, they labored to establish the doctrine of purgatory, and also to make it appear that they had a mighty influence in that formidable region" (*Eccl. Hist.* cent. x, pt. ii, ch. iii, § 1). "Purgatory as a burning-away of sins," said Döllinger at the Bonn Conference of Old Catholics in 1875, "was an idea unknown in the East as well as the West till Gregory the Great introduced it. What was thought was that after death those who were not ready for heaven were kept for some time in a state of preparation, and that the prayers of the living were an advantage for them. See Invocation of Saints. Gregory the Great added the idea of a tormenting fire. This the schoolmen gradually converted into doctrine which they associated with papal indulgence, till it came to apply to the dead generally, which, of course, made all seek indulgence. It went on to have degrees: some could receive indulgence for a few of their sins, others for all, and so on; so that eventually the pope, having already the keeping of heaven and the dominion on earth, obtained also sovereignty under the earth." Certain it is, and beyond reasonable dispute, that the doctrine of purgatory, in all its representations and forms, is a variation from scriptural authority: divine revelation affords it no countenance. The doctrine of an *intermediate state* (q. v.), from which the merits of Jesus Christ cannot deliver man, is not only "grounded on no warranty of Scripture," but is so far positively "repugnant to the Word of God" as it is contrary to the absolute and unreserved offers of mercy, peace, and happiness contained in the Gospel, and as it derogates from the fulness and perfection of the one expiatory sacrifice made by the death of Christ for the sins of mankind. For the Scriptures say, "The dead know not anything, neither have they any more a reward, for the memory of them is forgotten. Also their love and their hatred and their envy are now perished; neither have they any more a portion, forever, in anything that is done under the sun" (Eccles. ix, 5, 6); whereas this Romish doctrine of an intermediate state for purgation teaches, quite to the contrary, that when they are dead they have a part or portion in the prayers of the faithful and the sacrifices of the altar. Again, the Scripture makes mention but of a twofold receptacle of souls after death—the one of happiness, the other of misery (1 Sam. xxv, 29; Matt. vii, 13, 14; viii, 11; Luke xvi, 22, 23); whereas this doctrine brings in a third, called purgatory, between heaven and hell, half happiness and half misery. Again, Scripture says, "The blood of Jesus Christ, his Son, cleanseth [or purgeth] us from all sin" (1 John i, 7); but this doctrine would persuade us there are some sins which are to be purged away by the prayers and good works of others. To name no more, the Gospel represents Lazarus as at once conveyed to a state of comfort and joy (Luke xvi, 22, 23); Christ promised to the penitent thief upon the cross, "*This day* shalt thou be with me in paradise" (Luke

xxiii, 43); Paul exults in the prospect of a "crown of righteousness after death" (2 Tim. iv, 8); and he represents "to depart and to be with Christ" (Phil. i, 23), and "to be absent from the body and present with the Lord" (2 Cor. v, 8), as states which were immediately to follow each other. On the contrary, this Romish doctrine about purgatory bids him not to be so hasty, for he might depart and yet not be with Christ; he might pass from death, and yet not to life; he might and must be absent from the body a good while before he can be present with the Lord; he might go from earth, yet not to heaven, but to purgatory, a place St. Paul never dreamed of.

The Bible passages quoted by Romanists as in direct support of the doctrine of purgatory, Protestants simply set aside as a ridiculous attempt at malpractice in exegesis. First it is answered that the books of Maccabees have no evidence of inspiration, and that the second of these books, whence the support is purported to come, is far from being one of the best books of the Apocrypha (q. v.); besides, that the passage referred to would rather prove that there is no such place as purgatory, since Judas did not expect the souls departed to reap any benefit from the sin-offering till the resurrection. The texts quoted from the Scriptures have no reference to the doctrine, as may be seen by consulting the context, and any just commentator upon it; they relate to nothing more than prayer for the dead. The text Matt. xii, 32 is explained as relating to the final judgment; and 1 Cor. iii, 11, 15, as relating to a trial of *works*, and not of persons; while 1 Cor. xv, 29 is regarded as having nothing more to do with the subject than any verse taken at random from any part of the Bible. (An excellent examination of all these passages was made in the *Episcopalian*, Feb. 16, 1867.) What is called the "historical" or critical view of the genesis of this doctrine is well given by Neander (*Dogmengeschichte*, vol. i). This learned Church historian conceives that its source is to be sought for in the ancient Persian doctrine of a purifying conflagration which was to precede the victory of Ormuzd, and consume everything that was impure. From the Persians it passed with modifications to the Jews, and from them found its way into the ethical speculations of the more cultivated Christians. It harmonized admirably with the wide-spread philosophical notion borrowed by the Gnostic Christians from Neo-Platonism, that matter is inherently evil. If, then, the *body* was to rise, it must be purged of evil, and the instrument of purification—fire—was at hand for the purpose. Moreover, the high and pure conception of the character of God revealed in the New Testament, necessitating a corresponding moral excellence on the part of his worshippers—"without holiness shall no man see the Lord"—must have greatly assisted in the establishment of the doctrine; for how could men, only lately gross heathens, possessing yet but the rudiments of the new faith, and with most of their heathen habits still clinging about them, be pronounced "holy" or "fit for the presence of God?" Their "faith" in Christ was sufficient to save them, but the work of sanctification was incomplete when they died, and must go on. Probably it was a strong Christian feeling of this sort that determined the reception of the doctrine of purgatory into the creed of the Roman Church, rather than any Gnostic philosophizings, though the Neo-Platonic divines of Alexandria are the first to mention it.

It remains for us to speak of the theory in the Christian Church regarding the preparation for final admission into the divine presence. Blunt is pleased to call it the "Judgment-day Purgatory." In its support are pleaded the words of the apostle Paul literally understood, that the "fire shall try every man's work," and that even he who has built wood, hay, straw, stubble, on the true foundation "shall be saved, yet so as by fire" (1 Cor. iii, 11–15). In proof of this doctrine is also quoted the frequent use of the word *fire* in connection with Christ's coming or the Day of Judgment (see Psa. i, 3; Isa. iv, 4; Dan. vii, 9; Zech. xii, 9; Mal. iii, 2, 3; iv, 1). Many of the Church fathers are cited in support of the belief that Christians must pass through the fire on the Day of Judgment, though all will not be injured by it—the highest saints passing through unhurt, and others suffering a punishment proportioned to their sins, till "the wood, hay, straw, and stubble" built on the true foundation be consumed. Among the fathers of the Western Church, St. Hilary thus speaks of the severity of the Judgment-day purgation by fire, through which all, even the Virgin Mary, must pass (*Luc.* ii, 35; *Tract. in Psalm. cxviii*, lib. iii, § 12); and St. Ambrose says: "We must all pass through the fire, whether it be John the Evangelist, whom the Lord so loved that he said to Peter, 'If I will that he remain, what is that to thee; follow thou me.' Of his death some have doubted, of his passing through the fire we cannot doubt; for he is in paradise, and not separated from Christ" (Jerome, *in Psalm. cxviii*, serm. xx, § 12, *et vid.* § 15). St. Jerome likewise compares the ten revolted tribes of Israel to heretics, and the other two "to the Church, and to sinners [members] of the Church, who confess the true faith, but on account of the defilement of vice [*vitiorum sordes*] have need of the purging fires" (Jerome, *Comment. in Amos*, lib. iii, c. 7). Again he says, "As we believe that the torments of the devil, and of all infidel [*negatorum*] and wicked men who have said in their hearts 'There is no God,' are eternal, so of sinners, although Christians [the common reading is "sic peccatorum atque impiorum et tamen Christianorum." "In vetustiori Ambrosiano MS. 'sic peccatorum et tamen Christianorum,' verius opinor ad Hieronymi mentem" (Note, Migne ed.)], whose works are to be tried and purged by fire [*in igne*], we believe that the sentence of the Judge will be lenient [*moderatam*], and tempered with mercy." "Let me not be among those," says St. Augustine, "to whom thou wilt hereafter say, Go into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels. Neither chasten me in thy hot displeasure, so that thou mayest cleanse me in this life, and make me such that I may after that stand in no need of the cleansing fire for those who are to be saved so as by fire. Why? Why, but because they build upon the foundation wood, stubble, and hay. Now, they should build on it gold, silver, and precious stones, and should have nothing to fear from either fire; not only that which is to consume the ungodly forever, but also that which is to purge those who are to escape through [*per*] the fire. For it is said, he himself shall be saved, yet so as by fire. And because it is said he shall be saved, that fire is thought lightly of. For all that, though we shall be saved by fire, yet will that fire be more grievous than anything that man can suffer in this life whatsoever" (Augustine *on the Psalms* [Oxf. transl.], ii, 71). Again, "But if he shall have built on the foundation wood, hay, stubble, that is, have built worldly attachments on the foundation of his faith; yet if Christ be in the foundation, so that he have the first place in the heart, and nothing absolutely is preferred to him, even such are borne, even such are tolerated. The furnace shall come; it shall burn the wood, the hay, the stubble: but 'himself, he saith, shall be saved, yet so as by fire.' This shall the furnace do; some it shall sever to the left, others it shall in a manner melt out to the right" (*ibid.* v, 105). To illustrate the doctrine of the Eastern Church, a passage may first be quoted from Clement of Alexandria: "We say that fire sanctifies not flesh, but sinful souls, speaking of that fire which is not all-devouring, such as is used by artisans (*παμφάγον καὶ βάναυσον*), but of that which is discriminative (*φρόνιμον*), pervading the soul which passes through the fire" (Clem. Alex. *Stromata*, lib. v, c. 6). Origen often speaks of the Judgment-day fire: thus he says that though Peter and Paul must pass through the fire, they shall hear the words, "When thou passest through the fire, the flame shall not harm thee" (Orig. *Homil. iii, in Psalm.*

xxxvi; vid. Homil. vi, in Exod.). St. Basil, in his *Commentary on Isaiah* (iv, 4), says that baptism may be understood in three senses—in the one, of regeneration by the Holy Spirit; in another, of the punishment of sin in the present life; and in a third, "of the trial of judgment by fire." They who have committed deadly sins after they have received the knowledge of the truth, need the judgment which is by fire (*τῆς ἐν τῷ καίματι κρίσεως*) (Basil. *Opera*, t. i, *ad loc.* Gaume). In his work on the Holy Spirit, illustrating the passage "He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire," he calls the trial of judgment a "baptism of fire;" as the apostle says, "the fire shall try every man's work of what sort it is" (*ibid.* iii, p. 40). Gregory of Nazianzum, speaking of the Novatians, says: "Perchance in the future world they shall be baptized with fire, the last baptism more severe and long continued, which devours as grass the stubble, and consumes every vestige of wickedness" (*δαπανᾷ πάσης κακιας κουφότητα*) (Greg. Naz. *Opera*, t. ii, c. 358, Migne). Also in one of his poems he speaks of standing in fear of the fiery river of judgment (*μέσος φόβων ἕστηκα πυρωποτάμου*) (*ibid.* t. iii, c. 1423). Gregory of Nyssa says, speaking of infants who die unbaptized: "How shall we judge of those who thus died? Shall that soul behold its Judge, and shall it be placed with others before his tribunal? Shall its past life be judged, and will it receive a deserved recompense, purified by fire according to the teaching (*φωνὰς*) of the Gospel, or refreshed by the dew of benediction?" (Greg. Nyss. t. iii, c. 161). So he teaches, in another oration, that "we must either be purified in this present life by prayer and the love of wisdom (*φιλοσοφίας*), or after our departure hence in the furnace of the purging fire" (*ibid.* t. iii, c. 498). See Willet, *Synopsis Papismi;* Bull, *On the Trinity;* Haag, *Hist. des Dogmes;* Elliott, *Delineation of Romanism*, ch. xii; Cramp, *Text-book of Popery;* Knapp, *Theology*, p. 52; Neander, *Hist. of Dogmas*, p. 618 sq.; Doddridge, *Lectures*, lect. 270; Barnett, *On the XXXIX Articles*, art. 22; Edgar, *Variations of Popery*, ch. xiv; Faber, *Difficulties of Romanism*, p. 157–192, 448–471, 2d ed.; and especially Hale, *Doctrine of Purgatory and the Practice of Prayer for the Dead Examined* (Lond. 1843); Alger, *Hist. of the Doctrine of a Future Life;* Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrines*, ii, 126 sq., 130 sq., 326 sq.; *Tracts for the Times*, No. 79 and No. 90; Wetstein, *De Vanitate Purgatorii;* Allen, *Defence of Purgatory;* Marshall, *Doctrine of Purgatory, Patriarchal, Papistical, and Rational;* Valverde, *Ignis Purgatorius Assertus;* Bellarmine, *De Controversiis Fidei;* Usher, *Answer to a Jesuit's Challenge;* Hall, *Doctrine of Purgatory;* Kitto, *Journ. of Sacred Literature*, i, 289 sq.; vol. xx *Wesleyan Mag.* 1843, p. 832 sq. See also the literature quoted in the art. HADES; INTERMEDIATE STATE.

PURGATORY, RABBINIC. The doctrine of purgatory (q. v.) is not only a peculiarity of the Romish Church, but also of orthodox Judaism. The latter maintains "that the souls of the righteous enjoy the beatific vision of God in paradise, and that the souls of the wicked are tormented in hell with fire and other punishments. It teaches that the sufferings of the most atrocious criminals are of eternal duration, while others remain only for a limited time in purgatory, which does not differ from hell with respect to the place, but to the duration. They pray for the souls of the dead, and imagine that many are delivered from purgatory on the great day of expiation. They suppose that no Jew, unless guilty of heresy, or certain crimes specified by the rabbins, shall continue in purgatory above a year, and that there are but few who suffer eternal punishment." Maimonides (q. v.), Abrabanel (q. v.), and other celebrated Jewish writers maintain the annihilation of the wicked. Others suppose that the sufferings of hell have the power of purifying souls and expiating sin. This statement will be made the more clear when we examine some of the writings bearing on this subject. Among the prayers of the Feast of Tabernacles we find the following declaration and prayer: "It is customary among the dispersions of Israel to make mention of the souls of their departed parents, etc., on the day of atonement, and the ultimate days of the three festivals, and to offer prayers for the repose of their souls. 'May God remember the soul of my honored father, A. B., who is gone to his repose; for that I now solemnly vow charity for his sake; in reward of this, may his soul be bound up in the bundle of life, with the souls of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; Sarah, Rebekah, Rachel, and Leah; with the rest of the righteous males and females that are in paradise, and let us say Amen.' 'May God remember the soul of my honored mother,'" etc. In the Jewish ritualistic work called *Joreh Deah*, by Joseph Karo (q. v.), p. 376, we read: "Therefore the custom is for twelve months to repeat the prayer called Kaddish, and also to read the lesson in the prophets, and to pray the evening prayer at the going-out of the Sabbath, for that is the hour when the souls return to hell; but when the son prays and sanctifies the public, he redeems his father and his mother from hell." The doctrine of the Talmud is that those who die in communion with the synagogue, or who have never been Jews, are punished for twelve months, but that Jewish heretics and apostates are doomed to eternal punishment. "Israelites who sin with their body, and also Gentiles, descend into hell, and are judged there for twelve months. After the twelve months their body is consumed and their soul is burned, and the wind scatters them under the soles of the feet of the righteous, as it is said: 'Ye shall tread down the wicked, for they shall be ashes under the soles of your feet' (Mal. iv, 3). But heretics, and informers, and Epicureans, who have denied the law or the resurrection of the dead, or who have separated from the customs of the congregation, or who have caused their fear in the land of the living, who have sinned, or caused many to sin, as Jeroboam, the son of Nebat, all such go down to hell, and are judged forever" (*Rosh Hashanah*, p. 17, a). According to this, the dying Israelite ought to expect twelve months of torment, and his surviving son ought to repeat the prescribed prayer for twelve months; but the rabbins have commanded that the prayer should be repeated only for eleven months, to intimate that the deceased was not so wicked as to be obliged to remain all the time of torment: "The custom is not to say Kaddish more than eleven months, so as not to cast a reproach on the character of the deceased father and mother as if they were wicked, for twelve months are the term appointed for the wicked" (*Joreh Deah*, i, 1). As to the prayer used, it is found in all Hebrew prayer-books, and runs thus: "May his great name be exalted and sanctified throughout the world, which he has created according to his will. May he establish his kingdom in our lifetime, and in the lifetime of the whole house of Israel, soon, and in a short time, and say ye, Amen, Amen. May his great name be blessed and glorified for ever and ever. May his hallowed name be praised, glorified, exalted, magnified, honored, and most excellently adored; blessed is he, far exceeding all blessings, hymns, praises, and beatitudes that are repeated throughout the world, and say ye Amen. May our prayer be accepted with mercy and kindness. May the prayers and supplications of the whole house of Israel be accepted in the presence of their Father, who is in heaven, and say ye Amen. Blessed be the name of the Lord from henceforth and for evermore. May the fulness of peace from heaven, with life, be granted unto us, and all Israel; and say ye Amen. My help is from the Lord, who made heaven and earth. May he who maketh peace in his high heavens bestow peace on us, and on all Israel; and say ye Amen." See Adams, *Hist. of the Jews*, ii, 249 sq.; M'Caul, *Old Paths*, p. 295 sq.; Basnage, *Hist. des Juifs* (Taylor's transl.), p. 390; Bodenschatz, *Kirchliche Verfassung der heiligen Juden*, iii, 78 sq. (B. P.)

Purification (prop. טָהֳרָה, *tohorâh*, καθαρισμός), a ceremony enjoined in the Mosaic law for the purpose of cleansing from pollution or defilement (Numb. xix, 9). Purifications were, for the most part, performed with water, sometimes with blood and with oil (Heb. ix, 21, 22; Exod. xxx, 26–29; Lev. viii, 10, 11). Sometimes fire was used for the purpose of purging or purifying (Isa. i, 25; x, 26; Zech. xiii, 9; Mal. iii, 3).

In its legal and technical sense, the term is specially applied to the ritual observances whereby an Israelite was formally absolved from the taint of uncleanness, whether evidenced by any overt act or state, or connected with man's natural depravity. The cases that demanded it in the former instance are defined in the Levitical law [see UNCLEANNESS]: with regard to the latter, it is only possible to lay down the general rule that it was a fitting prelude to any nearer approach to the Deity; as, for instance, in the admission of a proselyte to the congregation [see PROSELYTE], in the baptism (καθαρισμός, John iii, 25) of the Jews as a sign of repentance [see BAPTISM], in the consecration of priests and Levites [see LEVITE; PRIEST], or in the performance of special religious acts (Lev. xvi, 4; 2 Chron. xxx, 19). In the present article we are concerned solely with the former class, inasmuch as in this alone were the ritual observances of a special character. The essence of purification, indeed, in all cases, consisted in the use of water, whether by way of ablution or aspersion; but in the *majora delicta* of legal uncleanness, sacrifices of various kinds were added, and the ceremonies throughout bore an expiatory character. Simple ablution of the person was required after sexual intercourse (Lev. xv, 18; 2 Sam. xi, 4); ablution of the clothes after touching the carcass of an unclean beast, or eating or carrying the carcass of a clean beast that had died a natural death (Lev. xi, 25, 40); ablution both of the person and of the defiled garments in cases of *gonorrhœa dormientium* (xv, 16, 17)—the ceremony in each of the above instances to take place on the day on which the uncleanness was contracted. A higher degree of uncleanness resulted from prolonged *gonorrhœa* in males and menstruation in women: in these cases a probationary interval of seven days was to be allowed after the cessation of the symptoms; on the evening of the seventh day the candidate for purification performed an ablution both of the person and of the garments, and on the eighth offered two turtle-doves or two young pigeons, one for a sin-offering, the other for a burnt-offering (vers. 1–15, 19–30). Contact with persons in the above states, or even with clothing or furniture that had been used by them while in those states, involved uncleanness in a minor degree, to be absolved by ablution on the day of infection generally (vers. 5–11, 21–23), but in one particular case after an interval of seven days (ver. 24). In cases of childbirth the sacrifice was increased to a lamb of the first year, with a pigeon or turtle-dove (xii, 6), an exception being made in favor of the poor, who might present the same offering as in the preceding case (ver. 8; Luke ii, 22–24). The purification took place forty days after the birth of a son, and eighty after that of a daughter, the difference in the interval being based on physical considerations. The uncleannesses already specified were comparatively of a mild character: the more severe were connected with death, which, viewed as the penalty of sin, was in the highest degree contaminating. To this head we refer the two cases of (1) touching a corpse, or a grave (Numb. xix, 16), or even killing a man in war (xxxi, 19); and (2) leprosy, which was regarded by the Hebrews as nothing less than a living death. The ceremonies of purification in the first of these two cases are detailed in Numb. xix.

A peculiar kind of water, termed the *water of uncleanness* (מֵי־הַנִּדָּה, A. V. "water of separation"), was prepared in the following manner: an unblemished red heifer, on which the yoke had not passed, was slain by the eldest son of the high-priest outside the camp. A portion of its blood was sprinkled seven times towards (אֶל־נֹכַח פְּנֵי) the sanctuary; the rest of it, and the whole of the carcass, including even its dung, were then burned in the sight of the officiating priest, together with cedar-wood, hyssop, and scarlet. The ashes were collected by a clean man and deposited in a clean place outside the camp. Whenever occasion required, a portion of the ashes was mixed with spring-water in a jar, and the unclean person was sprinkled with it on the third and again on the seventh day after the contraction of the uncleanness. That the water had an expiatory efficacy is implied in the term *sin-offering* (חַטָּאת, A. V. "purification for sin") applied to it (Numb. xix, 9), and all the particulars connected with its preparation had a symbolical significance appropriate to the object sought. The sex of the victim (female, and hence life-giving), its red color (the color of blood, the seat of life), its unimpaired vigor (never having borne the yoke), its youth, and the absence in it of spot or blemish, the cedar and the hyssop (possessing the qualities, the former of incorruption, the latter of purity), and the scarlet (again the color of blood)—all these symbolized life in its fulness and freshness as the antidote of death. At the same time, the extreme virulence of the uncleanness is taught by the regulations that the victim should be wholly consumed outside the camp, whereas generally certain parts were consumed on the altar, and the offal only outside the camp (comp. Lev. iv, 11, 12); that the blood was sprinkled *towards*, and not *before*, the sanctuary; that the officiating minister should be neither the high-priest, nor yet simply a priest, but the *presumptive* high-priest, the office being too impure for the first and too important for the second; that even the priest and the person that burned the heifer were rendered unclean by reason of their contact with the victim; and, lastly, that the purification should be effected, not simply by the use of water, but of water mixed with ashes which served as a lye, and would, therefore, have peculiarly cleansing qualities. See PURIFICATION-WATERS.

The purification of the leper was a yet more formal proceeding, and indicated the highest pitch of uncleanness. The rites are thus described in Lev. xiv, 4–32: The priest having examined the leper and pronounced him clear of his disease, took for him two birds "alive and clean," with cedar, scarlet, and hyssop. One of the birds was killed under the priest's directions over a vessel filled with spring-water, into which its blood fell; the other, with the adjuncts, cedar, etc., was dipped by the priest into the mixed blood and water, and, after the unclean person had been seven times sprinkled with the same liquid, was permitted to fly away "into the open field." The leper then washed himself and his clothes, and shaved his head. The above proceedings took place outside the camp, and formed the first stage of purification. A probationary interval of seven days was then allowed, which period the leper was to pass "abroad out of his tent:" on the last of these days the washing was repeated, and the shaving was more rigidly performed, even to the eyebrows and all his hair. The second stage of the purification took place on the eighth day, and was performed "before the Lord at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation." The leper brought thither an offering consisting of two he-lambs, a yearling ewe-lamb, fine flour mingled with oil, and a log of oil. In cases of poverty the offering was reduced to one lamb, and two turtle-doves, or two young pigeons, with a less quantity of fine flour, and a log of oil. The priest slew one of the he-lambs as a trespass-offering, and applied a portion of its blood to the right ear, right thumb, and great toe of the right foot of the leper; he next sprinkled a portion of the oil seven times before the Lord, applied another portion of it to the parts of the body already specified, and poured the remainder over the

leper's head. The other he-lamb and the ewe-lamb, or the two birds, as the case might be, were then offered as a sin-offering and a burnt-offering, together with the meat-offering. The significance of the cedar, the scarlet, and the hyssop, of the running water, and of the "alive (full of life) and clean" condition of the birds, is the same as in the case previously described. The two stages of the proceedings indicated, the first, which took place outside the camp, the readmission of the leper to the community of men; the second, before the sanctuary, his readmission to communion with God. In the first stage, the slaughter of the one bird and the dismissal of the other symbolized the punishment of death deserved and fully remitted. In the second, the use of oil and its application to the same parts of the body as in the consecration of priests (Lev. viii, 23, 24) symbolized the rededication of the leper to the service of Jehovah. See PURIFICATION-OFFERING.

The ceremonies to be observed in the purification of a house or a garment infected with leprosy were identical with the first stage of the proceedings used for the leper (Lev. xiv, 33–53). See LEPROSY.

The necessity of purification was extended in the post-Babylonian period to a variety of unauthorized cases. Cups and pots, brazen vessels and couches, were washed as a matter of ritual observance (Mark vii, 4). The washing of the hands before meals was conducted in a formal manner (vii, 3), and minute regulations are laid down on this subject in a treatise of the Mishna entitled *Yadaim*. These ablutions required a large supply of water, and hence we find at a marriage feast no less than six jars containing two or three firkins apiece, prepared for the purpose (John ii, 6). We meet with references to purification after childbirth (Luke ii, 22), and after the cure of leprosy (Matt. viii, 4; Luke xvii, 14), the sprinkling of the water mixed with ashes being still retained in the latter case (Heb. ix, 13). What may have been the specific causes of uncleanness in those who came up to purify themselves before the Passover (John xi, 55), or in those who had taken upon themselves the Nazarite's vow (Acts xxi, 24, 26), we are not informed; in either case it may have been contact with a corpse, though in the latter it would rather appear to have been a general purification preparatory to the accomplishment of the vow. See WASHING.

In conclusion, it may be observed that the distinctive feature in the Mosaic rites of purification is their expiatory character. The idea of uncleanness was not peculiar to the Jew: it was attached by the Greeks to the events of childbirth and death (Thucyd. iii, 104; Eurip. *Iph. in Taur.* 383), and by various nations to the case of sexual intercourse (Herod. i, 198; ii, 64; Pers. ii, 16). But with all these nations simple ablution sufficed: no sacrifices were demanded. The Jew alone was taught by the use of expiatory offerings to discern to its full extent the connection between the outward sign and the inward fount of impurity. See ABLUTION.

PURIFICATION IN THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH. The Protestant Church recognises no ceremonial purifications, because it does not seek for anything emblematic to point to the necessity of holiness in the people of the Lord. Christ taught purification of the heart only, and so the evangelical Christians teach purity of heart as the fit condition in which to approach the Deity in worship; the blood of the Son of God having cleansed from all sin those who accept of his atonement in righteousness. See IMPURITY; SIN.

In the Roman Catholic Church and the Greek Church, as well as some of the ultra-ritualistic churches which still cling to Protestantism, acts of purification prevail to some extent. There is, firstly, the act of purification after the communion in the mass. It relates (*a*) to the purification of the chalice; some wine is poured into it by the servant of the altar, and slightly shaken with a circular motion, to take in all particles of the holy blood; then the chalice is emptied in two draughts, the mouth touching the same place from which the holy blood has been drunk. During this performance the prayer *Quod ore sumsimus* is recited: this prayer stands in an old Gothic missal of Charlemagne's time as *Postcommunio*. In the oldest times of Christianity the purification of the chalice was done with water, which was afterwards poured into a special vessel placed at the side of the altar, and called *piscina* (q. v.). It was Innocent III who directed that the purification of the chalice should be done with wine. (*b*) To the periodical purification of the *ciborium* (q. v.), which is performed after the partaking of the holy blood and before the purification of the chalice, by gathering with wine the rest of the holy blood left in the *ciborium*, and emptying it as before, and then wiping out its inside with the *purificatorium* (q. v.). There is, secondly, the act of purification for women, which has been derived *through* rather than *from* the Jewish rite (Lev. xii). It is based upon the practice of the Blessed Virgin Mary, whose compliance with the demand of the Jewish ceremonial law is related in Luke ii, 22–24. The Romish Church has in commemoration of this purification act instituted a festival called *Feast of Purification of the Blessed Virgin Mary;* and as by the Levitical law the ceremony was appointed for the fortieth day after childbirth, the feast is put on Feb. 2 (reckoning from Dec. 25, the Nativity of Christ). As on the same occasion the Holy Virgin complied also with the law of Numb. xviii, 15, by the offering prescribed in redemption of the first-born, the festival is also called by the name of the *Presentation of the Child Jesus*, or the *Feast of Simeon*, and sometimes, also, of the *Meeting* (*occursus*), in allusion to Simeon's meeting the Virgin Mother, and taking the child into his arms (Luke ii, 25). The date of the introduction of this festival is uncertain. The first clear trace of it is about the middle of the 5th century, during the reign of Marcia, and in the Church of Jerusalem. Its introduction in the Roman Church, in 494, was made by pope Gelasius the occasion of transferring to a Christian use the festivities which at that season were annexed to the pagan festival of the Lupercalia.

In the Church of England, the restoration of woman to the privileges of the Church is accompanied by a solemn thanksgiving for deliverance in her great danger. The title of the service, *The Thanksgiving of Women after Childbirth*, was adopted in 1552 to bring this point into prominence. The old Sarum title, *Ordo ad Purificandam Mulierem post Partum*, and that in the Prayer-book of 1549, *The Order of the Purification of Women*, seemed to mark an unholiness in the woman which the service removed. The Puritans objected to the use of the service for this very reason—"For what else doth this churching imply but a restoring her unto the Church, which cannot be without some bar or shutting forth presupposed?" They complained, too, against such individualizing of prayer and praise (see the controversy between Cartwright and Whitgift and Hooker, in Keble, 3d ed. of Hooker's *Works*, ii, 434–438). In the Sarum use the service was read at the church door, *ante ostium ecclesiæ;* in the book of 1549, "nigh unto the quire door," afterwards at the altar rails; now at "some convenient place." The solemn readmission of the woman to divine service of the Sarum use has been wholly discontinued. The Book of Common Prayer requires of the woman to be "decently apparelled," which means that she shall appear at church veiled. Hooker gives an instance where a woman appeared unveiled and was therefore excommunicated, and when the case was appealed to the bishops they confirmed the decision. Palmer says that all the Western rituals and that of Constantinople had offices for this rite. A service of the 10th century is given by Migne, *Cursus* (Paris, 1841), cxxxviii: "Benedictio Puerperæ secundum usum Æthiopum." The anointing the forehead of the woman and child, *sacra unctione*, the imposition of hands, the reception of holy communion, the giving of

incense, are parts of this rite. See Siegel, *Christliche Alterthümer* (Index in vol. iv); Riddle, *Christian Antiquities* (see Index); *Brit. Quar. Rev.* July, 1871, p. 110. See also Ablution.

Purification-offerings were such as the law enjoined upon those who had been raised from leprosy, unclean issues, hæmorrhages, and childbed. See Pollution. Those for lepers were the most burdensome, since a trespass-offering was among them.

1. The purifying offerings of menstrual women and of men after unclean issues were just the same (Lev. xv). And the eighth day after the cure was certain, each brought two turtle-doves, or young pigeons, to be slain by the priests—the one as a sin-offering, the other as a burnt-offering (xv, 14 sq., 29 sq.). Drink-offerings are not expressly mentioned in connection with these. See Woman.

2. The offerings of purification of women after childbirth (Lev. xii, 6–8), offered thirty-three or sixty-six days after confinement, consisted in a yearling lamb as a burnt-offering, and a young pigeon or a turtle-dove as a sin-offering. In case of poverty, two turtle-doves or young pigeons sufficed—the one as a burnt-offering, the other as a sin-offering (comp. Luke ii, 24). See Child.

3. More extended was the purifying ceremony of healed lepers (Lev. xiv; comp. *Negaim*, in the 6th part of the Mishna, ch. xiv). The ritual is composed of two parts: (*a*) vers. 2–8. The healed leper brought to the priest for cleansing must present two small birds, alive and clean (according to the *Negaim*, xiv, 5, they must be in form, size, and value precisely alike and bought at the same time; but this was not necessary; comp. Lutz, *De Duab. Avib. Purgat. Leprosi Destin. earumq. Myster.* [Hal. 1737]). The one was to be slain over an earthen vessel filled with fresh spring-water (and then buried; *Negaim*, xiv, 1), and the living bird, together with a bundle consisting of cedar-wood, scarlet wool, and hyssop, was dipped into the vessel, now containing water and blood mixed together, and the leper was sprinkled with it seven times. The priest then let the living bird loose into the open air (perhaps bearing away the guilt). See Expiation. Then the man healed was required to wash, shave off all his hair, and bathe. He was now so far cleansed as no longer to render unclean the place he occupied (*Negaim*, xiv, 2), and might again abide in the city, but was required to "tarry abroad out of his own tent" or house. This is referred by the rabbins, as a euphemism, to sexual intercourse, but without reason (yet Bähr follows them; *Symbol.* ii, 520 sq.). The ceremony with the two birds is not a sacrifice, but a mere symbol of the purifying of the blood from the humors of the disease, and the return of freedom on the part of the leper again to associate with men (otherwise explained in Bähr, *op. cit.* p. 515 sq.). (*b*) Vers. 9–31. On the seventh day, the leper was required again to shave his whole body with the utmost care—not even sparing the eyebrows—to wash, and to bathe. A special chamber was provided in a corner of the women's court-yard of the second Temple for this purpose (*Middoth*, ii, 5; comp. *Negaim*, xiv, 8. Bähr is mistaken, and contradicts Lev. xiv, 9, in referring this washing to the eighth day). On the eighth day he presented two lambs and a yearling sheep. The lamb was first slain as a trespass-offering, and the healed man was touched with its blood in three places—on the right ear, the right thumb, and the great toe of the right foot. Then the priest took the oil offered by the leper, and, after sprinkling of it seven times "before the Lord," touched the leper with it in the same three places of the body, and poured the remainder over his head. Finally, the sin-offering and the burnt-offering were slain. Poor persons were allowed to bring for these two turtle-doves or young pigeons. See Leprosy.

The putting of the blood on the body, as well as touching it with oil, in this second service, is considered as a ceremony expressing reconciliation; but the rabbins consider the final anointing with the oil as the essential part (*Negaim*, xiv, 10), because in this connection alone is mention made of "an atonement before the Lord" (Lev. xiv, 18). In other respects, the whole ceremony strongly resembles the consecration of priests (Bähr, *op. cit.* 521 sq.). The cutting-off of the hair belonged to the medical police of the law, for the leprosy conceals itself most easily under the hair, and hence the last traces of the disease could thus be detected. On the ceremonies of purification in consecrating priests and Levites, see those articles. See Nazarite.

Purification-waters (מֵי־נִדָּה, *mey-nid'dâh'*, properly *waters of uncleanness*, i. e. of *purification*; Sept. ὕδωρ ῥαντισμοῦ, *water of sprinkling*, after the Chaldee usage; comp. *nedah'*, נִדָּה, *to sprinkle* [see Rosenmüller, *on Numb.* xix, 9]). This was a holy water of cleansing, which was mixed with the ashes of a red or reddish-brown heifer—one which had never been under the yoke (comp. Deut. xxi, 3; Bochart, *Hieroz.* i, 328: on the age of this heifer the interpreters of the law were not agreed; see *Para*, i, 1; Jonathan, *on Numb.* l. c., speaks of a two-year-old). With this water those who had contracted impurity by contact with a corpse or otherwise were sprinkled by means of a sprig or branch of hyssop, and were thus cleansed (Numb. xix, 2 sq.; xxxi, 19 sq.; Heb. ix, 13; Josephus, *Ant.* iv, 4, 6; comp. the Talmudical tract *Para*, in the 6th part of the Mishna). The ceremony of burning the heifer, which was accounted a sin-offering (Numb. xix, 9, 17), was as follows according to the law (comp. Mishna, *Para*, vi, 4): A priest, who had set himself apart and purified himself for this work for seven days previous (*ibid.* iii, 1; Josephus ascribes the duty to the high-priest, which may have been the custom in his time, although the Mishna usually speaks only of a priest, iii, 1, 9, 10; comp. Philo, *Opp.* ii, 252; *Para*, iii, 8), led it out of the Temple (through the east door, Mishna, *Middoth*, i, 3) before the city (on the Mount of Olives, *Para*, iii, 6), slew it, and burned it entire, with its flesh, skin, blood, and dung (Numb. xix, 5), on a fire fed with cedar-wood, scarlet wool, and hyssop (comp. Lev. xiv, 6). The ashes were then gathered, and kept in a clean place outside the city (according to the *Para*, iii, 2, they were divided into three parts, one of which was kept in a court outside the Temple, the second on the Mount of Olives, and the third was given to the priests). A heifer was burned thus anew whenever the supply of ashes was exhausted. The *Para* (iii, 5) tells us that only nine in all were ever burned, and only one of them before the captivity (Jerome, *Ep.* 108 *ad Eustach.*, says that one was burned yearly). A part of these ashes was mixed with fresh water (comp. *Para*, viii, 8), and a clean person sprinkled with it the unclean on the third and on the seventh day after the contraction of uncleanness. With it, too, the house of the dead and the vessels rendered unclean by a corpse were sprinkled. He who burned the heifer, the priest who slew her, and the man who collected the ashes were unclean until evening (Numb. xix, 7, 8, 10). The same took place in the use of the water; he who sprinkled it on the unclean, and all that touched it, were unclean until evening (xix, 21 sq.). This is analogous to Lev. xvi, 24, 26, 28; although in that case the uncleanness contracted by contact with the goats was considered as removed immediately after the required washings. Clericus properly remarks on this passage in Numbers, "The victim was considered as unclean through the sins which the prayer of the priest placed on his head. The ashes of this victim cleansed the unclean by taking his pollution; but they also defiled the clean, because no pollution could seem to pass from them to the water." The last clause, however, is not clear.

The whole ceremony is peculiar, and suggests many questions which have never been fully solved. In particular, the symbolic meaning of the details is still un-

settled, as the disagreement of recent expositors shows (Bähr, *Symbol.* ii, 493 sq.; Hengstenberg, *Moses und Egypten*, p. 181 sq.; Anonymous, *Evangel. K.-Z.* 1843, No. 19; Baumgarten, *Comment. zum Pentat.* ii, 333 sq.; Philippson, *Pentat.* p. 768 sq.; Kurtz, in the *Stud. u. Krit.* [1846], iii, 629 sq.). We cannot here dwell upon this unfruitful investigation, but will refer singly to the principal points.

1. The purification of those made unclean by a corpse was effected, not by the usual means of cleansing—pure water—but by this sharp fluid, because this kind of uncleanness was considered very deep and sad. The reason of this is obvious. Hence the means of cleansing is a kind of lye, which is strong in its action. We find ashes and lye among the means of purification used not merely by the Romans (Virgil, *Eclog.* viii, 101; Ovid, *Fast.* iv, 639, 725, 733; Arnob. *Gent.* v, 32), but by the old Persians, who made their most powerful cleansing stuff out of water and ashes by means of fire (*Zendavesta*, iii, 216; another kind of sacred water used by Egyptian priests is mentioned in Ælian. *Anim.* vii, 45). Besides, this lye among the Israelites was made, not out of ashes in general, but from the ashes of a sin-offering, and from that which alone remained of this sin-offering.

2. A heifer, not a bull (Lev. iv, 14), is used, perhaps (Bähr, p. 498) because the female sex is that which brings forth life (comp. Gen. iii, 20; otherwise Hengstenberg and Baumgarten—the former interpreting too outwardly, *op. cit.* p. 182; the latter too artificially). But the object may have been simply to distinguish this particular sin-offering, when the animal was made a means to a hallowing purpose, from that in which it was presented to Jehovah in his sanctuary as a sacrifice of reconciliation. Yet physical uncleanness is always less burdensome than sin against the moral law (comp. Philippson, p. 769). Why a *red* heifer? The explanation of Spencer (*Leg. Rit.* ii, 15, 2, 6), that a red heifer was chosen in token of opposition to the Egyptian custom of sacrificing red cattle to Typhon, who was fancied to be of a red color (Plut. *Isidor.* 22), is worthless. The recent expositors of the symbols waver between red as the color of *life* (Bähr, Kurtz) and of sin and death (Hengstenberg). According to the rabbins, Solomon did not know the reason, and no ancient tradition respecting it has reached us. The secret will never be discovered. If it be said that red heifers were chosen for their scarcity, which rendered them prized in the East (Reland, *Antiq. Sacr.* ii, 5, 23; *Amralkeis* [ed. Lette], p. 74), the answer is only rendered more difficult. Rarity is not made an object in the directions given. Perhaps the dark color is simply selected as according with the serious nature of the work in hand, and aiding to keep the removal of sin steadily before the eye. White heifers were unfitted for this purpose; black ones are very rare in the East. As the accompaniments—cedar-wood, hyssop, and scarlet wool, which Maimonides in his time already felt the difficulty of explaining—have never yet been fully accounted for, Bähr's explanation is the most intelligent (p. 502 sq.), while Baumgarten's is absurd. See Hyssop.

3. The twofold sprinkling on the third and seventh days has an analogy in two other places (Lev. xii, 2 sq.; xiv, 8 sq.). That terrible impurity was not to be removed in a moment; its serious nature demanded two periods of effort. Three and seven, too, are significant numbers in themselves. The seven, or week, is also a liturgically complete period, and with it the ceremony of purification ends.

4. The reason why the heifer was burned without the holy city, and the persons occupied in this work were accounted unclean, is not the impurity of the sacrifice in itself (as Bähr has well remarked), but in the fact of its relation with the most unclean things—death and the corpse.

See, in general, Moses Maimon. *Tr. de Vacca Rufa*, Hebr. et Lat. (ed. Zeller, Amsterd. 1711); Marck, *Dissert. ad Vet. Test. Fascic.* p. 114 sq.; Deyling, *Observat.* iii, 89 sq.; Th. Dassov. *De Vacca Rufa, Observat. Instruz.* (J. G. W. Dunkel, Lips. 1758); Bashuysen, *De Aspersione Sacra ex Mente Gemaristar.* (Serv. 1717); Reland, *Antiq. Sacr.* ii, 5, 23.

Purificatorium is a piece of linen folded several times, which is used in drying the chalice and wiping the paten during the mass. It was originally a towel fastened to the piscina, or vessel placed at the side of the altar. Only in later times it took the present simpler form—probably at the time when the priest himself drank the wine which had been used for the purification of the chalice and the ablution of the fingers. The cleaning of the *purificatorium*, as it comes in immediate contact with the consecrated forms, must, by prescription of the canon, be done by the priest himself. Its length and width must be about half an ell, and as it is exclusively employed for the ritual use, it must be consecrated and marked in the middle with a cross. The Greeks use a sponge for the cleaning of the chalice and paten—a custom mentioned by Chrysostom (*Homil. in Epist. ad Ephes.*).—Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* s. v.

Purifier. See Purificatorium.

Pu'rim (פּוּרִים, *Purim;* Sept. Φρουραί v. r. Φρουρίμ, etc.; also יְמֵי הַפּוּרִים, *days of the Purim*, Esth. ix, 26, 31), the annual festival instituted by Mordecai, at the suggestion of Esther, to commemorate the wonderful deliverance of the Jews in Persia from the destruction with which they were threatened through the designs of Haman (Esth. ix; Josephus, *Ant.* xi, 6, 13). (The following article is substantially compiled from Biblical and Rabbinical authorities. See Festival.

I. *Name of the Festival and its Signification.*—The name פּוּרִים (singular פּוּר), which is derived from the Persian *parê*, cognate with *pars, part*, and which is explained in Esther (iii, 7; ix, 24) by the Hebrew גּוֹרָל, *lot*, has been given to this festival because it records the casting of lots by Haman to ascertain when he should carry into effect the decree which the king issued for the extermination of the Jews (Esth. ix, 24). The name Φρουραί, which, as Schleusner (*Lex. in LXX*, s. v.) and others rightly maintain, is a corruption of Φουραί, is the Greek pronunciation of the Hebrew term. In like manner, the modern editors of Josephus have changed Φρουραῖοι into Φουραῖοι (*Ant.* xi, 6, 13). In the following article we follow the Scriptural and Talmudical authorities, with illustrations from modern sources. See Festival.

It was probably called Purim by the Jews in irony. Their great enemy Haman appears to have been very superstitious and much given to casting lots (Esth. iii, 7). They gave the name Purim, or Lots, to the commemorative festival because he had thrown lots to ascertain what day would be auspicious for him to carry into effect the bloody decree which the king had issued at his instance (ix, 24).

Ewald, in support of his theory that there was in patriarchal times a religious festival at every new and full moon, conjectures that Purim was originally the full-moon feast of Adar, as the Passover was that of Nisan, and Tabernacles that of Tisri.

II. *The Manner in which the Feast was and still is observed.*—All that the Bible tells us about it is that Mordecai ordered the 14th and 15th of Adar to be kept annually by the Jews, both nigh and afar; that these two days are to be made days of feasting and of joy, as well as of interchange of presents and of sending gifts to the poor, and that the Jews agreed to continue to observe this festival every year in the same manner as they had begun it (Esth. ix, 17–24). No further directions are given about its observance, and the Bible here, as elsewhere, left the rites and ceremonies to develop themselves with the circumstances of the nation. It is not easy to conjecture what may have been the

ancient mode of observance, so as to have given the occasion something of the dignity of a national religious festival. The traditions of the Jews, and their modern usage respecting it, are curious. It is stated that eighty-five of the Jewish elders objected at first to the institution of the feast, when it was proposed by Mordecai (Jerus. Gem. *Megillah;* Lightfoot, *on John x,* 21). A preliminary fast was appointed, called "the fast of Esther," to be observed on the 13th of Adar, in memory of the fast which Esther and her maids observed, and which she enjoined, through Mordecai, on the Jews of Shushan (Esth. iv, 16). See MORDECAI.

The following is the mode in which the festival of Purim is kept at the present day. The day preceding—i. e. the 13th of Adar—is kept as a fast-day, and is called "the fast of Esther" (תַּעֲנִית אֶסְתֵּר), in accordance with the command of this Jewish queen (Esth. iv, 5, 6); and sundry prayers expressive of repentance, humiliation, etc. (סליחות), are introduced into the regular ritual for the day. As on all the fast-days, Exod. xxxii, 11–14; xxxiv, 1–11, are read as the lesson from the law, and Isa. lv, 6–lvi, 9, as the Haphtarah. If the 13th of Adar falls on a Sabbath, the fast takes place on the Thursday previous, as no fasting is allowed on this sacred day, nor on the preparation-day for the Sabbath. Some people fast three days, as Esther enjoined at first. On the evening of this fast-day—i. e. the one closing the 13th of Adar and introducing the 14th, as soon as the stars appear—the festival commences, when the candles are lighted, and all the Israelites resort to the synagogue, where, after the evening service, the book of Esther, called, *κατ' ἐξοχήν, the Megillah* (מְגִלָּה, *the Roll*), is read by the prælector. Before commencing to read it he pronounces the following benediction: "Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, King of the universe, who hast sanctified us with thy commandments, and hast enjoined us to read the Megillah! Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, King of the universe, who hast wrought miracles for our forefathers in those days and at this time. Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, King of the universe, who hast preserved us alive, sustained us, and brought us to this season!" The Megillah is then read. The prælector reads in a histrionic manner, suiting his tones and gestures to the changes in the subject-matter. As often as he pronounces the name of Haman the congregation stamp on the floor, saying, "Let his name be blotted out. The name of the wicked shall rot!" while the children spring rattles. The passage in which the names of Haman and his sons occur (Esth. ix, 7, 9) is read very rapidly, and if possible in one breath, to signify that they were all hanged at the same time, the congregation stamping and rattling all the time. It is for this reason that this passage is written in the MSS. in larger letters than the rest, and that the names are arranged under one another. After the Megillah is read through, the whole congregation exclaim, "Cursed be Haman; blessed be Mordecai. Cursed be Zoresh (the wife of Haman); blessed be Esther. Cursed be all idolaters; blessed be all Israelites, and blessed be Harbonah who hanged Haman." The volume is then solemnly rolled up. Lastly, the following benediction is pronounced by the reader: "Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, King of the universe, who hast contended our contest, judged our cause, hast avenged our wrongs, requited all the enemies of our souls, and hast delivered us from our oppressors. Blessed art thou who hast delivered thy people from all their oppressors, thou Lord of salvation!" All go home and partake of a repast said to consist mainly of milk and eggs.

On the morning of the 14th of Adar the Jews again resort to the synagogue, insert several appointed prayers into the ordinary daily ritual; Exod. xvii, 8–16 is read as the lesson from the law, which relates the destruction of the Amalekites, the people of Agag (1 Sam. xv, 8), the supposed ancestor of Haman (Esth. iii, 1), and the Megillah or the Book of Esther as the Haphtarah, under the same circumstances as those of the previous evening. The rest of the festival is spent in great rejoicings: presents are sent backwards and forwards among friends and relations, and gifts are liberally forwarded to the poor. Games of all sorts, with dancing and music, commence. In the evening a quaint dramatic entertainment, the subject of which is connected with the occasion, sometimes takes place, and men frequently put on female attire, declaring that the festivities of Purim, according to Esth. ix, 22, suspend the law of Deut. xxii, 5, which forbids one sex to wear the dress of the other. A dainty meal then follows, sometimes with a free indulgence of wine, both unmixed and mulled. According to the Gemara (*Megilla,* vii, 2), "tenetur homo in festo Purim eo usque inebri-



The Feast of Purim in a Modern Synagogue.

ari, ut nullum discrimen norit inter maledictionem Hamanis et benedictionem Mardochæi."

From the canons which obtained in the time of Christ, we learn that the Megillah had to be written in Hebrew characters, on good parchment, and with ink (Mishna, *Megilla*, ii, 2); that if the 14th of Adar fell on a Tuesday or Wednesday, the inhabitants of villages read the Megillah on the Monday in advance, or on Thursday, because the country people came to town to attend the markets and the synagogues in which the law was read and tribunals held (*Megilla*, i, 1–3); that any one was qualified to read it except deaf people, fools, and minors (*ibid.* ii, 4), and that it was lawful to read it in a foreign language to those who understood foreign languages (*ibid.* ii, 1). But though the Mishna allows it to be read in other languages, yet the Megillah is generally read in Hebrew.

The rejoicings continue on the 15th, and the festival terminates on the evening of this day. During the whole of the festival the Jews may engage in trade, or any labor, if they are so inclined, as there is no prohibition against it. When the month Adar used to be doubled, in the Jewish leap-year, the festival was repeated on the 14th and 15th of the second Adar.

It would seem that the Jews were tempted to associate the Christians with the Persians and Amalekites in the curses of the synagogue (see *Cod. Theodos.* xvi, 8, 18). Hence probably arose the popularity of the feast of Purim in those ages in which the feeling of enmity was so strongly manifested between Jews and Christians. Several Jewish proverbs are preserved which strikingly show the way in which Purim was regarded, such as, "The Temple may fail, but Purim never;" "The Prophets may fail, but not the Megillah." It was said that no books would survive in the Messiah's kingdom except the law and the Megillah. This affection for the book and the festival connected with it is the more remarkable because the events on which they are founded affected only an exiled portion of the Hebrew race, and because there was so much in them to shock the principles and prejudices of the Jewish mind. So popular was this festival in the days of Christ that Josephus tells us that, "even now, all the Jews that are in the habitable earth keep these days festivals, and send portions to one another" (*Ant.* xi, 6, 13), and certainly its popularity has not diminished in the present day.

III. *Did Christ celebrate this Feast?*—It was first suggested by Kepler that the ἑορτὴ τῶν Ἰουδαίων of John v, 1 was the feast of Purim. The notion has been confidently espoused by Petavius, Outram, Lamy, Hug, Tholuck, Lücke, Olshausen, Stier, Wieseler, Winer, and Anger (who, according to Winer, has proved the point beyond contradiction), and is favored by Alford and Ellicott. The question is a difficult one. It seems to be generally allowed that the opinion of Chrysostom, Cyril, and most of the fathers, which was taken up by Erasmus, Calvin, Beza, and Bengel, that the feast was Pentecost, and that of Cocceius, that it was Tabernacles (which is countenanced by the reading of one inferior MS.), are precluded by the general course of the narrative, and especially by John iv, 35 (assuming that the words of our Lord which are there given were spoken in seed-time) compared with v, 1. The interval indicated by a comparison of these texts could scarcely have extended beyond Nisan. The choice is thus left between Purim and the Passover.

The principal objections to Purim are, (*a*) that it was not necessary to go up to Jerusalem to keep the festival; (*b*) that it is not very likely that our Lord would have made a point of paying especial honor to a festival which appears to have had but a very small religious element in it, and which seems rather to have been the means of keeping alive a feeling of national revenge and hatred. It is alleged, on the other hand, that our Lord's attending the feast would be in harmony with his deep sympathy with the feelings of the Jewish people, which went further than his merely "fulfilling all righteousness" in carrying out the precepts of the Mosaic law. It is further urged that the narrative of John is best made out by supposing that the incident at the pool of Bethesda occurred at the festival which was characterized by showing kindness to the poor, and that our Lord was induced, by the enmity of the Jews then evinced, not to remain at Jerusalem till the Passover, mentioned John vi, 4 (Stier).

The identity of the Passover with the feast in question has been maintained by Irenæus, Eusebius, and Theodoret, and, in modern times, by Luther, Scaliger, Grotius, Hengstenberg, Gresswell, Neander, Tholuck, Robinson, and the majority of commentators. The principal difficulties in the way are, (*a*) the omission of the article, involving the improbability that the great festival of the year should be spoken of as "*a* feast of the Jews;" (*b*) that as our Lord did not go up to the Passover mentioned John vi, 4, he must have absented himself from Jerusalem for a year and a half, that is, till the feast of Tabernacles (John vii, 2). Against these points it is contended that the application of ἑορτή without the article to the Passover is countenanced by Matt. xxvii, 15; Luke xxiii, 17 (comp. John xviii, 39); indeed, it makes but little difference in Hellenistic Greek whether the article is present or absent with a noun thus in regimen with a following genitive; that it is assigned as a reason for his staying away from Jerusalem for a longer period than usual, that "the Jews sought to kill him" (John vii, 1; cf. v, 18); that this long period satisfactorily accounts for the surprise expressed by his brethren (John vii, 3); and that, as it was evidently his custom to visit Jerusalem once a year, he went up to the feast of Tabernacles (vii, 2) instead of going to the Passover. A still more conclusive argument in favor of the Passover is the use of the peculiar epithet δευτερόπρωτος in Luke vi, 1, for the Sabbath following, which can mean no other than that occurring after the Paschal week. Moreover, the fact of the ripe but unharvested barley at that time leads to the same conclusion. See PASSOVER.

The arguments on one side are best set forth by Stier and Olshausen on John v, 1, by Kepler (*Eclogæ Chronicæ*, Frankfort, 1615), and by Anger (*De Temp. in Act. Apost.* i, 24); also, in Hug's *Introd.* (pt. ii, § 64), and in Lücke's *Comment. on St. John's Gospel* (see the English translation of Lücke's *Dissertation* in the appendix to Tittmann's *Meletemata Sacra, or a Commentary on St. John's Gospel*, in *Bib. Cabinet*, vol. xlv); those on the other side, by Hengstenberg (*Christology* vol. ii, "On the Seventy Weeks of Daniel," p. 408–414, Engl. transl., Washington, 1839); Robinson, *Harmony*, note on the "Second Passover;" and Neander, *Life of Christ*, § 143. See also Lightfoot, Kuinöl, and Tholuck, on John v, 1, and Gresswell, *Diss.* viii, vol. ii; Ellicott *Lect.* 135.

IV. *Literature.*—See Carpzov, *App. Crit.* iii, 11; Reland, *Ant.* iv, 9; Schickart, *Purim sive Bacchanalia Judæorum* (Crit. Sac. iii, col. 1184); Buxtorf, *Syn. Jud.* xxix. The Mishnical treatise *Megilla* contains directions respecting the mode in which the scroll should be written out and in which it should be read, with other matters, not much to the point in hand, connected with the service of the synagogue. See also Stauben, *La Vie Juive en Alsace;* Mills, *British Jews*, p. 188; Axenfeld, *Betrachten* עַל פּוּרִים (Erlang. 1807); *Bible Educator*, iii, 26. See ESTHER.

Puritans, a name given to a large party in the reign of queen Elizabeth, who complained that the Reformation in England was left in an imperfect state, many abuses both in worship and discipline being still retained. The name Puritans was derived from the frequent assertion of those who composed the party that the Church of England was corrupted with the remains of popery, and that what they desired was a "pure" system of doctrine and discipline; but the Eng-

lish word "Puritans" happens accidentally to represent the Greek name "Cathari" which had been assumed by the Novatians, and which had been adopted in Germany during the Middle Ages in the vernacular form "Ketzer" for the Albigenses and other opponents of the Church. It first came into use as the designation of an English Church party about the year 1564 (Fuller, *Ch. Hist.* ix, 66), but after a few years it got to be used also as inclusive of many who had separated from the Church of England. It was gradually superseded as regards the latter by the names of their various sects, as Independents, Presbyterians, Baptists, etc., and as regards the former by the term "Nonconformists." At a still later time, towards the end of the 17th century, the Church Puritans were represented by "Low-Churchmen," and the Non-Church Puritans by "Dissenters."

The presence of a Puritan party in the Church of England is, however, traceable for two centuries before the name of "Puritan" was assumed. In the 14th century the common people had become alienated from their parish priests by the influence of the friars, who had authority from the pope to preach and to receive confessions wherever they pleased, and quite independently of the ordinary clergy. This extra-parochial system of mission clergy weakened the hold of the Church upon the populace at large; and, when the friars themselves began to lose their influence, alienation from the clergy developed into alienation from the Church. Thus arose the Lollards of the 15th century, a party which made no attempt to set up separate places of worship or a separate ministry, but which introduced its antisacerdotal principles into many parish churches, and made many of the clergy as strong opponents of the existing ecclesiastical system as was Wycliffe himself. During the trying times of the Reformation the party thus formed was largely augmented by those whose opposition to Romish abuses had, by a similar excess, developed into opposition to the whole of the established ecclesiastical system—men who thought that "pure" doctrine and "pure" worship could only be attained by an utter departure from all that had been believed and practiced during the times when the Church of England had contracted impurities of doctrine and worship through popish influences.

While Luther's movement was at its height, the party which thus became the progenitors of the Puritans was formed into a society under the name of "The Christian Brethren," which seems, from the faint view we get of it, to have been very similar to that organized by John Wesley two centuries later. The headquarters of the Brethren were in London, but they had gained a footing at both the universities, apparently among the undergraduates and younger graduates. As early as the year 1523, a body of Cambridge residents "met often at a house called 'The White Horse' to confer together with others, in mockery called Germans, because they conversed much in the books of the divines of Germany brought thence. This house was chosen because those of King's-College, Queen's College, and St. John's might come in at the back side and so be the more private and undiscovered" (Strype, *Eccles. Mem.* i, 568, ed. 1822). Among those mentioned as so meeting are the names of Barnes, Arthur, Bilney, Latimer, and Coverdale, familiarly known as precursors of the Puritan movement in Edward VI's and queen Elizabeth's reign. A few years later, in 1527, similar gatherings were detected at Oxford, where the names of Frith, Taverner, Udal, Farrar, and Cox, Edward VI's tutor, are found among those who met together for the same purpose (*ibid.* i, 569). Among the Oxford party the men of Wolsey's college held a conspicuous position, and his leniency towards all who were brought before him on charges of heresy was very striking.

The principles which were developed among the more extreme section of these early Puritans may be seen by an extract from a work written by William Tyndale (himself a friar and a priest), who was their representative man. Writing of the ministerial office, he says: "Subdeacon, deacon, priest, bishop, cardinal, patriarch, and pope be names of offices and service, or should be, and not sacraments. There is no promise coupled therewith. If they minister their offices truly, it is a sign that Christ's Spirit is in them; if not, that the devil is in them. . . . O dreamers and natural beasts, without the seal of the Spirit of God, but sealed with the mark of the beast, and with cankered consciences, . . . By a priest understand nothing but an elder to teach the younger, and to bring them unto the full knowledge and understanding of Christ, and to minister the sacraments which Christ ordained, which is also nothing but to preach Christ's promises. . . . According, therefore, as every man believeth God's promises, longeth for them, and is diligent to pray unto God to fulfil them, so is his prayer heard; and as good is the prayer of a cobbler as of a cardinal, and of a butcher as of a bishop; and the blessing of a baker that knoweth the truth is as good as the blessing of our most holy father the pope. . . . Neither is there any other manner of ceremony at all required in making our spiritual officers than to choose an able person, and then to rehearse him his duty, and give him his charge, and so put him in his room" (*Obed. of Christ. Man* [Park. Soc. ed.], p. 254–259).

These floating elements of Puritanism had, however, very little compactness and unity except in the one particular of opposition to the principles and practices which then prevailed in the Church of England. But in the latter years of Henry VIII's reign, Calvin was consolidating a system of doctrine, worship, and ecclesiastical discipline which was exactly calculated to unite in a wieldy form the individual particles which had previously been comparatively powerless for want of cohesion. Calvin gained some personal influence in England by means of pertinacious letters addressed to the king, the protector Somerset, and archbishop Cranmer; but the principles of his system were chiefly propagated through the introduction of some of his foreign disciples into positions of influence in the Church of England. Thus an Italian named Pietro Vermigli, who had been an Augustinian friar, was made regius professor of divinity at Oxford, and is known to history as Peter Martyr (q. v.). A similar appointment was made at Cambridge, where the regius professor of divinity was a German named Martin Bucer (q. v.), who had been a Dominican friar. Paul Bücher, or Fagius, a companion of Bucer, was destined for the professorship of Hebrew at Cambridge, but died in 1549. Bernard Ochinus (q. v.), ex-vicar-general of the Capuchin friars and confessor to pope Paul III, came from Geneva with Peter Martyr, and was made canon of Canterbury, being afterwards banished from place to place on the Continent for his Socinianism and his advocacy of polygamy. John à Lasco, the Pole, was an inmate of Lambeth Palace, where he and other foreigners formed a kind of Calvinistic privy council to Cranmer; and John Knox (A.D. 1505–72), the Scotch preacher, was at one time carrying out his duties as chaplain to the young king, and at another going on a roving commission to preach down the Church in Northumberland, Durham, and the other northern counties (Jackson, *Works*, iii, 273).

It was not to be expected from his character that Henry VIII, though he rescued the kingdom from the papal yoke, would proceed very far in reforming the religion of the country. His successor, however, Edward VI, a young prince of earnest piety, was likely, had his valuable life been spared, to have carried out a real reform, which would have rendered the Church of England more simple in her ritual and more strict in her discipline than she has ever had it in her power to be. But Mary succeeded to the throne, and the ancient superstitions were restored. Several congrega-

tions of German Protestants, fleeing from Continental persecution, had found an asylum in England. One of the principal of these was settled in London under the pastoral care of John à Lasco, a man of great repute, the friend and patron of Erasmus; while another was placed by the duke of Somerset, the protector during the king's minority, at Glastonbury, upon the lands of the famous monastery then recently dissolved. The influence of the foreigners in matters of religion, however imperceptible, must have already been such as to excite suspicion, for they were commanded to leave the kingdom without delay. Nor did they retire alone. A furious burst of persecution drove with them a thousand Englishmen, who felt that to remain at home was to incur a needless hazard. The Low Countries, the free cities of the Rhine, and Switzerland were now filled with these wanderers. Frankfort, Basle, Zurich, and Geneva particularly attracted them; for there the doctrines of the Reformation had taken the strongest hold, and there its most eminent professors dwelt. Mingled with these were the leaders of the Continental Reformation. The English refugees had constant intercourse with Calvin, with Gualter, with Peter Martyr, and John à Lasco, and, above all, with Henry Bullinger.

On the death of Mary, the English exiles returned home, "bringing nothing back with them," says Fuller, "but much learning and some experience." It is likely that they were influenced by the manners of the German churches. On their return to England, the contrast between the splendor of the English ceremonial and the simplicity of that abroad was the more striking. Their opponents never ceased to attribute much of the discontent that followed to the Genevan exile. "They were for the most part Zwinglian-gospellers at their going hence," says Heylin, "and became the great promoters of the Puritan faction at their coming home." The Puritans themselves were never unwilling to own their obligations to the German Reformers, still, however, founding their scruples rather upon what they themselves conceived to be the absence of scriptural simplicity than upon the practice of other Christians. The question of the habits, or, as it has since been termed, the *vestiarian controversy* (q. v.), most unsettled them, and it then began to wear an anxious, if not a threatening aspect.

It was urged by the dissatisfied party that the imposition of the vestments was an infringement of their Christian liberty. They were called under the Gospel to worship God in spirit and in truth; and no outward forms or splendors could contribute in any measure to assist the devout mind in a service so spiritual and exalted. On the contrary, the tendency of these official garments was to distract the worshipper, and to debase his devotions by an admixture of those sentiments which are allowed no place in spiritual things. The Church of Christ was only safe in its simplicity, and such was its inward glory that any attempts to decorate could but in fact degrade it. They objected, too, that the vestments against which they were contending had a Jewish origin, and belonged not to the Christian ministry, but to the priesthood of the house of Aaron. To introduce them into the Church of Christ was to pervert their meaning. They were a part of the divinely appointed constitution of the Jewish Church, and had passed away, together with the rest of its figurative and mystic ceremonial.

It was a further objection, and one that appealed not only to divines and controversialists, but to the feelings of the common people, that the vestments were identical with all the superstitions of popery. They were looked upon as the badge of antichrist; and those who wore them were regarded with suspicion, as men either indifferent to the cause of the Reformation, or not yet sufficiently enlightened as to the danger, and indeed the sinfulness, of approaching the most distant confines of a system which ought to be avoided with alarm and horror. "If we are bound to wear popish apparel when commanded, we may be obliged to have shaven crowns, and to use oil, and cream, and spittle, and all the rest of the papistical additions to the ordinances of Christ."

The accession of Elizabeth, after the brief but bloody reign of Mary, revived the hopes of those who had been longing for a day of more complete reformation. But it soon became quite apparent that the queen, though opposed in principle to popery, was resolved, notwithstanding, to retain as much show and pomp in religious matters as might be possible. A meeting of convocation was held in the beginning of the year 1562, at which the proposal for a further reformation was seriously discussed. Six alterations in particular were suggested—the abrogation of all holidays except Sabbaths and those relating to Christ; that in prayer the minister should turn his face to the people; that the signing of the cross in baptism should be omitted; that the sick and aged should not be compelled to kneel at the communion; that the partial use of the surplice should be sufficient; and that the use of organs should be laid aside. By a majority of one, and that the proxy of an absent person, these proposed alterations were rejected.

From this time the court party and the Reformers, as they may be termed, became more decidedly opposed to each other. The difference in their views is well described by Dr. Hetherington in his *History of the Westminster Assembly*. "The main question," says he, "on which they were divided may be thus stated: whether it were lawful and expedient to retain in the external aspect of religion a close resemblance to what had prevailed in the times of popery, or not? The court divines argued that this process would lead the people more easily to the reception of the real doctrinal changes, when they saw outward appearances so little altered, so that this method seemed to be recommended by expediency. The Reformers replied that this tended to perpetuate in the people their inclination to their former superstitions, led them to think there was, after all, little difference between the Reformed and the Papal churches; and, consequently, that if it made them quit popery the more readily at present, it would leave them at least equally ready to return to it should an opportunity offer; and for this reason they thought it best to leave as few traces of popery remaining as possible. It was urged by the court party that every sovereign had authority to correct all abuses of doctrine and worship within his own dominions: this, they asserted, was the true meaning of the Act of Supremacy, and consequently the source of the Reformation in England. The true Reformers admitted the Act of Supremacy in the sense of the queen's explanation given in the Injunctions, but could not admit that the conscience and the religion of the whole nation were subject to the arbitrary disposal of the sovereign. The court party recognised the Church of Rome as a true Church, though corrupt in some points of doctrine and government; and this view it was thought necessary to maintain, for without this the English bishops could not trace their succession from the apostles. But the decided Reformers affirmed the pope to be antichrist, and the Church of Rome to be no true Church; nor would they risk the validity of their ordinations on the idea of a succession through such a channel. Neither party denied that the Bible was a perfect rule of faith; but the court party did not admit it to be a standard of Church government and discipline, asserting that it had been left to the judgment of the civil magistrate in Christian countries to accommodate the government of the Church to the policy of the State. The Reformers maintained the Scriptures to be the standard of Church government and discipline as well as of doctrine; to the extent, at the very least, that nothing should be imposed as necessary which was not expressly contained in, or derived from, them by necessary consequence, adding that if any discretionary power in minor matters were necessary, it

must be vested, not in the civil magistrate, but in the spiritual office-bearers of the Church itself. The court Reformers held that the practice of the primitive Church for the four or five earliest centuries was a proper standard of Church government and discipline, even better suited to the dignity of a national establishment than the times of the apostles; and that, therefore, nothing more was needed than merely to remove the more modern innovations of popery. The true Reformers wished to keep close to the Scripture model, and to admit neither office-bearers, ceremonies, nor ordinances, but such as were therein appointed or sanctioned. The court party affirmed that things in their own nature indifferent, such as rites, ceremonies, and vestments, might be appointed and made necessary by the command of the civil magistrates; and that then it was the bounden duty of all subjects to obey. But the Reformers maintained that what Christ had left indifferent no human laws ought to make necessary; and, besides, that such rites and ceremonies as had been abused to idolatry, and tended to lead men back to popery and superstition, were no longer indifferent, but were to be rejected as unlawful. Finally, the court party held that there must be a standard of uniformity, which standard was the queen's supremacy and the laws of the land. The Reformers regarded the Bible as the only standard, but thought compliance was due to the decrees of provincial and national synods, which might be approved and enforced by civil authority."

From this contrast between the opinions of the two parties, it is plain that, though the use of the sacerdotal vestments formed the rallying-point of the whole controversy, its foundation lay deeper than any mere outward forms. The queen gave strict orders to the archbishop of Canterbury that exact order and uniformity should be maintained in all external rites and ceremonies. Nay, so determined was she that her royal will should be obeyed that she issued a proclamation requiring immediate uniformity in the vestments on pain of prohibition from preaching and deprivation from office. Matters were now brought to a crisis by this decided step on the part of the queen. Multitudes of godly ministers were ejected from their churches and forbidden to preach anywhere else. Hitherto they had sought reformation within the Church, but now, their hopes from that quarter being wholly blasted, they came to the resolution in 1566 to form themselves into a body distinct from the Church of England, which they regarded as only half reformed.

Elizabeth was enraged to see her royal mandate so signally set at naught. The suspended ministers took strong ground, and, having separated from the Church as by law established, they published a treatise in their own vindication, boldly declaring that the imposition of mere human appointments, such as the wearing of particular vestments by the clergy, was a decided infringement on Christian liberty, which it was not only lawful but a duty to resist. In the face of persecution, and under threats of the royal displeasure, the Puritans, who, since the Act of Uniformity had been passed, in 1562, were sometimes called *Nonconformists*, continued to hold their private meetings. Their first attempt to engage in public worship was rudely interrupted by the officers of justice, and under color of law several were sent to prison and were afterwards tried. The party, however, continued to increase, and so infected were the younger students at Cambridge with the Puritan doctrines that the famous Thomas Cartwright, with three hundred more, threw off their surplices in one day within the walls of one college.

The religious condition of England at this time was truly deplorable. "The Churchmen," says Strype, in his *Life* of Parker, "heaped up many benefices upon themselves, and resided upon none, neglecting their cures; many of them alienated their lands, made unreasonable leases and wastes of their woods, granted reversions and advowsons to their wives and children, or to others for their use. Churches ran greatly into dilapidations and decays, and were kept nasty and filthy, and indecent for God's worship. Among the laity there was little devotion. The Lord's day was greatly profaned and little observed. The common prayers were not frequented. Some lived without any service of God at all. Many were mere heathens and atheists. The queen's own court was a harbor for epicures and atheists, and a kind of lawless place, because it stood in no parish. Which things made good men fear some sad judgments impending over the nation."

To provide a remedy for the ignorance and inefficiency of the clergy, associations were established in different dioceses for the purpose of conducting "prophesyings," as they were called, or private expositions of difficult passages of Scripture. These meetings, however, excited the jealousy of the queen, who issued an order for their suppression. The Parliament seemed to be somewhat disposed to mitigate the sufferings of the Puritans, and in 1572 two bills were passed having that object in view. Encouraged by this movement in their favor, they prepared a full statement of their grievances under the title of an "Admonition to the Parliament;" and in this document, which is understood to have been the production of Cartwright, the Parliament was urged to reform the churches. Instead of obtaining redress, several of the leading Puritans were imprisoned and treated with great severity. The decided opposition which the queen had manifested to all reform in the Church finally led the Puritans to surrender all hope of any legislative act in favor of their views; and being most of them Presbyterians in principle, those of them resident in London and its neighborhood formed themselves into a presbytery, although the step thus taken called forth from the queen another proclamation enforcing uniformity.

In 1572, a Presbyterian Church was formed and a meeting-house erected at Wandsworth, in Surrey. Field, the lecturer of Wandsworth, was its first minister; and several names of consideration with the Puritans, including those of Travers and Wilcox, were among its founders. Presbyteries were formed in other parts of the kingdom, and numerous secret meetings were held in private houses, which gave more alarm to the government, or at least a stronger pretext for severity. Even moderate men began to express anxiety. To meet the danger, the High Court of Commission was now first put in motion. It empowered the queen and her successors, by their letters patent under the great seal, to authorize, whenever they thought fit, and for as long a period as they pleased, a commission of persons, lay or clerical, to exercise all manner of jurisdiction, under the queen and her successors, in spiritual things; and "to order, visit, reform, and redress all heresies, errors, schisms, abuses, contempts, offences, and enormities whatsoever." One of its first acts was the violent suppression of the Presbyterian meeting at Wandsworth; its subsequent labors were of the same character. Notwithstanding these severities, Puritanism continued to increase; for the persecution which does not exterminate a religious party never fails to strengthen it. And while the cause was gaining strength in London, it was taking firm root in the great seats of learning.

The Puritans were now effectually separated from the Church of England, and were organized under a different form of Church polity. But the independent attitude which they had thus assumed rendered them only the more obnoxious to the queen and the High-Church party. Stronger measures were accordingly adopted to discourage them and destroy their influence; many of them were silenced, imprisoned, banished, and otherwise oppressed. In 1580, an act of Parliament was passed prohibiting the publication of such books or pamphlets as assailed the opinions of the prelates and defended those of the Puritans. This was followed in the same session by another act authorizing the inflic-

tion of heavy fines and imprisonment upon those who absented themselves from "church, chapel, or other place where common prayer is said according to the Act of Uniformity."

The effect of these harsh and rigorous enactments was to render the Puritans bolder and more determined. No longer limiting their complaints against the Established Church to merely outward rites and ceremonies, some of them even went so far as to renounce her communion, and to declare her as scarcely entitled to the name of a Christian Church. Political discussion broke in upon religious inquiry. The hierarchy was assailed, the Prayer-book vilified, and ministers who had been silenced for their irregularities were listened to, perhaps with the greater satisfaction because of their nonconformity, in the prophesyings. The general religious condition of the country meanwhile suffered greatly. In many counties scarcely one preacher could be found. In some dioceses there were two or three; there was a general thirst for religious instruction, but the people, as the archbishop told the queen, were allowed to perish for lack of knowledge. Grindal resolved to take the "prophesyings" under his own care, and at the same time to remove the causes of objection. He therefore forbade the introduction of politics, the speaking of laymen, or ministers suppressed, and the allusions, hitherto not unfrequent, to matters of government; and instead of a chairman elected by the societies, he placed the meetings for the future under the care of the archdeacon, or of some grave divine to be appointed by the bishop. Ten bishops heartily approved of the primate's decision, and encouraged the prophesyings in their dioceses. But the queen regarded them with great dislike, and the court resolved on their suppression. It was in vain the faithful primate remonstrated with the queen. "Alas! madam, is the Scripture more plain in any one thing than that the Gospel of Christ should be plentifully preached? I am forced, with all humility, and yet plainly, to profess that I cannot with safe conscience, and without offence to the majesty of God, give my assent to the suppressing of the said exercises." In vain did the earl of Leicester and the lord-treasurer Burleigh, who presented the remonstrance, add the weight of their intercessions. The queen was enraged, and the primate, who was old and sick, was ordered to consider himself a prisoner in his own house, and would probably have been deprived if death had not stepped in to his release. He died July 6, 1583. Preaching fell into contempt, and the Church of England has never since entirely recovered from the blow. There has always since this event been a party in the Church which has regarded this divine ordinance with real or well-feigned contempt.

One of the leaders of the extreme section of the Puritan party was Robert Brown, who is thought to have been the founder of the Independent or Congregational Church in England. See BROWNISTS. The greater number of the Puritans, however, were either Presbyterians, or still retained their connection with the Church of England. But in all circumstances they were the objects of the most bitter and unrelenting hostility on the part of Elizabeth. The tide of persecution ran high and strong. In vain did the House of Commons attempt to throw the shield of their protection over the poor oppressed Puritans; the queen was inexorable, and parliament was compelled to yield.

In this state of matters all hope of a legislative remedy was abandoned, and the Puritan ministers set themselves to devise plans for their own usefulness and efficiency as Christian teachers. Although many of the Puritans thus formed separate sects, a very large proportion of them still continued in the Church; and very subtle measures were taken by some of their leaders a few years later, under Cartwright's advice and direction, for the inoculation of the country with Presbyterian principles in such a manner as to avoid the forfeiture of their benefices. On May 8, 1582, sixty clergymen from the eastern counties met at Cockfield, in Suffolk, of which parish one of them—Knewstub—was vicar (oddly enough, Cockfield is within a short distance of Hadleigh, where the earliest plans of the Tractarians were laid), to consult about the ordinary Puritan platform—"apparel, matter, form, days, fastings, injunctions," etc. They adjourned to Cambridge, and from thence to London, "where they hoped to be concealed by the general resort of the people to Parliament." At length, under the guidance of Cartwright, the late Margaret professor, and of Travers, afterwards Hooker's opponent, and who was at the time domestic chaplain and tutor in the family of lord Burleigh, this convocation of Puritan clergy framed the following systematic plan for grafting their new system on that of the Church. The document is of sufficient importance to be given at full length:

"*Concerning Ministers.*—Let no man, though he be a university man, offer himself to the ministry; nor let any man take upon him an uncertain and vague ministry, though it be offered unto him.

"But such as be called to the ministry by some certain Church, let them impart it unto that *Classis* or *Conference* whereof themselves are, or else unto some greater Church assembly; and if such shall be found fit by them, then let them be commended by their letters unto the bishop, that they may be ordained ministers by him.

"Those ceremonies in the Book of Common Prayer which, being taken from popery, are in controversy ought to be omitted and given over, if it may be done without danger of being put from the ministry. But if there be any imminent danger to be deprived, then this matter must be communicated to the Classis in which that Church is, that by the judgment thereof it may be determined what ought to be done.

"If subscription to the Articles of Religion and to the Book of Common Prayer shall be again urged, it is thought that the Book of Articles may be subscribed unto, according to the statutes 13 Eliz., that is, unto such of them only as contain the sum of Christian faith and doctrine of the sacraments. But, for many weighty causes, neither the rest of the Articles in that book nor the Book of Common Prayer may be allowed; no, though a man should be deprived of his ministry for it.

"*Concerning Churchwardens.*—It seemeth that churchwardens and collectors for the poor might be thus turned into elders and deacons.

"When they are to be chosen, let the Church have warning fifteen days before of the time of elections, and of the ordinances of the realm; but especially of Christ's ordinance touching appointing of watchmen and overseers in his Church, who are to foresee that none offence or scandal do arise in the Church; and if any such happen, that by them it be duly abolished.

"*Of Collectors for the Poor, or Deacons.*—And touching deacons of both sorts—viz., men and women—the Church shall be monished what is required by the apostle; and that they are not to choose men of custom and of course, or of riches, but for their faith, zeal, and integrity; and that the Church is to pray, in the meantime, to be so directed that they make choice of them that be meet.

"Let the names of such as are chosen be published the next Lord's day, and after that their duties to the Church, and the Church's towards them, shall be declared; then let them be received unto the ministry to which they are chosen with the general prayers of the whole Church.

"*Of Classes.*—The brethren are to be requested to ordain a distribution of all churches, according to these rules in that behalf that are set down in the Synodical Discipline, touching classical, provincial, comitial, or of commencements and assemblies for the whole kingdom.

"The Classes are to be required to keep acts of memorable matters, which they shall see delivered to the comitial assembly, that from thence they may be brought by the provincial assembly.

"They are to deal earnestly with patrons to present fit men whensoever any Church is fallen void in that Classis.

"The comitial assemblies are to be admonished to make collections for the relief of the poor and of scholars, but especially for the relief of such ministers here as are put out for not subscribing to the articles tendered by the bishops; also for relief of Scottish ministers and others, and for other profitable and necessary uses.

"All the provincial synods must continually aforehand foresee in due time to appoint the keeping of their next provincial synods, and for the sending of chosen persons with certain instructions unto the national synod, to be holden whensoever the Parliament for the kingdom shall be called, and at some certain time every year" (*Dangerous Positions and Proceedings* [1593], p. 46; Neal, *Hist. of the Puritans*, i, 345).

A Book of Discipline was prepared for their direction in their pastoral work; and this document was

subscribed by upwards of five hundred of the most devoted ministers in England.

The High-Church party now took a bold step in advance. Dr. Bancroft, in a sermon which he preached at Paul's Cross, Jan. 12, 1588, maintained the divine right of bishops, thus exposing the Puritans to the charge of heresy. The promulgation of a doctrine so novel and startling excited the utmost commotion throughout all England. Many of the moderate supporters of episcopacy were not prepared to coincide in the extreme view which Dr. Bancroft had taken, and the friends of royal supremacy were alarmed lest the propagation of such opinions might lead to an infringement of the queen's prerogative as head of the Church of England. The Puritans, on the other hand, were for a considerable time disposed to treat the whole matter with ridicule, and, accordingly, the famous Martin Mar-Prelate tracts were issued at this time, characterized by the most pungent wit and caustic satire, levelled against the bishops and their supporters. These anonymous pamphlets were circulated in great numbers throughout the country, and read with the utmost avidity by all classes of the people. The authors of these clever though coarse productions were never discovered, and their damaging effect upon the High-Church party was only arrested by the seizure of the printing-press from which they had been thrown off.

But the evil which Bancroft wrought was not limited to the extravagant assertion of the divine right of episcopacy; he persecuted the Puritans with such relentless fury that in one year three hundred ministers were silenced, excommunicated, imprisoned, or compelled to leave the country. An act was passed for the suppression of conventicles on pain of perpetual banishment. In short, throughout the whole reign of Elizabeth, the Puritans were assailed with the most cruel persecution in almost every conceivable form. At length, as the life of the despotic queen approached its close, the hopes of the oppressed and down-trodden party began to revive. The throne, when vacant, was likely to be filled by James VI of Scotland, whose education in a Presbyterian country, as well as his avowed preference for a Presbyterian Church, was likely to predispose him to favor their views.

March 24, 1603, queen Elizabeth died, and the Scottish king was proclaimed sovereign of England. The Puritans lost no time in taking steps to call the attention of the new king to the heavy grievances under which they had long labored. As James was travelling southwards to take possession of the English throne, a document, commonly known by the name of the Millenary Petition, was put into his hands, in the preamble of which the petitioners declared—and hence the name—"That they, to the number of more than a *thousand* ministers, groaned under the burden of human rites and ceremonies, and cast themselves at his majesty's feet for relief." This petition was signed by seven hundred and fifty ministers, which was probably about one half of the Puritan ministers in England. As was to have been expected, the prelatic party also assailed the royal ear with plausible statements of their High-Church views. James professed to have a peculiar skill in theological debate, and by way of appearing to be impartial, he arranged a public discussion of the contested points to take place in his presence on an appointed day. This is well known as the *Hampton Court Conference*, which ended in convincing the Puritans that they were utterly mistaken in looking for protection, not to speak of favor, from the new monarch, who had evidently become a sudden convert to Episcopacy, and that, too, of the strongest and most High-Church character.

James had no sooner ascended the throne of England than he began to manifest a disposition to be still more tyrannical and despotic than even Elizabeth herself had been. The High Commission, which had long been an engine of the most cruel oppression against the Puritans, was continued; subscription to canons and articles was enforced with the utmost rigor, and those ministers who refused to subscribe were silenced or deposed. Thus insulted and oppressed, both by the government and the dominant party in the Church, the Puritans felt it to be important that their true principles should be thoroughly understood by the people. With this view a treatise was published, entitled *English Puritanism*, which afforded a full and impartial statement of their peculiar opinions.

The extent to which James was disposed to push the royal prerogative was well fitted to awaken alarm both in the Parliament and the people. Both civil and religious liberty were evidently in danger, and Parliament prepared to interfere and to demand redress of grievances which had now become intolerable. "But the king," says Dr. Hetherington, "met all their remonstrances and petitions for redress with the most lofty assertions of his royal prerogative, in the exercise of which he held himself to be accountable to God alone, affirming it to be sedition in a subject to dispute what a king might do in the height of his power. The Parliament repeated the assertion of their own rights, accused the High Commission of illegal and tyrannical conduct, and advocated a more mild and merciful course of procedure towards the Puritans. Offended with the awakening spirit of freedom thus displayed, the king, by the advice of Bancroft, dissolved the Parliament, resolved to govern, if possible, without parliaments in future. This arbitrary conduct on the part of James aroused, in the mind of England, a deep and vigilant jealousy with regard to their sovereign's intentions, which rested not till, in the reign of his son, it broke forth in its strength and overthrew the monarchy."

Deprived of all hope of redress, numbers of the Puritans fled to the Continent, and some of them, having there become imbued with the principles of Independency, returned to introduce that system of Church polity into England. Thus arose a body of Christians which ere long assumed a prominent place both in the religious and political history of the kingdom. The king, though a professed religionist, was still more a politician; and so completely was the former character merged in the latter that he had come to rank all as Puritans who dared to limit the royal prerogative or to uphold the rights and liberties of the people as established by law and the constitution of the country. To the maintenance of despotism in the State he added also the fostering of a novel theology in the Church, avowing his hostility to the Calvinistic views in which he had been reared in Scotland, and bestowing his favors upon those of the English clergy who were beginning to teach Arminian sentiments. The condition of the country, both in a political and religious aspect, was every day becoming more agitated, and matters were fast ripening for a great national convulsion, when the death of James, in 1625, and the accession of his son Charles I, arrested the revolutionary tendencies for a time. Additional cruelties, however, were inflicted upon the Puritans under the new reign; fresh ceremonies of a thoroughly Romish character were introduced by Laud with the royal sanction; and, in consequence, numbers who refused to conform were obliged to seek refuge in other countries.

A few years before the new reign had commenced, a body of Puritans, unable longer to endure the persecution to which they were exposed, had embarked as exiles, seeking a new home on the western shores of the Atlantic, and had formed a settlement in New England, destined to be the foundation of a new empire. This colony of the Pilgrim fathers (q. v.) received vast accessions in consequence of the arbitrary measures of Laud. An association for promoting emigration to New England was formed on a large scale. Men of rank and influence and ejected Puritan ministers of high standing encouraged the scheme, and a grant of land from

the government was applied for. The king was not opposed to the design, and a patent was obtained for the government and company of Massachusetts Bay. Emigrants to the number of 200 set sail, and, landing at Salem in 1629, established a new colony there. Next year 1500 left the shores of England, including many both of wealth and education. The desire for emigration on the part of the oppressed Puritans continued to gather strength, and year after year large numbers of them proceeded to New England. Neal alleges that had not the civil power interfered to check the rage for emigration, in a few years one-fourth part of the property of the kingdom would have been taken to America. But the government became alarmed, and a proclamation was issued "to restrain the disorderly transporting of his majesty's subjects, because of the many idle and refractory humors, whose only or principal end is to live beyond the reach of authority." Next day an order appeared to "stay eight ships now in the river of Thames prepared to go for New England," and the passengers, among whom was Oliver Cromwell, were obliged to disembark. Notwithstanding the check thus given to emigration, it is calculated that during twelve years the emigrants amounted to no less than 21,000 persons.

The tyrannical conduct of Charles and his minions, both in the government and the Church, soon precipitated the country into all the horrors of a civil war, which ended in the death of the king by the axe of the executioner, and in the establishment of the Commonwealth under the protectorate of Cromwell. By the act of Sept. 10, 1642, it was declared that prelacy should be abolished in England from and after Nov. 5, 1643, and it was resolved to summon together an assembly of divines in order to complete the necessary reformation. In the meantime, various enactments were passed for the suppression of some of the most crying evils, and for affording some support to those Puritan ministers who had been ejected in former times for nonconformity, or had recently suffered from the ravages of the king's army. It was a religious age; and though the people had trampled the crown beneath their feet, they showed no disposition to depreciate the office of the clergy. During the heat of the war the Puritans, who almost to a man sided with the Parliament, preached to large congregations; and, in all the great towns at least, they had the implicit ear of the people. Episcopacy being at an end, they acted, for a while, according to the dictates of conscience or mere taste; the surplice was generally laid aside; and extempore prayer was used in the parish churches even before the ordinance of Parliament appeared, in 1645, forbidding the Book of Common Prayer. The old Puritanism, however, was now passing away. A generation had arisen in whose eyes the principles of Cartwright were crude and imperfect. They no longer contended against the forms and vestments, but against the constitution of the Church of England. Prelacy, by which we understand the episcopacy titled and associated with civil authority, was detested; all forms of prayer were decried; and episcopacy, even in its mildest forms, was thought unscriptural. Thus Puritanism, properly so called, became extinct because the grounds of the old contention no longer existed. The later Puritans appeared and immediately fell into two great parties, Presbyterians (q. v.) and Independents (q. v.). For nine months after the passing of the act for the abolition of prelacy there was no fixed and legalized form of Church government in England at all. Even Charles had consented to the removal of the bishops from the House of Lords; and though he had not sanctioned the abolition of the hierarchy, yet a large party regarded the measure as called for in the circumstances of the country. In this state of matters the Westminster Assembly of Divines was convened, consisting largely of Puritan preachers who had gradually become attached to Presbyterianism. The Independent or Congregational party in the Assembly, however, though few in point of number, yet had sufficient influence to prevent presbytery from being established in England. Throughout the days of the Commonwealth Puritanism existed in the form chiefly of Independency. On Dec. 25, 1655, Cromwell issued a proclamation that thenceforth no minister of the Church of England should dare to preach, administer the sacraments, or teach schools, on pain of imprisonment or exile. After the Restoration of Charles II, in 1662, the name of Puritan was changed into that of *Nonconformist*, which comprehended all who refused to observe the rites and subscribe to the doctrines of the Church of England in obedience to the Act of Uniformity. By this act nearly 2000 ministers of the Church of England were ejected from their charges and thrown into the ranks of the Nonconformists (q. v.).

It may be proper to mention, in conclusion, the doctrinal Puritans. These formed, in fact, the moderate Church party during the reign of Charles I. Their leaders were bishops Davenant, Hall, Williams, and Carleton. The title of doctrinal Puritans was fastened upon them by the Laudian party. They held and taught the doctrines of the Reformation, in opposition to the sacramental system which Laud had recently introduced. They entertained no scruples as to the forms and ceremonies of the Church of England, to which they willingly conformed. But they rejected with indignation the innovations of the Laudian party, who, in return, branded them with the name of Puritans. It was an entirely new application of the word, and one against which they did not fail to protest. It seems to have been first used about 1625 by bishop Montague in a controversy with Carleton, and the latter exclaims, "This is the first time that I ever heard of a Puritan doctrine in points dogmatical, and I have lived longer in the Church than he hath done. I thought that Puritans were only such as were factious against the bishops, in the point of pretended discipline; and so I am sure it hath been understood in our Church." The controversies which have ever since existed within the bosom of the Church of England now for the first time appeared. The construction of the baptismal offices became a subject of contention, and the whole question of baptismal and sacramental grace. The doctrinal Puritans adhered to the ancient forms of worship, and for doing so were severely harassed. The Laudian party maintained "that whatever rites were practiced in the Church of Rome, and not expressly abolished at the Reformation, nor disclaimed by any doctrine, law, or canon, were consistent with the Church of England." Under this general maxim they introduced a multitude of ceremonies—such, for instance, as bowing to the east and placing candles on the altar, now gorgeously decorated once more—which had long been dismissed as badges of popery. Thus in a short time a difference was apparent between the two parties both in doctrinal teaching and in visible forms. To complete the quarrel, the Laudians were of the Arminian school, while the doctrinal Puritans were moderate Calvinists. For twenty years the doctrinal Puritans were subjected to all manner of annoyance; but they remained steadfast in their attachment to the Church, and when the storm burst upon it they were exposed to all its fury. They took no share in Laud's convocation of 1640, and greatly disapproved of its arbitrary measures. But the popular rage made no distinctions, and the Church Puritans suffered just as much as their old opponents of the high prelatic party. The Church itself was overthrown; and in the darkness and confusion that ensued they disappear from sight during the civil war.

The literature of the Puritans, as a religious party, consists chiefly of controversial and practical theology, and in both its ability is confessed by friend and foe. As Whitgift and his disciple Hooker exhausted the argument in favor of episcopacy and a liturgical Church,

so did Cartwright and Travers that in behalf of Presbyterian discipline. The student, after a wide search among the combatants of later times, finds, to his surprise, how insignificant are all their additions to a controversy opened, and, as far as learning and argument can go, finally closed, by the earliest champions on either side. Of the practical divinity of Elizabeth's reign, a large proportion was contributed by the Puritans. The party embraced men of high rank and general education as well as men of theological learning; and the literature of the age bears many tokens of their influence. If we descend to the next age, the names of the greatest men of the reigns of James, Charles I, and the Commonwealth present themselves as in a greater or less degree connected with the Puritans. Selden, Whitelock, Milton, with their pens; Rudyard, Hampden, Vane, in Parliament; Owen, Marshall, Calamy, Baxter, and a host of others, in the pulpit; Cromwell, Essex, and Fairfax, in the field—all ranged themselves under the Puritan cause. Never was a party more distinguished in its advocates; never was a cause lost amid more hopeful prospects, or when to human eyes its triumph was more secure. In 1650 it was at the summit of its pride and power, with the Church of England at its feet. Ten years afterwards its influence had passed away; and, in the persons of the Presbyterians who crossed over to propitiate the young king at Breda, it was submissively pleading for its life. See *Zurich Letters;* Strype, *Life of Cranmer;* Paull, *Life of Whitgift;* Brook, *Memoir of Thomas Cartwright;* Hall, *Hard Measure and Shaking of the Olive Tree;* Whitelock, *Memorials; Speeches in this Great and Happy Parliament*, 1645; *History of the Westminster Assembly;* Clarendon, *History of the Great Rebellion;* Neal, *History of the Puritans;* Heylin, *History of the Reformation*, and *Life of Laud;* Gardiner, *History of the English Revolution* (republished in the excellent series of history manuals by Scribner & Co., New York); Marsden, *Dictionary of Sects and Heresies*; and the exhaustive articles in Gardner, *Dictionary of Faiths*, and Blunt, *Dictionary of Historical Theology*, both of which we have freely used.

Purity, the freedom of anything from foreign admixture; but more particularly it signifies the temper directly opposite to criminal sensualities, or the ascendency of irregular passions. See CHASTITY.

Purity implies—1. A fixed, habitual abhorrence of all forbidden indulgences of the flesh. 2. All past impurities, either of heart or life, will be reflected on with shame and sorrow. 3. The heart will be freed, in a great measure, from impure and irregular desires. 4. It will discover itself by a cautious fear of the least degree of impurity. 5. It implies a careful and habitual guard against everything which tends to pollute the mind. In the relations of the sexes purity was strictly guarded in the early Church. It needed to be so, for heathenism around it was one mass of defilement, as the first chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, the satires of Juvenal, the poems of Catullus, Petronius Arbiter, Johannes Secundus, etc., abundantly show. Women were, therefore, forbidden to wash in the same bath with men. If a clergyman bathed with women, he was to be deposed, and a layman so guilty was to be excommunicated. A man, by one of the laws of Justinian, might divorce his wife if she had been found bathing with men. Certain kinds of dancing and songs were also strictly forbidden, especially at marriage feasts, for they were the remains of old pagan obscenities. Women, also, were not allowed to keep vigils in churches under pretence of devotion, because the practice led to secret wickedness, as the council of Elvira intimates. Lascivious books were condemned, and these at the period must have been common. Stage-plays were no less put under ban. Cyprian says, "Adultery was learned by seeing it acted." To know what this means, the reader has only to be referred to the English comedies of the reign of Charles II. The heathen deities in those primitive times were brought upon the stage—the wanton Venus and the rake Jupiter—and men, as Cyprian says again, "imitate the gods whom they worship." The impurities of the stage were virtually the "pomps of Satan," which Christians renounced at baptism. For similar reasons intemperance was reprobated. "Drunkenness and lust," said Tertullian, "are two devils combining." Changing of their respective dresses on the part of the sexes was also condemned. "If any woman," said the council of Gangra, "on pretence of living a religious life, take the apparel of men, let her be anathema." Similar enactments may be found in more recent times. "The General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, by their act, July 19, 1649, finding that scandal and abuse arose from promiscuous dancing, do therefore discharge the same; the censure is referred to the several presbyteries." By the Church discipline of France, c. xiv, art. 27, "those who make account to dance, or are present at dancing, after having been several times admonished, shall be excommunicated upon their growing obstinate and rebellious, and all Church judicatures are to see this act put to execution." By art. 26, "all persons who wear habits to have open marks of dissoluteness, shame, and too much newness, as painting, naked breasts, and the like, the consistory shall use all possible means to suppress such badges of immodesty by censures. All obscene pictures, which are apt to dispose and incite to unclean thoughts and desires, are declared to be most improper furniture for the houses of Christians, and therefore the users of them may fall under Church censure, if they be not removed." See Taylor, *Holy Living;* Evans, *Sermons on the Christian Temper*, ser. 23; and Watts, *Sermons*, ser. 27; *Meth. Qu. Rev.* April, 1873, art. ii. — Buck, *Theol. Dict.* s. v.; Eadie, *Eccles. Dict.* s. v.

Purkhiser, MICAH GILBERT, a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Washington township, Clermont County, O., Oct. 15, 1813. In his nineteenth year he was converted at a camp-meeting, and united with the Church. In 1834 he was licensed to preach, and in the following year joined the travelling connection in the Ohio Conference, and was appointed to Monroe Circuit, in Michigan Territory. During the year he rode about 2000 miles, preached nearly 200 times, obtained many seals to his ministry, and for his living received the modest sum of $47 37½. His next appointment was to Spring Arbor Circuit. His next charge was as assistant on Georgetown Circuit, O. Next he preached on the West Charge, Cincinnati, and then removed to Batavia Circuit, where he labored two years. His subsequent appointments were: 1841, Fulton, Guyandotte, W. Va.; Frankfort, West Union, Highland, New Lexington, West White Oak, New Richmond, Goshen, Clarksville, Highland, Lynchburgh, New Market, Union, Miamisburgh and Germantown, New Paris, Highland, and Sinking Springs. At the conference of 1869 he took a supernumerary relation, and he died April 29, 1875. See *Minutes of Conferences*, 1875, p. 114.

Purmann, JOHANN G., a German theologian and educator, was born Jan. 1, 1733, at Königsberg. After having completed his studies, in 1760 he was appointed co-rector at Frankfort-on-the-Main, and in 1770 rector of the gymnasium, and there he died, Dec. 11, 1813. He wrote, *Archæologiæ Georgicæ Spec. de Re Rustica Veterum Hebræorum* (Frankf.-on-the-Main, 1786–87): —*Geschichte des Glaubens an einen Gott* (ibid. 1795–96, 2 pts.): — *Fata Doctrinæ de Immortalitate Animorum* (ibid. 1798–1802, 6 pts.): —*De Paschate Christ. ex Antiquitate* (ibid. 1799): —*Narratio de Synodo Ecclesiast. anno* 794, *a Carolo M. Francofurti ad Mœnum habita* (ibid. 1794, 2 pts.). See Winer, *Handbuch der theolog. Literatur*, p. 717 and Index; Fürst, *Bibl. Judaica*, iii, 124. (B. P.)

Purner, JOHN MILTON, a minister of the Methodist

Episcopal Church, was born in Cecil County, Md., March 31, 1833. He was converted at Elkton, Md., in 1854, and was for some time engaged in business at Oxford, Pa. In 1858 he felt called to preach, and was made assistant pastor on Lewistown Circuit. In the following year he joined the Philadelphia Conference, and was made junior preacher on Laurel Circuit, Del., in 1859, and on Church Creek Circuit, Md., in 1860. In 1861 and 1862 he was in charge on Aries Circuit, Md. In 1863 and 1864 he was in charge on Sharptown Circuit, Md., and in 1865 was appointed junior preacher on Princess Anne Circuit, Md., and at the same time attended the Biblical Institute, Concord, N. H. In 1866 he was in charge of Atlantic Circuit, Va., and in 1867 he preached in Accomac Circuit for a short time, whence he was removed by the presiding elder and appointed in charge of Princess Anne Circuit, Md. There he closed his labor and his life in September, 1867. See *Minutes of Conferences*, 1867.

Purple (אַרְגָּמָן, *argamân*, from the Sanscrit *râga, red;* see Gesen. *Thes.* s. v.; Chald. אַרְגְּוָן, *argevân*, from the same root, in 2 Chron. ii, 7; Dan. v, 7, 16, 29; Sept. and Greek Test. *πορφύρα*; Vulg. *purpura*) occurs in Exod. xxv, 4; xxvi, 1, 31, 36; xxvii, 16; xxviii, 5, 6, 8, 15, 33; xxxv, 6, 23, 25, 35; xxxvi, 8, 35, 37; xxxviii, 18, 23; xxxix, 1, 2, 3, 5, 8, 24, 29; Numb. iv, 13; Judg. viii, 26; 2 Chron. ii, 14; iii, 14; Esth. i, 6; viii, 15; Prov. xxxi, 22; Cant. iii, 10; vii, 5; Jer. x, 9; Ezek. xxvii, 7, 16, Ecclus. xlv, 10; Bar. vi, 12, 72; 1 Macc. iv, 23; viii, 14; x, 20, 62; 2 Macc. iv, 38; Mark xv, 17, 20; Luke xvi, 19, John xix, 2, 5; Acts xvi, 14; Rev. xvii, 4; xviii, 12, 16. In many of these passages the word translated "purple" means "purple cloth," or some other material dyed purple, as wool, thread, etc.; but no reference occurs to the means by which the dye was obtained, except in 1 Macc. iv, 23, where we have *πορφύρα θαλασσία*, "purple of the sea" (comp. Diod. Sic. iii, 68; Josephus, *War*, v, 5, 4). There is, however, no reason to doubt that it was obtained, like the far-famed Tyrian purple, from the juice of certain species of shell-fish. Different accounts are given by the ancients respecting the date and origin of this invention. Some place it in the reign of Phœnix, second king of Tyre, B.C. 500; others at the time that Minos I reigned in Crete, B.C. 1439, and consequently before the Exodus (Suidas, s. v. Ἡρακλῆς, ii, 73). But the person to whom the majority ascribe it is the Tyrian Hercules, whose dog, it is said, instigated by hunger, broke a certain kind of shell-fish on the coast of Tyre, and his mouth becoming stained of a beautiful color, his master was induced to try its properties on wool, and gave his first specimens to the king of Tyre, who admired the color so much that he restricted the use of it by law to the royal garments (Pollux, *Onom.* i, 4; Achilles Tatius, *De Clitoph.;* Palæphat. in *Chron. Paschal.* p. 43). It is remarkable that though the Israelites, as early as the first construction of the tabernacle in the wilderness, appear to have had purple stuff in profusion (Exod. xxv, 1–4), which they had most likely brought with them out of Egypt, yet no instance occurs in the pictorial language of the Egyptians, nor in Wilkinson's *Ancient Manners and Customs*, of the actual process of dyeing either linen or woollen, although dyes similar to the Tyrian were found among them. These facts agree, at least, with the accounts which ascribe the invention to the earliest of these two periods, and the pre-eminent trade in it to the Tyrians. The Greeks attributed its first introduction among themselves to the Phœnicians (Eurip. *Phœn.* 1497). Their word *φοίνιξ*, *Phœnix*, means both *Phœnician* and *purple*. The word *πορφύρα* is, according to Martinius, of Tyrian origin. Though purple dyes were by no means confined to the Phœnicians (comp. Ezek. xxvii, 7, "purple from the isles of Elisha," supposed to mean Elis, "and from Syria," ver. 16), yet violet purples and scarlet were nowhere dyed so well as at Tyre, whose shores abounded with the best kind of purples (Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* ix, 60, p. 524, ed. Harduin), and which was supplied with the best wool by the neighboring nomads. The dye called purple by the ancients, and its various shades, were obtained from many kinds of shell-fish, all of which are, however, ranged by Pliny under two classes: one called "buccinum," because shaped like a horn, found, he says, in cliffs and rocks, and yielding a sullen blue dye, which he compares to the color of the angry raging sea in a tempest; the other called "purpura," or "pelagia," the proper purple shell, taken by fishing in the sea, and yielding the deep-red color which he compares to the rich, fresh, and bright color of deep-red purple roses and to coagulated blood, and which was chiefly valued (*ibid.* c. 61, 62). The latter is the *Murex trunculus* of Linnæus and Lamarck (see *Syst. Nat.* p. 1215, and *Animaux sans Vertèbres* [Paris, 1822], vii, 170). Both sorts were supposed to be as many years old as they had spirals round. Michaelis thinks that Solomon alludes to their shape when he says (Cant. vii, 5), "The hair of thine head is like purple," meaning that the tresses (Sept. *πλόκιον κεφαλῆς*, Vulg. *comæ capitis*) were tied up in a spiral or pyramidal form on the top. Others say that the word "purple" is here used like the Latin *purpureus*, for beautiful, etc., and instance the "purpurei olores," "beautiful swans" of Horace (*Carm.* iv, 1, 10), and the "purpureus capillus" of Virgil (*Georg.* 1, 405); but these phrases are not parallel. The juice of the whole shell-fish was not used, but only a little thin liquor called the flower, contained in a white vein or vessel in the neck. The larger purples were broken at the top to get at this vein without injuring it, but the smaller were pressed in mills (Aristot. *Hist. An.* v, 13, 75; Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* ix, 60). The *Murex trunculus* has been demonstrated to be the species used by the ancient Tyrians by Wilde, who found a concrete mass of the shells in some of the ancient dye-pots sunk in the rocks of Tyre (*Narrative* [Dublin, 1840], ii, 482). It is of common occurrence now on the same coasts (Kitto, *Physical History of Palestine*, p. 418), and throughout the whole of the Mediterranean, and even of the Atlantic. In the Mediterranean, the countries most celebrated for purples were the shores of Peloponnesus and Sicily, and in the Atlantic the coasts of Britain, Ireland, and France. Horace alludes to the African (*Carm.* ii, 16, 35). There is, indeed, an essential difference in the color obtained from the purples of different coasts. Thus the shells from the Atlantic are said to give the darkest juice; those of the Italian and Sicilian coasts, a violet or purple; and those of the Phœnician, a crimson. It appears from the experiments of Réaumur and Duhamel that the tinging juice is perfectly white while in the vein; but upon being laid on linen, it soon appears first of a light-green color, and, if exposed to the air and sun, soon after changes into a deep green, in a few minutes into a sea-green, and in a few more into a blue; thence it speedily becomes of a purple red, and in an hour more of a deep purple red, which, upon being washed in scalding water and soap, ripens into a most bright and beautiful crimson, which is permanent. The ancients applied the word translated "purple" not to one color only, but to the whole class of dyes manufactured from the juices of shell-fish, as distinguished from the vegetable dyes (*colores herbacei*), and comprehending not only what is commonly called purple, but also light and dark purple, and almost every shade between. Various methods were adopted to produce these different colors. Thus, a sullen blue was obtained from the juice of the buccinum alone; a plain red, yet also deep and brown, from the pelagia; a dark red by dipping the wool, etc., first in the juice of the purpura, and then in that of the buccinum; a violet (which was the amethyst color so much valued by the Romans) by reversing the process; and another, the most valued and ad-

mired of all—the tyriamethystus—by again dipping the amethyst in the juice of the pelagia. This Pliny calls *dibapha Tyria;* so named, he says, because "bis tincta" (*Hist. Nat.* ix, 39). No reference to this process occurs in the Scriptures, but it is often alluded to in Roman authors. Thus, Horace (*Epod.* xii, 21): "Muricibus Tyriis iteratæ vellera lanæ" (the wools with Tyrian purple double dyed). Other varieties of color may have been produced by the use of various species of mollusks, and of those from different coasts. The Phœnicians also understood the art of throwing a peculiar lustre into this color by making other tints play over it, and producing what we call a shot color, which seems to have been wonderfully attractive (Pliny, ix, 41).

Purple was employed in religious worship both among Jews and Gentiles. It was one of the colors of the curtains of the tabernacle (Exod. xxvi, 1); of the veil (ver. 31); of the curtain over the grand entrance (ver. 36); of the ephod of the high-priest (xxviii, 5, 6), and of its girdle (ver. 8); of the breastplate (ver. 15); of the hem of the robe of the ephod (ver. 33); (comp. Ecclus. xlv, 10); of cloths for divine service (Exod. xxxix, 1; comp. Numb. iv, 13), resumed when the Temple was built (2 Chron. ii, 7, 14; iii, 14). The material upon which the Jews used purple and other brilliant colors, at least in their sacred paraphernalia, seems to have been exclusively *wool*, which, it is well known, takes colors better than linen. See TABERNACLE. Pliny records a similar use of it among the Romans: "Diis advocatur placandis" (*Hist. Nat.* ix, 60; Cicero, *Epist. ad Atticum*, ii, 9). The Babylonians arrayed their idols in it (Jer. x, 9; Bar. xii, 72). It was at an early period worn by kings (Judg. viii, 26). Homer speaks as if it were almost peculiar to them (*Il.* iv, 144; 1 Macc. viii, 14). Pliny says it was worn by Romulus and the succeeding kings of Rome, and by the consuls and first magistrates under the republic. Suetonius relates that Julius Cæsar prohibited its use by Roman subjects, except on certain days; and that Nero forbade it altogether, upon pain of death. The use of it was bestowed by kings upon favorites, etc.; Josephus says by Pharaoh on Joseph (*Ant.* ii, 5, 7). It was given by Ahasuerus to Mordecai (Esth. viii, 15); to Daniel by Belshazzar (Dan. v, 7, 16, 29). It was the dress of an ethnarch or prince, and as such given by Alexander to Jonathan (1 Macc. x, 20, 62, 64, 65; comp. 2 Macc. iv, 38). In the last chapter of the Proverbs it is represented as the dress of a matron (ver. 22). It was at one time worn by Roman ladies and rich men (Livy, xxxiv, 7, and Valerius Max. ii, 1). See also the parable of the rich man and Lazarus (Luke xvi, 19). In Esth. i, 6, it appears as part of the royal furniture of Ahasuerus; and in Cant. iii, 10, as the covering of the royal chariot; and Pliny refers to its general use, not only for clothes, but carpets, cushions, etc. (ix, 39). The robe in which the Prætorian guard arrayed the Saviour, called χλαμὺς κοκκινη by Matthew (xxvii, 28), and πορφύρα by Mark (xv, 17, 20), and ἱμάτιον πορφυροῦν by John (xix, 2), and which appears to have been the cast-off sagum of one of their officers, was no doubt scarlet—that is, proper *crimson*, as will hereafter appear—of a deeper hue and finer texture than the sagum or chlamys of the common soldier, but inferior in both respects to that of the emperor, which was also of this color in the time of war, though purple during peace. The adjectives used by the evangelists are, however, often interchanged. Thus a vest, which Horace (*Sat.* ii, 6, 102) calls "rubro cocco tincta," in l, 106 he styles "purpurea." Braunius shows that the Romans gave this name to any color that had a mixture of red (*De Vestitu Sacerdotum* [Lugd. Bat. 1680], i, 14). Ovid applies the term "purpureus" to the cheeks and lips (*Amor.* i, 3). In Acts x, 14, reference is found to Lydia, of the city of Thyatira, a seller of purple cloth. The manufacture seems to have decayed with its native city. A colony of Jews which was established at Thebes in Greece in the 12th century carried on an extensive manufactory for dyeing purple. It ultimately became superseded by the use of indigo, cochineal, etc., whence a cheaper and finer purple was obtained, and free from the disagreeable odor which attended that derived from shell-fish (Martial, i, 50, 32). The method of the ancients in preparing and applying it, and other particulars respecting its history, uses, and estimation, are most fully given by Pliny (*Hist. Nat.* ix, 36–42). The best modern books are Amati, *De Restitutione Purpurarum* (3d ed. Cesena, 1784); the treatise by Capelli, *De Antiqua et Nupera Purpura*, with notes; and Don Michaele Rosa, *Dissertazione delle Porpore*, etc. (1768). See also *Dictionnaire des Sciences Naturelles*, xliii, 219, etc.; Bochart, edit. Rosenmüller, iii, 675, etc.; Heeren, *Historical Researches*, translated (Oxford, 1833), ii, 85, etc. Steger, *De Purpura, Sacræ Dignitatis Insigni* (Lips. 1741).

Crimson (Heb. *karmil'*, כַּרְמִיל, a Persian word akin to Sanscrit *krimi*, Eng. *crimson*. It occurs in 2 Chron. ii, 7–14; iii, 14; Sept. κόκκινος, Vulg. *coccinum*). This word is by some supposed to signify another kind of shell-fish, yielding a crimson dye, so called because found on the shore near Mount Carmel. If so, these words (Cant. vii, 5), "thine head upon thee is like Carmel," may contain another reference to the shape of some sort of *purpura* (Bochart, iii, 661, etc.). Gesenius says it is a word belonging to later Hebrew, and most probably of Persian or Armenian origin.

The purple dye itself was a liquor, contained in a vein situated in the neck of the animal, which when first opened resembled cream in color and consistence. Small shells were collected and bruised in mortars, but the larger ones were opened singly, the fluid carefully removed, and mingled with salt to prevent decomposition. It was diluted with five or six times as much water, and kept moderately hot in leaden or tin vessels for eight or ten days, during which the liquor was often skimmed, to separate all the impurities. After this, the wool to be dyed, being first well washed, was immersed, and kept therein for five hours; then taken out, cooled, and again immersed, and continued in the liquor till all the color was exhausted (Thomson, *Hist. of Chemistry*, i, 91). Prior to the researches of Mr. Wilde, noticed above, it had been concluded that the purpura of Pliny was the *Murex trunculus* of Linnæus from indirect evidence. The buccinum of the same ancient writer is thought to be the *Purpura patula* of Lamarck; and probably the *P. lapillus*, one of the most abundant of species on the rocky shores of Europe, including Great Britain, may have been the chief of the smaller sorts. It has been supposed by some that the conchylium of Pliny, which gave a paler and bluer purple, was our *Janthina fragilis;* but this is out of the question, because though this snail-like mollusk discharges a violet fluid, it is exceedingly volatile, and therefore wholly unfit for dyeing, whereas unalterable permanency characterized the Phœnician purples. *Scalaria clathrus*, another European shell-fish which discharges a coloring fluid, is liable to the same objection, unless the ancients had some mode of fixing what we find evanescent. Colonel Montagu instituted some experiments on this. "The purple juice," he says, "may be collected either from the recent or dried animal, by opening the part behind the head; and as much can be procured from five individuals as is sufficient, when mixed with a few drops of spring-water, to cover half a sheet of paper." Neither volatile nor fixed alkali materially affects it; mineral acids turn it a bluish green or sea-green; sulphuric acid renders it a shade more inclining to blue; vegetable acids probably do not affect it, since cream of tartar did not in the least alter it. These colors, laid on paper, were very bright, and appeared for some months unchanged by the action of the air or the sun; but being exposed

for a whole summer to the solar rays in a south window, they almost vanished. The application of alkali to the acidulated color always restores it to its primitive state, and it is as readily changed again by mineral acid (Montagu, *Testacea Brit.* Supp. p. 122). The circumstance that the fluid effused by *Janthina* and *Scalaria* is purple from the first is conclusive against its being the purple dye of the ancients, who



Tyrian Rock-shell—*Murex trunculus.*

tell us distinctly that this was white or cream-like while within the vein. This agrees accurately with the genera *Murex* and *Purpura*, as may be readily tested in the case of *P. lapillus*, the common dog-whelk of the British coast. Montagu thus records the result of his experiments on this species: "The part containing the coloring-matter is a slender longitudinal vein, just under the skin on the back, behind the head, appearing whiter than the rest of the animal. The fluid itself is of the color and consistence of cream. As soon as it is exposed to the air it becomes of a bright yellow, speedily turns to a pale green, and continues to change imperceptibly, until it assumes a bluish cast, and then a purplish red. Without the influence of the solar rays, it will go through all these changes in the course of two or three hours; but the process is much accelerated by exposure to the sun. A portion of the fluid, mixed with diluted vitriolic acid, did not at first appear to have been sensibly affected; but, by more intimately mixing it in the sun, it became of a pale purple, or purplish red, without any of the intermediate changes. Several marks were now made on fine calico, in order to try if it were possible to discharge the color by such

Dog-whelk—*Purpura lapillus.*

chemical means as were at hand; and it was found that after the color was fixed at its last natural change, nitrous no more than vitriolic acid had any other effect than that of rather brightening it; aqua regia, with or without solution of tin, and marine acid, produced no change; nor had fixed or volatile alkali any sensible effect. It does not in the least give out its color to alcohol, like cochineal, and the succus of the animal of *Turbo* (*Scalaria*) *clathrus;* but it communicates its very disagreeable odor to it most copiously, so that opening the bottle has been more powerful in its effects on the olfactory nerves than the effluvia of assafœtida, to which it may be compared. All the markings which had been alkalized and acidulated, together with those to which nothing had been applied, became, after washing in soap and water, of a uniform color rather brighter than before, and were fixed at a fine unchangeable crimson" (*Test. Brit.* Supp. p. 106). The changes of color are absolutely dependent on the stimulus of light. Dr. Bancroft found that linen stained with the fluid of the *Purpura* might be kept for years shut between the leaves of a book without any visible change, which at the expiration of its incarceration presently passed through all the changes, under the influence of light, to a glowing purple (*On Perman. Col.* i, 145). Réaumur asserts that the immature egg-capsules of the same mollusk will yield the dye more abundantly, and with more facility, than the animal itself (*Hist. Acad. Sci.* 1711). It would appear as if the knowledge of this art had never been lost, but had been perpetuated even in Great Britain from the classical ages. Bede, in the 8th century, alludes to it familiarly, and with admiration of the brilliancy and permanency of the hue (*Hist. Eccles. Ang.* i, 1); and Richard of Cirencester speaks of it in the 14th (*Descr. of Brit.* p. 28). About the same time the following description was given in a translation of Higden's *Polychronicon:* "Ther is allso of shel that we dyeth with fyne reede. The reednesse ther of is wondre fayre and stable and steyneth nevyr with colde ne with hete ne with drie but ever the eldere the hew is fayrere" (*Of Bretayne*, i, 38). Three hundred years later the art was practiced for profit by persons on the coast of Ireland, who guarded it as an heirloom secret. Cole, however, found that the *Purpura lapillus* was the shell employed. See *Bible Educator*, iii, 327 sq.; iv, 217; and comp. COLOR.

Purple Manuscript (CODEX PURPUREUS, sometimes called "*the Cotton MS.*," variously designated as



Specimen of the *Codex Purpureus* (containing John xv, 20: του λογου ου | εγω ειπον υ|μιν· ουκ εστιν | δουλος μιζω | του κυ αυτου).

N, J, and Γ of the Gospels), a beautiful uncial MS. of the Greek Gospels, of which only twelve leaves remain: four of these (containing Matt. xxvi, 57–65; xxvii, 26–34; John xiv, 2–10; xv, 15–22) are in the Cotton Library (*Codex Cottonianus*, the "J" of Wetstein) of the British Museum; two (containing Luke xxiv, 13–21, and 34–39) are in the Imperial Library at Vienna ("N" of Wetstein and others); and six (containing Matt. xix, 6–13; xx, 6–22; xx, 29–xxi, 19) are in the Vatican Library at Rome (called "Γ" by Scholz). These are written in silver letters (now turned black), occasionally in gold letters, on purple vellum, in a large round hand, and in two columns, with the Ammonian sections and Eusebian canons in the margin. The date is of the end of the 6th or the beginning of the 7th century. Some of the fragments were collated in part by Wetstein and Scholz, and the whole were accurately published by Tischendorf in his *Monumenta Sacra Inedita* (Lips. 1846). See Tregelles, in Horne's *Introd.* iv, 177; Scrivener, *Introd.* p. 110 sq. See Manuscripts, Biblical.

Purpose of God. The word *purpose* is commonly used and preferred to the word *decree* when God's determination regarding man's relation to eternity is referred to. The word *purpose* owes its use to the fact that it is more comprehensive and expresses the idea of intelligent design, and therefore more clearly and with less of prejudice sets forth the true scope of the divine government. See Predestination.

Purpureus, Codex. See Purple Manuscript.

Purse (כִּיס, *kis*, Prov. i, 14; a "bag" for money, Isa. xlvi, 6, or for weights, Deut. xxv, 13: Prov. xvi, 11; Mic. vi, 11; *βαλάντιον*, Luke x, 4; xii, 23 ["bag"]; xxii, 35, 36; but *ζώνη*, Matt. x, 9; Mark vi, 8, is the *girdle*, as elsewhere rendered). The Hebrews, when on a journey, were provided with a bag, in which they carried their money (Gen. xlii, 35; Prov. i, 14; vii, 20; Isa. xlvi, 6), and if they were merchants, also their weights (Deut. xxv, 13; Mic. vi, 11). This bag is variously termed in Heb. כִּיס, *kis* (as above); צְרוֹר, *tserôr;* and חֲרִיט, *charit*. The last occurs only in 2 Kings v, 23 ("bags"); Isa. iii, 22 (A. V. "crisping-pins"). The latter is supposed to refer to the long, round form of the purse. The money-bag is described in the New Test. by the terms *βαλάντιον* (as above, peculiar to Luke x, 4; xii, 33; xxii, 35, 36), and *γλωσσόκομον* (peculiar to John xii, 6; xiii, 29). The former is a classical term (Plato, *Conviv.* p. 190, *e*, *σύσπαστα βαλάντια*); the latter is connected with the classical *γλωσσοκομεῖον*, which originally meant the bag in which musicians carried the mouthpieces of their instruments. In the Sept. the term is applied to the chest for the offerings at the Temple (2 Chron. xxiv, 8, 10, 11), and was hence adopted by John to describe the common purse carried by the disciples. The girdle also served as a purse, and hence the term *ζώνη* occurs in Matt. x, 9; Mark vi, 8. See Girdle. Ladies wore ornamental purses (Isa. iii, 23). The Rabbinists forbade any one passing through the Temple with stick, shoes, and purse, these three being the indications of travelling (Mishna, *Berachoth*, 9, § 5). See Bag; Money.

Purslain. See Mallows; White of an Egg.

Purtenance (קֶרֶב, *ke'reb*, *midst*, or inner part) stands improperly in one passage of the A. V. (Exod. xii, 9) for the *viscera*, or "inwards" (as elsewhere rendered), of a sacrificial victim.

Puru, in Hindû mythology, was the son of Jajadu and of Devajani, the daughter of a Brahmin. He was the boldest warrior in the army of the Devas during their struggles against the dæmons and giants: he distinguished himself by the terrible use he knew how to make of his war-hatchet. There was another Puru—the first king of India from the family of the Children of the Moon: his father, Buddha, was the son of the Moon. He is the forefather of the whole dynasty of the Children of the Moon, who were all celebrated rulers, and seemed to have founded on the upper Ganges an eternal empire. The kings Dushmanta, Kuru, Dritarashtra, Pandu, etc., belonged to this family, in which Krishna was born several times.

Purus, in Hindû mythology, was the name of the first man created, the Adam of the Indians. The name of his wife was Pargute. See Puru.

Purver, Anthony, a Quaker preacher of great note for his remarkable literary attainments, especially his exegetical knowledge, was born at Up Hurstbourne, in Hampshire, about 1702. He was originally apprenticed to a shoemaker, but later he was employed in keeping sheep. Though his early education was very limited, his capacity and inclination for the acquisition of learning were very great. He found leisure for study, and his curiosity being excited by the perusal of a tract in which some inaccuracies of the A. V. were pointed out, he determined to study the original languages of the Scriptures. He secured the assistance of a Jew in the acquisition of Hebrew, Chaldee, etc., and other aid for learning Greek and Latin. He joined the Society of Friends, and preached among them. While laboring as a schoolmaster at Andover, he occupied himself in preparing a new version of the Scriptures; and this, after spending more than thirty years over it, he published by the aid of Dr. Fothergill, who gave him £1000, and carried it through the press at his own expense. It appeared in 1764, entitled *A New Translation of the Old and New Testaments, with Notes, Critical and Explanatory*, in two volumes folio, beautifully got up. Notwithstanding the enormous labor bestowed upon it by its author, and though there is now and then a better rendering to be found in it than in the A. V., Purver's translation, as a whole, is not of much critical value. The style is crude and bombastic, the very reverse of what might have been expected from a member of the society whose language is so simple; while the notes, though containing much valuable matter, abound in contemptuous expressions about the labors of others in the same department. Purver's Bible is therefore deservedly scarce. He died in 1777. See Orme, *Biblioth. Bibl.* s. v.; Kitto, *Bible Dict.* s. v.; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s. v. (J. H. W.)

Purvey, John, the friend and fellow-laborer of Wycliffe, with whom he lived in his latter years. His denunciations of the errors of the Romish Church, as well as his endeavors to make the Bible accessible to the people at large by translating it into English, drew upon him the severest penalties which it was in the power of the hierarchy to inflict. He was forbidden, by a mandate of the bishop of Bristol, dated August, 1387, to preach in the diocese where he officiated after the death of Wycliffe; his books were declared to be erroneous and heretical, and were among those which the bishops of Worcester, Salisbury, and Hereford were authorized to seize (May 29, 1388, Jan. 18, Dec. 16, 1389). Some years after, however, he made a recantation at St. Paul's Cross (Sunday, March 6, 1401), and was admitted (Aug. 11, 1401), on the presentation of the archdeacon of Canterbury, to the vicarage of West Hythe, in Kent, which he resigned Oct. 8, 1403. He then returned to the simple teaching of the Bible, denouncing the erroneous doctrines of the Church, for which he was again imprisoned, and in 1421 recanted a second time, at Saltwood, before archbishop Arundel. He is supposed to have died about 1427. Purvey immortalized his name through his translation of the Scriptures into English. As the Bible *of late translated* by Wycliffe required correction, he tells us, in the general introduction, that he undertook to make the version more faithful, intelligible, and popular. The plan which he adopted to effect this, according to his own description, was as follows: With

the assistance of several fellow-laborers he (1) corrected the Latin text by comparison of Bibles, doctors, and glosses; (2) studied the text thus corrected with the gloss and other authorities, particularly De Lyra on the Old Test.; (3) made special reference to the works of grammarians and theologians for the meaning of difficult words and passages; and (4) did not translate literally, but according to the sense and meaning as clearly as he could, taking care to have many persons of ability present at the correction of the translation. He inserted numerous textual glosses in the Old Test., and only occasionally omitted those of Wycliffe's version, but made no such insertions in the New Test., and carefully excluded all the glosses which were introduced into the former version. That he improved upon Wycliffe's translation is beyond doubt, as may be seen from a comparison of the following passages in the respective versions: Gen. ix, 13; Exod. xxix, 2; Deut. xxxii, 2; xxxiii, 7; Josh. v, 15; vi, 25; Job x, 1; xi, 12; xiv, 12; Matt. xii, 5; xiii, 52; 1 Cor. iii, 13-15; which are pointed out by the erudite editors, the Rev. Josiah Forshall and Sir Frederic Madden, who for the first time published this early English version, together with Wycliffe's translation, in an entire form, in parallel columns, 4 vols. 4to, Oxford University Press, 1850. Purvey's translation of the New Test. was first published by Lewis (Lond. 1731, fol.) as Wycliffe's translation; it was then erroneously reprinted as Wycliffe's by Baber (Lond. 1810, 4to), and by Bagster in the English *Hexapla*. Comp. Foxe, *The Acts and Monuments*, Townsend's ed. (Lond. 1844), iii, 285, 292, 822, 826; and the elaborate preface by Forshall and Madden to their edition of Wycliffe's and Purvey's translation of the Bible.

Purveyor. This word is not found in the A. V., although it would perhaps represent the meaning of the Heb. נִצָּב, *nitstsáb'*, in 1 Kings iv, 5, 7, rather than the word καθεσταμένοι, or the similar "officers" of our version. The Hebrew word, however, is the Niphal (passive) participle of the word נָצַב, *natsab'*, *to put* or *station*, and is literally translated by the Greek, which has the same meaning, *the appointed*. Solomon divided his kingdom into twelve parts, and these men were placed, one over each province, to procure provisions for the king's household. Thus he was enabled to entertain foreigners, and to support a vast number of wives, servants, and attendants (Patrick, *Comment.* ad loc.). The number twelve refers, not to the tribes, but the months of the year, each being required to furnish the provisions of a month. These collections probably corresponded to tax-gathering among the moderns. Patrick thinks the officers were merely purchasers; but Kitto regards this as an error (Kitto, *Pict. Bible*, ad loc.). Rosenmüller calls these officers head collectors of taxes (*Alt. u. n. Morgenland*, iii, 166), and Ewald thinks they were stewards of the royal domains; but Thenius (*Exeg. Handb.* ad loc.) holds that they were officers of higher rank, of whose duties the supply of the royal table formed only a part. Josephus calls them ἡγεμόνες (*Ant.* viii, 2, 4). See PALESTINE; SOLOMON.

Puseyism is one of the names by which the ritualistic movement of the Church of England and her offspring is sometimes designated, but it is properly descriptive only of the followers of the much-celebrated Oxford professor in theology, the Rev. Dr. E. B. Pusey. Though he was by no means alone in originating the movement to which his name has been given, the Puseyites now form a very different class from that which organized and kept alive what is known as the Tractarian movement, and of which we have treated in the art. OXFORD TRACTS (q. v.).

The *Tractarians* advocated the acceptance by the Church of England of the doctrines of Apostolical Succession, Priestly Absolution, Baptismal Regeneration, the Real Presence, the Authority of the Church, and of Tradition. "Scripture and tradition," says one of the Tractarians, "taken together, are the joint rule of faith" (No. 78, p. 2, English ed.). "Consentient patristical tradition," says Keble in his *Sermons*, "is the record of that oral teaching of the apostles which the Holy Spirit inspired." By this patristic tradition, which these tractarians extolled as an infallible interpretation of Scripture and test of doctrinal truth, they understood the *voice of Catholic antiquity*, or the voice of the theologians of the Nicene age, of the 4th century; and yet a majority of them were at one time devoted to the Arian heresy. For example, Froude says, "Your trumpery principles about Scripture being the sole rule in fundamentals, I nauseate the word" (i, 413). Thus, having broken away from the corner-stone of Protestantism, it was easy for them to accept the Romish view of the sacraments (q. v.), restoring also the old Romish number of *seven* (Tract 90), and affirming with the Church of Rome that "the sacraments, and not preaching, are the sources of divine grace." Says Mr. Dennison, "I understand the Tractarian doctrine of the sacraments to be this:

"I. That man is 'made a member of Christ, the child of God, and an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven,' in and by holy baptism.

"II. That man 'made a member of Christ, the child of God, and an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven,' in and by holy baptism, is renewed from time to time in holy communion.

"III. That 'a death unto sin and a new birth unto righteousness' are given to every adult and every infant, in and by the outward visible sign or form in baptism, 'water in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.'

"IV. That the gift may be received, in the case of adults, worthily or unworthily, but that it is always received.

"V. That the body and blood of Christ are given to every one who receives the sacramental bread and wine.

"VI. That the gift may be received worthily or unworthily, but that it is always received."

"Antiquity," wrote the author of Tract 90, "continually affirms *a change in the sacred elements*" (p. 73). Palmer, in his *Letter to a Protestant Catholic*, declared that "the bread and wine are *changed* by the consecration of the priest and the operation of the Holy Ghost, and become the very body and blood of our Lord" (p. 30). "The table is properly an altar," said their organ, the *British Critic*, "and altars presume a propitiatory sacrifice" (July, 1841, p. 24).* With such views of the sacraments evangelical views on regeneration were impossible for the Tractarians, and there need be no surprise that they stigmatized the grand Protestant doctrine of justification by faith alone as a "Lutheran heresy." "Whether any one heresy," says the *Critic*, "has ever infested the Church so hateful and unchristian as this doctrine [of justification]. it is perhaps not necessary to determine: none certainly has ever prevailed so subtle and extensively poisonous. We must plainly express our conviction that a religious heathen, were he really to accept the doctrine which Lutheran language expresses, so far from making any advance, would sustain a heavy loss in exchanging fundamental truth for fundamental error" (No. lxiv, p. 391). Again, speaking of the Tractarian party, this open confession is made: "We cannot stand where we are; we must go backward or forward, and it will surely be the latter. As we go on, we must recede more and more from the principles, if any such there be, of the English Reformation" (No. lix, p. 45). "The Reformation," says Froude (i, 433), "was a limb badly set; it must be broken again, in order to be righted." "Utterly reject and anathematize the principle of the Reformation as a heresy, with all its forms, sects, and denominations," says Palmer (*Letter to Golightly*, p. 9).

* This inference is undoubtedly correct, and as Christ is not sacrificed in Protestant churches, the table on which the sacramental elements are placed ought not to be termed an *altar*, but a table. Altars are not congenial to the spirit of Protestantism; and as the thing was wisely discarded by the Reformers, the name also should be dropped.

The Tractarian movement terminated with Newman's secession to Rome, but its effect remains in several visible results: the revival and strengthening of the High-Church party, which still maintains, to a great extent, the principles advocated in the Tracts; the introduction of various alterations in the mode of performing divine service, such as the use of the surplice instead of the gown, intoning the prayers and singing the responses, the elevation of the communion-table into an altar, the substitution of low, open benches for high pews; a remarkable impulse given to the building and restoration of churches, and the revival of Gothic architecture in all parts of England; the secession of many English clergy and laity, some of them men of considerable ability and distinction, to the Church of Rome; and the establishment of colleges and sisterhoods, and other religious and charitable institutions, under Episcopal auspices.

Dr. Pusey himself, in his earlier years, inclined to that Protestant view of Christianity according to which all things and ceremonies acting on the senses must be removed from the Church (see his *Rise and Decline of Rationalism in Germany*). But he gradually turned away from that system in which the heart and soul are sustained by the intellectual appreciation of theological truths, and came to accept another which is dependent upon the outward actions of the body — one which abounds in observances, reaching the heart through the medium of the senses, and encouraging a habit of devotion by the use of bodily action. This change in Pusey's ideas is attributed to the influence of his friend, John Henry Newman, and in the year 1833 Pusey accepted the confession of faith and practice drawn up by Newman. The publication of writings called *Tracts for the Times* was in 1841 interdicted by the bishop of Oxford, but the ninety that had reached the public gave a clear insight into the new religious tendencies. Newman, Pusey, and their friends wished no fusion with the Roman Church, some of the tenets of which filled them with actual horror; but they tried to introduce into the English Church, the origin of which they did not approve and the decay of which they acknowledged, such doctrines as the Romish Church has distinctively preserved. Newman tried, in consequence, to conciliate the Thirty-nine Anglican Articles with the resolutions of the Council of Trent, in which, of course, he did not succeed, as he could satisfy neither of the parties, Catholics nor Anglicans. Newman was made aware that his position between the two churches was a false and untenable one, and he passed over to Romanism. His example was followed by several ecclesiastics and professors of the High Church, and by men belonging to the first families of the kingdom. Pusey, however, has persevered in his former course. He and his followers have remained to this day in the Anglican Church, the situation of which they do not despair of mending. But they discard the name by which they are generally designated as a class. In 1870, Dr. Pusey himself wrote respecting this party-name as follows: "I never was a party leader, I never acted on any system. My name was used first to designate those of us who gave themselves to revive the teaching of forgotten truth and piety, because I first had occasion to write on baptismal regeneration; but it was by opponents, and not by confederates. We should have thought it a note against us to have deserved any party name, or to have been anything but the followers of Jesus, the disciples of the Church, the sons and pupils of the great fathers whom he raised up in her. I never had any temptation to try to form a party, for it was against our principles. . . . Then, personally, I was the more exempt from this temptation, because God has given me neither the peculiar organizing abilities which tempt men to it, nor any office—as that of an archdeacon—which would entitle me directly to counsel thus. . . . My life, contrary to the character of party leaders, has been spent in a succession of insulated efforts; bearing, indeed, upon one great end—the growth of Catholic truth and piety among us, or, contrariwise, resistance to what might hinder, retard, or obscure it; but still insulated" (*Eirenicon*, iii, 338).

The Puseyites have adopted from the Romish Church, without assenting in a general way to her dogmas, a number of ritual institutions, and even some points of faith. They affix to their churches portable crosses; have burning tapers on their altars; adorn chasubles and Prayer-books with crosses; have a Latin choir; and, what is more than these exterior conformities, they have declared for the Romish doctrine about the situation and power of the Church, and about the sacraments, the number of which they have increased; they also introduced auricular confession. In the doctrine of justification, where it was first intended to deviate from the Roman Catholic tenets, the resolutions of the Tridentinum were finally admitted as a base. The Puseyites went even the length of acknowledging in the pope a pre-eminence of spiritual honor and authority; they say that, as patriarch of Rome, not only his spiritual, but also his temporal authority extends over Italy; that the Church of England is bound to recognise it; and that all decrees of the Council of Trent may be authoritatively construed in such a sense as to make them acceptable to the Anglican Church. The Puseyites call themselves *Catholics*, a branch of the universal Catholic Church: they object most decidedly to being called Protestants. They regard the Church as one organic body, and primitive apostolic Christianity as a mere germ or seminal principle, to be developed and properly matured in the progress of ages. They adopt as such legitimate additions to Biblical Christianity obvious gross corruptions, which gained currency in the Church in different centuries, and were taught by leading fathers or councils — a practice which "throws an uncertainty about the lineaments of Christianity, and opens the door for every species of error that designing men may be inclined to adopt, while it enables the so-called Church Catholic to justify every one of her errors, both doctrinal and ritual" (Schmucker). Another gross appendage sometimes associated with this theory of development is that Christ has placed himself in some kind of physical connection or concorporation with the mass of his disciples, the Church, by which his body nourishes them in some mystical manner through the Eucharist, and furnishes the germ of their resurrection body. Though Newman, still before his perversion, recommended, in the *Ninetieth Tract for the Times*, the acceptance of the doctrines of purgatory, of the invocation of saints, and of papal authority, Pusey has persisted in rejecting them. He also rejects the worship of Mary, the use of Latin in the mass, and the communion in one form (comp. Pusey, *A Letter to his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury* [Oxf. 1842], and *The Holy Eucharist* [ibid. 1843]). As Puseyism is in progress among the cultivated classes of England, especially among the clergy, and as it is thought to be only a forerunner of Catholicism, it is combated by the English bishops with admonitions, speeches, and disciplinary measures. They do not tolerate the rites introduced by the Puseyite ecclesiastics, and pronounce them a "mixture of Romanism or popery." They ordain no student of divinity if suspected of Puseyistic tendencies. At the University of Oxford, the seminary of the High-Church clergy, the antagonism of Puseyites and anti-Puseyites has broken out so openly that there is a storm of both parties on every vacant professorship. Puseyism has its representatives in the most influential literary papers: the *Quarterly Review* has published a series of articles in favor of the Puseyite innovations. The chief adversaries of the Puseyites, or Anglo-Catholics, are the Evangelicals, a party which originated in Methodism — the latter being opposed both to the Puseyites and to the Episcopalians. If we compare the judgment of the English papers of different colors on the religious situation of Great Britain, and especially on Puseyism, we find a

great diversity of appreciations. The radical press of the Dissenters, averse to Anglicanism, rejoices at its visible decay, and attributes the embarrassment of the Church to the circumstance that, owing to the opposition of the bishops, reformation could not completely achieve its work. It could only produce an imperfect, undecided form, and was smothered in the arms of an exterior political priesthood. The Tory papers originally advocated Puseyism, in which they saw a support for the High-Church; but they soon changed their mind: they agree with the Whig papers on this point that the manner in which philosophy is taught at the University of Oxford is the cause of these religious phenomena. It is thought that the facility with which so many leave the High-Church for Puseyism, and from Puseyism step over to Romanism, is due to the miserable situation of philosophical studies in general, and especially in the latitudinarianism of the Aristotelian logic which is taught at Oxford, and of the Platonic mysticism after the scholastic fashion. Others expect from Puseyism a regeneration of the High-Church and of the whole Anglican religious situation. See Petri, *Würdigung des Wesens und der Bedeutung des Puseyismus* (Gött. 1843); Schleyer, *Der Puseyismus nach seinem Ursprung und als Lehrsystem* (Freib. 1845); Hurst's Hagenbach, *Church Hist. 18th and 19th Centuries*, ii, 392 sq.; Schumaker, *Elemental Contrast* (Gettysb. 1852); Garbett, *Pusey and the University of Oxford* (1847); Taylor, *Ancient Christianity and the Doctrines of the Oxford Tracts for the Times* (Lond. 1844, 3 vols.); Fletcher, *Lectures on the Principles of the Roman Catholic Church and of Puseyism* (Lond. 1846); Boyd, *England, Rome, and Oxford* (Lond. 1846); Saville, *A Letter to Rev. Dr. Pusey on Auricular Confession* (Lond. 1878); Dorner, *Hist. Prot. Theol.* ii, 488 sq., 504 sq.; *London Academy*, 1873, p. 87; Nov. 14, 1874, p. 529; *Ch. of Engl. Quar. Rev.* July, 1855, art. vii; *Amer. Presb. Rev.* Oct. 1861; Rez, *Studien u. Kritiken*, 1838–47; *Brit. and For. Rev.* 1844, p. 5; 1846, p. 189; *Christian Remembrancer*, Jan. 1866, p. 164; Oct. 1868, p. 381.

Pushtû Version. Pushtû is the language spoken in Afghanistan (q. v.), in Asia; hence it is also called *Afghan*. We have not as yet a complete version of the Holy Scriptures. The New Testament was first translated by the Rev. J. Löwenthal (d. 1864), a convert from Judaism. Besides the New Testament, the historical books of the Old Testament have been published by the Serampore Mission. At present the Rev. T. P. Hughes, of the Church Missionary Society at Peshawer, is preparing a translation of the Old Testament in Pushtû. The committee of the British and Foreign Bible Society had some sheets of his MS. printed by the zincophotographic process, to be submitted to Afghan scholars with a view of having the whole work printed in the same manner. For the study of the language, comp. Bellew, *A Dictionary of the Pukkhto or Pukshto Language, on a New and Improved System* (Lond. 1867); the same, *A Grammar of the Pukkhto or Pukshto Language* (ibid. 1867); Raverty, *A Dictionary of the Pukhto, Pushto, or Language of the Afghans; with Remarks on the Originality of the Language, and its Affinity to the Semitic and other Oriental Languages* (ibid. 1860); the same, *A Grammar of the Pukhto, Pushto, or Language of the Afghans* (ibid. 1860); *Selections from the Poetry of the Afghans* (ibid. 1862); *The Gulshan-i-Roh: being Selections, Prose and Poetical, in the Pushto or Afghan Language* (ibid. 1860); *The Poetry of the Afghans, from the 16th to the 19th Century* (ibid. 1863); Dorn, *A Chrestomathy of the Pushtu or Afghan Language* (St. Petersburg, 1847), and his contributions to *The Pushtu Grammar* in the *Mémoires de l'Académie Impériale des Sciences de St.-Pétersbourg* (ibid. 1840, 1845); F. Müller, *Die Conjugation des Avghânischen Verbums* (Wien, 1867); *Ueber die Sprache der Avghânen* (ibid. 1862–63); E. Trumpp, *Grammar of the Pashto, or Language of the Afghans, compared with the Iranian and North-Indian Idioms* (Tübingen, 1873). (B. P.)

Pusillanimity is a feebleness of mind, by which one is terrified at mere trifles or imaginary dangers, unauthorized by the most distant probability.

Puspadanta, in Hindû mythology, was one of the celebrated twelve Buddhas who were particularly worshipped by the Jainas. He was the son of Sugriya and of Roma, from the family of Ikswaku. He is represented as a man ending in the body of a fish.

Pustkuchen-Glanzow, Fr. Cph., a German theologian of some note, flourished as pastor at Wiebelskirchen, near Treves. He was born Feb. 4, 1793, at Detmold, and died Jan. 2, 1834. He wrote, *Die Urgeschichte der Menschheit in ihrem vollen Umfange* (Lemgo, 1821):—*Historisch-kritische Untersuchung der bibl. Urgeschichte* (Halle, 1823):—*Wiederherstellung des ächten Protestantismus*, etc. (Hamb. 1827):—*Der Beruf des evangel. Pfarrers nach seinem Zweck u. Wesen*, etc. (Barmen, 1832):—*Grundzüge des Christenthums* (Hamb. 1827, 3d ed.):—*Glaubens- u. Sittenlehre* (Barmen, 1831–33, 2 vols.):—*Maria, oder die Frömmigkeit der Weiber* (Hamb. 1827, 2d ed.):—*Kirche, Schule u. Haus* (Elberfeld, 1832). See Winer, *Handbuch der theolog. Literatur*, p. 717 (see Index); Fürst, *Bibl. Judaica*, iii, 124; Zuchold, *Bibl. Theologica*, iii, 1022; Diestel, *Gesch. des Alten Testaments*, p. 726, 733. (B. P.)

Püstrich, an ill-shaped Slavonic idol: it is of bronze, and hollow. It represents a small, chubby boy holding one of his hands over his head. The head has two holes, one at the top, the other at the place of the mouth. It is believed that the priests used this figure to terrify the people by the spectacle of an infuriated deity. It was filled with water, and, the holes being stopped, put on a fire: in due time the stoppers were driven out of the holes with considerable noise and tremendous eruption of steam and boiling water. Other more modern investigations would lead to the conclusion that the chubby god was nothing but an instrument of distillery.

Put (1 Chron. i, 8; Nah. iii, 9). See Phut.

Pute'oli (Græcized Ποτίολοι [Acts xxviii, 13], but in classical Greek often Πουτεόλοι; a Latin word, from *puteus, a well*, on account of the *wells* or *sources* of a volcanic origin with which it abounded), a maritime town of Campania, in Italy, on the northern shore of the bay of Naples, and about eight miles north-west from that city. Here Paul landed on his way to Rome (Acts xxviii, 13). As above noted, it derived its name from its tepid baths, and the district in which they exist is now called Terra di Lavoro. The earlier name of Puteoli, when the lower part of Italy was Greek, was *Dicæarchia;* and this name continued to be used to a late period. Josephus uses it in two passages (*Ant.* xvii, 12, 7; xviii, 7, 2); in a third (*Life*, 3), he speaks of himself (after the shipwreck which, like St. Paul, he had recently gone through) as διασωθεὶς εἰς τὴν Δικαιαρχίαν, ἣν Ποτιόλους Ἰταλοὶ καλοῦσιν. So Philo, in describing the curious interview which he and his fellow Jewish ambassadors had here with Caligula, uses the old name (*Legat. ad Caium*, ii, 521). Its Roman history may be said to have begun with the Second Punic War. It was a favorite watering-place of the Romans, as its numerous hot-springs were judged efficacious for the cure of various diseases. It was also the port where ships usually discharged their passengers and cargoes, partly to avoid doubling the promontory of Circeium, and partly because there was no commodious harbor nearer to Rome. Hence the ship in which Paul was conveyed from Melita landed the prisoners at this place, where the apostle stayed for a week (Acts xxviii, 13). In connection with St. Paul's movements, we must notice its communications, in Nero's reign, along the mainland with Rome. The coast road leading northward to Sinuessa was not made till the reign of Domitian; but there was a cross-road leading to Capua, and



Map of the Bay of Puteoli.

there joining the Appian Way. See THREE TAVERNS. The remains of this road may be traced at intervals; and thus the apostle's route can be followed almost step by step. We should also notice the fact that there were Jewish residents at Puteoli. We might be sure of this from its mercantile importance; but we are positively informed of it by Josephus (*Ant.* xvii, 12, 1) in his account of the visit of the pretended Herod-Alexander to Augustus; and the circumstance shows how natural it was that the apostle should find Christian "brethren" there immediately on landing. From this port it was that the Roman armies were despatched to Spain, and here the ambassadors from Carthage landed. It had the privileges of a colony from a very early period, and these were successively renewed by Nero and Vespasian, the latter bestowing on the place the title of Colonia Flavia. Puteoli was at that period a place of very great importance. We cannot elucidate this better than by saying that the celebrated bay a part of which is now "the bay of Naples," and in early times was "the bay of Cumæ," was then called "Sinus Puteolanus." The city was at the north-eastern angle of the bay. Close to it was Baiæ, one of the most fashionable of the Roman watering-places. The emperor Caligula once built a ridiculous bridge between the two towns; and the remains of it must have been conspicuous when St. Paul landed at Puteoli in the Alexandrian ship which brought him from Malta. See CASTOR AND POLLUX; MELITA; RHEGIUM; SYRACUSE. In illustration of the arrival here of the corn-ships we may refer to Seneca (*Ep.* 77) and Suetonius (*Octav.* 98). No part of the Campanian shore was more frequented. The associations of Puteoli with historical personages are very numerous. Scipio sailed from hence to Spain. Cicero had a villa (his "Puteolanum") in the neighborhood. Here Nero planned the murder of his mother. Vespasian gave to this city peculiar privileges, and here Hadrian was buried. In the 5th century Puteoli was ravaged both by Alaric and Genseric, and it never afterwards recovered its former eminence. It is now a fourth-rate Italian town, still retaining the name of *Pozzuoli*.

The remains of Puteoli are considerable. The aqueduct, the reservoirs, portions (probably) of baths, the great amphitheatre, the building called the temple of Serapis, which affords very curious indications of changes of level in the soil, are all well worthy of notice. But our chief interest here is concentrated on the ruins of the ancient mole, which is formed of the concrete called *Pozzolana*, and sixteen of the piers of which still remain. No Roman harbor has left so solid a memorial of itself as this one at which St. Paul land-



Mole of Puteoli.

ed in Italy. Here, too, was the statue erected to Tiberius to commemorate his restoration of the Asiatic cities destroyed by an earthquake, and of which statue the pedestal with its inscription remains almost entire to this day. See Mazzella, *Situs et Antiquitas Puteol.* in Grævius and Burnam, *Thesaur.* ix, pt. iv; Romanelli, *Viaggio a Pozzuoli* (Naples, 1817); Jorio, *Guida di Pozzuoli* (ibid. 1830); Löwenigh, *Die Landschaft Pozzuoli* (Aachen, 1841); Lewin, *St. Paul*, ii, 218 sq. See ITALY; PAUL.

Pu'tiel (Heb. *Putiel'*, פּוּטִיאֵל, *afflicted of God*; Sept. Φουτιήλ), the father of the wife of Eleazar the priest and the mother of Phinehas (Exod. vi, 25). B.C. cir. 1619. In modern Jewish traditions Putiel is confounded with Jethro the Midianite, "who fatted the calves for idolatrous worship" (Targum Pseudojon. *On Exod. vi*, 25; *Gemara of Sota* by Wagenseil, c. viii, § 6).

Putnam, Franklin, a Presbyterian minister, was born in Marietta, O., July 22, 1801. After receiving a good academical training, he entered Athens College, O., and graduated with honor in 1823. During the last year of his college course he was converted, and though up to this time the law had been the object of his studies, the Gospel now became his all-absorbing hope. He entered the Theological Seminary at Auburn, N.Y., and in 1826 was licensed by Oneida Presbytery, N. Y. In 1827 he returned to Ohio, and was appointed to labor as a missionary and evangelist to the feeble churches in Springfield, Urbana, and Buck Creek, O. Subsequently he accepted a call to Springfield Church, and was ordained and installed pastor by Dayton Presbytery; here he labored for eighteen months, when he accepted a call to the Church in Dayton, O. In 1837, at the division in the Church, he resigned, and accepted a call to Circleville, O., where he continued to labor for over six years, when, by reason of paralysis of one half of his body, he resigned his charge, and removed to Delaware, O. Here, after devoted care on the part of his family, his health was restored, and he resumed preaching and ministered to the Church at Delaware, and subsequently at Tiffin, Greenville, and Republic, O., and Thorntown, Ind. He died at the latter place Oct. 11, 1859. Mr. Putnam was a logical thinker, and full of zeal for the cause of Christ; an excellent pastor, ever ready in sorrow to administer comfort and consolation. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1861, p. 162. (J. L. S.)

Putnam, George, D.D., a Unitarian minister of the Old School, was born in Massachusetts in 1808, and was educated at Harvard University, class of 1826. He early entered the ministry, and finally became pastor at Roxbury, Mass., where he sustained a pastorate of nearly half a century, enjoying not only the warm affection of his own people, but the highest respect and confidence of the whole community. Away from home also Dr. Putnam wielded a very wide influence in all directions, and he was beloved by men of every religious school in an eminent degree. Dr. Putnam was more than an ordinary man. He was not only possessed of the most noble personal characteristics, but was endowed with excellent scholarship, remarkable intellectual powers, and great wisdom in judgment. He was always vigorous, fresh, and often very eloquent in his pulpit discourses. For years his Fast-day and Thanksgiving services were largely attended by visitors from what was then the adjoining city (Boston), to listen to his thoughtful and powerful discussions upon public and national questions. A shock of paralysis in 1872 warned him that the period of his vigor was terminating, and he was obliged to consent to have a younger associate with him in the pastorate. For the last two years before his death, which occurred in 1878, he was able to render service only at the marriage or funeral of some one of his beloved parishioners, who, in these joyful and painful domestic æras, especially welcomed even the trembling voice of their old pastor. From 1849 to 1856 Dr. Putnam was editorially connected with the *Christian Examiner*. He published a number of separate sermons, orations, etc.

Putnam, Jonathan W., a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Leyden, N. Y., July 31, 1815. He was converted at the age of twelve, and was received into the Methodist Episcopal Church. He was licensed to exhort in 1835; in 1836 he received license to preach. He travelled four years in the New-Jersey Conference, and then went to the Wisconsin Conference. In 1856 he was transferred to the East-Genesee Conference, and stationed at East Palmyra. Afterwards he was successively appointed to Tyrone, Catharine, Southport, Jackson, Canton, Prattsburgh, Dresden, and Middlesex. He had just begun the work of the second year on this last charge, with good promise of success, when death overtook him on Sept. 9, 1871. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 1872, p. 130, 131; *Northern Christian Advocate*, 1871.

Putsha, in Hindû mythology, is the name of the small, bloodless sacrifices, consisting of fruits and flowers, which were offered to the genii, as well as to the three great gods.

Putshiari, in Hindû mythology, is the name of the Brahmins who, after twelve years' study, determine to devote their lives entirely to the gods, and in consequence attach themselves to some pagoda.

Puxis is the box in which the consecrated hosts for the sick are preserved. See PYX.

Puzza is a Chinese goddess who has some resemblance to the Cybele of the Greeks and the Isis of the Egyptians. The bonzes relate that three genii of the female sex descended once from their heavenly abode to enjoy a bath in an earthly stream. The water had scarcely touched their bodies when the most beautiful of them perceived on her garment a lotos-plant, with blossoms and fruit, and could not imagine whence the plant had come. She could not resist the desire of tasting the fruit; but this was attended with evil consequences, for behold a little son was born from her at the same moment. She brought him up, and when he had reached the years of maturity she returned to heaven. This nymph was Puzza; and, as her offspring became a mighty ruler of the heavenly empire of China, she was worshipped as the queen of the world, the mother of all that is good, and the supporter of all that is living. Puzza is represented with eighteen arms, sitting on a flower, and her head surrounded with an aureola.

Pyer, JOHN, an English minister who labored successively with the Wesleyans and the Independents, was born in 1790. He began his labors as a tent missionary, devoting himself entirely to the connected evangelistic work. After the tent ceased to be the property of the Methodist body, he built a chapel at Manchester, where he remained nine years. As he changed his doctrinal views, he abandoned the Wesleyan Church, and joined the Congregationalists. For the succeeding four years he was agent of the London Christian-Instruction Society. Ill-health finally required him to seek a less laborious position, and he became the Congregational pastor of South Molton. Later he removed to Cork, and in 1839 accepted a pastorate at Devon, where he remained the last twenty years of his life, and died in 1859, laborious and active to the very last: he was found by the servants lifeless, having literally fallen asleep in Jesus. Pyer was the writer of a few useful hymns; among them, "Met again in Jesus' name," which is found in the *New Congregational Hymn-book*, No. 803.

Pygarg (דִּישׁוֹן, *dishôn*, from *dûsh*, דּוּשׁ, *to tread*, or perhaps *dûts*, דּוּץ, *to leap*; Sept. πύγαργος, Vulg. *pygargus*) occurs only (Deut. xiv, 5) in the list of clean animals, being the name apparently of some species of *antelope*, though it is by no means easy to identify it.

The Greek πύγαργος denotes an animal with a "white rump," and is used by Herodotus (iv, 192) as the name of some Libyan deer or antelope. Ælian (vii, 19) also mentions the πύγαργος, but gives no more than the name; comp. also Juvenal (*Sat.* xi, 138). It is usual to identify the *pygarg* of the Greek and Latin writers with the *addax* of North Africa, Nubia, etc. (*Addax nasomaculatus*), known to the ancient Greeks under the same title (*Oryx addax*, Lieht.), which has been recognised as a beast of chase in the old Egyptian sculptures. It is widely spread over Central Africa, extending to the borders of the Nile in Nubia, and is well known to the Arabs, who still distinguish it by its ancient name, with the familiar prefix of Abu, or father — *Father Addas*. The addax is a coarse and heavy antelope, three feet high at the withers, with a large clumsy head and stout legs. The horns exist in both sexes, are long, twisted outwards, covered with rings nearly to the points, which are sharp; the tail is long and tufted. The head and neck are of a deep reddish brown color, with a band of white across the face; the forehead and throat are clothed with coarse black hair, and all the rest of the body and limbs is of a whitish gray hue. It is one of that group of antelopes in which we may clearly discern an approach to the bovine race. See Ox.

Addax Antelope (*Oryx addax*).

Against this identification of the *dishôn* with the *addax*, however, there are some considerable objections. In the first place, this antelope does not present at all the required characteristic implied by its name; and, in the second, there is much reason for believing, with Rüppell (*Atlas zu der Reise im nörd. Afrika*, p. 21) and Hamilton Smith (Griffith's Cuvier's *Anim. Kingdom*, iv, 193), that the *addax* is identical with the *strepsiceros* of Pliny (*N. H.* xi, 37), which animal, it must be observed, the Roman naturalist distinguishes from the *pygargus* (viii, 53). Indeed, we may regard the identity of the *addax* and Pliny's *strepsiceros* as established; for when this species was, after many years, at length rediscovered by Hemprich and Rüppell, it was found to be called by the Arabic name of *akas* or *adas*, the very name which Pliny gives as the local one of his *strepsiceros*. The *pygargus*, therefore, must be sought for in some animal different from the *addax*. The required characters seem to be found in a group of antelopes described by Mr. Bennett (*Trans. Zool. Soc.* vol. i). They have many peculiarities in common with the group which includes the spring-bok (*Antidorcas euchore*) and the houte-bok (*Damalis pygarga*), those fine white-rumped species of South Africa, but are distinguished by the characters of the horns, which are larger, thicker, more bovine, and of bolder curvature, turning first almost horizontally backwards, and then hooked abruptly forwards. The legs are long, the neck long and slender, and there is a white patch on the throat in all the species. The group is confined to the northern half of the African continent. The best-known species is the mhorr (*Antilope mhorr*, Bennett), which stands two feet eight inches high at the croup. The horns are ringed from the base about half-way up, whence to the tip they are round, smooth, and obtusely pointed. The expression of the face is gentle; the eye large, dark, and liquid. The tail is long, close-haired at the base, but tipped with a tuft of long black hair—a very ox-like character. The general hue of the coat, which is short and sleek, is a deep brownish red; the line of the belly and the inner surface of the limbs are white. But *the whole region around the base of the tail is pure white*, abruptly separated from the dark red of the flanks; the patch running forwards in a point on each hip, and downwards on the posterior surface of the thighs. The strong contrast of the two colors has a very singular effect, and would probably be seized on to form a descriptive appellation. Two males of this beautiful species were sent to the Zoological Society from Morocco; they were not, however, indigenous to that country, but had been brought from the eastern side of the desert. The species is hunted by the Arabs for the sake of the stomachal concretion called *bezoar*, to which it is peculiarly subject, and which is so highly valued in Oriental pharmacy. These stones are called in Morocco *baid el-mhorr*, or mhorr's eggs. There is, however, another species, considerably larger than the mhorr, but having the same general form and the same distributions of the colors. It is the addra (*A. ruficollis*), a fine beast found in the wastes of Nubia by Rüppell, and by Hemprich and Ehrenberg in Dongola. This animal stands about three feet three inches high at the croup, and is five feet four inches in length. It is seen in considerable flocks on the eastern borders of the Great Desert, and may well have been the pygarg of the ancients. See Tristram, *Natural History of the Bible*, p. 126; Wood, *Bible Animals*, p. 141 sq.; *Bible Educator*, ii, 24, 135, 167. Comp. Antelope.

Pygmies of Western Africa. The existence of pygmy races of human beings in Africa has often been asserted, and many circumstances less easily credible than their diminutive size have been reported. Du Chaillu has recently discovered the actual existence of a pygmy race, but of whom the diminutive size is the only remarkable characteristic. He found them in the mountainous country on the east of the southern great branch of the Ogobai. They are called *Obongos*, and live in the midst of negro tribes of ordinary stature. They showed extreme timidity on being visited by a white man. In stature they are only about four feet and a half. They subsist chiefly on animal food, but partly also on the roots, berries, and nuts which they find in the forests. In their mental calibre, these pygmies vary as greatly as ordinary races. Hence there is no settled theory as to their religious tendency, some of them comprehending their religious need, while others seem to be almost void of any religious consciousness. See Pre-Adamites; Religion.

Pyle, Thomas, an eminent Anglican divine, was born at Stodey, near Holt, Norfolk, in 1674. He was educated at Caius College, Cambridge, and, after taking holy orders, distinguished himself as minister of St. Margaret's parish, in King's Lynn. He was afterwards made prebendary of Salisbury by Dr. Hoadly for his services in the Bangorian Controversy. His *Paraphrase on the Acts and all the Epistles* is an excellent work, often reprinted. He published, besides, *Paraphrase of the Books of the Old Testament* (Lond. 1717–25, 4 vols. 8vo):—*The Scripture Preservative against Popery* (ibid. 1735):—and three volumes of *Sermons*. He died at Lynn in 1757, greatly respected and highly admired in all England for his excellency in purpose and superiority in scholarship. See Hook, *Eccles. Biog.* viii, 172; *Gentleman's Magazine* (Lond. 1783), p. 659, 692; Nichols, *Literary Anecdotes*.

Pynchon, William, an English divine, was born in the second half of the 16th century, and, after mi-

grating to this country, settled at Roxbury, Mass., in 1630, aged 71 or 73. In 1637 he removed to Springfield, Mass. He finally returned to England, and died at Wraysbury, Buckinghamshire, in 1662. He published, *The Meritorious Price of Christ's Redemption* (Lond. 1650 and 1655, 4to); which was so heretical in tendency that it offended the Puritanic fathers, and was burned on the Common by order of the authorities of Massachusetts: — *The Jewes' Synagogue* (1652, 4to): — *Time and Manner how the First Sabbath was Ordained*, etc. (1654, 4to).

Pyne, Smith, D.D., a clergyman of the Protestant Episcopal Church, was a native of Ireland, and was educated at Eton and Oxford, England. After arriving in this country he studied theology, and was admitted to holy orders by bishop Hobart in 1826. He was in turn rector of a parish at Elizabeth, N. J.; Christ Church, Middletown, Conn.; St. John's Church, Yonkers, N. Y.; Calvary parish and St. John's Church, Washington. In the latter position he remained upwards of twenty years. During the war, Dr. Pyne worked in the camps and hospitals and among the soldiers. He was at one time a trustee of the General Theological Seminary, and of Trinity College, Hartford. He died in New York Dec. 7, 1875.

Pyramid (*πυραμίς*, perhaps from the Egyptian *br*), a structure of the shape of the geometric figure so called, erected in different parts of the Old and the New World, the most important being the pyramids of Egypt and Mexico. Those of Egypt were considered one of the seven wonders of the world. They are in all seventy in number, of different sizes, lying between 29° and 30° N. lat., and are masses of stone or brick, with square bases and triangular sides. Although various opinions have prevailed as to their use, as that they were erected for astronomical purposes, for resisting the encroachment of the sand of the desert, for granaries, reservoirs, or sepulchres, the last-mentioned hypothesis has been proved to be correct in recent times by the excavations of the late general Howard Vyse. They were all the tombs of monarchs of Egypt who flourished from the fourth to the twelfth dynasty, none having been constructed later than that time, the subsequent kings being buried at Abydos, Thebes, and other places, in tombs of a very different construction. The picture of a pyramid forms a part of the hieroglyphic name of Memphis, and the immutability of most things in Egypt leads us to infer, from this circumstance, that the foundation of the pyramids was coeval with that of the city. It is probable that the title of being the builders of them, and the honor of being buried in them, were given to the monarchs by whom they were finished. The pyramids are solid mounds raised over the sepulchral chambers of the kings, the first act of an Egyptian monarch being to prepare his future "eternal abode." For this purpose, a passage of the size of the intended sarcophagus was first hollowed in the rock at a suitable incline to lower it, and at a convenient depth a rectangular chamber was excavated in the solid rock. Over this chamber a cubical mass of masonry, of square blocks, was then placed, leaving the orifice of the shaft open. Additions continued to be made to this cubical mass both in height and breadth as long as the monarch lived, so that at his death all that remained to be done was to face or smooth the exterior of the step-formed mound. But in some cases the masonry passed beyond the orifice of the shaft, which involved the construction of a new shaft, having its orifice beyond it. The pyramid was faced by adding courses of long blocks on each layer of the steps, and then cutting the whole to a flat or even surface, commencing from the summit. The outer masonry, however, or casing, as it is called, has in most instances been partially stripped off. Provision was made for protecting the vertical joints by placing each stone half way over another. The masonry is admirably finished, and the mechanical means by which such immense masses of stone were raised to their places has long been a mystery; the discovery, however, of large circular holes in some of the stones has led to the conclusion that they were wound up by machines. The stones were quarried on or near the spot; sometimes, however, granite taken from the quarries of Syene was partially employed. The entrances were carefully filled up, and the passage protected by stone portcullises and other contrivances, to prevent ingress to the sepulchral chamber. There appears to have been also a door, or pylon, at the entrance of the shaft, ornamented with Egyptian sculptures and hieroglyphs. The sides of the pyramids face the cardinal points, and the entrances face the north. The work of the larger pyramids was executed by corvées of laborers.

Hieroglyph of Memphis.

The most remarkable and finest pyramids are those of Gîzeh, situated on a level space of the Libyan chain at Memphis, on the west bank of the Nile. The largest three are the most famous. The first or Great Pyramid, as appears from the excavations of Vyse, was the sepulchre of the Cheops of Herodotus, the Chembes, or Chemmis, of Diodorus, and the Suphis of Manetho and Eratosthenes (Shufu I, B.C. 2218–2186). The name of the founder of the Great Pyramid has been detected in a small tomb in its immediate vicinity. It is written in Greek by Manetho, Σοῦφις, which is said by Eratosthenes to mean in Egyptian *κομαστές*, "one who has much hair." The hieroglyphic name, *Shufu*, has also the same meaning as in the

General View of the Pyramids.



Plan of the Pyramids of Gîzeh.

Hieroglyph of Cheops.

Coptic, "much hair." Its height was 480 feet 9 inches, and its base 764 feet square, having an area of about 13 acres. Its slope or angle is 51° 50′. It has, however, been much spoiled and stripped of its exterior blocks for the building of Cairo. The original sepulchral chamber, called the Subterranean Apartment, 46 feet by 27 feet, and 11 feet 6 inches high, has been hewn in the solid rock, and was reached by the original passage, 320 feet long, which descended to it by an entrance at the foot of the pyramid. The excavations in this direction were subsequently abandoned on account of the vast size attained by the pyramid, rendering it impracticable to carry on the entrance on a level with the natural rock, which had been cut down and faced for that purpose. Accordingly a second chamber, with a triangular roof, was constructed in the masonry of the pyramid, 17 feet by 18 feet 9 inches, and 20 feet 3 inches high. This was reached by a passage rising at an inclination of 26° 18′, terminating in a horizontal passage. It is called the Queen's Chamber, and occupies a position nearly in the centre of the pyramid. The monument—probably owing to the long life attained by the monarch—still progressing, a third chamber, called the King's, was finally constructed, by prolonging the ascending passage of the Queen's Chamber for 150 feet farther into the very centre of the pyramid, and, after a short horizontal passage, making a room 17 feet 1 inch by 34 feet 3 inches, and 19 feet 1 inch high. To diminish, however, the pressure of the superincumbent masonry on the flat roof, five small chambers were made vertically in succession

Entrance of the Great Pyramid.

above the roof, the last one pointed, varying in height from 1 foot 4 inches to 8 feet 7 inches, the apex of the top one being rather more than 69 feet above the roof of the King's Chamber. The end of the horizontal passage was finished in a superior style, and cased with red syenitic granite; and in the King's Chamber was the granite sarcophagus of the king, Cheops, 7 feet 6½ inches long, 3 feet 3 inches broad, and 3 feet 5 inches high, for whom the pyramid was built. As the heat of this chamber was stifling, owing to want of ventilation, two small air-channels, or chimneys, about nine inches square, were made, ascending to the north and south sides of the pyramid. They perfectly ventilate this chamber. After the mummy was deposited in the King's Chamber, the entrance was closed with granite portcullises, and a well made at the junction of the upward-inclined and horizontal passages, by which the workmen descended into the downward-inclined passage, after carefully closing the access to the sepulchral chambers. The changes which took place in this pyramid gave rise to various traditions, even in the days of Herodotus, Cheops being reported to lie buried in a chamber surrounded by the waters of the Nile. It took a long time for its construction—100,000 men being employed on it for thirty years. The operations in this pyramid by general Vyse gave rise to the discovery of marks scrawled in red ochre in a kind of cursive hieroglyphs on the blocks brought from the quarries of Turah. These contained the name and titles of Shufu (the hieroglyphic form of Cheops); numerals and directions for the position of materials: with them were mason's marks.



Section of the Great Pyramid of Gizeh.

A. Pyramid when cased and entire.
B. Pyramid as at present.
C. Base of pyramid.
D. Natural rock.
a. Entrance.
b. Descending passage.
c. Horizontal section of *b*.
d. Subterranean chamber.
e. Passage out of *d*.
f. Pit dug by general H. Vyse.
g. Granite block closing upper passage.
h. Passage forced by caliph El-Maimûn.
i. Ascending gallery.
j. Mouth of well.
k. Well.
l. Horizontal gallery leading to Queen's Chamber.
m. Queen's Chamber.
n. Great gallery.
o. Vestibule.
p. King's Chamber.
q. Sarcophagus in the King's Chamber.
r. Davidson's Chamber.
s. Wellington's Chamber.
t. Nelson's Chamber.
u. Lady Arbuthnot's Chamber.
v. Campbell's Chamber.

Hieroglyph of Chephren.

The second pyramid is situated on a higher elevation than the first, and was built by Shufu II, or Chephren (B.C. 2186–2163), the son of Shufu I. His name reads *Shefré:* he is called Suphis II by Manetho, and Cephrenes by Herodotus. It is inscribed on a beautiful tablet in the British Museum, which was brought from one of the tombs near Memphis, and was engraved in memory of a personage who acted as superintendent of the building of the pyramid. This pyramid has two sepulchral chambers, and appears to have been broken into by the caliph Alaziz Othman ben-Yussûf, A.D. 1196. Subsequently, it was opened by Belzoni. The masonry is inferior to the first, but it was anciently cased below with red granite. The casing still remains at the summit.

The third pyramid, built by Mencheres, or Mycerinus (brother of Chephren, B.C. 2163–2130), is much smaller than the other two, being only 218 feet high by 354 feet 6 inches square. It also has two sepulchral chambers, both in the solid rock. The lower sepulchral chamber, which held a sarcophagus of rectangular shape, of whinstone, had a pointed roof, cut like an arch inside; but the cedar coffin, in shape of a mummy, had been removed to the upper or large apartment, and its contents there rifled. Among the débris of the coffin and in the chambers were found the legs and part of the trunk of a body with linen wrapper, supposed by some to be that of the monarch, but by others to be that of an Arab, on account of the anchylosed right knee. This body and fragments of the coffin were removed to the British Museum; but the stone sarcophagus was unfortunately lost off Carthagena, by the sinking of the vessel in which it was being transported to England. There is a hieroglyphic inscription very beautifully engraved on the fragment of the coffin, containing a royal name, which reads *Menka-re.* The masonry of this pyramid is most excellent, and it was anciently cased half-way up with black granite.

Hieroglyph of Mycerinus.

The second pyramid has a line of chambers cut in the rock, and on its eastern side are the ruins of a temple. The third has a similar temple and avenue; and, indeed, the eastern face of the Great Pyramid has traces, though more indistinct, of a similar structure; but the second temple, that of Chephren, is distinguished by having the Sphinx ranged in front of the centre of its eastern face, bearing all the marks of having been connected with it by communications cut through the rock under-ground. Between the paws of the Sphinx a perfect temple was discovered, a few years ago, by Belzoni, on clearing away the sand by which it had been choked up for ages.

There are six other pyramids of inferior size and interest at Gizeh: one at Abu Rûsh, five miles to the north-west of the same spot, is ruined, but of large dimensions; another at Zowyet el-Arrian, also made of limestone, is still more ruined; another at Rigah, a spot in the vicinity of Abusîr, also much ruined, and built for the monarch User-en-Ra, by some supposed to be Busiris. There are five of these monuments at Abusîr, one with a name supposed to be that of a monarch of the third dynasty; and another with that of the king Sahura. A group of eleven pyramids remains at Sakkara, one with a doorway inlaid with porcelain tiles, and having a royal name. Five other pyramids are at Dashûr, the northernmost of which, built of brick, is supposed to be that of the king Asychis of Herodotus, and has a name of a king apparently about the twelfth dynasty. Others are at Meydûn and Illahûn; and two at Biahmo, at Medinet el-Fayûm, apparently the sepulchres of the last kings of the twelfth dy-

nasty. Some small brick pyramids of the kings of the eleventh dynasty are at the Drah Abû Negr at Thebes. In Nubia, the ancient Æthiopia, are several pyramids, the tombs of the monarchs of Meroë, and of some of the Ethiopian conquerors of Egypt. They are taller in proportion to their base than the Egyptian pyramids, and generally have a sepulchral hall, or propylon, with sculptures, which faces the east. The principal groups of these pyramids are at Bege Rauie, or Begromi, 17° N. lat., in one of which gold rings and other objects of late art, resembling that of the Ptolemaic period, were found. See Egypt.

In Assyria, the Birs Nimrûd, or Tower of Belus, was a kind of step-shaped pyramid of seven different-colored bricks, dedicated to the planets by Nebuchadnezzar. See Babel. The Mujellibé, another mound, was of pyramidal shape. The pyramid also entered into the architecture of the tomb of Sardanapalus at Tanus, and of the mausoleum of Artemisia at Halicarnassus. A small pyramid, the sepulchre of C. Cestius, imitated from the Egyptian in the days of Augustus, still exists within the wall of Aurelian at Rome. Temples and other monuments of pyramidal shape are found in India, China, Java, the Polynesian Islands, and elsewhere. The Toltecs and Aztecs erected temples in Mexico, called *Teocalli*, or abodes of gods, of pyramidal shape, with steps or terraces by which to ascend and reach an altar, generally placed on the summit, where they performed human sacrifices and other rites. These, however, are not true pyramids, the pure and simple form of which is restricted to Egypt. The pyramid entered extensively into the architecture of the Egyptians, and appears on the tops of obelisks and tombs as a kind of roof. Small models of pyramids, with inscribed adorations to the sun, or having royal names, were also placed in the tombs. See Lepsius, *Ueber den Bau der Pyramiden* (1843), p. 143, 217; Wilkinson, *Topogr. of Thebes* (Lond. 1835); Vyse, *Operations carried on at Gizeh in* 1837 (ibid. 1840–42); Perring, *Views*, etc. (ibid. 1839–42); Gliddon, *Otia Ægyptiaca* (ibid. 1849); Taylor, *The Great Pyramid* (ibid. 1859, 1864); Smyth, *Life and Work at the Great Pyramid* (1867); also, *Our Inheritance in the Great Pyramid* (Lond. 1864, 1866, 1877, a work full of fanciful theories); St. Day, *Plates and Notes* (Edinb. 1869).

PYRAMID, a sepulchral monument in imitation of a spire of flame. Beleth mentions one built at Tours, and another, called St. Peter's Needle, at Rome.—Walcott. See Effigies.

Pyrker, Johann Ladislav of Felsö-Eör, a Roman Catholic prelate, and a poet of some talent, was born Nov. 2, 1772, at Langk, in Hungary. His father was the manager of an estate. John studied first at the gymnasium of Stuhlweissenburg and the academy of Fünfkirchen, and then decided to enter the service of the State. His application for admission in the chief chancery at Ofen having met with a refusal, he accepted a situation as private secretary in the house of a count at Palermo, but never performed these functions; for, while on his journey, in the spring of 1792, and on the point of passing over to Sicily, he suddenly changed his mind and returned. On his journey home he escaped an ambush of pirates, which circumstance gave origin to the tale that he was taken by pirates, sold at Algiers, and escaped to Genoa. The aspect of the South exercised an animating influence upon Pyrker's poetical talent. On his return through Venice and Vienna, he made the acquaintance of a former Cistercian monk, and applied for admission to that order. His request was granted at Lilienfeld (Lower Austria), Oct. 18, 1792. He studied theology at St. Pölten, received holy orders in 1796, and subsequently exercised several monastical functions. In 1807 he became curate of Tirniz. In 1811 he was recalled to his monastery as prior, and in 1812 he was elected abbot of Lilienfeld. In 1818 he was appointed bishop of Zips, where he founded a seminary for country teachers. In 1820 he became patriarch of Venice, and in the ensuing year primate of Dalmatia, chaplain of the Lombardo-Venetian kingdom, etc. In 1827 he was called to the archiepiscopal see of Erlau, which post he held until his death, at Vienna, Dec. 2, 1847. Pyrker was a man of amiable manners, a conscientious and courageous priest, a Mæcenas to the arts, a father to the poor, an ornament to science, and enjoyed general esteem and affection. His heart rests in the cathedral at Erlau; his body, in conformity with his will, in a spot of the cemetery of Lilienfeld chosen by himself. His epitaph, chiselled on a simple slab of marble, is also of his own composition: *Ossa I. L. P. Patr. Archiep. Agriensis requiescant in pace.* Of his works, we consider it appropriate to mention here only *Perlen der heiligen Vorzeit* (Vienna, 1821; 2d ed. 1826):—*Bilder aus dem Leben Jesu und der Apostel* (Leips. 1842–43):—*Legenden der Heiligen* (ibid. 1842). His complete works were published at Stuttgart (1832–34, 3 vols.; new ed. 1843). Severe critics miss in Pyrker's poems creative freshness and the charm of an original fancy; but they cannot deny the power and beauty of his poetical pictures, the pronounced relief of his characters, and his masterly management of the language and rhythm. See Ignaz Hub, *Deutschlands Balladen- und Romanzen-Dichter* (Carlsruhe, 1849. 2d ed.), p. 188; Winer, *Handb. der theol. Literatur*, ii, 351, 718; but especially Brühl, *Gesch. der kathol. Literatur, Deutschlands* (Vienna, 1861), p. 340 sq.

Pyrlæus, John Christopher, a Moravian itinerant and missionary among the Indians, was born April 25, 1713, at Pausa, in Swabia, graduated at the University of Leipsic, and immigrated to America in 1740. After having spent a part of the year 1743 in the Mohawk country, in order to learn its language and customs, he opened a so-called "Indian school" at Bethlehem, Pa., in which he prepared young men for missionary service among the aborigines, and, in particular, taught them the Mohawk tongue. The illustrious David Zeisberger (q. v.) was one of his pupils. He continued such instructions at Gnadenhütten, a missionary settlement in Pennsylvania, whither he removed in 1747, taking part at the same time in the work of the mission. Besides translating a number of hymns into the Mohawk, he wrote three valuable treatises on this language; which, however, were never printed. The MSS. are deposited in the library of the American Philosophical Society, Philadelphia. In 1751 he went to England, where he labored in the ministry for nearly twenty years. He died at Herrnhut, Saxony, May 28, 1785. (E. de S.)

Pyrrho (Πύρρων), a Greek philosopher of much eminence, is especially noted as the founder of the Pyrrhonian or first Sceptic school of Greece. He was the son of Pleistarchus, or Pleistocrates, and a native of Elis, a town of Peloponnesus. He lived about the time of Philip and Alexander of Macedonia, and was originally a poor painter; but, after having learned the elements of science from Dryson, he followed Alexander the Great in his Eastern expedition, and thus became acquainted with the doctrines of the Indian gymnosophists and the Persian magi (Diog. Laert. ix, 11, 2). He was also an ardent admirer of Democritus. During the greater part of his life he dwelt in quiet retirement, abstaining from pronouncing any decided opinion upon anything, and endeavoring to preserve the greatest calmness and composure in whatever circumstances he was placed. Notwithstanding this apparently inactive and indolent mode of life, he was highly honored by his countrymen, who not only made him their high-priest, but, for his sake, decreed that all philosophers should be exempt from payment of taxes (Diog. Laert. ix, 11, 5). Pausanias (vi, 24, 4) saw his statue in a portico at Elis, and a monument erected in honor of him at a little distance from the town. The Athenians honored him with the franchise of their city. He died at the advanced age of ninety. Cicero (not so far wrongly either) ranks him

among the Socratics; and, indeed, he was as much opposed to the pretensions of the Sophists as Socrates himself, though from a different point of view. An undisturbed peace of mind (*ἀπαθία*) appeared to Pyrrho the highest object of philosophy; and, thinking that this peace of mind was disturbed by the dogmatic systems and the disputes of all other philosophic schools, he was led to scepticism; but he was by no means of that class of thorough-going scepticism which is usually associated with his name, and which is synonymous with absolute and unlimited infidelity. He simply considered a real scientific knowledge of things to be altogether impossible. His fundamental principle was, that there is nothing true or false, right or wrong, honest or dishonest, just or unjust; that there is no standard in anything, but that all things depend upon law and custom, and that uncertainty and doubt belong to everything. Yet, like the eminent modern German thinker, he appears to have tenaciously maintained the obligations of morality, and he declared virtue to be the only thing worth striving after (Cicero, *De Fin.* iv, 16). On all occasions, therefore, he answered his opponents, "What you say may be true, but I cannot decide." This and other similar expressions drew upon him the ridicule of his adversaries; and most of the absurd anecdotes respecting his conduct in the common occurrences of life, which Diogenes repeats with all the credulity of a gossip, are probably the fabrications of his opponents, made for the purpose of ridiculing Pyrrho. He had many distinguished followers and disciples, who are called *Pyrrhonii*, or simply Sceptics: some of them are mentioned and characterized by Diogenes Laertius (ix, c. 7, etc., and c. 12; comp. Gellius, xi, 5; and Cicero, *De Orat.* iii, 17). Their doctrines and mode of reasoning are seen clearest in the works of Sextus Empiricus: their object was rather to overthrow all other systems than to establish a new one; hence we can scarcely speak of a school of Pyrrhonists, inasmuch as they opposed every school. The whole philosophy of Pyrrho and his followers is called Pyrrhonism — a name which in subsequent times has been applied to any kind of scepticism, though the Pyrrhonian philosophy in reality is, as we have seen above, only one particular, and an elementary, form of scepticism. Cicero, in several passages, speaks of the philosophy of Pyrrho as long exploded and extinct. Pyrrho himself is said by some ancient authors to have left no works behind him; the tropes or epochs, or fundamental principles of his philosophy, being justly ascribed to one or more of his followers. But Sextus Empiricus (*Adv. Math.* i, 282) says that he wrote a poem addressed to Alexander the Great, for which he was richly rewarded; and Athenæus (x, p. 419) quotes a passage from a work of Pyrrho, the character of which is entirely unknown. The first writer on the scepticism of Pyrrho is said to have been Timon, his friend and disciple, whose life is written by Diogenes Laertius. See *English Cyclop.* s. v.; Smith, *Dict. of Class. Biog.* s. v.; Kingsley, *Alexandria and her Schools*, p. 59 sq.; Ueberweg, *Hist. of Philos.* (see Index in vol. ii); Mackintosh, *Works*, i, 306, 307; Bordas-Demoulin, *Mélanges Philosophiques* (Par. 1846), p. 47 sq.

Pyrrhonii. See PYRRHO.

Pyrrhonism. See PYRRHO.

Pyr'rhus (Πύρρος, *fiery*-haired, a common Greek name) is given in the best MSS. as the name of the father of Sopater, Paul's companion (Acts xx, 4). See SOPATER.

Pythagoras, one of the earliest and most celebrated sages of Greece, the alleged originator of the name and of the profession of *philosopher*, and the founder of a sect which enjoyed great and enduring reputation. Notwithstanding the numerous fables which are interwoven with the traditionary accounts of his career, it is certain that none of the elder philosophers of Greece attained higher eminence in speculation, impressed himself more forcibly on the contemporary world, or influenced more widely and more permanently the character of subsequent investigation. Engaged equally and simultaneously in abstract inquiry and in scientific research, at once theorist and practical politician, and predominant wherever his efforts were directed, he instituted a school, a religious fraternity, a secret society, and a political association, all combined in one body; and he controlled for many years the public movement of the community in which he had fixed his abode. His political ascendency was a potent influence during a considerable part of his life, and was prolonged, in a mitigated and disguised form, through successive generations. His sect survived alike the peculiar circumstances which had favored its original establishment and the violent catastrophe which crushed the primitive association, and, after his characteristic doctrines had been accepted, with modifications and additions, by other schools, devoted itself with marked earnestness to the public and private ethics which had chiefly attracted the regards of the master. His discoveries, or happy conjectures, in mathematics, in astronomy, in music, etc., fascinated Plato, and were largely incorporated into the all-embracing system of Aristotle. Even in cases in which they were questioned, rejected, or almost forgotten by later antiquity, they have been revived by modern philosophy, and may frequently be recognised as furnishing the corner-stones for modern sciences. To Pythagoras have been ascribed the anticipation of the Copernican system, the demonstration of the relation between the squares of the sides of a right-angled triangle, and the determination of the mathematical basis of the theory of music. To him must also be assigned the honor of introducing, however fantastically, numerical relations for the explanation of the laws and operations of the material universe. A man connected so prominently and so effectively with so many important branches of human research and of human action, at the very outset of systematic speculation and systematized activity, may well excite wonder and attract curiosity—a wonder which is converted into amazement by reputed miracles, and a curiosity which is baffled and bewildered by the accumulation of myths around his name and around all the salient incidents of his career.

I. *Life and Labors.*—The details of the life and opinions of Pythagoras, as transmitted to us by the ancients, are so confused and contradictory, and are so blended with fantastic fables, that it is impracticable to extract from them a plain, trustworthy, and consistent account (Brucker, *Hist. Crit. Phil.* i, 991). The founder, in a remote age, of a secret society at once religious and political, philosophical and scientific, afforded an apt frame on which to hang the exaggerations of admiring disciples and the credulous fancies of his own and of other generations. We have no authentic remains and no contemporary memorials of the Samian philosopher. The relics attributed to his earlier followers are not acknowledged to be genuine. The special works of Aristotle and of his pupils, Dicæarchus, Aristoxenus, and Heraclides Ponticus, on the subject of the Pythagoreans, were early lost. A few scant notices survive in Herodotus, Heraclitus, Xenophanes, Isocrates, Plato, and Aristotle; but our chief sources of information are the late writers Diogenes Laertius, Porphyry, and Iamblichus. Whatever materials may have been accessible to them, they cannot be supposed to have had credible authorities for their compilations. The loose and uncritical habits of Diogenes do not invite confidence, while the mythical and thaumaturgic proclivities of the Neo-Platonists do provoke constant suspicion. These miracle-mongers would greedily welcome any marvellous legends, and would not be scrupulous about adding embellishments or fictions of their own to the tales of wonder which they might find already in circulation. We are singularly unfortunate in regard to this pioneer in philosophy. Antiquity has bequeathed to us much in regard to him which is absurd as well as incredible;

it has left little that can be received without hesitation, to form a portrait of the man, or to furnish an adequate scheme of his doctrines.

The birth of Pythagoras is placed by Mullach in the first year of the 43d Olympiad (B.C. 608), on the strength of a legend reported by Eratosthenes and cited by Diogenes Laertius. The same date is deduced, with some uncertainty, from a statement made by Antiochus and preserved by Clemens Alexandrinus. The nativity of Pythagoras is brought down nearly forty years later by accepting the declaration of Aristoxenus that he left Samos at the age of forty, in the reign of Polycrates. The difference between these estimates is sufficient to destroy any confidence in either, and distrust is increased by the very dubious character of early Greek chronology; yet each of these deductions has been espoused by eminent scholars. Bentley and Larcher are on the side of Mullach; Dodwell attaches himself to the declaration of Aristoxenus; Grote, apparently convinced of the inconclusiveness of all reasoning on the subject, aims at the golden mean, and places the birth of Pythagoras about B.C. 580. The only safe conclusion is that the philosopher began to flourish in the second half of the 6th century before Christ.

The birthplace of Pythagoras, if less doubtful than the date of his birth, has been more variously determined. He is usually designated the Samian. This rests, primarily, upon a passage in Herodotus, in which the curious story of Zamolxis is related. Grote considers the passage decisive. On referring to the text, it will be found that Herodotus says nothing positively of the philosopher's place of birth. The general belief of antiquity, however, accredited Pythagoras to Samos, and it is only this belief that is attested by Isocrates (*Busir.* c. xi). Aristoxenus represented him as a Tyrrhenian from Lemnos or Imbros. By some writers he was represented as the son of a Phliasian refugee who settled in Samos. Neanthes regarded him as a Syrian or Tyrian; Theopompus and Aristarchus entertained the opinion of Aristoxenus; Hippobotus and Hermippus endorsed the common belief.

Contradictions continue to multiply. There is no agreement in regard to the paternity of Pythagoras. The accepted tradition presents him as the son of Mnesarchus; Justin, however, names his father Demaratus. Those who assigned a Phliasian origin to his father gave him the name of Marmacus, which Voss and Faber think that Justin blunderingly converted into Demaratus. Tzetzes, a very late author indeed, calls his mother Pythaïs. His father is variously reputed to have been an engraver of gems and a rich merchant; he may have been both or neither. Two brothers, older than himself, are given to Pythagoras—Eunomus, or, according to other accounts, Eunostes, and Tyrrhenus. These names are very suspicious.

These confusions and perplexities are noticed, not with any desire of exhibiting the numerous opinions which prevailed in relation to the birth of Pythagoras, but to show how uncertain and unauthenticated, even in antiquity, were those points in his history which were least apt to provoke diversity of statement. If there were such differences in such matters, there is little reason to expect trustworthy accounts in regard to more important concerns, where enforced secrecy promoted fanciful conjecture, where the love of the marvellous might indulge itself without check or fear of detection, and where the character of the school cherished the wildest inventions and encouraged their acceptance. The story is, throughout, involved in fable and in superfetations of fable.

Tradition has been wholly unrestrained in relating the education of Pythagoras. Several teachers have been assigned to him. He is said to have been placed by his uncle Zoïlus under the charge of Pherecydes in the island of Lemnos. He is reported to have afterwards attached himself to Hermodamas, or Leodamas (both names are given), the grandson of Creophylus, the cyclic poet. He is alleged to have been the disciple of Thales, of the Milesian Anaximander, and of the Cretan Epimenides, who is even a more shadowy personage than himself. The true significance of this combination of names may probably be found in the disposition of later times to regard Pythagoras as instructed in all the learning of the Greeks. Yet the accumulation of Hellenic knowledge was not considered a sufficient equipment for his career. He is supposed to have set out, while still young, on extensive travels through the Oriental world, just as the mediæval sages were believed to have gathered their stores of learning from the Saracenic schools in Spain and in the East.

Egypt seems to have been the first foreign country visited by Pythagoras. He is said to have been commended to Amasis by a letter from his friend Polycrates, and to have remained in the country long enough to acquire all the wisdom of the Egyptians—their language, arithmetic, geometry, religious rites, etc. During his stay, he is alleged to have been captured by the Persian armies of Cambyses, and to have received the instructions of the Magi; he is also said to have studied astrology with the Chaldæans, and to have received from the Brahmins in India their peculiar doctrines. This last imagination is apparently a late deduction from the correspondence of the Pythagorean metempsychosis with Hindû tenets. Hermippus and Porphyry ascribe to him also studies among the Jews. He may have visited Crete, and there is no improbability in the supposition that anxiety to note the institutions of Lycurgus may have carried him to Sparta.

After a long and uncertain absence, Pythagoras returned to Samos, and opened a school, at the request of his countrymen, for the dissemination of the marvels of learning which he had collected in his extensive travels. His pupils were few and listless, and his method of teaching—by signs and symbols—irritated rather than enlightened his acolytes. To add mystery to his instructions and a divine sanction to his wisdom, he visited Delos and other oracular shrines. To these journeys may be assigned his appearance at the Olympic Games, and his celebrated invention of the name of "Philosopher," though this is also referred to a conversation with the Tyrant of Phlius, and probably did not originate with him.

Having, by these journeys, by frequent intercourse with the divinities, by the pretension of a divine origin and of miraculous gifts, and also by the admiration excited in the congresses of men, extended and heightened his reputation, Pythagoras came back to Samos, and reopened his school under brighter auspices than before. He gave public instruction in ethical and political philosophy, and freely responded to those who consulted him in regard to the government of the island. But, besides conducting this public academy, he provided a retreat for those who sought and were deemed worthy of more recondite education. Outside of the city he procured a cave, to which he retired with his more select disciples. Here he spent much of the night, as well as of the day, in esoteric instruction, and especially in teaching the wonders of mathematical science. He added the arts of the charlatan to the learning of the scholar and the wisdom of the sage.

Samos, however, proved an uncongenial abode. Whether his philosophical vocation was too much interrupted by the embassies and public duties imposed on him by his countrymen, or the Samians displayed too little aptitude for philosophy; whether he was offended by the tyranny of his friend Polycrates, or imperilled by that of Syloson, the brother and successor of Polycrates, it is vain to inquire. It is sufficient to know, from the universal testimony of antiquity, that Pythagoras abandoned Samos, and migrated to Southern Italy, which proved singularly hospitable to philosophy. But there is as much discrepance in regard to the time when this migration took place as in regard to other circumstances in the life of the Samian teach-

er; it is placed about B.C. 531 by Fynes Clinton, in 529 by Ueberweg, and other dates are given.

Crotona received the emigrant. He was soon surrounded by numerous admirers, belonging to the wealthier and more influential part of the population. He is said to have united these, to the number of three hundred or more, in a secret organization. Among the earliest consequences of his residence in Crotona is mentioned the complete reformation of the manners and morals of the people, produced by his persuasive address, by the authority of his divine pretensions, by his imposing demeanor, and by his judicious counsels. His disciples were of the rich and noble class, and, by converting them to a more sober and abstemious life, he would necessarily suppress luxury and sensuality; for these are not the vices of poor laborers and "rude mechanicals." Moreover, as the political control was still in the hands of the aristocracy, though already contested, political interest might conspire with religious enthusiasm and philosophical convictions in facilitating a reform requisite to maintain a doubtful ascendency. That aristocratic rule was confirmed by the action of Pythagoras was the belief of later times; and that Crotona was strengthened by the reformation is shown by its subsequent victory over Sybaris, under Pythagorean leadership. How far the Pythagorean rule was intentionally political, how far Pythagoras directed his secret society to political aims, cannot be ascertained, and has been diversely determined. It has been well observed that a select body of influential men, interested in the maintenance of a specific policy; bound together by the closest ties of opinion, sentiment, and affectionate regard; united, moreover, by secret obligations, would necessarily employ concerted action in public affairs. It should also be observed that the Greek schools, until the close, or nearly the close, of Plato's career, had always a decided political inclination.

It may well be supposed that Pythagoras, who had already tested, at Samos, the efficacy of supernatural claims, would avail himself of like arts to establish his predominance in a new land. He had previously presented himself as a son of Phœbus, and he is said to have been worshipped in Italy, after his death, as the offspring of the Hyperborean Apollo; his golden thigh had been shown to Abaris at the Olympic Games as evidence of his divine descent. The claim was consonant with the whole tenor of Greek genealogy, and is illustrated by many striking parallels in Greece and in other lands. He offered, in confirmation of his doctrine of the transmigration of souls, his recognition, in the temple of Juno at Argos, of the shield of Euphorbus, slain in the Trojan War, whose body he had then inhabited.

"Ipse ego (jam memini) Trojani tempore belli,
Panthoïdes Euphorbus eram" (Ovid, *Met.* xv, 160, 161).

To the earlier years of his residence at Crotona may be assigned his death, burial, and resurrection, and his report of the wonders of the nether world; to the same time may be referred (though there is really no chronology in these matters) his familiar intercourse with animals, his handling snakes with impunity, his prediction of earthquakes, his control over tempests, his removal of pestilences, etc. To the closing years of his life must be referred his remarkable apparition to his friends at Metapontum and Tarentum simultaneously, and his public conversation with them. It is scarcely surprising that the Neo-Platonists, by whom his biography was composed (or consarcinated), should have presented him as the counterpart and rival of Christ. It is natural that these miraculous endowments should be regarded as the bold inventions of late pagans; but this solution is not satisfactory, as some of them are evidently of much earlier origin, and all of them appear, in modified forms, in other myths in widely separated regions. There are many points in the story of Pythagoras which appear to be only late survivals of primitive superstitions and delusions.

The high and various endowments of Pythagoras, real and fictitious, rendered him singularly successful in the institution of his school at Crotona. The most important, the most credulous, or the most zealous of his pupils were constituted as a secret society, were subjected to the most stringent discipline, and to the most absolute obedience to their inspired teacher. According to some traditions, the property of all was surrendered for the common use. This is scarcely probable, as the age of communism had not yet arrived. The statement may simply indicate that the means of the members were freely employed for common objects, and that the wealthier brethren generously ministered to the requirements of the poorer.

The society seems to have been divided into two classes: the more advanced, or esoterical, and the neophytes, or exoterical. Other divisions are also mentioned, as into *Pythagorici*, *Pythagorei*, and *Pythagoristæ*, according to their progress in the studies of the sect, and the intimacy of their communion with their common superior.

The candidates for admission were carefully scrutinized, and great attention was paid to physiognomy and the external indications of moral and mental qualities. If accepted, they had to pass through a long period of probation. It was credited in after-times that they had to maintain silence for five years; that, during this period, they were not allowed to behold the face of the master; and that they were required to undergo other tests of fitness for membership. Silence, or the government of the tongue (ἐχεμυθία), was prescribed as earnestly as by St. James; but the length and degree of the silence required were not uniform in all cases. The fellows of the guild received instruction in all the knowledge then existent, either directly from the scholarch himself, or through the intervention of his more instructed pupils. The esoteric studies have been differently supposed to have been the political theories and the political projects of Pythagoras, and the mystic religious rites, or *orgies*, which rendered the society a theosophic sect: they were probably the latter.

The publication of the characteristic Pythagorean doctrines was absolutely prohibited; and when these were published by Philolaus, in a later age, the procedure was regarded as a grave infraction of Pythagorean proprieties. Daily self-examination, which presupposes habitual meditation, was a constant requirement.

"*They* summ'd the actyonns of the daie
Eche nyghte before *they* slept."

Such reverence was paid to the declarations of the master that all contradiction, cavil, and doubt were unknown. Every difference of opinion was promptly settled by the autocratic dictum, Αὐτὸς ἔφα.

In the midst of the luxury, sensuality, idleness, and extravagance for which Crotona, like other cities of Magna Græcia, was noted, the greatest restraint was imposed on the elect in regard to all those vices which undermine or fritter away morality. Modesty and simplicity in dress, decorum in behavior, abstemiousness in food, abstinence from meats, beans, and other articles of food, and moderation in all things, were earnestly inculcated. The institutions of Pythagoras appear to have been, in many respects, an anticipation of the monastic life of the early mediæval Benedictines. Healthful recreations for mind and body, music and gymnastics, each of which embraced a large and varied sphere, were zealously prosecuted.

The members of the association were segregated from "the vulgar herd," not merely by their secret organization and higher culture, but also by the pride of learning, of creed, of power, and by the haughty contempt for inferiors which usually attends such pride. The mystic secrecy and the careful separation from the multitude were maintained by signs and enigmatic symbols, which enabled Pythagoreans to recognise each other with certainty and without display.

The best and the latest investigators of the perplex-

ed subject of Pythagoreanism agree in rejecting the opinion that Pythagoras intended to found a distinct political organization for the purpose of maintaining aristocratic authority. Nevertheless, if any weight is to be given to concurrent testimony, or to the natural tendencies of an aristocratic organization held together by secret bonds, or to the existing condition of Greek communities, the Pythagorean fraternity did secure the control of Crotona, and instituted affiliated societies in Metapontum and other neighboring cities. The influence exercised by the Pythagoreans may well have been favorable to private morals, to public virtues, and to general prosperity. But the power of an exclusive, arbitrary, and haughty section of the community, and the constraint imposed by it on the free action as well as on the accustomed passions, the sensual gratifications, and the avidity of license, which is the first manifestation of the spirit of progressive freedom, would be certain to provoke reaction. It would thus be in perfect consonance with the natural order of events that the story should be true which related that, after Pythagoras had taught at Crotona for twenty years, the people made a combined attack upon the cœnobitic association assembled in the house of Milo the athlete. Cylon, a noble who had been refused admission into the society, and Ninon were the reputed leaders. The assailants are sometimes said to have been only Crotoniates; at other times they are reputed to have consisted also of deputations from the other cities in which Pythagorean clubs had been established. The *cœnaculum* was burned to the ground, and most of the congregation lost their lives. According to some accounts, Pythagoras himself perished in the flames; according to others, he escaped, retired to Metapontum, and soon after died, or was slain. This calamity is calculated to have happened about B.C. 510, when Pythagoras was ninety-eight years of age, if the earliest date of his nativity be accepted. The same story, however, with the requisite modifications, is told in regard to the Pythagoreans of a later generation. But there are so many and such inconsistent narratives of the end of the philosopher, and of the suppression or dispersion of the Pythagorean organization, that no greater certainty can be expected in these matters than is attainable in regard to other points in his career. The whole story is as mythical as the fable of King Arthur and the Knights of the Round Table, though unquestionably encrusting a large substratum of fact. "The stories told of him," says Cox, "must be classed along with the tales which related the exploits of the Messenian Aristomenes."

Pythagoras was married, and had a family consisting of two sons, Telauges and Mnesarchus, and three daughters or more, Damo, Muia, and Arignote, all of whom became his disciples. Telauges is said to have succeeded him in the conduct of the school. But the disciples appear to have been scattered, the school broken up, and the sect utterly dissipated as a community, though its chiefs continued to be named, as late, at least, as Archytas of Tarentum. His wife, and the mother of his children, is usually reported to have been Theano, the daughter of Brontinus of Crotona; but she is called a Cretan, and the daughter of Pythonax, by Suidas. Confusion and discord attend every step of the inquiry.

II. *Writings and Doctrines.*—All the works ascribed to Pythagoras are spurious beyond all doubt. The *Golden Song* is not excepted from this censure. David, the scholiast of Aristotle (p. 13, l. 15–26, r. ed. Brandis), gives the reasons assigned by Pythagoras for his refusal to commit anything to writing, and explicitly assigns the *Golden Song* to a nameless Pythagorean. This shows how utterly destitute the ancients themselves were of genuine Pythagorean texts, and how uncertain are all sources of information. The earliest documents are the *Fragments* of Philolaus, whose authenticity is still debated, and the *Golden Song*, often ascribed to Lysis, but, in all probability, the production of a later age. As Philolaus was the pupil of Archytas and the instructor of Simmias and Cebes, he belonged to the Socratic æra; and, as Lysis was the teacher of Epaminondas, he may be regarded as the contemporary of Plato. The interval must have been considerable between Pythagoras and Philolaus, as Archytas, the instructor of the latter, was regarded as the eighth in the succession of the Pythagorean scholarchs. Yet the distinctive doctrines of Pythagoras must have been bruited abroad long before the publication of Philolaus; for we find among the fragments of Xenophanes an epigram on the Pythagorean doctrine of metempsychosis, and Xenophanes was born before the death of Pythagoras. But the doctrines of Pythagoras, deducible from earlier and later writers, cannot be regarded as even a fragmentary exposition of a definite system constructed by him. They are only the mutilated expression of his leading principles, as interpreted and expanded by those who claimed to be representatives of his teachings. The remnants of the early Greek inquirers, whether didactic or speculative, exhibit their disposition to employ terse aphorisms for the utterance of their views. This is the tendency of all primitive speculation. While recognising the unsystematic character of the exposition thence resulting, it is well also to remember the commendation and employment of the same mode of communication by Francis Bacon in a period of much ampler knowledge and more diffused intelligence.

Gathering from the unsatisfactory materials that remain the distinctive doctrines of Pythagoras, they appear to be these: The soul is, in its nature, immortal, and akin to divinity. It consists of two parts: the rational, which is alone immortal; and the sensuous, or irrational, which is ultimately mortal. Plants possess the latter. In this distinction may be found the germ of the Aristotelian dogma of three souls: the intelligent, the animal, and the vegetative. The rational soul is pure; the irrational, impure, because immersed in matter: both are united in man. The former attests his divine nature and origin; the latter guides and governs his material frame, with which it is united in life, and through which it is diffused. Death is the withdrawal of this complex soul from the corporeal involucre in which it has been enclosed, and which it has animated. The spirit, thus released, dwells in the circumambient air, retaining, in shadowy guise, its former shape, visible as a ghost, or intervening in the affairs of men through dreams and other influences. Souls that have divested themselves in life of the taint of their irrational companion, and of their corporeal environment, enter into enduring bliss, and become wholly divine, apparently without loss of individual nature.

> ἦν δ' ἀπολείψας σῶμα ἐς αἰθέρ' ἐλεύθερον ἔλθῃς,
> ἔσσεαι ἀθάνατος, θεὸς ἄμβροτος, οὐκ ἔτι θνητός
> (*Carm. Aur.* 70, 71).

Souls not liberated from the vices and passions of the lower soul, or from the impurities and temptations of their material vesture, float for a time in the air, tormented by the Furies and the ministers of vengeance, till they are allowed a new trial, and are subjected to a new ordeal, by passing into new bodies, human or bestial.

> "animam sic semper eandem
> Esse, sed in varias doceo migrare figuras"
> (Ovid, *Met.* xv, 171, 172).

The air is always full of souls, undergoing the penal consequences of their sins, and awaiting their descent into new bodies.

> "penitusque necesse est
> Multa diu concreta modis inolescere miris"
> (Virgil, *Æn.* vi, 737, 738).

This is the noted metempsychosis of Pythagoras, which is usually conceived to have been of Hindû origin, but is often referred to an Egyptian source, though having little correspondence with the metensomatosis or the anacatastasis of Egyptian mythology. It is much more reasonable to consider it a philosophical adaptation of the primitive beliefs in regard to spiritual existence after death (see Tylor, *Primitive Culture*).

It is an obvious deduction from the doctrine of metempsychosis that animal life should be scrupulously regarded, and that animals should not be slaughtered for food. The butcher is a homicide, if not a murderer. It is a natural consequence from the doctrine of disembodied spirits that Pythagoras should have attached great importance to dreams and other spiritual communications. The sanctity of all life, and the consideration of human life as a probation and as a progress to a higher existence, explain his strong condemnation of suicide.

"The Everlasting had fixed
His canon 'gainst self-slaughter."

(See Thom. Aquin. *Summa Theolog.* II, ii, qu. xxiv, art. v.)

Not only the spirits of men are divine, according to Pythagoras, but those of the sun, moon, and stars, which move at such musical intervals from each other, and in such regulated concord, as to produce the music of the spheres—a doctrine welcome to the poetic imagination of Plato.

"Such harmony is in immortal souls.
But while this muddy vesture of decay
Doth grossly close it in, we cannot hear it."

The ontology of Pythagoras was intimately associated with his transcendental theory of numbers. It can scarcely be determined which suggested the other, or by what series of reciprocal reactions both were produced. The cosmogony attributed to him is much more manifestly an evolution from the numerical fantasy which has always been held to be the most distinctive part of Pythagoreanism.

Mullach justly observes that the exposition of the significance and potency of numbers in the Pythagorean theory would require an ample volume; hence he notices them very briefly. The like course must be adopted here, and a summary, abridged from an abridgment by Baring-Gould, must suffice.

"1. The unit, or Monad, is the beginning and end of all. It is the symbol of existence, identity, equality, conservation, and harmony (comp. Philolai *Fragm.* 15).
"2. Two, or the Dyad, is the origin of contrasts, the symbol of diversity, division, change, disorder.
"3. Three, or the Triad, is the first of unequals. It represents God and the soul of man.
"4. Four, or the Tetrad, is the most perfect of numbers; the root, or origin, of all things, whence the soul derives its eternal nature: hence it furnishes the Pythagorean oath.

[Ναὶ μὰ τὸν ἀμετέρᾳ ψυχᾷ παραδόντα τετρακτύν,
Παγὰν ἀενάου φύσεως (*Carm. Aur.* 47, 48)].

"5. Five, or the Pentad, is everything, supplying the principle of everything, and repelling evil spirits.
"6. Six, or the Hexad, is the number of good fortune.
"7. Seven, or the Heptad, is a sacred number, generating good and evil.
"8. Eight, or the Octad, the first cube, is a perfect number.
"9. Nine, or the Ennead, being the square of three, is sacred.
"10. Ten, or the Decad, the sum of the first four numbers, contains all numeric relations. All science proceeds from it and returns to it (comp. Philolai *Fragm.* 13)."

Whether numbers constituted the essences of things, or were only similitudes, or symbols, is still in dispute, and was, perhaps, never clearly determined. The language of Aristotle (*Met.* I, v) is vague and indistinct. That they were generally employed in a symbolic sense is apparent. The monad was the first principle of all things, the origin whence all things emanated; it was at once the odd and the even, the limited and the unlimited, God and the universe. The dyad, or first evolution of number, was the even, and represented the interval between limiting extremes. The triad generated the progressive scale of numbers. The tetrad was the union of the triad with the unit, or of the dyad with itself, and indicated geometrical body. The pentad was physical body, with its properties and accidents of sense. Numbers, again, represented points; by the procession of points, lines are formed; by the movement of lines, surfaces; by the progress of surfaces, solids. From these last arise all bodies, and the four elements of earth, air, water, fire, which undergo constant change and reciprocal conversion.

"Nec species sua cuique manet: rerumque novatrix
Ex aliis alias separat Natura figuras.
Nec perit in tanto quicquam, mihi credite, mundo,
Sed variat, faciemque novat" (Ovid, *Met.* xv, 252–255).

A fifth element was added by the pentad; this was the upper air, the surrounding ether, the Quintessence. These five cosmic elements were also symbolized by the five mathematical bodies. The cube was the earth; the pyramid, fire; the octahedron, air; the dodecahedron, space, or ether; and the eicosahedron, water. All were contained within the enveloping sphere. Such are the bare outlines of the Pythagorean cosmogony.

Much more influential than this in the intellectual development of Greece was the moral instruction, which long continued to form a large part of Pythagorean speculation. Morals were divided into two departments: disciplinary, or ethical, for the perfection of the individual; and political, for the furtherance of the common welfare. In both parts, great stress was laid upon the obligation and the benefit of friendship, which extended, also, to the metaphysical and to the material constitution of the universe, producing the harmony of the former, and the attractions, combinations, and absorptions of the latter. The efficacy, in actual life, of the Pythagorean friendship is exemplified by the well-known story of Damon and Pythias. The Pythagorean Symbols belong mainly to practical morals, and exhibit a decided advance on the contemporaneous sentiments of the Greek world. They are unauthentic. Many belong to a later date, many are simply ceremonial, and others are general and traditionary precepts.

Condensed and inadequate as is this summary of the alleged career and teachings of Pythagoras, it reveals the powerful influence exercised by him on the communities with which he was associated, and on the later generations which professed the adoption of his alleged philosophy. Admitting the utmost confusion and uncertainty in the chronology of both his biography and his doctrines, and the fabulous nature of much that was ascribed to him, he must yet be deemed worthy of the reputation he left behind him, and is still "clarum et venerabile nomen."

III. *Literature.*—All the historians of ancient philosophy, and all the extended histories of Greece, necessarily treat of Pythagoras with more or less fulness and with more or less discernment. Brucker, as usual, provides an ample accumulation of materials; Ueberweg is brief but perspicacious; while Ritter is very copious and discreet. Grote's observations are valuable. Of more special sources of information may be enumerated: Mullach, *Fragmenta Philosophorum Græcorum* (Paris, 1875–77); Hieroclis *Commentarius in Carmen Aureum* (ap. Mullach, *Fragm. Phil. Græc.*); Aristotelis *Metaphysica*, lib. i, ix, xii, xiii; Diogenes Laertius (ed. Hübner, Lips. 1828–31, 2 vols.); Porphyrii *Pythagoræ Vita*; Iamblichi *Pythagoræ Vita* (ed. Kiessling, Lips. 1813); Fabricii *Bibliotheca Græca*, i, 750–804; Mason, ap. Smith, *Dict. Greek and Roman Biog. and Myth.* s. v.; Schilter, *Diss. de Discipl. Pythagoræ*; Terpstra, *De Sodalitii Pythagor. Origine* (Utrecht, 1824); Wendt, *De Rebus Princ. sec. Pythagoram* (Lips. 1827); Ritter, *Gesch. der pythag. Philosophie* (Hamburg, 1826); Krische, *De Societatis a Pythag. conditæ Scopo Politico* (Göttingen, 1830); Beckmann, *De Pythagoreor. Reliquiis* (Berlin, 1844); also *Quæstiones Pythagoricæ* (Braunsberg, 1852–1858); Langel, *Pythagore, sa Doctrine et son Histoire*, in the *Revue des Deux Mondes* (Paris, 1864); Zeller, *Pythagoras und die Pythagorassage* (Leips. 1865); Balzer, *Pythagoras der Weise von Samos* (Nordhausen, 1865); Rathgeber, *Grossgriechenland und Pythagoras* (Gotha, 1866); Chaignet, *Pythagore* (Paris, 1873); Montée, *Quelques Mots sur le Philosophe Pythagore* (Douai, 1876). (G. F. H.)

Python occurs in the margin of Acts xvi, 16, *a spirit of Python*, where the text of the A. V. reads *a*

spirit of divination. The word *Python* (Πύθων in Greek mythology) is the name of a serpent or dragon slain by Apollo, then transferred to Apollo himself; in later times used for *diviners, soothsayers,* held to be inspired of the Pythian Apollo (Plutarch, *De Defect.; Orac.* c. q.). The *Pythones,* like the *oböth,* "familiar spirits," among the idolatrous Hebrews (Lev. xix, 31; 1 Sam. xxviii, 3, 7, 8, 9), were called *ventriloquists* because the god or spirit was supposed to be in them, and to speak from their bellies without any motion of the lips. See NECROMANCY.

Pythonism (from *Pythonissa,* a prophetess inspired by the Pythian god in Delphi, Apollo, who killed the serpent Python in the country called Pytho, near Mount Parnassus) is the ecstatic striving after supernatural enlightenment, in order to be able to foresee the future: it is oracular mania. This degeneracy of the natural instinct of curiosity is well described by an anonymous author in the writing *Une Pythonisse Contemporaine* (Paris, 1835, 8vo). This book relates the adventures of a young lady of noble extraction, who is inveigled by the arts of a modern Pythoness, and, by her superstitious regard for the insane oracles of her teacher, gets from aberration to aberration, and falls at last into all kinds of turpitudes—into crime, vice, and misery. Pythonism is also called *Sibyllinism.*

Pyx (πύξος, the *box-tree;* hence a *box,* properly *box*wood), the sacred vessel used in the Roman Catholic Church to contain the consecrated eucharistic elements, which are preserved after consecration, whether for the communion of the sick or for the adoration of the faithful in the churches. Already in the 4th century the host was kept in a special vessel, but this vessel was not called by its present name until the Councils of Tours and York in 1179. Its use was enjoined by pope Innocent III, in 1215, and by Odo of Rouen, in 1266, to be over or near an altar. The form of the Pyx has varied very much at different times. Anciently it was sometimes of the form of a dove, which was hung suspended over the altar. More commonly, however, it was, as its name implies, a simple box. Up to the 13th century the material was ivory, but subsequently, when it became rare, it was generally made of the precious metals, or at least of metal plated with gold or silver. At present, the pyx is commonly cup-shaped, with a close-fitting cover of the same material. The interior is ordered to be of gold, or at least plated with gold. Like all other sacred utensils connected with the administration of the Eucharist, it must be blessed by a bishop, or priest delegated by a bishop. See Walcott, *Sacred Archæol.* s. v.; Siegel, *Christliche Alterthümer* (see Index in vol. iv); Barnum, *Romanism,* p. 476; Elliott, *Romanism; Chambers's Encyclop.* s. v. See also CIBORIUM.

Pyx, Ashmolean Museum, Oxford.

Q.

Quadragesĭma (*fortieth* day) is a name sometimes applied to the Lenten season, or more properly to the first Sunday of Lent (q. v.). It is so called by analogy with the three Sundays which precede Lent, and which are called respectively Septuagesima, seventieth; Sexagesima, sixtieth; and Quinquagesima, fiftieth. The whole period of Quadragesima is in the Roman Catholic Church accounted as *tempus clausum.*

Quadrangle is an architectural term used to describe a square or court surrounded by buildings. The buildings of monasteries were generally arranged in quadrangles. See also QUADRATUM.

Quadrans. See FARTHING.

Quadrātum (*squared*), a name which was given to the nave of a church because of its square form. See CHURCH; NAVE; QUADRANGLE.

Quadrātus, bishop of Athens, flourished under the government of Antoninus Pius. Quadratus is reputed to have been a disciple of the apostles and a native of Athens. Under emperor Adrian, while Publius was bishop of Athens, the Christians were persecuted and the congregation scattered. When Quadratus later succeeded to the episcopate of Athens, he wrote, for the purpose of ending the persecution of his co-religionists, an *Apology for the Christian Faith,* and presented it to the emperor. This *Apology,* which had the desired effect, was extant in Eusebius's time, who tells us that it showed the genius of the man and the true doctrine of the apostles; but we have only a small fragment, preserved by Eusebius in the fourth book of his history, wherein the author declares that "none could doubt the truth of the miracles of Jesus Christ, because the persons healed and raised from the dead by him had been seen, not only when he wrought his miracles, or while he was upon earth, but even a very great while after his death; so that there were many," says he, "who were yet living in our time." Valesius, and others upon his authority, make of this Quadratus a different person from Quadratus the bishop of Athens; but this assertion is generally rejected. Jerome affirms that the Quadratus of Athens and the one reputed to have lived at Magnesia were the same. Nothing certain can be collected concerning the death of Quadratus; but it is supposed that he was banished from Athens, and then put to a variety of torments, under the reign of Adrian. See Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* iv, 3; Cave, *Hist. Lit.;* Donaldson, *Literature of the Early Centuries;* Lardner, *Works;* Hook, *Eccles. Biog.* viii, 173; Smith, *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog.* s. v.

Quadrio, FRANCESCO SAVERIO, a learned Italian Jesuit, was born in Valtellina, Dec. 1, 1695. He was of an infirm and susceptible temper, which involved him in sundry broils and disappointments, in consequence of which he sought and obtained leave to quit the Order of the Jesuits and assume the garb of a secular priest or abbé. He died at Milan, Nov. 21, 1756. He is noted principally as a secular writer. His historical and descriptive work on his own country, which he dedicated to pope Benedict XIV — *Dissertazioni Critico-storiche intorno alla Rezia, di quà dalle Alpi oggi detta Valtellina* (Milan, 1755, 3 vols. 4to)—is the best account extant of that secluded region. But the principal work of Quadrio is his general history of poetry in all ages and countries; *Storia e Ragione d' ogni Poesia* (Bologna and Milan, 1741–52, 7 vols. 4to), a laborious work, containing a vast deal of information not found collected in any other compilation; and, notwithstanding several mistakes and imperfections, is a very useful library book. Its composition occupied the author a considerable part of his life. See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale,* s. v.

Quadripartite is the technical term for the divisions of a vault into four triangular spaces.

Quadrisacramentarians is a controversial name for some German reformers in Wittenberg and vicinity who maintained that there are *four* sacraments necessary to salvation, viz., baptism, the Lord's supper, absolution, and holy orders. See Melancthon, *Loci Comm.* See also SACRAMENTARIANS.

Quadrivium (*quatuor,* four, and *via,* a road), the

name given, in the language of the schools of the West, to the higher course of the mediæval studies, from its consisting of four branches, as the lower course, for an analogous reason, was called *Trivium*, or "Three Roads." The quadrivium consisted of arithmetic, music, geometry, and astronomy. It would carry us beyond our limits to detail the nature and extent of each of these branches as pursued in the mediæval schools. The reader will find much curious and new matter on all questions of this nature in the volumes of the works of Roger Bacon, lately edited in the series issued under authority of the Master of the Rolls, as also in the Introduction prefixed to the volumes.

Quail (שְׂלָו [*Keri*, שְׂלָוִי], *selâv*; Sept. ὀρτυγομήτρα; Vulg. *coturnix*) occurs in Exod. xiv, 13; Numb. xi, 31, 32; Psa. cv, 40, where it is mentioned as food of the Israelites while they were in the desert. According to Schultens (*Orig. Heb.* i, 231), the Hebrew שְׂלָו is derived from an Arabic root "to be fat." The round, plump form of the quail is eminently suitable to this etymology; indeed, its fatness is proverbial. Josephus (*Ant.* iii, 1, 5), too, expressly names the bird referred to here *ortyx*, ὄρτυξ. In fact, the Hebrew word שְׂלָוִי is unquestionably identical with the Arabic *salwâ*, a "quail." Nevertheless, various opinions have been held as to the nature of the food denoted by the Hebrew *selâv*, which on two distinct occasions was supplied to the Israelites in the wilderness (see Exod. xvi, 13, on which occasion the people were between Sin and Sinai; and Numb. xi, 31, 32, when at the station named, in consequence of the judgment which befell them, Kibroth-hattaavah). Ludolf, for instance, an author of high repute, has endeavored to show that the *selâv* were locusts (see his *Dissertatio de Locustis, cum Diatriba*, etc. [Franc. ad Moen. 1694]). His opinion has been fully advocated and adopted by Patrick (*Comment.* on Numb. xi, 31, 32). The Jews in Arabia also, as we learn from Niebuhr (*Beschreib. von Arab.* p. 172), "are convinced that the birds which the Israelites ate in such numbers were only clouds of locusts, and they laugh at those translators who suppose that they found quails where quails were never seen." Rudbeck (*Ichthyol. Bibl. Spec.* i) has argued in favor of the *selâv* meaning "flying-fish," some species of the genus *Exocetus*. Michaelis at one time held the same opinion, but afterwards properly abandoned it (see Rosenmüller, *Not. ad* Bochart, *Hieroz.* ii, 649). A later writer, Ehrenberg (*Geograph. Zeitschr.* ix, 85), from having observed a number of "flying-fish" (gurnards, of the genus *Trigla* of Oken, *Dactylopterus* of modern ichthyologists) lying dead on the shore near Elim, believed that *this* was the food of the Israelites in the wilderness, and named the fish *Trigla Israelitarum*. Hermann von der Hardt supposed that the locust bird (*Pastor roseus*) was intended by *selâv;* and recently Mr. Forster (*Voice of Israel*, p. 98) has advanced an opinion that "red geese" of the genus *Casarca* are to be understood by the Hebrew term. A similar explanation has been suggested by Stanley (*S. and P.* p. 82) and adopted by Tennent (*Ceylon*, i, 487, note): this is apparently an old conceit, for Patrick (on Numb. xi, 31) alludes to such an explanation. Some writers, while they hold that the original word denotes "quails," are of opinion that a species of sand-grouse (*Pterocles alchata*), frequent in the Bible lands, is also included under the term (see Rosenmüller [*Not. ad Hieroz.* ii, 649], Faber [in *Harmar*, ii, 442], and Gesenius [*Thesaur.* s. v. שְׂלָוִי]). It is usual to refer to Hasselquist as the authority for believing that the *Kata* (sand-grouse) is denoted: this traveller, however, was rather inclined to believe, with some of the writers named above, that "locusts," and not birds, are to be understood (p. 443); and it is difficult to make out what he means by *Tetrao Israelitarum*. Linnæus supposed he intended by it the common "quail." In one paragraph he states that the Arabians call a bird "of a grayish color and less than our partridge" by the name of *Kutta*. He adds "An Selaw?" This cannot be the *Pterocles alchata*. The view taken by Ludolf may be dismissed with a very few words. The expression in Psa. lxxviii, 27, of "feathered fowl" (עוֹף כָּנָף), which is used in reference to the *selâv*, clearly denotes some bird, and Ludolf quite fails to prove that it may include winged insects. Again, there is not a shadow of evidence to support the opinion that *selâv* can ever signify any "locust," this term being used in the Arabic and the cognate languages to denote a "quail." As to any species of "flying-fish," whether belonging to the genus *Dactylopterus* or to that of *Exocetus*, being intended, it will be enough to state that "flying-fish" are quite unable to sustain their flight above a few hundred yards at the most, and never could have been taken in the Red Sea in numbers sufficient to supply the Israelitish host. The interpretation of *selâv* by "wild geese" or "wild cranes," or any "wild fowl," is a gratuitous assumption without a particle of evidence in its favor. The *Casarca*, with which Mr. Forster identifies the *selâv*, is the *C. rutila*, a bird of about the size of a mallard, which can by no means answer the supposed requisite of standing three feet high from the ground. "The large red-legged cranes" of which Prof. Stanley speaks are evidently white storks (*Ciconia alba*), and would fulfil the condition as to height; but the flesh is so nauseous that no Israelite could ever have done more than have tasted it. With respect to the *Pterocles alchata*, neither it, nor indeed any other species of the genus, agrees with the Scriptural account of the *selâv*. The sand-grouse is a bird of strong wing and of unwearied flight, and never could have been captured in any numbers by the Israelitish multitudes. It is at all times a tenant of the wilderness far from water, and, strictly taken, is perhaps not a clean bird, all the species subsisting, for the most part, on larvæ, beetles, and insects. We much question, moreover, whether the people would have eaten to excess—for so much the expression translated "fully satisfied" (Psa. lxxviii, 29) implies—of the flesh of this bird, for, according to the testimony of travellers, from Dr. Russell (*History of Aleppo* [2d ed.], ii, 194) down to observers of to-day, the flesh of the sand-grouse is hard and tasteless. The ὀρτυγομήτρα, or "quail-mother," of the Sept. should not be passed over without a brief notice. It is not easy to determine what bird is intended by this term as used by Aristotle and Pliny (*ortygometra*). According to the account given of this bird by the Greek and Latin writers on natural history just mentioned, the *ortygometra* precedes the quail in its migrations, and acts as a sort of leader to the flight. Some ornithologists, as Belon and Fleming (*Brit. Anim.* p. 98) have assigned this term to the "land-rail" (*Crex pratensis*), the Roi des Cailles of the French, Rè di Quaglie of the Italians, and the Wachtelkönig of the Germans, but with what reason we are unable to say. Probably the Sept. uses the term as a synonym of ὄρτυξ, or to express the good condition in which the birds were, for Hesychius explains ὀρτυγομήτρα by ὄρτυξ



Sand-grouse (*Pterocles Alchata*).

ὑπερμεγέθης, i. e. "a quail of large size." See PARTRIDGE.

The objections which have been urged by Patrick and others against "quails" being intended are very easily refuted. The expression "as it were two cubits [high] upon the face of the earth" (Numb. xi, 31) is explained by the Sept., by the Vulg., and by Josephus (*Ant.* iii, 1, 5) to refer to the height at which the quails flew above the ground, in their exhausted condition from their long flight. As to the enormous quantities which the least successful Israelite is said to have taken (viz. "ten homers") in the space of a night and two days, there is every reason for believing that the "homers" here spoken of do not denote strictly the measure of that name, but simply "a heap;" this is the explanation given by Onkelos and the Arabic versions of Saadias and Erpenius in Numb. xi, 31. Indeed, the inspired historian has himself shown that a complete covering of the ground with a compact mass is out of the question. For he has informed us that the people "spread them all abroad for themselves round about the camp." This was in order to dry them in the sun for keeping, and it would require to be performed before decomposition had begun to set in; therefore the ground about the camp was free and clean for the drying process, which could not have been if it had been covered a yard deep with birds, twenty bushels to the square yard. As it was, however, the store they collected in thirty-six hours lasted them for a whole month. The bodies, after having been split and cleansed, may have been simply dried in the sun without any antiseptic; for desiccation having once taken place, which a few hours of sunshine would be sufficient to accomplish, the stock would be preserved in the arid climate of the desert for an indefinite period. Thus the flesh of animals taken in hunting is simply sun-dried in South Africa, and thus the stock-fisch of the Norwegians is prepared from the cod, without salt. It is possible that a portion of the preserved meat may have been salted. The Egyptians used a large quantity of salt provisions, particularly fish and fowl; and the processes of splitting and salting geese are well depicted in the paintings of the tombs. The Hebrews would thus be sufficiently familiar with the art; and we know, from the ordinances concerning sacrifice (Lev. ii, 13), that they carried salt with them. But that they had, or could on the spur of the occasion procure, salt enough for the curing of a hundred millions of bushels of quails (allowing twenty millions to have been consumed in the fresh state), is altogether improbable. A comparatively small quantity may have been so preserved, but the bulk was doubtless simply sun-dried. The Egyptians similarly prepared these birds (see Herodotus [ii, 77], and Maillet [*Lettres sur l'Egypte*, ix, 21; iv, 130]). See EXODE.

Common Quail (*Coturnix Dactylisonans*).

Quails form a subdivision of the *Tetraonidæ*, or grouse family, being distinguished from partridges by their smaller size, finer bill, shorter tail, and the want of a red naked eyebrow and of spurs on the legs. There are several species, whereof the common, now distinguished by the name of *Coturnix dactylisonans*, is abundant in all the temperate regions of Europe and Western Asia, migrating to and from Africa in the proper season. Thus it crosses the Mediterranean and Black seas twice a year in vast multitudes; but being by nature a bird of heavy flight, the passage is partially conducted by way of intermediate islands or through Spain, and in the East, in still greater numbers, along the Syrian desert into Arabia, forming, especially at the spring season, innumerable flocks. This quail, the only species of the genus known to migrate, has, in fact, a very wide geographical range, being found in China, India, the Cape of Good Hope, and England, and, according to Temminck, in Japan (see Col. Sykes's paper on *The Quails and Hempodii of India* [*Trans. of Zool. Soc.* vol. ii]). Enormous flights of this bird, after crossing an immense surface of sea, are annually observed at the spring and fall to take a brief repose in the islands of Malta, Sicily, Sardinia, Crete, in the kingdom of Naples, and about Constantinople, where on those occasions there is a general shooting-match, which lasts two or three days. This always occurs in the autumn. The birds, starting from the Crimea about seven at night, and with a northerly wind, before dawn accomplish a passage of above sixty leagues in breadth, and alight on the southern shore to feed and repose. In the vernal season the direction of the flight is reversed, and they arrive in similar condition on the Russian coast. The same phenomena occur at Malta, etc.; and as gregarious birds of passage are known to guide their course by given landmarks, which they distinguish with unerring precision, and which, unless they have been driven out of their usual direction by storms of wind, they invariably arrive at or over before they take a new flight, so also quails congregate in Arabia in numbers proportionate to the surface of Western Asia, whither they are proceeding. The providential nature of their arrival within and around the camp of the Israelites, in order that they might furnish meat to a murmuring people, appears from the fact of its taking place where it was not to be expected; the localities, we presume, being out of the direction of the ordinary passage; for, had this not been the case, the dwellers in that region, and the Israelites themselves, accustomed to tend their flocks at no great distance from the spot, would have regarded the phenomenon as a well-known periodical occurrence. Aristotle (*Anim.* viii, 14) mentions the habit; and Pliny (*Hist. Nat.* x, 23) states that they sometimes alight on vessels in the Mediterranean and sink them! Belon found quails alight in autumn on a vessel bound from Rhodes to Alexandria; they were passing from the north to the south, and had wheat in their craws. In the preceding spring, sailing from Zante to the Morea, he saw flights of quails going from south northwards. Buffon relates that M. le Commandant Godelun saw quails constantly passing Malta during certain winds in May, and repassing in September; and that they flew by night. Tournefort (*Voyage*, i, 329) says that all the islands of the Archipelago at certain seasons of the year are covered with these birds. Col. Sykes states that such quantities were once caught in Capri, near Naples, as to have afforded the bishop no small share of his revenue, and that in consequence he has been called Bishop of Quails. The same writer mentions also (*Trans. Zool. Soc.* vol. ii) that 160,000 quails have been netted in one season on this little island. M. Temminck says that in spring such prodigious numbers of quails alight on the western shores of the kingdom of Naples, about Nettuno, that one hundred thousand are taken in a day (Yarrell, *Brit. Birds* [2d ed.], ii, 404). It is interesting to note the time specified: "it was at even" that they began to arrive; and they, no doubt, continued to come all the night. Many observers have recorded that the quail migrates by night, though this is denied by Col. Montagu

(*Ornithol. Dict.* s. v.). "On two successive years I observed enormous flights of quails on the north coast of Algeria, which arrived from the south *in the night*, and were at daybreak in such numbers through the plains that scores of sportsmen had only to shoot as fast as they could reload" (H. B. Tristram). When the numbers, however, are very great, and the distance to be achieved remote, we can well imagine that both day and night would be spent on the wing, as on the second occasion recorded in the sacred text. The expression "quails from the sea" (Numb. xi, 31) must not be restricted to denote that the birds came from the sea as their starting-point, but it must be taken to show the direction from which they were coming. The quails were, at the time of the event narrated in the sacred writings, on their spring journey of migration northwards, an interesting proof, as Col. Sykes has remarked, of the perpetuation of an instinct through some 3300 years; the flight which fed the multitudes at Kibroth-hattaavah might have started from Southern Egypt and crossed the Red Sea near Ras Mohammed, and so up the gulf of Akabah into Arabia Petræa. The Israelites would have had little difficulty in capturing large quantities of these birds, as they are known to arrive at places sometimes so completely exhausted by their flight as to be readily taken, not in nets only, but by the hand. See Diod. Sic. (i, 82 [ed. Dindorf]), Prosper Alpinus (*Rerum Ægypt.* iv, 1), and Josephus (*Ant.* iii, 5). Sykes (*l. c.*) says "they arrive in spring on the shores of Provence so fatigued that for the first few days they allow themselves to be taken by the hand." Diodorus tells us (i, 60) that the inhabitants of Rhinocolura, a town on the border of Palestine and Egypt, placed long nets made of split reeds along the shore a length of many furlongs, in which the quails were arrested that had crossed the sea in flocks; and that they then preserved them for future subsistence. In the northern parts of Persia and Armenia, according to Morier, quails are taken in great abundance, and with great ease, with the simplest possible machinery. The men stick two poles in their girdles, on which poles they so stretch a coat or a pair of trousers that the sleeves or the legs shall project like the horns of a beast. Thus disguised, they prowl about the fields with a hand-net, and the quails, simply supposing the strange object to be a horned beast, and therefore harmless to them, allow him to approach till he throws the net over them. Rude as such a contrivance seems, the Persians catch quails thus with astonishing rapidity (*Second Journey*, p. 343). The flesh of the quail, though of an agreeable quality, is said by some writers to be heating, and it has been supposed by some that the deaths that occurred from eating the food in the wilderness resulted partly from these birds feeding on hellebore (Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* x, 23) and other poisonous plants; but this is exceedingly improbable, although the immoderate gratification of the appetite for the space of a whole month (Numb. xi, 20) on such food, in a hot climate, and in the case of a people who at the time of the wanderings rarely tasted flesh, might have induced dangerous symptoms. "The plague" seems to have been directly sent upon the people by God as a punishment for their murmurings, and perhaps is not even in a subordinate sense to be attributed to natural causes. See, in general, Bochart, *Hieroz.* ii, 648 sq.; Bartlett, *Forty Days in the Desert*, p. 40; Tristram, *Nat. Hist. of the Bible*, p. 229; Wood, *Bible Animals*, p. 430 sq.; *Bible Educator*, i, 157, 250; iii, 88.

Quaini, Luigi, an Italian painter, the son of Francesco, was born at Bologna in 1643. After having acquired the rudiments of the art and a knowledge of perspective from his father, he became a disciple first of Guercino, and afterwards of his relation Carlo Cignani, in whose school he was contemporary with Marc Antonio Franceschini. His improvement was so great that in a few years he was employed, as well as Franceschini, to assist Cignani in the execution of some of his great works. Their method of handling and coloring was so similar that it was difficult to determine what part of any work was executed by either of them. In Cignani's principal works, however, it seems that Quaini painted the landscape, the architecture, and other ornaments, and Franceschini the figures. After Cignani's death the two artists continued to work together. They were employed at Bologna, Modena, Piacenza, Genoa, and Rome, where they painted the cartoons for a cupola in St. Peter's, which has since been executed in mosaic. Quaini also painted many historical subjects from his own compositions, which were entirely finished by himself. In the church of St. Joseph at Bologna there is a picture of the *Visitation;* in La Carità, the dead *Christ Supported by the Virgin;* and in the church of St. Nicholas the principal altar-piece is by Quaini — it represents *St. Nicholas in Prison Visited by the Virgin and an Angel*, and is favorably spoken of by Lanzi. Quaini died in 1717.

Quakers. See Friends.

Quam despectus, quam dejectus, is the beginning of a passion-hymn, written by the *doctor seraphicus*, St. Bonaventura (q. v.), of which the first stanza runs thus:

"Quam despectus, quam dejectus,
Rex cœlorum est effectus,
Ut salvaret sæculum;
Esurivit et sitivit,
Pauper et egenus ivit
Usque ad patibulum."

This beautiful hymn has been translated into English by P. S. Worsley, and from the *Lyra Messianica*, p. 277, we subjoin the first stanza:

"Oh, what shame and desolation,
Working out the world's salvation,
Deigned the King of Heaven to bear!
See him bowed with sorrows endless,
Hungry, thirsty, poor, and friendless,
Even to the cross repair."

For the original, see Trench, *Sacred Latin Poetry* (Lond. 1864), p. 143 sq. (B. P.)

Quam dilecta tabernacŭla is the beginning of a prose of Adam of St. Victor (d. about 1192) for the dedication of a church. "This hymn," says Mr. Trench, "of which the theme is, the dignities and glories of the Church, as prefigured in the Old Testament and fulfilled in the New, is the very extravagance of typical application, and were it only as a study in mediæval typology, would be worthy of insertion; but it has other and higher merits, even though it must be owned rather that the poet's learned stuff masters him, than that he is able effectually to master it. Its title indicates that it was composed for the occasion of a church's dedication, the services of which time were ever laid out for the carrying of men's thoughts from the temple made with hands to that spiritual temple, on earth or in heaven, 'whose builder and maker is God.'" We subjoin the first verse:

"Quam dilecta tabernacula
Domini virtutum et atria!
Quam electi architecti,
Tuta ædificia,
Quæ non movent, immo fovent,
Ventus, flumen, pluvia!"

There are two English translations of this prose, one by W. B. Flower, in *Lyra Mystica*, p. 211 sq.—"How loved thy halls and dwelling-place"—and the other by Neale, in his *Mediæval Hymns*, p. 146 sq., with explanatory notes. A third translation, but only of the last stanzas, is given by Mr. Bonar in the *Sunday at Home* (Jan. 1878), which, for their beauty, we subjoin:

"Future things in figure shadowed
This our day of grace displays!
On the couch with our beloved
Here we rest, and sing, and praise,
Now the bridal day has come!

"Days of which the silver trumpets
Of the ancient feasts first told;

Day of days, whose promised glory
Israel's holy psalms unfold,
Giving voice to solemn sound.

"Thousand, thousand are the praises
To the Bridegroom which they raise;
With one voice in triumph singing
Through the everlasting days,
Hallelujah, without end."

See Trench, *Sacred Latin Poetry*, p. 227 sq.; Mone, *Hymni Latini*, i, 316; Koch, *Geschichte des deutschen Kirchenliedes*, i, 109. (B. P.)

Quandt, Johann Jacob, a Lutheran theologian, doctor and professor of theology, was born March 27, 1686, at Königsberg, in Prussia, where he also died Jan. 17, 1772, as church-counsellor and general superintendent. Of his writings we mention, *Judenpredigt* (Königsberg, 1710):—*De Atramento Hebræorum, ex Pandectis Talmudicis* (ibid. 1713):—*De Cultris Circumcisoriis et Secespitis Hebræorum* (ibid. 1713):—*De Cornibus Altaris Exteriorib* (ibid. 1713):—*De Cinere in Sacris Hebræorum* (ibid. 1713):—*Dissertatio de Sagan* (סגן) *sive Pontificis Maximi Suffraganeo* (Lips. 1708), reprinted in Ugolino, *Thesaurus Antiquitatum Sacrarum*, etc. xii, No. 16:—*De Christo Vero Ecclesiæ Fundamento in Nomine Sethi typice adumbrato Gen. iv*, 25 (Königsberg, 1726). See Fürst, *Bibl. Judaica*, iii, 124; Winer, *Handbuch der theolog. Literatur*, i, 637; ii, 718 (Leips. 1838). (B. P.)

Quänian Version. The Quänes, a wandering people, for whom this version is made, inhabit that most northerly portion of Lapland which is called Finmark or Norwegian Lapland. This dreary region, having for its northern boundary the Arctic or Frozen Ocean, is the habitation of about 6000 people, called the Quänes, who till within the last half century were left without any version of the Scriptures in their vernacular dialect. The Bible Society of Finland sent to them copies of the Finnish Testament, but this version was unintelligible to them, and even so the Lappish Testament, although they speak a dialect of Laplandish. In 1822 the British and Foreign Bible Society voted £200 to promote a version in Quänian, and it was not till the year 1828 that arrangements for the immediate translation of the New Testament were made by the Norwegian Society. The execution of the translation was committed to Mr. Stockfleth, a missionary of eminent devotedness, who in 1828 was laboring as a pastor among the uncivilized tribes of Laplanders under the seventy-first degree of north latitude, where, during two months of the year, the sun never rises. In 1840 the translation of the New Testament was completed, and an edition was published at Christiania, under the superintendence of the Norwegian Bible Society. See *The Bible of Every Land*, p. 324. (B. P.)

Quanwon is, in Japanese mythology, an embodiment of the goddess Amida. She is represented with a multitude of hands, each holding a different object, probably things useful to men, whom she has undertaken to make happy. Her temples are splendid, of extraordinary dimensions, and filled with idols: 33,333 are said to be contained in the temple of Miako; hence its name, *San mun San Tsin*, which signifies the temple of the 33,333 images. A large number of children are represented around her in her pictures: they are the gods themselves looking up to her with love and veneration.

Quarantāna. In the mountainous wilderness between Jerusalem and Jericho, in which, according to tradition, our Lord's temptation took place, there is a very high mountain, one of the highest in Judæa, called *Quarantana* (by the Arabs *Kuruntul*), in allusion to the forty days' fasting of Jesus, and which is supposed to be the mount alluded to in Matt. iv, 8 (see Thomson, *Land and Book*, ii, 450; Wilson, *Bible Lands*, ii, 12); but by some it is identified with the Rock of Rimmon, where the defeated Benjamites took refuge (Judg. xx, 47). "The mountain rises precipitously, an almost perpendicular wall of rock, twelve or fifteen hundred feet above the plain, crowned with a chapel on its highest point. The eastern front is full of grots and caverns, where hermits are said once to have dwelt in great numbers. At the present day, some three or four Abyssinians are said to come hither annually to pass the time of Lent upon the mountain, living only upon herbs. There is nothing else remarkable about this naked cliff to distinguish it from the other similar ones along the Ghor and the Dead Sea farther south. The tradition which regards the mountain as the place of our Lord's temptation, as well as the name Quarantana, appears not to be older than the age of the Crusades" (Robinson, *Bib. Res.* ii, 303).

Quare impĕdit (i. e. *why he hinders*) is the title of an English action whereby a person who has purchased an advowson, or right of presentation to an ecclesiastical benefice, sues any one who disturbs or hinders him in the exercise of his legal right.

Quare incumbrāvit (*why he has cumbered* or *taken possession*). During a plea between two persons for the possession of an advowson [see Quare impedit], if the bishop admits the presentee of one of them within six months, the other can have a writ of this form against the bishop.

Quare non admīsit (*why he has not admitted*). When one has recovered an advowson, and the bishop refuses to admit his presentee, such a writ may be employed.

Quarrel (Fr. *carré*, square) is a technical term employed in architecture to describe a diamond-shaped pane of glass, or a square one placed diagonally. It is also the name of a small piercing in the tracery of a window. A wax taper (q. v.) used in churches is also called "quarrel."

Quarry (פֶּסֶל, *pesîl*, but only in the plur.; Sept. γλυπτά, Vulg. *idola*). In the account of the exploit of Ehud in Judg. iii, 19, 26, for the "quarries that were by Gilgal" of our version, or, as the Syriac and Chaldee read, stone-pits or quarries, the primary signification of *images* of false gods may be intended, as in Deut. vii, 25; Isa. xlii, 8; Jer. viii, 19; li, 52; Hos. xi, 12, etc.; and it is so understood by the Sept. and the Vulg. in the above text. We have no knowledge of any quarries at Gilgal, in the plain of Jericho; and Boothroyd conjectures that idols might have been erected at Gilgal by Eglon, and that the sight of them there inspired Ehud with new ardor to execute his purpose. Rosenmüller, after Rashi, adheres to the above inter-

Enormous Stone in the Quarry near Baalbek.

pretation of quarries, and in this Fürst and Keil agree. The last-named interpreter remarks that the Gilgal intended cannot be the one near the Jordan, but that in the hills of Ephraim. See GILGAL. Gesenius regards *Pesilim* as the name of a place. Cassel, in Lange's *Commentary*, understands by it *boundary-stones*, i. e. "termini," of an idolatrous form. That the ancient Canaanites had extensive quarries is evinced by the cyclopean blocks at the foundation of the temple at Baalbek (q. v.).

Quarterly Fast. See FASTING.

Quarterly Meeting. See MEETING, QUARTERLY.

Quartodecimāni, a name in ecclesiastical history for those Christians of Asia Minor who, in the first ages of the Church, annually commemorated the death of Christ at the 14th of Nisan, the time when the Jews celebrated the Passover [see PASCHAL CONTROVERSY], and three days after the resurrection of Jesus, totally ignoring the regard for the day of the week usually taken as the one on which this event is believed to have occurred. This difference it was determined to adjust at the Council of Nice in A.D. 325, when it was decreed that the practice of observing Friday as the day of crucifixion (q. v.), and the following Sunday as the day of ascension (q. v.), should prevail. Those who refused to accept this decision of the council were denominated *Quartodecimani*, because of their contending for the fourteenth day of the first Hebrew month as the proper time for observing Easter, *quartadecima lunæ*, on the fourteenth day of the moon. They are sometimes called *Paschites*. The Audæans, Montanists, Novatians, and other sects were *Quartodecimani*. See Schaff, *Ch. Hist.* vol. ii; Riddle, *Christian Antiquities;* Waterland, *Works*, vol. vi.

Quar'tus (Græcized Κούαρτος, for the Latin *quartus*, fourth), a Christian resident at Corinth, and, from his name, apparently a Roman, whose salutations Paul communicated to the Church of Rome in his epistle thereto (Rom. xvi, 23). A.D. cir. 50. There is the usual tradition that he was one of the seventy disciples; and it is also said that he ultimately became bishop of Berytus (Tillemont, i, 334).

Quas laudes TIBI NOS, PATER, CANĒMUS, is the beginning of one of the hymns written by the "præceptor Germaniæ," Philip Melancthon (q. v.). It was composed in the year 1527, and is based on Psa. cxi. It is found with his other poems, of which he composed altogether about 400, in Bretschneider's *Corpus Reformatorum* (Hal. Sax. 1842), vol. x. A selection of about fifty-one, together with a German metrical translation, was published by Oberhey, *Melanchthon's Gedichte, ausgewählt und übersetzt* (Halle, bei Mühlmann, 1862). See Koch, *Geschichte des deutschen Kirchenliedes*, i, 259. (B. P.)

Quaser. The Scandinavian *Edda* tells us that the divine families of the Asas and Vanas, having warred against each other for many years, felt tired at last of these never-ceasing disputes, and determined to create a being on whose wisdom they might safely rely, and whom they would take for their umpire. The Asas and Vanas spat into a common vessel, and formed Quaser. He was so wise that no one could ask him a question which he was not able to answer. Therefore, having pronounced his sentence in the quarrel of the gods, he travelled about in the world to impart his wisdom to men. But two gnomes, Fialar and Galar, killed him, mingled his blood with honey, and thus prepared a delicious mead, which made poets of all those who tasted it. The gods having shown some anxiety as to what had become of the great sage, the gnomes managed to spread the rumor that Quaser had been choked by his own wisdom (a phrase which has become proverbial in the north), as nobody could relieve him of it by his questions. Shortly afterwards the same dwarfs killed the giant Gilling and his wife by crushing them with a mill-stone while sleeping. The giant Suttung, Gilling's son, avenged his father by exposing the murderers on a deserted island, to die there of starvation. In this extremity they offered him, to ransom their lives, their poetical mead. Suttung listened to their proposition, set them free, and had the precious liquid carefully guarded by his beautiful daughter Gunlöda in the interior of a mountain. Odin, by a stratagem, penetrated into the mountain, gained the favor of the young giantess, and drank the mead to the last drop.

Quasimodogeniti is a term sometimes used to denote the first Sunday after Easter. It is of comparatively late origin, and is derived from the Latin version of 1 Pet. ii, 2: *Quasi modo geniti infantes*, etc.—"As new-born babes," etc. See EASTER.

Quatember are fasts observed in the Church of Rome, and by other ecclesiastical bodies, among them the Church of England. According to Jewish custom, the four seasons of the year were observed as occasions for fasting. These were the four fast-weeks: one after Ash-Wednesday, Pentecost, the Crucifixion (Sept. 14), and after Lucia (Dec. 13). The fast-days were Wednesday, Friday, and Saturday. Wednesday was the day on which the quarterly offerings were brought, and it was principally called Quatember-day. In the German Protestant Church these fasts were for a long time observed also.

Quater'nion (τετράδιον, *a body of four*). "A quaternion of soldiers" (Acts xii, 4) was a detachment of four men, which was the usual number of a Roman night-watch (Veget. *De Re Milit.* iii, 8; Philo, *In Flacc.* p. 98; Polyb. vi, 33, 37). See SOLDIER. Peter, therefore, was guarded by four soldiers, two within the prison, probably attached to his person, and two outside the doors; and, as the watch was usually changed every three hours, it was necessary that the "four quaternions" mentioned in the text should be appointed for the purpose. See PRISON. Or one set of sentinels may have been posted at the door of the cell (which was probably thought to be so secure as not to require a guard within), and another at the outer or street gate (Walch, *De Vinclis Petri*, in his *Dissert.* ad loc.). See PETER.

Quatremère, ÉTIENNE MARIE, a celebrated French Orientalist, was born at Paris, July 12, 1782. He began his studies at a very early age, and as a youth was noted for his remarkable attainments. In 1807 he was employed in the Imperial Library, and in 1809 was called to the professor's chair at Rouen. In 1815 he was appointed to the Academy of Inscriptions, and in 1819 instructor of Hebrew, Chaldee, and Syriac at the College of France. In 1827 he became professor of Persian. He was now known as one of the greatest Orientalists in the world, and was especially noted as an Egyptologist, and how well he deserved this distinction appears from his publications in this line of study. In his religious proclivities he was Gallican and Jansenist. He used his pen freely against the innovations of the papists and against their assumptions. We have not room here to mention his severe satires against the Ultramontanes, but refer the reader who desires to study them to Rénan's *Essays*. Quatremère died Sept. 18, 1857.

Quaw, JAMES E., a minister of the Reformed (Dutch) Church. He graduated at the New Brunswick Theological Seminary in 1828, and was engaged during his ministerial life chiefly in missionary work among feeble churches in New York and Michigan. He was the author of two remarkable books — *The Cold Water Man*, a powerful plea for total abstinence, and *Bible Baptism, or the Immerser Instructed from Various Sources*. The latter has passed through a number of editions, and is a real thesaurus of information, and of learned, acute, and valuable discussion of the mode of baptism. The object is to place before its readers the *results* of learned investigation, and to prove that im-

mersion is not the only scriptural mode of baptism; that sprinkling is scriptural, and that infants are proper subjects of that ordinance. The individuality of the author's character, life, and ministry, and his independence of thought and treatment of his subject, may be gathered from his prefatory statement: "Many of the materials for the following work were collected while the author was travelling in primitive apostolic style in different parts of the great American valley. In these, his ministerial journeyings, he usually preached six or eight times a week, while he often travelled on foot without purse or scrip or two coats, sometimes with scarcely one, often for days without bread and occasionally without water. But the mighty God of Jacob was always with him. . . . This book was written in a Western log-cabin, in a room which at one and the same time answered for a study, a parlor, a sitting-room, a dining-hall, bedroom, and kitchen. The hours which for six or eight months the author could spare from the discharge of the duties of a New-Testament bishop, he has, in this rather romantic study, devoted to this work." Mr. Quaw was lost on Lake Erie in the dreadful wreck of the steamer Erie in 1845. He was a godly and self-denying man, peculiar in appearance and manner, a faithful missionary to the needy, and an able writer. (W. J. R. T.)

Quedara Wardon is a Hindû festival in honor of the goddess Parwati (q. v.). It imposes on him who has once celebrated it the obligation of celebrating it every year. The participants in this solemnity are distinguished by a yellow string, which they carry around their arm. They fast the whole day of the feast.

Quedil is a Hindû feast in honor of the goddess Mariatale. The performances are the same as those of the goddess Mariyammai. Mariatale is probably identical with the latter.

Quedlinburg, Synods of. Several ecclesiastical councils were held in this German city in mediæval times. The first took place in 1085. The bishops who sided with pope Gregory VII assembled it immediately after Easter, and it was presided over by the papal legate Otto di Ostia. Among those who attended were archbishops Gebhard of Salzburg and Hartwick of Magdeburg; the bishops Adalbere of Würzburg, Altmann of Passau, Bernard of Merseburg, Günther of Zeiz, St. Benno of Meissen, Albert of Worms, Burchard of Halberstadt, Herrmann of Metz, Reginhard of Minden, Wigold of Augsburg, Gebhard of Constance, Heinrich of Bamberg. The council recognised, first, the primacy of the pope, whose decisions it was allowed to no one to alter or to criticise. In conformity with the decrees of former popes, the consecration of the bishops unlawfully established by Henry IV, Wenzel of Mentz, Siegfried of Augsburg, Norbert of Chur, etc., was declared null, and likewise all other ordinations and consecrations of the same kind. The synod rejected the erroneous assertions of Wenzel of Mentz in regard to excommunication. Excommunications are only valuable when they are pronounced according to the forms adopted by the Church. The six following resolutions are of a general kind: The sixth canon recommends to the priests, deacons, and subdeacons perpetual continence; the seventh canon prohibits the lays from touching the altar-palls and holy vessels; according to the eighth canon, the lays shall not take hold of the dimes without having the consent of the legitimate owners; the ninth canon directs that the spring fast of Quatember shall be held in the first week of Lent, the summer fast in the week of Pentecost; the tenth canon decrees no one shall eat eggs or cheese during the forty days of Lent; the eleventh canon declares that the choice made by the legate Otto of Gebhard as bishop of Constance, and everything done by the legate in that city, is approved by the council. At the close of the council the anathema was pronounced, with burning tapers, against the anti-pope Wibert (pseudo-Clemens III), the heresiarch; against the apostate Hugo of Albano, who had presided at the Council of Worms in 1076; against Johannes (Petrus), archbishop of Porto, and against Petrus, late chancellor of the pope; against archbishop Liemar of Bremen, Udo of Hildesheim, Otto of Constance, Burchard of Basle, Huzmann of Spire, deposed bishops; finally, against the usurping bishops Wenzel, archbishop of Mentz; Siegfried, bishop of Augsburg; Norbert, bishop of Chur, and all their followers. See Labbe, *Concil.* x; Hardouin, *Concil.* vi; Hartzheim, *Conc. Germ.*; Binterim, *Deutsche Conc.* vol. iii; Flotho, *König Heinrich IV* (Stuttg. 1855). Two other synods were held at Quedlinburg — one in 1105, for the reformation of manners; a third in 1121, about the situation of the empire and the investitures. See Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* s. v.

Quedu was, in Hindû mythology, the son of Kassiaba and Siugfriede. He and his brother Rahu were redoubtable giants and wicked dæmons. They tried to prevent the gods from preparing the beverage of immortality, the *amrita*. The gods having succeeded in their enterprise, by causing the Mandar Mountain to rotate in the middle of the milk sea, the two giants robbed the vessel which contained the amrita. The sun and moon had been witnesses to the robbery: they denounced it to Vishnu, who cut off the heads of the giants at the very moment when they carried the immortalizing liquid to their lips. A drop of the amrita had already made the two heads immortal; they flew towards the sky, and there became planets. They are only visible at the time of eclipses. They are fierce enemies of the sun and moon, which they pursue and try to swallow.

Queen. The Hebrews had no word properly answering to our term *queen* in the sense of a female sovereign, neither had they the dignity which that word denotes. Of the three Hebrew terms used as the equivalents of "queen" in the A. V. (מַלְכָּה; שֵׁגַל; גְּבִירָה), the first (*malkâh*) alone is applied to a queen *regnant*; the first and second (*shegâl*) equally to a queen *consort*; without, however, implying the dignity which in European nations attaches to that position; and the third (*gebirâh*) to the queen *mother*, to whom that dignity is transferred in Oriental courts. The etymological force of the words accords with their application. *Malkâh* is the feminine of *mêlek*, "king;" it is applied in its first sense to the queen of Sheba (1 Kings x, 1), and in its second to the chief wife, as distinguished from all other females in a royal harem (Esth. i, 9 sq.; vii, 1 sq.; Cant. vi, 8): the term "princesses" is similarly used in 1 Kings xi, 3. *Shegâl* simply means "wife," i. e. of the first rank, as distinguished from mere concubines; it is applied to Solomon's bride or perhaps mother (Psa. xlv, 9), and to the wives of the first rank in the harems of the Chaldee and Persian monarchs (Dan. v, 2, 3; Neh. ii, 6). *Gebirâh*, on the other hand, is expressive of authority; it means "powerful" or "mistress," being the feminine of גָּבִיר, *gebir*, "master," or "lord." The feminine is to be understood by its relation to the masculine, which is not applied to kingly power or to kings, but to general authority and dominion. It is, in fact, the word which occurs twice with reference to Isaac's blessing of Jacob: "Be *lord* over thy brethren;" and "I have made him thy *lord*" (Gen. xxvii, 29, 37). It would therefore be applied to the female who exercised the highest authority, and this, in an Oriental household, is not the wife, but the mother, of the master. Strange as such an arrangement at first sight appears, it is one of the inevitable results of polygamy: the number of the wives, their social position previous to marriage, and the precariousness of their hold on the affections of their lord combine to annihilate their influence, which is transferred to the mother, as being the only female who occupies a fixed and dignified position. Hence the application of the term *gebirâh* to the queen *mother*, the extent of whose influence is well illustrated by the

narrative of the interview of Solomon and Bathsheba, as given in 1 Kings ii, 19 sq. The term is applied to Maachah, Asa's mother, who was deposed from her dignity in consequence of her idolatry (1 Kings xv, 13; 2 Chron. xv, 16); to Jezebel as contrasted with Joram (2 Kings x, 13, "the children of the king and the children of the queen"); and to the mother of Jehoiachin or Jeconiah (Jer. xiii, 18; comp. 2 Kings xxiv, 12; Jer. xxix, 2). In 1 Kings xi, 19, the text perhaps requires emendation, the reading followed in the Sept., הַגְּדוֹלָה, "the elder," according better with the context. The limited use which is made even of the restricted term *gebirâh* is somewhat remarkable. It is only employed twice with reference to *the wife* of a king: in one of these two cases it is applied to the wife of the king of Egypt, where the condition of the royal consort was more *queenly* than in Palestine (1 Kings xi, 19; comp. Wilkinson, *Anc. Egypt.* ii, 59; iii, 64; v, 28); and in the other to Jezebel, the wife of Ahab, who, as the daughter of a powerful king, appears to have enjoyed peculiar privileges in her matrimonial state (2 Kings x, 13). In two other places it is not clear whether the king's wife or mother is intended (Jer. xiii, 18; xxix, 2); and in the remaining passages it is pointedly referred to the king's mother in such terms as clearly show that the state which *she* held was one of positive dignity and rank (1 Kings xv, 13; 2 Chron. xv, 16). See WIFE.

The result of all inquiry into the subject seems to show that among the Jewish kings the usages bearing on this point were not different from those which are still exhibited in Western Asiatic courts. Where woman never becomes the head of the State, there can be no queen regnant; and where polygamy is allowed or practiced, there can be no queen consort. There will, however, be a chief wife in the harem; and this is no doubt the rank indicated in the Bible by the words which we render "queen." This rank may be variously acquired. The *first* wife of the king, or the first whom he took *after his accession*, usually obtained it; and if she is both of high birth and becomes the mother of the first son, her position is tolerably secure; but if she possesses neither of these advantages, she may be superseded in her position as head of the harem by a wife of higher birth and connections subsequently espoused, or by one who becomes the mother of the heir apparent. The king, however, will sometimes act according to his own pleasure in this matter, promote any favorite lady to this dignity, and also remove her from it at his pleasure; but more generally he finds it convenient to follow the established routine. The daughter of the king of Egypt was, doubtless, from her high rank, the chief wife of Solomon; as was Jezebel, for the same reason, the chief wife of Ahab. In like manner the high-born mother of Absalom was probably the chief wife of David, although it is possible that the mother of the eldest son, Amnon, at first enjoyed that distinction, which, we may safely presume, eventually devolved on Bathsheba, after her son Solomon had been recognised as the heir. In one of Mr. Morier's amusing books (*Hajji Baba in England*) there is a passage which strikingly illustrates this matter. The court of Persia is there represented as being perplexed how to answer a letter which, in ignorance of Eastern customs, had been addressed by the queen consort of England "to the queen of Persia." The cause of the dilemma thus created was that—"Although the shah's principal wife is called the banou harem, or head of the seraglio, yet her situation in the State bears as little affinity to that of the queen of England as one may say the she buffalo kept in the enclosure for food and milk has to the cow fed and worshipped by the Hindû as his god. Our shah can kill and create banous at pleasure, whereas the queen of England maintains her post till the hand of fate lays her in the grave" (comp. Chardin, *Voyages* [ed. Langles], vol. vi, ch. xii; Thornton's *Turkey*, ii, 264–286). Very different was, and is to this day, in Western Asia, the position of the king's mother, whose state is much the nearest to that of a European queen of any with which the East is acquainted. It is founded on that essential principle of Oriental manners which in all cases considers the mother of the husband as a far superior person to his wife, and as entitled to more respect and attention. This principle should be clearly understood; for it extends throughout the Bible, and is yet entirely different from our own social arrangements, under which the mother, as soon as she becomes widowed, abandons her place as head of the family to the daughter-in-law. Mr. Urquhart has admirably illustrated and developed this principle in his *Spirit of the East* (ii, 387 sq.); and his remarks, although primarily illustrative of Turkish manners, are, with some unessential limitations, applicable to the ancient and modern East. In p. 389 there is an anecdote of the late Ibrahim Pasha, who is represented as staying a whole week in the harem of his mother, waiting to find a favorable opportunity of pressing a request upon her; and when admitted, kissing her feet, refusing to be seated, and standing an hour and a half before her with his arms crossed, without, after all, succeeding in the suit which he—the conqueror of Syria and the victor of Konieh—preferred to an aged woman. The arrangement in the seraglios of the more magnificent Hebrew monarchs was probably similar to that of Turkey, with this difference, that the chief women in the harems of the Jewish sovereigns entered it as wives, and not as slaves. The grand signior, from an indeterminate number of female slaves, selects his favorites, who are distinguished by the title of *cadun*, which, as it means "lady of the house," seems nearly equivalent to the Hebrew *gebirâh*. The number of these is said to be limited to seven, and their rank seems to correspond to that of the "wives" of the Hebrew seraglio, whose number was unlimited. The mother of a boy is called *hasseky*, unless the boy die, in which case she descends to her former rank. The caduns, or wives, of a deceased or deposed sultan are all removed from the imperial harem to a separate palace, with the single exception of the *validé sultan*, the mother of the reigning sultan, who has her liberty, a palace, and revenues to support a suitable establishment. But the hassekies, or those who have a son living, are treated with marked respect, as in the natural course of events they may become *validé*. The title of *sultan* (for the Turkish has no distinction of gender), though from courtesy it may be given to the hassekies, is, strictly speaking, appropriate only to the sovereign's mother, and to the sons and daughters of the imperial family (Thornton, ii, 276; Urquhart, ii, 433). This statement, especially the last point of it, strikingly illustrates the view we have taken as to the more *queenly* position of the king's mother than of his wife in the Jewish and other Asiatic courts. It must be clearly understood that this position is by no means peculiar to the modern East, or to the Jews among the ancient Orientals. Heeren, indeed,

Ancient Egyptian Queen.

thinks that the power of "the queen mother" was even more considerable among the ancient Persians than among the modern Turks (*Hist. Researches*, i, 400); and the narratives of Herodotus and Ctesias respecting the tyrannical influence exercised by Parysatis, Amestris, and others bear ample testimony to this fact. The careful reader of Scripture will easily be able to trace the same ideas respecting the position of the king's mother among the Israelites. In how marked a manner does the mother of Solomon come forward at the end of her husband's and the beginning of her son's reign! She takes an active part in securing her son's succession; it is in the conviction of her commanding influence that Adonijah engages her to promote his suit, alleging "he will not say thee nay;" and then, when Bathsheba appears before her son, the monarch rises from his place, advances to meet her, bows himself before her, and seats her on the right hand of his throne (1 Kings i, ii). That the king's mother possessed high dignity is further evinced by the fact that Asa found it necessary to remove his mother, Maachah, "from being queen," on account of her abuse of the power which that character conferred (1 Kings xv, 13). Jezebel was, as already stated, very powerful in the lifetime of her husband; but it is only under her son that she is called "the queen" (*gebîrâh*); and the whole history of his reign evinces the important part which she took in public affairs (2 Kings ix, 22, 30, 37; x, 13). Still more marked was the influence which her daughter Athaliah exercised in Judah during the reign of her son Ahaziah, which was, indeed, such as enabled her at his death to set the crown on her own head, and to present the anomaly in Jewish history of a regnant queen (2 Kings xi). See WOMAN.

QUEEN OF HEAVEN. In Jer. vii, 18; xliv, 17, 18, 19, 25, the Heb. מְלֶכֶת הַשָּׁמַיִם, *meléketh hash-shamáyim*, is thus rendered in the A. V. In the margin is given "frame or workmanship of heaven," for in twenty of Kennicott's MSS. the reading is מְלֶאכֶת, of which this is the translation, and the same is the case in fourteen MSS. of Jer. xliv, 18, and in thirteen of Jer. xliv, 19. The latter reading is followed by the Sept. and Peshito Syriac in Jer. vii, 18, but in all the other passages the received text is adopted, as by the Vulg. in every instance. Kimchi says "א is wanting, and it is as if מלאכת = 'workmanship of heaven,' i. e. the stars; and some interpret 'the queen of heaven,' i. e. a great star which is in the heavens." Rashi is in favor of the latter; and the Targum renders throughout "the star of heaven." Kircher was in favor of some constellation, the Pleiades or Hyades. It is generally believed that the "queen of heaven" is the moon (comp. "siderum regina," Horace, *Carm. Sec.* 35, and "regina cœli," Apul. *Met.* xi, 657), worshipped as Ashtaroth or Astarte, to whom the Hebrew women offered cakes in the streets of Jerusalem. Hitzig (*Der Proph. Jeremia*, p. 64) says the Hebrews gave this title to the Egyptian Neith, whose name in the form Ta-nith, with the Egyptian article, appears with that of Baal Hammân, on four Carthaginian inscriptions. It is little to the purpose to inquire by what other names this goddess was known among the Phœnician colonists; the Hebrews, in the time of Jeremiah, appear not to have given her any special title. The Babylonian Venus, according to Harpocration (quoted by Selden, *De Dis Syris* [ed. 1617], synt. 2, cap. 6, p. 220), was also styled "the queen of heaven." Mr. Layard identifies Hera, "the second deity mentioned by Diodorus, with Astarte, Mylitta, or Venus," and with the "'queen of heaven,' frequently mentioned in the sacred volumes. . . . The planet which bore her name was sacred to her, and in the Assyrian sculptures a star is placed upon her head. She was called Beltis, because she was the female form of the great divinity, or Baal; the two, there is reason to conjecture, having been originally but one, and androgyne. Her worship penetrated from Assyria into Asia Minor, where its Assyrian origin was recognised. In the rock tablets of Pterium she is represented, as in those of Assyria, standing erect on a lion, and crowned with a tower or mural coronet, which, we learn from Lucian, was peculiar to the Shemitic figure of the goddess. This may have been a modification of the high cap of the Assyrian bas-reliefs. A figure of Astarte found in Etruria represents her as winged (Rawlinson, *Herod.* ii, 404). To the Shemites she was known under the names of Astarte, Ashtaroth, Mylitta, and Alitta, according to the various dialects of the nations among which her worship prevailed" (*Nineveh*, ii, 454, 456, 457). It is so difficult to separate the worship of the moon-goddess from that of the planet Venus in the Assyrian mythology when introduced among the Western nations that the two are frequently confused. Movers believes that Ashtoreth was originally the moon-goddess, while according to Rawlinson (*Herod.* i, 521) *Ishtar* is the Babylonian Venus, one of whose titles in the Sardanapalus inscriptions is "the mistress of heaven and earth" (see Onias, De מלכת השמים [Alt. 1666]). See ASHTORETH.

Phœnician Coin with Head of Astarte.

With the cakes (כַּוָּנִים, *cavvanîm;* Sept. *χαυῶνες*) which were offered in her honor, with incense and libations, Selden compares the *πίτυρα* (A. V. "bran") of Ep. of Jer. 43, which were burned by the women who sat by the wayside near the idolatrous temples for the purposes of prostitution. These *πίτυρα* were offered in sacrifice to Hecate while invoking her aid for success in love (*Theocr.* ii, 33). The Targum gives כַּרְדּוּטִין, *kardutîn*, which elsewhere appears to be the Greek *χειριδωτὸς*, a sleeved tunic. Rashi says the cakes had the image of the goat stamped upon them, and Theodoret that they contained pine-cones and raisins. See CAKE.

QUEEN OF THE SOUTH. See SHEBA.

Queen Anne's Bounty is the name given in England to a fund appropriated to increase the income of the poorer clergy. It was created out of the first-fruits and tenths which before the Reformation were exacted by the pope from the clergy. These were funded by a statute in queen Anne's time; hence the name. See *Chambers's Encyclop.* s. v. See ANNATES.

Queensferry Declaration. After the defeat at Bothwell Bridge, the stricter and more violent portion of the Covenanters drew off from the main body, and adhered exclusively to the ministers Cameron and Cargill. An outline of their opinion had been composed, and the document was found in possession of Hall of Haughhead, on his apprehension at Queensferry on June 3, 1680. Hall was mortally wounded as he was defending himself, and Cargill, his companion, escaped. This document, unsigned and unfinished, and named after the place where it was seized, after affirming adherence to the Scriptures and the covenanted work of reformation, goes on, however, to say: "We do declare that we shall set up over ourselves, and over what God shall give us power of, government and governors according to the Word of God; that we shall no more commit the government of ourselves, and the making of laws for us, to any one single person, this kind of government being most liable to inconveniences, and aptest to degenerate into tyranny." This bold avowal of revolution was soon charged against the entire Presbyterian body, and increased persecutions was the result. See COVENANTERS; RUTHERGLEN DECLARATION; SANQUHAR DECLARATION.

Queiss, Eberhard von, a German prelate of the Reformation period, flourished near the opening of the 16th century. In 1523 he was made bishop of Pomerania, but in the following year he felt constrained to announce his abandonment of the old faith and became Protestant. In 1527 he resigned his worldly power (the episcopates of Germany then holding secular as well as ecclesiastical sway) into the hands of the duke of Pomerania. He also abandoned the celibate, and in every way he identified himself with the Protestant cause. He was overshadowed by the greatness of his predecessor in the see, George von Polentz (q. v.), and little is known of Queiss after 1527. Probably his decease only two years later was the reason for this obscured page in his life's history.

Quelen, Hyacinthe Louis de, a French Roman Catholic prelate of note, was born at Paris, Oct. 8, 1778, and was educated at the seminary in St. Sulpice. In 1807 he was ordained to the priesthood, and made shortly after secretary of cardinal Fesch. When this noted dignitary fell out with Napoleon, Quelen accompanied his eminence to Lyons. Under the Restoration he became general vicar of Talleyrand, took an active part in the establishment of the concordat, and was rewarded for his valuable services by the bishopric *in partibus* of Samosata in 1819. When Talleyrand was elevated to the archbishopric of Paris, Quelen was made his coadjutor *cum spe succedendi*, and on Oct. 20, 1821, succeeded Talleyrand in the primacy of France. He made many journeys and busied himself greatly with *relique* controversies (Francis de Sales, Vincent de Paul): but his stout advocacy of Ultramontanism and the Jesuits, whose expulsion from France in 1828 he vainly endeavored to prevent, made him very unpopular, and he was subjected to repeated attacks in his palace by the mobs of Paris in 1830 and 1831. He lived on, however, until 1839, when sudden death ended the ignominious rôle of this great ecclesiastic. See Henrion, *Vie et Travaux Apostoliques de M. de Quelen;* D'Exauvillez, *Vie Abrégée;* Clavel, *Hist. Chrét. des Diocèses de France*, s. v.

Quenstedt, Johann Andreas, a German theologian, was born at Quedlinburg in 1617, studied at Helmstädt under Calixtus and Hornejus, and in Wittenberg under Leyser. Won to the theology of the latter high-school, he became in 1646 theological adjunct, in 1649 extraordinary, and in 1660 ordinary professor of theology at Wittenberg, and always distinguished himself as a most ardent Lutheran. He died in 1688. His most celebrated work, *Theologia Didactico-polemica, s. Systema Theologicum* (Wittenb. 1685), is a most elaborate treatise of Lutheran scholasticism, and constitutes one of the best polemics of its distinguishing dogmas. Other works of his of note are, *De Sepultura Veterum* (ibid. 1648, 8vo, and later):—*Dialogus de Patriis Illustrium Doctrina et Scriptis Virorum* (ibid. 1654, 4to):—*Disputationes Exegeticæ in Epistolam ad Colossenses* (ibid. 1664, 4to):—*Ethica Pastoralis* (ibid. 1678, 8vo, and later):—*Antiquitates Biblicæ et Ecclesiasticæ* (ibid. 1688, 4to, and later). Personally Quenstedt was a mild, unpretentious character, and even his polemics is nothing less than zealotical. He appeared on the stage when the period of dissolution had touched Lutheranism and rejuvenated the old orthodox spirit, and gave it new and attractive form. His power was not only with his pen, but in the university. See Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctr.* (see Index); Jöcher, *Allgem. Gelehrten-Lexikon*, s. v.; Tholuck, *Wittenberger Theologen*, p. 214 sq.; Gass, *Geschichte der protest. Dogmatik*, i, 357 sq. (J. H. W.)

Quental, Bartholomeu do, a Portuguese theologian, was born of noble parentage, Aug. 22, 1626, in the isle of St. Michael, Azores. In 1643 he was sent to Portugal to study at Evora and other Portuguese high-schools, and after taking holy orders became one of the confessors of the king. He greatly served papal interests, and was distinguished by pope Clement XI with the title of "the venerable." Quental introduced the "Congregation of the Oratory," and in other ways strengthened Romanism. He died at Lisbon, Dec. 20, 1698. His principal works are, *Meditações* (Lisb. 1666–95, 6 vols. 8vo):—*Sermões* (ibid. 1692, 4to). See Niceron, *Mémoires*, vol. xlii.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xli, 300.

Queras, Mathurin, a French controversialist, was born at Sens, Aug. 1, 1614, studied theology at Paris, where he obtained the doctorate, and was attached to the Sorbonne. He was a Jansenist in proclivity, and in 1656 refused to abandon the Port-Royalists even on the threat of being ousted from his professorship. He was rewarded for his consistency by the archbishop of Sens, who made Queras one of his grand vicars and placed him at the head of his theological seminary. In 1674, upon the death of his protector, Queras was obliged to retire to Troyes, and became prior of St. Quentin. He spent the remainder of his life, like the Port-Royalists, in retirement and penitence. He died April 9, 1695. His most important works is *Éclaircissement de cette Célèbre et Importante Question*, referring to the decisions of the Council of Trent on the dogmas of justification and grace (Paris, 1683, 8vo), in which he takes ground against the council.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.

Quercus, Synod of. In the year 403 a council was held at a place in the neighborhood of Chalcedon. The spot is designated ἐπὶ δρῦν (to the oak), and the council is therefore known as the *Concilium ad Quercum*. It was presided over by Paul, bishop of Heraclea. Theophilus of Alexandria here succeeded in effecting the deposition of his archenemy St. John Chrysostom, which was decreed by the thirty-six bishops present, among whom were Acacius of Berea, Severianus of Gabala, in Syria, Antiochus of Ptolemais, and Cyprian of Chalcedon. St. Chrysostom was cited, but refused to appear, unless Theophilus, Acacius, Antiochus, and others of his declared foes withdrew. The emperor Arcadius, yielding to the wish of his wife Eudoxia, who had determined the ruin of Chrysostom, confirmed the judgment of the council, and banished him to Bithynia. However, an earthquake, which occurred on the very day of his departure, terrified the empress to such a degree that he was instantly brought back, and re-entered Constantinople in triumph. See Chrysostom.

Querini, Angelo Maria, an illustrious Italian prelate of the Church of Rome, was born at Venice, of noble parentage, in 1680. He first studied under the Jesuits, and at the age of seventeen entered the Benedictine order. Having become well acquainted with the Greek, Hebrew, and Biblical learning, he was made instructor of the novices, for whom he wrote a dissertation, *De Mosaicæ Historiæ Præstantia*. He afterwards travelled four years in France, England, Holland, and Germany, and enjoyed the society of some of the most distinguished men of those countries. In his *Commentarii de Rebus ad se Pertinentibus*, he gives some account of what he saw and the conversations he had with many learned men. On his return to Italy he published several works on liturgic antiquities: *Vetus Officium Quadragesimale Græciæ Orthodoxæ:—Diatribæ ad Priorem Partem Veteris Officii:—De Ecclesiasticorum Officiorum apud Græcos Antiquitate:—De Hymnis Quadragesimalibus Græcorum:—De Aliis Canticis Quadragesimalibus.* In 1721 Querini was made archbishop of Corfu, and he wrote on the antiquities and history of that island. In 1728 he was transferred to the see of Brescia, and soon after he was made a cardinal and librarian of the Vatican. It was after his promotion to the see of Brescia that he wrote his literary history of Brescia. He also published the *Lives* of Paul II (q. v.) and Paul III (q. v.), in the former of which he endeavored to clear the memory of that pope from the charges of Platina and other historians; and he edited a collection of the epistles of cardinal Reginald Pole. His other works consist of dis-

sertations upon literary subjects, both sacred and profane, and of numerous epistles, chiefly in Latin. Cardinal Querini was in every respect one of the most distinguished prelates of the Roman Church in the 18th century. Spotless in his morals, modest and simple in his habits, generous, meek, and charitable, he conciliated the esteem of men of all countries and opinions. Frederick the Great wrote to him in the most flattering terms. Voltaire dedicated to him his tragedy of *Semiramis* and other works. Querini labored particularly to improve the town of Brescia, of which he was bishop. He completed the structure of its handsome cathedral, founded a clerical college, a house for female instruction in the Val Camonica, and, lastly, he established the public library of Brescia. He died in 1755.

Quesnel, PASQUIER, a celebrated French priest or the Oratory, was born of Scottish descent, at Paris, in 1634. He studied at the Sorbonne, and in 1657 entered the Congregation, to which his two brothers belonged also. Those were times that tried men's souls. All France was agitated by the controversy which threatened the exodus of Holland from the domain of Romanism. The heresy of Jansen had found warm advocates in France also, and Quesnel was himself one of the most ardent of these. In 1671 he brought out his *Abrégé de la Morale de l'Évangile*, which constitutes only the opening of the now celebrated work of his, *Le Nouveau Testament en Français, avec des Réflexions Morales* (first complete ed. Paris, 1687, and often since). This work most unequivocally condemned much in the papacy, and advocated pretty boldly many features of Jansenism. Voltaire says that thirty pages of this book, properly qualified and softened, would have prevented much of the disturbance which Jansenism created in France. In 1675, Quesnel made the breach wider by his publication of the works of Leo I and of St. Hilary of Arles, greatly enriched by marginal notes, in the interest and defence of the rights of the Gallican Church. Of course, the book was placed on the *Index*, and its author proscribed at Rome. The superior of the Oratorians, père Abel de Sainte-Marthe, was himself an enthusiastic Jansenist, and positively endorsed Quesnel. But when the archbishop of Paris, De Harlay, exiled Sainte-Marthe, Quesnel found France a very undesirable home, and he determined to go beyond its borders. In 1681 he was not even left to make his choice, for he was in that year driven from Paris. At first he went to Orleans. His persistent refusal to abandon Jansenism made him uncomfortable here also. In 1684, finally, his order promulgated an anti-Jansenistic formula and demanded the signature of all its members. Quesnel refused to comply, and, feeling insecure, retired to Brussels, where he found the great Arnauld living, also in exile, on account of his Jansenistic proclivities. The two theologians became intimate companions and wrought much together, until the death of Arnauld, in 1694, terminated their relations. One of the most telling labors in defence of Jansenism brought out at Brussels by Quesnel was his *Réflexions Morales*. Notwithstanding its favorable treatment of Jansenism, the work, by its spirit of devotion and fervor, attracted many readers and warm admirers. Its beauties made even the moderate Ultramontanes forget the Jansenistic proclivities of the pen that wrote it, and all bestowed high encomiums on it. Several bishops were loud in its praises. Even the ultra-Jesuits would read it to catch its holy influences; and Voltaire (*Siècle de Louis XIV*, vol. ii) asserts that it was freely read at Rome. He tells the story that the abbé Rénaudot, one of the most learned men in France, being at Rome the first year of Clement XI's pontificate, went one day to wait upon this pope, who loved men of letters, and was himself a man of learning, and found him reading Quesnel's book. "This," said his holiness, "is an excellent performance; we have no one at Rome capable of writing in this manner. I wish I could have the author near me." Yet this very pope in 1708 published a decree against it, and afterwards, in 1713, issued the famous bull *Unigenitus*, in which were condemned a hundred and one propositions extracted from it. We must not, however, look upon this condemnation of Clement XI as a contradiction to the encomium he had before given; it proceeded entirely from reasons of state. The warmest advocate of the *Réflexions* was cardinal de Noailles (q. v.). While still bishop of Chalons he had defended Quesnel's works. Later, in the archiepiscopal see of Paris, he again espoused the cause of the Port-Royalists, and, of course, of Quesnel. In 1696 he even brought out an edition of the *Réflexions* at Paris. But the Jesuits were at work, and they finally succeeded in securing the pope's disapproval of the work, and in blackening the character of its author. They accused him of plotting against the authorities and as a dangerous and seditious person. In 1703 Quesnel was arrested by order of king Philip V, at the instigation of the archbishop of Malines, and put in prison. He was rescued, however, by Jansenistic friends, and made good his escape to Amsterdam, where he spent the remainder of his days building up Jansenism in Holland and strengthening it in France and Belgium also. He died in 1719. The titles of all his writings fill in Moréri several columns. We have room here to mention only, *L'Idée du Sacerdoce et du Sacrifice de Jésus-Christ* (Par. 1688, 12mo):—*Causa Arnaldina* (ibid. 1697, 8vo): —*La Paix de Clément IX, ou Démonstration des deux Fausseté Capitales avancées dans l'Histoire de cinq Propositions contre la Foi des Disciples de Saint-Augustin*, etc. (ibid. 1701, 2 vols. 12mo):—*Consultation sur le Fameux Cas de Conscience* (ibid. 1704, 12mo):—*La Discipline de l'Église* (ibid. 1698, 2 vols. 4to):—*Tradition de l'Église Romaine sur la Prédestination des Saints et sur la Grace Efficace* (ibid. 1687, 4 vols. 12mo). See Guettée, *Hist. de l'Église de France*, vols. x and xi; Ceillier, *Dict. Hist. des Aut. Eccles.*; Jervis, *Hist. of the Church of France* (see Index); Reuchlin, *Gesch. v. Port-Royal*, vol. ii; Neander, *Christian Dogmas*; Hagenbach, *Hist. of Rationalism*, p. 381; *Princeton Review*, 1856, p. 132; Moréri, *Dict. Historique*, s. v. (J. H. W.)

Question, MODERN, is, in Scotland, "Whether it be the duty of all to whom the Gospel is preached to repent and believe in Christ?" and it is called modern because it is supposed never to have been agitated before the early part of the last century. It originated in Northamptonshire, in the churches in which Mr. Davis of Rothwell preached, though it does not appear that he took an active part in it. The question thus started was pursued by a variety of inferior writers down to the time of Andrew Fuller, who very ably supported the positive side of the question, namely, that faith is the duty of all men, although, through the depravity of human nature, men will not believe till regenerated by the Holy Spirit. On the other side it was contended "that faith was not a duty, but a grace," the exercise of which was not required till it was bestowed. On this subject Mr. Fuller published *The Gospel Worthy of All Acceptation; or, The Duty of All Men to Believe in Jesus Christ*. Thereupon Fuller was attacked by Mr. Hutton, a Supralapsarian, on the one hand, and by Mr. Daniel Taylor, an Arminian, on the other, to whom he replied by *A Defence* of his former tract.

Questmen are parish officers whose duty it is to assist church-wardens.

Quetif, JACQUES, a French Dominican, was born in Paris, Aug. 6, 1618. At a very early age he entered the order, and in 1635 was sent to Bordeaux to study theology. In 1642 he was ordained to the priesthood at Paris. After filling several positions of trust in houses of his order in provincial towns, he was recalled to Paris, in 1652, and placed in charge of the library of the Jacobin convent. Thereafter, he became noted for his bibliographical attainments and his intimate knowledge

of the canon law. He died March 2, 1698. We have from him: *Hieronymi de Medicis Formalis Explicatio Summæ Theol. D. Thomæ Aquinatis* (Paris, 1657, fol.):—*Concilii Trid. Canones* (ibid. 1666, 12mo):—*Vita Hier. Savonarolæ* (ibid. 1674, 3 vols. 12mo):—*Petri Morini Opuscula et Epistolæ* (ibid. 1675, 12mo):—*Scriptores Ordinis Prædicatorum Recensiti* (ibid. 1719 sq. 2 vols. fol.), left incomplete and continued by Echard. See *Scriptores Ordinis Prædicatorum*, ii, 746; Niceron, *Mémoires*, xxiv; Moréri, *Dict. Hist.* s. v.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.

Quetzalcoatl, a Mexican divinity, represented by the green-feathered serpent, is the god of the air. He was, while on earth, a high-priest in the city of Tuta, and was so immensely rich that his houses were built with nothing but gold and precious stones. He was, at the same time, a legislator of incredible wisdom; his commands were published from the top of a mountain by a herald whose voice could be heard at a distance of three hundred miles. It was to him that useful inventions were due; he was, besides, a favorite of the gods, who, for his sake, loaded the land with blessings of all kinds. In that time an ear of corn was of such a size that it was no light burden for a strong man. But as the country, through him, grew happy to excess, and as the gods were well aware that such unmixed felicity was not to the advantage of the people, they advised him to emigrate. He did so; went to Cholula, where the people chose him for their ruler. His reign was as prosperous as could be expected. After his death he was worshipped as god of the air. Almost all peoples, even those hostile to Cholula, recognised his divinity and built temples in his honor.

Quevedo y Villegas, Francisco Gomez de, a Spanish author of note, was born in Madrid, Sept. 26, 1580; was educated at the university at Alcalá, and when only fifteen years of age took his degree in theology. He would probably have risen to great distinction in the Church had not his hot temper involved him in strife and controversy, which ended in a duel and exile. He removed to Italy and there also led a restless and eventful life. He died at Villanueva de los Infantes in 1645. Many of his writings were confiscated by the government, but among those that reached the public we are interested in the treatises *On the Providence of God:—God's Politics and Christ's Government*, in which he attempts a complete body of political philosophy based upon the example of the Saviour:—*On a Holy Life:—The Militant Life of a Christian*, etc. There is a complete edition of his works by Sancho (Madrid, 1790–94, 11 vols. 8vo), and a more recent one by Guerra y Orbe (ibid. 1852).

Quiatri is, in the mythology of the Hindûs, the conceiving force resting (therefore sterile, ineffectual) in Brahma. It is called his wife, and as such is opposed to the prolific goddess, Saraswati. The latter is the feminine element of Brahma in its exterior appearance; Quiatri is the same resting in himself.

Quichés, Kichés, or **Utlatecas**, a semi-civilized nation of Guatemala, occupying, at the time of the conquest, the greater part of what is now called Los Altos, or the highlands, of Guatemala, including the districts of Quiché, Totonicapam, and Quesaltenango. Their traditions indicate that they sprang from the Toltec stock. Their records, as written out by members of the royal house immediately after the conquest, give a long array of kings, and imply a high antiquity. It seems that the Kachiquels and Zutugils were once embraced in the Quiché kingdom, and that their separation was the act of the king Acxopil, who divided his power with his two sons, retaining to himself the capital and surrounding regions, which preserved the name of Quiché. These three divisions, subsequently becoming hostile, were easily conquered by the Spaniards. Alvarado encountered his most vigorous resistance in Quiché, where the king, Tecum-Umam, went out to meet him, according to the chroniclers, with 232,000 men. They fought with great bravery; but musketry and cannon, and, above all, the terror inspired by the Spanish horse, proved too powerful for the rude means of resistance at their command. The battle lasted six days, the Indians fighting desperately as they fell back. The king at last was slain by Alvarado, and the subjugation of the Quichés was completed. The ruins of the city of Quiché, described by Mr. Stephens, attest the grandeur and power of this people, and give a fair support to the early accounts of their numbers. The district which they occupied is the best-populated portion of Guatemala, and is almost purely Indian, the ancient language being still in general use. The people are described by Arthur Morelet as "an active, courageous race, whose heads never grow gray, persevering in their industry, skilful in almost every department of art, good workers in iron and the precious metals, generally well-dressed, neat in person, with a firm step and independent bearing, and altogether constituting a class of citizens who only require to be better educated to rise equal to the best." Their language is regarded as a purer dialect than either the Kachiquel or Zutugil, with which it is compared by Fray Ildefonso Flores, in his *Arte de la Lengua Kachiquel* (Guatemala, 1753). Much has recently been done for a better knowledge of this people by Brasseur de Bourbourg, especially in his *Grammaire de la Langue Quichée mise en Parallèle avec ses Deux Dialectes Cakchiquel et Tzutuhil, avec un Vocabulaire, servant d'Introduction au Rabinal Achi, Drame Indigène* (Paris, 1862); and *Popul Voh, le Livre Sacré et les Mythes de l'Antiquité Américaine, avec les Livres Héroïques et Historiques de Quiché* (1861).—*The Amer. Cyclop.* s. v.

Quichuas, the dominant people in the empire of Peru under the incas, who made their language the general one of their territory. The Quichuas extended from Lake Titicaca to Quito, and towards the coast to the territory of the Chinchas and Yuncas. The Aymarás, extending from Lake Titicaca to what is now the southern limit of Bolivia, were first reduced by the Quichuas under the incas. The Quichuas are gay, cheerful, energetic, and, under the wise sway of the incas, seem to have risen rapidly in many arts. They were assiduous cultivators of the soil; maize and other grains raised in Titicaca were sent to all parts of the empire as sacred presents, and the inca himself gave an example of the honor of agriculture. They wove and spun the wool of the llama, vicuña, and alpaca; they worked mines of gold, silver, and copper; built suspension-bridges; erected adobe houses with gables, niches, and arches, and temples of the same material or stone, cutting and fitting the blocks with an accuracy and finish that cannot be excelled; made sterile tracts productive by a wise and extended system of *azequias* and aqueducts, and also by excavating till moisture was reached. In astronomy they had not reached as high a degree as the Mexicans; and in literature, though preserving records mainly by *quipus*, or knotted cords, they cultivated poetry, and had dramas, as well as touching songs, that won the admiration of the Spaniards. The incas claimed to descend from the sun, and introduced the worship of that luminary. They reduced the Chancas and Huancas, apparently intrusive eastern tribes, and then attacked the Yuncas, the people of the coast, whose capital was at Chimu, near Trujillo, and who worshipped Pachacamac, creator of the world (of whom there were a famous idol and temple at the place that still bears the name), the god Rimac (who had a famous oracle near Lima), and other deities. After a long and bloody war, the inca Capac Yupanqui overthrew Chuqui Manca, king of Chimu, and reduced the Yuncas. They were compelled to accept the sun-worship; but the inca allowed the temple of Pachacamac to stand, as its fame was spread through most of South

America. There are remnants of the Yuncas still retaining their language at Moche, Eten, etc.; it is entirely different from the Quichua. The priests of the sun dressed in white, and practiced celibacy and fasts. Near each temple was also a convent of virgins of the sun. The men wore woollen tunics and leggins, the women long skirts and short cloaks, joined by gold, silver, or copper clasps. The incas were distinguished by the *llautu*, a fillet with a ball descending between the eyes. After the Spanish conquest, the Indians lost much of the arts they had gained, and retrograded generally. A desperate effort was made by the Quichuas in the last century to recover their freedom; but their leader, Tupac Amaru, a descendant of the incas, was taken and torn in pieces by horses in the plaza of Cuzco in 1780. There is a series of grammars of the Quichua, beginning with that of Fray Domingo de San Tomas (Valladolid, 1560), and coming down to Markham, *Contributions towards a Grammar and Dictionary of Quichua* (London, 1864). *Ollantay*, a Quichua drama, and several songs of the *haravecs*, or bards, have been published.

Quick, John, an English Presbyterian divine, was born at Plymouth in 1636. Having determined to enter the ministry, he was ordained in 1658. When the Nonconformity bill of 1662 was passed, he joined the conforming party, and was subjected to imprisonment. After his release, he went to London, and became the pastor of a Presbyterian congregation. He also interested himself in the French Protestants, and cared for those of the Huguenots who touched London on their way to a refuge from the intolerant measures of their own countrymen. He even wrote in their defence *Synodicon in Gallia Reformata* (Lond. 1692, 2 vols. fol.), being a history of the Reformed Church in France; and *Icones Sacræ Gallicanæ*, a biography of fifty Reformed French preachers, interrupted, however, by the death of Quick, which occurred in 1706. He left in manuscript several sermons and treatises, which all evince a superior mind. See Allibone, *Dict. Brit. and Amer. Auth.* s. v.; Hook, *Eccles. Biog.* viii, 183.

Quicksands, The (ἡ Σύρτις, Vulg. *Syrtis*), more properly, *The Syrtis* (Acts xxvii, 17), the broad and deep bight on the North African coast between Carthage and Cyrene. In the above passage it is stated that when the ship in which Paul was embarked was driven past the isle of Clauda on the south, the mariners, as would now be said, struck the sails, and scudded under bare poles, lest they "should fall into the quicksands." The original word *syrtis* denotes a *sand-bank*, or shoal, dangerous to navigation, *drawn*, or supposed to be *drawn* (from σύρω, "to draw"), together by the currents of the sea. According to others, the name is derived from *sert*, an Arabic word for "desert." For two reasons this region was an object of peculiar dread to the ancient navigators of the Mediterranean — partly because of the drifting sands and the heat along the shore itself, but chiefly because of the shallows and the uncertain currents of water in the bay. Josephus, who was himself once wrecked in this part of the Mediterranean, makes Agrippa say (*War*, ii, 16, 4), φοβεραὶ καὶ τοῖς ἀκούουσι Σύρτεις. So notorious were these dangers that they became a commonplace with the poets (see Horace, *Odes*, i, 22, 5; Ovid, *Fast.* iv, 499; Virgil, *Æn.* i, 111; Tibul. iii, 4, 91; Lucan, *Phars.* ix, 431). It is most to our purpose here, however, to refer to Apollonius Rhodius, who was familiar with all the notions of the Alexandrian sailors. In the fourth book of his *Argonaut.* 1232–1237, he supplies illustrations of the passage before us in more respects than one—in the sudden violence (ἀναρπάγδην) of the terrible north wind (ὀλοὴ Βορέαο θύελλα), in its long duration (ἐννέα πάσας Νύκτας ὁμῶς καὶ τόσσα φέρ' ἤματα), and in the terror which the sailors felt of being driven into the Syrtis (Προπρὸ μάλ' ἔνδοθι Σύρτιν, ὅθ', οὐκέτι νόστος ὀπίσσω Νηῒσι πέλει). See Clauda; Euroclydon. There were properly two Syrtes—the eastern, or larger, now called the *Gulf of Sidra*, and the western, or smaller, now the *Gulf of Cabes*. It is the former to which our attention is directed in this passage of the Acts. The ship was caught by a north-easterly gale on the south coast of Crete, near Mount Ida, and was driven to the island of Clauda. This line of drift, continued, would strike the greater Syrtis, whence the natural apprehension of the sailors. See Ship. The danger was not so imaginary in this case, we apprehend, as Dr. Falconer (*Dissert. on St. Paul's Voyage*, p. 13) conceives; for the apprehension does not appear to have been entertained till the ship had been driven *past* the isle of Clauda, which, as we take it, is mentioned merely as the last point of land which had been seen till the ship was wrecked on the isle of Melita. The position of that island must be regarded as indicating the course in which they were driven; and if that were Malta, it is clear that, had that course not been arrested by the intermediate shipwreck, they would, in all probability, have been driven upon the Syrtis Minor, which we may therefore conclude to have been the subject of their apprehension. That apprehension only becomes "imaginary" when Meleda in the Adriatic is taken, as Dr. Falconer himself takes it, for the Melita of Scripture. It may, therefore, be added to the arguments in favor of Malta that its identification with Melita gives reality to the fear entertained by the mariners, which, under the other alternative, must be supposed to have been imaginary. See Malta. The best modern account of this part of the African coast is that which is given by Admiral Smyth (in his *Memoir on the Mediterranean*, p. 87–91, 186–190), who was himself the first to survey this bay thoroughly, and to divest it of many of its terrors. See Shipwreck.

Quicunque vult. These are the initial words of the symbol known as the Athanasian Creed. The real composer of this ancient formulary being unknown, its origin is a mere matter of conjecture. A cursory notice of its history in ancient and modern times is all that can be here attempted. It probably had its origin in the Gallican Church. It was first used in that Church. Gallican councils and bishops have always treated it with especial deference. Churches which received the Gallican Psalter received with it this "expositio fidei." The oldest known translation into the vernacular was Gallican, as prescribed by Hincmar of Rheims to his priests. The first writers who cite its words were Avitus of Vienne and Cæsarius of Arles; the oldest commentator upon its text was Venantius Fortunatus, bishop of Poitiers; and MSS. were nowhere so abundant or so ancient as in Gaul (Waterland).

This "Creed," to use its scholastic title, first appeared in Latin, the Greek copies that exist being independent versions from that language. The age also of the oldest Latin MSS. exceeds that of the Greek exemplars by several centuries. The oldest Latin copy is referred by archbishop Usher to the beginning of the 7th century, and was in the Cottonian collection (*De Symb. Præf.* ii, 3). The Treves MS., acephalous, is of nearly equal antiquity. Five MSS. of the 8th century are known: the Ambrosian of Milan; the Cottonian in king Athelstan's Psalter, referable with certainty to A.D. 703, and professing to be "Fides St. Athanasii Alexandrini;" the Colbertine, copied in Saxon character from the Treves MS. shortly after the middle of the century, and, like the original, imperfect at the beginning; the Paris MS. of equal date, also in Saxon character; and the copy written in letters of gold which was presented by Charlemagne, while only king of France, to Adrian I on his accession to the pontificate, A.D. 772. It is still preserved at Vienna. The Greek copies are of much later date, and Montfaucon had never seen one that was more than three hundred years old (*Diatribe*, p. 727).

The earliest form in which this "expositio fidei" is found is the commentary of Venantius Fortunatus in the middle of the 6th century, showing that it was then

of popular use. The fourth Council of Toledo also (A.D. 633) adopted many of its more striking expressions. Rome, distrustful of novelties, only admitted it after long delay, as Waterland says, about A.D. 930. Thus it was accepted by the churches of the West "as soon as, or sooner than, the Nicene Creed."

This dogmatic composition has a direct bearing on the Apollinarian error, which was condemned by pope Damasus, A.D. 375. This heresy had much in common with the Eutychian error of the middle of the 5th century; but the latter had certain distinguishing features of which no notice is taken in the Creed, and for this reason the clauses that contravene both errors may be safely applied to Apollinarian notions: we need not look for its origin therefore so low as the Eutychian period (Harvey, *Hist. and Theol. of Creeds*, p. 549–557), in which the dying embers of Apollinarianism kindled up again. Neither can its production range later than the Nestorian controversy, which commenced with the first year of the patriarchate of Nestorius (A.D. 428), and led to the Council of Ephesus (A.D. 431); otherwise the crucial term θεοτόκος must as certainly have found its way into it as that the term ὁμοούσιος was made the "lapis Lydius" of orthodoxy by the Nicene fathers; hence this "expositio fidei" must have been written before the year A.D. 428 (Waterland, Harvey). But by how many years did it anticipate the council? There are undeniable points of resemblance between many of its expressions and the terms used by Augustine in his work *De Trinitate* (A.D. 416; Harvey, p. 562–564); which furnished the copy, the father or the Creed? Waterland affirms the former, but reasons quite as cogent point to the latter conclusion. Augustine says that the phrases used by him in defining the three Persons of the Godhead were adopted also by catholic writers his predecessors; and, in fact, the writer of the Creed may have borrowed the corresponding terms, in some few cases, from Tertullian, but abundantly from Ambrose. The Creed, then, so far as its phraseology is concerned, is quite as likely to have been written between A.D. 381, when Ambrose completed his work *De Spiritu Sancto*, and A.D. 416, when Augustine put forth his work *De Trinitate*, as after this latter date.

Further, the rudimental statements of the Creed are more fully developed in the work of Augustine. The Creed simply says, "The Holy Ghost is of the Father and the Son; neither made, nor created, nor begotten, but proceeding." The most unbending Greek theologian would have allowed the statement to pass unchallenged. E. g. Cyril of Alexandria says of the Holy Spirit, "For he is termed the Spirit of Truth, and Christ is truth; and he proceeds (προχεῖται) from him, as in fact he does from God and the Father" (*Ep. Synod.*; comp. Harvey, *Vindex Cathol.* i, 188). Thus also Basil says "the Spirit proceeds from God, not by generation as the Son, but as the Spirit of his mouth;" where it is manifestly intended that as the Spirit proceeds from God the Father, so also he proceeds from God the Word. Ambrose makes the matter more plain: "Dei Spiritus et Spiritus Christi et in Patre est et in Filio, quia oris est Spiritus" (Ambrose, *De Spir. Sanct.* i, 11, 37, 114; iii, 6). There is an Augustinian definiteness also in those other words of Ambrose: "Et si Spiritum dicas, et Deum Patrem, a quo procedit Spiritus, et Filium, quia Filii quoque est Spiritus, nuncupasti" (*ibid.*). The third Person was universally acknowledged to be of the Father and of the Son, and his origination was allowed to be by procession; that which was denied was his procession from the Son as well as the Father, instead of from the Father by the Son. But the work *De Trinitate* originated all the discussion that followed, and in fact led to that schism between the churches of the East and of the West which has never again been healed. Augustine expresses himself with his usual roundness and perspicuity upon a point that was a result of scriptural reasonings collected into one focus of light (*De Trin.* iv, 29; xv, 47). The concluding chapters of his work are filled with statements of the procession of the Holy Spirit, and a comparison of these with the more shadowy lines of the Creed satisfies the judgment that Augustine was indebted to the Creed, and not the Creed to Augustine. Then again the Creed instances by way of illustration the union of a spiritual and a material nature in the individual man: "As the reasonable soul and flesh is one man, so God and Man is one Christ." The illustration is exactly to the point; but Augustine follows out the idea in a strain of subtle argumentation that runs through six books of his work; finding points of analogy between the doctrine of a Trinity in Unity and the unity of the mind existing in different states; and falling into modes of expression that are exactly square with others in the Creed: "Hæc igitur tria, memoria intelligentia voluntas, quoniam non sunt tres vitæ sed una vita; nec tres mentes sed una mens; consequenter utique nec tres substantiæ sunt sed una substantia" (*De Trin.* x, 18). Both the Creed and Augustine argue from man's bodily and mental constitution, but the convincing simplicity of the former and the strained scholastic reasoning of the latter convince the mind that here again the Creed was the archetype. Diverging, therefore, at this point from Waterland, who dates the Creed A.D. 420, four years after the publication of the work *De Trinitate*, we may now see whether we can assign a prior date for its composition.

It should be borne in mind once more that the Apollinarian heresy is the latest form of error of which the Creed takes cognizance. But that heresy never took root in the churches of the West; therefore no newly appointed Gallican bishop would have gone out of his way to condemn it, as Waterland supposes Hilary to have done on his appointment to the see of Arles. "It is hardly in keeping with the mild 'credo' of a newly installed prelate. But in the year A.D. 401 we can point to a most popular and zealous bishop of Western Gaul, apostolical in his labors among the benighted population of the Nervii and Morini (Pas de Calais) as well as in his self-inflicted poverty (Paulin. Nol. *Ep.* 18 *ad Victric.*), who was accused publicly of teaching heresy, and that evidently of Apollinaris; who also gave account of his faith in a confession that, without any great degree of improbability, may be identified with this exposition of the catholic faith. This eminent son of the Church was Victricius, confessor and bishop of Rouen, who at the close of the 4th century was considerably advanced in years" (Harvey, *Hist. and Theol. of Creeds*, p. 578). The terms of this confession are sketched out by Paulinus of Nola (*Ep.* 37 *ad Victric.* 3, 4), and they harmonize remarkably with those of the Creed (*ibid.* p. 5, 6). There are historical reasons for believing that this confession was presented at Rome between A.D. 399 and 402 when Anastasius was pope (Harvey, *Hist. and Theol. of Creeds*). But the name of Victricius was in time expunged, and it then stood as the production of Anastasius. Hence, since one commentator terms it "Fides Anastasii," and a codex ascribes it to Anas*th*asius, it is highly probable that this name was connected with the Creed at an earlier date than that of Athanasius, into which it easily passed. The name of Athanasius is first placed at the head in a copy of the 8th century, which leaves a wide margin of three hundred years for the change of title. The earliest MS. (Cottonian, now lost) assigned no name to the Creed, but simply styled it "Fides Catholica," as does also Venantius Fortunatus in his commentary. The reasons for assigning it to Victricius have been thus summed up:

"(1.) Its careful, well-considered terms are more consistent with the mature age of Victricius, who had attained the honor of confessor forty years before the date now assigned to the Creed, in 401, than with the youth of Hilary, who was only eight-and-twenty years of age when he is supposed by Waterland to have composed the hymn on his advancement to the episcopate. (2.) Its style, though not that of an apology in vindica-

tion of the writer's faith, agrees well with the supposition that he was accused of the errors that he anathematizes. (3.) Its matter is exactly parallel with the subjects upon which Victricius, if we may judge from the expressions of Paulinus, was called to defend himself. With respect to both of these particulars, the supposition that Hilary should have been the author is singularly unsatisfactory to the judgment. His exposition of faith on entering upon his episcopal office would scarcely have been pointed with anathemas which the history of his time persuades us were not required. Indeed, the Creed can only be assigned to Hilary upon the supposition that Apollinarianism infested the Gallican Church at the date of his appointment to the see of Arles—a supposition wholly contrary to fact. But since we know that Pelagian tenets had then taken a firm root in the south of France, we know also the direction that any inaugural exposition by Hilary must have taken. (4.) Again, if Hilary had been the author of the Creed, his name must have commanded respect, and he would scarcely have met with such hard words from pope Leo I as may be found in his epistle to the French bishops, A.D. 445: e. g. 'Non est hoc . . . salubritatem impendere diligentiæ pastoralis, sed vim inferre latronis et furis. . . . Potest forsitan ad depravandos vestræ sanctitatis animos Hilarius pro suo more mentiri" (Leo, *Ep.* 10). On the other hand, the highly probable communication between Victricius and Anastasius, and the preparation of a confession of faith by the Gallican confessor, indicate the process whereby the name of Athanasius may have been placed at length, by assimilation, at the head of the Creed. For these reasons, therefore, it is considered that the authorship of the Creed may be referred to the confessor Victricius, bishop of Rouen; and that the date of the production may be assigned to the year 401" (Harvey, *On the Three Creeds*, p. 583). See Waterland, *On the Athanasian Creed;* Harvey, *Hist. and Theol. of the Three Creeds;* Blunt, *Annotated Prayer-book*, which latter work should be consulted with reference to its liturgical use. See CREED.

Quiddity, or **Quidity** (*quidditas*, from *quid*, what), a term employed in scholastic philosophy as equivalent to the τὸ τί ἦν εἶναι of Aristotle, and denotes what was subsequently called the *substantial form*. It is the answer to the question, What is it?—*quid est?* It is that which distinguishes a thing from other things, and makes it what it is, and not another. It is synonymous with essence, and comprehends both the substance and qualities; for qualities belong to substance, and by qualities substance manifests itself. It is the known essence of a thing, or the complement of all that makes us conceive of anything as we conceive of it as different from any or every other thing.—Krauth's Fleming, *Vocab. of Philosophy*, s. v.

Quien, Le. See LE QUIEN.

Quiercy, COUNCIL OF (*Concilium Carisiacense*). An ecclesiastical council was there held in 849 by Hincmar and thirteen other bishops, who condemned Gottschalk, a Predestinarian, and sentenced him to be flogged and imprisoned at Hautvilliers, where he wrote a profession of faith similar to that which he had presented at the Council of Mayence in 848. See Labbé, *Concil.* viii, 55.

Another council was held at the same place in 858. From this body the bishops of the provinces of Rheims and Rouen wrote a long letter, full of reproaches, to Louis, king of Germany, blaming him for invading France upon the invitation of the disaffected nobles of Charles, and declaring that it had come to their ears that, in the course of his march through the various dioceses, cruelties and abominations had been committed surpassing those of the heathen themselves. See Labbé, *Concil.* viii, 654.

Quietism is the doctrine that the highest character of virtue consists in the perpetual contemplation and love of supreme excellence. It recognises this excellence only in God, and maintains that perfect union with God must be effected, and that it is best attainable by a state of passive rest or quiet, more or less absolute. The quietude aimed at, beginning with an act of so-called resignation of self, is a state of mental inactivity, without thought, reflection, hope, or wish. In this state it is supposed that the soul is brought so immediately into the divine presence as to be merged in it by an essential union. Quietism, accordingly, is not peculiar, for it requires no basis of Christology. It results from every philosophical system by an excess or perversion of contemplation, when the ethical tendency of the mind is too weak to preserve a just balance with the contemplative. Vaughan (*Hours with the Mystics*, vol. i, ch. ii, p. 43) observes that "the same round of notions, occurring to minds of similar make under similar circumstances, is common to mystics in ancient India and in modern Christendom." He gives a summary of Hindû mysticism, that it (1) lays claim to disinterested love, as opposed to a mercenary religion; (2) reacts against the ceremonial, prescriptive, and pedantic literalism of the Vedas; (3) identifies in its pantheism subject and object, worshipper and worshipped; (4) aims at ultimate absorption into the Infinite; (5) inculcates, as the way to this dissolution, absolute passivity, withdrawal into the inmost self, cessation of all the powers—giving recipes for procuring this beatific torpor or trance; (6) believes that eternity may thus be realized in time; (7) has its mythical, miraculous pretensions, i. e. its theurgic department; (8) and, finally, advises the learner in this kind of religion to submit himself implicitly to a spiritual guide—his yaru. Of these articles, the third, fourth, fifth, and sixth give quietism, properly so called; and it is a question whether the manifestation of this doctrine in Christianity adds anything essential to the definition of article five, so as to save Christian quietism from the pantheistic conclusions of articles three and four.

In the Christian Church this mystical theology is defined by its professors to be that doctrine which reveals to man the hidden essence of God's Being. The way to this wisdom is in three stages, the purgative, the illuminative, the unitive; the first purging the will from low affections, the second communicating to the intellect the knowledge of God, and the third leading the soul thus prepared to union and deification.

The table at head of page 846, and taken from Arnold's *Historia Theologiæ Mysticæ*, gives this theology in outline. Some parts of it need an initiated interpreter.

It is evident that this scheme, if at all carried out to its legitimate consequences, leads directly to the error of those enthusiasts who supposed the kingdom of Christ to be an earlier and inferior dispensation, the reign of the Spirit the later and perfect dispensation. Men are taught by it, not the superiority of love to knowledge in St. Paul's sense, but that they may become more perfect by disregarding the knowledge of an earlier state, by becoming again children in understanding. To that earlier state are referred the power of Christ's resurrection and the sacrament of the holy eucharist. What the higher sacrament of unction is does not appear. In working out this scheme, Molinos taught as follows: 1. The perfection of men, even in this life, consists in an uninterrupted act of contemplation and love, which contains virtually all righteousness; that this act once effected lasts always, even during sleep, provided that it be not expressly recalled; whence it follows that the perfect have no need to repeat it. 2. In this state of perfection the soul ought not to reflect either on God or on itself, but its powers ought to be annihilated, in order to abandon itself wholly and passively to God. 3. Perfect prayer is this state of quietude, in which there should be absolutely no thought or wish or hope. Vocal prayer, confession, all external things, are but hindrances. 4. In prayer the first act of

VIA AD SAPIENTIAM EST VIA

UNIVERSALIS.	PURGATIVA.	ILLUMINATIVA.	UNITIVA.
Quæ intendit Summum	Bonum	Verum	Unum
hominis	Naturalis	Spiritualis	Deiformis
quoad	Corpus	Animam	Spiritum
cujus	Sanitas	Scientia	Sanctitas
est perfectio	Sensus	Rationis	Mentis
ex Dei	Bonitate	Sapientia	Potestate
secundum naturam	Humanam	Angelicam	Divinam:
Quæ 1° præparatur	Jejunio	Vigiliis	Oratione
vivendo	sobrie	juste	pie
erga	seipsum	proximum	Deum.
Et 2° comparatur	Mortificatione	Contemplatione	Adhæsione
membrorum	Carnis	Veritatis	Virtutis
per Christi	Passionem	Resurrectionem	Ascensionem;
Qui solus est	Via	Veritas	Vita
In lumine	Naturæ	Gratiæ	Gloriæ
Cujus gratia	Abluimur	justificamur	sanctificamur
In sacramento	Baptismatis	Cœnæ	Unctionis
per fidem in	Patrem	Filium	Spiritum S.
attestantibus	Aqua	Sanguine	Spiritu
atque 3° conservatur	Fide	Spe	Charitate
in schola	Pœnitentiæ	Scientiæ	Concordiæ
discipulorum	incipientium	proficientium	perfectorum
ætate	puerili	juvenili	virili
ubi classis	inferior	media	superior
et gradus	imaginationis	cognitionis	amoris
per oculum	pedum	manus	oris
ministerio	Angelico	Cherubico	Seraphico:
4° reparaturque	separatione	sublimatione	conjunctione
corporis	puri ab impuro	lucidi ab opaco	solidi cum soluto
cum temperamento	aqueo	aëreo	igneo
et sic ascendimus	e terra	per paradisum	in cœlum
et ingredimur in vitam	Corporis	Animæ	Spiritus æternam

faith, the first intention of resignation, prevails to constitute the whole an act of worship. "One may persevere in prayer though the imagination be carried about with various and involuntary thoughts." These are not to be actively resisted, but merely neglected. 5. The violent and painful suggestions of impatience, pride, gluttony, luxury, rage, blasphemy, cursing, despair, and an infinite number of others, are God's means for purifying those whom he calls. The soul ought not to be disquieted on account of them.

An example of pure quietism may be quoted in illustration of these principles: "Gregory Lopez having for the space of three years continued that ejaculation, Thy will be done in time and in eternity, repeating it as often as he breathed, God Almighty discovered to him that infinite treasure of the pure and continued act of faith and love, with silence and resignation; so that he came to say that, during the thirty-six years he lived afterwards, he always continued in his inward man that pure act of love, without ever uttering the least petition, ejaculation, or anything that was sensible or sprung from nature" (*Spiritual Guide* [transl. 1699], p. 75).

Molinos is charged by Romanist writers with teaching antinomianism. The charge does not appear to be well founded, but that his teaching regarding evil thoughts is most dangerous there can be no doubt. At the same time, the truth of which it is a perversion is very discernible.

Molinos proceeds to his doctrine of self-annihilation through what he calls infused contemplation. The means whereby the soul ascends to infused contemplation are two—the pleasure and the desire of it. The steps of it are three—satiety when the soul is filled with God; intoxication, an excess of mind and elevation of soul arising from satiety of divine love: security, when the soul is so drenched with love that it loses all fear, and would willingly go to hell if it knew such to be the will of God. Six other steps there are—fire, union, elevation, illumination, pleasure, and repose. But there are many other steps besides, as ecstasies, raptures, meltings, deliquiums, glee, kisses, embraces, exaltation, union, transformation, espousing, and matrimony; "which," Molinos says, "I omit to explain, to give no occasion to speculation." Madame Guyon, however, does explain: "The essential union is the spiritual marriage, where there is a communication of substance, when God takes the soul for his spouse, unites it to himself, not personally, nor by any act or means, but immediately reducing all to a unity. The soul ought not, nor can, any more make any distinction between God and itself. God is the soul, and the soul is God" (*Explicat. du Cant. des Cant.*).

Molinos passes through annihilation to the same result of deification. The soul that would be perfect passes, with the divine aid, into the state of nothingness: from the spiritual death the true and perfect annihilation derives its original; insomuch that when the soul is once dead to its will and understanding, it is properly said to have arrived at the perfect and happy state of annihilation, which is the last disposition for transformation and union. The soul no longer lives in itself, because God lives in it. The soul being in that manner the nothing, the Lord will be the whole in the soul.

Quietism aims at an entire abstraction from all externals, and seeks to put the spirit of man into direct and immediate union with the very nature of the Godhead. From this there inevitably results, instead of the Christian doctrine of the communion of saints, the doctrine of a pantheistic identification of the creature with the Creator, and an ultimate absorption of the soul into the substance of God. The Quietists call it indeed a vulgar error to say that in the prayer of rest the faculties operate not, and the soul is idle and inactive; but they assert at the same time that the soul operates neither by means of the memory nor by the intellect, nor by ratiocination, but by simple apprehension (Molinos, *Spiritual Guide*, i, 12). What an active apprehension is when none of the powers of the mind are exerted is not explained. The Quietists think to attain that repose of the mind which is the result of exertion, and that quiet rest in God which follows from the earnestness of meditative prayer, by altogether surceasing from the exertion and superseding the earnestness. Consequently, the mind being reduced to inactivity, the body has sway; and the state of perfect quietude, supposed to be a waiting for the divine access, becomes that state (which may be produced by "mesmeric" process) in which the body suffers or simulates catalepsy, and the mind apes a divine trance. Quietism becomes mental sleep.

There is a remarkable similarity between the mysticism of the Quietists and of the Plotinian school of philosophy. The aim of Plotinus was to enter into the immediate vision of Deity. "Unconditioned Being, or the Godhead, cannot be grasped by thinking or science,

only by intuition. In this pure intuition, the good, or the absolute being, gazes upon itself through the medium of our own spirits. To close the eye against all things transient and variable, to raise ourselves to this simple essence, to take refuge in the absolute, this must be regarded as the highest aim of all our spiritual efforts" (Prof. C. A. Brandis, in Smith's *Biog. Dict.* art. Plotinus, p. 427). Plotinian contemplation may find a place in the system of John Smith and Henry More, but it may also pass as readily into the reveries of Molinos. It is to be considered whether the tendency of such contemplation is not to reduce the Father manifested in the Son to the cold abstraction of the Plotinian Deity.

In the Church there have been two kinds of mysticism, one a churchly mysticism, which allies itself with the ordinances and rites of the Gospel; the other subjective or inward, which gradually rejects more and more all that is external, and even at last passes beyond the contemplation of the humanity of our Lord, and the sacraments which make men partakers of his body, to "seek a resting-place beyond all that is created in the Logos as he existed prior to the incarnation and creation" (Dorner, *On the Person of Christ*, II, i, 233). This unchristianizing of Christianity, this presentation of the great drama without its central figure, this removal of God Incarnate from the mystery of godliness, as the result of a perverted or depraved mysticism, is exhibited more than once in the history of the Church. The words quoted from Dorner on the subject were used regarding Maximus Confessor. We may resume and continue them. "True love and knowledge unite to seek a resting-point beyond all that is created, beyond even the humanity of Christ: their final goal is the pure and bare (*γυμνός*) Logos, as he existed prior to the incarnation and the creation. It is clear that in the last instance Christ is hereby reduced to the position of a mere theophany, and that the historical significance of his person is destroyed. The same thing appears also from his application to the professedly highest stage of the words. Even though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now know we him no longer. So far was Maximus Confessor from attributing eternal significance to the God-man that he regarded the humanity of Christ rather in the light of a hindrance to the full knowledge and love of the pure God—a hindrance which must be surmounted by those who aim to reach the highest stage" (Dorner, *l. c.*, and see note 48 there referred to). So in Italy, Marsilius Ficinus and John Pico of Mirandola turned Christianity in many respects into a Neo-Platonic theosophy.

In the article Mysticism (q. v.) this subject is more opened, and the schools of mysticism of the Greek and Latin churches classified. In the article Hesychasts (q. v.) is related the quietism of the Greek Church. The directions of the abbot Simon for producing the visions of quietism (supposed to have been written in the 11th century) are still in existence: "Alone in thy cell, shut thy door, and seat thyself in a corner; raise thy mind above all things vain and transitory; recline thy beard and chin on thy breast; turn thy eyes and thy thoughts towards the middle of thy belly, the region of the navel; and search the place of the heart, the seat of the soul. At first all will be dark and comfortless; but if you persevere day and night, you will feel an ineffable joy; and no sooner has the soul discovered the place of the heart than it is involved in a mystic and ethereal light." At present it is only necessary to point out that these Hesychasts had the same rule as the Hindû Quietists, viz. that to produce the state of abstraction the eyes must be steadily fixed on some particular object. The Hindûs presented the tip of the nose, the Hesychasts the navel.

In German mediæval mysticism a quietistic element is met with. It, however, borders on pantheism, very much as the pantheism of Dionysius the Areopagite borders on quietism.

The real founder of quietism in the Church is thus reputed to be Molinos (q. v.), a Spanish priest, whose opinions, published at Rome towards the end of the 17th century, called forth violent opposition from the authorities of the Church, but met with many supporters in Italy, Spain, France, and the Netherlands. He seems to have held "that religion consists in the perfect tranquillity of a mind removed from all external and finite things, and centred in God, and in such a pure love of the Supreme Being as is independent of all prospect of interest or reward." In more modern times Fénelon and Madame Guyon have taught quietism. They are, however, usually called Semi-Quietists. The two following propositions from Fénelon's *Maxims of the Saints* were condemned by Innocent XII in 1699: 1. There is attainable in this life a state of perfection in which the expectation of reward and the fear of punishment have no place. 2. Souls may be so inflamed with love to God, and so resigned to his will, that if they believed that God had condemned them to eternal pain, they would absolutely sacrifice their salvation. Madame Guyon thought she had learned a method by which souls might be carried to such a state of perfection that a continual act of contemplation and love might be substituted for all other acts of religion. She came forward as one of the chief promoters of quietism in France, and hence arose a celebrated controversy between Bossuet and Fénelon—the former of whom attacked and the latter defended several of that pious lady's opinions. See the dissertation by M. Bonnel, *De la Controversé de Bossuet et Fénelon sur le Quiétisme* (Nevers, 1850, 8vo); Dr. Burnet, *Tracts* (1689, 12mo), vol. i; *Recueil des Diverses Pièces concernant le Quiétisme et les Quiétistes* (1688); Weisman, *Hist. Eccles.* § xvii.

Quinisextum, Concilium (Σύνοδος πενδεκτή, as a complement of the fifth and sixth, so-called, œcumenical councils, A.D. 555 and 680), was held at Constantinople in 692, and intended to complete the disciplinary measures proposed, but not completed, at the previous councils. The meetings of this council were held in a hall in the imperial palace called Trullus, and hence it received, also, the name of the *Trullan Council.* It was composed chiefly of Oriental bishops, and its canons were publicly received in all the churches within the territories of the Greek emperors. Although the Roman legates subscribed to the acts of this council, it was never recognised by the Romish Church nor by its then ruling pope, Sergius I. This is due to the decisions of the council regarding the number of the apostolical canons, against enforced clerical celibacy, the rank of patriarchs, the fasting on Sabbath eves, the partaking of blood, etc. See Schaff, *Ch. History;* Milman, *Hist. of Christianity;* Butler, *Ch. History*, i, 359; Riddle, *Hist. of the Papacy;* Mosheim, *Eccles. Hist.* vol. i; Lea, *Celibacy.*

Quinn, William, a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born June 20, 1790. He was converted in his sixteenth year, and about four years after began to preach. In 1817 he joined the Philadelphia Conference. His various fields of labor, as indicated in the Conference Minutes, were: Talbot Circuit, 1817; Caroline, 1818; Dauphin, 1819; Lewiston, 1820; Dorchester, 1821–22; Accomac, 1823–24; and Annamessex, 1825. He then took a supernumerary relation until 1838, when, entering again the active work, he served the Church on Salisbury Circuit, 1839–40; Kent, 1841–42; Milford, 1843–44; and Berlin, 1845. Declining health then obliged him to take rest, and he settled at Newtown, Pa., where he died Dec. 13, 1867. He was a well-cultured man and did honor to his Church and generation as a student and a Christian. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 1868.

Quinquagesĭma is the name by which the Sunday before Lent (q. v.) is designated. The first Sunday in Lent being called Quadragesima, this being further from Easter was called Quinquagesima (or

fiftieth Sunday), reckoning the distance from Easter in round numbers. It was sometimes called *Quinquagesima pœnitentiæ*, in order to distinguish it from the other Quinquagesima, or interval between Easter and Whitsuntide, called *Quinquagesima paschalis*, or *lætitiæ*. It is also called *Shrove-Sunday* (q. v.). In ordinary years Quinquagesima is the forty-ninth day before Easter; in leap-year it is the fiftieth.

Quinquarboreus, Joannes (or Jean Cinqarbre), a learned Frenchman, was a native of Aurillac, in Auvergne. In 1554 he was made regius professor of the Hebrew language at Paris; in 1575 he was made dean of the faculty, and occupied this position until the year 1587, when he died. He wrote, *Institutio Linguæ Ebraicæ, cum Notis*, etc. (Paris, 1610):—*De Re Grammatica Hebraica Opus* (ibid. 1549, 1556, 1582; *Accessit etiam Liber de Notis*, i. e. *Abbreviaturis Hebræorum* [Venice, 1588, and Paris, 1609, *cum Notis P. Vignolii*]):—*Notæ in Clenardi Grammatica Hebraica* (Paris, 1549, 1564). He also translated into Latin the Chaldee of Jonathan on *Hosea*, *Joel*, *Amos* (ibid. 1556 and 1563). See Fürst, *Bibliotheca Judaica*, ii, 106; iii, 124; Steinschneider, *Bibliographisches Handbuch*, p. 113; Wolf, *Bibliotheca Hebr.* iv, 250, 298; Jöcher, *Allgem. Gelehrten-Lexikon*, s. v. (B. P.)

Quinquarticular Controversy is a dispute which arose at Cambridge in 1594 between the Arminians and Calvinists respecting the following five points: predestination, free will, effectual grace, perseverance, and the extent of redemption. In 1626 two fruitless conferences were held on these same points; and in 1630 bishop Davenant preached at court on these disputed matters, and thereby gave great offence to Charles I. The next year the controversy was revived at Oxford, and in Ireland, of which archbishop Usher was then primate. The king issued certain injunctions concerning the bounds within which these points might be discussed; but these limits having been exceeded by Thomas Cooke, a fellow of Brazenose College, Oxford, in a Latin sermon preached before the university in 1634, he was compelled to make a public recantation. See Collier, *Eccles. Hist.*; Mosheim, *Eccles. Hist.* vol. iii. See, also, Dort, Synod of; Five Points.

Quinquatria, an ancient Roman festival celebrated in honor of Minerva on March 19. Some writers allege that its observance was limited to one day; others, however, say that it lasted for five days. This last is the opinion of Ovid, who considers it to have been a festival held in commemoration of the birthday of Minerva; and hence it was customary for women on that day to consult diviners and fortune-tellers.

Quinquennalia, games celebrated among the ancient Romans in imitation of the Greek festivals at the end of every four years. On these occasions keen competitions were carried on in music, gymnastics, and horse-racing. Quinquennalia were observed in honor of Julius Cæsar, and also of Augustus; but they seem to have been celebrated with peculiar splendor under Nero, from whose time they were discontinued, until at length they were revived by Domitian in honor of Jupiter Capitolinus.

Quintillāni were a sect of Montanists who appeared in Phrygia about 189. They were so called from their prophetess, Quintilla of Carthage. One of the peculiar tenets of this strange sect was that women are by the Scriptures entitled to perform episcopal and other ministerial duties. They attributed extraordinary gifts to Eve, in consequence of her having eaten of the forbidden tree, and quoted the history of Miriam, and the four daughters of Philip, who were prophetesses, in vindication of their proceedings. In their assemblies virgins appeared in white robes, personating prophetesses. The errors of this sect were condemned in the Council of Laodicea in 320. Tertullian charges the Quintillani with having opposed baptism, and wrote a work on that subject.

Quintillians. See Quintillani.

Quintin Matsys, sometimes called the *Farrier of Antwerp*, was famous for having been transformed from a blacksmith to a painter by the force of love. He had followed the trade of a blacksmith and farrier near twenty years, when, falling in love with a painter's daughter, who was very handsome, and disliked nothing in him but his profession, he quitted his trade and betook himself to painting, in which art, assisted by a good natural taste, a master, and the power of love into the bargain, he made a very uncommon and surprising progress. He was a painstaking, diligent imitator of ordinary life, and much better at representing the defects than the beauties of nature. One of his best pieces is a *Descent from the Cross*, in the chapel at the Cathedral of Antwerp, for which, and a multitude of other histories and portraits, he gained many admirers, especially for his laborious neatness, which, in truth, was the principal part of his character. He died in 1529. His works are dispersed throughout Europe.

Quin'tus Memmius (2 Macc. xi, 34). See Memmius.

Qui procēdis ab Utrōque (*who proceedest from both*, i. e. from the Father and the Son) is the beginning of a sequence of Adam of St. Victor to the Holy Spirit, omitted entirely by the compilers of *Songs of the Spirit*. The first verse runs thus in the original:

"Qui procedis ab utroque,
Genitore, Genitoque,
Pariter, Paraclite,
Redde linguas eloquentes,
Fac ferventes in te mentes
Flamma tua divite."

There is an English translation, by P. S. Worsley, in the *Lyra Mystica*, p. 170 sq., and by Caswall, in *Hymns and Poems, Original and Translated*, p. 136 sq. German translations are given, together with the original, in Königsfeld, *Lateinische Hymnen*, ii, 181 sq.; Simrock, *Lauda Sion*, p. 209 sq.; Bässler, *Auswahl altchristlicher Lieder*, p. 111, 221. See Trench, *Sacred Latin Poetry*, p. 187; Daniel, *Thesaurus Hymnol.* ii, 73; Gautier, *Adam de S. Victor*, i, 115; Rambach, *Anthologie christlicher Gesänge*, p. 293; Fortlage, *Gesänge christlicher Vorzeit*, p. 401. (B. P.)

Quirēnus. See Cyrenius.

Quirinalia, a festival celebrated among the ancient Romans in honor of Quirinus. It was kept on Feb. 17, being the day on which Romulus, who was called Quirinus, was said to have been carried up to heaven.

Quirini. See Querini.

Quirk is an architectural term for a small acute channel or recess much used in mouldings.

Quiroga, Joseph, a Spanish Jesuit, was born at Lugo, in Galicia, and distinguished himself as a missionary in America. During his residence here he collected much information respecting the territories he visited, and on his return to Europe published his travels. He died in 1784.

Quisqueja. This island, one of the Great Antilles, now called *St. Domingo* or *Hayti*, was, at the time of the discovery of this part of the world, inhabited by a peaceable and harmless population, who were soon annihilated by Spanish cruelty. They adored the sun (Tonatiks) and the moon (Tona). Both luminaries resided at first on the earth, in the island of Quisqueja, of course, where a splendid cave was their mansion. Finally, they went to Turii (the heavens), thence to diffuse their light over the world. The cave is still shown; it has a diameter of 200 feet, and is 130 feet high. The purity of its form betokens the interference of human art. The figures of gods, genii, guardian spirits, are engraved in the walls. In a large number of places idols must have stood in ancient times. This supposition is in accordance

with the scanty traditions that have reached us. More than a thousand idols were distributed at intervals in the interior (says the tradition), and the two largest, representing the sun and moon, stood at the entrance. This seems to have been the only temple of Quisqueja, for multitudes of worshippers flocked to it every day from all parts of the island. They believed that their country was the cradle of the human race. The first men were shut up in two caves of the Kauta mountain, and there watched by a giant. The jailer, having once ventured out of this recess, was changed into stone by the sun, whose rays were too powerful for him. The captive men, thus liberated, came forth in their turn. Many were those who shared the giant's fate, being transformed into animals, stones, or plants. Little by little those denizens of darkness became used to the light of day. The souls of men repair to the mountains which cover the middle part of the island, and there, in a cool country, rich in springs, they feed on the savory fruit of the memmey-tree, called by the Spaniards apricots of St. Domingo. The living men piously abstain from touching those fruits, so as not to deprive the souls of their subsistence.

Their country was, primitively, much larger, and was not an island; but a terrible flood inundated the land, leaving only discovered the tops of the mountains. This happened under the following circumstances: A rich man, called Toja, lost by a sudden death his youngest son, whose mother had died in giving him birth. Not to part from the dear remains, he put them into a large pumpkin. After some time he took off the lid, and saw, to his dismay, that the pumpkin was filled with greenish water, in which a multitude of fishes and aquatic monsters were swimming about. In his terror he had recourse to his friends, and deliberated with them what was to be done. Meanwhile his other children took the pumpkin in their midst to have a look at the sea which, they had heard, was hidden in it. When they saw their father returning from his call, conscious of punishable inquisitiveness, they put the pumpkin roughly on the ground and ran away. The funereal vessel, thus carelessly handled, got a rent, and hence the waters of the sea flowed, without intermission, night and day, until all lower parts of the earth were covered, and the mountain-tops alone protruded from the universal ocean. Those tops became islands and the abode of the surviving few. The sun and moon sent to Quisqueja as their representatives two other gods, Tokahuna and Temno, the supreme rulers. Other superior beings followed, and were all, more or less, solemnly worshipped. Images of stone and of clay were made of them, and decorated the great temple and the interior of the huts. These gods were thankful for the worship they received. and in return granted the pious people successful fishing and hunting, victory in battle (their images were fastened in battle with a string to the forehead of the combatants), plentiful crops, rain or sunshine, as circumstances required. The women were blessed with happy childbeds and the girls with pleasant husbands. A great festival was solemnized every year in honor of all these gods. The cacique on that occasion appeared with a drum made of the trunk of a hollow tree, which he beat unremittingly. The whole township followed him to the temple, where the priests received every coming crowd with tremendous shouts, and took possession of the offerings. The latter consisted of thin flour cakes, which were broken in the presence of the god, and small portions of them given back to the heads of the families. Those little slices were carefully preserved through the whole year. A general dance followed. It was at this solemn occasion that most of the matrimonial offers and arrangements took place. All traces of this ancient pagan worship were destroyed by the fanatical Spaniards, and the small Indian people was exterminated.

Quisshion (*pulvinar, cussinus, culcitrum*), a cushion, usually of velvet, and stuffed with wool or horse-hair, for the service-book on the south side of the altar, appears in Henry's VI's Book of the Hours, and was used by bishop Andrewes. In the former it is on the south side, in the latter on the north. Albertis mentions the wooden desk, plated (*legile*), as a modern substitute. The book was first set on the right side and afterwards moved to the left side of the altar at mass.

Quistorp, a family of Christian theologians, of whom we mention the following:

1. Bernhard Fr., was born at Rostock, April 11, 1718. In 1753 he was made superintendent, in 1766 doctor and professor of theology, in 1779 general superintendent, and afterwards chancellor and curator of the University of Greifswalde, where he died, Jan. 4, 1788. He wrote, *Dissertatio Epist. de Atheismo Benedicti de Spinoza* (Rostock, 1743):—*Diss. Epist. de Collatione Librorum Scripturæ Sacræ in Interpretatione S. S. haud Injusta* (ibid. 1736):—*Disp. Exegetico-dogmatica eaque Inaug. de Judæis Corde Compunctis* (ibid. 1749):—*Ob die Altväter vor und nach der Sündfluth haben schreiben können? Disp. de Notione Filiorum et Filiarum Dei* (ibid. 1751):—*Disp. de Adoptione Ecclesiastica V. T.* (ibid. 1755):—*Ob, ehe die sogenannte griechische Uebersetzung der siebzig Dolmetscher von der Bibel des A. T. zu Stande gekommen, schon eine griechische Uebersetzung der fünf Bücher Moses vorhanden gewesen sei?* (ibid. 1756):—*Num Michælis Archangeli cum Diaboli de Corpore Mosis Disceptatio Fabula sit?* (Greifswalde, 1770):—*De Angelis Dei in Legislatione Sinaitica Ministris, Gal. iii*, 19 (ibid. 1771):—*Disp. de* ס' תורה ביד משה בברית ר"י *abs.* חלקיהו, *reperto* 2 *Chron. xxxiv*, 14, 15, *et* 2 *Kings xii*, 8 (ibid. 1771):—*De Triplici Christi Officio* (ibid. 1784). See Fürst, *Bibl. Judaica*, iii, 124 sq.; Winer, *Theol. Handbuch*, p. 436, 719.

2. Johann (1), was born at Rostock, Aug. 18, 1584. Having completed his studies at his native place and at Frankfort-on-the-Oder, he travelled through Holland, Brabant, and Flanders, and after his return, in 1615, he became professor in his native city. In 1616 he was made doctor of theology, in 1645 he was called as pastor and superintendent of St. Jacobi, and died at Dobran, May 2, 1648. He wrote, *Annotationes in Omnes Libros Biblicos* (Frankfort, 1698):—*Comment. in Omnes Epp. Pauli*:—*Castigatio Hebræorum*, etc. See Fürst, *Bibl. Judaica*, iii, 125; Jöcher, *Allgem. Gelehrten-Lexikon*, s. v.

3. Johann (2), son of the preceding, was born at Rostock, Feb. 5, 1624. He studied at Greifswalde, Königsberg, Copenhagen, and Leyden, was made doctor of theology, and died as *rector magnificus* Dec. 24, 1689. He wrote, *Catechesis Antipapistica*:—*Pia Desideria*, etc. See Jöcher, *Allgem. Gelehrten-Lexikon*, s. v.

4. Johann Nikolaus, son of the foregoing, was born at Rostock, Jan. 6, 1651, studied at his native place and Königsberg, travelled through Germany, Holland, and Denmark, and after his return, in 1676, he was made deacon of St. Nicolai, afterwards pastor and superintendent, and finally professor of theology. He died Aug. 9, 1715. His writings, which are very numerous, touch upon almost every department of theology, and are enumerated by Jöcher in his *Allgem. Gelehrten-Lexikon*, s. v. See, also, Diestel, *Geschichte des Alten Testaments in der christl. Kirche* (Jena, 1869), p. 372. (B. P.)

Quitaztli is, according to Mexican mythology, the serpent woman who, at the beginning of the fourth age of the world, populated the earth by the successive birth of a number of twins. The latter are represented on monuments holding in their hands the shells of the eggs from which they have crept.

Quitman, Frederick Henry, D.D., an eminent American divine of the Lutheran Church, was born in 1760, and after studying theology at home and abroad became pastor at Rhinebeck, on the Hudson, and

greatly distinguished himself in the pulpit and the press. He died in 1832. Among his noteworthy publications are a *Treatise on Magic* (1810):—*Evangelical Catechism* (1814):—*Hymn-book of the Synod of New York* (1817). See *Evangel. Rev.* Oct. 1858, p. 186; Sprague, *Annals of the American Pulpit*, ix, 115 sq.

Quiver is the rendering in the A. V. of two very different Hebrew words. The English word "quiver" is a variation of "cover" (from the French *couvrir*), and therefore answers to the second of the two Hebrew words. See ARMOR.

1. תֶּלִי, *teli*. This occurs only in Gen. xxvii, 3—"take thy weapons (literally "thy things"), thy *quiver* and thy bow." It is derived (by Gesenius, *Thesaur.* p. 1504, and Fürst, *Handwörterb.* ii, 528) from a root which has the force of *hanging*. The passage itself affords no clue to its meaning. It may therefore signify either a quiver or a suspended weapon—for instance, such a sword as in our own language was formerly called a "hanger." Between these two significations the interpreters are divided. The Sept., Vulg., and Targum Pseudo-Jon. adhere to the former; Onkelos, the Peshito and Arabic versions, to the latter.

Ancient Persian with Bow and Quiver.

2. אַשְׁפָּה, *ashpâh*. The root of this word is uncertain (Gesenius, *Thesaur.* p. 161). From two of its occurrences, its force would seem to be that of containing or *concealing* (Psa. cxxvii, 5; Isa. xlix, 2). It is connected with arrows only in Lam. iii, 13. Its other occurrences are Job xxxix, 23; Isa. xxii, 6; and Jer. v, 16. In each of these the Sept. translates it by "quiver" (φαρέτρα), with two exceptions, Job xxxix, 23, and Psa. cxxvii, 5, in the former of which they render it by "bow," in the latter by ἐπιθυμία.

The quiver is a case or box for arrows, which was slung over the shoulder in such a position that a soldier could with ease draw out the arrows when he wanted them (Isa. xlix, 2; Jer. v, 16). There is nothing in the Bible to indicate either its form or material, or in what way it was carried. The quivers of the Assyrians are

Assyrian Warrior with Quiver.



Assyrian Chariot with Quiver.

rarely shown in the sculptures. When they do appear, they are sometimes richly decorated with groups of figures and fanciful designs. They were worn at the back, with the top between the shoulders of the wearer, or hung at the side of the chariot. The Egyptian war-

Ancient Egyptian Archer and Quiver.

Quivers on Greek Sculptures.

riors, on the other hand, wore them slung nearly horizontal, drawing out the arrows from beneath the arm (Wilkinson, *Anc. Egypt.* abridgm. i, 354). The quiver was about four inches in diameter, supported by a belt passing over the shoulder and across the breast to the opposite side. When not in actual use, it was shifted behind, or hung at the side of the chariot, like that of the Assyrians. See CHARIOT. Among the ancient Greeks, the quiver was principally made of hide or leather, and was adorned with gold, painting, and braiding. It had a lid (*πῶμα*), and was suspended from the right shoulder by a belt passing over the breast and behind the back. Its most common position was on the left hip, and is so seen in the annexed figures, the right-hand one representing an Amazon, and the left-hand an Asiatic archer.

"Quiver" is also used figuratively for *house*, and arrows for *children* (Psa. cxxvii, 5). See ARCHER.

Quobdas is the magic drum used by physicians and sorcerers among the Laplanders to chase the evil spirits which are supposed to be the cause of the diseases. It is covered with figures of animals and mysterious characters, and embellished with divers ornamental appendages.

Quod permittat is, in the Church of England, a writ granted to the successor of a minister for the recovery of pasture by the statute of Edward I, c. 24.

Quoin, the outer angle of a wall.

Quotations, BIBLICAL. The verbal citations contained in Scripture are of three classes: (*a*) Those which the later writers of the Old Test. make from the earlier. (*b*) The quotations made by Paul from heathen authors —viz. Acts xvii, 28 from Aratus, *Phænom.* 5, or Cleanthes, *Hymn. ad Jov.* 5; 1 Cor. xv, 33 from Menander's *Thais;* and Tit. i, 12 from Callimachus, *Hymn. ad Jov.* 8, according to Theodoret, or Epimenides according to Jerome, Chrysostom, Epiphanius, and others. To these may be added Gal. v, 23, where the words *κατὰ τῶν τοιοῦτων οὐκ ἔστι νόμος* are identical with the words of Aristotle, *Pol.* iii, 8 (Gill, *Notes and Queries*, v, 175). Perhaps also Acts xiv, 17 and James i, 17, from their rhythmical form, may be quotations. (*c*) Those which the New Test. contains from the Old Test. The first and third of these classes are the most important, and the only ones demanding special notice here. The following treatment as to both is compiled from the various authorities on Biblical introduction and interpretation, with additions from other sources.

I. *Parallel Passages of the Old-Testament Scriptures.*—The principal of these are the following: Many sections of the books of Chronicles seem to be quoted from the earlier Scriptures. The historical chapters of the book of Isaiah (xxxvi–xxxix) are repeated in 2 Kings xviii–xx. The last chapter of Jeremiah reappears in 2 Kings xxiv, xxv. Of Psa. xviii we have two copies, one in 2 Sam. xxii. Compare also Gen. xlvi with Numb. xxvi, and Ezra ii with Neh. vii. Other instances are cited: Hab. ii, 14 from Isa. xi, 9; Jon. ii, 3 from Psa. xlii, 8; ii, 5 from Psa. lxix, 2; Obad. i, 8 from Jer. xlix; and several passages in the later Psalms, which are found also in the earlier. The reader will find a list of the variations discovered by a comparison of most of the foregoing passages in the notes to Cappelli, *Crit. Sac.* (i, 30–44 [ed. 1775]). See also Kennicott, *Biblia Hebraica* (ii, 727, etc.), and *State of Printed Hebrew Text* (pt. i).

The question to be determined is, Are we to regard each of the textual variations thus brought to light as a blunder to be corrected in one or other of the parallel Scriptures, or as a deviation (intentional or otherwise) on the part of the later writer from the language of the earlier? In considering this question a distinction must be made between two classes of parallel passages—the one class consisting of those in which the same story is told, or the same sentiments expressed, by two different writers, and the later writer avails himself of the language of the earlier, though it may be without any very exact or servile adherence in every word and clause; the other consisting of those in which a public or other document is inserted in two separate records. It would seem that such variations as are met with in passages of the former description are more likely to be designed and original, being probably traceable to the free use which the later writer made of the materials furnished by the earlier; and that variations met with in passages of the latter description are more likely to be blunders arising from the negligence of transcribers and similar causes. But this anticipation is only partially realized, inasmuch as errors of transcription are found in the former class of passages, and alterations obviously designed are found in the latter. Let us illustrate this by four examples, two of each class.

1. The very remarkable prophecy contained in Isa. ii, 1–4 is found also in Mic. iv, 1–3. The variations are few and of no great importance. But, such as they are, there is no reason to suppose that the text of either of these passages ever differed from what it is now. It is of no consequence in the present inquiry whether Micah borrowed from Isaiah or Isaiah from Micah, or both from an older prophet. There is no evidence whatever that the later writer made it a matter of conscience to reproduce in every minute particular the language of his predecessor. His heart was too full of the great thought embodied in the language to permit him to be minutely attentive to every fold of the dress in which it had been presented. Possibly, also, the quotation was made from memory; and, if so, the wonder is not that any varieties of expression are found in it, but that they are so few and so trivial. In such a case as this, therefore, it would be quite unwarrantable to correct the one passage from the other. The text in both passages is accurate and genuine, and any attempted emendations with the view of bringing the two passages into rigid harmony would certainly be alterations for the worse, not for the better.

2. The prophecy of Nathan in 2 Sam. vii occupies a very conspicuous position in the Old Test., and, as we might expect, the whole narrative is repeated in 1 Chron. (xvii), not, however, without a very considerable number of alterations. In this case, also, it is quite evident that most of the alterations are to be traced to the author of Chronicles, and cannot be regarded as various readings. As is usual, the later writer makes a free use of the earlier narrative, adapting it and the language in which it is conveyed to the circumstances of his own time. Thus he writes דויד for דוד, prefers אֱלֹהִים to יְהוָה or אֲדֹנָי, sometimes substitutes מַלְכוּת for מַמְלָכָה, *kingdom*, and alters or omits words or clauses which appear to him obscure or unessential. The most remarkable omission is in ver. 13 as compared with ver. 14 of the narrative in Samuel. Compare also ver. 17 with ver. 19 of Samuel. Still, though it is evident that most of the variations between the two narratives are to be traced to the design of the later author, and cannot be regarded as errors of transcription, we do not think that all of them can be accounted for in this way. Two instances may be given, in the one of which the text in Chronicles may fittingly be corrected by that in Samuel; in the other the text in Samuel may be corrected by that in Chronicles. (1.) In 1 Chron. xvii, 18, 19 we read, "What can David speak more to thee *for the honor of thy servant*, לְכָבוֹד אֶת־עַבְדֶּךָ. . . . For thy *servant's* sake, and according to thine own heart hast thou done all this greatness." Not to mention the difficulty in the construction of the Hebrew in ver. 18, it is evident that the spirit of the whole passage is quite out of harmony with the context. Accordingly, on turning to the corresponding verses in Samuel, we are not surprised to find the sentiment expressed very different indeed, the words being "And what can David say more unto thee . . . for thy *word's* sake, and according to

thine own heart," etc. (ver. 20, 21). It is not improbable that what we cannot but regard as the erroneous readings in Chronicles are to be traced to the similarity between לדבר and לכבד in the former of the two verses, and דברך and עברך in the latter. It may be added that in the Septuagint translation of Chronicles the objectionable words are omitted. (2.) The other instance is in 2 Sam. vii, 23, compared with 1 Chron. xvii, 21. In the former we read, according to the authorized translation, "What one nation in the earth is like thy people, even like Israel, whom God went to redeem for a people to himself, and to make him a name, and to do for you great things and terrible, *for thy land, before thy people* (מִפָּנֶיךָ, from before), which thou redeemedst to thee from Egypt, [from] the nations and their gods?" The text of this verse is obviously very confused; and in order to extract from it some tolerable sense, our translators have rendered מִפָּנֶיךָ as if it were לְפָנֶיךָ and have inserted *from*, without any authority, towards the close. Now, without venturing to affirm that the text in Chronicles is to be received as in every particular the true and genuine one, we have no hesitation in borrowing from it what we believe to be an important emendation of the text in Samuel—viz. the substitution of לגרש, *to drive out*, for לארצך (the words are very similar), *for thy land*. This will allow us to give מִפָּנֶיךָ its proper force, and render unnecessary the insertion of the unauthorized *from;* the meaning of the latter half of the verse when thus corrected being as follows: "To drive out from before thy people, whom thou redeemedst to thee from Egypt, nations and their gods."

3. The two remaining examples are of a different description, consisting not of historical or prophetical passages freely made use of by a later writer, but of documents of which we have, so to speak, two editions. The first is David's noble song of thanksgiving, of which two copies have come down to us—the one incorporated with the history in 2 Sam. xxii, the other with the psalm-book as Psa. xviii. Now, on comparing these two copies of the same song, we find scarcely a single line of the one exactly identical with the corresponding line of the other; some of the variations being of extremely little importance, others of greater moment. The question here again arises: How are these variations to be accounted for? How comes it that two copies of the same song, handed down to us in the same volume, should, though identical in the general sentiments expressed, in the train of thought, and in the order of the verses, present so many minute differences in the details of the composition? On first thought, we are disposed to conclude, somewhat rashly, that all the variations must be regarded as errors of transcription, and that in this case there is no room for the hypothesis of design on the part of the author or editor, inasmuch as we have here the case not of an independent author adapting to his own purpose the materials furnished by previous writers, but of a collector giving insertion to a document which, one would suppose, it is his duty to present as nearly as possible in the words of the original author. On comparing, however, the psalm with the history, it is evident that all the variations cannot be accounted for in this way. For example, the very first words of the psalm, "I will love thee, O Lord, my strength," do not appear in the other copy; and of this the only admissible explanation plainly is that the words in question constitute an authorized addition to the song in its original form, the addition being made probably for the purpose of adapting it more perfectly to liturgical use. If this explanation be admitted, it follows that of this song there have been transmitted to us two *authorized* editions—the one, which is inserted in the history, presenting the song in its original form; the other presenting it in the slightly altered form which was given to it when incorporated with the authorized hymn-book of the Hebrew nation. In this way a considerable number of the variations may be accounted for, but not, by any means, all of them; for, with regard to many of them, it is impossible to discover any useful purpose which could be served by their introduction; and several of them are just the sort of alterations which most usually arise from the mistake of transcribers—as, for example, the interchange of letters of similar form, the transposition of letters, etc. (thus for וירא, *and he was seen*, in 2 Sam. xxii, 11, we find in Psa. xviii, 11 [10] ויראו, *and he did fly;* and for ויחגרו in 2 Sam. xxii, 46 we find ויחרגו in Psa. xviii, 46 [45]). The text in Samuel is the more antique in form—as, for example, in the more sparing insertion of vowel letters; but that of the Psalm appears to have been more carefully preserved. Thus, there is little doubt that for גְּבוֹר, in 2 Sam. xxii, 26, we ought to read גֶּבֶר, as in the Psalm; and in ver. 28, ואת of Samuel ought to be read וְאַתָּה or כִּי אַתָּה, as in the Psalm; and in the second clause also the reading in the Psalm is much to be preferred. So in vers. 33, 44, 47, 49. On the other hand, in vers. 5, 43, the reading in Samuel may be preferred to that of the Psalm.

4. Our last example is the Decalogue, of which we have two editions, in Exod. xx and Deut. v, between which there are not a few differences, some of considerable importance. But it is very doubtful whether any of these differences can be laid to the charge of the copyist; certainly the more important of them must be traced to the author. They are principally to be found in the fourth and tenth commandments: in the latter, the two first clauses are transposed in Deuteronomy, and a slight addition and alteration made; and in the former, the *remember* of Exodus is exchanged for *observe* in Deuteronomy; *thy cattle* is expanded into *thine ox and thine ass and all thy cattle;* and the "reason annexed" in Exodus—"For in six days," etc.—is entirely omitted in Deuteronomy, and another statement substituted for it—"That thy man-servant and maid-servant may rest as well as thou; and remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt," etc. The other alterations are of less importance. In each of the fourth and fifth commandments, the clause "As the Lord thy God hath commanded thee" is inserted in Deuteronomy, the promise in the latter being also expanded by the addition of the clause "that it may be well with thee;" and in the ninth, עֵד שָׁוְא (*false witness*) is substituted for עֵד שֶׁקֶר. Now, there is not one of these variations which can be certainly traced to the oversight of a transcriber. It is, indeed, on first thought, surprising that any writer, however conscious of the guidance of the Divine Spirit, should have ventured to depart, even in the minutest particular, from the *ipsissima verba* of a document which had been stamped in so special a manner with the impress of Heaven. It is, perhaps, the most remarkable example of that complete mastery of the essential over the accidental, of the spirit over the letter, which distinguishes the entire revelation at once of the Old Testament and of the New. But to explain this phenomenon does not fall within our present purpose. It is sufficient to remark that most of the variations are evidently to be traced to the first composition of the book of Deuteronomy, and that none of them can with any degree of certainty be placed in the category of various readings. See DECALOGUE.

From the four examples of parallel passages which have been under review, the following conclusions have been elicited: (*a.*) That most of the variations are to be traced to the author or editor, and not to the copyist; and, in all such cases, both forms of the passage must be preserved as belonging equally to the sacred text. (*b.*) That, notwithstanding, a considerable number of variations still remain which cannot be accounted for in this way, but probably arose through oversight in transcription. In such cases it is allowable to correct the more faulty text by the more accurate; but, in the absence

of any external testimony to the accuracy of the reading which we prefer, such corrections must be introduced with caution, and might, perhaps, with greater propriety be placed in the margin (as was the practice with the ancient Jewish critics) than incorporated with the text. The variations of this class would have appeared still more numerous had we selected our examples of parallel passages from those which are occupied with lists of names or numbers. See Kennicott, *Dissertation on the State of the Printed Hebrew Text*, pt. i.

II. *Quotations from the Old Testament in the New.*—These form one of the outward bonds of connection between the two parts of the Bible. They are manifold in kind; but all that we need here to say respecting them may be summed up under the following heads:

1. *Sources whence the Quotations are made.*—These are two—the Hebrew original and the Septuagint translation. On comparing the passages, in order to apportion the quotations between these two sources, we find that by far the larger number are taken, either wholly or chiefly, from the Sept., while a very few materially differ from both the Sept. and the Hebrew. The latter were probably quoted from memory, the occasion not requiring punctilious accuracy in the citation. For the most part, the deviations from the text of the Hebrew or the Sept. are not material. They may be classed as follows:

(1.) Changes of person, number, or tense in particular words. Thus, in Matt. xxvi, 31, we read, *πατάξω τὸν ποιμένα, καὶ διασκορπισθήσεται τὰ πρόβατα τῆς ποίμνης*; while the Sept. gives it, *πάταξον τὸν ποιμένα, καὶ διασκορπισθήσονται*, κ. τ. λ. (Zech. xiii, 7) (this is the reading of the Alexandrine Codex; that of the Vatican differs considerably: *πατάξατε τοὺς ποιμένας καὶ ἐκσπάσατε τὰ πρόβατα*); John xix, 36, *Ὀστοῦν οὐ συντριβήσεται αὐτοῦ*, for *Ὀστοῦν οὐ συντρίψετε ἀπ' αὐτοῦ*, Exod. xii, 46; 1 Pet. ii, 24, *Οὗ τῷ μώλωπι αὐτοῦ ἰάθητε*, for *μώλωπι αὐτοῦ ἰάθημεν*, Isa. liii, 5, etc. Comp. also Matt. xi, 10 with Mal. iii, 1; and John xix, 37 with Zech. xii, 4.

(2.) Substitution of synonymous words or phrases for those used in the Sept. or Hebrew: e. g. John xiii, 18, *Ὁ τρώγων μετ' ἐμοῦ τὸν ἄρτον, ἐπῆρεν ἐπ' ἐμὲ τὴν πτέρναν αὐτοῦ*, for *Ὁ ἐσθίων ἄρτους μου ἐμεγάλυνεν ἐπ' ἐμὲ πτερνισμόν*, Psa. xl (xli), 9. Comp. Heb. viii, 8 sq. Matt. xii, 20, where לְאֶמֶת יוֹצִיא מִשְׁפָּט (Isa. xlii, 3) is rendered by *ἕως ἂν ἐκβάλῃ εἰς νῖκος τὴν κρίσιν*. Sometimes the words thus substituted are synonymous with those for which they are used only *historically*; as when Paul (Gal. iv, 30) calls Isaac *ὁ υἱὸς τῆς ἐλευθέρας*, in a passage quoted from Gen. xxi, 10, where, in the words of Abraham, he is mentioned by name as *ὁ υἱός μου Ἰσαάκ*. Occasionally, also, this kind of substitution is effected by the use of a word describing a species for one designating the genus to which it belongs; as when Paul, in 1 Cor. iii, 20, substitutes the words *τῶν σοφῶν* for the more general expression, *τῶν ἀνθρώπων*, used in the passage (Psa. xix, 11) which he quotes; or as in Matt. xxii, 37, where *διανοία* is put for בְּכָל, the special kind of strength intended being that of the mind.

(3.) Words and phrases transposed: e. g. Rom. x, 20, *Εὑρέθην τοῖς ἐμὲ μὴ ζητοῦσιν, ἐμφανὴς ἐγενόμην τοῖς ἐμὲ μὴ ἐπερωτῶσιν*, for *Ἐμφανὴς ἐγενήθην τοῖς ἐμὲ μὴ ἐπερωτῶσιν, εὑρέθην τοῖς ἐμὲ μὴ ζητοῦσιν*, Isa. lxv, 1, etc. The Codex Alex. gives this passage exactly as cited by Paul.

(4.) Words and clauses interpolated or added: e. g. John vi, 31, *ἄρτον ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς φαγεῖν*, where the words *ἐκ τοῦ* and *φαγεῖν* are an addition (comp. Psa. lxxviii, 24); 1 Cor. xv, 45, *Ἐγένετο ὁ πρῶτος ἄνθρωπος Ἀδὰμ εἰς ψυχὴν ζῶσαν*, where the words *πρῶτος* and *Ἀδάμ* are added by the apostle (comp. Gen. ii, 7). These additions are made sometimes from parallel passages, and sometimes of the writer's own device, for the purpose of rendering the meaning of the passage clearer, or connecting it more readily with the preceding or subsequent context.

(5.) Words omitted and passages abridged: e. g. Matt. iv, 6, *τοῖς ἀγγέλοις αὐτοῦ ἐντελεῖται περὶ σοῦ, καὶ ἐπὶ χειρῶν ἀροῦσί σε, μήποτε προσκόψῃς πρὸς λίθον τὸν πόδα σοῦ*, for *τοῖς ἀγγέλοις αὐτοῦ ἐντελεῖται περὶ σοῦ, τοῦ διαφυλάξαι σε ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ὁδοῖς σοῦ· ἐπὶ χειρῶν ἀροῦσί σε, μήποτε προσκόψῃς πρὸς λίθον τ. π. σ.*, Psa. xc, 11, 12. Comp. also Matt. xxii, 24 with Deut. xxv, 5; Rom. ix, 27, 28 with Isa. x, 22, 23; Heb. iv, 4 with Gen. ii, 3, etc.

(6.) Passages paraphrastically rendered, or the general sense only given: e. g. Rom. ix, 25, where we have a paraphrastic rendering of Hos. ii, 23; Rom. x, 6 sq., a free rendering of Deut. xxx, 12 sq.; 1 Cor. i, 31, where the general sense of Jer. ix, 24 is given; comp. also 1 Pet. ii, 22 with Isa. lix, 9.

(7.) Several passages quoted together, so as to form one connected sense: e. g. in 2 Cor. vi, 16–18 we have a passage made up of no less than three different passages—Lev. xxvi, 11; Isa. lii, 11; Jer. xxxi, 1. Comp. also Mark i, 2, 3, where Mal. iii, 1 and Isa. xl, 3 are combined; also Rom. xi, 8, where Isa. xxix, 10 and Deut. xxix, 4 are strangely mixed together.

(8.) Several of these species of deviations combined together: e. g. Rom. ii, 24, *τὸ γὰρ ὄνομα τοῦ Θεοῦ δι' ὑμᾶς βλασφημεῖται ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσι*, for *δι' ὑμᾶς διὰ παντὸς τὸ ὄνομά μου βλασφημεῖται ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσι*. Here we have the substitution of *τοῦ Θεοῦ* for *μοῦ*, and the omission of *διὰ παντός*. Comp. also Rom. xi, 3 with 1 Kings xix, 14, for an instance of the combination of omission, substitution, and transposition.

(9.) Passages rather indicated, or hinted at, than formally quoted: e. g. Eph. v, 14, *Ἔγειραι ὁ καθεύδων, καὶ ἀνάστα ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν, καὶ ἐπιφαύσει σοι ὁ Χριστός*. The difficulty of assigning this quotation to any passage in the Old Test. has been felt by all interpreters, and various theories have been proposed for the sake of removing it. The most probable, however, seems that which regards these words as formed upon Isa. lx, 1–3, and the passage as rather hinted at than quoted. Comp. also Heb. xiii, 15 with Hos. xiv, 2. To this head may be also referred John vii, 38, where no particular passage is quoted, but such passages as Isa. xliv, 3; lv, 1; lviii, 11; Zech. xiv, 8; xiii, 1, are alluded to.

In the quotations of all kinds from the Old Test. in the New we find a continual variation from the *letter* of the older Scriptures. To this variation four causes may be specified as having contributed:

First. All the New-Test. writers quoted from the Sept.—correcting it, indeed, more or less, by the Hebrew, especially when it was needful for their purpose; occasionally deserting it altogether; still abiding by it to so large an extent as to show that it was the primary source whence their quotations were drawn. Their use of it may be best illustrated by the corresponding use of our liturgical version of the Psalms—a use founded on love as well as on habit, but which, nevertheless, we forego when it becomes important that we should follow the more accurate rendering. Consequently, when the errors involved in the Sept. version do not interfere with the purpose which the New-Test. writer had in view, they are frequently allowed to remain in his quotation (see Matt. xv, 9 [a record of our Lord's words]; Luke iv, 18; Acts xiii, 41; xv, 17; Rom. xv, 10; 2 Cor. iv, 13; Heb. viii, 9; x, 5; xi, 21). The current of apostolic thought, too, is frequently dictated by words of the Sept., which differ much from the Hebrew (see Rom. ii, 24; 1 Cor. xv, 55; 2 Cor. ix, 7; Heb. xiii, 15). Or even an absolute interpolation of the Sept. is quoted (Heb. i, 6 [Deut. xxxii, 43]). On the other hand, in Matt. xxi, 5; 1 Cor. iii, 19, the Sept. is corrected by the Hebrew; so, too, in Matt. ix, 13; Luke xxii, 37, there is an effort to preserve an expressiveness of the Hebrew which the Sept. had lost: and in Matt. iv, 15, 16; John xix, 37; 1 Cor. xv, 54, the Sept. disappears altogether. In Rom. ix, 33 we have a quotation from the Sept. com-

bined with another from the Hebrew. In Mark xii, 30; Luke x, 27; Rom. xii, 19, the Sept. and Hebrew are superadded the one upon the other. In the Epistle to the Hebrews, which in this respect stands alone, the Sept. is uniformly followed; except in the one remarkable quotation (Heb. x, 30), which, according neither with the Hebrew nor the Sept., was probably derived from the last-named passage (Rom. xii, 19), wherewith it exactly coincides. The quotation in 1 Cor. ii, 9 seems to have been derived, not directly from the Old Test., but rather from a Christian liturgy or other document into which the language of Isa. lxiv, 4 had been transferred.

Secondly. The New-Test. writers must have frequently quoted from memory. The Old Test. had been deeply instilled into their minds, ready for service whenever needed; and the fulfilment of its predictions, which they witnessed, made its utterances rise up in life before them (comp. John ii, 17, 22). It was of the very essence of such a living use of Old-Test. Scripture that their quotations of it should not of necessity be verbally exact.

Thirdly. Combined with this there was an alteration of conscious or unconscious design. Sometimes the object of this was to obtain increased force; hence the variation from the original in the form of the divine oath (Rom. xiv, 11); or the result "I quake" substituted for the cause (Heb. xii, 21); or the insertion of rhetorical words to bring out the emphasis (Heb. xii, 26); or the change of person to show that what men perpetrated had its root in God's determinate counsel (Matt. xxvi, 31). Sometimes an Old-Test. passage is abridged, and in the abridgment so adjusted, by a little alteration, as to present an aspect of completeness and yet omit what is foreign to the immediate purpose (Acts i, 20; 1 Cor. i, 31). At other times a passage is enlarged by the incorporation of a passage from another source. Thus in Luke iv, 18, 19, although the contents are professedly those read by our Lord from Isa. lxi, we have the words "to set at liberty them that are bruised," introduced from Isa. lviii, 6 (Sept.); similarly in Rom. xi, 8, Deut. xxix, 4 is combined with Isa. xxix, 10. In some cases still greater liberty of alteration is assumed. In Rom. x, 11 the word πᾶς is introduced into Isa. xxviii, 16, to show that that is uttered of Jew and Gentile alike. In Rom. xi, 26, 27, the "to Zion" of Isa. lix, 20 (Sept. ἕνεκεν Σιών) is replaced by "out of Sion" (suggested by Isa. ii, 3); *to* Zion the Redeemer had already come; *from* Zion, the Christian Church, his law was to go forth; or even from the literal Jerusalem (comp. Luke xxiv, 47; Rom. xv, 19), for till she was destroyed the type was still in a measure kept up. In Matt. viii, 17 the words of Isa. liii, 4 are adapted to the divine removal of disease, the outward token and witness of that sin which Christ was eventually to remove by his death, thereby fulfilling the prophecy more completely. For other, though less striking, instances of variation see 1 Cor. xiv, 21; 1 Pet. iii, 15. In some places, again, the actual words of the original are taken up, but employed with a new meaning; thus the ἐρχόμενος, which in Hab. ii, 3 merely qualified the verb, is in Heb. x, 37 made the subject to it.

Fourthly. Still more remarkable than any alteration in the quotation itself is the circumstance that in Matt. xxvii, 9 Jeremiah should be named as the author of a prophecy really delivered by Zechariah; the reason being, as has been well shown by Hengstenberg in his *Christology*, that the prophecy is based upon that in Jer. xviii, xix, and that without a reference to this original source the most essential features of the fulfilment of Zechariah's prophecy would be misunderstood. The case is, indeed, not entirely unique; for in the Greek of Mark i, 2, 3, where Mal. iii, 1 is combined with Isa. xl, 3, the name of Isaiah alone is mentioned; it was on his prophecy that that of Malachi partly depended. On the other hand, in Matt. ii, 23; John vi, 45, the comprehensive mention of the prophets indicates a reference not only to the passages more particularly contemplated, Isa. xi, 1; liv, 13, but also to the general tenor of what had been elsewhere prophetically uttered. See NAZARENE. On John vii, 38 it may suffice here to remark that perhaps the best solution of the difficulty is to regard our Lord as not making any direct quotation from any part of the Old Test., but as only referring in metaphorical language, suited to the strain of his previous address (comp. ver. 37), to a fact which in plainer style is unquestionably announced in the ancient prophecies, viz. the abundant possession of divine knowledge by those who should live under the Messiah's reign. The passage James iv, 5 is beset with difficulty. Not only is there doubt as to what "Scripture" is cited, but much obscurity hangs over the meaning of the words themselves so adduced. We cannot enter into the details of the investigation. Referring for these to Huther's note on the passage in Meyer's *Commentar*, pt. 15, the substance of which is given by dean Alford in his notes, we content ourselves here with saying that some interpreters understand πνεῦμα of the human spirit, and translate, "the spirit [temper, feeling of mind] which dwells in us lusts to envy [covetousness];" while others understand it of the Holy Spirit, or the Spirit implanted in the soul by God, and translate, either, "The Spirit which dwelleth in us lusts [desires, inclines] against envy;" or, "The Spirit which he [God] hath placed in us jealously desireth [us for himself]." In neither case can the statement be referred to any single passage in the Old Test.; but if the last rendering be adopted, the writer may be supposed to refer generally to those parts of the Old Test. in which God is represented as dwelling in his people (Numb. xxxv, 34; Ezek. xxxvi, 27), and as desiring them with a jealous affection (Deut. xxxii, 10 sq.). This is far from satisfactory, but it seems the best solution that has been offered.

2. *Mode in which Quotations from the Old Test. in the New Test. are introduced.*—For this purpose certain formulæ are employed, of which the following is a list: Καθώς or Οὕτω γέγραπται, Πῶς γέγραπται, Ἔστι γεγραμμένον, Ὁ λόγος ὁ γεγραμμένος, Κατὰ τὸ γεγραμμένον, Ἐρρέθη, Καθώς εἴρηται, Κατὰ τὸ εἰρήμενον, Ἡ γραφὴ εἶπε or λέγει, or simply Λέγει (sup. Θεός vel. προφήτης), Περιέχει ἐν τῇ γραφῇ, Ὁ νόμος ἔλεγεν, Εἴρηκε δέ τις, Βλέπετε τὸ εἰρημένον, Οὐδέποτε ἀνέγνωτε, Καθὼς ἐλάλησε, Τότε ἐπληρώθη ἡ γραφή, Ἵνα (ὅπως) πληρωθῇ (τελειωθῇ) τὸ ῥηθέν (ἡ γραφή). Surenhusius is of opinion, and labors to prove, that by attending to the force of these different formulæ we may ascertain with what intent the words they respectively introduce are quoted, as each formula, he asserts, involves a different meaning (*Præf. in Bib. Catall.*). A fatal objection, however, to this opinion is that we find the very *same quotations*, expressed in the same words and brought to prove the very same points, introduced by *different* formulæ in different Gospels (Horne, *Introd.* ii, 339). At the same time, there are obviously two classes of these formulæ, the difference between which is distinctly marked by the circumstance that, while some of them merely express the fact that what follows is a quotation, others of them intimate the existence of a material relation between the passage quoted and the subject of which the writer quoting it is treating. Thus, when it is simply said, "The Scripture saith," nothing more is *necessarily* implied than that what follows is taken from the Old Test.; but when it is said, "Then was the Scripture fulfilled which saith," or "This was done that the Scriptures might be fulfilled," we immediately perceive that the writer would intimate a real connection of some sort between the event he is recording and the statement with which he compares it in the passage quoted. We may therefore so far adopt the hypothesis of Surenhusius as to admit a distinction between these two classes, and expect to find in the passages introduced by the latter of them something more than a mere verbal quotation. See FULFIL.

Besides the quotations introduced by these formulæ,

there are a considerable number scattered through the writings of the apostles which are inserted in the train of their own remarks without any announcement whatever of their being cited from others. To the cursory reader the passages thus quoted appear to form a part of the apostle's own words, and it is only by intimate acquaintance with the Old-Test. Scriptures, and a careful comparison of these with those of the New Test., that the fact of their being quotations can be detected. In the common version every trace of quotation is in many of these passages lost, from the circumstance that the writer has closely followed the Sept., while our version of the Old Test. is made from the Hebrew. Thus, for instance, in 2 Cor. viii, 21, Paul says, *προνοούμενοι καλὰ οὐ μόνον ἐνώπιον Κυρίου, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐνώπιον ἀνθρώπων*, which, with a change in the mood of the verb, is a verbatim citation of the Sept. version of Prov. iii, 4. Hardly any trace of this, however, appears in the common version, where the one passage reads, "Providing for honest things not only in the sight of the Lord, but also in the sight of men;" and the other, "So shalt thou find favor and good understanding in the sight of God and man." So, also, in 1 Pet. iv, 18, the apostle quotes word for word from the Sept. version of Prov. xi, 31 the clause *εἰ ὁ δίκαιος μόλις σώζεται, ὁ ἀσεβὴς καὶ ἁμαρτωλὸς ποῦ φανεῖται*; a quotation which we should in vain endeavor to trace in the common version of the Proverbs, where the passage in question is rendered, "Behold, the righteous shall be recompensed in the earth; much more the wicked and the sinner." Such quotations evidently show how much the minds of the New-Test. writers were imbued with the sentiments and expressions of the Old Test. as exhibited in the Alexandrine version.

3. *Purposes for which these Quotations are introduced.*—These, as appears from an examination of the passages, are as follows:

(1.) *For the explanation or proof of some doctrinal position.* Thus Paul, for the sake of explaining and confirming his doctrine of the efficacy of faith, quotes repeatedly from Hab. ii, 4 the sentence "The just shall live by faith." So, also, in order to prove that mere natural descent from Abraham did not of itself entitle any one to the divine favor, the same apostle quotes the terms of God's promise to Abraham, in which he expressly declares that in Isaac alone, of all Abraham's family, was the *seed* of Abraham—i. e. the spiritual Israel—to be called or chosen. Comp. also Rom. iv, 7, 8; ix, 12, 13, 15, 17, 20, 21; xii, 19, 20; xiv, 10, 11, etc. It is to be observed that the passages thus adduced are almost always found in writings addressed to Jews, and are therefore to be regarded as containing *argumenta e concessis*. They are always applied, if not in the words, at least in the sense, of the original from which they are taken.

(2.) For the purpose *of pointing out the application of the passage quoted to some statement or description in the context into which it is introduced.* From the circumstance that several of the passages thus adduced are, in the phraseology of the New Test., as well as in that of the Rabbinical writings, said to be "fulfilled," it has been hastily inferred by some that they are all to be regarded as designed prophecies of the events to which they are applied. For this opinion, however, no adequate support seems to be afforded by the phrase in question. The general idea attached to the verb *πληρόω* is that of filling up to its full capacity anything of which it is predicated. Thus the Jews are said by Christ to have filled up the measure (*πληρώσατε τὸ μέτρον*) of their fathers (Matt. xxiii, 32). The phrase in question consequently is susceptible of application to whatever is thought of as supplying the complement of any given capacity, and that whether it is used in a literal or tropical sense. Hence it is appropriately used in the New Test. with respect to passages quoted from the Old Test. in the following cases:

First. When it announces the accomplishment of a prophecy contained in the words quoted. As the prediction is a mere empty declaration, as it were, until the fact predicted has occurred; so that fact, by giving meaning and force to the prediction, is viewed as its complement or filling up. Thus, the New-Test. writers, in recording the facts of our Lord's history, when they come to any which formed the subject of ancient prophecy, whether explicit or typical, direct the attention of their readers to the circumstance by adducing the prediction and intimating its *fulfilment* in the fact they have recorded.

Secondly. When it introduces some description or statement which affords a *parallel* to what the writer has been saying. Such a description being regarded as involving a fact of general applicability to the human race, or to certain portions of it, is thought of as being, so to speak, in a state of deficiency until the measure of its applicability has been filled up. Each new case, therefore, which affords a parallel to that to which the description was originally applied goes so far to supply this deficiency by affording another instance in which the description holds; and hence the New-Test. writers are in the habit of quoting such descriptions as having been fulfilled in the cases to which they are applied by them. Thus a passage from the prophecies of Jeremiah, in which a description is given of the desolation caused by the divine judgments upon the Jews, under the beautiful personification of Rachel rising from the dead looking in vain for her children, and refusing to be comforted because they are not, is adduced by Matthew (ii, 17, 18) as fulfilled in the sorrow which was produced by the massacre of the babes in Bethlehem by order of Herod. No person who studies the context of the passage as it occurs in the Old Test. can suppose for a moment that it contains a *prediction* of the cruelties which were perpetrated on the occasion related by the evangelist. The sole purport of the quotation seems to be to intimate, as bishop Kidder remarks, that "such another scene of sorrow appeared then (upon the murder of the innocents) as was that which Jeremy mentions upon another sad occasion" (*Demonstration of the Messias*, pt. ii, p. 215). See, also, Sykes, *Essay on the Truth of the Christian Religion*, etc., p. 217, 218; Blaney, *ad loc.*; Henderson, *ad loc.*, and *On Hos. ii*, 1; De Wette, *On Matt. ii*, 17, 18; and Marsh's *Notes to Michælis*, i, 473. Comp. Matt. xv, 7, 8, with Isa. xxix, 13; Matt. xiii, 14 with Acts xxviii, 25 and Isa. vi, 9, etc.

It appears, then, that even when a quotation is introduced by a part of the verb *πληρόω*, it does not necessarily follow that it is to be regarded as containing a prophecy. This is true as well of the conditional formula *ἵνα* (*ὅπως*) *πληρωθῇ*, as of the more direct *τότε ἐπληρώθη*, for these particles, as used in the New Test., frequently express nothing more than that occasion is given for a particular action or remark.

Besides the passages introduced as *fulfilled*, there are others referable to the same general head, which are introduced by others of the formulæ above mentioned. Of these, some belong to both the classes just described —*prophecies* of which the New Test. announces the fulfilment, and *general descriptions* to which something parallel is brought forward. Another class consists of moral and religious maxims, which are adduced as applicable to the state of things of which the writer or speaker is discoursing, and which, though not said to be fulfilled thereby, are quoted under essentially the same idea. Such sentences embody, as it were, certain laws of human nature and conduct, certain general facts in the human economy, of which we are to expect the verification wherever the necessary conditions are exemplified. Like the laws of physical science, therefore, they are dependent for their verification upon the examination of the phenomena appropriate to that region to which they belong; and as no law of science can be said to lie absolutely beyond the possibility of refutation until every one of the phenomena which it em-

braces has been examined and been found to support it, every experiment or occurrence that favors it may be said to fill up what is wanting to its perfect and undeniable certainty. Hence the New-Test. writers, in recording events or describing characters which accord with and so exemplify the truth of the moral maxims of the Old Test., speak of these as if they had contained actual pre-intimations of the occurrence to which they are applied. They contain, in fact, the *norm*, or *rule*, according to which the matter in question has occurred.

The usage of the New-Test. writers in the cases we have been considering is illustrated by that of the Rabbinical writers in their quotations from the Old Test., as Surenhusius has largely shown in his work upon this subject (Βίβλος Καταλλαγῆς, etc., lib. i; see, also, Wähner, *Antiquitates Hebræorum*, i, 527 sq.). Instances have also been adduced of a similar usage by the classical and ecclesiastical writers. Thus, Ælian introduces Diogenes Sinopensis as saying that "he *fulfilled* and endured the curses out of the tragedy" (ὅτι αὐτὸς ἐκπλήροι καὶ ὑπομένει τὰς ἐκ τῆς τραγωδίας ἀράς). Olympiodorus says of Plato that "a swarm of bees made honey on his lips, *that it might become true* concerning him, 'And from his tongue flowed a strain sweeter than honey,'" which is what Homer says of Nestor. Epiphanius says of Ebion, "But in him is *fulfilled* that which is written; I had nearly been in all mischief, between the Church and the Synagogue" (ἀλλ' ἐν αὐτῷ πληροῦται τὸ γεγραμμένον, κ. τ. λ. [*Hæresis Ebion.* c. i]). So, also, the Latin *implere* is used by Jerome: "Cæterum Socraticum illud *impletur* in nobis, Hoc tantulum scio, quod nescio" (*Ep.* 103 *ad Paulin.*). Comp. Clem. Rom. *Ep.* 1 *ad Cor.* sec. 3.

Thirdly. The New-Test. writers make quotations from the Old, for the purpose of *clothing their own ideas in language already familiar to their readers, or attractive from its beauty, force, or dignity.* The writings of the Old Test. were the great classics of the Jewish nation, venerable at once for their literary value and their divine authority. In these the youth of Judæa were carefully instructed from their earliest years, and with their words all their religious thoughts and feelings were identified. Hence it was natural, and nearly unavoidable, that in discoursing of religious subjects they should express their thoughts in language borrowed from the books which had formed the almost exclusive objects of their study. Such quotations are made for merely literary purposes—for ornament of style, for vigor of expression, for felicity of allusion, or for impressiveness of statement. The passages thus incorporated with the writer's own thoughts and words are not appealed to as proving what he says or as applying to any circumstance to which he refers; their sole use appears to be to express in appropriate language his own thoughts. Thus when Paul, after dissuading the Roman Christians from the indulgence of vindictiveness, adds, in the words of Solomon (Prov. xxv, 21, 22), "Therefore, if thine enemy hunger, feed him; if he thirst, give him drink, for in so doing thou shalt heap coals of fire upon his head," the quotation evidently serves no other purpose than to express, in language of an appropriate and impressive kind, the duty which the apostle would enjoin, and which would have been equally intelligible and equally binding if expressed in his own words as when uttered in those of the inspired author of the Proverbs. On what other principle, moreover, are we to account for the quotation made by Paul, in Rom. x, 18, from the 19th Psalm, where, in speaking of the diffusion of the Gospel among the Jews, he says, "But I say, have they not heard? Yes, verily, their sound went into all the earth, and their words into the end of the world"—a passage originally applied by the Psalmist to the heavenly bodies? To insist upon regarding this as a prediction of the diffusion of the Gospel, or as furnishing even a parallel to it, is surely to sacrifice reason and common-sense to prejudice or some favorite theory.

It has appeared to some that the hypothesis of an *accommodation* of words originally used of one thing to designate another is inconsistent with due reverence to the divine Word. But wherein does the alleged irreverence of such a practice lie? To employ the words of Scripture to express low and unworthy ideas, or for the sake of giving point to mere worldly reasonings, is to use them irreverently; but to use them to convey ideas as elevated as those originally attached to them, if not more so (which is the case, e. g., in Rom. x, 18), has but little appearance of treating them with irreverence. The only ground on which such a charge could be maintained is, that words once employed by an inspired writer in a peculiar combination become thenceforward *sacred to the expression in that combination of the one idea they were first used to designate*, whatever others they may be susceptible of expressing. But who is there that could seriously attempt to defend such a position as this? If this were the case, every quotation not made expressly as authority would be liable to censure; and, as the number of such in the New Test. is indisputably considerable, hardly any of its writers would stand clear of blame. See ACCOMMODATION.

The truth is, the practice of making use, in this way, of previous and popular writers is one which was common not only in the days of the apostles, but which can hardly fail to be common wherever an established national literature exists. In proof of this we have only to examine the writings of the later classics of Greece and Rome, which abound in quotations direct and accommodated from their earlier authors. We see the same course pursued by the Rabbinical writers towards the Old Test. and by the Christian fathers towards both the Old Test. and the New Test., as well as towards the profane classics. Indeed, such quotations form so apt and natural an ornament of style that writers of all ages and countries, where the means of doing so exist, have availed themselves of it. Why, then, should we wonder that such a practice should have been followed by the sacred writers, who, in other respects, appear to have obeyed in the preparation of their works the ordinary rules and usages, both grammatical and rhetorical, of literary composition?

Literature.—Surenhusius, Βίβλος Καταλλαγῆς, *in quo secundum Vet. Theol. Hebræorum Formulas allegandi et Modos interpretandi conciliantur Loca ex V. in N. T. allegata* (Amst. 1713, 4to); Drusius, *Parallela Sacra: h. e. Locorum V. T. cum iis quæ in N. citantur conjuncta Commemoratio, Ebraice et Græce, cum Notis* (1616, 4to; published also in vol. viii of the *Critici Sacri*); Hoffmann, *Demonstratio Evangelica per ipsum Scripturarum Consensum ex Oraculis V. T. in N. allegatis declarata, edidit T. G. Hegelmaier* (1773–79–81, 3 vols. 4to); Michaelis, *Einleitung in die göttlichen Schriften des N. B. Erster Theil*, p. 223–265 (Eng. transl. by Marsh, i, 200–246); Owen, *Modes of Quotation used by the Evangelical Writers Explained and Vindicated* (1789, 4to); Randolph, *Prophecies and other Texts cited in the New Test. compared with the Hebrew Original and with the Sept. Version* (1782, 4to); Koppe, *Excursus I in Ep. ad Romanos, N. T. Koppianum* (1806), iv, 346; Horne, *Introduction*, ii, 281 (8th ed.); Davidson, *Hermeneutics*, ch. xi; Gough, *New Test. Quotations Collated with the Old Test.* (Lond. 1853); Alexander, *Connection and Harmony of the Old and New Test.* (ibid. 1853, 2d ed.); Stier, *Words of the Lord Jesus* (Amer. ed.), i, 432 sq.

QUOTATIONS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT IN THE TALMUD. In order to understand many quotations which are cited in the Talmud from the Scriptures, we must remember that the ancient rabbins, in their colloquies and disputations, did not use a MS., but cited from memory—a mode of citation often found in the New Test. Dr. M. Steinschneider, in his essay *Jewish Literature*, in Ersch and Gruber's *Allgem. Encycl.* § 2, vol. xxvii, p. 375, makes the following statement: "The influence of the Bible on gnomonics in particular is shown in the following steps—(1.) Biblical precepts were

used unchanged in meaning and expression, as sentiments or favorite sayings of particular persons.* (2.) Biblical sentences, unchanged in form, were made by extending or contracting their contents into new expressions of various truths, which had elsewhere been clothed in known proverbs. so that these last were in some sense deduced from the Bible. A wide field was thus opened for the Midrash; and, finally, the words of the Bible were made into proverbs with an entirely different sense.† (3.) Lastly, Biblical phrases and ideas were used more or less intentionally in newly formed sententiæ,‡ and passed into proverbial forms, as they are to be found in the old Halachah (e. g. *Peah*, ii, 2).

1. As the ancient rabbins made the Bible their study for years, we must not wonder when, in their colloquies, they were able to quote a correct Biblical text. And yet we must bear three things in mind, in order not to have a misconception of the matter. To make this intelligible, we will quote the following examples:

(*a.*) *The Talmudists sometimes erroneously attribute a Biblical verse to another context.* Thus we read in the Talmud (*Pesachim*, fol. 109, col. 1), "It is every man's duty to rejoice with his household on the feast, for it is written, 'And thou shalt rejoice in thy feast,'" וְשָׂמַחְתָּ בְחַגֶּךָ (Deut. xvi, 14, where reference is made to the Feast of Tabernacles). The Tosaphoth on this passage, however, reads, "And thou shalt rejoice, thou and thine household" (וְשָׂמַחְתָּ אַתָּה וּבֵיתֶךָ). Now the original reading was that as in the Tosaphoth, which is found in Deut. xiv, 26, where the second tithe is spoken of. The rabbins, however, thought that the reading alluded to in the Tosaphoth is found in the section which treats of the Feast of Tabernacles; hence, when the editors of the Talmud found out the mistake, they substituted for the reading ושמחת אתה וביתך that of ושמחת בחגך.

(*b.*) *Sometimes sentences are quoted in the Talmud as Biblical which are not found in the Bible.* In *Berakoth*, fol. 61, col. 1, *in fine*, we read: Rab Nachman said Manoah was an ignorant man (עם הארץ), for it is written, "He went after his wife" (Judg. xiii, 11). R. Nachman, the son of Isaac, asked, should this not also apply to Elkanah, for it is written, "And Elkanah went after his wife;" and to Elisha, of whom the Scripture says, "And he arose and followed her" (2 Kings iv, 30)? He followed her, indeed! Yes, but he followed her words and advice, and so here likewise he (Manoah) went after her words and counsel. The Tosaphoth correctly remarks on what the Talmud says concerning Elkanah: שבוש הוא שאין פסוק זה בכל המקרא; i. e. "It is an error, for this verse is not found in the whole Scripture."

Ibid. fol. 55, col. 2, *in fine*, we read: "It is said in the name of R. Banah, once I had a dream, and I went to all [interpreters of dreams—the passage having reference to the twenty-four interpreters of dreams said to have been at Jerusalem], and the interpretation of the one was different from that of the other, but all were fulfilled, to fulfil what is said: All dreams go after the interpretation. But is this a verse of the Scripture? Yes, and according to R. Eliezer, who said, Whence do we know that all dreams go after the interpretation? For it is said, 'And it came to pass as he interpreted' (Gen. xli, 13)."

In the Talmud (*Pesachim*, fol. 56, col. 1) it is said that Jacob, before his death, cited the words ברוך שם כבוד מלכותו לעולם ועד; i. e. "blessed be the glorious name of his kingdom for ever and ever." But such a quotation is nowhere found in the Scriptures.

In *Yoma*, fol. 85, col. 2, and *Berakoth*, fol. 62, col. 2, we read that the Scripture says, "If any one wants to kill you, kill him first" (בא להרגך השכם להרגו), but such a passage is nowhere found. Oftentimes quotations are made from Ecclesiasticus, and are introduced by the phrases generally applied to scriptural passages, as in *Niddah*, fol. 16, col. 2 (לדכתיב); *Berakoth*, fol. 48, col. 1 (דכתיב); *Erubin*, fol. 65, col. 1 (שנאמר); *Baba Kama*, fol. 92, col. 2 (שנוי בנבראים, Judg. xi, 3; דבר זה כתיב בתורה ומשולש, Gen. xxviii, 9; בכתובים, Ecclus. xiii, 20). As these passages are already enumerated in this *Cyclopædia*, we can only refer to the art. Ecclesiasticus (vol. iii, p. 44, a).

(*c.*) *Biblical phrases are here and there changed for the sake of brevity.* In *Erubin*, fol. 31, col. 2 (*Berakoth*, fol. 27, col. 2; *Kiddushin*, fol. 54, col. 1), those things are mentioned which may be used for the Erub (i. e. the ceremony of extending the Sabbath boundary). But to prove those things which may not be used, the phrase is ונתן חכסף וקם לו. But these four words are nowhere found in this connection together.

Sometimes some verses are contracted into one, as Deut. xi, 5 and 6, in *Rosh ha-Shana*, fol. 4, col. 2; Prov. xix, 17 and 14, 31, in *Berakoth*, fol. 18, col. 1; Ezek. xv, 4, and Jer. xxxvi, 22, in *Sabbath*, fol. 20, col. 1; Lev. xiv, 39 and 44, in *Maccoth*, fol. 13, col. 2; Lev. xix, 13, and v, 23; *ibid.* fol. 16, col. 1. The same is often the case in the New Test., e. g. Matt. xxi, 5, where Isa. lxii, 2 and Zech. ix, 9 are connected; Isa. vi, 9 and 10 in Mark i, 11; Isa. xl. 6, 7, and lii, 10, in Luke iii, 4, 5, 6; Exod. xvi, 14, 15; Numb. xi, 7; Psa. lxxviii, 24 in John vi, 31, 49, etc.

2. Having thus shown the mode of quotations, we will now give a list of passages which are read otherwise in the Talmud than in our Bible:

A. *Passages quoted in the Mishna.*

1. Lev. xxv, 36, אל־תקח מאתו; *Baba Metsia*, ch. v, § 11, ממנו.

2. Numb. xxviii, 2, ואמרת אלהם; *Taanith*, ch. iv, § 2, אליהם.

3. Numb. xxxii, 22, והייתם נקים; *Shekalim*, ch. iii, § 2, נקיים [thus likewise in two MSS.].

4. Deut. xxiv, 19, לא־תשוב; *Peah*, ch. vi, § 4, בל־תשוב [three times].

5. Josh. viii, 33, the words לארון ובל־ישראל are quoted *Sotah*, ch. vii, § 5, but instead of ושוטרים the reading is ושוטריו [probably on account of the antecedent וזקניו and following ושופטיו; the reading in the Mishna is also marked by Michaelis, *Bibl. Hebr.* 1720, ad loc., and so likewise in the Syriac, Chaldee, and Arabic versions].

6. Isa. x, 13, שושתי; *Yadaim*, ch. iv, § 4, שוסתי [in the Bible (with the exception of our passage) שסה is always read with the Samech].

7. Ezek. xlvi, 21, ארבעת מקצעי; *Middoth*, ch. ii, § 5, ארבע מקצעות [probably on account of the following

---

* To illustrate Steinschneider's statement, we give the following example. In the Talmud (*Nidda*, fol. 51, col. 2) it was said in the school of R. Ishmael, "He will magnify the law and make it honorable" (Isa. xlii, 41).

† In the Talmud (*Sabbath*, fol. 10, col. 1) the question was raised, how long the judges were obliged to sit at court. R. Sheshel answered, "Until mid-day." To which R. Chama said, "Where do you find this in the Scripture?" The answer was, "It is said, 'Woe to thee, O land, when thy king is a child, and thy princes eat in the morning' (Eccles. x, 16)." R. Jeremiah once engaged himself with R. Sera in the law. When the time for the evening prayer had already advanced, R. Jeremiah betook himself quickly to read it. To this R. Sera applied the passage (Prov. xxviii, 9), "He that turneth away his ear from hearing the law, even his prayer shall be abomination" (*Sabbath*, fol. 19, col. 1). Of R. Tarphon it is said that when some one told him something intellectual, he used to say כפתור ופרח בסנדלו, "A knop and a flower in one branch" (Exod. xxv, 33); but when the tale was not according to his taste, he used the words (Gen. xlii, 39), "My son shall not go down with you" (*Bereshith Rabba*, ch. xci).

‡ E. g. כבר שתה עליך כוס תנחומין, i. e. "He already drank for thee the cup of consolation" (*Bereshith Rabba*, fol. 20, etc.); i. e. to be comforted over something. The phrase "cup of consolation" is found in Jer. xvi, 7.

מקצעת in v, 22; ארבע is the reading also of one MS.].

8. Amos ix, 14, ושבתי את שבות עמי ישראל; *Yadaim*, ch. iv, § 4, reads after ישראל ויהודה.

9. Mal. iii, 16, ספר; *Aboth*, ch. iii, § 3, בספר [which is supported by seven MSS. and the Syr.].

10. Mal. iii, 23, הנה אנכי שלח לכם אליה הנביא; *Eduyoth*, ch. viii, § 7, הנני שלח לכם את אליהו חנביא

11. Psa. lxviii, 27, אלהזם אדני; *Berakoth*, ch. vii, § 3, אלהים יהוה [יהוה is the reading of eleven MSS.].

12. Job i, 1, והיה האיש ההוא תם וישר וירא אלהים; *Sotah*, ch. v, § 5, אישתם וישר ירא אלהים.

13. Prov. xxii, 28, עולם; *Peah*, ch. v, § 6, עולים [but ch. vii, § 3, the reading is, as in the Bible, עולם].

14. 2 Chron. xxviii, 15, חלבישי; *Sotah*, ch. viii, § 1, הלבישום.

B. *Passages quoted in the Gemara.*

15. Gen. vii, 8, אינגא טהרה; *Pesachim*, fol. 3, col. 1, אינגא טהורה.

16. Gen. vii, 23, מאדם עד־בהמה; *Berakoth*, fol. 61, col. 1, ועד.

17. Gen. xv, 2, in *Berakoth*, fol. 7, col. 2, we read: "R. Jochanan said, in the name of R. Simeon ben-Yochai, from the day when God created the world, no one called him Lord (אדון) until Abraham came and called him Lord, for it is written (Gen. xv, 8), 'And he said, Lord God (אֲדֹנָי יֱהוִה), whereby shall I know that I shall inherit it?'" [But in xv, 2, we already read ויאמר אברם אדני יהוה.]

18. Gen. xxv, 6, ולבני הפילגשים אשר לאברהם; in the *Bereshith Rabba*, sect. lxi, fol. 67, col. 4 (where the question is whether Abraham had one or more concubines), it is stated that the reading is פילגשם [one concubine. This reading of the Midrash is followed by Rashi, who, in his commentary on Gen. xxv, 6, remarks, "The textual reading is פילגשם, defective, because Abraham had only one concubine, namely, Hagar, who was identical with Keturah." But this reading is contrary to the Masorah, which distinctly remarks that the word פילגשים occurs twice *entirely plene*, that is, with the two Yods after the two Chireks. The one instance is in Gen. xxvi, 6, and the other in Esth. ii, 14].

19. Gen. xxxv, 18, בנימין *plene;* in *Sotah*, fol. 36, col. 2, where the passage in ch. xlix, 27, בנימין זאב יטרף, is treated, we read that, with the exception of xlix, 27, the word בנימין is written בנמין, defective. [From this statement, it seems that at that time Gen. xxxv, 18; xlii, 4; xliii, 14, 16, 29; xlv, 12 was written בנמין.]

20. Exod. xii, 3, עדת ישראל; in *Pesachim*, fol. 6, col. 2, עדת בני ישראל [so Sam., Sept., Syr., Vulg., Targum; comp. our *Horæ Samaritanæ* on Exodus, in *Bibliotheca Sacra*, July, 1876, loc. cit.; in the Talmud editions of Prague, Vienna, and Warsaw, the word בני is omitted].

21. Exod. xii, 6, לחדש הזה; *Erakin*, fol. 13, col. 2, לחדש הראשון.

22. Exod. xiii, 16, טטפת; Deut. vi, 8, טטפת; xi, 18, טוטפת; in *Menachoth*, fol. 34, col. 2, we read, "The sages propound, Rabbi Ishmael said in לטטפת לטטפת, לטוטפת, the four compartments [in the phylactery] are indicated." [To understand this, we will remark that the word טטפת occurs only three times, as indicated above: in two instances it has no ו (Deut. vi, 8; xi, 18), and in the third (Exod. xiii, 16) there is a ו after the first ט, i. e. טוטפת; hence R. Ishmael regards it as a dual, and makes of the three words *four*, to obtain the four compartments in the phylacteries. But Chayim, in his Introduction to the Rabbinic Bible, tells us that "in the correct codices, as well as in the Book of Crowns,* the reading is לטטפת (Deut. vi, 8; xi, 18) and ולטוטפת (Exod. xiii, 16), but there is no ו between the פ and the ת; yet I myself have seen that in the ancient Book of the Crowns, even לטוטפת in Deut. xi, 18 is written with a ו after the first ט." The latter statement proves that our present reading is correct.]

23. Exod. xxxi, 1, ויַדַבֵּר; in *Berakoth*, fol. 55, col. 1, ויאמר.

24. Lev. iv, 25, 30, 34, קַרְנֹת, defective; in *Sanhedrin*, fol. 4, col. 1, we read that the school of Shammai read קרנות קרנות, while that of Hillel, קרנות קרנת [i. e. once *plene* written; the same is also said in *Zebachim*, fol. 37, col. 2; comp. also the note in Michaelis, *Biblia Hebr.* ad loc.].

25. Lev. x, 12, וַיְדַבֵּר; *Berakoth*, fol. 61, col. 1, ויאמר.

26. Lev. xv, 10, וְהַנּוֹשֵׂא; *Nidda*, fol. 33, col. 1, והנשא בכתיב.

27. Lev. xviii, 18, וְאִשָּׁה אֶל־אֲחֹתָהּ לֹא תִקָּח; *Kiddushin*, fol. 50, col. 2, דאמר קרא אשה אל אחותה לא תקח.

28. Numb. v, 19, אִם לֹא שָׁכַב; *Gittin*, fol. 60, *Yoma*, fol. 37, col. 2, אם שכב אם לא שכב.

29. Numb. xviii, 16, וּפְדוּיָו מִבֶּן־חֹדֶשׁ תִּפְדֶּה; in the Talmud seems once to have stood חדש after ומעלה, at least this is intimated in the Tosaphoth, or additional commentary to the Talmud; *Erakin*, fol. 18, col. 2, where it is stated וחפשנו אחר מקרא הזה ולא מצאנוהו, i. e. "We sought for this reading, but could not find it."

30. Deut. vi, 7, וּבְשָׁכְבְּךָ; *Berakoth*, fol. 2, col. 1, בשכבך [thus likewise the Samar. and Vulg.].

31. Deut. vi, 9, מְזוּזוֹת; *Menachoth*, fol. 34, col. 1, R. Meïr seems to have read מזזות.

32. Deut. vi, 20, מָה to אתכם; Jerusalem Talmud, *Pesachim*, ch. x, § 4, אותנו.

33. Deut. xxiii, 1, בְּנַת אָבִיו; *Berakoth*, fol. 21, col. 2, את כנת.

34. Deut. xxv, 7, לֹא אָבָה יַבְמִי; *Yebamoth*, fol. 106, col. 2, R. Ashai found R. Kahana, who, being perplexed about it, read ולא אבה יבמי (with ו conjunctive). In correct codices, as is also evident from the Masorah, it is read לא אבה [some Hebr. MSS., 1 Sam., the Syr., Ar., and Vulg. have ולא].

35. Josh. iii, 17 is quoted in *Berakoth*, fol. 54, col. 1, but instead of הארון בריית יהוה it reads ארון יהוה, and for עד אשר תמו כל הגוי the reading is עד תום כל חצם.

36. Josh. x, 11, מִפְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל; *Berakoth*, fol. 54, col. 2, מפני בני ישראל.

37. Josh. xiv, 7, 10. These two verses for the sake of brevity are thus contracted (see No. 1, *c*, above), *Erakin*, fol. 13, col. 1, מנלן (?) ד קאמר כלב בן ארבעים שנה בשלח אותי משה עבד ה׳ מקדש ברנע לרגל את הארץ ועתה אנכי היום בן חמש ושמונים, i. e. "It is said of Caleb, forty years old was I when Moses the servant of the Lord sent me from Kadesh-barnea to espy out the land, and now I am this day fourscore and five years old."

38. Josh. xvi, 6, תַּאֲנַת שִׁלֹה; *Zebachim*, fol. 118, col. 2, Rabbi Abdini bar-Chasa said, the Scripture says, ולו תאנת שילה, to which the commentary remarks, חיפשתיו ולא מצאתיו במקרא, i. e. "I have sought but not found it in the Scripture, but I found in Joshua xvi, אבל מצאתיו תאנת שילה."

39. Judg. xv, 20; xvi, 31, where Samson is said to have judged Israel twenty years (xvi, 31). The Talm. Hieros. *Sotah*, fol. 17, "One passage reads, and he judged Israel forty years, and another that he judged Israel twenty years. R. Acha answered, From this we see that the Philistines feared him twenty years after his death, just as they did twenty years before it." [On this passage R. Chayim, in his preface to the Rabbinic Bible, makes the following interpretation: "To me it appears, however, that there is no difficulty in it; for what the Talmud speaks about Samson refers to the Midrashic interpretation, viz. 'Why is the verse, that he judged Israel twenty

* The Book of Crowns (ספר תגין) is an ancient treatise, containing Masoretical rules on the ornamental letters. It has lately been published, for the first time, by Burges (Paris, 1866).

years, repeated twice? R. Acha answered, From this we see that the Philistines feared him (viz. Samson) twenty years after his death, just as they did twenty years before it, and this makes forty years.' Hence the Talmud does not say, Why is it written in the text, 'he judged Israel forty years?' but simply, 'he judged forty years,' that is, according to the Midrash. And now everything comes out right when thou lookest into it." We may well subscribe what Claudius Capellanus, in his *Mare Rabbinicum Infidum*, p. 350, note, says, "Tam insigne mendacium quod decepit doctissimum Buxtorfium facile corruet vel sola adductione loci Talmudici." This much is certain, that in the time of the Talmud, one codex at least had the reading, ארבעים שנה. ארבעים שנה.]

40. 1 Sam. ii, 24, מַעֲבְרִים; in *Sabbath*, fol. 55, col. 2, "is not the reading מַעֲבְרִים? Whereupon R. Hunnah ben R. Joshua said the reading is מעברים." [Rashi remarks that the reading of the most trustworthy codices is מעברים *plene*, i. e. with a Yod after the Resh.]

41. 2 Sam. iii, 35, להברות; *Sanhedrin*, fol. 20, col. 1, it is written להכרות, but is read להברות [a number of MSS. read להכרות; comp. also the Dicts. of Kimchi, *Lib. Rad.* s.v. כרה, and Menachen ben-Sarug, *Lex. Rad.* בר and כר (ed. Filipowski, Lond. 1854, p. 48, 109)].

42. 2 Sam. xxiv, 15, וַיִּתֵּן יְהוָה דֶּבֶר בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל מֵהַבֹּקֶר; *Yoma*, fol. 22, col. 2, ויתן ה׳ דבר בעם מן הבקר ועד עת מועד. וְעַד־עֵת מוֹעֵד

43. 2 Kings xvii, 31, נִבְחַז; *Sanhedrin*, fol. 63, col. 2, נבחן [D. Kimchi also asserts to have seen the Nun (ן) final, instead of the נ *majuscular*, as written now].

44. 2 Kings xxiii, 17; in *Erakin*, fol. 33, col. 1, the whole verse is quoted with the exception of האלה אשר עשית.

45. Isa. xxxviii, 16, וְהַחֲיֵנִי; *Berakoth*, fol. 55, col. 1, ותחייני.

46. Isa. xlii, 5, וְנוֹשְׂחֵיהֶם; *Bereshith Rabba*, sect. xii, fol. 15, 3, ונושיהם [i. e. leaders].

47. Isa. lviii, 7, לֹא תִתְעַלָּם; Jerusalem Talmud, *Kethuboth*, ch. xi, § 3, אל תתעלם.

48. Ezek. xl, 48; xlvii, 1; *Erubin*, fol. 2, col. 1, דכתיב אל פתח אולם הבית; but such a passage is not to be found in the Scriptures. [Tosaphoth remarks on this passage, "Such a passage is nowhere to be found, but we find written (xl, 48) אוּלָם חַבַּיִת and פֶּתַח חַבַּיִת (xlvii, 1)."]

49. Ezek. xliv, 9, is quoted *Moed Katon*, fol. 5, col. 1, but with the addition לשרתני after מקדשי.

50. Hos. iv, 11, וְתִרֹושׁ *plene*; *Yoma*, fol. 76, col. 2, it is written תירוש and read תירוש.

51. Amos iv, 6, וְגַם אֲנִי נָתַתִּי; *Nidda*, fol. 65, col. 1, גם אנכי נתתי.

52. Amos viii, 11, אֶת דִּבְרֵי יְהוָה; *Sabbath*, fol. 138, col. 2, את דבר יהוה [דברי is found in the ed. princeps, but later editions, Kimchi, Aben-Ezra, Sept., Syriac, Vulg., Targum, read דבר].

53. Amos ix, 11, וַאֲשִׁיבֹתִי אֶת שְׁבוּת; *Berakoth*, fol. 28, col. 1 (ed. princeps), חנני משיב את שבית. [Later ed. reads as in our text of the Bible.]

54. Micah iv, 2, גּוֹיִם; *Berakoth*, fol. 55, col. 2, עמים.

55. Zech. xii, 10, אֵלַי; *Sukka*, fol. 52, col. 1, אלוי [forty codices have אלוי, and so many Jewish commentators].

56. Mal. i, 2, מְאָהֲלֵי יַעֲקֹב; many editions of the Talmud have מאהלי for מאהלי, but this is of no importance, since the ed. princeps, *Sanhedrin*, fol. 82, col. 1, only quotes the first part of the verse till ער ובונה.

57. Psa. v, 5, כִּי לֹא אֵל־חָפֵץ רֶשַׁע אַתָּה לֹא יְגֻרְךָ רָע; *Chagiga*, fol. 12, col. 2, לֹא אֵל־חָפֵץ רֶשַׁע אַתָּה, לֹא יָגוּר בְּמַגּוּרְךָ רָע. But this does not stand in the Bible as Tosaphoth already remarked, אין זה מקרא.

58. Psa. xvi, 10, חֲסִידֶךָ; *Erubin*, fol. 19, col. 1; *Yoma*, fol. 87, col. 1 (in five eds. of the Talmud) read חסידך [so likewise Sept., Syriac, Vulg., Jerome].

59. Psa. lvi, 11, בֵּאלֹהִים אֲהַלֵּל דָּבָר בַּיהוָה אֲהַלֵּל דָּבָר; *Berakoth*, fol. 60, col. 1, ביהוה אהלל דבר באלהים.

60. Psa. lxviii, 21, לַמָּוֶת תּוֹצָאוֹת; *Berakoth*, fol. 8, col. 1, ולמות.

61. Psa. xcv, 5, וְיַבֶּשֶׁת יָדָיו יָצָרוּ; *Kethuboth*, fol. 5, col. 1, ידו כתיב והכתיב יצרו.

62. Psa. xcvii, 7, תִּשְׁתַּחֲווּ; Jerusalem Talmud, *Eduyoth*, fol. 44, col. 1, ישתחוו [comp. Epistle to the Hebrews, i, 6, προσκυνησάτωσαν, κ.τ.λ.].

63. Psa. cxxvii, 5, אֶת־אַשְׁפָּתוֹ; *Kiddushin*, fol. 30, col. 2, without את.

64. Psa. cxxxix, 5, כַּפָּה; *Chagiga*, fol. 12, col. 1, כפך.

65. Prov. viii, 13, שִׂנְאַת רָע; *Pesachim*, fol. 113, col. 2, שונאי רע.

66. Prov. xi, 17, אִישׁ חֶסֶד; *Taanith*, fol. 11, col. 2, איש חסיד.

67. Prov. xv, 1, יָשִׁיב; *Berakoth*, fol. 17, col. 2, משיב.

68. Job ii, 8, לְהִתְגָּרֵד; *Midrash Bereshith Rabba*, sect. lxiv (towards the end), להתגרר.

69. Job xiii, 4, אֱלִיל; *Chullin*, fol. 121, col. 1, אֱלִיל.

70. Job xiv, 6, כִּי־יָפָה; Jerusalem Talmud, *Berakoth*, ch. v, § 1, כי אתה.

71. Job xxxvi, 5, הֵן־אֵל בַּבִּיר וְלֹא יִמְאָס; *Berakoth*, fol. 8, col. 2, הן אל כביר לא ימאס תם, without the Vav before לא. [It may be that the Talmud confounds this passage with Job viii, 20, הֵן־אֵל לֹא יִמְאַס־תָּם.]

72. Job xxxvi, 11, יַכְלוּ; *Sanhedrin*, fol. 108, col. 1, יבלו.

73. Ruth iii, 15, הָבִי; *Midrash Ruth*, ad loc. חבה כתיב.

74. Eccles. ix, 14, מְצוֹדִים גְּדוֹלִים; *Nedarim*, fol. 32, col. 2, מצודים וחרמים.

75. Eccles. ix, 15, חכם; *Nedarim*, fol. 32, col. 2, וחכם.

76. Eccles. x, 5, שַׁלִּיט; *Kethuboth*, fol. 62, col. 2; *Moed Katon*, fol. 18, col. 1; *Baba Mezia*, fol. 68, col. 1, שירוצא.

77. Dan. ii, 29, *Berakoth*, fol. 55, col. 2, where for מאתה, סלקו, רעיונך is written רעיונך, סלקו, אנת.

78. Dan. iv, 14, וּמֵאמַר קַדִּישִׁין; *Pesachim*, fol. 33, col. 1; *Sanhedrin*, fol. 38, col. 2, ובמאמר קדישין [some codices have also וביומאמר].

79. Dan. vi, 18, וְחֵירָת; *Nidda*, fol. 69, col. 2, וחיראית.

80. Dan. x, 13, אַחַד הַשָּׂרִים; *Berakoth*, fol. 4, col. 2, אחד מן השרים.

81. Ezra iv, 3, לִבְנוֹת בַּיִת לֵאלֹהֵינוּ; *Erakin*, fol. 5, col. 2, לבנות את בית אלהינו.

82. Neh. iv, 16, הַלַּיְלָה מִשְׁמָר וְהַיּוֹם מְלָאכָה; *Megillah*, fol. 20, col. 2, הלילה למשמר והיום למלאכה; but in *Berakoth*, fol. 2, col. 2, מלאכה and משמר are extant.

83. Neh. viii, 8, בַּסֵּפֶר בְּתוֹרַת הָאֱלֹהִים; *Nedarim*, fol. 37, col. 2, בספר תורת האלהים (תורת, so likewise the Sept., Vulg., Syr.].

84. Neh. viii, 8, מְאֹלהִים, ibid. אלהים; but in *Megillah*, fol. 3, col. 1, האלהים.

85. Neh. viii, 15, לַעֲשׂוֹת; *Sukka*, fol. 37, col. 1, ועשו.

86. Neh. viii, 17, וַיַּעֲשׂוּ כָל־הַקָּהָל; *Erakin*, fol. 32, col. 2, ויעשו בני הגולה; for יַשִּׁיבוּ read יהושע, ibid.

87. 1 Chron. iii, 17, וּבְנֵי יְכָנְיָה אֲסִר שַׁאַלְתִּיאֵל בְּנוֹ; *Sanhedrin*, fol. 37, col. 2, בני יכניה אסיר בנו שלתיאל בנו.

88. 1 Chron. iv, 10, וְתָּחֹל יָדֶךָ עִמִּי וְעָשִׂיתָ מֵרָעָה; *Temurah*, fol. 16, col. 1, ידך עמדי ועשה מרעתי.

89. 1 Chron. v, 24, וַעֲפַר וְיִשְׁעִי; *Baba Bathra*, fol. 123, col. 2, חפר וישעי.

90. 1 Chron. xvi, 5, מַשְׁמִיעַ; *Erakin*, fol. 13, col. 2, להשמיע.

91. 1 Chron. xvii, 9, לְבַלֹּתוֹ; *Berakoth*, fol. 7, col. 2, לכלותו.

92. 1 Chron. xxvi, 8, כָּל־אֵלֶּה מִבְּנֵי עֹבֵד אֱדוֹם; *ibid.* fol. 64, col. 1, כל אלה עובד אדום.

93. 1 Chron. xxvi, 24, בֶּן־מֹשֶׁה; *Baba Bathra*, fol. 110, col. 1, בן מנשה.

94. 1 Chron. xxvii, 34, יְהוֹעָדָע בֶּן־בְּנָיָהוּ; *Berakoth*, fol. 3, col. 2, בניהו בן יהוידע.

95. 2 Chron. xxxi, 13, וַעֲזַתְיָהוּ־לוֹ; *Sanhedrin*, fol. 103, col. 1, מאי דכתיב וישמע אליו ויחתר לו.

96. In fine, we will quote the following interesting passage. In the Jerusalem Talmud, *Taanith*, fol. 68, col. 1, we read the following: "Three codices [of the Pentateuch] were found in the court of the Temple, one of which had the reading מָעוֹן, the other זְעֻטוּטֵי, and the third differed in the number of passages wherein הוּא is read with a Yod; thus in the one codex it was written מְיָעוֹן, *dwelling* [Deut. xxxiii, 27], while the other two codices had מְעוֹנָה; the reading of the two was therefore declared valid, whereas that of the one was invalid. In the second codex, again, זְעֻטוּטֵי was found [in Exod. xxiv, 11], while the other two codices had אֶת־נְעָרֵי; the reading in which the two codices agreed was declared valid, and that of the one invalid. In the third codex, again, there were only nine passages which had הִיא written with a Yod [as it is generally written הוּא, with a Vav], whereas the other two had eleven passages; the readings of the two were declared valid, and those of the one invalid."

3. The different passages which we have presented here, and which might be yet increased to a great extent, do not justify us in presuming that the readings found in the Talmud were those of the Old-Testament codices of that time, and much less in the presumption that the readings of the Talmud are to be preferred to those of our text, for the following reasons: 1. We have not as yet a critical edition of the Talmud; 2. The formulas אל תקרא כך אלא כך, i. e. "read not so, but so," and יש אם למקרא ויש אם למסורת, i. e. "there is a solid root for the reading of the text, and there is a solid root for the traditional pronunciation," already indicate that these variations arose partly for the sake of allegory, partly for exegetical purposes. Thus Richard Simon, *Disquisit. Crit. de Variis Bibl. Edit.* cap. iii, p. 17, remarks on the formula אל תקרא כך אלא כך, "Cavendum est, ne ista loquendi formula quam frequenter in Talmude usurpant *ne legas sic sed sic* ad lectionum varietatem trahatur. Lusus enim est allegoricus illis doctoribus admodum familiaris qui servata dictionum ut ita loquar substantia diversos unius ejusdemque vocis legendae modos pueriliter comminiscuntur." To illustrate this, the following may suffice. Isa. liv, 13, we read, "thy sons," בָּנַיִךְ, but in *Berakoth*, fol. 64, we read, "Do not read בָּנַיִךְ 'thy sons,' but בּוֹנַיִךְ 'thy builders, thy wise,' whereby it should be proved that 'the wise build the peace in the world.'" *Sanhedrin*, fol. 37, col. 1, the word בִּגְדֵיהֶם, "his raiment," in Gen. xxvii, 27, is read בּוֹגְדִים, "his perfidious," to prove thereby the perfidy of Jose ben-Joëser's nephew. (For more such examples the reader is referred to G. Surenhusius Βίβλος καταλλαγῆς, p. 59 sq. [Amst. 1713].) As to the second formula, יש אם כו', Buxtorf (*De Punct. Antiq.* p. 96, 103–110) makes the following correct remark: "Usus vero hujus axiomatis Talmudici hic est. Cum de re seu quæstione aliqua disputant ac in diversas sententias abeunt, sæpe accidit ut uterque dissentientium fundamentum suum in uno eodemque Scripturæ loco, imo et in eadem voce ponat: unus sc. in communi et recepta lectione, alter in lectione mystica et allegorica, eadem illa voce sed aliis vocalibus animata vel aliter explicata. Prior dicit: *est mater lectionis*, q. d.: mea sententia innititur communi et receptæ lectioni, cum punctis et vocalibus propriis, *sensui literali*. Alter dicit: *est mater lectionis*, h. e. ego meam sententiam elicio et educo ex sensu mystico et lectione vel expositione aliqua per traditionem accepta, qua didici, hanc vocem pro infinita fecunditate legis sic quoque posse legi et explicari." To illustrate this, the following may suffice: In Exod. xii, 46 we read concerning the Passover, "In one house shall it be eaten," יֵאָכֵל. But in the Talmud, *Pesachim*, fol. 86, col. 2, two inferences are deduced from this passage. R. Jehudah maintains that the man who partakes of the Passover, *He* must eat it (יֵאָכֵל) in one place (בבית אחד), but that the Passover itself may be divided, and a part of it may be eaten by another company in another place; basing his argument upon the מסורות, viz. יֵאָכֵל, *he must eat it at one place*. Whereas R. Simeon maintains that the Passover itself must be eaten (יֵאָכֵל) in one place (בבית אחד), and cannot be divided between two different companies in different places, though the man himself, after having eaten his Passover at home, may go to another place and partake of another company's Passover; basing his argument upon the מקרא, viz. יֵאָכֵל, *it must be eaten in one place*. To the same category belongs the rule that שבעים (Lev. xii, 5) is to be read שְׁבֻעַיִם, *two weeks*, and not שִׁבְעִים, *seventy days*; and that בחלב (Lev. xxiii, 19) is to be pronounced בַּחֲלֵב, *in the milk*, and not בְּחֶלֶב, *in the fat*.

4. *Literature.* — Compare Pesaro, Aaron di, תולדות אחרן; בית אהרן (Frankf. ad Viadr. fol.), which also gives all the passages found in the Midrashim and Sohar; Surenhusius Βίβλος καταλλαγῆς (Amsterd. 1713); Weisse, in *Bechinath ha-Olam* (ed. Stern, Vienna, 1847), praef. p. xix adn.; Fromman, *Opuscula Philologica*, i, 1–46; Schorr, in *He-chaluz* (Lemberg), i, 97–116; ii, 56; Geiger, in *Jüdische Zeitschrift*, iv (1866), p. 43, 99 sq., 165–171; S. Rosenfeld, ספר חקת התורה (Vilnæ, 1866); Buxtorf filius, *Anticritica*, pt. ii, cap. xxi, p. 808; Strack, *Prolegomena Critica* (Lips. 1873), p. 59 sq. (B. P.)

Quotidian (*secta chori*), payment for duties performed in choir and personal attendance at divine service. The præsentiarius paid it in foreign cathedrals.

Quotidiāna Oratio (*daily prayer*) is the name sometimes applied to the Lord's Prayer on account of its daily use by Christians. See LORD'S PRAYER.

Qwanti, the god of war among the Chinese. Magnificent processions are held in honor of this deity.—Gardner, *Faiths of the World*, s. v.

R.

Raa, one of the principal deities of the Polynesians, or South-Sea Islanders. The third order of divinities appears to have consisted of the descendants of Raa. These were numerous and varied in their character, some being gods of war and others of medicine.

Raah. See GLEDE.

Ra'amah [some *Raa'mah*] (Heb. *Ramah'*, רַעְמָה; once *Rama'*, רַעְמָא [1 Chron. i, 9], a *shuddering*, hence a horse's *mane*, as in Job xxxix, 19; Sept. Ῥεγμά, but Ῥαμμα [v. r. Ῥαγμά] in Ezek. xxvii, 22; Vulg. *Regma* and *Reema*), the fourth son of Cush, and the father of Sheba and Dedan (Gen. x, 7; 1 Chron. i, 9), B.C. post 2513. It appears that the descendants of Cush colonized a large part of the interior of Africa, entering that great continent probably by the strait of Bab-el-Mandeb. A

section of the family, however, under their immediate progenitor, Raamah, settled along the eastern shores of the Arabian peninsula. There they founded nations which afterwards became celebrated, taking their names from Raamah's two sons, Sheba and Dedan. See CUSH. Though Sheba and Dedan became nations of greater importance and notoriety, yet the name Raamah did not wholly disappear from ancient history. Ezekiel, in enumerating the distinguished traders in the marts of Tyre, says, "The merchants of Sheba and *Raamah*, they were thy merchants: they occupied in thy fairs with chief of all spices, and with all precious stones, and gold" (xxvii, 22). The eastern provinces of Arabia were famed in all ages for their spices. The position of Sheba (q. v.) is well known, and Raamah must have been near it.

There can be little doubt that in the classical name *Regma* (Ῥεγμά of Ptolemy, vi, 7, and Ῥῆγμα of Steph. Byzantium), which is identical with the Sept. equivalent for Raamah, we have a memorial of the Old-Test. patriarch and of the country he colonized. The town of Regma was situated on the Arabian shore of the Persian Gulf, on the northern side of the long promontory which separates it from the ocean. It is interesting to note that on the southern side of the promontory, a few miles distant, was the town called Dadena, evidently identical with Dedan (q. v.). Around Regma Ptolemy locates an Arab tribe of the Anariti (*Geog.* vi, 7). Pliny appears to call them Epimaranitæ (vi, 26), which, according to Forster (*Geog. of Arabia*, i, 64), is just an anagrammatic form of *Ramanitæ*, the descendants of *Raamah*—an opinion not improbable. Forster traces the migrations of the nation from Regma along the eastern shores of Arabia to the mountains of Yemen, where he finds them in conjunction with the family of Sheba (*ibid.* p. 66–71). There the mention of the *Rhamanitæ* tribe by Strabo, in connection with the expedition of Gallus (xvi, p. 781), seems to corroborate the view of Forster. Of Sheba, the other son of Raamah, there has been found a trace in a ruined city so named (*Shebà*) on the island of Awál (Marásid, s. v.), belonging to the province of Arabia called El-Bahreyn, on the shores of the gulf. See SHEBA. Be this as it may, however, there can be no doubt that the original settlements of the descendants of Raamah were upon the south-western shores of the Persian gulf. Probably, like most of their brethren, while retaining a permanent nucleus, they wandered with their flocks, herds, and merchandise far and wide over Arabia. For the different views entertained regarding Raamah, see Bochart (*Phaleg.* iv, 5) and Michaelis (*Spicileg.* i, 193). The town mentioned by Niebuhr called *Reymeh* (*Descr. de l'Arabie*) cannot, on etymological grounds, be connected with Raamah, as it wants an equivalent for the ע; nor can we suppose that it is to be probably traced three days' journey from San'à, the capital of Yemen.

Raami'ah (Heb. *Raamyah'*, רַעַמְיָה, *thunder of Jehovah;* Sept. Ῥεελμά [v. r. Νααμία]), one of the chief Israelites who returned from exile with Zerubbabel (Neh. vii, 7), B.C. 445. In the parallel list (Ezra ii, 2) he is called REELAIAH, and the Greek equivalent of the name in the Sept. of Nehemiah appears to have arisen from a confusion of the two readings, unless, as Burrington (*Geneal.* ii, 68) suggests, Ῥεελμά is an error of the copyist for Ῥεελαία, the uncial letters *ai* having been mistaken for *m*. In 1 Esdr. v, 2 the name appears as REESAIAS.

Raam'ses (Exod. i, 10). See RAMESES.

Rab. See RABBI; RABBINISM.

Rab, properly ABBA ARIKHA, a noted Jewish teacher, was born at Kaphri, a small place between Sura and Nehardea, in Babylon, about A.D. 170. In early life he went in quest of knowledge into Palestine, and became one of the most favorite scholars of Jehudah the Holy (q. v.). On his return to the East he labored, some say for thirty years (between A.D. 188 and 219), at Nehardea as *meturgeman*, or *amora*, under Shila and Samuel; and at the close of that relationship, he entered upon the higher sphere of school rector and judge at Sura (or Sora), where he exercised those offices till the end of his life. "In this college, which was called *Be-Rab* (ברב), being an abbreviation of *Beth-Rab* (ביתרב), *the school of Rab*, the disciples assembled two months in the year—viz. *Adar* and *Elul*—in autumn and spring, for which they were denominated *Yarche Kullah* (ירחי כלה), *the months of assembly;* and into it all the people were admitted a whole week before each principal festival, when this distinguished luminary delivered expository lectures for the benefit of the nation at large. So eager were the people to hear him, and so great were the crowds, that many could find no house accommodation, and were obliged to take up their abode in the open air on the banks of the Sora River (*Succa*, 26 a). These festival discourses were denominated *rigle* (רגלי), and during the time in which they were delivered all courts of justice were closed (*Baba Kama*, 113 a)." After holding the presidency for about twenty-eight years, Rab died in A.D. 247, lamented by the whole nation. The esteem in which he was held during his lifetime is best expressed in the title "Rab," i. e. teacher, by which they called him, just as Jehudah the Holy was called "Rabbi" or "Rabbenu" in Palestine. One of Rab's main works was the systematic exposition of the Mishna (q. v.), a copy of which, as revised and somewhat amended by Rab himself, in his later years, he had brought from Palestine. This second recension of the Mishna became the authorized or canonical form of that work, and, under the Aramaic name of *Matnita de Be-Rab*, "the Mishna of the School of Rab," constituted the *text* of the Babylonian Talmud. But, besides his labors as an oral expositor on the Mishna, Rab was the author of two important works which greatly contributed to the advancement of Biblical exegesis. These were, *Siphra* or *Siphra de Be-Rab*, "the Book of the School of Rab" (ספרא דבירב), a Midrash on Leviticus; and *Siphre* or *Siphre de Be-Rab* (ספרי דבירב), a similar commentary on Numbers and Deuteronomy. These works have, indeed, been sometimes attributed to other authors, but the greatest weight of authority assigns them to the doctor of Sura. An analysis of these works is given in the article MIDRASH, where also some of the editions are mentioned. The best edition of the *Siphra* is that of M. L. Malbim, with the commentary *Hatora vehamitzva* (Bucharest, 1860), and that of Weiss (Vienna, 1862); the *Siphre* has been best edited by M. Friedmann (ibid. 1864). Rab also enriched the present *Seder Tephiloth*, or *Order of Common Prayers*, and some of the finest prayers and thanksgivings are the production of his pen. See Grätz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, iv, 214, 232, 279, 289, 293; Fürst, *Kultur- u. Literaturgeschichte der Juden in Asien*, p. 33 sq.; id. *Bibliotheca Judaica*, iii, 125 sq.; Etheridge, *Introduction to Hebrew Literature*, p. 157 sq.; Ginsburg, in Kitto, art. "Rab;" De Rossi, *Dizionario degli Autori Ebrei* (Germ. transl. by Hamberger), p. 272 sq.; Joël, *Etwas über die Bücher Sifra und Sifre* (Breslau, 1873); but above all, the excellent monograph by Mühlfelder, *Rab: ein Lebensbild zur Geschichte des Talmud* (Leips. 1871). (B. P.)

Rabad (ראב"ד), or ABRAHAM IBN-DAUD, for which the acrostic stands, a noted rabbi, was born at Toledo about 1110, and died as a martyr 1180. He was one of the most renowned Talmudists of his time, highly esteemed for his historical knowledge. He is the author of the סֵ֫פֶר הַקַּבָּלָה (*The Successions of Tradition*), written in the form of annals, giving the history of the world from Adam to his own time (1161), and showing the uninterrupted chain of tradition to his day, against the opinion of the Karaites, who denied all tradition. As a supplement to this chronicle, Ibn-Daud wrote a succinct

history of the Roman empire, from its foundation by Romulus till the West Gothic king Reccared, entitled *Memoirs of the Events of Rome* (זכרון דברי רומי), and the *History of the Jewish Kings during the Second Temple* (דברי מלכי ישראל בבית שני). These histories were first published, together with the *Seder Olam*, in Mantua (1513), then in Venice (1545), and Basle (1580); the *Sepher Ha-kabbalah* by itself, with the *Seder Olam Rabba and Sutta* (Cracow, 1820), and with a Latin translation by Gilbert Genebrard (Paris, 1572). He also wrote a work in Arabic, *Akida Rafina;* in Hebrew, *Emunah Ramah* (ed. Weil, Frankfort-on-the-Main, 1857), on the elements of nature and their capability of leading to elements of religious faith; on these elements of faith, and on the medicine for the soul in its infirmities. He also wrote *Astronomical Notices* and *Replies* to Abn-Alpharag on the section of the law named the "Journeyings," i. e. Numb. xxxiii, etc. See Fürst, *Bibl. Jud.* i, 7 sq.; Grätz, *Gesch. der Juden*, vi, 176–183, 212; Jost, *Gesch. des Judenth. u. s. Sekten*, ii, 425; Dessauer, *Gesch. der Juden*, p. 295; Braunschweiger, *Gesch. der Juden in den romanischen Staaten*, p. 70 sq.; Lindo, *History of the Jews in Spain*, p. 60; Finn, *Sephardim*, p. 193; Etheridge, *Introd. to Hebrew Literature*, p. 251; Ueberweg, *History of Philosophy*, i, 420, 427; Guggenheimer, *Die Religionsphilosophie des R. Abr. ben-David ha-Levi* (Augsburg, 1860); Levita, *Massoreth ha-Massoreth* (ed. Ginsburg, Lond. 1867), p. 108. (B. P.)

Rabanus Maurus. See RHABANUS.

Rabardeau, MICHEL, a French Jesuit, was born at Orleans in 1572, and became a member of the order in 1595. He had enjoyed the very best educational facilities, and was therefore employed by the Society in its schools. He taught philosophy and moral theology, and became successively rector of Bourges and of Amiens. He died at Paris in 1649. He is celebrated especially for his mastery of casuistry and his intimate knowledge of the canon law. In the domain of the latter he displayed his power in 1640, when Hersaut the Oratorian sought a schism in the Church of France by his work *Optati Galli de Cavendo Schismate*, after cardinal Richelieu had attempted the assumption of the patriarchate. Rabardeau, in his *Optatus Gallus Benigno Manu Sectus* (Paris, 1641, 4to), defended the cardinal, and tried to prove that such an assumption bore in it no trace of a schism, as the patriarchates of Jerusalem and Constantinople in nowise interfered with the power of the Roman papacy and its supreme authority. Of course, at Rome the book was displeasing, and was put into the *Index*. See Sotwell, *Bibl. Scriptor. Soc. Jesu.* —Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.

Rabat is a linen neck-collar worn by ecclesiastics.

Rabaudy, BERNARD DE, a French theologian, was born in 1681, at Toulouse, of an ancient noble family. At an early age he took the monastic vow with the Dominicans, and, after having completed his education, he taught at Limoges and in the University of Toulouse. In 1706 he was nominated superintendent of the order in France, and in 1716 was made successor to the general of the order in a professorship at Toulouse. He died there Nov. 3, 1731. He wrote, *Exercitationes Theologicæ* (Toul. 1714, 2 vols. 8vo), and *Quæstiones de Deo Uno* (ibid. 1718, 8vo). See Échard, *Bibl. Script. Ord. Prædicat.* vol. ii.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.

Rabaut, PAUL, a French Protestant divine, who was a martyr to the cause of true Christianity in France, was born at Bédarieux, near Montpelier, in 1718. He was educated at the seminary in Lausanne for the holy office of the ministry, and became one of the "Preachers of the Desert," among whom he soon ranked as first in many respects. In 1743 he was made pastor of the Reformed Church at Nismes, and there became the leader of French Protestantism. This was a time of persecution indeed. The government of Louis XV had taken up anew the task of rooting out the heretical doctrines which had flourished their banner in the face of the very man who had given authority to his government by saying "*L'état c'est moi.*" In spite of all opposition, and in the face of a host of plotting enemies, Rabaut maintained his position, and in 1785 he was even emerited. But in 1793, when the great Revolution succeeded, he was arrested as a traitor, and only gained his freedom in 1794 by the reversal of the 9th Thermidor. He died shortly after (Sept. 25, 1794). Rabaut took part in the Reform National Synod of 1744, and was presiding officer of that in 1763; and although his heterodox views on many important points made him a pronounced Chiliast in doctrine and an Episcopalian in government, he was yet so greatly revered for his fortitude, consistency, frankness, and devotion to Protestantism that his leadership was never rejected, but always gladly accepted by the Huguenot successors. He was not a great man. His education was moderate, his power in the pulpit ordinary. It was his sterling qualities of character that made him a leader in the Israel of France. His eldest son, Paul, also called St. Étienne, who was born in 1743, and was both preacher and lawyer, distinguished himself as a leader of the Revolution, to which both he and his wife fell martyrs. It was his influence that carried through the National Council religious equality for all France. His novel *Triomphe de l'Intolérance* (Lond. 1779; republished at Paris in 1820 and 1826 under the title *Le Vieux Cévenol*) is important for the history of French Protestantism. Another son (the second), Antoine R.-Pommier, who was born Oct. 24, 1744, was also a preacher, and likewise distinguished himself in the Revolution. He finally entered the civil service, but in 1815 he was obliged to quit France on account of his having voted for the execution of Louis XVI, and was only allowed to return in 1818. He died at Paris in 1820. He published *Annuaire Ecclésiastique, à l'Usage des trois Séances sur P. R. et les Prot. Français au* XVIII*e Siècle* (Lausanne, 1859). See *New York Nation*, xviii, 267; *London Academy*, Aug. 1, 1874, p. 119; De Felice, *Hist. of the French Protestants*, p. 416, 451, 462; Register, *Studien u. Kritiken*, 1838–47; Smith, *Hist. of the Huguenots;* Bridel, *Sketches of Paul Rabaut and the French Protestants of the 18th Century* (transl. from the French, with an Appendix containing portions of Paul Rabaut's writings now first published [Lond. 1861, 12mo]). (J. H. W.)

Rab'bah (Heb. *Rabbah'*, רַבָּה), the name of several ancient places both east and west of the Jordan, although it appears in this form in connection with only two in the A. V. The root is *rab*, meaning *much*, and hence *great*, whether in size or importance (Gesenius, *Thesaur.* p. 1254; Fürst, *Handwörterb.* ii, 347). The word survives in Arabic as a common appellative, and is also in use as the name of places—e. g. *Rabba*, on the east of the Dead Sea; *Rabhah*, a temple in the tribe of Medshidj (Freytag, ii, 107 *a*); and perhaps also *Rabat*, in Morocco. In the following account we chiefly follow the usual Biblical and archæological authorities, with additions from other sources. See RABBI.

1. A very strong place on the east of Jordan, which, when its name is first introduced in the sacred records, was the chief city of the Ammonites. In five passages (Deut. iii, 11; 2 Sam. xii, 26; xvii, 27; Jer. xlix, 2; Ezra xxi, 20) it is styled at length רַבַּת בְּנֵי עַמּוֹן, *Rabbáth-benê-Ammôn*, A. V. "Rabbath of the Ammonites," or "of the children of Ammon;" but elsewhere (Josh. xiii, 25; 2 Sam. xi, 1; xii, 27, 29; 1 Chron. xx, 1; Jer. xlix, 3; Ezra xxv, 5; Amos i, 14) simply "Rabbah." The Sept. generally has Ῥαββάθ, but in some MSS. occasionally Ῥαβάθ, or ἡ Ῥαββά. In Deut. iii, 5 it is τῇ ἄκρᾳ τῶν υἱῶν Ἀμμών in both MSS. In Josh. xiii, 25 the Vat. has Ἄραβα ἡ ἐστιν κατὰ πρόσωπον Ἀράδ, where the first and last words of the sentence seem to have changed places. Other various readings likewise occur.

Rabbah appears in the sacred records as the single city of the Ammonites; at least no other bears any distinctive name, a fact which contrasts strongly with the abundant details of the city life of the Moabites. Whether it was originally, as some conjecture, the Ham of which the Zuzim were dispossessed by Chedorlaomer (Gen. xiv, 5), will probably remain forever a conjecture. The statement of Eusebius (*Onomast.* s. v. 'Αμμάν) that it was originally a city of the Rephaim implies that it was the Ashteroth Karnaim of Gen. xiv. In agreement with this is the fact that it was in later times known as *Astarte* (Steph. Byz. quoted by Ritter, p. 1155). In this case, the dual ending of Karna*im* may point, as some have conjectured in Jerusha*laim*, to the double nature of the city—a lower town and a citadel. When first named it is in the hands of the Ammonites, and is mentioned as containing the bedstead of the giant Og (Deut. iii, 11), possibly the trophy of some successful war against the more ancient Rephaim. With the people of Lot, their kinsmen the Israelites had no quarrel, and Rabbath-of-the-children-of-Ammon remained to all appearance unmolested during the first period of the Israelitish occupation. It was not included in the territory of the tribes east of Jordan; the border of Gad stops at "Aroer, which faces Rabbah" (Josh. xiii, 25). The attacks of the Bene-Ammon on Israel, however, brought these peaceful relations to an end. Saul must have had occupation enough on the west of Jordan in attacking and repelling the Philistines and in pursuing David through the woods and ravines of Judah to prevent his crossing the river, unless on such special occasions as the relief of Jabesh. At any rate, we never hear of his having penetrated so far in that direction as Rabbah. But David's armies were often engaged against both Moab and Ammon. His first Ammonitish campaign appears to have occurred early in his reign. A part of the army, under Abishai, was sent as far as Rabbah to keep the Ammonites in check (2 Sam. x, 10, 14), but the main force under Joab remained at Medeba (1 Chron. xix, 7). The following year was occupied in the great expedition by David in person against the Syrians at Helam, wherever that may have been (2 Sam. x, 15–19). After their defeat the Ammonitish war was resumed, and this time Rabbah was made the main point of attack (xi, 1). Joab took the command, and was followed by the whole of the army. The expedition included Ephraim and Benjamin, as well as the king's own tribe (ver. 11), the "king's slaves" (ver. 1, 17, 24), probably David's immediate body-guard, and the thirty-seven chief captains. Uriah was certainly there, and, if a not improbable Jewish tradition may be adopted, Ittai the Gittite was there also. See Ittai. The ark accompanied the camp (ver. 11), the only time that we hear of its doing so, except that memorable battle with the Philistines, when its capture caused the death of the high-priest. On a former occasion (Numb. xxxi, 6) the "holy things" only are specified—an expression which hardly seems to include the ark. David alone, to his cost, remained in Jerusalem. The country was wasted, and the roving Ammonites were driven with all their property (xii, 30) into their single stronghold, as the Bedouin Kenites were driven from their tents inside the walls of Jerusalem when Judah was overrun by the Chaldæans. See Rechabite. The siege must have lasted nearly, if not quite, two years; since during its progress David formed his connection with Bathsheba, and the two children, that which died and Solomon, were successively born. The sallies of the Ammonites appear to have formed a main feature of the siege (2 Sam. xi, 17, etc.). At the end of that time Joab succeeded in capturing a portion of the place—the "city of waters," that is, the lower town, so called from its containing the perennial stream which rises in and still flows through it. The fact (which seems undoubted) that the source of the stream was within the lower city, explains its having held out for so long. It was also called the "royal city" (עִיר הַמַּלְכָה), perhaps from its connection with Molech or Milcom—"the king"—more probably from its containing the palace of Hanun and Nahash. But the citadel, which rises abruptly on the north side of the lower town, a place of very great strength, still remained to be taken, and the honor of this capture, Joab (with that devotion to David which runs like a bright thread through the dark web of his character) insists on reserving for the king. "I have fought," writes he to his uncle, then living at ease in the harem at Jerusalem, in all the satisfaction of the birth of Solomon—"I have fought against Rabbah, and have taken the city of waters; but the citadel still remains: now, therefore, gather the rest of the people together and come; put yourself at the head of the whole army, renew the assault against the citadel, take it, and thus finish the siege which I have carried so far," and then he ends with a rough banter (comp. 2 Sam. xix, 6)—half jest, half earnest—"lest I take the city and in future it go under my name." The waters of the lower city once in the hands of the besiegers, the fate of the citadel was certain, for that fortress possessed in itself (as we learn from the invaluable notice of Josephus, *Ant.* vii, 7, 5) but one well of limited supply, quite inadequate to the throng which crowded its walls. The provisions also were at last exhausted, and shortly after David's arrival the fortress was taken, and its inmates, with a very great booty, and the idol of Molech, with all its costly adornments, fell into the hands of David. We are not told whether the city was demolished or whether David was satisfied with the slaughter of its inmates. In the time of Amos, two centuries and a half later, it had again a "wall" and "palaces," and was still the sanctuary of Molech—"the king" (Amos i, 14). So it was also at the date of the invasion of Nebuchadnezzar (Jer. xlix, 2, 3), when its dependent towns ("daughters") are mentioned, and when it is named in such terms as imply that it was of equal importance with Jerusalem (Ezra xxi, 20). At Rabbah, no doubt Baalis, king of the Bene-Ammon (Jer. xl, 14), held such court as he could muster, and within its walls was plotted the attack of Ishmael which cost Gedaliah his life and drove Jeremiah into Egypt. The denunciations of the prophets just named may have been fulfilled either at the time of the destruction of Jerusalem, or five years afterwards, when the Assyrian armies overran the country east of Jordan on their road to Egypt (Josephus, *Ant.* x, 9, 7). See Jerome, *on Amos i*, 41.

In the period between the Old and New Testaments, Rabbath-Ammon appears to have been a place of much importance and the scene of many contests. The natural advantages of position and water supply, which had always distinguished it, still made it an important citadel by turns to each side during the contentions which raged so long over the whole of the district. It lay on the road between Heshbon and Bosra, and was the last place at which a stock of water could be obtained for the journey across the desert; while, as it stood on the confines of the richer and more civilized country, it formed an important garrison station for repelling the incursions of the wild tribes of the desert. From Ptolemy Philadelphus (B.C. 285–247) it received the name of *Philadelphia* (Jerome, *on Ezra xxv*, 1), and under this name it is often mentioned by Greek and Roman writers (Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* v, 16; Ptolemy, *Geog.* v, 15), by Josephus (*War*, i, 6, 3; i, 19, 5; ii, 18, 1), and upon Roman coins (Eckhel, iii, 351; Mionnet, v, 335), as a city of Arabia, Cœle-Syria, or Decapolis. The district either then or subsequently was called Philadelphene (Josephus, *War*, iii, 3, 3), or Arabia Philadelphensis (Epiphanius, in Ritter, *Syrien*, p. 1155). In B.C. 218 it was taken from the then Ptolemy (Philopator) by Antiochus the Great, after a long and obstinate resistance from the besieged in the citadel. A communication with the spring in the lower town had been made since (possibly in consequence of) David's siege, by a long

Coin of Philadelphia, showing the Tent or Shrine of Herakles, the Greek equivalent of Molech.

(*Obv.*: AVT·KAICM·AVΓ·ANTΩNINV. Bust of M. Aurelius, r.—*Rev.*: ΦΙΑΚΟCΤΡΗΡΑΚ-ΛЄΩΝ ΡΜΑ [A.V.C. 690]. Shrine in quadriga, r. [ΦΙΑΔΑΕΛΦЄΩΝ ΚΟΙΔΗC CYPIAC ΗΡΑΚΛЄΙΩΝ].)

secret subterranean passage, and had not this been discovered to Antiochus by a prisoner, the citadel might have been enabled to hold out (Polybius, v, 17). During the struggle between Antiochus the Pious (Sidetes) and Ptolemy, the son-in-law of Simon Maccabæus (B.C. cir. 134), it is mentioned as being governed by a tyrant named Cotylas (*Ant.* xiii, 8, 1). Its ancient name, though under a cloud, was still used; it is mentioned by Polybius (v, 71) under the hardly altered form of *Rabbatamana* (Ῥαββατάμανα). About B.C. 65 we hear of it as in the hands of Aretas (one of the Arab chiefs of that name), who retired thither from Judæa when menaced by Scaurus, Pompey's general (Josephus, *War*, i, 6, 3). The Arabs probably held it till the year B.C. 30, when they were attacked there by Herod the Great. But the account of Josephus (*War*, i, 19, 5, 6) seems to imply that the city was not then inhabited, and that although the citadel formed the main point of the combat, yet that it was only occupied on the instant. The water communication above alluded to also appears not to have been then in existence, for the people who occupied the citadel quickly surrendered from thirst, and the whole affair was over in six days.

At the Christian æra Philadelphia formed the eastern limit of the region of Peræa (Josephus, *War*, iii, 3, 3). It was one of the cities of the Decapolis, and as far down as the 4th century was esteemed one of the most remarkable and strongest cities of the whole of Cœle-Syria (Eusebius, *Onomast.*; Ammianus Marc. in Ritter, p. 1157). Its magnificent theatre (said to be the largest in Syria), temples, odeon, mausoleum, and other public buildings were probably erected during the 2d and 3d centuries, like those of Jerash, which they resemble in style, though their scale and design are grander (Lindsay). Among the ruins of an "immense temple" on the citadel hill, Mr. Tipping saw some prostrate columns five feet in diameter. Its coins are extant, some bearing the figure of Astarte, some the word Herakleion, implying a worship of Hercules, probably the continuation of that of Molech or Milcom. From Stephanus of Byzantium we learn that it was also called Astarte, doubtless from its containing a temple of that goddess. Justin Martyr, a native of Shechem, writing about A.D. 140, speaks of the city as containing a multitude of Ammonites (*Dial. with Trypho*), though it would probably not be safe to interpret this too strictly.

Philadelphia became the seat of a Christian bishop, and was one of the nineteen sees of "Palæstina tertia" which were subordinate to Bostra (Reland, *Palæst.* p. 228). The church still remains "in excellent preservation" with its lofty steeple (lord Lindsay). Some of the bishops appear to have signed under the title of *Bakatha;* which Bakatha is by Epiphanius (himself a native of Palestine) mentioned in such a manner as to imply that it was but another name for Philadelphia, derived from an Arab tribe in whose possession it was at that time (A.D. cir. 400). But this is doubtful (see Reland, *Palæst.* p. 612; Ritter, p. 1157).

When the Moslems conquered Syria, they found the city in ruins (Abulfeda in Ritter, p. 1158; and in note to lord Lindsay); and in ruins remarkable for their extent and desolation even for Syria, the "land of ruins," it still remains. The ancient name has been preserved among the natives of the country. Abulfeda calls it *Amman* (*Tab. Syr.* p. 19), and by that name it is still known. The prophet Ezekiel foretold that Rabbah should become "a stable for camels," and the country "a couching-place for flocks" (Ezek. xxv, 5). This has been literally fulfilled, and Burckhardt actually found that a party of Arabs had stabled their camels among the ruins of Rabbah. Too much stress has, however, been laid upon this minute point by Dr. Keith and others (*Evidence from Prophecy*, p. 150). What the prophet meant to say was that Ammon and its chief city should be desolate; and he expressed it by reference to facts which would certainly occur in any forsaken site in the borders of Arabia; and which are now constantly occurring not in Rabbah only, but in many other places. Rabbah lies about twenty-two miles from the Jordan at the eastern apex of a triangle, of which Heshbon and es-Salt form respectively the southern and northern points. It is about fourteen miles from the former and twelve from the latter. Jerash is due north, more than twenty miles distant in a straight line, and thirty-five by the usual road (Lindsay, p. 278). It lies in a valley which is a branch, or perhaps the main course, of the Wady Zerka, usually identified with the Jabbok. The *Moiet-Ammân*, or water of Amman, a mere streamlet, rises within the basin which contains the ruins of the town. The main valley is a winter torrent, but appears to be perennial, and contains a quantity of fish, by one observer said to be trout (see Burckhardt, p. 358; G. Robinson, ii, 174; "a perfect fish-pond," Tipping). The stream runs from west to east, and north of it is the citadel on its isolated hill. The public build-



Amman, as seen in approaching it from the South.

ings are said to be Roman, in general character like those at Jerash, except the citadel, which is described as of large square stones put together without cement, and which is probably more ancient than the rest. Among the ruins are chiefly noticeable a spacious church, built with large stones, and having a steeple; a temple, with part of the side walls and a niche in the back wall remaining; a curved wall along the water-side, with many niches, and in front of it a row of large columns, four of which remain, though without capitals; a high-arched bridge over the river, still perfect, apparently the only one that had existed. The citadel on the hill, a structure of immense strength, and the theatre have been referred to above. The remains of private houses scattered on both sides of the stream are very extensive. They have been visited, and described in more or less detail, by Burckhardt (*Syria*, p. 357–360), Seetzen (*Reisen*, i, 396; iv, 212–214), Irby (June 14), Buckingham (*E. Syria*, p. 68–82), lord Lindsay (5th ed. p. 278–284), G. Robinson (ii, 172–178), lord Claud Hamilton (in Keith, *Evid. of Proph.* ch. vi), De Saulcy (*Dead Sea*, i, 387 sq.), Tristram (*Land of Israel*, p. 544 sq.), Porter (*Handb. for Palest.* p. 302), Bädeker (*Palästina*, p. 319), and the Rev. A. E. Northern, in the *Quar. Statement* of the "Pal. Explor. Fund," April, 1872, p. 57 sq., where a plan is given.

2. (רַבָּה, with the definite article; Sept. Σωφηβᾶ v. r. Ἀρεββά; Vulg. *Arebba*) a city of Judah, named, with Kirjath-jearim, in Josh. xv, 60 only. It lay among the group of towns situated to the west of Jerusalem, on the northern border of the tribe of Judah (Keil, *Comment.* ad loc.). It is probably only an epithet for Jerusalem itself, which otherwise would not appear in the list. See JUDAH (*Tribe of*).

3. In one passage (Josh. xi, 8) ZIDON is mentioned with the affix Rabbah—*Zidon-rabbah*. This is preserved in the margin of the A. V., though in the text it is translated "great Zidon."

4. Although there is no trace of the fact in the Bible, there can be little doubt that the name of Rabbah was also attached in Biblical times to the chief city of Moab. Its Biblical name is "Ar," but we have the testimony of Eusebius (*Onomast.* s. v. Moab) that in the 4th century it possessed the special title of Rabbath-Moab, or, as it appears in the corrupted orthography of Stephanus of Byzantium, the coins, and the Ecclesiastical Lists, *Rabathmoba*, *Rabbathmoma*, and *Ratba* or *Robba Moabitis* (Reland, *Palæst.* p. 226, 957; Seetzen, *Reisen*, iv, 227; Ritter, p. 1220). This name was for a time displaced by *Areopolis*, in the same manner that Rabbath-Ammon had been by Philadelphia: these, however, were but the names imposed by the temporary masters of the country, and employed by them in their official documents; and when they passed away, the original names, which had never lost their place in the mouths of the common people, reappeared, and *Rabba*, like *Amman*, still remains to testify to the ancient appellation. Rabba lies on the highlands at the south-east quarter of the Dead Sea, between Kerak and Jibel Shihân. Its ruins, which are unimportant, are described by Burckhardt (July 15), Seetzen (*Reisen*, i, 411), De Saulcy (Jan. 18), and Porter (*Handb. for Palestine*, p. 297 sq.). See AR.

Rab'bath OF THE CHILDREN OF AMMON, and OF THE AMMONITES. (The former is the more accurate, the Hebrew being in both cases רַבַּת בְּנֵי עַמּוֹן; Sept. ἡ ἄκρα τῶν υἱῶν Ἀμμών, Ῥαββὰθ υἱῶν Ἀμμών; Vulg. *Rabbath filiorum Ammon.*) This is the full appellation of the place commonly given as RABBAH (q. v.). It occurs only in Deut. iii, 11 and Ezek. xxi, 20. The *th* is merely the Hebrew "construct state," or mode of connecting a word ending in *ah* with one following it. Comp. GIBEATH; KIRJATH; RAMATH, etc.

Rabbenu Gershom, or, more properly, *Rabbi* GERSHOM BEN-JEHUDA, the reputed founder of the Franco-German Rabbinical school, in which the studies of that of Babylonia were earnestly revived, was born about 960, and died in 1028. He was called "The Ancient," "The Light of the Exile," and was the founder of monogamy and other "institutions" among the Jews, which were for a long time disputed and rejected, and himself was placed under ban for attempting to abrogate the Mosaic precept respecting the marriage of a man with the childless wife of his deceased brother. Gershom also wrote a commentary on the Talmud, and some hymns and penitential prayers, which are extant in the Machzor. For reasons unknown he went to Mayence, where he founded a college, which soon attracted the youth of Germany and Italy. See Fürst, *Bibl. Jud.* i, 328; De Rossi, *Dizionario Storico* (Germ. transl.), p. 114; Grätz, *Gesch. der Juden* (Leips. 1871), v, 364 sq.; Braunschweiger, *Gesch. der Juden in den romanischen Staaten*, p. 32 sq.; Jost, *Gesch. d. Judenth.*

u. s. Sekten, ii, 388; Dessauer, *Gesch. d. Israeliten*, p. 310; Etheridge, *Introd. to Heb. Literature*, p. 283 sq.; Steinschneider, *Jewish Literature*, p. 69; Zunz, *Literaturgesch. d. synagogalen Poesie*, p. 238; id. *Synagogale Poesie*, p. 171–174; Delitzsch, *Zur Gesch. der jüd. Poesie*, p. 51, 156; Adams, *Hist. of the Jews*, i, 226; Frankel, *Monatsschrift*, 1854, p. 230 sq. (B. P.)

Rabbenu Tam. See Tam.

Rab'bi (Ραββί, רַבִּי), a title of honor given by the Jews to their learned men, authorized teachers of the law, and spiritual heads of the community, and which in the New Test. is frequently given to Christ. In the following article we combine the Biblical and Talmudical statements on the subject, with additions from later sources.

I. *Different Forms, and the Signification of the Title.*—The term רַבִּי, *Rabbi*, is a form of the noun רַב, *Rab* (from רָבַב, *to multiply, to become great, distinguished*), which in the Biblical Hebrew denotes *a great man; one distinguished either for age, position, office*, or *skill* (Job xxxii, 9; Dan. i, 3; Prov. xxvi, 10); but in the canonical books it does not occur with this suffix. It is in post-Biblical Hebrew that this term is used as a title, indicating sundry degrees by its several terminations for those who are distinguished for learning, who are the authoritative teachers of the law, and who are the appointed spiritual heads of the Jewish community. Thus, for instance, the simple term רַב, *Rab*, without any termination, and with or without the name of the person following it, corresponds to our expression *teacher, master*, διδάσκαλος, and is the lowest degree; with the pronominal suffix first person singular—viz. רַבִּי, *Rabbi*, Ραββί, *my Rabbi* (Matt. xxiii, 7, 8; xxvi, 25, 49; Mark ix, 5; xi, 21; xiv, 45; John i, 38, 49; iii, 2, 26; iv, 31; vi, 25; ix, 2; xi, 8)—it is a higher degree; and with the pronominal suffix first person plural—viz. רַבָּן, *Rabbân*, Ραββον, *our teacher, our master*, in the Chaldee form—it is the highest degree, and was given to the patriarchs (נשׂיאים) or the presidents of the Sanhedrim. Gamaliel I, who was patriarch in Palestine A.D. 30–50, was the first that obtained this extraordinary title, and not Simon ben-Hillel, as is erroneously affirmed by Lightfoot (*Harmony of the Four Evangelists*, John i, 38). This is evident from the following statement in the *Aruch* of R. Nathan (s. v. אבּיר): "We do not find that the title *Rabbon* began before the patriarchs rabbon Gamaliel I, rabbon Simon his son (who perished in the destruction of the second Temple), and rabbon Jochanan ben-Zakkai, all of whom were presidents." Lightfoot's mistake is all the more strange since he himself quotes this passage elsewhere (comp. *Hebrew and Talmudical Exercitations*, Matt. xxiii, 7). רַבָּן, however, which, as we have said, is the noun רַב, with the Chaldee pronominal suffix first person plural, is also used in Aramaic as a noun absolute, the plural of which is רַבָּנִין and רַבָּנִים (comp. Chaldee paraphrase on Psa. lxxx, 11; Ruth i, 2); pronominal suffix second person singular רַבָּנַיִךְ (Song of Songs vi, 4); pronominal suffix third person plural רַבָּנֵיהוֹן (Psa. lxxxiii, 12). Accordingly Ραββονί in Mark x, 51, which in John xx, 16 is spelled Ραββουνί, is the equivalent of רַבָּנִי, *Rabbanî, my master*, giving the Syriac pronunciation to the *Kamets* under the *Beth*. As such it is interpreted by the evangelists (διδάσκαλος, John i, 39; xx, 16; Matt. xxiii, 8).

II. *Origin and Date of these Titles.*—Nathan ben-Jechiel (q. v.) tells us, in his celebrated lexicon denominated *Aruch* (s. v. אבּיר), which was finished A.D. 1101, that Mar Rab Jacob asked Sherira Gaon, and his son Hai, the co-Gaon (A.D. 999), for an explanation of the origin and import of these different titles, and that these spiritual heads of the Jewish community in Babylon replied as follows: "'The title *Rab* (רב) is Babylonian, and the title *Rabbi* (רבי) is Palestinian.' This is evident from the fact that some of the Tanaim and Amoraim are simply called by their names without any title—e. g. Simon the Just, Antigonus of Soho, Jose ben-Jochanan, Rab, Samuel, Abaje, and Rabba; some of them bear the title *Rabbi* (רבי)—e. g. rabbi Akiba, rabbi Jose, rabbi Simon, etc.; some of them have the title Mar (מר)—e. g. mar Ukba, mar Januka, etc.; some the title of *Rab* (רב)—e. g. rab Hana, rab Jehudah, etc.; while some of them have the title *Rabbon* (רבן)—e. g. rabbon Gamaliel, rabbon Jochanan ben-Zakkai, etc. The title *Rabbi* (רבי) is that of the Palestinian sages, who received there of the Sanhedrim the laying-on of the hands, in accordance with the laying-on of the hands as transmitted in unbroken succession by the elders (זקנים), and were denominated *Rabbi*, and received authority to judge penal cases; while *Rab* (רב) is the title of the Babylonian sages, who received the laying-on of hands in their colleges. The more ancient generations, however, who were far superior, had no such titles as *Rabbon* (רבן), *Rabbi* (רבי), or *Rab* (רב), either for the Babylonian or Palestinian sages, as is evident from the fact that Hillel I, who came from Babylon, had not the title *Rabbon* (רבן) attached to his name; and that of the prophets, who were very eminent, it is simply said 'Haggai the prophet,' etc.; 'Ezra did not come up from Babylon,' etc., without the title *Rabbon* being affixed to their names. Indeed, we do not find that this title is of an earlier date than the patriarchate. It began with rabbon Gamaliel the elder (A.D. 30), rabbon Simon, his son (who perished in the destruction of the second Temple), and rabbon Jochanan ben-Zakkai, all of whom were patriarchs or presidents of the Sanhedrim (נשׂיאים). The title *Rabbi* (רבי), too, comes into vogue among those who received the laying-on of hands at this period—as, for instance, rabbi Zaddok, rabbi Eliezer ben-Jacob, etc., and dates from the disciples of rabbon Jochanan ben-Zakkai downwards. Now the order of these titles is as follows: *Rabbi* is greater than *Rab; Rabbon*, again, is greater than *Rabbi;* while the simple name is greater than *Rabbon*. No one is called *Rabbon* except the presidents." From this declaration of Sherira Gaon and Hai, that the title *Rabbi* obtained among the disciples of Jochanan ben-Zakkai, the erudite Grätz concludes that "we must regard the title Rabbi, which in the Gospels, with the exception of that by Luke, is given to John the Baptist and to Jesus, as an anachronism. We must also regard as an anachronism the disapprobation put into the mouth of Jesus against the ambition of the Jewish doctors, who love to be called by this title, and the admonition to his disciples not to suffer themselves to be styled *Rabbi*—καὶ φιλοῦσι (οἱ γραμματεῖς) . . . καλεῖσθαι ὑπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ῥαββί ῥαββί. Ὑμεῖς δὲ μὴ κληθῆτε ῥαββί, Matt. xxiii, 7, 8). This, moreover, shows that when the Gospels were written down the title *Rabbi* stood in so high a repute that the fathers could not but transfer it to Christ" (*Geschichte der Juden* [Berl. 1853], iv, 500). But even supposing that the title *Rabbi* came into vogue in the days of Jochanan ben-Zakkai, this would by no means warrant Grätz's conclusion, inasmuch as Jochanan lived upwards of a hundred years, and survived four presidents—viz. Hillel I (B.C. 30–10), Simon I (A.D. 10–30), Gamaliel I (A.D. 30–50), and Simon II (A.D. 50–70), and it might therefore obtain in the early days of this luminary, which would be shortly after the birth of Christ. The Tosaphoth at the end of *Edyoth*, however, quoted in the *Aruch* in the same article, gives a different account of the origin of this title, which is as follows: "He who has disciples, and whose disciples again have disciples, is called *Rabbi;* when his disciples are forgotten (i. e. if

Modern Jewish Rabbi, attired for Prayer.

he is so old that his immediate disciples already belong to the past age), he is called *Rabbon;* and when the disciples of his disciples are also forgotten, he is simply called by his own name." This makes the titles coeval with the origin of the different schools, and at the same time accounts for the absence of them among the earliest doctors of the law.

Some account of the rabbins and the Mishnical and Talmudical writings may be found in Prideaux (*Connection*, pt. i, bk. 5, under the year B.C. 446; pt. ii, bk. 8, under the year B.C. 37); and a sketch of the history of the school of Rabbinical learning at Tiberias, founded by rabbi Judah Hak-kodesh, the compiler of the Mishna, in the 2d century after Christ, is given by Robinson (*Biblical Researches*, ii, 391). See also Note 14 to Burton, *Bampton Lectures*, and the authorities there quoted —for instance, Brüker (ii, 820) and Basnage (*Hist. des Juifs*, iii, 6, p. 138). Compare Hill, *De Rabbinis* (Jen. 1741); Bohn, *ibid.* (Erf. 1750); Müller, *De Doctoribus* (Vitemb. 1740). See MASTER.

Rabbim. See BATH-RABBIM.

Rabbinic Bibles, also called *Mikraôth Gedolôth* (מקראות גדולות), or *Great Bibles*, is the name given to the following Hebrew Bibles, which, besides the original text, also contain the commentaries of sundry Jewish rabbins.

1. ארבעה ועשרים חומש עם תרגום אונקלוס ועם פירושרש"י . . . נדפסעם רב העיון על ידי דניאל בומבירגי מאנווירשא בויניזיאה, fol. This is the first Rabbinic Bible published by Bomberg, and carried through the press by Felix Pratensis (q. v.) (Venice, 1516–17) (ראח = 278). It consists of four parts, with a separate title-page to each, and with the following contents:

a. The *Pentateuch*, with the Chaldee paraphrase of Onkelos (q. v.) and the commentaries of Rashi (q. v.).

b. The *Prophets*, with the Chaldee of Jonathan ben-Uziel (q. v.) and the commentaries of Kimchi (q. v.).

c. The *Hagiographa*, viz. the *Psalms*, with the Targum of Joseph bar-Chija (q. v.) and D. Kimchi's (q. v.) commentary; *Proverbs*, with Joseph's Targum and David Ibn-Jachja's (q. v.) commentary; *Job*, with Joseph's Targum and the commentaries of Nachmanides (q. v.) and Farrisol (q. v.); the Five Megilloth (i. e. *Canticles*, *Ruth*, *Lamentations*, *Ecclesiastes*, and *Esther*), with Joseph's Targum and Rashi's commentary; *Daniel*, with Ralbag's (q. v.) commentary; *Ezra*, *Nehemiah*, and *Chronicles*, with Rashi's and Simon Darshan's, or Cara's (q. v.), commentary. Appended to the volume are the Targum Jerusalem on the Pentateuch, the second Targum on Esther, the variations between Ben-Asher (q. v.) and Ben-Naphtali, the differences between the Eastern and Western codd., Aaron ben-Asher's (q. v.) Dissertation on the Accents, Maimonides's (q. v.) thirteen articles of faith, the 613 precepts (q. v.), a table of the Parashioth and Haphtaroth (q. v.), according to the Spanish and German rituals.

This edition, however, did not prove acceptable to the Jews, since it did not come up to all the requirements of Masoretic rules, as can be seen from the remark Levita makes in his *Masoreth ha-Masoreth:* "Let me therefore warn and caution every one who reads the folio or quarto editions of the four-and-twenty books published here in Venice in the year 1517 to pay no attention to the false remarks printed in the margin, in the form of *Keri* and *Kethib*, *plene* and *defective*, *Milel* and *Milra*, and *variations in the vowels and accents*, or to any of those things which ought not to have been done, as I have stated above. The author of them did not know how to distinguish between his right hand and his left. Not being a Jew, he knew nothing about the nature of the Masorah, and what he did put down simply arose from the fact that he sometimes found variations in the copies which he had before him, and, as he did not know which reading was the correct one, he put down one in the margin and another in the text. Sometimes it so happened that he put the correct reading into the text and the incorrect one into the margin, and sometimes the reverse is the case; thus he was groping in darkness like a blind man. Hence they are not to be heeded, for they are confusion worse confounded." When Levita states that the editor was no Jew, he is wrong: he was born a Jew, in 1513 embraced Christianity at Rome, and died in 1539. The defectiveness of this first edition induced Bomberg to undertake another edition, for which he employed as editor the celebrated Jacob ben-Chajim (q. v.), and which he published under the title

2. . . . שער יהוה הקדש, i. e. *Porta Dei Sancta* (Venice, 1524–25, 4 vols. fol.). This edition is an improvement upon the former, and its contents are as follows:

a. The first volume, embracing the Pentateuch (תורה), begins, 1, with the elaborate introduction of the editor, in which he discusses the *Masorah*, the *Keri*, and *Kethib*, the variations between the Talmud and the Masorah, the *Tikune Sopherim* (תקוני סופרים), and the order of the larger Masorah; 2, an index of the sections of the whole Old Test. according to the Masorah; and, 3, Aben-Ezra's preface to the Pentateuch. Then follow the five books of Moses in Hebrew, with the Chaldee paraphrases of Onkelos and Jonathan ben-Uziel, and the commentaries of Rashi and Aben-Ezra, the margins being filled up with as much of the Masorah as they would admit.

b. The second volume, comprising the earlier prophets (נביאים ראשונים), i. e. Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and the Kings, has the Hebrew text, the Chaldee paraphrase of Jonathan ben-Uziel, and the commentaries of Rashi, Kimchi, and Levi ben-Gershon, and the Masorah in the margin.

c. The third volume, comprising the later prophets (נביאים אחרונים), i. e. Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the twelve minor prophets, contains the Hebrew text, the Chaldee paraphrase of Jonathan ben-Uziel, the commentaries of Rashi, which extend over all the books in this volume, of Aben-Ezra on Isaiah and the minor prophets, and of Kimchi on Jeremiah, and the Masorah in the margin.

d. The fourth volume, comprising the Hagiographa (כתובים), gives the Hebrew text, the Chaldee paraphrase of Joseph the Blind, the commentaries of Rashi on the Psalms, Ezra, Nehemiah, the Five Megilloth, and Chronicles; of Aben-Ezra on the Psalms, Proverbs, Job, Daniel, the Five Megilloth, Ezra, and Nehemiah; of Levi ben-Gershon on Proverbs and Daniel; of Saadias on Daniel and the second Targum of Esther.

But the most valuable part of his labors are the appendices to this volume, which are, "1, the Masorah which

could not be got into the margin of the text in alphabetical order, with Jacob ben-Chajim's directions; 2, the various readings of Ben-Asher and Ben-Naphtali, and the Eastern and Western codd.; and, 3, a treatise upon the points and accents, containing the work דרכי הנקוד והנגינות, or כללי הנוקוד, by Moses Nakdan. Jacob ben-Chajim bestowed the utmost labor in amassing the Masorah and in purifying and arranging those materials which Felix Pratensis published very incorrectly in the first edition of Bomberg's Rabbinic Bible. He was, moreover, the first who, in his elaborate introduction, furnished the Biblical student with a treatise on the Masorah; and his edition of the Bible is of great importance to the criticism of the text, inasmuch as from it most of the Hebrew Bibles are printed. Kennicott published a Latin translation of Jacob ben-Chajim's valuable introduction from an anonymous MS. in the Bodleian Library in an abridged form (comp. *Dissertation the Second* [Oxford, 1759], p. 229–244), and Ginsburg has published an English translation of the whole with explanatory notes in the *Journal of Sacred Literature*, 1863. In after-life Jacob ben-Chajim embraced Christianity, a circumstance which will account for Elias Levita's vituperations against him (תהי נשמתו צרורה בצרור נקוב, i. e. 'Let his soul be bound up in a bag with holes')."

3. A revised and improved edition of the second Bombergian Bible was published at Venice in 1546–48, under the supervision of Cornelius Adelkind. The changes made in this edition consist in omitting Aben-Ezra's commentary on Isaiah and the Minor Prophets, while Jacob ben-Asher's (q. v.) commentary on the Pentateuch and Isaiah di Trani's (q. v.) commentary on Judges and Samuel are inserted.

4. Bomberg's fourth Rabbinic Bible, by Joan. de Gara, carried through the press and corrected by Isaac ben-Joseph סלם and Isaac ben-Gershon Treves (Venice, 1568, 4 vols. fol.). The correctors remark at the end that they have reinserted in this edition the portion of the Masorah which was omitted in the edition of 1546–48. Appended is the so-called Jerusalem Targum on the Pentateuch. Wolf (*Bibliotheca Hebr.* ii, 372) says: "In catalogo quodam MSS. codicum Hebr. Bibl. Bodlej. observatum vidi, quod hæc editio opera Genebrardi passim sit castrata in iis quæ contra rem Christianam et præcipue contra Romanos dicuntur;" but Steinschneider (in *Catalogus Libr. Hebr.*) states, "sed exemplar tale in Bodl. non exstat."

5. חמשה חומשי תורה מן העשרים וארבע . . . גדול שמו בישראל ונודע, published at Venice in 1617–19 (4 vols. fol.) by Pietro and Lorenzo Bragadin, and edited by the celebrated Leon di Modena (q. v.) and Abraham Chaber-Tob ben-Solomon Chajim Sopher. It contains the whole matter of the foregoing edition, and is preceded by a preface written by Leon di Modena. This edition, however, is of less value to the critical student, being castrated by the Inquisition, under whose censorship it was published, as may be seen from the remark of the censor at the end: "Visto per me, Fr. Renato da Mod. a. 1626."

6. ה' תשועתך באמרתך בכל דור ודור ממשלתך . . . [i. e. God, thy salvation is in thy word, and thy kingdom is from generation to generation], printed at Basle in 1618–19 (2 vols. fol.), and edited by John Buxtorf. This Bible is divided into four parts, the latter of which, consisting of the later prophets and Hagiographa, is dated 1619. The title-page is followed by a Latin preface by Buxtorf, a table of the number of chapters in the Bible, and a poem of Aben-Ezra on the Hebrew language. Besides the Hebrew text and the Chaldee paraphrases, it contains as follows: 1, Rashi on the whole Old Test.; 2, Aben-Ezra on the Pentateuch, Isaiah, the Minor Prophets, Psalms, Job, the Five Megilloth, and Daniel; 3, Moses Kimchi on the Proverbs, Ezra, and Nehemiah; 4, D. Kimchi on Chronicles; 5, Ralbag on the earlier prophets and Proverbs; 6, Saadias on Daniel; 7, Jacob ben-Asher on the Pentateuch; 8, Jachja on Samuel; 9, the Masorah Finalis and Buxtorf's *Tiberias*, etc.; 10, the various readings of Ben-Asher and Ben-Naphtali; 11, the variations between the Eastern and Western codices; 12, a treatise on the accents. The whole is formed after Jacob ben-Chajim's second edition (1546–48), with some corrections and alterations by Buxtorf. Buxtorf, in editing this Bible, has erected to himself a lasting monument. Of course, like every human work, it is imperfect; but, in spite of its deficiencies, the student must still thank the editor for this work, and Richard Simon, in his *Histoire Critique du V. T.* p. 513, certainly does great injustice when he says: "Bien qu'il prétende que son édition est plus exacte que les autres, les Juifs cependant ne l'estiment pas beaucoup, à cause des fautes qui s'y rencontrent, surtout dans les commentaires des rabbins, où il a laissé les erreurs des copistes, qui étoient dans les éditions précédentes, et il y en a ajouté de nouvelles. Il seroit nécessaire d'avoir de bons exemplaires manuscrits de ces commentaires des rabbins, pour les corriger en une infinité d'endroits; et c'est à quoi Buxtorfe devoit plutôt s'appliquer, qu'à réformer la punctuation du texte Caldaique."

7. ספר קהילת משה, or the Amsterdam Rabbinic Bible, edited by Moses Frankfurter (Amsterdam, 1724–27, 4 vols. royal fol.). This is unquestionably the most valuable of all the Rabbinic Bibles. It is founded upon the Bomberg editions, and gives not only their contents, but also those of Buxtorf's, with much additional matter. This is the last Rabbinic Bible which is described in bibliographical works, and for this reason we give here the literature pertaining to the above Bibles: Wolf, *Bibliotheca Hebr.* ii, 365 sq.; Le Long-Mash, *Bibliotheca Sacra*, i, 95 sq.; Rosenmüller, *Handbuch der bibl. Literatur*, i, 249 sq.; Steinschneider, *Catalogus Libr. Hebr. in Bibliotheca Bodleiana*, col. 6 sq.; Ginsburg, in Kitto, s. v. "Rabbinic Bibles;" Carpzov, *Critica Sacra* (Lipsiæ, 1748), p. 409 sq.; R. Simon, *Histoire Critique du Vieux Test.* p. 512 sq. See FRANKFURTER.

a. The first volume, including the Pentateuch, contains: 1, an index of the things explained by R. Abdias Seforno, according to the *Parashayoth;* 2, a treatise by the same author on the Law; 3, approbations of the synagogues of Amsterdam, Frankfort, and others; 4, an explication by Moses (the author) of the signs used to designate the authors referred to; 5, ancient prefaces at the head of former editions; 6, an index of the chapters of the books of the Old Test.; 7, the prefaces of R. Chiskuni; 8, the preface of Levi ben-Gershon (Ralbag), with a revision of the Talmud; 9, the preface of R. Abdias Seforno; 10, the preface of Aben-Ezra.

To the sacred text are added the *Targums* (that of Onkelos in the Pentateuch; in the other volumes, such as exist), the commentaries of Rashi, Aben-Ezra, Baal-Turim, the Greater and the Lesser *Masorah*, the notes (in this vol.) of Levi ben-Gershon, Chiskuni, Jacob de Letkias, the *Imre-Noach* ("Precepts of Noah"), and the commentary of R. Abdias Seforno. The *Komets Minchah* (a collection from various commentaries) is added by the editor. The columns are so disposed that the Hebrew text and the Targum are in the centre of the page, printed in square type; the Lesser Masorah in the intermediate space, and the Greater Masorah (likewise in square type) at the bottom. At the sides, in large round (Rabbinic) letters, in the inner margin, is the commentary of Rashi; in the outer margin, that of Aben-Ezra and sometimes that of Chiskuni. In the lesser column, in small round type, are placed Baal-Turim, the *Imre-Noach*, and the *Komets Minchah;* in the lower part of the page, the commentaries of Ralbag and Seforno, in small round type.

b. The second volume contains the earlier prophets (accompanied by the Targum and Masorah as above), with the commentaries of Rashi, Ralbag, and Esaias, also extracts from the book *Keli Jaker* by R. Samuel Lañado, and the *Minchah Ketanah* (extracts from the commentaries of Moses Alsheich and R. Aaron ben-Chajim; also a commentary called *Leb Aharon* on the book of Joshua and Judges) of the editor in the margin. The prefaces of Kimchi, Levi ben-Gershon, and R. Samuel Lañado in the *Keli Jaker*, follow the title of this volume.

c. The third volume contains the later prophets (the text, etc., arranged as before), with the commentaries of Rashi, Radak (R. David Kimchi), Aben-Ezra on Isaiah and Jeremiah, R. Samuel Lañado, R. Jacob ben-Rab, R. Abdias Seforno, Samuel Almesnires, and R. Isaac Gershon, and the *Minchah Gedolah* (a series of extracts similar to the above) by the editor.

d. The fourth volume, containing the Kethubim (in like style), has the prefaces of Aben-Ezra, Aben-Esaias, and Simeon ben-Zemach in the *Ohel Meshnat* and the *Miskpat Zedek*. There are also various commentaries on the Hagiographa, by Rashi, Aben-Ezra, Isaac Jabez, Aben-Je-

chaja; Abdias Seforno on the Psalms, and extracts from the *Miẓma Lattora* of Samuel Arepol; on the Proverbs, by Rashi, Aben-Ezra, Ralbag, Aben-Jechaja, Menahem Hammeiri, with the commentary *Kab Venaki* of Solomon ben-Abraham; on Job, by Rashi, Aben-Ezra, Aben-Jechaja, Isaac Jabez, Rambau, Abo, Perizol, Abdias Seforno, and Simeon ben-Zemach; on the Canticles, by Rashi, Aben-Ezra, Ralbag, Aben-Jechaja, Isaac Jabez, Meri Arama, and Abdias Seforno; on Ruth, by Rashi, Aben-Ezra, Ralbag, Aben-Jechaja, and Isaac Jabez; on Ecclesiastes, by the same commentators, with the addition of Abdias Seforno; on Esther, by Rashi, Aben-Ezra, Ralbag, Aben-Jechaja; on Daniel, by Rashi, Aben-Ezra, Saadias, Aben-Jechaja, Isaac Jabez, and Ralbag; on Ezra and Nehemiah, by Rashi, Aben-Ezra, Aben-Jechaja, and Isaac Jabez; on Chronicles, by Rashi, Radak, and Aben-Jechaja. The editor has also added his own commentary throughout this volume of the work, under the title *Minchah Ereb*. At the end of the work are placed the Greater Masorah, the variations of the Eastern and Western Recensions (so called), and the treatise on the accents. Each of the assistants in the work is celebrated in Hebrew verse.

According to Wolff, this edition of the Rabbinic Bible is the most copious and the best. Some interpolations from MSS. have been introduced, in some instances entire, in others by extracts. Verses 36 and 37 of Josh. xxi have been rejected, and this is marked in the margin, which states that they exist in some MSS., but not in the most correct and ancient ones. In some copies designed for the use of Christians, Tyschendorf has remarked that the treatise of R. Abdias Seforno, *De Scopa Legis*, is wanting.

8. The latest Rabbinic Bible, with thirty-two commentaries, is the מקראות גדולות עם ל"ב פירושים, published at Warsaw by Lebenson (1860–68, 12 vols. small fol.). It contains, besides the original Hebrew, the Chaldee of Onkelos and Jerushalmi on the Pentateuch, the Chaldee on the prophets and Hagiographa, and the second Targum on Esther. Of commentaries, it contains that of Rashi on the whole Bible; Aaron Pesaro's (q. v.) Toldot Aaron; Asheri's and Norzi's (q. v.) commentary on the Bible; Aben-Ezra on the Pentateuch, the Five Megilloth, the Minor Prophets, the Psalms, Job, and Daniel; Moses Kimchi on Proverbs; Nachmanides on the Pentateuch; Obadiah de Seforno (q. v.) on the Pentateuch, Song of Songs, and Ecclesiastes; El. Wilna (q. v.) on the Pentateuch, Joshua, Isaiah, and Hezekiah; S. E. Lenczyz and S. Edels on the Pentateuch; J. H. Altschuler on the prophets and Hagiographa; D. Kimchi on the later prophets; Ralbag on Joshua, Kings, Proverbs, and Job; Is. di Trani on Judges and Samuel; S. Oceda (q. v.) on Ruth and Lamentations; Eliezer ben-Elia Harofe on Esther; Saadias on Daniel. It also contains the Masorah Magna and Parva, a treatise on the vowel-points and accents, the various readings between Asher and Naphtali, and the introduction of Jacob ben-Chajim. This edition is recommended by the greatest Jewish authorities in Poland, as Meisels, of Warsaw; Muscat, of Prague; Heilprin, of Bialystock, etc. (B. P.)

Rabbinical Dialect. By this term we understand that form of the Hebrew language in which the principal Scripture commentators among the rabbins wrote, as Kimchi, Aben-Ezra, Abrabanel, Rashi, together with the Mishna, the Jewish Prayer-books, etc. Books in this dialect are generally printed in a round character, more resembling writing than the ordinary square Hebrew letters; but the power, value, and pronunciation of the letters are precisely the same as in Biblical Hebrew. The Rabbinical characters are given below. Although substantially Hebrew, yet this dialect has so many peculiarities as to require a separate study. The scholar who is well versed in the pure or classic Hebrew of the Holy Scriptures would be unable to read the first two lines in the Talmud without an especial indoctrination in its grammatical forms, aside from the difficulty of explaining words derived from the Greek, Latin, French, Arabic, and the like. The orthography, too, of this dialect has, to the reader of pure Hebrew, often an uncouth, and at first sight unintelligible, appearance. This is caused by the habit of inserting the letters א, ו, י, instead of using the corresponding vowel-points, and thus א stands for ַ or ָ, as שָׁאנִי for מֵאִי, for ֶ or ֵ, as כּוֹלֶם for מֵי; ו stands for ֹ or ֻ, as לְפָתְרוֹ for כֻּלָּם; ר for ֹ or ֻ, as פֵּרוּשׁ for אֶפְשָׁר; also for ּ or dagesh, as לְמִינוֹת for כְּסָה. Sometimes a radical in verbs is dropped either at the beginning, middle, or end of a word. It drops the first, as נא for אנש, חד for אחד, אמר for מר, נן for אנן, אכל for כל. It drops the second, as קם for קדם, אר for אור, תלים for תהלים, שעה for שה; or it drops the third, as בר for בין, אר for אין, כר for בית, שב for כרן, תו for תוב, שכנ for שבת. Parts of words are often prolonged, as by doubling letters, or inserting double *Yod;* and to this and many other peculiarities must be added the use of numerous abbreviations, requiring a study in itself—thus e. g. א"א may be אני אופן אחד, אמר אחד, אמר אליהו, אדני אבי, אומר אין, אי אמרת, אשת איש, אמן אמן, אי אפשר אברהם אבינו עליו השלום; אומרים אאנה stands for

א	ק in Hebrew	
ב	"	
ג	"	
ד	"	
ה	"	
ו	"	
ז	"	
ח	"	
ט	"	
י	"	
כ ך	"	ד
ל	"	
מ ם	"	
נ ן	"	ר
ס	"	
ע	"	
פ ף	"	ת
צ ץ	"	
ק	"	
ר	"	
ש	"	
ת	"	

We give a list of such works as will help the student in this branch of literature. (I.) *Grammars.*—J. H. Mai, *Grammatica Rabbinica* (Giessen, 1712); Mercer, לוחי דקדוקי כשראה או ארמאה, *Tabulæ in Gr. L. Chald. quæ et Syr. dicitur: multa interim de Rabbinico et Talmudico Stilo traduntur* (Paris, 1560); Reland, *Analecta Rabbinica* (Ultraj. 1723); Millius, *Catalecta Rabbinica* (ibid. 1728); Alting, *Synopsis Institutionum Rabbinorum* (Frankfort-on-the-Main, 1701); Danz, סנלתא דרבנן, *sive Rabbinismus Enucleatus* (Jena, 7th ed. 1735); Cellarius, *Rabbinismus sive Inst. Gram. Rabbinorum Scriptis, Legendis, et Intellig. accommodata* (Zeiz, 1684); Genebrard, *Isagoge ad Legenda et Intelligenda Rabbinorum Comment.* (Paris, 1563); Tychsen, *Elem. Dialect. Rabb.* (Bützow, 1753), Dukes, *Die Sprache der Mischna, lexicogr. und grammat. betrachtet* (Esslingen, 1846); Geiger, *Lehr- u. Lesebuch zur Sprache der Mischna* (Breslau, 1845); Landau, *Geist und Sprache der Hebräer nach dem zweiten Tempelbau* (Prague, 1822); Luzzatto, *Elementi Grammaticali del Caldeo Biblico e del Dialetto Talmudico Babilonese* (transl. into German by Krüger [Breslau, 1873]); Faber, *Anmerkungen zur Erlernung des Talmudischen und Rabbinischen* (Göttingen, 1770); Weiss, *Studien über die Sprache der Mischna* (Heb. [Vienna, 1867]); Nolan, *An Introduction to Chaldee Grammar*, etc. (Lond. 1821).

(II.) *Rabbinical Lexicons and Word-books.*—Buxtorf. *Lexicon Chaldaicum, Talmudicum, et Rabbinicum* (Basle, 1640, fol. [new ed. by Fischer, Leips. 1866 sq.]); id. *Lexicon Breve Rabbinico-Philosophicum* (ibid. 1607, and often since); Hartmann, *Supplementa ad J. Buxtorfii et W. Gesenii Lexicon* (Rostock, 1813); id. *Thesaurus Linguæ Hebraicæ e Mishna augend.* (ibid. 1825–26); Löwy, לשון חכמים, *Wörterbuch enthaltend hebr. Wörter u. Redensarten, die sich im Talmud befinden* (Prague, 1845–47, 2 pts.); Nathan ben-Jechiel, *Ha-Aruch* (Rome, 1515); Dessauer, *Leshon Rabbanan* (Erlangen, 1849); Stern, *Ozar ha-Millin* (Vienna, 1864);

Levy, *Neuhebräisches und chaldäisches Wörterbuch* (Leips. 1875 sq.); Rabinei, *Rabbinisch-aramäisches Wörterbuch* (Lemberg, 1857); Young, *Rabbinical Vocabulary*, etc. (Edinb. s. a.).

(III.) *Miscellaneous.*—For the abbreviations, comp. Wolf (*Bibl. Hebr.* vols. ii, iv), and also Buxtorf (ed. Fischer), where at the end of each letter the abbreviations of the respective letter are given. (B. P.)

Rabbinism is that development of Judaism which, after the return from Babylon, but more especially after the ruin of the Temple and the extinction of the public worship, became a new bond of national union, and the great distinctive feature in the character of modern Judaism. After the return from the Babylonian captivity, the Mosaic constitution could be but partially re-established. The whole structure was too much shattered, and its fragments too widely dispersed, to reunite in their ancient and regular form. The Levites who had returned from the captivity, it is true, were the officiating priesthood, and no more. They were bound to be acquainted with the forms and usages of the sacrificial ritual; but the instruction of the people and the interpretation of the law by no means fell necessarily within their province. From the captivity the Jews brought with them a reverential, or, rather, a passionate, attachment to the Mosaic law; and this it seems to have been the prudent policy of their leaders, Ezra and Nehemiah, to encourage by all possible means as the great bond of social union, and the unfailing principle of separation from the rest of mankind. By degrees, attachment to the law sank deeper and deeper into the national character: it was not merely at once their Bible and their statute-book; it entered into the most minute detail of common life. "But no written law can provide for all possible exigencies. Whether general and comprehensive, or minute and multifarious, it equally requires the expositor to adapt it to the immediate case which may occur, either before the public tribunal or that of the private conscience. Hence the law became a deep and intricate study. Certain men rose to acknowledged eminence for their ingenuity in explaining, their readiness in applying, their facility in quoting, and their clearness in offering solutions of, the difficult passages of the written statutes. Learning of the law became the great distinction to which all alike paid reverential homage. Public and private affairs depended on the sanction of this self-formed spiritual aristocracy," or rabbinical oligarchy, which, itself held together by a strong corporate spirit, by community of interest, by identity of principle, has contributed, more than any other external cause, to knit together in one body the widely dispersed members of the Jewish family, and to keep them the distinct and separate people which they appear in all ages of the world.

The first stage of development appears in the work of the so-called *Sopherim*, the last of whom was Simon the Just (q. v.); and their work will be more fully described in the art. Scribes. The Sopherim were followed by another class of men, known as the *Tanaïm*, or teachers of the law (the *νομοδιδάσκαλοι* in the N. T.), comprising a period from B.C. 200 to A.D. 220. While we reserve a description of their work for the art. Scribes, we will only mention that from this school proceeded the oldest Midrashim, as *Mechilta*, *Siphra*, and *Siphri* [see Midrash], and the *Mishna* (q. v.). The most distinguished rabbins of the Tanaïm (who are in part given already, or will be given, in this *Cyclopœdia*) were: 1. Antigonus of Soho (B.C. 200–170), whose famous maxim—"Be not like servants who serve their master for the sake of receiving wages, but be like servants who serve their master without expecting to receive wages; and let the fear of the Lord be upon you" (*Aboth*, i, 3)—a maxim pronounced by Pressensé (in his *Jesus Christ: his Times*, etc.) as "[a noble and almost evangelical one],* truly a most beautiful maxim, and one denoting a legitimate reaction from the legal formalism which was in process of development"—is said to have given rise to Sadduceeism; 2. Jose ben-Joeser, of Zereda, and his companion, Jose ben-Jochanan, of Jerusalem; 3. Jochanan, the high-priest (commonly called John Hyrcanus, q. v.); 4. Jehoshua ben-Perachja, the reputed teacher of Christ, and his colleague, Nithai of Arbela (q. v.); 5. Simon ben-Shetach (q. v.) and Jehudah ben-Tabai; 6. Shemaja (q. v.) and Abtalion; 7. Hillel I (q. v.); 8. Simon ben-Hillel I (q. v.); 9. Gamaliel I (q. v.); 10. Simon II ben-Gamaliel (q. v.), who fell at the defence of Jerusalem; 11. Jochanan ben-Zachai (q. v); 12. Gamaliel II, of Jabne (q. v.); 13. Simon II ben-Gamaliel II (q. v.) and R. Nathan ha-Babli (q. v.); 14. Jehudah I the Holy (q. v.); and, 15. Gamaliel III.

The Tanaïm were followed by the *Amoraïm*, or later doctors of the law; and the fruits of their work are laid down in the Talmud (q. v.), the completion of which (about A.D. 500) terminated the period of the Amoraïm, to be opened by that of the *Saboraïm*, or the teachers of the law after the conclusion of the Talmud. To this period (A.D. 500–657), perhaps, belongs the collection, or final redaction, of some of the lesser Talmudic treatises and the Masorah (q. v.). After the Amoraïm came the so-called *Gaonim*, or the last doctors of the law in the chain of Rabbinic succession, comprising a period from A.D. 657 to 1040. The work of these different schools, together with the biographies of the most distinguished men, will be treated more fully in the art. Scribes.

On the dissolution of the Babylonian schools, Spain, Portugal, and Southern France became the centre of Rabbinism. As early as about A.D. 1000 the Talmud is said to have been translated into Arabic. In Spain, the most flourishing school was that of Cordova, founded by Moses ben-Chanoch (q. v.). Besides Cordova, Rabbinism flourished in Granada, then in Lucena, the most famous representative of which was Isaac ben-Jacob Alfasi (q. v.). To the 11th and 12th centuries belong especially Jehudah ha-Levi ben-Samuel (q. v.), Aben-Ezra (q. v.), the Kimchis (q. v.), and Solomon Parchon (q. v.). In France flourished Gershom ben-Jehudah, or Rabbenu Gershom (q. v.), and Rashi (q. v.). But the most distinguished of all was Moses Maimonides (q. v.), of Cordova, whose philosophical treatment of tradition divided Judaism, after his death, into two hostile parties; and the Spanish and French schools were divided for some time. When, in 1305, Asher ben-Jechiel, of Germany, came into Spain, he succeeded in bringing the French school, which was hostile to philosophy, to supremacy, and thus philosophy was proscribed. But there was another kind of philosophy—if it deserve that name at all—which was especially cultivated in these times—the so-called Cabala, as it especially appears in the Sohar (q. v.). As the foremost representatives of this branch of literature, we may mention Meir ibn-Gabbai (q. v.), Joseph Karo (q. v.), Salomo al Kabez, Moses Cordovero (q. v.), Isaac Loria (q. v.), Moses Galante (q. v.), Samuel Laniado (q. v.), Jacob Zemach, and Hajim Vidal. The invention of the art of printing produced a new activity in the Church as well as in the Synagogue, and the first printed edition of the Talmud, in 1520, at Venice; the edition of the second Bomberg Rabbinic Bible, by Jacob ben-Chajim, in 1526; and the writings of Elias Levita (q. v.), are the first Jewish fruits of the art. Rabbinism was again revived and represented in the schools of Brody, Lemberg, Lublin, Cracow, Prague, Fürth, Frankfort, Venice, and Amsterdam. The party spirit which, in former ages, was represented in the Spanish and French schools was revived in the Portugueso-Italian and Germano-Polish schools. Moses Mendelssohn (q. v.), and his friends—as Hartwig Wessely, David Friedländer, and others—opened a new epoch, and endeavored to enlighten their coreligionists; but the chasm was not healed. On the contrary, a final division was produced; and Reformed and Ortho-

* The clause in brackets is found in the Amer. ed. of 1868, but is omitted in the 4th Engl. ed. (London, 1871).

dox Judaism are the two antipodes of the present day. As a religious system, "Rabbinism," says the late Dr. M'Caul, "has fared like all other religious systems: it has had prejudiced assailants to attack, and over-zealous admirers to defend it. The former have produced whatever they could find objectionable; the latter have carefully kept out of view whatever seemed to its disadvantage. The truth is, that it is a mixed system of good and bad. Founded on the inspired writings of Moses and the prophets, it necessarily contains much truth and wisdom; but, expounded and enlarged by prejudiced men, it presents a strange incongruity of materials." See the art. "Rabbinism," in Herzog's *Real-Encykl.*; the same art. in *Theol. Universal-Lexicon; Wesen des Rabbinismus*, in Jost, *Gesch. d. Judenth. u. s. Secten*, i, 227 sq.; M'Caul, *Sketches of Judaism and the Jews* (London, 1838), ch. iv—"Rabbinism Considered as a Religious System," p. 69 sq. (B. P.)

Rab'bith (Heb. רַבִּית, *Rabbith'* [always with the art.], *multitude;* Sept. Ῥαββάθ v. r. Δαβιρίον), a city in the tribe of Issachar (Josh. xix, 20). Schwarz (*Palest.* p. 166) found a village, *Arubuni*, three English miles west of Beth-shean, which he is disposed to identify with the *Rebbo* of Jerome, and the Rabbith of Joshua. But this is beyond the bounds of Issachar. Probably the locality in question is in the north-east part of the tribe, possibly at the ruins *Sumurieh* (? Samaria).

Rabbling, a term employed to denote the summary ejectment, on Christmas-day, 1688, of Episcopal clergymen and their families by the Scottish populace, after the Revolution. The incumbents were turned out of their houses, and often into the snow; the church doors were locked, and the key was taken away. These measures were certainly harsh and uncalled for; but the people had been exasperated, especially in the west country, by twenty-five years of bloodshed and persecution. Though they were "rude, even to brutality," yet, as lord Macaulay says, "they do not appear to have been guilty of any intentional injury to life or limb." The better part of the people put a stop to the riotous proceedings on the part principally of the Cameronians; but a form of notice, or a threatening letter, was sent to every curate in the Western Lowlands.

RABBLING ACT, a law passed by the Scottish Parliament, in 1698, to prevent disturbance and riots at the settlement of ministers. The Episcopalians in the North rabbled the Presbyterians, especially on the day of an ordination; for they did not like to see their incumbents supplanted. So violent were their measures that the legislature had thus to interfere against them. See REVOLUTION SETTLEMENT.

Rabbo'ni (Ῥαββουνί, or Ῥαββονί, for Chaldaic רַבֻּנִי, *my master*), the title of highest honor applied by the Jews to the teachers of the law. See RABBI. In Mark x, 51 (where it is translated "Lord"), and John xx, 16, it is applied to Christ; but, as it seems to us, rather in its literal acceptation than with reference to the conventional distinction which it implied (if such distinction *then* existed) in the Jewish schools. There were but seven great professors, all of the school of Hillel, to whom the title was publicly given. There is some difference as to their names, and even the Talmud varies in its statements. But the only one there whose name occurs in Scripture is Gamaliel, unless, indeed, as some suppose, the aged Simeon, who blessed the infant Saviour (Luke ii, 25), was the same as the Rabban Simeon of the Talmud. See SIMEON.

Rabe. See ROSENBACH.

Rabh. See RAB.

Rab'-mag (Heb. רַב־מָג, *Rab-mág, chief magician:* Sept. Ῥαβ-μάγ or Ῥαβαμάχ), a word found only in Jer. xxxix, 3 and 13, as a title borne by a certain Nergal-sharezer who is mentioned among the "princes" that accompanied Nebuchadnezzar to the last siege of Jerusalem. Nergal-sharezer is probably identical with the king, called by the Greeks Neriglissar, who ascended the throne of Babylon two years after the death of Nebuchadnezzar. See NERGAL-SHAREZER. This king, as well as certain other important personages, is found to bear the title in the Babylonian inscriptions. It is written, indeed, with a somewhat different vocalization, being read as *Rabu-Emga* by Sir H. Rawlinson. The signification is somewhat doubtful. *Rabu* is most certainly "great," or "chief," an exact equivalent of the Hebrew רַב, whence Rabbi, "a great one, a doctor;" but *Mag*, or *Emga*, is an obscure term. It has been commonly identified with the word "Magus" (Gesenius, *ad voc.* מָג; Calmet, *Commentaire Littéral*, vi, 203, etc.); but this identification is somewhat uncertain, since an entirely different word—one which is read as *Magusu*—is used in that sense throughout the Behistûn inscription (Oppert, *Expédition Scientifique en Mésopotamie*, ii, 209). Sir H. Rawlinson inclines to translate *emga* by "priest," but does not connect it with the Magi, who in the time of Neriglissar had no footing in Babylon. He regards this rendering, however, as purely conjectural, and thinks we can only say at present that the office was one of great power and dignity at the Babylonian court, and probably gave its possessor special facilities for obtaining the throne. See MAGI.

Rab'saces (Ῥαψάκης), a Græcized form (Ecclus. xlviii, 18) of the name RAB-SHAKEH (q. v.).

Rab'-saris (Heb. רַב־סָרִיס, *Rab-Saris*), a name applied to two foreigners, but probably rather the designation of an office than of an individual, the word signifying *chief eunuch;* in Dan. i, 3, Ashpenaz is entitled the master of the eunuchs (Rab-sarisim). Luther translates the word, in the three places where it occurs, as a name of office, the arch-chamberlain (*der Erzkämmerer, der oberste Kämmerer*). Josephus (*Ant.* x, 8, 2) takes them as the A. V. does, as proper names. The chief officers of the court were present attending on the king; and the instance of the eunuch Narses would show that it was not impossible for the Rab-saris to possess some of the qualities fitting him for a military command. In 2 Kings xxv, 19, a eunuch (סָרִיס, *Saris*, in the text of the A. V. "officer," in the margin "eunuch") is spoken of as set over the men of war; and in the sculptures at Nineveh "eunuchs are represented as commanding in war; fighting both on chariots and on horseback, and receiving the prisoners and the heads of the slain after battle" (Layard, *Nineveh*, ii, 325). But whether his office was really that which the title imports, or some other great court office, has been questioned. The chief of the eunuchs is an officer of high rank and dignity in the Oriental courts; and his cares are not confined to the harem, but many high public functions devolve upon him. In the Ottoman Porte the Kislar Aga, or chief of the black eunuchs, is one of the principal personages in the empire, and in an official paper of great solemnity is styled by the sultan the most illustrious of the officers who approach his august person, and worthy of the confidence of monarchs and of sovereigns (D'Ohsson, *Tab. Gén.* iii, 308). It is, therefore, by no means improbable that such an office should be associated with a military commission; perhaps not for directly military duties, but to take charge of the treasure, and to select from the female captives such as might seem worthy of the royal harem. See EUNUCH.

1. (Sept. Ῥαβσαρείς v. r. Ῥαφίς.) An officer of the king of Assyria sent up with Tartan and Rab-shakeh against Jerusalem in the time of Hezekiah (2 Kings xviii, 17). B.C. 713.

2. (Sept. Ναβουσαρείς v. r. Ναβουζαρίς.) One of the princes of Nebuchadnezzar, who was present at the capture of Jerusalem, B.C. 588, when Zedekiah, after en-

deavoring to escape, was taken and blinded and sent in chains to Babylon (Jer. xxxix, 3). Rab-saris is mentioned afterwards (ver. 13) among the other princes who at the command of the king were sent to deliver Jeremiah out of the prison. It is not improbable that we have not only the title of this Rab-saris given, but his name also, either *Sarsechim* (ver. 3) or (ver. 13) *Nebushasban* (worshipper of Nebo, Isa. xlvi, 1), in the same way as Nergal-sharezer is given in the same passages as the name of the Rab-mag.

Rab'-shakeh (Heb. *Rabshakeh'*, רַבְשָׁקֵה; Sept. Ῥαψάκης v. r. Ῥαβσάκης), an Aramaic name, signifying *chief cup-bearer*, but applied to an Assyrian general (2 Kings xviii, 17, 19, 26, 28, 37; xix, 4, 8; Isa. xxxvi, 2, 4, 12, 13, 22; xxxvii, 4, 8). B.C. 713. Notwithstanding its seemingly official significance, it appears to have been used as a proper name, as Butler with us; for the person who bore it was a military chief in high command under Sennacherib, king of Assyria. Yet it is not impossible, according to Oriental usages, that a royal cup-bearer should hold a military command; and the office itself was one of high distinction, in the same way as *Rab-saris* denotes the chief eunuch, and *Rab-mag*, possibly, the chief priest. See Rawlinson, *Ancient Monarchies*, ii, 440. Luther, in his version, is not quite consistent, sometimes (2 Kings xviii, 17; Isa. xxxvi, 2) giving Rab-shakeh as a proper name, but ordinarily translating it as a title of office—arch-cupbearer (*der Erzschenke*). The word *Rab* may be found translated in many places of the English version; for instance, 2 Kings xxv, 8, 20; Jer. xxxix, 11; Dan. ii, 14 (רַב־טַבָּחִים), *Rab-tabbachim*, "captain of the guard"—in the margin, "chief marshal," "chief of the executioners;" Dan. i, 3, *Rab-sarisim*, "master of the eunuchs;" ii, 48 (רַב־סַגְנִין), *Rab-signin*, "chief of the governors;" iv, 9; v, 11 (רַב־חַרְטֻמִּין), *Rab-chartummin*, "master of the magicians;" Jonah i, 6 (רַב חַחֹבֵל), *Rab-hachobél*, "ship-master." It enters into the titles Rabbi, Rabboni, and the name Rabbah. See Rabbi.

Rab-shakeh is the last named of three Assyrian generals sent against Jerusalem in the reign of Hezekiah. Sennacherib, having taken other cities of Judah, was now besieging Lachish; and Hezekiah, terrified at his progress, and losing, for a time, his firm faith in God, sends to Lachish with an offer of submission and tribute. This he strains himself to the utmost to pay, giving for the purpose not only all the treasures of the Temple and palace, but stripping off the gold plates with which he himself, in the beginning of his reign, had overlaid the doors and pillars of the house of the Lord (2 Kings xviii, 16; 2 Chron. xxix, 3; see Rawlinson, *Bampton Lectures*, iv, 141; Layard, *Nineveh and Babylon*, p. 145). But Sennacherib, not content with this—his cupidity being excited rather than appeased—sends a great host against Jerusalem under Tartan, Rab-saris, and Rab-shakeh; not so much, apparently, with the object of at present engaging in the siege of the city as with the idea that, in its present disheartened state, the sight of an army, combined with the threats and specious promises of Rab-shakeh, might induce a surrender at once. In Isa. xxxvi, xxxvii, Rab-shakeh alone is mentioned, the reason of which would seem to be that he acted as ambassador and spokesman, and came so much more prominently before the people than the others. Keil thinks that Tartan had the supreme command, inasmuch as in 2 Kings he is mentioned first, and, according to Isa. xx, 1, conducted the siege of Ashdod. In 2 Chron. xxxii, where, with the addition of some not unimportant circumstances, there is given an abstract of these events, it is simply said that (ver. 9) "Sennacherib king of Assyria sent his servants to Jerusalem." Rab-shakeh seems to have discharged his mission with much zeal, addressing himself, not only to the officers of Hezekiah, but to the people on the wall of the city, setting forth the hopelessness of trusting to any power, human or divine, to deliver them out of the hand of "the great king, the king of Assyria," and dwelling on the many advantages to be gained by submission. Many have imagined, from the familiarity of Rab-shakeh with Hebrew, that he either was a Jewish deserter or an apostate captive of Israel. Whether this be so or not, it is not impossible that the assertion which he makes on the part of his master, that Sennacherib had even the sanction and command of the Lord Jehovah for his expedition against Jerusalem ("Am I now come up without the Lord to destroy it? The Lord said to me, Go up against this land to destroy it"), may have reference to the prophecies of Isaiah (viii, 7, 8; x, 5, 6) concerning the desolation of Judah and Israel by the Assyrians, of which, in some form, more or less correct, he had received information. Being unable to obtain any promise of submission from Hezekiah, who, in the extremity of his peril returning to trust in the help of the Lord, is encouraged by the words and predictions of Isaiah, Rab-shakeh goes back to the king of Assyria, who had now departed from Lachish. See Hezekiah.

Rabulas of Edessa, an Eastern prelate who flourished near the opening of the 5th century, was a student of Theodorus of Mopsuestia, and, in 431, was prominently identified with the Antiochites at the council in Ephesus. In the following year, however, Cyril of Alexandria succeeded in gaining Rabulas to his side; and after this we hear of him as a devout orthodox. He energetically opposed Nestorius, and greatly weakened the Nestorians. He condemned the bishop of Edessa, the writings of Diodorus of Tarsus and of Theodorus of Mopsuestia, banished and drove off the teachers from the school at Edessa who were reputed favorable to their doctrines, and thus became an unwilling instrument in the founding of the school at Nisibis by Barsumas and in the spread of Nestorianism in the East. He died in 436. His successor at Edessa was Ibas (q.v.). Under the name of Rabulas there is extant an old canonical collection of the Syrian Church, pieces of which are contained in the edition of the *Nomoncanon* of Bar-Hebræus by Mai (*Script. Vet. Nov. Coll.* vol. x).

Rabusson, Paul, a French monastic, was born Sept. 5, 1634, at Gannat. After having entered monastic life among the Clugniacs, he taught theology in the abbeys of St. Martial at Avignon, and St. Martin des Champs at Paris. He was also made twice the general of his order (1693–1705, 1708–14). He died at Paris, Oct. 23, 1717. He wrote works of interest only to the student of his order. See Nicéron, *Mémoires*, vol. i.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.

Ra'ca (Ῥακά), a term of reproach used by the Jews of our Saviour's age (Matt. v, 22). Critics are agreed that it is but the Greek form of the Chaldee term רֵיקָא, *reyka'* (the terminal א being the definite article, used in a *vocative* sense), with the sense of "worthless;" but they differ as to whether this term should be connected with the root רוּק, conveying the notion of *emptiness* (Gesen. *Thesaur.* p. 1279), or with one of the cognate roots רָקַק (Tholuck) or רָקַע (Ewald), conveying the notion of *thinness* (Olshausen, De Wette, *On Matt. v*, 22). The first of these views is probably correct. We may compare the use of רִיק, "vain," in Judg. ix, 4; xi, 3, *al.*, and of κενέ in James ii, 20. Jesus, contrasting the law of Moses, which could only take notice of overt acts, with his own, which renders man amenable for his motives and feelings, says in effect: "Whosoever is rashly angry with his brother is liable to the judgment of God; whosoever calls his brother raca is liable to the judgment of the Sanhedrim; but whosoever calls him fool (μωρέ) becomes liable to the judgment of Gehenna." To apprehend the higher criminality here attached to the term fool, which may not at first seem very obvious, it is necessary to observe

that while "raca" denotes a certain looseness of life and manners, "fool" denotes a wicked and reprobate person: foolishness being in Scripture opposed to spiritual wisdom (Lightfoot, *Hor. Hebr.* ad loc.). See FOOL.

Racchei is the name sometimes given by mistake to the *Zacchei* (q. v.).

Racci, MATTEO, a noted Jesuit missionary of the 16th century, is closely identified with the Romanizing work of that æra in the Chinese empire. The very year which marks the death of Xavier (1552), marks the occurrence of an event which opened China to the Europeans. A party of Jesuit missionaries, at whose head was Racci, in that year landed stealthily at Macao. These missionaries of Rome had determined to win over the Chinese to Christianity by stratagem. They had studied mathematics and natural science, with a view to astonish the natives by their exhibitions. Some objects, common enough in Europe, but unheard of in China, were prepared as presents for the mandarins and others. A clock that showed the rising and setting of the sun and moon; a prism that by the emission of its rainbow-rays was mistaken for a fragment of the celestial hemisphere, and maps which exhibited the world of barbarians, with China filling the east and Europe in the remote west, produced sensations of wonder such as had never before stirred the placid spirit of the viceroy of Canton. Instead of driving them away from the country, as they feared, he actually detained the Jesuits to exhibit and explain their wonders; for only they had the secret of keeping that curious machine in action, and only they could manage the spectrum, and expound the new system of geography. Literary men crowded the palace to see the Jesuits and to hear their wisdom, and the missionaries thus gained an influence which they knew well how to utilize. The popularity thus acquired by Racci, Ruggiero, and others was truly astonishing; and by virtue of an imperial edict, Racci took up his residence near the royal palace, and enjoyed the highest reputation for learning. He courted the literati; withheld from their knowledge such parts of the sacred history and doctrine as were likely to offend their prejudices or wound their pride; by his influence at court secured the protection of his brethren in the provinces; and by extreme sagacity surrounded himself with a considerable number of persons who might be variously described as pupils, partisans, converts, or novices. In a secret chapel he disclosed to the more favored symbols of his worship, yet so shaped as not to be repugnant to their heathen notions, and intermingled with other symbols from the religion of Confucius. Racci died in 1610, and was honored with a solemn funeral. The remains of a foreigner never before had such a distinction. It is said that both mandarins and the people saluted with a mournful admiration the corpse of the Jesuit as it was taken to the grave by a company of Christians, with a splendid cross going before it; and that it was interred, by the order of the emperor, in a temple dedicated to the true God.

Rac(c)ovian Catechism was a Polish Protestant compilation stating the different articles of the Slavic Reformers. It was published in 1605 at Racova, a city in the Polish palatinate Sandomir, which owed its origin to the Reformer John Sieminsky, and by his son's (Jacob) acceptance of the Socinian doctrines became the headquarters of this branch of the Polish Reformed Church. Racova became the seat of a theological school. The general synods were held there, of which those of 1580 and 1603 are of historic importance; and, the printing of the Socinians being done there, the catechism came to be known as the Raccovian. It was prepared by Schmalz, Morkorzowsky, and Völkel, and was based on the theological writings of F. Socinus. A Latin edition was published in 1609, dedicated to King James I. of England; a German edition in 1608, dedicated to the Wittenberg University. In 1818 Rees made an English version of the Raccovian Catechism. An abridgment was published in Polish and German in 1605, 1623; and in 1629 in Latin. See Krasinski, *Hist. of the Ref. in Poland*, ii, 370; Gieseler, *Eccles. Hist.* vol. iv; Mosheim, *Eccles. Hist.* vol. iii; Liddon, *Divinity of Christ* (see Index); Farrar, *Critical Hist. of Free Thought*, p. 391; Waterland, *Works*, vol. vi; Hallam, *Intr. to Hist. of Lit.* i, 554; ii, 335. (J. H. W.)

Race (prop. מֵרוֹץ, Eccles. ix, 11; δρόμος, "course;" but in the A. V. the rendering, likewise, of אֹרַח, a *path*, and in the New Test. only of ἀγών and στάδιος). Races were evidently known to the Hebrews (Eccles. ix, 11). In the New Test. there are allusions to the various gymnastic sports and games celebrated by the Greeks. So the term "race" is often used in comparisons drawn from the public races and applied to Christians, as expressing strenuous effort in the Christian life and cause; and we are exhorted to strive after the rewards of the Gospel as strenuously as the athletes did in the public games (1 Cor. ix, 24–27; Gal. ii, 2; v, 7; Phil. ii, 16; iii, 14; 2 Tim. ii, 5; iv, 6–8; Heb. xii, 1). Among the principal public games noticed by the historians are the Olympic, which were celebrated every fifth year, the Pythian, Nemean, and the Isthmian. These exercises principally consisted in trials of strength and skill—in running on foot, wrestling, leaping, throwing the dart and discus, also in the horse-race and chariot-race. See GAME.

The stadium in which they took place was an oblong area terminated at one end by a straight line, at the other by a semicircle having the breadth of the stadium for its base. Around this area were ranges of seats rising above one another in steps. After the Roman conquest of Greece, the form of the stadium was often modified, so as to resemble the amphitheatre, by making both its ends semicircular, and by surrounding it with seats supported by vaulted masonry, as in the Roman amphitheatre. The Ephesian stadium still has such seats around a portion of it.



The Stadium at Ephesus, as restored by Krause.

The most strict and laborious preparation was made for these *agonistic* contests, and the whole course of preparation, as well as the contest, was governed by strict and established rules. The athletes who contended for the prize were divested of clothing; every impediment was removed; the prize was placed on a tripod in the middle of the stadium, in the full view of the competitors; and the crown was placed upon the conqueror's head the moment the issue was proclaimed by the judges. Those per-

Ancient Greek Horse-race.

Ancient Greek Chariot-race.

sons who designed to contend in these games were obliged to repair to the public gymnasium at Elis ten months before the solemnity, where they prepared themselves by continual exercises. No man who had omitted to present himself in this manner was allowed to contend for any of the prizes; nor were the accustomed rewards of victory given to such persons, if by any means they introduced themselves and overcame their antagonists. No person who was himself a notorious criminal, or nearly related to any such, was permitted to contend; and, further, if any person were convicted of bribing his adversary, a severe fine was laid upon him. Nor were these precautions alone thought a sufficient guard against evil and dishonorable contracts and unjust practices, but the contenders were obliged to swear that they had spent ten whole months in preparatory exercises; and both they and their fathers, or brethren, took a solemn oath that they would not, by any sinister or unlawful means, endeavor to stop the fair and just proceedings of the games (Potter, *Greek Antiq.*).

The races themselves were (1) the *foot-race*, (2) the *horse-race*, (3) the *chariot-race*, (4) the *torch-race*, either (*a*) on foot or (*b*) on horseback. Of all these the first was the simplest and the best test of personal capacity. Hence the exercise of *running* was in great esteem among the ancient Grecians, insomuch that those who prepared themselves for it thought it worth their while to use means to burn or parch their spleen, because it was believed to be a hindrance to them and to retard them in their course. Homer tells us that swiftness is one of the most excellent endowments a man can be blessed withal:

> "No greater honor e'er has been attain'd
> Than what strong hands or nimble feet have gain'd."

Indeed, all those exercises that conduced to fit men for war were more especially valued. Swiftness was looked upon as an excellent qualification in a warrior, both because it serves for a sudden assault and onset, and likewise for a nimble retreat; and therefore it is not to be wondered at that the constant character which Homer gives of Achilles is, that he was swift of foot; and in the Holy Scripture, David, in his poetical lamentation over those two great captains Saul and Jonathan, takes particular notice of this warlike quality of theirs: "They were swifter than eagles, stronger than lions" (2 Sam. i, 23). See AHIMAAZ.

Ancient Greek Foot-race.

Ancient Greek Torch-race on Foot.

Such as obtained victories in any of these games, especially the Olympic, were universally honored—nay, almost adored. At their return home they rode in a triumphal chariot into the city, the walls being broken down to give them entrance; which was done (as Plutarch is of opinion) to signify that walls are of small use to a city that is inhabited by men of courage and ability to defend it. At Sparta they had an honorable post in the army, being stationed near the king's person. At some towns they had presents made to them by their native city, were honored with the first place at shows and games, and ever after maintained at the public charge. Cicero reports that a victory in the Olympic games was not much less honorable than a triumph at Rome. Happy was that man esteemed who could but obtain a single victory; if any person merited repeated rewards, he was thought to have attained the utmost felicity of which human nature is capable; but if he came off conqueror in all the exercises, he was elevated above the condition of men, and his actions styled wonderful victories. Nor did their honors terminate in themselves, but were extended to all about them; the city that gave them birth and education was esteemed more honorable and august; happy were their relations, and thrice happy their parents. It is a remarkable story which Plutarch relates of a Spartan who, meeting Diagoras, that had himself been crowned in the Olympic games, and seen his sons and grandchildren victors, embraced him and said, "Now die, Diagoras; for thou

Ancient Greek Torch-race on Horseback.

canst not be a god!"

Medal Commemorating an Isthmian Victory.

By the laws of Solon, a hundred drachms were allowed from the public treasury to every Athenian who obtained a prize in the Isthmian games, and five hundred drachms to such as were victors in the Olympian. Afterwards, the latter of these had their maintenance in the Prytaneum, or public hall of Athens. The rewards given in these games have been thus rendered into English by Addison, from the Greek:

"Greece, in four games thy martial youth were train'd,
For heroes two, and two for gods ordain'd:
Jove bade the olive round his victor wave;
Phœbus to his an apple-garland gave;
The pine Palæmon; nor with less renown,
Archemorus conferr'd the parsley crown."
(*Anc. Med.* Dial. 2.)

Compare with these fading vegetable crowns that immortal life which the Gospel offers as a prize to the victor, in order to understand the apostle's comparison (1 Cor. ix, 25; 1 Pet. v, 4). See CROWN.

Ra'chab (Matt. i, 5). See RAHAB.

Ra'chal (Heb. *Rakal'*, רָכַל, *trade;* Sept. Ῥαχάλ v. r. Ῥαχήλ), a town in the tribe of Judah, and apparently in the southern part; being one of those to which David sent presents out of the spoil of the Amalekites (1 Sam. xxx, 29). "The Vatican edition of the Sept. omits this name, but inserts five names in this passage between 'Eshtemoa' and 'the Jerahmeelites.' The only one of these which has any similarity to Rachal is Carmel, which would suit very well as far as position goes; but it is impossible to consider the two as identical without further evidence." See DAVID.

Racham, Rachamah. See GIER-EAGLE.

Rachel. See SHEEP.

Ra'chel (Heb. *Rachel'*, רָחֵל, a "ewe" or "sheep," as in Gen. xxxi, 38; xxxii, 14; Cant. vi, 6; Isa. liii, 7; Sept. and New Test. Ῥαχήλ, Josephus Ῥαχήλας), the younger daughter of the Aramæan grazier Laban (Gen. xxix, 16), whom Jacob, her near blood-relation, earned for his wife, as wages for a second seven-years' service (ver. 18 sq.). B.C. 1920. See LEAH. After a long period of unfruitfulness, she bore him a son (xxix, 31), Joseph (xxx, 22 sq.). She went with him to Canaan, on which occasion she stole the household gods of her father and hid them artfully (xxxi, 19, 34), and finally died on the journey, after the birth of Benjamin, not far from Ephrath (xxxv, 16 sq.). See RACHEL'S TOMB.

"The story of Jacob and Rachel has always had a peculiar interest: there is that in it which appeals to some of the deepest feelings of the human heart. The beauty of Rachel, the deep love with which she was loved by Jacob from their first meeting by the well of Haran, when he showed to her the simple courtesies of the desert life, and kissed her and told her he was Rebekah's son; the long servitude with which he patiently served for her, in which the seven years 'seemed to him but a few days, for the love he had to her;' their marriage at last, after the cruel disappointment through the fraud which substituted the elder sister in the place of the younger; and the death of Rachel at the very time when, in giving birth to another son, her own long-delayed hopes were accomplished, and she had become still more endeared to her husband; his deep grief and ever-living regrets for her loss (Gen. xlviii, 7)—these things make up a touching tale of personal and domestic history which has kept alive the memory of Rachel—the beautiful, the beloved, the untimely-taken-away—and has preserved to this day a reverence for her tomb; the very infidel invaders of the Holy Land having respected the traditions of the site, and erected over the spot a small, rude shrine, which conceals whatever remains may have once been found of the pillar first set up by her mourning husband over her grave. Yet, from what is related to us concerning Rachel's character, there does not seem much to claim any high degree of admiration and esteem. The discontent and fretful impatience shown in her grief at being for a time childless, moved even her fond husband to anger (xxx, 1, 2). She appears, moreover, to have shared all the duplicity and falsehood of her family, of which we have such painful instances in Rebekah, in Laban, and, not least, in her sister Leah, who consented to bear her part in the deception practiced upon Jacob. See, for instance, Rachel's stealing her father's images, and the ready dexterity and presence of mind with which she concealed her theft (ch. xxxi): we seem to detect here an apt scholar in her father's school of untruth. From this incident we may also infer (though this is rather the misfortune of her position and circumstances) that she was not altogether free from the superstitions and idolatry which prevailed in the land whence Abraham had been called (Josh. xxiv, 2, 14), and which still to some degree infected even those families among whom the true God was known. The events which preceded the death of Rachel are of much interest and worthy of a brief consideration. The presence in his household of these idolatrous images, which Rachel, and probably others also, had brought from the East, seems to have been either unknown to or connived at by Jacob for some years after his return from Haran; till, on being reminded by the Lord of the vow which he had made at Bethel when he fled from the face of Esau, and being bidden by him to erect an altar to the God who appeared to him there, Jacob felt the glaring impiety of thus solemnly appearing before God with the taint of impiety cleaving to him or his, and 'said to his household and all that were with him, Put away the strange gods from among you' (Gen. xxxv, 2). After thus casting out the polluting thing from his house, Jacob journeyed to Bethel, where, amid the associations of a spot consecrated by the memories of the past, he received from God an emphatic promise and blessing, and, the name of the Supplanter being laid aside, he had given to him instead the holy name of Israel. Then it was, after his spirit had been there purified and strengthened by communion with God, by the assurance of the divine love and favor, by the consciousness of evil put away and duties performed—then it was, as he journeyed away from Bethel, that the chastening blow fell and Rachel died. These circumstances are alluded to here not so much for their bearing upon the spiritual discipline of Jacob, but rather with reference to Rachel herself, as suggesting the hope that they may have had their effect in bringing her to a higher sense of her relations to that Great Jehovah in whom her husband, with all his faults of character, so firmly believed." The character of Rachel cannot certainly be drawn from the few features given in the history; yet Niemeyer (*Charak.* ii, 315) thinks that sufficient ground exists for preferring the disposition of Leah to that of her sister.

Those who take an interest in such interpretations may find the whole story of Rachel and Leah allegorized by St. Augustine (*Contra Faustum Manichæum*, xxii, li–lviii, vol. viii, 432, etc., ed. Migne) and Justin Martyr (*Dialogue with Trypho*, c. 134, p. 360; see also Archer, *Rachel a Type of the Church* [Lond. 1843]). See JACOB.

In Jer. xxxi, 15, 16, the prophet refers to the historical event of the exile of the ten tribes (represented by "Ephraim") under Shalmaneser, king of Assyria, and the sorrow occasioned by their dispersion (2 Kings xvii, 20), under the symbol of Rahel (q. v.), i. e. Rachel, the maternal ancestor of the tribes of Ephraim and Manasseh, bewailing the fate of her children. This lamentation was *a type* or symbol of another connected with the early history of our Lord, which met with its *fulfilment* in the mournful scene at Bethlehem and its vicinity, when so many infants were slaughtered under the barbarous edict of Herod (Matt. ii, 16–18). See RAMAH.

RACHEL'S TOMB (קֶבֶר־רָחֵל, *Kibráth Rachêl;* Sept. in Gen. for the former half of the title μνημεῖον, but in Jer. xlviii, 7, and 2 Kings v, 19, Χαβραθά. This seems to have been accepted as the name of the spot [Demetrius in Eus. *Pr. Ev.* ix, 21], and to have been actually encountered there by a traveller in the 12th century [Burchard de Strasburg, by Saint-Genois, p. 35], who gives the Arabic name of Rachel's tomb as *Cabrata*, or *Carbata*. The present name is *Kubbet Rahil*, i. e. "Rachel's grave"). "Rachel died and was buried in the way to Ephrath, which is Bethlehem. And Jacob set a pillar upon her grave: that is the pillar of Rachel's grave unto this day" (Gen. xxxv, 19, 20). As Rachel is the first related instance of death in childbearing, so this pillar over her grave is the first recorded example of the setting-up of a sepulchral monument; caves having been up to this time spoken of as the usual places of burial. The spot was well known in the time of Samuel and Saul (1 Sam. x, 2); and the prophet Jeremiah, by a poetic figure of great force and beauty, represents the buried Rachel weeping for the loss and captivity of her children, as the bands of the exiles, led away on their road to Babylon, passed near her tomb (Jer. xxxi, 15–17). Matthew (ii, 17, 18) applies this to the slaughter by Herod of the infants at Bethlehem. See RACHEL.

The position of the Ramah here spoken of is one of the disputed questions in the topography of Palestine [see RAMAH]; but the site of Rachel's tomb, "on the way to Bethlehem," "a little way to come to Ephrath," "in the border of Benjamin," has never been questioned. It is about five miles south of Jerusalem, and half a mile north of Bethlehem. "It is one of the shrines which Moslems, Jews, and Christians agree in honoring, and concerning which their traditions are identical." It was visited by Maundrell in 1697. The description given by Dr. Robinson (i, 218) may serve as the representative of the many accounts, all agreeing with each other, which may be read in almost every book of Eastern travel. It is "merely an ordinary Moslem *wely*, or tomb of a holy person—a small square building of stone with a dome, and within it a tomb in the ordinary Mohammedan form, the whole plastered over with mortar. Of course the building is not ancient: in the 7th century there was here only a pyramid of stones. It is now neglected and falling to decay, though pilgrimages are still made to it by the Jews. The naked walls are covered with names in several languages, many of them in Hebrew. The general correctness of the tradition which has fixed upon this spot for the tomb of Rachel cannot well be drawn in question, since it is fully supported by the circumstances of the Scriptural narrative. It is also mentioned by the *Itin. Hieros.*, A.D. 333, and by Jerome (Ep. lxxxvi, *ad Eustoch. Epitaph. Paulæ*) in the same century." Since Robinson's visit, it has been enlarged by the addition of a square court on the east side, with high walls and arches (*Later Researches*, p. 273). Schwarz (*Palest.* p. 109 sq.) strongly supports the identity of the true grave of Rachel with the monument which now bears that name (see also *Bibliotheca Sacra*, 1830, p. 602; *Journ. of Sac. Lit.* April, 1864). This monument is particularly described by Hackett (*Illust. of Script.* p. 101 sq.). See BETHLEHEM.



Rachel's Tomb.

Racine, BONAVENTURE, a French priest and historian, was born at Chauny, Nov. 25, 1708, and was the son of the most illustrious of French poets. He was educated at Paris, in the Collége Mazarin, and made remarkable progress in the languages and in theology. In 1729 he was placed at the head of the Collége de Rabasteins; but in 1731, becoming satisfied of the injustice done the Jansenists in the bull *Unigenitus* [see JANSENISM], he took ground against it, and thereby so displeased the powers that were at Rome and at Paris that he was displaced. The bishop of Montpellier, however, took his part, and gave him the presidency of the college at Lunel. But the Jesuits set the flames of opposition going, and Racine was obliged to quit Lunel in much haste. He went to Paris, and there supported himself by teaching as a private tutor after having been ousted, by order of the cardinal Fleury, from a minor position he had secured at a Paris college. Finally the bishop of Auxerre, M. de Caylus, took an interest in Racine, called him into his diocese, and gave him a canonicate in his cathedral. He died May 15, 1755. He wrote much. His principal work is an *Abrégé de l'Histoire Ecclésiastique* (Paris, 1748–56, 13 vols. 4to), which clearly reveals the position of its author on the important ecclesiastical questions of his time, and is a valuable index to the Jansenistic proclivities of France in the 18th century. His *Réflexions sur l'Histoire Ecclésiastique* (2 vols. 12mo) are not less valuable. See Feller, *Dict. Historique*, s. v.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.

Radbertus. See PASCHASIUS.

Radbod, ST., a Dutch prelate of the Church of Rome, flourished in the second half of the 9th century. He was educated at Cologne, and, being of noble birth, was much at the court of Charles the Bald. In 899 he was placed over the church at Utrecht, and he ruled this episcopal charge with great devotion and honor. He died, according to Mabillon, in 918. For his writings, see *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, vi, 158.

Rad'dai (Heb. *Raddaʼy*, רַדַּי, *trampling;* Sept. Ῥαδδαΐ v. r. Ζαβδαΐ), the fifth of the seven sons of Jesse, and an elder brother of king David (1 Chron. ii, 14). B.C. 1068. He does not appear in the Bible elsewhere than in this list, unless he be, as Ewald conjectures (*Geschichte*, iii, 266, note), identical with Rei (q. v.).

Radegunda, ST., daughter of Berthar, a prince of Thuringia, flourished in the earlier part of the 6th century. Having been carried as a prisoner to France in the twelfth year of her age by Clothaire V, at that time

king of the district whose capital is now called Soissons, she was educated in the Christian religion, and when she reached a maturer age was induced, very reluctantly, to become his wife. Her own wish having been to become a nun, her married life was in great measure given up to works of charity and religion, and Clothaire complained that he "had married a nun rather than a queen." Romanists delight in extolling her virtues, and many curious feats are reported to have been performed by her. Thus they tell that one day, as she walked in her garden, she heard the prisoners, who were only separated from her by a wall, weeping and imploring pity. She thought only of her own sorrows in the past, and she prayed earnestly for them, not knowing how else to aid them; and as she prayed, their fetters burst asunder, and they were freed from captivity. Eventually, about the year 553, Radegunda obtained the king's leave to retire to a monastery at Noyon, where she was consecrated a deaconess by the bishop Medard. Soon afterwards she founded a monastery at Poitiers, in which she lived as a simple sister, but which she endowed richly, not only with money and lands, but also with relics and other sacred objects obtained from the Holy Land and all the more eminent churches of the East and West. It was on the occasion of the translation to her church at Poitiers of a relic of the holy cross that the Christian poet Venantius Fortunatus composed the celebrated and truly magnificent Latin hymn, *Vexilla Regis Proderent*. Radegunda outlived him by more than a quarter of a century, during which she was regarded as a model of Christian virtue; and her life has formed the subject of many beautiful legends, still popular in Germany and France. Her monastery, before her death, which took place in 587, numbered no fewer than 200 nuns. Her feast is held on August 13, the anniversary of her death. In ecclesiastical paintings she is represented with the royal crown, and beneath it a long veil. See Butler, *Lives of the Saints*, Aug. 13; Montalembert, *Monks of the West*, vol. ii, bk. vi; *Chambers's Encyclop.* s. v.; Rettberg, *Kirchengesch. Deutschlands*, vol. ii.

Rader, Matthæus, a learned German Jesuit, was born at Jeichingen, in the Tyrol, in 1561. He flourished for a while as a teacher of rhetoric at Augsburg, then joined the order, and was engaged in various important missions for the Jesuits. He died at Munich in 1634. He published several editions of classical and ecclesiastical writers, and wrote, among others, *Vita Canisii* (1614):—*Bavaria Sancta* (1615):—*Bavaria Pia* (1628):—*Viridiarium Sanctorum* (1604–12).

Radewin, Florentinus, a Roman Catholic of note, was born at Leyerdam, in Holland, about 1350, studied at Prague, and was for some time canon at Utrecht. He became associated with Gerard de Groot, and was one of the founders of the Brethren of the Common Life, and after De Groot's death (1384) was placed at the head of the brotherhood. He died about 1400. He was also the founder of the convent of the regular canons at Windesheim, near Zwolle, and of the frater-house at Deventer; he thus became, so to speak, the second founder of the Brethren of the Common Life. His *Life* was written by Thomas à Kempis. See Ullmann, *Reformers before the Reformation*, ii, 81 sq.; Gieseler, *Kirchengesch.* ii, 3, 226 sq. (J. H. W.)

Radha Vallabhis, a Hindû sect which worships Krishna as Radha Vallabha, the lord or lover of Radha. This favorite mistress of Krishna is the object of adoration to all the sects who worship that deity, but the adoration of Radha is of very recent origin. The founder of this sect is alleged to have been a teacher named Hari Vans, who settled at Vrindavan, and established a *math* there, which, in 1822, comprised between forty and fifty resident ascetics. He also erected a temple there which still exists.

Raey, John de, a Dutch theologian and philosopher, flourished in the second half of the 17th century, at Leyden. He was a devoted Cartesianist, and distinguished himself greatly as such in 1665 at public disputation. He was in favor of complete alienation of philosophy from religion, and had a dangerous tendency to scepticism of the very worst character. See Spanheim, *Epistola*, in *Opp.* i, 959.

Raffaelle. See Raphael.

Rafflenghen, Franz, a Dutch theologian of note, was born at Lancy, near Ryssel, in 1539. He was educated at Leyden University, and greatly distinguished himself in the Greek and Oriental languages. He was first made professor of the former at Cambridge, and later of the latter languages at his alma mater. He died in 1597. Rafflenghen corrected the Antwerp Polyglot, and wrote, *Lexicon Arab.* (Leyden, 1599):—*Dict. Chald.*:—*Gramm. Hebr.*, and other works.

Raffles, Thomas, D.D., LL.D., an English Independent divine of great celebrity as a pulpit orator and theologian, was born in London, May 17, 1788, of good parentage, and was connected with Sir Thomas S. Raffles. He pursued his theological studies at Homerton College, and in 1809 was settled as a Congregational minister at Hammersmith. In 1812 he accepted a call from the Great George Street Chapel in Liverpool, and remained sole pastor until 1858, when he was furnished a colleague as an assistant. In 1860 he resigned his charge, and withdrew from the responsibilities of the stated ministry altogether, his health having become inadequate to any considerable labor, yet he preached frequently after that at the opening of chapels and on other similar public occasions. He died Aug. 18, 1863. Probably no minister in the Congregational body in England has been more widely or more favorably known during the last half century than Dr. Raffles. Besides being one of the most popular preachers in Great Britain, and being called abroad on occasions of public interest oftener, perhaps, than any other one, he has done good service to the cause both of literature and religion by his pen. In 1817 he published a highly interesting volume of *Letters during a Tour through Some Parts of France, Savoy, Switzerland, Germany, and the Netherlands*. Shortly after the commencement of his ministry he preached a sermon before the London Missionary Society, which attracted great attention and was very widely circulated; and several other of his discourses have been given to the public and received with great favor. He was accustomed to celebrate the return of the new year by an appropriate piece of poetry, which was printed and sent forth among his friends as a most welcome remembrancer. He has, in addition to these pieces, written many beautiful hymns, some of which have found their way into some of the collections of sacred song. He is also the author of a *Memoir* of the life and ministry of his predecessor, the Rev. Thomas Spencer, a work which passed through many editions, and in America it has been several times reprinted. His *Lectures on Christian Faith and Practice*, though widely circulated, deserve to be better known than they are, being a clear and conclusive exposition and vindication of the Gospel and the rule and motives of morality. He published several separate sermons preached on various public occasions, and contributed frequently to periodicals. See *The Patriot* (Liverpool), Aug. 20, 1863; *N. Y. Observer*, Sept. 19, 1863; *Princeton Rev.* April, 1870, art. iii.

Raffles, Thomas Stamford, *Sir*, an English philanthropist, born July 5, 1781, was British governor of the island of Java from 1811 to 1816, and, after a visit home, returned to the East as resident at Bencoolen, in Sumatra, and was instrumental in founding a college for the promotion of Anglo-Chinese literature. He died in England, July 4, 1826. He published a *History of Java*.

Rafin, Gaspard, a French Protestant minister, was born at Réalmont (Tarn), in the first half of the 16th century. He was a devoted Huguenot, and his home

was the rallying-place of French Protestants during the days of oppression and persecution.

Ra'gau (Ῥαγαῦ; Vulg. *Ragau*), the Greek form of the name of a place and of a person.

1. A place named only in the Apocrypha (Judith i, 5, 15). In the latter verse the "mountains of Ragau" are mentioned. It is probably identical with RAGES (q. v.).

2. One of the ancestors of our Lord, son of Phalec (Luke iii, 35). He is the same person with REU (q. v.), son of Peleg; and the difference in the name arises from our translators having followed the Greek form, in which the Hebrew ע was frequently expressed by γ, as is the case in Raguel (which once occurs for Reuel), Gomorrha, Gotholiah (for Atholiah), Phogor (for Peor), etc.

Ra'ges (Ῥάγη, Ῥάγοι; Vulg. *Rages, Ragau*) was an important city in north-eastern Media, where that country bordered upon Parthia. It is not mentioned in the Hebrew Scriptures, but occurs frequently in the book of Tobit (i, 14; v, 5; vi, 9, 12, etc.), and twice in Judith ("Ragau" [i, 5, 15]). According to Tobit, it was a place to which some of the Israelitish captives taken by Shalmaneser (Enemessar) had been transported, and thither the angel Raphael conducted the young Tobiah. In the book of Judith it is made the scene of the great battle between Nebuchodonosor and Arphaxad, wherein the latter is said to have been defeated and taken prisoner. Neither of these accounts can be regarded as historic, but the latter may conceal a fact of some importance in the history of the city.

Rages is a place mentioned by a great number of profane writers. The name is said to have been derived from the *chasms* (ῥαγάς) made in the vicinity by earthquakes (Strabo, i, 13). It appears as *Ragha* in the Zendavesta, in Isidore, and in Stephen; as *Ruga* in the inscriptions of Darius; *Rhagæ* in Duris of Samos (Fr. 25), Strabo (xi, 9, § 1), and Arrian (*Exp. Alex.* iii, 20); and *Rhagæa* in Ptolemy (vi, 5). Properly speaking, Rages is a town, but the town gave name to a province, which is sometimes called Rages or Rhagæ, sometimes Rhagiana. It appears from the Zendavesta that here was one of the earliest settlements of the Arians, who were mingled, in Rhagiana, with two other races, and were thus brought into contact with heretics (Bunsen, *Philosophy of Universal History*, iii, 485). Isidore calls Rages "the greatest city in Media" (p. 6), which may have been true in his day; but other writers commonly regard it as much inferior to Ecbatana. It was the place to which Frawartish (Phraortes), the Median rebel, fled when defeated by Darius Hystaspis, and at which he was made prisoner by one of Darius's generals (*Beh. Inscr.* col. ii, par. 13). See MEDIA. This is probably the fact which the apocryphal writer of Judith had in his mind when he spoke of Arphaxad as having been captured at Ragau. When Darius Codomannus fled from Alexander, intending to make a final stand in Bactria, he must have passed through Rages on his way to the Caspian Gates; and so we find that Alexander arrived there, in pursuit of his enemy, on the eleventh day after he quitted Ecbatana (Arrian, *Exp. Alex.* iii, 20). In the troubles which followed the death of Alexander, Rages appears to have gone to decay, but it was soon after rebuilt by Seleucus I (Nicator), who gave it the name of Europus (Strab. xi, 13, § 6; Steph. Byz. ad voc.). When the Parthians took it, they called it *Arsacia*, after the Arsaces of the day; but it soon afterwards recovered its ancient appellation, as we see by Strabo and Isidore. That appellation it has ever since retained, with only a slight corruption, the ruins being still known by the name of *Rhey*. These ruins lie about five miles south-east of Teheran, and cover a space 4500 yards long by 3500 yards broad. The walls are well marked, and are of prodigious thickness; they appear to have been flanked by strong towers, and are connected with a lofty citadel at their north-eastern angle. The importance of the place consisted in its vicinity to the Caspian Gates, which, in a certain sense, it guarded. Owing to the barren and desolate character of the great salt desert of Iran, every army which seeks to pass from Bactria, India, and Afghanistan to Media and Mesopotamia, or *vice versa*, must skirt the range of mountains which runs along the southern shore of the Caspian. These mountains send out a rugged and precipitous spur in about long. 52° 25′ E. from Greenwich, which runs far into the desert, and can only be rounded with the extremest difficulty. Across this spur is a single pass—the Pylæ Caspiæ of the ancients—and of this pass the possessors of Rhages must have at all times held the keys. The modern Teheran, built out of its ruins, has now superseded Rhey; and it is perhaps mainly from the importance of its position that it has become the Persian capital. For an account of the ruins of Rhey, see Ker Porter, *Travels*, i, 357–364; and compare Fraser, *Khorassan*, p. 286.

Ragged Schools is the popular name for a voluntary agency providing education for destitute children, and so preventing them from falling into vagrancy and crime. Vagrant children, and those guilty of slight offences, are provided for in the English Certified Industrial School; but the two institutions are in Great Britain frequently combined. See INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS. The movement which established ragged schools was almost simultaneous with that which instituted reformatories. John Borgia, an unlettered laboring mason, established a "ragged school" towards the close of the last century, composed of thievish and vagrant children gathered from the streets and by-ways of Rome. A few years later, John Pounds, an uneducated cobbler, for twenty years, till his death in 1839, gathered into his shop the most destitute and degraded children of Portsmouth, and thus instituted the first ragged school in England. Both wrought miracles among the juvenile *gamins* of the street. The mental, industrial, moral, and religious training which they imparted to the juvenile generation of their time was a work most appropriately honored as "the beginning of the greatest of all social problems." It saved thousands of children from beggary and vice, and raised multitudes from the verge of infamy to the rank of a useful and honored life. The first school in which education was accompanied by offer of food was opened by Sheriff Watson in Aberdeen in 1841, and from thence ragged feeding-schools spread over all the country. London had a ragged Sunday-school in 1838, which eventually became a free day-school. Field Lane followed in 1843. The Ragged School Union of London in 1864 numbered 201 day-schools, with 17,983 scholars (of these, 2849 were industrial); 180 Sunday-schools, with 23,360 scholars; and 205 night-schools, with 8325 scholars. The number of schools throughout the country cannot be ascertained, as they are not officially known. A Privy-council minute of 1856 allowed a capitation grant of £2 10*s.* to every child fed in the schools. This was withdrawn in 1859, as was also the grant of one third the cost of material used in industrial training. Many of the existing schools certified under the Act of 1857, as in Scotland under Mr. Dunlop's Act of 1854; but these acts operated very slightly in changing the character of the schools, though introducing the principle of compulsory detention, more fully worked out under recent acts. In the present code of government education, ragged schools are left out. They can obtain grants on the same conditions as other schools—conditions to them often difficult and unnecessary. For industrial teaching, they receive nothing. The ragged school joined to the certified industrial is precluded from aid from any quarter. There are still, it is estimated, 25,000 ragged children in the streets of London. Schools for the instruction of poor colored children were established by the Friends of Philadelphia as early as 1770, and their benevolent care has not relaxed in this respect for an entire century. See also SUNDAY-SCHOOLS.

Ragstatt, Frederic, of Weile, a minister of the Reformed Church, was born, of Jewish parents, at Metz in 1648. In the year 1671 he was baptized at Cleves in the faith of the Reformed Church; and his conversion and public confession of the divine truths of Christianity were not less remarkable. Shortly after his baptism, when scarcely twenty-three years of age, he published a Latin apology: *Theatrum Lucidum, exhibens Verum Messiam, Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum, ejusque Honorem Defendens contra Accusationes Judæorum seu Rabbinorum in Genere, speciatim R. Lipmanni Nizzachon* (Amst. 1671), in which the name of the Messiah, our Lord Jesus Christ, was gloriously maintained against the abominable Nizzachon of the famous Rabbi Lipmann (q. v.). Having studied at Groningen and Leyden, in 1680 he was called to the pastorate at Spyk, near Gorcum, in South Holland, where he labored with great blessing, bringing many of his former coreligionists to the foot of the cross. Besides his *Theatrum*, he published some other writings. See Fürst, *Bibl. Judaica*, iii, 128 sq.; Jöcher, *Gelehrten-Lexikon*, s. v. "Von Weile;" Wolf, *Biblioth. Hebr.* I, iii, 4 (Nuremb. 1850); Bayle, *Dictionnaire*, s. v.; Kalkar, *Israel u. die Kirche*, p. 63 sq.; Delitzsch, *Wissenschaft, Kunst u. Judenthum*, p. 138; Da Costa, *Israel and the Gentiles*, p. 561 sq. (B. P.)

Ragu'el (Heb. *Reuel'*, רְעוּאֵל; Sept. Ῥαγουήλ), a less correct Anglicism of the name Reuel (q. v.).

1. A prince-priest of Midian, the father of Zipporah, according to Exod. ii, 21, and of Hobab according to Numb. x, 29. As the father-in-law of Moses is named Jethro in Exod. iii, 1, and Hobab in Judg. iv, 11, and perhaps in Numb. x, 29 (though the latter passage admits of another sense), the *prima-facie* view would be that Raguel, Jethro, and Hobab were different names for the same individual. Such is probably the case with regard to the two first, at all events, if not with the third. See Hobab. One of the names may represent an official title, but whether Jethro or Raguel is uncertain, both being appropriately significant (Jethro = "pre-eminent," from יָתַר, "to excel," and Raguel = "friend of God," from רֵעַ אֵל). Josephus was in favor of the former (τοῦτο, i. e. Ἰεθεγλαΐος, ἣν ἐπίκλημα τῷ Ῥαγουήλῳ, *Ant.* ii, 12, 1), and this is not unlikely, as the name Reuel was not an uncommon one. The identity of Jethro and Reuel is supported by the indiscriminate use of the names in the Sept. (Exod. ii, 16, 18); and the application of more than one name to the same individual was a usage familiar to the Hebrews, as instanced in Jacob and Israel, Solomon and Jedidiah, and other similar cases. Another solution of the difficulty has been sought in the loose use of terms of relationship among the Hebrews; as that *chothên* (חֹתֵן) in Exod. iii, 1; xviii, 1; Numb. x, 29, may signify any relation by marriage, and consequently that Jethro and Hobab were brothers-in-law of Moses; or that the terms *âb* (אָב) and *bath* (בַּת) in Exod. ii, 16, 21, mean *grandfather* and *granddaughter*. Neither of these assumptions is satisfactory, the former in the absence of any corroborative evidence, the latter because the omission of Jethro, the father's name, in so circumstantial a narrative as in Exod. ii, is inexplicable; nor can we conceive the indiscriminate use of the terms father and grandfather without good cause. Nevertheless, this view has a strong weight of authority in its favor, being supported by the Targum Jonathan, Aben-Ezra, Michaelis, Winer, and others. See Jethro.

2. Another transcription of the name Reuel, occurring in Tobit, where Raguel, a pious Jew of "Ecbatane, a city of Media," is father of Sara, the wife of Tobias (Tob. iii, 7, 17, etc.). The name was not uncommon, and in the book of Enoch it is applied to one of the great guardian angels of the universe, who was charged with the execution of the divine judgments on the (material) world and the stars (xx, 4; xxiii, 4, ed. Dillmann).

Ragueneau, Frédéric de, a French prelate who flourished in the second half of the 16th century. He was of noble birth, and after taking holy orders, his uncle vacated the bishopric of Marseilles in order to make room for him. He became a zealous and devoted ecclesiastic, and in many instances displayed more than ordinary manliness. As he was suspected of a strong leaning towards Protestantism, the leaguists greatly annoyed him, and he finally quitted the country, as his life was threatened. He took refuge with Christina of Lorraine in Italy, until after the abjuration of Henry IV, when Ragueneau returned to France; but he paid for his trust in the change of the times by his life's blood. He was assassinated Sept. 26, 1603, in his castle. See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xli, 473, 474; *Arrêt du Parlement de Province contre les Auteurs de l'Assassinat commis sur la Personne de F. de Ragueneau* (new ed. Marseilles, 1854, 8vo).

Ra'hab, the form, in the A. V., of two names quite different in the Hebrew.

1. (Heb. *Rachab'*, רָחָב, *wide;* Sept. Ῥαχάβ [and so in Matt. i, 5, "Rachab"], Ῥαάβ; Josephus, Ῥαχάβης, *Ant.* v, 1, 2.) A woman of Jericho at the time of the Eisode, whose name has become famous in that connection (Josh. ii) and in Jewish lineage (B.C. 1618). In the following account of her we chiefly follow the Biblical and other ancient authorities, with additions from modern sources. See Exode.

1. *Her History.*—At the time of the arrival of the Israelites in Canaan she was a young unmarried woman, dwelling in a house of her own alone, though she had a father and mother, and brothers and sisters, living in Jericho. She was a "harlot," and probably combined the trade of lodging-keeper for wayfaring men. She seems also to have been engaged in the manufacture of linen, and the art of dyeing, for which the Phœnicians were early famous; since we find the flat roof of her house covered with stalks of flax put there to dry, and a stock of scarlet or crimson (שָׁנִי, *shanî*) thread in her house—a circumstance which, coupled with the mention of Babylonish garments at vii, 21 as among the spoils of Jericho, indicates the existence of a trade in such articles between Phœnicia and Mesopotamia. Her house was situated on the wall, probably near the town gate, so as to be convenient for persons coming in and going out of the city. Traders coming from Mesopotamia or Egypt to Phœnicia would frequently pass through Jericho, situated as it was near the fords of the Jordan; and of these many would resort to the house of Rahab. Rahab, therefore, had been well informed with regard to the events of the Exodus. She had heard of the passage through the Red Sea, of the utter destruction of Sihon and Og, and of the irresistible progress of the Israelitish host. The effect upon her mind had been what one would not have expected in a person of her way of life: it led her to a firm faith in Jehovah as the true God, and to the conviction that he purposed to give the land of Canaan to the Israelites. When, therefore, the two spies sent by Joshua came to her house, they found themselves under the roof of one who, alone, probably, of the whole population, was friendly to their nation. Their coming, however, was quickly known; and the king of Jericho, having received information of it—while at supper, according to Josephus—sent, that very evening, to require her to deliver them up. It is very likely that, her house being a public one, some one who resorted there may have seen and recognised the spies, and gone off at once to report the matter to the authorities. But not without awakening Rahab's suspicions; for she immediately hid the men among the flax-stalks which were piled on the flat roof of her house, and, on the arrival of the officers sent to search her house, was ready with the story that two

men—of what country she knew not—had, it was true, been to her house, but had left it just before the gates were shut for the night. If they pursued them at once, she added, they would be sure to overtake them. Misled by the false information, the men started in pursuit to the fords of the Jordan, the gates having been opened to let them out, and immediately closed again. When all was quiet, and the people were gone to bed, Rahab stole up to the house-top, told the spies what had happened, and assured them of her faith in the God of Israel, and her confident expectation of the capture of the whole land by them—an expectation, she added, which was shared by her countrymen, and had produced a great panic among them. She then told them her plan for their escape: it was to let them down by a cord from the window of her house, which looked over the city wall, and that they should flee into the mountains which bounded the plains of Jericho, and lie hidden there for three days, by which time the pursuers would have returned, and the fords of the Jordan be open to them again. She asked, in return for her kindness to them, that they should swear by Jehovah that, when their countrymen had taken the city, they would spare her life, and the lives of her father and mother, brothers and sisters, and all that belonged to them. The men readily consented; and it was agreed between them that she should hang out her scarlet line at the window from which they had escaped, and bring all her family under her roof. If any of her kindred went out-of-doors into the street, his blood would be upon his own head; and the Israelites, in that case, would be guiltless. The event proved the wisdom of her precautions. The pursuers returned to Jericho after a fruitless search, and the spies got safe back to the Israelitish camp. The news they brought of the terror of the Canaanites doubtless inspired Israel with fresh courage, and within three days of their return the passage of the Jordan was effected. In the utter destruction of Jericho which ensued, Joshua gave the strictest orders for the preservation of Rahab and her family; and, accordingly, before the city was burned, the two spies were sent to her house, and they brought out her, her father, and mother, and brothers, and kindred, and all that she had, and placed them in safety in the Israelitish camp. The narrator adds, "and she dwelleth in Israel unto this day;" not necessarily implying that she was alive at the time he wrote, but that the family of strangers of which she was reckoned the head continued to dwell among the children of Israel. May not the three hundred and forty-five "children of Jericho" mentioned in Ezra ii, 34; Neh. vii, 36, and "the men of Jericho" who assisted Nehemiah in rebuilding the walls of Jerusalem (Neh. iii, 2) have been their posterity? Their continued sojourn among the Israelites as a distinct family would be exactly analogous to the cases of the Kenites, the house of Rechab, the Gibeonites, the house of Caleb, and perhaps others. See JERICHO.

As regards Rahab herself, we learn from Matt. i, 5 that she became the wife of Salmon, the son of Nahshon, and the ancestress of Boaz, Jesse's grandfather. The suspicion naturally arises that Salmon may have been one of the spies whose life she saved, and that gratitude for so great a benefit led, in his case, to a more tender passion, and obliterated the memory of any past disgrace attaching to her name. We are expressly told that the spies were "young men" (Josh. vi, 23)—Sept. *νεανίσκους*, ii, 1; and the example of the former spies who were sent from Kadesh-Barnea, who were all "heads of Israel" (Numb. xiii, 3), as well as the importance of the service to be performed, would lead one to expect that they would be persons of high station. But, however this may be, it is certain, on the authority of Matthew, that Rahab became the mother of the line from which sprang David, and, eventually, Christ; and there can be little doubt that it was so stated in the public archives from which the evangelist extracted our Lord's genealogy, in which only four women are named—viz. Thamar, Rachab, Ruth, and Bathsheba—who were all, apparently, foreigners, and named for that reason; for that the Rachab mentioned by Matthew is Rahab the harlot is as certain as that David in the genealogy is the same person as David in the books of Samuel. The attempts that have been made to prove Rachab different from Rahab (chiefly by Outhov, a Dutch professor, in the *Biblioth. Bremens.* iii, 438: the earliest expression of any doubt is by Theophylact, in the 11th century) in order to get out of the chronological difficulty, are singularly absurd, and all the more so because, even if successful, they would not diminish the difficulty as long as Salmon remains as the son of Nahshon and the ancestor of Boaz. However, as there are still found those who follow Outhov in his opinion, or at least speak doubtfully (Valpy, *Greek Test.* with English notes, *on Matt.* i, 5; Burrington, *On the Genealogies*, i, 192–194, etc.; Kuinöl, *on Matt.* i, 5; Olshausen, *ibid.*), it may be as well to call attention, with Dr. Mill (p. 131), to the exact coincidence in the age of Salmon, as the son of Nahshon, who was prince of the children of Judah in the wilderness, and that of Rahab the harlot, and to observe that the only conceivable reason for the mention of Rachab in Matthew's genealogy is that she was a remarkable and well-known person, as Tamar, Ruth, and Bathsheba were. The mention of an utterly unknown Rahab in the line would be absurd. The allusions to "Rahab the harlot" in Heb. xi, 31; James ii, 25, by classing her among those illustrious for their faith, make it still more impossible to suppose that Matthew was speaking of any one else. The four generations, Nahshon, Salmon, Boaz, Obed, are, nevertheless, not necessarily all consecutive. See DAVID. There does not seem, however, to be any force in Bengel's remark, adopted by Olshausen, that the article (*ἐκ τῆς Ῥαχάβ*) proves that Rahab of Jericho is meant, seeing that all the proper names in the genealogy which are in the oblique case have the article, though many of them occur nowhere else, and that it is omitted before *Μαρίας* in ver. 16. See GENEALOGY OF JESUS CHRIST.

The Jewish writers abound in praises of Rahab, on account of the great service she rendered their ancestors. Even those who do not deny that she was a harlot admit that she eventually became the wife of a prince of Israel, and that many great persons of their nation sprang from this union. The general statement is, that she was ten years of age at the time the Hebrews quitted Egypt; that she played the harlot during all the forty years they were in the wilderness; that she became a proselyte when the spies were received by her; and that, after the fall of Jericho, no less a personage than Joshua himself made her his wife. She is also counted as an ancestress of Jeremiah, Maaseiah, Hanameel, Shallum, Baruch, Ezekiel, Neriah, Seriah, and Huldah the prophetess. See Talm. Babyl. *Megilla*, fol. 14, col. 2; *Yuchasin*, x, 1; *Shalshalet Hakabala*, vii, 2; Abarbanel, Kimchi, etc., *on Josh.* vi, 25; *Mitzvoth Toreh*, p. 112; Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb.* ad Matt. i, 4; Meuschen, *N. T. Talmud*, p. 40. See JOSHUA.

2. *Rahab's Character.*—This has been a subject of deep interest and no little controversy. In the narrative of these transactions, Rahab is called זוֹנָה, *zonâh*, which our own, after the ancient versions, renders "harlot." The Jewish writers, however, being unwilling to entertain the idea of their ancestors being involved in a disreputable association at the commencement of their great undertaking, chose to interpret the word "hostess," one who keeps a public-house, as if from זָנַן, "to nourish" (Josephus, *Ant.* v, 1; ii and vii; comp. the Targum, and Kimchi and Jarchi on the text). Christian translators, also, are inclined to adopt this interpretation for the sake of the character of a woman of whom the apostle speaks well, and who would appear, from Matt. i, 4, to have become, by a subsequent marriage with Salmon, prince of Judah, an ancestress of Jesus. But we must be content to take facts as they stand,

and not strain them to meet difficulties; and it is now universally admitted by every sound Hebrew scholar that זוֹנָה means "harlot," and not "hostess." It signifies "harlot" in every other text where it occurs, the idea of "hostess" not being represented by this or any other word in Hebrew, as the function represented by it did not exist. (See Frisch, *De Muliere Peregrina ap. Heb.* [Lips. 1744].) There were no inns; and when certain substitutes for inns eventually came into use, they were never, in any Eastern country, kept by women. On the other hand, strangers from beyond the river might have repaired to the house of a harlot without suspicion or remark: the Bedawin from the desert constantly do so at this day in their visits to Cairo and Bagdad. The house of such a woman was also the only one to which they, as perfect strangers, could have had access, and certainly the only one in which they could calculate on obtaining the information they required without danger from male inmates. This concurrence of analogies in the word, in the thing, and in the probability of circumstances ought to settle the question. If we are concerned for the morality of Rahab, the best proof of her reformation is found in the fact of her subsequent marriage to Salmon: this implies her previous conversion to Judaism, for which, indeed, her discourse with the spies evinces that she was prepared. Dismissing, therefore, as inconsistent with truth and with the meaning of זוֹנָה and *πόρνη*, the attempt to clear her character of stain by saying that she was only an innkeeper, and not a harlot (*πανδοκευτρία*, Chrysostom and Chald. Vers.), we may yet notice that it is very possible that to a woman of her country and religion such a calling may have implied a far less deviation from the standard of morality than it does with us ("vitæ genus vile magis quam flagitiosum:" Grotius), and, moreover, that with a purer faith she seems to have entered upon a pure life. See HARLOT.

As a case of casuistry, her conduct in deceiving the king of Jericho's messengers with a false tale, and, above all, in taking part against her own countrymen, has been much discussed. With regard to the first, strict truth, either in Jew or heathen, was a virtue so utterly unknown before the promulgation of the Gospel that, so far as Rahab is concerned, the discussion is quite superfluous. The question, as regards ourselves, whether in any case a falsehood is allowable—say to save our own life or that of another—is different, but need not be argued here. The question, in reference both to Rahab and to Christians, is well discussed by Augustine, *Contr. Mendacium* (*Opp.* vi, 33, 34; comp. Bullinger, *3d Dec. Serm.* iv). With regard to her taking part against her own countrymen, it can only be justified—but is fully justified—by the circumstance that fidelity to her country would, in her case, have been infidelity to God, and that the higher duty to her Maker eclipsed the lower duty to her native land. Her anxious provision for the safety of her father's house shows how alive she was to natural affections, and seems to prove that she was not influenced by a selfish insensibility, but by an enlightened preference for the service of the true God over the abominable pollutions of Canaanitish idolatry. If her own life of shame was in any way connected with that idolatry, one can readily understand what a further stimulus this would give, now that her heart was purified by faith, to her desire for the overthrow of the nation to which she belonged by birth, and the establishment of that to which she wished to belong by a community of faith and hope. Anyhow, allowing for the difference of circumstances, her feelings and conduct were analogous to those of a Christian Jew in Paul's time, who should have preferred the triumph of the Gospel to the triumph of the old Judaism, or to those of a converted Hindû in our own days, who should side with Christian Englishmen against the attempts of his own countrymen to establish the supremacy either of Brahma or Mohammed.

This view of Rahab's conduct is fully borne out by the references to her in the N. T. The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews tells us that "by faith the harlot Rahab perished not with them that believed not, when she had received the spies with peace" (Heb. xi, 31); and James fortifies his doctrine of justification by works by asking, "Was not Rahab the harlot justified by works, when she had received the messengers, and had sent them out another way?" (James ii, 25). In like manner Clement of Rome says, "Rahab the harlot was saved for her faith and hospitality" (*ad Corinth.* xii).

The fathers generally ("miro consensu:" Jacobson) consider the deliverance of Rahab as typical of salvation, and the scarlet line hung out at her window as typical of the blood of Jesus, in the same way as the ark of Noah and the blood of the paschal lamb were—a view which is borne out by the analogy of the deliverances, and by the language of Heb. xi, 31 (*τοῖς ἀπειθήσασιν*, "the disobedient"), compared with 1 Pet. iii, 20 (*ἀπειθήσασίν ποτε*). Clement (*ad Corinth.* xii) is the first to do so. He says that by the symbol of the scarlet line it was "made manifest that there shall be redemption through the blood of the Lord to all who believe and trust in God," and adds that Rahab in this was a prophetess as well as a believer—a sentiment in which he is followed by Origen (*in lib. Jes., Hom.* iii). Justin Martyr, in like manner, calls the scarlet line "the symbol of the blood of Christ, by which those of all nations who once were harlots and unrighteous are saved;" and in a like spirit Irenæus draws from the story of Rahab the conversion of the Gentiles, and the admission of publicans and harlots into the kingdom of heaven through the symbol of the scarlet line, which he compares with the Passover and the Exodus. Ambrose, Jerome, Augustine (who, like Jerome and Cyril, takes Psa. lxxxvii, 4 to refer to Rahab the harlot), and Theodoret, all follow in the same track; but Origen, as usual, carries the allegory still further. Irenæus makes the singular mistake of calling the spies *three*, and makes them symbolical of the Trinity! The comparison of the scarlet line with the scarlet thread which was bound round the hand of Zarah is a favorite one with them. See Irenæus, *Contr. Her.* iv, xx; Just. Mart. *Contr. Tryph.* p. 11; Jerome, *Adv. Jovin.* lib. i; *Epist. xxxiv ad Nepot.; Breviar. in Psa. lxxvi;* Origen, *Comm. in Matt. xxvii;* Chrysost. *Hom.* 3 *in Matt.*, also 3 *in Ep. ad Rom.;* Ephr. Syr. *Rhythm* 1 and 7 *on Nativ.; Rhythm* 7 *on the Faith;* Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catechet. Lect.* ii, 9; x, 11. Bullinger (*5th Dec. Serm.* vi) views the line as a sign and seal of the covenant between the Israelites and Rahab.

The Jews, as above observed, are embarrassed as to what to say concerning Rahab. They praise her highly for her conduct; but some rabbins give out that she was not a Canaanite, but of some other Gentile race, and was only a sojourner in Jericho. The Gemara of Babylon mentions the above-noted tradition that she became the wife of Joshua—a tradition unknown to Jerome (*Adv. Jovin.*). Josephus (*Ant.* v, 1) describes her as an innkeeper, and her house as an inn (*καταγώγιον*), and never applies to her the epithet *πόρνη*, which is the term used by the Sept.

See the *Critici Sacri, Thesaur. Nov.* i, 487; Simeon, *Works*, ii, 544; Gordon, *Christ as Made Known*, etc. ii, 268; Ewald, *Gesch. Isr.* ii, 246; Niemeyer, *Charak.* iii, 423 sq.; Abicht, *De Rachab Meretrice* (Lips. 1714); Caunter, *Hist. and Char. of Rahab* [insists that she could not have been a harlot] (Lond. 1850); Hoffmann, *Rahab's Erettung* (Berl. 1861). See JOSHUA.

2. (Heb. *Ra'hab*, רַהַב, *strength;* Sept. Ῥαάβ, Psa. lxxxvii, 4; *τὸ κῆτος*, Job xvi, 12; *ὑπερήφανος*, Psa. lxxxix, 10; omits Isa. li, 9). A poetical name signifying "sea monster," which is applied as an appellation to Egypt in Psa. lxxiv, 13, 14; lxxxvii, 4; lxxxix, 10; Isa. li, 9 (and sometimes to its king, Ezek. xxix, 3; xxxiii, 3; comp. Psa. lxviii, 31)—which metaphorical designation probably involves an allusion to the croco-

diles, hippopotami, and other aquatic creatures of the Nile (q. v.). As the word, if Hebrew, radically denotes "fierceness, insolence, pride," when applied to Egypt, it would indicate the national character of the inhabitants. Gesenius thinks it was probably of Egyptian origin, but accommodated to Hebrew, although no likely equivalent has been found in Coptic, or, we may add, in ancient Egyptian (*Thesaur.* s. v.). That the Hebrew meaning is alluded to in connection with the proper name does not seem to prove that the latter is Hebrew, but this is rendered very probable by its apposite character and its sole use in poetical books. See BEHEMOTH.

The same word occurs in a passage in Job, where it is usually translated, as in the A. V., instead of being treated as a proper name. Yet many interpreters, comparing this passage with parallel ones, insist that it refers to the Exodus: "He divideth the sea with his power, and by his understanding he smiteth through the proud" [or "Rahab"] (xxvi, 12). The prophet Isaiah calls on the arm of the Lord, "[Art] not thou it that hath cut Rahab, [and] wounded the dragon? [Art] not thou it which hath dried the sea, the waters of the great deep; that hath made the depths of the sea a way for the ransomed to pass over?" (li, 9, 10; comp. 15). In Psa. lxxiv the division of the sea is mentioned in connection with breaking the heads of the dragons and the heads of Leviathan (ver. 13, 14). So, too, in Psa. lxxxix God's power to subdue the sea is spoken of immediately before a mention of his having "broken Rahab in pieces" (ver. 9, 10). Rahab, as a name of Egypt, occurs once only without reference to the Exodus: this is in Psa. lxxxvii, where Rahab, Babylon, Philistia, Tyre, and Cush are compared with Zion (ver. 4, 5). In one other passage the name is alluded to with reference to its Hebrew signification, where it is prophesied that the aid of the Egyptians should not avail those who sought it, and this sentence follows: רַהַב הֵם שָׁבֶת, "Insolence (i. e. 'the insolent'), they sit still" (Isa. xxx, 7), as Gesenius reads, considering it to be undoubtedly a proverbial expression. See CROCODILE.

Ra'ham (Heb. *Rach'am*, רַחַם, *belly;* Sept. Ῥαάμ), the son of Shema and father of Jorkoam, in the genealogy of the descendants of Caleb the son of Hezron, of the tribe of Judah (1 Chron. ii, 44). B.C. post 1600. Rashi and the author of the *Quæst. in Paral.*, attributed to Jerome, regard Jorkoam as a place, of which Raham was founder and prince.

Rahauser, FREDERICK A., a German Reformed minister, was born in York Co., Pa., in 1782, of humble but excellent parentage. He was brought up as a weaver, the profession of his father. His early educational advantages were very limited. At the age of twenty-one he went to Hanover, Pa., there studied with a Lutheran minister, and then determined to prepare for the work of the ministry. His brother Jonathan greatly aided him, and Frederick Rahauser pleased as a preacher as soon as he entered upon the ministerial task. He was ordained in 1808, and preached for nearly half a century. He served during this period several large and laborious charges, which are now among the most prosperous and prominent places in the Reformed Church. In those early days all ministers did hard work, for then the fields were large and the laborers were yet fewer than now. His first settlement was at Emmettsburg, Md., in the summer of 1808. This charge, which he served with great acceptance for about eight years, then included Gettysburg, Taneytown, Apples, and other distant points. Some of the congregations were seven, ten, twelve, and even twenty miles apart. But during all his hard service his general health was good, so that he rarely failed to meet an appointment. In 1816 he accepted a call to the church at Harrisburg, Pa., to which he ministered till 1819, when he removed to Chambersburg, Pa. To this charge he gave his matured and most vigorous labors, and there faithfulness also was attended with success for a period of seventeen years. In 1836 he removed to Tiffin, O., and for four years was pastor of the German Reformed Church in that city. In 1840 he took charge of some country churches in Sandusky and Seneca counties, in a region called the Black Swamp. Here he continued the work of his ministry, till declining years and failing energies disabled him from the active duties of his holy office. He lived with his children until his death, July 15, 1865.

Ra'hel, a form originally adopted everywhere in the A. V. (in the edition of 1611) for the present familiar name RACHEL (q. v.), but retained in our present Bible only in Jer. xxxi, 15, apparently by a mere oversight of the later editors.

Râhu is, in Indian mythology, the dæmon who is imagined to be the cause of the eclipses of sun and moon. When, in consequence of the churning of the milk sea, the gods had obtained the amrita, or beverage of immortality, they endeavored to appropriate it to their exclusive use; and in this attempt they had also succeeded, after a long struggle with their rivals, the Daityas, or dæmons, when Rahu, one of the latter, insinuating himself among the gods, obtained a portion of the amrita. Being detected by the sun and moon, his head was cut off by Vishnu; but, the amrita having reached his throat, his head had already become immortal; and out of revenge against sun and moon, it now pursues them with implacable hatred, seizing them at intervals, and thus causing their eclipses. Such is the substance of the legend as told in the *Mahabhârata* (q. v.). In the Purânas (q. v.), it is amplified by allowing both head and tail of the dæmon to ascend to heaven, and produce the eclipses of sun and moon, when the head of the dæmon is called *Râhu* and his tail *Ketu*, both, moreover, being represented in some Purânas as the sons of the dæmon Viprachitti and his wife Sinhika. In the *Vishnu-Purâna*, Rahu is also spoken of as the king of the meteors.

Rái Dásis, a Hindû sect founded by Rái Dás, a disciple of Ramánand. It is said to be confined to the *chamars*, or workers in hides and in leather, and among the very lowest of the Hindû mixed tribes. This circumstance, as Prof. H. H. Wilson thinks, renders it difficult, if not impossible, to ascertain whether the sect still exists.

Raiford, MATTHEW, a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born in Jefferson Co., Ga., July 12, 1789. He enjoyed the comfortable assurance of grace at or before the tenth year of his age, and joined the Church in his eleventh year. He was licensed to exhort March 28, 1818, and was licensed to preach Dec. 6. He entered the Georgia Conference at the ensuing session, and filled various appointments until 1842, when he ceased to be an effective preacher. He was sorely afflicted for several years before his death, but often spoke of it with calmness and Christian confidence. He died in Monroe Co., Ga., April 16, 1849. —*Minutes of Annual Conf. of the M. E. Ch., South*, 1850, p. 25.

Raikes, Henry, an Anglican divine of considerable note, was born Sept. 24, 1782, and was the second son of Thomas Raikes, a gentleman distinguished in English civic life. He was educated at Eton and Cambridge University, where he graduated at St. John's College, in 1804, with second-class honors. The next three years were spent on the Continent in extensive travels. He enjoyed the society of the most cultured, and returned, in 1808, to enter the service of the Church with more than usual intellectual and social qualifications. He became curate of Betchworth, in Surrey, and later of Burnham, in Buckshire, whence he removed to Bognor, in Sussex; and finally enjoyed the distinction of holding the chancellorship of Chester for eighteen years. He refused, about 1829, the bishopric of Calcutta and a valuable preferment in the North of Ireland

and in Lincolnshire. He was attached to his home, and loved the quiet and retirement of his parish. He died in February, 1854. Chancellor Raikes's varied and great learning was scarcely known by his most intimate friends. His was so unpretentious a nature that few were aware of his acquirements in Oriental learning and patristic subjects. His printed productions are his least valuable efforts. Yet among these lesser works and contributions to the religious periodicals of the day, he published a volume of *Sermons* of a very original type, on the "Divine Attributes;" but this volume incurred the fate of most works adopted by a party as its manifesto in great temporary popularity and early oblivion. A far more important work, and one of vast influence on the Church, was his *Essay on Clerical Education.* It materially influenced the universities to the recognition of a higher truth, of a more precious learning than had, at that time, scarcely found a place in the extensive range of university studies and examinations. It is to be regretted that, besides the repeated publication of series of sermons, the productions of Chancellor Raikes are left in MS. form. He was so well qualified for original work, and did so much of it in certain unexplored fields, that it is to be hoped his writings will, some day, find their way to print in a complete edition. See *Gentleman's Mag.* (Lond.) 1855, i, 198 sq. (J. H. W.)

Raikes, Richard, uncle of Henry, was a clergyman of the Church of England, and flourished near the middle of the 18th century. He was educated at St. John's College, Cambridge, and held a fellowship from that university. After taking holy orders, he was made prebendary of St. David's. He was a man of exact learning and of refinement of taste. He was the early teacher of Henry. The founder of Sunday-schools also received much help and encouragement from this divine, who himself published *Essays on Sunday-schools.* See *Gentleman's Magazine* (Lond.), 1855, p. 199.

Raikes, Robert, the noted English philanthropist who founded the modern Sunday-school (q. v.), was a native of Gloucester, England, where he was born Sept. 14, 1735. His ancestors were people of good rank, and some of them are distinguished as clergy and politicians. His father was a printer and an editor. He published the *Gloucester Journal,* a county Tory newspaper, and the first journal that attempted to give a report of parliamentary proceedings, which was considered, at the time, so great a breach of privilege that he was reprimanded at the bar of the House of Lords in the dark days of George I and under the partisanship of lord-chancellor King. Robert was brought up with a view of succeeding his father in business, and enjoyed, therefore, a liberal education. Having finally become proprietor of the *Journal,* he managed to give his paper a wide influence and respectful reading. He was a truly devout man, and carried his Christianity into every-day life. He was not only scrupulous about his church attendance on the Sabbath, but made it the rule to frequent early morning prayers on week-days at the Gloucester cathedral. A man who could thus devote the hours of a working-day to the glory of his God was likely to cherish an interest in his fellows also. Raikes was particularly interested in the lowly and the degraded. He visited prisons and went about the streets seeking to do good wherever there was need of aid or counsel. The improvements in prison discipline at the close of the last century in England are largely due to Robert Raikes. His newspaper was an important agency which he used freely, and thus powerfully affected public opinion in favor of the suffering and degraded classes of society. In 1781 his attention was directed to the children of the poor. He had, by frequent intercourse with the common people, learned of their low intellectual state and the absolute neglect suffered by the rising generations. He was struck, as he himself tells us in one of his letters written in 1784, with the number of wretched children whom he found in the suburbs of Gloucester, chiefly in the neighborhood of a pin manufactory, where their parents were employed, wholly abandoned to themselves, half clothed, half fed, and growing up in the most degrading vices. The state of the streets was worse on Sunday, when the older children, who were employed in the factory on week-days, were joined to their younger associates; and all manner of excesses became the theme of complaint on the part of the shopmen and the property-owners generally. Even the farmers near there complained of the depredations frequently committed by juvenile offenders. Raikes determined to provide a remedy for this growing evil. He saw very clearly the surest result in education, and therefore sought the help of four excellent teachers and devoted Christian women, whom he paid a small allowance for their services, and, gathering the children on the Sabbath-day, attempted the kind of work which has given shape to the modern Sabbath-school. He procured the help of the clergy, and the enterprise begun in such an unpretending manner grew into proportions of which Raikes himself had not had the faintest idea. The instruction was at first confined to reading and writing. Instead of secular text-books, the Bible was the principal reading-book used, and so the children were made familiar with the Gospel's great benefits to man. How he got the children we will let him tell in his own language: "I went around," he says, "to remonstrate with numbers of the poor on the melancholy consequences that must ensue from a fatal neglect of their children's morals. I prevailed with some, and others soon followed; and the school began to prosper in numbers. The children were to come soon after ten in the morning and stay till twelve; they were then to go home and return at one, and, after reading a lesson, they were to be conducted to church. After church they were to be employed in repeating the catechism till half-past five, and then to be dismissed with an injunction to go home without making a noise, and by no means to play in the street. With regard to the rules adopted, I only required that they come to the school on Sunday as clean as possible. Many were at first deterred because they wanted decent clothing, but I could not undertake to supply this defect. Although without shoes and in a ragged coat, I rejected none on that account; all that I required were clean hands, a clean face, and the hair combed. If they had no clean shirt, they were to come in that which they had on. The want of decent apparel at first kept great numbers at a distance, but they gradually became wiser, and all pressed to learn. I had the good luck to procure places for some that were deserving, which was of great use. The children attending the school varied from six years old to twelve or fourteen. Little rewards were distributed among the most diligent; this excited an emulation." The mode of procedure is thus described by himself: "Upon the Sunday afternoon the mistresses take their scholars to church, a place which neither they nor their ancestors ever entered with a view to the glory of God. They assemble at the house of one of the mistresses, and walk before her to church, two and two, in as much order as a company of soldiers. I am generally at church, and after service they all come round me to make their bow, and, if any animosities have arisen, to make their complaint. The great principle I inculcate is to be kind and good-natured to each other; not to provoke one another; to be dutiful to their parents; not to offend God by cursing and swearing, and such plain precepts as all may comprehend." Although other schemes may have been formed on a larger scale and excited a more romantic interest, none were ever so productive of more extensively beneficial results. The necessity, and the advantages to be derived from the establishment, of such schools seem to have occurred about the same time to several individuals in various parts of the country; and although Mr. Stoke, in particular, the rector of St. John's, Gloucester, cordially co-operated in the erec

tion and superintendence of the Sunday-schools in that city, yet, for the energetic development of the principle, for the carrying-out into practical details and bringing it in the most advantageous form before the country so as to render it a prolific source of public benefit, to Robert Raikes, beyond all dispute, belongs the honorable title of the Founder of Sunday-schools. Three years after the inauguration of the Gloucester institution, the inhabitants of an obscure district where he had fixed a school remarked that "the place had become quite a heaven upon Sundays compared to what it used to be." Schools of the same kind were, ere long, opened in most of the large towns in England. A Sunday-school Society was opened in London under the auspices of such men as Henry Thornton, bishops Barrington, Porteus, and other well-known Christians of the period; and, at a general meeting of that association, held on July 11, 1787, it was resolved unanimously that, in consideration of the zeal and merits of Robert Raikes, he be admitted an honorary member of the society. Within the sphere of his own immediate experience, Raikes had the satisfaction of seeing the happiest fruits spring from the institutions in Gloucester; for, out of all the thousands of poor children who were educated at those Sunday-schools, it was found, after a long series of years, that not one had ever been either in the city or county prisons. Raikes died April 5, 1811. See *Gentleman's Magazine* (Lond.), 1784–1831, pt. ii, 132, 294; *Sketch of the Life of Robt. Raikes, and the History of Sunday-Schools* (N. Y. 18mo); Cornell, *Life of Robert Raikes* (N. Y. 1864); Jamieson, *Christian Biography*, s. v.

Raikes, Timothy, the grandfather of Robert Raikes, was a clergyman of the Church of England, and of some note. He was born near the middle of the 17th century, and was educated at St. John's College, Cambridge. After taking holy orders, he was vicar of Tickhill. He held the vicarate of Hessle, near Hull, at the time of his death, in 1722.

Raillon, JACQUES, a French prelate, born at Bourgoin, July 17, 1762, was educated for the priesthood at the seminary in Luçon, in which he had been placed by bishop Mercy of that place. After graduation he was made a curate of Montaigu, but was obliged in the Revolutionary period to quit his parish, and lived for some time at Paris, where he took the defence of the priests in his *Appel au Peuple Catholique* (1792, 8vo). But he became only notorious, and, by the gravity of the situation, was forced from the country. He lived for a while at Soleur, in Switzerland, then at Venice, in Italy, and only returned to France in 1804. He at once became teacher in the house of Portalis, then minister of cultus, and by his influence Raillon was in 1809 made professor of pulpit oratory in the theological faculty at Paris, and titulary canon of Notre Dame. In the latter capacity he pronounced the funeral orations upon marshal Lannes and other distinguished countrymen of his, and so markedly acquitted himself in this task that he was given the episcopacy of Orleans in 1810. The unpleasant relations then existing between the government of France and the papacy, however, prevented his confirmation, and in 1816 he went into retirement at Paris. The government, however, was unwilling to suffer the loss of such a faithful and efficient ecclesiastic, and in 1829 he was nominated bishop of Dijon and promptly confirmed as such. In 1830 he was made archbishop of Aix, and there he resided until his death, in 1835. On his departure from Dijon a medal was struck in his honor by his diocese, so greatly was he beloved. The recently expired Dupanloup (1878), who figured as bishop, and more recently as archbishop, of Orleans, at one time involved Raillon in controversy and took offensive ground; but Raillon was universally supported by the French press and a majority of the French clergy, and for a while bishop Dupanloup lost much of his popularity on account of his conduct in this affair. His works are of a secular character, excepting the *Histoire de Saint-Ambrose* (which was to form four or five vols. in 8vo, but of which the MS. was lost). See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v. (J. H. W.)

Rails OF THE ALTAR date from the time of bishop Andrewes, who calls them "wainscot banisters," and Laud, who intended to preserve the altar from profanation by their use. They are, in fact, the *cancelli* moved eastward, resembling the mediæval "reclinatorium," and answer to the primitive altar-veils and Greek "iconostasis." At Leamington Priors, St. German's, and Wimborne they are covered with a white linen cloth at the time of holy communion, a relic of the custom for communicants to hold the houselling-cloth (*dominicale*, for the Lord's body) below their chin for the purpose of retaining upon it any portion of the sacrament which might fall during the administration. The custom was disused at the coronation of William IV. St. Augustine and Cæsarius of Arles mention a linen cloth (*linteamen*) used by women for the same purpose.

Raiment. See CLOTHING; DRESS; GARMENT.

Raimondi, Giovanni Battista, a celebrated Italian Orientalist, was born at Cremona in 1540, removed in his youth to Naples, where he studied at the university theology, philosophy, and mathematics, and then spent some time in Asia studying Eastern civilization and languages. Returning to Italy, he became engaged in various literary enterprises, and enjoyed the society of the great and the learned. He brought out an edition of the Gospels in Arabic with a Latin interlinear translation (1591), and wrote grammars of Syriac and Arabic. He was also engaged on a polyglot Bible more complete than that of Alcalá or of Antwerp, and only ceased labor when the death of pope Gregory XIII (1585) and the departure of cardinal Ferdinand de' Medici (1587) deprived him of the necessary funds for such an enterprise. He died about 1610. He was engaged after 1587 in the compilation of Oriental MSS. and other like labors. See Tiraboschi, *Della Letteratura Italiana*.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.

Raimondi, Marc Antonio, an Italian engraver who devoted himself to classical and sacred art, was born at Bologna in 1487. He was a student first of Francesco Francia, but perfected himself under Raphael, who favored him so greatly that Raimondi may be placed by the side of his great master. The two artists together exerted such a great influence upon this particular branch of art that the works of that time have never been excelled in drawing and clearness of outline, though much surpassed in gradation of tone and delicacy of modelling. It should be remembered that it was from the drawings, and not the finished pictures, of Raphael that Marc Antonio worked. He was especially remarkable for the exactness with which he copied; he seems to have been willing to lose himself entirely in the master he reproduced. His life may be said to have been devoted to multiplying the works of Raphael. He also executed a few plates after Michael Angelo, Mantegna, Bandinelli, and Giulio Romano. He was imprisoned on account of some plates after the designs of the latter, which were so indecent as to enrage Clement VII, and it was with difficulty that his release was obtained by some of the cardinals and Bandinelli. In 1527 Raimondi was in full favor in Rome, when he was driven away by the sacking of the Spaniards. He was plundered, and fled to Bologna. His last work was done in 1539, in which year he is said to have been killed by a nobleman of Rome, because he had engraved a second plate of the *Murder of the Innocents*, contrary to his agreement. His works are numerous, and in selecting them great attention should be paid to the different impressions, for some of the plates have been retouched by those who have had them, until they are greatly changed. The best impressions have no publisher's name. Heineken gives a complete catalogue of his prints. Very fine collections are in the Louvre and in

the British Museum. At Venice Raimondi engraved, after Dürer, two sets of prints—viz. those illustrating the life of the Virgin and the life and Passion of Christ. See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.

Rain, Heb. מָטָר, *matâr*, and also גֶּשֶׁם, *géshem*, which, however, rather signifies a *shower* of more violent rain; it is also used as a generic term, including the early and latter rain (Jer. v, 24; Joel ii, 23). Another word, of a more poetical character, is רְבִיבִים, *rebîbim* (a plural form, connected with *rab*, "many," from the multitude of the drops), translated in our version "showers" (Deut. xxxii, 2; Jer. iii, 3; xiv, 22; Mic. v, 7 [Heb. 6]; Psa. lxv, 10 [Heb. 11]; lxxii, 6). The Hebrews have also the word זֶרֶם, *zérem*, expressing violent rain, storm, tempest, accompanied with hail—in Job xxiv, 8, the heavy rain which comes down on mountains; and the word סַגְרִיר, *sagrîr*, which occurs only in Prov. xxvii, 15, continuous and heavy rain (Sept. *ἐν ἡμέρᾳ χειμερινῇ*).

Early Rain means the rains of the autumn, יוֹרֶה, *yoréh*, part. subst. from יָרָה, "he scattered" (Deut. xi, 14; Jer. v, 24); also the Hiphil part. מוֹרֶה, *moréh* (Joel ii, 23); Sept. *ὑετὸς πρώϊμος*.

Latter Rain is the rain of spring, מַלְקוֹשׁ, *malkôsh*, (Prov. xvi, 15; Job xxix, 23; Jer. iii, 3; Hos. vi, 3; Joel ii, 23; Zech. x, 1); Sept. *ὑετὸς ὄψιμος*. The early and latter rains are mentioned together (Deut. xi, 14; Jer. v, 24; Joel ii, 23; Hos. vi, 3; James v, 7).

In a country comprising so many varieties of elevation as Palestine, there must of necessity occur corresponding varieties of climate. An account that might correctly describe the peculiarities of the district of Lebanon would be in many respects inaccurate when applied to the deep depression and almost tropical climate of Jericho. In any general statement, therefore, allowance must be made for not inconsiderable local variations. Contrasted with the districts most familiar to the children of Israel before their settlement in the land of promise — Egypt and the Desert — rain might be spoken of as one of its distinguishing characteristics (Deut. xi, 10, 11; Herodotus, iii, 10). For six months in the year no rain falls, and the harvests are gathered in without any of the anxiety with which we are so familiar lest the work be interrupted by unseasonable storms. In this respect, at least, the climate has remained unchanged since the time when Boaz slept by his heap of corn; and the sending of thunder and rain in wheat harvest was a miracle which filled the people with fear and wonder (1 Sam. xii, 16–18); so that Solomon could speak of "rain in harvest" as the most forcible expression for conveying the idea of something utterly out of place and unnatural (Prov. xxvi, 1). There are, however, very considerable, and perhaps more than compensating, disadvantages occasioned by this long absence of rain: the whole land becomes dry, parched, and brown; the cisterns are empty; the springs and fountains fail; and the autumnal rains are eagerly looked for, to prepare the earth for the reception of the seed. These, the early rains, commence about the end of October or beginning of November, in Lebanon a month earlier—not suddenly, but by degrees: the husbandman has thus the opportunity of sowing his fields of wheat and barley. The rains come mostly from the west or south-west (Luke xii, 54), continuing for two or three days at a time, and falling chiefly during the night. The wind then shifts round to the north or east, and several days of fine weather succeed (Prov. xxv, 23). During the months of November and December the rains continue to fall heavily, but at intervals; afterwards they return, only at longer intervals, and are less heavy; but at no period during the winter do they entirely cease. January and February are the coldest months, and snow falls, sometimes to the depth of a foot or more, at Jerusalem, but it does not lie long: it is very seldom seen along the coast and in the low plains. Thin ice occasionally covers the pools for a few days, and while Porter was writing his *Handbook*, the snow was eight inches deep at Damascus, and the ice a quarter of an inch thick. Rain continues to fall more or less during the month of March; it is very rare in April, and even in Lebanon the showers that occur are generally light. In the valley of the Jordan the barley harvest begins as early as the middle of April, and the wheat a fortnight later; in Lebanon the grain is seldom ripe before the middle of June. See Robinson (*Biblical Researches*, i, 429) and Porter (*Handbook*, ch. xlviii). See PALESTINE.

With respect to the distinction between the early and the latter rains, Robinson observes that there are not at the present day "any particular periods of rain or succession of showers which might be regarded as distinct rainy seasons. The whole period from October to March now constitutes only one continued season of rain, without any regularly intervening term of prolonged fine weather. Unless, therefore, there have been some change in the climate, the early and the latter rains for which the husbandman waited with longing seem rather to have implied the first showers of autumn which revived the parched and thirsty soil and prepared it for the seed; and the later showers of spring, which continued to refresh and forward both the ripening crops and the vernal products of the fields (James v, 7; Prov. xvi, 15). In April and May the sky is usually serene; showers occur occasionally, but they are mild and refreshing. On May 1 Robinson experienced showers at Jerusalem, and "at evening there were thunder and lightning (which are frequent in winter), with pleasant and reviving rain. May 6 was also remarkable for thunder and for several showers, some of which were quite heavy. The rains of both these days extended far to the north, . . . but the occurrence of rain so late in the season was regarded as a very unusual circumstance" (*Biblical Researches*, i, 430 [he is speaking of the year 1838]). In 1856, however, "there was very heavy rain accompanied with thunder all over the region of Lebanon, extending to Beirût and Damascus, on May 28 and 29; but the oldest inhabitant had never seen the like before, and it created," says Porter (*Handbook*, ch. xlviii), "almost as much astonishment as the thunder and rain which Samuel brought upon the Israelites during the time of wheat harvest." During Dr. Robinson's stay at Beirût on his second visit to Palestine, in 1852, there were heavy rains in March, once for five days continuously, and the weather continued variable, with occasional heavy rain, till the close of the first week in April. The "latter rains" thus continued this season for nearly a month later than usual, and the result was afterwards seen in the very abundant crops of winter grain (Robinson, *Biblical Researches*, iii, 9). These details will, it is thought, better than any generalized statement, enable the reader to form his judgment on the "former" and "latter" rains of Scripture, and may serve to introduce a remark or two on the question, about which some interest has been felt, whether there have been any change in the frequency and abundance of the rain in Palestine, or in the periods of its supply. It is asked whether "these stony hills, these deserted valleys," can be the land flowing with milk and honey; the land which God cared for; the land upon which were always the eyes of the Lord, from the beginning of the year to the end of the year (Deut. xi, 12). So far as relates to the other considerations which may account for diminished fertility, such as the decrease of population and industry, the neglect of terrace-culture and irrigation, and husbanding the supply of water, it may suffice to refer to the article on AGRICULTURE, and to Stanley (*Sinai and Palestine*, p. 120–123). With respect to our more immediate subject, it is urged that the very expression "flowing with milk and honey" implies abundant rains to keep alive the grass for the pasture of the numerous herds supplying the milk, and to nourish the flowers clothing the

now bare hill-sides, from whence the bees might gather their stores of honey. It is urged that the supply of rain in its due season seems to be promised as contingent upon the fidelity of the people (Deut. xi, 13–15; Lev. xxvi, 3–5), and that as from time to time, to punish the people for their transgressions, "the showers have been withholden, and there hath been no latter rain" (Jer. iii, 3; 1 Kings xvii, xviii), so now, in the great and long-continued apostasy of the children of Israel, there has come upon even the land of their forfeited inheritance a like long-continued withdrawal of the favor of God, who claims the sending of rain as one of his special prerogatives (Jer. xiv, 22). See CALENDAR, JEWISH.

The early rains, it is urged, are by comparison scanty and interrupted, the latter rains have altogether ceased, and hence, it is maintained, the curse has been fulfilled, "Thy heaven that is over thy head shall be brass, and the earth that is under thee shall be iron. The Lord shall make the rain of thy land powder and dust" (Deut. xxviii, 23, 24; Lev. xxvi, 19). Without entering here into the consideration of the justness of the interpretation which would assume these predictions of the withholding of rain to be altogether different in the manner of their infliction from the other calamities denounced in these chapters of threatening, it would appear that, so far as the question of fact is concerned, there is scarcely sufficient reason to imagine that any great and marked changes with respect to the rains have taken place in Palestine. In early days, as now, rain was unknown for half the year; and if we may judge from the allusions in Prov. xvi, 15; Job xxix, 23, the latter rain was even then, while greatly desired and longed for, that which was somewhat precarious, by no means to be absolutely counted on as a matter of course. If we are to take as correct our translation of Joel ii, 23, "The latter rain in the first (month)," i. e. Nisan or Abib, answering to the latter part of March and the early part of April, the times of the latter rain in the days of the prophets would coincide with those in which it falls now. The same conclusion would be arrived at from Amos iv, 7, "I have withholden the rain from you when there were yet three months to the harvest." The rain here spoken of is the latter rain, and an interval of three months between the ending of the rain and the beginning of harvest would seem to be in an average year as exceptional now as it was when Amos noted it as a judgment of God. We may infer also from the Song of Solomon, ii, 11–13, where is given a poetical description of the bursting-forth of vegetation in the spring, that when the "winter" was past, the rain also was over and gone. We can hardly, by any extension of the term "winter," bring it down to a later period than that during which the rains still fall.

It may be added that travellers have, perhaps unconsciously, exaggerated the barrenness of the land, from confining themselves too closely to the southern portion of Palestine; the northern portion, Galilee, of such peculiar interest to the readers of the Gospels, is fertile and beautiful (see Stanley, *Sinai and Palestine*, ch. x, and Van de Velde, there quoted), and in his description of the valley of Nablûs, the ancient Shechem, Robinson (*Biblical Researches*, ii, 275) becomes almost enthusiastic: "Here a scene of luxuriant and almost unparalleled verdure bursts upon our view. The whole valley was filled with gardens of vegetables and orchards of all kinds of fruits, watered by several fountains, which burst forth in various parts and flow westward in refreshing streams. It came upon us suddenly, like a scene of fairy enchantment. We saw nothing like it in all Palestine." The account given by a recent lady traveller (*Egyptian Sepulchres and Syrian Shrines*, by Miss Beaufort) of the luxuriant fruit-trees and vegetables which she saw at Meshullam's farm in the valley of Urtas, a little south of Bethlehem (possibly the site of Solomon's gardens, Eccles. ii, 4–6), may serve to prove how much now, as ever, may be effected by irrigation (q. v.).

Rain frequently furnishes the writers of the Old Test. with forcible and appropriate metaphors, varying in their character according as they regard it as the beneficent and fertilizing shower, or the destructive storm pouring down the mountain-side and sweeping away the labor of years. Thus Prov. xxviii, 3, of the poor man that oppresseth the poor; Ezek. xxxviii, 22, of the just punishments and righteous vengeance of God (comp. Psa. xi, 6; Job xx, 23). On the other hand, we have it used of speech wise and fitting, refreshing the souls of men; of words earnestly waited for and heedfully listened to (Deut. xxxii, 2; Job xxix, 23); of the cheering favor of the Lord coming down once more upon the penitent soul; of the gracious presence and influence for good of the righteous king among his people; of the blessings, gifts, and graces of the reign of the Messiah (Hos. vi, 3; 2 Sam. xxiii, 4; Psa. lxxii, 6).

Rain Dragon, THE, a Chinese deity, from whose capacious mouth it is believed the waters are spouted forth which descend upon the earth in the form of rain. This god is worshipped by those who cultivate the soil, only, however, when his power is felt either by the absence of rain or by too abundant a supply. Sometimes the farmers earnestly implore him to give them more rain and sometimes less. In cases of drought each family keeps erected at the front door of the house a tablet on which is inscribed, "To the Dragon King of the Five Lakes and the Four Seas." Before this tablet, on an altar of incense, they lay out their sacrificial offerings to propitiate the gods. Processions are also got up, among the farmers particularly, to attract the favor of the gods. On these occasions there may sometimes be seen a huge figure of a dragon made of paper or of cloth, which is carried through the streets with sound of gongs and trumpets.

Rainald OF CITEAUX, a mediæval ecclesiastic, flourished in the first half of the 12th century. He was son of Milon, and had St. Bernard for teacher. In 1113, on the death of St. Stephen, he became abbot of Citeaux, and here he gave shelter to Abélard, and became the mediator for the restoration of that great mediæval philosopher and theologian to papal favor. In 1148 Rainald was president of a general chapter of his order. He died Dec. 13, 1151. He published a *Recueil* (in eighty-seven chapters) on divers chapters of the Order of Citeaux, etc. See *Gallia Christiana*, vol. iv, col. 985; *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, xii, 418; Rémusat, *Vie de Abélard*, i, 251.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.

Rainaldi, Francesco, an Italian Jesuit, was born at Matelica, in the Ancona marshes, in 1600. At twenty-two he entered the Order of the Jesuits, and passed his life at Rome in the house of the Society of Jesus. He died in 1677. We mention of his writings, *Lumen Hominis Devoti* (Rome, 1633, 24mo):—*Cibo dell' Anima* (ibid. 1637, 12mo):—*Vita J. Lainez* (ibid. 1672, 8vo). See Southwell, *Bibl. Soc. Jesu*, p. 246.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.

Rainaldi, Theophilus. See RAYNAUD.

Rainbow (Heb. קֶשֶׁת, *késheth*, i. e. a *bow* with which to shoot arrows, Gen. ix, 13–16; Ezek. i, 28; Sept. τόξον, so Ecclus. xliii, 11; Vulg. *arcus*. In the New Test. [Rev. iv, 3; x, 1], ἶρις), the token of the covenant which God made with Noah when he came forth from the ark that the waters should no more become a flood to destroy all flesh. With respect to the covenant itself, as a charter of *natural* blessings and mercies ("the world's covenant, not the Church's"), re-establishing the peace and order of physical nature, which in the flood had undergone so great a convulsion, see Davidson, *On Prophecy*, lect. iii, p. 76–80. With respect to the token of the covenant, the right interpretation of Gen. ix, 13 seems to be that God took the rainbow, which had hitherto been but a beautiful object shining in the heavens when the sun's rays fell on falling rain, and consecrated it as the sign of his love and the witness of his promise. The bow in the cloud, seen by every nation under heaven, is an un-

failing witness to the truth of God. Was the rainbow, then, we ask, never seen before the flood? Was this "sign in the heavens" beheld for the first time by the eight dwellers in the ark when, after their long imprisonment, they stood again upon the green earth, and saw the dark, humid clouds spanned by its glorious arch? Such seems to be the meaning of the narrator. Yet this implies that there was no rain before the flood, and that the laws of nature were changed, at least in that part of the globe, by that event. There is no reason to suppose that in the world at large there has been such a change in meteorological phenomena as here implied. That a certain portion of the earth should never have been visited by rain is quite conceivable. Egypt, though not absolutely without rain, very rarely sees it. But the country of Noah and the ark was a mountainous country; and the ordinary atmospherical conditions must have been suspended, or a new law must have come into operation after the flood, if the rain then first fell, and if the rainbow had consequently never before been painted on the clouds. Hence, many writers have supposed that the meaning of the passage is, not that the rainbow now appeared for the first time, but that it was now for the first time invested with the sanctity of a sign; that not a new phenomenon was visible, but that a new meaning was given to a phenomenon already existing. The following passages, Numb. xiv, 4; 1 Sam. xii, 13; 1 Kings ii, 35, are instances in which נָתַן, *nathán*, literally "give"—the word used in Gen. ix, 13, "I do *set* my bow in the cloud"—is employed in the sense of "constitute," "appoint." Accordingly there is no reason for concluding that ignorance of the natural cause of the rainbow occasioned the account given of its institution in the book of Genesis. See Noah.

The rainbow is frequently seen in Palestine in the rainy season, and thus it furnishes a common image to the sacred writers. There is a reference to the rainbow, though not named, in Isa. liv, 9, 10; and it is mentioned in other passages. "As the appearance of the bow which is in the cloud in the day of rain, so was the appearance of the brightness round about" (Ezek. i, 28). "And there was a rainbow about the throne in sight like unto an emerald" (Rev. iv, 3). "And I saw another mighty angel come down from heaven, clothed with a cloud, and a rainbow was upon his head" (x, 1). These three passages correspond with and reflect light upon each other. The rainbow in all of them is the designed token of God's covenant and mercy, and of his faithful remembrance of his promise. "Look upon the rainbow," says the son of Sirach (Ecclus. xliii, 11, 12), "and praise him that made it: very beautiful it is in the brightness thereof; it compasseth the heaven about with a glorious circle, and the hands of the Most High have bended it." Among the Greeks and Romans, the personified rainbow, Iris, became the messenger of the gods, and the natural rainbow seems to have been conceived as the passage-way on which Iris came down to men (Serv. on Virgil's *Æn.* v, 610). The Indian mythology made a yet nearer approach to the Biblical view (Von Bohlen, *India*, i, 237); but the Edda represents the rainbow as a bridge connecting heaven and earth (see, in general, Menzel, *Mythol. Forsch.* p. 235 sq.). On the physical views of the ancients with regard to the rainbow, see Forbiger, *Handb. d. alt. Geog.* i, 596 sq. See Schlichter, *De Iride ejusque Emblem.* (Hal. 1739); Ausfeld, *De Iride Diluvii non redituri Signo* (Giess. 1756). See Bow.

Scientifically considered, the rainbow is a natural phenomenon which is formed by rays of light from the sun (occasionally the moon) striking drops of falling rain, being refracted in entering them, reflected back, in part, from the opposite side of the drops, and refracted again on leaving them, so as to produce prismatic colors, some of which meet the eye. In the inner or primary bow, the light is refracted downwards, and undergoes but one reflection; while in the outer or secondary bow the light, striking the lower side of the drop, is first refracted upwards, and reflected twice within the drop before leaving it; hence its light is fainter. Both present the colors of the prismatic spectrum; but in the primary bow the tints gradually ascend from the violet to the red, while in the outer the violet is more elevated. The colors of the rainbow are the result of the decomposition of white light in its passage through the globular drops of water forming a shower of rain.

Rainbow, Edward, D.D., an English prelate, was born at Bliton, Lincolnshire, in 1608, was educated at Corpus Christi College, Oxford, and Magdalen College, Cambridge, and, after taking holy orders and filling minor appointments, was made master of Magdalen College in 1642. In 1650 he was deprived on account of nonconformity, but in 1660 was restored. In 1661 he was appointed to the deanery of Peterborough, and in the following year became vice-chancellor of the University of Cambridge. In 1664 he was elevated to the episcopacy by being made bishop of Carlisle. He died in 1684. He published three separate *Sermons* (1634, 1649, 1677). See *Athenæ Oxon.; Life*, by Jonathan Banks (Lond. 1688, 8vo); *Funeral Sermon*, by the Rev. Thomas Tully (1688, 12mo).

Raine, James, an English divine, was born at Lovington in 1791, and, after receiving full educational advantages at the University of Cambridge, took holy orders, and finally became rector of Meldon, and librarian to the dean and chapter of Durham. He died in 1858. Dr. Raine devoted himself largely to antiquarian studies, and published several valuable works on English ecclesiology and Church antiquities. We have room here to mention only *Saint Cuthbert* (Durham, 1828, 4to). See, for further details, the excellent article in Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, ii, 1725.

Raine, Matthew, another English divine, brother of the preceding, was born in 1760, and was educated at the University of Cambridge, in Trinity College, of which he became a fellow in 1783. In 1791 he was made schoolmaster of the Charter House, in 1809 preacher of Gray's Inn, and in 1810 rector of Little Hallingbury, Essex, but died shortly after. He published *Sermons* (1786, 1789).

Rainerio, Sacchoni, an Italian ecclesiastic, flourished in the first half of the 13th century. He was a native of Piacenza. He was originally a Catharist, but abandoned his brethren, entered the Church of Rome, became a Dominican monk, and when made inquisitor became one of the worst persecutors of his former coreligionists. In 1252 a conspiracy against him was discovered in time to prevent his murder, but he was never restful after that time, and when Pallavicino gained the upper-hand at Milan, Rainerio was driven from the city. He died in 1259. He wrote much, and wielded a powerful pen, for he was a man of much learning. His *Summa de Catharis et Leonistis*, written for the information of the Inquisition, is the principal source of information regarding the Catharists. The best edition of this work is by Gretser (Ingolstadt, 1613). See Gieseler, *Kirchengesch.* i, 598; and his *De Rainerii Summa* (Gött. 1834); Milman, *Hist. of Latin Christianity*, v, 61–66; Piper, *Monumental Theol.* § 140. (J. H. W.)

Raines, John, a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Hull, England, Jan. 14, 1818. He came to the United States while yet a child, and at the age of nineteen years professed conversion, and united with the Church. Four years later he became a local preacher, and in 1845 was received on trial in the Genesee Conference. He gave to the Church twenty-six years of uninterrupted labor, when he was seized with blindness. He died in Canandaigua, N. Y., Sept. 4, 1877. He was a man of strong convictions, earnest and uncompromising piety, and devoted to his work.—

Minutes of Annual Conferences of the M E. Church, 1877, p. 149.

Rain-makers are, in Kaffreland, a class of crafty and designing men who profess to have supernatural influence and powers. When no rain has fallen upon the land for several months, and the ground is parched and dry, and both grass and water are becoming exceedingly scarce, the people apply to the rain-maker, who immediately exerts himself on their behalf, if they bring him satisfactory presents. A large gathering of the people now takes place, an ox is slaughtered, and a large quantity of Kaffre beer is imbibed; and when the rain-maker has become sufficiently animated by the part he takes in the feast, he commences his incantations. He dances round the camp-fire, and exerts himself with such violent gesticulations that the perspiration streams down his naked body. He then commands the people to go and look towards the western horizon for the appearance of the rain-clouds. If no indication of coming showers is seen, the wily rain-maker tells the deluded natives that the presents which they have brought him are not sufficient. They then go to bring more, the feast is renewed, and the heathen ceremonies are repeated to gain time; and if the foolish exercises are continued till a shower actually falls, the rain-makers triumph in their success. The presence of Christian missionaries in Kaffreland has of late years greatly impaired the power and influence of the rain-makers, and bids fair to annihilate the gross deception altogether.

Rainold(e)s (also written *Raynolds*, *Reynolds*, and occasionally in the Latin *Reginaldus*), JOHN, was a celebrated English divine of the second half of the 16th century. He was born at Pinhoe, Devonshire, in 1549; was educated at Merton College, Oxford, and Corpus Christi College, of the same university; and was chosen probationer fellow in 1566. He finally took holy orders, and in 1593 was promoted to the deanery of Lincoln. In 1598 he was offered a bishopric, and at the same time was called to the presidency of Corpus Christi College. He cared less for distinctions than for scholarly tasks, and therefore gave the preference to the offer of his alma mater. In this new position he became famous beyond seas, as well as in England. His learning and readiness of application gave him a reputation second to none in England; and the king, who prided himself on his own reputation for scholarship, and desired above all things to maintain this reputation, leaned greatly on this distinguished divine, and always favored his projects It is thus that we owe to Rainolds the King James Version of the Scriptures, for it is well known that Rainolds urged the king to the undertaking, and demonstrated its necessity. He was a great Hebraist, and made translations of small portions at first, and, reading these to the king in his private chamber, convinced his royal master of the want, and the good likely to be accomplished as well as the renown to be gained. See ENGLISH VERSIONS. Rainolds died in 1607. Bishop Hall speaks of Rainolds as being near to a miracle in his prodigious treasury of knowledge; John Milton refers to him always as "our famous Dr. Raynolds;" and Wood, in his *Athenæ Oxon.* (ii, 13), calls him "the very treasury of erudition." Hallam, in his *Constitutional Hist. of England*, calls him "nearly, if not altogether, the most learned man in England" (i, 297), and in his *Literary Hist. of Europe* (i, 560), "the most eminently learned man of the queen's reign." He published a number of separate sermons, treatises against the Church of Rome, and some other theological productions, of which there is a complete list in Wood (*Athenæ Oxon.* ii, 11–19). We have room here to mention only, *Sex Theses de S. Scriptura et Ecclesia* (Lond. 1580; Ruppelæ, 1586; Lond. 1602, 8vo; in English, 1598, 12mo; 1609, 4to):—*The Summe of the Conference between John Rainoldes and John Hart touching the Head and Faith of the Church*, etc. (1584, 1588, 1598, 1609, 4to; Latin, Oxon. 1619, fol.):—*Orationes duæ in Coll. Corp. Christi* (Oxon. 1587, 8vo):—*De Romanæ Ecclesiæ Idololatria in Cultu Sanctorum Reliquiarum, Imaginum, Aquæ, Salis, Olei*, etc. (1596, 4to):—*The Overthrow of Stage Playes, by the Way of Controversie betwixt D. Gager and D. Rainoldes*, etc. (1599, 4to; Middleburgh, 1600, 4to; Oxf. 1629, 4to); see Collier, *Hist. of Dramatic Poetry*, iii, 201, and his *Bibl. Account of Early English Literature* (1865), s. v. "Rainoldes;" *Archæol.* Nov. 1841, p. 114:— *Defence of the Judgment of the Reformed Churches that a Man may lawfullie not only put awaie his Wife for her Adultirie, but also marrie Another*, etc. (1609–10, 4to):— *Censura Librorum Apocryphorum Veteris Testamenti* (Oppenheim, 1611, 2 vols. 4to; very rare); not only in this work, but in the Hampton Court Conference also (where, by the way, he sided with the Puritans), Rainolds protested against the reading of apocryphal lessons in the public service of the Church:— *The Prophesie of Obadiah*, sermons (Oxon. 1613, 4to):—*Orationes duodecim* [including *The Summe of the Conference*, etc.] *in Coll. Corp. Christi* (1614, 1628, 8vo); the first oration was published in an English transl. by J. Leicester (Lond. 1638, 12mo):—*The Original of Bishops and Metropolitans* (1641, 4to):— *Judgment concerning Episcopacy, whether it be God's Ordinance* (Lond. 1641, 4to):—*Prophesie of Haggai*, fifteen sermons (1649, 4to). See the literature quoted in Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s. v.; Middleton, *Evangel. Biog.* vol. ii; Soames, *Hist. of the Church of England in the Elizabethan Reign* (see Index); Froude, *Hist. of England* (see Index in vol. xii).

Rainor, MENZIES, a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church near the opening of our century, was admitted to the work of the itinerancy in 1790, and travelled in Dutchess (N. Y.) Circuit with Peter Moriarty, under the superintendence of Freeborn Garrettson (q. v.). In 1791 he was colleague of Lemuel Smith at Hartford, Conn. In 1792 he labored at Lynn. Subsequently he travelled the Elizabethtown (N. J.) and Middletown (Conn.) circuits. In 1795 he withdrew from the conference, and afterwards from the Church. He was a young man of promise, and acceptable among the people as a preacher. After his withdrawal from the Methodist Church, he joined the Protestant Episcopal Church, and afterwards became a Universalist. See Stevens, *Memorials of New England Methodism*, p. 127.

Rainssant, JEAN FIRMIN, a noted French Benedictine monk, was born at Suippes, near Chalons-sur-Marne, in 1596, and took the monastic vow in 1613 at Verdun. In 1627 he became prior of Breuil, in the diocese of Rheims, and so distinguished himself by austerity and purity that he was by cardinal Richelieu selected in 1630 as one of the thirty who were to reform the Clugny Congregation. In 1633 he became prior of Ferrières, in Gatinais; but after the union of the Clugniacs and Maurists ceased in 1644, he gave the preference to the last congregation. In 1645 he was elected prior of the abbey of St.-Germain-des-Prés, at Paris. In 1651 he was elected visitor of the province of Bretagne. On his very first journey in the country he fell from his saddle and broke a leg; from the injuries thus sustained he sickened and died, Nov. 8, 1651, in the convent of Lehon, near Dinan. He contributed largely to the literature on monasticism in later mediæval times; and whatever he wrote is valuable to the student of this subject, because Rainssant freely confessed the failings of the ascetics of the Church of Rome, and earnestly sought their reform. We have not room here to insert a list of his writings, but refer to Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xli, 497, and Le Cerf, *Biblioth. des Auteurs de la Congrégation de St. Maur.*

Raisins (צִמֻּקִים, *tsimmukim*, 1 Sam. xxv, 18; xxx, 20; 2 Sam. xvi, 1; 1 Chron. xii, 20) signifies dried grapes, or rather cakes made of them, such as the Italians still call *simmaki*. Grapes are often thus preserved for food (Numb. vi, 3). See GRAPE; VINE.

Raisse, Arnold, a French theologian, was born at Douai near the opening of the 17th century. He was canon of the Church of St. Peter, and as such had ample opportunity to explore the vast treasures of this church and neighboring churches and monasteries for the ecclesiastical history of the Low Countries. He died in 1644, leaving a large material for the history of the saints in the Netherlands, and its stores have not yet been fully exhausted. His other writings are of no special interest now.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.

Ra'kem (1 Chron. vii, 16). See Rekem.

Rak'kath (Heb. *Rakkath'*, רַקַּת, *shore;* Sept. Ῥακκάθ v. r. Δακέθ), a fortified city in the tribe of Naphtali, mentioned only in Josh. xix, 35, where it is grouped between Hammath and Chinnereth. We may hence infer that it lay on the western shore of the lake of Galilee, not far distant from the warm baths of Tiberias, which are on the site of the ancient Hammath (q. v.). According to the rabbins (*Megilla*, 6 a), Rakkath stood upon the spot where the city of Tiberias was afterwards built (see Lightfoot, *Opp.* ii, 223). See Cinnereth. Rakkath appears to have fallen to ruin at an early period, or at least it was not a place of sufficient note to be mentioned in history, and the name passed away altogether when Tiberias was founded. The statement of Josephus that ancient tombs had to be removed to make room for the buildings of Tiberias does not, as Dr. Robinson supposes, make it impossible that the city stood on the site of Rakkath (Josephus, *Ant.* xviii, 2, 3; Robinson, *Bib. Res.* ii, 389). Rakkath may have stood close on the shore where there were no tombs; while Tiberias, being much larger, extended some distance up the adjoining rocky hill-sides, in which the tombs may still be seen. Thomson (*Land and Book*, ii, 66) identifies Hammath with the Emmaus of Josephus (*Ant.* xviii, 2, 3), and supposes Rakkath to be the same name with the Arab *Kerak*, at the mouth of the Jordan; but this latter rather represents the ancient Tarichæa (q. v.). The enumeration of the towns in the connection requires us to understand this to be the same with the name preceding, i. e. Hammath-Rakkath. See Naphtali, Tribe of.

Rak'kon (Heb. *ha-Rakkon'*, הָרַקּוֹן, with the article; the *temple* [of the head], Gesen.; a well-*watered* place, Fürst; Sept. Ἱεράκων, Vulg. *Arecon*), one of the towns in the inheritance of Dan (Josh. xix, 46), apparently not far distant from Joppa. As it is mentioned between Me-jarkon and Japho, the site is possibly that of the village *Kheibeh* or *Kubeibeh*, marked on the maps as lying north of the Nahr Rubin, west of Akir (Ekron).

Rakshas, or **Râkshasa**, is, in Hindû mythology, the name of a class of evil spirits or demons, who are sometimes imagined as attendants on Kuvera, the god of riches, and guardians of his treasures, but more frequently as mischievous, cruel, and hideous monsters, haunting cemeteries, devouring human beings, and ever ready to oppose the gods and to disturb pious people. They have the power of assuming any shape at will, and their strength increases towards the evening twilight. Several of them are described as having many heads and arms [see, for instance, Râvana], large teeth, red hair, and, in general, as being of repulsive appearance; others, however, especially the females of this class, could also take beautiful forms in order to allure their victims. In the legends of the *Mahabhârata*, *Râmâyana*, and the Purânas, they play an important part, embodying, as it were, at the period of these compositions, the evil principle on earth, as opposed to all that is physically or morally good. In the Purânas, they are sometimes mentioned as the offspring of the patriarch Pulastya, at other times as the sons of the patriarch Kasyapa. Another account of their origin, given in the *Vishnu-Purâna*, where, treating of the creation of the world (bk. i, ch. v), is the following: "Next, from Brahma, in a form composed of the quality of foulness, was produced hunger, of whom anger was born; and the god put forth in darkness beings emaciate with hunger, of hideous aspects, and with long beards. Those beings hastened to the deity. Such of them as exclaimed, 'Not so; oh! let him be saved,' were named Râkshasa (from *raksh*, save); others who cried out, 'Let us eat,' were denominated, from that expression, Yaksha (from *yaksh*, for *jaksh*, eat)." This popular etymology of the name, however, would be at variance with the cruel nature of these beings, and it seems, therefore, to have been improved upon in the *Bhagavata-Purâna*, where it is related that Brahma transformed himself into night, invested with a body; this the Yakshas and Râkshasas seized upon, exclaiming, "Do not spare it—devour it!" when Brahmâ cried out, "Don't devour me (*mâ mâm jakshata*) — spare me! (*rakshata*)." (See F. E. Hall's note to Wilson's *Vishnu-Purâna*, i, 82.) The more probable origin of the word *Rakshas*—kindred with the German *Recke* or *Riese*—is that from a radical *rish*, "hurt," or "destroy," with an affix *sas;* hence, literally, the destructive being.

Rakusians is the name of a Christian sect whom Mohammedan writers speak of as having existed among them in Arabia. Nothing is definitely known about them. Their tenets appear to have been those of the *Mendæans* (q. v.) or *Sabians* (q. v.), still further corrupted by Ebionite influences. See Sprenger, *Mohammed*, i, 41; ii, 155; iii, 387, 395; Weil, *Mohammed*, p. 249, 386; Ueberweg, *Hist. of Philosophy*, i, 409.

Ralbag, so called by Jews from the initial letters of his name, ר' לוי בן גרשון = *R. Levi ben-Gershon*, and known by Christian writers by the name *Magister Leo de Bannolis* or *Gersonides*, was born in 1288 at Bañolas, not far from Gerona, and died about 1345. Little is known about the personal history of this remarkable Hebrew beyond the fact that, by virtue of his residence in Orange and Avignon, he was providentially exempted from the fearful sufferings inflicted upon his brethren in 1306, by the cruel government of Philip the Fair and his successors, and that he was thus enabled quietly to consecrate his extraordinary powers to the elucidation of the Scriptures, as well as to the advancement of science. His principal work, and perhaps the greatest on religious philosophy, is his ס' מלחמות השם, *The Wars of God* (Riva di Trento, 1560; Leipsic, 1866). In this work Gersonides had the audacity to confess the eternity of matter, so that it was ironically called "The Wars with (against) God." But, as free as God's sun, he uttered his convictions, careless of consequences, and without fear of offending this or that man, sect, or established opinions. He believed in the progressive nature of thoughts, and added his to those of his predecessors, leaving the consequence in the hand of God, and believing that "time develops truth." "Truth," he says, "must be brought to light even if it contradicts the revealed law most emphatically; as the Bible is no tyrannical law which intends to impose untruth for truth, but its design is to lead us to true knowledge" (introd. p. 2 b, sect. vi, p. 69 a). This great philosophical work treats: 1. Of the immortality of the soul (on which there are fourteen chapters); 2. On dreams and prophecy (eight chapters); 3. On the omniscience of God and the conflict between philosophy and religion (six chapters); 4. On Providence, viewed from the philosophical and religious standpoints (seven chapters). The remaining portion of the work is a cosmogony designed to show the harmony between the statements of the Bible and the phenomena of the universe. That part of his work which treats on astronomy, and which describes an astronomical instrument invented by Gersonides to facilitate observations, was so much appreciated that pope Clement VI, in 1342, had it translated into Latin; and Kepler, as he says in a letter to John

Remus, took much trouble to get the book of rabbi Levi, as he calls him (*utinam apud Rabbinos invenire posses tractatum R. Levi quintum defensionum Dei*). The same was done by Pico de Mirandola and the great Reuchlin, who quotes largely from Gersonides. Though he began his authorship with philosophical and scientific productions when about thirty (1318), yet he published no exegetical work till he was thirty-seven years of age, from which time he unremittingly devoted himself to the exposition of the Bible. His first commentary is on the book of Job, and was finished in 1325. Twelve months later (1326) he published a commentary on the Song of Songs, and in 1328 a commentary on Coheleth, or Ecclesiastes. About the same time Ralbag finished his commentary on the first chapters of Genesis, treating on the hexahemeron, and shortly after issued an exposition of Esther (1329). The Pentateuch now engaged his attention, and after laboring on it eight years (1329–1337), he completed the interpretation of this difficult part of the Old Test. In 1338 he finished a commentary on the earlier prophets — i. e. Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings — together with his comments on Proverbs, Daniel, Ezra, Nehemiah, and Chronicles. The following are the editions of his exegetical works: פירוש על התורה, *Commentary on the Pentateuch* (first printed at Mantua before 1480, then by Corn. Adelkind, Venice, 1547, and then again in Frankfurter's Rabbinic Bible, Amst. 1724–1727):—פירוש על נביאים ראשונים, *Commentary on the Earlier Prophets* (Leira, and in all the Rabbinic Bibles; latest edition, Königsberg, 1860:—excerpts of the commentaries on the Pentateuch and the earlier prophets, entitled תועלות, *Utility*, were published in 1550, and a Jewish-German version of them is given in Jekutiel's German translation of the Bible [Amst. 1676–78]):—פירוש על משלי, *Commentary on Proverbs* (Leira, 1492, and in all the Rabbinic Bibles); a Latin translation was published by Ghiggheo (Milan, 1620):—פירוש על איוב, *Commentary on Job* (Ferrara, 1477, and in all the Rabbinic Bibles); a Latin translation of ch. i–v was published by L. H. d'Aquine (Paris, 1623), and of ch. iv–viii by Chr. Ludovicus (Leipsic, 1700):—פירוש על שיר השירים אסתר קהלת ורות, *Commentary on Song of Songs, Esther, Ecclesiastes, and Ruth*, with an introduction by Jacob Morkaria (Riva, 1560):—פירוש על דניאל, *Commentary on Daniel*, published in Italy before 1480, in Pratensis's Rabbinic Bible, and in Frankfurter's. The commentaries on Ezra, Nehemiah, and Chronicles, which he finished in 1338, are still in MS., Cod. MSS. Opp. 288 Q. and Mich. 623. "As to his mode of interpretation, Ralbag first gives an explanation of the words (ביאור המלות) in each section, then propounds the meaning according to the context (ביאיר הפירוש), and finally gives the utility or application of the passage (תועלות)." See Fürst, *Bibliotheca Judaica*, i, 82–84; Steinschneider, *Catalogus Libr. Hebr. in Bibl. Bodl.* col. 1607–1615; Wolf, *Bibliotheca Hebr.* i, 726, etc.; iv, 892; Ginsburg, in Kitto, s. v.; Joël, in Frankel's *Monatsschrift*, ix, 223, etc. (Leips. 1860), x, 41–60, 93–111, 137–145, 297–312, 333–344, xi, 20–31, 65–75, 101–114; Grätz, *Geschichte d. Juden*, vii, 345–352 (Leips. 1873); Jost, *Gesch. d. Judenth. u. s. Secten*, iii, 83; Etheridge, *Introduction to Hebrew Literature*, p. 261 sq.; De Rossi, *Dizionario Storico degli Autori Ebrei*, p. 114 sq. (Germ. transl.); Basnage, *Histoire des Juifs* (Taylor's transl.), p. 673; Ueberweg, *History of Philosophy*, i, 421; Prantl, *Gesch. d. Logik*, ii, 394–396, Margoliouth, *Modern Judaism Investigated*, p. 253 (Londor., 1843); Levy, *Die Exegese bei den französ. Israeliten*, etc., p. 34 sq. (Leips. 1873). (B. P.)

Rale (**Rasle**, or **Rasles**), Sebastian, a French Roman Catholic missionary, was born in 1657 or 1658, in the province of Franche-Comté. Having entered the Order of the Jesuits, he was despatched to the foreign work in 1689. He arrived at Quebec in the fall of that year, and labored faithfully among the Indians for their conversion, and for a time with much show of success. But his venturesome spirit led him into dangerous paths: he frequently went far beyond the territory of those savages friendly to him, and he finally paid for his daring with his life. He was killed in 1724, while out on an expedition with Indians; but not by the savages—he fell pierced with English bullets. He had been guilty of great cruelty to Englishmen who had fallen into the hands of Indians, and this was only a revenge for his treachery to the whites. His death was a loss not only to Roman Catholics, but to the world of learning. Rale was a superior linguist, and had made himself master of the aboriginal languages and compiled a dictionary of the Abnaki language—of which the MS. is in the Harvard Library—which was published at the express wish of great savants. A monument was erected to his memory by bishop Fenwick, Aug. 29, 1833. See *Memoir*, by C. Francis, D.D., in Sparks, *Amer. Biog.* 2d series, vol. vii. (J. H. W.)

Raleigh, Walter, *Sir*, the distinguished English soldier, navigator, and writer of the Elizabethan age, deserves a place here on account of his contributions to sacred song. He was born at Hayes, near the coast of Devonshire, in 1552, and was educated at Oriel College, Oxford. In 1569—about a year after graduation—he entered the volunteer corps which, under Champernon, went to France to fight for the Huguenots. Subsequently he fought, under the prince of Orange, in the Netherlands, against the Spanish. In 1579 he made his first venture in navigation, which through life continued, at intervals, to attract him. He then sailed, in conjunction with his half-brother, Sir Humphrey Gilbert, with the purpose of founding a colony in North America. But the expedition proved unsuccessful; and during the year following he held a captain's commission in Ireland, where, in operations against the rebels, he distinguished himself by his courage and conduct. He attracted the notice of queen Elizabeth; and, for some years afterwards, he was constant in his attendance upon the queen, who distinguished him by employing him, from time to time, in various delicate offices of trust, and by substantial marks of her favor. The spirit of enterprise was, however, restless in the man; and in 1584, a patent having been granted him to take possession of lands to be discovered by him on the continent of North America, he fitted out two ships at his own expense, and shortly achieved the discovery and occupation of the territory known as Virginia—a name chosen as containing an allusion to the "virgin queen" herself. Elizabeth also conferred on Raleigh the honor of knighthood. If we except the questionable benefit—with which his name remains connected—of the introduction of tobacco into Europe, no immediate good came of the colony; and, after some years of struggle, during which he sent out several auxiliary expeditions, he was forced to relinquish his connection with it. In 1587–88, the country being menaced by a Spanish invasion, Raleigh was actively and responsibly occupied in organizing a resistance, and held command of the queen's forces in Cornwall. In the latter year he shared, with new access of honor, in the series of actions which ended in the defeat and dispersion of the great Armada, and was thanked and rewarded for his services. His private marriage with Elizabeth Throckmorton, one of the queen's maids of honor, incurred her Majesty's severe displeasure, and he was banished from court. He now recurred to those schemes of conquest and adventure in the New World which formed one main dream of his life, and in 1595 headed an expedition to Guiana, having for its object the discovery of the fabled El Dorado, a city of gold and gems, the existence of which in these regions was then generally believed in. Of this brilliant but fruitless adventure, on returning, he published an account. Having re-

gained the royal favor, he was made, in 1596, admiral in the expedition against Cadiz, commanded by Howard and the earl of Essex, and was admittedly the main instrument of its success. Also, in the year following, he took part in the attack on the Azores made by the same commanders. In the court intrigues which ended in the downfall of the earl of Essex, he, after this, became deeply involved; and certain points of his conduct—as, notably, the sale of his good offices with the queen in behalf of such of the earl's adherents as would buy them—though easily regarded by the current morality of the time, have fixed somewhat of a stain on a fame otherwise so splendid. With the death of Elizabeth, in 1603, ends his brilliant and successful career. Her successor, James, from the first regarded him with suspicion and dislike. He had, besides, made powerful enemies; and, when accused of complicity in a plot against the king, though no jot of evidence of his being any way concerned in it was produced at his trial, a verdict was readily procured finding him guilty of high-treason. The language of the prosecutor, attorney-general Coke, was outrageously abusive. He called Raleigh "a damnable atheist," "a spider of hell," a "viperous traitor," etc. Sentence of death was passed, but James did not venture to execute him; and he was sent to the Tower, where, for thirteen years, he remained a prisoner, his estates being confiscated, and made over to the king's favorite, Carr, subsequently earl of Somerset. During his imprisonment, Raleigh devoted himself to literary and scientific pursuits, his chief monument in this kind being his *History of the World*, a noble fragment, still notable to the student as one of the finest models of quaint and stately old English style. Certain of his poetical pieces, giving hint of a genius at once elegant and sententious, also continue to be esteemed. In 1615 he procured his release, and once more sailed for Guiana. The expedition, from which great results were expected, failed miserably. He himself, in consequence of severe illness, was unable to accompany it inland; and nothing but disaster ensued. To add to his grief and disappointment, his eldest and favorite son was killed in the storming of the Spanish town of St. Thomas. He returned to England, broken in spirit and in fortunes, only to die. On the morning of Oct. 29, 1618, he was infamously executed, nominally on the sentence passed on him sixteen years before, but really, there is reason to suppose, in base compliance, on James's part, with the urgencies of the king of Spain, who resented his persistent hostility. Raleigh was a man of noble presence, of versatile and commanding genius, unquestionably one of the most splendid figures in a time unusually prolific of all splendid developments of humanity. In the art and *finesse* of the courtier, the politic wisdom of the statesman, and the skilful daring of the warrior, he was almost alike pre-eminent. The moral elevation of the man shone out eminently in the darkness which beset his later fortunes; and the calm and manly dignity with which he fronted adverse fate conciliated even those whom his haughtiness in prosperity had offended. Raleigh's *Life* has been written by Oldys, Cayley (Lond. 1806, 2 vols.), and P. F. Tytler (Edin. 1833). His poems were collected and published by Sir E. Brydges (Lond. 1814); his *Miscellaneous Writings*, by Dr. Birch (1751, 2 vols.); and his *Complete Works*, at Oxford (1829, 8 vols.).

Rale(i)gh, Walter, D.D., nephew of the foregoing, was born in 1586, and was educated at Magdalen College, Oxford. He took holy orders, and finally became, in 1620, rector of Chedzoy, Somersetshire. In 1630 he was made chaplain to the king, and won much favor from Charles I. In 1634 he was made prebend of Wells, in 1641 was promoted to the deanery of Wells, and later became rector of Streat, with the chapel of Walton, Wiltshire. During the rebellion, he fell under suspicion, and was imprisoned in his house. While thus confined, he was stabbed, one day (1646), in an encounter with the guard, from whose impertinent curiosity he was determined to hide a private letter. England lost in this divine an eloquent preacher and a scholarly man. Chillingworth said of him that he was the best disputant he ever met with. His works are—*Reliquiæ Raleghanæ;* being discourses and sermons on several subjects, with an account of the author by bishop Patrick (Lond. 1679, 4to; 1689, 4to):—*Certain Queries Proposed by Roman Catholics, and Answered by Dr. Walter Raleigh* (pub. by Howell, 1719, 8vo). See Wood, *Athenæ Oxon.; Gentleman's Magazine* (Lond.), 1857, ii, 643; 1858, i, 82.

Ralston, Samuel, D.D., a Presbyterian minister, was born in the county of Donegal, Ireland, in 1756; studied at the University of Glasgow; and, after entering the ministry, emigrated to this country in the spring of 1794. After itinerating about two years in Eastern Pennsylvania, he went West, and in 1796 became pastor of the united congregations of Mingo Creek and Williamsport (now Monongahela City), where he remained for the rest of his life, being pastor of the latter branch thirty-five years, and of the former forty years. In 1822 he was made D.D. by Washington College, Pa., and died in Washington County, Pa., Sept. 25, 1851. As a preacher, he was eminently didactic and distinctive, clear, copious, and profound in the exposition and defence of truth. His published works are mostly of a controversial character; among them we find—*The Curry-comb* (1805):—a work on baptism, comprising a review of Campbell's debate with Walker, and letters in reply to his attack upon this review:—*A Brief Examination of the Principal Prophecies of Daniel and John:—A Defence of Evangelical Psalmody.*—Sprague, *Annals*, iv, 146.

Ram (Heb. *id.* רָם, *high*), the name of three men in Scripture.

1. (Sept. Ἀράμ, v. r. Ἀρράν and Ὀράμ; Vulg. *Aram.*) The son of Hezron and father of Amminadab, B.C. cir. 1780. He was born in Egypt after Jacob's migration there, as his name is not mentioned in Gen. xlvi, 4. He first appears in Ruth iv, 19. The genealogy in 1 Chron. ii, 9, 10 adds no further information concerning him, except that he was the *second* son of Hezron, Jerahmeel being the first-born (ver. 25). He appears in the New Test. only in the two lists of the ancestry of Christ (Matt. i, 3, 4; Luke iii, 33), where he is called Aram.

2. (Sept. Ῥάμ, v. r. Ῥάν, Ἀράμ; Vulg. *Ram.*) The first-born of Jerahmeel, and therefore nephew of the preceding (1 Chron. ii, 25, 27). B.C. post 1780. He had three sons—Maaz, Jamin, and Eker.

3. (Sept. Ῥάμ, v. r. Ἀράμ; Vulg. *Ram.*) Elihu, the son of Barachel the Buzite, is described as "of the kindred of Ram" (Job xxxii, 2). Rashi's note on the passage is curious: "'of the family of Ram,' Abraham; for it is said, 'the greatest man among the Anakim' (Josh. xiv); this [is] Abraham." Ewald identifies Ram with Aram, mentioned in Gen. xxii, 21 in connection with Huz and Buz (*Gesch.* i, 414). Elihu would thus be a collateral descendant of Abraham, and this may have suggested the extraordinary explanation given by Rashi. See Aram.

Ram (אַיִל, *áyil;* κριός). As this animal, fattened, was a favorite article of food (Gen. xxxi, 38; Ezek. xxxix, 18), it was considered, when offered as sacrifice, of higher value than sheep and lambs (Gen. xv, 9, Numb. xv, 5, 6; xxiii, 1 sq.; xxviii, 11 sq., 28 sq.; Mic. vi, 7), and the legal ritual gave exact directions on the sacrifice of them. The rams were sometimes burnt-offerings (Lev. viii, 18, 21; ix, 2; xvi, 3; xxix, 18; Numb. vii, 15; Psa. lxvi, 15; Isa. i, 11; Ezek. xlv, 23, etc.), sometimes thank-offerings (Lev. ix, 4, 18; Numb. vi, 14, 17; vii, 17; xxviii, 11, etc.), sometimes trespass-offerings (Lev. v, 15, 18, 25; vi, 6; comp. Lev. xix, 21; Numb. v, 8; Ezra x, 19, etc.). The ram, too, appears not only in public and private offerings in general, but especially in the purifying sacrifices of the

Nazarite (Numb. vi, 14) and the sacrifices of Priestly Consecration. It was not used as a sin-offering. In 2 Chron. xxix, 21 only *the seven he-goats* belong to *the sin-offering*, as ver. 23 shows; the rams, with the other animals, forming the burnt-offering. The use of the ram as thank- and trespass-offering is pointed out in Exod. xxix, 22 (comp. Lev. viii, 16; ix, 19; Isa. xxxiv, 6). The Greeks and Romans used rams for sacrifice only exceptionally; yet comp. Pliny, *H. N.* xxxiv, 19, 19. In Egypt this was more frequent (Wilkinson, v, 191 sq.); only in the Thebais it was prohibited, save at the great annual festival of Ammon (Herod. ii, 42). On the symbolic use of the ram in Daniel to signify the Persian empire, see CATTLE, No. II; and on the BATTERING-RAM, see s. v. The use of ram's skins for covering is alluded to in Exod. xxv, 5; xxvi, 14; xxxvi, 19; xxxix, 34, and is still common in Palestine, where they are also "*dyed red*" (Exod. xxv, 5) for the use of the shoemakers (Thomson, *Land and Book*, i, 139). See SHEEP.

Ram, BATTERING (כַּר; Sept. *βελόστασις, χάραξ*; Vulg. *aries*). This instrument of ancient siege operations is twice mentioned in the Old Test. (Ezek. iv, 2; xxi, 22 [27]); and as both references are to the battering-rams in use among the Assyrians and Babylonians, it will only be necessary to describe those which are known from the monuments to have been employed in their sieges. With regard to the meaning of the Hebrew word there is but little doubt. It denotes an engine of war which was called a *ram*, either because it had an iron head shaped like that of a ram, or because, when used for battering down a wall, the movement was like the butting action of a ram.

In attacking the walls of a fort or city, the first step appears to have been to form an inclined plane or bank of earth (comp. Ezek. iv, 2—"cast a mount against it"), by which the besiegers could bring their battering-rams and other engines to the foot of the walls. "The battering-rams," says Mr. Layard, "were of several kinds. Some were joined to movable towers which held warriors and armed men. The whole then formed one great temporary building, the top of which is represented in sculptures as on a level with the walls, and even turrets, of the besieged city. In some bas-reliefs the battering-ram is without wheels; it was then, perhaps, constructed upon the spot, and was not intended to be moved. The movable tower was probably sometimes unprovided with the ram, but I have not met with it so represented in the sculptures. . . . When the machine containing the battering-ram was a simple framework and did not form an artificial tower, a cloth or some kind of drapery, edged with fringes and otherwise ornamented, appears to have been occasionally thrown over it. Sometimes it may have been covered with hides. It moved either on four or on six wheels, and was provided with one ram or with two. The mode of working the rams cannot be determined from the Assyrian sculptures. It may be presumed, from the representations in the bas-reliefs, that they were partly suspended by a rope fastened to the outside of the machine, and that men directed and impelled them from within. Such was the plan adopted by the Egyptians, in whose paintings the warriors working the ram may be seen through the frame. Sometimes this engine was ornamented by a carved or painted figure of the presiding divinity kneeling on one knee and drawing a bow. The artificial tower was usually occupied by two warriors: one discharged his arrows against the besieged, whom he was able, from his lofty position, to harass more effectually than if he had been below; the other held up a shield for his companion's defence. Warriors are not unfrequently represented as stepping from the machine to the battlements. . . . Archers on the walls hurled stones from slings and discharged their arrows against the warriors in the artificial towers; while the rest of the besieged were no less active in endeavoring to frustrate the attempts of the assailants to make breaches in their walls. By dropping a double chain or rope from the battlements they caught the ram, and could either destroy its efficacy altogether, or break the force of its blows. Those below, however, by placing hooks over the engine and throwing their whole weight upon them, struggled to retain it in its place. The besieged, if unable to displace the battering-ram, sought to destroy it by fire, and threw lighted torches or firebrands upon it; but water was poured upon the flames through pipes attached to the artificial tower" (*Nineveh and its Remains*, ii, 367–370). See BATTERING-RAM.

Ram, PIERRE FRANÇOIS XAVIER DE, a Belgian historian and theologian, was born at Louvain, Sept. 2, 1804, studied at Malines, and in 1823 was made professor in a seminary of the same place, and taught there until its suppression, in 1825. He was then made archivist to the archbishop of the diocese of Malines. In 1827 he took holy orders, and two years after was appointed professor of ecclesiastical history and philosophy in the theological seminary at Malines, of which, when (in 1834) enlarged to a university, he was made rector. In 1835 he was transferred to Louvain, and there taught until his death, in 1862. He was a learned man and greatly revered by his countrymen. His writings were very numerous. Besides his biography of the principal saints and celebrated persons of the Low Countries — a work in which he freely used the writings of Raine—Ram published the following works of interest to us: *Synodicum Belgicum, sive Acta omnium Ecclesiarum Belgii a Concilio Tridentino usque ad* 1801 (Mal. 1828–58); *Historia Philosophiæ* (Louv. 1832–34, 8vo); *Vie des Saints de Godescard* (Louv. 1828–35, 22 vols. 8vo, and often); *Documents relatifs aux Troubles du Pays de Liège, sous les Princes-évêques Louis de Bourbon et Jean de Horn*, 1455–1585 (Brux. 1844, 4to), a most important chapter from a Romanist on a noteworthy period of the ante-reformation movement in the Low Countries, etc. See Quérard, *La France Littéraire*, vol. xi, for full bibliography.

Ra'ma (Ῥαμᾶ), the Greek form of *Ramah*, found in Matt. ii, 18, referring to Jer. xxxi, 15. The original passage alludes to a massacre of Benjamites or Ephraimites (comp. vers. 9, 18) at the Ramah in Benjamin or in Mount Ephraim. This is seized by the evangelist and turned into a touching reference to the slaughter of the innocents at Bethlehem, near to which was (and is) the sepulchre of Rachel. The name of Rama is alleged to have been lately discovered attached to a spot close to the sepulchre. If it existed there in Matthew's day, it may have prompted his allusion, though it is not necessary to suppose this, since the point of the quotation does not lie in the name Ramah, but in the lamentation of Rachel for the children, as is shown by the change of the *υἱοῖς* of the original to *τέκνα*. The allusion is doubtless to Ramah, one of the leading cities of Benjamin, and not, as many have supposed, to some place of that name near Bethlehem. The passage is a difficult one, but the difficulty may be solved by a careful examination of the topography of the district. The difficulties are these: 1. Why is Rachel, the mother of Benjamin, represented as weeping for her children, seeing that Bethlehem was in *Judah* and not in *Benjamin*? The reply is, Rachel died and was buried near Bethlehem (Gen. xxxv, 19); the border of the tribe of Benjamin reached to her sepulchre (1 Sam. x, 2); not only were the children of Bethlehem slain, but also those "in all the coast thereof," thus including part of Benjamin. The spirit of the departed Rachel is then represented as rising from the tomb and mourning her slaughtered children. 2. But why was the voice of lamentation heard in Ramah, nearly ten miles distant? The answer is now easy. So deep was the impression made by the cruel massacre, that the cry of distress went through the whole

land of Benjamin, reaching to the capital of the tribe.

Râma is, in Hindû mythology, the name common to three incarnations of Vishnu, of Parasurâma, Râmachandra, and Balarâma. See VISHNU.

Ramadân, the ninth month in the Mohammedan year. In it Mohammed received his first revelation, and every believer is therefore enjoined to keep a strict fast throughout its entire course, from the dawn—when a white thread can be distinguished from a black thread—to sunset. Eating, drinking, smoking, bathing, smelling perfumes, and other bodily enjoyments, even swallowing one's spittle, are strictly prohibited during that period. Even when obliged to take medicine, the Moslem must make some kind of amends for it, such as spending a certain sum of money upon the poor. During the night, however, the most necessary wants may be satisfied—a permission which, practically, is interpreted by a profuse indulgence in all sorts of enjoyments. The fast of Ramadân, now much less observed than in former times, is sometimes a very severe affliction upon the orthodox, particularly when the month—the year being lunar—happens to fall in the long and hot days of midsummer. The sick, travellers, and soldiers in time of war, are temporarily released from this duty, but they have to fast an equal number of days at a subsequent period, when this impediment is removed. Nurses, pregnant women, and those to whom it might prove really injurious, are expressly exempt from fasting. We may add that according to some traditions (Al-Beidâwi), not only Mohammed, but also Abraham, Moses, and Jesus received their respective revelations during this month. The principal passages treating of the fast of Ramadân are found in the second Surah of the Koran, called "The Cow." See Wellsted, *City of the Caliphs*, ii, 245.

Ra'mah (Heb. *Ramah'*, רָמָה) signifies *a height*, or *a high place*, from the root רוּם, *to be high;* and thus it is used in Ezek. xvi, 24. Very many of the ancient cities and villages of Palestine were built on the tops of hills, so as to be more secure, and hence, as was natural, such of them as were especially conspicuous were called by way of distinction הָרָמָה (with the article), *the Height;* and this in the course of time came to be used as a proper name. We find no less than five Ramahs mentioned in Scripture by this simple name, besides several compounds, and in modern Palestine the equivalent Arabic name is of very frequent occurrence. With regard to most of them the traveller can still see how appropriate the appellation was. In the A. V. we have various forms of the word—*Ramáth* (רָמַת), the *status constructus* (Josh. xiii, 26), *Ramôth* (רָמוֹת and רָמֹת), the plural (Josh. xxi, 36; 1 Sam. xxx, 27); and *Ramathâim* (רָמָתַיִם), a dual form (1 Sam. i, 1). *Rémeth* (רֵמֶת) appears to be only another form of the same word. In later Hebrew, *ramtha* is a recognised word for a hill, and as such is employed in the Jewish versions of the Pentateuch for the rendering of Pisgah. See also ARIMATHÆA. In the following account we largely follow the usual geographical authorities, with important additions from other sources.

1. RAMAH OF BENJAMIN (Sept. Ῥαμά and Ἀραμά, v. r. Ἰαμά, Ῥαμμά, Ῥαμμάν, Βαμά, Vulg. *Rama*), frequently mentioned in Scripture. Joshua, in enumerating the towns of Benjamin, groups Ramah between Gibeon and Beeroth (xviii, 25). This position suits the present Ram-Allah; but the considerations named in the text make it very difficult to identify any other site with it than er-Râm. It is probably this place which is mentioned in the story of Deborah, "She dwelt under the palm-tree of Deborah, between Ramah and Bethel in Mount Ephraim" (Judg. iv, 5). The Targum on this passage substitutes for the Palm of Deborah, Ataroth-Deborah, no doubt referring to the town of Ataroth. This has everything in its favor, since 'Atâra is still found on the left hand of the north road, very nearly midway between er-Râm and Beitîn. Its position is clearly indicated in the distressing narrative of the Levite recorded in Judges xix. He left Bethlehem for his home in Mount Ephraim in the afternoon. Passing Jerusalem, he journeyed northward, and, crossing the ridge, came in sight of Gibeah and Ramah, each standing on the top of its hill; and he said to his servant, "Come and let us draw near to one of these places to lodge all night, in Gibeah or in Ramah" (ver. 13). The towns were near the road on the right, and about two miles apart. The position of these two ancient towns explains another statement of Scripture. It is said of Saul (1 Sam. xxii, 6) that "he abode in Gibeah under a tree in Ramah." The meaning appears to be that the site of his standing camp was in some commanding spot on the borders of the two territories of Gibeah and Ramah. When Israel was divided, Ramah lay between the rival kingdoms, and appears to have been destroyed at the outbreak of the revolt; for we read that "Baasha, king of Israel, went up against Judah, and *built* Ramah" (1 Kings xv, 17). It was a strong position, and commanded the great road from the north to Jerusalem. The king of Judah was alarmed at the erection of a fortress in such close proximity to his capital, and he stopped the work by bribing the Syrians to invade northern Palestine (vers. 18–21), and then carried off all the building materials (ver. 22). There is a precise specification of its position in the catalogue of the places north of Jerusalem which are enumerated by Isaiah as disturbed by the gradual approach of the king of Assyria (Isa. x, 28–32). At Michmash he crosses the ravine; and then successively dislodges or alarms Geba, Ramah, and Gibeah of Saul. Each of these may be recognised with almost absolute certainty at the present day. Geba is Jeba, on the south brink of the great valley; and a mile and a half beyond it, directly between it and the main road to the city, is er-Râm, on the elevation which its ancient name implies. Ramah was intimately connected with one of the saddest epochs of Jewish history. The full story is not told, but the outline is sketched in the words of Jeremiah. In the final invasion of Judæa by the Babylonians, Nebuchadnezzar established his headquarters on the plain of Hamath, at Riblah (Jer. xxxix, 5). Thence he sent his generals, who captured Jerusalem. The principal inhabitants who escaped the sword were seized, bound, and placed under a guard at Ramah, while the conquerors were employed in pillaging and burning the temple and palace, and levelling the ramparts. Among the captives was Jeremiah himself (xl, 1, 5, with xxxix, 8-12). Perhaps there was also a slaughter of such of the captives as, from age, weakness, or poverty, were not worth the long transport across the desert to Babylon. There, in that heart-rending scene of captives in chains wailing over slaughtered kindred and desolated sanctuaries, was fulfilled the first phase of the prophecy uttered only a few years before: "A voice was heard in Ramah, lamentation and bitter weeping: Rachel weeping for her children, refused to be comforted for her children because they were not" (Jer. xxxi, 15). That mourning was typical of another which took place six centuries later, when the infants of Bethlehem were murdered, and the second phase of the prophecy was fulfilled (Matt. ii, 17). As Ramah was in Benjamin, the prophet introduces Rachel, the mother of that tribe, bewailing the captivity of her descendants. See RAMA.

Ramah was rebuilt and reoccupied by the descendants of its old inhabitants after the captivity (Ezra ii, 26; Neh. vii, 30). The Ramah in Neh. xi, 33 is thought by some to occupy a different position in the list, and may be a distinct place situated farther west, nearer the plain. (This, and Jer. xxxi, 15, are the only passages in which the name appears without the article.) The Sept. finds an allusion to Ramah in Zech. xiv, 10, where it renders the words which are translated in the A. V.

"and shall be lifted up (רָאמָה), and inhabited in her place," by "Ramah shall remain upon her place." According to Josephus (who calls it Ῥαμαζών), it was forty stadia distant from Jerusalem (*Ant.* viii, 12, 3); and Eusebius and Jerome place it in the sixth mile north of the holy city (*Onomast.* s. v. "Rama;" but in his commentary on Hos. v, 8, Jerome says *in septimo lapide*); and the latter states that in his day it was a small village (*ad Sophoniam*, i, 15).

Modern travellers are right in identifying Ramah of Benjamin with the village of *er-Râm* (Brocardus, vii; Robinson, *Bibl. Res.* i, 576); though Maundrell and a few others have located it at Neby Samwil. Er-Râm is five miles north of Jerusalem and four south of Bethel. The site of Gibeah of Saul lies two miles southward, and Geba about the same distance eastward. Râm is a small, miserable village; but in the walls and foundations of the houses are many large hewn stones, and in the lanes and fields broken columns and other remains of the ancient capital. The situation is commanding, on the top of a conical hill, half a mile east of the great northern road, and overlooking the broad summit of the ridge; the eastern view is intercepted by bare ridges and hill-tops. The whole country round Ramah has an aspect of stern and even painful desolation; but this is almost forgotten in the great events which the surrounding heights and ruins recall to memory. On the identity of this Ramah with that of Samuel, see RAMATHAIM-ZOPHIM.

2. RAMAH OF ASHER (Sept. Ῥαμά; Vulg. *Horma*), a town mentioned only in Josh. xix, 29, in the description of the boundaries of Asher. It would appear to have been situated near the sea-coast, and not far from Tyre, towards the north or north-east. Eusebius and Jerome mention this place, but in such a way as shows they knew nothing of it further than what is stated by Joshua. In the Vulgate Jerome calls it *Horma*, making the Hebrew article ה a part of the word; this, however, is plainly an error (*Onomast.* s. v. "Rama;" and note by Bonfrère). Robinson visited a village called *Rameh*, situated on the western declivity of the mountain-range, about seventeen miles south-east of Tyre. It "stands upon an isolated hill in the midst of a basin with green fields, surrounded by higher hills." In the rocks are numerous ancient sarcophagi, and the village itself has some remains of antiquity. He says "there is no room for question but that this village represents the ancient Ramah of Asher" (*Bibl. Res.* iii, 64). Its position, however, notwithstanding the assertion of so high an authority, does not at all correspond with the notice in Scripture; and the name Ramah was too common to indicate identity with any degree of certainty. Another Rameh has been discovered on a little tell, two miles south-east of modern Tyre, and about one mile north-east of Ras-el-Ain, the site of ancient Tyre (Van de Velde, *Map* and *Memoir*, p. 342). In position this village answers in all respects to the Ramah of Asher.

3. RAMAH OF GILEAD (2 Kings viii, 29; 2 Chron. xxii, 6), identical with Ramoth-Gilead (q. v.).

4. RAMAH OF NAPHTALI (Sept. Αραήλ v. r. Ῥαμά; Vulg. *Arama*), one of the strong cities of the tribe, mentioned only in Josh. xix, 36, and situated apparently to the south of Hazor, between that city and the Sea of Galilee. Reland seems inclined to identify it with the Ramah of Asher; but they are evidently distinct cities, as indicated both by ancient geographers and the sacred writer (*Palæst.* p. 963). Eusebius and Jerome record the name, though they appear to have known nothing of the place (*Onomast.* s. v. "Rama"). *Beth-Rimah* (בֵּית רִמָּה), a place in Galilee on a mountain, and famous for its wine, according to the Talmud (*Menachoth*, viii, 6), is thought by Schwarz (*Palest.* p. 178) to be the Ramah of Naphtali. About six miles west by south of Safed, on the leading road to Akka, is a large modern village called *Rameh*. It stands on the declivity of the mountain, surrounded by olive-groves, and overlooking a fertile plain. It contains no visible traces of antiquity; but the name and the situation render it highly probable that it occupies the site of Ramah of Naphtali. It was visited by Schultz in 1847 (Ritter, *Pal. und Syr.* iii, 772), and by Robinson in 1852 (*Bib. Res.* iii, 79). See also Hackett, *Illustr. of Script.* p. 240; Thomson, *Land and Book*, i, 515. See RAMATHITE.

5. RAMAH OF SAMUEL, the birthplace and home of that prophet (1 Sam. i, 19; ii, 11, etc.), and the city elsewhere called RAMATHAIM-ZOPHIM.

6. RAMAH OF THE SOUTH. See RAMATH-NEGEB.

7. A place mentioned in the catalogue of towns reinhabited by the Benjamites after their return from the captivity (Neh. xi, 33). It may be the Ramah of Benjamin (above, No. 1), or the Ramah of Samuel, but its position in the list (remote from Geba, Michmash, Bethel, ver. 31; comp. Ezra ii, 26, 28) seems to remove it farther west, to the neighborhood of Lod, Hadid, and Ono. There is no further notice in the Bible of a Ramah in this direction; but Eusebius and Jerome allude to one, though they may be at fault in identifying it with Ramathaim and Arimathæa (*Onomast.* s. v. "Armatha Sophim;" and the remarks of Robinson, *Bibl. Res.* ii, 239). The situation of the modern *Ramleh* agrees very well with this, a town too important and too well placed not to have existed in the ancient times. The consideration that Ramleh signifies "sand," and Ramah "a height," is not a valid argument against the one being the legitimate successor of the other, if so, half the identifications of modern travellers must be reversed. Beit-ûr can no longer be the representative of Beth-horon, because *ûr* means "eye," while *horon* means "caves;" nor Beit-lahm, of Bethlehem, because *lahm* is "flesh," and *lehem* "bread;" nor el-Aal, of Elealeh, because *el* is in Arabic the article, and in Hebrew the name of God. In these cases the tendency of language is to retain the sound at the expense of the meaning.

8. RAMAH NEAR HEBRON, called *Er-Rameh*, or *Ramet el-Khalîl*—Ramah of Hebron, or Ramah of the Friend, i. e. Ramah of Abraham, or the High-place of Abraham the Friend of God. It lies about two miles north of Hebron, a little to the right or east of the road from Hebron to Jerusalem, on an eminence, the top and southern slope of which are covered with ancient foundations, the principal of which are those of a large building, apparently a Christian church. The ruins are described by Wolcott (*Biblioth. Sac.* i, 45), and by Dr. Wilson (*Lands of the Bible*, i, 382). The top commands a fine view of the Mediterranean through a gap in the mountains towards the north-west. This Ramah the Jews call the "House of Abraham," where, they say, Abraham lived when he dwelt at Mamre. But the "*plain* of Mamre," with the great *Sindian*, or evergreen oak in the middle of it (if not the same, the offspring, most probably, of the tree), under which Abraham entertained the angels, would seem to have anciently lain to the west of Hebron, as Machpelah, which is at Hebron, is said to be *before*, i. e. to the east of, Mamre. It is very possible, however, that Abraham may have had his habitation or tent at Ramah for a part of the time he was at Mamre or near Hebron, or, which is still more probable, the altar which he erected (Gen. xiii, 18), his high-place, or place of worship, may have been at er-Rameh, or Ramet el-Khalîl, "the high-place of the Friend," i. e. of Abraham the friend of God, while he dwelt or had his tent in the plain of Mamre.

Some suppose that this Ramah may be the Ramah of Samuel and the place where Saul was anointed. Wolcott and Van de Velde contend for this. But this place is far too distant from Rachel's tomb to admit of the supposition, not to speak of other insuperable difficulties. The place where Samuel was when he anointed Saul was evidently near or not far from Rachel's tomb (1 Sam. x, 1-11). It is much more probable that Bethlehem, or the high-place at or near Bethlehem,

was the place where Samuel anointed Saul. The name of Ramet el-Khalîl implies that that place had to do with Abraham the friend of God, and not with Samuel.

Ramanandis, a Hindû sect which addressed its devotions particularly to Ramachandra, and the divine manifestations connected with Vishnu in that incarnation. The originator of this sect was Ramánand, who is calculated by Prof. H. H. Wilson to have flourished in the end of the 14th or beginning of the 15th century. He resided at Benares, where a *mat'h*, or monastery, of his followers is said to have formerly existed, but to have been destroyed by some of the Mussulman princes. The Ramanandis reverence all the incarnations of Vishnu, but they maintain the superiority of Ráma in the present age or *Kali-Yug*, though they vary considerably as to the exclusive or collective worship of the male and female members of this incarnation. The ascetic and mendicant followers of Ramanand are by far the most numerous sectaries in Gangetic India. In Bengal they are comparatively few; beyond this province, as far as to Allahabad, they are probably the most numerous, though they yield in influence and wealth to the Saiva branches. From this point they are so abundant as almost to engross the whole of the country along the Ganges and Jumna. In the district of Agra they constitute seven tenths of the ascetic population. The numerous votaries of the Ramanandis belong chiefly to the poorer classes, with the exception of the Rajputs and military Brahmins.—Gardner, *Faiths of the World*, s. v.

Ramatha'im-zo'phim (Heb. with the art. *ha-Ramatha'yim Tsophim'* הָרָמָתַיִם צוֹפִים, *the two heights, watchers;* Sept. Ἀρμαθαὶμ Σιφά, v. r. Ἀρμαθαὶμ Σωφίμ, making the art. ה part of the word; Vulg. *Ramathaim Sophim*), the birthplace of the prophet Samuel (1 Sam. i, 19), his own permanent and official residence (vii, 17; viii, 4), and the place of his sepulture (xxv, 1). It was in Mount Ephraim (i, 1). It had apparently attached to it a place called Naioth, at which the "company" (or "school," as it is called in modern times) of the sons of the prophets was maintained (xix, 18, etc.; xx, 1); and it had also in its neighborhood (probably between it and Gibeah of Saul) a great well, known as the well of Has-Sechu (xix, 22). See Sechu. This is all we know of it with any degree of certainty.

Ramathaim, if interpreted as a Hebrew word, is dual —"the double eminence." This may point to a peculiarity in the shape or nature of the place, or may be an instance of the tendency, familiar to all students, which exists in language to force an archaic or foreign name into an intelligible form. It is given in its complete shape in the Hebrew text and A. V. but once (1 Sam. i, 1). Elsewhere (i, 19; ii, 11; vii, 17; viii, 4; xv, 34; xvi, 13; xix, 18, 19, 22, 23; xx, 1; xxv, 1; xxviii, 3) it occurs in the shorter form of Ramah (q. v.). The Sept., however (in both MSS.), gives it throughout as Armathaim, and inserts it in i, 3 after the words "his city," where it is wanting in the Hebrew and A. V. Gesenius questions the identity of Ramathaim-zophim and Ramah (*Thesaurus*, p. 1275); but a comparison of 1 Sam. i, 1 with ver. 19 shows without doubt that the same place is referred to. It is implied by Josephus, and affirmed by Eusebius and Jerome in the *Onomasticon* ("Armathem Seipha"); nor would it ever have been questioned had there not been other Ramahs mentioned in the sacred history. Of the force of "Zophim" no feasible explanation has been given. It was an ancient name on the east of Jordan (Numb. xxiii, 14), and there, as here, was attached to an eminence. In the Targum of Jonathan, Ramathaim-zophim is rendered "Ramatha of the scholars of the prophets;" but this is evidently a late interpretation, arrived at by regarding the prophets as watchmen (the root of *zophim*, also that of *mizpeh*, having the force of looking out afar), coupled with the fact that at Naioth in Ramah there was a school of prophets. The most natural explanation appears to be that Zuph, one of Samuel's ancestors, had migrated from his home in Ephratah (1 Sam. i, 1; 1 Chron. vi, 35), and settled in a district to which he gave his own name, and which was afterwards called *the land of Zuph* (1 Sam. ix, 5). Ramah, or Ramathaim, was the chief town of this district, and was hence called Ramathaim-*Zophim*, that is, "Ramah of the Zuphites" (see Robinson, *Bib. Res.* ii, 7). See Zophim.

The position of Ramathaim-zophim is regarded by many scholars as one of the puzzles of Biblical geography. As the city is one of great interest, it may be well to give the principal theories as to its site, and then to state the data on which alone the site can be determined.

(1.) Eusebius and Jerome locate it near Diospolis or Lydda (*Onomast.* s. v. "Armatha Sophim"), and identify it with the Arimathæa of the N. T. (Matt. xxvii, 57). Jerome's words are: "Armathem Seipha: the city of Helkana and Samuel. It lies near (πλησίον) Diospolis: thence came Joseph, in the Gospels said to be from Arimathæa." Diospolis is Lydda, the modern Ludd; and the reference is, no doubt, to Ramleh, the well-known modern town, two miles from Ludd. Jerome agrees with Eusebius in his translation of this passage; but in the *Epitaphium Paulæ* (Epist. cviii) he connects Ramleh with Arimathæa only, and places it *haud procul a Lyddâ*. This last identification may be correct; for the Sept. Ἀρμαθαὶμ seems to be the same name as the New-Test. Ἀριμαθαία, and represents the Hebrew הרמתים, with the article. There is no doubt there was a city called Armatha or Ramathem on the plain near Lydda at an early period; and its modern representative may be Ramleh, as suggested by Reland and others (Reland, *Palæst.* p. 580, 959; see, however, Robinson, *Bib. Res.* ii, 238). But Ramah of Samuel could not have been so far distant from Gibeah of Saul; and there is a fatal obstacle to this identification in the fact that Ramleh ("the sandy") lies on the open face of the maritime plain, and cannot in any sense be said to be in Mount Ephraim or any other mountain district. Eusebius possibly refers to another Ramah named in Neh. xi, 33.

(2.) Some would identify this city with Ramah of Benjamin (Gesenius, *Thesaur.* p. 1275; Winer, *Real-Wörterb.* s. v. "Rama"); but this Ramah seems too close to Saul's residence at Gibeah to suit the requirements of the sacred narrative in 1 Sam. xix, 18. (Yet see below.)

(3.) Robinson has suggested that the site of Ramah may be that now occupied by the village of Sôba, which stands on a lofty and conspicuous hill-top, about six miles west of Jerusalem. Sôba, he thinks, may be a corruption of the old name *Zuph*. Its elevation would answer well to the designation *Ramah*. It might be regarded as included in the mountains of Ephraim, or, at least, as a natural extension of them; and a not very wide détour would take the traveller from Sôba to Gibeah by the tomb of Rachel (*Bib. Res.* ii, 7–9). The arguments are plausible, but not convincing; and it must be admitted that even Robinson's remarkable geographical knowledge has failed to throw light on the site of Ramathaim-zophim.

(4.) Wolcott, seeing on the spot the difficulties attending Robinson's theory, and finding a remarkable ruin, called *Ramet el-Khulil*, near Hebron, concluded that this was the site of Samuel's city. A summary of his reasons is given by Robinson in the *Biblical Cabinet* (xliii, 51; see also *Bib. Res.* iii, 279). They are not more convincing than those advanced in favor of Sôba, yet they have been adopted and expanded by Van de Velde (*Narrat.* ii, 48–54; *Memoir*, p. 341). This is also supported by Stewart (*Tent and Khan*, p. 247).

(5.) Gesenius thinks that *Jebel Fureidis*, or, as it is usually called, *Frank Mountain*, the conspicuous conical hill three miles south-east of Bethlehem, is the true

site of Ramah (*Thesaurus*, p. 1276). This, however, is pure conjecture, without any evidence to support it.

(6.) Ewald is in favor of the little village of *Ram-Allah*, a mile west of Beeroth (*Geschichte*, ii, 550, *note*). It is doubtless situated in Mount Ephraim, retains the old name, and the name *Allah*, "God," might be an indication of some old, peculiar sanctity; but it is open to the same objections as all others north of Rachel's tomb. Lieut. Conder inclines to this position (*Tent Work in Palestine*, ii, 116), remarking that near it is a ruined village called Sueikeh, perhaps the Sechu of 1 Sam. xix, 22.

(7.) One of the most ancient, and certainly one of the most plausible, theories is that which locates Ramathaim-zophim at *Neby Samwil*. It is most probably to this place Procopius alludes in the statement that Justinian caused a well and a wall to be erected for the convent of St. Samuel (*De Ædific. Just.* v, 9; comp. Robinson, *Bib. Res.* i, 459). From the 7th century, when Adamnanus described Palestine, and spoke of "the city of Samuel, which is called Ramatha" (*Early Travels* [Bohn], p. 5), down through the Middle Ages to the present day, the name of the prophet has been connected with this spot; and the uniform tradition of Jews, Christians, and Mohammedans has made it the place of his birth and burial (see authorities cited in Robinson, *l. c.*). The Crusaders built a church over the alleged tomb, which, after the fall of the Latin kingdom, was converted into a mosque; and its walls and tall minaret are still visible from afar (Quaresmius, ii, 727; Pococke, ii, 48). Neby Samwîl is unquestionably the site of a very ancient city; its position on the summit of a high conical hill would give it a just title to the name Ramah; it probably lay within the region termed the "Mountains of Ephraim;" and it would form an appropriate residence for the great judge of Israel. It is near this place that the great well of Sechu, to which Saul came on his way to Ramah, now called Samuel's fountain, near Beit Iska, or Beit Isku, is thought by some to be found; and near Neby Samwîl is Beit Hanînah, supposed to be Naioth, the College of Prophets, or "the House of Instruction" of the Jewish Targum, which was connected with Ramah of Samuel (1 Sam. xix, 18–24). See NAIOTH. Yet there are very formidable objections to its identification with Ramathaim-zophim. It appears to be too near Gibeah, the capital of Saul's kingdom, to form a safe refuge for David when he fled from that monarch: it is not an hour's ride distant, and it is in full view. It has been shown, besides, that Neby Samwîl is most probably the site of Mizpah (q. v.).

(8.) Bonar (*Land of Promise*, p. 178, 554) adopts *er-Ram*, which he places a short distance north of Bethlehem, east of Rachel's sepulchre. Eusebius (*Onomast.* s. v. Ῥαβεδέ) says that "Rama of Benjamin" is near (περί) Bethlehem, where the "voice in Rama was heard;" and in our times the name is mentioned, besides Bonar, by Prokesch and Salzbacher (cited in Robinson, *Bib. Res.* ii, 8, *note*); but this cannot be regarded as certain, and Stewart has pointed out that it is too close to Rachel's monument to suit the case.

(9.) Schwarz (*Palest.* p. 152–158), starting from Gibeah of Saul as the home of Kish, fixes upon *Rameh*, north of Samaria and west of Sanur, which he supposes also to be Ramoth, or Jarmuth, the Levitical city of Issachar. All that is directly said as to its situation is that it was in Mount Ephraim (1 Sam. i, 1); and this would naturally lead us to seek it in the neighborhood of Shechem. But the whole tenor of the narrative of the public life of Samuel (in connection with which alone this Ramah is mentioned) is so restricted to the region of the tribe of Benjamin, and to the neighborhood of Gibeah, the residence of Saul, that it seems impossible not to look for Samuel's city in the same locality. It appears, from 1 Sam. vii, 17, that his annual functions as prophet and judge were confined to the narrow round of Bethel, Gilgal, and Mizpeh—the first on the north boundary of Benjamin; the second near Jericho at its eastern end; and the third on the ridge in more modern times known as Scopus, overlooking Jerusalem, and therefore near the southern confines of Benjamin. In the centre of these was Gibeah of Saul, the royal residence during the reign of the first king, and the centre of his operations. It would be doing a violence to the whole of this part of the history to look for Samuel's residence outside these narrow limits.

Those Scriptural allusions which tend to indicate the position of Ramathaim-zophim are the following, and they are our only trustworthy guides. The statements of Eusebius and later writers can have little weight; and, indeed, it appears that all knowledge of the city was lost before their time.

(*a.*) In 1 Sam. i, 1 we read, "There was a certain man of Ramathaim-zophim, of Mount Ephraim." From this it would appear, at first sight, that Ramathaim was situated in the district called Mount Ephraim. The construction of the Hebrew, however, does not make this quite certain. The phrase מן־הרמתים צופים מהר אפרים might possibly mean, not that Ramathaim was *in* Mount Ephraim (which would be expressed rather by בהר), but that Elkanah was in some way *of* Mount Ephraim (the Hebrew is מהר), though residing in Ramathaim. The statement of the sacred writer, therefore, does not form an insuperable objection to a theory that would locate Ramathaim beyond the bounds of Mount Ephraim. Besides, the extent of the region called Mount Ephraim is nowhere defined. It may mean that section of mountain allotted to the tribe of Ephraim, or it may have extended so as to include part, or even the whole, of Benjamin. In the mouth of an ancient Hebrew, the expression would mean that portion of the mountainous district which was, at the time of speaking, in the possession of the tribe of Ephraim. "Little Benjamin" was for so long in close alliance with, and dependence on, its more powful kinsman, that nothing is more probable than that the name of Ephraim may have been extended over the mountainous region which was allotted to the younger son of Rachel. Of this there are not wanting indications. The palm-tree of Deborah was "in Mount Ephraim," between Bethel and Ramah, and is identified with great plausibility by the author of the Targum on Judg. iv, 5 with Ataroth, one of the landmarks on the south boundary of Ephraim, which still survives in 'Atâra, two and a half miles north of Ramah of Benjamin (er-Râm). Bethel itself, though in the catalogue of the cities of Benjamin (Josh. xviii, 22), was appropriated by Jeroboam as one of his idol sanctuaries, and is one of the "cities of Mount Ephraim" which were taken from him by Baasha and restored by Asa (2 Chron. xiii, 19; xv, 8). Jeremiah (ch. xxxi) connects Ramah of Benjamin with Mount Ephraim (ver. 6, 9, 15, 18). It could scarcely have embraced any portion of Judah, since the two tribes were rivals for sovereignty. The allusions to Mount Ephraim in 1 Sam. ix, 4; Josh. xvii, 15; Judg. xvii, 1, appear to confine the name to the territory of the tribe.

(*b.*) Ramah would appear to have been at some considerable distance from the residence of Saul at Gibeah. Such, at least, is the conclusion one would naturally draw from the following passages: 1 Sam. xv, 34, 35; xix, 18–23. But in neither of these passages is it clearly asserted nor certainly implied. In another passage the immediate proximity of Gibeah and Ramah seems to be directly stated (1 Sam. xxii, 6). This passage, it is true, may either be translated (with Junius, Michaelis, De Wette, and Bunsen), "Saul abode in Gibeah under the tamarisk *on the height*" (in which case it will add one to the scanty number of instances in which the word is used otherwise than as a proper name); or it may imply that Ramah was included within the precincts of the king's city. The Sept. reads Bama for Ramah, and renders the words "on the hill under the

field in Bama." Eusebius, in his *Onomasticon* (s. v. Ῥαμά), characterizes Ramah as the "city of Saul." In any case, there seems to be no insuperable objection against the identity of Ramah of Saul with Ramah of Benjamin.

(*c.*) It is usually assumed that the city in which Saul was anointed by Samuel (1 Sam. ix, x) was Samuel's own city, Ramah. Josephus certainly (*Ant.* vi, 4, 1) does give the name of the city as Armathem, and, in his version of the occurrence, implies that the prophet was at the time in his own house; but neither the Hebrew nor the Sept. contains any statement which confirms this, if we except the slender fact that the "land of Zuph" (1 Sam. ix, 5) may be connected with the Zophim of Ramathaim-zophim. Robinson admits that "the answer of the maidens (ix, 11, 12) would, perhaps, rather imply that Samuel had just arrived, possibly on one of his yearly circuits in which he judged Israel in various cities" (*Bib. Res.* ii, 10). It cannot be questioned, indeed, that, apart from all theories, the whole course of the narrative leaves the impression that Samuel was in his own house in Ramah when Saul visited him. He was there when the Lord informed him, apparently on the preceding day (comp. 1 Sam. viii, 4, 22; ix, 15, 16), of his intention to appoint a king. The words of Saul's servant, too, convey the same impression: "When they were come to the land of Zuph, Saul said, Let us return;" but the servant said, "Behold now, there is *in this city* a man of God . . . let us go thither" (ix, 5, 6). This would scarcely apply to a place in which Samuel was but a casual visitor. But, on the other hand, the place of the interview could not have been within the tribe of Benjamin, because [1] the Lord, in foretelling to Samuel the coming of Saul, said, "To-morrow, about this time, I will send thee a man out of the land of Benjamin" (1 Sam. ix, 16); and [2] Saul, when in search of the asses, "passed through Mount Ephraim, and passed through the land of Shalisha; then through the land of Shalim; and he passed through the land of the Benjamites" (ver. 6). Then they came "to the land of Zuph." The land of Zuph was consequently south of Benjamin. So, in returning home (apparently to Gibeah) from the place of the interview, Saul's way led past Rachel's tomb, the site of which is well known, near Bethlehem. It follows, from the minute specification of Saul's route in 1 Sam. x, 2, that the city in which the interview took place was near the sepulchre of Rachel, which, by Gen. xxxv, 16, 19, and other reasons, appears to be fixed with certainty as close to Bethlehem. This supplies a strong argument against its being Ramathaim-zophim, since, while Mount Ephraim, as we have endeavored already to show, extended to within a few miles north of Jerusalem, there is nothing to warrant the supposition that it ever reached so far south as the neighborhood of Bethlehem. Saul's route will be most conveniently discussed under the head of SAUL; but the question of both his outward and his homeward journey, minutely as they are detailed, is beset with difficulties, which have been increased by the assumptions of the commentators. For instance, it is usually taken for granted that his father's house—and therefore the starting-point of his wanderings—was Gibeah. True, Saul himself, after he was king, lived at Gibeah; but the residence of Kish would appear to have been at Zela, where his family sepulchre was (2 Sam. xxi, 14); and of Zela no trace has yet been found. The A. V. has added to the difficulty by introducing the word "meet" in x, 3 as the translation of the term which is more accurately rendered "find" in the preceding verse. Again, where was the "hill of God," the *gibath-Elohim*, with the *netsib* of the Philistines? A *netsib* of the Philistines is mentioned later in Saul's history (1 Sam. xiii, 3) as at Geba, opposite Michmash; but this is three miles north of Gibeah of Saul, and does not at all agree with a situation near Bethlehem for the anointing of Saul. The Targum interprets the "hill of God" as "the place where the ark of God was," meaning Kirjath-jearim. There is no necessity whatever for supposing that Samuel was at Ramah when he anointed Saul. The name of the place where Samuel was at the time is not given in the sacred narrative, the language of which rather implies that it was not his regular abode; for it says that he had come that day into the city to attend a sacrifice or a feast of the people (1 Sam. ix, 11, 12). The city was most probably Bethlehem, with the inhabitants of which Samuel was connected, being a descendant of Zuph, an Ephrathite, and was likely to have been invited to their feast; and the land of Zuph, into which Saul had come, must have been the region of Bethlehem. That Samuel was in the habit of visiting Bethlehem for the purpose of sacrificing is certain from 1 Sam. xvi, 1–5 (comp. xx, 29). We may therefore conclude that he had come at this time thither from Ramah of Benjamin.

On the whole, Ramathaim-zophim is as likely to have been the Ramah of Benjamin as any other.

Ra'mathem (Ῥαμαθέμ v. r. Ῥαθαμείν; Josephus, Ῥαμαθά [Ant. xiii, 4, 9]; Vulg. *Ramathan*), one of the three "governments" (*νομοί* and *τοπαρχίαι*) which were added to Judæa by king Demetrius Nicator out of the country of Samaria (1 Macc. xi, 34); the others were Aphærema and Lydda. It no doubt derived its name from a town of the name of Ramathaim, probably that renowned as the birthplace of Samuel the prophet.—Smith.

Ra'mathite (Heb. *Ramathi'*, רָמָתִי, *an inhabitant of Ramah;* Sept. *ὁ* Ῥαμαθαῖος), an epithet of the Shimei (q. v.) who was over the vineyards of king David (1 Chron. xxvii, 27). The name implies that he was native of a place called Ramah, but of the various Ramahs mentioned none is said to have been remarkable for vines; nor is there any tradition or other clue by which the particular Ramah to which this worthy belonged can be identified. See RAMAH.

Ra'math-le'hi (Heb. *Ramath' Lechi'*, רָמַת לֶחִי, *craggy height* [see below]; Sept. Ἀναίρεσις σιαγόνος; Vulg. *Ramathlechi, quod interpretatur elevatio maxillæ*). The origin of this name, which occurs only in Judg. xv, 17, forms one of the most romantic episodes in Scripture history. Samson, having been bound with two new cords, was given up to the Philistines at a place called *Lehi*, a name which signifies "jawbone." When the enemy attacked him, he burst his bonds, seized the jawbone (*lehi*) of an ass that lay upon the ground, and with this odd weapon slew a thousand of them. Then he threw away the jawbone, and, as a memorial of the event, and by a characteristic play upon the old name, he called the place *Ramath-lehi*—that is, the lifting (or wielding?) of the jawbone; and so it is interpreted in the Vulgate and in the Sept. See SAMSON. But Gesenius has pointed out (*Thesaur.* p. 752 *a*) that to be consistent with this the vowel-points should be altered, and the words become רַמַּת לְחִי; and that as they at present stand they are exactly parallel to Ramath-mizpeh and Ramath-negeb, and mean the "height of Lechi." If we met with a similar account in ordinary history, we should say that the name had already been Ramath-lehi, and that the writer of the narrative, with that fondness for paronomasia which distinguishes these ancient records, had indulged himself in connecting the name with a possible exclamation of his hero. But the fact of the positive statement in this case may make us hesitate in coming to such a conclusion in less authoritative records. For the topography of the place, see LEHI.

Ra'math-miz'peh (Heb. *Ramath' ham-Mitspeh'*, רָמַת הַמִּצְפֶּה, *high-place of the watch-tower;* Sept. Ἀραβὼθ κατὰ τὴν Μασηφά, v. r. Ῥαμὼθ κατὰ τὴν Μασφά; Vulg. *Ramath Masphe*). In defining the boundaries of the tribe of Gad, Joshua states that Moses gave them inheritance . . . : "from Heshbon

unto Ramath-mizpeh, and Betonim" (Josh. xiii, 26). This place is nowhere else mentioned; and it appears to have constituted one of the landmarks on the northern border of the tribe, which ran from the banks of the Jabbok, in the parallel of Jerash, to the southern end of the Sea of Galilee. It was in this region Jacob and Laban had their remarkable interview and entered into the covenant. The place where they vowed to each other was marked by a heap of stones, and called both *Galeed* and *Mizpah* (Gen. xxxi, 48, 49). This would seem to suggest the identity of the Mizpah of Jacob and Ramath-Mizpeh. See GAD; JEGAR-SAHADUTHA. There was a Mizpeh in Gilead, on the north-east border of Gad, and close to the territory of the Ammonites. In later times the latter became the great gathering-place of Israel east of the Jordan. See RAMOTH-GILEAD. It apparently was the same as Ramath-mizpeh. In the books of Maccabees it probably appears in the garb of *Maspha* (1 Macc. v, 35), but no information is afforded us in either Old Test. or Apocrypha as to its position. The lists of places in the districts north of es-Salt, collected by Dr. Eli Smith, and given by Dr. Robinson (*Bibl. Res.* 1st ed. App. to vol. iii), contain several names which may retain a trace of Ramath, viz. *Rumeimin* (167 *b*), *Reimûn* (166 *a*), *Rumrâma* (165 *a*); but the situation of these places is not accurately known.

Ra'math-ne'geb, or RAMATH OF THE SOUTH (Heb. *Ramath' Ne'geb*, רַמַּת נֶגֶב; Sept. Βαμὲθ κατὰ λίβα, v. r. Ἰαμὲθ κατὰ λίβα; Vulg. *Ramath contra australem plagam*), a place apparently on the extreme southern border of Simeon. In this form it is only mentioned in Josh. xix, 8; and, from the peculiarity of the construction, there being no copulative, it would seem to be only another name for BAALATH-BEER, as suggested by Reland (*Palæst.* p. 964), and interpreted by Keil (ad loc.); yet the Sept. makes the places distinct. Be this as it may, Negeb is manifestly the name of a district, and not a general term, signifying "south." See NEGEB. Ramah is not mentioned in the list of Judah (comp. Josh. xv, 21–32), nor in that of Simeon in 1 Chron. iv, 28–33; nor is it mentioned by Eusebius and Jerome. Van de Velde (*Memoir*, p. 342) takes it as identical with Ramath-lehi, which he finds at Tell el-Lekiyeh; but this appears to be so far south as to be out of the circle of Samson's adventures, and, at any rate, must wait for further evidence.

In 1 Sam. xxx, 27, SOUTH RAMOTH (רְמוֹת־נֶגֶב, in the plural; Sept. Ῥαμὰ νότου, v. r. Ῥαμὰθ νότου; Vulg. *Ramoth ad meridiem*) is mentioned as one of the cities to which David sent portions of the spoils of the Amalekites. Doubtless, it is the same place called by Joshua Ramath-negeb. The name should be written *Ramoth-negeb*. The site is unknown, and the region where it stood is, in a great measure, unexplored.

Ramayâna is the name of one of the two great epic poems of ancient India (for the other, see MAHABHÂRATA). Its subject-matter is the history of Râma, one of the incarnations of Vishnu (q. v., and see RÂMA), and its reputed author is Valmîki, who is said to have taught his poem to the two sons of Râma, the hero of the history; and, according to this legend, would have been a contemporary of Râma himself. But though this latter account is open to much doubt, it seems certain that Valmîki—unlike Vyâsa (q. v.), the supposed compiler of the *Mahabhârata*—was a real personage; and, moreover, that the *Ramayâna* was the work of one single poet—not like the *Mahabhârata*, the creation of various epochs and different minds. As a poetical composition, the *Ramayâna* is therefore far superior to the *Mahabhârata;* and it may be called the best great poem of ancient India, fairly claiming a rank in the literature of the world equal to that of the epic poetry of Homer. Whereas the character of the *Mahabhârata* is cyclopædical, its main subject-matter overgrown by episodes of the most diversified nature, its diction differing in merit, both from a poetical and grammatical point of view, according to the ages that worked at its completion—the *Ramayâna* has but one object in view, the history of Râma. Its episodes are rare, and restricted to the early portion of the work, and its poetical diction betrays throughout the same finish and the same poetical genius. Nor can there be any reasonable doubt as to the relative ages of both poems, provided that we look upon the *Mahabhârata* in the form in which it is preserved as a whole. Whether we apply as a test the aspect of the religious life, or the geographical and other knowledge displayed in the one and the other work, the *Ramayâna* appears as the older of the two. Since it is the chief source whence our information of the Râma incarnation of Vishnu is derived, its contents may be gathered from that portion of the article VISHNU which relates to *Ramachandra*. The *Ramayâna* contains (professedly) 24,000 epic verses, or *slokas*, in seven books, or *kandas*, called the *Bâla-Ay-odhyâ-*, *Aranya-*, *Kishkindhâ-*, *Sundara-*, *Yuddha-* (or *Lankâ-*), and *Uttara-kanda*. The text which has come down to us exhibits, in different sets of manuscripts, such considerable discrepancies that it becomes necessary to speak of two recensions in which it now exists. This remarkable fact was first made known by A. W. von Schlegel, who, in Europe, was the first to attempt a critical edition of this poem; it is now fully corroborated by a comparison that may be made between the printed editions of both texts. The one is more concise in its diction, and has less tendency than the other to that kind of descriptive enlargement of facts and sentiments which characterizes the later poetry of India; it often also exhibits grammatical forms and peculiarities of an archaic stamp, where the other studiously avoids that which must have appeared to its editors in the light of a grammatical difficulty. In short, there can be little doubt that the former is the older and more genuine, and the latter the more recent, and in some respects more spurious, text. A complete edition of the older text, with two commentaries, was published at Madras in 1856 (in the Telugu characters, vol. i–iii); another edition of the same text, with a short commentary, appeared at Calcutta in two volumes (1860), and a more careful and elegant one at Bombay (1861). Of the later edition, Gaspare Gorresio has edited the first six books (vol. i–v, Paris, 1843–50) without a commentary, but with an Italian, somewhat free, translation in poetical prose (vol. i–x, Paris, 1847–58). Former attempts at an edition and translation of the *Ramayâna* remained unfortunately incomplete. The earliest was that made by William Carey and Joshua Marshman, who edited the first two books, and added to the text a prose translation in English and explanatory notes (vol. i–iii, Serampore, 1806–10; and vol. i, containing the first book, Dunstable, 1808). Another edition, of an eclectic nature, is that by A. W. von Schlegel; it contains the first two books of the text, and an excellent Latin translation of the first book and twenty chapters of the second (vol. i, pts. i and ii, and vol. ii, pt. i, Bonn, 1846). Various episodes from the *Ramayâna*, it may also be added, have at various times occupied sundry editors and translators.

Rambach, August Jakob, was born May 28, 1777, at Quedlinburg. Having completed his studies at Halle, he was appointed on May 2, 1802, deacon of St. Peter's at Hamburg. On Dec. 20, 1818, he succeeded his father as pastor of St. Michael's. In the year 1827 the Marburg University honored him with the degree of doctor of divinity, and in 1834 he was made senior of the ministry at Hamburg. In 1846 bodily infirmities obliged him to resign the pastorate, and he retired to his country-seat in Ottensen, where he died Sept. 7, 1851. His main study was that of hymnology, and his library contained 2200 volumes on

that subject. He wrote, *Supplemente zu Richter's biogr. Lexicon geistl. Liederdichter* (Hamburg, 1804):—*Luther's Verdienst um den Kirchengesang* (ibid. 1813). But his greatest work is *Anthologie christlicher Gesänge aus der alten und mittleren Zeit* (Altona, 1816–33, 6 vols.); a very valuable collection of Greek, Latin, and German hymns. Comp. Koch, *Geschichte des Kirchenliedes*, vii, 36, 70; Zuchold, *Bibliotheca Theologica*, ii, 1026; Petersen, *In Memoriam A. J. Rambachii*, etc. (Hamburg, 1856). (B. P.)

Rambach, Johann Jakob, was born at Halle Feb. 24, 1693, and died April 19, 1735, at Giessen, where he was professor of theology and first superintendent. During his comparatively short life he devoted himself to sacred studies, and produced some valuable works. Besides assisting Michaelis in the preparation of his Hebrew Bible, and of his *Adnotationes Uberiores in Hagiographa*, he was the author of *Institutiones Hermeneuticæ Sacræ*, of which the eighth edition appeared in 1764:—*Exercitationes Hermen., sive p. ii Institut. Herm.* (Jena, 1728; 2d ed. 1741):—*Comment. Herm. de Sensus Mystici Criteriis* (ibid. 1728, 1731). His other works are dogmatical and polemical.

Rambam. See Maimonides.

Ramban. See Nachmanides.

Rambour, Abraham, a French Protestant theologian, was born at Sedan, the seat of French evangelical Christianity, about 1590, studied at the academy in that place, and closed his career there by his thesis *De Potestate Ecclesiæ* (1608, 8vo). After ordination, he became pastor of the parish of Francheval. In 1616 he was called to Sedan, and preached there until 1620, when he was made a professor in his alma mater. He held the chair of theology and Hebrew, and so greatly distinguished himself that he was four times honored with the rectorate of that excellent Protestant seminary of divinity. He died in 1651, and left his colleagues to mourn the loss of a great and good man. All his writings give proof of profound scholarship, and a more than usual mastery of ancient Bible lore. He was an excellent polemic, and what he wrote as such the Romanists always found unanswerable. We note here, of his writings of this character, *De Christo Redemptore* (Sedan, 1620, 4to), and *Traité de l'Adoration des Images* (ibid. 1635, 8vo). His sixty-one theses on different Biblical subjects have been inserted in the *Thesaurus Theologiæ Sedanensis*, vol. ii. See Haag, *La France Protestante*, s. v.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.

Rameau, Jean-Philippe, a very celebrated French musician who cultivated sacred music and was a noted organist, was a native of Dijon. He was born in 1683. His father was also a musician, and was, at the time of Jean-Philippe's birth, organist in the Sainte-Chapelle of Dijon. He was an enthusiast in his love for music, and taught his children the classical works long before they knew their letters. After travelling for some time, creating everywhere great sensation by his wonderful musical genius, Jean-Philippe settled as organist of the cathedral at Clermont, in Auvergne. In middle life he removed to Paris, and became organist of Sainte-Croix de la Bretonnerie. In 1722 he published his *Traité de l'Harmonie*, which laid the basis of his future renown. He died in 1764. His compositions were mostly of a secular character. One of his operas, *Samson*, was never permitted to be put on the stage, because, as it was argued, it prostituted sacred music. Voltaire and D'Alembert were personal friends and warm admirers of Rameau. See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.

Ramenghi, Bartolomeo, an Italian artist of note, usually called *Il Bagnacavallo*, from the place of his birth (Bagnacavallo, on the road from Ravenna to Lugo), which took place in 1484, was a pupil of Raphael, and one of his principal assistants in the Vatican, and, after the death of his great master, carried the principles of his style to Bologna, and assisted to enlarge the character of that school. Raphael was his model and test of excellence, and he did not attempt to look beyond him. Though possessing less vigor than Giulio Romano or Perino del Vaga, Bagnacavallo acquired more of the peculiar grace of Raphael's style, especially in his infants, and his works were much studied by the great scholars of the Caracci. There are, or rather were, works by Bagnacavallo in the churches of San Michele in Bosco, San Martino, Santa Maria Maggiore, and Sant' Agostino agli Scopettini in Bologna. He died at Bologna in 1542. See Lanzi, *Lives of Painters; English Cyclop.* s. v.; Spooner, *Biog. Dict. of the Fine Arts*, s. v.

Ram'eses (Heb. *Rameses'*, רַעַמְסֵס; Sept. Ῥαμεσσῆ v. r. Ῥαμεσσής), or **Raam'ses** (Heb. *Raamses'*, רַעַמְסֵס, only in Exod. i, 11; Sept. Ῥαμεσσῆ), the name of a city (Exod. i, 11; xii, 37; Numb. xxxiii, 3, 5) and district (Gen. xlvii, 11) in Lower Egypt. There can be no reasonable doubt that the same city is designated by the Rameses and Raamses of the Hebrew text, and that this was the chief place of the land of Rameses, all the passages referring to the same region. The name is Egyptian, the same as that of several kings of the empire, of the eighteenth, nineteenth, and twentieth dynasties. In Egyptian it is written *Ra-meses* or *Ramses*, it being doubtful whether the short vowel understood occurs twice or once: the first vowel is represented by a sign which usually corresponds to the Hebrew ע in Egyptian transcriptions of Hebrew names, and Hebrew of Egyptian. The name means *Son of the Sun*, such titles being common with the ancient kings of Egypt, one of whom was probably the founder of the city. See Egypt.

The first mention of Rameses is in the narrative of the settling by Joseph of his father and brethren in Egypt, where it is related that a possession was given them "in the land of Rameses" (Gen. xlvii, 11). This land of Rameses (אֶרֶץ רַעַמְסֵס) either corresponds to the land of Goshen, or was a district of it, more probably the former, as appears from a comparison of a parallel passage (ver. 6). The name next occurs as that of one of the two cities built for the Pharaoh who first oppressed the children of Israel. "And they built for Pharaoh treasure cities (עָרֵי מִסְכְּנוֹת), Pithom and Raamses" (Exod. i, 11). So in the A. V. The Sept., however, reads πόλεις ὀχυράς, and the Vulg. *urbes tabernaculorum*, as if the root had been שָׁכַן. The signification of the word מִסְכְּנוֹת is decided by its use for storehouses of corn, wine, and oil, which Hezekiah had (2 Chron. xxxii, 28). We should therefore here read store-cities, which may have been the meaning of our translators. The name of Pithom indicates the region near Heliopolis, and therefore the neighborhood of Goshen, or that tract itself; and there can therefore be no doubt that Raamses is "Rameses in the land of Goshen." In the narrative of the Exode we read of Rameses as the starting-point of the journey (Exod. xii, 37; see also Numb. xxxiii, 3, 5). See Goshen.

If, then, we suppose Rameses or Raamses to have been the chief town of the land of Rameses, either Goshen itself or a district of it, we have to endeavor to determine its situation. Lepsius supposes that *Abû-Kesheid* is on the site of Rameses. His reasons are that in the Sept. Heroöpolis is placed in the land of Rameses (κατ' Ἡρώων πόλιν, ἐν γῇ Ῥαμεσσῆ, or εἰς γῆν Ῥαμεσσῆ), in a passage where the Hebrew only mentions "the land of Goshen" (Gen. xlvi, 28), and that there is a monolithic group at Abû-Kesheid representing Tûm and Ra, and between them Rameses II, who was probably there worshipped. There would seem, therefore, to be an indication of the situation of the district and city from this mention of Heroöpolis, and the statue of Rameses might mark a place named after that king. It must, however, be remembered (*a*) that the situation of Heroöpolis is a matter of great doubt, and that there-

fore we can scarcely take any proposed situation as an indication of that of Rameses; (*b*) that the land of Rameses may be that of Goshen, as already remarked, in which case the passage would not afford any more precise indication of the position of the city Rameses than that it was in Goshen, as is evident from the account of the Exodus; and (*c*) that the mention of Heroöpolis in the Sept. would seem to be a gloss. It is also necessary to consider the evidence in the Biblical narrative of the position of Rameses, which seems to point to the western part of the land of Goshen, since two full marches, and part at least of a third, brought the Israelites from this town to the Red Sea; and the narrative appears to indicate a route for the chief part directly towards the sea. After the second day's journey they "encamped in Etham, in the edge of the wilderness" (Exod. xiii, 20), and on the third day they appear to have turned. If, however, Rameses was where Lepsius places it, the route would have been almost wholly through the wilderness, and mainly along the tract bordering the Red Sea in a southerly direction, so that they would have turned almost at once. Even could it be proved that it was anciently called Rameses, the case would not be made out, for there is good reason to suppose that many cities in Egypt bore this name. Apart from the ancient evidence, we may mention that there is now a place called "Remsees" or "Ramsees" in the Boheireh (the great province on the west of the Rosetta branch of the Nile), mentioned in the list of towns and villages of Egypt in De Sacy's *Abd-allatif*, p. 664. It gave to its district the name of "Hóf-Remsees" or "Ramsees." This "Hóf" must not be confounded with the "Hof" commonly known, which was in the district of Belbeis.—Smith. Of the old translators, only Saadias and Pseudo-Jonathan point out a place for Rameses; the rest all preserve the name from the Hebrew (comp. Arab. of Erpen, *On Exod. i*, 11). Saadias gives *Heliopolis;* Jonathan, *Pelusium.* The latter is certainly wrong; the former is supported by Jablonski (*Opusc.* ii, 136), on the ground of a Coptic etymology. But Heliopolis, which Tischendorf also (*Reis.* i, 175, and *Dissert. de Isr. per Mare Rub. Trans.* p. 15 sq.) makes to be Raamses, is elsewhere always called On (q. v.), and is expressly distinguished from Rameses by the Sept. (Exod. i, 11; here the Cod. Mediolan. reads indeed ἥ καὶ Ὧν, but this amounts to nothing against the Hebrew text). Others (as Hengstenberg, *Moses*, p. 48 sq.; Ewald, *Isr. Gesch.* ii, 52 sq.; Forbiger, *Handb.* ii, 784) understand *Heroöpolis* (comp. Sept. at Gen. xlvi, 28; where, however, the region of Raamses is spoken of, as above, and it is only asserted that Heroöpolis lay in this district). To the same purpose is the view of Clericus, Lakemacher (*Observ. Philol.* vi, 321 sq.), and Müller (*Satur. Observ. Philol.* p. 189) that Rameses is *Avaris* (Gr. Ἄυαρις, Ἀβαρις), in the Saitic (or, according to Bernard's plausible emendation, the Sethrotic) district (Ptolemy, iv, 5, 53), a place fortified by Salatis, the king of the Hyksos (Josephus, *Apion*, i, 14, 26; comp. Michaelis, *Suppl.* p. 2261). For Avaris (according to Manetho, in Josephus, *Apion*, i, 26) is the city of Typhon, and this is probably Heroöpolis itself (comp. Rosenmüller, *Alterth.* iii, 261; Ewald, ii, 53) — Winer. The location of Rameses is doubtless indicated by the present *Tell Ramsîs*, a quadrangular mound near Belbeis. See Red Sea, Passage of.

An argument for determining under what dynasty the Exode happened has been founded on the name Rameses, which has been supposed to indicate a royal builder. See Pharaoh. We need only say that the highest date to which Rameses I can be reasonably assigned (B.C. 1302) is inconsistent with the true date of the Exode (B.C. 1658), although we find a prince of the same name two centuries earlier, so that the place might have taken its name either from this prince, or a yet earlier king or prince Rameses. That the last supposition is the true one seems to be established by the occurrence of the name in Gen. xlvii, 11, as early as the time of Joseph (B.C. 1874). See Chronology.

Rames'sè (Ῥαμεσσῆ), the Greek form (Judith i, 9) of the name of the land of Rameses (q. v.).

Rami'ah (Heb. *Ramyah'*, רַמְיָה, *fixed of Jehovah*; Sept. Ῥαμία), an Israelite of the sons of Parosh, who divorced his Gentile wife under the influence of Ezra (Ezra x, 25). B.C. 458.

Ramirez, Francisco, a Roman Catholic prelate of Mexico, was born in the city of Mexico in 1823. He early decided upon the priesthood, and was educated at home and in Europe, where he became a great favorite with many distinguished ecclesiastics, and therefore enjoyed rapid promotion in office. After holding various positions of responsibility, he became identified with the opposition against Juarez in politics, and prepared the way for the imperial rule under Maximilian. He was then bishop of Caradro. When the empire had been established, Ramirez became the emperor's almoner, and subsequently cabinet councillor. He was also made vicar apostolic of Tamaulipas, Mexico. With the downfall of Maximilian, Ramirez's stay in Mexico became an impossibility. He escaped to Texas, and lived in obscurity and want at Brazos Santiago until July 18, 1869.

Ramists, the followers of Peter Ramus, a French logician in the 16th century, who distinguished himself by his opposition to the philosophy of Aristotle. From the high estimation in which the Stagyrite was at that time held, it was accounted a heinous crime to controvert his opinions; and Ramus, accordingly, was tried and condemned as being guilty of subverting sound morality and religion. The sole ground of his offence was that he had framed a system of logic at variance with that of Aristotle. "The attack which Ramus made," says the elder M'Crie, in his *Life of Melville*, "on the Peripatetic philosophy was direct, avowed, powerful, persevering, and irresistible. He possessed an acute mind, acquaintance with ancient learning, an ardent love of truth, and invincible courage in maintaining it. He had applied himself with avidity to the study of the logic of Aristotle; and the result was a conviction that it was an instrument utterly unfit for discovering truth in any of the sciences, and answering no other purpose than that of scholastic wrangling and digladiation. His conviction he communicated to the public; and, in spite of all the resistance made by ignorance and prejudice, he succeeded in bringing over a great part of the learned world to his views. What Luther was in the Church, Ramus was in the schools. He overthrew the infallibility of the Stagyrite, and proclaimed the right of mankind to think for themselves in matters of philosophy—a right which he maintained with the most undaunted fortitude, and which he sealed with his blood. If Ramus had not shaken the authority of the long-venerated *Organon* of Aristotle, the world might not have seen the *Novum Organum* of Bacon. The faults of the Ramean system of dialectics have long been acknowledged. It proceeded upon the radical principles of the logic of Aristotle; its distinctions often turned more upon words than things; and the artificial method and uniform partitions which it prescribed in treating every subject were unnatural, and calculated to fetter, instead of forwarding, the mind in the discovery of truth. But it discarded many of the useless speculations and much of the unmeaning jargon respecting predicables, predicaments, and topics which made so great a figure in the ancient logic. It inculcated upon its disciples the necessity of accuracy and order in arranging their own ideas and in analyzing those of others. And as it advanced no claim to infallibility, submitted all its rules to the test of practical usefulness, and set the only legitimate end of the whole logical apparatus constantly before the eye of the student, its faults were soon discovered, and yielded readily to a more improved method of reasoning and investigation."

After the death of Ramus his logic found very ex-

tensive favor and acceptance in various countries of Europe. He defined logic to be "ars bene disserendi," and like Cicero considered rhetoric an essential branch of it. It was introduced by Melancthon into Germany; it had supporters also in Italy; and even in France itself, where the logic of the Stagyrite was held in veneration, the Ramean system was largely favored. Andrew Melville taught the doctrines of Ramus at Glasgow, and his work on logic passed through various editions in England before 1600. The same system was also known at this time in Switzerland, Holland, and Denmark. The most noteworthy Ramists were, among others, Andomar Talæus (Talon) and his two disciples, Thomasius Frigius, of Fribourg, and Franciscus Fabricius; Fr. Benchus, Wilh. Ad. Scribonius, and Gaspar Pfaffrad. There was also a class of eclectics who tried to unite the method of Ramus with the Aristotelian logic of Melancthon. Among these, most noteworthy is Rudolph Goclenius, who was of service to psychology, and whose pupil, Otto Cassman, prosecuted his researches into psychological anthropology. To these may be added the poet John Milton. See Waddington, *Ramus* (Paris, 1855, 8vo), where a catalogue of Ramist works is given; Desmaze, *Ramus* (1864); and Cantor, in Gelzer's *Protest. Monatsblätter*, Aug. 2, 1867.

Rammohun Roy, a celebrated Hindû convert to Western civilization and a liberal Christianity, is noted especially as the founder of a theistic school of thought among the Hindûs, and in a certain sense may be pronounced the forerunner of Sen. Rammohun Roy was born about 1774 at Bordnan, in the province of Bengal, of Brahminic parentage of high caste. Reared like other youths of India, he enjoyed his elementary training at home, and was then placed under the care of the great masters of the Vedas and the Shastras, and, both at Patna and afterwards at Benares, acquired great proficiency in the sacred writings of Hindûism. His familiarity with the Arabic, Persian, and Sanscrit languages led him to an examination of the religious doctrines of the various sects of India, and finally to those of the West. He had evinced a sceptical turn of mind while yet a youth; and, once led away into these inquiries, he was soon forced to abandon the ground of his ancestry. But instead of accepting the inspired religion of the Christians, he sought the engrafting of its ethics upon the old faith of India, and the restoration of Hindûism in its ancient purity, as the first step to this accomplishment. His parents unyieldingly opposed his purpose. His father sent him away and disinherited him. His mother conceded the superstitious basis of her faith, but pleaded for its observance on the ground of duty towards her people and race. "You are right," she said to him, when she was about to set out on a pilgrimage to Juggernaut; "but I am a woman, and cannot give up observances which are a comfort to me." A wanderer from home, he spent two or three years in Thibet, where he excited general anger by denying that the Lama (q. v.) was the creator and preserver of the world. He was finally recalled by his father and restored to paternal favor. But in a short time, as he tells us himself, "my continued controversies with the Brahmins on the subject of their idolatry and superstition, and my interference with their custom of burning widows, and other pernicious practices, revived and increased their animosity against me; and, through their influence with my family, my father was again obliged to withdraw his countenance openly, though his limited pecuniary support was still continued to me." His father died in 1803, and he then published various books and pamphlets against the errors of the Brahmins, in the native and foreign languages. He says: "The ground which I took in all my controversies was, not that of opposition to Brahminism, but to a perversion of it; and I endeavored to show that the idolatry of the Brahmins was contrary to the practice of their ancestors and to the principles of the ancient books and authorities which they professed to revere and obey." In order to deprive him of caste, the Brahmins commenced a suit against him, which, after many years of litigation, was decided in his favor. Of the body of Hindû theology comprised in the Vedas there is an ancient extract called the *Vedant*, or the Resolution of all the Veds, written in Sanscrit. Rammohun Roy translated it into Bengalee and Hindostanee, and afterwards published an abridgment of it for gratuitous circulation; of this abridgment he published an English translation in 1816. He afterwards published some of the principal chapters of the Vedas in Bengalee and English. He was at different times the proprietor or publisher of newspapers in the native languages, in which he expressed his opinion freely against abuses, political as well as religious, especially the burning of widows. He was also, in conjunction with other liberal Hindûs, proprietor of the *Bengal Herald*, an English newspaper. His intimate association with the English, and the constant interchange with European thought and familiarity with the West generally, led him at last to abandon the old ground entirely, and he brought before his countrymen the excellence of the moral theories of Christianity in 1820 in a work which he entitled *The Precepts of Jesus, the Guide to Peace and Happiness*. It was written in English, Sanscrit, and Bengalee, and consists, besides selections from the New Test., of such commentaries as a Hindû apostate who abandoned heathenism for bald theism would be likely to produce. The divinity of Christ is ignored, the miracles are rejected, and many other portions of the Gospel held to be fundamental in orthodox Christianity; and the simple morality of Jesus is held up as "a guide to happiness and peace." The position taken in this work not only encountered the opposition of his abandoned friends; his new associates also felt grieved and disappointed, and, in the first hour of disappointment, severely rebuked his false theology. He was replied to, and a controversy opened on the great question of the Trinity. His *Appeal*, published not under his own name, but as coming from a "friend of truth," and, later, his treatise on the unity of God, entitled *One Supreme Being*, greatly modified his first position, and showed that he took, at least, the advanced ground of a Unitarian of the Old School, and recognised in Jesus Christ the "Son of God, by whom God made the world and all things." In April, 1831, Rammohun Roy visited England, and he associated generally with the Unitarians, whose chapels he visited as a worshipper. He also took great interest in the political questions of the day. The great question of parliamentary reform was then agitating the country. Of the Reform Bill he wrote that it "would, in its consequences, promote the welfare of England and her dependencies—nay, of the whole world." His society was universally courted in England. He was oppressed with invitations to attend social parties and political and ecclesiastical meetings. His anxiety to see everything and to please all led him to overtask himself to such an extent that his health, long failing, at last broke down. He died at Bristol, Sept. 27, 1833. The adverse circumstances of his birth were such as might easily have enslaved even his powerful understanding, or, still more easily, might have perverted it to selfish ends; but he won his high position by an inflexible honesty of purpose and energy of will, and had he lived he might have become an important factor in the propagation of Christianity in the East. See sketch of his life, written by himself, in the *Athenæum*, No. 310, Oct. 5, 1833; *Chambers's Edinburgh Journal*, Aug. 2, 1834; Carpenter, *Review of Labors, Opinions, and Character of Rajah Rammohun Roy;* Pauthier, in the *Revue Encyclopédique*, 1833; *Asiatic Journal*, vol. xii; *Theol. Eclectic*, June, 1869; *English Cyclop.* s. v.

Rammok. See Dromedary.

Ramoth. See Coral.

Ra'moth (Heb. *Ramoth'*, רָמוֹת [but רָאמוֹת in Deut. iv, 43; Josh. xx, 8; 1 Chron. vi, 73, 80], *heights*,

plur. of Ramah [q. v.]; Sept. usually Ῥαμώθ, but Ῥημώθ in Ezra x, 29, Ῥαμμώθ in 2 Chron. xviii, 2, 3, 5, etc.), the name of three towns in Palestine, and also of one man.

1. (Sept. ἡ Ῥαμώθ.) One of the four Levitical cities of Issachar according to the catalogue in 1 Chron. (vi, 73). In the parallel list in Josh. (xxi, 28, 29), among other variations, JARMUTH (q. v.) appears in place of Ramoth. It seems impossible to decide which is the correct reading; or whether, again, REMETH (q. v.), a town of Issachar, is distinct from them, or one and the same.

2. A city in the tribe of Gad (Deut. iv, 43; Josh. xx, 8; xxi, 38; 1 Chron. vi, 80), elsewhere called RAMOTH-GILEAD (q. v.).

3. (Sept. Ῥαμᾶ.) A city in the tribe of Simeon ("South Ramoth," 1 Sam. xxx, 27). See RAMATH-NEGEB.

4. (Heb. text *Yirmoth'*, יִרְמוֹת, marg. *ve-Ramoth'*, וְרָמוֹת, and *Ramoth;* Sept. Ῥημώθ v. r. Μημών.) An Israelitish layman of the sons of Bani, who renounced his strange wife at Ezra's instigation (Ezra x, 29). B.C. 458.

Ramoth-gileäd (Heb. *Ramoth' Gilad'*, רָמֹת גִּלְעָד; Sept. Ῥεμμάθ, Ῥεμμώθ, and Ῥαμώθ Γαλαάδ; Ἐρεμαθγαλαάδ v. r. Ῥαμμώθ; Josephus, Ἀραμαθά; Vulg. *Ramoth Galaad*), the "heights of Gilead;" or RAMOTH IN GILEAD (רָאמֹת בַּגִּלְעָד; Sept. ἡ Ῥαμὼθ ἐν Γαλαάδ, Ἀρημώθ, Ῥεμμὰθ Γαλαάδ, v. r. Ῥαμμώθ, Ῥαμώθ; Vulg. *Ramoth in Galaad*, Deut. iv, 43; Josh. xx, 8; xxi, 38; 1 Kings xxii, 3 [in the A. V. only], also written *plene*, רָמוֹת, in 2 Chron. xxii, 5; and simply RAMAH, רָמָה, in 2 Kings viii, 29, and 2 Chron. xxii, 6), one of the chief cities of the tribe of Gad, on the east side of the Jordan. It was allotted to the Levites, and appointed a city of refuge (Deut. iv, 43; Josh. xx, 8). The latter fact would seem to indicate that it occupied a central position in the tribe, and also probably in the country assigned to the Israelites east of the Jordan. Ramoth played for a time an important part in Israelitish history, and was the scene of many a hard struggle. It was apparently a strong fortress, and considered the key of the country. Hence, when taken by the Syrians, the kings of Israel and Judah regarded it as a national loss, affecting both kingdoms, and they combined to drive out the common enemy (1 Kings xxii, 4 sq.). The united attack was unsuccessful, and the king of Israel was mortally wounded in the battle (xxii, 34–37). At a later period, apparently in the reign of Joram (2 Kings ix, 14, 15; comp. Josephus, *Ant.* ix, 6, 1), Ramoth was taken from the Syrians and held, notwithstanding all the efforts of Hazael to regain it. Joram, having been wounded in the struggle, left his army under the command of Jehu, and returned to Jezreel to be healed (2 Kings viii, 29). During his absence Jehu was anointed by order of Elisha (ix, 1, 2), and commissioned to execute vengeance on the wicked house of Ahab (ver. 7–10). Leaving Ramoth, Jehu drove direct to Jezreel. The king, expecting news from the seat of war, had watchmen set on the towers, who saw his chariot approaching (ver. 16, 17). The rest of the story is well known. See AHAB; JEHU. After this incident Ramoth-gilead appears no more in Jewish history.

The exact position of Ramoth is nowhere defined in Scripture. The name (*Ramoth*, "heights") would seem to indicate that it occupied a commanding position on the summit of the range of Gilead. In 1 Kings iv, 13, we read that when the districts of Solomon's purveyors were arranged, the son of Geber was stationed in Ramoth, and had charge of all the cities of Jair the son of Manasseh, both in Gilead and Bashan; and these cities extended over the whole north-eastern section of Palestine beyond Jordan. Various opinions have been entertained regarding the site of this ancient city. Some would identify it with *Jerash*, the old Roman *Gerasa*, whose ruins are the most magnificent and extensive east of the Jordan (see *Benjamin of Tudela*, by Asher); but this is too far north, and Jerash, besides, lies in a valley. Ewald would locate it at the village of *Reimun* among the mountains, five miles west of Jerash (*Gesch. Isr.* iii, 500). For this there is no evidence whatever. Others locate it on a site bearing the name of *Jel'âd*, exactly identical with the ancient Hebrew *Gilead*, which is mentioned by Seetzen (*Reisen*, March 11, 1806), and marked on his map (*ibid.* iv) and that of Van de Velde (1858) as four or five miles north of es-Salt. Schwarz (*Palest.* p. 232 sq.) identifies this Ramoth with *Kullot el-Rabat*, which is situated on one of the highest points of the mountain of Gilead, not far from the Wady Rajib, and west of Ajlûn. It is even now strongly fortified, and is visible at a great distance, especially to the north-east. The most probable opinion regarding the site of Ramoth is that which places it at the village of *es-Salt*. This is indicated (*a*) by its position on the summit of a steep hill; (*b*) by its old ecclesiastical name *Saltus Hieraticus*, which appears to point to its original "sacerdotal" and "holy" character, Ramoth having been both a Levitical city and a "city of refuge" (see Reland,

Es-Salt (Ramoth-gilead. From a photograph by the Editor.)

Palæst. p. 213); (*c*) by the fact that about two miles to the north-west of es-Salt is the highest peak of the mountain-range still bearing the name Jebel Jilâd, "Mount Gilead;" and (*d*) by the statement of Eusebius that Ramoth-gilead lay in the fifteenth mile from Philadelphia towards the west, and this is the exact distance of es-Salt from Rabbath-Ammon (*Onomast.* s. v. "Rammoth"). The situation of es-Salt is strong and picturesque. The hill on which it stands is separated by deep ravines from the loftier mountains that encompass it, and its lower slopes are covered with terraced vineyards, while the neighboring hill-sides and valleys abound with olive-groves. On the summit stands the castle, a rectangular building with towers at the corners, and defended by a deep moat hewn in the rock. The foundations appear to be Roman, if not earlier, but the upper walls are Saracenic. In the town itself, which contains some three thousand inhabitants, there are few remains of antiquity. In the cliffs and ravines beneath it are great numbers of tombs and grottos (*Handbook for Sinai and Palestine*, p. 308). Es-Salt is famous for its vineyards, and its raisins are esteemed the best in Palestine. They are carried in large quantities to Jerusalem (Burckhardt, *Syria*, p. 349; Irby and Mangles, *Travels*, p. 321; Ritter, *Pal. und Syr.* p. 1121–38; Abulfeda, *Tab. Syr.* p. 92; Buckingham, *Travels*, p. 20).—Kitto. It is now the only inhabited place in the province of Belka. It is still a place of comparative strength, and overawes the Bedawîn by a garrison under the pasha of Damascus. Tristram says of it, "Ramoth-gilead must always have been the key of Gilead—at the head of the only easy road from the Jordan, opening immediately on the rich plateau of the interior, and with this isolated cone (the Osha) rising close above it, fortified from very early times, by art as well as by nature. Of the fortress only a tall fragment of wall remains, and a pointed archway, with a sort of large dial-plate, carved deeply in stone, surrounded by a rose-work decoration. It appears to be all modern Turkish work" (*Land of Israel*, p. 555). There is a plateau, he further tells us, on the road towards Jordan, and there probably the battle was fought where Ahab received his mortal wound—that being the only place where chariots could come into play.

Winer and others identify Ramoth-gilead, Ramath-mizpah, and Mizpah of Gilead. On this, see Mizpah; Ramah.

Ramoth-negeb. See Ramath-negeb.

Rampalle, Jeanne, a French female ascetic of note, was born Jan. 3, 1583, at Saint-Remy; displayed at an early age a tendency to a contemplative life; and when old enough to be admitted to a monastery, joined the Ursulines of Avignon, until, in 1602, she determined to found a home of her own, and established it on the rule of St. Augustine. She then took the name *Jeanne de Jésus*, provided the constitution and such religious books as she believed her companions to be in need of, e. g. *Retraite Spirituelle; Pratique de Dévotion*, etc., also hymns and songs. She died July 6, 1636. See *Vie de la Mère Jeanne de Jésus* (Avignon, 1751, 12mo).—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.

Rampart (חֵיל, *cheyl*, Lam. ii, 8; Nah. iii, 8; elsewhere "trench," "bulwark," etc.), a fortification or low wall surrounding and protecting a military trench (2 Sam. xx, 15; Isa. xxvi, 1, etc.; comp. 1 Kings xxi, 23; Psa. xlviii, 14). See Army; Siege. In the Talmud the Hebrew word is applied to the interior space surrounding the wall of the Temple (Lightfoot, *Opp.* ii, 193). See Temple.

Rampelogo (or **Rampeloco**), Antonio, an Italian theologian, was born at Genoa and flourished in the second half of the 15th century. He was an Augustinian monk, and passed for a learned controversialist in his times. According to some modern ecclesiastical writers of Rome, Rampelogo was such an eloquent and persuasive disputant that he was called to the Council of Constance in order to convert the Hussites. He is the author of *Repertorium Biblicum*, which was put in the *Index* by pope Clement VIII, but which, nevertheless, has often been printed (Ulm, 1476, fol.; Nuremb. 1481; Milan, 1494, etc.). See Oudin, *De Script. Eccles.* iii, 2310.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.

Rampen, Henri, a Belgian divine, was born at Hui, Nov. 18, 1572. Studied successively at Cologne, Mayence, and Louvain, and taught Greek and philosophy at the college in Lys. From 1620 to 1637 he taught exegesis of the Scriptures at the university, of which he was several times rector. He finally entered the practical work of the ministry, and secured a canonicate at Breda, but did not like this work, and returned to pedagogy as rector at St. Anne College. He died March 4, 1641. He published *Commentarius in Quatuor Evangelia* (Lond. 1631–34, 3 vols. 4to).—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.

Ramrayas, a sect of the Sikhs, deriving their appellation from Rama Raya, who flourished about A.D. 1660. They are by no means numerous in Hindostan.—Gardner, *Faiths of the World*, s. v.

Ram's Horn (יוֹבֵל, *yobel'*, Josh. vi, 4, 13; elsewhere "jubilee," "trumpet"). The Hebrew word *kéren*, i. e. *horn*, is also used for the crooked trumpet, a very ancient instrument. Sometimes it was made of the horns of oxen, and sometimes ram's horns were employed. It is probable that in later times they were made of metal. They were employed in war, and on solemn occasions (Exod. xix, 13). The latter word is also rendered *cornet* (Dan. iii, 5, 7, 10–15). See Jubilee; Musical Instruments.

Rams' Skins Dyed Red (עֹרֹת אֵילִם מְאָדָּמִים [Exod. xxv, 5; xxxv, 7], *'orôth elim meoddamîm;* Sept. *δέρματα κριῶν ἠρυθροδανωμένα*; Vulg. *pelles arietum rubricatæ*) formed part of the materials that the Israelites were ordered to present as offerings for the making of the tabernacle (Exod. xxv, 5), of which they served as the outer covering, there being under the rams' skins another covering of badgers' skins. See Tabernacle. The words may be rendered "red rams' skins," and then may be understood as the produce of the African audad, the *Ovis tragelaphus* of naturalists, whereof the bearded sheep are a domesticated race. The tragelaphus is a distinct species of sheep, having a shorter form than the common species, and incipient tear-pits. Its normal color is *red*, from bright chestnut to rufous chocolate, which last is the cause of the epithet *purple* being given to it by the poets. Dr. Harris thinks that the skins in question were tanned and colored crimson; for it is well known that what is now termed red morocco was manufactured in the remotest ages in Libya, especially about the Tritonian Lake, where the original ægis, or goat-skin breastplate of Jupiter and Minerva, was dyed bright red; and the Egyptians had most certainly red leather in use, for their antique paintings show harness-makers cutting it into slips for the collars of horses and furniture of chariots. It is much more probable, however, that the skins were those of the domestic breed of rams, which, as Rashi says, "were dyed red after they were prepared." See Ram.

Ramsauer, Otto Heinrich David, a hymnist of the Reformed Church, was born Nov. 19, 1829, at Oldenburg. Having made his preparatory studies at the gymnasium of his native place, he went, in 1848, to Zurich, in Switzerland, where the well-known Dr. J. P. Lange especially attracted him. While yet a student he wrote a collection of hymns, entitled *Der Friede und die Freude der Kirche*, which were edited by his teacher in 1851. In 1852 he was appointed vicar to dean Frei in Trogen, in Switzerland, whom he also succeeded in the pastorate. Three years afterwards, May 27, 1856, he died in the vigor of life. Some of his hymns are very fine, but have not yet found a place in any of our modern German hymn-books. See Koch, *Geschichte des*

deutschen Kirchenliedes, vii, 384; Zuchold, *Bibliotheca Theologica*, ii, 1027. (B. P.)

Ramsay, James P., a Presbyterian minister, was born near Canonsburg, Pa., Aug. 26, 1809. He graduated from Jefferson College, Canonsburg, Pa., in 1827; prosecuted the study of theology under his venerated father, then sole professor in the Theological Seminary of the Associate Church; was licensed to preach Aug. 27, 1833, by the Presbytery of Chartiers, and was ordained and installed pastor of the congregation of Deer Creek, New Bedford, Lawrence Co., Pa., July 1, 1835, by the Associate Presbytery of Ohio. For about twenty-two years he continued faithfully testifying the Gospel of the grace of God among this people. But, his health failing, he subsequently located himself in New Wilmington, and for a time exercised his ministry there. He died Jan. 30, 1862. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1863, p. 362. (J. L. S.)

Ramsdell, Hezekiah S., a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born at Chatham, Conn., Dec. 4, 1804. When ten years old, the death of his father left him to support himself. At sixteen he was converted, and commenced preaching at nineteen. He joined the New England Conference in 1825, and his successive appointments were, Needham, Chelsea, Vt.; Craftsbury, Vt.; Irisburg, Vt.; Tolland, Conn.; Windsor, Conn.; Tolland and Stafford, Manchester, Conn.; East Putnam, Conn.; Colchester, Conn.; East Putnam, Vernon, Conn.; Vernon and Windsorville, East Putnam, Coventry. From 1833 to 1861, and again from 1868, impaired health prevented him from active work. He frequently spoke on temperance, of which he was an earnest, able advocate. He also served with marked ability in the Senate of the State of Connecticut, and filled various offices of responsibility and trust. Those conversant with his comparatively brief, active ministry speak of him as an able, eloquent preacher, and as equally an indefatigable pastor. In one locality his earnest advocacy of truth raised the anger of some, and they resolved at his next visit to tar and feather him. It was no idle threat; the preparations were made; his brethren urged him not to go, but he was fearless, and went. The leader of the mob was awakened, converted, and became his fast friend. Mr. Ramsdell lived to see his views prevail among his fellows. He died Oct. 23, 1877. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 1878.

Ramsey, William B., a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born in Rutherford Co., Tenn., March 12, 1831. He embraced religion in 1846, was licensed to preach in 1853, and was admitted on trial in the Memphis Conference in the fall of that year. His health failing him in 1854, he entered Andrew College, from which he graduated in 1858. He was readmitted into the Conference in the same year, granted a supernumerary relation in 1862, and in 1863 served in the Confederate army as chaplain for four months. He died of consumption, July, 1865. Mr. Ramsey was sweet-spirited, modest, and unassuming.—*Minutes of Annual Conferences of the Meth. Episc. Church, South*, 1865, p. 594.

Ramus, Petrus, also known by his original name *Pierre de la Ramée*, was the French philosopher of the 16th century who broke the fetters of barbarous scholastic thought and led men into the clear light of Platonic philosophy. He is usually called one of the founders of modern metaphysics, and this is certainly true in so far as Ramus prepared the way for Descartes (q. v.) in philosophy, and for Pascal in theology, as we shall see presently. Ramus was born of very humble parentage at Cuth, a village in Vermandois, in 1515. He was obliged, when old enough to be of any service, to perform duties as a shepherd. He loved the broad, open fields, but he loved books more. He studied as much as his humble associations could afford him the means of knowledge, and finally, satisfied that he could only get more away from home, left for the city. He went straight to the capital, though yet a youth of a little over eight. Homesickness compelled him to return to the paternal roof, and he walked home as he had walked to Paris, but only to return soon again to the city where he had found so much to learn, and before he was twelve he was once more at Paris. He could not enter school, as his pockets were empty and his stomach unsatisfied. He hired out as a servant to a rich student at the Collége de Navarre, and, by devoting the day to his duties, obtained the night for study, and, under his master's guidance and help, made rapid progress. At the age of twenty-one he was ready to pass examination as if he had been within the walls of a college. The indomitable spirit of the boy had made a resolute man; and, unlike most students, he had not only learned the *dicta* of the savans, but had formed an opinion which was his only own. In presenting himself for the degree of master, he came forward as the champion of reform in the schools of thought. He undertook to prove the then almost impious task that Aristotle was not infallible. He had gradually withdrawn from Aristotelianism as an authority, and pleaded now for the exercise of individual reason as against the "authority," which scholasticism imposed on all students of philosophy. Enthusiast as he was, he was led to make the extravagant statement in his thesis that "all that Aristotle had said was false" (*quæcunque ab Aristotele dicta essent, commentitia esse*). It speaks, however, a great deal for the ability he showed on this occasion that his judges, although themselves Aristotelians, were compelled to applaud him. Ramus was immediately made a teacher in the Collége du Mans, and along with two learned friends opened a special class for reading the Greek and Latin authors, designed to combine the study of eloquence with that of philosophy. His audience was large, and his success as a teacher remarkable. He now turned his attention more particularly to the science of logic, which, in his usual adventurous spirit, he undertook to "reform;" and no one acquainted with his system will deny that many of his innovations were both rational and beneficial. His attempts excited much hostility among the Aristotelians; and when his treatise on the subject (*Dialecticæ Partitiones*) appeared in 1543, it was fiercely assailed by the doctors of the Sorbonne, the Academy of Geneva, the majority of the high-schools of the Continent, which had all, in alliance with the Church, given Aristotelianism the supreme rule. The University of Paris linked itself with jurists, councillors, the king's ministers, the king himself, to crush this bold innovator. He was charged with impiety and sedition, and with a desire to overthrow all science and religion through the medium of an attack on Aristotle. On the report of an irregular tribunal appointed to consider the charges made against him, the king ordered his works to be suppressed, and forbade his teaching or writing against Aristotle on pain of corporal punishment. Ramus now devoted himself exclusively to the study of mathematics, and to prepare an edition of Euclid. Cardinals Charles de Bourbon and Charles de Lorraine befriended him, and through their influence he was permitted to begin a course of lectures on rhetoric at the Collége de Presles, the plague having driven away numbers of students from Paris. He was finally, in 1545, named principal of this college, and the Sorbonne ineffectually endeavored to eject him on the ground of the royal prohibitory decree. The decree was cancelled in 1545, through the influence of the cardinal de Lorraine. Ramus raised the Collége de Presles from a condition of decay to the height of prosperity, and his reputation went over all the land as an educator as well as philosopher. In 1551 cardinal Lorraine succeeded in instituting for him a chair of eloquence and philosophy at the Collége Royal, and his inaugural address (*Pro Philosophica Disciplina* [Paris, 1551]) is reckoned a masterpiece of the kind. He devoted the first eight years of his teaching to the first three of the "liberal arts" (grammar, rhetoric, and logic), which he called elementary or exoteric,

and published three grammars successively—Greek, Latin, and French. He also mingled largely in the literary and scholastic disputes of the time, and on account of his bustling activity came under the satire of Rabelais. But though Ramus had innumerable adversaries, he might have defied them all, so great was his influence at court, had his love of "reformation" not displayed itself in religion as well as in logic. In an evil hour (for his own comfort) he embraced Protestantism. He had long been suspected of a leaning that way, and, as we have seen, his intellect was by nature scornfully rebellious towards the *ipse dixit* of "authority;" but he had for years decently conformed to the practices of the Catholic cult, and it was only after cardinal Lorraine, in reply to the Conference of Poissy (1561), frankly admitted the abuses of the Church and the vices of the clergy that he ventured formally to abjure the older faith. The outbreak of the religious wars in France plunged him into the dangers of the time, and he finally perished in the fatal massacre of St. Bartholomew, August, 1572. It is believed that he was assassinated at the instigation of one of his most violent and persistent enemies, Charpentier, rector of the Collége de Presles. See RAMISTS.

Rancé, ARMAND JEAN LE BOUTHILLIER DE, the well-known founder of the reformed order of La Trappe, was born Jan. 9, 1626, at Paris, where he was educated. Having taken his degree in the Sorbonne with great applause, and embraced the ecclesiastical profession, he soon became distinguished as a preacher, and through the favor of cardinal Richelieu obtained more than one valuable benefice. He possessed as a young man a large fortune, and, notwithstanding his clerical character, was carried away by the gayety and dissipation of Parisian life. After a time, however, having embraced the cause of cardinal Retz, he displeased and finally forfeited the favor of cardinal Mazarin; and being deeply moved by the death of a lady, the duchess de Montbazon, to whom he was much attached, he withdrew altogether from Paris, resolved to distribute all his property among the poor, and to devote himself exclusively to the practice of piety and penitential works. Finally, he resigned all his preferments (of which, by the abusive practice of the period, he held several simultaneously) with the exception of the abbacy of La Trappe, to which convent he retired in 1662, with the intention of restoring the strict discipline of the order. The history of the reforms which he effected will be found under the head TRAPPISTS. He lived in this seclusion for thirty-three years, during which he published a large number of works, chiefly ascetical. He died Oct. 27, 1700. The only remarkable events of his literary life are his controversy with Mabillon, in reply to his *Études Monastiques*, on the subject of the studies proper for the monastic life, which is entitled *Traité de la Sainteté des Devoirs de l'État Monastique*, and his controversy with Arnauld, which drew upon Rancé the hatred of the Jansenists. Rancé's works are numerous. In his youth he edited *Anacreon* in one volume, octavo (Paris, 1639), with a dedication to cardinal Richelieu. His most noteworthy publications of his religious life, aside from those referred to, are, *Explication sur la Règle de St.-Benoît* (Paris, 1689, 2 vols. 4to):—*Abrégé des Obligations des Chrétiens*:—*Réflexions Morales sur les Quatres Évangélistes* (Paris, 1699, 12mo):—*Conférences* (on the same, 1699):—*Relation de la Vie et de la Mort de Quelques Religieux de la Trappe* (1696, 4 vols. 12mo), and other works on monastic life and its reforms, etc. See Tillemont, *Vie de Rancé* (1719, 2 vols. 12mo); Marsollier, *Vie* (1703); Chateaubriand, *Vie;* Moréri, *Dict. Hist.* s. v.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.

Ranconnier, JACQUES, a French Jesuit missionary, was born in 1600 in the county of Bourgogne, entered the novitiate of the Jesuits at the age of nineteen in Malines, and in 1625 went into the missionary work in Paraguay. He labored very successfully for seven years among the Itatines, whom he converted to Christianity, such as he had to offer, and died among this new people of the Gospel about 1640. He wrote frequent reports of the progress of his work in Paraguay, which are valuable contributions to the history of that South American country. See Sothwell, *Bibl. Script. Soc. Jesu*, p. 209; Charlevoix, *Hist. de Paraguay*, liv. viii.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v. See also PARAGUAY.

Rand, Asa, an American Congregational divine, born at Rindge, N. H., Aug. 6, 1783, was educated at Dickinson College, where he took his degree in 1806, studied for the ministry, and was ordained at Gorham, Me., Jan. 18, 1809, as pastor of a Congregational Church. In 1822 he undertook the editorial care of the *Christian Mirror* at Portland, Me., and held this until 1825, when he took the principalship of a female seminary at Brookfield. In July, 1826, he accepted the editorship of the *Boston Recorder*, the *Youth's Companion*, and the *Volunteer*, the last a religious monthly. His health, which had for some time been failing, and had originally forced him from the ministry, finally compelled him also to leave the editorial chair, and he connected himself with a book-store and printing-office at Lowell, Mass. He finally went back to editorial work, and started the *Lowell Observer*, a weekly paper. In 1835 he again began to preach and address public audiences. He took up the slavery question and spoke in behalf of abolition in Maine and Massachusetts. From 1837 to 1842 he preached in Pompey, N. Y., then became pastor of the Presbyterian church in Peterborough, N. Y., the home of the celebrated abolitionist Gerritt Smith. His last years Mr. Rand spent at Ashburnham, Mass., where he died Aug. 24, 1871. He was, while at Gorham, a frequent writer for the religious quarterly published at Portland for 1814–18, and, besides occasional sermons, put in print a volume of *Familiar Sermons*:—a *Review of Finney's Sermons*:—*New Divinity Theology*, a vindication of the same:—and a *Letter* to Dr. Lyman Beecher. See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, vol. i.

Rand, William, an American divine of colonial times, flourished in the first half of the 18th century. He was a student at Harvard University, class of 1721, then took holy orders, and became pastor at Sunderland, Mass., of a Congregational Church. In 1746 he removed, in the same capacity, to Kingston, N. Y., and died there in 1779. He published five separate sermons (1739–1757). See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, i, 386.

Randall, John, an English divine of note, was born about the middle of the 16th century. He was educated at Oxford University, in St. Mary's Hall, and Trinity College, and, after taking holy orders, became rector of St. Andrew Hubbard, London, in 1599. He died in 1622. His published works are: *Sermons on Matt. v*, 20, *and on* 1 *Pet. ii*, 11, 12 (1620, 4to):—*Sermons on Rom. viii*, 38, 39 (1623, 4to):—*Nature of God and Christ* (1624, 4to):—*Great Mystery of Godliness* (1624, 4to; 3d ed. 1640):—*The Sacraments* (1630, 4to):—*Lectures on the Lord's Supper* (1630, 4to):—*Twenty-nine Lectures of the Church* (1631, 4to).

Randall, Matthew, a distinguished layman of the Baptist denomination, was born in London. His mercantile tastes led him into business vocations, where he met with success as a merchant. Soon after the peace of 1783, he came to the United States, and took up his residence in Philadelphia, where he remained nearly all his life. For two or three years he lived in Burlington, N. J. While in this place he was baptized by Rev. Dr. Staughton, and continued a member of the Burlington Church until his death, which took place in Philadelphia, Sept. 14, 1833. Dr. Baron Stow says of him that "he was highly esteemed in Christian circles, and his early familiarity with Robert Hall and Drs. Ryland and Stennett was of importance to him in matters of theology, as well as of taste and piety." He

adds: "Having the confidence of the authorities of Pennsylvania, he was appointed to several important offices, the duties of which he creditably performed." See *The Missionary Jubilee*, p. 118. (J. C. S.)

Randallites. See FREE-WILL BAPTISTS.

Randle, Richmond, a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was originally a member of the Tennessee Conference, where he travelled five years. He was transferred in 1836 to the Arkansas Conference, which then included Louisiana west of the Mississippi River. Here he labored efficiently in stations and as presiding elder until the Conference of 1844, when he took a superannuated relation. In 1845 he became again effective, and so continued until 1861, serving as presiding elder for nine of these years. His sons having volunteered, he accompanied them to the war, soon to die. He was a man of deep and fervent piety, a true friend, a noble and useful preacher.—*Minutes of Annual Conf. M. E. Church, South*, 1861, p. 323.

Randle, Thomas Ware, a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born in Stewart County, Tenn., April 13, 1815. He was admitted on trial in the Tennessee Conference in 1832, and continued to be an active and very efficient preacher until within a few months of his death, which took place Aug. 26, 1859. He was several times a delegate to the General Conference. Mr. Randle was a Christian gentleman, modest and kind. His talents as a preacher were excellent, and his zeal knew no abatement.—*Minutes of Annual Conf. M. E. Church, South*, 1859, p. 116.

Randle, William, a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born in September, 1807. He was converted when about thirty years of age, and was received on trial in the Tennessee Conference in 1841. He labored successfully until 1862, when he became supernumerary. In 1866 he resumed active work as presiding elder on Cross Plains (now Fountain Head) district, where he closed his life, May 2, 1869. He was a man of artless simplicity, true sincerity, and ardent zeal.—*Minutes of Annual Conf. M. E. Church, South*, 1869, p. 349.

Randolph, Francis, D.D., an English divine, was born in 1755. He was made prebend of Bristol in 1791, and died in 1831. He published, *Letter to William Pitt on the Slave Trade* (Lond. 1788, 8vo):—*Scriptural Revision of Socinian Arguments in Answer to B. Hobhouse* (1792, 8vo):—*Correspondence with the Earl and Countess of Jersey* (1796, 8vo):—*Sermons on Advent* (1800, 8vo):—*Sermons* (Bath, 1803, 8vo):—*State of the Nation* (1808, 8vo):—*Book of Job* (from the Heb. by Elizabeth Smith, with *Preface* and *Annotations* by F. R. [Bath, 1810]).

Randolph, John, a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born in Trigg County, Ky., May 9, 1829. He was converted in 1847 (or 1848), licensed to preach Nov. 23, 1850, and admitted on trial in the Louisville Conference in 1851. He filled twelve important fields of labor, continuing his work until the first Sunday in June, 1863. The staple of his preaching, as of all he did, was strong practical sense, sanctified and rendered efficient by deep piety.—*Minutes of Annual Conf. M. E. Church, South*, 1864, p. 481.

Randolph, Samuel E., a minister in the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born in Tennessee. He entered the Tennessee Conference, from which he was transferred in 1860 to the Florida Conference. He enlisted in 1861 with the Lowndes Volunteers, and in three months fell a victim to disease at Camp Alleghany, Va., Aug. 29, 1861.—*Minutes of Annual Conf. M. E. Church, South*, 1861, p. 345.

Randolph, Thomas, an English divine of note, was born Aug. 30, 1701, at Canterbury, studied at Oxford University, where he was bursar, and after completing his theological course was in 1725 admitted to orders, then taught for a while, and finally accepted two benefices in Kent. In 1748 he was elected president of Corpus Christi College, and later was given a professorship in theology (1768). He died at Oxford March 24, 1783. Dr. Thomas Randolph published a work on the *Prophecies cited in the New Testament compared with the Hebrew Original and the Septuagint Version*, which is exceedingly valuable and scarce. "It presents," says Orme, "at one view the Heb. text, the Sept. version of it, and the quotation in the Greek New Test." The substance of the work is incorporated in Horne's *Chapter on Quotations*.

His son John, who was born July 6, 1749, and was educated at Oxford, became under his father's administration professor of Greek and theology, in 1799 was made bishop of Oxford, was transferred to the see of Bangor in 1807, and in 1809 to that of London, where he died July 28, 1813. He was a member of the Royal Society of London, and published several sermons. See *Gentleman's Magazine*, lxxxiii, lxxxiv, and the biographical sketch prefaced to the collected writings of Thomas Randolph; Saunders, *Evenings with Sacred Poets*, p. 231; Hook, *Eccles. Biog.* viii, 191. (J. H. W.)

Ranew, NATHANIEL, an English divine of the 17th century, noted as a Nonconformist who was ejected at the Restoration, was minister of Little Eastcheap, London, and afterwards vicar of Tilsted, Essex. He died in 1672, aged about seventy-two. He published, *Solitude Improved by Divine Meditation*, etc. (Lond. 1670, 8vo; last ed. 1847, 18mo), a very excellent work in the domain of practical theology:—*Account concerning the Saint's Glory*, etc., equally devout in spirit and excellent in composition and purpose.

Ranfaing, MARIE ELISABETH DE, a French lady, celebrated as the foundress of a religious order, and known under the name of Elizabeth of the Cross of Jesus, was born, Nov. 30, 1592, at Remiremont, of a noble Lorraine family, and was noted for her beauty. She was affianced to a man for whom she had not the shadow of affection, and therefore objected to wedlock; and when her parents persisted, she sought the retirement of the monastery. She was, however, brought back to society, and married M. Dubois, by whom she had three children. Her husband's death and other mishaps led her to determine the founding of a religious community made up wholly of women reclaimed from a life of debauchery. The number of these women having increased, the prince bishop of Toul thought proper to form them into a religious order, under the name of "Our Lady of Refuge." Mrs. Dubois and her three daughters took the dress belonging to the monastery Jan. 1, 1631. In 1634 Urban VIII gave his approval to this order. It extended over several of the cities of the realm, especially Avignon, Toulouse, Montpellier, and Rouen; and it survived the storms of the Revolution. The mother of Ranfaing died the death of a saint, Jan. 14, 1649. See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.

Range is the rendering of two Heb. words of marked import, besides one or two in an ordinary sense.

1. כִּיר, *kir* (only in the dual, כִּירַיִם, *kira'yim*, Lev. xi, 35, "ranges for pots"), apparently a cooking-furnace, perhaps of pottery (as it could be broken), and double (as having places for two pots or more, or, perhaps, consisting of two stoves set together). See OVEN; POT.

2. שְׂדֵרָה, *sederah'*, a *rank*, or row, of soldiers, drawn up in cordon ("range," 2 Kings xi, 8, 15; 2 Chron. xxiii, 14); also timbers or chambers in the stories of a building ("board," 1 Kings vi, 9). See ATHALIAH, TEMPLE.

Rangier(us), a French cardinal of mediæval times, was born, about 1035, in the diocese of Rheims. St. Bruno of that place was his tutor. One of his pupils was Eudes of Châtillon, pope under the name of Urban II. Rangier went, to take the habit of Benedictine, to Marmontiers, where he would probably have died in obscurity, had it not been for contention which arose among the monks, and Raoul of Sangeais, archbishop of Tours. Rangier's abbot, Bernard of Saint-Venant, charged him with a

mission to Rome, to maintain the rights of the abbey. The two ecclesiastics obtained a bull conformed to their wishes; but Rangier was kept at Rome by Urban II, who soon made him cardinal, and, in 1090, archbishop of Reggio. In 1095 he went with the pope to France, and took part in the Council of Clermont, where the first crusade was decided upon. After the Council, Rangier followed Urban II to Limoges and to Poitiers, and found himself, March 10, 1096, at the consecration of the abbey of Marmontiers. He soon after returned to his own diocese, and left it no more, excepting to assist Pascal II at the Council of Guastalla (1106). Ughelli speaks of him as a man of great power ("vir magnæ auctoritatis"). —Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.

Ranieri, St., an Italian ascetic of mediæval times, was born, in or about the year 1100, of a noble family of Pisa. In his youth, the Romish legends say, he had a vision: an eagle appeared to him, bearing in his beak a blazing light, and said, "I come from Jerusalem to enlighten the nations." But Ranieri refused to heed this call to a religious life, and gave himself up to pleasure. But, in the midst of his debaucheries, he was one day surprised by the visit of a holy man, who persuaded him to desert his sinful life. Soon he embarked for Jerusalem, where he took off his own garments, and wore the *schiavina*, or slave-shirt, ever after in token of humility. For twenty years he was a hermit in the deserts of Palestine, and during this time is reputed to have had numberless visions. On one occasion, he felt his vows of abstinence to be almost more than he could keep. He then had a vision of a golden vase, set with precious stones, and full of oil, pitch, and sulphur. These were set on fire, and none could quench the flames. Then there was put into his hands a small ewer of water; and when he turned on but a few drops, the fire was extinguished. This vision he believed to signify human passions by the pitch and sulphur, but the water was the emblem of temperance. He then determined to live on bread and water alone. His reverence for water was very great, and most of his miracles were performed through the use of it; so that he was called *San Ranieri dell' Acqua*. But when he tarried with a host who cheated his guests by putting water in his wine, the saint did not hesitate to expose the fraud; for he revealed to all present the figure of Satan, sitting on one of the wine-casks, in the form of a huge cat with the wings of a bat. He did many miracles after his return to Pisa, and made converts by the sanctity of his life and example. When he died (July 17, 1161), many miraculous manifestations bore witness to his eminent holiness. All the bells in Pisa were spontaneously tolled; and the archbishop Villani, who had been sick in bed for two years, was cured to attend his funeral. At the moment in the funeral service when it was the custom to omit the *Gloria in Excelsis*, it was sung by a choir of angels above the altar; while the organ accompanied them without being played by any perceptible hands. The harmony of this chant was so exquisite that those who heard it thought the very heavens were opened. He was buried in a tomb in the Duomo. After the plague in Pisa in 1356, the life of this saint was painted in the Campo Santo by Simone Memmi and Antonio Veneziano. These frescos are most important in the history of art, and consist of eight scenes from the life of St. Ranieri: 1. His conversion; 2. He embarks for Palestine; 3. He assumes the hermit's dress; 4. He has many temptations and visions in the desert; 5. He returns to Pisa; 6. He exposes the fraud of the innkeeper; 7. His death and funeral obsequies; 8. His miracles after death.—Mrs. Clement, *Hand-book of Legendary and Mythological Art*, s. v.

Ranke, Carl Ferdinand, doctor of theology and philosophy, and brother of the famous historian, Leopold Ranke, was born at Wiehe, in Thuringia, in 1802. Having finished his preparatory studies at the gymnasium in Pforta, he betook himself to the study of philology and theology. He soon became the head of the Quedlinburg Gymnasium. In 1837 he was called to Göttingen, and in 1842 to Berlin, where he not only superintended the Frederic-William Gymnasium, but also the Royal Real-school, the Royal Elizabeth School, etc. He died March 29, 1876. Ranke was not only an able philologist and pedagogue, but also an excellent Christian, and took an active part in the inner mission and Bible Society. He wrote, *Plan und Bau des Johanneischen Evangeliums* (Berlin, 1854):—*De Libris' Historicis Novi Testamenti* (ibid. 1855):—*Clemens von Alexandrien u. Origenes als Interpreten der heiligen Schrift* (ibid. 1861):—*Das Klagelied der Hebraër* (ibid. 1863), etc. As a contributor to Piper's *Evangelical Year-book*, he wrote on the apostles Andrew (vii, 94), James the Elder (viii, 139), Timothy (i, 70), Titus (i, 68); on Symphorianus (xix, 60), Perpetua and Felicitas (ix, 56), Saturninus (xx, 63), Arethas (xiii, 129), Eustasius (xviii, 96), Olaf Petersen (xix, 170), and contributed the German translation of Clement of Alexandria's hymn, Στόμιον πώλων ἀδαῶν, to Piper's monograph on that hymn (xix, 29, 31). See Schneider, *Theol. Jahrbuch* (1877), p. 227; *Literarischer Handweiser* (1876), p. 235. (B. P.)

Ranke, Friedrich Heinrich, doctor of theology and *Ober-Consistorialrath*, brother of Carl Ferdinand, was born at Wiehe in 1797. Having completed his studies, he labored as a pastor at Rückersdorf, not far from Nuremberg, and then as dean at Thurnau. In 1840 he was appointed ordinary professor of dogmatics at the Erlangen University. In 1841 he was made counsellor of consistory at Bayreuth, and shortly afterwards he was appointed Ober-Consistorialrath. Some years ago he retired from his different offices, and died Sept. 2, 1876. Of his writings we mention, *Untersuchungen über den Pentateuch* (Erlangen, 1834-40, 2 vols.):—*Predigten*:—*Gebete über Worte der heil. Schrift* (Frankfort-on-the-Main, 1867):—*The Institution of the Lord's Supper* (ibid. xi, 81):—*David*, in Piper's *Evangelical Year-book* (viii, 106). See Fürst, *Bibl. Jud.* iii, 129; Zuchold, *Bibliotheca Theologica*, ii, 1028; Winer, *Handbuch der theol. Literatur*, i, 78; ii, 108, 327, 330, 732; Schneider, *Theol. Jahrbuch* (1877), p. 227; *Literarischer Handweiser* (1876), p. 235, 550; Hauck, *Theolog. Jahresbericht* (1867), p. 382. (B. P.)

Ranken, David, a Scotch divine, was a member of the Episcopal Church of Scotland at Edinburgh in the first half of the 18th century, and was an author of some repute. He published, *Three Discourses*, 1 *Pet. iii*, 13, 14 (Edin, 1716, 8vo):—*Three Discourses*, 1 *Pet. iii*, 14, 16 (1716, 8vo):—*Serm.*, 1 *Pet. iii*, 13–16 (1717, 8vo):—*Serms.* (1720, 8vo):—*Three Discourses, Phil. i*, 27 (1722, 8vo).

Rankin, Thomas, a somewhat noted minister of the early Methodist Episcopal Church — one of Wesley's general assistants—was born in Dunbar, Scotland, 1738. He was religiously trained by his parents, and, at an early age, expressed the desire to become a minister of the Gospel. After the death of his father, he formed bad acquaintances, and gave himself up to worldly amusements. When he was seventeen years of age, Dunbar was visited by troops of dragoons, among whom were a number of devout Christians, who held meetings morning and evening. Young Rankin attended, and was deeply impressed. He afterwards removed to Edinburgh, where he came under the personal influence of Mr. Whitefield, and was decided to devote himself to Christian work. With this purpose in view, he prepared to enter the College at Edinburgh. Circumstances, however, occurred which prevented his taking a collegiate course; and, by the advice of a friend, he sailed for America, to engage in a commercial enterprise. Wearying of this life, he was glad to find himself once more in Scotland, breathing a more congenial religious atmosphere. Shortly after his return, he met a Methodist minister, who saw the unsettled condition of his mind, and invited Rankin to visit, with

him, the different Methodist societies of the North. He was even prevailed upon to preach, though he consented with great reluctance, and was so dissatisfied with himself that he was often well-nigh resolved to attempt it no more. While in this state of mind, he listened to the preaching of Wesley, and from that time had the most intense admiration for him. After a great spiritual conflict, he sought Wesley, and related to him his experience of the two preceding years. Wesley advised him to persevere in his religious work, and so removed his doubts that he expressed himself willing to be known everywhere "as a poor, despised Methodist preacher." He was regularly appointed in 1761 to the Sussex Circuit, and in the following year to the Sheffield Circuit. At the next Conference, he was appointed to the Devonshire Circuit. In 1764 he became assistant-preacher in the Cornwall Circuit. In 1765 he was appointed to spend a part of the year in the Newcastle and a part in the Dales Circuit. In 1766 he was stationed upon the Epworth Circuit, and, upon request of the people, was returned the second year. In 1768 he was appointed to labor again in the west of Cornwall. In 1769 he was sent to the London and Sussex Circuit, and also travelled with John Wesley on his preaching tour through the kingdom. In 1770 he accompanied Wesley to the west of England, and everywhere their labors met with great success. In 1771 he was once more stationed with his friends in Cornwall. While at the conference held at Leeds, he met captain Webb, lately arrived from America. Wesley had become greatly dissatisfied with the management of the American mission, and, when the question came up before the conference, intimated his desire to send Rankin as general superintendent. The appointment was made; and he, together with George Shadford, sailed for America in 1773. Soon after his arrival, Rankin called a conference, the first ever held in America, July 4, 1773, at Philadelphia. Asbury had been previously appointed and sent over as the general assistant of the societies in America; but as Rankin had travelled several years longer, he took precedence over Asbury when he reached here. Besides, the displeasure of Wesley against the American work had probably led him to select for the place a man who could claim superiority over Asbury. Rankin, therefore, held the place of "general assistant" while here, and presided at the conferences which convened while he was in America. He was stationed at New York and Philadelphia alternately, and remained in this country until 1778, when he again appears at work in England. He visited, while here, many of the churches then within the territory known as the Philadelphia Conference, and would probably have remained, had not the Revolutionary struggle made his stay ill-advised. Immediately after his return to England, he was stationed at London, where he lived two years. In 1783 he asked to be made a supernumerary; and after this date he lived quietly in the English metropolis until his death, May 17, 1810. He was buried in City Road, near Wesley. He was a truly pious man, but too stern and uncompromising to succeed as a leader; and he failed in this country to be of any especial service to Asbury, whom he was intended to assist. He never wavered in difficulties and trials, and showed a truly heroic spirit in the hour of need. His irregular education had probably as much to do with his inconsistencies of conduct as his natural propensity to the severe aspects of life. See Stevens, *Hist. of Methodism*, i, 239; and his *Hist. of the M. E. Ch.* (see Index); Bangs, *Hist. of the M. E. Ch.* (N. Y. 1838, 2 vols. 12mo), i, 77–124; Wakeley, *Lost Chapters* (see Index); Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, vii, 28–34.

Ransom (פִּדְיוֹן, *pidyon'*, Exod. xxi, 30; "redemption," Psa. xlix, 8; or פְּדוּיִם, *pidyom'*, "redemption," Numb. iii, 49, 51; elsewhere כֹּפֶר, *kôpher*, *forgiveness*, or גָּאַל, *to act the part of Goël* [q. v.]; N. T. λύτρον, or ἀντίλυτρον), a price paid to recover a person or thing from one who detains that person or thing in captivity. Hence prisoners of war or slaves are said to be ransomed when they are liberated in exchange for a valuable consideration (1 Cor. vi, 19, 20). Whatever is substituted or exchanged in compensation for the party is his ransom; but the word ransom is more extensively taken in Scripture. A man is said to ransom his life (Exod. xxi, 30); that is, to substitute a sum of money instead of his life as the penalty of certain offences (Exod. xxx, 12; Job xxxvi, 18). The poll-tax of half a shekel for every Hebrew was deemed the *ransom*, or atonement money, and was declared to be a heave-offering to Jehovah, to propitiate for their lives (Exod. xxx, 12–16). Some of the sacrifices (as the sin- and trespass-offerings) might be regarded as commutations or ransoms (Lev. iv, 1–35; v, 1–19). In like manner, our Blessed Lord is said to give himself a ransom for all (1 Tim. ii, 6; Matt. xx, 23; Mark x, 43)—a substitute for them, bearing sufferings in their stead, undergoing that penalty which would otherwise attach to them (Rom. iii, 34; vii, 23; 1 Cor. i, 30; Eph. i, 7; iv, 30; Heb. ix, 13). See Redemption.

Ranters is (1) one of the many names by which the Presbyterians designated the most advanced of the mystical radicals of the Cromwellian period. They were Antinomian heretics, and were probably related to the Familists (q. v.), to whom Fuller (*Ch. Hist.* iii, 211 sq.) traces them. In Ross's Πανσεβεία, the Ranters are described as making an open profession of lewdness and irreligion; as holding that God, angels, devils, heaven, hell, etc., are fictions and fables; that Moses, John the Baptist, and our Lord were impostors; that praying and preaching are useless; that all ministry has come to an end; and that sin is a mere imagination. He says that in their letters the Ranters endeavored to be strangely profane and blasphemous, uttering atheistical imprecations; and he gives a specimen which quite bears out his words. He also alleges that they sanctioned and practiced community of women (ed. 1655, p. 287). Much the same account, also, is given a few years later by Pagitt (*Heresiography* [ed. 1662], p. 259, 294). Baxter also writes respecting them: "I have myself letters written from Abingdon, where, among both soldiers and people, this contagion did then prevail, full of horrid oaths and curses, and blasphemy not fit to be repeated by the tongue and pen of man; and this all uttered as the effect of knowledge and a part of their religion, in a fanatic strain, and fathered on the Spirit of God" (*Own Life and Times*, p. 77). The following passage is found in a *Life of Bunyan*, added to an imitation of his work which is called *The Third Part of the Pilgrim's Progress*: "About this time" (in Bunyan's early life), "a very large liberty being given as to conscience, there started up a sect of loose, profane wretches, afterwards called Ranters and Sweet Singers, pretending themselves safe from, or being incapable of, sinning; though, indeed, they were the debauchest and profligate wretches living in their baudy meetings and revels. For, fancying themselves in Adam's state, as he was in Paradise before the fall, they would strip themselves, both men and women, and so catch as catch could; and to it they went, to satiate their lust under pretence of increasing and multiplying" (*An Account of the Life and Actions of Mr. John Bunyan*, etc. [London, 1692], p. 22). (See Weingarten, *Revolutions-Kirchen Englands* [Leips. 1868], p. 107 sq.; Blunt, *Dict. of Sects*, s. v.). (2.) In recent times—since 1828—the name of "Ranters" has been given to those Primitive Methodists who separated from the main body of Methodists, and were distinguished by their unusual physical demonstrations.

Raoul de Flaix, a French monastic, flourished near the middle of the 12th century. It is difficult to enumerate definitely his works. He is undoubtedly the author of *Commentaire sur le Lévitique* (Cologne, 1536, fol.). The authors of the *Literary History of*

France claim for him a discourse abridged from the *Work of Six Days*, which is found in a manuscript in the King's Library, No. 647; also a *Commentary on the Proverbs*, of which they mention a copy at Cambridge in the library of Pembroke College; and a *Commentary on the Epistles of St. Paul*. They add that Raoul de Flaix commented on Nahum and the Apocalypse. These glossaries on Nahum and the Apocalypse exist, in fact, under the name of Master Raoul (Magistri Radulfi), in a volume of Clairvaux, which is numbered at present 227 in the library of Troyes. But this is a mistake into which Lelong led the authors of the *Literary History*. A commentary on the Song of Songs, published in some ancient editions of Gregory the Great, had been attributed to Raoul de Flaix. Lelong and Mabillon having proved that this work is by Robert de Tombelaine, abbey of St. Vign de Bayeux, the authors of the *Literary History* have thought it necessary, in consequence, to strike the Canticle of Canticles from the list of sacred books annotated by our Raoul. But in that they appear to be mistaken. In fact, the volume of Clairvaux which is to-day preserved in the library of Troyes offers us, besides the glossaries on the Apocalypse and Nahum, glossaries on the Canticles entirely different from those which have been published under the name of Gregory and restored to the abbot Robert. Sanders mentions also, among the works of Raoul de Flaix, a theological summary—*Summa Radulfi Flaviacensis*—and a treatise, *De Amore Carnis et Odio Carnis*—works of which we have no other account.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.

Raoul de St. Trond, a Belgian monastic, was born at Moutier-sur-Sambre, in the diocese of Liege, studied at Liege, and then entered the Benedictine order at Aix-la-Chapelle. He was there made sacristan, master of a school, and grand provost. He was a very devout man; and, dissatisfied with the lax condition of the monastery at Aix, he left for St. Trond, where, after two years, he was made prior, and introduced the reforms of the Clugniacs. In 1108 he was elected abbot, and took part in the quarrel for the pope which agitated the Liege diocese and resulted in its division. He went twice to Rome, where he was warmly received and had much influence. He died March 6, 1138. He wrote: *Gesta Abbatum Trudonensium Ord. Sancti Benedicti*, in D'Achéry's *Spicilegium*, vii, 344 sq.:—*De Susceptione Puerorum in Monasteriis*, in Mabillon's *Analecta*:—*Contra Simoniacos, Lib. VII*, which is still in MS. See *Gallia Christiana*, iii, 958–960; Ceillier, *Hist. des Aut. Ecclés.* xxii, 68.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.

Raoul de Vaucelle, a French monastic, was born probably at Merston, in England, and flourished in the first half of the 12th century, first a monk at Clairvaux, and later as abbot of the new monastery founded at Vaucelle, in the diocese of Cambray, by St. Bernard. Raoul is renowned both for his magnificence and for his charity. In the time of want, he supported for months as many as five thousand paupers. Charles de Visch, in his *Bibliothèque Cistercienne*, counts him among the learned writers of his time, and attributes to him many works; but, according to Pastoret, these works are lost. He died in 1152.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.

Rapaport, Salomo Jehuda Löw, a noted Jewish scholar, was born at Lemberg, in Austrian Galicia, in 1790. He first attracted attention among his coreligionists by notes to a Talmudical work of his father-in-law, and subsequently rose to the highest rank among the Hebrew writers of the age by critico-biographical sketches of Saadia Gaon, Rabbi Nathan, Hai Gaon, the poet Eleazar Kalir, etc., in the *Bikkure ha-Ittim* (Vienna, 1828–31); by contributions to the *Kerem Chemed* (Vienna and Prague, 1833–43); and by numerous other dissertations in Hebrew and German, inserted in various other publications. He translated into Hebrew verse Racine's *Esther*, entitled שארית יהודה (Vienna, 1827). He also published, under the title of סֵ֫פֶר בִּכּוּרִים, a linguistic and archæological lexicon, of which only one part has as yet appeared (Prague, 1852). His poetical contributions in the *Bikkure* may be identified by the cipher שׁ"ר. Having officiated for some time as rabbi at Tarnopol, he was elected, in 1840, to fill a similar office at Prague, where he died, Oct. 16, 1867. Besides his numerous essays, which are to be found in the different reviews and periodicals, he published, in 1861, a criticism on Frankel's *Darke ha-Mishna*, entitled *Dibre Shulom ve-Emeth*. See Fürst, *Bibl. Jud.* iii, 131 sq.; Etheridge, *Introduction to Hebrew Literature*, p. 482; Grätz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, xi, 485 sq.; Jost, *Gesch. d. Judenth. u. s. Secten*, iii, 343 sq.; Stern, *Gesch. d. Judenthums*, p. 218 sq.; Dessauer, *Gesch. d. Israeliten*, p. 533 sq.; Geiger, *Jüd. Zeitschrift* (1867), p. 241 sq.; id. *Nachgelassene Schriften* (Berlin, 1875), ii, 262; Zunz, *Die Monatstage des Kalenderjahres* (Eng. transl. by the Rev. B. Pick, in the *Jewish Messenger*, N. Y., 1874–75); Cassel, *Leitfaden zur jüd. Gesch. u. Literatur* (1872), p. 114; Delitzsch, *Zur Gesch. d. jüdischen Poesie*, p. 102, 118, 155; Kurländer, *S. L. Ropaport: eine biographische Skizze* (Pesth, 1868). (B. P.)

Raper, William H., a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Western Pennsylvania, Sept. 24, 1793. He was first brought to notice by the service he rendered his country in the second war with England. In 1819 he was received on trial in the Ohio Conference, and remained in the effective ranks for about thirty years. He served the Church in various positions, and always acceptably. He was honored by being sent to several general conferences, and had many admirers and friends. He died while travelling with bishop Morris to Aurora, Ind., Feb. 11, 1852. Mr. Raper was a profound theologian, of amiable social qualities, fearless and earnest.—*Minutes of Annual Conf. of M. E. Ch.* 1852, p. 123.

Ra'pha (Heb. *Rapha'*, רָפָא, as in 1 Chron. viii, 2), or **Ra'phah** (Heb. *Raphah'*, רָפָה, as in 2 Sam. xxi, 16, meaning *giant* [q. v.], as translated in 1 Chron. xx, 4, 6, 8; 2 Sam. xxi, 16, 18, 20, 22; Sept. Ῥαφής, v. r. Ῥαφά and Ῥαφαία), the name of two men. See also Beth-Raphia.

1. The last of the five sons of Benjamin, son of Jacob (1 Chron. viii, 2, "Rapha"). B.C. post 1927. The name does not occur in the original register of the family (Gen. xlvi, 21); but at Numb. xiii, 9, Raphu was the name of the father of the person chosen from Benjamin to spy out the land of Canaan — showing the name, or something similar, to have belonged to the tribe. Raphah is apparently but a variation of the name of Rosh (q. v.). See Jacob.

2. The son of Binea, and father of Eleasah; eighth in lineal descent from David's friend Jonathan (1 Chron. viii, 37, "Raphah"). B.C. post 1000. He is called Rephaiah in 1 Chron. ix, 43.

Ra'phaël (Ῥαφαήλ = רָפָאֵל, "the divine healer"), "one of the seven holy angels which . . . go in and out before the glory of the Holy One" (Tob. xii, 15). According to another Jewish tradition, Raphael was one of the *four* angels that stood round the throne of God —Michael, Uriel, Gabriel, Raphael. His place is said to have been behind the throne, by the standard of Ephraim (comp. Numb. ii, 18); and his name was interpreted as foreshadowing the healing of the schism of Jeroboam, who arose from that tribe (1 Kings xi, 26, see Buxtorf, *Lex. Rabb.* p. 47). In Tobit he appears as the guide and counsellor of Tobias. By his help, Sara was delivered from her plague (Tob. vi, 16, 17), and Tobit from his blindness (xi, 7, 8). In the book of Enoch he appears as "the angel of the spirits of men" (xx, 3; comp. Dillmann, *ad loc.*). His symbolic character in the apocryphal narrative is clearly indicated when he describes himself as "Azarias the son of Ananias" (Tob.

v, 12), the messenger of the Lord's help, springing from the Lord's mercy. See TOBIT. The name, in its Heb. form, occurs in 1 Chron. xxvi, 7 as that of a man. See RAPHAEL.

Raphael, St. (Lat. *Sanctus Raphael;* Ital. *San Raffaello;* Fr. *St. Raphael;* Germ. *Der Heilige Rafael*), the same with the above, is considered the guardian angel of humanity. He was sent to warn Adam of the danger of sin, and its unhappy consequences.

"Be strong, live happy, and love! but first of all
Him whom to love is to obey, and keep
His great command. Take heed lest passion sway
Thy judgment to do aught which else free-will
Would not admit. Thine and of all thy sons
The weal or woe in thee is placed. Beware!" (Milton).

He was the herald who bore to the shepherds the "good tidings of great joy which shall be for all people." He is especially the protector of the young, the pilgrim, and the traveller. In the apocryphal romance, his watchful care of the young Tobias during his eventful journey is typical of his benignity and loving condescension towards those whom he protects. His countenance is represented as full of benignity. Devotional pictures portray him dressed as a pilgrim, with sandals; his hair bound with a diadem or a fillet; the staff in his hand, and a wallet, or *panetière,* hung to his belt. As a guardian spirit, he bears the sword and a small casket, or vase, containing the "fishy charm" (Tob. vi, 6) against evil spirits. As guardian angel, he usually leads Tobias. Murillo's painting, in the Leuchtenberg Gallery, represents him as the guardian angel of a bishop who appears as a votary below. St. Raphael is commemorated in the Church of Rome on Sept. 12.

Raphael, or **Raffaello** SANTI or SANZIO, called by his countrymen "*Il Divino,*" i. e. "the Divine," is ranked by almost universal opinion as the greatest of painters. He was certainly the Sophocles of the glorious art of form and color. He was born at Urbino April 6, 1483. In 1497, on the death of his father, Giovanni Santi, who was his first instructor, he was placed under Pietro Perugino (q. v.), the most distinguished painter of the period, who was then engaged on important works in the city of Perugia. The profound feeling, the mystic ecstasy, which characterized the Umbrian school while yet under the leadership of its founder, the Perugian, and before it degenerated into the mannerism and facile manufacture at which Michael Angelo sneered, took possession of the soul of Raphael. He soon acquired a wonderful facility of execution. He showed such great talent that Perugino employed him on his own works; and so well did he perform his task that it is difficult now to separate the work of the master from that of the pupil. In 1504 Raphael visited Florence, and improved his style by studying composition and expression in the works of Masaccio, the sweet and perfect modelling of Leonardo da Vinci, and color and effect in those of Fra Bartolomeo. He seems to have lived in Florence till 1508, when he went to Rome, on the invitation of pope Julius II. His celebrated frescos in the Vatican, and numerous important works, were then commenced. Julius died in 1513, but his successor, Leo X, continued Raphael's services, and kept his great powers constantly in exercise. Raphael and Rome are synonymous terms in the history of Italian art of the 16th century. Though Michael Angelo labored at Rome, and the impress of his genius is everywhere in the avenues of Roman art, yet by common consent the Roman school of art owes its origin and life to Raphael. It became the grandest of all the Italian schools of painting, and gave concrete reality to the aspirations and longings of his predecessors by carrying art to a height all but ultimate. The Roman school combined the virility and boldness of Florence with the simplicity and the devotional sweetness of Umbria and Siena; in short, all Italian excellences Raphael gathered in his Roman creation; but with the artist who gave it birth the school alone can be identified, and, illustrious as were many of his pupils, his own death marks the fading hour of the Roman school. Of all the Roman painters, it was Raphael alone who made his works not less the expression and measure of all the knowledge, philosophy, and poetry of his time than witnesses to his genius and vouchers for what we call the immortality of his fame. He achieved the labors of a demigod; his successors wrought like mere men. Raphael had scarcely reached his prime when a sudden attack of fever carried him off, on the anniversary of his birth, in 1520. "The works of Raphael are generally divided into three classes: his first style, when under the influence of Perugino's manner; his second, when he painted in Florence from 1504 to 1508; and his third style, which is distinguishable in the works executed by him after he settled in Rome. Each of these styles has its devoted admirers. Those who incline to art employed in the service of religion prefer the first manner, as embodying purity and religious feeling. His last manner, perfected when the taste for classical learning and art was strongly excited by the discovery of numerous valuable works of the classic period, is held by many connoisseurs as correctly embodying the highest art; while his middle, or Florentine, style is admired by some as exemplifying his powers freed from what they deem the rigid manner of Perugino, and untainted by the conventionalism of classic art. In all these different styles he has left works of great excellence. The *Coronation of the Virgin,* in the gallery of the Vatican, and the *Sposalizio,* or Marriage of the Virgin, in the Brera Gallery at Milan, which is an improved version of Perugino's *Sposalizio,* painted in 1495 for the cathedral of Perugia, belong to the first period. The *St. Catharine,* in the National Gallery, London; the *Entombment,* in the Borghese Gallery, Rome; *La Belle Jardinière,* in the Louvre, belong to his second period. The *St. Cecilia,* at Bologna; the *Madonna di San Sisto,* at Dresden; the *Cartoons,* at Hampton Court; the *Transfiguration,* and all the Vatican frescos, except *Theology, or the Dispute on the Sacrament,* the first he executed on his arrival from Florence, are in his third manner, or that which peculiarly marks the Roman school in its highest development" (Chambers). The two great Madonnas of Raphael are the *Madonna della Sedia* and the *Madonna di San Sisto.* The former, which is at the Pitti Palace, Florence, is, according to critical standards, not so perfect as others of the same painter which have failed to obtain universal popularity. But as a representation of the Roman view of the Holy Family, nothing could be more beautifully expressed. We see only a happy mother bending over the lovely child in the intensity of her affection and content, while the babe looks forth from the picture with a strange glance of conscious superiority. The *Madonna di San Sisto* cannot be described, and no copies of it, photographs or engravings, can convey a correct idea. In this work Raphael reached the perfection of his type, humanity raised to divinity. The grace and beauty of the Virgin seem apart from and above earthly associations. In the solemn, thoughtful, yet childlike expression of the infant Christ there is the foreshadowing of the sufferer, the Saviour, and the Judge. It is singular that not until 1827, when the picture was cleaned, were the innumerable heads of angels surrounding the Virgin discovered. The *Transfiguration,* which was Raphael's last and also his greatest work, he left unfinished. It seems as if he had labored while already on the way to heaven, and we do not wonder that Vasari, in his ecstasy of joy over this work by human hands, with so much of heavenly skill in it, is led to exclaim, "Whosoever shall desire to see in what manner Christ transformed into the Godhead should be represented, let him come and behold it in this picture." "Raphael," says Lanzi, "is by common consent placed at the head of his art, not because he excelled all others in every department of painting, but because no other artist has ever possessed the vari-

cus parts of the art united in so high a degree." See, besides Vasari and Lanzi, Robertson, *The Great Painters of Christendom* (published by Cassell, Lond. and N. Y., and handsomely illustrated), p. 79–95; Radcliffe, *Schools and Masters of Painting* (N. Y. 1877, 12mo), ch. viii et al.; Mrs. Clement, *Painters*, etc. (ibid. 1877, 12mo), p. 473–485; Duppa, *Life of Raphael* (in Engl., Lond. 1815); Wolzogen, *Raphael* (tr. by Burnett, ibid. 1866); Quatremère de Quincy, *Vie de Raphael* (tr. into Engl. by Hazlitt, 1846); Perkins, *Raphael and Michael Angelo* (Lond. and Bost. 1878); *Lond. Quar. Rev.* April, 1870.

Ra'phah (1 Chron. viii, 2). See RAPHA.

Raph'aïm (Ῥαφαίν, but some MSS. omit), a name given (Judith viii, 1) as that of the son of Gideon and father of Acitho in the ancestry of Judith. It is evidently=רְפָאִים, *Rephaim* (q. v.).

Raphall, MORRIS JACOB, a Jewish rabbi, was born at Stockholm, Sweden, in September, 1798. He was educated at the Jewish college of Copenhagen, and was so precocious that in his thirteenth year he received the Hebrew degree of Chabir Socius (analogous to the "fellowship" of the English universities), which entitled him to the honorable designation of Rabbi. In 1812 he went to England, where he remained for six years, devoting himself to the study of the English language. The next six years he spent in travelling and studying in Europe. On his return to England in 1825 he married, and took up his residence in London. In 1832 he gave some lectures on the Biblical poetry of the Hebrews, and in 1834 commenced the publication of the *Hebrew Review*, the first Jewish publication ever issued in England. When this had reached its seventy-eighth number, ill-health compelled him to relinquish it. In 1840 he acted as secretary of Dr. Solomon Herschel, the chief rabbi of London, and in 1841 he was appointed rabbi preacher of the synagogue at Birmingham, England. He was also the chief instrument in founding the first national school in England for the Jews, of which he acted as head master. In 1849, having previously received the degree of Ph.D. from the University of Giessen, he was called to New York as rabbi preacher to the Anglo-German congregation *B'nai Jeshurun*, where he died, June 23, 1868. His main work is his *Post-Biblical History of the Jews* (N. Y. 1866, 2 vols.), and the translation of *Eighteen Treatises of the Mishna*, in connection with D. A. de Sola (2d ed. Lond. 1845). Besides, he translated into English from the works of Maimonides, Albo, and Wessely, which translations are found in the *Hebrew Review*. (B. P.)

Raphel, GEORG, a German Lutheran divine of some note, was born in 1673, and was last superintendent of Lüneburg. He died in 1740. He was one of the best commentators of that class of exegetists who have attempted to illustrate the Bible from classic authors. His *Annotationes in Sacram Scripturam* contains historical illustrations of some passages in the Old Test., and philological explanations of many in the New, chiefly taken from Xenophon, Polybius, Arrian, and Herodotus. He also edited the Greek homilies of Chrysostom, with a Latin translation and notes, annexed to the edition of the *Annotations* published at Leyden (1747, 2 vols. 8vo). See Orme, *Biblioth. Bibl.* s. v.; Horne, *Introd. to the Scriptures.*

Ra'phon (Ῥαφειών; Alex. and Josephus, Ῥαφών; Peshito, *Raphon*), a city of Gilead, under the walls of which Judas Maccabæus defeated Timotheus (1 Macc. v, 37 only). It appears to have stood on the eastern side of an important wady, and at no great distance from Carnaim—probably Ashteroth-Carnaim. It may have been identical with Raphana, which is mentioned by Pliny (*Nat. Hist.* v, 16) as one of the cities of the Decapolis, but with no specification of its position. Nor is there anything in the narrative of 1 Macc., of 2 Macc. (ch. xii), or of Josephus (*Ant.* xii, 8, 3) to enable us to decide whether the torrent in question is the Hieromax, the Zerka, or any other. In Kiepert's map, accompanying Wettstein's *Hauran*, etc. (1860), a place named *Er-Râfe* is marked, on the east of Wady Hrêr, one of the branches of the Wady Mandhur, and close to the great road leading to Sanamein, which last has some claims to be identified with Ashteroth-Carnaim. But in our present ignorance of the district this can only be taken as mere conjecture. If Er-Râfe be Raphana, we should expect to find large ruins.

Ra'phu (Heb. *Raphu'*, רָפוּא, *healed;* Sept. Ῥαφοῦ), father of Palti, which latter was sent with Caleb and Joshua as a spy into the promised land; representing the tribe of Benjamin (Numb. xiii, 9). B.C. ante 1658.

Rappists, also known as **Harmonists,** are a Christian people living in community of goods, and in celibate state, at Economy, Pa., in the vicinity of Pittsburgh, and hence also not infrequently called **Economites.** They owe their origin to George Rapp, a German, who was born at Iptingen, in Würtemberg, in October, 1757, of humble parentage, and had enjoyed only a moderate education. Having always been a devout Christian and a close reader of the Bible, he became convinced that the lifeless condition of the churches was ill in accord with the vital character of apostolic Christianity, and in 1787 began to preach among those of like mind with himself in the little village where he was then living. The clergy resented this interference with their office, and both Rapp and his adherents were visited with all manner of persecution, and denounced as "Separatists," a name which they bore ever after while in Germany, and which they themselves accepted gladly. In the course of six years the Rappists numbered not less than 300 families, scattered over a distance of twenty miles from the home of George Rapp. The consistent manner in which the Separatists bore themselves gave little opportunity for positive accusation, yet they were constantly annoyed by government and clergy, and in 1803 finally determined to end all strife by emigration to a land of freedom. Rapp, accompanied by his son and two other followers, came to this country in advance to select a home for all like-minded with himself. In the course of one year 600 persons came over, and were settled by Rapp in different parts of Pennsylvania and Maryland, while he himself, with several skilful mechanics and ingenious persons, prepared for a family home for the Separatists the land he had purchased in Butler County, Pa., along the Conequenessing Creek. On Feb. 15, 1805, those who had come with Rapp, and such others as had followed thither, organized themselves formally and solemnly into the "Harmony Society," agreeing then to throw all their possessions into a common fund, to adopt a uniform and simple dress and style of house, to keep thenceforth all things in common, and to labor for the common good of the whole body. Later in the spring they were joined by fifty additional families; and thus they finally began with what must have made up all together less than 750 men, women, and children. But these were all accustomed to labor, and with such a leader as Rapp then was—in the prime of life, only forty-eight years old, of robust frame and sound health, with great perseverance, enterprise, and executive ability, and remarkable common-sense—the society got on very successfully. In the first year they erected between forty and fifty log-houses, a church and school-house, a grist-mill, a barn, and some workshops, and cleared 150 acres of land. In the following year they cleared 400 acres more, and built a saw-mill and a tannery, and planted a small vineyard. A distillery was also a part of this year's building—a thing not so very strange in those days of general tendency towards strong drink among the laboring classes—though they themselves indulged only very moderately in any intoxicating liquors. Rapp was the general in all departments. He planned for all. He was their preacher, teacher, guide, and keeper.

Until 1807 community of goods and the hope of the

approach of the millennial reign alone distinguished the Rappists from other Christians; but in that year an unusual religious awakening led them to determine upon a still closer life with God, and, having become persuaded that it was the duty of the followers of Jesus to conform in *all* things to the life of Christ and his apostles, the Rappists, in the spirit of the apostle Paul, that "He that is unmarried careth for the things that belong to the Lord, how he may please the Lord; but he that is married careth for the things of the world, how he may please his wife," forsook marriage, and since that time celibacy is one of the distinguishing tenets of the Harmonists, and they that have wives do truly live "as though they had none." A member writing on the constancy of the Rappists to the decision of 1807, in 1862, says, "Convinced of the truth and holiness of our purpose, we voluntarily and unanimously adopted celibacy, altogether from religious motives, in order to withdraw our love entirely from the lusts of the flesh, which, with the help of God and much prayer and spiritual warfare, we have succeeded well in doing now for fifty years."

In 1814 the Rappists determined to remove to Indiana, and the unanimity of feeling which prevailed when the council so ordered proves how well organized and how sincere they all were. They settled in the Wabash valley, on a tract of 27,000 acres, and called the place "New Harmony"—a property which, in 1824, they sold to Robert Owen (q. v.), who settled upon it his New Lanark colony—and bought and removed to the property they still hold at Economy. For some years the society was in a most flourishing condition, and, by frequent accessions from Germany, maintained their ground remarkably until 1831, when an adventurer—Bernhard Müller by right name, who had assumed the title *Graf*, or count, Maximilian de Leon, and had gathered a following of visionary Germans—joined the Economists, and sowed the seed of discord. In 1832 Rapp determined upon a dissolution, and 250 members—about one third—left Economy for Philipsburg, where they settled, to break up in a short time, and finally to furnish a small quota to the Bethel Community in Missouri. Thereafter the Economists no more sought for accession. But they have steadily increased in wealth in spite of all their removals and numerical decadence; and now own, besides their village and estate at Economy, much property in other places, having a large interest in coal-mines and oil-wells, and railroads and manufactories, and controlling at Beaver Falls the largest cutlery establishment in the United States.

At present the town of Economy counts about 120 houses, very regularly built, and it is well drained and paved. It has water led from a reservoir in the hills, abundant shade-trees, a church, an assembly hall, a store, and different factories. The house which the society built for their founder is a sort of museum, and serves also as a pleasure resort to all that remain of the Rappists, who, according to Nordhoff, number about 110 persons, most of whom are aged, and none under forty, with some 35 *adopted* children, and an equal number living there with parents who are hired laborers, these numbering about 100. The whole population is German, and German is the medium of communication on the street and in the church, as well as in the houses. Most of the men wear for week-day dress blue "roundabouts," like boys' spencers, and pantaloons of the same color, and broad-brimmed hats; and are full of quiet dignity and genuine politeness. On Sunday the men wear long coats. The women are dressed quite as oddly as the men, with their short loose gowns, kerchiefs across the shoulders, and caps that run up to the top of a high back-comb. The present dress of the Harmonists was worn by Rapp and his associates when they came to this country, and continued from choice by them and their successors.

The agreement, or articles of association, under which the "Harmony Society" was formed in 1805, and which has been signed by all members thenceforward, reads as follows:

"*Whereas*, by the favor of Divine Providence, an association or community has been formed by George Rapp and many others upon the basis of Christian fellowship, the principles of which, being faithfully derived from the Sacred Scriptures, include the government of the patriarchal age, united to the community of property adopted in the days of the apostles, and wherein the simple object sought is to approximate, so far as human imperfections may allow, to the fulfilment of the will of God, by the exercise of those affections and the practice of those virtues which are essential to the happiness of man in time and throughout eternity:

"*And whereas* it is necessary to the good order and well-being of the said association that the conditions of membership should be clearly understood, and that the rights, privileges, and duties of every individual therein should be so defined as to prevent mistake or disappointment, on the one hand, and contention or disagreement, on the other;

"*Therefore*, be it known to all whom it may concern that we, the undersigned, citizens of the county of Beaver, in the commonwealth of Pennsylvania, do severally and distinctly, each for himself, covenant, grant, and agree, to and with the said George Rapp and his associates as follows, viz.:

"Article 1. We, the undersigned, for ourselves, our heirs, executors, and administrators, do hereby give, grant, and forever convey to the said George Rapp and his associates, and to their heirs and assigns, all our property, real, personal, and mixed, whether it be lands and tenements, goods and chattels, money or debts due to us, jointly or severally, in possession, in remainder, or in reversion or expectancy, whatsoever and wheresoever, without evasion, qualification, or reserve, as a free gift or donation, for the benefit and use of the said association or community; and we do hereby bind ourselves, our heirs, executors, and administrators, to do all such other acts as may be necessary to vest a perfect title to the same in the said association, and to place the said property at the full disposal of the superintendent of the said community without delay.

"Article 2. We do further covenant and agree to and with the said George Rapp and his associates that we will severally submit faithfully to the laws and regulations of said community, and will at all times manifest a ready and cheerful obedience towards those who are or may be appointed as superintendents thereof, holding ourselves bound to promote the interest and welfare of the said community, not only by the labor of our own hands, but also by that of our children, our families, and all others who now are or hereafter may be under our control.

"Article 3. If, contrary to our expectation, it should so happen that we could not render the faithful obedience aforesaid, and should be induced from that or any other cause to withdraw from the said association, then and in such case we do expressly covenant and agree to and with the said George Rapp and his associates that we never will claim or demand, either for ourselves, our children, or for any one belonging to us, directly or indirectly, any compensation, wages, or reward whatever for our or their labor or services rendered to the said community, or to any member thereof; but whatever we or our families jointly or severally shall or may do, all shall be held and considered as a voluntary service for our brethren.

"Article 4. In consideration of the premises, the said George Rapp and his associates do, by these presents, adopt the undersigned jointly and severally as members of the said community, whereby each of them obtains the privilege of being present at every religious meeting, and of receiving not only for themselves, but also for their children and families, all such instructions in church and school as may be reasonably required, both for their temporal good and for their eternal felicity.

"Article 5. The said George Rapp and his associates further agree to supply the undersigned severally with all the necessaries of life, as clothing, meat, drink, lodging, etc., for themselves and their families. And this provision is not limited to their days of health and strength; but when any of them shall become sick, infirm, or otherwise unfit for labor, the same support and maintenance shall be allowed as before, together with such medicine, care, attendance, and consolation as their situation may reasonably demand. And if at any time after they have become members of the association, the father or mother of a family should die or be otherwise separated from the community, and should leave their family behind, such family shall not be left orphans or destitute, but shall partake of the same rights and maintenance as before, so long as they remain in the association, as well in sickness as in health, and to such extent as their circumstances may require.

"Article 6. And if it should so happen, as above mentioned, that any of the undersigned should violate his or their agreement, and would or could not submit to the laws and regulations of the Church or the community, and for that or any other cause should withdraw from the association, then the said George Rapp and his associates agree to refund to him or them the value of all such property as he or they may have brought into the community,

in compliance with the first article of this agreement, the said value to be refunded without interest, in one, two, or three annual instalments, as the said George Rapp and his associates shall determine. And if the person or persons so withdrawing themselves were poor, and brought nothing into the community, notwithstanding they depart openly and regularly, they shall receive a donation in money, according to the length of their stay and to their conduct, and to such amount as their necessities may require, in the judgment of the superintendents of the association."

In 1818 a book in which was recorded the amount of property contributed by each member to the general fund was destroyed. In 1836 a change was made in the formal constitution or agreement above quoted, in the following words:

"1. The sixth article [in regard to refunding] is entirely annulled and made void, as if it had never existed; all others to remain in full force as heretofore. 2. All the property of the society, real, personal, and mixed, in law or equity, and howsoever contributed or acquired, shall be deemed, now and forever, joint and indivisible stock. Each individual is to be considered to have finally and irrevocably parted with all his former contributions, whether in lands, goods, money, or labor; and the same rule shall apply to all future contributions, whatever they may be. 3. Should any individual withdraw from the society or depart this life, neither he, in the one case, nor his representatives, in the other, shall be entitled to demand an account of said contributions, or to claim anything from the society as a matter of right. But it shall be left altogether to the discretion of the superintendent to decide whether any, and, if any, what allowance shall be made to such member or his representatives as a donation."

On the death of "Father" Rapp, Aug. 7, 1847, the articles were re-signed by the whole society, and two trustees and seven elders were put in office to perform all the duties and assume all the authority which their founder had relinquished with his life.

Under this simple constitution the Harmony Society has flourished for sixty-nine years; nor has its life been threatened by disagreements, except in the case of the count de Leon's intrigue. It has suffered three or four lawsuits from members who had left it, but in every case the courts have decided for the society, after elaborate, and in some cases long-continued trials. It has always lived in peace and friendship with its neighbors.

Its real estate and other property was, from the foundation until his death in 1834, held in the name of Frederick (Reichert) Rapp, who was an excellent business man, and conducted all its dealings with the outside world, and had charge of its temporalities generally, the elder Rapp himself avoiding all general business. Upon Frederick's death the society formally and unanimously imposed upon father Rapp the care of the temporal as well as the spiritual affairs of the little commonwealth, placing in his name the title to all their property. But, as he did not wish to let temporal concerns interfere with his spiritual functions, and as, besides, he was then growing old, being in 1834 seventy-seven years of age, he appointed as his helpers and subagents two members, R. L. Bäker and J. Henrici, the latter of whom is still, with Mr. Jonathan Lenz, the head of the society, Mr. Bäker having died several years ago.

The theological belief of the Harmony Society naturally crystallized under the preaching and during the life of father Rapp. It has some features of German mysticism, grafted upon a practical application of the Christian doctrine and theory. At the foundation of all lies a strong determination to make the preparation of their souls or spirits for the future life the pre-eminent business of life, and to obey in the strictest and most literal manner what they believe to be the will of God as revealed and declared by Jesus Christ. In the following paragraphs is given a brief summary of what may be called their creed:

1. They hold that Adam was created "in the likeness of God;" that he was a dual being, containing within his own person both the sexual elements, reading literally. In confirmation of this, the text (Gen. i, 26, 27), "And God said, Let us make man in *our* image, after *our* likeness, and let *them* have dominion;" and, "So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them;" which they hold to denote that both the Creator and the first created were of this dual nature. They believe that had Adam been content to remain in his original state, he would have increased without the help of a female, bringing forth new beings like himself to replenish the earth.

2. But Adam fell into discontent, and God separated from his body the female part, and gave it him according to his desire, and therein they believe consisted the fall of man.

3. From this they deduce that the celibate state is more pleasing to God; that in the renewed world man will be restored to the dual Godlike and Adamic condition; and,

4. They hold that the coming of Christ and the renovation of the world are near at hand. This nearness of the millennium is a cardinal point of doctrine with them; and father Rapp firmly believed that he would live to see the wished-for reappearance of Christ in the heavens, and that he would be permitted to present his company of believers to the Saviour whom they endeavored to please with their lives. So vivid was this belief in him that it led some of his followers to fondly fancy that father Rapp would not die before Christ's coming; and there is a touching story of the old man that when he felt death upon him, at the age of ninety, he said, "If I did not know that the dear Lord meant I should present you all to him, I should think my last moments come." These were indeed his last words. To be in constant readiness for the reappearance of Christ is one of the aims of the society; nor have its members ever faltered in the faith that this great event is near at hand.

5. Jesus they hold to have been born "in the likeness of the Father;" that is to say, a dual being, as Adam before the fall.

6. They hold that Jesus taught and commanded a community of goods, and refer to the example of the early Christians as proof.

7. They believe in the ultimate redemption and salvation of all mankind; but hold that only those who follow the celibate life, and otherwise conform to what they understand to be the commandments of Jesus, will come at once into the bright and glorious company of Christ and his companions; that offenders will undergo a probation for purification.

8. They reject and detest what is commonly called "Spiritualism."

—Nordhoff, *Communistic Societies*, p. 81–86.

Raratongan Version. Raratonga, the largest and most important of the Harvey Islands, between 500 and 600 miles west of Tahiti, and discovered by the Rev. John Williams, of the London Missionary Society, in 1823, is inhabited by about 3500 inhabitants. The language of Raratonga is spoken throughout the other six islands of the Harvey group; and although it has a close affinity to the Tahitian and Marquesan idioms, yet a distinct version of the Scriptures was found necessary. The Raratongan version mainly devolved on the Rev. John Williams, and in 1830 the Gospel of St. John and the Epistle to the Galatians were printed. In 1836 an edition of 5000 copies of the New Testament was published in London by the British and Foreign Bible Society. In 1842 a second edition of 5000 copies was printed, and in 1851 the entire Scriptures were published by the same society, having availed itself of the Raratongan version prepared by Mr. Buzacott, a missionary at Raratonga. Of the first edition 5000 copies were printed, but in 1854 a subsequent edition of 5000 copies was rendered necessary, which is still in course of circulation. The good effects of reading this version, and the change thereby produced in the state and character of the natives of Raratonga, have been thus described by the martyred Williams: "In 1823 I found them all heathens; in 1834 they were all professing Christians. At the former period I found them with idols and maraes; these, in 1834, were destroyed. I found them without a written language, and left them reading in their own tongue the wonderful works of God." See *The Bible of Every Land*, p. 378 sq. (B. P.)

Rashba (רשב"א), the initials of RABBI SOLOMON BEN-ABRAHAM *Ibn-Adrat*, a native of Barcelona, who was born about 1285, and died in 1310. He studied under Nachmanides (q. v.), and in 1280 he was acknowledged president of the school of Barcelona, and a kind of oracle with the East and the West, with which he maintained an extensive correspondence. He was an acute thinker, an enemy to all equivocation, and an advocate of the open truth. He wrote a large collec-

tion of חדושים, or *Novellas*, discussive and expository of Talmudic law, published in successive portions and times: — שאלות ותשובות, *Questions and Answers* on law and ritual subjects (Lemberg, 1812):—אגרות, *Letters* (ibid. 1809): — עבודת הקדש, *On Sabbath and Festival Observances* (Buda, 1820):—תורת הבית, *The Law of the House*, domestic regulations from the Talmud (Prague, 1811): — פרוש אגדות, *Explanations of the Agadoth* (Fürth, 1766). He also prohibited the study of Grecian philosophy until after twenty-five years of age. See Fürst, *Bibl. Jud.* i, 18 sq.; De Rossi, *Dizionario Storico degli Autori Ebrei* (Germ. transl.), p. 26; Grätz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, vii, 157 sq.; Lindo, *Hist. of the Jews in Spain*, p. 112; Finn, *Sephardim*, p. 301 sq.; Etheridge, *Introd. to Hebrew Literature*, p. 252; Dessauer, *Gesch. d. Israeliten*, p. 295; but especially the monograph by Dr. Perles, *Salomo ben-Abraham ben-Aderet, sein Leben u. s. Schriften, nebst handschriftlichen Beilagen zum ersten Male herausgegeben* (Breslau, 1863), and the reviews of that monograph in Frankel's *Monatsschrift*, 1863, p. 183 sq.; Geiger, *Jüd. Zeitschrift*, 1863, p. 59 sq. (B. P.)

Rashbam (רשב"ם), the initials of Rabbi Samuel ben-Meïr, Rashi's daughter's son, who was born at Ramero about 1065, and died in 1154. He was a sober exegete, appealing to the "intelligentes." He completed the commentaries on certain Talmudic treatises left unfinished by his grandfather Rashi (q. v.), and also the commentary on Job. Rashbam's literal, grammatical, and exegetical principles in the interpretation of the Word of God convinced his grandfather to such a degree that he declared that if he had to rewrite his expositions he would adopt those principles. In this manner Rashbam wrote his commentary on the Pentateuch, under the title of פֵּי הרש"בם, *The Exposition of Rashbam*, which was published for the first time in the edition of the Hebrew Pentateuch, with several commentaries (Berlin, 1705). It was republished in the imperfect condition from Oppenheimer's MS., beginning with Gen. xviii, and ending with Deut. xxxiii, 3, in the excellent edition of the Hebrew Pentateuch, with sundry commentaries (Amsterdam, 1727–29). Dr. A. Geiger published from a Munich MS. a portion of the missing commentary, extending from Gen. i, 1–31, in the *Kerem Chemed* (Berlin, 1854), viii, 41–51, which, however, has not been inserted in the excellent edition of the Pentateuch, with sundry rabbinic commentaries, published at Vienna in 1859, in which Rashbam's commentary is given. A supercommentary, entitled קרן שמואל, *The Horn of Samuel*, on Rashbam's exposition, by S. S. Hessel, was published in Frankfort-on-the-Oder in 1727. Rashbam also wrote a *Commentary on the Five Megilloth*, of which that on the Song of Songs and Ecclesiastes was published by A. Jellinek (Leipsic, 1855), while excerpts from the other three Megilloth were also edited by the same author (ibid. 1855). Rashbam is also said to have written a commentary on the Psalms, which was edited by Isaac Satanow, Berlin, and reprinted in Vienna in 1816; but it is very doubtful whether he is really the author. See Fürst, *Bibl. Jud.* iii, 239 sq.; De Rossi, *Dizionario Storico degli Autori Ebrei* (Germ. transl.), p. 285; Ginsburg, in Kitto's *Cyclop.* s. v.; Grätz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, vi, 158 sq.; Jost, *Gesch. d. Judenth. u. s. Secten*, ii, 391; iii, 34; Levy, *Exegese bei den französ. Juden* (Leips. 1873), p. 17 sq.; Ginsburg, *Commentary on Ecclesiastes*, p. 42 sq., where the first chapter of the commentary on Ecclesiastes is given in English (Lond. 1861); id. *Song of Songs* (ibid. 1857), p. 43 sq.; Zunz, *Zur Geschichte u. Literatur* (Berl. 1845), p. 70 sq.; Geiger, in נטעי נעמנים (ibid. 1847), p. 29–39; id. *Parshandatha* (Leips. 1855), p. 20–24; Jellinek, in his edition of the Song of Songs and Ecclesiastes (ibid. 1855), p. vii sq. (B. P.)

Rashbaz (ר"ש"בי"ן), the initials of Rabbi Simon ben-Zemach *Duran*, who belonged to a family which, originally of Provence, was then settled in Spain, and ultimately emigrated to Algiers. In the persecution that took place in 1391, Simon Duran, with a number of his coreligionists, emigrated to Algiers, where, from his profound learning, he obtained the title of the Great. Here he succeeded Ribash (q. v.), who had also fled from Spain, as the head of all the Jewish congregations, which position he occupied until his death, in 1444. He wrote various works, some so violent against Christianity and Moslemism that they have very properly been suppressed by his coreligionists. Of his works we mention אוחב משפט, *The Lover of the Just*, a commentary on Job, with an introduction on the principles upon which it should be expounded; edited by Jos. Malcho (Venice, 1590), and reprinted in Frankfurter's Rabbinic Bible:—מגן אבות, *Shield of the Fathers*, a great theological work, in three parts, treating of different subjects, especially of the fundamental articles of religion; to be found in the Bodleian and in *Oppenheimeriana;* one part is a commentary on the treatise *Aboth* (Livorno, 1762: Leipsic, 1855), while the second part, which is very severe against Christians and Turks, has been published by his son under the title of קשת ומגן, *Bow and Shield.* He was also famed for his medical abilities, and practiced with great reputation in Aragon. His profound erudition in Rabbinical lore, philosophy, and medicine procured for him the esteem of the learned Israelites of his time. His learned solutions of upwards of 700 points of law are consulted at the present day. See Fürst, *Bibl. Jud.* i, 216 sq.; De Rossi, *Dizionario Storico degli Autori Ebrei* (Germ. transl.), p. 92; id. *Bibliotheca Antichristiana*, p. 109, 111; Lindo, *Hist. of the Jews in Spain*, p. 194; Finn, *Sephardim*, p. 387; Basnage, *Hist. des Juifs* (Taylor's transl.), p. 657; Steinschneider, *Jewish Literature*, p. 128; Etheridge, *Introd. to Hebrew Literature*, p. 289; Grätz, *Gesch. d. Juden* (1875), viii, 101, 154, 170 sq.; Jost, *Gesch. d. Judenth. u. s. Secten*, iii, 87; Zunz, *Literaturgesch. d. synagog. Poesie* (Berl. 1865), p. 251; Cassel, *Leitfaden der jüd. Gesch. u. Literatur*, p. 13; but especially Jaulus, *R. Simeon ben-Zemach Duran*, in Frankel's *Monatsschrift*, 1874, p. 241 sq. (B. P.)

Rashi (רש"י), formed of the initials of Rabbi Solomon Izchaki, or Isaaki=ben-Isaac, the great Talmudic scholar and commentator, founder of the Germano-French school of Biblical exegesis, and erroneously called *Jarchi*, was born in 1040 at Troyes, in Champagne, and not at Lunel, in Perpignan. He was the son of a thorough Talmudist, and thus from his youth imbibed an insatiable desire to become master of Rabbinic lore. He was a pupil of R. Isaac ben-Jakar, the greatest pupil of Rabbi Gershom (q. v.). As to the extent of his scholarship, it is a matter of dispute. Basnage terms him one of the most learned of the rabbins, while Jost takes but a low estimate of his scientific and literary attainments. However this may be, he was certainly a master in Israel in the ordinary learning of his people, the Holy Scriptures, and the whole cycle of Talmudic lore. He spent much of his life in wandering from place to place, visiting the different seats of learning in Italy, Greece, Palestine, Egypt, Persia, and Germany, giving lectures and maintaining disputations in the Jewish schools. At Worms they may still show, as they could a few years ago, the chamber where he taught a class of students, and the stone seat hewn in the wall from which he dispensed his instructions. His famous lectures secured for him the distinguished and witty title of *Parshandatha* (פרשנדתא), i. e. *Interpreter of the Law*, which is the name of one of Haman's sons (Esther ix, 7). Under the title פֵּי תלמוד בבלי, he wrote a commentary on thirty treatises of the Talmud, printed in the editions

of that work, and the several books separately in many different editions; they are also published with super-commentaries and glossaries:—פ׳ פרקי אבות, *A Commentary on Aboth* (Cracow, 1621, a. o.):—פ׳ המשניות, *A Commentary on the Mishna*, condensed from that on the Talmud (Berlin, 1716):—*A Commentary on the* 100 *Chapters of the Bereshith Rabba*, ס׳ מדרש רבה בראשית (Venice, 1568):—a collection of Halachoth, entitled ס׳ הפרדס (Constant. 1802):—penitential hymns, or Selichoth. Besides these, and other works too many to be enumerated, he also wrote on the Old Test., under the general title of *Perush al Esrim vaarba*, פרוש על עשרים וארבע, which, for the most part, is found in the Rabbinic Bibles. They have also been published in different portions in numerous editions, with and without the text, especially that on the Pentateuch, a good and critical edition of which has been edited by Dr. A. Berliner (Berlin, 1866). Various parts have also been translated into Latin by different authors, but more extensively by B. J. F. Breithaupt, 1710–14 (viz. Pentateuch, 1710; historical books, 1714; Prophets, Job, and Psalms, 1713), who also accompanied the translation with very learned and extensive annotations, besides giving the supercommentaries entitled גור אריה by Löwe (Prague, 1578), and שפתי חכמים by Sabbatai Bass. Rashi, having been long engaged in writing annotations on the Talmud, formed the habit of composing after the manner of that work, in an extremely concise and obscure style, and with the frequent use of its terms and idioms. He condensed as much as possible, and endeavored to give the precise original thought by a natural method of interpretation, by explaining the grammar of the passage, by paraphrasing its meaning, by supplying the wanting members of elliptical forms, and by sometimes rendering a word or expression into the French of that day. At the same time, he did not fail to bring forward the received interpretations of the Talmud and Midrashim, and to point out the support which the Rabbinical Halachoth receive from such passages as he thought available. The rigid brevity of his style, which often leaves the reader in perplexity as to his meaning, has served to call forth a number of supercommentaries on his works by several Jewish authors, which are enumerated in Fürst. In his commentaries on the Bible he combines the traditional exposition contained in the Talmud and Midrashim with a simple and liberal explanation of the text, and does not see any inconsistency in putting side by side with the Halachic and Hagadic interpretation his own verbal interpretations, which are sometimes at variance with tradition. Though unacquainted with the labors of the Spanish grammarians and expositors, he incorporates in his commentaries all the lore contained in the cyclopædias of Jewish tradition, as well as the learning of the French expositors, and all are made tributary to the elucidation and illustration of the Scriptures. Rashi's piety and learning were so great, and his influence upon the Jewish nation by means of his expositions was so extraordinary, that his comments are almost looked upon as part of the Bible, and his interpretations in the present day are regarded by the most orthodox Jews as the authoritative import of Holy Writ. Rashi died July 13, 1105. See Fürst, *Bibl. Jud.* ii, 78–90; De Rossi, *Dizionario Storico degli Autori Ebrei* (Germ. transl.), p. 125 sq.; Kitto, *Cyclop.* s. v.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* s. v.; *Theolog. Universal-Lexikon*, s. v.; Steinschneider, *Catalogus Librorum Hebr. in Bibl. Bodleian.* col. 2340–2357; Turner, *Jewish Rabbis*, p. 17 sq., 69 sq., 110 sq.; Basnage, *Hist. des Juifs* (Taylor's transl.), p. 630; Geiger, *Jüd. Zeitschrift*, 1867, p. 150 sq.; id. *Parshandatha* (Leips. 1855), p. 12, etc.; Zunz, in *Zeitschrift für die Wissenschaft des Judenthums* (Berl. 1822), p. 277, etc.; id. *Heisst Rashi Jarchi?* in Jost's *Annalen*, i, 328 and 385, etc.; Zunz, *Zur Geschichte u. Literatur* (ibid. 1845), p. 62, etc.; id. *Literaturgesch. zur synagogalen Poesie* (ibid. 1865), p. 252 sq.; *Synagogale Poesie* (ibid. 1855), p. 181–183; Kimchi, *Liber Radicum*, p. xliii sq. (Berol. 1847, ed. Biesenthal and Lebrecht); Grätz, *Gesch. d. Juden* (Leips. 1871), vi, 70 sq.; Braunschweiger, *Gesch. d. Juden in den roman. Staaten* (Würzb. 1865), p. 53 sq.; Jost, *Gesch. d. Judenth. u. s. Secten*, ii, 230 sq.; Dessauer, *Gesch. d. Israeliten* (Bresl. 1870), p. 311; Adams, *Hist. of the Jews* (Bost. 1812), i, 256; Etheridge, *Introd. to Heb. Literature*, p. 282 sq., 406 sq.; Ginsburg, *Levita's Masoreth ha-Masoreth* (Lond. 1867), p. 105; id. *Ecclesiastes* (ibid. 1861), p. 38 sq.; and *Song of Songs* (ibid. 1857), p. 40 sq.; Keil, *Introd. to the Old Testament* (Edinb. 1870), ii, 383 sq.; Bleek, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament* (Berl. 1865), p. 100, 103, 105; Diestel, *Gesch. d. Alten Testaments* (Jena, 1869), p. 196, 199, 339, 522; Levy, *Die Exegese bei den französischen Israeliten vom 10ten bis 14ten Jahrhundt.* (Leips. 1873), p. 10 sq.; and the interesting essay in Merx's *Archiv für wissenschaftliche Erforschung des Alten Testaments*, i, 428 sq.; Siegfried, *Rashi's Einfluss auf Nicolaus von Lyra und Luther in der Auslegung der Genesis* (Halle, 1870). (B. P.)

Raskolniks (that is, *Schismatics*), the general name used to denote the various sects which have dissented from the Russo-Greek Church. The first body that left the Established Church was the sect of the *Strigolniks*, which arose in the 14th century. Another more remarkable sect appeared in the latter part of the 15th century in the republic of Novgorod, teaching that Judaism was the only true religion, and that Christianity was a fiction because the Messiah was not yet born. The chief promoters of this sect were two priests called Dionysius and Alexius, the protopapas of the cathedral of Novgorod, together with one named Gabriel, and a layman of high rank. These secret Jews conformed outwardly to the Greek Church with so great strictness that they were reputed to be eminent saints, and one of them, Zosimus by name, was raised, in 1490, to the dignity of archbishop of Moscow, and thus became head of the Russian Church. By the open profession of adherence to the Established Church of the country, the members of this Jewish, or rather Judaizing, sect managed to conceal their principles from public notice; but they were at length dragged to light by Gennadius, bishop of Novgorod, who accused them of having called the images of the saints logs; of having placed these images in unclean places, and gnawed them with their teeth; of having spit upon the cross, blasphemed Christ and the Virgin, and denied a future life. The grand-duke ordered a synod to be convened at Moscow on Oct. 17, 1490, to consider these charges; and although several of the members wished to examine the accused by torture, they were obliged to content themselves with anathematizing and imprisoning them. Those, however, who were sent back to Novgorod were more harshly treated. "Attired," says count Krasinski, "in fantastic dresses intended to represent demons, and having their heads covered with high caps of bark, bearing the inscription, 'This is Satan's militia,' they were placed backwards on horses, by order of the bishop, and paraded through the streets of the town, exposed to the insults of the populace. They had afterwards their caps burned upon their heads, and were confined in a prison—a barbarous treatment, undoubtedly, but still humane considering the age, and compared to that which the heretics received during that as well as the following century in Western Europe."

The metropolitan Zosimus, finding that the sect to which he secretly belonged was persecuted as heretical, resigned his dignity in 1494, and retired into a convent. About the beginning of the 16th century, a number of these Judaizing sectarians fled to Germany and Lithuania, and several others who remained in Russia were burned alive. The sect seems to have disappeared about this time; but there is still found, even at the present day, a sect of the Raskolniks which observes sev-

eral of the Mosaic rites, and are called *Subotniki*, or Saturday-men, because they observe the Jewish instead of the Christian Sabbath.

Soon after the Reformation, though Protestant doctrines were for a long time unknown in Russia, a sect of heretical Raskolniks arose who began to teach that there were no sacraments, and that the belief in the divinity of Christ, the ordinances of the councils, and the holiness of the saints was erroneous. A council of bishops convened to try the heretics condemned them to be imprisoned for life. Towards the middle of the 17th century various sects arose in consequence of the emendations introduced into the text of the Scriptures and the Liturgical books by the patriarch Nicon. This reform gave rise to the utmost commotion in the country, and a large body both of priests and laymen violently opposed what they called the Niconian heresy, alleging that the changes in question did not correct, but corrupt, the sacred books and the true doctrine. The opponents of the amended books were numerous and violent, particularly in the north of Russia, on the shores of the White Sea. By the Established Church they were now called *Raskolniks*. They propagated their opinions throughout Siberia and other distant provinces. A great number of them emigrated to Poland and even to Turkey, where they formed numerous settlements. Animated by the wildest fanaticism, many of them committed voluntary suicide, through means of what they called a baptism of fire; and it is believed that instances of this superstition occur even now in Siberia and the northern parts of Russia.

The Raskolniks are divided into two great branches, the *Popovschins* and the *Bezpopovschins*, the former having priests, and the latter none. These again are subdivided into a great number of sects, all of which, however, are included under the general name of Raskolniks. The Popovschins are split into several parties in consequence of a difference of opinion among them on various points, but particularly on outward ceremonies. They consider themselves as the true Church, and regard it as an imperative duty to retain the uncorrected text of the sacred books. They consider it to be very sinful to shave the beard, to eat hares, or to drive a carriage with one pole. The separation between the Raskolniks and the Established Church was rendered complete by Peter the Great, who insisted upon all his subjects adopting the civilized customs of the West, among which was included the shaving of the beard. Peter's memory is in consequence detested by the Raskolniks; and some of them maintain that he was the real Antichrist, having shown himself to be so by changing the times, transferring the beginning of the year from the 1st of September to the 1st of January, abolishing the reckoning of the time from the beginning of the world, and adopting the chronology of the Latin heretics who reckon from the birth of Christ.

The most numerous class of the Raskolniks are adherents of the old text, who call themselves *Starovertzi* (those of the old faith), and are officially called *Staroobradtzi* (those of the old rites). There are very numerous sects also included under the general denomination of *Bezpopovschins*, or those who have no priests. The most remarkable are the *Skoptzi*, or Eunuchs; the *Khlestovschiki*, or Flagellants; the *Malakanes*, and the *Duchobortzi*. But the purest of all the sects of Russian dissenters are the *Martinists*, who arose in the beginning of the present century, and have signalized themselves by their benevolence and pure morality. See RUSSIAN SECTS; RUSSO-GREEK CHURCH.

Rasponi, Cesare, an Italian cardinal, was born at Ravenna, July 15, 1615, of noble family, and lived at Rome in his youth. He studied under the Jesuits with such success that they made him speak in public at fourteen years of age. Urban VIII gave him, among other presents, an abbey with a rental of 300 crowns. A poem entitled *Princeps Hiero-politicus*, dedicated to the pope, testified to the gratitude of the young beneficiary. He studied Greek; wrote some poetry, both serious and comic, in Italian; and, by the advice of cardinal Barberini, he abandoned his studies of antiquity for canonical law. Admitted to the degree of Doctor, he took possession, in 1636, of a prebendaryship of the Collegiate Church of St. John Lateran. The office of keeper of the records of that chapter gave him the opportunity to collect materials for the history of that church, which he published in 1656. He showed so much zeal and prudence in fulfilling the important duties with which he was intrusted that Innocent X, enemy of the Barberinis, loaded him with additional favors. During a voyage which he made to France, he reconciled cardinal Barberini with the pope, and was so happy as to put an end to the division which had existed so long between these two families, arresting the marriage of the niece of Innocent X with Maffeo Barberini. There is a curious manuscript of this voyage in existence, commencing Nov. 5, 1648, and ending March 19, 1650. Being appointed health officer by Alexander VII, he saved the pontifical domain from the pestilence and famine which ravaged the neighboring countries. In the great quarrel which happened between the Corsican guards and the duke de Créqui, ambassador of the king of France, armed with full power by the pope, he showed such a spirit of conciliation that, after the treaty of Pisa, concluded in 1664, the pope accorded to him the cardinal's hat (1666), and called him to the government of the duchy of Urbino, which he kept in spite of great bodily suffering. He died at Rome, Nov. 21, 1675. His tomb is in the Church of St. John Lateran. He left a large part of his wealth to the hospital of the catechumens. We have of his works *Historia Basilicæ S. Joannis Laterani;* he also left, in manuscript, *Mémoires sur sa Vie:—Recueil des Statuts*, etc.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.

Rasponi, Felice, an Italian nun, was born at Ravenna in 1523 of an illustrious house, which, since the 12th century, had given prelates, captains, senators, and magistrates to several little Italian states. She was but three years old when the death of her father, senator Zeseo, left her to the care of a mother, who brought her up with great rigor. In order to divert her mind from the severe treatment she had to endure, she learned the Latin language; studied, in the translations, Aristotle and Plato; and made the works of the holy fathers the object of her constant meditations. She was compelled to enter the convent of Sant' Andrea di Ravenna. Her learning and beauty were celebrated by many poets of the time. She was chosen superior of the convent in 1507. She died July 3, 1573. She left a *Traité de la Connoissance de Dieu*, and a *Dialogue sur l'Excellence de l'État Monacal.* See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.

Ras'ses, CHILDREN OF (*vioi* Ῥασσεῖς; Vulg. *filii Tharsis*), one of the nations whose country was ravaged by Holofernes in his approach to Judæa (Judith ii, 23 only). They are named next to Lud (Lydia), and apparently south thereof. The old Latin version reads *Thiras et Rasis*, with which the Peshito was probably in agreement before the present corruption of its text. Wolff (*Das Buch Judith* [1861], p. 95, 96) restores the original Chaldee text of the passage as Thars and Roses, and compares the latter name with Rhosus, a place on the Gulf of Issus, between the Ras el-Khanzir (Rhossicus Scopulus) and Iskenderûn, or Alexandretta. If the above restoration of the original text is correct, the interchange of Meshech and Rosos, as connected with Thar, or Thiras (see Gen. x, 2), is very remarkable; since if Meshech be the original of Muscovy, Rosos can hardly be other than that of Russia. See ROSH.—Smith. The Vulg. reads *Tharsis*, which has led some to suppose that the original was תרשיש, and that *Tarsus* is meant. Fritzsche proposes to find the place in

Ῥῶσος, Ῥῶσσος, a mountain-range and town south from Amanos (*Exeg. Handb.* p. 143).

Rastall, JOHN, a learned London printer of the first half of the 16th century, deserves a place here for his controversy with John Frith, which resulted in his becoming a Protestant. He was educated at Oxford, and he died in 1536. Though he printed, edited, and translated as well as compiled many books, he is principally known in connection with his *Three Dialogues*, of which the *New Boke of Purgatorye* (1530, fol.) was answered by Frith; his *Apology against John Frith;* and *The Church of John Rastall.* See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth.* ii, 1743; Wood, *Athenæ Oxon.* i, 100.

Rastenburg, CONVERSATION AT. This was a religious conference, held in 1531, to consider the rights of the Anabaptists in Prussia. On the Lutheran side, the debate was conducted by Poliander (q. v.), Speratus (q. v.), and Brismann; on the part of the Anabaptists, Peter Zenker (q. v.), preacher at Dantzic, replied. Duke Albert was present, and finally decided against the Anabaptists, who were banished peremptorily from the country. The Conversation at Rastenburg had been preceded by a synod, held there in 1530, on which occasion Zenker had presented his confession of faith.

Rastignac, Armand Anne Auguste Antonin Sicaire, DE CHAPT DE, a French prelate, nephew of Louis Jacques (q. v.), was born in 1726. He had scarcely received the degree of D.D. when he was made vicar-general by the archbishop of Arles. In the conference of the clergy in 1755 and 1760, he voted for the refusal of sacraments to the opponents of the bull *Unigenitus.* Three times he refused the bishopric; and when, in 1773, his uncle, marshal Biron, obtained for him, without his knowledge, the Abbey of Saint-Mesmain, in the diocese of Orleans, he hastened to resign a priory which he held *in commendam.* He was deputed by the clergy to the States-general in 1789; but in August, 1792, he was imprisoned, and on the 3d of September following he was massacred. Among his works are—*Questions sur la Propriété des Biens-fonds Ecclésiastiques en France* (Paris, 1789, 8vo):—*Accord de la Révélation et de la Raison contre le Déisme* (ibid. 1791, 8vo). See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.

Rastignac, Aymeric, DE CHAPT DE, a French prelate, was born about 1315. He was a descendant of an ancient family, originally from Limousin. After filling various ecclesiastical preferments, he became, in 1359, bishop of Volterra, Tuscany. In 1361 he was transferred by Innocent VI to the bishopric of Boulogne, and at the same time was made governor of that city. In 1364 the emperor Charles IV conferred on him a diploma which gave him the title "prince of the empire." While chancellor of the University at Boulogne, he made for it a name which it preserved for a long time. In 1371 George XI transferred him to the bishopric of Limoges, and in 1372 the duke of Anjou made him governor-general of Limousin. He died at Limoges, Nov. 10, 1390.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.

Rastignac, Louis Jacques, DE CHAPT DE, a French prelate, was born at Rastignac in 1684. He was the third son of François de Chapt, marquis of Rastignac. In 1714, after having been made prior of the Sarbonne, and also grand vicar of Luçon, he received the degree of D.D. In 1720 he was made bishop of Tulle; and in 1723 the king gave him the abbey La Couronne, in the diocese of Angoulême, and, two days afterwards, transferred him to the archbishopric of Tours. Pope Benedict XIII eulogized him in a short speech in 1725, on account of the zeal which he showed in opposing the Jansenists; but the many dissensions which he afterwards had with the Jesuits caused him to favor the Gallican body, and even the Jansenists. He had displayed so much talent in the meetings of the clergy in 1726, 1734, and 1743 that he was chosen to preside over those of 1745, 1747, and 1748; and the speeches which he delivered during the different sessions are monuments of his knowledge and eloquence. In 1746 he established the foundling hospital, Madeleine, at Tours. By a mandamus, in 1747, he condemned the book of père Pichon, *L'Esprit de l'Eglise;* and, in order to counteract the pernicious principles of this Jesuit, in 1748 and 1749 he wrote three works—one upon repentance, one upon communion, and the third upon Christian justice in relation to the sacraments of penance and the eucharist. So many complaints were made that cardinal Rohan, by order of the king, instructed four bishops to examine the work. They wrote to M. de Rastignac, asking for explanations; but he refused to make any. He used the greater part of his income in assisting the poor. He died Aug. 2, 1750.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.

Rat. See MOLE.

Ratcliffe, WILLIAM P., a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born in Williamsburg, Va., Feb. 18, 1810. He was admitted to the ministry in the fall of 1834, and was transferred to the Arkansas Conference at its first session, 1836. He labored faithfully for more than thirty years, not only filling circuits, stations, and districts, but also serving as Bible agent. He died in the village of Mount Ida, Montgomery Co., Ark., May 1, 1868.—*Min. of Annual Conf. M. E. Ch., South*, 1868, p. 274.

Ratel, LOUIS JEAN BAPTISTE JUSTIN, a French priest, was born at St. Omer, Dec. 14, 1758. He was the son of a hatter, and was placed by his uncle, a dignitary in one of the abbeys of Artois, in the Seminary of the Thirty-three at Paris, where he studied theology. Having taken license, he was, while yet very young, appointed to the living of Dunkirk. But, although French, this parish was dependent on the Dutch diocese of Ypres; and each nomination of a curate became the occasion of litigation. The abbot Ratel defended this benefice when the Revolution broke out. Having taken up arms in 1792, he did not wait to be exempted from the service on account of the weakness of his sight; and, during the terrors of the period, he took refuge with his family in the village of La Roche-Guyon. He afterwards returned to Paris, and organized and directed the correspondence with the Vendeans and the Norman Federation. He aided, also, the famous English admiral Sir William Sidney Smith to escape from the Temple, and published many pamphlets which attracted attention, particularly that one which related to the *coup d'état* of 18th Brumaire. Concealed in Boulogne, he there secretly fulfilled the duties of agent of count d'Artois, then succeeded, amid a thousand dangers, in escaping to England, where he was long known under the names of Dubois and Lemoine. His relations with lord Castlereagh and the principal members of the English cabinet enabled him to be of great service to French emigrants. It was also by his mediation that Pichegru and Moreau were reconciled. Although absent, he was accused of various conspiracies; and he was condemned to death, and a price set on his head. He was long searched for by the imperial police. He did not return to his native city till April, 1814. During the Hundred Days he retired to Ypres, where he fell sick; and, after the return of the Bourbons, he went to live on his place at Maigiral, where he died, Jan. 26, 1816.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.

Rates, CHURCH, money raised annually in the parishes of England for the maintenance or repair of the parish church, etc. Rates are agreed on by the parish in vestry assembled; and they are charged, not on the land, but on the occupier. The parish meetings are summoned by the church-wardens, who, if they neglect to do so, may be proceeded against criminally in the ecclesiastical courts. See CHURCH-WARDENS. Not fewer than eighteen bills have been before Parliament these last twenty years for the modification or settle-

ment of church-rates. In Ireland, these rates have been altogether abolished by the Church Temporality Act of 1833.

Rathbun, VALENTINE, an American divine of colonial days, flourished near the opening of the 18th century as pastor of a Baptist Church at Pittsfield, Conn., and later at Stonington, Conn.; where he died in 1723. He was at one time a member of the Shaker community, but three months sufficed to satisfy him that his place was in other folds. He published a tract against the Shakers, entitled *Some Brief Hints of a Religious Scheme*, etc. (Hartford, 1781, 12mo, and often).

Räthel, WOLFGANG CHRISTOPHER, a German educator, of note also as a writer on patristics, was born at Selbitz, April 12, 1663; was educated at Jena; and, after teaching privately, was, in 1689, made professor of Hebrew at the gymnasium at Bayreuth, in 1697 ecclesiastical superintendent of Neustadt, and in this position savagely opposed all inroads of the Pietists. He died June 28, 1729. Among his works of interest to us is *De Bibliotheca Patrum* (Neust. 1726, fol.).—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xli, 459, 460.

Ratherius (RATHIER) OF LIEGE, a monastic of mediæval times, was born of a noble family, probably in 890. He was reared in the convent at Lobach, in the diocese of Liege, and was afterwards one of its monks. In 926, when his friend Hilduin, also a monk, went to Italy to visit his nephew, king Hugo, Ratherius accompanied him. Hilduin was made first bishop of Verona (931), and shortly after archbishop of Milan; and upon this promotion, his friend Ratherius was placed in the vacated see of Verona. In 934, when Arnold of Bavaria invaded Italy, Ratherius sided with the invader; and when Arnold was successfully disposed of, Ratherius was promptly deposed and imprisoned at Pavia. During his incarceration he wrote his *Prælequia* (in six books). By the intercession of powerful friends he was put into the custody of the bishop of Arno, and thence escaped, in 939, to Southern France. He was private tutor for a time, and in 944 returned to Lobach. He was full of ambition, and pined for the opportunity to return to Italy. Finally, made bold by hope of regaining the king's favor in open confession, he hastened to Hugo's presence, and really secured the forfeited place. But though restored to the see, he could not recover the favor of his parishioners; and, after various vicissitudes, he returned to the dwelling-place of his youth once more. In 952 Otho the Great called him into the vicinity of his brother Bruno; and when he was elevated to the archbishopric of Cologne, Ratherius was made bishop of Liege. He proved, however, very soon that the disappointments of life had told too greatly upon his whole character to fit him any longer for great responsibilities. He failed in all his undertakings, politically and ecclesiastically; and the discontent in the see was so great and widespread that the emperor felt compelled to dispossess him, and retire him to the little abbey of Alna, a dependence of Lobach. Even here he made himself extremely unpopular by his overzealous defence of the sacramental views of Paschasius Radbertus. In 961, for the third time, the see of Verona was given to him, but the clergy of the diocese succeeded again in effecting his removal. He was once more after this a monk at Lobach and abbot at Alna. He died before he had secured the Abbey of Lobach, for which he strove finally as if an honor to be coveted. He died at the house of the count of Namur, April 25, 974. His writings, which are numerous and valuable, are collected in one edition by P. and H. Ballerini (Verona, 1765). See Vogel, *Ratherius von Verona* (Jena, 1854, 2 vols. 8vo); Lea, *Hist. of Celibacy;* Mosheim, *Eccles. Hist.* vol. ii, Gieseler, *Eccles. Hist.;* Ffoulkes, *Divisions of Christendom*, i, 7; Milman, *Hist. Lat. Christianity*, iii, 171, 172. (J. H. W.)

Rathmann, HERRMANN, a German theologian of the Pietistic tendency, was born at Lubeck in 1585; studied at Leipsic, Rostock, and last at Cologne, where he became magister of the philosophical faculty; and delivered philosophical lectures at Frankfort-on-the-Main and Leipsic until 1612, when he became dean of St. John's Church at Dantzic. In 1617 he took a like position at St. Mary's, in the same place, and in 1626 was made pastor of St. Catharine's. He died June 30, 1628. He got into a controversy with his zealous Lutheran colleague, John Corvinus (q. v.), regarding Mysticism and Osiandrianism. Rathmann was a very devout man, and rejected the mere *profession* of faith as sufficient to entitle a person to Christian fellowship. He also distinguished between the mere letter of the Holy Word and its inner meaning, regarding the former as a dead, fruitless instrument ("instrumentum passivum, lumen instrumentale historicum"), which could only take life by the inspiring influence of the Holy Spirit. The Königsberg theologians (Osiander school) accused him of Schwenkfeldianism; those of Jena, of Calvinism; only Rostock accepted his theology as orthodox. See Dorner, *Gesch. der deutschen Theologie*, p. 551 sq.; Frank, *Gesch. d. prot. Theol.* i, 365 sq.; Niedner, *Zeitschr. f. hist. Theol.* 1854, p. 43–181. (J. H. W.)

Rath'umus (Ῥάθυμος v. r. Ῥάθυος; Vulg. *Rathimus*), "the story-writer" (1 Esdr. ii, 16, 17, 25, 30), the same as "Rehum the chancellor" (Ezra iv, 8, 9, 17, 23).

Ratich, WOLFGANG, a distinguished German educator, was born in 1571, at Wilsten, in Holstein. A difficulty in speech compelled him to give up the ministry, for which he had intended fitting himself; and he applied himself to the study of the Hebrew and Arabic languages and mathematics. He claimed to be the inventor of a new system of instruction, vastly superior to the prevailing ones, and in 1612 addressed a memorial to the Diet of Frankfort, in which he asserted that not only could old and young in a short time easily learn Hebrew, Greek, Latin, German, philosophy, theology, and the arts and sciences, but that uniformity of language and religion could be introduced into the whole empire. Several princes were led to interest themselves in his scheme. Professors Helwig and Jung, of Giessen, and Granger, Brendel, Walter, and Wolf, of Jena, were invited to investigate it. They judged it excellent in theory, and made a favorable report upon it. Ratich agreed with prince Ludwig of Anhalt-Köthen and duke John Ernest of Weimar to instruct children by his new system, and also by it to qualify teachers to give instruction in any language, in less time and with less labor than by any other method used in Germany. A printing-office was furnished him in Köthen, and his books were printed in six languages. A school was established for him, with one hundred and thirty-five scholars. But Ratich proved incompetent to give practical effect to his theories. He became unpopular, and, being an earnest Lutheran, fell under the ban of the religious prejudices of a community attached to the Reformed faith. His school failed in a short time. Prince Ludwig quarrelled with him, and, in 1619, imprisoned him; but he was released in 1620, after having signed the declaration that "he had claimed and promised more than he knew or could bring to pass." His system was now attacked by some who had been his friends. The countess Sophia von Schwarzburg-Rudolstadt, however, recommended him to the Swedish chancellor, Oxenstierna. At the request of that statesman, Drs. Brückner, Meyfart, and Ziegler examined his method; and they again made a favorable report upon it in 1634. Ratich, without doubt, had a practical conception of the objects of education. He preferred to give instruction in those branches which could be made useful in life rather than to pay so much attention to the dead languages. In his memorial to the Diet at Frankfort, he held that a child should first learn to read and speak the mother-tongue correctly, so as to be able to use the German

Bible. Hebrew and Greek should then be learned as the tongues of the original text of the Bible, after which Latin might be studied. His views were embodied in a number of rules, or principles, the chief of which are: 1. Everything should be presented in its order, a due regard being always had to the course of nature. 2. Only one thing should be presented at a time. 3. Each thing should be often repeated. 4. Everything should be taught at first in the mother-tongue; afterwards other languages may be taught. 5. Everything should be done without compulsion. 6. Nothing should be learned by rote. 7. There should be mutual conformity in all things. 8. First the thing by itself, and afterwards the explanation of it; that is to say, a basis of material must be laid in the mind before any rules can be applied to it. Thus, in teaching grammar, he gave no rules, but began with the reading of the text, and required that the rules should be deduced from it. 9. Everything by expression, and the investigation by parts. In his *Methodus* he has left minute directions to teachers concerning the details of the course, and the proper methods of instruction; but they are very prolix, and impose an immense amount of labor on the teacher, without seeming to call for a corresponding degree of exertion on the part of the pupil. Comenius, after reading his book, remarked that he "had not ill displayed the faults of the school, but that his remedies were not distinctly shown." Ratich's works were written in Latin, and are diffuse, tedious, and somewhat pedantic. He died in 1635. See *Biographie Universelle*, s. v.

Ratier, Vincent, a French preacher of note, was born in 1634. At sixteen years of age he entered the Order of the Dominicans, and in 1694 was made superior-general of the order in France. He resigned this position in 1698, and died near the opening of the 18th century, greatly respected on account of his indefatigable zeal. He had preached with great success in the principal cities of France. He wrote, *Octave Angélique de Saint-François de Sales* (Orleans, 1667, 8vo):—*Oration Funèbre de Jeanne-Gabrielle Dauvet des Marets, Abbesse du Mont-Notre-Dame, près Provins* (Orleans, 1690, 4to). —Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.

Ratification is, in the Book of Common Prayer, used to indicate the act of confirming and sanctioning something previously done by another, as in assuming the obligations of baptism at the reception of confirmation.

Rationālè. (1.) The chairs of theology and philosophy (during the scholastic ages) were the oracular seats from which the doctrines of Aristotle were expounded as the *rationale* of theological and moral truth. "There cannot be a body of rules without a *rationale*, and this *rationale* constitutes the science. There were poets before there were rules of poetical composition; but before Aristotle, or Horace, or Boileau, or Pope could write their arts of poetry and criticism, they had considered the reasons on which their precepts rested, they had conceived in their own minds a theory of the art. In like manner, there were navigators before there was an art of navigation; but before the art of navigation could teach the methods of finding the ship's place by observations of the heavenly bodies, the science of astronomy must have explained the system of the world." Anthony Sparrow, bishop of Exeter, is the author of a work entitled *A Rationale upon the Book of Common Prayer.*

(2.) A peculiar form of the bishop's *pallium* (*pectorale*, λογίον), appropriated by the bishops of Rome to themselves from the time in which they began to assume the title of *pontifices maximi* and the dignity of the high-priests of the Old Testament. It was sometimes sent by the Roman pontiffs to other bishops as a mark of distinction and favor. It was in the form of a trefoil, quatrefoil, or oblong square, like the piece of stuff worn by the Aaronic high-priest. It appears in England on bishop Gifford's monument at Worcester in 1301. It was worn, perhaps for the last time on record, at Rheims. The pope has a formal, and cardinals and Italian bishops wear superb brooches to clasp their copes. The Greek περιστέθιον, worn by patriarchs and metropolitans over the chasuble, is an oblong plate of gold or silver, jewelled.

(3.) The word *rationale* is also the name of a treatise explaining the meaning, and justifying the continuance, of that ceremonial which it was thought fit to retain in the Church of England in the year 1541. The members of the committee to whom this subject was intrusted were warmly attached to the splendor of the Roman ritual, and, of course, made few alterations. The collects in which prayers were offered for the pope, and the offices for Thomas à Becket and some other saints, were omitted; but so slight were the changes introduced that in many churches the missal and breviary already in use were retained. The *Rationale Divinorum Officiorum* of Durand, bishop of Mende, written in the latter part of the 13th century, gives the "reasons" of the forms and ceremonies of Romish worship. See Collier, *Eccles. Hist.* v, 106; Burnet, *Hist. of the Ref.* i, 63; Riddle, *Christian Antiq.* (see Index).

Rationalism, a term applied to a specific movement in theology which assumed definite shape about the middle of the 18th century, and culminated in the first decades of the 19th. Its chief seat was in Protestant Germany. Its distinguishing trait consisted in erecting the human understanding into a supreme judge over the Word of God, and thus, by implication, denying the importance, and even necessity, of any miraculous revelation whatever. But a tendency to rationalism has existed to some degree wherever human thought has made the least advances. Especially are its outbreaks distinctly recognisable at several points along the course of the history of theology; and in several countries it had existed as a clearly defined movement even before its full development in Germany. (In the chief features of this article, we shall follow the paper of Dr. Tholuck in Herzog's *Real-Encyklop.* xii, 537–554.)

I. *English Rationalism.*—Sporadic tendencies towards rationalism existed among the Averrhoists in the Middle Ages, and among the anti-Trinitarians of the 16th century; but these were largely of a philosophical or a mystical type. But in English *deism* the tendency became definitely theological and anti-Biblical. In reaction against the confessional persecutions and intolerance of the 17th century, not a few gifted minds were led to look for a really tenable position only in the elementary traits that are common to all confessions, and even to all religions whatsoever. This led gradually to a denial of the necessity of revelation, and to an exclusive reliance upon the light of nature (*lumen naturæ*). This *lumen* became thus both the source and the judge of all religious truth. This movement was variously styled *naturalism, deism*, and occasionally also *rationalism.* English deism differs, however, in this respect from German—that it proceeded mainly from non-theologians, and was openly hostile to the Bible; whereas German rationalism sprang from theologians eminent in the Church, and it professedly honored the Scriptures as a valuable summary of the highest religious truths. The former, according to Nitzsch (*System*, § 28), was largely a *denier of revelation;* the latter was a *philosophical exegete.* But as the former relied, in the last instance, on the *lumen naturæ*, and the latter on the so-called "sound human understanding," the ultimate result was identical.

II. *Rationalism in the Netherlands.*—This arose simultaneously with English deism. Here, also, the toleration of different confessions led to latitudinarianism. The tendency was further promoted by a revival of classical humanism. Forerunners of rationalism appeared before the middle of the 17th century. Voetius (*Disput. Theol.* i, 1) mentions a work (of 1633) which did not hesitate to hold thus: *Naturalis ratio judex et norma fidei.* The tendency was systematically pre-

pared for by the Cartesian philosophy. Without directly touching the foundations of faith, it yet silently undermined them by the fundamental maxim, *De omnibus dubitandum*. This maxim, though reverently intended, yet resulted, in practice, in a thoroughly anti-Biblical drift. Duker and Roell held that human reason is as infallible as God, its author; and that if it ever errs, this results from mere lack of attention to its inner light. The influence of Spinoza was in the same direction. In his *Tractatus Theologico-politicus*, he had subjected the religion of the Bible to a philosophical interpretation which was fatal to its positive validity. His disciple, L. Meyer, taught unhesitatingly (1666), *Quidquid rationi contrarium, illud non est credendum*. Also from the time of Spinoza forward there appears, even among devout theologians, a tendency to break loose from orthodox traditions. This is further promoted by the works of gifted French refugees—Bayle, Le Clerc, and others.

III. *German Rationalism.*—This subject falls naturally into the following five subdivisions: the period of preparatory discussion (1660–1750); the period of historical criticism (1750–1780); the period of philosophical criticism (1780–1800); the period of the so-called *rationalismus vulgaris* (1800–1814); the period of philosophical rationalism (from Kant to Feuerbach).

1. *Preparatory.*—It was only incidentally that foreign rationalism attracted the attention of German theologians before the close of the 17th century. The earliest assailant of Herbert of Cherbury and of Spinoza was Musæus, in 1667 and 1674. But a German basis for rationalism had already been laid. In the midst of the violence of orthodox polemics, Calixtus had laid the foundations for a less rigid tendency. The Thirty Years' War (1618–1648) had spread immorality among the masses and indifference among the nobility. The succeeding years of material prosperity and of French luxury still further undermined the power of the old orthodoxy. But the Lutheran Church still firmly held its old position till towards the close of the century. The Reformed Church was the first to be affected. Duisburg became the rallying-point of suspected Cartesians from all quarters. Here H. Hulsius (1688) defended the principle of Roell, that reason is the ultimate judge in matters of faith, and substituted syllogistic argumentation for the *testimonium internum*. He also declared that theology was the handmaid of philosophy, instead of the converse. The same views were found elsewhere in Reformed circles. Bashuysen held, in a dissertation (Zerbst, 1727), that reason is the test of faith, and that none but fanatics appealed to a *testimonium spiritus*. Similar sentiments soon found place in Lutheran schools, though not in the theological faculties. Thomasius, first at Leipsic, then at Halle, was the first to give to them much prominence. His main endeavor of life was the "dissipation of prejudices" from every field of thought or inquiry, and the criterion of his efforts was a prudential regard for the "useful;" and as the only judge of the "useful" was the so-called common-sense of the educated classes, it is plain that the rationalistic foundation was already fully laid. But the name rationalism was as yet almost wholly unknown, and in outward form the authority of the Scriptures was still almost universally admitted.

Inside of the German Church of the 17th century, and down to the middle of the 18th, there prevailed two parallel streams of life—the subjective devotion of pietism, and a subjective proclivity to individual criticism—both of them having this in common, that they opposed the objective validity of formal orthodoxy. On the part of pietism, this opposition was not *consciously* intended; but in laying such exclusive emphasis on the Bible as opposed to creeds, and on the witness of the Spirit as opposed to priestly guidance, it actually did so in fact. Thus the venerable Michael Lang, of Altdorf, allowed himself, in his zeal for vital piety, to stigmatize the orthodox symbols as ape-Bibles and sectarian documents. Spener found the yoke of these symbols insupportable in some points; Joachim Lange and others actually disregarded them on occasion. Haferung seriously objects to the formula that good works spring from faith. The pious Rambach virtually undermines the orthodox theory of inspiration. The form of dogmatics began to undergo a change. Breithaupt (1700) and Freylinghausen (1703) purposely avoided the traditional phraseology in their systems of theology. And this tendency from within the Church was promoted by influences which came now from England and Holland. The force of this influence may be judged of by the opposition it at first met with. Lilienthal mentions, between 1680 and 1720, no less than forty-six works against atheism, twenty-seven against rationalism, and fifteen against indifferentism. The forms of the opposition varied all the way from a natural desire for a clear understanding of the grounds of faith to an absolute indifference, or even a frivolous atheism. The eminent Leipsic pastor Zeidler (1735) thought to honor the Bible by the utmost contempt of systems of doctrine. Out of pietism there sprang a number of warm-hearted mystics, who laid exclusive stress on the "inner spark, the inner word," thus opening the path to every sort of vagary. Under the guidance of this "inner word," Dippel presented, in 1697, a very free criticism of the dogmas of inspiration and atonement. Löscher complained, in 1725, that even good theologians were falling into the danger of insisting simply on Christian love and morals, and forgetting the danger from assaults of false teachers. In the same year, an eminent publicist called for a consolidation of the Lutheran and Reformed confessions, asserting that, after all, piety and love were the only things essential. Edelmann began, in 1735, with slight variations from strict orthodoxy, and ended, with Spinoza, in denying the personality of God and the immortality of the soul. The aged Löscher sorrowfully laments, in 1746, that, after his forty-seven years of faithful ministry, the condition of theology and of the Church was only growing worse and worse; and sadder still is the lament of Koch, in 1754, that the Bible had almost lost all respect on the part of the cultured classes, and that it was abandoned to the ignorant as a collection of childish fables.

All the preceding inroads upon orthodox tradition had been carried out under the demands of the so-called sound human understanding. It was mostly the work of non-theologians. But from the beginning of the 18th century, a definite philosophical system was made to serve the interests of rationalism. Leibnitz and Wolff threw out thoughts that powerfully contributed to ends which their authors were very far from intending. Leibnitz's distinction of doctrines into those which can be rationally proved and those which are above reason was used to cast positive suspicion upon the whole of the latter class. Wolff's distinction of theology into the two parts, natural and revealed, was turned to the same service. As natural theology could give a *reason* for its dicta, and revealed theology could *not*, it came to pass that almost the whole stress was laid upon the former. But this incipient undermining process was as yet hardly felt outside of the professional circles. The pulpit remained almost unaffected. The most eminent example of the union of the old with the new tendencies was in the case of Matthew Pfaff, professor in Tübingen (1716), then in Giessen (1756), who died in 1760. Holding fast to the chief old landmarks, he yet relaxed much from confessional rigidity, and earnestly labored for the union of the two German churches. The mention of Pfaff brings us to the close of this first phase of German rationalism.

2. *The Period of Historical Criticism.*—The condition of theology, and, indeed, of science and art also, about the middle of the 18th century, was that of a mummy-like stiffness and a shallow systematization. The vital contest which had broken out in Spener's time between pietism and orthodoxy had lost its vigor and died away.

The second generation of Halle pietists had left the stage, J. H. Michaelis in 1738, J. Lange in 1744; G. Francke outlived his age—until 1770. So, also, had departed the last champions of the old orthodoxy—Wernsdorf in 1729, Cyprian in 1745, Löscher in 1749; Wolff, having outlived the vitality of his own system, departed in sadness in 1754. The superficial and pedantic Gottsched still held his mastery in the fine arts. An unproductive, compiling spirit prevailed in science and theology. "Most of our preachers," says Erenius, "give now large attention to the making of collections of curiosities, stamps, and old coins." There was wanting a fresh wind to fill the weary sails of life. But just now the lacking stimulus was abundantly supplied; it was furnished by the furor of criticism which broke out first on the field of *history*, then on that of *philosophy*.

Although Thomasius and others had already done something in the field of historical criticism, this was only from a superficial, empirical standpoint. It was only when historical criticism assumed a thorough and systematic form that it wrought its full clarifying and revolutionizing effects on the whole field of theology. New investigations were now instituted; every nook and corner of antiquity, linguistics, and science of every form was subjected to a searching and sifting such as had never before been paralleled; and the results attained were such as clearly required a re-examination and reconstruction of the whole circle of the religious sciences. It is true the main motive which inspired the critical movement was devoid of deep religious character, and hence many of its boasted results have proved to be untenable; but many others are admitted, and accepted by all parties as absolutely unassailable.

Also, on this critical field, English deism had been in the advance, and had contributed no insignificant results. Toland, Collins, Tindal, and Bolingbroke had unsettled the popular faith in the authenticity of the canon, insisting that the multiplicity of apocryphal books, some of them accepted by the fathers, threw doubt upon all the others; that many passages in the Gospels were manifestly spurious; that the time of the settlement of the canon was absolutely unknown; that the genuine sacred books of the Jews had perished in the time of the Exile, etc. Hobbes gave lengthy reasons for disbelieving the Pentateuch; Collins threw discredit upon Daniel; Morgan gave to the views of Toland and Bolingbroke an attractive rhetorical expression, thus disseminating them among the uneducated. Collins assailed the very foundations of the historical argument—to wit, the prophecies—insisting that the predictions of the Old Testament relate, when properly interpreted, to very different things from those to which the New-Testament writers apply them. Only in one of the Prophets—Daniel—are there real predictions; but these relate, not to Christ, but to political events. Moreover, these prophecies of Daniel "were written after the events."

In Germany the full tide of revolutionary criticism takes systematic form in Semler of Halle. By Semler almost the whole circle of orthodox landmarks was thrown into confusion: the Bible-text was assailed; the pertinency of standard proof-texts was denied; the genuineness of Biblical books was contested; the foundation was dashed away from numerous usages and dogmas which had hitherto passed as absolutely unassailable. Although many of the points which Semler made were subsequently further developed and accepted as sound, yet the immediate effect in *his* day was to throw doubt into the whole arsenal of orthodoxy.

The general effect was to set in motion an unparalleled vigor of critical investigation. It spread like wildfire among all the universities and all ranks of the clergy. Biblical criticism and exegesis, the history of the Church and of doctrine, were speedily enriched and enlarged. In Halle, Semler found an able and like-spirited pupil in Gruner, at Leipsic labored the cautious but progressive Ernesti (since 1759); Michaelis represented the movement at Göttingen (since 1750); Griesbach, Döderlein, Eichhorn, at Jena; Henke at Helmstedt; Töllmer, Steinhart, at Frankfort-on-the-Oder. Under the labors of these and kindred critics there was scarcely a single dogma that remained unscathed. But the general inspiration, the purpose, of the whole is not the overturning, but only the clarification, the correct construction, of the Biblical teachings. Even the authority of the Church is held fast to by Semler, though in a peculiar manner. The symbols and forms of the Church are useful in preserving external unity and uniformity. Criticism is simply the right of the private judgment of the individual. His position seemed practically to involve a doubt of the possibility of attaining to objective truth; his radical mistake was the assumption that religion can exist without a doctrinal basis. Starting out from the warm atmosphere of pietism, he gradually descended until he had little more reverence for the oracles of God than for the fables of Ovid. Holding that the inner conviction of our own truth-loving heart is the sole test as to the inspiration of a book, he decided against the claim of Ruth, Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther, and the Canticles; he doubted the genuineness of Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings, and Daniel; he held that the Pentateuch is but a collection of legendary fragments. The New Testament is better than the Old, though some of its parts are positively pernicious; the Apocalypse is the fabrication of a fanatic; the Gospel of John is the only one which is *useful* for the modern Church. There are two elements in the Bible, the transitory and the eternal. It is the prerogative of criticism to sift among the chaff and select out the scattered grains of pure truth. Much of the Bible was written simply for local or party purposes: it was never intended for general use. A principle of which Semler made large use was the celebrated "accommodation theory." He insisted, namely, that Christ and the apostles taught many things by way of mere accommodation to the whims and prejudices of the age. They did not abruptly contradict many false views that prevailed, but they partially accepted them, though planting within them a substratum of absolute truth. To sift out this truth from the encasement of rubbish is the privilege of the clear-sighted modern critic. In the field of dogmatics Semler was almost ferocious in his iconoclasm. For the Protestant or even the apostolical fathers he showed the most thorough disrespect. One after another of the central dogmas of orthodoxy fell under the hammer of his criticism, and seemed to be dissipated forever. And what Semler did at Halle, a bold choir of like-minded men did in other parts of Germany.

Of very considerable influence in this second half of the 18th century were translations of the works of English and Dutch rationalists and deists. Semler himself acknowledges his great indebtedness to Wettstein and Le Clerc. The biographies of the day are full of references to the wide influence of Toland and Tindal. The same fact is evinced by the scores and scores of clerical attempts at refuting these sceptics.

From the lawless subjectivism of Semler the descent was easy to the most absurd and degrading consequences. Two theological writers especially carried out the logical consequences in both their writings and their lives. Edelmann took up the tradition of Thomasius, and constructed his whole system of theology from a superficial utilitarian standpoint. Not what is *true*, but what is of use to the subject, was his whole inquiry. The result was that he simply reduced Christianity to a feeble and insipid deism. But the climax was reached in Bahrdt. This man used his eminent popular talents to ridicule the Bible, to blaspheme Christ, and to degrade to the very lowest infamy the name of theologian. His popular treatises were read by the ten thousand, and produced great evil. But his career as a whole marked a turning-point in the tide of rationalism. Criticism, when left unguided by any fixed principle of objective truth, was found to be fruitless and to lead only to destruction. It became necessary to look about for some

corner-stone of truth upon which to stay the tottering edifice of theology and religion. The various attempts to discover this constitute—

3. *The Period of Philosophical Criticism* (1780–1800).—After the decline of the popularity of Wolff, the vitality of philosophy in Germany stood at the zero point. So long as philosophy was represented by the feeble eclecticism of Mendelssohn, Garve, Sulzer, Meiners, Platner, Reinhard, and Flatt, the criticism of the Semler school could flatter itself with standing upon philosophical ground; for both tendencies were built upon the one principle of the so-called "sound human understanding." But when Kant came, both systems were overturned at a blow. Kant showed that our transcendental knowledge reaches no further than our experience, and that our knowledge of supernatural objects is defensible only as postulates of the practical reason. Philosophy and theology must concede that the proofs for the existence of God avail no further than simply to establish a probability. The subjective morality of utility was overthrown by the principle that no morality is possible save where it is grounded upon a purely objective "ought." It was shown that the whole duty of theology was, by the help of religious ideas, to contribute to the supremacy of the "ought" in human society. But also the philosophy of Kant took on somewhat of the coloring of the age, and many of the old rationalists interpreted it as favorable to them. Thus the three Kantian *postulates* of the *practical* reason were metamorphosed into mere *hypotheses* of the *theoretical* reason. The objective categorical imperative was identified with the subjective voice of conscience; and that "morality is the chief thing in religion" was said to be the very essence of the old subjectivism. But there were two phases to the matter: while one current of rationalistic theology welcomed Kant and vainly hoped to force the new wine into the old bottles, another current mocked at it as mere mysticism and scholastic jargon. Only a few deeper-sighted men, such as Schmidt, Vogel, and Tieftrunk, saw the folly of both of these positions—saw that the *new* was utterly subversive of the *old*.

4. *The Period of the So-called Rationalismus Vulgaris* (1800–1833).—The attitude of the theology dominant at the dawn of the 19th century was thus: The Holy Scriptures *rationally interpreted* were still revered as the codex of a rational religion and morality. But with every advance step in what was called historical exegesis, the discrepancy between the traditional sense of the Bible and the new construction which reason endeavored to put upon it became more strikingly apparent. Semler's accommodation theory was made to apply to every narrative and every doctrinal statement of the whole Bible. Every passage in the Scriptures was thought to be so enveloped in a Judaistic haze as to render necessary a great deal of clarification before the true sense could be reached. The New Testament citations from the Old were thought to be totally misapplied. Jesus was thought by some to have been a veritable fanatic. John the Baptist regarded him as sinless; but did Jesus think so himself? The myth theory began now to play its *rôle*. L. Bauer published in 1800 a Hebrew mythology of the Old and New Testaments; the miracles were explained away as mere natural events.

As early as 1794 the aspect of matters was thus summed up by Riem: "The champions of the religion of pure reason have already advanced so far that all the best theologians are going over to them, and all candidates for position hold them in great honor. It has already come to be a settled matter that reason is the court of highest appeal; and that this court will not decide against itself is easy to see." A writer in 1792 had said: "The truth of a doctrine rests upon rational grounds. If it can stand the test of reason; if it does not contradict any of the results of science and experience; if it commends itself to all rational men, then it is true, and no fanatic can prove the contrary." Krug went so far in 1795 as to deny to Christian truth any more permanent worth than that of the teachings of any other transitory system of philosophy. "Let no one say that God could make none other than a perfect revelation. There is no perfect revelation. The utterances of holy men spring up from their souls just as the utterances of other men; hence they necessarily bear the coloring of the environment from which they sprang." Such sentiments were legislatively condemned in some parts of Germany; but not so in Prussia. Here the chief Church councillor, Teller, on being asked whether any positive confession was any longer to be exacted of candidates for Church membership, replied that, apart from baptism and the eucharist, no other yoke was to be imposed; on the contrary, every applicant was to be unhesitatingly received with the simple formula: "I baptize thee upon thy confession of Christ, the founder of a more spiritual and more joyous religion than that of the society [the world] to which thou hast hitherto belonged."

With the changed phase of things at the close of the 18th century, the term "rationalism" came into more frequent use. At first it was chiefly used by opponents. Men like Gabler contrasted rationalism with the fundamental principle of Protestantism, to wit, the normative authority of the Bible, showing the utter inconsistency of the two. Henceforth it is used mainly as a term of reproach; it was never cordially accepted by those to whom it was applied.

As soon as rationalism became clearly conscious of its attitude towards revelation, it felt more fully than ever the necessity of defining its own fundamental principles. Also an external stimulus urged it to this step. Hitherto it had peaceably reclined its head on the bosom of each successively rising system of philosophy; but since the rise of the speculative systems of Fichte and Schelling, such an alliance was impossible. The haughty speculative systems disdained to fraternize with the superficial reasonings of the "sound human understanding." Also, even rationalism stood aghast at the bottomless abyss of the pantheistic mysticism of Schelling; and numerous works of rationalistic source assailed the new "atheism." But the empirical platitudes of rationalism met with only ridicule and sneers from the new lords of the intellectual world. Fichte, Schelling, and Göthe agreed in stigmatizing the best principles and the whole system of the rationalists as commonplace and vulgar.

At last, however, there appeared a system of philosophy under the wings of which the rationalists felt that they could flee for refuge; this was the faith-philosophy of Jacobi. The radical weakness of the old rationalism was that it gave no scope to the spontaneities of sentiment and the heart, but rather measured everything by the cold, dry processes of argumentation. It was utterly ungenial, unpoetic; a mere probability was the highest word it could say in behalf of the most central truths. The system of Jacobi remedied this. It supplemented the coldness of mere intellectual probability by the "immediate certainty of feeling;" it restored to *faith* its colegitimacy with knowledge. Accordingly, all the better representatives of honest rationalism hailed the faith-philosophy of Jacobi, and used it to rescue the sinking bark of the current theology. Notably was this the case with Gabler, who now urged as the deepest proof of the truth of religion a "Nöthigungsgefühl mit Urausspruchen der allgemeinen Vernunft"—that is, he held that religious truth commends itself directly to our inner consciousness with all the compelling force of intuition. From this time forward it became common to lay great stress upon what, with Kant, was the imperative of the practical reason, and to style it the faith of reason (*Vernunftglauben*). This procedure was partially justified by Kant himself, who claimed to have set limits to reason only in order to give greater play to faith. It was still more justified by the Half-Kantians, such as Bouterweck, who derives all the ideas of reason

from a so-called truth-feeling and truth-faith. This is the philosophic ground upon which are based the definitions of reason and the understanding as given in the theology of Bretschneider and Wegscheider; to wit, that reason is the faculty for generating ideas directly out of consciousness without the intervention of the discursive activity, while understanding is the faculty for confirming and elucidating these ideas.

Thus rationalism has, since the beginning of the 19th century, made considerable advances beyond its previous dry and shallow common-senseism. It was helped to this by the philosophy of Fries, who, by his doctrine of faith and insight, placed reason in antagonism to the understanding; and still more so when this philosophy was adopted by the gifted and noble-minded De Wette. For a long while yet—into the third decade—the tone and foibles of rationalism remained largely the same as those given to it by the abstract, shallow prosiness of Nicolai and of Teller, of Semler, and in some respects of Gabler. Röhr and Paulus follow in the steps of Teller; Bretschneider and Wegscheider reproduce much of the loose syncretism of a Semler. The chief scientific weakness of Wegscheider's celebrated *Institutiones* lies in its dearth of definitely fixed ideas and in its avoidance of decided utterances. He asserts: "In rebus gravissimis ad religionem pertinentibus convenire omnes gentes." Hase raises the question whether any real student of the history of philosophy could agree to this. Wegscheider's only defence is to timidly insert a *fere omnes*. He reiterates the old demonstrations of the existence of God; and when Kant's antinomies stare him in the face, he concedes that, taken singly, these demonstrations are not conclusive, but thinks that they are so when *taken all together*. Hahn declares that deism and naturalistic rationalism are identical. Wegscheider indignantly protests, inasmuch as rationalism accepts revelation thus far: "that God endowed the founder of Christianity with extraordinary inner gifts, and gave him many outward tokens of special guidance."

At this point there rises the so-called *supernaturalist* school. It includes those who protested against the absolute autonomy of reason in matters of religion; and though many of its adherents still clung to views irreconcilable with due reverence for the Bible, still it formed the platform upon which a higher and more Biblical standpoint was subsequently reached. Among these supernaturalists were men like Storr and Flatt in Würtemberg, and Reinhard in Dresden. But by the beginning of the second decade of the century even these feeble supernaturalist voices were silent, and rationalism seemed to remain solitary and victorious upon the field of battle. Yet the dry crumbs of rationalism could not satisfy the deep wants of the German nation; the stimulus to a deeper insight and a richer faith came from without. It was from the thunder-strokes of the Leipsic and the Waterloo victories that the rejuvenation of German life went forth. This rejuvenation brought in its train a restoration of life, first in the German Church and then in German theology. Inside of theology the rationalistic movement continued until 1825. Among its ablest assailants at this time are Tittmann and Sartorius; but outside of the schools many signs indicated that its reign was over. The new policy of the Prussian government discountenanced it; the religious and patriotic enthusiasm occasioned by the tercentenary of the Reformation (1817) was uncongenial to it, the theses of Harms and the disputation of Leipsic (which had the courage to summon the rationalistic clergy to resign their clerical positions) were of the same purport. In 1830 the new *Kirchenzeitung* of Hengstenberg went so far even as to call for the expulsion of rationalistic professors from the universities. As yet, however, it was but a small band who opposed rationalism. But they had the courage of faith and the vitality of truth on their side, and their influence was very deeply felt.

Just at this time the decisive influence of Schleiermacher came to the help of the opponents of rationalism. With all its rationalistic methods, the system of this great theologian was hostile to rationalism as a whole. It promoted a positive faith in a positive Christianity; it was powerfully influential in implanting a reverence for positive religion in the higher and learned circles of German life; it regarded religion as one of the essential necessities of human nature, and it saw in the Church an organization essential to the nurture of religion. The period was now past when *faith* and *culture* were regarded as uncongenial to each other. In effecting this change in public sentiment, Fichte and Schelling contributed no inconsiderable increments to the potent influence of Schleiermacher. The very last scientific effort of rationalism was made on the appearance of Hase's *Hutterus Redivivus*. In this book Hase transports himself into the sphere of ancient Protestant orthodoxy, and attempts such a presentation of it as shall harmonize with the rich fruits of modern culture. The school of Röhr assailed (1833) this book with desperate earnestness; but the very choice of its weapons betrayed the forlorn hope of the cause. The replies which Hase made to these assaults may be regarded as having given the death-blow to scientific rationalism. As a result of the contest, rationalism was forced to confess that the "reason" upon which it leans for support is simply the common-sense of man in general. Henceforth the system is branded with the title *rationalismus vulgaris*, against which Röhr himself has no other objection to make save that the adjective *communis* would be a little more polite.

5. *Philosophical Rationalism.*—During the whole period of theological rationalism there had existed a current of *philosophical* rationalism. The climax of this current was reached when Hegel persuaded himself that he had imposed upon Christianity such an interpretation as presented it as the adequate expression of the very highest philosophical truth. But this climax-period was but of momentary duration. When the vapors of enthusiasm were dissipated, it was seen that this transfiguration of Christianity was but a delusion. The downward flow of speculative rationalism begins with Strauss's *Dogmatik* (1840). In this work it is shown that the connection between speculative thought and Christian doctrine is only of the very slightest kind. The next downward step was taken by the Young Hegelians, when they taught, with Feuerbach, that philosophy alone can give any real satisfaction to thought, and that religion can serve at best only a practical need. This changed opinion in regard to the nature of religion sprang from a changed position in philosophy. The proud monism of Hegel had given place to a feeble dualism. Feuerbach denies that speculative thought is the only instrument for philosophizing, and insists that the telescope of the astronomer and the hammer of the geologist are also entitled to respect. Thus *induction* is substituted for *deduction*, and the entering wedge for the whole stream of modern materialism is started in its course. The climax of speculative degradation was reached when, in the hands of the more advanced Young Hegelians, philosophy completely discrowned itself, and confessed that the sum total of attainable useful truth is to be found in the path of material experiment and practical observation.

We have now reached the close of rationalism as a vital movement. It sprang out of a reaction against the stiff, formal orthodoxy of the opening 18th century. It expired in 1833, under the critical strokes of Hase and the religious inspiration that went out from Schleiermacher. Taking up the inspiration of Schleiermacher, and rising to a much higher theological position than he, a noble company of the most gifted theologians of any age have completely rescued German scientific theology from the dishonor and obscuration which had befallen it during the rationalistic period. Pre-eminent among these rehabilitators of orthodoxy are such men as Neander, Nitzsch, Ewald, Julius Müller, Dorner, Twesten, Olshausen, Sack, Ebrard, Ullmann, Hundes-

hagen, Lücke, Umbreit, Stier, Hagenbach, Gieseler, Bleek, Tholuck, Rothe, and their disciples. In the hands of these men Christian theology has been raised to the dignity of the noblest of sciences; and supreme reverence for Christ and the Bible have been shown to consist well with the profoundest learning and the greatest speculative ability.

But the scattered echoes of German rationalism were long in entirely dying away. Faint imitations of the movement went out over all the other Protestant nations. It invaded modern Holland and England and France and America. But in these countries it was but a foreign importation, and it has shown no vital power of original production. And even in Germany there are individual representatives of the dead system. But these are without popular power or scientific significance. They are simply echoes from a buried past.

IV. *Literature.*—On the general subject of rationalism, consult Stäudlin, *Gesch. des Rationalismus und Supranaturalismus* (1826); Saintes, *Hist. du Rationalisme* (1841); Hagenbach, *Gesch. des 18ten und 19ten Jahrhunderts* (1856); Hundeshagen, *Der deutsche Protestantismus* (1850); Auberlen, *Die göttliche Offenbarung* (Basle, 1861–64); Beyschlag, *Ueber das "Leben Jesu" von Renan* (Halle, 1864); Bockshammer, *Offenbarung und Theologie* (Stuttg. 1822); Bretschneider, *Ueber die Grundprincipien der evang. Theologie* (1832); La Saussaye, *La Crise Religieuse en Hollande* (Leyd. 1860); Cornil, *Feuerbach und seine Stellung zur Religion und Philos. der Gegenwart* (Frankfort-on-the-Main, 1851); Engelhardt, *Schenkel und Strauss* (Erlangen, 1864); Feldmann, *Der Wahre Christus und sein rechtes Symbol* (Altona, 1865); Van Prinsterer, *Le Parti Anti-révolutionnaire et Confessionnal dans l'Église Réformée des Pays-Bas* (Amsterdam, 1860); Haffner, *Die deutsche Aufklärung* (Mainz, 1864); Held, *Jesus der Christ* (Zurich, 1865); Henhofer, *Der Kampf des Unglaubens* (Heidelberg, 1861); Henke, *Rationalismus und Traditionalismus im 19ten Jahrhundert* (1864); De Groot, *Die Gröninger Theologen* (Gotha, 1863); Hurter, *Ueber die Rechte der Vernunft und des Glaubens* (Innspruck, 1863); Kahnis, *Der innere Gang des deutschen Protestantismus seit der Mitte des vorigen Jahrhunderts* (Leipsic, 1854); Nicolas, *Die Gottheit Jesu* (Regensburg, 1864); Noack, *Die Freidenker in der Religion* (Berne, 1851); Riggenbach, *Der heutige Rationalismus* (Basle, 1862); Rückert, *Der Rationalismus* (Leipsic, 1859); Schott, *Briefe über Religion* (Jena, 1826); Schwartz, *Zur Gesch. der neuesten Theologie* (Leipsic, 1864); Tholuck, *Die Gesch. des Rationalismus* (Berlin, 1865); Astie, *Les Deux Théologies Nouvelles* (Paris, 1862); Colani, *Ma Position* (ibid. 1860); Fazet, *Lettres à un Rationaliste* (ibid. 1864); Franchi, *Le Rationalisme* (Brussels, 1858); Lups, *Le Traditionalisme et le Rationalisme* (Liege, 1859); Rémusat, *Philosophie Religieuse* (Paris, 1864); Farrar, *Critical Hist. of Free Thought* (Lond. 1863); Draper, *Intellectual Development of Europe* (N. Y. 1863); Hedge, *Reason in Religion* (Bost. 1865); Jelf, *Supremacy of Scripture* (Lond. 1861); Mansel, *Limits of Religious Thought* (ibid. 1859); Pusey, *Historical Inquiry* (ibid. 1826); Rigg, *Modern Anglican Theology* (ibid. 1859); Schaff, *Germany, its Theology* (Philadel. 1857); Hurst, *Hist. of Rationalism* (N. Y. 1865); Wuttke, *Christian Ethics* (N. Y. 1873), vol. i; Lecky, *Rationalism in Europe* (ibid. 1866); Schaff, *Creeds of Christendom* (ibid. 1877), vol. i. (J. P. L.)

Ratisbon, a city of Germany, is noted in ecclesiastical history as the seat of several important Church councils (*Concilia Ratisponenses*). The first of these was held in 792. In this council the errors of Felix, bishop of Urgel, who maintained that Christ is only the *adoptive* Son of God, were condemned, and he himself sent to Rome to pope Adrian, before whom he confessed and abjured his heresy in the church of St. Peter; he maintained, with Elipandus, that Christ, as to his human nature, was the Son of God by adoption only. See Labbé, *Concil.* vii, 1010. See also Felicians.

A second council was held in 796. Grievous complaints having been made both by the priests and laity of the ministrations of the chorepiscopi, it was decided in this council that the latter had no power to perform episcopal functions, being only priests, and that, consequently, all the previous acts were null and void; it was also forbidden to make any new chorepiscopi. This rank, however, among the clergy did not entirely cease until the middle of the 10th century. See Labbé, *Concil.* vii, 1152.

A third council was the conference held in 1541, and generally called the *Diet of Ratisbon*. Though it had in view the settlement of all religious differences between the Protestants and the adherents to papal authority, it only resulted in effecting a mutual agreement to refer the settlement of their differences to a general council. See Riddle, *Hist. of the Papacy*; Mosheim, *Eccles. Hist.*; *Meth. Quar. Rev.* Jan. 1872, p. 143; Marsden, *Hist. of the Sects of Christendom*; Buchanan, *Treatise on Justification*; Farrar, *Crit. Hist. of Free Thought*. See also Reformation.

Ratramnus of Corbey, an Aquitanian monk of the first half of the 9th century, is noted in ecclesiastical history as the controversialist of Paschasius Radbertus on the subject of the holy eucharist (q. v.). Ratramnus's personal history is scarcely known, except that he was the personal friend of Godeschalcus, and was regarded in his day as one of the ablest defenders of Augustinianism. He is sometimes called *Bertram the Monk*, or *Bertram the Priest*, but it is thought that this is a corruption of B. Ratramnus, "Beatus" being sometimes prefixed to the names of venerated writers, even when there had been no act of beatification. His literary activity falls between 830 and 868. One of the works in defence of Augustinianism which proves its author to have been more than ordinarily versed in patristic literature is by Ratramnus, and is entitled *De Predestinatione Dei*. It was written at the request of king Charles the Bald in 850. He lays down the following Augustinian dogmatics: "The elect are destined to mercy and salvation; the godless to eternal punishment; the latter are given over to sin only in so far as, on account of their foreseen hard-heartedness and wickedness, the divine help towards goodness is denied them." More important is his controversy with Paschasius on the eucharist, which led to the composition of his work *Liber de Corpore et Sanguine Domini*, also written at the express wish of the king in 844, and being a defence of pure symbolical sacramental doctrine. To the question of Charles the Bald, "Quod in ecclesia ore fidelium sumitur, corpus et sanguis Christi utrum in mysterio fiat an in veritate?" he answered with the distinction of what occurred really, perceivably, "in veritate," and what "in mysterio" comes to pass. A change, he held, occurred in the eucharist, but not a real, perceivable one; it is the mere act of faith which makes bread and wine the spiritual food and drink of the body and blood of Christ. The book was lost sight of after a time, and it was even ascribed, when met with, to Scotus Erigena, and as such it was burned in 1050 by the Synod of Vercelli in the Berengarian Controversy. During the English Reformation the work was suddenly resurrected from its obscurity, and had much influence. It was published at Cologne in 1532, after having been brought into notice by bishop Fisher, of Rochester, as early as 1526, that prelate referring to it as maintaining the *Catholic* doctrine of the eucharist. It largely influenced the minds of archbishop Cranmer and bishop Ridley; and, as it proved of more service to the Protestants than to the Romanists, it was put into the *Index* in 1559 by the censors of the Tridentine Council. In England an edition was brought out in English by William Hugh, under the name of *The Book of Bertram*, in 1548. In the *Bibliotheca Maxima*, containing Ratramnus's writings, this work is omitted, on the ground that it is a forgery of the Reformers, or is, at least, so hopelessly interpolated by supposititious heretics that it is not worth while to attempt its restoration. Yet there are

theologians even in the Church of Rome who maintain the position assumed by Ratramnus as defensible. Against Hincmar of Rheims Ratramnus defended Godeschalcus in the dispute over the *trina deitas;* but this apology is lost. Another work is his *Liber de Eo, quod Christus ex Virgine natus est*, in which it is not questioned that Mary, *utero clauso*, conceived, but rather the opinion which sprang up at about that time, that the conception had been *incerto tramite*. Ratramnus gained most renown among his contemporaries by his work *Contra Græcorum Opposita*, with which, by request of Hincmar of Rheims, he opposed the encyclica of Photius in 867, and defended the Oriental Church and her dogmas. In the Migne edition, these works are in the *Patrologie*, cxxi, 1–346 and 1153–1156. See Mabillon, *Benediktiner Annalen*, vol. ii and iii; *Hist. Littéraire de la France*, v, 332–351; Hilgenfeld, *Zeitschrift f. hist. Theol.* 1858, p. 546 sq.; Baur, *Dogmengesch.* vol. ii; Gieseler, *Eccles. Hist.*; Soames, *Hist. of the Reformation*, iii, 118 sq.

Ratte, Guitard de, a French prelate, was born at Montpellier in 1552. He was advisory clerk in the Parliament of Toulouse. When imprisoned with the president, Duranti, he showed so much opposition to the government that his house and library were pillaged, and he was condemned by Parliament to be executed. Henry IV indemnified Ratte by giving him the abbey of Saint-Sauveur of Lodève, and a life-pension of 12,000 francs. For his fidelity to the king, he afterwards received the abbey of Val-Richer, in the diocese of Bayeux, and that of Saint-Chinian, in the diocese of Saint-Vous. He was made vicar-general at Montpellier and archdeacon of Valence, and in 1596 bishop of Montpellier. On his way to Toulouse he was attacked by three large dogs, and mortally wounded. He died July 7, 1602. See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.

Rattles (Fr. *crécelle, tarturelle, rattelle;* Lat. *crotalum*). Prior to the introduction of *bells* (q. v.), rattles of wood or of iron were struck or shaken by the hand to summon the people to worship. The Celtic *cloc*, which preceded the use of bells, was a board with knockers. The Greeks used the ἀγιοσίδηρον (sacred iron), a mallet and plate of iron, and the ἅγια ξύλα (sacred wood), two clappers, as a summons to prayer. The latter are mentioned by John Climacus as used for rapping at the cell-doors in the monasteries of Palestine, in the 6th century, as a night signal and waking-hammer. At University and New colleges, Oxford, fellows are summoned to a meeting in common room by the blow of a hammer at the stair-foot. By the rule of Pachomius a trumpet was used. At Burgos the clappers are called *matraca;* in Italy, *serandola;* and in some parts of France, *symandres*, which sound for service between the Mass on Maundy-Thursday and the *Gloria in Excelsis*, sung on Easter eve in the Mass after Nones, when the bells are disused, in memory of the Lord's silence in the tomb, and the speechless timidity of the apostles—a custom dating from the 8th century. At Caen the ceremonial gives the signal for censing with tablets. Neogorgus says that boys carried rattles in the procession of Good-Friday.

Rattray, Thomas, D.D., an English prelate, flourished in the first half of the 18th century. He was educated at Oxford University, took holy orders shortly after graduation, and, after filling various ecclesiastical preferments, became in 1727 bishop of Dunkeld, and in 1739 primus. He died in 1743. His publications are, *Essay on the Nature of the Church*, etc. (Edinb. 1728):—*The Ancient Liturgy of the Church of Jerusalem* (Lond. 1744, 4to):—*Some Particular Instructions concerning the Christian Covenants* (ibid. 1748).

Ratze(n)berger, Matthæus, a physician at the court of the elector Joachim in the Reformation period. He took such an important part in the Protestant movement that he deserves a place here. He was born at Wangen, in Würtemberg, in 1501, and was educated at the University of Wittenberg, where he was the constant companion of Luther; and when, by the decided part he had taken at the court of the elector Joachim, where he was court physician, he was obliged to abandon a most lucrative position and practice, he was, by the intercession of his dear school friend, made body physician of the count of Mansfield, and held this position until, in 1538, the elector John Frederic of Saxony made him his court doctor. He was also the house physician of the great Reformer himself, and frequently together the two friends discussed the exciting questions of the day, the physician being daily drawn closer and closer towards the earnest evangelical preacher. Ere he was aware of it, Ratzenberger was as much a student of theology as of medicine, and finally he wrote theological treatises, many of which have retained their value, and attest the unconscious influence of Martin Luther upon him. All his writings betray a desire of approval for the Lutheran position, and they are therefore valuable as an index of much that Luther thought, but never wrote himself. Hence, also, Ratzenberger's *Historia Lutheri*, newly edited by Neudecker (Jena, 1850), is one of the most valuable contributions to the material for Luther's memoirs. The *Historica Relatio de Johanne Friderico*, etc., first mentioned in Arnold's *Kirchen u. Ketzergesch.*, later as *Historia Arcana*, and finally published under the title *D. M. Ratzenberger's geheime Geschichte*, etc. (Altorf, 1775), is now generally regarded as a forgery of the anti-Melancthonians, and W. von Reiffenstein, of Stolberg, is supposed to have been its author (1570). After the death of Luther, Ratzenberger was one of his executors, and an editor of the German edition of the Reformer's writings published at Jena. See the *Life of Luther* by Seckendorf; *Biographie von Andreas Poach* (Jena, 1559).

Rau, a name common to many literati, of whom we mention the following:

1. Christian, was born Jan. 25, 1613, at Berlin, studied at Wittenberg, and was made magister in 1636. He then went to Königsberg, Leipsic, Rostock, Hamburg, and Upsala, where he was offered a pastorate, which he declined. In 1638 he visited England, and in 1639 set out for the Orient, and resided a short time at Smyrna, where he learned Turkish, Persian, Italian, Spanish, and Modern Greek. In Constantinople he made a valuable collection of old books, and in 1642 was made professor of Oriental languages at Oxford; in 1644 he was called to Utrecht; in 1645 he lectured at Amsterdam, in 1650 at Upsala, in 1669 at Kiel, and finally settled at Frankfort-on-the-Oder in 1671, where he died, June 21, 1677. His best work is *Concordantiarum Hebr. et Chald. J. Buxtorfio Epitome* (Berl. and Frankf. 1677). A number of other works are enumerated in Jöcher's *Gelehrten-Lexikon*, iii, 1926. See Fürst, *Bibl. Jud.* iii, 134; Winer, *Handbuch der theolog. Literatur*, p. 121, 721; Steinschneider, *Bibliographisches Handbuch*, p. 114.

2. Heribert, a rationalist and preacher of the so-called German-Catholic Congregation, was born at Frankfort-on-the-Main in 1813, where he also died, Sept. 26, 1876. He wrote, *Allgemeine Geschichte der christl. Kirche von ihrem Entstehen bis auf die Gegenwart* (Frankfort-on-the-Main, 1846):—*Neue Stunden der Andacht* (4th ed. Leips. 1863, 3 vols.):—*Sermons*, etc., published at different times. See *Literarischer Handweiser*, 1876, p. 551; Zuchold, *Bibl. Theolog.* ii, 1032.

3. Joachim Justus, doctor and professor of theology, was born April 11, 1713, at Berlin, studied at Jena, and in 1736 was called to Königsberg as professor of theology and Oriental languages, where he died, Aug. 19, 1749. He wrote, *Diatribe Hist.-philos. de Philosophia Lactantii Firm.* (Jena, 1733):—*Kurzgefasste Anfangsgründe der hebr. Grammatik nach den Lehrsätzen des D. Danz* (Königsb. 1739; published by G. D. Kypke, ibid. 1749, etc.). See Jöcher, *Gelehrten-Lexikon*, s. v.; Fürst.

Bibl. Jud. iii, 134; Steinschneider, *Bibliogr. Handbuch*, p. 114; Winer, *Handbuch der theol. Literatur*, i, 40, 909; ii, 721.

4. Johann Eberhard, professor of theology, was born at Altenbach, in the principality of Siegen, and died in 1770 at Herborn. He wrote, *Dissertatio de Precibus Hebræorum* (Marburg, 1717):—*Diatribe de Synagoga Magna* (Utrecht, 1725):—*Dissert. Philologico-theologica de Libamine Facto in Sacra Mensa Exod. xxv, 29, ventilata* (Herborn, 1732):—*Notæ et Animadversiones in Hadr. Relandi Antiquitates Veterum Hebr.* (ibid. 1743):—*Exercitatio Academica de Nube super Arcam Fœderis* (ibid. 1757–58; reprinted, Utrecht, 1760):—*Duæ Dissertationes Sacræ Antiquariæ* (ibid. 1760). See Fürst, *Bibl. Jud.* iii, 134; Winer, *Handbuch der theol. Literatur*, i, 137–139; ii, 722.

5. Johann Wilhelm, doctor and professor of theology, was born at Rentweinsdorf, in Franconia, March 9, 1745. In 1770 he was repetent at Göttingen; in 1773, rector at Peine, in Hanover; in 1775 he was made rector and professor of theology at Dortmund, and in 1779 ordinary professor of theology at Erlangen, where he died, July 1, 1807. He wrote, *Nonnulla ad Quæstion. an Oratio Montana Apostolor. Initiandor. Causa dicta sit* (Erlangen, 1802–3):—*Untersuchungen die wahre Ansicht der Bergpredigt betreffend* (ibid. 1805):—*Freimüthige Untersuchungen über die Typologie* (ibid. 1784):—*De Jo. Bapt. in rem Christ. Studiis* (ibid. 1785–86):—*Materialien zu Kanzelvorträgen* (ibid. 1797–1806). See Fürst, *Bibliotheca Judaica*, iii, 134; Winer, *Handbuch der theologischen Literatur*, i, 246, 247, 390, 556, 557, 559; ii, 122, 722. (B. P.)

Rauch, Christian Daniel, one of the most distinguished German sculptors, and noted for his work in the latter years of his life in sacred art, was born at Arolsen, the capital of the principality of Waldeck, in 1777. He began the study of sculpture as a boy, but the death of his father in 1797 obliged him to accept the humble but profitable position of valet to Frederick William II, king of Prussia. Under Frederick William III, who conceived a great liking for young Rauch, facilities for designing and modelling statues were afforded him, and he was even recommended as a pupil in the Academy of the Fine Arts. A statue of Endymion and a bust of queen Louisa of Prussia, executed at this time, convinced the king of Rauch's abilities; and although his request for dismissal had been repeatedly refused, he was now granted his request, and given a small pension in order to be enabled to proceed to Rome for further improvement. He spent six years in that city, working at his profession, and enjoyed the friendship of Thorwaldsen, Canova, and also of William Humboldt, at that time Prussian minister there. Among his works at this time were bass-reliefs of *Hippolytus and Phædra*, a *Mars and Venus wounded by Diomedes*, a colossal bust of the king of Prussia, a bust of the painter Raphael Mengs, etc. In 1811 he was called by the king of Prussia to Berlin, to execute a monumental statue of queen Louisa. This great work obtained for Rauch a European reputation. It is in the mausoleum of the queen in the garden of Charlottenburg. Not quite satisfied with this triumph, he commenced a new statue of the queen, which he finished eleven years afterwards, and which is allowed to be a masterpiece of sculpture. It is placed in the palace of Sans-Souci, near Potsdam. Rauch, after this, lived principally at Berlin, but occasionally visited Rome, Carrara, and Munich. He labored indefatigably in his profession, and by 1824 had executed seventy busts in marble, of which twenty were of colossal size. He died at Dresden, while on a visit there, Dec. 3, 1857. His greatest secular work is the magnificent monument of Frederick the Great, which adorns Berlin. His greatest work in sacred art is his *Moses Group*, in the entry of the Friedenskirche (Church of Peace) at Potsdam. It was begun in 1854 and finished in 1855, and is really his last great work. Noteworthy are also his group of the first two Polish kings in the cathedral at Posen, his statues of Schleiermacher and Kant, and his representations of Faith, Hope, and Love in the church at Arolsen.

Rauch, Christian Henry, distinguished as that missionary of the Moravian Church who began its work among the North American Indians, was born at Bernburg, Germany, July 5, 1715. He arrived in this country July 16, 1740, and soon after visited Shekomeko, Dutchess County, N. Y., a village inhabited by Mohicans and Wampanoags, notorious for their evil ways, and especially for their love of strong drink. Various other missionaries had attempted to convert them without success. Rauch, on his arrival, went into the hut of the worst savage of the whole clan, Wasamapah by name, commonly known as Tschoop, seated himself at his side, told him of the Saviour, and then, saying that he was very tired in consequence of his long journey, lay down by the fire and went to sleep. This simple act of trust made a deep impression upon the Indians. He won their confidence. Tschoop was converted and baptized, and became an eloquent and enthusiastic preacher of the Gospel; other converts were gathered in, and a flourishing mission was established at Shekomeko, which subsequently spread to New England. In 1757, Rauch went to Jamaica as missionary to the negroes. He died on the island of Jamaica, Nov. 11, 1763. See Spangenberg, *Account of the Manner in which the United Brethren carry on their Missions* (Lond. 1788), p. 62, 63; Amer. S. S. Union, *Tschoop, the Converted Indian Chief;* Schweinitz, *Life and Times of Zeisberger*, ch. v. (E. de S.)

Rauch, Frederick Augustus, Ph.D., D.D., first president of Marshall College, Mercersburg, Pa., was born at Kirchbracht, in Hesse-Darmstadt, Germany, July 27, 1806. At the age of eighteen he entered the University of Marburg, and took his diploma in 1827. He then became a teacher in Frankfort, and afterwards spent a year at the University of Heidelberg. In his twenty-fourth year he became extraordinary professor in the University of Giessen. After one year he was called as ordinary professor to Heidelberg, but this appointment he never realized. Having uttered his mind too freely on the subject of government in some public exercises at Giessen, he arrayed the civil powers against himself, and was compelled to provide for his safety in voluntary self-expatriation. He arrived in this country in the fall of 1831. He spent one year at Easton, as professor of German, in Lafayette College, and in the study of the English language. In June, 1832, he was appointed to take charge of the classical school connected with the seminary of the German Reformed Church at York, Pa. The same year he was ordained to the holy ministry. In 1835 he removed to Mercersburg, and became the first president of Marshall College, which position he ably filled till his death, March 2, 1841. Shortly before his death he published his *Psychology*, which has passed through a number of editions, and is used as a text-book in its department of philosophy in several of our colleges. *The Inner Life* is a posthumous work, being a selection of sermons by Dr. Rauch, edited by the Rev. Dr. Gerhart. Thoroughly learned, deeply pious, ardent, generous, and noble, Dr. Rauch's brief life has left behind it a lasting influence. In March, 1859, his remains were removed to Lancaster, Pa., under the auspices of the alumni of Marshall College and the board of trustees of Franklin and Marshall College, on which occasion a eulogy on his life and character was delivered by his distinguished colleague, Prof. J. W. Nevin, D.D.

Raucourt, Louis Marie, a French prelate, was born in 1743. He entered the Benedictine Order, and studied theology in many of its monasteries. In 1768 he was made procurer of the abbey of Clairvaux, in 1773 prior, and in 1783 abbot. He did much in embellishing this abbey, and greatly increased the library. Being expelled during the Revolution, he fled to Ju-

rancourt, where he lived in retirement till 1804, when he settled in Bar-sur-Aube, where he died in 1824.

Rauhe Haus (Germ. for *Rough House*), THE, a great juvenile reform institution at the little hamlet of Horn, three miles from the German port of Hamburg, owes its origin to John Henry Wichern, the founder also of the German Home Mission Work. See INNER MISSION. The peculiar name which it bears (*Rough House*) is not due to any peculiar feature of the institution, as one might suppose, but rather to an awkward translation of the German *patois* into the classical language. The house in which the institution was first located was built some hundred and fifty years ago by a certain Mr. Ruge, a gentleman of wealth and culture, and in every sense quite contrary in character to the name given him in classical German. People of Hamburg's suburbs always knew the place by the name of the "Ruge House," and so the institution was called *Rauhe Haus* when it was first opened on Nov. 1, 1833, by Wichern, with the assistance of his mother, he being then but a young man of twenty-five, and as yet not even in social relations with the opposite sex. For years previous to this event Wichern had conceived a plan for the amelioration of the condition of the lower classes. While at the university his mystical tendencies were noted. He frequently gave himself up to practices of great personal self-denial, and he formed an association of young men for self-improvement and religious edification. There was a constant longing for entire and unconditional consecration to God's service in this band, who all recognised the great fact that Christianity is only a truth to those who experience it. An acquaintance with Dr. Julius, then well known as a philanthropist, who had visited England and America in the interests of prison reform, only quickened Wichern in his purposes, and when, on his return from the university to Hamburg, he was placed in charge of a Sabbath-school in the religiously neglected suburbs of St. George, Wichern conceived a plan that should enable him to begin the task for which he felt himself called of God. Though poor himself, his father having died while he was yet scarcely out of the years of infancy, and his mother having depended upon him for years, he yet set about to realize his purpose. All the difficulties that arose in his way only acted as fresh incentives to exertion. His enthusiasm knew no restraints nor barriers. Finally he succeeded in interesting the syndic Seiveking, a man of warm heart and full pocket-book. A house upon his estate which was occupied by a gardener was vacated for Wichern as a place in which to try his schemes by actual experiment. It was a small space for so vast an undertaking, but Wichern was quite content to let his enterprise have a small beginning. Full of faith, and encouraged by what was already gained, he made immediate arrangements for the occupancy of the *Rauhe Haus* (see illustration), small and poor as it was, and however uninviting its little windows, and thatched roof, and low ceilings appeared. With the help of a few interested friends, such repairs as were absolutely necessary were made, he entering the premises himself as an inmate. The day of opening was marked by the admission of three boys; in a short time the number increased to twelve, and thus humbly began beneath that roof of straw, on the Seiveking estate, a movement for the neglected youth of Germany whose influence is seen and felt not only in that country, but all over the Continent and far beyond it, and whose results can never be estimated by mortal man. A careful examination shows that, so far as the children of the Rauhe Haus alone are concerned, a very moderate estimate gives eighty per cent. of them as saved from what would inevitably have been a life of vice or crime. Describing this most Christian charity, Elihu Burritt says:

"These boys had been treated or regarded as a species of human vermin, baffling the power of the authorities to suppress. They had slept under carts, in doorways, herding with swine and cattle by night, when begging or thieving hours were past. Such were the boys that found themselves looking at each other in wonder and surprise the first evening they gathered around the hearth-stone of that cottage-home. There was no illusion about this sudden transformation in their experience. In their midst was that bland, benevolent man, with his kind eyes and voice, looking and speaking to them as a father to his children. And there was his mother, with the law of kindness on her lips, in her looks, in every act and word; and *he* called her mother, and *they* call her mother; and the first evening of their common life she became the mother of their love and veneration; and they, ragged, forsaken, hopeless castaways, conceived in sin and shapen in iniquity, became the children of her affection. This cottage, away from the city and its haunts, with its bright fire by night and the little beds under the roof—with its great Bible and little Psalm-books, was to be their home. The great chestnut-tree that threw out its arms over it, and all the little trees, and the ditches, hillocks, and bushes of that acre, *were their own*. . . . The feeling of home came warming into their hearts like the emotions of a new existence, as the father spoke to them of our house, our trees, our cabbages, turnips, potatoes, pigs, and geese and ducks, 'which we will grow for our comfort.'"

The boys at once set to work. At the end of the first week they had made a year's progress in this new life and its hopes and expectations. The faith that they could do something, be something, and own something grew daily within them. "So eager did they become," says the first report of the institution, "to accomplish the undertaking that they frequently worked by lantern-light in the evening, rooting up bushes and trees, in spite of snow or rain."

As the number of pupils increased, and there seemed danger that the size of the family would seriously affect its domestic character, Mr. Wichern divided the company into households, containing from twelve to fifteen each—the children themselves, as each new house was required, performing a large part of the work. The first colony, "under the care," as the report says, "of an earnest young disciple of the law of love, who had come from a distance to discipline his heart and life to the régime of kindness, and who had lived in their midst as an elder brother," commenced their separate family life with affecting ceremonies. On a bright Sabbath morning, and in the presence of several hundred friends, the new cottage was dedicated "to the Good Shepherd, through whose love and help twenty-seven boys had already been gathered into a sheltering fold." With numbers and resources increased, new cottages of the same unpretending character were built in a semicircle around the Rough House. Girls were admitted, and separate cottages were constructed for them; and a new building was erected which afforded a more commodious residence for the superintendent, a chapel, kitchen, and other apartments for the general use of the little community, which grew to be quite a village. In 1851 Mr. Burritt found a considerable cottage-village, with workshops, dwelling-houses, a little chapel, a wash- and drying-house, a

The original Rauhe Haus.

printing-office, bake-house, and other buildings. There were in all about seventy boys and twenty-five girls, constituting four families of boys and two of girls. Each family-house was under the charge of a superintendent (male or female), assisted by one or more brothers, as they are called—the superintendent being ordinarily a candidate for the ministry. The brothers are young men of the best character, who undergo a training of three or four years, after which they devote themselves to the care of similar institutions now rising all over Germany, quickened into life by this blessed experiment; or they become city missionaries, carrying the Gospel personally to the neglected and wretched. From thirty to forty brothers are inmates of this institution at one time, receiving no remuneration but their living, superintending the industry and aiding in conducting the moral discipline of the establishment. In its daily life this singular village is separated into three important divisions: domestic, educational, and industrial. Each family is to some extent an independent community. The members eat and sleep in their own dwelling, and the children belonging to each look up to their own particular father or mother as home-bred children to a parent. Each household has thus its individual character, its peculiar interest and history, and each bears some name of its own, such as the Beehive, the Dove's-nest, and the like. The bond of union is the loving father at the head of the whole institution; closely drawn by the morning and evening gatherings for prayer in the chapel or mother-house, and the celebration in common of the many festivals of the Church. The superintendents of the several houses meet the chief weekly to render their reports, and to discuss all questions of discipline. In their turn, each separate family visits him once a week in his study; and the record of each member, whether good or bad, is fully considered and passed upon—any child being admitted, at the close of the interview, to private conference with him, a privilege that is often improved. The children were told at the beginning that *labor* is the price of *living*, and that they must earn their own bread if they would enjoy it. Mr. Wichern did not point them to ease and affluence, but to an honorable poverty, which they were taught was not in itself an evil. In illustration of this, the dress, food, and furniture of the cottages are of the simplest character. The secular education given is of the most rudimental description, reaching about the average of the German primary schools—three quarters of the weekly recitations being devoted to the study of the Bible Catechism, Church history, and to music. The principal labor, farming, is carefully taught in all its branches; in addition, instruction is given by the brothers in printing and other trades. The boys remain at the Rough House about four years, and the girls five. They are then apprenticed to service, chiefly in the city of Hamburg, whenever the work of redemption is sufficiently confirmed to admit of their exposure again to temptation. But it must not be inferred from the duration of their term of reform that the Rough House holds its inmates by force. As they come voluntarily, so they stay until dismissed by their own choice. The simple means relied upon for the accomplishment of this great reform work are prayer, the Bible, singing, affectionate conversation, severe punishment when unavoidable, and constant, steady employment in useful labor. "In a peculiar manner," says Dr. Peirce, "Wichern relied upon the Word of God. He made the whole Bible the familiar companion and food of the pupil. The whole Scripture was made to open to their minds, in an impressive series of readings, like a mine of priceless metal—reaching a climax in the Evangel of the New Testament. The thought that, miserable, wicked, despised as they were, Christ, the Son of God, loved them—loved them enough to suffer and die for them, and still loved them—melted their hearts, and gave them both hope and a strong incentive to reformation."

As the Rauhe Haus is now constituted, it is partly a refuge for morally neglected children, partly a boarding-school for the moral and intellectual education of those children of the higher classes whose vicious or unmanageable character makes them fit subjects for training by such competent hands as the Rauhe Haus superintendents; lastly, a training-school for those who wish to become teachers or officials in houses of correction, hospitals, etc., in promotion of the objects of the Home Mission. This is an especially important enterprise. Its trained men are employed in positions of trust, such as prison directors, stewards of estates, and superintendents of charitable houses. It was founded in 1845, and is a kind of conventual house. Entrance into this institution is limited to the age of twenty to thirty. Besides religious belief and good character, freedom from military duties, bodily and mental health, some scholastic acquirements, and a knowledge of some craft or of agriculture are required. The boarding-school was established in 1851, and at the same time a seminary was founded, in which twelve brethren of the Rauhe Haus are especially prepared for school-work. A printing-office, a bookbinder's shop, and bookselling, form part of the institution also. The last named has its principal depot at Hamburg, and from it trade with all Germany has been opened. The Rauhe Haus has brought out numerous publications, and all these enjoy a very large sale. A monthly periodical called *Fliegende Blätter*, devoted to the Inner Mission, is printed, edited, and circulated by the Rauhe Haus. It may be added also that during the recent German wars the inmates furnished the principal organizers of what was like our "Sanitary Commission" in the war with the South. Dr. Wichern is still living as we write (1878), but he has retired from all *active* connection with the Rauhe Haus. See *Amer. Education. Monthly*, Jan. 1868, art. i; (*Luth.*) *Ev. Quar. Rev.* Jan. 1874, p. 129; *National Repository*, Dec. 1878, art. iii; Hurst's Hagenbach, *Church Hist. of the 18th and 19th Centuries* (see Index).

Raulin, Hippolyte, a devoted Minim, was born about 1560, at Rethel. For many years he preached with great success, and was considered one of the most eloquent men of his day. In the capacity of a provincial of his order he governed the province of Lyons; afterwards that of Lorraine. He wrote, *Panégyre Orthodoxe, Mystérieux, et Prophétique sur l'Antiquité, Dignité, Noblesse, et Splendeur des Fleurs de Lys* (Paris, 1626). See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.

Raulin, Jean, a French preacher, was born at Toul in 1443. After finishing his studies, he received the degree of D.D. Before this time he had composed a commentary upon the *Logic* of Aristotle. In 1481 he was made president of the college at Navarre, and so acquitted himself that he was greatly esteemed. Desiring to live a more secluded life, he entered the Abbey of Clugny in 1497, and by his exemplary life led many others to follow his example. Under the direction of cardinal Amboise, he greatly aided in reforming the Order of St. Benedict. Raulin enjoyed the same reputation as Barlette, Millaid, and Menot. His sermons were plain, methodical, and replete with citations made from sacred writings and scholars. He wrote, *Epistolæ* (Paris, 1520):—*Doctrinale de Triplici Morte, Naturali, Culpæ, et Gehennæ* (ibid. 1520). His *Sermons* in Latin were published in Paris in 1642. He died Feb. 6, 1514. See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.

Raumer, Frederic von, the accomplished German historian, was born at Wörlitz, in Anhalt-Dessau, in 1781. In 1811 he was appointed professor of history at Breslau, and in 1819 he was called to Berlin. In 1859 he was released from the duty of lecturing, but he still continued till near his death, June 13, 1873. He was the Nestor of all German historians, and senior of all the living German professors. He is the author of the well-known *History of the Hohenstaufen Dynasty* (1823–

27, and often, 6 vols.), a work deserving praise for its interesting narrative of the events of a romantic period. He also published *Lectures on Ancient History* (3d ed. 1861, 2 vols.):—*History of Europe from the Close of the 15th Century* (1832–50, 8 vols.), a work marked by the conciliatory style in which it describes the contentions of various religious and political parties. Besides, he wrote a number of other works, as *Handbuch zur Gesch. d. Literatur* (1864–66), etc., which we pass over. See *Literarischer Handweiser*, 1873, p. 300; Gostwick and Harrison, *Outlines of German Literature*, p. 551 sq. (B. P.)

Raumer, Karl Georg von, doctor of philosophy and theology, brother of the well-known historian Frederic (q. v.), was born April 7, 1783, at Wörlitz, in Anhalt-Dessau. Having graduated at the Joachimsthal Gymnasium in Berlin, he went to Göttingen for the study of languages, history, and poetry. From Göttingen he went to Halle in 1803, where he attended the lectures of Wolf and Becker, and where he also made the acquaintance of Steffens, who introduced him in 1805 to the famous geologist Werner at Freiberg. In 1808 we see Raumer at Paris, in 1810 at Berlin; in 1811 he is professor and member of council for mining at Breslau. The Franco-Prussian war, in which he acted as adjutant to general Gneisenau, being over, he was called in 1819 as professor to Halle, where he remained till 1823, being obliged to leave the place in consequence of distrust aroused against him. He then acted as tutor in the Dittmar Educational Institution at Nürnberg, when, in 1827, he was called as professor to Erlangen, where he died, June 2, 1865. Raumer took a very lively and active interest in all matters promoting the kingdom of God. He is best known as the author of, *Palästina* (Leipsic, 1835, and often since):—*Der Zug der Israeliten aus Aegypten nach Canaan* (ibid. 1837):—*Beiträge zur biblischen Geographie* (ibid. 1843):—*Geschichte der Pädagogik* (3d ed. Stuttgart, 1857, 1861, 4 vols.):—and as the editor of Augustine's *Confessiones*, with notes (ibid. 1856, and often). See Fürst, *Bibl. Judaica*, iii, 134; Zuchold, *Biblioth. Theolog.* ii, 1033; *Literarischer Handweiser*, 1873, p. 300; Winer, *Theolog. Handbuch*, ii, 722; Thomasius, *Rede am Grabe des Herrn Karl v. Raumer* (Erlangen, 1865); Raumer, *Leben von ihm selbst* (Stuttgart, 1866); Hauck, *Theolog. Jahresbericht*, 1865, p. 734 sq.; 1866, p. 361 sq. (B. P.)

Raumer, Rudolph von, professor of languages and son of Karl Georg von Raumer, was born April 14, 1815, at Breslau. He prepared himself at the gymnasia in Erlangen and Nürnberg, and in 1832 entered the University of Erlangen, continuing, however, his studies at Göttingen and Munich. In 1840 he commenced lecturing at Erlangen, in 1852 was made professor in ordinary, and died there Aug. 30, 1876. He wrote *Die Einwirkung des Christenthums auf die althochdeutsche Sprache* (Stuttgart, 1845), which he concludes with the remarkable words that "the destiny of our (the German) people will always be connected with Christianity:"—*Ein Wort der Verständigung über die Schrift: die Einwirkung des Christenthums*, etc. (ibid. 1852):—*Geschichte der germanischen Philologie, vorzugsweise in Deutschland* (ibid. 1870). See Zuchold, *Bibl. Theolog.* ii, 1033; *Literarischer Handweiser*, 1873, p. 300; 1876, p. 352; Schneider, *Theolog. Jahrbuch*, 1878, p. 226 sq. (B. P.)

Raus(s), Lucas, one of the earlier Lutheran ministers in this country, was born in 1723 in the city of Hermanstadt, in Transylvania. He was the son of Lucas Raus, an eminent German divine, under whose careful training he enjoyed the best opportunities for mental and moral culture. Designed for the Christian ministry, his studies were prosecuted at the universities of Leipsic and Jena. He immigrated to the United States in 1750, and at once identified himself with its interests. He commenced his labors in Philadelphia, and, as there were few organized Lutheran churches at the time and the members were scattered, his work was very much of an itinerant character. In 1754 he removed to York, Pa., where he continued to reside until his death, which occurred July 11, 1788. Mr. Raus enjoyed the reputation of being an accomplished scholar, particularly in the department of the Latin, Greek, and Oriental languages. He conversed with great fluency in several modern languages. His descendants are still numbered among the citizens of the place in which he so long labored. See *Luth. Observer*, April 19, 1878.

Rauscher, Joseph Othmar, one of the most prominent ecclesiastical princes of Austria and of the 19th century, was born Oct. 6, 1797, at Vienna, being the son of an imperial officer. He first intended to study law, which he did for three years, but afterwards betook himself to the study of theology, and, almost twenty-six years of age, he was ordained priest Aug. 27, 1823. For two years he labored as vicar at Hütteldorf, not far from Vienna, but he was soon called to Salzburg as professor of canon law and Church history. Here he commenced the elaboration of a comprehensive Church history, of which the first two volumes, reaching down to Justinian (Sulzbach, 1824–29), promised so well for the young author that he undoubtedly would have become one of the brightest stars among the Roman Catholic historians were he left in his position; but in 1832 he was appointed director of the Oriental Academy at Vienna, and from that time on he was invested with different offices, to which also belonged the instruction of the present Austrian emperor and his brothers. In 1849 the metropolitan archbishop of Salzburg, prince Friedrich von Schwarzenberg, his former pupil and now his friend, appointed Rauscher to the bishopric of Seckau. For four years he discharged his episcopal duties, amid great difficulties, in the most zealous and happy manner, when, in 1853, the emperor appointed him to the archiepiscopal see. In his new position the emperor intrusted to him a mission which forever connected his name with the Church history of Austria, viz. the negotiation of a concordat between Austria and the Apostolic See, which, unhappily for Austria, was signed Aug. 18, 1855. For this deed Rauscher was made cardinal, Dec. 17 of the same year. For twenty years Rauscher moulded the ecclesiastical as well as political affairs of Austria; for his position made him not only the intimate counsellor of the emperor, but also a prominent member of the House of Peers. It would be too long to enumerate his numerous speeches and pastoral letters, which are all distinguished both by the depth of thought as well as by their rhetoric and noble language. He also took a prominent part in the last Vatican Council, and died Nov. 24, 1875. See *Literarischer Handweiser*, 1875, p. 470; Kurtz, *Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte* (9th ed. Mitau, 1874), ii, 344, 363 sq. (B. P.)

Rautenberg, Johann Wilhelm, father of the Inner Mission at Hamburg, was born at Moorflath, near Hamburg, March 1, 1791. He studied at Kiel under Twesten, and at Berlin under Neander, who both influenced him, and brought him nearer to Him whom he afterwards proclaimed with such fervor and blessing. In 1820 he was appointed pastor of St. George, a suburb of Hamburg, where, amid many difficulties and obstacles, he labored for forty-five years. He promoted every Christian enterprise which furthered the kingdom of God, and the many societies which he assisted with his word and counsel are his lasting monument. He died March 1, 1865. Rautenberg is well known as a hymn-writer and preacher. After his death Sengelmann published *Festliche Nachklänge*, a collection of 169 hymnological pieces (Hamburg, 1865); he also published *Predigten* (ibid. 1866). See Koch, *Geschichte des deutschen Kirchenliedes*, vii, 292 sq.; Zuchold, *Biblioth. Theolog.* ii, 1034; Löwe, *Denkwürdigkeiten aus dem Leben u. Wirken Rautenbergs* (Hamb. 1866); Hauck, *Theologischer Jahresbericht* (1866), ii, 198 sq., 701 sq. (B. P.)

Rautenstrauch, Franz Stephan, a German theologian of the Romish Church, was born at Platten, Bo-

hemia, in 1734, became a Benedictine monk at Braunan, and was there teacher of philosophy, theology, and canon law. In 1773 he was made prelatus of the convent and director of the theological faculty at Prague, and in the following year was called to Vienna to assist in the Ministry of Education. He died at Erlau, Hungary, in 1785. He was a more than ordinary man, and as a Romanist enjoyed the confidence of all liberal-minded men. He was a favorite at the court of the scholarly emperor, and was the intimate friend of Hontheim (q. v.), whose liberal ideas he favored; but on these very accounts he had much to suffer from the enmity of the Jesuits. He prepared the scheme for the course of instruction for the theological faculty in the Austrian universities, and published several minor works. On the occasion of the visit of pope Pius VI in Vienna, he wrote *Patriot. Betrachtungen*, etc.; but he is best known by his *Synopsis Juris Ecclesiastici* (Vienna, 1776). See Sabröckh, *Kirchengesch. seit der Reformation*, vii, 144 sq.—Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* s. v.

Ravana (from the causal of the Sanscrit *ru*, cry, alarm; hence literally he who causes alarm) is the name of the *Râkshasha* (q. v.) who, at the time of Râma, ruled over Lankâ or Ceylon, and, having carried off Sîta, the wife of Râma, to his residence, was ultimately conquered and slain by the latter. Ravana is described as having been a giant with ten faces, and, in consequence of austerities and devotion, as having obtained from Siva a promise which bestowed upon him unlimited power, even over the gods. As the promise of Siva could not be revoked, Vishnu evaded its efficacy in becoming incarnate as Râma, and hence killed the dæmon-giant.—*Chambers's Encyclop.* s. v. See Vishnu.

Ravanel, Pierre, a French Protestant theologian, was born about 1680. He was a descendant of the celebrated Jean Mercier. He was pastor of a church at Souzet. His works are, *Bibliotheca Sacra, sive Thesaurus Scripturæ Canonicæ Amplissimus* (Geneva, 1650, 1660, 2 vols.):—*Additamenta Nova ad Bibliothecam Sacram* (ibid. 1685).

Raven (עֹרֵב, *'oreb'*; Sept. and New Test. κόραξ, Vulg. *corvus*), the well-known bird of that name which is mentioned in various passages in the Bible. There is no doubt that the Heb. *'oreb* is correctly translated, the old versions agreeing on the point, and the etymology, from a root (עָרַב) signifying "to be black," favoring this rendering. A raven was sent out by Noah from the ark to see whether the waters were abated (Gen. viii, 7). This bird was not allowed as food by the Mosaic law (Lev. xi, 15); the word *'oreb* is doubtless used in a generic sense, and includes other species of the genus *Corvus*, such as the crow (*C. corone*), and the hooded crow (*C. cornix*). Ravens were the means, under the divine command, of supporting the prophet Elijah at the brook Cherith (1 Kings xvii, 4, 6). They are expressly mentioned as instances of God's protecting love and goodness (Job xxxviii, 41; Luke xii, 24; Psa. cxlvii, 9). They are enumerated with the owl, the bittern, etc., as marking the desolation of Edom (Isa. xxxiv, 11). "The locks of the beloved" are compared to the glossy blackness of the raven's plumage (Cant. v, 11). The raven's carnivorous habits, and especially his readiness to attack the eye, are alluded to in Prov. xxx, 17. See Oreb. The Sept. and Vulg. differ materially from the Hebrew and our A. V. in Gen. viii, 7; for whereas in the Hebrew we read "that the raven went forth to and fro [from the ark] until the waters were dried up," in the two old versions named above, together with the Syriac, the raven is represented as "not returning until the water was dried from off the earth." On this subject the reader may refer to Houbigant (*Not. Crit.* i, 12), Bochart (*Hieroz.* ii, 801), Rosenmüller (*Schol. in V. T.*), Kalisch (*Genesis*), and Patrick (*Commentary*), who shows the manifest incorrectness of the Sept. in representing the raven as keeping away from the ark while the waters lasted, but as returning to it when they were dried up. The expression "to and fro" clearly proves that the raven must have returned to the ark at intervals. The bird would doubtless have found food in the floating carcasses of the deluge, but would require a more solid resting-ground than they could afford. See Deluge. The subject of Elijah's sustenance at Cherith by means of ravens has given occasion to much fanciful speculation. It has been attempted to show that the *'orebim* ("ravens") were the people of Orbo, a small town near Cherith; this theory has been well answered by Reland (*Palæst.* ii, 913). Others have found in the ravens merely merchants; while Michaelis has attempted to show that Elijah merely plundered the ravens' nests of hares and other game! Keil (*Comment.* on 1 Kings xvii) makes the following just observation: "The text knows nothing of bird-catching and nest-robbing, but acknowledges the Lord and Creator of the creatures, who *commanded* the ravens to provide his servant with bread and flesh." It has also been well replied that an animal unfit for food or sacrifice did not necessarily defile what it touched. "An ass was as unclean as a raven; yet no one was polluted by riding on an ass, or by eating that which an ass had carried." An objection more to the point would be that the flesh which ravens would bring would leave the prophet no opportunity of being satisfied that it was such as he could legally receive; either that it was the flesh of a clean beast, or, if so, that it had not died with the blood undrained. But to this, too, the answer is obvious: if Jehovah could so restrain and overrule the instincts of these voracious birds as to make them minister to his servant, he could also take care that they should select nothing but what was fit, and he could give Elijah confidence that it was so. Some, however, understand *Arabs* to be there meant. See Elijah.

The raven belongs to the order *Insessores*, family *Corvidæ*. The raven is so generally confounded with the carrion crow that even in the works of naturalists the figure of the latter has sometimes been substituted for that of the former, and the manners of both have been mixed up together. They are, it is true, very similar, belonging to the same Linnæan genus, *Corvus*, and having the same intensely black color; but the raven is the larger, weighing about three pounds; has proportionably a smaller head, and a bill fuller and stouter at the point. Its black color is more iridescent (hence the comparison to the bridegroom's locks, Cant. v, 11), with gleams of purple passing into green, while that of the crow is more steel-blue; the raven is also gifted with greater sagacity; may be taught to articulate words; is naturally observant and solitary; lives in pairs; has a most acute scent; and flies to a great height. Unlike the crow, which is gregarious in its habits, the raven will not even suffer its young, from the moment they can shift for themselves, to remain within its haunt; and, therefore, though a bird found in nearly all countries, it is nowhere abundant (Bo-



Raven (*Corvus corax*).

chart, *Hieroz.* ii, 796 sq.; Kimchi *on Psa.* xiv, 7). Whether the raven of Palestine is the common species, or the *Corvus montanus* of Temminck, is not quite determined; for there is of the ravens, or greater form of crows, a smaller group including two or three others, all similar in manners, and unlike the carrion crows (*Corvus corone*, Linn.), which are gregarious, and seemingly identical in both hemispheres. Sometimes a pair of ravens will descend without fear among a flight of crows, take possession of the carrion that may have attracted them, and keep the crows at a distance till they themselves are gorged. (Comp. Horace, *Ep.* i, 16, 48; Aristoph. *Thesmoph.* 942). The habits of the whole genus typified by the name *'oreb* render it unclean in the Hebrew law; and the malignant, ominous expression of the raven, together with the color of its plumage, powers of voice, and solitary habits, are the causes of that universal and often superstitious attention with which mankind have ever regarded it.

In the mythological history of the Gentiles, we find the appellation of Ravens bestowed upon an oracular order of priesthood. In Egypt, it seems, the temples of Ammon were served by such—perhaps those priests that occur in the catacombs playing on harps, and clothed in black. More than one temple in Greece had similar raven priests. It was the usual symbol of slaughter among the Scandinavians; and a raven banner belonged to the Danes, and also to the Saxons; one occurs among the ensigns of the Normans in the Bayeux tapestry; and it was formerly a custom in the Benedictine abbeys on the Continent to maintain in a very large cage a couple of ravens, where several are recorded to have lived above fifty years. The Raven of the Sea, that ominous bird in Northern mythology, is properly the cormorant—the *morvran* of the Celtæ. Jewish and Arabian writers tell strange stories of this bird and its cruelty to its young; hence, say some, the Lord's express care for the young ravens after they had been driven out of the nests by the parent birds; but this belief in the raven's want of affection to its young is entirely without foundation. To the fact of the raven being a common bird in Palestine, and to its habit of flying restlessly about in constant search for food to satisfy its voracious appetite, may, perhaps, be traced the reason for its being selected by our Lord and the inspired writers as the especial object of God's providing care. There is something weird and shrewd in the expression of the raven's countenance; a union of cunning and malignity, which may have contributed to give it among widely severed nations, and in remote ages, a character for preternatural knowledge. Its black hue—the hue of night and of mourning—its recluse, solitary suspicion, and its harsh croak have no doubt increased its uncanny reputation. Certain it is that the "infausta cornix" has long been feared and hated as the messenger of evil and the prognosticator of death, while the Romans dedicated it to Apollo as the god of divination. An anonymous writer familiar with the habits of the bird has ingeniously suggested an explanation of its divining power. "The smell of death is so grateful to them that they utter a loud croak of satisfaction instantly on perceiving it. In passing over sheep, if a tainted smell is perceptible, they cry vehemently. From this propensity in the raven to announce his satisfaction in the smell of death has probably arisen the common notion that he is aware of its approach among the human race, and foretells it by his croakings. I have no doubt the idea is founded in truth, although I think the coming event is not communicated to the raven by any immediate or supernatural impulse, but that in passing over a human habitation from which a sickly or cadaverous smell may escape, it is perfectly natural for him to announce his perception of it by his cries" (*Zoologist*, p. 217). The shepherd has a better reason for calling the raven a bird of ill omen. A more vigilant or more cruel enemy to the flock can hardly exist, and it frequently makes its ferocious assaults on the yet living victim. See Wood, *Bible Animals*, p. 439 sq.; Tristram, *Nat. Hist. of the Bible*, p. 198 sq.

Ravenna, an important city of Central Italy, forty-three miles east-southeast from Bologna, and four and a half miles from the Adriatic, with a population of nearly 60,000 people, was once the capital of the empire (from A.D. 401), and is not only a very ancient city, whose history is of great interest to Christianity on account of its early relation to the Church, but more particularly on account of the different ecclesiastical councils which have been held there, and the disputes which the metropolitanate of Ravenna maintained in early mediæval days with the bishopric of Rome, especially in the 7th century, under Constans (666), in the 8th against pope Hadrian, and in the 9th, when in 861 the strife was finally put at rest at a synod in Rome. Aside from the council of bishops in 419, called by Honorius to decide upon the choice of popes between Boniface and Eulalius, the following councils of Ravenna (*Concilia Ravennata*) are noteworthy:

(I.) Held July 22, 877, by pope John VIII, at the head of forty-nine bishops (Holstenius and Labbé say the number of bishops was 130). The object of this council was to remedy the disorders of the Church. Nineteen chapters remain to us, relating to the discipline and privileges of the Church; also a letter confirming the possession of a monastery to the bishop of Autun.

Chap. 1. Enjoins the metropolitan to send to Rome for the pallium within three months after his consecration, and forbids him to exercise any of the functions of his office until that be done.

2. Enjoins that all bishops elect shall be consecrated by their metropolitans within three months after election, under pain of excommunication.

3. Forbids metropolitans to make use of the pallium except on great festivals and during mass.

5, 6, 7, and 8. Excommunicate and anathematize those who rob the Church, injure ecclesiastics, and commit various other crimes.

9. Declares those persons to be themselves excommunicated who voluntarily communicate with the excommunicated.

12. Excommunicates those who absent themselves from their parish church on three Sundays successively.

19. Forbids judges and royal commissioners to hold courts and to lodge in churches.

—Labbé, *Concil.* ix, 299.

(II.) Held in 898 (or 904, according to Labbé) by John IX, in the matter of Formosus and Stephen; the emperor Lambert being present and seventy-four bishops. Ten regulations were approved.

1. Enacts the observation of the canons of the fathers, and all that is contained in the capitularies of Charlemagne, Louis le Debonnaire, Lothaire, and Louis II.

3. Confirms the privileges granted to the Church of Rome by the emperors.

4. Approves all that had been done in the Council of Rome, A.D. 898, in the matter of Formosus.

5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10. Relate to the political circumstances of the Roman see.

—Labbé, *Concil.* ix, 507.

(III.) Held in April, 967. In this council the emperor, Otho I, yielded to the pope, John XIII, the city and territory of Ravenna. Heroldus, archbishop of Salzburg, was deposed and excommunicated; the act of deposition being subscribed on April 25 by the emperor and fifty-seven bishops, including the pope. Lastly, Magdeburg was erected into an archbishopric: this, however, was not completed until the following year.—Labbé, *Concil.* ix, 674.

(IV.) Held May 1, 997, by Gerbert, archbishop of Ravenna, and eight suffragans. Three canons remain, of which

1. Condemns an infamous custom which existed in the cathedral of Ravenna of selling the holy eucharist and chrism.

—Labbé, *Concil.* ix, 766.

(V.) Held April 30, 1014, by the new archbishop, Arnold, to remedy the abuses caused by the long vacancy of eleven years, and the intrusion of Adalbert, who had

unlawfully conferred holy orders and dedicated certain churches. It was determined that those upon whom orders had been thus conferred should remain suspended until the matter could be minutely considered; and that the consecrations of churches and oratories made by Adalbert were null and void.—Labbé, *Concil.* ix, 833.

(VI.) Held by Peter, cardinal of St. Anastasia, in 1128. Here the patriarchs of Aquileia and Venice, or Grade, were deposed, having been convicted of favoring schismatics.—Pagi; Labbé, *Concil.* x, 936.

(VII.) Held in 1286, July 8, by Bonifacius the archbishop, who presided, assisted by eight bishops, his suffragans. Nine canons were published.

2. Exhorts the clergy to almsgiving, and grants indulgences to those who feed and clothe the poor.
3. Relates to the dress of the clergy; and forbids them to carry arms without the bishop's permission.
5. Orders that the usual daily distributions shall be made only to those canons who attend the holy office.

—Labbé, *Concil.* xi, 1238.

(VIII.) Held in 1310 by Rainaldus the archbishop, in the matter of the Templars. Present, eight bishops of the province, three inquisitors, two preaching friars, and one Minorite: seven Templars were brought before them, who constantly affirmed their innocence. On the following day it was determined that they who had confessed from a fear of torture only should be considered innocent; nevertheless, there were five who went through the canonical ordeal.—Labbé, *Concil.* xi, 1533.

(IX.) Held in 1311 by Rainaldus the archbishop, five bishops and six proctors attending. Thirty-two canons were published.

2. Orders mass to be said daily for a month by the other bishops in behalf of a bishop deceased.
3. Orders that yearly, on July 20, a solemn service shall be said for the deceased bishops; and that on that day twelve poor persons shall be fed.
4. Enjoins the same thing on behalf of patrons and benefactors of churches.
6. Orders that the sacraments be administered fasting.
10. Enjoins curates to warn the people every Sunday, after the gospel and offertory, of the festivals and fast-days in the coming week.
11. Orders that the form of baptism shall be publicly said in church three times a year.
15. Orders that the canon "omnis utriusque sexus" shall be published at Advent and Lent. That medical men shall not visit a patient a second time if he have not called in the priest.
16. Forbids to give a benefice to any one who cannot read or chant.
18. Orders annual synods.
23. Orders that Jews shall wear a distinguishing badge.
26. Renews the canonical penalties for striking, maltreating, and driving the clergy from their churches.

—Labbé, *Concil.* xi, 1569.

(X.) Held in 1314 by the same archbishop, assisted by six bishops and four deputies. Twenty canons were published.

2. Forbids to ordain to the priesthood persons under twenty-five years of age; also to ordain a deacon under twenty, and a sub-deacon under sixteen years.
6. Orders that the church bells shall be rung when a bishop passes, that the people may come out to receive his blessing upon their knees; also regulates the form to be observed by the chapter of a cathedral upon the bishop's visit.
8. Declares, under pain of excommunication, that no monks, or other persons, can claim exemption from episcopal visitation upon plea of prescriptive right, or any other plea.
10. Enacts that the clergy shall be soberly dressed; that they shall not carry arms, nor dress in colored clothes; that they shall wear a close cassock, observe the tonsure, and keep their hair cut short, etc.
11. Forbids men to enter the monastic houses of females.
14. Orders curates to teach their people the form of baptism at least once a year.
16. Orders fasting and almsgiving on the three days before the meeting of provincial councils.
29. Revokes the permission given to monks to preach indulgences.

—Labbé, *Concil.* xi, 1603. See also Milman, *Hist. of Latin Christianity;* Hefele, *Conciliengesch.* vol. v, et al.; Landon, *Manual of Councils*, s. v. For the Council of Ravenna held in 1317, see BOLOGNA.

Ravenscroft, John Stark, D.D., an Episcopal minister in America, afterwards bishop of North Carolina, was born near Blandford, Prince George County, Va., in 1772. He entered William and Mary College in 1789, but with little profit, and, on his return from Scotland soon after, settled in Lunenburg County. In 1810 his mind changed, and he joined the "Republican Methodists," and became a lay elder in their Church. He was subsequently ordained in the Protestant Episcopal Church, became assistant minister at Richmond, and was elected bishop the same year. In 1828 he retired to Williamsburgh from ill-health, and, on his return to North Carolina, died March 5, 1830. He published several *Sermons and Charges:*—also, *The Doctrine of the Church Vindicated*, etc.:—*Revealed Religion Defended against the No-Comment Principle.* Sixty-one *Sermons* and a *Memoir* (2 vols. 8vo) were also published after his death. See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, v, 617.

Ravenscroft, Stephens, a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born of pious and respectable parentage in Staffordshire, England, March 6, 1803, was converted very young, and licensed to preach in his eighteenth year by the Wesleyans. In 1838 he emigrated to the United States. He was a great admirer of republican institutions, and as loyal a citizen as ever breathed the free air of America. In 1839 he was admitted into the Indiana Conference, and appointed to Booneville. His subsequent appointments were Mount Vernon, New Lebanon, Carlisle, Spencer, Bloomfield, and Bowling Green. While on the last-named charge his health failed, and he was located at his own request. He moved with his family to Point Commerce, and supplied Linton and New Albany circuits. He afterwards travelled as a Bible agent in Clark and Floyd counties until his health became so poor that he had to give up the work entirely. He then moved to Rockport, Ind., where, as a supply, he ended his nine years' service as a local preacher. In 1859 he was readmitted into conference and placed on the superannuated list, which relation he sustained until his death In 1869 he moved to Worthington, Ind., and in 1870 to Petersburgh, Ind., where he was appointed postmaster, and where he died, Oct. 20, 1871. See *Minutes of Conf.* 1872, p. 79.

Ravenscroft, Thomas, an eminent English musical composer, deserves a place here for his devotion to sacred subjects. He was born in 1592, received his musical education in St. Paul's choir, and had the degree of bachelor of music conferred on him when only fifteen years of age. In 1611 appeared his *Melismata, Musical Phansies*, a collection of twenty-three part-songs, some of them of great beauty; and three years later he brought out another collection of part-songs under the title of *Brief Discourses*, with an essay on the old musical modes. Turning his attention to psalmody, he published in 1621 a collection of psalm-tunes for four voices, entitled *The Whole Book of Psalms, composed into Four Parts by Sundry Authors to such Tunes as have been and are usually sung in England, Scotland, Wales, Germany, Italy, France, and the Netherlands.* This was the first publication of its kind, and all similar works of later date have been largely indebted to it. Among the contributors to this collection were Tallis, Morley, Dowland, and all the great masters of the day; the name of John Milton, the father of the poet, appears as the composer of York and Norwich tunes; while St. David's, Canterbury, Bangor, and many others which have since become popular, are by Ravenscroft himself. Each of the 150 Psalms has a distinct melody assigned to it. Two collections of secular songs similar to the *Melismata*, and entitled *Pammelia* and *Deuteromelia*, have been assigned to Ravenscroft; but it is probable that only a few of these songs were composed by him, while he may have revised and edited the whole. A selection from the *Melismata, Brief Discourses, Pam-*

melia, and *Deuteromelia* was printed by the Roxburghe Club in 1823. He died about 1640.—Chambers. See also *Engl. Ch. Register*, vol. i; *Amer. Quar. Ch. Rev.* Jan. 1871, p. 526.

Ravesteyn, Josse (in Latin *Tiletanus*), a Belgian theologian, was born about 1506 at Tielt, Flanders. He was educated at Louvain, and taught theology there. He was sent by Charles V to the Council of Trent (1551), then to the Colloquy of Worms (1557), and distinguished himself at these ecclesiastical councils by his knowledge and moderation. In 1559 he replaced Ruard Tapper in the charge of the nuns who had the care of the hospital of Louvain. He had twice been elected rector of the university of that city, and held divers benefices of imperial munificence. "He was," said Paquot, "a wise doctor, quick at controversy, a zealous defender of the Church, and much opposed to the errors of Baius, whom he regarded as his most ardent adversary." He died at Louvain Feb. 7, 1571. His principal writings are, *Confessionis editæ a Ministris Antwerpiensibus Confutatio* (Louvain, 1567, 8vo); the Confession of the pastors had already been refuted by William of Linda:—*Apologia Catholicæ Confutationis*, etc. (ibid. 1568, 8vo); directed against the *Centuries de Magdebourg*, of which Matthew Flach Francowitz was the principal author:—*Apologiæ Decretorum Concilii Tridentini de Sacramentis* (ibid. 1568–70, 2 vols. 12mo). He left several works in manuscript.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.

Ravignan, Gustavus Francis Xavier Delacroix de, one of the most celebrated of Roman Catholic preachers of our times, and also a distinguished member of the Jesuit Order, was born at Bayonne Dec. 2, 1795. He studied in the Lycée Bonaparte at Paris, and was by his parents intended for the legal profession, which he also entered by obtaining his degree and being named auditor of the Cour Royale at Paris. In 1821 he received an appointment in the Tribunal of the Seine. The prospect thus opened for him, however, lost its attraction after a change of views in religion had made him serious about the future, and in 1822 he formed the resolution of relinquishing his career at the bar, and entering the Church. Having spent some time in the College of St. Sulpice, he soon passed into the novitiate of the Jesuits at Montrouge, and thence to Dole and St. Acheul for his theological studies, at the termination of which he was himself appointed a professor. The religious fervor of his soul found expression in many of the material forms which prevail so generally among the Romanists of his order. Thus, for example, he wore for a long time, as a mark of penance, a leather girdle stuck full of needles, around his waist, on the bare body. On the expulsion of the Jesuits from France in 1830, father Ravignan withdrew to Freiburg, in Switzerland, where he continued to teach in the schools of his own order; but after some time, when he was supposed to have gained sufficient notoriety by the afflictive discipline of his body, he was transferred to the more congenial duty of preaching, first in several of the Swiss towns, and afterwards in Savoy, at Chambery, at St. Maurice, and other places. At length, in 1835, he appeared in the pulpit of the cathedral of Amiens. In the following year he was chosen to preach the Lenten sermons at the church of St. Thomas d'Aquin in Paris; and finally, in 1837, was selected to replace Lacordaire (q. v.) at Notre Dame in the duty of conducting the special "conferences" for men which had been opened in that church. For ten years father Ravignan occupied this pulpit with a success which has rarely been equalled, and his *Conferences* are regarded as models of ecclesiastical eloquence. In 1842 he undertook, in addition, to preach each evening during the entire Lent; and it is to the excessive fatigue thus induced, as well as to the many trials imposed, that the premature break-down of his strength is ascribed. To the labors of the pulpit he added those also of the press. He published an *Apology* of his order in 1844; and in 1854 a more extended work with the same view, *Clément XIII et Clément XIV* (2 vols. 8vo), which was intended as a reply to the *Life of Clement XIV* by the Oratorian father Theiner. These, with some occasional *Sermons* and *Conferences*, constitute the sum of the publications issued during his life. In 1855 he was invited by the emperor Napoleon III to preach the Lent at the Tuileries. He died Feb. 26, 1858, in the convent of his order at Paris. None of the Jesuit preachers of our times have so zealously labored among the Protestants as father Ravignan, but, alas!.too frequently he employed measures in no way adding honor to the already overcast name of the Jesuitical order. His *Memoirs* have been published by his brethren, and a collected edition of his works and remains has been for some time in progress. The *Memoir* has been translated into English, under the title of *The Life of Father Ravignan*, by father De Ponlevoy (Dublin, 1869; N. Y. 1869).

Ravle is, in ecclesiastical language, the name of a cloak worn by women mourners. See Mourning.

Rawlett, John, an English theologian, was born about 1642, and was a lecturer in divinity at Newcastle-upon-Tyne at the time of his death, in 1686. He published, *Explication of the Creed, the Ten Commandments, and the Lord's Prayer* (Lond. 1672, 8vo; 1769, 8vo):—*Dialogue between Two Protestants* (1686, 8vo):—*Christian Monitor*, in Welsh (Oxon. 1689, 8vo):—*Treatise of Sacramental Covenanting* (5th ed. Lond. 1692, 8vo).

Rawley, William, an Anglican divine of some note, was born about 1588, and was educated at Bene't College, Cambridge, of which he was made fellow in 1609. He finally took holy orders, and in 1612 became rector of Bowthorpe, Norfolk; in 1616, vicar of Landbeach, Cambridge. He was chaplain and amanuensis to lord Bacon, and subsequently chaplain to Charles I and Charles II. He wrote prefaces and dedications to some of Bacon's works, and translated several of them into Latin. In 1638, after Bacon's death, he published them in folio form; and in 1657 he published, under the title of *Resuscitatio*, several other of Bacon's tracts, with a memoir of the author prefixed. In 1661 he republished the *Resuscitatio*, with additions. He died in 1667.

Rawlin, Richard, an English Independent divine, was born in 1687, and flourished as pastor of an Independent congregation in Fetter Lane, London. He died in 1757. He published, *Christ the Righteousness of his People, seven Discourses on Justification by Faith in Him* (1741, 8vo; 1722, 1797, 12mo).

Rawlings, Charles, a Wesleyan preacher of some note, was born May 24, 1813, at Cheltenham. He was destined for mercantile life, but finally, brought under the influence of the Wesleyans, he was converted and taken into the Church. In 1836 he entered the ministry, and for twenty-nine years filled some of the best circuits in the connection. He last held the appointment of superintendent of the Swansea (English) Circuit. He died July 14, 1865. See *Cambria Daily Leader* (of that date).

Rawlinson, George, an English divine, noted also as a scientist, was born in 1828, and was educated at King's College and Emmanuel College, Cambridge. In 1854 he was made curate of St. Mary's, Vincent Square, London. In 1856 he was appointed professor of applied sciences at Elphinstone College, Bombay, where he remained until his death in September following. He published in 1857, at Bombay, a work on dynamics. His *Elementary Statics*, edited by Edw. Sturgis, was published at Cambridge and London (1861, 8vo). See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s. v.

Rawlinson, John, D.D., an English divine, noted also as an educator, flourished in the first half of the 17th century. He was at one time principal of St. Edmund's Hall. He published, *Three Sermons* (Lond. 1609–11;

Oxon. 1612, 4to):—*Sermon on* 1 *Sam. x*, 24 (ibid. 1616, 4to):—*Sermons on Luke xxii*, 48 (Lond. 1616, 4to): —*Four Lent Sermons* (1625, 4to). See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s. v.

Rawson, Grindal, an early American preacher, was born in 1658, and was educated at Harvard College, where he graduated in 1678. He entered the ministry, and was pastor of a Presbyterian congregation at Mendon, Mass., from 1680 until his death, in 1715. He published *Election Sermons* (Bost. 1709, 16mo). See Mather, *Deaths of Good Men*.

Rawson, Joseph, D.D., an English divine, flourished near the opening of last century as canon of Lichfield. He published nine single *Sermons* (1703–16), and a *Narrative* of his case (Lond. 1737, 8vo). See Watt, *Bib. Brit.* s. v.

Ray, Benjamin, an English clergyman, flourished in the first half of the last century. He was perpetual curate of Surfleet and curate of Cowbitt, and died in 1760. He contributed to the *Trans. of the Spalding Society*, to the *Gentleman's Magazine*, 1744 (on an ancient coin, etc.), and to the *Philosophical Transactions*, 1751 (on a water-spout), and left some works in manuscript. See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s. v.

Ray, John, a celebrated English naturalist, of humble origin, but indomitable perseverance, was the author of two works showing the relation of science to religion (*The Wisdom of God in the Works of Creation* [Lond. 1691, and often since]; and *Three Physico-Theological Discourses* [ibid. 1693, and later]). He was born in 1628 at Black Notley, in Essex; was educated at Braintree School, and at Catharine Hall and Trinity College, Cambridge; lost his fellowship in the latter college by refusing to comply with the Act of Uniformity; travelled on the Continent for three years with Mr. Willoughby and other friends; became a fellow of the Royal Society, and died in 1705. His works are numerous and valuable, chiefly on scientific and literary subjects. See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s. v.

Ray, Thomas, a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Pennsylvania, Oct. 18, 1794, became a Christian in early life, and, after preaching for several years, in 1833 joined the Indiana Conference, within whose limits he travelled until his death, Jan. 31, 1871, at Inwood, Ind.—*Minutes of Ann. Conf.* 1871, p. 184.

Raybold, George A., a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Philadelphia, Pa., Oct. 18, 1802. He was converted in April, 1822, and began to preach in 1825. In April, 1829, he withdrew from the Methodist Episcopal Church, and joined the Methodist Protestant Church, but reunited with the Methodist Episcopal Church in September, 1831. In 1833 he was admitted on trial in the Philadelphia Conference, ordained deacon in 1835, and elder in 1837. When the New Jersey Conference was formed, he was set off with it, and continued to fill the several appointments to which he was assigned until 1847, when he was granted a supernumerary relation. For over thirty years he was a great sufferer from disease, and yet maintained a devout, patient spirit until his death, at Haddonfield, N. J., Dec. 4, 1876.—*Minutes of Annual Conferences of the M. E. Church*, 1877, p. 159.

Rayland, John, D.D., a learned minister of the Baptist denomination in England, was born at Warwick Jan. 29, 1753. In his childhood he developed remarkable talents as a scholar. Having been thoroughly trained under the tuition of his father, he became his assistant in the school under his charge, and his successor when he retired from his official duties. He began to preach in 1771 at Northampton and its vicinity. In 1781 he became colleague with his father in the pastorate of the Northampton church, and sole pastor on the removal of his father to Enfield. He occupied this position for ten years, and then became pastor of the Broadmead Chapel in Bristol, and at the same time president of the Baptist Institute in that place. Here he continued until his death, May 25, 1825. Brown University conferred the degree of D.D. on Dr. Rayland in 1772. His *Sermons*, etc., were collected after his death, and published in two octavo volumes. The funeral sermon of Dr. Rayland by Robert Hall presents a most charming portraiture of this excellent man. (J. C. S.)

Raymond, St. (Spanish, *San Ramon*), a Roman Catholic prelate who flourished in Spain in the first half of the 13th century, is frequently called by his surname *Nonnatus*, which he owes to the fact that he was taken out of the body of his mother after her death by the Cesarean operation. He was thus born at Portel, in Catalonia, in 1204, and was of a gentleman's family of small fortune. His early life was spent in the mountain fastnesses of his native country; but when he had attained to the years of a maturer youth, he set out for the court, and there attracted attention. The dissipation of his royal associates disgusted him, and he sought the retirement of the cloister. He joined the Order of Mercy, which aimed at the redemption of captives from the Moors, and was admitted by the founder himself, St. Peter Nolasco (q. v.). While in Algiers he was taken up by the authorities, and punished with excruciating tortures of the body; but he bore all meekly, and even continued his work after his release. The story goes that the governor, when informed of the incurability of Raymond's zeal of propagandism, had him seized anew, and his lips were bored through with a red-hot iron and fastened with a padlock. He was released after eight months' imprisonment, and taken back to Spain by friends of his, and under direction of the pope of Rome, who shortly after made him a cardinal. He was also made the general of his order, and as such was invited to visit Rome. On his way thither he fell sick at Cardona, only six miles from Barcelona, and died Aug. 31, 1240. Both pope Gregory IX and king James of Aragon assisted at his funeral. Pope Alexander VII inserted Raymond's name in the *Martyrology* in 1657. See Butler, *Lives of the Saints*, viii, 567 sq.

Raymond of Magnelonne, a French mediæval prelate, flourished near the opening of the 12th century. It is supposed that he was of the family of the nobles of Montpellier. He was bishop from 1129, but not without opposition. Bernard, count of Substantion, finding the choice of Raymond contrary to his views, for revenge, tried to destroy the church of Magnelonne; but the constancy of Raymond triumphed over this opposition, and forced the same Bernard to make public confession of his fault. The name of this bishop is cited in many of the acts mentioned or published by the *Gallia Christiana* and *L'Histoire de Languedoc* of M. Vaissette. He died in November, 1159.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.

Raymond of Penafort (*Saint*), a Spanish Dominican, was born in 1175 at the château of Penafort, in Catalonia, and belonged to one of the noble families of Spain allied to the royal house of Aragon. He was educated at Barcelona, and made such progress that at the age of twenty he taught the liberal arts at that place. He went to perfect himself at the University of Bologna, where he received the title of doctor in civil and canonical law. Attracted by his reputation, which was still rising, Béranger, bishop of Barcelona, on his returning to his church from Rome, went to see him at Bologna, and succeeded in persuading him to return with him to Spain. He did not, however, content himself with the mere discharge of the duties of his canonicate and his archdeaconry in the Barcelona cathedral, but was very much occupied with all manner of good works. He finally felt persuaded to take the Dominican habit, April 1, 1222. His example was followed by several persons distinguished for their knowledge and birth. Pope Gregory IX called him to Rome, and employed him in 1228 in the collection of the *Decretals:*

he wished even to raise him to the metropolitan see of Tarragona, but Raymond preferred the solitude of Barcelona to all the advantages which his friends had hoped for him. Nominated general of his order in 1238, he gave up his charge two years later, and contributed much by his zeal and counsel to the establishment of the Order of Mercy. Peter Nolascus was one of his converts, and so were many other distinguished characters of that period. Indeed, his influence is said to have been so great that the expulsion of the Moors from Spain is principally attributed to him. Raymond was also made the spiritual director of the king of Aragon, and he persuaded his royal master James to favor the establishment of the Inquisition in his kingdom and in Languedoc, and the popes permitted him to provide for the offices of this tribunal. Pope Clement VIII canonized him in 1601. We have of his works a collection of *Decretals*, which forms the fifth volume of the canon law. This collection is in five books, and the author has joined several decrees of the councils to the constitutions of the popes:—a *Summa* on penitence and marriage, which he had printed many times:—an abridgment of this work, and divers other works which have not been printed, and which do not merit it. Raymond de Penafort died at Barcelona Jan. 6, 1275. He is commemorated Jan. 23.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v. See Butler, *Lives of the Saints*, i, 200 sq.; Mrs. Jameson, *Legendary and Mythological Art* (see Index).

Raymond OF SABUNDE (or SEBUNDE), a French ecclesiastic, who was a native of Spain, but flourished in the first half of the 15th century at Toulouse, is noted as a philosopher and theologian. About 1436 he taught medicine at Toulouse, and perhaps also theology. He is especially noteworthy as the author of *Liber Naturæ s. Creaturam*, etc., which has had several emendations and translations. Raymond sought in a rational, yet in some respects rather mystical, manner to demonstrate the harmony between the book of nature and the Bible. He asserts that man has received from the Almighty two books, wherein he may discover the important facts which concern his relation to his Creator, viz. the book of Revelation and that of Nature; affirming the latter to be the most universal in its contents, and the most perspicuous. He endeavored by specious rather than solid arguments to deduce the theology of his age, even in its more peculiar doctrines, from the contemplation of nature and of man. "Setting out with the consideration of the four stages designated as mere being, life, sensation, and reason, Raymond (who agrees with the Nominalists in regarding self-knowledge as the most certain kind of knowledge) proves by ontological, physico-teleological, and moral arguments (the latter based on the principle of retribution) the existence and trinity of God, and the duty of grateful love to God, who first loved us. His work culminates in the mystical conception of a kind of love to God by which the lover is enabled to grow into the essence of the loved" (Ueberweg). This attempt of Raymond of Sabunde to prove the doctrines of Christianity from the revelation of God in nature has no imitators. It certainly deserved, from its just observations on many subjects, especially on morals, greater success than it met with. Montaigne directed to it the attention of his contemporaries by a translation he made of it. (See Montaigne's observations in his *Essays*, lib. ii, ch. xii.) The best Latin editions of the *Liber Naturæ* are those of Frankfort, 1635, and Amsterdam, 1761. See Matzke, *Die natürl. Theol. des R. v. Sab.* (Breslau, 1846); Nitzsch, *Quæst. Raimundanæ*, in *Zeitsch. für hist. Theol.* 1859, No. 3; Zöckler, *Theol. Natur.* (Frankf. 1860), vol. i; Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrines* (see Index); Ritter, *Christl. Philos.* ii, 747–754; Ueberweg, *Hist. of Philos.* i, 465–467.—Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* s. v.

Raymond, Lully. See LULLY.

Raymond, Martin, a Spanish Dominican who flourished in the 13th century, near its middle, was in 1250 presiding officer of the eight colleges which the kings of Castile and Aragon had erected in the Dominican convents for the study of the Oriental tongues. The principal object of these schools was to fit out missionaries, and to aid the work of missions in all possible ways. Our Raymond was one of the greatest promoters of that work in his time, and his name deserves to be commemorated in the annals of Christian missions. He died after 1286. He is especially known by his *Pugio Fidei contra Mauros et Judæos*, ed. by De Voisin (Paris, 1651), and by Carpzov (Leipsic, 1687). See Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrines*, i, 383; ii, 17.

Raynaud (*Rainaldi*), THEOPHILUS, a celebrated Italian Jesuit, was born Nov. 15, 1583, at Sospello, near Nice. He studied at Avignon, and became quite accomplished as a student of philosophy. In 1602 he entered the Society of Jesus, and was made one of their teachers at Lyons. At first he taught elementary branches, but soon found advancement, and was finally given a professorship of philosophy and theology. In 1631 he was chosen confessor to prince Maurice of Savoy, and repaired to Paris. Here he was made uncomfortable by unpleasant relations to Richelieu, who, having been attacked by a Spanish theologian for the alliance of the French government with the German Protestants, had asked Raynaud for a reply and been refused. Raynaud was, at his request to the order, transferred to Chambéry, and this bishopric soon becoming vacant, he was solicited to fill it. But he was far from being pleased, and even prepared to return to Lyons. He did not again revisit Savoy until 1639, and then only to his unhappiness. He had, during his sojourn at Chambéry, contracted a close friendship with father Pierre Monod, his companion; and when he heard of his detention in the fortress of Montmélian, he tried in every way to have it brought to an end. Richelieu took offence at this ardent affection, which was natural between friends, and, not being willing to permit relations between Raynaud and a prisoner of the state, he solicited and obtained from the court of Savoy the arrest of the unfortunate Jesuit. At the end of three months he was released, and sought refuge at Carpentras, which then belonged to the Papal States. But the aversion of his enemies would not leave him long undisturbed. By order of the cardinal-legate Antonio Barberini, he was conducted to Avignon, and locked in a chamber of the pontifical palace. With difficulty released, he left for Rome, with the manuscript of *Heteroclita Spiritualia*, of which the impression had been suspended, submitted it for examination to father Alegambe, and obtained the authority to publish. In 1645 he returned to Rome in company with cardidal Federigo Sforza, and was presented to the pope and the Sacred College as one of the most ardent champions of the papal rights. He afterwards made two journeys to the Eternal City, the first time in 1647, and there occupied for some time a theological chair; the second time in 1651, when he assisted at the general assembly of his order. He afterwards obtained permission to establish himself at Lyons, and there passed the rest of his life in teaching and composing his works. He died Oct. 31, 1663. Father Raynaud had all the qualities of a good friar: he was sober, pious, and very charitable; but by his pen he did not spare his adversaries, and showed himself severe and irascible. He wrote a great many works, which, though extravagant in style, tedious, and trivial, were nearly all received with favor. Tiraboschi was unable to forbear comparing them "to one of those vast magazines full of merchandise of all kinds, good and bad, ancient and modern, useful and useless, in which every one could find, with taste and patience, everything which suited him." The writings of père Raynaud worth mentioning here are, *Theologia Naturalis* (Lyons, 1622, 1637, 4to):—*Splendor Veritatis Moralis* (ibid. 1627, 8vo; under the name of Stephanus Emonecus):—*Moralis Disciplina* (ibid. 1629, fol.):—*Indiculus Sanctorum Lugdunensium* (ibid. 1629, 12mo):—

Calvinismus, Vestiarum Religio (Paris, 1630, 12mo; under the name of Rivière):—*De Communione pro Mortuis* (Lyons, 1630, 8vo); he pretends that the sacraments have no virtue except for those who receive them uncensured by the Church of Rome:—*De Martyrio per Pestem* (ibid. 1630, 8vo); in the index of this book he tried to show that those who exposed themselves voluntarily to the plague in assisting those who had it were the real martyrs:—*Nova Libertatis Explicatio* (Paris, 1632, 4to); against father Gibieuf, an Orator:—*Metamorphosis Latronis in Apostolum Apostolique in Latronem* (Lyons, 1634, 2 vols. 8vo); followed by several other treatises:—*De Ortu Infantium contra Naturam, per Sectionem Cæsaream* (ibid. 1637, 8vo); a singular and curious book:—*Hipparchus de Religioso Negotiatore* (Francopolis [Chambéry], 1642, 8vo); a satirical work, translated into French (Chambéry, 1645, 8vo) by Tripier, teacher of the natural children of the duke of Savoy; and Amsterdam (1761, 12mo):—*Dypticha Mariana* (Grenoble, 1643, 4to):—*Mala Bonorum Ecclesiasticorum* (Lyons, 1644, 4to):—*De Incorruptione Cadaverum* (Avignon, 1645, 8vo); a dissertation written upon the dead body of a woman which was found in 1642 at Carpentras without any signs of decomposition, although it had been buried for a long time; Raynaud pretended that the incorruption of the body was not due to natural causes, nor to the artifices of the devil, but to God himself; but, adds he, as this last supposition is far from being demonstrated, it will be well to find what God himself has decreed on this subject:—*Heteroclita Spiritualia* (Grenoble, 1646, 8vo; Lyons, 1654, 4to); a collection of the extraordinary practices which superstition and ignorance have introduced into religion:—*Vitæ ac Mortis Humanæ Terminalia* (Orange, 1646, 8vo); he had not then reason to doubt, following the author, that God has fixed the term of life for the good and the wicked; but ordinarily the length of the life of men and their death depend upon natural causes:—*Trinitas Patriarcharum* (Lyons, 1647, 8vo); notices upon Simeon Stylites, Francis de Paulo, and Ignatius de Loyola:—*Erotemata de Malis ac Bonis Libris, deque Justa aut Injusta eorumdem Confixione* (ibid. 1650, 4to); this work, full of research, is an answer to an attack on his *De Martyrio per Pestem:*—*Theologia Patrum* (Antwerp, 1652, fol.):—*De Sobria Alterius Sexus Frequentatione per Sacros et Religiosos Homines* (Lyons, 1653, 8vo):—*Scapulare Marianum* (Paris, 1653, 8vo):—*De Pileo Exteriusque Capitis Tegminibus, tam Sacris quam Profanis* (Lyons, 1655, 4to):—*Eunuchi, Nati, Facti, Mystici, ex Sacra et Humana Literatura Illustrati; Puerorum Emasculatores ob Musicam quo Loco Habendi* (Dijon, 1655, 4to); under the name of Jean Héribert, he treated, in a very diffuse manner, the subject of eunuchs; but he had forgotten the most essential point, whether they were able to marry; this question was very fully treated in his work *Traité des Eunuques* (1707, 4to):—*Hercules Commodianus* (Aix, 1565, 8vo); under the name Honorat Léotard; it is a virulent satire against Jean de Launoi:—*Trias Fortium David* (Lyons, 1657, 4to); remarks upon Robert d'Arbrissel, St. Bernard, and César of Bus:—*Missi Evangelici ad Siwas, Japionam et Oras Confines* (Antw. [Lyons] 1659, 8vo); under the name of Léger Quintin:—*O Parascevasticum* (Lyons, 1661, 4to):—*Hagiologium Lugdunense* (ibid. 1662, 8vo):—*De Immunitate Autorum Cyriacorum a Censura* (ibid. 1662, 8vo). See Dupin, *Biblioth. des Auteurs Eccles.;* Nicéron, *Mémoires*, vol. xxvi. His *Life*, written by himself, is preserved in the Jesuit Library at Lyons. See also Sotwei, *Script. Soc. Jesu.*—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.

Ra'zis (Ῥαζείς, Vulg. *Razias*), "one of the elders of Jerusalem," who killed himself under peculiarly terrible circumstances, that he might not fall "into the hands of the wicked" (2 Macc. xiv, 37–46). In dying he is reported to have expressed his faith in a resurrection (ver. 46)—a belief elsewhere characteristic of the Maccabæan conflict. This act of suicide, which was wholly alien to the spirit of the Jewish law and people (John viii, 22; comp. Ewald, *Alterth.* p. 198; Grotius, *De Jure Belli*, II, xix, 5), has been the subject of considerable discussion. It was quoted by the Donatists as the single fact in Scripture which supported their fanatical contempt of life (Augustine, *Ep.* 104, 6). Augustine denies the fitness of the model, and condemns the deed as that of a man "non eligendæ mortis sapiens, sed ferendæ humilitatis impatiens" (Augustine, *l. c.;* comp. *c. Gaud.* i, 36–39). At a later time the favor with which the writer of 2 Macc. views the conduct of Razis — a fact which Augustine vainly denies — was urged rightly by Protestant writers as an argument against the inspiration of the book. Indeed the whole narrative breathes the spirit of pagan heroism, or of the later zealots (comp. Josephus, *War*, iii, 7; iv, 1, 10), and the deaths of Samson and Saul offer no satisfactory parallel (comp. Grimm, *ad loc.*

Razor is the rendering in the A. V. of the following words: 1. מוֹרָה, *morah'* (Sept. *σίδηρος, ξύρον*; Vulg. *novacula, ferrum:* from מָרָה, "scrape," or "sweep." Gesenius connects it with the root יָרֵא, "to fear" [*Thesaur.* p. 819]). This word occurs in Judg. xiii, 5; xvi, 17; 1 Sam. i, 11. 2. תַּעַר, *ta'ar* (Sept. *ῥομφαία*; Vulg. *gladius:* from עָרָה, to *lay bare*), a more general term (Numb. vi, 5; Psa. lii, 2; Isa. vii, 20; Ezek. v, 1) for a sharp *knife* (as rendered in Jer. xxvi, 23) or *sword* ("sheath," 1 Sam. xvii, 51, etc.; although many regard this as a different word of the same form). The *barber* is designated by גַּלָּב, *gallab'* (Sept. *κουρεύς*; Vulg. *tonsor*, 2 Sam. xx, 8). "Besides other usages, the practice of shaving the head after the completion of a vow must have created among the Jews a necessity for the special trade of a barber (Numb. vi, 9, 18; viii, 7; Lev. xiv, 8; Judg. xiii, 5; Isa. vii, 20; Ezek. v, 1; Acts xviii, 18). The instruments of his work were probably, as in modern times, the razor, the basin, the mirror, and perhaps, also, the scissors, such as are described by Lucian (*Adv. Indoct.* ii, 395, ed. Amst.; see 2 Sam. xiv, 26). The process of Oriental shaving, and especially of the head, is minutely described by Chardin (*Voy.* iv, 144). It may be remarked that, like the Levites, the Egyptian priests were accustomed to shave their whole bodies (Herod. ii, 36, 37)." The Psalmist compares the tongue of Doeg to a sharp razor (Psa. lii, 2) starting aside from what should be its true operation to a cruel purpose and effect. In the denunciation of the woes that were to be brought upon Judah in the time of Ahaz by the instrumentality of the Assyrians, we have the remarkable expression, "In the same day shall the Lord shave with a razor that is hired, namely, by them beyond the river, by the king of Assyria, the head, and the hair of the feet; and it shall also consume the beard" (Isa. vii, 20). It seems likely that there is here an implication of contempt as well as suffering, as the office of a barber ambulant has seldom been esteemed of any dignity either in the East or West. To shave with the hired razor the head, the feet, and the beard is an expression highly parabolical, to denote the utter devastation of the country from one end to the other, and the plundering of the people from the highest to the lowest by the Assyrians, whom God employed as his instrument to punish the rebellious Jews. See BARBER.

Rea, JOHN, D.D., a Presbyterian divine, was born in the village of Tully, Ireland, in 1772. He emigrated to the United States in 1799, and, after remaining at Philadelphia a short time, "I left on foot," he says, "travelled mostly alone through the wilderness, sad, gloomy, and dispirited, until, after many days, I arrived west of the Alleghany Mountains, stopping at the house of Mr. Porter, a Presbyterian minister." He now labored and struggled amid many adverse circumstances to secure a literary course of education, teaching school and studying alternately, until he graduated with honor

at Jefferson College, when it was only a small school kept in a log-cabin near Canonsburg, Pa. He studied theology under the direction of Dr. John M'Millan, was licensed by the Ohio Presbytery in June, 1803, and, after itinerating awhile in the wilderness of Eastern Ohio among some Indian camps, he was appointed to supply the newly organized churches of Beechsprings and Crabapple, over which he was ordained and installed pastor in 1805. The country was settled rapidly, and his charges grew as fast, so that it soon became necessary to have the relation between these two churches dissolved, that he might labor all his time at the Beechsprings. "So untiring and devoted was this servant of Christ that, besides constantly ministering to his own large congregation, he found time to be instrumental in raising up some six or seven separate societies that went out as colonies from the mother Church, and are now self-sustaining and prominent congregations." He died, after a ministry of fifty-two years, Feb. 12, 1855. Dr. Rea was pastor of the Church at Beechsprings forty-five years, and the history of the Presbyterian Church in Eastern Ohio is closely connected with his biography. He was a close, persevering student, clear in the arrangement of his subject, original in his thinking, and independent in thought and expression. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1867, p. 193. (J. L. S.)

Read, Francis H., a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Harrison County, Va., Nov. 25, 1812, was converted in his youth, joined the Church promptly in 1829, and in 1834, feeling called of God to the holy ministry, entered the travelling connection within the bounds of the Pittsburgh Conference, Pa. When the West Virginia Conference was formed, he became united with it, and there labored until 1855, when he was located. He removed to Illinois, and shortly after entered the Rock River Conference, and was appointed to the Newark Circuit. After two years he again took a location, and removed to Iowa. In 1858 he was admitted into the Iowa Conference, and afterwards, by the formation and division of territory, he fell first into the Western Iowa, and then into the Des Moines Conference. His appointments in these conferences were Hopeville Circuit, Osceola, Chariton, Ottawa Circuit, Corning, and the Atlantic District. In this field truly "he died at his post." His death occurred July 13, 1871, at Panora, Guthrie County, Iowa. See *Minutes of the Annual Conferences*, 1871, p. 218, 219.

Read, Henry Clay, a Presbyterian minister, was born in Stanford, Lincoln County, Ky., Jan. 30, 1826. He graduated at Centre College, Danville, Ky., in 1849, and at the theological seminary at Princeton, N. J., in 1850; was licensed by Transylvania Presbytery June 27, 1850, and began his labors at Westport, Lagrange, and Ballardsville, Ky. In 1851 he moved to Glasgow, Ky., and was ordained over that Church April 9, 1852. In 1858 he moved to Columbia, Ky., and engaged as joint principal of the high-school in that place, during which period he preached half of his time to the Church there, and the churches of Edmonton and Munfordsville. In 1859 he took full charge of the Church and school, but discontinued the school in 1862. He was a commissioner to the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church which met in Peoria, Ill., in 1863. He died Oct. 23, 1863. Mr. Read was a most exemplary Christian, a man of sound judgment, and a good preacher. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1864, p. 191. (J. L. S.)

Read, Thomas Buchanan, an American artist of some renown, deserves a place here for his distinction in works on sacred subjects. He was born in Chester County, Pa., March 12, 1822. When but seventeen years old he entered the studio of a sculptor in Cincinnati, intending to devote himself to sculpture for life; but painting soon proved the more attractive to him, and he practiced sculpture only as an amateur. In 1841 he went to New York, then to Boston, and settled in Philadelphia in 1846. He visited Europe first in 1850, since which time he has lived in Florence and Rome, passing some interval in Cincinnati. His pictures and his poems have the same characteristics, as might be expected. They are full of aerial grace and delicacy; an exquisite refinement and an ideal charm mingle in all he did. And yet he sometimes wrote with the spirit we find in *Sheridan's Ride*, and painted with such force as is seen in *Sheridan and his Horse*. Among his most charming pictures is his *Star of Bethlehem*. He died in Europe, where he had resided for over five years, while on his way home, May 11, 1872.

Reader, one of the five inferior orders of the Church of Rome. The office of reader is of great antiquity in the Church, dating as far back as the 3d century. It is, however, abundantly evident that it was not a distinct order, the reader (in the Latin Church at least) never having been admitted to his office by imposition of hands. According to the Council of Carthage, the Bible was put into the hands of the appointee, in presence of the people, with these words: "Take this book, and be thou a reader of the Word of God, which office thou shalt faithfully and profitably perform. Thou shalt have part with those who minister in the Word of God." At the time of the Reformation, readers were admitted in churches and chapels for which no clergyman could be procured, to the end that divine service in such places might not be altogether neglected. The office, or rather the name, is still continued in the Church of England. The following is the pledge to which, at the time of the Reformation, the *readers* were obliged to subscribe:

"*Imprimis*, I shall not preach or interpret, but only read that which is appointed by public authority. I shall not minister the sacraments or other public rites of the Church, but bury the dead, and purify women after their childbirth. I shall keep the register-book according to the injunctions. I shall use sobriety in apparel, and especially in the church at common prayer. I shall move men to quiet and concord, and not give them cause of offence. I shall bring in to my ordinary testimony of my behavior from the honest of the parish where I dwell, within one half year next following. I shall give place, upon convenient warning, so thought by the ordinary, if any learned minister shall be placed there at the suit of the patron of the parish. I shall claim no more of the fruits sequestered of such cure where I shall serve but as it shall be thought meet to the wisdom of the ordinary. I shall daily, at the least, read one chapter of the Old Testament, and one other of the New, with good advisement, to the increase of my knowledge. I shall not appoint in my room, by reason of my absence or sickness, any other man, but shall leave it to the suit of the parish to the ordinary for assigning some other able man. I shall not read but in poorer parishes, destitute of incumbents, except in the time of sickness, or for other good considerations to be allowed by the ordinary. I shall not openly intermeddle with any artificer's occupations, as covetously to seek a gain thereby, having in ecclesiastical living the sum of twenty nobles, or above, by the year."

In Scotland also, at the Reformation, readers were appointed to read the Scriptures and the common prayers —that is, the forms of the Church of Geneva. They were not allowed to preach or administer the sacraments. The readers were tempted now and then to overstep these limits, and were as often forbidden by the General Assembly, till, in 1581, the office was formally abolished. The *First Book of Discipline* says:

"To the churches where no ministers can be had presentlie must be appointed the most apt men that distinctlie can read the common praiers and the Scriptures, to exercise both themselves and the Church, till they grow to greater perfection: and in process of time he that is but a reader may attain to a farther degree, and, by consent of the Church and discreet ministers, may be permitted to minister the sacraments; but not before that he be able somewhat to perswade by wholesome doctrine, beside his reading, and be admitted to the ministerie, as before is said. . . . Nothing have we spoken of the stipend of readers, because, if they can do nothing but reade, they neither can be called nor judged true ministers, and yet regard must be had to their labors; but so that they may be spurred forward to vertue, and not by any stipend appointed for their reading to be retained in that estate. To a reader, therefore, that is newly entered, fourty merkes, or more or lesse, as parishioners and readers can agree, is sufficient: provided that he teach the children of the parish, which he must doe, besides the reading of the com-

mon prayers, and bookes of the Old and New Testament. If from reading he begin to exhort and explain the Scriptures, then ought his stipend to be augmented, till finally he come to the honour of a minister. But if he be found unable after two yeares, then must he be removed from that office, and discharged of all stipend, that another may be proved as long; for this alwaies is to be avoided, that none who is judged unable to come at any time to some reasonable knowledge, whereby he may edifie the Kirk, shall be perpetually sustained upon the charge of the Kirk. Farther, it must be avoided that no child, nor person within age—that is, within twentie-one yeares of age—be admitted to the office of a reader."

The name occurs, however, in Church records long after that period, for in many places the office was tacitly permitted. The precentor sometimes bore it; and exhorters—persons who read the Scriptures and added a few words of remark—were found in various towns. See PRECENTOR.

Reading, ORIENTAL MODE OF (Heb. קָרָא, *to call* aloud; *ἀναγινώσκω*). Mr. Jowett remarks, in his *Christian Researches in Syria*, etc., that "when persons are reading privately in a book, they usually go on reading aloud with a kind of singing voice, moving their heads and bodies in time, and making a monotonous cadence at regular intervals, thus giving emphasis, although not such an emphasis as would please an English ear. Very often they seem to read without perceiving the sense, and to be pleased with themselves merely because they can go through the mechanical art of reading in any way." This practice may enable us to "understand how it was that Philip should hear at what passage in Isaiah the Ethiopian eunuch was reading before he was invited to come up and sit with him in the chariot (Acts viii, 30, 31). The eunuch, though probably reading to himself, and not particularly designing to be heard by his attendants, would read loud enough to be understood by a person at some distance." See BOOK.

Reading, COUNCILS OF (*Concilia Redingensia*). The first of these was held in July, 1279, by archbishop Peckham of Canterbury, assisted by his suffragans. The twelve following constitutions were published:

1. Renews the twenty-ninth constitution of Othobon against pluralities, and directs bishops to cause a register to be kept of all incumbents in their dioceses, with all particulars relating to them and their livings.

2. Relates to commendaries, and declares such as are held otherwise than the constitution of Gregory, made in the Council of Lyons, 1273, permits, to be vacant.

3. Orders all priests, on the Sunday after every rural chapter, to explain to the people the sentences of excommunication decreed by the Council of Oxford in 1222; and to publish four times in each year the constitutions of Othobon concerning baptism at Easter and Pentecost, and that concerning concubinaries at the four principal rural chapters, the laity being first dismissed.

4. Orders that children born within eight days of Pentecost and Easter shall be reserved to be baptized at these times; but that children born at other times shall be baptized at once, for fear of sudden death.

5. Orders the eighth constitution of Othobon (1268) against concubinary priests to be read openly in the four principal rural chapters, and declares that such reading shall be taken as a monition. If the dean or his deputy neglect this, he is directed to fast every Friday on bread and water until the next chapter.

6. Relates to the chrism: orders that what remains of the old chrism shall be burned when the new is consecrated; directs that priests shall be bound to fetch the chrism for their churches every year from their bishops before Easter; forbids to use any other than the new chrism, under the heaviest penalties.

7. Orders that the consecrated host be kept in a fair pyx, within a tabernacle; that a fresh host be consecrated every Lord's day; that it be carried to the sick by a priest in surplice and stole, a lantern being carried before and a bell sounded, that the people may "make humble adoration wheresoever the King of Glory is carried under the cover of bread."

8. Declares the custom of praying for the dead to be "holy and wholesome;" and ordains that upon the death of any bishop of the province of Canterbury his surviving brethren shall perform a solemn office for the dead, both singly in their chapels, and together, when called to assemble in council or otherwise, after the death of the said bishop; orders, further, every priest to say one mass for the soul of his deceased diocesan, and entreats all exempt religious priests and seculars to do likewise.

9. Relates to the preaching of indulgences, and orders caution in so doing, "lest the keys of the Church be despised."

10. Forbids to set free, or admit to purgation, on slight grounds, clerks who, having been put in prison for their crimes, are delivered to the Church as convicts.

11. Enjoins that care be taken to preserve the chastity of friars and nuns; forbids them to sojourn long in the houses of their parents and friends.

12. Forbids parishioners to dispose of the grass, trees, or roots growing in consecrated ground; leaves such produce at the disposal of the rectors; forbids the latter, without sufficient cause, to spoil or grub up such trees as are an ornament to the churchyards and places thereabouts.

Then follows (in some copies) an injunction that the clergy of each diocese should send at least *two* deputies to the next congregation, to treat with the bishops for the common interests of the Church of England. This injunction, however, is by some persons said to be not genuine. In this same council a deed protecting the liberties of the scholars at Oxford was drawn up, in which the archbishop declared that, "moved by their devout prayers, he received under his protection their persons and property, and confirmed to them and their successors the liberties and immunities granted to them by bishops, kings, and others of the faithful;" it is also provided that sentences of suspension and excommunication passed by the chancellor, or his deputies, etc., upon men on account of offences committed by them in the university shall be put into execution throughout the province of Canterbury; further, it is ordered that the benefices of clerks found in arms by day or night, to the disturbance of the peace of the university, shall be sequestered for three years; and if the clerks so offending be unbeneficed, they shall be incapable of holding any benefice for five years, unless they shall make competent satisfaction in the interim.

Thirteen prelates attended this council, viz. the archbishop, and the bishops of Lincoln, Salisbury, Winchester, Exeter, Chichester, Worcester, Bath, Llandaff, Hereford, Norwich, Bangor, and Rochester.—Johnson, *Eccles. Canons;* Labbé, *Concil.* xi, 1062; Wilkins, *Concil.* ii, 33.

Reading-desk, the desk or pew from which the minister reads the morning and evening prayer. In the early part of the reign of Edward VI it was the custom of the minister to perform divine service at the upper end of the choir, near the communion-table; towards which, whether standing or kneeling, he always turned his face in the prayers. This being objected to, a new rubric was introduced (in the fifth year of king Edward), directing the minister to turn so that the people might best hear. In some churches, however, the too great distance of the chancel from the body of the church hindered the minister from being distinctly heard by the people; therefore the bishops, at the solicitation of the clergy, allowed them in several places to supersede their former practice, and to have desks or reading-pews in the body of the church; which dispensation, begun at first by some few ordinaries, grew by degrees to be more general, till at last it came to be a universal practice; insomuch that the Convocation, in the beginning of the reign of James I, ordered that in every church there should be a "convenient seat made for the minister to read service in." It is remarkable that the reading-desk is only once recognised in the Prayer-book, viz. in the rubric prefixed to the Commination; and also that the rubric prefixed to the Communion office supposes the continuance of the old practice of reading the service in the choir or chancel. See AMBO; LECTERN.

Reading-in, a form required of each incumbent on taking possession of his cure in the Church of England. The minute of the procedure is as follows:

"*Memorandum*, That on Sunday, the —— day of ——, in the year of our Lord ——, the reverend A B, clerk, rector, or vicar of ——, in the county of —— and diocese of ——, did read in this church of —— aforesaid the articles of religion commonly called the Thirty-nine Articles, agreed upon in Convocation in the year of our Lord 1562, and did declare his unfeigned assent and con-

sent thereto; also, that he did publicly and openly, on the day and year aforesaid, in the time of divine service, read a declaration in the following words, viz. 'I, A B, declare that I will conform to the liturgy of the United Church of England and Ireland as it is now by law established.' Together with a certificate under the right hand of the reverend ——, by divine permission lord bishop of ——, of his having made and subscribed the same before him; and also that the said A B did read in his parish church aforesaid, publicly and solemnly, the morning and evening prayer, according to the form prescribed in and by the book intituled the *Book of Common Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments, and other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church, according to the Use of the Church of England; together with the Psalter or Psalms of David, printed as they are to be sung or said in Churches; and the Form and Manner of Making, Ordaining, and Consecrating Bishops, Priests, and Deacons;* and that immediately after reading the evening service, the said A B did openly and publicly, before the congregation there assembled, declare his unfeigned assent and consent to all things therein contained and prescribed, in these words, viz. 'I, A B, do declare my unfeigned assent and consent to all and everything contained and prescribed in and by the book intituled the *Book of Common Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments, and other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church; according to the Use of the Church of England, together with the Psalter or Psalms of David, printed as they are to be sung or said in Churches, and the Form and Manner of Making, Ordaining, and Consecrating Bishops, Priests, and Deacons.*' And these things we promise to testify upon our corporal oaths, if at any time we should be duly called upon so to do. In witness whereof we have hereunto set our hands, the day and year first above written."

Reading, John, an English theologian, was born in 1588, in the county of Buckingham. He was curate at Dover, and afterwards chaplain of Charles I, but he manifested so much zeal in defending the cause of the king that in 1642 he was cast into prison, where he remained seventeen months. Archbishop Laud having conferred upon him, during his detention at the Tower, the parish of Chatham and a prebend at Canterbury, the king would not allow him to take possession of either of these benefices; and he even had a new imprisonment to undergo. When in 1660 Charles II landed at Dover, it was Reading who was first congratulated, upon his return, on the renown of the city. We have several religious works written by Reading, among others, *A Guide to the Holy City* (Oxford, 1651, 4to):—*An Antidote to Anabaptism* (1654, 4to); also several sermons. Reading died Oct. 26, 1667, at Chatham, Kent. See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s. v.

Reading, William, an Anglican divine, flourished in the early opening of last century as keeper of the Library of Sion College, London. He prepared an edition of the early ecclesiastical historians (Eusebius, etc.) in Greek and Latin, with notes (Cantab. 1720, 3 vols.). He also wrote, *Sermons* (1714, 8vo):—*Hist. of Jesus Christ* (Lond. 1716, 12mo; 1851, 32mo; 1852, 32mo):—*Sermons—Mortification, Holiness,* etc. (1724, 8vo):—*Bibliothecæ Cleri Londinensis in Collegio Sionesi Catalogus Duplici Forma concinnatus* (1724, fol.):—*Sermons Preached out of the First Lessons of Every Sunday in the Year, with an Appendix of Six Sermons* (4 vols. 8vo—i, ii, 1728; iii, iv, 1730; 1755, 4 vols. 8vo); very rare; commended by D'Oyle and Maret in their *Commentary on the Bible:*—*Sermons* (1731, 8vo):—*Tracts on Government* (1739, 8vo).

Readings, VARIOUS. See VARIOUS READINGS.

Reai'a (1 Chron. v, 5). See REAIAH.

Reai'ah (Heb. *Reayah'*, רְאָיָה, *seen of Jehovah*), the name of three Hebrews.

1. (Sept. Ῥάδα v. r. Ῥειά.) A "son" of Shobal son of Judah (1 Chron. iv, 2). B.C. post 1658. He is apparently designated by the epithet *Haroeh* (הָרֹאֶה, *ha-Roëh, the seer;* Sept. Ἀραά, Vulg. *qui videbat;* evidently a mere corruption of *Reaiah*). See SHOBAL.

2. (Sept. Ῥηχά.) The son of Micah and father of Baal, apparently phylarchs of the tribe of Reuben not long before the invasion of Tiglath-Pileser (1 Chron. v, 5, A. V. "Reaia"). B.C. ante 720.

3. (Sept. Ῥαιά v. r. Ῥααιά, etc.) One of the Nethinim whose posterity returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel (Ezra ii, 47; Neh. vii, 50). B.C. ante 536.

Real Presence, in the eucharist, is a doctrine forming an article in the belief of the Roman, the Greek, and other Eastern churches, and of some bodies or individuals in other Christian communions. Those who espouse the *real presence* in the eucharist hold that, under the appearance of the eucharistic bread and wine, after consecration by the minister, Christ himself is really and substantially present, body and blood, soul and divinity. The word *really* is used in opposition to "figuratively;" and the decree of the Council of Trent, which is the authoritative expositor of the Roman Catholic belief, conjoins with that word the terms "truly" and "substantially," the former being used in order to exclude the notion of a barely *typical* representation, such as is recognisable in the Paschal Lamb and the other Messianic types of the old law; and the latter for the purpose of meeting the view ascribed to Calvin, that Christ, as apprehended by the faith of the believer, was, for such believer, rendered virtually present in the eucharist, and that his body and blood were received in virtue and efficacy, although not in corporal substance. See LORD'S SUPPER.

In the Protestant churches of the Reformation, this question became a matter of serious conflict between Lutherans and Zwinglians. The belief of the Roman and Eastern churches as to the reality of the presence was shared by Luther, who, however, differed from Catholics as to the mode. One school of divines in the Anglican Church, whose doctrine became very prominent in the time of Laud, and has been revived in the late Tractarian movement, also hold to transubstantiation in such a forbidding form to the Protestants as to stand entirely alone within the fold of Protestantism. Yet it must be remarked that between Roman Catholics and all other theological schools, of whatever class, one marked difference exists. According to the former, the presence of Christ in the consecrated eucharist is *permanent;* so that he is believed to be present not alone for the communicant who receives the eucharist during the time of his communion, but also remains present in the consecrated hosts reserved after communion. On the contrary, all the Lutherans, and almost all Anglicans, confine their belief of the presence to the time of communion, and all, with hardly an exception, repudiate the worship of the reserved elements, as it is practiced by Catholics. See CONSUBSTANTIATION; LUTHERANISM.

In the Protestant Episcopal Church, while the "real presence" is undoubtedly held, yet it is considered as of a spiritual and heavenly character. The homily on the sacrament expressly asserts, "Thus much we must be sure to hold, that in the supper of the Lord there is no vain ceremony, no bare sign, no untrue figure of a thing absent; but the communion of the body and blood of the Lord in a marvellous incorporation, which by the operation of the Holy Ghost is through faith wrought in the souls of the faithful," etc. In the Office of the Communion, the elements are repeatedly designated as the body and blood of Christ; and after their reception we give thanks that God "doth vouchsafe to feed us, who have duly received these holy mysteries, with the spiritual food of the most precious body and blood of [his] Son our Saviour Jesus Christ." The Catechism, in agreement with this, defines the "inward part" of this sacrament to be "the body and blood of Christ, which are spiritually taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's supper." The 28th Article asserts, respecting the eucharist, that "to such as rightly, worthily, and with faith receive the same, the bread which we break is a partaking of the body of Christ; and, likewise, the cup of blessing is a partaking of the blood of Christ." "By maintaining this view," says Stoughton, "the Church supports the dignity of this holy sacrament without involving the dogma of transubstantiation, which she everywhere repudiates, asserting that it

cannot be proved by Holy Writ, but it is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions." Instead of this—i. e. a corporal presence by the change of the elements into the natural body and blood of Christ—she goes on to assert that "the body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the supper only after a heavenly and spiritual manner. And the mean whereby the body of Christ is received and eaten in the supper is faith" (Article XXVIII). See Waterland, *Works*, vol. vi; Willet, *Syn. Pap.*; Wheatley, *Common Prayer*; Hooker, *Ch. Polity*; *North Brit. Rev.* Jan. 1870, p. 272. See TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

Realino, BERNARDINO, an Italian Jesuit scholar, was born Dec. 1, 1530, at Carpi. Son of a gentleman in the service of Luigi di Gonzaga, he received an excellent education at Modena, and graduated at Bologna. He studied jurisprudence, and made himself known by a commentary upon the *Nuptials of Thetis and Peleus* of Catullus (Bologna, 1551, 4to), when one of his parents began an unjust lawsuit to take away part of his fortune. The affair lasted a long time, and was finally left to the verdict of an arbitrator, who hastened to decide against Realino without even hearing him. About the time of the encounter at Carpi, this arbitrator addressed him in very strong terms, and, in great wrath, Realino gave him a sword-cut in the face. Condemned for this bold action, the young man fled to Bologna. Made doctor of law in 1556, he obtained in the same year the office of magistrate of Felizzano, a borough of Milan; after this he became attorney of Alessandria; then the marquis of Peschiera gave him control of the vast domains which he possessed in the kingdom of Naples. At the age of thirty-four he grew weary of the world, arranged his affairs, and entered, at Naples, the Society of Jesus (1564). He there distinguished himself by a zeal, a patience, and a charity for the poor in which he was always consistent. Having received, in 1574, the order to lay the foundation of a college at Lecce, he did it just before his death. An inquiry was started to establish his rights to canonization, but the court of Rome refused the application. Realino composed quite a number of small books, mentioned by Sotwel; his notes upon ancient authors have been inserted in vol. ii of the *Thesaurus Criticus* of Gruter. — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.

Realism is a distinct and readily apprehended doctrine in the higher ranges of metaphysics, characterizing the whole scheme of speculation with which it may be associated. A Realist is one who maintains this doctrine. Realism asserts that *General Terms*, or *Ideas*, as they are called by Plato, such as *Man*, *Horse*, *Plant*, have a substantive, or real, existence independent of their actual and individual manifestations. This dogma early encountered opposition, which became so violent in the 12th and ensuing centuries as to distract philosophy, and to excite controversies that disturbed creeds and kingdoms, and that still survive, though in disguised forms and with greatly diminished virulence. The war of words frequently proceeded to blows and slaughter. Excommunication often attended the less popular side. Tracts, pamphlets, and formidable volumes were sustained or resisted with carnal and sanguinary weapons. Communities were divided by the bitter logomachy into hostile factions. The Church swarmed with discords. Universities were arrayed against each other, or were torn by intestine dissensions. Cities were opposed to cities; states to states; one religious order to another; and the conflict between the temporal and spiritual sovereignty was exacerbated and widened by the metaphysical strife. Brucker, and multitudes less cognizant than he of the influence of metaphysical conclusions on the condition and conduct of governments and societies, have superciliously sneered at these envenomed and long-enduring contentions, as merely the blind sophistries of men bewildered by vain abstractions or futile fantasies. But a philosophical problem which has remained unsolved for thousands of years, which engrossed and embattled the most acute intellects for centuries, and which has not yet ceased to produce perplexity and division; which enlisted the zeal alike of the scholar and the people, the priest and the prince, can be regarded as frivolous only by those who fail to discern the intellectual forces and associations by which the progress of the world is moulded. Sir William Hamilton, indeed, doubts the continued existence of any Realist doctrine, and regards it "as curious only in a historical point of view;" but this opinion apparently results from inattention to the transformations which speculative tenets undergo, and to the vitality of old doctrines through the instrumentality of new disguises. There is a true metempsychosis of metaphysical questions:

> "Nec manet ut fuerat, nec formas servat easdem,
> Sed tamen ipsa eadem est: animam sic semper eandem
> Esse, sed in varias doceo migrare figuras."

Sir William Hamilton's scant notices of Realism and Nominalism are ingenious, subtle, delicate, but they want compass, completeness, and depth.

Twin-born with Realism was *Nominalism* (q. v.), its direct opposite, which strenuously denies the reality of *General Terms*, and maintains that they are names only, logical entities, convenient artifices of expression (*nomina mera*, *voces nudæ*, *flatus vocis*, articulated air, "*vox et præterea nihil*"). Springing, as these antagonist views do, from the weakness of the human mind, which is unable to comprehend the primordial origin of being, and which is inevitably inclined to consider its imperfect knowledge complete and conclusive, the opposition began with the beginning of systematic speculation, accompanied its development, and acquired predominance in the ages characterized by dialectical earnestness and verbal precision. The contradictory tenets were upheld by rival sects of Hindû philosophers; they produced a wide severance of opinion in the brightest æra of Greek philosophy; they remained irreconcilable, though at times indistinct, in the schools of Alexandria; they burst out into clamorous fury in the Middle Ages, when the loftiest intellects were employed in laying the foundations of systematic theology and of orthodox expression.

Between the extreme and contradictory schemes of Realism and Nominalism was interposed, chiefly by the keen perspicacity of Abelard, but in accordance with the probable views of Aristotle, a doctrine of compromise which has been designated Conceptualism. The Conceptualist theory holds that *General Notions*, or *Universals*, have a real existence in individuals, but no real or substantial being without them. It recognises their positive existence in the mind, which derives them by abstraction and generalization from particulars, and employs them as the signs or names of the classes of concrete realities to which they are applicable. The Realist doctrine is that, before Socrates, Plato, and Phædo, or any other individual men existed, *Man*, as an abstract idea, had an essential and immutable reality, and that Socrates, Plato, and Phædo were men solely in consequence of possessing this ideal manhood—*κατὰ μέθεξιν*. The Nominalist, on the other hand, alleged that humanity existed only in Socrates, Plato, Phædo, and other individuals; that the term was only an intellectual device for indicating the common properties characteristic of Socrates, Plato, and Phædo by giving them the general name *Man*, and thus embracing them in one class. The Conceptualist agreed with the Nominalist in refusing an absolute existence to the general term *Man*, and in assigning to it a *real* existence only in conjunction with Socrates, Plato, Phædo, etc., but he endeavored to satisfy the demands of the Realist by admitting that the conception *Man*, attained by abstraction and generalization from individuals, had an actual existence, and was an intelligible reality in the mind apprehending it. Thus Abelard was antagonist at once to Will-

iam of Champeaux and to Roscellinus. Employing the quaint but precise language of the schoolmen, the Realists held *universalia esse ante rem;* the Nominalists, *universalia esse post rem;* the Conceptualists of various types, *universalia esse in re.* To the last should be added *et etiam in intellectu.* These distinctions may appear shadowy and impalpable, but metaphysics dwells amid such "airy shapes," and these have had a marked influence and serious consequences in politics, law, morals, philosophy, and religion: "inclusas animas, superumque ad lumen ituras."

Nominalism has already met with due consideration. See NOMINALISM. The present notice will consequently be confined to Realism, except so far as Nominalism and Conceptualism may be inextricably entwined with it.

I. *Origin of Realism.*—It would be misplaced industry, and inconsistent with the brevity required here, to investigate the Realist doctrines which were entertained and developed in the philosophy of the Hindûs. But the mediæval dogma is so intimately connected with the tenor of Greek speculation that a reference to its remote source in the schools of Athens cannot be avoided. The controversy between Realism and Nominalism did not become predominant in speculation till the close of the 11th century, but the antagonism was distinctly declared from the times of Plato and Aristotle. The wide differences which separated the schemes of the great teacher and his greater pupil in their explanation of the intelligible universe (*mundus intelligibilis*) were plainly manifest to the successors of those great heresiarchs. The doctrine of Plato and the earnest opposition of Aristotle may be best appreciated by the careful consideration of the multitudinous passages in the text of Aristotle referred to in the index of Bonitz (Aristotelis *Opera* [ed. Acad. Berolin.], vol. iv) under the head of "Plato, 2." Evidences not merely of the continued antagonism of the Academic and Peripatetic schools, but also of the recognition of the gravity and the consequences of this antagonism, are abundant in the subsequent ages. It may suffice to refer to Plotinus (*Ennead.* III, ix, 1; V, v, 1; IX, iii, 10), to a passage in Porphyry, which will soon require to be cited, and to Hesychius Milesius (Fr. 7, ii, 53, *Fragm. Histor. Græc.* iv, 173), who has stated clearly and precisely the Platonic thesis (Ἔστι δὲ τῶν εἰδῶν ἓν ἕκαστον ἀΐδιόν τε καὶ νόημα καὶ πρὸς τούτοις ἀπαθές. Διὸ καί φησιν ἐν τῇ φύσει τὰς ἰδέας ἑστάναι καθάπερ παραδείγματα, τὰ δ' ἄλλα ταύταις ἐοικέναι, τούτων ὁμοιώματα καθεστῶτα). But the divergence of the schools in regard to *Universals,* or *genera generalissima,* and to abstract notions generally, remained an indeterminate disputation in the Hellenic world, and was not raised to supreme importance till it passed, in the mediæval period, from transcendental ontology to dialectics and theology. The germ of the grand debate is found in one of the associates of the Neo-Platonic schools, but it scarcely vegetated till the scholastic period. Porphyry had said, in his introduction to the *Categories* of Aristotle (*Schol. Aristot.* ap. Aristot. *Opera* [ed. Acad. Berolin.], iii, 1), that he would abstain from the more recondite inquiries, and aim only at a concise presentation of the simpler topics. "For," he proceeds, "I will decline to speak of the essential character of genera and species, or to inquire whether they are substantially corporeal or incorporeal, and whether they are separable or existent only in perception, since this is a most profound investigation, and requires other and deeper examination." The Greek of Porphyry was almost entirely unknown to mediæval speculators, but the Latin paraphrase of Boethius was familiar to them, and constituted, as it were, a text-book of elementary logic. Thus the question of the nature of *Universals* was distinctly raised, and the opposite views which were entertained on the subject divided reasoners into hostile camps, and led to those passionate controversies which have been already alluded to. It was only gradually, however, that the opposition became clear and well marked, and connected itself closely with the gravest interests that have occupied the minds of men. In the first half of the 9th century, Rabanus Maurus, commenting on the text of Porphyry just quoted, but using the version of Boethius, recognises the conflict of opinion (Cousin, *Introd. aux Œuvres Inédits d'Abélard,* p. 77), and is supposed to have inclined to the Nominalistic side (Caraman, *Hist. des Rév. de la Philosophie,* i, 249). It would probably be more correct to conclude that he sought a ground of conciliation between the two extremes. The difficult problem was, however, brought forward into distinct contemplation. If there was any tendency in Rabanus Maurus to what was afterwards known as Nominalism, the reaction showed itself promptly. In the next generation, the philosophy of Johannes Scotus Erigena, which was founded on an imperfect acquaintance with the Neo-Platonic teachings, ran into decided Pantheism, in accordance with the results of those teachings, as developed by Plotinus. Regarding God as the source whence all things proceed, by which all things are sustained, and to which all things return—representing creation as the self-evolution of the Creator, and destruction as the self-reabsorption, he rendered God all things and all things God. The basis of his whole scheme was involved in the Platonic theory of ideas [see PLATONIC PHILOSOPHY], and in the Realist tenet *universalia ante rem.* Not merely were the body and spirit of Scotus's philosophy heterodox, but it contained several particular conclusions which were deemed heretical, and which provoked the ecclesiastical censure which they received. The Pantheistic doctrines of Scotus Erigena naturally excited opposition when the results to which they led became apparent. If God were all things, then necessarily all things would be essentially God—being the external and phenomenal manifestations of the divine activity, and constituting, at the same time, the divine essence, inasmuch as their whole support was a real existence in the divine substance. It is the inevitable tendency of a metaphysical dogma to be unfolded by its acolytes into its ultimate logical consequences, which reveal the extravagances and the hazards of the position. It is the inevitable tendency of such revelation to arouse antagonism, and to suggest security in the opposite extreme. By such oscillation between contradictory tenets, the human intellect is kept from stagnation, and research and meditation are constantly stimulated. The Pantheism of Scotus Erigena annihilated independent individual existence and individual responsibility; and it obliterated the distinction between the Creator and the creation. The refutation of his errors was sought in the examination and denial of his premises, as well as in the repudiation of his conclusions. His views had been founded on the supposititious writings of Dionysius the Areopagite, which were steeped in Neo-Platonism (q. v.). Their antidote was expected from the school of Aristotle, whose logical opinions were gradually disseminated throughout Western Europe, through Saracenic and Jewish channels, and which had been partially known through Boethius during nearly all mediæval times.

But the latter part of the 9th, the whole of the 10th, and most of the 11th century were eminently unfavorable to diligent study and tranquil speculation. It was the period of Arab ravage and encroachment in the Eastern Empire; the period of the ruthless descents of Danes and Northmen in the Western; the period when the reigning dynasties of France and England were changed; when Italy was distracted by invasions and by wars between contending emperors; and when the fierce strife between the secular and spiritual authority became peculiarly acrimonious. As the result of these wide-spread disturbances, discord and anarchy, lawlessness and rapine, general wretchedness and insecurity prevailed. Two centuries thus elapsed before the great question of *Universals* distinctly emerged out of the earlier discordances of opinion. Towards their conclu-

sion, a purely theological question had arisen, which recalled eager inquiry into the nature of *Universals*. This was the denial of transubstantiation by Berengarius on grounds which implied Nominalism.

About the same time, the doctrine of Nominalism was explicitly asserted by Roscellinus, a canon of Compiègne. He has been usually regarded as the founder of the sect, but may have been preceded by his master, Johannes Surdus (John the Deaf), of whom very little is known. Roscellinus held that "*genera* and *species* are not realities, but only words denoting abstractions;" that, consequently, "there are no such things as universals, but only individuals." Realism is thus directly contradicted. These speculations pointed towards dangerous heresies in theology. Roscellinus, denying all but individual existences, assailed the unity of persons in the Trinity, and thus maintained Tritheism. The Church was at once aroused. Numerous confutations were propounded, the most celebrated of which was the tractate of Anselm, archbishop of Canterbury, *De Fide Trinitatis*. Anselm holds the Realist doctrine of *Universals*, and is occasionally betrayed into extravagance. His polemics is, however, theological rather than dialectical or metaphysical. He attacks perilous errors in religious belief, and assails speculative opinions only incidentally. Rémusat, while considering him a decided Realist, deems that his prominence in the controversy between Realism and Nominalism has been exaggerated (Rémusat, *St. Anselme*, pt. ii, ch. iii, p. 494). Efforts were made to reconcile the conflict between the discordant doctrines, but they only rendered the issue and the antagonism more pronounced. William de Champeaux (De Campbellis) held that "the *Universal* or *genus* is something real; the individuals composing the genus have no diversity of essence, but only of accidental elements." This is the first precise asseveration of Realism in mediæval philosophy. With William de Champeaux "the essence of things is ascribed to the *genera*, the individual is reduced to a simple accident. With Roscellinus, the individuals alone exist, and they constitute the essence of things. With Champeaux, the essence of things is in the *genera* to which they belong, for so far as they are individuals they are only accidents" (Caraman, *Hist. des Rév. de la Phil.* vol. ii, ch. ii, p. 48).

Thenceforward the great controversy proceeds with increasing ardor, and furnishes the battle-field for the rival schools and rival schoolmen of the Middle Ages. The further consideration of these dissensions belongs, however, more appropriately to the discussion of the development of scholasticism. See SCHOLASTICISM.

II. *Nature of Realism.* — The general character of Realism has been exhibited sufficiently to render its origin and evolution intelligible. A fuller explanation is needed to enable us to understand the importance which it assumed in mediæval speculation. Cicero has said that "there is nothing so absurd as not to have been maintained by some of the philosophers." It is easier to ridicule than to appreciate the reveries of philosophy. The aberrations of metaphysics and the paradoxes of dialectics are only the zealous and inadequate expression of far-reaching truths imperfectly apprehended. We certainly should not complain of either the excesses or the blindness of the schoolmen, in an age which is inclined to accept protoplasm as a sufficient explanation of all life, and evolution as a complete exposition of creation, or a substitute for it. Yet, even in these cases, much is charged upon the hierophants which they do not accept as part of their doctrines. Realism was the mediæval and dialectical reproduction of the Platonic ideas. It asserted that general terms, such as *Man*, *Horse*, *Tree*, *Flower*, etc., were not merely logical devices, creatures of abstraction, ingenuities of language, but were realities, separable (χωριστά) from the being of individual *men*, *horses*, *trees*, *flowers*, etc. In Plato and the Platonic school these ideas were supposed to have a real, primordial, changeless, and eternal existence in the Divine Mind, as the archetypes of all things that are made. It demands no extraordinary range of intellect to point out the presumption of attempting to determine the contents of the Divine Mind and the modes of its procedure in ordering the creation. It needs no great intellectual effort to dilate upon the practical incongruities of representing Socrates as a transitory accident; having no real existence except so far as he partakes of the one, universal, ideal *Man*, who is immortal, incorporeal, immaterial, and unchangeable; communicated and communicable to all men, past, present, and future; completely contained in each, yet abundant for all, and independent of each and of all. These objections blink or evade the subtleties of the problem. These sneers do not reach the difficulty with which the greatest philosophers have struggled, and struggled in vain. No doubt our knowledge of *generals* and *specials* is attained (so far as the human mind is capable of ascertaining the process of attaining knowledge) by abstraction from individual things observed, and by recombination of their accordant characteristics. No doubt the abstract terms, so arrived at, are the instruments of linguistic and logical classification, which we employ unsuspiciously in reasoning and conversation. But is this all? Is this a complete solution of the enigma? Is it not a mere screen which conceals the real enigma from us? There is a general, not an individual, resemblance between all men—*homo simillimus homini —nihil similius homini quam homo*. They are alike in consequence of their participation in a common humanity. Our knowledge of this humanity may be—must be—derived by generalization from the common characteristics of all men. But, again, it should be asked, Is this all? Does our knowledge precede or follow this possession of a common humanity? Does it do anything more than recognise its presence? How does the common humanity come into existence? How does it continue in existence? How is it to be interpreted? Is there no plan or order in creation? No eternal design in the purposes of the Creator? Is everything spasmodical, momentary creation, with observance of antecedent forms? Whence, then, such observance, and the maintenance of uniformity, and all the characteristics of preordination? How does it occur that the earth proceeds ever to "bring forth the living creature *after his kind*, cattle and creeping thing, and beast of the earth *after his kind*," if the several kinds and genera and species are mere abstractions, pure figments of the generalizing faculty? Did this unvarying observance of the type arise, without any reality of the type, by the accidental collision of atoms in all the infinite variety of their hypothetical contacts, and by survival of the fittest, through self-adaptation to their shifting surroundings? No permanent forms, transmitted from generation to generation, from age to age, could thus be maintained. The unmitigated repudiation of Realism leads straight to the acceptance of the creed of Lucretius and Darwin and Herbert Spencer.

> "Nam certe neque consilio Primordia rerum
> Ordini se quæque, atque sagaci mente locarunt:
> Nec quos quæque darent motus pepigere profecto;
> Sed quia multimodis, multis, mutata, per Omne
> Ex infinito vexantur percita plagis,
> Omne genus motus, et cœtus experiundo,
> Tandem devenient in taleis disposituras,
> Qualibus hæc rebus consistit summa creata;
> Et multos etiam magnos servata per annos,
> Ut semel in motus conjecta 'st convenienteis."

The answer of the Epicurean herd will not solve the riddles proposed. Realism offered a very different solution, which, however inadequate and unsatisfactory it may be deemed, did not affect to treat the questions as shallow or unimportant. But may there not be some genuine truth, obscured, disguised, mutilated, lame—yet, nevertheless, struggling into meaning, in the theory of Realism? Is there not a plan, a divine order, throughout all creation? Are there not types—intelligible, potential, not actual types—to be accounted for? Has a conception of the reason—never varying, but per-

sisting as long as the reason and the objects of reason endure — has such a conception a less real existence than the concrete and material, or individual forms which correspond to the conception, but which are changing at all times during their existence, and are born to perish? The existence is of very different character, but is it less truly existence? The ambiguity and vagueness of their terms may not have been recognised by the mediæval Idealists and Realists. Are they always clearly apprehended by their critics? Have the censors of Realism fully appreciated the incomprehensibility and variability of the Realist doctrine without loss of its distinctive character and without sacrifice of its essential tenet? Doubtless the theory of Realism was indistinct, not rigorously determined, and scarcely palpable. Doubtless the modes of its statement were obnoxious to grave exceptions, and led to misapprehensions and misconceptions on the part even of its advocates. The subjects with which the theory dealt may very well lie beyond any determinate grasp of the human faculties. But an earnest effort was made to interpret the great mysteries of existence—the permanence of type, with the variability and fragility of all embodiments of the type. This world may be "all a fleeting show, for man's illusion given;" but is there nothing unseen behind it which is true, and which furnishes its unalterable patterns? There is some justification, or at least some elucidation, of the thesis of the Realists to be deduced from the conclusions of comparative anatomy. Aristotle taught that the skeletons of the beast, the bird, and the fish revealed a common type, with characteristic deviations (*De Part. Animal.*). Six centuries later, Lactantius, or the Pseudo-Lactantius, reproduced the same tenet in a remarkable passage: "Una dispositio, et unus habitus, innumerabiles imaginis præferat varietates" (*De Opific. Dei*, c. vii). In our own day, the distinguished comparative anatomist Owen has demonstrated the validity of the conjecture of Aristotle by his work *On the Archetypal Skeleton of Vertebrate Animals;* and Dr. M'Cosh has given, perhaps without full recognition of its import, a most instructive application of the principle in his *Typical Forms and Special Ends in Creation.* Is there no truth, no validity, no reality in the types?

Is Realism, then, to be regarded as true? By no means. It only contains an element, an unsegregated element, of truth. It is a very important element, but it is dimly entertained and extravagantly expressed. Is its opposite, Nominalism, true? Again the answer must be, By no means. It contemplates only one side of the truth; runs into equal extravagance, and excludes utterly the indispensable particle of truth contained in the adverse doctrine. Is the truth attained by combining the antagonistic views? Not so. The two schemes cannot be united, and can scarcely be reconciled, except by regarding them as imperfect expositions from opposite points of view. Moreover, two partial and fragmentary truths can never make the whole truth. Truth is a consistent, harmonious, organic whole. It can never be attained by dovetailing patches of truth, or by forming a mosaic.

Philosophy, in its development, is a series of erroneous and conflicting positions. One extreme provokes another extreme; but the conception of first principles, and the range of deductions from them, become enlarged and cleared with the progress and succession of errors, although the full and precise truth may never be reached.

The truth which seems to be involved in Realism is this: Universals, genera, species, represent the permanent forms of the intelligible creation. They attest a settled and regular order in the sensible universe. They reveal a preordained, or predetermined, plan in the several classes of existence; an enduring truth; an abiding uniformity in the midst of individual deviations and transitory manifestations; a design habitually fulfilled; types which subsist, though actualities vanish. A part, at least, of the error of Realism—for neither its whole truth nor its whole error can be distinctly grasped and perspicuously expressed—consisted in presenting these important conclusions in an exaggerated form, so that they contradicted the partial truth equally involved in Nominalism: that individuals have a real as well as an actual existence, and that the generic and specific terms which are habitually employed, and are indispensable in language, are modes of classifying our perceptions and conceptions, and are used altogether independently of any ulterior suggestions which may be implicated in them.

The Nominalist denied a metaphysical truth because it was not embraced within the sphere of his logical requirements. The Realist assailed the logical truth because it failed to embrace an ontological explanation, and appeared to be at variance with it.

Bitter contradictions and acrimonious hostilities necessarily resulted from the antagonism, in consequence of the inevitable association of the conflicting doctrines with adverse parties and interests in theology, in Church and in State.

III. *Literature.*—The historians of philosophy, who embrace the philosophy of the Middle Ages, necessarily pay much attention to Realism and Nominalism. More special sources of information are, Caraman, *Hist. des Révolutions de la Philosophie en France;* Baumgarten Crusius, *De Vero Scholast. Real. et Nominal. Discrimine* (Jena, 1821); Cousin, *Fragmens Philosophiques* (Paris, 1840); id. *Introd. aux Œuvres Inédits d'Abélard;* Exner, *Nominalismus und Realismus* (Prague, 1842); Köhler, *Realismus und Nominalismus in ihrem Einfluss auf die dogmat. Syst. des Mittelalt.* (Gotha, 1857); Hauréau, *Philosophie Scolastique* (Paris, 1858); Cupely, *Esprit de la Philosophie Scolastique* (ibid. 1868). Much valuable suggestion may also be obtained from Rémusat, *Abélard* (ibid. 1845, 2 vols.); id. *St. Anselme* (ibid. 1853). To these may be added, Emerson, *Realism and Nominalism.* (G. F. H.)

Reanointers is the name of a Russian sect, which dates from about the year 1770. They do not rebaptize those who join them from the Greek Church, but they insist upon their having the chrism again administered to them. They are said to be especially numerous in Moscow. See Russian Sects.

Reaping (קָצַר, *katsar', to cut off;* θερίζω). Reaping in Palestine was usually done by the sickle, to which reference is occasionally made in Scripture. See Sickle. But there can be little doubt that the modern practice of pulling up by the roots, instead of cutting the corn, also prevailed to a considerable extent in ancient times. The corn seldom yields so much straw as in this country, and pulling is resorted to in order to obtain a larger supply of fodder. Maundrell thus describes the practice as he noticed it in 1697: "All that occurred to us new in these days' travel was a particular way used by the country people in gathering their corn, it being now harvest-time. They plucked it up by handfuls from the roots, leaving the most fruitful fields as naked as if nothing had ever grown on them. This was their practice in all the places of the East that I have seen; and

Ancient Egyptians Reaping.

the reason is that they may lose none of their straw, which is generally very short, and necessary for the sustenance of their cattle, no hay being here made. I mention this," he adds, "because it seems to give light to that expression of the Psalms (cxxix, 6), 'which withereth before it be plucked up,' where there seems to be a manifest allusion to the custom." This undoubtedly is the correct meaning of the expression; and the real allusion is lost sight of by the rendering in the A. V., "before it groweth up." It grows, but withers before the plucking-time comes — an emblem of the premature decay and fruitlessness of the wicked. See AGRICULTURE.

Reason denotes that function of our intelligence which has reference to the attainment of a particular class of truths. We know a great many things by immediate or actual experience. Our senses tell us that we are thirsty, that we hear a sound, that we are affected by light. These facts are truths of sense or of immediate knowledge, and do not involve the reason. Reason comes into play when we know a thing not immediately, but by some indirect process; as when, from seeing a river unusually swollen, we believe that there have been heavy rains at its sources. Here the mere sense tells us only that the river is high. It is by certain transitions of thought, or by the employment of our thinking powers, that we come to know the other circumstance—that in a remote part of the country there have been heavy rains.

In ascertaining these truths of reason or of inference, as they are called, there are various steps or operations, described under different names. Thus we have (1) *Deduction*, or *Syllogism;* (2) *Induction;* and (3) *Generalization* of notions, of which *Abstraction* and *Definition* are various phases. These are well represented by their several designations. The nature of the function or faculty denominated Reason, or the Reasoning Faculty, can be explained by showing how it results from the fundamental powers of the intelligence.

There is another and peculiar signification attached to the word reason, growing out of the philosophy of Kant (q. v.), which maintains a distinction between *reason* and *understanding*, the latter being that faculty called by the Greeks *νοῦς*, and by Hamilton called the "Regulative Faculty." See Fleming and Krauth, *Vocab. of Philosophy*, s. v.

REASON, USE OF, IN RELIGION. The sublime, incomprehensible nature of some of the Christian doctrines has so completely subdued the understanding of many pious men as to make them think it presumptuous to apply reason in any way to the revelations of God; and the many instances in which the simplicity of truth has been corrupted by an alliance with philosophy confirm them in the belief that it is safer, as well as more respectable, to resign their minds to devout impressions than to exercise their understandings in any speculations upon sacred subjects. Enthusiasts and fanatics of all different names and sects agree in decrying the use of reason, because it is the very essence of fanaticism to substitute, in place of the sober deductions of reason, the extravagant fancies of a disordered imagination, and to consider these fancies as the immediate illumination of the Spirit of God. Insidious writers in the deistical controversy have pretended to adopt those sentiments of humility and reverence which are inseparable from true Christians, and even that total subjection of reason to faith which characterizes enthusiasts. A pamphlet was published about the middle of the last century that made a noise in its day, although it is now forgotten, entitled *Christianity not Founded on Argument*, which, while to a careless reader it may seem to magnify the Gospel, does in reality tend to undermine our faith by separating it from a rational assent; and Mr. Hume, in the spirit of this pamphlet, concludes his *Essay on Miracles* with calling those dangerous friends or disguised enemies to the Christian religion who have undertaken to defend it by the principles of human reason. "Our most holy religion," he says, with a disingenuity very unbecoming his respectable talents, "is founded on faith, not on reason;" and "mere reason is insufficient to convince us of its veracity." The Church of Rome, in order to subject the minds of her votaries to her authority, has reprobated the use of reason in matters of religion. She has revived an ancient position, that things may be true in theology which are false in philosophy; and she has, in some instances, made the merit of faith to consist in the absurdity of that which was believed.

The extravagance of these positions has produced, since the Reformation, an opposite extreme. While those who deny the truth of revelation consider reason as in all respects a sufficient guide, the Socinians, who admit that a revelation has been made, employ reason as the supreme judge of its doctrines, and boldly strike out of their creed every article that is not altogether conformable to those notions which may be derived from the exercise of reason. These controversies concerning the use of reason in matters of religion are disputes, not about words, but about the essence of Christianity. But a few plain observations are sufficient to ascertain where the truth lies in this subject.

The first use of reason in matters of religion is to examine the evidences of revelation; for, the more entire the submission which we consider as due to everything that is revealed, we have the more need to be satisfied that any system which professes to be a divine revelation does really come from God. See FAITH AND REASON.

After the exercise of reason has established in our minds a firm belief that Christianity is of divine origin, the second use of reason is to learn what are the truths revealed. As these truths are not in our days communicated to any by immediate inspiration, the knowledge of them is to be acquired only from books transmitted to us with satisfying evidence that they were written above seventeen hundred years ago, in a remote country and foreign language, under the direction of the Spirit of God. In order to attain the meaning of these books, we must study the language in which they were written; and we must study, also, the manners of the times and the state of the countries in which the writers lived, because these are circumstances to which an original author is often alluding, and by which his phraseology is generally affected; we must lay together different passages in which the same word or phrase occurs, because without this labor we cannot obtain its precise signification; and we must mark the difference of style and manner which characterizes different writers, because a right apprehension of their meaning often depends upon attention to this difference. All this supposes the application of grammar, history, geography, chronology, and criticism in matters of religion—that is, it supposes that the reason of man had been previously exercised in pursuing these different branches of knowledge, and that our success in attaining the true sense of Scripture depends upon the diligence with which we avail ourselves of the progress that has been made in them. It is obvious that every Christian is not capable of making this application. But this is no argument against the use of reason, of which we are now speaking; for they who use translations and commentaries rely only upon the reason of others instead of exercising their own. The several branches of knowledge have been applied in every age by some persons for the benefit of others; and the progress in sacred criticism which distinguishes the present times is nothing else than the continued application, in elucidating the Scripture, of reason enlightened by every kind of subsidiary knowledge, and very much improved in this kind of exercise by the employment which the ancient classics have given it since the revival of letters.

After the two uses of reason that have been illustrated, a third comes to be mentioned, which may be considered as compounded of both. Reason is of emi-

nent use in repelling the attacks of the adversaries of Christianity. When men of erudition, of philosophical acuteness, and of accomplished taste, direct their talents against our religion, the cause is very much hurt by an unskilful defender. He cannot unravel their sophistry; he does not see the amount and the effect of the concessions which he makes to them; he is bewildered by their quotations; and he is often led, by their artifice, upon dangerous ground. In all ages of the Church there have been weak defenders of Christianity; and the only triumphs of the enemies of our religion have arisen from their being able to expose the defects of those methods of defending the truth which some of its advocates had unwarily chosen. A mind trained to accurate and philosophical views of the nature and the amount of evidence, enriched with historical knowledge, accustomed to throw out of a subject all that is minute and irrelative, to collect what is of importance within a short compass, and to form the comprehension of a whole, is the mind qualified to contend with the learning, the wit, and the sophistry of infidelity. Many such minds have appeared in this honorable controversy during the course of this and the last century; and the success has corresponded to the completeness of the furniture with which they engaged in the combat. The Christian doctrine has been vindicated by their masterly exposition from various misrepresentations; the arguments for its divine original have been placed in their true light; and the attempts to confound the miracles and prophecies upon which Christianity rests its claim with the delusions of imposture have been effectually repelled. Christianity has in this way received the most important advantages from the attacks of its enemies; and it is not improbable that its doctrines would never have been so thoroughly cleared from all the corruptions and subtleties which had attached to them in the progress of ages, nor the evidences of its truths have been so accurately understood, nor its peculiar character been so perfectly discriminated, had not the zeal and abilities which have been employed against it called forth in its defence some of the most distinguished masters of reason. They brought into the service of Christianity the same weapons which had been drawn for her destruction, and, wielding them with confidence and skill in a good cause, became the successful champions of the truth. See RATIONALISM.

The fourth use of reason consists in judging of the truths of religion. Everything which is revealed by God comes to his creatures from so high an authority that it may be rested in with perfect assurance as true. Nothing can be received by us as true which is contrary to the dictates of reason, because it is impossible for us to receive at the same time the truth and the falsehood of a proposition. But many things are true which we do not fully comprehend; and many propositions, which appear incredible when they are first enunciated, are found, upon examination, such as our understandings can readily admit. These principles embrace the whole of the subject, and they mark out the steps by which reason is to proceed in judging of the truths of religion. We first examine the evidences of revelation. If these satisfy our understandings, we are certain that there can be no contradiction between the doctrines of this true religion and the dictates of right reason. If any such contradiction appear, there must be some mistake. By not making a proper use of our reason in the interpretation of the Gospel, we suppose that it contains doctrines which it does not teach; or we give the name of right reason to some narrow prejudices which deeper reflection and more enlarged knowledge will dissipate; or we consider a proposition as implying a contradiction, when, in truth, it is only imperfectly understood. Here, as in every other case, mistakes are to be corrected by measuring back our steps. We must examine closely and impartially the meaning of those passages which appear to contain the doctrine; we must compare them with one another; we must endeavor to derive light from the general phraseology of Scripture and the analogy of faith; and we shall generally be able, in this way, to separate the doctrine from all those adventitious circumstances which give it the appearance of absurdity. If a doctrine which, upon the closest examination, appears unquestionably to be taught in Scripture, still does not approve itself to our understanding, we must consider carefully what it is that prevents us from receiving it. There may be preconceived notions hastily taken up which that doctrine opposes; there may be pride of understanding that does not readily submit to the views which it communicates; or reason may need to be reminded that we must expect to find in religion many things which we are not able to comprehend. One of the most important offices of reason is to recognise her own limits. She never can be moved, by any authority, to receive as true what she perceives to be absurd. But if she has formed a just estimate of human knowledge, she will not shelter her presumption in rejecting the truths of revelation under the pretence of contradictions that do not really exist; she will readily admit that there may be in a subject some points which she knows, and others of which she is ignorant; she will not allow her ignorance of the latter to shake the evidence of the former, but will yield a firm assent to that which she does understand without presuming to deny what is beyond her comprehension. Thus, availing herself of all the light which she now has, she will wait in humble hope for the time when a larger measure shall be imparted.

Reay, Stephen, an Anglican divine, was born at Montrose, New Brunswick, in 1782, was educated at St. Alban's Hall, Oxford, and was Laudian professor of Arabic from 1840 till his death. He published, *Observations on the Defence of the Church Missionary Society against the Objections of the Archdeacon of Bath*, by Pileus Quadratus (1818, 8vo):—*Narratio de Josepho e Sacro Codice* (1822):—*Textus Hebraicus* (Lond. 1822, 1840, 12mo).

Reay, William, an English divine of the Establishment, flourished near the middle of the 18th century. He was curate and lecturer of Wordsworth in 1755. He died in 1756. He published *Sermons*, with Preface by T. Church, D.D., prebend of St. Paul's (Lond. 1755, 8vo).

Re'ba (Heb. *id.* רֶבַע, *four;* Sept. Ῥοβόκ in Numb., Ῥοβέ in Josh.; Vulg. *Rebe*), one of the five kings of the Midianites slain by the children of Israel in their avenging expedition when Balaam fell (Numb. xxxi, 8; Josh. xiii, 21). B.C. 1858.

Rebaptism. The ancient Church, if it did not openly declare against the repetition of baptism, certainly refused to rebaptize, and supported its position by assigning, not one, but many reasons. It especially maintained that there is no example of rebaptization in Scripture; and as baptism succeeds to circumcision, which was the entrance and seal of the old covenant, and could not be repeated, so baptism, being the sign and seal of admission to the new covenant, the breaches of this covenant are not to be repaired by repeated baptisms. There were in the early Church some heretics who rebaptized, such as the Marcionites; but the Catholic Church disapproved of the practice. In one of Cyprian's epistles there is a question referred to Stephen, bishop of Rome, whether it was necessary to rebaptize heretics who sought admission to the Catholic Church; or whether it should be deemed sufficient, proceeding upon the acknowledged validity of their baptism, to receive them with the simple ceremony of imposition of hands and ecclesiastical benediction. The Roman bishop acceded to the latter opinion. The African bishops, on the other hand, declared the baptism of heretics to be null and void, and would not recognise their confirmation at the hands of a Catholic bishop as sufficient for their reception into the Church. They demanded another baptism, to be followed by the usual

confirmation, notwithstanding the Church of Rome persevered in maintaining that the baptism of heretics, provided only that it had been administered in due form, was valid and sufficient and ought not to be repeated.—Farrar, *Theol. Dict.* s. v. In the modern Church rebaptism is practiced by the Romanists and the Anglicans. The latter deny the validity of other Protestant bodies if such oppose the divine right of apostolical succession. The Baptists, of course, recognise as valid only immersion, and not infrequently repeat this ordinance if it has been performed by persons known as *Pædobaptists* (q. v.). See Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrines*, ii, 364 sq.; Höfling, *Lehre von der Taufe* (Erlang. 1846). See also Anabaptists; Baptism.

Rebec'ca (Ῥεβέκκα), the Græcized form (Rom. ix, 10) of the name Rebekah (q. v.).

Rebek'ah (Heb. *Ribkah'*, רִבְקָה, *a noose*, i. e. *ensnarer;* Sept., New Test., and Josephus, Ῥεβέκκα), the daughter of Bethuel (Gen. xxii, 23) and sister of Laban, married to Isaac, who stood in the relation of a first cousin to her father and to Lot. She is first presented to us in the account of the mission of Eliezer to Padan-aram (ch. xxiv), in which his interview with Rebekah, her consent and marriage, are related. B.C. 2023. The elder branch of the family remained at Haran when Abraham removed to the land of Canaan, and it is there that we first meet with Laban, as taking the leading part in the betrothal of his sister Rebekah to her cousin Isaac (xxiv, 10, 29–60; xxvii, 43; xxix, 4). Bethuel, his father, plays so insignificant a part in the whole transaction, being in fact only mentioned once, and that *after* his son (xxiv, 50), that various conjectures have been formed to explain it. Josephus asserts that Bethuel was dead, and that Laban was the head of the house and his sister's natural guardian (*Ant.* i, 16, 2), in which case "Bethuel" must have crept into the text inadvertently, or be supposed, with some (Adam Clarke, *ad loc.*), to be the name of another brother of Rebekah. Le Clerc (*in Pent.*) mentions the conjecture that Bethuel was absent at first, but returned in time to give his consent to the marriage. The mode adopted by Prof. Blunt (*Undesigned Coincidences*, p. 35) to explain what he terms "the consistent insignificance of Bethuel," viz. that he was incapacitated from taking the management of his family by age or imbecility, is most ingenious; but the prominence of Laban may be sufficiently explained by the custom of the country, which then, as now (see Niebuhr, quoted by Rosenmüller, *ad loc.*), gave the brothers the main share in the arrangement of their sister's marriage and the defence of her honor (comp. Gen. xxxiv, 13; Judg. xxi, 22; 2 Sam. xiii, 20–29). See Bethuel. The whole chapter has been pointed out as uniting most of the circumstances of a pattern marriage—the sanction of parents, the guidance of God, the domestic occupation of Rebekah, her beauty, courteous kindness, willing consent and modesty, and success in retaining her husband's love. For nineteen years she was childless; then, after the prayers of Isaac and her journey to inquire of the Lord, Esau and Jacob were born; and, while the younger was more particularly the companion and favorite of his mother (Gen. xxv, 19–28), the elder became a grief of mind to her (xxvi, 35). When Isaac was driven by a famine into the lawless country of the Philistines, Rebekah's beauty became, as was apprehended, a source of danger to her husband. But Abimelech was restrained by a sense of justice such as the conduct of his predecessor (ch. xx) in the case of Sarah would not lead Isaac to expect. It was probably a considerable time afterwards when Rebekah suggested the deceit that was practiced by Jacob on his blind father. She directed and aided him in carrying it out, foresaw the probable consequence of Esau's anger, and prevented it by moving Isaac to send Jacob away to Padan-aram (ch. xxvii) to her own kindred (xxix, 12). B.C. 1927. The Targum Pseudo-Jon. states (Gen. xxxv, 8) that the news of her death was brought to Jacob at Allon-bachuth. It has been conjectured that she died during his sojourn in Padan-aram; for her nurse appears to have left Isaac's dwelling and gone back to Padan-aram before that period (comp. xxiv, 59, and xxv, 8), and Rebekah is not mentioned when Jacob returns to his father, nor do we hear of her burial till it is incidentally mentioned by Jacob on his death-bed (xlix, 31). Paul (Rom. ix, 10) refers to her as being made acquainted with the purpose of God regarding her children before they were born. For comments on the whole history of Rebekah, see Origen, *Hom. in Genesin* x and xii; Chrysostom, *Hom. in Genesin*, p. 48–54. Rebekah's inquiry of God, and the answer given to her, are discussed by Deyling, *Obser. Sac.* i, 12, p. 53 sq., and in an essay by J. A. Schmid in *Nov. Thes. Theol.-philolog.* i, 188; also by Ebersbach (Helmst. 1712). The agreement of the description of Rebekah in Gen. xxii with modern Eastern customs and scenes is well noticed by Thomson, *Land and Book*, ii, 403. See Isaac; Jacob.

Reber, Joel L., a minister of the German Reformed Church, was born in Berks County, Pa., Nov. 8, 1816. He spent his youth on a farm, and afterwards learned the printing business. He pursued his studies in the college and seminary at Mercersburg, Pa., from 1837 to 1842, and was ordained in May, 1843. He was pastor successively in Brush Valley, Centre County, Pa.; Jonestown, Lebanon County, Pa.; Millersville, Lancaster County, Pa.; Codorus, York County, Pa. He died Aug. 15, 1856. In 1850 Mr. Reber published a small work in German entitled *An Earnest Word on the Sect-Spirit and Sect-Work*, which passed through two editions. He also wrote much for the periodicals of the day in German and English, in both of which languages he was able to write with equal vigor and correctness. He was possessed of a strong, original mind, was an earnest and powerful preacher, and manifested a laborious, self-sacrificing spirit.

Recanati, Menahem di, a Jewish writer, was born in Recanati (the ancient Recinetum) about 1290, and is the author of a commentary on the Pentateuch (פרוש על התורה), which is little else than a commentary on the *Sohar*. This commentary, which was first published by Jacob ben-Chajim in Bomberg's celebrated printing establishment (Venice, 1523; then again ibid. 1545; and in Lublin, 1595), has been translated into Latin by the famous Pico della Mirandola. He also wrote ס' הדינים, a treatise forensic, moral, and ceremonial (Bononia, 1538):—טעמי המצות, an exposition of the precepts of the law (Constantinople, 1544). Besides these works, he wrote a number of others, which are still unpublished. See Fürst, *Bibl. Jud.* iii, 135 sq.; De Rossi, *Dizionario Storico* (Germ. transl.), p. 275; Steinschneider, *Catalogus Libr. Hebr. in Bibl. Bodlei.* col. 1733–37; Etheridge, *Introd. to Hebr. Literature*, p. 286; Ginsburg, *Kabbalah*, p. 118 sq.; Jost, *Gesch. d. Judenth. u. s. Secten*, iii, 77. (B. P.)

Receipt of Custom. See Custom.

Recensions of the Old Testament. Under this head we present an outline of the history of the printed Hebrew text, not in the manner of Bartolocci, Wolf, and Le-Long-Mash, who give a long list of editions, but according to the different recensions which the Hebrew text underwent from time to time. The history of the unprinted text in its different periods has already been treated in the article Old Testament (q. v.). From the article Manuscripts (q. v.) it will be seen that some of the most important MSS. are lost, and that they are only known to us from quotations. Yet a great many MSS. of the Old Test. existed in the different countries where Jews resided; and, as certain rules and regulations were laid down by the scribes according to which MSS. were to be written, it is but natural to infer that the MSS. of the different countries would, in the main, correspond with each other. After the invention of printing, many were desirous of pub-

lishing corrected editions of the Holy Scriptures, though they seldom gave an account of the materials they used. The history of the printed text is important as showing the manner in which our present copies of the Hebrew Bible were edited, and the sources available for obtaining the exact words of the original. In order to do this we must examine the different editions according to the text which they contain; we must know the different degrees of relationship in which the editions stand to each other; in a word, we must have the genealogy of the present editions.

Before entering upon the history of the printed text, we must mention, first, the editions of different parts of the Old Test. which formed the basis of later editions. The first part of the Hebrew Scriptures which was published is—

(I.) תהלים, i. e. *Psalterium Hebraicum cum Commentario Kimchii* (237 [i. e. A.D. 1477], 4to, or sm. fol., sine loco). This very rare edition is printed on 149 folios, each page containing forty lines, but without division of verses, in majuscular and minuscular letters. Only the first four psalms have the vowel-points, and these but clumsily expressed. Each verse is accompanied by Kimchi's commentary. The pages and psalms are not numbered. The *Soph Pasuk* (i. e. :) is often omitted, especially when two verses stand by each other. For יהוה, often an empty space is left, sometimes omitted; in the space we often find an inverted *he*, ה, or an inverted *vav*, ו, in the word יהוה; often the word is expressed by a sign of abbreviation, ״, which generally occurs in the commentary. In Psa. cxix, 1 we find יהיה, i. e. a *yod* for a *vav*. The letters כ and ב, ך and ד, ר and ד, ן and ז, ג and נ; ע and ש can hardly be distinguished from each other. The text is far from being correct, as a few examples will show. Thus, in

Psa. i, 3 we read פריה, in Van der Hooght, פריו

i, 5	"	צריקם	"	צדיקים
ii, 1	"	ריק	"	ריק
ii, 2	"	עבותימו	"	עבתימו
iv, 1	"	מזמור שיר	"	מזמור לדוד

It is divided into five books, as can be seen from superscriptions to Psa. xli, lxxii, lxxxix, and cvi. As to the commentary, it is very valuable, because it contains all the anti-Christian passages of Kimchi, which are not found in later editions. At the end two epigraphs are printed, one in rhyme, the other in prose. See on this edition, Eichhorn, *Repertorium*, vi, 134 sq.; De Rossi, *Annales Hebræo-typographici*, p. 14; and *De Hebraicæ Typographiæ Origine ac Primitiis*, etc., p. 13; Kennicott, *Diss. Gen. in V. T.* p. 91.

(II.) חומש עם תרגום אונקלוס ופירוש רש״י בולוניא רמ״ב, i. e. *Pentateuchus Hebraicus cum Punctis et cum Paraphrasi Chaldaica et Commentario Rabbi Salomonis Jarchi* (Bononiæ, 242 [i. e. A.D. 1482], fol.). This copy is printed on 218 parchment leaves. Above and below the Hebrew Rashi's commentary is given, while the Chaldee is printed on the side of the Hebrew. The text is very correct, and when compared with Van der Hooght's, the latter seems to be a reprint of this Pentateuch. The harmony of this Pentateuch with that found in Van der Hooght's edition is of the utmost importance for the printed text. In the first place, it corroborates the fact that, prior to the year 1520, the beginning had already been made to print the Hebrew text according to recent MSS. and the Masorah; in the second place, we must admit that all variations which are found in the Pentateuch printed at Soncino in 1488, and which is a reprint of our edition, are nothing but negligences of the printer and corrector, in so far as these variations are not supported by the Masorah, and hence cannot be regarded as a testimony against the Masoretic text. In the third place, we see that all MSS. and editions which were prepared by Jews are of the utmost correctness, and that the variations are nothing but an oversight of either the copyist or printer. At the end is a very lengthy epigraph in Hebrew, to give which in an English translation space forbids. See Eichhorn, *Repertorium*, v, 92 sq., where the variations of this Pentateuch from Van der Hooght's text are given.

(III.) *Ruth, Ecclesiastes, Canticum Canticorum, Threni cum Comm. Jarchi, et Esther cum Comm. Aben-Ezræ* (sine anno et loco [but probably Bononiæ, 1482], fol.). See De Rossi, *De Ignotis Nonnullis Antiquissimis Hebr. Textus Editionibus* (Erlangen, 1782).

(IV.) *Prophetæ Priores ac Posteriores cum Comm. Kimchii* (Soncino, 1485–86, 2 vols. fol.). On this, see Eichhorn, *Repertorium*, viii, 51 sq.

(V.) *Quinque Megilloth et Psalterium* (Soncini et Casali, 1486).

(VI.) *Quatuor Sacra Volumina, seu Ruth, Canticum, Threni et Ecclesiastes* (ibid. 1486), with vowel-points, but with no accents.

(VII.) *Hagiographa*, with different commentaries (Neapoli, 1487).

(VIII.) *Biblia Hebraica Integra cum Punctis et Accentibus* (Soncini, 248 [i. e. A.D. 1488], fol.). This is the first complete Hebrew Bible, with vowel-points and accents. It is very rare; only nine copies are known to be extant, viz. one at Exeter College, Oxford; two at Rome, two at Florence, two at Parma, one at Vienna, and one in the Baden-Durlach Library. According to Bruns (*Dissertat. General. in V. Test.* p. 442 sq.), the text is printed neither from an ancient nor good MSS., but is full of blunders; and Kennicott asserts that it contains more than 12,000 variations ("quæ una editio ab exemplaribus hodiernis discrepat in locis plus quam 12,000"). How carelessly the printing was executed may be seen from the fact that ver. 16 of Psa. lxxiv was interpolated after ver. 12 of Psa. lxxxix.

(IX.) *Pentateuchus Hebraicus absque Punctis*, etc. (1490).

(X.) *Pentateuchus cum Haphtaroth et Megilloth Hebraice* (sine loco et anno, 4to [1490–95?]). For a long time only two copies were known to be extant; one in the Library of St. Mark at Florence, and one in the library of the cardinal Zelada. De Rossi, however, procured some copies.

Between 1490 and 1494 twelve other editions of different books were published, which we will not enumerate for want of space. In 1494 the *Biblia Hebraica cum Punctis* (4to) was published at Brescia; remarkable as being the one from which Luther's German translation was made. The Royal Library at Berlin preserves that copy in a case. This edition has many various readings. As it cannot historically be proved that in the edition of this Bible MSS. have been used—on the contrary, in its *lectionibus singularibus* it agrees with the edition of Soncino (1488)—it is very probable that it was reprinted from the Soncinian text. A full description of this Bible is given by Schulze, *Vollständigere Kritik* (Berlin, 1766). A collection of various readings is given by Le-Long-Mash in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*. Between 1494 and 1497 four other editions of different parts of the Hebrew Old Test. were published, which would make the number either of entire editions of the Old Test. or of single parts thereof about twenty-eight, and which all belong to the 15th century.

I. The first main recension was the Complutensian text of 1514–17. The editions which were published in the following centuries are mainly taken from one of the three main sources: the *Complutensian Bible*, the *Soncinian Text* of 1488, and *Bomberg's* (1525); yet there is a fourth class, which contains a mixed text, composed of many old editions. The Complutensian text was entitled *Biblia Sacra Polyglotta*, etc. (in Complutensi Universitate, 1514–17). See Polyglot Bibles. This was followed by the *Heidelberg* or *Bertram's Polyglot* (*Sacra Biblia Hebraice*, etc.) (ex officina Sanctandreana, 1586, 3 vols. fol.; republished in 1599, 3 vols. fol. ex officina Commeliniana, and in 1616, 3 vols. fol. ibid.).

II. The second main recension, or the Soncinian text of 1488, was the basis of:

1. *Biblia Rabbinica Bombergiana I*, curavit F. Pratensis (Venice, 1517–18). See Rabbinic Bibles.

2. *Bomberg's Editions* (4to): *α.* the first published in 1518; *β.* the second in 1521; *γ.* the third in 1525–28; *δ.* the fourth in 1533; *ε.* the fifth in 1544.

3. *Münster's Editions* of 1534, 1536, and 1546. The first contains the Hebrew text only, and was published by Froben at Basle. This edition is very rare and valuable on account of a collection of various readings, partly taken from MSS., which must have been collected by a Jewish editor. The other two editions have, besides the Hebrew, a Latin translation.

4. *Robert Stephens's* first edition (Paris, 1539–44, 4 vols.). This was not published as a whole, but in parts, each having a title. The first part that was published was ספר ישעיה, or *Prophetia Isaiæ* (ibid. 1539). Of variations, we subjoin the following: i, 25, סיגיך; ver. 29, מאלים; iii, 16, וּמְשַׂקְרוֹת; vi, 5, נרמתי; viii, 6, חשלח (dagesh in ל); ver. 13, מערצכם; x, 15, ואת; ver. 16, כבודו; ver. 18, כמסים; ver. 33, רשפרי, etc. The second part contained the twelve minor prophets (1539); the third, the Psalms (1540); the fourth, the Proverbs (1540); in the same year also Jeremiah, Daniel, the five Megilloth; in 1541, Job, Ezra, Ezekiel; in 1543, Chronicles, the former prophets, and the Pentateuch. Richard Simon, in his *Histoire Critique du V. T.* p. 513, makes this remark on that edition: "Si l'on a égard à la beauté des caractères, il n'y a guères de Bibles qui approchent de celle de Robert Estienne in *quarto*; au moins d'une partie de cette Bible; mais elle n'est pas fort correcte." The same is confirmed by Carpzov, *Critica Sacra*, p. 421: "Plurimis autem scatere vitiis, non in punctis modo vocalibus et accentuum, sed etiam in literis, imo in integris nonnunquam vocibus

deprehenditur," etc.; and Samuel Ockley, in his *Introduct. ad Linguas Orient.* cap. ii, p. 34, says: "Hæc Roberti Stephani editio pulchris quidem characteribus est impressa . . . sed pluribus mendis scatet, quæ libri pulcherrimi nitorem turpiter fœdarunt."

III. The third main recension was the Bombergian text of 1525. A new recension of the text, which has had more influence than any on the text of later times, was Bomberg's second edition of the Rabbinic Bible, edited by Jacob ben-Chajim (Venice, 1525–26, 4 vols. fol.). See Rabbinic Bibles. This edition was followed by—

1. *R. Stephens's* second edition, published in parts, like the first (Paris, 1544–46, 16mo).

2. *Bomberg's third Rabbinical Bible* (1547–49). See Rabbinic Bibles.

3. *M. A. Justiniani's Editions*, published at Venice in 1551, 1552, 1563, and 1573.

4. *J. de Gara's Editions*, published at Venice, viz.: *a.* an edition in 4to, 1566; *b.* an edition in 8vo, 1568; *c.* a *Rabbinic Bible* (1568, 4 vols. fol.) [see Rabbinic Bibles]; *d.* an edition in 8vo, 1570; *e.* an edition in 4to, 1582; *f.* an edition with Rashi's commentary (1595, 4to); *g.* the same edition, published in 1607.

5. *Plantin's Manual Editions*, published at Antwerp, viz.: *a.* an edition in 4to, 8vo, and 16mo, in 1566; *b.* a 4to edition in 1580; *c.* an 8vo edition in 1590.

6. *Crato's Editions*, published at Wittenberg in 1586 and 1587.

7. *Hartmann's Editions*, published at Frankfort-on-the-Oder in 1595–98.

8. *Bragadin's Editions*, published at Venice, viz.: *a.* an edition in 4to and 12mo (1614–15); *b.* a *Rabbinic Bible* [see Rabbinic Bibles] (1617–18, 4 vols. fol.); *c.* a 4to edition (1619); *d.* a 4to edition (1628); *e.* a 4to edition, with Italian notes (1678); *f. Biblia Hebræa ad usum Judæorum* (1707, 4to); *g. Biblia Hebraica*, with a Spanish commentary in Rabbinic letters, "con licenza de' superiori" (1730, 4to).

9. *I. de la Rouvière's*, or *Cephas Elon's Editions*, published at Geneva in 1618, in 4to, 8vo, and 18mo, are but a reprint of No. 3.

IV. The fourth main recension, or mixed text, was formed from Nos. II and III above, and was the Antwerp Polyglot, or *Biblia Sacra Hebraice* (Antwerp, 1567) [see Polyglot Bibles], which was followed by—

1. *The Paris Polyglot.* See Polyglot Bibles.

2. *The London*, or *Walton's Polyglot.* See Polyglot Bibles.

3. *Plantin's Hebrew-Latin Editions* (Antwerp, 1571, 1583). In the first edition, in Gen. iii, 15, where the Vulg. has "ipsa conteret caput," with reference to the Virgin Mary, we read הוּא, instead of הִוא, with a little circle above to indicate a different reading in the passage (הִוא). But this corruption was not made by Arias Montanus, the Latin translator.

4. *The Burgos Edition*, a very rare reprint of Plantin's first edition, published at Burgos, in Spain, in 1581 (fol.).

5. *The Geneva Editions*, in Hebrew and Latin, published in 1609 and 1618 (fol.).

6. *The Leyden Edition*, published in 1613 (large 8vo).

7. *The Vienna Edition*, published in 1743 (large 8vo).

8. *Reineccius's Polyglot and Manual Editions.* See Reineccius.

V. *Hutter's Text.* Several older editions contributed to Hutter's Bibles:

a. Biblia Sacra, etc. (Hamburg, 1587, fol.). The outward appearance of this edition is splendid. In the margin the number of chapters is marked, and every fifth verse. From the preface we see that Hutter perused the editions of Bomberg, Münster, Stephens, etc. This edition was only printed once, but was published in 1588, 1596, and 1603 with new title-pages.

b. Biblia Sacra Polyglotta (incomplete; only the Pentateuch, Joshua, Judges, and Ruth) (Nuremberg, 1599). Hutter's Hebrew Bible was reprinted in Nissel's edition (Lugduni Batavorum, 1662, large 8vo), with the title *Sacra Biblia Hebræa ex Optimis Editionibus*, etc.

VI. *Buxtorf's Editions.* A text revised accurately after the Masorah, and therefore deviating here and there from the earlier editions, is furnished by Buxtorf's editions, viz.:

a. The Manual Edition (Basle, 1611, 8vo), which was followed by—

1. *Jansson's Edition* (Amst. 1639), or עשרים וארבעה.

2. *Menasseh ben-Israel's Edition* (ibid. 1635, 4to). It would have been well if the editor had stated which four editions he perused, and to which the mistakes, which are not a few in this edition, are to be ascribed. Each page has two columns. The order of the books is rather uncommon; the Hagiographa and five Megilloth come before the earlier and later prophets. As to the edition itself, R. Simon, in his *Histoire Critique*, p. 514, remarks: "L'édition en quarto de Menassé ben-Israel, à Amsterdam en 1635, a cette commodité, qu'elle est non seulement correcte, mais aussi à deux colonnes; au lieu que les éditions de Robert Estienne et de Plantin sont à longues lignes et par consequent incommodes pour la lecture."

b. Buxtorf's Rabbinic Bible [see Rabbinic Bibles], which was followed by—

1. *Frankfurter's Rabbinic Bible.* See Rabbinic Bibles.

2. *Lebenson's*, or *Warsaw Rabbinic Bible.* See Rabbinic Bibles.

VII. *Joseph Athias's Text.* Neither the text of Hutter nor that of Buxtorf was without its permanent influence; but the Hebrew Bible which became the standard to subsequent generations was that of Joseph Athias, a learned rabbi and printer at Amsterdam. His text was based on a comparison of the previous editions with two MSS.; one bearing the date 1209, the other a Spanish MS., boasting an antiquity of 900 years. The first edition of this new text was published at Amsterdam (1661, 2 vols. 8vo), with the title, *Biblia Hebraica correcta et collata cum Antiquissimis et Accuratissimis Exemplaribus Manuscriptis et hactenus impressis.* This is the first edition in which each verse is numbered. A second edition, with a preface by Leusden, was published in 1667. These editions were much prized for their beauty and correctness, and a gold medal and chain were conferred on Athias in token of their appreciation by the States-General of Holland.

VIII. *Clodius's Editions* were based upon the text of Athias.

a. Biblia Testamenti Veteris, etc. Opera et studio Clodii (Frankfort-on-the-Main, 1677).

b. Biblia Hebraica, etc.; recognita a J. H. Majo (ibid. 1692).

c. Biblia Hebraica, etc.; ed. G. Chr. Bürcklin (ibid. 1716, 4to). In spite of all the care which Bürcklin bestowed upon this edition, some mistakes were left, as: Isa. i, 16, רחקו for וחצו; xli, 22, חרשנות for חראשנית; Jer. iv, 18, על for עד; xxiii, 21, עליהם for אליהם; Ezek. xl, 25, סביב for סביב; Hos. vii, 16, לאגם for לעגם; Amos vii, 10, בים for בית; Lam. v, 22, כי for כי אם; Psa. lxxv, 1, אסק for אסק, etc.

IX. *Jablonski's Editions*, or—

a. Biblia Hebraica cum Notis Hebraicis, etc. (Berolini, 1699, large 8vo or 4to). For this edition Jablonski collated all the cardinal editions, together with several MSS., and bestowed particular care on the vowel-points and accents, as he expresses himself more fully in his preface, § 6, 7.

b. Biblia Hebraica in Gratiam, etc. (ibid. 1712, 12mo). This is the last of Jablonski's editions, but less correct; and the same may be said of the one published in 1711 (24mo) without the vowel-points.

X. *H. Michaelis's Bible* was based on Jablonski's first edition of 1699, and was entitled עשרים וארבע ספרי הקדש (Halle, 1720, 8vo and 4to). For this edition Michaelis compared five Erfurt MSS. and nineteen printed editions, which are all enumerated in the preface. This edition is much esteemed, partly for its correctness and partly for its notes, which, on account of the very small type, are a task to the eyes.

Michaelis's text is said to have been the basis of the so-called *Mantuan Bible*, edited, with a critical commentary, by Norzi (q. v.) (Mantua, 1742–44).

XI. *Van der Hooght's Text*, or *Biblia Hebraica, secundum ultimam Editionem Jos. Athia*, etc. (Amst. 1705, 2 vols. 8vo). This edition—of good reputation for its accuracy, but above all for the beauty and distinctness of its type—deserves special attention as constituting our present *textus receptus.* The text was chiefly formed on that of Athias; no MSS. were used for it, but it has a collection of various readings from printed editions at the end. The Masoretic readings are given in the margin. In spite of all the excellences which this edition has above others, there are still a great many mistakes to be found therein, as Bruns has shown in Eichhorn's *Repertorium*, xii, 225 sq. The following editions are either printed from or based on Van der Hooght's text:

1. *Proop's Editions*, published at Amsterdam (1724, 1762).

2. *The Leipsic Edition*, with Seb. Schmid's Latin translation (1740, 4to).

3. *Forster's Biblia Hebraica sine Punctis* (Oxford, 1750, 2 vols. 4to).

4. *Simoni's Editions* (Halle, 1752, 1767, 1822, 1828; the latter two with a preface by Rosenmüller).

5. *Houbigant's* (q. v.) *Edition* (Paris, 1753, 4 vols. fol.).

6. *Bayly's Old Testament*, in Hebrew and English (Lond. 1774, large 8vo).

7. *Kennicott's* (q. v.) *Vetus Testamentum* (Oxford, 1776–80, 2 vols. fol.).

8. *Jahn's Biblia Hebraica*, etc. (Vienna, 1806, 4 vols. 8vo), with readings from De Rossi, Kennicott, etc. With injudicious peculiarity, however, the books are arranged in a new order; the Chronicles are split up into fragments for the purpose of comparison with the parallel books.

9. *Boothroyd's Biblia Hebraica*, with various readings (Pontefract, 1810–16, 2 vols. 4to).

10. *Frey's Biblia Hebraica* (Lond. 1812, 2 vols. 8vo), which was entirely superseded by

11. *D'Allemand's Biblia Hebraica* (ibid. 1822, and often).

Van der Hooght's text is found in all English editions of the Hebrew Bible published by Duncan or Bagster, and is also made the basis of—

12. *The Hexaglot Bible* [see POLYGLOT BIBLES] (Lond. 1876, 6 vols. royal 4to).

13. *The Basle Edition* of 1827.

14. *Hahn's Editions*, published at Leipsic in 1831, 1832, 1833, 1839, and 1867; the last is superior to the former, as can be seen from the preface. Hahn's text has also been reprinted in the polyglot of Stier and Theile (Elberfeld, 1847, and often). There is also a small edition of Hahn's Bible (in 12mo), with a preface by Rosenmüller, in small but clear type. The last of this edition was published in 1868.

15. *Theile's Editions* (ibid. 1840; 4th ed. 1873). This edition may be regarded as one of the best Hebrew Bibles according to Van der Hooght's recension. Wright, in his *The Book of Genesis in Hebrew* (Lond. 1859), has followed Theile's text.

XII. *Opitz's Text*, or *Biblica Hebraica cum Optimis Impressis*, etc. Studio et Opera D. H. Opitii (Kiloni, 1709, 4to). Opitz compared for this edition three codices and fourteen printed editions, which are enumerated in the preface. This text was reprinted in—

1. *Zullichow Biblia cum Præfatione Michaelis* (1741, 4to).

2. *Evangelische deutsche Original-Bibel*, containing the Hebrew and Luther's German translation (Kiloni, 1741).

XIII. *Editions with a Revised Text.* With Van der Hooght's edition a *textus receptus* was given, which was corrected and improved from time to time. But the more the Masorah and ancient Jewish grammarians were studied, the more it was found that the present text, while on the whole correct, did not come up to the requirements and rules laid down by ancient grammarians, for, as Delitzsch observes, in the edition of the Old Test., the minutest points must be observed, trifling and pettifogging as they may appear to the superficial reader; "yet ἰῶτα ἓν ἢ μία κεραία maximi apud nos ponderis esse debet." Thus it came to pass that from time to time new editions of the Hebrew text were published כל פי המסרה, i. e. in accordance with the Masorah. Of such editions we mention, passing over the editions of single parts of the Old Test.,

1. The edition published at Carlsruhe (1836–37) and edited by Epstein, Rosenfeld, and others.

2. *Philippsohn's Israelitische Bibel* (Leipsic, 1844–54). But this edition, says Delitzsch, "quamquam textum אל פי המסרה conformatum se exhibere prædicat, Masorethicæ diligentiæ vix ullum vestigium ostendit et vitiis plurimis scatet."

3. *Letteris's Edition*, or ספר הקדש והוא תורה נביאים וכתובים (Vienna, 1852, 2 vols. 8vo). This edition was reprinted by the British and Foreign Bible Society at Berlin, with the corrections of Theophilus Abramsohn (1866, and often; latest edition, 1874). With an English title-page, "*The Hebrew Bible*, revised and carefully examined by Myer Levi Letteris," the society's edition was published (?) by Wiley and Son (N. Y. 1875).

4. A new edition, which, as we hope, will become the standard text for the future, is that commenced by Baer and Delitzsch. As early as 1861, S. Baer, in connection with Prof. Delitzsch, published the ספר תהלים, or *Liber Psalmorum Hebraicus. Textum Masorethicum accuratius quam adhuc factum est expressit . . . Notas criticas adjecit* S. Baer. Præfatus est F. Delitzsch (Lipsiæ, 1861). Mr. Baer, who for about twenty years has made Masoretic lore his specialty, the results of which he partly gave to the public in his תורת אמת (Rödelheim, 1852), was best adapted for such a task, and his connection with Prof. Delitzsch, one of the greatest living Hebrew scholars, is the best guarantee that the work is in able hands. An improved edition of the Psalms was published in 1874, under the title ספר תהלות, *Liber Psalmorum Hebraicus atque Latinus ab Hieronymo ex Hebræo conversus.* Consociata opera ediderunt C. de Tischendorf, S. Baer, et Fr. Delitzsch. In the preface, which is prepared by Delitzsch, we get a great deal of instructive matter as to the sources used for this edition. The Hebrew and Latin text is followed by *Appendices Criticæ et Masorethicæ* of great value to the student. Both these editions are published in 12mo. Besides the Psalms, which in their present size are probably not intended for a complete edition of the Old Test., they published—

(1.) ספר בראשית הוא ספר ראשון לחמשה חמשי תורה, *Liber Genesis, Textum Masorethicum accuratissime expressit, e Fontibus Masoræ varie illustravit, Notis Criticis confirmavit*, S. Baer. Præfatus est edendi operis adjutor Fr. Delitzsch (Lipsiæ, 1869, gr. 8vo). The title fully indicates the contents of the work, which, however, we will specify. The Hebrew text is followed by—

a. Specimen Lectionum in hac Editione Genesis receptarum.

b. Loci Genesis Vocalem non productam in Medio Extre. move Versu retinentes.

c. Scripturæ Genesis inter Scholas Orientales et Occidentales controversæ.

d. Loci Genesis a Ben-Asher et Ben-Naphtali diverse Punctis signati.

e. Loci Genesis Consimiles qui facile confunduntur.

f. Loci Genesis Lineola Pasek notati.

g. Sectiones Libri Genesis Masorethicæ.

h. Conspectus Notarum Masoreticarum: α. Varietas scriptionis et lectionis; *β.* Adnotationes Masoreticæ; *γ.* Clausula libri.

(2.) *Liber Jesaiæ* . . . (Lipsiæ, 1872), containing the same critical matter as Genesis.

(3.) *Liber Jobi* . . . (ibid. 1875). Opposite the title-page stands a fac-simile of the Codex Tshufutkale No. 8 *a*, which gives a good specimen of the Babylonian system of punctuation.

(4.) *Liber Duodecim Prophetarum* . . . (ibid. 1878).

The prefaces which precede the Hebrew text in all these volumes give an account of the various MSS., editions, etc., which have been perused for each book, and are full of instruction to the student of the sacred text. When completed, this edition of the Old Test. will form not *a* recension, but *the* recension of the best Hebrew text with which the student can be furnished.

Literature.—For the different editions of the Old Test., see Le-Long-Mash, Wolf, Bartolocci, Rosenmüller, and introductions to the Old Test., together with Davidson, *Biblical Criticism*, i, 137 sq., and De Rossi, *De Hebraicæ Typographiæ Origine*, etc. (Parma, 1776); id. *De Typographia Hebræo-Ferrariensi*, etc. (ibid. 1780); id. *De Ignotis Nonnullis Antiquissimis Hebr. Textus Editt.* etc. (Erlangen, 1782); id. *Annales Hebræo-typographici*, etc. (Parma, 1795). For various readings, see the editions of Kennicott, Michaelis, Jahn, Reineccius-Meissner-Döderlein; the *Variæ Lectiones* of De Rossi (ibid. 1784, 4 vols.); Davidson, *The Hebrew Text of the Old Testament*, etc. (Lond. 1855)—following, as Davidson does, De Rossi and Jahn, his work, besides being deficient, cannot always be relied upon; Pick, *Horæ Samaritanæ, or a Collection of Various Readings of the Samaritan Pentateuch compared with the Hebrew and other Ancient Versions*, in *Bibl. Sacra* (Andover, 1876–78); Strack, *Katalog der hebr. Bibelhandschriften in St. Petersburg* (St. Petersburg, 1875). For critical purposes, see, besides the articles QUOTATIONS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT IN THE TALMUD AND MASORAH in this *Cyclopædia*, together with the literature given in those articles, Strack, *Prolegomena Critica in V. T.* (Lipsiæ, 1873); id. *Zur Textkritik des Jesaias*, in *Lutherische Zeitschrift* (Leipsic, 1877), p. 17 sq., and his preface to the edition of the *Prophetarum Codex Babylonicus Petropolitanus* (Petrop. 1876); Meir Ha-Levi Abulafia (q. v.), ספר מסורת סייג לתורה (Florence, 1750; Berlin, 1761), Lonzano, אור תורה (Venice, 1618; Berlin, 1745); Norzi (q. v.), מנחת שי (Vienna, 1813); also in the Warsaw Rabbinic Bible; Heidenheim, חומש מאור עינים (Rödelheim, 1818–21); Kimchi, *Liber Radicum* edd. Lebrecht et Biesenthal (Berlin, 1847); Frensdorff, *Die Massora Magna* (Hanover and Leipsic, 1876); Geiger, *Urschrift und Uebersetzungen der Bibel* (Breslau, 1857), p. 231 sq.; the critical notes appended by Baer and Delitzsch to the different books edited by them; the *Masechet Soferim* (q. v.), best ed. by J. Müller (Leipsic, 1878); the forthcoming work of Ginsburg on the Masorah, which will be published in 4 vols.—viz. vol. i, the Masorah Magna, lexically arranged; vol. ii, the Masorah Parva; vol. iii, an English translation, with explanatory notes; vol. iv, the original Hebrew text of the Bible according to the Masorah; and Delitzsch, *Complutensische Varianten zu dem Alttestamentlichen Texte* (ibid. 1878). (B. P.)

RECENSIONS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT. After the critical materials at the basis of the New-Test. text had accumulated in the hands of Mill and Bentley, they began to be examined with care. Important readings in different documents were seen to possess resemblances more or less striking. Passages were found to present the same form, though the MSS. from which they were derived belonged to various times and countries. The

thought suggested itself to Bengel that the mass of materials might be definitely classified in conformity with such peculiarities. The same idea afterwards occurred to Semler. Bengel classified all the documents from which various readings are collected into two *nations* or *families*—the Asiatic and the African. To the former belonged the Codex Alexandrinus as the chief; to the latter the Græco-Latin codices. At first that eminent critic does not seem to have had a very distinct apprehension of the subject; and therefore he speaks in general terms of it in his edition of the Greek Testament published in 1734; but in the posthumous edition of the *Apparatus Criticus* (1763, edited by Burkius) he is more explicit. Semler was the first that used the term *recension* of a particular class of MSS., in his *Hermeneutische Vorbereitung* (1765). This critic, however, though acquainted with Wetstein's labors on the text of the New Test., had nothing more than a dim notion of the subject. He followed Bengel without clearly understanding or enlarging his views. Griesbach was the first scholar who treated the topic with consummate learning and skill, elaborating it so highly that it became a prominent subject in the criticism of the New Test. But he had the benefit of Wetstein's abundant treasures. The term *recension* applied to MS. quotations by ancient writers, and versions of the Greek Testament bearing an affinity to one another in characteristic readings, became a classical word in his hands, and has continued so. The appellation is not happily chosen. *Family, nation, class,* or *order* would have been more appropriate; because *recension* suggests the idea of revision, which is inapplicable. If it be remembered, however, that the word denotes nothing more than a certain class of critical documents characterized by distinctive peculiarities in common, it matters little what designation be employed.

The sentiments of Griesbach, like those of Bengel, developed and enlarged with time. Hence we must not look for exactly the same theory in his different publications. In his *Dissertatio Critica de Codicibus Quatuor Evangeliorum Origenianis* (pars prima, published in 1771), he says that there are, perhaps, three or four recensions into which all the codices of the New Test. might be divided (*Opuscula Academica*, edited by Gabler, i, 239). In the preface to his first edition of the Greek Testament (1777), he states that at the beginning of the 3d century there were two recensions of the gospels, the Alexandrian and the Western. In the prolegomena to the first volume of his second edition of the Greek Testament, the matured sentiments of this able critic are best set forth. There he illustrates the Alexandrian recension, the Western, and the Constantinopolitan. The first two are the more ancient, belonging to the time in which the two collections of the New-Test. writings, the εὐαγγέλιον and ὁ ἀπόστολος, were made. The Alexandrian was an actual recension arising at the time when the two portions in question were put together; the Western was simply the accidental result of carelessness and arbitrary procedure on the part of transcribers and others in the MSS. current before the ἀπόστολος, or epistles, were collected. The Constantinopolitan arose from the intermingling of the other two, and, like the Western, is no proper *recension*, but was rather the result of a condition of the documents brought about by the negligence and caprice of copyists or meddling critics. The Alexandrian is presented by the MSS. C, L, 33, 102, 106, and by B in the last chapters of the four gospels; by the Memphitic, Ethiopic, Armenian, and Philoxenian versions; and the quotations of Clemens Alexandrinus, Origen, Eusebius, Athanasius, Cyril of Alexandria, and Isidore of Pelusium. The Western accords with the Græco-Latin codices, with the Ante-Hieronymian Latin version, and with B in the gospel of Matthew; also with 1, 13, 69, 118, 124, 131, 157; with the Thebaic and Jerusalem-Syriac versions, and the quotations of Irenæus in Latin, Cyprian, Tertullian, Ambrose, and Augustine. The third or Constantinopolitan is shown in A, E, F, G, H, S, of the gospels, the Moscow codices of the Pauline epistles, the Gothic and Slavonic versions; and in the quotations of such fathers as lived during the 4th, 5th, and 6th centuries in Greece, Asia Minor, and the neighboring provinces. The text in Chrysostom is described by Griesbach as a mixed one; and of P, Q, and T he says that they accord sometimes with the Alexandrian, sometimes with the Western. The Alexandrian recension sought to avoid and change whatever might be offensive to Greek ears; but the Western preserved the harsher genuine readings when opposed to the genius of the Greek language; Hebraizing ones; readings involving solecism or unpleasant to the ear. The Alexandrian sought to illustrate words and phrases rather than the sense; the Western endeavored to render the sense clearer and less involved by means of explanations, circumlocutions, additions gathered from every side, as well as by transpositions of words and sentences. It also preferred the readings which are more full and verbose, as well as supplements taken from parallel passages, sometimes omitting what might render the sense obscure or seem repugnant to the context or parallel passages, in all which respects the Alexandrian is purer. The Alexandrian critic acted the part of a grammarian, the Western that of an interpreter. In all these points Griesbach asserts that the Constantinopolitan commonly agrees with the Alexandrian; but with this difference, that it is still more studious of Greek propriety, admits more glosses into the text, and intermingles either Western readings, which differ from the Alexandrian, or else readings compounded of Alexandrian and Western. No recension is exhibited by any codex in its original purity (*Prolegomena in Novum Testamentum* [3d ed. by Schulz], vol. i, p. lxx sq.).

Michaelis thinks that there have existed four principal editions: 1. The Western, used in countries where the Latin language was spoken. 2. The Alexandrian or Egyptian, with which the quotations of Origen coincide and the Coptic version. 3. The Edessene edition, embracing the MSS. from which the old Syriac was made. 4. The Byzantine, in general use at Constantinople after that city became the capital of the Eastern empire. This last is subdivided into the ancient and the modern (*Introduction to the New Test.*, translated by Marsh, ii, 175 sq., 2d ed.).

Assuredly this classification is no improvement upon Griesbach's.

Somewhat different from Griesbach's system is that of Hug, which was first proposed in his *Einleitung in das neue Testament* (1808). 1. The κοινὴ ἔκδοσις, i. e. the most ancient text, unrevised, which came into existence in the 2d century, found in D, 1, 13, 69, 124, of the gospels; in D, E, F, G, of Paul's epistles; in D, E, of the Acts; and in the old Latin and Thebaic versions. The Peshito also belongs to this class of text, though it differs in some respects from D. 2. About the middle of the 3d century, Hesychius, an Egyptian bishop, made a recension of the κοινὴ ἔκδοσις. To this belong B, C, L, of the gospels; A, B, C, 40, 30, 367, in the Acts; A, B, C, 40, 367, in the Catholic epistles; A, B, C, 46, 367, 17, of the Pauline epistles; and A, C, of the Apocalypse. It appears in the citations of Athanasius, Marcus and Macarius the monks, Cyril of Alexandria, and Cosmas Indicopleustes. This recension had ecclesiastical authority in Egypt and Alexandria. 3. About the same time, Lucian, a presbyter of Antioch, in Syria, revised the κοινὴ ἔκδοσις as it then existed in the Peshito, comparing different MSS. current in Syria. In this way he produced a text which did not wholly harmonize with the Hesychian because he was less studious of elegant Latinity. It appears in E, F, G, H, S, V, of the gospels, and b, h, of the Moscow *Evangelistaria* collated by Matthäi, with most of the cursive MSS.; in f, a_1, b, d, c, m, k (Matthäi), of the Acts; in g (Matthäi), f, k, l, m, c, d, of the Pauline and Catholic epistles; in r, k, p, l, o, Moscow MSS., of the Apocalypse; in the Goth-

ic and Slavonic versions, and the quotations of Theophylact, though his text is no longer pure. 4. A fourth recension Hug attributes to Origen during his residence at Tyre. To it belong A, K, M, 42, 106, 114, 116, and 10 of Matthäi in the gospels, the Philoxenian Syriac, the quotations of Theodoret and Chrysostom. From this summary it appears that Hug's *κοινὴ ἔκδοσις* agrees substantially with the Western recension of Griesbach. It is more comprehensive, as including the Peshito, with the quotations of Clement and Origen. The Hesychian recension of Hug coincides with the Alexandrian of Griesbach.

Eichhorn's system is substantially that of Hug, with one important exception. He assumed an unrevised form of the text in Asia, and, with some differences, in Africa also. This unrevised text may be traced in its two forms as early as the 2d century. Lucian revised the first, Hesychius the second. Hence, from the close of the third century, there was a threefold phase of the text—the African or Alexandrian, the Asiatic or Constantinopolitan, and a mixture of both. Eichhorn denied that Origen made a new recension (*Einleitung in das neue Testament*, vol. iv, § 35 sq.).

In 1815 Nolan published an *Inquiry into the Integrity of the Greek Vulgate*, in which he propounded a peculiar theory of recensions. He divided all the documents into three classes—the Palestinian, equivalent to Griesbach's Alexandrian; the Egyptian, identical with Griesbach's Western; and the Byzantine. The three forms of the text are represented, as he assumed, by the Codex Vaticanus and Jerome's Vulgate, with the Codices Vercellensis and Brixianus of the Latin version. The last two contained a more ancient text than that represented by the version of Jerome. The Palestinian recension, which he attributes to Eusebius of Cæsarea, is greatly censured as having been executed by this father with arbitrariness and dishonesty, since he tampered with passages because of their opposition to his Arian opinions. At the end of the 5th century this recension was introduced into Alexandria by Euthalius, and was circulated there.

Scholz made two classes or families—the Alexandrian or Occidental, and Constantinopolitan or Oriental. Griesbach's Western class is contained in the former. He referred to the Alexandrian several of the ancient MSS., and a few later ones—the Memphitic, Thebaic, Ethiopic, and Latin versions, and the ecclesiastical writers belonging to Western Europe, with those of Africa. To the Constantinopolitan he referred the MSS. belonging to Asia Minor, Palestine, Syria, Eastern Europe, especially Constantinople, with the Philoxenian, Syriac, Gothic, Georgian, and Slavonic versions, besides the fathers of these regions. To the latter he gave a decided preference, because of their alleged mutual agreement, and also because they were supposed to be written with great care after the most ancient exemplars; whereas the Alexandrian documents were arbitrarily altered by officious grammarians. Indeed, he traces the Constantinopolitan to the autography of the original writers.

Rinck agrees with Scholz in classifying all documents under two heads—the Occidental and the Oriental; the former exhibited in A, B, C, D, E, F, G, in the epistles, the latter containing the cursive MSS. The former he subdivides into two families—the African (A, B, C) and the Latin codices (D, E, F, G). He finds in it the result of arbitrary correction, ignorance, and carelessness.

Tischendorf's view, given in the prolegomena to the seventh edition of his Greek Testament, is that there are two pairs of classes—the Alexandrian and Latin, the Asiatic and Byzantine. The oldest form of the text, and that which most bears an Alexandrian complexion, is presented in A, B, C, D, I, L, P, Q, T, X, Z, Δ, perhaps also R, in the gospels. A later form, bearing more of an Asiatic complexion, is in E, F, G, H, K, M, O, S, U, V, Γ, Δ. For the Acts and Catholic epistles the oldest text is given in A, B, C; for Acts probably D and I also. For the Pauline epistles the oldest text is represented by A, B, C, H, I, D, F, G, the first five being Alexandrian, the last two Latin; D standing between the two classes. A and C in the Apocalypse have a more ancient text than B.

Lachmann disregarded all systems of recensions, and proceeded to give a text from ancient documents of a certain definite time—the text which commonly prevailed in the 3d and 4th centuries, drawn from Oriental MSS.—with the aid of Occidental ones in cases where the former disagree among themselves. In his large edition he follows the united evidence of Eastern and Western MSS. His merits are very great in the department of New-Test. criticism; but this is not the place to show them. He does not, however, profess to give a text as near as possible to that which he judges to proceed from the sacred writers themselves, as Griesbach and Tischendorf have done. On the contrary, he has simply undertaken to present that form of the text which is found in documents belonging to a certain period as a basis contributing to the discovery of the authentic text itself. *His* text is an important aid to the work of finding out the original words; not the original itself, as he would have given it. For this reason his edition contains readings which, in his own opinion, could *not* have been original. His object was therefore somewhat different from that of most editors. But he set an example of rigid adherence to the task proposed, and of critical sagacity in eliminating the true text from ancient documents of the time, evincing the talents and skill of a master. Since his time it has been the fashion among inferior critics and imitators to attach undue weight to antiquity. Uncial MSS. and their readings have been too implicitly followed by some.

Tischendorf more recently adopted the same views as those of Lachmann, holding that the most ancient text alone should be edited, though it may not always be what the sacred authors wrote. This principle being laid at the basis of his eighth edition, lately completed, made a considerable difference between it and the *seventh*. The internal goodness of readings, the context, and sound judgment are thus excluded, and this at the expense of something more valuable; for mere outward and ancient testimony can never elicit what ought to be an editor's chief object—the presentation of a text as near the original one as can be procured. The oldest text of the best MSS. and versions is valuable only so far as it assists in attaining that object. It is owing to the undue elevation of antiquity that such a reading as *ὁ μονογενὴς Θεός* in John i, 18 has been given in the text of a recent edition. The same excessive veneration for antiquity has led to the separation of *ὃ γέγονεν* from *οὐδὲ ἕν* (John i, 3) in modern times. Lachmann is exceeded by smaller followers, not in his own exact line.

To Griesbach all must allow distinguished merit. He was a consummate critic, ingenious, acute, candid, tolerant, and learned. His system was elaborated with great ability. It exhibits the marks of a sagacious mind. But it was assailed by many writers, whose combined attacks weakened its basis. In Germany, Eichhorn, Bertholdt, Hug, Schulz, Gabler, and Schott made various objections to it. In consequence of Hug's acute remarks, the venerable scholar himself modified his views. He did not, however, give up the three recensions, but still maintained that the Alexandrian and Western were distinct. He admitted that the Syriac, which Hug had put with the *κοινή*, was nearer to that than to the Alexandrian class; but he hesitated to put it with the Western because it differed so much. He denied that Origen used the *κοινή*, maintaining that the Alexandrian, which existed before his time, was that which he employed. He conceded, however, that Origen had a Western copy of Mark besides an Alexandrian one; that in his commentary on Matthew, though the readings are chiefly Alexandrian, there is

a great number of such as are Western, and which therefore appear in D_1, 13, 28, 69, 124, 131, 157, the old Italic, Vulgate, and Syriac. Thus Origen had various copies at hand, as he himself repeatedly asserts. Griesbach also conceded that Clemens Alexandrinus had various copies, differing in the forms of their texts. Hence his citations often agree with the κοινὴ ἔκδοσις and D. Thus Origen and Clement cease, in some measure, to be standard representatives of the Alexandrian recension. The concessions of Griesbach, resulting from many acute observations made by Hug and others, amounted to this, that the nearness of MSS. and recensions to one another was greater than he had before assumed; that his two ancient recensions had more points of contact with one another in existing documents than he had clearly perceived. The line between his Alexandrian and Western classes became less perceptible. This, indeed, was the weak point of the system, as no proper division can be drawn between the two. In the *application* of his system he professed to follow the consent of the Alexandrian and Western recensions, unless the internal marks of truth in a reading were so strong as to outweigh this argument. But he departed from his principle in several instances, as in 1 Cor. iii, 4; Gal. iv, 14; Phil. iii, 3; 1 Thess. ii, 7; Heb. iv, 2.

In the year 1814 Dr. Laurence published objections to Griesbach's system, many of which are unfounded. Some of his observations are pertinent and fair; more are irrelevant. He does not show much appreciation of the comparative value of MSS. and texts, and reasons in a sort of mechanical method against Griesbach. It is evident that he was somewhat prejudiced against the Alexandrian recension. Observations like the following show an animus against the German critic: "Too much dazzled, perhaps, by the splendor of intricate and perplexing research, he overlooked what lay immediately before him. When he threw his critical bowl among the established theories of his predecessors, he too hastily attempted to set up his own without having first totally demolished theirs, forgetting that the very nerve of his criticism was a principle of hostility to every standard text" (*Remarks upon the Systematic Classification of MSS. adopted by Griesbach*, p. 57). The pamphlet of the Oxford scholar is now almost forgotten, yet it produced considerable effect at the time of its appearance, when the reprinting of Griesbach's Greek Testament in England was associated with the active dissemination of Unitarian tenets, and the accomplished German himself was unjustly charged with leaning to similar views.

In America, Mr. Norton subsequently animadverted upon the same system with considerable acuteness and plausibility. It is evident, however, that he did not fully understand all Griesbach's sentiments; he had not studied the peculiar readings of MSS., the quotations of the fathers, and the characteristics of ancient versions, yet he has urged some objections forcibly and conclusively against the adoption of the system.

Hug's theory of recensions, so far as it differs from Griesbach's, is without foundation. It makes Origen use the κοινὴ ἔκδοσις, whereas his usual text agrees with the Alexandrian. The Hesychian recension was employed at least a hundred years previously by Clement of Alexandria, and that Hesychius was really the author of a recension is historically baseless; he may have corrected, in some places, a few copies which he used. The recension attributed to Lucian is also destitute of historical proof. The basis of this is supposed to have been the κοινὴ ἔκδοσις as it existed in Syria. Again, it is very improbable that Origen undertook to revise the κοινὴ ἔκδοσις. It is true that Jerome appeals to the *exemplars* of Origen, but this does not imply that the latter made a revision of existing copies. The Alexandrian father used copies of the New Test. selected with care, and probably corrected them in various places, but he did not undertake in his old age the laborious task of making a peculiar revision. The silence of ancient writers, especially of Eusebius, who is most copious in his praises of Origen, speaks strongly against the critical studies of the Alexandrian father in the New-Test. text. We believe, therefore, that the recension system of Hug is unsustained by historical data. Succeeding critics have refused to adopt it. Griesbach himself made several pertinent objections to it. It was also assailed by Schott, Rinck, Gabler, and others. Mr. Norton, too, opposed it.

Nolan's system is fundamentally wrong. There is no evidence that the Codex Brixianus contains the Latin version in its oldest form, and therefore the assumed connection of it with the Byzantine text fails to show that the latter is the most ancient and best representative of the original Greek. The Codex Brixianus, on the contrary, is itself a revision of the old Latin text. Nolan thinks that the Codex Vercellensis has a text corrected by Eusebius of Vercelli after that which he brought from Egypt on his return from exile. But this form of the text circulated in the West before Eusebius, and the Palestinian recension, which he supposes to have been introduced into Alexandria by Euthallus, was there before; thus the system so ingeniously elaborated by the critic is historically erroneous. It introduces arbitrary and baseless conjectures into the department of criticism, ignores facts, and deals in unjust accusations against ancient writers, such as Eusebius of Cæsarea, who were as honest as the zealous upholder himself of the Byzantine text. All attempts to maintain the most recent in opposition to the most ancient text must necessarily fail. Thoroughly erroneous as Nolan's theory is, it was eagerly welcomed by some advocates of the received text in England. Mr. Horne could say of it, even in the ninth edition of his *Introduction to the Critical Study and Knowledge of the Scriptures*, "The integrity of the Greek Vulgate he has confessedly established by a series of proofs and connected arguments the most decisive that can be reasonably desired or expected."

With regard to Scholz's system, which is identical with Bengel's, it may be preferable to Griesbach's so far as it allows but two classes of documents; it is certainly simpler. His estimate, however, of *the value* of families is erroneous. He failed to prove that the particular form of the text current in Asia Minor and Greece during the first three centuries was the same as that presented by the Constantinopolitan MSS. of a much later date. He did not show that the Byzantine family was derived from the autographs of the original writers in a very pure state; and he was obliged to admit that the text which obtained at Constantinople in the reigns of Constantine and Constance was collated with the Alexandrian, a circumstance which would naturally give rise to a mingling of readings belonging to both. Eusebius states that he made out fifty copies of the New Test. for the use of the churches at Constantinople at the request of Constantine; and as we know that he gave a decided preference to Alexandrian copies, it cannot be doubted that he followed those sanctioned by Origen's authority. Constantinopolitan codices differ in their characteristic readings from the Alexandrian, but the preference belongs to the latter, not to the former. Why should junior be placed above older documents? Antiquity may be overbalanced by other considerations, and certainly the Alexandrian MSS. are neither faultless nor pure. But the Byzantine and later MSS. are more corrupt. *Numbers* must not be considered decisive of right readings in opposition to *antiquity*, yet numbers had an undue influence on Scholz's mind. Rinck has refuted his supposed proofs of the superiority of Constantinopolitan MSS., and Tischendorf has more elaborately done the same in the preface to his first edition of the Greek Testament (1841). In fact, Scholz's historical proofs are no better than fictions which true history rejects.

No definite system of recensions such as those of Griesbach, Hug, and Scholz can be made out, because lines of division cannot be drawn with accuracy. Our knowledge of the ways in which the early text was deteriorated—of the influences to which it was exposed, the

corrections it underwent in different places at different times, the methods in which it was copied, the principles, if such there were, on which transcribers proceeded—is too meagre to build up a secure structure. The subject must therefore remain in obscurity. Its nature is such as to give rise to endless speculation without affording much real knowledge; it is vague, indefinite, shadowy, awakening curiosity without satisfying it. Yet we are not disposed to reject the entire system of classification as visionary. It is highly useful to arrange the materials. The existence of certain characteristic readings may be clearly traced in various monuments of the text, however much we may speculate on their causes. It is true that in several cases it is very difficult to distinguish the family to which a particular reading belongs, because its characteristics may be divided between two classes, or they may be so mixed that it is almost impossible to detect the family with which it should be united; the evidences of its relationship may be so obscure as to render the determination of its appropriate recension a subtle problem. It is also unquestionable that no one MS. version or father exhibits a recension in a pure state, but that each form of the text appears more or less corrupted. The speculations of the critics to which we have referred have had one advantage, viz. that they have made the characteristic readings of MSS. better understood, and enabled us to group together certain documents presenting the same form of text. Thus in the gospels, ℵ, A, B, C, D, I, L, P, Q, T, X, Z present an older form of the text than E, F, G, H, K, M, S, U, V, Γ. Among the former, ℵ, B, Z have a text more ancient and correct than that of the others.

Matthäi repudiated the whole system of recensions as useless and absurd. We question whether he was warranted by learning, penetration, or judgment to use the contemptuous language which he applied. His industry in collating MSS. and editing their text was praiseworthy, but he had not the genius to construct a good text out of the materials within his reach. He overestimated his Moscow codices, and looked on Griesbach's merits with envious eye; hence his diatribe on recensions shows more ardent zeal than discretion. What sentence can show the spirit of the man better than this?—"Griesbach has been hammering, filing, and polishing for thirty years at this masterpiece of uncriticism, unbelief, and irreligiousness in Semler's recension-manufactory" (*Ueber die sogenannten Recensionen, welche der Herr Abt Bengel, der Herr Doctor Semler, und der Herr Geheim-Kirchenrath Griesbach, in dem griechischen Texte des N. T. wollen entdeckt haben*, p. 28). Prof. Lee employed language equally strong with Matthäi's, but not so scurrilous, though of the same tendency: "Ingeniosæ illæ familiarum fabricæ, ut mihi videtur, in unum tantummodo finem feliciter exstructæ sunt; ut rem in seipsa haud valde obscuram, tenebris Ægyptiacis obscuriorem reddant; Editoresque eos qui se omnia rem acu tetigisse putent, supra mortalium labendi statum, nescio quantum, evehere" (*Prolegomena in Biblia Polyglotta Londinensia Minora*, p. 69). Neither is sufficiently eminent to be justified in the employment of phraseology from which masters in criticism like Griesbach would refrain. Hear the veteran scholar, in his last publication, speaking of Hug: "Dubitationis igitur causas exponere mihi liceat, sed paucis et modeste, nec eo animo, ut cum viro doctissimo quem permagni me facere ingenue profiteor, decertem, sed ut tum alios viros harum rerum peritos, tum in primis ipsum excitem et humanissime invitem ad novum instituendum causæ, quæ in universa re critica Novi Testamenti maximi momenti est, examen, quo ea, si ullo modo fieri id possit, ad liquidum tandem perducatur" (*Meletemata de Vetustis Textus Novi Testamenti Recensionibus*, particula ii, p. 42). The preceding observations will help to account for the varying schemes of different critics. Some may look for greater exactness and nicety than others, hence they will make more families of documents; others, with less acuteness or ingenuity, will rest satisfied with classes more strongly marked by the number of materials they embrace or the breadth of territory over which they were supposed to circulate. There is no possibility of arriving at precision. The commingling of readings has obliterated many peculiarities in the progress of time, though enough has been left to form the basis of a rough classification.

It is more difficult to classify the ancient versions, such as the Peshito-Syriac, because their texts have suffered frequent interpolations and changes. In the quotations of the fathers we must make allowance for *memoriter* citation, without expecting great care or attachment to the letter. Griesbach, however, denies that Origen quoted from memory—and none has investigated the citations of the Alexandrian father with equal labor—but the state of his commentaries is far from being what we could wish, and the original is often lost or corrupted.

The term *recension* is sometimes applied to the Old Test. as well as the New Test. There the materials hitherto collated all belong to one recension, viz. the Masoretic. Some, indeed, have divided them into Masoretic and Ante-Masoretic, but the latter cannot be traced. At present we are acquainted with only one great family, though it is probable that particular revisions of parts of the Old Test. preceded the labors of the Masoretes. Whether the Karaite Hebrew MSS.—of which many have been recently brought to St. Petersburg—present a different form of the text from the Masoretic will be seen after they have been collated; it is certain that their vowel-system is different from the present one. We expect, therefore, that important readings may be furnished by these very ancient codices.

See Bengel, *Introductio in Crisin N. T.*, prefixed to his edition of the Greek Testament (Tübingen, 1734, 4to); Semler, *Vorbereitungen zur Hermeneutik* (Halle, 1760–69, 8vo); Michaelis, *Introduction to the N. T.*, by Marsh, ii, 173 sq.; Griesbach, *Opuscula* (edited by Gabler, with the Preface of the latter [Jena, 1824–25, 2 vols. 8vo]); id. *Commentarius Criticus in Textum Græcum*, particulæ i and ii (ibid. 1798, 1811, 8vo); id. *Prolegomena* to the second edition of his Greek Testament (1796, 8vo); Eichhorn, *Einleitung* (Gött. 1827, 8vo), vol. iv; Bertholdt, *Einleitung* (Erlangen, 1812, 8vo), vol. i; Schulz, *Prolegomena* to the third edition of Griesbach (Berl. 1827, 8vo); Hug, *Einleit.* (4th ed. Stuttgart, 1847, 8vo), vol. i; De Wette, *Einleit. in das neue Testament* (6th ed. Berl. 1860, 8vo); Schott, *Isagoge Historico-critica* (Jena, 1830, 8vo); Matthäi, *Ueber die sogenannten Recensionen*, etc. (Leips. 1804, 8vo); Scholz, *Biblisch-kritische Reise*, etc. (ibid. 1823, 8vo); id. *Prolegomena to the N. T.* (1830), vol. i; Laurence, remarks on Griesbach's *Systematic Classification of MSS.* (Oxford, 1814, 8vo); Rinck, *Lucubratio Critica in Acta Apost., Epp. Cathol. et Paulin.* etc. (Basil. 1830, 8vo); Tischendorf, *Prolegomena* to his edition of the Greek Testament (Leips. 1841, 8vo), with the *Prolegomena* to his seventh edition (ibid. 1859), and his article *Bibeltext* in Herzog's *Encyklopädie;* Reuss, *Die Geschichte der heiligen Schriften neuen Testaments* (4th ed. Brunswick, 1864); Norton, *Genuineness of the Gospels* (Boston, 1837, 8vo), vol. i; Davidson, *Treatise on Biblical Criticism* (Edinburgh, 1852), vol. ii. See CRITICISM; MANUSCRIPTS; VARIOUS READINGS.

Reception of the Holy Ghost. In the act of conferring the orders of the ministry simple, or of its higher functions, such as the eldership or bishopric, the solemn words are used, "Receive the Holy Ghost." Having been originally used by Jesus when he commissioned his apostles, the expression has been retained by the Church as the most proper and authoritative form in which the powers of the Christian priesthood can be conveyed. "That the Church is vindicated," says Stoughton, "in employing them at the consecration of bishops is manifest from the fact that the min-

isterial powers of office are identically the same with those held by the apostles, and if given at all must proceed from the same source—i. e. the Holy Ghost." In the ordination of priests the same principle will apply. "Those under the designation of presbyters or elders also received their authority from this divine source, notwithstanding that there might be one or more intermediate links in the chain of transmission." "Take heed," said Paul to the elders of Ephesus, "unto yourselves and to all the flock over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers." If, therefore, it be granted that the bishop has the power of ordaining, it follows that he stands as an agent between the heavenly source of authority and the candidate to whom that authority is to be given, and is qualified to pronounce, "Receive the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a priest [or bishop] in the Church of God," etc.

We have quoted Stoughton because he fully exhibits the High-Church notion of *ordination* (q. v.), but we do not wish to be understood as its endorsers. Even the Low-Church clergy of the Anglican communion and the Protestant Episcopal Church refuse to give it approval. See Episcopacy. In the Methodist Episcopal Church bishops are not regarded as the successors of the apostles, and the apostolical succession of its ministry is not maintained. See art. Episcopacy, § iv. The form of ordination is very like in the different churches, and its variability of opinion depends upon the interpretation of the language employed.

RECEPTION, Religious, of monks, nuns, and other religious persons, is the ceremonial whereby they are admitted to the probationary state called the novitiate (q. v.). Before the ceremony of reception a short preparatory stage must be passed through by the candidate (called at this stage a "postulant"), the duration of which usually ranges from two to six months. The ceremony of the reception, called also "clothing," is performed by a bishop, or a priest delegated by a bishop, and consists in blessing the religious dress or habit and investing the postulant therein with appropriate prayers, the hair being at the same time cut off and the secular dress laid aside, in token of the renunciation of the world and its pomps and pleasures. The reception, however, is understood to be only a provisional step, and the novice remains free to return to secular life at any time during the novitiate.

Receptorium was the name of an ecclesiastical outer building, a kind of speaking-room, a parlor contiguous to the ancient churches; it is sometimes called *salutatorium* (q. v.). Mention of it occurs in Sidonius Apollinaris (l. v, epist. 17), Sulpitius Severus (*Dial.* ii, 1), the first Council of Mâcon (can. ii), Theodoretus, and many other authors. Theodoretus relates that Theodosius, when he came to request absolution from St. Ambrose, found the saint sitting *in salutatorio*. Scaliger is wrong in supposing this to be a room in the bishop's mansion; it adjoined the church, and was a part of the church building. In the receptorium the sacred utensils, the ornaments, and robes of the (mediæval) clergy were deposited for safe-keeping. Here the clergy were accustomed to retire for private devotions, preparatory to their engaging in public exercises. It was also a general audience-room, where friends and acquaintances met to exchange their affectionate salutations and inquiries, and where the bishop or the priests received the people who came to ask their blessing or recommend themselves to their prayers, or to take their advice in matters of importance. Sulpitius Severus (*Dial.* ii, 1) shows us St. Martin sitting in a kind of sacristy, and his priests in another, receiving visitors and transacting business.

Receveur, François Joseph Xavier, a French priest and historian, was born at Longeville (Doubs) April 30, 1800. Hardly had he received his orders when he was called to Paris (Oct., 1824) to fill a subordinate position in the cabinet of the minister of ecclesiastical affairs and of public instruction. From June, 1828, to June, 1829, he was head of the bureau of secretaryship to the same minister. Afterwards appointed a teacher in the theological faculty of Paris (May 1, 1831), he became titular professor of moral philosophy March 1, 1841, and dean of the faculty Dec. 6, 1850. He had not long been relieved from these last duties when he died in his native country, May 7, 1854. The various positions which he filled permitted him to devote his labors to several important works. We have: *Recherches Philosophiques sur le Fondement de la Certitude* (Paris, 1821, 12mo):—*Accord de la Foi avec la Raison, ou Exposition des Principes sur lesquels repose la Foi Catholique* (ibid. 1830–33, 12mo):—*Essai sur la Nature de l'Âme, sur l'Origine des Idées et le Fondement de la Certitude* (ibid. 1834, 8vo):—*Tractatus Theologicus de Justitia et Contractibus* (ibid. 1835, 12mo):—*Introduction à la Théologie* (Besançon, 1839, 8vo):—*Histoire de l'Église depuis son Établissement jusqu'au Pontificat de Grégoire XVI* (Paris, 1840–47, 8 vols. 8vo). As an editor, abbé Receveur has given a new edition of the *Théologie Dogmatique et Morale* of Bailly (1830), and another of the *Théologie Morale* of Liguori, to which he has added some notes (1833). Collector for the *Nouvelle Biographie Générale*, he died a short time after having contributed the articles *Saint-Cyprien* and *Saint-Cyrille*.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.

Re'chab (Heb. *Rechab'*, רֵכָב, *a rider;* Sept. Ῥηχάβ), the name of three men.

1. The first named of the two "sons of Rimmon the Beerothite," "captains of bands," who murdered Ishbosheth in his bed in order to gain favor with David, but were put to death by him, with expressions of abhorrence for their crime (2 Sam. iv, 5–12). B.C. 1046. Josephus calls him *Thannus* (Θάννος, *Ant.* vii, 2, 1). The other's name was Baanah (q. v.).

2. The "father" of Jehonadab (or Jonadab, Jer. xxxv, 6), who was Jehu's companion in destroying the worshippers of Baal (2 Kings x, 15, 23). See Jehonadab. B.C. ante 882. He was the ancestor of the Rechabites (q. v.).

3. The father of Malchiah, which latter was ruler of part of Beth-haccerem, and is named as repairing the dung-gate in the fortifications of Jerusalem under Nehemiah (Neh. iii, 14). B.C. ante 446.

Rech'abite [properly *Re'chabite*] (Heb. always in the plur. and with the art., *ha-Rekabim'*, הָרֵכָבִים, a patrial from *Rechab;* Sept. Ἀρχαβείν, Ῥαχαβείν, etc.), a tribe who appear only in one memorable scene of Scripture (Jer. xxxv, 2–18). Their history before and after it lies in some obscurity. We are left to search out and combine some scattered notices, and to get from them what light we can.

I. In 1 Chron. ii, 55 the house of Rechab is identified with a section of the Kenites who came into Canaan with the Israelites and retained their nomadic habits, and the name of Hemath is mentioned as the patriarch of the whole tribe. See Hemath; Kenite. It has been inferred from this passage that the descendants of Rechab belonged to a branch of the Kenites settled from the first at Jabez, in Judah. See Jehonadab. The fact, however, that Jehonadab took an active part in the revolution which placed Jehu on the throne seems to indicate that he and his tribe belonged to Israel rather than to Judah, and the late date of 1 Chron., taken together with other facts (*infra*), makes it more probable that this passage refers to the locality occupied by the Rechabites after their return from the captivity. In confirmation of this view, it may be noticed that the "shearing-house" of 2 Kings x, 14 was probably the known rendezvous of the nomad tribe of the Kenites with their flocks of sheep. See Shearing-house.

Of Rechab himself nothing is known. He may have been the father, he may have been the remote ancestor, of Jehonadab. The meaning of the word makes it probable enough that it was an epithet passing into a proper

name. It may have pointed, as in the robber-chief of 2 Sam. iv, 2, to a conspicuous form of the wild Bedouin life; and Jehonadab, the son of the *Rider*, may have been, in part at least, for that reason, the companion and friend of the fierce captain of Israel who drives as with the fury of madness (2 Kings ix, 20). Another conjecture as to the meaning of the name is ingenious enough to merit a disinterment from the forgotten learning of the 16th century. Boulduc (*De Eccles. ante Leg.* iii, 10) infers from 2 Kings ii, 12; xiii, 14, that the two great prophets Elijah and Elisha were known, each of them in his time, as the chariot (רֶכֶב, *Re'keb*) of Israel, i. e. its strength and protection. He infers from this that the special disciples of the prophets, who followed them in all their austerity, were known as the "sons of the chariot," *Bene-Rekeb;* and that afterwards, when the original meaning had been lost sight of, this was taken as a patronymic, and referred to an unknown Rechab. At present, of course, the different vowel-points of the two words are sufficiently distinctive; but the strange reading of the Sept. in Judg. i, 19 (ὅτι Ῥηχὰβ διεστείλατο αὐτοῖς, where the A. V. has "because they had *chariots* of iron") shows that one word might easily enough be taken for the other. Apart from the evidence of the name and the obvious probability of the fact, we have the statement (*quantum valeat*) of John of Jerusalem that Jehonadab was a disciple of Elisha (*De Instit. Monach.* c. 25).

II. The personal history of Jehonadab has been dealt with under that name. Here we have to notice the new character which he impressed on the tribe of which he was the head. As his name, his descent, and the part which he played indicate, he and his people had all along been worshippers of Jehovah, circumcised, and so within the covenant of Abraham, though not reckoned as belonging to Israel, and probably therefore not considering themselves bound by the Mosaic law and ritual. The worship of Baal introduced by Jezebel and Ahab was accordingly not less offensive to them than to the Israelites. The luxury and license of Phœnician cities threatened the destruction of the simplicity of their nomadic life (Amos ii, 7, 8; vi, 3–6). A protest was needed against both evils, and, as in the case of Elijah, and of the Nazarites of Amos ii, 11, it took the form of asceticism. There was to be a more rigid adherence than ever to the old Arab life. What had been a traditional habit was enforced by a solemn command from the sheikh and prophet of the tribe, the destroyer of idolatry, which no one dared to transgress. They were to drink no wine, nor build house, nor sow seed, nor plant vineyard, nor have any. All their days they were to dwell in tents, as remembering that they were strangers in the land (Jer. xxxv, 6, 7). This was to be the condition of their retaining a distinct tribal existence. For two centuries and a half they adhered faithfully to this rule; but we have no record of any part taken by them in the history of the period. We may think of them as presenting the same picture which other tribes, uniting the nomad life with religious austerity, have presented in later periods.

The Nabathæans, of whom Diodorus Siculus speaks (xix, 94) as neither sowing seed, nor planting fruit-tree, nor using nor building house, and enforcing these transmitted customs under pain of death, give us one striking instance. The fact that the Nabathæans habitually drank "wild honey" (μέλι ἄγριον) mixed with water (Diod. Sic. xix, 94), and that the Bedouin as habitually still make locusts an article of food (Burckhardt, *Bedouins*, p. 270), shows very strongly that the Baptist's life was fashioned after the Rechabitish as well as the Nazaritish type. Another is found in the prohibition of wine by Mohammed (Sale, *Koran, Prelim. Diss.* § 5). A yet more interesting parallel is found in the rapid growth of the sect of the Wahabîs during the last and present century. Abd-ul-Wahab, from whom the sect takes its name, reproduces the old type of character in all its completeness. Anxious to protect his countrymen from the revolting vices of the Turks, as Jehonadab had been to protect the Kenites from the like vices of the Phœnicians, the Bedouin reformer felt the necessity of returning to the old austerity of Arab life. What wine had been to the earlier preacher of righteousness, the outward sign and incentive of a fatal corruption, opium and tobacco were to the later prophet, and, as such, were rigidly proscribed. The rapidity with which the Wahabîs became a formidable party, the Puritans of Islam, presents a striking analogy to the strong political influence of Jehonadab in 2 Kings x, 15, 23 (comp. Burckhardt, *Bedouins and Wahabîs*, p. 283, etc.).

III. The invasion of Judah by Nebuchadnezzar in B.C. 607 drove the Rechabites from their tents. Possibly some of the previous periods of danger may have led to their settling within the limits of the territory of Judah. Some inferences may be safely drawn from the facts of Jer. xxxv. The names of the Rechabites show that they continued to be worshippers of Jehovah. They are already known to the prophet. One of them (ver. 3) bears the same name. Their rigid Nazaritish life gained for them admission into the house of the Lord, into one of the chambers assigned to priests and Levites, within its precincts. They were received by the sons or followers of a "man of God," a prophet or devotee, of special sanctity (ver. 4). Here they are tempted, and are proof against the temptation, and their steadfastness is turned into a reproof for the unfaithfulness of Judah and Jerusalem. See JEREMIAH. The history of this trial ends with a special blessing, the full import of which has, for the most part, not been adequately apprehended: "Jonadab, the son of Rechab, shall not want a man to stand before me forever" (ver. 19). Whether we look on this as the utterance of a true prophet, or as a *vaticinium ex eventu*, we should hardly expect at this precise point to lose sight altogether of those of whom it was spoken, even if the words pointed only to the perpetuation of the name and tribe. They have, however, a higher meaning. The words "to stand before me" (עֹמֵד לְפָנַי) are essentially liturgical. The tribe of Levi is chosen to "stand before" the Lord (Deut. x, 8; xviii, 5, 7). In Gen. xviii, 22; Judg. xx, 28; Psa. cxxxiv, 1; Jer. xv, 19, the liturgical meaning is equally prominent and unmistakable (comp. Gesenius, *Thesaur.* s. v.; Grotius, *ad loc.*). The fact that this meaning is given ("ministering before me") in the Targum of Jonathan is evidence (1) as to the received meaning of the phrase; (2) that this rendering did not shock the feelings of studious and devout rabbins in our Lord's time; (3) that it was at least probable that there existed representatives of the Rechabites connected with the Temple services in the time of Jonathan. This, then, may possibly have been the extent of the new blessing. The Rechabites were solemnly adopted into the families of Israel, and were recognised as incorporated into the tribe of Levi. Their purity, their faithfulness, their consecrated life, gained for them, as it gained for other Nazarites, that honor. See PRIEST, HEBREW. In Lam. iv, 7 we may perhaps trace a reference to the Rechabites, who had been the most conspicuous examples of the Nazaritish life in the prophet's time, and most the object of his admiration.

It may be worth while to refer to a few authorities agreeing in the general interpretation here given, though differing as to details. Vatablus (*Crit. Sac.* ad loc.) mentions a Jewish tradition (R. Judah, as cited by Kimchi; comp. Scaliger, *Elench. Trihæres. Serrar.* p. 26) that the daughters of the Rechabites married Levites, and that thus their children came to minister in the Temple. Clarius (*ibid.*) conjectures that the Rechabites themselves were chosen to sit in the great council. Sanctius and Calmet suppose them to have ministered in the same way as the Nethinim (Calmet, *Diss. sur les Réchab.* 1726). Serrarius (*Trihæres.*) identifies them with the Essenes; Scaliger (*loc. cit.*) with the Chasidim, in

whose name the priests offered special daily sacrifices, and who, in this way, were "standing before the Lord" continually.

IV. It remains for us to see whether there are any traces of their after-history in the Biblical or later writers. It is believed that there are such traces, and that they confirm the statements made in the previous paragraph.

1. We have the singular heading of Psa. lxxi in the Sept. version (*τῷ Δαυίδ, υἱῶν Ἰωναδάβ, καὶ τῶν πρώτων αἰχμαλωτισθέντων*), which, however, is evidence merely of a tradition in the 3d century B.C. indicating that the "sons of Jonadab" shared the captivity of Israel, and took their place among the Levitical psalmists who gave expression to the sorrows of the people. The psalm itself belongs to David's time. See PSALMS.

2. There is the significant mention of a son of Rechab in Neh. iii, 14 as co-operating with the priests, Levites, and princes in the restoration of the wall of Jerusalem.

3. The mention of the house of Rechab in 1 Chron. ii, 55, though not without difficulty, points, there can be little doubt, to the same conclusion. The Rechabites have become scribes (סוֹפְרִים, *sopherim*). They give themselves to a calling which, at the time of the return from Babylon, was chiefly, if not exclusively, in the hands of Levites. The other names (Tirathites, Shimeathites, and Suchathites in the A. V.) seem to add nothing to our knowledge. The Vulg. rendering, however (evidence of a traditional Jewish interpretation in the time of Jerome), gives a translation based on etymologies, more or less accurate, of the proper names, which strikingly confirms the view now taken: "Cognationes quoque Scribarum habitantium in Jabes, canentes atque resonantes, et in tabernaculis commorantes." Thus interpreted, the passage points to a resumption of the outward form of their old life and its union with their new functions. The etymologies on which this version rests are, it must be confessed, very doubtful. Scaliger (*Elench. Trihær. Serrar.* c. 23) rejects them with scorn. Pellican and Calmet, on the other hand, defend the Vulg. rendering, and Gill (*ad loc.*) does not dispute it. Most modern interpreters follow the A. V. in taking the words as proper names. It deserves notice also that while in 1 Chron. ii, 54, 55 the Rechabites and Netophathites are mentioned in close connection, the "sons of the singers" in Neh. xii, 28 appear as coming in large numbers from the villages of the same Netophathites. The close juxtaposition of the Rechabites with the descendants of David in 1 Chron. iii, 1 shows also in how honorable an esteem they were held at the time when that book was compiled.

4. The account of the martyrdom of James the Just given by Hegesippus (Euseb. *H. E.* ii, 23) brings the name of the Rechabites once more before us, and in a very strange connection. While the scribes and Pharisees were stoning him, "one of the priests of the sons of Rechab, the son of Rechabim, who are mentioned by Jeremiah the prophet," cried out, protesting against the crime. Stanley (*Sermons and Essays on the Apostolic Age*, p. 333), struck with the seeming anomaly of a priest, "not only not of Levitical, but not even of Jewish descent," supposes the name to have been used loosely as indicating the abstemious life of James and other Nazarites, and points to the fact that Epiphanius (*Hær.* lxxviii, 14) ascribes to Simeon, the brother of James, the words which Hegesippus puts into the mouth of the Rechabite, as a proof that it denoted merely the Nazaritish form of life. Calmet (*loc. cit.*) supposes the man to have been one of the Rechabite Nethinim, whom the informant of Hegesippus took, in his ignorance, for a priest. The view which has been here taken presents, it is believed, a more satisfactory solution. It was hardly possible that a writer like Hegesippus, living at a time when the details of the Temple services were fresh in the memories of men, should have thus spoken of the Rechabim unless there had been a body of men to whom the name was commonly applied. He uses it as a man would do to whom it was familiar, without being struck by any apparent or real anomaly. The Targum of Jonathan on Jer. xxxv, 19 indicates, as has been noticed, the same fact. We may accept Hegesippus therefore as an additional witness to the existence of the Rechabites as a recognised body up to the destruction of Jerusalem, sharing in the ritual of the Temple, partly descended from the old "sons of Jonadab," partly recruited by the incorporation into their ranks of men devoting themselves, as did James and Simeon, to the same consecrated life. The form of austere holiness presented in the life of Jonadab, and the blessing pronounced on his descendants, found their highest representatives in the two brothers of the Lord.

5. Some later notices are not without interest. Benjamin of Tudela, in the 12th century (ed. Asher, 1840, i, 112–114), mentions that near El Jubar (=Pumbeditha) he found Jews who were named Rechabites. They tilled the ground, kept flocks and herds, abstained from wine and flesh, and gave tithes to teachers who devoted themselves to studying the law and weeping for Jerusalem. They were 100,000 in number, and were governed by a prince, Salomon han-Nasi, who traced his genealogy up to the house of David, and ruled over the city of Thema and Telmas. A later traveller, Dr. Wolff, gives a yet stranger and more detailed report. The Jews of Jerusalem and Yemen told him that he would find the Rechabites of Jer. xxxv living near Mecca (*Journal*, 1829, ii, 334). When he came near Senaa he came in contact with a tribe, the Beni-Khaibr, who identified themselves with the sons of Jonadab. With one of them, Mûsa, Wolff conversed, and he reports the dialogue as follows: "I asked him, 'Whose descendants are you?' Mûsa answered, 'Come, and I will show you,' and read from an Arabic Bible the words of Jer. xxxv, 5–11. He then went on. 'Come, and you will find us 60,000 in number. You see the words of the prophet have been fulfilled: Jonadab the son of Rechab shall not want a man to stand before me forever'" (*ibid.* p. 335). In a later journal (*ibid.* 1839, p. 389) he mentions a second interview with Mûsa, describes them as keeping strictly to the old rule, calls them now by the name of the Beni-Arhad, and says that Beni-Israel of the tribe of Dan live with them. A paper *On Recent Notices of the Rechabites*, by Signor Pierotti, was read at the Cambridge meeting of the British Association (October, 1862). He met with a tribe calling themselves by that name near the Dead Sea, about two miles south-east from it. They had a Hebrew Bible, and said their prayers at the tomb of a Jewish rabbi. They told him precisely the same stories as had been told to Wolff thirty years before. The details, however, whether correct or not, apply to Talmudical Jews more than to Rechabites. They are described as living in caverns and low houses, not in tents—and this in Arabia, where Bedouin habits would cease to be singular; nor are any of the Rechabite rules observable in them except that of refraining from wine—an abstinence which ceases to be remarkable in Arabia, where no one drinks wine, and where, among the strongholds of Islam, it could probably not be obtained without danger and difficulty. There were large numbers of Talmudical Jews in Arabia in the time of Mohammed, and these supposed Rechabites are probably descended from a body of them. See Witsius, *Dissert. de Rechabitis*, in *Miscell. Sacra*, ii, 176 sq.; Carpzov, *Apparat.* p. 148; Calmet, *Dissert. sur les Réchabites*, in *Commentaire Littéral*, vi, 18–21. For the modern temperance organization by this name, see TEMPERANCE.

Rechac, JEAN GIFFRE DE (whose religious name was *Jean de Sainte-Marie*), a French Dominican, was born at Quillebœuf Aug. 25, 1604. He took the habit of a monk, and taught Greek and Hebrew at Paris, then at Bordeaux. He travelled in the Orient as an apostolic missionary, and visited the isle of Scio and Constantinople. Returning to Paris about the end of 1631, he became in 1637 prior of the convent of the Domin-

icans at Rouen, and devoted himself with success to preaching. Being sent to Bordeaux in 1640, he collected numerous materials for writing the history of his order; and when, in 1656, the monks of St. Dominic founded several houses in France, he was charged with the erection of divers novitiates. He died April 9, 1660. We have of his works, *Les Vrais Exercices Solides et Pratiques de la Vie Spirituelle et Religieuse* (Rouen, 1638–40, 4 vols. 12mo):—*Vie de Saint-Hyacinthe* (Paris, 1643, 12mo):—*Les Vies de Trois Bienheureux de Bretagne, Yves Mahreuc, Évêque de Rennes, Alain de la Roche, Pierre Quintin* (ibid. 1645, 12mo):—*Vie de Renaud de Saint-Gilles, Doyen de Saint-Agnau d'Orléans* (who died in 1220) (ibid. 1646, 12mo):—*Vie de Saint-Dominique, avec la Fondation de tous les Convents des Frères Prêcheurs de l'un et de l'autre Sexe en France et dans les Pays-Bas* (ibid. 1647, 4to):—*Les Vies et Actions Mémorables des Saintes et Bienheureuses de l'Ordre des Frères Prêcheurs* (1635, 2 vols. 4to):—and a great number of other works printed or in MS., among them *Prophéties de Nostradamus expliquées* (Paris, 1656, 12mo), published without the name of the author.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.

Re'chah (Heb. *Rekah'*, רֶכָה, *hindermost;* Sept. Ῥηχάβ v. r. Ῥηφά). In 1 Chron. iv, 12, Beth-rapha, Paseah, and Tehinnah the father, or founder, of Ir-nahash, are said to have been "the men of Rechah." In the Targum of R. Joseph they are called "the men of the Great Sanhedrin," the Targumist apparently reading רַבָּה. Schwarz regards it as the name of a place inhabited by the posterity of Judah, and identifies it with "a village *Rashiah*, three English miles to the south of Hebron" (*Palest.* p. 116).

Reche, Johann Wilhelm, the main representative of the Kantian rationalism in the Lutheran Church of the Rhine countries, was born Nov. 3, 1764, at Lennep. In 1786 he became pastor of the newly organized Lutheran church at Hückeswagen, and in 1796 pastor at Mühlheim-on-the-Rhine, where, during the Revolution, he published a translation of Marcus Aurelius's philosophical treatise Τὰ εἰς ἑαυτὸν (1797), in order to show how a man should become a stoic. After the taking of the Rhine countries by Prussia, he became a member of the consistory of Cologne, which in 1826 was dissolved. In 1830 he retired from the ministry to his country-seat at Wesseling, between Cologne and Bonn, being dissatisfied with the new religious movement of his time, and died as an angry philosopher Jan. 9, 1835. He published some hymns, which, though of little value, are, however, found in some of the modernized German hymn-books. He also published a collection of sermons in two volumes, which are enumerated in Zuchold, *Bibliotheca Theologica*, ii, 1035 (comp. also Koch, *Geschichte des deutschen Kirchenliedes*, vi, 259). (B. P.)

Rechenberg, Karl Friedrich Wilhelm, a Lutheran minister, was born Feb. 10, 1817, at Barnickow, near Königsberg, in Prussia. From 1835 to 1840 he studied in the seminary of the Berlin Missionary Society, and in 1841 he came to this country to work among his countrymen. His first pastorate was at Syracuse, N. Y., where he labored for about fifteen years. In the year 1855 he was called to Albany, at which place he remained three years. He then went to Canada, where he labored for about thirteen years in Toronto and for five years at Montreal. Among his coreligionists he was a prominent member, and was the first president of the Canadian synod. He also edited for a long time the paper of his denomination, and as president of the Missionary Board he cared for his countrymen with word and sacrament. His bodily infirmities obliged him to retire from his large field of labor, and he accepted the call of a small congregation at Port Chester, N. Y., in 1875, where he died Dec. 13, 1877. (B. P.)

Recluse (Lat. *reclusus*, also *inclusus*, "shut up"), a class of monks or nuns who, from a motive of special penance, or with a view to the more strict observance of Christian perfection, remained shut up from all converse, even with members of their own order, in a small cell of a hermitage or other place of strict retirement. This practice, which was a kind of voluntary imprisonment, either from motives of devotion or penance, was not allowed except to persons of tried virtue and by special permission of the abbot; and the recluse, who took an oath never to stir out of his retreat, was with due solemnity locked up in the presence of the abbot or the bishop, who placed his seal upon the door, not to be removed without the authority of the bishop himself. Everything necessary for support was conveyed through a window. If the recluse were a priest, he was allowed a small oratory with a window which looked into the church, through which he might make his offerings at mass, hear the singing, and answer those who spoke to him; but this window had curtains before it, so that he could not be seen. In later mediæval times the recluse was allowed a small garden near his cell for the planting of a few herbs and for recreation in fresh air. If he fell sick, his door was opened by the authorities for the sake of affording assistance. The celebrated mediæval theologian Rabanus Maurus was a recluse when elected archbishop of Mentz. Nuns also were found to practice the same voluntary seclusion, especially in the Benedictine, Franciscan, and Cistercian orders. A rule specially designed for female recluses was composed by Ælred of Keresby, and is preserved by Holstenius in his *Codex Regularum Monasticarum*, i, 418 sq. In a wider sense, the name *recluse* is popularly applied to all cloistered persons, whether men or women—even those who live in community with their brethren. The inmates of the celebrated French retreat for Jansenists — Port-Royal — were also called recluses. See Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon* (art. "Inclusi"); *Cults, Scenes, and Characters of the Middle Ages* (Lond. 1873).

Recognitions. See Clementines.

Recollet (Lat. *recollectus*, "gathered together") is the name given to the members of certain reformed bodies of monastic orders, whether of men or women, in

A Recollet.

the Roman Catholic Church. Among orders of men, an offshoot of the Augustinian hermits, which, under Louis de Montaya, in 1530, obtained considerable popularity in Spain, was called by this name, and the order still exists at Medina Sidonia, Leon, and Pamplona; but outside of Spain, this order is better known under the title of the *Reformed Franciscans*, who originated about 1592, and were established in France under Henry IV and Louis XIV, and spread thence into Belgium, their houses in these countries and Germany becoming so numerous that they reckoned no less than ten provinces. In the French army of Louis XIV the Reformed Franciscans used to administer the sacrament. A reform of the Cistercian order of nuns in Spain was also called by the same name (*Chambers*). See *Histoire du Clergé Séculier et Régulier*, ii, 367 sq.; Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* ix, 71.

Reconciliatio Pœnitentium is the act by which offenders of the Church are restored to ecclesiastical rights and privileges. See PENITENTS.

Reconciliation (usually some form of כָּפַר, to *cover* sin, καταλλαγή) is making those friends again who were at variance, or restoring to favor those having fallen under displeasure. Thus the Scriptures describe the disobedient world as having been at enmity with God, but "reconciled" to him by the death of his Son. The expressions "reconciliation" and "making peace" necessarily suppose a previous state of hostility between God and man, which is reciprocal. This is sometimes called enmity, a term, as it respects God, rather unfortunate, since enmity is almost fixed in our language to signify a malignant and revengeful feeling. Of this, the oppugners of the doctrine of the atonement have availed themselves to argue that as there can be no such affection in the divine nature, therefore reconciliation in Scripture does not mean the reconciliation of God to man, but of man to God, whose enmity the example and teaching of Christ, they tell us, are very effectual to subdue. It is, indeed, a sad and humbling truth, and one which the Socinians, in their discussions on the natural innocence of man, are not willing to admit, that by the infection of sin "the carnal mind is enmity to God;" that human nature is malignantly hostile to God and to the control of his law. But this is far from expressing the whole of that relation of man in which, in Scripture, he is said to be at enmity with God, and so to need a reconciliation—the making of peace between God and him. That relation is a legal one, as that of a sovereign, in his judicial capacity, and a criminal who has violated his laws and risen up against his authority, and who is therefore treated as an enemy. The word ἐχθρός is used in this passive sense, both in the Greek writers and in the New Test. So, in Rom. xi, 28, the Jews, rejected and punished for refusing the Gospel, are said by the apostle, "as concerning the Gospel," to be "enemies for your sakes"—treated and accounted such; "but, as touching the election, they are beloved for the fathers' sakes." In the same epistle (v, 10) the term is used precisely in the same sense, and that with reference to the reconciliation by Christ: "For if, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son," i. e. when we were objects of the divine judicial displeasure, accounted as enemies, and liable to be capitally treated as such. Enmity, in the sense of malignity and the sentiment of hatred, is added to this relation in the case of man; but it is no part of the relation itself, it is rather a case of it, as it is one of the actings of a corrupt nature which render man obnoxious to the displeasure of God and the penalty of his law, and place him in the condition of an enemy. It is this judicial variance and opposition between God and man which is referred to in the term reconciliation, and in the phrase "making peace," in the New Test.; and the hostility is therefore, in its own nature, mutual.

But that there is no truth in the notion that reconciliation means no more than our laying aside our enmity to God may also be shown from several express passages. The first is the passage we have above cited: "For if, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God" (Rom. v, 10). Here the act of reconciling is ascribed to God, and not to us; but if this reconciliation consisted in the laying-aside of our own enmity, the act would be ours alone. And, further, that it could not be the laying-aside of our enmity is clear from the text, which speaks of reconciliation while we were yet enemies. The reconciliation spoken of here is not, as Socinus and his followers have said, our conversion. For that the apostle is speaking of a benefit obtained for us previous to our conversion appears evident from the opposite members of the two sentences—"much more, being justified, we shall be saved from wrath through him;" "much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life." The apostle argues from the greater to the less. If God were so benign to us before our conversion, what may we not expect from him now we are converted? To reconcile here cannot mean to convert, for the apostle evidently speaks of something greatly remarkable in the act of Christ. But to convert sinners is nothing remarkable, since none but sinners can be ever converted; whereas it was a rare and singular thing for Christ to die for sinners, and to reconcile sinners to God by his death, when there have been but very few good men who have died for their friends. In the next place, conversion is referred more properly to his glorious life than to his shameful death; but this reconciliation is attributed to his death as contradistinguished from his glorious life, as is evident from the antithesis contained in the two verses. Besides, it is from the latter benefit that we learn the nature of the former. The latter, which belongs only to the converted, consists of the peace of God and salvation from wrath (Rom. v, 9, 10). This the apostle afterwards calls receiving the reconciliation. And what is it to receive the reconciliation but to receive the remission of sins? (Acts x, 43). To receive conversion is a mode of speaking entirely unknown. If, then, to receive the reconciliation is to receive the remission of sins, and in effect to be delivered from wrath or punishment, to be reconciled must have a corresponding signification.

"God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them" (2 Cor. v, 19). Here the manner of this reconciliation is expressly said to be not our laying aside our enmity, but the non-imputation of our trespasses to us by God; in other words, the pardoning of our offences and restoring us to favor. The promise on God's part to do this is expressive of his previous reconciliation to the world by the death of Christ; for our actual reconciliation is distinguished from this by what follows, "and hath committed to us the ministry of reconciliation," by virtue of which all men were, by the apostles, entreated and besought to be reconciled to God. The reason, too, of this reconciliation of God to the world, by virtue of which he promises not to impute sin, is grounded by the apostle, in the last verse of the chapter, not upon the laying-aside of enmity by men, but upon the sacrifice of Christ: "For he hath made him to be sin" (a sin-offering) "for us, who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him." "And that he might reconcile both unto God in one body by the cross, having slain the enmity thereby" (Eph. ii, 16). Here the act of reconciling is attributed to Christ. Man is not spoken of as reconciling himself to God; but Christ is said to reconcile Jews and Gentiles together, and both to God, "by his cross." Thus, says the apostle, "he is our peace;" but in what manner is the peace effected? Not, in the first instance, by subduing the enmity of man's heart, but by removing the enmity of "the law." "Having abolished in," or by, "his flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments." The ceremonial law only is here probably meant; for by its abolition, through its fulfilment in Christ, the enmity between Jews and Gentiles

was taken away. But still it was not only necessary to reconcile Jew and Gentile together, but to "reconcile both unto God." This he did by the same act; abolishing the ceremonial law by becoming the antitype of all its sacrifices, and thus, by the sacrifice of himself, effecting the reconciliation of all to God, "slaying the enmity by his cross," taking away whatever hindered the reconciliation of the guilty to God, which, as we have seen, was not enmity and hatred to God in the human mind only, but that judicial hostility and variance which separated God and man as Judge and criminal. The feeble criticism of Socinus on this passage, in which he has been followed by his adherents to this day, is thus answered by Grotius: "In this passage the dative Θεῷ, *to God*, can only be governed by the verb ἀποκαταλλάξῃ, *that he might reconcile;* for the interpretation of Socinus, which makes *to God* stand by itself, or that to reconcile to God is to reconcile them among themselves that they might serve God, is distorted and without example. Nor is the argument valid which is drawn from thence, that in this place Paul properly treats of the peace made between Jews and Gentiles; for neither does it follow from this argument that it was beside his purpose to mention the peace made for each with God. For the two opposites which are joined are so joined among themselves that they should be primarily and chiefly joined by that bond; for they are not united among themselves, except by and for that bond. Gentiles and Jews, therefore, are made friends among themselves by friendship with God."

Here, also, a critical remark will be appropriate. The above passages will show how falsely it has been asserted that God is nowhere in Scripture said to be reconciled to us, and that they only declare that we are reconciled to God; but the fact is, that the very phrase of *our being reconciled to God* imports the turning-away of his wrath from us. Whitby observes, on the words καταλλάττειν and καταλλαγή, "that they naturally import the reconciliation of one that is angry or displeased with us, both in profane and Jewish writers." When the Philistines suspected that David would appease the anger of Saul by becoming their adversary, they said, "Wherewith should he *reconcile* himself to his master? Should it not be with the heads of these men?" Not, surely, how shall he remove his own anger against his master? but how shall he remove his master's anger against him?—how shall he restore himself to his master's favor? "If thou bring thy gift to the altar and there rememberest that thy brother hath aught against thee," not that thou hast aught against thy brother, "first be reconciled to thy brother," i. e. appease and conciliate him; so that the words, in fact, import "See that thy brother be reconciled to thee," since that which goes before is, not that he hath done thee an injury, but thou him. Thus, then, for us to be reconciled to God is to avail ourselves of the means by which the anger of God towards us is to be appeased, which the New Test. expressly declares to be meritoriously "the sin-offering" of him "who knew no sin," and instrumentally, as to each individual personally, "faith in his blood." See PROPITIATION.

"We know," says Farrar, "that God cannot literally feel anger, or any other passion; nor can he be literally grieved and pained at anything man can do, since (as the 1st article of our [Anglican] Church expresses it) he is without body, parts, or passions; though in Scripture hands and eyes and other bodily members are figuratively attributed to him, as well as anger, repentance, and other passions. But all these are easily understood as spoken in reference to their *effects on us*, which are the same as if the things themselves were literally what they are called. It is well known to astronomers that the sun keeps its place, and yet they, as well as the vulgar, speak familiarly of the sun's rising and setting without any mistake or perplexity thence arising, because the effects on this earth—the succession of light and darkness—are exactly the same as if the sun did literally move round it daily. In like manner, when the Scriptures speak of God's wrath, fierce anger, etc., against sinners, it is meant not that *he* literally feels angry passions, but that the *effect* on men will be the same as if he did. And, similarly, when 'reconciliation' with God is spoken of, it is to be understood as meaning that the effects of the death of Christ are such as to cause men to be regarded by God with that favor with which he would regard them if literally returned from a state of enmity to a state of reconciliation."

See Nitzsch, *Practische Theologie;* Fletcher, *Works* (see Index); *Presbyterian Confessions;* Pearson, *on the Creed;* Goodwin, *Works;* Knapp, *Christian Theology;* Reynolds [John], *On Reconciliation;* Ritschl, *Critical History of the Christian Doctrine of Justification and Reconciliation* (Edinb. 1872); Pope, *Compendium of Christian Theology* (Lond. 1875, 12mo), p. 196–200.

Recordāre SANCTÆ CRUCIS is the beginning of a passion-hymn composed by the "Seraphic Doctor," St. Bonaventura (q. v.). This is his best poem, and consists of fifteen stanzas, the last bearing a strong resemblance to the next to the last of the *Stabat Mater Dolorosa*. There are two English translations of this hymn—one by Dr. H. Harbaugh in the *Mercersburg Review*, 1858, p. 481 ("Make the Cross your Meditation"); another by Dr. J. W. Alexander, of which the first stanza runs thus:

> "Jesus' holy cross and dying,
> Oh, remember! ever eying
> Endless pleasure's pathway here;
> At the cross thy mindful station
> Keep, and still in meditation
> All unsated persevere."

It has also been translated into German by Simrock, in his *Lauda Zion Salvatorem*, p. 269; by Rambach, in his *Anthology*, i, 315, "An des Herrn Kreuz zu denken," which is now generally found in German hymn-books; by Stadelmann, in Bässler's *Auswahl altchristlicher Hymnen*, p. 118, "Woll des heiligen Kreuzes denken;" by Königsfeld, in his collection of *Latin Hymns*, i, 151, "An des Herrn Kreuzesleiden." The English of Alexander is given in Schaff's *Christ in Song*, p. 165. (B. P.)

Recorder (מַזְכִּיר, *mazkir', a remembrancer;* Sept. ἀναμιμνήσκων, ὑπομνηματογράφος), an officer of high rank in the Jewish state, exercising the functions, not simply of an annalist, but of chancellor or president of the privy council (Isa. xxxvi, 3, 22). The title itself may, perhaps, have reference to his office as adviser of the king; at all events, the notices prove that he was more than an annalist, though the superintendence of the records was without doubt intrusted to him. In David's court the recorder appears among the high officers of his household (2 Sam. viii, 16; xx, 24; 1 Chron. xviii, 15). In Solomon's he is coupled with the three secretaries, and is mentioned last, probably as being their president (1 Kings iv, 3). Under Hezekiah, the recorder, in conjunction with the præfect of the palace and the secretary, represented the king (2 Kings xviii, 18, 37). The patronymic of the recorder at this time, Joah the son of Asaph, makes it probable that he was a Levite. Under Josiah, the recorder, the secretary, and the governor of the city were intrusted with the superintendence of the repairs of the Temple (2 Chron. xxxiv, 8). These notices are sufficient to prove the high position held by him. The same office is mentioned as existing in the Persian court, both ancient and modern, where it is called *waka nuwish;* and also in the time of the Roman emperors Arcadius and Honorius, under the name of *magister memoriæ*. In Ezra iv, 15, mention is made of "the book of the records," and in Esth. vi, 1; x, 2, of "the book of records of the chronicles," written by officers of this nature. Many of the royal annals of Egypt and Assyria were sculptured on the obelisks, slabs, and monuments, and are still in fine preservation; and already they have contributed to the illustration of the inspired records. See SCRIBE.

Records, a frequent name for the books and papers of a Church, which contain a record or account of the history and temporal business of the parish. In these books are written, from time to time, all such transactions as relate to the election of officers, the purchase or sale, etc., of Church property, the erection of buildings, the engaging of ministers, the support of public worship, and other matters connected with the temporal affairs of the Church. Under the name of "parish records," or "Church records," may also be included the *register*, containing the minister's account of baptisms, marriages, etc. See REGISTER.

Rectitude (or UPRIGHTNESS) is the choice and pursuit of those things which the mind, after due inquiry and attention, clearly perceives to be fit and good, and the eschewing of those that are evil. "*Rectitude* of conduct," says Whately, "is intended to express the term κατόρθωσις, which Cicero translates *recta effectio*; κατόρθωμα he translates *rectum factum*. Now the definition of κατόρθωμα was *νόμου πρόσταγμα*, 'a thing commanded by law' (i. e. by the law of nature, the universal law). Antoninus, speaking of the *reasoning* faculty, how, without looking further, it rests contented in its own energies, adds, 'for which reason are all actions of this species called *rectitudes* (κατορθώσεις, κατὰ ὀρθός, right onwards), as denoting the directness of their progression right onwards'" (Harris, *Dialogue on Happiness*, p. 73, note). "Goodness in actions," says Hooker (*Eccles. Pol.* bk. i, § 8), "is like unto *straightness*; wherefore that which is done well we term *right*, for, as the *straight* way is most acceptable to him that travelleth, because by it he cometh soonest to his journey's end, so, in action, that which doth lye the evenest between us and the end we desire must needs be the fittest for our use." If a term is to be selected to denote that in action and in disposition of which the moral faculty approves, perhaps the most precise and appropriate is *rectitude*, or *rightness*. "There are other phrases," says Dr. Reid (*Active Powers*, Essay v, ch. vii), "which have been used, which I see no reason for adopting, such as, *acting contrary to the relations of things—contrary to the reason of things—to the fitness of things—to the truth of things—to absolute fitness*. These phrases have not the authority of common use, which, in matters of language, is great. They seem to have been invented by some authors with a view to explain the nature of vice; but I do not think they answer that end. If intended as definitions of vice, they are improper; because in the most favorable sense they can bear, they extend to every kind of foolish and absurd conduct as well as to that which is vicious." But what is rectitude, or rightness, as the characteristic of an action? According to Price and others, this term denotes a simple and primitive idea, and cannot be explained. "It might as well be asked what is *truth*, as the characteristic of a proposition? It is a capacity of our rational nature to see and acknowledge truth; but we cannot define what truth is. We call it the conformity of our thoughts with the reality of things." "It may be doubted how far this explanation makes the nature of truth more intelligible. In like manner some explain *rectitude* by saying that it consists in a congruity between an action and the relations of the agent. It is the idea we form of an action, when it is in every way conformable to the relations of the agent and the circumstances in which he is placed. On contemplating such an action we approve of it, and feel that if we were placed in such circumstances and in such relations, we should be under an obligation to perform it. Now the circumstances and relations in which man is placed arise from his nature and from the nature of things in general; and hence it has been said that *rectitude is founded in the nature and fitness of things*, i. e. an action is right when it is fit or suitable to all the relations and circumstances of the agent, and of this fitness conscience or reason is the judge. Conscience or reason does not constitute the relations; these must arise from the nature of man and the nature of things. But conscience or reason judges and determines as to the conformity of actions to these relations; and these relations arising necessarily from the very nature of things, the conformity with them, which constitutes *rectitude*, *is said to be eternal and immutable*" (Krauth's Fleming, *Vocab. of Philos.* s. v.).

Rector (Lat. *rector*, a ruler), the title of several classes of clerical and collegiate officials, some of which are referred to under their respective heads.

1. As regards clerical rectors, the title, in its most ordinary English use, is applied to the clergyman who holds complete and independent charge of a parish. This use, however, is a departure from the canonical signification of the title, which meant rather a clergyman who was appointed to govern a parish where the chief parochial jurisdiction was vested in a religious corporation or in some non-resident dignitary. The office of vicar is an outgrowth of the rectorate, on the appropriation of benefices to monasteries and other religious houses of old; and the distinction between rector and vicar, which is therefore to be noticed here, is as follows: The rector has the right to all the ecclesiastical dues in his parish, whereas the vicar has generally an appropriator or impropriator over him, who is entitled to part of the profits, and to whom he is, in effect, only perpetual curate, with an appointment of glebe and generally one third of the tithes. See VICAR.

2. In certain of the monastic orders, the name rector is given to the heads of convents, as it is

3. Also given to the heads of universities, colleges, seminaries, and similar educational corporate institutions.

Rectory. "A rectory or parsonage," says Spelman, "is a spiritual living, composed of land, tithe, and other oblations of the people, separate or dedicate to God in any congregation, for the service of his Church there, and for the maintenance of the governor or minister thereof, to whose charge the same is committed."

Recusant is, in English law, a person, whether Papist or Protestant, who refuses or neglects to attend at the worship of the Established Church on Sundays and other days appointed for the purpose. The offence may be dated back in its origin to 1534, when king Henry became head of the Church; but, as a legal one, may be held to date from 1 Elizabeth, c. 2. "There were four classes punishable under the statutes against recusancy: simple 'recusants;' 'recusants convict,' who absented themselves after conviction; 'popish recusants,' who absented themselves because of their being Roman Catholics; and 'popish recusants convict,' who absented themselves after conviction. It was against the last two classes that the statutes were mainly directed. In addition to the general penalties of recusancy, the popish recusants, for wilfully hearing mass, forfeited 100 marks (£66 13*s.* 4*d.*); and for saying mass, 200 marks, or £133 6*s.* 8*d.*, in addition (in both cases) to a year's imprisonment. They were disabled, unless they renounced popery, from inheriting, purchasing, or otherwise acquiring lands; and they could not keep or teach schools under pain of perpetual imprisonment. Popish recusants convict could not hold any public office; could not keep arms in their houses; could not appear within ten miles of London under penalty of £100; could not travel above five miles from home without license; could not bring any action at law or equity; could not have baptism, marriage, or burial performed except by an Anglican minister—all under penalties of forfeiture and imprisonment. Protestant dissenting recusants were relieved from the penalties of recusation by the Toleration Act of 1 Will. and Mary, c. 18. Catholics were partially relieved in the year 1791, and completely by the Emancipation Act of 1829." See MEMBERSHIP (IN THE CHURCH).

Red. See COLOR; RUDDY.

Red Heifer. See PURIFICATION, WATER OF; SIN-OFFERING.

Red Sea, the usual designation of the large body of water separating Egypt from Arabia. The following account of it is based upon the Scriptures and other ancient and modern authorities. See SEA.

I. *Names.*—The sea known to us as the Red Sea was by the Israelites called *the sea* (הַיָּם, Exod. xiv, 2, 9, 16, 21, 28; xv, 1, 4, 8, 10, 19; Josh. xxiv, 6, 7; and many other passages); and specially "the sea of *Sûph*" (יַם־סוּף, Exod. x, 19; xiii, 18; xv, 4, 22; xxiii, 31; Numb. xiv, 25; xxi, 4; xxxiii, 10, 11; Deut. i, 40; xi, 4; Josh. ii, 10; iv, 23; xxiv, 6; Judg. xi, 16; 1 Kings ix, 26; Neh. ix, 9; Psa. cvi, 7, 9, 22; cxxxvi, 13, 15; Jer. xlix, 21). It is also perhaps written *Suphah'*, סוּפָה (Sept. Ζωόβ), in Numb. xxi, 14, rendered "Red Sea" in the A. V.; and in like manner, in Deut. i, 1, סוּף, without יַם. The Sept. always renders it ἡ ἐρυθρὰ θάλασσα (except in Judg. xi, 16, where סוּף, Σίφ, is preserved). So, too, in the New Test. (Acts vii, 36; Heb. xi, 29); and this name is found in the Apocrypha (1 Macc. iv, 9; Wisd. x, 18; xix, 7) and Josephus (*Ant.* viii, 6, 4). By the classical geographers this appellation, like its Latin equivalent *Mare Rubrum* or *M. Erythræum*, was extended to all the seas washing the shores of the Arabian peninsula, and even the Indian Ocean: the Red Sea itself, or Arabian Gulf, was ὁ Ἀράβιος κόλπος, or Ἀραβικὸς κ., or *Sinus Arabicus*, and its eastern branch, or the Gulf of the 'Akabah, Αἱλανίτης, Ἑλανίτης, Ἐλανιτικὸς κόλπος, *Sinus Ælanites*, or *S. Ælaniticus*. The Gulf of Suez was specially the Heroöpolitic Gulf, Ἡρωοπολίτης κόλπος, *Sinus Heroöpolites*, or *S. Heroöpoliticus*. Dr. Beke (*Sinai in Arabia* [Lond. 1878], p. 361 sq.) contends (in keeping with his wild notion that the Mizraim of the Bible was not Egypt, but the peninsula of Arabia) that the Gulf of 'Akabah, and not that of Suez, was the Yam-Sûph of the Hebrews, chiefly on the rash assumption that the former only was known to the Israelites, whereas the itinerary of Moses clearly distinguishes Eziongeber on the one from the crossing at the other (Numb. xxxiii, 8, 10, 35, 36). Among the peoples of the East, the Red Sea has for many centuries lost its old names: it is now called generally by the Arabs, as it was in mediæval times, *Bahr-el-Kulzum*, "the Sea of El-Kulzum," after the ancient Clysma, "the sea-beach," the site of which is near, or at, the modern Suez. In the Koran, part of its old name is preserved, the rare Arabic word *yamm* being used in the account of the passage of the Red Sea (see also El-Beydawi, *Comment. on the Kuran*, vii, 132, p. 341; xx, 81, p. 602). These Biblical names require a more detailed consideration.

1. *Yâm,* יָם (Coptic, *iom;* Arabic, *yamm*), signifies "the sea," or any sea. It is also applied to the Nile (exactly as the Arabic *bahr* is so applied) in Neh. iii, 8, "Art thou better than populous No, that was situate among the rivers (*yeorîm*), [that had] the waters round about it, whose rampart [was] the sea (*yâm*), and her wall was from the sea (*yâm*)?" See also Isa. xix, 5.

2. *Yam-Sûph,* יַם־סוּף; in the Coptic version, *phiom nshapi;* A. V. "Red Sea." The meaning of *sûph*, and the reason of its being applied to this sea, have given rise to much learned controversy. Gesenius renders it *rush, reed, sea-weed.* It is mentioned in the Old Test. almost always in connection with the sea of the Exodus. It also occurs in the narrative of the exposure of Moses in the יְאֹר (*yeôr*); for he was laid in *sûph*, on the brink of the *yeôr* (Exod. ii, 3), where (in the *sûph*) he was found by Pharaoh's daughter (ver. 5); and in the "burden of Egypt" (Isa. xix), with the drying-up of the waters of Egypt, "And the waters shall fail from the sea (*yâm*), and the river (*nahâr*) shall be wasted and dried up. And they shall turn the rivers (*nahâr*, constr. pl.) far away; [and] the brooks (*yeôr*) of defence (or of Egypt?) shall be emptied and dried up: the reeds and flags (*sûph*) shall wither. The paper reeds by the brooks (*yeôr*), by the mouth of the brooks (*yeôr*), and everything sown by the brooks (*yeôr*) shall wither, be driven away, and be no [more]. The fishers also shall mourn, and all they that cast angle into the brooks (*yeôr*) shall lament, and they that spread nets upon the waters shall languish. Moreover, they that work in fine flax, and they that weave net works (white linen?) shall be confounded. And they shall be broken in the purposes thereof, all that make sluices [and] ponds for fish" (ver. 5–10). *Sûph* only occurs in one place besides those already referred to. In Jon. ii, 5 it is written, "The waters compassed me about, [even] to the soul; the depth closed me round about, the weeds (*sûph*) were wrapped about my head." With this single exception, which shows that this product was also found in the Mediterranean, *sûph* is Egyptian, either in the Red Sea or in the *yeôr*, and this *yeôr* in Exod. ii was in the land of Goshen.

The signification of סוּף, *sûph*, must be gathered from the foregoing passages. In Arabic, the word with this signification (which commonly is "wool") is found only in one passage in a rare lexicon (the *Mohkam* MS.). The author says, "*Sûf-el-bahr* (the *sûf* of the sea) is like the wool of sheep. And the Arabs have a proverb, 'I will come to thee when the sea ceases to wet the *sûf*,'" i. e. never. The סוּף of the יָם, it seems quite certain, is *a sea-weed resembling wool.* Such sea-weed is thrown up abundantly on the shores of the Red Sea. Fürst says, s. v. סוּף, "Ab Æthiopibus herba quædam *supho* appellabatur, quæ in profundo Maris Rubri crescit, quæ rubra est, rubrumque colorem continet, pannis tingendis inservientem, teste Hieronymo de qualitate Maris Rubri" (p. 47, etc.). Diodorus (iii, c. 19), Artemidorus (ap. Strabo, p. 770), and Agatharchides (ed. Müller, p. 136, 137) speak of the weed of the Arabian Gulf. Ehrenberg enumerates *Fucus latifolius* on the shores of this sea, and at Suez *Fucus crispus, F. trinodis, F. turbinatus, F. papillosus, F. diaphanus*, etc., and the specially *red* weed *Trichodesmium erythræum.* The Coptic version renders *sûph* by *shari* (see above), supposed to be the hieroglyphic *sher* (sea?). If this be the same as the *sari* of Pliny (see next paragraph), we must conclude that *shari*, like *sûph*, was both marine and fluvial. The passage in Jonah proves it to be a marine product, and that it was found in the Red Sea the numerous passages in which that sea is called the sea of *sûph* leave no doubt.

3. The "Red Sea," ἡ ἐρυθρὰ θάλασσα. The origin of this appellation has been the source of more speculation even than the obscure *sûph*, for it lies more within the range of general scholarship. The theories advanced to account for it have been often puerile and generally unworthy of acceptance. Their authors may be divided into two schools. The first have ascribed it to some natural phenomenon, such as the singularly red appearance of the mountains of the western coast, looking as if they were sprinkled with Havana or Brazil snuff, or brick-dust (Bruce), or of which the redness was reflected in the waters of the sea (Gosselin, ii, 78–84); the red color of the water sometimes caused by the presence of zoophytes (Salt; Ehrenberg); the red coral of the sea; the red sea-weed; and the red storks that have been seen in great numbers, etc. Reland (*De Mare Rubro, Diss. Miscell.* i, 59–117) argues that the epithet *red* was applied to this and the neighboring seas on account of their tropical heat; as, indeed, was said by Artemidorus (ap. Strabo, xvi, 4, 20), that the sea was called red because of the reflection of the sun. The second have endeavored to find an etymological derivation. Of these the earliest (European) writers proposed a derivation from Edom, "red," by the Greeks translated literally. Among them were Fuller (*Miscell. Sacr.* iv, c. 20); be-

The Red Sea and Jebel Atâkah, near Suez. (From a photograph by the Editor.)

fore him Scaliger, in his notes to *Festus*, s. v. "Ægyptinos" (ed. 1574); and still earlier Genebrard (*Comment. ad Ps.* 106). Bochart (*Phaleg*, iv, c. 34) adopted this theory (see Reland, *Diss. Miscell.* [ed. 1706] i, 85). The Greeks and Romans tell us that the sea received its name from a great king, Erythras, who reigned in the adjacent country (Strabo, xvi, 4, § 20; Pliny, *H. N.* vi, c. 23, § 28; Agatharch. i, § 5; Philostr. iii, 15; and others). The stories that have come down to us appear to be distortions of the tradition that Himyer was the name of apparently the chief family of Arabia Felix, the great South Arabian kingdom, whence the Himyerites and Homeritæ. Himyer appears to be derived from the Arabic "ahmar," *red* (Himyer was so called because of the red color of his clothing [*En-Nuweyrî in Caussin*, i, 54]); "aafar" also signifies "red," and is the root of the names of several places in the peninsula so called on account of their redness (see *Marâsid*, p. 263, etc.); this may point to Ophir: φοίνιξ is red, and the Phœnicians came from the Erythræan Sea (Herod. vii, 89).

II. *Physical Description.*—In extreme length, the Red Sea stretches from the Strait of Bâb el-Mandeb (or rather Râs Bâb el-Mandeb), in lat. 12° 40′ N., to the modern head of the Gulf of Suez, lat. 30° N. Its greatest width may be stated roughly at about 200 geographical miles; this is about lat. 16° 30′, but the navigable channel is here really narrower than in some other portions, groups of islands and rocks stretching out into the sea between thirty and forty miles from the Arabian coast and fifty miles from the African coast. From shore to shore, its narrowest part is at Râs Benâs, lat. 24°, on the African coast, to Râs Beridî opposite, a little north of Yembo', the port of El-Medîneh; and thence northwards to Râs Mohammad (i. e. exclusive of the gulfs of Suez and the 'Akabah) the sea maintains about the same average width of 100 geographical miles. Southwards from Râs Benâs it opens out in a broad reach; contracts again to nearly the above narrowness at Jiddah (correctly Juddah), lat. 21° 30′, the port of Mekkeh, and opens to its extreme width south of the last-named port.

At Râs Mohammad the Red Sea is split by the granitic peninsula of Sinai into two gulfs—the westernmost, or Gulf of Suez, is now about 130 geographical miles in length, with an average width of about eighteen, though it contracts to less than ten miles; the easternmost, or Gulf of el-'Akabah, is only about ninety miles long from the Strait of Tirân to 'Akabah, and of proportionate narrowness. The navigation of the Red Sea and Gulf of Suez near the shores is very difficult from the abundance of shoals, coral-reefs, rocks, and small islands, which render the channel intricate, and cause strong currents often of unknown force and direction; but in mid-channel, exclusive of the Gulf of Suez, there is generally a width of 100 miles clear, except the Dædalus reef (Wellsted, ii, 300). The bottom in deep soundings is in most places sand and stones from Suez as far as Jiddah, and thence to the strait it is commonly mud. The deepest sounding in the excellent Admiralty chart is 1054 fathoms, in lat. 22° 30′.

Journeying southwards from Suez, on our left is the peninsula of Sinai; on the right is the desert coast of Egypt, of limestone formation, like the greater part of the Nile valley in Egypt, the cliffs on the sea-margin stretching landwards in a great rocky plateau, while more inland a chain of volcanic mountains (beginning about lat. 28° 4′ and running south) rear their lofty peaks at intervals above the limestone, generally about fifteen miles distant. Of the most importance is Jebel Ghârib, 6000 feet high; and as the Strait of Jubal is passed, the peaks of the primitive range attain a height of about 4500 to 6900 feet, until the "Elba" group rises in a huge mass about lat. 22°. Farther inland is the Jebel ed-Dukhkhân, the "porphyry mountain" of Ptolemy (iv, 5, § 27; M. Claudianus, see Müller, *Geogr. Min.* Atlas vii), 6000 feet high, about twenty-seven miles from the coast, where the porphyry quarries formerly supplied Rome, and where are some remains of the time of Trajan (Wilkinson, *Modern Egypt and Thebes*, ii, 383); and besides these, along this desert southwards are "quarries of various granites, serpentines, breccia verde, slates, and micaceous, talcose, and other schists" (*ibid.* p. 382). Jebel ez-Zeit, "the mountain of oil," close to the sea, abounds in petroleum (*ibid.* p. 385). This coast is especially interesting in a Biblical point of view, for here were some of the earliest monasteries of the Eastern Church, and in those secluded and barren mountains lived very early Christian hermits. The convent of St. Anthony (of the Thebaïs), "Deir Mâr Antuniyus," and that of St. Paul, "Deir Mâr Bôlus," are of great renown, and were once important. They are now, like all Eastern monasteries, decayed; but that of St. Anthony gives, from its monks, the patriarch of the Coptic Church, formerly chosen from the Nitrian monasteries (*ibid.* p. 381). South of the "Elba" chain, the country gradually sinks to a plain, until it rises to the highland of Jidân, lat. 15°, and thence to the strait extends a chain of low mountains. The greater part of the African coast of the Red Sea is sterile, sandy, and thinly peopled—first beyond Suez by Bedouin chiefly of the Ma'âzi tribe; south of the Kuseir road are the 'Abab'deh; and beyond, the Bishâris, the southern branch of whom are called by Arab writers Bejâ, whose customs, language, and ethnology demand a careful investigation, which would undoubtedly be repaid by curious results (see El-Makrîzi's *Khitat, Descr. of the Bejâ*, and *Descr. of the Desert of Eydhâb*; Quatremère's *Essays* on these subjects, in his *Mémoires Hist. et Géogr. sur l'Égypte*, ii, 134, 162; and *The Genesis of the Earth and of Man*, 2d ed. p. 109); and then, coast-tribes of Abyssinia.

The Gulf of el-'Akabah (i. e. "of the mountain-road") is the termination of the long valley of the Ghôr or

'Arabah that runs northwards to the Dead Sea. It is itself a narrow valley; the sides are lofty and precipitous mountains of entire barrenness; the bottom is a river-like sea, running nearly straight for its whole length of about ninety miles. The northerly winds rush down this gorge with uncommon fury, and render its navigation extremely perilous, causing at the same time strong counter-currents; while most of the few anchorages are open to the southerly gales. It "has the appearance of a narrow deep ravine, extending nearly a hundred miles in a straight direction, and the circumjacent hills rise in some places two thousand feet perpendicularly from the shore" (Wellsted, ii, 108). The western shore is the peninsula of Sinai. The Arabian chain of mountains, the continuation of the southern spurs of the Lebanon, skirt the eastern coast, and rise to about 3500 feet; while Jebel Teibet-'Ali, near the strait, is 6000 feet. There is no pasturage and little fertility, except near the 'Akabah, where are date-groves and other plantations, etc. In earlier days this last-named place was, it is said, famous for its fertility. The island of Graia, Jeziret Fara'ûn, once fortified and held by the Crusaders, is near its northern extremity on the Sinaitic side. The sea, from its dangers and sterile shores, is entirely destitute of boats.

The Arabian coast outside the Gulf of the 'Akabah is skirted by the range of Arabian mountains, which in some few places approach the sea, but generally leave a belt of coast country, called Tihâmeh, or the Ghôr, like the Shephelah of Palestine. This tract is generally a sandy parched plain, thinly inhabited, these characteristics being especially strong in the north (Niebuhr, *Descr.* p. 305). The mountains of the Hejâz consist of ridges running parallel towards the interior, and increasing in height as they recede (Wellsted, ii, 242). Burckhardt remarks that the descent on the eastern side of these mountains, like the Lebanon and the whole Syrian range east of the Dead Sea, is much less than that on the western; and that the peaks seen from the east or land side appear mere hills (*Arabia*, p. 321 sq.). In clear weather they are visible at a distance of forty to seventy miles (Wellsted, ii, 242). The distant ranges have a rugged pointed outline, and are granitic; at Wejh, with horizontal veins of quartz; nearer the sea many of the hills are fossiliferous limestone, while the beach hills "consist of light-colored sandstone, fronted by and containing large quantities of shells and masses of coral" (p. 243). Coral also "enters largely into the composition of some of the most elevated hills." The more remarkable mountains are Jebel 'Ein-Unnâ (or 'Eynuwunnâ, *Marâsid*, s. v. "'Ein," Ὄννη of Ptol.), 6090 feet high near the strait; a little farther south, and close to Mo'eileh, are mountains rising from 6330 to 7700 feet, of which Wellsted says: "The coast . . . is low, gradually ascending with a moderate elevation to the distance of six or seven miles, when it rises abruptly to hills of great height, those near Mowîlah terminating in sharp and singularly shaped peaks. . . . Mr. Irwin [1777] . . . has styled them Bullock's Horns. To me the whole group seemed to bear a great resemblance to representations which I have seen of enormous icebergs" (ii, 176; see also the Admiralty chart, and Müller's *Geogr. Min.*). A little north of Yembo' is a remarkable group, the pyramidal mountains of Agatharchides; and beyond, about twenty-five miles distant, rises Jebel Radwâ. Farther south Jebel Subh is remarkable for its magnitude and elevation, which is greater than any other between Yembo' and Jiddah; and still farther, but about eighty miles distant from the coast, Jebel Râs el-Kurâ rises behind the holy city Mekkeh. It is of this mountain that Burckhardt writes so enthusiastically (how rarely is he enthusiastic!), contrasting its verdure and cool breezes with the sandy waste of Tihâmeh (*Arabia*, p. 65 sq.). The chain continues the whole length of the sea, terminating in the highlands of the Yemen. The Arabian mountains are generally fertile, agreeably different from the parched plains below and their own bare granite peaks above. The highlands and mountain summits of the Yemen, "Arabia the Happy," the Jebel as distinguished from the plain, are precipitous, lofty, and fertile (Niebuhr, *Descr.* p. 161), with many towns and villages in their valleys and on their sides. The coast-line itself, or Tihâmeh, "north of Yembo', is of moderate elevation, varying from fifty to one hundred feet, with no beach. To the southward [to Jiddah] it is more sandy and less elevated; the inlets and harbors of the former tract may be styled coves, in the latter they are lagoons" (Wellsted, ii, 244). The coral of the Red Sea is remarkably abundant, and beautifully colored and variegated. It is often red, but the more common kind is white; and of hewn blocks of this many of the Arabian towns are built.

The earliest navigation of the Red Sea (passing by the prehistorical Phœnicians) is mentioned by Herodotus. "Sesostris (Rameses II) was the first who, passing the Arabian Gulf in a fleet of long vessels, reduced under his authority the inhabitants of the coast bordering the Erythræan Sea. Proceeding still farther, he came to a sea which, from the great number of its shoals, was not navigable;" and after another war against Ethiopia he set up a stela on the promontory of Dira, near the strait of the Arabian Gulf. Three centuries later, Solomon's navy was built "in Eziongeber, which is beside Eloth, on the shore of the Red Sea, in the land of Edom" (1 Kings ix, 26). In the description of the Gulf of el-'Akabah, it will be seen that this narrow sea is almost without any safe anchorage, except at the island of Graia near the 'Akabah, and about fifty miles southward the harbor of ed-Dhahab. It is supposed by some that the sea has retired here as at Suez, and that Eziongeber is now dry land. See ELATH; EZIONGEBER. Solomon's navy was evidently constructed by Phœnician workmen of Hiram, for he "sent in the navy his servants, shipmen that had knowledge of the sea, with the servants of Solomon." This was the navy that sailed to Ophir. We may conclude that it was necessary to transport wood as well as men to build and man these ships on the shores of the Gulf of the 'Akabah, which from their natural formation cannot be supposed to have much altered, and which were, besides, part of the Wilderness of the Wandering; and the Edomites were pastoral Arabs, unlike the seafaring Himyerites. Jehoshaphat also "made ships of Tarshish to go to Ophir for gold; but they went not, for the ships were broken at Eziongeber" (1 Kings xxii, 48). The scene of this wreck has been supposed to be ed-Dhahab, where is a reef of rocks like a "giant's backbone" (=Eziongeber) (Wellsted, ii, 153), and this may strengthen an identification with that place. These ships of Jehoshaphat were manned by "his servants," who, from their ignorance of the sea, may have caused the wreck. Pharaoh-necho constructed a number of ships in the Arabian Gulf, and the remains of his works existed in the time of Herodotus (p. 159), who also tells us that these ships were manned by Phœnician sailors.

The fashion of the ancient ships of the Red Sea, or of the Phœnician ships of Solomon, is unknown. From Pliny we learn that the ships were of papyrus and like the boats of the Nile; and this statement was no doubt in some measure correct. But the coasting craft must have been very different from those employed in the Indian trade. More precise and curious is El-Makrîzi's description, written in the first half of the 15th century, of the ships that sailed from Eidhâb on the Egyptian coast to Jiddah: "Their 'jelebehs' (P. Lobo, ap. Quatremère, *Mémoires*, ii, 164, calls them 'gelves'), which carry the pilgrims on the coast, have not a nail used in them, but their planks are sewed together with fibre which is taken from the cocoanut-tree, and they calk them with the fibres of the wood of the date-palm; then they 'pay' them with butter or the oil of the *Palma Christi*, or with the fat of the kirsh (*Squalus carcharias;* Forskål, *Descr. Animalium*, p. viii, No. 19). . . . The sails of these jelebehs are of mats made of the dôm palm" (the *Khitat*, "Desert of Eidhâb"). The crews of the latter, when

not exceptionally Phœnicians, as were Solomon's and Pharaoh-necho's, were without doubt generally Arabians rather than Egyptians—those Himyerite Arabs whose ships carried all the wealth of the East either to the Red Sea or the Persian Gulf. The people of 'Omân, the south-east province of Arabia, were among the foremost of these navigators (El-Mes'ûdi's *Golden Meadows*, MS., and *The Accounts of Two Mohammedan Travellers of the 9th Century*). It was customary, probably to avoid the dangers and delays of the narrow seas, for the ships engaged in the Indian trade to transship their cargoes at the Strait of Bâb el-Mandeb to Egyptian and other vessels of the Red Sea (Agath. § 103, p. 190; *anon. Peripl.* § 26, p. 277, ed. Müller). The fleets appear to have sailed about the autumnal equinox, and returned in December or the middle of January (Pliny, *H. N.* vi, c. xxiii, § 26; comp. *Peripl.* passim). Jerome says that the navigation was extremely tedious. At the present day the voyages are periodical and guided by the seasons; but the old skill of the seamen has nearly departed, and they are extremely timid, rarely venturing far from the coast.

The Red Sea, as it possessed for many centuries the most important sea-trade of the East, contained ports of celebrity. Of these, Elath and Eziongeber alone appear to be mentioned in the Bible. The Heroöpolitic Gulf is of the chief interest—it was near to Goshen; it was the scene of the passage of the Red Sea; it was also the seat of the Egyptian trade in this sea and to the Indian Ocean. Heroöpolis is doubtless the same as Hero, and its site has been probably identified with the modern Abû-Kesheid, at the head of the old gulf. By the consent of the classics, it stood on or near the head of the gulf, and was sixty-eight miles (according to the *Itinerary* of Antoninus) from Clysma, by the Arabs called el-Kulzum, near the modern Suez, which is close to the *present* head. Suez is a poor town, and has only an unsafe anchorage with very shoal water. On the shore of the Heroöpolitic Gulf was also Arsinoë, founded by Ptolemy Philadelphus; its site has not been settled. Berenice, founded by the same, on the southern frontier of Egypt, rose to importance under the Ptolemies and the Romans; it is now of no note. On the western coast was also the anchorage of Myos Hormos, a little north of the modern town el-Kuseir, which now forms the point of communication with the old route to Coptos. On the Arabian coast the principal ports are Mu'eileh, Yembo' (the port of el-Medineh), Jiddah (the port of Mekkeh), and Mukhâ, by us commonly written Mocha. The Red Sea in most parts affords anchorage for country vessels well acquainted with its intricacies, and able to creep along the coast among the reefs and islands that girt the shore. Numerous creeks on the Arabian shore (called "shurûm," sing. "sharm") indent the land. Of these the anchorage called es-Sharm, at the southern extremity of the peninsula of Sinai, is much frequented.

The commerce of the Red Sea was, in very ancient times, unquestionably great. The earliest records tell of the ships of the Egyptians, the Phœnicians, and the Arabs. Although the ports of the Persian Gulf received a part of the Indian traffic, and the Himyeritic maritime cities in the south of Arabia supplied the kingdom of Sheba, the trade with Egypt was, we must believe, the most important of the ancient world. That all this traffic found its way to the head of the Heroöpolitic Gulf seems proved by the absence of any important Pharaonic remains farther south on the Egyptian coast. But the shoaling of the head of the gulf rendered the navigation, always dangerous, more difficult: it destroyed the former anchorages, and made it necessary to carry merchandise across the desert to the Nile. This change appears to have been one of the main causes of the decay of the commerce of Egypt. We have seen that the long-voyaging ships shifted their cargoes to Red-Sea craft at the strait; and Ptolemy Philadelphus, after founding Arsinoë and endeavoring to reopen the old canal of the Red Sea, abandoned the upper route and established the southern road from his new city Berenice, on the frontier of Egypt and Nubia, to Coptos, on the Nile. Strabo tells us that this was done to avoid the dangers encountered in navigating the sea (xvii, 1, § 45). Though the stream of commerce was diverted, sufficient seems to have remained to keep in existence the former ports, though they have long since utterly disappeared. Under the Ptolemies and the Romans the commerce of the Red Sea varied greatly, influenced by the decaying state of Egypt and the route to Palmyra (until the fall of the latter). But even its best state at this time cannot have been such as to make us believe that the 120 ships sailing from Myos Hormos, mentioned by Strabo (ii, v, § 12), were other than an annual convoy. The wars of Heraclius and Chosroes affected the trade of Egypt as they influenced that of the Persian Gulf. Egypt had fallen low at the time of the Arab occupation, and yet it is curious to note that Alexandria even then retained the shadow of its former glory. Since the time of Mohammed the Red Sea trade has been insignificant. But the opening of the Suez Canal has lately rendered it the great thoroughfare to India.

RED SEA, PASSAGE OF. The departure of the Israelites out of Egypt was their *independence-day* and the date of the nation's birth. As such it is always referred to in Scripture in terms of lofty jubilee and devout acknowledgment of the power of Jehovah, which was so strikingly displayed at almost every step. Two hundred and sixteen years before this event, their patriarch, Jacob, had left the land of his childhood and old age, and emigrated with all his family to Egypt, then the most highly cultivated land on earth. Settled in the most fertile part of the country, they had grown to a population of some two millions of souls. Divine Providence had specially fostered them. But now, for about eighty years, the Egyptian government, under a new and jealous dynasty, had adopted a severe policy towards them, and they were gradually reduced to a condition of servitude. Nevertheless, Jehovah had not forsaken them. Moses had been in process of training all these later years as an instrument for their deliverance, and the time had at length arrived for their emancipation. We need not here review the mighty acts of divine interference by which the Egyptian court were finally compelled to grant the release of the Hebrews. We will come at once to the scenes of their exit from the country. The region where it occurred is not only memorable from the inspired narrative of that event, but is likewise remarkable for its natural features, and interesting on account of the modern associations of the vicinity.

Goshen, the territory occupied by the Israelites in Egypt, was an extension eastward of the "Delta," or triangular alluvial plain around the mouths of the Nile. It seems to have corresponded substantially to the present valley of *Tumeilat*, which is a fertile, tongue-shaped tract about eighteen miles long, and averaging about two and a half miles broad, extending along the present railway which branches off to Ismailia from the direct line between Alexandria and Cairo. Westward Goshen probably included, likewise, a considerable tract of the adjoining Delta. The ruins scattered along the continuation of the valley, still farther east, are thought to indicate a populous region there likewise, and hence the name of Goshen is usually extended considerably farther in that direction; but the neglect of irrigation has allowed the sands of the desert on either side to encroach upon this narrow tract, so that it is now almost uninhabitable. The portion named above, however, is still so rich that it was sold in 1863 for two million dollars, and is now worth much more. See GOSHEN.

The government works upon which the Israelites were compelled to serve were public edifices in the two cities Pithom and Raamses, or Rameses, doubtless situated in or near the land of Goshen. The first of these places is generally identified with the present *Tell el-Kebir*, a village in the centre of the valley of Tumeilat

with remains of antiquity in its vicinity. The other is probably represented by *Tell Ramsis*, a quadrangular mound on an arm of the Nile opposite the modern village of Belbeis, located on the Damietta branch of the railway, about seventeen miles south-west of the former place. The canal which conveys the sweet water of the Nile from Cairo to Suez passes through both these villages, parallel with the railway, by way of Ismailia, pursuing very nearly the same line as the ancient one constructed for the same purpose, but choked up and obliterated for many centuries. By this route small craft, during the Roman period and the Middle Ages, used to furnish a communication with the market at Memphis for the citizens of Clysma, which was situated in the immediate vicinity of Suez, as traces of the name still attest. The Suez Canal, which was opened in 1869 for navigation between the Mediterranean and the Red Sea, has made this neighborhood public to thousands of persons travelling across the isthmus to India and China, as large steamers sail directly through it from European ports to these distant lands. Those who wish to see more of Egypt can disembark at Alexandria, take the cars for Cairo, and thence back by way of Ismailia, intercepting their vessel again at Suez. Thus most of the spots rendered memorable by the exodus of the Israelites have been rapidly seen, at least from a distance, by multitudes of passengers on their way to and from the more distant East. The abrupt contact of modern improvements with these ancient scenes is calculated, perhaps, to dissipate some of the romantic haze which the imagination of Bible-readers usually throws around them, but deepens rather than lessens their interest by the familiarity of approach.

After these preliminaries, we are prepared to follow the Hebrews in their exit from the land of their bondage. On the eve of the Passover, corresponding to our Easter, they had rendezvoused, by divine appointment, at Rameses. Memphis, the capital, was forty miles distant, and hence Moses's final interview with Pharaoh, when the Israelitish leader uttered the ominous words, "Thou hast spoken well, I will see thy face again no more," must have taken place at some nearer point. The sacred meal was eaten in haste, the destroying angel at midnight smote all the first-born, and by the morning light the Israelitish host were on their march. As it is expressly stated that "God led them not by the way of the land of the Philistines, . . . but by the way of the wilderness of the Red Sea" (not the desert between Cairo and Suez, as Palmer thinks [*Sinai from the Monuments*, p. 144], but the great desert of et-Tih itself), we are sure that they took the direct south-easterly route towards the head of the Gulf of Suez, doubtless corresponding substantially with the modern pilgrim road. This way would lead them out of the fertile valley of Goshen across a rolling gravelly plain between low hills of shifting sand the whole distance. There was no obstruction to their journey, and they would make rapid progress. They had but little household stuff, for Orientals, especially those of nomadic habits such as the Israelites inherited from their tent-dwelling forefathers, are not apt to encumber themselves much with furniture. Rain-water would be abundant in the pits and rocks along their path at that time of the year, and they carried with them provisions enough to last several days. Their first day was a long one, and they, no doubt, were anxious to fall as soon as possible into the main Haj road. Their first camp is called Succoth, or "booths" (Exod. xii, 37; xiii, 20; Numb. xxxiii, 56), probably a rough khan, like those established in all ages along this thoroughfare. The present Derb el-Bân, a northern branch of the great pilgrim route, leads direct from Belbeis, south-west down the valley by way of Rubeihy and Aweibet, and falls into the main Haj road at the castle of Ajrûd, sixty miles from Belbeis. Ajrûd has been thought by many to correspond to the next station of the Israelites, "Etham, in the edge of the wilderness" (Exod. xiii, 20; Numb. xxxiii, 6). It is a long-established Egyptian outpost



Map of the Region between the Nile and the Red Sea.

on the frontier of the desert. The whole air of the sacred narrative gives us the impression that this was a great landmark for travellers, and that it formed the first or immediate point of destination for the Hebrews on their journey. If this be Etham, it will be necessary to allow thirty miles for each day's journey, which, under the pressing circumstances, is not extravagant, although an ordinary day's march in caravan is only about twenty miles. See ETHAM.

At Etham the Israelites received this divine command: "Turn and encamp before Pi-hahiroth, between Migdôl and the sea, over against Baal-zephon: before it shall ye encamp by the sea" (Exod. xiv, 2). This direction must be carefully examined, as it is the only precise description we have of the actual crossing-place of the Red Sea by the Israelites. It is substantially repeated in ver. 9, where the Egyptians are said to have overtaken the Hebrews "encamping by the sea, beside Pi-hahiroth, before Baal-zephon." Of the names of these localities no trace at present exists; their identification, therefore, must depend upon a comparison of the circumstances of the narrative, with some slight corroboration from the etymology and historical application of the names. Three or four places have been selected by different writers as rivals for the honor of this remarkable crossing, and their claims have been somewhat hotly contested at times. We propose calmly and carefully to discuss their respective merits, and to be guided by the explicit terms of the Biblical account, irrespective of any theological considerations as to whether the miracle involved may thus be enhanced or lessened. We take them up in their geographical order.

1. *On the Mediterranean Shore.*—M. Brugsch has recently discovered a new crossing-place for the Israelites on their passage out of Egypt, which, on account both of the fame of the author and his confident announcement, has attracted no little attention (*L'Exode et les Monuments Égyptiens:* Discours prononcé à l'occasion du Congrès International d'Orientalistes à Londres, par Henri Brugsch-Bey, délégué de son Altesse Ismael Premier, le Khédive d'Égypte; accompagné d'une carte [Leipsic, J. C. Hinrichs, 1872, 8vo], p. 36). He conceives that they did not cross the Red Sea at all, but a noted morass — the Sirbonian Bog of antiquity, the modern *Sabâket Bardawâl*—a shallow lake along the Mediterranean, on the confines of Egypt towards Palestine. He thinks he has found all the names of the Biblical account in the Egyptian papyri, and that he has succeeded in identifying them with modern localities. Thus On he sets down as equivalent to Anu, a city, according to him, in the Heroöpolitic nome. Pi-beseth or Bubastis is, of course, Tell-Bast. Goshen he traces, through the hieroglyphical Phacoussa, to the modern Kûs or Facus; and in the Sethroïtic nome on the north of this he finds mention of Pithan and Sukkoth, with Pi-ramses, or Rameses, in the same neighborhood. Etham he conjectures to be Khetam, noticed as another of three ancient stations in this latter region of Tanis-Rameses; the remaining one adjoining being Migdôl, which, of course, must be the Magdolum of classical writers, and the present Tell es-Semut. Baal-Zephon becomes Mount Casius, and Pi-hahiroth is the entrance upon the narrow sand-beach separating the Mediterranean from the Sirbonian Lake just east of Pelusium. Many of these identifications, which M. Brugsch gives with great brevity, and without the detailed authority, the reader might reasonably question, both on the ground of strained etymological resemblance and inadequate historical data for position. But we prefer to call attention to a few palpable discrepancies with the scriptural narrative, which seem to put this locality utterly out of the question, notwithstanding the author's claim of their perfect accord. To be sure, the Hebrews, on this theory, simply threaded their way along a narrow beach till they came to a bar which allowed them an easy crossing-place over the marsh, and M. Brugsch candidly admits (p. 32), "The miracle, it is true, then ceases to be a miracle; but let us acknowledge, with all sincerity, that Divine Providence always maintains its place and authority." What childlike faith!

In the first place, it certainly was the Red Sea that the Israelites crossed on this occasion. True, the history in Exodus does not explicitly name the body of water, but the immediate context and other passages of Scripture do so most definitely and unequivocally (Exod. xv, 4–22; Deut. xi, 4; Josh. iv, 23; xxiv, 6; Psa. cvi, 9; cxxxvi, 13, 15, etc.). Josephus distinctly understands it so (*Ant.* ii, 15, 1), and the New-Test. writers are equally clear (Acts xii, 36; Heb. xi, 29). Even M. Brugsch has felt himself obliged on his map to call the Sirbonian Sea *Yam Súf*, the Hebrew name exclusively applied to the Arabian Gulf, thus committing a twofold blunder.

In the next place, the route which this theory selects for the Israelites on setting out is exactly the one which they avoided. "And it came to pass, when Pharaoh had let the people go, that God led them not through the way of the land of the Philistines, although that was near, . . . but God led the people about, through the way of the wilderness of the Red Sea" (Exod. xiii, 17, 18). Moreover, it makes no proper account of the abrupt turn, or rather retrogression, on their way in order to reach the sea (Exod. xiv, 2).

Finally, this view is wholly unsupported by any local tradition, and requires a displacement of the well-settled positions of Marah, Elim, etc. This latter M. Brugsch locates at "the place which the Egyptian monuments designate by the name of Aalim or Tentlim; that is to say, 'the city of fishes,' situated near the Gulf of Suez, in a northerly direction." Moses, however, speaks of no "city" there, much less so large a one as Heroöpolis, which M. Brugsch sets down there on his map; but only of some wells and palms.

This view of the Red-Sea crossing M. Brugsch reiterates in his latest work (*Gesch. Aegyptens*, Leips. 1877), but "he has not won a single Egyptologist of note to a theory which demands so many conjectures in geography and such fanciful analogies in philology" (Dr. J. P. Thompson, in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, July, 1877, p. 544).

2. *At the "Bitter Lakes."*—These are a series of shallow ponds of brackish water, some of them of very considerable extent, stretching at intervals from the head of the Gulf of Suez to the Mediterranean. They are supposed to have formerly constituted a continuous water connection between those two great seas, which has since been broken by a change of level, leaving these isolated basins partly salt from the remnant of seawater. A few geological evidences in support of this theory have been adduced, the most palpable of which is the fact that sea-shells, of the same character with those now thrown up by the Red Sea, may be seen along the shore of these lakes (see Dr. Harman, *Egypt and the Holy Land*, p. 106). This would seem to indicate a continuity of these bodies of water in earlier times. (See further in Laborde, *Commentaire Géographique sur l'Exode* [Paris, 1841, fol.], p. 79 a.)

The great bed of the Bitter Lakes extends in a northerly and southerly direction, and is separated from the Red Sea by a sand-bank 4000 to 5000 meters long, which is seldom more than one meter higher than the sea. It is forty to fifty lower than the water-level of the sea basin, and from plain indications was once covered with the sea (Du Bois Aimée, in the *Descr. de l'Égypt. Mod.* i, 188 sq., 1st ed.). Before it had a connection with the Nile by means of the well-known canal, and thus received fresh water, its waters were bitter (Strabo, xvii, 804). It is a favorite theory that it was originally embraced in the Heroöpolitan Gulf (Stickel, in the *Stud. u. Kritiken*, 1850, p. 328 sq.). Yet this is no proof that the ancient Heroöpolis was situated in the inner corner of the Arabian Sea (Strabo, xvi, 767; xvii, 836; Plĭny, vi, 33), and that vessels sailed thence (Strabo, xvi, 768); but more probably this city was located far

north of Clysma, the modern Kolsum, near the present Suez (Ptolemy, iv, 5, 14, and 54; *Itinerar Anton.* p. 107, ed. Wess.), namely, somewhere about the modern Abu-Keished, or Mukfar (Knobel, *Commentar zu Exodus*, p. 140 sq.). Its ruins are still visible there (Champollion, *Égypte*, ii, 88). Its importance gave name to the entire adjacent nome and to the contiguous gulf. Both were likewise more properly designated from Arsinoë, which was situated near the present head of the bay (see Smith, *Dict. of Greek and Roman Geography*, s. v. "Arsinoë"). This latter seems to have been the official designation of the place which was popularly termed Clysma (namely, *the beach*, τὸ κλύσμα [Reland, *Palæstina*, p. 472, 556]).

A rise of the intermediate land has been inferred from the stoppage of the ancient canal along this line; but this can readily be accounted for by the drifting-in of sand and the neglect of the banks. On the other hand, that no material change of level has taken place in this region in modern times seems to be proved by the fact that the fresh-water canal now actually conveys water from the Nile to Suez, just as it formerly did, without any considerable cutting for that purpose. The brackishness of these lakes merely argues a connection at some period with the Mediterranean, and not necessarily with the Red Sea likewise, and the shells and other marine indications are probably traces of this connection only. In fact, the immense lagoon of Lake Menzâleh still reaches almost to Lake Timsah, the principal or deepest of the Bitter Lakes, and there is nothing but flats and marshes in this direction; whereas southerly the Suez Canal required extensive excavations for its continuance to the Gulf of Suez, cutting in some places, not through sand and silted *débris* merely, but through firm strata of clay and crystalline alabaster.

This theory rests upon so problematical a foundation that it has not been much resorted to in this discussion except for the purpose of strengthening the location of the Israelites' crossing at Suez, by way of showing that the water at the latter point was deeper anciently than now, and so preserving the greater appearance of a miracle in the case. It is thus incidentally alluded to by Calmet and Robinson, and by several later writers. But for this purpose, if it proves anything, it proves too much; for if at the time of the Exodus the Red Sea extended thus far north, there is no occasion to seek for any other place of crossing, so far as a sufficiency of water is concerned.

Aside from these geological and theological speculations, there is in favor of this crossing-place only the shorter distance from Belbeis, rendering it an easy three days' journey of only fifteen miles per day to any point that might be selected in the vicinity of Ismailia. The attempt of Fürst (*Hebrew Lexicon*, p. 766) to identify Baal-zephon with Heroöpolis is mere conjecture; and his remark that Migdôl is the Magdolum of Herodotus (ii, 159) is founded on a mistake (repeated in Smith's *Dict. of Greek and Roman Geography*, ii, 246), for Megiddo in Palestine is doubtless there intended. (See Rawlinson, *Herod.* ii, 207.) The Magdolum of Egypt was twelve miles west of Pelusium (*Antonine Itinerary*, p. 14), entirely too remote for the precise indication of locality in the Mosaic narrative.

Against the location of the miracle at the Bitter Lakes are the following facts in the Biblical text: (1.) In order to go round the head of the sea (if thus far north) the Israelites would be obliged to start, not by "the way of the wilderness," as the text states, but precisely by that direct "way of the land of the Philistines" which the text expressly says they did not take (Exod. xiii, 17, 18). (2.) There would be no change of their course requisite or possible in order to reach this point, as the word "turn" (xiv, 2) demands; they were already going on the direct and only route they could well have taken. Indeed, if the region of Lake Timsah were then so low as to be filled from the Red Sea, it is difficult to see how the water from the Mediterranean on the other side could have been kept out, and then there would be a continuous lake from sea to sea, and a miracle would have been necessary, at all hazards, in order to effect the passage anywhere. The Hebrews had no occasion to "turn" at all, for that matter. (3.) In that case Pharaoh's observation (ver. 3, 4), "The children of Israel are entangled in the land, the wilderness hath shut them in," would have been very inapt; at least, its force is not at all clear; for, go which way they might, the material obstacle would be the same, viz. the water merely. (4.) There is no local or historical tradition confirmatory of this spot; in short, circumstances on this theory are all so uncertain and ill-defined that we may safely dismiss it as altogether hypothetical. If we are to determine anything definite concerning the place of the transaction, it must be based upon the known relations of the localities as they now exist.

Kalisch thinks (*Comment. on Exod.* ad loc.) that the Israelites turned *northwards;* but in that case likewise, as Shaw long since observed (*Travels*, p. 311), they could not in any proper sense have become "entangled in the land" nor "shut in by the wilderness," for all would have been free before them to escape; in fact, they would have been only pursuing a more direct route to Canaan.

3. *At Suez.*—This location of the event in question has a far greater array of names in its support, among the most notable of whom is Dr. E. Robinson (in the *Biblical Repository*, 1832, p. 753 sq., repeated in his *Bibl. Res.* i, 80), who followed in the wake of Niebuhr (*Travels in Arabia*, translated by Heron [Edinb. 1792], i, 198, 451), and whose views have been substantially reproduced by the latest writers. Other important authorities on the same side are Laborde (*Commentaire Géographique*, p. 77), who cites, as having adopted it with some modification, the earlier writers, Le Clerc, G. Baer, Du Bois Aimée, Salvator, etc., to whom we add the author of *Murray's Hand-book for Egypt* (ed. 1873), p. 279; Keil, *Comment. on the Pentateuch* (Clarke's translation, Edinb. 1866, 3 vols. 8vo), ii, 46 sq. The obvious purport of the arguments adduced in favor of this as the place of the Israelites' passage is, notwithstanding the disclaimer of most of its advocates, to reduce the miracle to its minimum terms, and to find a spot where it is practicable by merely natural forces. This has created a prejudice against it in the minds of most readers, and induced a controversy not always temperate or logical. Let us look at the arguments on both sides from scriptural sources purely.

In favor of this view we may say that—(1.) The distance from Belbeis (assuming that to correspond substantially with the site of Rameses) sufficiently agrees with the requirements of a three days' march, being about fifty miles in a straight line. (2.) The general direction is about the required one for the Israelites at the outset. (3.) The adjoining localities are thought to correspond with those of the Scripture account; thus it is generally agreed that Migdôl (the tower) answers to some fortress on Jebel Atâkah. (4.) There are shoals reaching nearly or quite across the channel at this point, so that an east wind might readily lay it bare; and it is, moreover, so narrow that the Israelites could easily cross in the few hours presumed to have been occupied in the passage.

Other features of this locality do not well tally with the requirements of the case, and some appear absolutely to contradict the Biblical statements. Even the above coincidences—especially the last—when more closely examined, do not prove satisfactory. (1.) The direction to "turn" from the regular course hitherto pursued by the fugitives does not admit of an adequate explanation on this view. The word is an emphatic one, not the ordinary סוּר, or נָטָה, *to turn aside* or *away*, but שׁוּב, *to return, turn back*, viz. actually retrograde. (Ewald, who treats the record in his usually arbitrary and irreverent manner, is yet too good a scholar

not to feel the force of this expression, which he construes by saying that Moses "led the host half-way back" [*Hist. of Israel* (translated by Martineau, London, 1869, 5 vols. 8vo), ii, 69]). At least a marked digression or détour is required to meet the significance of this term. But Suez is directly on the beaten track of all ages, and precisely in the line which the Israelites had already been pursuing. It is true the immemorial Haj route does not actually come down to the village of Suez itself, as, of course, it does not cross the head of the gulf there; it passes a mile or two above, so as to avoid the water. But this small divergence would be quite inconsiderable in the direction of a whole day's march; for the order to "turn," be it observed, was given at Etham before setting out the third day, not near its close, or in the vicinity of the sea, where the difference in direction might have been more perceptible. This last consideration is, therefore, altogether too insignificant to justify the Hebrew term. (2.) None of the places given in the Biblical account as fixing the spot determine it at Suez. Even Jebel Atâkah, if Migdôl, is too far away to be naturally selected for such a minute specification of the immediate scene. Any point from Râs Atâkah to the south end of the Bitter Lakes would be "east" of (or "before") that mountain in this general sense. As for Pi-hahiroth (whether Hebrew for *mouth of the ravines*, or, as is more likely, Coptic for *the sedge-plat*), it finds no special adaptation to any place in that neighborhood. The attempt to identify it with Ajrûd fails utterly, for the Hebrew and Arabic names have but one radical letter in common. Equally unsatisfactory is every effort to discover Baal-zephon in any prominent landmark north of Jebel Atâkah. (Some writers refer Migdôl to *Muktâla*, but this seems to be an error for the pass *Mantûlah*, and therefore fails of verbal correspondence.) There is in that direction nothing but a flat, monotonous tract of sand, with no striking name or object to fix upon. (3.) At Suez the Israelites, so far from being hemmed in by barriers on either side and an impassable sea in front, as the Biblical situation evidently was, had nothing to do if they wished to escape but to act just as every caravan at Suez now does, simply keep on across the open plain around the head of the bay—an easy, free, and direct passage of some three or four miles at farthest. At Suez it was impossible for them to be either "entangled in the land" or "shut in by the wilderness." The way was clear, so far as natural obstacles or intricacy was concerned, and no troop of six hundred cavalry even could effectually cut them off from it; certainly no enemy in the rear could hinder them. (4.) "A strong east wind blowing all night" across the head of the gulf (Exod. xiv, 21) would leave by morning no "wall of waters" either "on the right hand or on the left" of passengers at Suez. As will be seen by inspecting the soundings on the accompanying sketch from the British sailing-chart, the channel opposite Suez is (except, of course, the artificial bed of the Suez Canal) nowhere over four feet deep at low-water, and not more than one twelfth of a mile wide. It could be waded across without any miracle or extra wind at all; in fact, this has actually been done. One traveller hired a man to walk through the water at ebb-tide at Suez, which he effected, holding his hands over his head (Madden, *Travels*, ii, 143, 150). So all the way down to the bar at the mouth of the creek which puts up into Suez the water is at the most only five or six feet deep (in one or two spots), and generally three or four at ordinary low tide, with a tolerably uniform width of about one tenth of a mile. But a powerful and prolonged east wind, acting upon the mass of water in the outer or broad part of the bay itself, would so greatly lower the tide on the eastern shore, where the channel of Suez lies, as to drain the latter almost, if not absolutely, dry throughout its whole extent. It is true there would



Map of the Head of the Gulf of Suez.

be water enough left in the bay itself to prevent an enemy from surrounding the passing host on that side, but on the north there would be no such protection. Thus, even on the supposition that the term "wall" is used in ver. 22 in the sense of *defence*, the explanation clearly fails to meet the language of the text: "The waters were a wall unto them on the right hand and on the left." We desire to insist on this fact, and to us it appears decisive of the whole issue. But the phraseology seems to us to be stronger even than this interpretation. The term "wall" (חֹמָה) is rarely, if ever, used in this metaphorical sense of *protection*, but invariably (1 Sam. xxv, 16 is, we believe, the only doubtful instance) signifies some *physical barrier*, whether of stone or other material, placed more or less vertically for the purpose of protection. Its meaning is by no means fulfilled in the supposition of a vague water-line, shelving away at a distance on one side. Surely nothing but a desire to minify the preternatural element in the discussion could lead to the adoption of so inadequate an interpretation; for the language, it must be remembered, occurs not in a poetical or figurative connection, but in a plain, prosaic history. The poetical version of the transaction (Exod. xv, 8) uses much stronger language: "The floods *stood upright as a heap*, and the depths were congealed in the heart of the sea." The phraseology here, although figurative, no doubt correctly represents the *facts* as seen by an eye-witness. Psa. lxxviii, 13, "He made the waters to *stand as a heap*," shows the same traditional interpretation, and 1 Cor. x, 2 confirms it, "Baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea"—that is, wet with the spray.

For these reasons, even if we could find no better crossing-place for the Israelites, we should be disposed to reject the one at Suez as not fairly meeting the scriptural requirements in the case.

4. *At Râs Atâkah.*—This place has been preferred as that of the crossing by the great majority of writers and travellers, including Pococke, Joly, Monconys, Shaw, Ovington, Sicard, Bruce, Arundale, Raumer, Kitto, Olin, Wilson, Durbin, Bartlett, Porter, Bonar, Murphy, etc. It seems to us to meet the demands of the Biblical account more perfectly than any other. This cape is situated about six miles, in a direct line, south of Suez, opposite the southern end of Jebel Atâkah. It is a tongue running out more than a mile into the water beyond the average shore-line, and continued nearly a mile farther by a shoal, over which the water at ordinary low tide is not more than fourteen feet deep. Beyond this again stretches, for nearly a mile and a half in the same direction, a lower shoal, covered nowhere by more than twenty-nine feet of water at low tide. Opposite this point there reaches out, for about two miles from the eastern shore, a similar shoal, only thirty feet under water at its deepest place. The entire width of the sea at this point is about five miles, while the space where it is not over fifteen feet deep is but three and a half miles, and the channel, itself not over fifty feet deep, is less than three quarters of a mile wide. The sea immediately above and below this spot, in the channel, is about seventy feet deep. Here, then, is a place where a strong and continued east wind, of the preternatural character implied in the sacred narrative, might open a passage suitable for the occasion, and leave a mass of water fitly comparable to a "wall on either hand." Moreover, the Israelites would,



Map of the Bay of Suez.

Ayûn Mûsa. (From a photograph by the Editor.)

in that case, emerge on the shore near Ayûn Mûsa (Wells of Moses), the very name of which, in addition to other local traditions, represents the scene of the event.

A close examination of the text itself confirms this view of the transaction. It says (Exod. xiv, 21), "Jehovah caused the sea to go (וַיּוֹלֶךְ, *made it walk*) by a strong east wind all night, . . . and the waters were divided (וַיִּבָּקְעוּ, *were split*)." Similar is the language in ver. 16: "Divide it (the sea), and the children of Israel shall go . . . through the *midst* of the sea." The statement that the wind blew "all night" gives no just countenance to the inference that the Israelites did not begin the passage till near morning, and therefore could have gone but a very short distance in all, or, at least, when the wind lulled and the miracle ceased. For aught that appears, they may have already walked many miles, or even have continued their march some time the next forenoon if necessary in order to cross. True, the text says (ver. 27), "The sea returned at the turning of the morning (לִפְנוֹת בֹּקֶר, *at daybreak*; comp. Judg. xix, 25, 26) to its usual bed (לְאֵיתָנוֹ, *to its perennial flow*)," but it does not necessarily follow from this that the Israelitish host had at that time all reached the opposite shore. Indeed, rather the contrary is intimated by the statement, *given subsequently* to this, that "the children of Israel walked upon dry land in the midst of the sea" (Exod. xiv, 29), as if they continued their march some time after the overthrow of the Egyptians in their rear. Nor is it certain from ver. 20 that both camps remained quiet all the night, although such might be the inference at first sight. The true state of the case appears to have been about this: the Egyptians overtook the Israelites about nightfall, just as they were about to encamp (חֹנִים, in the act of *pitching their tents*, or preparing to do so) near the shore of the sea (ver. 9), and marched down directly upon them (ver. 10). In their dismay at the prospect of instant destruction, Moses ordered them to press forward immediately (ver. 15, וְיִסְּעוּ, *and they shall pull up stakes*, that is, break up their preparations for camp). While they were doing this the wind sprang up, which did not lull till daylight. As they were marching to the beach the guardian pillar took its position in their rear (ver. 19), and so followed them all night as a light to their steps (ver. 20). When they had reached the middle of the sea (ver. 21), and the Egyptians were not far behind them (ver. 22), the morning began to dawn (ver. 24), and to prevent the enemy from overtaking the fugitives the march of the Egyptians was miraculously retarded, so that they, in their panic, were about to retreat (ver. 25). This they would hardly have thought of doing had they been nearly across, or had it been but a little way to the opposite shore: indeed, every reference to their destruction shows that they were yet in the middle of the sea. So, too, was Moses apparently at this juncture, when, at his extended rod, the water behind the host—who had gained somewhat by the delay of the enemy—began to fall, and the Egyptians actually turned to flee, but were overtaken in the heart of the sea (ver. 27), while the Israelites continued their march through the channel, still open in front of them (ver. 29), till they reached the shore, which the following waves soon strewed with the corpses of the foe (ver. 30). From this recital of incidents in the exact order of the text, it appears that the march really lasted some part of the night, and we consequently require a considerable width of water for its occurrence.

Râs Atâkah, too, seems to correspond to the geographical features of the case. The point where the Israelites struck the western coast-line of the Red Sea is (as we have seen above) explicitly defined in three passages of the sacred itinerary, which we translate literally: "Speak to the sons of Israel, and they shall return (וְיָשֻׁבוּ) and encamp before (לִפְנֵי) Pi-ha-Chirôth, between Migdôl and the sea; before (לִפְנֵי) Bá'al-Tsephôn, opposite it (נֹכַח) shall ye encamp upon (עַל) the sea" (Exod. xiv, 2). "And they [the Egyptians] overtook (וַיַּשִּׂיגוּ) them [the Israelites] encamping upon the sea; upon (עַל) Pi-ha-Chirôth, which is before Bá'al-Tsephôn" (ver. 9). "And they [the Israelites] removed from Etham, and he [Israel] returned (וַיָּשָׁב) upon (עַל) Pi-ha-Chirôth, which is before Bá'al-Tsephôn; and they encamped before Migdôl" (Numb. xxxiii, 7). The meaning of Pi-hahiroth, if it be Hebrew, can only be *mouth of the gorges* (root חוּר, *to bore*); or, if Egyptian (as Gesenius and Fürst prefer), it is doubtless *sedgy spot* (Coptic, *pi-achi-roth*, "the place of meadows," according to Jablonski). In either etymology it would most probably designate a grassy shore, as at the opening of a valley with a brook into the sea. Such a spot is found in the reedy plain (sometimes called *Badeah*) at the mouth of a wide valley just south of Jebel Atâkah. The writer's Egyptian dragoman, who was thoroughly familiar with these localities, called it Wady *Ghubbeh* ("cane-valley"); Robinson calls it Wady *Tawârik*, others Wady *Mûsa*, and still other names are assigned to it. Baal-zephon is doubtless a Hebrew rendering of the name of a place "sacred to Typhon," the Greek form of the Egyptian malignant deity, of whose haunt in this vicinity there are traces in ancient writers (see the Hebrew lexicographers). In that case it was probably a mountain, or at least an eminence, in accordance with the heathen preference for hills as sites of shrines. Migdôl is the common Hebrew word for a *tower*, and was, therefore, most likely also a commanding position. It occurs, however, as the name of a town in this quarter of Egypt (Jer. xliv, 1; xlvi, 14), and may be nothing more than a Hebraized form of the Coptic *megtol*, "many hills" (see the authorities in Gesenius). In Ezek. xxix, 10; xxx, 6, it recurs in the phrase מִגְדֹּל סְוֵנֵה, which may most

naturally be rendered *from Migdôl of Seveneh;* in the English Bible, "from the tower of Syene," after the Vulg. *a turre Syene;* but the rendering of the Sept., *ἀπὸ Μαγδώλου ἕως* [once *καὶ*] *Συήνης*, suggests that the latter name should be pointed סְוֵנָה, *to Sevên*, thus marking out the natural limits of Egypt, from Migdôl on the north to Assuan on the south, precisely as today; and this conclusion is generally adopted by modern scholars. Fürst, in his *Hebrew Lexicon*, gives a curious interpretation of this whole geographical question: "From Migdôl a road led to Baal-zephon, the later Heroöpolis on the Red Sea, and therefore the Red Sea is mentioned with it, Exod. xiv, 2; Numb. xxxiii, 7." Most readers, however, will prefer to see in these texts, so carefully worded in almost exact agreement with each other, a precise indication of the very spot where the Israelites crossed; and if the above reasons be correct, we ought to find on each side of the crossing-place a conspicuous landmark, probably a mountain. This we exactly have at the valley in question, with Jebel Atâkah ("hill of liberty") on the north, and Jebel Abû-Daraj ("hill of the father of steps," that is, *long march*) on the south, and a fine well-watered plain between suitable for an encampment. In this position the Israelites would be effectually hemmed in by the sea in front, the mountains on either hand, and the Egyptians in their rear. The enemy, of course, came directly down from Memphis along Wady et-Tîh ("the valley of wandering"), which terminates in the wady in question, thus intercepting the Israelites, who could not escape along the narrow, rocky margin of the shore around the point called Râs Atâkah. The writer tried to travel that rough coast and found it impracticable enough. Small companies, as was the case with Dr. Durbin, may, indeed, pass slowly along it, but not so great and encumbered a multitude as the Israelites. Besides, it is about a day's march by this route from Râs Atâkah to Suez, and the Egyptians might readily have intercepted the fugitives by sending a detachment around the other side of the mountain.

The particular path by which the Israelites reached Râs Atâkah from Ajrûd has not been agreed upon by the advocates of this point of crossing. Sicard thought they came down Wady et-Tîh from Memphis; but this, as we have seen, is not at all likely. Most others suppose that they came first to Suez, and then along the shore. But if they came that way, why might they not escape by the same? As we have just seen, they could do neither. There remains, therefore, the supposition that they passed around partly behind and across Jebel Atâkah. This exactly tallies with the command to "turn" back from Etham. From Ajrûd the route would thus be not merely a deflection, but in part an actual retrogression, as the accompanying map shows. A path is laid down on several of the maps of this region between the highest and westernmost summits of Jebel Atâkah, which the fugitives would most naturally take. By this route the distance for the third day's march from Ajrûd to the spring on the shore at the mouth of Wady Tawârik would be a little less than thirty miles, the average allowed above for each of the previous days' travel. Thence to the extremity of Râs Atâkah is not quite ten miles, and thence to Ayûn Mûsa is scarcely seven miles more. The journey does not seem to us to be an impracticable one under the urgency of the circumstances. It might be materially shortened for each of the succeeding days, especially the last, by locating Etham on the Haj route, somewhat to the west of Ajrûd—a supposition not at all forbidden by any known fact.

Kurtz (*History of the Old Covenant* [Clarke's transl. Edinb. 1859, 4 vols. 8vo], i, 357 sq.) has an extended observation on the time that elapsed upon the route from Rameses to the Red Sea, which he argues must have been more than the three days that appear in the narrative (by *implication* only, however, for there is no express statement to that effect). We condense his statements into the following points: (1.) Jewish tradition assigns seven days, and this seems to have been the origin of the Passover week. (2.) The term מַסָּע, "journey," denotes only an *encampment*, while the successive days of travel are expressed by יָמִים, or "day's journey." (3.) In Numb. x, 33, we find stations three days apart, with no locality named between (the same, we may add, is the case in xxxiii, 8, 16). (4.) It would have been impossible for the Israelites all to rendezvous at one place and start together, especially as they all kept the Passover in their own homes the preceding night, and were not allowed to leave till morning (Exod. xii, 22). (5.) The distance, under any calculation, was too great for a three days' continuous march. (6.) The message to Pharaoh of their movements at Etham (xiv, 5) requires at least four days from that point to the Red Sea—two for him to get the information, and two more for his army to be got ready and overtake the Israelites. To these arguments we may add the fact that a whole month was consumed (Numb. xxiii, 3; Exod. xvi, 1) in making the first eight stations (Numb. xxxiii, 5–11), containing—so far as the narrative directly states—but ten days of marching. As the remainder of the time could hardly have been all spent in camp—of which, moreover, there is no mention in the account—there arises a suspicion that the most prominent stations only are named, or those where more than one night's halt was made, or some noteworthy incident occurred. Of course the fugitives would travel faster, longer, and more continuously, till they were escaped from Egypt, and more leisurely after the event at the Red Sea had relieved them from danger. Be all this as it may, it is in any case clear that they could as easily journey from Ajrûd to the mouth of Wady Tawârik in one day as they could from Tell Ramsîs to Ajrûd in two.

5. Capt. Moresby (in Aiton's *Land of the Messiah*, p. 118 sq.) is of the opinion that the Israelites crossed at Râs Tarafîneh, south of Mount Abû-Derâj, some sixty miles below Suez, where the sea is twenty miles wide and two hundred and fifty feet deep. This accords with certain traditions of the Arabs of the Desert, who name the warm springs in the rocks opposite after Pharaoh. The inducement, however, to this view seems chiefly to be a desire to exaggerate the miracle.

6. The last and most preposterous theory broached is that of Dr. Beke (*Sinai in Arabia* [Lond. 1878]), who contends that the eastern arm of the Red Sea, i. e. the Gulf of 'Akabah, and not the Gulf of Suez, is that which the Israelites crossed. He is driven to this conclusion by his chimerical idea that Mount Sinai is not the traditional mountain in the peninsula, but Jebel Baghîr, east of 'Akabah. See SINAI.

Among the localities named, the choice really lies between Suez and Râs Atâkah, and of these we decidedly prefer the latter.

Besides the works cited above, and the commentaries on Exodus, the question has been discussed by the following among the more modern writers: Kitto, *Pictorial History of the Jews* (Lond. 1843, 2 vols. small 4to), i, 187 sq.; Latrobe, *Scripture Illustrations* (ibid. 1838, 8vo), p. 29 sq.; Raumer, *Beiträge zur biblischen Geographie* (Leips. 1843, 8vo), p. 1 sq.; Sharpe, in Bartlett's *Forty Days in the Desert* (Lond. 2d ed. large 8vo), p. 23 sq.; Wilson, *The Lands of the Bible* (Edinb. 1847, 2 vols. 8vo), i, 149 sq.; Olin, *Travels in Egypt*, etc. (N. Y. 1843, 2 vols. 12mo), i, 342 sq.; Durbin, *Observations in the East* (ibid. 1845, 2 vols. 12mo), i, 120 sq.; Porter, in Murray's *Hand-book for Syria* (Lond. ed. 1868, 12mo), i, 9 sq.; Palmer, *Desert of the Exodus* (N. Y. reprint, 1872, 8vo), p. 42 sq.; Bonar, *The Desert of Sinai* (ibid. reprint, 1857, 12mo), p. 82 sq.: Morris, *Tour through Turkey*, etc. (Phila. 1842, 2 vols. 12mo), ii, 219 sq.; Strauss, *Sinai und Golgotha* (Berl. 1850, 12mo), p. 147 sq. One of the most recent monographs on the subject—that of Unruh, *Der Zug der Israeliten aus Aegypten nach Canaan* (Langensalza, 1860, 8vo)—

after extending the Gulf of Suez so far north as nearly to join a deep bay of the Mediterranean, locates Succoth at the narrow isthmus, Pi-hahiroth at Suez, and the other scriptural localities (Etham, Migdôl, and Baal-zephon) *east* of the gulf, which on this view was not actually crossed at all. This is the rationalistic theory fully carried out. The lively writer (Kinglake) of *Eöthen* (Lond. 1844; N. Y. 1845, 12mo), p. 188, thus briefly puts the main points of the controversy: "There are two opinions as to the point at which the Israelites passed the Red Sea. One is that they traversed only the very small creek at the northern extremity of the inlet, and that they entered the bed of the water at the spot on which Suez now stands; the other that they crossed the sea from a point many miles down the coast. The Oxford theologians, who, with Milman, their professor, believe that Jehovah conducted his chosen people without disturbing the order of nature, adopt the first view, and suppose that the Israelites passed during the ebb-tide, aided by a violent wind. One among many objections to this supposition is that the time of a single ebb would not have been sufficient for the passage of that vast multitude of men and beasts, or even for a small fraction of it. Moreover, the creek to the north of this point can be compassed in an hour, and in two hours you can make the circuit of the salt marsh over which the sea may have extended in former times. If, therefore, the Israelites crossed so high up as Suez, the Egyptians, unless infatuated by divine interference, might easily have recovered their stolen goods from the encumbered fugitives by making a slight détour." See EXODE.

Redditio Symbŏli (*rehearsal of the creed*). In early times the candidates for baptism were accustomed, on Maundy-Thursday, to recite publicly the creed in the presence of the bishop or presbyters, and this act was designated *redditio symboli*.

Redeemer, a frequent rendering of the Heb. גֹּאֵל, *goël*, which strictly means the *nearest kinsman*. It is thus applied to Christ, as he is the avenger of man upon his spiritual enemy, and delivers man from death and the power of the grave, which the human avenger could not do. The right of the institution of *goël* was only in a relative—one of the same blood—and hence our Saviour's assumption of our nature is alluded to and implied under this term. There was also the right of buying back the family inheritance when alienated; and this also applies to Christ, our *goël*, who has purchased back the heavenly inheritance into the human family. Under these views Job joyfully exclaims, "I know that my Redeemer (my *goël*) liveth," etc. See GOËL; JESUS CHRIST; MEDIATOR.

Redemption, in theology, denotes our recovery from sin and death by the obedience and sacrifice of Christ, who on this account is called the "Redeemer" (Isa. lix, 20; Job xix, 25). "Being justified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus" (Rom. iii, 24). "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us" (Gal. iii, 13). "In whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace" (Eph. i, 7). "Forasmuch as ye know that ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, from your vain conversation received by tradition from your fathers; but with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot" (1 Pet. i, 18, 19). "And ye are not your own, for ye are bought with a price" (1 Cor. vi, 19, 20).

By redemption those who deny the atonement made by Christ wish to understand *deliverance* merely, regarding only the effect, and studiously putting out of sight the cause from which it flows. But the very terms used in the above-cited passages, "to redeem" and "to be bought with a price," will each be found to refute this notion of a gratuitous deliverance, whether from sin or punishment, or both. "Our English word *redemption*," says Dr. Gill, "is from the Latin, and signifies *buying again*; and several words in the Greek language of the New Test. are used in the affair of our redemption which signify the obtaining of something by paying a proper price for it; sometimes the simple verb ἀγοράζω, *to buy*, is used; so the redeemed are said to be bought unto God by the blood of Christ, and to be bought from the earth, and to be bought from among men, and to be bought with a price—that is, with the price of Christ's blood (1 Cor. vi, 20); hence the Church of God is said to be purchased with it (Acts xx, 28). Sometimes the compound word ἐξαγοράζω is used, which signifies to *buy again*, or out of the hands of another, as the redeemed are bought out of the hands of justice, as in Gal. iii, 13; iv, 5. *To redeem* literally means 'to buy back;' and λυτρόω, *to redeem*, and ἀπολύτρωσις, *redemption*, are, both in Greek writers and in the New Test., used for the act of setting free a captive by paying λύτρον, *a ransom* or *redemption price*." Yet, as Grotius has fully shown by reference to the use of the words both in sacred and profane writers, redemption signifies not merely "the liberation of captives," but deliverance from exile, death, and every other evil from which we may be freed; and λύτρον signifies everything which satisfies another so as to effect this deliverance. The nature of this redemption or purchased deliverance (for it is not gratuitous liberation, as will presently appear) is therefore to be ascertained by the circumstances of those who are the subjects of it. The subjects in the case before us are sinful men; they are under guilt, under "the curse of the law," the servants of sin, under the power and dominion of the devil, and "taken captive by him at his will," liable to the death of the body and to eternal punishment. To the whole of this case the redemption—the purchased deliverance of man as proclaimed in the Gospel—applies itself. Hence in the above-cited and other passages it is said, "We have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins," in opposition to guilt; redemption from "the curse of the law;" deliverance from sin, that "we should be set free from sin;" deliverance from the power of Satan; from death, by a resurrection; and from future "wrath" by the gift of eternal life. Throughout the whole of this glorious doctrine of our redemption from these tremendous evils there is, however, in the New Test., a constant reference to the λύτρον, *the redemption price*, which λύτρον is as constantly declared to be the death of Christ, which he endured in our stead. "The Son of man came to give his life a *ransom* for many" (Matt. xx, 28). "Who gave himself a *ransom* for all" (1 Tim. ii, 6). "In whom we have *redemption* through his blood" (Eph. i, 7). "Ye were not *redeemed* with corruptible things, as silver and gold, but with the precious blood of Christ" (1 Pet. i, 18, 19). That deliverance of man from sin, misery, and all other penal evils of his transgression, which constitutes our redemption by Christ, is not, therefore, a gratuitous deliverance, granted without a consideration, as an act of mere prerogative; the ransom—the redemption price—was exacted and paid; one thing was given for another—the precious blood of Christ for captive and condemned men. Of the same import are those passages which represent us as having been "bought" or "purchased" by Christ. Peter speaks of those "who denied the Lord τὸν ἀγοράσαντα αὐτούς, that bought them;" and Paul, in the passage above cited, says, "Ye are bought with a price" (ἠγοράσθητε), which price is expressly said by John to be the blood of Christ: "Thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God (ἠγόρασας, hast purchased us) by thy blood" (Rev. v, 9). The ends of redemption are, that the justice of God might be satisfied; his people reconciled, adopted, sanctified, and brought to glory. The properties of it are these: (1) it is agreeable to all the perfections of God; (2) what a creature never could merit, and therefore entirely of free grace; (3) it is special and particular; (4) full and complete; (5) it is eternal as to its blessings. See Edwards, *Hist. of Redemp-*

tion; Cole, *On the Sovereignty of God; Lime-street Lect.* lect. 5; Watts, *Ruin and Recovery;* Owen, *On the Death and Satisfaction of Christ;* Gill, *Body of Divinity;* Pressensé, *Religion;* Goodwin, *Works;* Knapp, *Theology,* p. 331; *Bullet. Théol.* Avril, 1868; Calvin, *Institutes; Evangel. Quar. Rev.* April, 1870, p. 290; *Presbyt. Confess.;* Werner, *Gesch. der deutschen Theol.; Meth. Quar. Rev.* Oct. 1868; July, 1874, p. 500; Jan. 1876, art. ii; *Presbyt. Quar. Rev.* July, 1875, art. ii; Fletcher, *Works; New-Englander,* July, 1870, p. 531; Barnes [Albert], *The Atonement in its Relations to Law and Moral Government* (Phila. 1858, 12mo); *Princeton Rev.* July, 1859; Oct. 1859; *Bibl. Sacra,* Jan. 1858; Delitzsch, *Bibl. Psychol.* p. 482; Müller, *On Sin;* Pearson, *On the Creed;* Liddon, *Divinity of Christ;* Pin, *Jésus-Christ dans le Plan Divin de la Rédemption* (1873). See PROPITIATION; RECONCILIATION; SATISFACTION.

Redemptorists, ORDER OF, or "*the Congregation of the Most Holy Redeemer,*" was established by Alfonso Maria di Liguori (q. v.) in the city of Scala in 1732, and spread first in the kingdom of Naples and in the Papal States. The end of this institute was the association of missionary priests who should minister by special services to the spiritual wants of the abandoned in towns and villages, without undertaking regular ordinary parochial duties. After St. Alfonso had founded several houses of his community, pope Benedict XIV solemnly approved of his rule and institute, under the above title, Feb. 25, 1749. The order rapidly found favor, and was introduced into other countries, chiefly through the instrumentality of Clement Maria Hoffbauer. This man, the first German Redemptorist, was born in Moravia Dec. 26, 1751. He became a baker, and exercised his profession for some years in the Premonstrant convent of Bruck. Here he obtained the favor of the abbot, who made him commence his studies. After studying four years very actively, he left the convent in 1776 with a view to turn hermit, and spent two years at the renowned shrine of Mühlfrauen. When the hermitages were abolished, he went to Vienna, where he supported himself by working at his former trade. In company with his friend Peter Emanuel Kunzman, who eventually joined the Liguorians as a lay-brother, he made several pilgrimages to Rome, and subsequently completed his studies at Vienna. Here he became acquainted with John Thaddæus Hibel, who was afterwards his most zealous follower and firm friend. The two friends visited Rome, and together entered the convent of the Priests of the Most Holy Redeemer. The rector of the convent designated them some time after to go to Germany to establish the order there, and thus to supply the place of the Jesuits, who had been expelled. After they had finished the necessary studies, they were ordained. They went in 1785 to Vienna; but as there was no prospect of Joseph II allowing their order to be established in Austria, they turned their attention to Poland. Through the mediation of the papal nuncio Saluzzo, they obtained the church of St. Benno at Warsaw and a dwelling-house, and from this their followers subsequently received in Warsaw the name of *Bennonites.* The priests of the new order, during the first years of their establishment, were in the habit of preaching every Sunday and feast-day in the open air; but as this was subsequently forbidden by the civil authorities, they commenced preaching every Sunday in their church of St. Benno two sermons in Polish, two in German, and one in French. Their activity was rewarded by great success, for in 1796, shortly after they had commenced, the number of their communicants had reached, it is said, 19,000. Natives of Poland, in large numbers, entered the order; and Hoffbauer, during his sojourn in Poland, even opened a seminary for the clergy. In 1794, the order was invited to Mitau, in Courland, and Hoffbauer sent three priests to establish it there. In Warsaw they obtained a second church—that of the Holy Cross. In 1799 the order numbered twenty-five members in that city. As they were at a great distance from Rome, Francis de Paulo had, in 1785, given Hoffbauer full power to establish colleges, receive members, etc.; and in 1792 he appointed him his vicar-general. In 1801 or 1802 they were invited to Switzerland, and in 1803 some of them were sent there. They settled at first on the estate of the duke of Schwarzenberg at the frontier of Switzerland, and afterwards in the village of Jestetten, on Mount Tabor. In August, 1803, Hoffbauer went to Rome, afterwards to Poland, and thence to Mount Tabor. While at the latter place he received a request to send a member of his order to the church at Tryberg, in the Black Forest, a place of pilgrimage. Still the two establishments at Mount Tabor and at Tryberg proved unsuccessful, and were subsequently abandoned. In 1806 Hoffbauer returned to Warsaw; but the very next year proceedings were instituted against the society, their papers searched, and finally the community was suppressed by the military authorities. The fathers were imprisoned in the fort of Küstrin, where they were retained one month, and then sent back two by two to their native country. Hoffbauer retired to Vienna, where he sought to reunite his order. In 1813 he was appointed confessor and ecclesiastical director of the Ursuline convent of that city, an office which he retained until his death. The church of the convent was soon transformed into a mission church, Hoffbauer's reputation as a confessor became considerable, and he preached, besides, every Sunday in the church of St. Ursula. As he died March 15, 1820, he did not witness the establishing of his order in Austria; although, one month after his death, the Redemptorists were permitted to establish a college, and before the close of the year the emperor granted them a church at Vienna. In the fall of 1826 they formed a branch establishment at Frohnleiten. The Liguorians now continued in Vienna until driven out of it in March, 1848. In Bavaria the king authorized, March 11, 1841, fifteen to twenty members of the Congregation of the Most Holy Redeemer to establish themselves at Alt-Oetting. On the other hand, the government became satisfied in 1848 that the Redemptorists and their doctrines would prove dangerous to Bavaria. They were therefore replaced by the Benedictines. The authorities gave as their reasons for this change that the fathers were instilling fanatical views among the people by means of the confessional, and that their preaching excited the lower classes to disorder. A part of the members of the society removed to America after its dissolution, others went to Austria, and some became secular priests. In France the Redemptorists established themselves first at Vischenberg, in the diocese of Strasburg: they were suppressed by the revolution of July, 1830, but succeeded in obtaining their re-establishment, and have at present several establishments in France. The Redemptorists still adhere to the rule of their original constitution. We find in the *Catholic Directory* for England for this year, after mention of their church at Bishop Eton, Liverpool, a memorandum to the effect that "this is not a parochial church—hence the fathers do not baptize children, or assist at marriages and funerals, except in cases of necessity; but they are always ready to hear confessions, visit the sick, administer the sacraments, preach, and instruct." The Redemptorists have also a house at Clapham, Surrey. Of late years they have been busily pursuing their mission in various parts of Ireland. In America they have founded establishments at New York, Baltimore, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Rochester, Albany, Buffalo, and Mouzon. According to the *Catholic Directory,* they number over 100 members in this country, about 90 of them priests, who have charge of 20 or more churches, mostly at important centres, viz. New York (2), Rochester, Buffalo, and Elmira, N. Y.; Philadelphia and Pittsburgh, Pa.; Baltimore (4), Annapolis, Ilchester, etc., Md.; New Orleans (3), La.; Chatawa, Pike County, Miss.; Detroit, Mich.; Chicago, Ill.; St. Louis, Mo. They are building a church in

Boston; and the large cathedral on Fifth Avenue, New York, which has cost over $1,000,000, is under their supervision. They have 5 convents in Maryland, with a novitiate and a house of studies, 27 or 28 clerical members (including the provincial, the "Very Rev. Joseph Helmpröcht, C.SS.R."), 5 novices, 36 lay brothers, and 50 students connected with them; 2 houses in New York city, with 14 priests and 2 lay brothers; and houses in other cities, etc., usually with from 4 to 8 priests, besides lay brothers, connected with each. The headquarters is at present at Nocera dei Pagani, in the kingdom of Naples. Their present number, according to the *Statistical Year-book of the Roman Catholic Church*, is about 2000.

There is also a congregation of female Redemptorists, which Liguori instituted in 1732. They had two establishments in Austria — at Vienna and Stein — but these were also abolished in 1848. They have still a house at Bruges, in Belgium. Pösl stated in 1844 their possessions as consisting of their colleges in the kingdom of Naples, Sicily, and the Papal States; in Austria, the colleges of Vienna, Eggenberg, Mautern, Frohnleiten, Marburg, Innspruck, and the hospitals of Leoben and Donauberg; in Bavaria, the college of Alt-Oetting; in Belgium, that of Liege, St. Trond, Tournay, and the hospital of Brussels; in Holland, the college of Wittem; in America, the colleges of Baltimore and Pittsburgh, and the missionary stations of Albany, Buffalo, Philadelphia, Detroit, Rochester, and New York; in Switzerland, the college of Freiburg; in France, the establishments of Vischenberg, Landser, and one near Nancy; in England, a station at Falmouth. See Pösl, *Clemens Maria Hofbauer* (Regensb. 1844); Henrion, *Gesch. d. Mönchsorden;* Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* viii, 440; Barnum, *Romanism as it Is*, p. 318, 319.

Redemptorist.

Redenbacher, Wilhelm, an evangelical German minister and senior of the chapter of Gunzenhausen, was born in 1800, and died July 14, 1876, at Dornhausen. He was a popular Christian writer, and published, *Christliches Allerlei* (Nuremb. 1855, 3 vols.):—*Einfache Betrachtungen, das Ganze der Heilslehre umfassend* (2d ed. ibid. 1851):—*Geschichtliche Zeugnisse für den Glauben* (Dresden, 1850, 1858, 2 vols.):—*Kurze Reformations-Geschichte* (Stuttgart, 1856). See Zuchold, *Bibl. Theol.* ii, 1039; Schneider, *Theol. Jahrb.* 1877, p. 227. (B. P.)

Redford, George, D.D., an English Congregational minister, was born in London Sept. 27, 1785, and was educated at Hoxton College and the University of Glasgow. His first settlement as a minister was at Uxbridge, where he remained fourteen years. In 1825 he became pastor of the Congregational church at Worcester. In 1855 he was thrown from his carriage, and suffered a nervous shock from which he never recovered. He retired to Edgebaston, near Birmingham, and his congregation at Worcester allowed him £100 per annum. He died May 20, 1860. He was a man of great industry and talent. Faithful in his pastoral work to a remarkable degree, he gave himself largely to literature. He was for some years editor of the *Congregational Magazine*, and was a frequent contributor to the *Eclectic* and to the *British Quarterly Review*. He published, besides a number of minor writings, the *Pastor's Sketch-book* (12mo):—*Holy Scripture Verified*, the Congregational lecture for 1837 (8vo):—*Faith Triumphant* (1841, 12mo):—*The Great Change*, a treatise on conversion (1843, 18mo):—*Body and Soul Considered* (1847, 8vo):—*Life of the Rev. W. Jay:*—*Life of the Rev. J. A. James* (1860, 12mo). He was made D.D. by Amherst College, and LL.D. by the University of Glasgow in 1834.—*English Congregational Year-book*, 1861.

Redman (Redmayne), John, D.D., an English divine, flourished in the first half of the 16th century. He was a native of Yorkshire, and was born probably in 1499. He was educated at Corpus Christi College, Oxford, and at Paris. He became public orator of the university, master of King's Hall, first master of Trinity College, archdeacon of Taunton, prebend of Wells and of Westminster, and died in 1551. He was one of the most learned men of his age, according to bishop Burnet. Dodd says that "he divided himself between both religions;" but on his death-bed he certainly professed to embrace the cardinal doctrines of the Reformers. He published nothing; but after his death appeared, *Opus de Justificatione* (Antw. 1555, 4to):—*Hymnus in quo Peccator Justificationem quærens Rudi Imagine describitur:—The Complaint of Grace* (1556, 8vo):—*Resolutions concerning the Sacrament*, etc.

Reece, Richard, a preacher of Methodism in England, who travelled without interruption for a longer period than any other Methodist preacher—no less than fifty-nine years—and thus figured at one time as the oldest effective Methodist preacher in the world, was born about the year 1765. In 1823 he visited this country with John Hannah as a delegate of the Wesleyans to the Methodist Episcopal Church; and he spent some time here visiting the societies, from Lynn, Mass., to Winchester, Va., and by his and Hannah's profound interest attested the general unity of all Methodists. In 1846 he was obliged to take a supernumerary relation, and he died in 1850. "He was a good, if not a great, preacher," says Stevens, "and a most amiable man. He is still generally remembered, by both English and American Methodists, for his perfect courtesy and his venerable appearance. His person was tall, his complexion ruddy, his head silvered with age, his voice commanding, his language flowing and pertinent, his piety tranquil, and his wisdom in counsel always reliable. He lived to share in the centenary celebration of Methodism, and by proposing that it should be signalized in England by the contribution of a million dollars for its public charities, excited the suspicion that his usual good judgment had suffered from the effect of age; but the people justified his calculation by giving seventy-five thousand dollars more. He was honored with an election to the presidency of the Conference." See Stevens, *Hist. of Methodism*, ii, 315, 316; iii, 236, 308; West, *Sketches of Wesleyan Preachers* (N. Y. 1848); *Wesleyan Magazine*, 1850, p. 652. (J. H. W.)

Reed. I. This is the rendering in the A. V. of the following words in the original. In the following ac-

count we employ the usual Scriptural and scientific authorities on the subject.

1. Usually *kaneh* (קָנֶה; Sept. κάλαμος, καλαμίσκος, καλάμινος, πῆχος, ἀγκών, ζυγός, πυθμήν; Vulg. *culmus, calamus, arundo, fistula, statera*), the generic name of a reed of any kind. It occurs in numerous passages of the Old Test., and sometimes denotes the "stalk" of wheat (Gen. xli, 5, 22), or the "branches" of the candlestick (Exod. xxv and xxxvii); in Job xxxi, 22, *kaneh* denotes the bone of the arm between the elbow and the shoulder (*os humeri*); it was also the name of a measure of length equal to six cubits (Ezek. xli, 8; xl, 5). The word is variously rendered in the A. V. by "stalk," "branch," "bone," "calamus," "reed."

In the New Test. the corresponding Greek word, κάλαμος, may signify the "stalk" of plants (Mark xv, 36; Matt. xxvii, 48, that of the hyssop, but this is doubtful), or "a reed" (Matt. xi, 7; xii, 20; Luke vii, 24; Mark xv, 19), or a "measuring-rod" (Rev. xi, 1; xxi, 15, 16), or a "pen" (3 John 13).

Strand (*Flor. Palæst.* p. 28–30) gives the following names of the reed plants of Palestine: *Saccharum officinale, Cyperus papyrus* (*Papyrus antiquorum*), *C. rotundus*, and *C. esculentus*, and *Arundo scriptoria;* but no doubt the species are numerous. See Bové (*Voyage en Palest., Annal. des Scienc. Nat.* 1834, p. 165): "Dans les déserts qui environnent ces montagnes j'ai trouvé plusieurs Saccharum, Milium arundinaceum et plusieurs Cyperacés." The *Arundo donax*, the *A. Ægyptiaca* (?) of Bové (*ibid.* p. 72), is common on the banks of the Nile, and may perhaps be "the staff of the bruised reed" to which Sennacherib compared the power of Egypt (2 Kings xviii, 21; Ezek. xxix, 6, 7). See also Isa. xlii, 3. The thick stem of this reed may have been used as walking-staves by the ancient Orientals; perhaps the measuring-reed was this plant. At present the dry culms of this huge grass are in much demand for fishing-rods, etc. See Metrology.

Some kind of fragrant reed is occasionally denoted by the word *kaneh* (Isa. xliii, 24; Ezek. xxvii, 19; Cant. iv, 14), or more fully by *kenêh bôsem* (קְנֵה בֹשֶׂם) (see Exod. xxx, 23), or by *kaneh hat-tôb* (קְנֵה הַטּוֹב) (Jer. vi, 20), which the A. V. renders "sweet cane," and "calamus." Whatever may be the substance denoted, it is certain that it was one of foreign importation, "from a far country" (Jer. vi, 20). Some writers (see Sprengel, *Com. in Dioscor.* i, xvii) have sought to identify the *kaneh bôsem* with the *Acorus calamus*, the "sweet sedge," to which they refer the κάλαμος ἀρωματικός of Dioscorides (i, 17), the κάλαμος εὐώδης of Theophrastus (*Hist. Plant.* iv, 8, § 4), which, according to this last-named writer and Pliny (*H. N.* xii, 22), formerly grew about a lake "between Libanus and another mountain of no note;" Strabo identifies this with the Lake of Gennesaret (*Geog.* xvi, p. 755, ed. Kramer). Burckhardt was unable to discover any sweet-scented reed or rush near the lake, though he saw many tall reeds there. "High reeds grow along the shore, but I found none of the aromatic reeds and rushes mentioned by Strabo" (*Syria*, p. 319); but whatever may be the "fragrant reed" intended, it is certain that it did not grow in Syria, otherwise we cannot suppose it should be spoken of as a valuable product from a far country. Dr. Royle refers the κάλαμος ἀρωματικός of Dioscorides to a species of *Andropogon*, which he calls *A. calamus aromaticus*, a plant of remarkable fragrance, and a native of Central India, where it is used to mix with ointments on account of the delicacy of its odor (see Royle, *Illustrations of Himalayan Botany*, p. 425, t. 97). It is possible this may be the "reed of fragrance;" but it is hardly likely that Dioscorides, who, under the term σχοῖνος, gives a description of the *Andropogon schœnanthus*, should speak of a closely allied species under a totally different name. See Cane.

"The beasts of the reeds," in Psa. lxviii, 30, margin, literally from the Hebrew, but rendered in the text



Andropogon schœnanthus.

of the A. V. "the company of spearmen," probably means the crocodiles. Yet for other interpretations see Rosenmüller *ad loc.* Gesenius, *on Isa. xxvii*, 1, understands *Babel.* See Crocodile.

2. *'Aróth* (עָרוֹת; Sept. τὸ ἄχι τὸ χλώρον πᾶν) is translated "paper-reed" in Isa. xix, 7, the only passage where the plural noun occurs. There is not the slightest authority for this rendering of the A. V., nor is it at all probable, as Celsius (*Hierob.* ii, 230) has remarked, that the prophet, who speaks of the paper-reed under the name *gôme* in the preceding chapter (xviii, 2), should in this one mention the same plant under a totally different name. "*'Aroth*," says Kimchi, "is the name to designate pot-herbs and green plants." The Sept. (as above) translates it by "all the green herbage." The word is derived from *'arâh*, "to be bare," or "destitute of trees;" it probably denotes the open grassy land on the banks of the Nile; and seems to be allied to the Arabic *'ara* (*locus apertus, spatiosus*). Michaelis (*Suppl.* No. 1973), Rosenmüller (*Schol. in Jes. xix*, 7), Gesenius (*Thesaur.* s. v.), Maurer (*Comment.* s. v.), and Simon (*Lex. Heb.* s. v.) are all in favor of this or a similar explanation. Vitringa (*Comment. in Isaiam*) was of opinion that the Hebrew term denoted the papyrus, and he has been followed by J. G. Unger, who has published a dissertation on this subject (*De* צִרוּת, *hoc est de Papyro Frutice* [Lips. 1731, 4to]). See Paper-reed.

3. In one passage (Jer. li, 32) *agám* (אֲגַם; Sept. σύστημα, Vulg. *palus*) is rendered "reed" (but elsewhere "pond" or "pool"), and is there thought to designate a *stockade* or fort enclosed by palisades.

II. Other Hebrew words representing, more or less accurately, various kinds of reedy plants are the following:

1. It has been made a question whether the Hebrew *agmon'*, אַגְמוֹן, which is mentioned in opposition to the palm-branch (Isa. ix, 13; xix, 15), and is translated "rush" in the A. V., does not rather mean *reed.* Both were, and are, used for making ropes (Sonnini, *Trav.* ii, 416; Pliny, xix, 9; comp. Job xl, 26). See Gesenius, Ewald, Knobel, and others; also Celsius, *Hierobot.* i, 465 sq. See Rush.

2. The Hebrew *achu'*, אָחוּ, originally an Egyptian word (see Jerome, *ad Isa. xix*, 7; comp. Jablonski,

Opusc. i, 45; ii, 160; Gesen. *Thesaur.* i, 67), occurs in Gen. xli, 2; Job viii, 11; in the first place the A. V. has *meadow*, in the second *rush*. It seems to mean, not reed, but "reed-grass," *Carex* (comp. Celsius, *Hierobot.* i, 340 sq.). On the other hand, *suph*, סוּף, Exod. ii, 3, 5, growing on the Nile, but distinct from *kaneh*, may be the *sari* (Pliny, xiii, 45). See FLAG.

3. The word *go'mè*, גֹּמֶא, Gr. βύβλος, the *papyrus*, *paper-reed* (so rendered, among the old interpreters, by the Sept.; Job *loc. cit.*; Isa. xviii, 2; Vulg. Isa. xviii, 2; Syr. Isa. xviii, xxxv; Arab. Exod. ii, 3. In the Talmud this word means *rush*; comp. Mishna, *Erubin*, x, 14. The leaves were used for binding wounds), does not belong to the genus *Arundo*, and is not a proper reed (called by Pliny, xxiv, 81 *akin to the reed*). It is the *Cyperus papyrus* of Linnæus, Class. iii, Monogynia. This plant, anciently so important, grew abundantly in the Egyptian swamps (even perhaps in those of the Nile, Pliny, xiii, 22; comp. v, 8. Hence Ovid, *Metaph.* xv, 753; *Trist.* iii, x, 27, calls this river *papyrifer*; comp. *Mart.* x, 1, 3), and is mentioned Isa. xxxv, 7; Job viii, 11; Exod. ii, 3; Isa. xviii, 2. The A. V. has *rush* in the first two places, *bulrush* in the others. It is now rarely met with in Egypt (according to Minutoli, *Abhandl. verm. Inhalts* [Berl. 1831], vol. ii, No. 7, only at Damietta; while Pluver, *Egypt. Naturgesch.* p. 55, says it does not now grow in Egypt), but in Palestine it is occasionally found at the Jordan (Von Schubert, iii, 259). It has a three-edged stalk, which below bears hollow, sword-formed leaves, covering each other; it grows to a height of ten feet or more, and has above a flower cup of reddish leaves, out of which a thick body of hair-like shoots spring up (comp. Theophr. *Plant.* iv, 9). The root is as thick as a man's arm, and is used as fuel (Dioscor. i, 115); vessels were framed of the stalks (Exod. ii, 3; Isa. xviii, 2; Pliny, vi, 24; vii, 57, p. 417; Hard. Plutarch, *Isid.* c. 18; Lucan, lv, 136; Rosellini, *Monument. Civ.* II, iii, 124; Wilkinson, iii, 185 sq.), which sailed very fast (Helidor. *Æthiop.* x, 4). Sails, shoes, ropes, sieves, mattresses, wicks, etc., were made of the green rind (Pliny, xiii, 22; xviii, 28; xxviii, 47; Herod. ii, 37; Veget. *Veterin.* ii, 57; Philo, *Op.* ii, 482; comp. Wilkinson, iii, 62, 146), but especially paper, on the mode of preparing which comp. Pliny, xiii, 23 sq. (see Rosellini, *Monument. Civ.* II, ii, 208 sq.; Becker, *Charicles*, ii, 219 sq.). See WRITING. The plant is now called *berde* or *berdi* by the Arabs (so Job viii, 11, in the Arabic). See PAPYRUS.

III. It will thus be seen that the reeds named in the Bible may be popularly distinguished as three.

1. The water-reed in pools, marshes, and on the shores of rivers, as of the Nile (Exod. ii, 3, 5) and of the Jordan (1 Kings xiv, 15; Job viii, 11; Isa. xix, 6; xxxv, 7). The most common species are *Arundo phragmites* and *Arundo calamagrostis* (comp. Oken, *Botany*, i. 805). See BULRUSH.

2. The stronger reed, adapted for staves and canes, and as measuring-rods (Ezek. xl, 3 sq.; Apoc. xi, 1; xxi, 15 sq.; 2 Kings xviii, 21; Isa. xxxvi, 6; Ezek. xxix, 6; Matt. xxvii, 29; Mishna, *Shab.* xvii, 3; Diog. Laert. *Proœm.* 6), the *Arundo denax*, whose hard, woody stem reaches a height of eight feet, and is thicker than a man's thumb. This, too, is very frequent on the banks of the Nile (Forskål, *Flora*, p. 24; comp. *Descript. de l'Égypte*, xix, 74).

3. The writing-reed (*Arundo scriptoria*) (3 John 13; see Mishna, *Shab.* viii, 5). It grows in the marshes between the Euphrates and Tigris; at Hellah, in the Persian Gulf, etc. The stalks are first soaked, then dried, and when properly cut and split make tolerable pens. Formerly the writing-reed grew in Egypt, in Asia Minor, and even in Italy (Pliny, xvi, 64; Martial, xiv, 36; comp. Beckmann, *Gesch. der Erfindungen*, iii, 48 sq.; see on the Hebrew name, Celsius, *Hierobot.* ii, 312 sq.). See PEN.

See, in general, Prosp. Alpin (*Plant. Ægypt.* c. 36, p. 53) and Vesling (p. 197) upon it; Rottböll, *Descr. Novar. Plant.* (Hafn. 1773) i, 32 sq.; Celsius, *Hierobot.* ii, 137 sq.; Bodæi a Stapel, *Comm.* 428 sq.; Bruce, *Travels*, v, 13 sq., 279, with plate i; Montfaucon, in the *Mémoires de l'Acad. des Inscript.* vi, 592 sq.; Oken, *Botany*, i, 819 sq.

Reed, Alanson, a Baptist missionary, was born in Chesterfield, Mass., in 1807. He pursued his studies at the Hamilton Literary and Theological Institution (now Madison University), N. Y., and was appointed Aug. 3, 1835, as a missionary by the American Baptist Missionary Union to labor among the Chinese living in Bangkok, Siam. Having acquired a knowledge of the language, he took a floating-house on the Meinam, two miles above Bangkok, and began his evangelical labors among the Chinese. While thus occupied, he was stricken down by disease, and died Aug. 29, 1837. (J. C. S.)

Reed, Alexander, D.D., a Presbyterian minister, was born at Washington, Pa., Sept. 28, 1832. He was the son of the Hon. Robert R. Reed, a child of the covenant dedicated to God in baptism, and early instructed both by precept and example in the ways of religion. His preparatory education was received in the English department of Washington College, and he graduated at that institute in 1851. After his graduation he went to Georgia and engaged in teaching, and while there joined the Church on a profession of religion under the ministry of the Rev. Dr. Baker, an eminent evangelist. In 1853 he entered the Western Theological Seminary at Pittsburgh, Pa., and was graduated in 1856. The following year he was ordained and installed pastor of the Presbyterian Church of Octorara, Pa. Here his labors were greatly blessed, and the bonds of affection between him and his people greatly strengthened, until the year 1864, when they were dissolved to enable him to accept the pastorate of the Central Church, Philadelphia. This call removed him to a wider sphere, and brought him to a more responsible position in a great city at one of the most critical periods of our national history. His sympathetic nature, ready and effective oratory, very soon attracted attention, and other duties than those merely of the pastorate were soon laid upon him. He was active and influential in the organization of the "Christian Commission," the spirit and object of which appealed to his sympathies and patriotic impulses, and some of his most stirring and powerful addresses were made in behalf of this great interest. He was not only alive to all the duties connected with his pastorate, but to all the general social and moral interests of the community. He gave to all the boards of the Church his zealous and faithful support, and at one time his personal attention as president of the Board of Ministerial Relief and also the Board of Publication. In the year 1873 Dr. Reed was called to the Westminster Presbyterian Church, Brooklyn, N. Y., and in accepting this call he threw himself with all his accustomed ardor into the labors of his new field. At the end of two years he was obliged, from declining health, to resign his charge. With the hope of regaining his health, he spent a year and a half in Europe, but he returned without any perceptible change for the better. Thinking that the dry and bracing air of Colorado might prove beneficial, he accepted the pastorate of the church in Denver City. Though in feeble health, he labored among that people, and greatly endeared himself to them by his affectionate nature and eminent pulpit ability. But his work was evidently done, and he was obliged to relinquish the active duties of the pastoral office. He was one of the most genial and companionable of men; a smile of heavenly sunshine played around his features and kindled in his eye, and no amount of sickness could cloud the sunshine or stop the exuberant flow of his feelings. He seemed to have caught the light and lived in the glory of the better world. Dr. Reed was a godly man, a man of faith and

prayer. He devoted himself wholly to the work of the ministry because he loved it. All his faculties were alive and active in the great cause in which he was engaged. By his strong power of will he seemed to hold the forces which were moving upon life's citadel in check until his brother, Dr. T. B. Reed, who was on his way to visit him in his distant home, might reach him. When he arrived, and he had committed to him the charge of his beloved wife and children, in perfect peace he laid himself down to die. He died at Denver, Col., Nov. 18, 1878. (W. P. S.)

Reed, Andrew, D.D., an English Independent divine, noted as one of the greatest philanthropists of our age, was born in 1788 at London, where his father, a pious man, was a watchmaker in Butcher Row, St. Clement's Danes. Many a time, it is said, Andrew's mother would keep the shop while his father was off on a preaching tour; for he was much given to itinerating in the suburban towns, proclaiming among the benighted "the truth as it is in Jesus," and so interested became he in this glorious work that Mrs. Reed found it needful to provide for the family herself by opening a china-shop, which she kept for twenty years in Chiswell Street. Young Andrew was brought up in the trade of his father, and no one supposed that he would ever leave watchmaking to go on the same errand as his father. Sent to a school in Islington to get such an education as was needful for an ordinary artisan, Andrew evinced a predilection not only for all study, but especially for the dead languages. He begged to be allowed to study Greek and Hebrew. The careful mother, anxious to prevent her son's defection—for she hoped from him support in the business his father had so much neglected—took him finally from school and apprenticed him to a master. But the temptation of books was a very harmless one compared with the temptations of another kind that awaited Andrew in his new situation. His master's son was a wild youth, and the young apprentice entered on his diary the following: "By the wicked behavior of my master's son I was made still worse. I went twice or thrice to the accursed play-houses." On this account he got his indentures cancelled and returned to the parental roof. Working the usual hours at watchmaking, in his leisure he kept his mother's books, instructed his sister, and taught a little orphan girl, their servant, to read and write—thus early beginning his orphan work. Books, books, evermore books, were the choice friends of his leisure hours; and though he worked well at his trade, his good mother in her diary might well write down, "These are things which, if the lad be for business, show too much taste for study." She was so far right that God was leading him through secular to sacred pursuits. Andrew Reed's Hebrew and Greek studies led him to theology, and his joy knew no bounds when it was decided in the family counsels that he might go to college. He dismantled his little workshop, sold his tools, and laid out the money in books. He entered Hackney Seminary, a collegiate and theological school of the Independents. It is needless to say that when he was ready to graduate his record was already begun as a preacher. He had many invitations to settle. Among other calls was that of colleague to the celebrated preacher Matthew Wilks (q. v.) at the Tabernacle. But Reed gave the preference to the church in the New Road, East London, where he remained the pastor for half a century. He resigned the place on Nov. 27, 1861, the anniversary of his birth and of his ordination. He died Feb. 25, 1862, happy to the last and conscious of his Master's love. Rarely, if ever, was such a record closed as this event ended. More than most men—even Christian ministers—Dr. Reed seems to have lived in the presence of some great public purpose, and to have consecrated, or rather sacrificed, all things to its accomplishment. Thus we read in the *Memoir* published by his sons (Lond. 1863) that at times he was so engrossed that he would not dine with his family for a week. "In the last four years," he writes in his diary, "I have been four hundred times to Earlswood [asylum for idiots]; each time has consumed the best part of a day, so that I may fairly say that it has cost me a whole year." Indeed, nothing less than a consecration like this could have accomplished Dr. Reed's work. He must, moreover, have combined the physical strength of a giant with the powerful will of the Christian philanthropist. He was one of the most successful and popular preachers of his day—the laborious pastor of one of the largest churches in the metropolis; and yet he found time to originate not only the Hackney Grammar-school, but five great national benevolent institutions—viz. the London Orphan Asylum, the Infant Orphan Asylum at Wanstead, the Asylum for Fatherless Children at Reedham, the Idiot Asylum at Earlswood, with its branch establishment at Colchester, and the Hospital for Incurables. The aggregate cost of their erection was £129,320; they accommodate 2110 objects of charity; and their total receipts under his administration amounted to the respectable sum of £1,043,566 13*s.* 1*d.* Emphatically was his "a life, with deeds to crown it." Andrew Reed began his work among the seafaring population of London. He befriended the parents, established schools for the children, and founded the first penny bank for savings. Besides these stupendous works of faith and labors of love, he founded a Home for Incurables; and, not forgetting the interests of education while employed in helping the helpless, he was the friend of the Hackney Grammar-school, and always the active promoter of Sabbath and day schools for the children of the industrial classes. He not only refused all remuneration for his great services, but contributed, besides, a large part of his yearly income in charity. The five asylums that he founded alone received from his hand £4540. When he opened a chapel he was ever ready with his £10, £20, and even £50, to encourage its friends to discharge a debt incurred in its erection. He lived in the most simple way, that he might have the more to give to him that needed. His remarkable success in his vast and varied enterprises he owed to his extraordinary business powers, his great sagacity, and his determined will. Few men saw more clearly what was to be done, or knew better how to do it. One record strikingly exhibits the stern kind of discipline that he was wont to exercise upon himself, and the resolute determination with which he concentrated his energies upon his object:

"The measure of mercy is the measure of obligation. Of the course I should take at present I see nothing. All is dark, very dark. Work which I had thought to do is now abandoned. This one thing is left me, and I will do it. For discipline I will do it. I have naturally a love for the beautiful, and a shrinking, almost a loathing, of infirmity and deformity. The thing I would not do is the very thing I am now resolved to do. Alas! poor idiot! while he is the greater sufferer, I am the greater sinner."

His benevolence was both a natural enthusiasm and a sacred religious duty, and whatever his warm heart prompted, his clear head conceived and his strong hand executed. A keen discriminator of character, he knew how to bend the wills of others to his purpose. As a speaker, he was endowed with very great power of eloquence. After the fashion of his generation, he was somewhat rhetorical and magniloquent, but there was a mighty power of passion in him. His *Sermons and Charges*, recently published, contain specimens of a very high order of pulpit eloquence; and few sermons of modern times have produced a greater effect than his missionary sermon at Surrey Chapel. His power in the pulpit was attested by his own crowded chapel, and by the large numbers whom he admitted to his Church fellowship. He was a polemic of no mean power—"a sharp threshing-instrument having teeth;" and perhaps earl Russell never listened to a more powerful or skilful storm of rhetoric than at the British and Foreign School meeting in Exeter Hall, when Dr. Reed claimed him as a leader in opposition to Sir J. Graham's Factories Bill. Dr. Reed's power of work was immense; his recreation

was change of benevolent employment, either the energetic prosecution of some philanthropic scheme or a campaign of provincial preaching. Amid all his literary and other labors, he did not think of writing his life. One of his sons, perceiving that his venerable father was fast failing, asked him if he had ever arranged any memoir. Dr. Reed replied by writing the following note:

"To my saucy boy who said he would write my life, and asked for materials:

A. R.
I WAS BORN YESTERDAY;
I SHALL DIE TO-MORROW;
AND I MUST NOT SPEND TO-DAY
IN TELLING WHAT I HAVE DONE,
BUT IN DOING WHAT I MAY FOR
HIM
WHO HAS DONE ALL FOR ME.
I SPRANG FROM THE PEOPLE; I HAVE LIVED FOR THE PEOPLE—
THE MOST FOR THE MOST UNHAPPY;
AND THE PEOPLE, WHEN THEY KNOW IT,
WILL NOT ALLOW ME TO DIE OUT OF LOVING REMEMBRANCE."

What can be added to such a summary? "It is not surprising that the sons of Dr. Andrew Reed should wish to publish the history of his life of goodness and active benevolence—though, in fact, the permanent records of his character and works exist in the many institutions which owe their existence to his activity and devotion." These are the words of the queen of England in reference to a man who was the honored instrument of doing such a vast amount of good that his name undoubtedly ranks among the first philanthropists of the age. Dr. Reed wrote many works in *practical* theology, principally on practical religion — all of which have had a most extensive circulation, and of which a list is given in Allibone. Dr. Reed is the author of many hymns, among which is the one beginning "There is an hour when I must part." In 1835 he visited this country as a representative of the Congregational Union of Britain, and made many friends here. On his return home, he wrote on his *Visit to the American Churches*, and the work was republished here (N. Y. 1835, and often). See, besides, the *Memoir* (Lond. 1863, small 8vo; 3d ed. 1867); *London Reader*, 1863, ii, 724; *London Patriot*, Dec. 17, 1863; *Eclectic and Congregational Rev.* Jan. 1864; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth.* s. v.; Grant, *Metropolitan Pulpit*, 1839, ii, 265–278; *Men of the Times* (1862), p. 648.

Reed, Caleb, an American divine, who belonged to the New Jerusalem Church, was born in 1797. He entered the ministry, but was finally made editor of the *New Jerusalem Magazine*, and continued its management for twenty years. He died in 1854. His publications were of a secular character.

Reed, Fitch, D.D., a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, whose memory is precious in all the communities where he has resided, was born March 28, 1795. His early Christian training was under Calvinistic influences, but, in his nineteenth year, while studying medicine, he was converted under the labors of the Rev. Marvin Richardson, and accepted Arminian doctrines as preferable. In 1815 he was licensed to preach, and was employed upon a circuit by Dr. Nathan Bangs, then presiding elder. In 1817 he was admitted into the New York Conference, and was sent to the extreme eastern point of Long Island. His second appointment was Dunham Circuit, in Canada East, which offered him all the hardships which the severity of a northern winter, a new country, unimproved and sometimes almost impassable roads, a poor people, and ill-constructed log-huts could afford. Of this he himself told, as follows, in a semi-centennial sermon: "I did at first wonder that my lot had fallen just here, and thought that possibly, after all, the bishop had made a mistake; yet the harsh climate, the hard work, and plenty of it, and harder fare were just what Infinite Wisdom saw I needed. I praise the Lord to this day for Dunham Circuit; it saved me from an early grave." His next field of labor was in the wilderness lying north of Lake Ontario. To this region he was sent as the first minister of the Gospel, within about twelve months after the first settlement had been made. He established his appointments, organized his circuit, which he travelled on foot, making his way through the trackless forest by the aid of a compass, and carrying with him "an Indian hatchet, as a defence against wild beasts and as a means of constructing bridges over streams of water too deep to ford." From 1820 to 1828 Mr. Reed was a member of Genesee Conference. He filled some of its most important stations, and, when twenty-eight years of age, was appointed presiding elder of Susquehanna District. After eight years he was again transferred to New York Conference and stationed at Rhinebeck, and subsequently in New York city, Brooklyn, Poughkeepsie, and other important fields of labor, including New Haven District. In 1848 he was transferred to Oneida Conference, to which he gave fourteen years of effective service, including seven years in the office of presiding elder. In the year 1862 he was compelled by increasing bodily infirmities to retire to the superannuated relation, and thereafter, though his love for the work never abated, he preached only as health and opportunity would permit. He died Oct. 10, 1871, leaving behind the record of a life well spent in the service of his heavenly Master. See *Christian Advocate*, Dec. 9, 1871.

Reed, John (1), D.D., an American Unitarian divine, was born in Framingham, Mass., Nov. 11, 1751, and was educated at Yale College, class of 1772. He studied for the ministry, and became pastor at Bridgewater, Mass., in 1780. He finally took interest in political affairs, and was a member of Congress from 1794 to 1800. He died Feb. 17, 1831. He published various sermons and theological treatises of passing value. See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, viii, 143.

Reed, John (2), D.D., a clergyman of the Protestant Episcopal Church, was born at Wickford, R. I., about 1777. He had his thoughts early turned towards the ministry, and went to Union College with a view to greater efficiency in the sacred work. On May 27, 1806, he was made a deacon, and on June 17, 1808, priest. His first pastorate was at St. Luke's Church, Catskill, N. Y. In 1810 he became rector at Christ Church, Poughkeepsie, and there preached for thirty-five years, in his latter years having the aid of an assistant. He died July 6, 1845. A tablet, erected in the church by the vestry, records the high respect and veneration in which he was held by his parish. He was a careful observer, a diligent student, a man of God, and an acceptable preacher. "His whole demeanor," said the Rev. Dr. John Brown, of Newburgh, N. Y., at the funeral service, "showed that his [Reed's] best treasure was in heaven." He published a small work in defence of episcopacy, and two or three separate *Sermons*. See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, v, 506–509; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s. v. (J. H. W.)

Reed, Joseph, a Roman Catholic priest, was born at Waterbury, Conn., about 1845. In 1869 he was ordained at Troy, N. Y., and, after supplying a mission at Birmingham, Conn., and serving as a curate at the cathedral in Providence, R. I., was appointed secretary and chancellor of the diocese of Hartford, Conn. He died in 1877.

Reed, Nelson, a pioneer minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Ann Arundel County, Md., Nov. 27, 1751. Nothing positive is known of his early history. In 1779 his name appears on the minutes as a travelling preacher, and he is believed to have thus preached for four years. His appointments were, in 1779 to Fluvanna; in 1780, Amelia; in 1781, Calvert; in 1782, Little York; in 1783, Caroline; in 1784, Dover. From 1785 to 1795 he had the charge of districts in Maryland and Virginia. In 1796 he was stationed at Fell's Point; in 1797, at Baltimore city; in 1798, at Fell's Point again; in 1799, on Baltimore Circuit. In

1800 his name is found among those "who are under a location through illness of body or family concerns," and it disappears now from the minutes until 1805, when we find him again on the Baltimore Circuit. The next year he was placed in charge of the Federal and Annapolis Circuit. In 1807, 1808, 1809, and 1810 he presided over the Baltimore District, on which were stationed at that time some of the strong men of the itinerancy. In 1811, 1812, 1813, and 1814 he presided over the Georgetown District. In 1815 we find him on the Baltimore District again, where he presided four years. In 1819 he stands connected with the Baltimore Circuit as a supernumerary. In 1820 his name appears on the superannuated list; in this relation he continued till the close of his life. At the time of his death, which occurred Oct. 20, 1840, he was the oldest Methodist preacher in Europe or America. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 1840; Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, vii, 68–70.

Reed, Sampson, a Swedenborgian of note as a writer especially, was born at West Bridgewater, Mass., in 1800, and was educated at Harvard College, class of 1818. He became editor of the *New Church Magazine* and co-editor of the *New Jerusalem Magazine*, and died in 1875. He published *Observations*.

Reed, Samuel, a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Union County, O., Nov. 18, 1816. He entered the ministry in 1838, and was sent to the Peru Circuit as a supply. He was admitted into the Conference, and travelled Auburn Mission in 1839–40, Frankfort in 1841–42, Vincennes in 1843, Evansville in 1844, Bedford in 1845, North Indiana Conference, Covington, in 1846–47. This fall he went to St. Louis and remained one year, returned with impaired health, and was superannuated for five years following. He was again made effective and appointed to New Harmony in 1853, to Petersburgh in 1854, to New Albany in 1855, and to Bedford in 1856, where he remained to the close of that conference year, when he superannuated a second time. He declined in health, but lingered on until Feb. 6, 1869.—*Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 1869, p. 187, 188.

Reëlai'ah (Heb. *Reëlayah'*, רְאֵלָיָה *fearer of Jehovah;* Sept. Ῥεελίας), one of "the children of the province" who returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel (Ezra ii, 2); called in the parallel passage (Neh. vii, 7) by the synonym RAAMIAH (q. v.).

Reël'ius (Ῥεελίας v. r. Βορολίας), one of the Israelites who returned with Zerubbabel from Babylon (1 Esdr. v, 8); inserted in place of the BIGVAI of the Hebrew lists (Ezra ii, 2; Neh. vii, 7) by confusion for the *Reelaiah* of Ezra's list.

Rees, ABRAHAM, D.D., a dissenting minister who held a distinguished rank in the literary and scientific world, was the son of a Welsh Nonconformist minister, and was born at Montgomery in 1743. Intended for the ministry, he was first placed under Dr. Jenkins, of Carmarthen, whence he was removed to the Hoxton Academy, founded by Mr. Coward, where his progress in his studies was so rapid that in his nineteenth year he was appointed mathematical tutor to the institution, and soon after resident tutor, in which capacity he continued upwards of twenty-two years. In 1768 he succeeded Mr. Read as pastor to the Presbyterian congregation of St. Thomas's, Southwark. On the death of Mr. White, in 1783, Rees accepted an invitation to become minister of a congregation in Jewin Street, Cripplegate, where he continued to officiate till the time of his death, June 9, 1825. On the establishment of the dissenting seminary at Hackney in 1786, Dr. Rees, who had, in conjunction with Drs. Savage and Kippis, seceded from that at Hoxton two years before, was elected to the situation of resident tutor in the natural sciences. This position he held till the dissolution of the academy, which took place on the death of Dr. Kippis (q. v.). It is, however, in a literary capacity that Dr. Rees is principally and most advantageously known. In 1776 he was applied to by the proprietors of *Chambers's Encyclopædia* to superintend a new and enlarged edition of that valuable compilation, which, after nine years' incessant labor, he brought to a conclusion in four folio volumes. The success of this work stimulated the proprietors to still further exertions. A new undertaking, similar in its nature, but much more comprehensive in its plan, and printed in quarto size, was projected and carried on by him; and he had at length the satisfaction to see the new *Cyclopædia*, now generally known by his name, advance from the publication of the first volume in 1802 to its completion in forty-five volumes with undiminished reputation. His other works, besides those of a secular character, are, *Practical Sermons* (1809–12, 2 vols.):—*The Principles of the Protestant Dissenters Stated and Vindicated:*—besides a variety of occasional discourses. See Jones, *Christian Biography*, p. 357; *Annual Biography*, 1825; *London Gentleman's Magazine*, 1825.

Reësai'as (Ῥησαίας), given (1 Esdr. v, 8) in place of the above REELAIAH (Ezra ii, 2) or RAAMIAH (Neh. vii, 7).

Reese, E. Yates, D.D., a minister of the Methodist Protestant Church, but especially noted as a writer, was born about the year 1820. He early entered the ministry, and, after filling many positions of prominence in the pastorate, became editor of the Methodist Protestant newspaper at Baltimore, and was in this position until, in 1860, in a fit of mental derangement, he committed suicide. *The Lutheran* of Philadelphia thus commented at the time: "Dr. Reese was one of the noblest and most genial of men. His paper was among the very best of the denominational organs in our country; but it was much more than a denominational organ, immeasurably more than a sectarian one. He drew around him many admirable writers, not only of his own Church, but of other churches, but no pen among them all was so versatile, so happy, as his own. He was a poet and an orator, who consecrated every gift to the service of the Saviour of men. His consecration had a wonderful charm. His delicacy of feeling, his fine tact, his generosity and large catholicity of feeling, made him very dear to all that knew him." Such testimony from another denomination is surely rare; but it was reprinted also by the *Reformed Messenger* of the German Reformed Church, and thus given still further approval than the bounds of one outside denomination.

Reese, Levi R., a minister of the Methodist Protestant Church, was born in Harford County, Md., Feb. 8, 1806, enjoyed a good preparatory training, and taught school for a while after he was seventeen. When about twenty years of age he joined the Methodist Episcopal Church, but shortly after the agitation opened which resulted in the formation of the Methodist Protestant Church, he was, it is said, the first preacher appointed by the new body. The first three years of his ministerial life were spent at Philadelphia and New York. In 1833 he was appointed by the Maryland Annual Conference to labor in Alexandria, Va., and there succeeded so well that he was successively given "every important position and every official position within the gift of the body with which he was connected." He was for two years president of the Church, and repeatedly a representative in their General Conference. In 1837 and 1838 he was chaplain to the United States Congress. He died in Philadelphia Sept. 21, 1851. He was highly esteemed as a preacher, and the seals of his ministry are all through Maryland. See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, vii, 751–754.

Reese, Thomas, D.D., a Presbyterian minister, was born in 1742, was educated at the College of New Jersey, class of 1768, and became the pastor of the Presbyterian Church at Salem, S. C., and subsequently

of two churches in Pendleton District, S. C. He died in 1796. He published, *Essay on the Influence of Religion on Civil Society* (1788):—*Farewell Sermon:*—*Two Sermons* (in the *American Preacher*, vol. i and ii). See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, iii, 331.

Reeve, Thomas, D.D., an Anglican divine of the 17th century, flourished as preacher of Waltham Abbey, Essex. He published, *Sermons* (Lond. 1632, 4to):—*Sermons* (1647, 4to):—*Public Devotions* (1651, 12mo):—*God's Plea for Nineveh, or London's Precedent for Mercy*, delivered in certain sermons, etc. (1657, fol.); "An extraordinary work, very severe in lashing and exposing the vices of the age; the sermons are a very lively picture of London manners now unknown; . . . this is one of the scarcest books in English theology" (Beloe, *Anec.* iii, 80–84):—an abridgment, entitled *London's Remembrancer*, was published soon afterwards:—*Sermons* (1660, 4to):—*England's Backwardness*, etc., a sermon (1661, 8vo):—*Discourses* (1661, 4to):—*Sermon* (1661, 4to):—*England's Restitution*, etc.:—*Sermons* (1661, 4to). See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth.* s. v.

Reeves, William, an Anglican divine, was born in 1668, and was educated at King's College, Cambridge, of which he was made a fellow. He took holy orders, and in 1694 became rector of Cranford, Middlesex, and in 1711 vicar of St. Mary, Reading. He died in 1726. He published, *Sermons* (1704, 4to):—*Sermon* (1706, 4to):—*The Apologies of Justin Martyr, Tertullian, and Minucius Felix in Defence of the Christian Religion, with the Commonitory of Vincentius Lirinensis concerning the Primitive Rule of Faith* (transl., with notes and a preliminary discourse upon each author, Lond. 1709–16, 2 vols. 8vo). "The translation is generally perspicuous and faithful. The notes contain a good deal of learning, and frequently illustrate the meaning where it is obscure. The preliminary dissertation may be considered an answer to the valuable work of Daillé on the same subject" (Orme). See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth.* s. v.

Refectory, the dining-hall of a monastery, college, etc. The internal arrangements and fittings were very similar to those of the ordinary domestic halls, except that it was usually provided with a raised desk or pulpit, from which on some occasions one of the inmates of the establishment read to the others during meal-time. There are remains of old English refectories at Chester and Worcester now used as a schoolhouse, at Carlisle and Durham as a library, and at Beaulieu as a church. Portions of the beautiful arcaded walls of one remain at Peterborough. It was usually, as at Lanercost and Rievalle, raised upon cellarage, which at Clugny contained the bath-rooms; and in Benedictine friars' and regular canons' houses it lay parallel to the minster, in order that the noise and fumes of dinner might not reach the sanctuary; but in most Cistercian houses, as Beaulieu, Byland, Ford, Netley, Tintern, Rievalle, Furness, and Kirkham, Maulbronn, Clairvaux, Braisne, Savigny, and Bonport, it stood at right angles to the cloister, as it did in the Dominican convents of Toulouse and Paris. A few foreign monastic refectories were of two alleys, as Tours, Alcobaça, the Benedictines', and St. Martin des Champs at Paris. At St. Alban's an abbot, on his resignation, went to reside in a chamber which he had fitted up under the refectory. The usual dinner-hour was three P. M. The small bell rang and the monks came out from the parlor and washed at the lavatory, and then entered the hall, two and two, taking their appointed places at the side-tables. At the high-table on the dais the superior sat, in the centre of the east wall, under a cross, a picture of the *Doom*, or the *Last Supper*, having the squilla-bell on his right hand, which he rang at the beginning and end of dinner. Usually the number of each mess varied between three and ten persons. Each monk drew down his cowl and ate in silence. While the hebdomadaries or servers of the week laid the dishes, the reader of the week began the lection from Holy Writ or the lives of saints in the wall pulpit. During dinner all the gates were closed, and no visitors were admitted. After dinner the broken fragments were sent down to the almonry for the poor and sick, and the brethren either took the meridian sleep, talked in the calefactory, read, or walked, but in some houses went in procession to the cemetery and prayed a while bareheaded among the graves of the brotherhood. At Durham the frater-house was used only on great occasions. It was fitted with benches and mats. The ordinary fare was pulse, fruit, vegetables, bread, fish, eggs, cheese, wine, or ale; and the evening meal, the biberes, collation, mistum, or caritas, consisted of bread and wine, and was followed by prayer in church before bedtime. The dinner-hour at length became put back to noon, and the supper was continued at the old time, about five P. M. At the entrance of the hall there was a large ambry for the mazers, cups, and plate. The Clugniacs distributed the unconsecrated hosts in hall. The *Last Supper* of Leonardo da Vinci, painted for the Dominicans of Milan, represents the high-table of a refectory of the order. French or Latin only was allowed to be spoken in hall or cloister, and in 1337 meat was not eaten on Wednesdays and Saturdays during Advent, or from Septuagesima to Easter-day. The hall of a guest-house was lined with beds at Clugny and Farfa, for men on one side and for women on the other, while movable tables down the centre were laid out at meal-time.

Refine. The art of refining, as referred to in Scripture, was of two different kinds, according as it was applied to liquids or to metals; and the processes, in themselves quite diverse, are expressed by different words. In respect to liquids the primary idea was that of *straining* or filtering—the word for which was זָקַק, *zakák* (Isa. xxv, 6); but in respect to metals it was that of *melting*, and thereby separating the ore from the dross—and for this the word was צָרַף, *tsaráph*. But the first word also in the course of time came to be used of gold or other metals, to denote their refined or pure state (1 Chron. xxviii, 18; xxix, 4; Job xxviii, 1; Psa. xii, 6; Mal. iii, 3). In figurative allusions, however, to the idea of refining, while both words might have been employed, we find almost exclusive use made of that which points to the more searching process of purification by fire (Isa. i, 25; xl, 19; xlviii, 10; Zeck. xiii, 9; Mal. iii, 2, 3). Hence the term "refiner" or *smelter* (צֹרֵף, *tsorêph*; מְצָרֵף, *metsarêph*, Mal. iii, 2, 3) denotes a worker in metals, specially of gold and silver (Prov. xxv, 4), a founder (Judg. xvii, 4), a goldsmith (Isa. xli, 7). That the ancients acquired, in comparatively remote times, some knowledge and skill in this art, as in the working of metals generally, admits of no doubt. See Metal. The Egyptians carried the working of metals to an extraordinary degree of perfection, as their various articles of jewelry preserved in museums evince; and there is no doubt that the Hebrews derived their knowledge of these arts from this source—though there is evidence that the art of working in copper and iron was known before the flood (Gen. iv, 22). The Egyptian monuments also give various representations on the subject, and in particular exhibit persons blowing at the fire, with a pot of metal on it, in order to raise it to a melting heat. See Bellows. The creation of a heat sufficiently intense for the purpose was the chief element in the process of refining, although, probably, borax and other substances were applied to expedite and perfect the result. The refiner's art was especially essential to the working of the precious metals. It consisted in the separation of the dross from the pure ore, which was effected by reducing the metal to a fluid state by the application of heat, and by the aid of solvents, such as alkali (בֹּר; A. V. "purely," Isa. i, 25) or lead (Jer. vi, 29), which, amalgamating with the dross, permitted the extraction

of the unadulterated metal. The Hebrews evidently understood the process of melting the metals, not only to make them fluid for the purpose of casting, but also for separating from the precious metals the mixed common minerals, such as silver from the lead ore with which it was combined (Ezek. xxii, 18-22; xxiv, 11). The instruments required by the refiner were a crucible or furnace (כּוּר) and a bellows or blowpipe (מַפֻּחַ). The workman sat at his work (Mal. iii, 3, "He shall sit as a refiner"); he was thus better enabled to watch the process, and let the metal run off at the proper moment. See MINE. The notices of refining are chiefly of a figurative character, and describe moral purification as the result of chastisement (Isa. i, 25; Zech. xiii, 9; Mal. iii, 2, 3). The failure of the means to effect the result is graphically depicted in Jer. vi, 29: "The bellows glow with the fire (become quite hot from exposure to the heat); the lead (used as a solvent) is expended (בָּאַשׁ תַּם [*keri*]); the refiner melts in vain, for the refuse will not be separated." The refiner appears, from the passage whence this is quoted, to have combined with his proper business that of assaying metals: "I have set thee for an assayer" (בָּחוֹן; A. V. "a tower," ver. 27). See FINING-POT.

Reformatio LEGUM ECCLESIASTICĀRUM, a code of *Church law*, first projected by Cranmer at the commencement of his primacy, and accomplished, after various impediments (1551), by a sub-committee of bishops, divines, canonists, and secular doctors of the law. It was ready to be submitted to king Edward, but his sudden decease prevented the royal confirmation, and so the project came to an end. The work, consequently, is not, and never was, of any authority; but it is a valuable record, as throwing a clear light on the views of the Reformers. It not only reveals their plans with respect to canonical jurisprudence, but their opinions on Christian doctrine.

Reformation, THE, is the name commonly given to the religious and ecclesiastical movement of the 16th century which resulted in the overthrow of the then all-powerful authority of the Roman popes in a large portion of the Christian world, and in the construction of a number of new religious organizations. The name itself is highly significant, and points to the importance of the new departure in the history of Christianity which then began. It has come into quite general use even among Roman Catholic writers, although the theologians of that Church have attempted to substitute for it other terms, like the "so-called Reformation," and the "separation of the Church." We have already had occasion in numerous articles of this *Cyclopædia* to refer to detached portions of the Reformation. The Church history of no important country of Europe could be complete without a mention of its reformatory movements, whether they were successful or unsuccessful, and the biographies of the great fathers of the Reformation consist chiefly of an account of their labors in behalf of the reconstruction of the Church upon a new basis. The present article treats of the great turning-point in the history of Christianity as a whole.

I. *Forerunners of the Reformation.*—Like most of the great events in the history of mankind, the Reformation has had its preparatory history, in which attempts of a similar nature were made for the same purpose, meeting with no or but partial success, but yet smoothing the way for the marvellous changes which were achieved by the victorious reformation of the 16th century.

1. All the Reformed churches which have sprung from the movements of the 16th century are agreed in regarding the undue power which the bishops of Rome at an early time began to arrogate to themselves, and the centralized constitution which consequently was forced upon the Christian Church, as one of the most fatal deviations from the doctrines of the Bible and the practice and the life of the apostolic age. In a wider sense of the word, all the efforts, therefore, which have been made to repress and abolish the arrogant and encroaching power of the Roman popes, and to bring back the Church to its purity in the time of her founder and his first disciples, might be called preparatory and forerunning movements of the great Reformation. These movements have been manifold and widely different in their origin, progress, and ramifications, and each of them has to be individually judged by its own character and history. Indeed, throughout the Middle Ages, even when the power of the papacy was most despotic and absolute, a reformatory tendency was pervading the Church, often confining itself to secrecy and occult labors, but frequently bursting the bonds of the Church, proclaiming its reformatory principles in public, and defying the ire of an enraged hierarchy. Some of these outbursts ran smoothly on in the channels of a purely evangelical belief; others became impregnated with fanatical, sometimes even anti-Christian, elements, and threatened with a common overthrow both the State and the Church of the times. Among the more prominent reformatory movements in the earlier part of the Middle Ages were those of the Albigenses, the Cathari, and the Waldenses, to all of which (and many others) this *Cyclopædia* devotes special articles.

In the latter part of the Middle Ages, the deviation of the ruling Church from Scripture and primitive Christianity became more and more glaring, and the corruption among all classes of the clergy, from the highest to the lowest, more and more general. The call for a "reformation in the head and members" spread rapidly, and even great nations began to look upon the reformation of the Church as a national cause. It has been justly remarked that the meaning given to the term "reformation in the head and members" was by no means uniform, and that "every one understood it to mean primarily that which he most desired—the removal of what seemed to him most oppressive and unchristian." All malcontents, however, appeared to agree in regarding the administration of the Christian Church by the papal court as utterly depraved, and as subversive of true Christianity.

The efforts made for putting an end to papal misrule and achieving a reformation of the Church were chiefly of two kinds. The one class found the seat of the degeneration not so much in a departure from the doctrine of the Bible as in the usurpation by the popes of greater power than belonged to them by divine and Church right. These men strongly believed in the continuity of the visible Church; they rejected the right of separation and secession, and looked upon the œcumenical councils of the Church as the only medium through which the needed reformation of the Church should be effected. This school had for a long time a centre in the most famous literary institution of the Church—the University of Paris. Its chief representatives were Peter d'Ailly, the chancellor, his pupil Gerson, and Nicolas de Clémanges, rector of that university. The hearty support of many of the foremost princes of the age, including several emperors, was secured, and at the three great councils of Pisa, Constance, and Basle the majority of the assembled bishops and theologians expressed their concurrence in these views, and earnestly endeavored to effect a radical reformation on this basis. The joyous hopes which had been raised in the Church by these reformatory efforts were, however, sorely disappointed when the pope succeeded in dissolving the Council of Basle.

Much more thorough than this class of reformers were a second, who not only turned against papal usurpations in the government of the Church, but also by a study of the Scriptures were led to look upon the entire doctrinal system of the Church, as it had gradually developed under the misguidance of the popes, as an apostasy from the Christianity of the Bible, and who therefore believed that, more than a reformation in its head and members, the Church needed a reformation in its spirit and doctrines. The foremost representatives of this

school were Wycliffe in England, and Huss in Bohemia. To Wycliffe the papacy appeared as anti-Christianity, and the papal power, in his opinion, was not derived from God, but from the emperor. He rejected altogether the existing hierarchical constitution of the Church, and advocated the substitution for it of the presbyterial constitution as he believed it to have existed in the apostolical age. To the traditions of the Church he absolutely denied an authoritative character, and declared the whole Scripture to be the only source and rule of religious knowledge. Huss derived his views of Church reform largely from Wycliffe, and in 1410 was excommunicated from the Church as a Wycliffite. One of the central doctrines of the reformation of the 16th century rose, however, in his system to greater prominence, and he also resembled his great followers more than Wycliffe by arousing the masses of the people in behalf of reform. Neither Wycliffe nor Huss succeeded in carrying through a reformation. When the English government, which had protected Wycliffe during his lifetime from personal injury, began a bloody persecution against his followers, most of whom were found in the higher classes and among the men of learning, the reformatory movement in England came to a sudden standstill. The reformatory ideas of Huss appeared for a time to gain complete control of an entire country, and thus to establish a stronghold of evangelical Christianity in the centre of Europe. But internal dissensions and the superior power of the German emperor annihilated in 1434 the prospects of the Hussite movement, which dwindled down into a small sect called the Bohemian and Moravian Brethren. Numerically too weak to exercise a missionary influence upon the remainder of Christian Europe, this religious denomination will yet always be counted among the ripest and most delicious fruits of the reformatory tendencies of the Middle Ages.

Nothing shows better the vast difference between the two classes of reformers who have been characterized in the above lines than the fact that Gerson, the most gifted representative of the first named, was the leading spirit at the Council of Constance which sentenced Huss to be burned at the stake. Besides these two broad currents of reformatory movements which are visible in the Church history of the latter part of the Middle Ages, there were a large number of theological writers who bravely contended for bringing the corrupt Church of their times back to the purity of Bible Christianity, and who more or less discussed all the great reformatory questions which agitated the world in the 16th century. Among the most celebrated of these reformers were John (Pupper) of Goch, rector of a convent of nuns at Mechlin, John Wessel (Gansfort), called by his friends *Lux Mundi*, and John (Ruenrath) of Wesel. Though many of these writers made undisguised assaults upon the received doctrines of the Church, their views, if not directly addressed to the people, were frequently tolerated as learned opinions of the school.

One of the most gifted reformatory preachers of the Middle Ages appeared towards the close of the 15th century in Italy. With a rare eloquence and boldness he attacked the immoral life prevailing in both Church and State, and demanded a radical reform of both. Though few reformatory preachers have ever succeeded better than Savonarola in swaying the emotions of large masses of the people, he did not lay the foundation of any reformatory organization; and when he was burned at the gibbet, there was no one to continue the work of his life.

2. At the close of the 15th century, the Church had succeeded in repressing all the reformatory movements of the Middle Ages, at least so far as to prevent, mostly by the sword of the secular arm, the consolidation of any of these movements into a powerful ecclesiastical organization, like that of the Eastern Church. But her triumph, after all, was more apparent than real. Her authority had been thoroughly undermined, and remained shaken in every country of Europe. The threats of the Church might extort reluctant recantations from a number of intimidated reformers; but her very successes of this kind had the effect of spreading the latent discontent with a religious organization which so palpably cared more for power than for the purity of Christian doctrine and Christian life. Other powerful agencies aided in shaking the belief of the educated classes in the Church. The most influential among them was the school of the Humanists, who used the revival of classical studies for promoting a general literary culture, which not only fully emancipated itself from the guardianship of the Church, but frequently assumed an indifferent and antagonistic position even with regard to Christianity. Especially in Italy, humanism became an enthusiastic worshipper of pagan antiquity, and it became quite common that high dignitaries of the Church were in the circles of their friends and acquaintances known as avowed atheists. Even pope Leo X was credited with the remark—and, whether true or not true, it was regarded as credible by his contemporaries—"It is generally known how much we and ours have profited by the fable of Christ." While in Italy many of the leading humanists became opponents of Christian belief, though they had no objection to retaining their positions, which often were of the highest rank, in the Church, the chief patrons of the classical studies in the Teutonic countries were mostly men of earnest Christian convictions, who cultivated them with a view to strengthening the cause of Christianity, and of reforming the Church. It was especially the community of the Brothers of the Common Life who founded a number of excellent schools, in which the highest attainments in the revived classical studies, and an education in the principles of earnest, purified Christianity, were aimed at. Though the community as a whole never entered into an oppositional attitude with regard to the Church, but rather, like its greatest member, Thomas à Kempis, limited itself to teaching, preaching, and practicing that which in the system of the ruling Church appeared to be unobjectionable to earnest and pious Christians, its teachers and pupils generally favored the idea of a Church reformation, and in the 16th century many of them became enthusiastical co-workers in the reformatory labors of Luther, Zwingli, and Calvin.

The labors of such men could not fail to kindle in Germany still more the desire for a reformation, and to strengthen the expectation that in resuming the work of reformation on a grand scale the German nation would take the lead. As early as 1457, chancellor Mayer of Mentz wrote to Æneas Sylvius, subsequently pope Pius II: "The German nation, once the queen of the world, but now a tributary handmaid of the Roman Church, begins to arouse herself as out of a dream, and is resolved to throw off the yoke." This spirit of preparing for the overthrow of the papal yoke and the purification of Christianity at the proper time was fondly nurtured by hundreds of learned and pious men in the latter part of the 15th and the beginning of the 16th century; and when at length the right leader appeared at the fulness of time, he found hundreds of thousands ready to fall at once into line as combatants in the grand army of reform.

II. *Luther's Reformation in Germany.*—While the forerunners of the Reformation diffused in the Church the yearning for a radical purification of Christianity, and while the humanists were educating a race much better fitted for being the standard-bearers of a thorough reform than were the reformers of preceding centuries, a number of other great events co-operated for bringing the mediæval history of mankind to a close, and for ushering in a new æra. Maritime discoveries of unparalleled magnitude widened the horizon of the European nations and led to a rapid growth of commerce, to an increase of manufactures, and a greater and more general diffusion of wealth. The invention of the art of printing diffused knowledge among the masses of the people to an extent which former generations would have regard-

ed as impossible. Feudalism and mediæval chivalry collapsed before the rise of the wealthier and more intelligent burgherdom of the cities and towns, on the one hand, and the consolidation of powerful states under centralized governments, on the other. The new forces which obtained a controlling influence upon modern society were not always, and not by necessity, hostile to the ruling Church; but it is at once apparent that when in alliance with reformatory Church movements they were a considerable aid in raising up more formidable oppositions to the popes and their Church than those which had been put down in the Middle Ages. Soon after the beginning of the 16th century, Germany, then the soil most favorable to religious reform, produced the man who succeeded in carrying through the reforms which the preceding centuries had so often in vain attempted, who dealt to the papacy a heavier blow than it had received since the separation of the Eastern Church, and whose name, forever associated with "The Reformation," stands at the portal of modern history as one of its greatest pillars. No one disputes the eminent position which Martin Luther occupies in history, nor the extraordinary qualities which elevated him to it. The *Manual of Church History*, by Dr. Alzog, which has been translated into nearly all the languages of Europe, and is very extensively used in the theological schools of the Roman Catholic Church, says of Luther: "If we look upon his agitated, eventful life, we must count him among the most remarkable men of all centuries, although he has not grasped his mission as a reformer of the Church. We must also recognise his courage, though it frequently degenerated into defiance—his untiring activity, his popular, irresistible eloquence, sparkling wit, and disinterestedness. He did not lack a profound religious sentiment, which yearned for satisfaction, and which constitutes the fundamental character and the most brilliant feature of his system." A Protestant Church historian (Kurtz) justly calls Luther a religious genius, who was called to his great work by the rarest union of the necessary qualifications and gifts of the intellect, sentiment, character, and will; who was trained and educated by a providential guidance of his life; who, in his own life, had passed through the entire essential course of reformation, had tested in himself its divine power, and then could not but make the holiest and dearest experience of his life serviceable to all the world.

1. The origin of the German Reformation was quite humble and indefinite. Pope Leo X, of whom even Roman Catholic writers must say that "he does not appear to have experienced the blessing and power of the Christian faith," and that "religion was not to him the highest affair of life," had arranged for a very extensive sale of indulgences. It was not deemed worth while to assign for such an outrage upon the religious sentiment of pious Christians a more specious pretext than that the proceeds of the sale were intended for a war against the Turks and the erection of St. Peter's church. The real destination of the money, it was quite commonly believed, was to defray the exorbitant expenditures of the pope's court and to serve as a marriage dowry of his sister. Archbishop Albert of Mentz, of whose Christian belief as little was known as of that of the pope, authorized the sale in Germany on condition that fifty per cent. of the gross income should flow into his own pocket. A Dominican friar (Tetzel) carried on the trade with an effrontery which outraged the sentiments of thousands of earnest Christians. Among those who were urged by their conscience to rise against this profanation of Christianity was Luther, then a young monk in an Augustinian convent. When a young student, he had been driven by his anxiety for the salvation of his soul into the retirement of a convent. After long doubts and mental troubles, he had derived from a profound study of the Scriptures, and of the writings of Augustine and Tauler, the consolatory belief that man is to be saved, not by his own works, but by faith in the mercy of God in Christ. When he became a doctor of the Sacred Scriptures, he was deeply impressed with the duty imposed upon him by the oath he had to take on the occasion of teaching and making known to the world the truths of Christianity. Both as an earnest Christian, who sincerely believed in the Christianity of the Scriptures, and as a conscientious teacher of theology, Luther felt himself impelled to enter an energetic protest against the doings of Tetzel. In accordance with the principles of the Church of Rome, he wrote to several neighboring bishops to stop the sale of indulgences, and only when this appeal remained unheeded he determined to act himself. On the eve of All-Saints' Day, Oct. 31, 1517, he affixed to the castle church of Wittenberg the celebrated ninety-five propositions, which are generally looked upon as the beginning of Luther's reformation. Both Protestant and Roman Catholic writers are agreed that these theses involved by no means on Luther's part a conscious renunciation of the Roman Catholic faith. Luther himself showed this clearly by his subsequent appeal to the pope; but Dr. Hase justly remarks that Luther certainly must have been aware that he had thrown out a challenge to the most powerful prelates and monks. On the other hand, the opposition to Rome was so widespread that Luther's words worked upon public opinion as the kindling spark in a powder-magazine. Even the pope, who had at first looked upon the matter as another monkish quarrel, became startled at the electric shock which it produced throughout the Christian world. Serious measures for arresting the progress of the movement were resolved upon. At first the pope cited Luther to Rome, but at the request of the University of Wittenberg and the elector of Saxony the concession was made that the papal legate, Thomas de Vio, of Gaeta (better known in history under the name Cajetanus), should examine Luther in a paternal manner. The characteristic feature in Luther's line of defence was the rejection of the arguments taken from the fathers and the scholastics, and the demand to be refuted by arguments taken from the Bible. It was also remarkable that soon after appealing from the cardinal's treatment to the pope when better informed, he was urged on, by a fresh papal bull in behalf of indulgences, to change his appeal and to direct it to an œcumenical council. Soon after, the Roman court found it expedient to change its policy with Luther, and to endeavor to bring him back by means of compromise and kindliness. The papal chamberlain, Karl von Miltiz, a native of Saxony, was so far successful that Luther promised to write letters in which he would admonish all persons to be obedient and respectful to the Roman Church, and to write to the pope to assure him that he had never thought of infringing upon the privileges of the Roman Church. The promised letter was actually indited; its language is full of expressions of humility, and exalts the Roman Church above everything but Christ himself. He also promised to discontinue the controversy if his opponents would do the same. But soon he was drawn into the Disputation of Leipsic (June 27 to July 15, 1519), which the vainglorious Dr. Eck (even Roman Catholic writers thus characterize him) had originally arranged with Carlstadt. History awards to Dr. Eck the glory of having been the more clever disputant, but Luther's cause was nevertheless greatly benefited by it. The arguments of his opponents drove Luther onward to a more explicit rejection of Romish innovations. He was led to assert that the pope was not by divine right the universal bishop of the Church, to admit a doubt of the infallibility of councils, and to be convinced that not all Hussite doctrines were heretical. At the same time, the reformatory movement was greatly strengthened by the universal sympathy that began to be expressed with Luther, by the alliance with the liberal humanists and knights of Germany, and especially by the open accession to his cause of one of the greatest scholars of the age, Dr. Melancthon. The conflict between Rome and Luther now became one for life and death. Dr. Eck re-

turned from a journey to Rome with a bull which declared Luther a heretic and ordered the burning of his writings. Luther, on the other hand, systematized his views in three works, all of which appeared in 1520: *To his Imperial Majesty and the Christian Nobility of the German Nation; On the Babylonian Captivity of the Church;* and *Sermon on the Freedom of a Christian Man.* Finally he broke away the last bridge of retreat by publicly burning (Dec. 10, 1520) the papal bull with the papal canon law. The pope succeeded in prevailing upon the German emperor and the German Diet of Worms (1521) to proceed against Luther; and when the latter firmly refused to recant, and avowed that he could yield nothing but to the Holy Scriptures and reasonable argument, he was placed under the ban of the empire; but so great was the discontent in Germany with Rome that the same assembly that condemned Luther for opposing the faith of their ancestors presented 101 articles of complaint against the Roman see. The ban of the empire involved serious dangers for Luther, for it gave permission to any one to assault his person and seize upon his property; but he was saved from these dangers by his secluded life at the Castle of Wartburg, to which disguised horsemen, according to a previous understanding with the elector, but against his own desire, had conducted him. Far from the turmoil of political agitation, he found time not only to issue several powerful polemical essays (against auricular confession, against monastic vows, against masses for the dead, and against the new idol of the archbishop of Mentz), which refuted the rumor that he was dead, but to conceive and partially execute the plan of translating the Bible into the native tongue. During the absence of Luther from Wittenberg, the Reformation under the leadership of men who were more impetuous and practical, but less circumspect and theological, assumed a more aggressive turn against Rome. Several priests renounced celibacy and were married; Carlstadt administered the Lord's supper in both kinds, and in the German language. To these changes Luther made no objection; but when Carlstadt began to commit open acts of violence in disturbing the public worship of the Roman Church — when enthusiastic prophets appeared from Zwickau, who boasted of immediate divine revelations, rejected infant baptism, and denounced Church, State, and science—he emerged once more from his seclusion, silenced by powerful sermons his adversaries at Wittenberg, and once more placed himself at the helm of the movement. In intimate union with Melancthon, he now labored for completing the theological system of the Church which began to rear itself on the basis of his reformatory movement. Luther himself gave his chief attention to continuing the translation of the Bible in German, which was completed in 1534, and constitutes in every respect one of the master-productions of the reformatory age; while Melancthon, in his celebrated work on theological science (*Loci Communes Rerum Theologicarum*), gave to the theological leaders of the new Church a hand-book of doctrine which, as a literary production, ranked with the best works that the Church of Rome had produced up to that time.

In Rome, Leo X had meanwhile (1521) been succeeded by Adrian VI, the son of a mechanic of Utrecht, who, while strongly attached to the continuity of the external Church and opposed to the separation already produced by Luther, was at the same time sincerely and honestly devoted to the cause of a religious reform. The energy displayed by him and the success obtained were, however, by no means commensurate with the honesty of his convictions. During his short administration (1521-23) he was neither able to arrest the anti-Church reformation of Luther nor to smooth the way for the introduction of any reforms within the Church. The latter were hated in Rome no less than the former, and when Adrian died he was succeeded by a humanist, Clement VII, who, like Leo X, was anxious to preserve the splendor and the power of the papal court, and showed not the least interest in the purity of religion.

In Germany, during this interval, the protracted absence of the emperor had prevented the adoption of any stringent measures for the suppression of the Reformation, and allowed the latter to strike deeper roots in the nation. The majority of the princes, it is true, were not yet willing to part with the religion of their fathers, and to identify themselves with the movement which they thought represented their beloved ancestors as heretics. They mistrusted Rome, however; persisted in demanding reforms; contented themselves with resolving at several successive diets that the Edict of Worms should be carried out as much as possible, and thus enabled the princes and free cities which were friendly to the Reformation to consolidate it within the boundaries of their states. When the papal legate Campeggio succeeded at the Diet of Ratisbon, in 1524, in bringing about an alliance between Ferdinand of Austria, the dukes of Bavaria, and most of the bishops of Southern Germany for the preservation of the old faith and for carrying out the Edict of Worms, landgrave Philip of Hesse and elector John of Saxony, at a meeting held at Gotha, took the initiatory step for a counter-alliance of the friends of the Reformation. Luther and Melancthon were at first opposed to the conclusion of any offensive and defensive alliance, on the ground that God's cause should not be defended by carnal weapons. When, however, the danger appeared to increase, a defensive alliance between the landgrave and the elector was concluded in 1526 at Torgau, and was soon joined by a number of other princes. As the emperor became involved in a new foreign war in which the pope was on the side of his enemies, the Diet of Spire unanimously agreed upon the decree that until the meeting of a free general council every state should act with regard to the Edict of Worms as it might venture to answer to God and his imperial majesty. This decree gave to the states which were friendly to the Reformation time to reorganize the churches of their territories on the basis of the Reformation. The lead was taken by the elector John the Constant of Saxony. Melancthon drew up the articles of visitation, in accordance with which, in 1529, a general Church visitation of ecclesiastical and lay councillors took place. Among the results of this visitation were the compilation of two catechisms by Luther for more efficient instruction of the children in the elements of religion, the appointment of superintendents to exercise spiritual supervision, and the introduction of an ecclesiastical constitution, which became the common model for the churches in the other German states. Luther, in the meantime (1525), had followed the example of many of his clerical friends and married. As the continuing centre of the entire movement, Luther exerted a powerful influence in many directions as professor and author by an extensive correspondence far beyond the borders of Germany, and by supplying the churches with a great number of excellent Church hymns in the native tongue. By these Church hymns, as well as by his translation of the Bible, Luther at the same time occupied so prominent a position in the history of German literature that Germany as a nation appeared to be under the greatest indebtedness to him, and its further progress to be closely linked to the success of the Reformation. A number of theological controversies into which Luther was drawn, and of which those with king Henry VIII of England, with Erasmus, with Carlstadt, and Zwingli were the most important, belong more to the personal history of Luther than to that of the Reformation.

2. A new crisis for the German Reformation began in 1529 with the Diet of Spire. The emperor having victoriously finished his wars, was now free from foreign entanglements, and showed himself determined to maintain the religious unity of the empire. A very numerous attendance of bishops and prelates secured a Catholic majority, which, in accordance with the imperial

demand, decreed that the Edict of Worms should be carried through in the states which had hitherto acknowledged its authority, but that no innovations should be required in the remaining provinces; that none should be obstructed in celebrating the mass; and that the privileges of every spiritual estate should be respected. Against this recess, which if carried out would have made a further progress of the Reformation impossible, Electoral Saxony, Hesse, Lüneburg, Anhalt, the margrave of Brandenburg, and fourteen imperial cities entered a protestation, from which they were henceforth called Protestants. They appealed from it to the emperor—to a free council and a German national assembly. Philip of Hesse urged the evangelical princes to assume a defiant attitude for the defence of the Reformation, and, in order to strengthen their alliance, advised a union with the imperial cities that favored the Reformation of Zwingli. In accordance with his wishes, a theological colloquy was arranged at Marburg (Oct. 1 to 3, 1529), in which Zwingli, Luther, Œcolampadius, and Melancthon took part. They failed to effect an agreement in the doctrine of the Lord's supper, but parted with the mutual promise to end the public controversy. Soon after the evangelical princes assembled at the Convention of Schwabach, Luther had drawn up, on the basis of the articles of Marburg, the so-called seventeen Schwabach articles, which the Zwinglian cities were requested to sign as conditional of their admission to the alliance. The request was, however, declined, and the convention remained without result. At the next Diet of Augsburg (1530) the emperor intended to put an end to the religious strife. The elector of Saxony therefore requested his theologians to draw up a brief summary of the evangelical faith, and they accordingly presented to him a revision of the Schwabach articles at Torgau (the Torgau articles). The elector was accompanied to Augsburg by Spalatin, Melancthon, and Jonas. Luther, who was still under the ban of the empire, remained behind at Coburg. The emperor's arrival was delayed, and Melancthon used the time up to the opening of the diet (June 20) for composing, on the basis of the Torgau articles, the famous Confession of Augsburg (q. v.), the first of the symbolical books of the Lutheran Church, which, after being approved by Luther, was signed by the states. It had been drawn up both in Latin and in German; and although the emperor desired the Latin text to be read, it was at the request of the elector publicly read to the diet in German (June 25). Some of the princes admitted that they had derived from this document a clearer conception of the Reformation than they had possessed heretofore of its character and design; but the emperor commissioned the Catholic theologians Faber, Eck, Cochlæus, and Wimpina to prepare a "confutation" of the Confession, which was read on Aug. 3. The emperor declared that he was determined to stand by the doctrines laid down in the confutation; that he expected the same from the princes; that he was the patron of the Church, and not willing to tolerate a schism in Germany. He refused to receive the "Apology of the Augsburg Confession," which had been composed by Melancthon in reply to the "confutation." The recess of the empire of Sept. 22 announced that the confession of the Protestants had been refuted, but that time for consideration would be given to them until April 15 of the next year; until then all should refrain from diffusing their heresy by writing or preaching; and within six months a general council would be called for the ultimate settlement of the matter. The Edict of Worms was to be carried out, and the imperial court was to proceed against the disobedient. As, soon after the close of the diet, a legal process was actually begun against the Protestant states for having confiscated the property of the Church, the Protestant powers met at Smalkald, and concluded (1531) a defensive alliance for six years, at the head of which the elector of Saxony and the landgrave of Hesse were placed. Fortunately for the new alliance, the emperor was soon again involved in a war with the Turks, who threatened an invasion of Austria and Germany, and his desire to obtain the aid of the Protestant churches once more disposed him favorably towards toleration. New negotiations resulted in the conclusion of the religious peace of Nuremberg (July 23, 1532), which enjoined upon both parties mutual friendship and Christian love until the approaching council. Pope Clement VII so far yielded to the demands of the emperor that he promised in 1533 to convoke a council within the space of a year at Mantua, Bologna, or Piacenza; but he demanded, at the same time, from the Protestants a previous unconditional submission to the decrees of the council. This promise the Protestants naturally refused to give, though they were ready to attend the council and plead their cause. The power of the Protestants in the meanwhile was greatly strengthened by the accession of the dukes of Pomerania and Würtemberg, and by a union with the cities which favored the Zwinglian Reformation; and which, after a religious colloquy, held at Cassel in 1535, between Melancthon and Bucer, agreed in May, 1536, upon the Wittenberg Concord, by which the cities unequivocally accepted the Augsburg Confession. When in July, 1536, the pope actually convoked the council at Mantua, the Protestant states met again for consultation at Smalkald. They accepted and signed the "Articles of Smalkald" which had been composed by Luther, and which presented the doctrines of the Reformation in much stronger terms than the Confession of Augsburg, and they remained unanimous in the resolve not to attend an Italian council, at which the pope would appear both as a party and as a judge. The council did not meet, but in 1538 a "holy league" for the suppression of Protestantism was formed at Nuremberg by the archbishops of Mentz and Salzburg, the dukes of Bavaria, George of Saxony, and Henry of Brunswick. But the next year George died, and was succeeded by his Protestant brother Henry, who found it easy to carry through the Reformation; and a few years later (1542), Henry of Brunswick was driven from his dominions, into which his conquerors likewise introduced the Reformation. The elector of Brandenburg, Joachim I, a decided enemy of Luther, was likewise (1535) succeeded by a Protestant son. Thus gradually the Reformation gained over to its side nearly all the secular princes of Germany, with the exception of the dukes of Bavaria and the house of Hapsburg, which found it necessary to adhere to the old faith on account of its connection with Spain, Belgium, and Italy. Several new attempts were made to effect a reconciliation of the contending parties. The Colloquy of Worms (1540) remained without any result. At the Diet of Ratisbon (1541), where Rome was represented by the pious legate Contarini, who himself favored the fundamental doctrines of Protestantism as they were then maintained, an agreement was effected between the theologians concerning the doctrine of justification and other points, but it was found impossible to harmonize views on transubstantiation. The Protestants, but not the Catholics, had to pledge themselves to abide by the agreed articles (the Ratisbon Interim) until the meeting of the council. The pope was finally prevailed upon by the emperor to open (Dec. 13, 1545) the long-promised council at Trent, a city of the German empire. The emperor still adhered to the plan to force the pope into a Catholic reformation of the Church, and the Protestants into submission to the Church. Another colloquy at Ratisbon was arranged in 1546 to draw up a basis of union to be submitted to the council, but it remained without result. At the same time, the emperor was determined to break the political power of Protestantism by annihilating the Smalkald alliance, and in this he was quite successful. The elector and the landgrave were declared guilty of high-treason, and in the ensuing Smalkaldic war, in which duke Maurice, though himself a Protestant, fought from political motives on the side of the emperor, both princes were defeated and made prisoners. The other members of the

league, with the exception of a few cities, submitted. The emperor was anxious not to give to his expedition the name of a religious war, but the pope accorded a plenary indulgence to all who would aid in the extermination of the heretics. Shortly before the beginning of the war (Feb. 18, 1546), Luther had died at Eisleben, where he had been invited to act as umpire between the counts of Mansfeld. In order to prevent the participation of the Protestants in the council, the pope caused the immediate condemnation of some important Protestant doctrines in the first session of that body; and to escape the reformatory pressure of the emperor, he transferred the council (March, 1547), on the pretext that in Trent it was threatened by the pestilence, to Bologna, where it soon dissolved. The emperor was greatly dissatisfied, and determined to go on with his own reformatory policy for preserving the religious unity of Christendom. At his request, the conciliatory and noble-minded bishop of Naumburg, Julius von Pflugk, and the court preacher of the elector of Brandenburg, John Agricola, drew up the Augsburg Interim (1548), which was adopted by the diet, and was to serve as the standard according to which all matters relating to religion should be arranged until the decision of the council. At first the Interim was intended to be valid for both Protestants and Catholics, but it really remained in force only among the former, to whom it conceded the marriage of the clergy, the use of the cup in the sacrament, and some indefinite constructions of particular doctrines of the Catholic Church. The Protestants submitted to the Interim with great reluctance; and even the emperor's ally, Maurice of Saxony, did not risk its unconditional introduction, and at his advice the Leipsic Interim (1548) was drawn up by Melancthon, in which the greater part of the Catholic ritual was declared to be indifferent (*adiaphoron*), and therefore fit to be retained. It also declared that the power of the pope and of the bishops might be acknowledged so long as they used it for the edification, and not for the destruction, of the Church. But even this more Protestant Interim gave no satisfaction, and the fermentation continued until the new pope, Julius III, reconvoked the Council of Trent for May 1, 1551. The emperor demanded that Protestants should attend the council, but Maurice made the attendance dependent upon the condition that Protestants should receive the right of voting, that the former resolutions against the Protestants should be annulled, and that the pope himself should be subject to a general council. Melancthon elaborated as the basis of the doctrinal negotiations the *Confessio Saxonica*, or *Repetitio Confessionis Augustanæ*. Protestant deputies from Würtemberg, Brandenburg, Saxony, and Strasburg appeared at Trent, and Melancthon, accompanied by several theologians of Wittenberg, set out to join them. The situation of the Reformation was radically changed when Maurice concluded a secret alliance against the emperor with a number of Protestant princes and the Catholic king of France, to whom, for his assistance, the three German bishoprics of Metz, Toul, and Verdun were treacherously surrendered by the allies. Maurice, in a short and decisive war (1552), completely defeated the emperor, who was sick at Innspruck, and compelled him to agree to the Treaty of Passau (July 30, 1552), which set the landgrave of Hesse at liberty (the elector of Saxony had been liberated previously), opened the imperial council to the adherents of the Reformation, promised a diet for the settlement of the religious differences, and provided a permanent peace for at least all those who sympathized with the Augsburg Confession. The continuance of the war between Germany and France delayed the convocation of the Diet of Augsburg until Feb., 1555. Both parties in Germany had arrived at the conviction that the hope of terminating the religious controversy by means of religious colloquies or by a general council must be abandoned for the present, and that peace and order in the empire could only be maintained by mutual forbearance. After long negotiations, the "Religious Peace of Augsburg" was concluded. It guaranteed the free exercise of religion to the Catholics and the adherents of the Confession of Augsburg. According to the "territorial system," which now came into use, the prince of every German state had a right to reform the Church within his dominion. The subjects of both Protestant and Catholic governments who were unwilling to conform to the ruling religion retained only the right to leave their country without obstruction. The Protestants remained in possession of the ecclesiastical benefices which they held in 1555. But with regard to the future, it was provided that all spiritual states of the empire which should subsequently go over to the Augsburg Confession should by that act forfeit their offices and possessions. The Catholics remembered with fear the losses which they had sustained by the secession of the grand master of the German order, Albert of Brandenburg, and with which they were threatened by the sympathy with the Reformation of the archbishop Hermann of Cologne; and they therefore believed that on the adoption of the articles securing to them the possession of bishoprics and other ecclesiastical states, even if their actual incumbents should become Protestants, the very existence of their Church would depend. The article called "Ecclesiastical Reservation" (*Reservatum Ecclesiasticum*) was proclaimed by the Roman king Ferdinand as an actual ordinance of the diet, though the Protestants loudly protested against it, and their protest had to be recorded in the peace.

III. *Zwingli's and Calvin's Reformation in Switzerland.*—Next to Germany, Switzerland became the principal source of the Reformation. But it sent forth two currents which have never fully united, though many connecting canals have been built between them, and both are now usually acknowledged as belonging to one comprehensive system, which is commonly designated as the Reformed Church. One of the movements originated in German, the other in French, Switzerland. At the head of the one was Ulric Zwingli, at the head of the other John Calvin. The thirteen cantons which constituted Switzerland at the beginning of the 16th century were still in nominal connection with the German empire; and the same causes, therefore, which have been referred to in our account of Germany favored the growth of the Reformation in Switzerland. Dissatisfaction with and contempt of Rome were, moreover, promoted in Switzerland by the large number of mercenaries who were employed in the military service of the popes, and who, after returning home, not only diffused a knowledge of the utter corruption prevailing in Rome, but by their own unworthy lives helped to bring Rome into disrepute.

1. Ulric Zwingli, who gave the first impulse to the Reformation in German Switzerland [see ZWINGLI], had received his education at the universities of Vienna and Basle, and in the latter place had joined himself to a circle of enthusiastic admirers of ancient learning and of enlightened religious views who gathered around Erasmus. It was more classical education and scientific study of the Holy Scriptures than, as in the case of Luther, religious experience which made Zwingli an earnest advocate of religious reform, although, like his teacher Erasmus, he continued to hope for a reformation within the Church by the ecclesiastical authorities themselves. Such views were entertained quite generally in Switzerland; and thus, though Zwingli in 1518 raised his voice against the effrontery of a trader in indulgences, the Franciscan monk Bernardin Samson, he was appointed papal chaplain by the papal legate. His preaching against the corruptions prevailing in the Church became more earnest after he had been appointed, in 1519, "Lent priest" in Zurich. The influences proceeding from Luther did not remain without effect upon him, and he began to be looked upon in Zurich as a Lutheran at heart. When he designated the rule of fasting as an ordinance of man, the Council of Zurich, in 1522, took his part against the bishop of Constance.

Zwingli's first reforming work, *Von Erkiesen und Freyheit der Spysen*, which was published at this time, gave a new impulse to the movement. In the same year, Zwingli, in the name of the reformatory party among the clergy, addressed the Diet of Lucerne and the bishop of Constance in behalf of a free preaching of the Gospel; he also demanded the abolition of priestly celibacy. In accordance with Zwingli's wish, the Council of Zurich arranged on Jan. 29, 1523, a religious conference, at which Zwingli presented the reformatory doctrines he had preached in sixty-seven articles, and defended them so successfully that the Council of Zurich charged all the preachers to preach the pure Gospel in the same manner. Soon after, Zwingli received an efficient colaborer in his reformatory efforts by the appointment of Leo Judæ as Lent priest at Zurich. Several events signalized at this time the steady advance of the cause. The council allowed nuns to leave their convents, several of the clergy married without hindrance, a German baptismal service was introduced, and the cathedral chapter, at its own request, received new and suitable ordinances. In other cantons, especially in Lucerne, Fribourg, and Zug, a violent opposition was manifested against the Reformation, but in Zurich its success was fully secured. The council convoked a new conference for October 26, upon images and the mass, to which all Swiss bishops and cantons were invited, but only Schaffhausen and St. Gall sent delegates. No champion for images and mass was found at the conference, and the Council of Zurich concluded to promote the reformation of the canton by diffusing the proper instruction in the country districts, for which purpose Zwingli, the abbot Von Cappel, and Conrad Schmidt, commander of the knights of St. John at Kussnacht, were appointed. With the assent of the council, Zwingli published his *Christian Introduction*, which was to explain to the people more fully the meaning of the religious Reformation. Soon new reformatory measures were adopted by the council. The shrined pictures in the churches were shut up, and every priest was left free to celebrate mass or not as he chose (Dec., 1523). On Whit-Sunday, 1524, the work of removing the images from the churches was begun, and it was completed in thirteen days. The abolition of many other usages followed in rapid succession; and the transformation in religious service was completed by the celebration on April 13, 14, and 16, 1525, of the Lord's supper again in its original simplicity in the great minster. The publication of Zwingli's *De Vera et Falsa Religione* and the first part of the Zurich translation of the Bible likewise gave a favorable impulse. Beyond Zurich, the Reformation was carried through in nearly the whole canton of Appenzell, and in the town of Mühlhausen; a broad foundation was laid in Berne by the preaching of the prudent Berchtold Haller; in Basle, Wolfgang Fabricius Capito and Caspar Hedio were the first preachers, and in 1524 the authorities conceded to John Œcolampadius those conditions in regard to reform under which he accepted an appointment as minister. The Reformation also gained a firm ground in Schaffhausen and St. Gall. The majority of the cantons were, however, still opposed to the Reformation, and the Diet of Lucerne (Jan., 1525) endeavored to satisfy the longing for a reformation without rending the Church. Its decrees, however, did not go into effect; and the Catholic cantons, in accordance with the advice of Dr. Eck, arranged a new religious disputation at Baden (May 19, 1526), where Œcolampadius acted as the spokesman of the Reformed theologians. Though both parties claimed the victory, the Reformation continued to make progress. In the summer of 1526, the Grisons granted religious freedom; in April, 1527, the Reformed party obtained a majority in the Council of Berne, which, after a new disputation at Berne (Jan. 6, 1528), officially introduced the Reformation. Decisive measures for securing the preponderance of the Reformation were taken in 1528 by St. Gall, and in 1529 by Basle and Glarus. As the most zealous of the Catholic cantons, especially Schwyz, Uri, Unterwalden, Lucerne, Valais, and Fribourg, resorted to forcible measures for the suppression of the Reformation, Zurich and Constance, on Dec. 25, 1527, formed a defensive alliance under the name of Burgher Rights. It was joined in 1528 by Berne and St. Gall; in 1529 by Biel, Mühlhausen, Basle, and Schaffhausen; in 1530 by Strasburg, which had been repelled by the German Protestants. The landgrave of Hesse also was received into it in 1530, at least by Zurich and Basle. In the meanwhile five Catholic cantons—Lucerne, Zug, Schwyz, Uri, and Unterwalden—had concluded (April, 1529) a league with king Ferdinand for the maintenance of the old faith. A war declared by Zurich in 1529 against the five cantons was of short duration, and the peace was favorable to the former. In 1531 the war was renewed, and the forces of Zurich were totally defeated at Cappel, Zwingli himself finding his death. The peace which Zurich and Berne were forced to conclude was, on the whole, humiliating; it recognised, however, and secured both confessions of faith. Soon after the battle of Cappel, Œcolampadius died (Nov. 23, 1531) of grief for the losses of the Reformed Church. Henry Bullinger in Zurich, and Oswald Myconius in Basle, now became the leading spirits among the Reformed, whose strength was greatly impaired by internal dissensions and by the progress of the Anabaptists. The Catholic cantons succeeded in arresting the further spread of the Reformation in German Switzerland, and in repressing it by force in some free districts and in parts of the cantons Soleure and Glarus; but in the remainder of the Reformed cantons, especially in Zurich and Berne, the population steadfastly continued to adhere to the cause of religious reform.

2. In French Switzerland, the reformatory movement began in 1526 in the French parts of the cantons Berne and Biel, where the Gospel was preached by William Farel, a native of France. In 1530 he established the Reformation in Neufchâtel. In Geneva a beginning was made as early as 1528; in 1534, after a religious conference held at the suggestion of the Bernese, in which Farel defended the Reformation, public worship was allowed to the Reformed; rapid progress was then made through the zeal of Farel, Froment, and Viret; and in 1535, after another disputation, the papacy was abolished by the council and the Reformation adopted. In 1536 John Calvin [see CALVIN] arrived in Geneva, and was induced by Farel to remain in the city and to aid him in his struggle against a party of freethinkers who called themselves *Spirituels*. In October of the same year he took part with Farel and Viret in a religious disputation held at Lausanne, which resulted in the adhesion of the Pays-de-Vaud to the cause of the Reformation. In 1538 both Calvin and Farel were banished by the council, which had taken offence at the strict Church discipline introduced by the Reformers. Soon, however, the friends of the Reformation regained the ascendency, and Calvin was recalled in 1541, while Farel remained in Neufchâtel. For several years Calvin had to sustain a desperate struggle against his opponents, but in 1555 they were finally subdued in an insurrection set on foot by Ami Perrin. From that time the reformatory ideas of Calvin were carried through in both Church and State with iron consistency, and Geneva became a centre whence reformatory influences spread to the remotest parts of Europe. By an extensive correspondence and numerous religious writings, he exerted a strong personal influence far beyond the boundaries of Switzerland. The theological academy of Geneva, founded in 1588, supplied the churches of many foreign countries, especially France, with preachers trained in the spirit of Calvin. When Calvin died, in 1564, the continuation of his work devolved upon the learned Theodore Beza. Calvin disagreed in many points with Zwingli, whose views gradually lost ground as those of Calvin advanced. The

Second Helvetic Confession, the most important among the symbolical books of the Reformed Church, which was compiled by Bullinger in Zurich, published in 1566, and recognised in all Reformed countries, completed the superiority of Calvin's principles over those of Zwingli.

3. Although the majority of the German Protestant churches remained in connection with the Lutheran Reformation, a German Reformed Church which wore a moderately Calvinistic aspect sprang up in several parts of Germany. In 1560 the elector Frederick III of the Palatinate embraced the Reformed creed, and organized the Church of his dominions according to Reformed principles. By his authority, Ursinus and Olevianus composed the Heidelberg Catechism, which soon came to be regarded not only as the standard symbolical book of the German Reformed Church, but was highly esteemed throughout the Reformed world. Maurice, the learned landgrave of Hesse-Cassel, after several fruitless attempts to reconcile the Lutheran and Reformed churches, joined the latter in 1564, and compelled the Lutheran Church of his dominion to enter into communion with Calvinism. In Anhalt, Calvinism was introduced chiefly from attachment to Melancthon, and Nassau introduced the Heidelberg Catechism in consequence of its relation to the house of Orange. The most important accession to the Reformed Church of Germany was that of John Sigismund, elector of Brandenburg, who on Christmas day, 1613, received the Lord's supper in the court church of Berlin according to the Calvinistic ritual. Although he tried, as all princes of these times did, to induce the people to follow his example, the overwhelming majority of the country continued to remain Lutheran. Among the free imperial cities, it was especially Bremen which adopted the Reformed creed.

IV. *The English Reformation.*—In England the writings of Luther were warmly welcomed by many, especially by those who secretly adhered to the doctrines of Wycliffe. King Henry VIII, who was a great admirer of St. Thomas à Becket, wrote against Luther (1521) the work *Adsertio VII Sacramentorum*, for which he received from the pope the title *Defensor Fidei*. He also wrote the emperor of Germany a letter in which he called for the extirpation of the heretics. But Lutheranism found zealous adherents even at the English universities, and an English translation of the Bible (1526) by Frith and Tyndale, members of the university of Cambridge, had a decisive effect. Soon the king fell out with the pope, because the latter refused to annul Henry's marriage with Catharine of Aragon, the niece of the emperor Charles V. The king, who represented that his marriage with Catharine, his brother's widow, was open to objections, laid the matter, by advice of Thomas Cranmer, before the Christian universities; and when replies were received declaring the marriage with a brother's wife as null and void, the king separated from Catharine, married Anne Boleyn, and fell under the papal ban. The English Parliament sundered the connection between England and Rome, and recognised the king as the head of the Church. Henry was desirous of destroying the influence of the pope over the Church of England, to which, in other respects, he wished to preserve the continuity of its Catholic character. The cloisters were subjected to a visitation in 1535, and totally abolished in 1536; and the Bible was diffused in the mother tongue (1538) as the only source of doctrine; but the statute of 1539 imposed distinct limits upon the Reformation, and, in particular, confirmed transubstantiation, priestly celibacy, masses for the dead, and auricular confession. A considerable number of those who refused to comply with the religious changes introduced into England were executed. A powerful party, headed by Thomas Cranmer, after 1533 archbishop of Canterbury, and Thomas Cromwell, after 1534 royal vicar-general for ecclesiastic affairs, exerted a silent influence in behalf of a nearer approach towards the Reformed churches of continental Europe. They met with little success during the reign of Henry, but obtained a majority in the regency which ruled England during the minority of Edward VI. Peter Martyr, Occhino, Bucer, and Fagius were called to England to aid Cranmer in carrying through the Reformation. The basis was laid in the Book of Homilies (1547), the new English liturgy (the Book of Common Prayer, 1548), and the Forty-two Articles (1552); but the labors of Cranmer were interrupted by the death of Edward VI (1553). His successor, queen Mary, the daughter of Henry and Catharine of Aragon, was a devoted partisan of the Church of Rome, during whose reign Cranmer and from three hundred to four hundred other persons were executed on account of their religion. A papal nuncio appeared in England, and an obsequious parliament sanctioned the reunion with Rome; but the affections of the people were not regained, and the early death of Mary (1558) put an end to the official restoration of the Papal Church. Queen Elizabeth, the daughter of Henry and Anne Boleyn, whose birth, in consequence of the papal decision, was regarded by the Roman Catholics as illegitimate, resumed the work of her father, and completed the English Reformation, as distinct both from the Church of Rome and the Reformations of Germany and Switzerland. The Book of Common Prayer which had been adopted under Edward was so changed as to be less offensive to Catholics, and by the Act of Uniformity, June, 1559, it was made binding on all the churches of the kingdom. Most of the Catholics conformed; of 9400 clergy, their benefices were only lost by fourteen bishops, fifteen heads of ecclesiastical corporations, fifty canons, and about eighty priests. Matthew Parker, the former teacher of the queen, was appointed archbishop of Canterbury. The validity of his ordination, which was not sanctioned by the pope, nor made according to the Roman rite, was at once disputed in numerous Catholic writings, but has also found some Catholic defenders, as Le Courayer. The Confession of Faith which had been drawn up under Edward in forty-two articles was reduced to thirty-nine articles, and in this form it was adopted by a convocation of the clergy at London in 1562, and by Parliament made, in 1571, the rule of faith for all the clergy. According to the Thirty-nine Articles, the Scriptures contain everything necessary to salvation; justification is through faith alone, but works acceptable to God are the necessary fruit of this faith; in the Lord's supper there is a communion of the body of Christ, which is spiritually received by faith; and predestination is apprehended only as it is a source of consolation. Supreme power over the Church is vested in the English crown, but it is limited by the statutes. Bishops continued to be the highest ecclesiastical officers and the first barons of the realm. Subscription to the articles was made binding only on the clergy; to the laity freedom of conscience was allowed. The adoption of the Thirty-nine Articles completed, in the main, the constitution of the Episcopal Church of England. Some parts of the Church government and the liturgy, especially the retaining of sacerdotal vestments, gave great offence to a number of zealous friends of a radical religious reformation who had suffered persecution during the reign of Mary, and, while exiles, had become strongly attached to the principles of strict Calvinism. They demanded a greater purity of the Church (hence their name Puritans), a simple, spiritual form of worship, a strict Church discipline, and a Presbyterian form of government. The Act of Uniformity (1559) threatened all Nonconformists with fines and imprisonment, and their ministers with deposition and banishment. When the provisions of the act began to be enforced, a number of the Nonconformist clergy formed separate congregations in connection with presbyteries (since 1572), and a considerable portion of the clergy and laity of the Established Church sympathized with them. The rupture between the parties was widened in 1592 by an act of Parliament that all who obstinately refused to attend public wor-

ship, or led others to do so, should be imprisoned and submit, or after three months be banished; and again in 1595, when the Presbyterians applied the Mosaic Sabbath laws to the Christian Sunday, and when Calvin's doctrines respecting predestination excited animated disputes.

A much more uncompromising opposition than that by the Puritans was made to the Established Church by Robert Brown, who embraced (from 1580) Calvinism in its strictest form, denounced the English Church as a false Church, and demanded that, in accordance with the apostolic example, every congregation should be an independent Church. His adherents, who were variously designated as Brownists, Independents, and Congregationalists, renounced all fellowship with the Church of England, and met with great success, though Brown himself returned to the Church of England. In 1593 there were about 20,000 Independents in England: those who fled to Holland founded a number of churches there, and from Holland the Pilgrim fathers brought this branch of the English Reformation over to the New World.

The Stuarts entertained immoderate opinions as to the royal authority in Church and State. James I, the son of Mary Queen of Scots, remained, in spite of the Gunpowder Plot (1605), mild towards the Catholics, but bitterly opposed to Puritanism. The Catholic element in the Established Church was greatly strengthened, and an attempt was even made to restore episcopacy in Scotland. A bond of union was, however, given to all parties by an excellent new translation of the Bible into English, with which king James's name is honorably connected. Charles I followed in the footsteps of his father; and as the bishops sided with him in his conflicts with Parliament and his endeavors to enforce the divine right of kings, the king's overthrow, which ended in his execution (1649), involved the overthrow of the supremacy of the Episcopal Church. The Parliament summoned an assembly of divines at Westminster—the Westminster Assembly (1643–49)—and, in accordance with the proposition of this assembly, introduced a Presbyterian form of government and a Puritanic form of worship. Soon after the death of Cromwell, however, the Stuarts were recalled (1660) and the Episcopal Church re-established. The Test Act (1673) prohibited every one from holding any public office unless he had acknowledged the king's ecclesiastical supremacy and had received the sacrament of the Lord's supper in an Episcopal church. In consequence of the adherence of James II to the Church of Rome, there arose one more conflict between the English king and the Episcopal Established Church; but when William III of Orange became king the constitution of the Church was definitely settled (1689). The Church of England retained the Episcopal form of government, and Ireland was placed under the jurisdiction of the Church of England. This connection between the Established Church of England and the Established Church of Ireland remained until 1870, when the latter was disestablished and its official connection with the Church of England severed. The "Church of Ireland" since then forms an independent, self-governing body; while the Scotch Episcopal Church and the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States agree with the religious creed of the Church of England, but frame their Church laws with entire independence.

V. *The Presbyterians of Scotland.*—The first knowledge of the Reformation begun in continental Europe was brought to Scotland by several Scotch students of Wittenberg. They tried to circulate Luther's writings, but found the ground not favorable to a reformation, because king James V had intimately allied himself with the clergy for the purpose of curbing the power of the nobility. Stringent measures were adopted against the favorers of the Reformation. The first victim was Patrick Hamilton (March 1, 1528), a youth of royal blood, who, while studying in Germany, had imbibed a love of the Reformation. Two more Reformers were burned in 1534; in 1539, five in Edinburgh and two in Glasgow. Nevertheless, the adherents of the Reformation steadily increased in number, especially among the nobles. When James V died, the leader of the reformatory party, James Hamilton, earl of Arran, succeeded in seizing the regency. When the latter saw his political influence endangered by the Reformed earl of Lennox, he was gained over by the widowed queen and by David Beautoun (Beton), cardinal-archbishop of St. Andrew's, to the Catholic side, and persecution began afresh. The Catholic party derived some advantages from the national war against Henry VIII of England, as the latter was looked upon as a patron of reformatory movements; but the burning of George Wishart, one of the theological leaders of the Reformation, rallied the reformatory party anew. Under the guidance of John Knox they began to advance more firmly, and to develop their ecclesiastical affairs more definitely. As both Knox and Wishart had been educated at Geneva, and were firmly addicted to the Reformed Confession, the reformed type of the Reformation now obtained in Scotland a decided and lasting ascendency over the Lutheran. The Reformed party allied itself with the English government, the Catholics with that of France. The latter sent the young daughter of James V, Mary Stuart, to France for education, where she was subsequently married to king Francis II of France, and imbibed an enthusiastic attachment to the Church of Rome. In 1554 the fanatical dukes of Guise, the brothers of the widowed queen, became regents of Scotland. The French influence was strongly used for the repression of the reformatory party, which, on the other hand, was benefited by the accession to the English throne of Mary, daughter of Henry VIII. Protection was afforded to the English Protestants who had fled on account of their religion, and freedom of worship was again secured by the native friends of the Reformation. John Knox, who in 1546 had had to flee from Scotland, returned in 1555 to strengthen the Reformed faith and to urge on the nobility and the people to an unceasing contest against the idolatries of Rome. Dissatisfied, however, with the feeble support which he found, Knox returned in 1556 to Geneva, in which city he received from the Scotch bishops the sentence to the stake which had been passed against him. The stirring letters which Knox wrote to Scotland from Geneva led (1557) to the formation of a defensive league of the Protestant nobility—the "Congregation of Christ." The accession of Elizabeth to the English throne was followed in Scotland by the adoption of new measures against the Reformation, which French troops were to carry into effect. This led to a furious outbreak of the Reformed party. John Knox once more returned, the Covenant of May 31 was signed, a new alliance with England was concluded, and the widowed queen deposed as regent. The iconoclastic devastation of Catholic churches and cloisters began at Perth and rapidly spread over the kingdom. A civil war which ensued was concluded by the treaty of Edinburgh (1560), which recognised the rights of the Reformed. The Scotch Parliament, which met soon after, immediately abolished the papal jurisdiction over Scotland, forbade the mass, and approved an entirely Calvinistic Confession (*Confessio Scottica*). In the next year (1561) the Presbyterian Church government was set in order in the Book of Discipline. These acts of the Parliament were, however, not sanctioned by the government until 1567, after the overthrow of Mary Stuart, who, notwithstanding her fanatical zeal in behalf of Rome, had been unable since her return from France (1561) to arrest the complete victory of the Reformed party. While the theology of the Scotch Confession was strictly Calvinistic, the episcopal benefices were allowed to continue, as the regents during the minority of James VI, and still more James himself, had a strong personal interest in their preservation. Melville, the successor of Knox, induced the Assembly of 1578 to adopt a strictly Presbyterian Church constitu-

tion, which admits no Church office except the four recognised by Calvin—of pastor, doctor, elder, and deacon. The sanction of this Church constitution (the Second Book of Discipline) by Parliament and the youthful king was not obtained until 1592. James was, however, personally averse to Presbyterianism and a strong adherent of an episcopal form of government. He left no means untried, especially after he had united the crown of England with that of Scotland, to force an episcopal form of government upon the Church of Scotland. Charles I went still further than his father, and gave to the Scotch a liturgy which the Presbyterians denounced as a service to Baal. The union of Scotch Presbyterians with the Puritans and Independents of England led to the overthrow of Charles I. In 1643 a new league and covenant was adopted, and in 1645 Scotland received the Westminster standards. After the execution of Charles I, the Scotch, from opposition to Cromwell, proclaimed Charles II, who had signed the covenant, as king. This led, however, to a serious and lasting division among Scotch Presbyterians. Other divisions, from various causes, followed in the course of time, and even at the present time (1879) Scotch Presbyterianism is split up into a large number of divisions. The Presbyterian character of the people has, however, remained unimpaired. Cromwell, who several times defeated the Scotch, did not allow the assembly to meet, but in no other way interfered with the freedom of the Scotch Church. Charles II relapsed into the Stuart tendency to introduce Episcopalianism; but on the expulsion of the Stuarts in 1689, the Church constitution of 1592, and the Westminster Confession were definitely restored. To the adherents of an Episcopalian Church an act of 1712 granted freedom of worship, and in 1792 they received the full enjoyment of civil rights.

VI. *The Reformed Church of Holland.*—Nowhere did the Reformation find a more favorable soil than in the Netherlands, which were closely united with Germany, being regarded as a fief of the empire. The people were noted for their industry and love of freedom, and were therefore inclined to an earnest opposition to every form of ecclesiastical and civil despotism. Besides, the Brethren of the Common Life, the Beghards, and other religious communities had awakened and fostered an interest in a purer, more scriptural form of Christianity, which, at the beginning of the 16th century, was far from being extinct. Therefore Luther's writings, although they were condemned by the University of Louvain, were enthusiastically received in the flourishing cities of Flanders, Brabant, and Holland. As the Netherlands were the hereditary land of the emperor Charles V, he made the utmost efforts to suppress the reformatory movement; and the penal law which was issued at Worms in 1521 was carried out with greater earnestness in the Netherlands than in Germany. In 1523 two Augustinian monks, Henry Vos and John Esch, were executed at Brussels—the first martyrs of the Reformation. Other edicts against the Protestants followed, and with them new executions. The progress of the Reformation was, however, not checked; but, in consequence of the closer connection of the people with France and Switzerland, it took a Reformed rather than a Lutheran type. The vigor of the persecution during the reign of Charles was somewhat mitigated by the mild disposition of the two stadtholders, Margaret of Savoy, and Mary, widowed queen of Hungary, the latter of whom, a sister of the emperor, was even suspected of a secret sympathy with the Reformation; and in many places the execution of the obnoxious decrees was even prevented by the outspoken personal inclinations of municipal and provincial authorities. An effort made by Charles V (1550) to establish a regular inquisition, after the pattern of the Spanish, was not successful. Philip II did not shrink from measures of the utmost cruelty to enforce submission to the laws and to the Council of Trent; but, instead of submitting, the people rallied for the defence of their religious and civil liberty. A Calvinistic confession of faith (*Confessio Belgica*) was in 1562 drawn up by Guido de Bres, and in 1566 it was recognised by a synod of Antwerp as a symbolical book of the Reformed churches of the Netherlands. In the latter year a defensive league, the *Compromiss*, was also concluded by the nobles, which spread with great rapidity. The name of *Gueux* (Beggars), by which the court at first had ridiculed the confederates, was received by the people as a title of honor, and served as a rallying-point for a great national movement towards freedom. When the stadtholder Margaret of Parma felt unable to curb any longer the rising opposition, the duke of Alba undertook to extinguish the Reformation with fire and sword. In the southern provinces he was successful; but seven of the northern provinces formed, in 1579, the Union of Utrecht, and renounced allegiance to the king of Spain. A long and bloody war of independence followed, which terminated in the establishment of the independent Dutch Republic. In the southern provinces, which remained under the crown of Spain, the Reformation was almost wholly extinguished. The Dutch Republic, though only one of the smaller Protestant states of Europe, soon added to the reputation of the Reformation by the conspicuous position it occupied in regard to literature and art, to civilization and to maritime conquest. In the inner history of the Reformed churches, the Arminian controversy [see ARMINIANISM] and the Synod of Dort (q. v.)—which was attended by delegates of the English Episcopal Church and the churches of Scotland, the Palatinate, Hesse, Switzerland, Wetteran, Geneva, Bremen, and Emden—were of considerable importance. The decision of the Synod of Dort led for a time, both in Holland and in the Reformed churches of several other countries, to a complete victory of strict Calvinism over a party which demanded more Biblical simplicity and less rigid conformity with the system of any theologian, even if it be Calvin; but soon strict Calvinism lost more ground in Holland than in any other Reformed Church, and rationalism obtained an ascendency so decisive and of so long duration that in the 19th century a numerous party of orthodox members of the National Church separated from the latter and constituted a Free Reformed Church. The Dutch Reformed Church has planted large and flourishing offshoots in North America and several countries of South Africa, and thus contributed an important share to the ascendency which Protestantism enjoys in these regions. In Belgium, under the cruel rule of the Spaniards, but very few and small Reformed congregations were able to continue their always endangered existence, until, in the 19th century, the reunion of the country with Holland began an æra of greater freedom and of progress, which continued after the erection of Belgium into an independent kingdom. Now Belgium has again a National Reformed Church, which is still one of the smallest Reformed national churches of Europe, but is recognised by the State, enjoys a steady progress, and the outspoken sympathy of many of the foremost statesmen of the country.

VII. *The Lutheran Reformation in the Scandinavian Kingdoms.*—At the time when Luther began his reformation, Christian II ruled over all the Scandinavian countries—Denmark, Norway, Iceland, and Sweden. He was an unprincipled tyrant, who favored the Reformation in Denmark in order to strip the bishops of their political power, while in Sweden he executed the noblest men under the plea that they were under the papal ban. As early as 1519 he called Martin Reinhard from Wittenberg to Copenhagen into the theological faculty, and in 1521 he issued a decree encouraging the marriage of the priests. When, in 1522, a papal delegate appeared in Denmark, Christian took back his decree on the marriage of the priests. He was, nevertheless, deposed in 1523, and among the grounds of the deposition which the estates brought forward was, that he had infected his wife with the Lutheran heresy, and introduced promoters of this same heresy into the Catholic kingdom.

of Denmark. Christian was succeeded by his uncle, Frederick I, duke of Holstein, who strongly inclined towards the Reformation, but who had, nevertheless, to promise to the estates of Denmark to put down, with persecution, the heresy that was pressing in. In the hereditary duchies of Schleswig and Holstein all violent interference with the great religious struggle was in 1524 forbidden, and the king's well-known sympathy with the Reformation greatly promoted the more rapid diffusion of Luther's doctrines and writings. The provincial of the Carmelite order, Paulus Eliæ, translated part of the Psalms; the New Test., translated by John Michelsen, a companion of the expelled king, Christian II, and printed in Leipsic in 1524, found a large circulation, and in 1525 the reading of the Bible was declared free. The nobility at an assembly at Viborg showed itself favorable; the king declared himself openly for it in 1526; the Diet of Odense, in 1527, deprived the bishops of their ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and granted religious liberty to all, and the right of marriage to the clergy until the meeting of a general council. Viborg, in Jutland, Malmö, in Scania, and Copenhagen became important centres of the movement, which now spread with great rapidity over the whole kingdom. At the Diet of Copenhagen in 1530, which was to attempt a reunion of the parties, the Lutheran preachers, with John Jansen (preacher at Copenhagen) at their head, presented a confession of faith in forty-three articles. Though the object for which the diet had been convoked was not attained, the predominance of the Lutherans was now fully decided, and the king openly ranged himself on their side. On the death of Frederick I the bishops used the political power which had been left to them for a last attempt to put down the Reformation, but it was of no avail. The new king, Christian III, by energetic and violent measures, soon destroyed the last remnant of the old Church and completed the victory of the Reformation. Immediately after his accession to the throne, he confirmed the freedom of religion. On Aug. 20, 1536, all the bishops were imprisoned. A diet held at Copenhagen decreed that the bishops should thereafter be deprived of all secular power, and that the Church property should be confiscated, and divided among the king, the nobility, and ecclesiastical and charitable institutions. When the imprisoned bishops declared their willingness to renounce their dignities, they were restored to liberty; only Rönnov, bishop of Roeskilde, refused, and died in prison. At the invitation of the king, John Bugenhagen came to Denmark, crowned (1537) the king and the queen, consecrated two evangelical bishops or superintendents, and took a leading part in the framing of a new Church constitution, which was published on Sept. 2, 1537, and sanctioned by the Diet of Odense in 1539. From that time all Denmark has firmly adhered to the Lutheran Church. For many years no other worship was allowed; and, even after the establishment of complete religious liberty in 1848, more than ninety-nine per cent. of the entire population continue to be classed as Lutherans.

On the progress of the Reformation in Norway we are but imperfectly informed. A monk Anthony is mentioned who preached the Gospel in Bergen. The majority of the bishops and the clergy appear to have been opposed to the Reformation, which was almost unknown until the reign of Christian III; then the Danish government began to introduce the Reformation. Olaf Engelbrechtsen, archbishop of Drontheim, soon abandoned his opposition to the Danish king and fled (1537) with his treasures to the Netherlands, and resistance to the new Church constitution soon ceased. Many of the bishops and clergy, however, left their positions; there was a scarcity of preachers, and the people for a long time showed a marked preference for Catholicism. But when the people had become settled in their new belief they became strongly attached to the Lutheran Church, with which now fully ninety-nine per cent. of the population are connected.

Iceland had become a part of the Danish kingdom by the Calmar Union of 1397, and the decree of the Danish Diet of 1536, which declared the Evangelical Church as the State religion of Denmark, became also valid for Iceland. For several years the two bishops of the country successfully neutralized the efforts of the Danish government. In 1540 Gifur Einarsson, who had studied in Wittenberg, became bishop of Skalholt, and began the introduction of the Reformation. His successor, Martin Einarsson, worked in the same direction, but was violently opposed by the other bishop, John Aresen, of Holar, who even took him prisoner, and had Gifur's bones dug up and interred in an unconsecrated place. But finally bishop Aresen was overpowered, and in 1550 executed as a rebel. This ended all opposition to the Reformation in Iceland. The entire population, as in Denmark and Norway, has ever since belonged to the Lutheran Church.

In Sweden the Reformation was hailed as a useful ally in the struggle for shaking off the yoke of Denmark and re-establishing the national independence. The bishops and higher clergy were the strongest supporters of Danish rule, and when Gustavus Vasa achieved the freedom of Sweden and was elected king (1523) by the Diet of Strengnäs he was looked upon by the bishops as a dangerous enemy. The king, who needed part of the immense wealth of the clergy to relieve the people of their taxes, at first endeavored to gain pope Adrian VI's co-operation for a reformation of the Church. When this was found to be useless, he commissioned the brothers Olaf and Lawrence Petersen, who had studied at Wittenberg, to introduce the Lutheran Reformation. The two brothers had returned to Sweden in 1519, gained a number of adherents, the most prominent of whom was the archdeacon Lawrence Andersen, and Olaf's sermons had made a great sensation at the Diet of Strengnäs. The king appointed Olaf preacher in Stockholm, Lawrence Petersen professor of theology in Upsala, and Lawrence Andersen his chancellor. In 1526 a public discussion took place under the king's protection at Upsala, and a translation of the New Test. into Swedish was made by chancellor Andersen. The bishops, however, whose prominent champion was bishop Brask, of Linköping, made a successful resistance to the progress of the Reformation; and the people, though irritated against the power and wealth of the clergy, manifested at the same time a superstitious attachment to the old Church. To bring matters to a crisis, the king offered (1527) at the Diet of Westerås to resign; but the Estates, placed before the alternative of either accepting the king's resignation or of surrendering the Church to his discretion, chose the latter. On account of the very outspoken aversion of the lower classes of the people to a change of religion, the king proceeded, however, with great caution. According to the so-called Westerås Ordinance the bishops were to give efficient preachers to the congregations, otherwise the king was to see to it. The bishops were to hand in to the king a schedule of their revenues, that he might determine how much should remain to the churches and what was to fall to the crown. The priests, in secular matters, were to be under the jurisdiction of the king; the Gospel was to be read in all the schools; excommunication was to be pronounced only after an investigation before a royal court. An assembly of clergy at Örebro in 1529 declared in favor of the Church Reformation, but retained many usages of the old Church, as the Latin language at divine service, the elevation of the host at the eucharist, the prayer for the dead, and the episcopal constitution. In 1531 Lawrence Petersen became archbishop of Upsala, and in 1537 another assembly of the clergy at Orebro provided for a more thorough evangelical purification of divine worship. The continuing aversion of the people to the new order of things was ascribed by the king to a want of energy on the part of the bishops, and he therefore appointed George Normann, a Pomeranian nobleman, superin-

tendent of all the clergy of the kingdom, with a number of custodians and religious councillors as overseers of particular provinces. This arrangement was received with general disfavor, and led to a number of conspiracies. At the death of the king (1560) the ecclesiastical condition of the kingdom was quite undecided. The oldest son and successor of Gustavus, Eric XIV, removed some more Catholic elements from the new constitution of the Swedish Church, and gave a hospitable asylum to persecuted Protestants of every creed; the orthodox Lutherans suspected him of an inclination towards Calvinism, which, however, did not gain any ground in Sweden. Eric's brother and successor, John III, was prevailed upon by his Catholic wife, who was a Polish princess, and by the hope of succeeding to the Polish throne, to attempt the re-establishment of a closer connection with the Church of Rome. The king was willing to recognise the supremacy of the pope, but demanded a number of concessions for the Swedish Church. The archbishop of Upsala was gained for the plan, a strongly Romanizing liturgy was introduced, but the boldness of the Jesuits incensed clergy and people against the counter-reformation, and the king finally took offence at the refusal of the pope to accept his proposition. The death of the Catholic queen and the king's second marriage with a Lutheran princess put an end to the negotiations with Rome, though the king stubbornly clung to the new liturgy. While John was wavering between Catholicism and Protestantism, his younger brother Charles, who was regent of South Ermeland, was an unflinching protector of the Reformation, and did not hesitate to incur the anger of his royal brother by affording a place of resort to the Lutheran clergy who had been expelled from the royal dominions for their unyielding character. King John was succeeded (1592) by his son Sigismund, who was already king of Poland and had been brought up a Catholic. Popular opinion by this time had undergone a great change, and demanded, prior to the recognition of Sigismund, a guarantee of the Lutheran State Church. An ecclesiastical council at Upsala (1593), which was convened by duke Charles as regent, decreed, even before the arrival of Sigismund, the exclusion of Catholicism from Sweden, and the official authority of the Confession of Augsburg. In 1595 the Diet of Sönderköping declared the Lutheran Church as the only tolerated State Church. In 1599 duke Charles was appointed administrator, and in 1604 he was elected king. The new king was somewhat inclined to Calvinism, but he confirmed the resolutions of the diets in favor of the exclusive rights of the Lutheran State Church, which since then has retained full control of the kingdom.

VIII. *Protestantism in the Austrian States.*—In the various states governed by the house of Hapsburg both the Lutheran and the Reformed Reformation spread with great rapidity. Great enthusiasm was awakened by Luther's Reformation in Bohemia, where deep-rooted opposition to Rome still pervaded the masses of the people. Both the Bohemian Brethren and the Calixtines entered into communication with the German Reformer. Though a full union between Luther and the Brethren, who had never returned to the communion with Rome, was not effected, there was a mutual recognition as evangelical Christians; and the Brethren, whose number now increased again rapidly, and who in 1533 handed in their confession of faith to Ferdinand, helped to strengthen the reformatory host in Europe. Among the Calixtines, so large a number adopted the doctrines of Luther that an assembly of the Estates in 1524 declared in favor of a continuation of the reformation begun by Huss in the way set forth by Luther. At the time of the Smalkald war, a majority of the Bohemians were attached to the Reformation; the Estates denied to king Ferdinand the aid of their troops, and united with the elector. When they had finally to submit, the king gave orders that in future only Catholics and Utraquists should be tolerated in the royal domains, and a large number of the Brethren deemed it best to emigrate to Poland and Russia. In the last years of his life Ferdinand showed a greater moderation towards Protestants, and his son Maximilian II was even, by Protestants as well as Catholics, regarded as a secret friend of the Reformation; but he was unable to protect the Protestants of his states against the persecutions instigated by the Jesuits. In 1575 the Calixtines and Brethren united and presented a common confession of faith, and received from Maximilian an oral pledge of recognition. In 1609 the king was forced to give to the adherents of the Confession of 1575 equal rights with the Catholics; but practically the persecutions continued. When the Estates of Bohemia refused to recognise Ferdinand as their king, and elected the Protestant elector of the Palatinate, Frederick V, the Thirty Years' War broke out, in the course of which appeared the fatal decree of 1627, that left to the people only the alternative of becoming Catholics or leaving the country. Notwithstanding the rigorous persecution, which lasted for more than a hundred years, several thousand Protestants maintained themselves secretly both in Bohemia and Moravia; but to-day ninety-six per cent. of the Bohemians and ninety-five per cent. of the Moravians are connected with the Church of Rome.

In the southern provinces of Austria the Reformation likewise spread at an early period. Luther's writings were eagerly read in Vienna as early as 1520. In 1528 more than one half the nobility of the archduchy of Austria were evangelical. The Estates demanded freedom of religion in 1542 at Innspruck, in 1548 at Augsburg, and in 1556 at Vienna, and bishop Naunea, of Vienna, intended to resign because the government tolerated the appointment of Lutheran professors at the University of Vienna. Under Maximilian the Estates called the Lutheran theologian David Chytræus to Vienna to compile a *Book of Religion* and a *Church Agenda*, and their use was sanctioned by Maximilian after long reluctance. Lower Austria was at once almost wholly won over to Protestantism; but the numerous and bitter doctrinal controversies of the Protestants made it easy for the Jesuits to enforce a counter-reformation. Gradually stringent laws demanded here, as in Bohemia, either a return to the Catholic religion or emigration; but how generally the people continued to be secretly attached to Protestantism became apparent when the victorious Hungarians and Transylvanians compelled the government, in 1606, to promise religious toleration. Whole towns at once returned to Protestantism, and in 1610 the emperor Matthias had to recognise the equal rights of the churches. The reviving hopes of Protestantism were, however, cruelly destroyed by the Thirty Years' War, which led to the utter extirpation of the Protestant congregations. In Austria, as in all other countries, the Reformers paid a special attention to the promotion of education; and for the ignorant South Slavic tribes in particular, where Primus Truber displayed a remarkable literary and reformatory activity, the Reformation promised to be the beginning of a national literature and of an æra of civilization. With the suppression of the Reformation, the Slavs relapsed into the utmost ignorance, from which only now an efficient system of State education is gradually extricating them. How thoroughly Protestantism has been eradicated in these provinces, in most of which it constituted at one time a majority of the population, may be seen from the fact that at present there are hardly any Protestants in Carinthia and the Tyrol, and that they are only one per cent. of the population in Styria, two in Upper and Lower Austria, five in Carinthia, and fifteen in Silesia.

The number of Hungarian students at Wittenberg at the time when Luther began his reformation was so great that his reformatory views became at once widely known in Hungary, and found many friends. As early as 1518 several adherents of the Reformation were

burned. The diet of 1523 passed a decree that all Lutherans and their patrons should be seized and burned. But the number of Protestants was already considerable: in Hermannstadt they had in 1523 the upper-hand; a new bloody law passed in 1524 remained ineffective, and in 1525 the five royal cities declared in favor of the Reformation. The civil war which followed the death of king Louis II, who fell in the battle of Mohacs in 1526, was favorable to the progress of Protestantism. Although both rivals for the throne—archduke Ferdinand of Austria and John of Zapolya, voyvode of Transylvania—issued laws of persecution, they were unable to carry them out. The number of influential preachers rapidly increased. As the first preacher, Thomas Preussner, of Käsmark (about 1520), is mentioned; among the most distinguished were Matthias Devay (called Lutherus Ungaricus), Leonhard Stöckel, who drew up the Confessio Pentapolitana, which the free cities of Upper Hungary in 1549 presented to the king, and John Honter, who had studied in Basle and worked in his native city, Kronstadt, as a preacher and at a printing-press. In 1529 Hermannstadt expelled all priests and monks, and Kronstadt soon followed this example. The episcopal sees which became vacant after the battle of Mohacs were partly not filled, and partly came into the hands of friends of the Reformation. Several bishops, as Kechery of Veszprim, Thurczo of Neutra, and Andrew Dudith, who had attended the Council of Trent, openly became Protestants; and even the primate of Gran, Nicholas Olah, approved Stöckel's Confession of Faith. The widow of king Louis II, to whom Luther wrote a letter and dedicated his translation of the Psalms, appointed an evangelical court preacher. Neither Ferdinand, who by the peace of 1538 was confirmed in the possession of the throne, nor John of Zapolya, who was to retain during his lifetime the royal title, Transylvania, and a portion of Upper Hungary, regarded it as safe to adopt stringent measures against the Protestants. The widow of John, Isabella, who, after John's death, endeavored to retain her husband's possessions, with the aid of the Turks, for her son John Sigismund, favored the Protestants; and in that part of the country which was subject to the Turks the Reformation advanced without any obstruction. Thus the Reformation obtained a decided ascendency in all Hungary and Transylvania. At one time only three families of magnates were Catholic; the archiepiscopal see of Gran remained vacant for twenty years; the whole Saxon population of Transylvania, at the Synod of Medves (1544), adopted the Confession of Augsburg, which for a long time remained a bond of union for all the Protestants of Hungary and Transylvania. Among the Magyars, however, Calvinism finally obtained the ascendency, and in 1566 all the Hungarian Reformed churches signed the Helvetic Confession. In Transylvania, in 1564, a Lutheran superintendent was appointed for the Saxons, and a Reformed for Magyars and Szeklers. In 1571 religious freedom was also extended to the Unitarians; and from this time Transylvania has always had four religions recognised by the State (*religiones receptæ*). In Hungary the Jesuits succeeded in arresting the further progress of Protestantism, and in instigating new and bloody persecutions. Repeatedly the Protestant princes of Transylvania, aided by the Hungarian Protestants, compelled the kings by force of arms to confirm anew the religious freedom of Protestantism; but each time these promises were immediately broken. In 1634 the majority of the Hungarian Diet had again become Catholic, and from that time persecutions naturally became all the more oppressive. Though, in spite of all these persecutions, the Protestants maintained themselves, they constitute at present only a minority of the population—about twenty-three per cent. in Hungary proper, and twenty-four per cent. in Transylvania.

IX. *Protestantism in Poland, Prussia, and Livonia.*—Towards the close of the Middle Ages the kings of Poland showed a firmer attachment to the Papal See than any other government of Europe. As, however, the powerful nobles were almost independent of the king, those of them who favored a religious reformation were able to give an asylum to many persecuted heretics during this period. The Hussite movement met with a great deal of sympathy, and a Polish translation of the Bible came into wide circulation. Luther's doctrines were favorably received by a large portion of the Polish nobility, which at that time was distinguished for its scholarship, and especially by the large German commercial cities of Polish Prussia. In the neighboring grand-mastership of Prussia, the domain of the Teutonic Order, the grand master Albert of Brandenburg called himself in 1523 two Lutheran preachers to Königsberg. The two bishops, and soon the grand master himself, confessed the Reformation, and in 1525 Albert took the duchy of Prussia in fief from Poland. The Reformation was soon generally accepted.

The success of the Reformation in Livonia was equally rapid, notwithstanding the determined opposition of the archbishop of Riga. The city of Riga took the lead, and in 1538 joined the League of Smalkald. Nearly all the population soon followed. The grand master Conrad Kettler followed the example of Albert of Brandenburg, and in 1561 assumed the title of duke of Courland and Semigallia. This duchy also was a Polish fief: that part of Livonia which was situated on the other side of the Dwina was united by a special treaty with Poland on condition that it should be permitted to profess the Confession of Augsburg.

The success of the Reformation in these two fiefs encouraged its friends in Poland proper. King Sigismund, who died in 1548, was opposed to Protestantism, but unable to arrest its progress. His son, Sigismund Augustus, favored the Reformation, entered into negotiations with Calvin, and granted religious liberty to the cities of Dantzic, Thorn, and Elbing. Notwithstanding the utmost efforts made by the national Catholic party, with bishop Hosius at its head, the Diet of Petrikow, in 1565, demanded a national council for the express purpose of introducing priestly marriage, the Lord's supper under both kinds, and other reforms. In 1583 an edict of religious toleration was passed, but in the next year Hosius caused the adoption of the decrees of the Council of Trent by the diet, and in 1565 the Jesuits who were called by him established their first college. The progress of the counter-reformation which now set in was greatly aided by the divisions existing among the Protestants. The Reformed effected a national organization in 1547; the Lutherans in 1565. The Bohemians retained their separate Church constitution, and the Unitarians, who had able leaders in Lælius Socinus, Blandrata, and Occhino, became likewise numerous. In 1570 the Reformed, Lutherans, and Bohemians agreed at the Synod of Sandomir upon a general confession to which all three could subscribe, but which left room for the retention by each Church of its doctrinal peculiarities. This Protestant union proved sufficiently strong to secure in 1573 the adoption of a general religious treaty, which guaranteed equal rights to Catholics and Protestants. A strong reaction against Protestantism began under king Stephen Bathori (1586 to 1587). His successor, Sigismund III, by conferring offices and dignities exclusively upon Catholics, induced many nobles to renounce Protestantism. In 1717 the erection of new Protestant churches was forbidden, and in 1733 the Protestants were excluded from all public offices. The increasing persecution of all non-Catholics led finally to the interference of Prussia and Russia, and to the partition of Poland.

X. *Protestantism in Italy, Spain, and France.*—1. In Italy the revival of the classical studies and the observation of the corrupt condition of the ruling Church had diffused among the educated and literary classes a widespread contempt not only of the Catholic Church, but of Christianity in general. The friends of a refor-

mation of the Church had, however, organized societies in Rome, Venice, and other cities, and the writings of the German and Swiss Reformers met therefore with a great deal of sympathy in all parts of Italy. One party of Italian reformers, which counted among its members several cardinals, as Contarini and Pole, was averse to a separation from the Church, and hoped for an evangelical regeneration of the old Church. Another party came out in favor of a thorough reformation, first in Ferrara (under the protection of the duchess Renata, a French princess), then in Modena and many other cities. A prominent centre of reformatory movements was subsequently in the city of Naples, where the Spanish nobleman Juan Valdez displayed a remarkable activity, and where two of the greatest preachers of Italy—Bernardino Occhino, the general of the Capuchins, and the learned Augustinian Peter Martyr Vermigli — were gained for the Reformation. Translations of the principal writings of German and Swiss Reformers, mostly under assumed names, found a wide circulation, and the Italian reformers themselves published a large number of writings, the most celebrated of which is the work entitled *On the Benefit of Christ*. Under Paul III the evangelical Catholics, like Contarini and his friends, had for a time a leading influence upon the government of the Church; but in 1542 a decided reaction began when the pope, by the advice of cardinal Caraffa, who had formerly been a friend of Contarini, appointed an inquisition for the suppression of Protestantism. Many of the leading friends of the Reformation fled to foreign countries; among them Occhino, Vermigli, Vergerio (bishop of Capo d' Istria), and Caraccioli, a nephew of cardinal Caraffa. When Caraffa became pope, under the name of Paul IV, the persecution extended also to the Catholics of evangelical sentiments, including a number of cardinals and bishops. Under Paul V an *Index Librorum Prohibitorum* led to the suppression of all literature friendly to Protestantism. Protestantism in Italy, as in other countries, had been divided into Lutheranism and Calvinism, with a prevailing inclination to the latter; and Anti-Trinitarian followers of Servetus had likewise become numerous, although they had to keep their opinions secret. The division of the Protestants weakened their power of resistance, and before the end of the century the Inquisition had destroyed all vestiges of Protestant communities. Among the distinguished martyrs of the Reformation were Carnesecchi and Palearius; two Waldensian congregations in Calabria were rooted out in a terrible massacre.

2. The union of Spain under one ruler with Germany and the Netherlands facilitated the introduction of the writings of the German Reformers. Besides, from Béarn, which was wholly Protestant, the doctrines of the Swiss Reformation spread into Aragon. Seville and Valladolid became the chief seats of the Reformation. Diego de Valera, John Egidius, Ponce de la Fuente (all of Seville), Alfonso and Juan Valdez, and Augustine Castalla were among its prominent friends. Francis Enzonas and Juan Perez translated the Bible. From fear of the Inquisition, the Spanish Protestants never ventured to constitute congregations; the Inquisition, nevertheless, discovered them, and exterminated them with merciless cruelty. In 1570 Protestantism was regarded as fully extinct.

3. France, during the Middle Ages, had often taken a leading part in opposing the claims of the papacy, and in asserting the superiority of general councils over the pope; but it had shown no sympathy with a thorough reform of doctrine. When Luther's views became known in France, they were condemned (1521) by the Sorbonne. One of the French bishops, Guillaume Briçonnet, took, however, an active interest in the reformation of the Church. He called to his aid men like Lefèvre, Farel (who was at that time regent of the college of cardinal Le Moine at Paris), Roussel, and others; but when the charge of heresy was raised against him, he cut loose from his Reformed friends, and in 1523 pronounced against Luther. When Parliament was appealed to for the suppression of Protestantism, it lent at once its arm to the clergy for bloody persecution. In 1524 Jean le Clerc, of Meaux, the first martyr of the Reformation, was executed in Metz. In 1529 a great sensation was aroused by the hanging and burning of Louis de Berquin, a royal councillor and zealous adherent of the Reformation, whose writings and translations had previously (1523) been condemned by the Sorbonne. Francis I was an admirer of Erasmus, and by nature averse to any decisive attitude in religious affairs; he was, moreover, quick in detecting the advantages which an alliance between the Protestant princes of Germany and the ruler of France against the Catholic emperor of Germany might have for him and for France. On the other hand, he was afraid of disturbing the religious unity of France, and desirous of securing the pope's aid in his war against the German emperor. Thus his course in the progress of the religious controversies was wavering and undecided. At his court, and even in his family, both parties were represented, the chief patron of the Reformation being his sister Margaret, queen of Navarre. While the persecution of the Lutherans went forward, and, in January, 1535, several of the Reformed were executed in Paris in a barbarous way, Francis assured the Protestant princes of Germany that he was really in favor of a religious reformation, and that only some fanatics were punished in France. Of considerable interest are the negotiations which took place between Francis and Melancthon. The king became acquainted with Melancthon in consequence of a memorial which the latter addressed in 1531 to Guillaume Bellay, and in which he explained the essential points of the Reformation, and how they might be reconciled with the Catholic doctrine. Melancthon's *Loci Communes* pleased the king much. In 1535 John Sturm, then professor in Paris, invited Melancthon to France. Melancthon answered cordially, and was then formally invited by the king himself, by cardinal Bellay, Sturm, and Guillaume Bellay. Luther was in favor of accepting the invitation, but the elector sharply refused to give him permission. Melancthon therefore did not go, but in August of the same year his *Consilium*, with many alterations, was presented to the Sorbonne for their decision, in the form of a confession of faith, and it was declared by them to be thoroughly objectionable. The king, nevertheless, announced in December to the Protestant princes assembled at Smalkald that he had formed a favorable opinion of the articles of Melancthon. Soon, however, the king, chiefly through the influence of cardinal Tournon, ceased to manifest any sympathy with the cause of the Reformation. With it the connection of Frenchmen with the Lutheran Reformation seems to have come to an end, until, at a later period, the conquest of German territories gave to France a considerable number of Lutheran congregations.

The friends whom bishop Briçonnet had called to Meaux to assist him in his reformatory work remained mostly, like himself, within the old Church, contenting themselves with diffusing spiritual and evangelical feelings among Catholics. Lefèvre (Faber Stapulensis), after having fled to Strasburg on account of the charges of heresy brought against him, was recalled by Francis I, appointed librarian at Blois, where he translated the Old Testament, and spent the end of his life at the court of Margaret of Navarre. Gerald Roussel, who fled with Lefèvre to Strasburg, became subsequently bishop of Oléron, where he introduced important reforms, but never ceased to be suspected of heresy. Even Margaret of Navarre, the zealous patron of all friends of the Reformation, who reformed all the churches of her little state according to evangelical principles, never regarded it necessary to separate externally from the Catholic Church. Her course was disapproved by Calvin, but her work was continued by her daughter Jeanne d'Albret, the wife of Antoine of Bourbon, and in 1569 the Reformation was fully carried through in Béarn.

The main reformatory movement of France, which has played a conspicuous part in its ecclesiastical as well as political history, attaches itself to the name of John Calvin. He was a native of France, and became thoroughly imbued with reformatory ideas while studying at Bourges and Paris. He had to flee in 1533, spent a short time at the court of the queen of Navarre, returned to Paris, but had to flee again to Switzerland in 1534, when he wrote his *Institutes*, in the preface of which he exposes the injustice of the king. From Basle he went to Geneva, where, with the exception of a few years which he spent in Strasburg, which was then a German city, he remained until the end of his life, as the author and recognised leader of one of the two great divisions of the Reformation of the 16th century. Though he was not allowed to return to France, Geneva became the hearth and home from which the Reformation in France itself was constantly receiving new food. In the latter years of the reign of Francis the persecution of the Reformed increased in severity; and especially the Waldenses in Mérindol and Cabrières, in Provence, suffered from a most horrible persecution, which in 1545 ended in a general massacre. Notwithstanding the persecution, the number of the Reformed grew steadily; it was very large even at the death of Francis I, in 1547, and rapidly increased during the reign of Henry II. Regular congregations began to be formed in the large cities in 1555, and in 1559 a general synod held at Paris agreed upon a confession of faith and a Church order. (For the further history of the Reformed Church, see FRANCE.) The subsequent history of the Reformed, to whom soon the name of Huguenots was generally applied, is closely connected with the political history of France. They were forced in self-defence to act no less as a political than an ecclesiastical party. While the Catholics adhered to the fanatical Guises, the Protestants looked for protection to the Bourbons. In 1570 they received in the Peace of St. Germain equal rights, and several fortresses as a guarantee of the peace; but two years later (1572), St. Bartholomew's Eve was the beginning of the most terrible ordeal through which they passed in their entire history, more than 30,000 of them being massacred during one month. King Henry III was driven by the arrogance of the Guises into the ranks of the Huguenots, and was soon after assassinated by the Dominican Clement. Then the first Protestant, Henry of Navarre, ascended the French throne. To save the Protestant cause, he submitted externally to the Catholic Church; but to his former coreligionists he preserved his sympathy and secured equal rights in the Edict of Nantes. During the reigns of the following kings the Huguenots again passed through a series of severe persecutions: under Louis XIV the Edict of Nantes was revoked, and a large number of families compelled to emigrate, and to settle in foreign countries. The French Revolution at last began for them the æra of religious freedom.

XI. *Main and Minor Divisions.*—The Reformation swept with irresistible power over all Europe. In some countries it was totally extinguished by fire and blood; in others it maintained itself as the religion of the minority; in others still it became the predominant or the exclusive religion of the people. Fifty years after its beginning it numbered many millions of adherents. All these millions agreed in protesting against the claim of Rome to be the only true Christian Church, and in the desire to restore a purer form of Christianity. The immense majority rallied around three centres—the Lutheran, the Reformed, the Anglican Reformation. These three main divisions, and even the principal subdivisions, of the 16th century have retained their identity to the present day. To the old subdivisions new ones have been added. Thus, in the 18th century, the Wesleyan Methodists sprang from the Church of England, and, with an unparalleled rapidity of growth, soon took a front rank among the most numerous subdivisions of the Reformed churches. The subdivisions have again been subdivided into a number of minor sects, and in many of them, at times, the old doctrinal platforms of the founders of the Reformers appeared to have been abandoned, leaving nothing but the name of the Church as a bond of connection with the Reformation of the 16th century. The very name, however, and the remaining consciousness of a live connection with the great movement of the 16th century have proved elements of great conservative force, and have been largely instrumental in keeping the territory which the three great branches of the Reformation conquered in the 16th century undiminished up to the present day. While it has been the prevailing tendency in the history of the subdivisions to develop independent life-organisms illustrating the vitality of the principles and theories which led to their separate existence, attempts have never been wanting to strengthen the bonds of union connecting them. Many subdivisions which had been formed in consequence of disagreeing views on particular points of belief or Church government have been reunited on the basis of the points common to all, allowing the right to disagree on points of minor importance. In modern times, attempts have even been made to find a permanent bond of union for all the subdivisions of the large groups of the Protestant churches. Thus, all the bishops of the churches in doctrinal conformity with the Church of England have twice been called to meet in Pan-Anglican councils. All the Reformed and Presbyterian churches met in 1877 for the first time in a Pan-Presbyterian Council in Edinburgh. The General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church took, in 1876, the first step towards the convocation of an Œcumenical Council of Methodism.

While the large majority of the millions which in the 16th century rose up against and separated from the Church of Rome rallied around three large centres, it was but natural that many, in the search of a pure Christianity, arrived at different results. Some of these dissenters never succeeded in forming sects; others became numerous, and have, in the course of time, assumed large dimensions. To the latter class belong the Baptists, the Anti-Trinitarians, the Friends, and many others. All of these have long had to struggle for toleration, because Protestant governments united with the Catholic in persecuting and suppressing them. More recently, however, the principle of religious liberty has gradually come to be recognised in nearly all Christian countries, and enabled individuals as well as sects to carry out the great principles which lay at the bottom of the Reformation of the 16th century to the best of their understanding, and to worship God according to the dictates of their own conscience. About the middle of the present century (1845), an attempt was made to unite in one association, called the Evangelical Alliance, Christians belonging to all denominations collectively called evangelical, and to represent, on a larger scale than had ever been attempted before, the unity of all these churches in the more important articles of faith, notwithstanding their separation by external organization. A list of nine articles was drawn up, to which, it was thought, all Christians wishing to be regarded as evangelical might be expected to assent. In the list of these articles are included the inspiration of the Bible, the Trinity, the utter depravity of human nature, justification by faith alone, the eternal blessedness of the righteous and the eternal punishment of the wicked, the divine institution of the Christian ministry. According to this programme, it could and did become a rallying-point for Lutherans, Reformed, and Presbyterians, Congregationalists, Methodists, Baptists, Moravians, the evangelical or Low-Church party of the Anglican churches, and a number of minor denominations. It was objected to by the so-called high and strict Church parties among Anglicans and Lutherans, by Unitarians and Universalists, by the Friends, by the Annihilationists, and by all Anti-Trinitarians and Rationalists.

XII. *Central and Fundamental Principles of the Ref-*

ormation.—The parties which withdrew from the Church of Rome in the 16th century and tried to restore a purer form of Christianity took different roads and arrived at different results; yet there was one principle in which they all agreed, and which may be declared to be pre-eminently the central principle of the Reformation—this was the absolute authority of the Holy Scriptures. Every Reformed Church charged the Church of Rome with holding doctrines and usages which the former deemed anti-scriptural, and which on that ground it rejected. The three large divisions of the Reformation were all more intent upon eliminating from the creed of Christendom what could be proved to be anti-scriptural than to undertake the revision of every article of the creed by a scriptural test exclusively. Thus they all retained what the early councils had defined on the essence of the Godhead and the person of Christ. Gradually other parties arose which demanded a greater prominence for the necessity of the scriptural affirmative proof, and that not too great a stress should be laid upon the testimony of the early Church. Hence many doctrines which the great Reformed churches of the 16th century agreed in continuing in their creeds were by other Christian inquirers declared to lack the foundation of a clear scriptural proof, and on that ground either rejected or held as indifferent on which Bible Christians had a right to disagree. All these parties, however, held fast to the fundamental principle that the Bible was the supreme authority for the believer in Christ. Other sects and parties have made a distinction between the written Scripture and the Word or Spirit of Christ, and placed the latter above the former; others, again, have found a hidden sense in the Bible besides the literal; yet all these parties concur in recognising the central principle of the Reformation. A total change of the basis of the Reformation was attempted by the Rationalists of the 18th and 19th centuries, who wanted to have the Bible regarded and interpreted as any other book, recognising what appeared to agree with sound reason, and claiming the right to reject all the remainder. The divergence between this view and the central principle of the Reformation is so apparent and so radical that the long-continued coexistence of both views in many of the European State churches can only be explained from the fact that the churches were enslaved by the State, and treated not as forms of religion, but as a division of the State administration. The introduction of self-government into these churches rapidly develops a tendency towards the complete separation between the Rationalistic and the Biblical conception of Christianity.

Theologians have sometimes called this principle the formal principle of the Reformation, or the *principium cognoscendi*. They have distinguished from it the material principle, or *principium essendi*, which proclaims the justification of the sinner by faith alone. Both are intimately connected. When the Church is no longer viewed as the infallible teacher of the true Christian doctrine, but the inquirer after Christian truth is pointed to the Bible and to Christ himself, the soul's salvation can only be found in a direct relation between Christ and the Christian soul. The doctrine occupies, however, a somewhat different position in the doctrinal systems of different Protestant churches. See JUSTIFICATION.

XIII. *The Reformation's Place in the History of the Christian Church and in the History of the World.*—It is agreed on all sides, and not even denied by the Catholics, that the Reformation is one of the great turning-points in the Christian Church, and that with it begins an entirely new æra. The compulsory uniformity of the Church was forever at an end. Church history, henceforth, has not to deal only with one predominant and all-powerful Church, but with a number of rival churches, the number of which has steadily increased. For a time, the leading reformatory churches in close alliance with the governments of the countries in which they prevailed endeavored likewise to enforce conformity with their doctrines and laws; but this course was gradually recognised to be untenable, and religious toleration, and subsequently the freedom of religious confession, has become one of the characteristic features of the Reformed countries. The Catholic Church continues up to the present day to brand the principle of religious liberty as a heresy of modern times; but it is a notable fact that nearly all the Catholic countries which nominally continue to adhere to the doctrine of the Church entirely disregard what their Church declares to be the Catholic principle, and have introduced the Protestant principles of religious freedom into their legislation.

In universal history, the Reformation is by all historians designated as one of the great movements which mark the transition from the Middle Ages to modern times. A characteristic feature of the countries which adopted the Reformation is the progress towards political freedom, and the separation between Church and State. The Catholic Church in the Middle Ages claimed a far-reaching influence upon civil legislation. It claimed the sole right of legislating on marriage affairs, exempted priests and monks from civil jurisdiction, and accumulated within its hand a very large proportion of the nation's wealth. Though the Reformed State churches pursued different courses in reforming the civil codes, the tendency to make all citizens equal before the law can be directly traced to the Reformation.

Although the Catholic Church still has a larger membership than all the Reformed churches combined, the power and the commanding influence upon the destinies of mankind are more and more passing into the hands of states the governments of which are separated from Rome. In the New World, the ascendency of the United States and British America, in both of which Protestantism prevails, over the states of Spanish and Portuguese America is not disputed even by Catholics. In Europe, England has become the greatest world-power, and in its wide dominions new great Protestant countries are springing into existence, especially in Australia and South Africa. In Germany, the supreme power has passed from the declining Catholic house of Hapsburg to the Protestant house of Hohenzollern, and the new Protestant German Empire marks an addition of the greatest importance to the aggregate power of the Protestant world. The combined influence of the three great Teutonic peoples—the United States, Great Britain, and Germany—continues to be cast in a steadily increasing ratio for the defence of that freedom from the dictation of Rome which was first won by the Reformation. That freedom is now not only fully secured against any possible combination of Catholic states, but the parliaments of most of the latter, as France, Italy, Austria, Portugal, are as eager in the defence of this freedom as the Protestant states. Thus it may be said that, after an existence of about 350 years, the Reformation has totally annihilated the influence of Rome upon the laws and the government of the civilized world.

XIV. *Literature.*—A great many works which are sources for the history of the Reformation have been mentioned in the articles on the Reformers and on particular churches. The following list contains works which more specially treat of the history of the Reformation: Sleidani *De Statu Religionis et Reipublicæ, Carolo V Cæsare, Commentarii* (Strasburg, 1555; Engl. transl. by Bohun, Lond. 1689); Sculteti *Annalium Evangelii passim per Europam Decimo Sexto Salutis Partæ Sæculo Renovati Decas I et II* [embracing the time from 1516 to 1536] (Heidelb. 1618); Burnet, *Hist. of the Reformation* (Lond. 1679 sq.); Gerdes, *Introductio in Hist. Evangelii Sæc. XVI passim per Europam Renovati* (Groning. 1744–52, tom. iv); Hagenbach, *Vorlesungen über das Wesen und Geschichte der Reformation in Deutschland und der Schweiz* (Leips. 1834–43, 6 vols.; Engl. transl. by Evelina Moore, Edinb. 1878 sq.); Clausen, *Populäre Vorträge über die Reformation* (Leips. 1837); D'Aubigné, *Histoire de la Réformation au XVIième Siècle* (Paris, 1835–53, 5 vols.; Engl. transl. N. Y. 1843 sq.); and the supplementary *Histoire de la Réformation au temps de Calvin* (Paris, 1862

sq. 8 vols.; Engl. transl. N. Y. 1862–79); Beausobre, *Hist. de la Réform.* (1785); Neudecker, *Gesch. der Reform.* (Leips. 1843), and *Gesch. des Protest.* (ibid. 1844, 2 vols.); Döllinger, *Die Reform.* (1846–48, 3 vols.); Gaillard, *Hist. of the Reform.* (N. Y. 1847); Guericke, *Gesch. der Reform.* (Berlin, 1855); Stebbing, *Hist. of the Reform.* (Lond. 1850); Waddington, *Hist. of the Reform.* (ibid. 1841); Hardwick, *Hist. of the Ch. during the Reform.* (Camb. 1856); Soames, *Hist. of the Reform.* (Lond. 1826); Fisher, *Hist. of the Reform.* (N. Y. 1873). On the doctrinal history of the Reformed churches, see Dorner, *Gesch. der Prot. Theologie* (1867, Engl. transl. 1871); and Schaff, *Creeds of Christendom* (N. Y. 1877, 3 vols.). (A. J. S.)

REFORMATION, FESTIVAL OF THE. This is an annual commemoration in Germany of the great event of the 16th century. It is held on Oct. 31, to remind of the opening of the Reformation by the nailing of the ninety-five theses on the church doors at Wittenberg (Oct. 31, 1517). It is first celebrated as a secular feast, and on the following Sabbath as an ecclesiastical commemoration.

REFORMATION RIGHTS (*jus reformandi*) are the privileges granted to the different princes of the Reformation compact at the Augsburg Interim in 1555 to introduce into their states either the Catholic or Protestant faith, and to maintain it as the faith of the people. The peace of Westphalia, in 1648, brought in modifications, but modern events have made so many changes that the rights of the Reformation exist only in name. At present it is religious liberty which each state concedes to its subjects, and the only question remaining is whether Church and State shall have any interdependence. See STATE.

Reformed Baptists. See CAMPBELLITES.

Reformed Churches, the name usually given to all the churches of the Reformation. In a conventional sense, it is used to designate those Protestant churches in which the Calvinistic doctrines, and still more the Calvinistic polity, prevail, in contradistinction to the Lutheran (q. v.). The influence of Calvin proved more powerful than that of Zwingli, which, however, no doubt considerably modified the views prevalent in many of these churches. The Reformed churches are very generally known on the continent of Europe as the *Calvinistic churches*, while the name *Protestant Church* is in some countries almost equivalent to that of *Lutheran*. One chief distinction of all the Reformed churches is their doctrine of the sacrament of the Lord's supper, characterized by the utter rejection not only of transubstantiation, but of consubstantiation; and it was on this point mainly that the controversy between the Lutherans and the Reformed was long carried on. See LORD'S SUPPER. They are also unanimous in their rejection of the use of images and of many ceremonies which the Lutherans have thought it proper to retain. Among the Reformed churches are those both of England and Scotland (notwithstanding the Episcopalian government of the former and the Presbyterianism of the latter), the Protestant Church of France, that of Holland and the Netherlands, many German churches, the once flourishing Protestant Church of Poland, etc., with those in America and elsewhere which have sprung from them. See PROTESTANTISM; REFORMATION.

Reformed (DUTCH) Church IN AMERICA, one of the oldest and most influential bodies of Christians in this country.

I. *Name.*—The former title of this denomination indicated its historical relations, "the Reformed Protestant Dutch Church in North America." It is "Reformed," as distinct from Lutheranism; "Protestant," as protesting against Rome; "Dutch," as expressing its origin in Holland. In 1867, by an almost unanimous vote of its General Synod, with the concurrence of the great majority of the classes, the name of the Church was restored to its simple and original form—*the Reformed Church*. The history and reasons of this change are fully presented in an elaborate report, which is appended to the minutes of the General Synod of 1867. The word "Dutch" was originally introduced to distinguish the Church from the "English" Church, by which the Episcopalian denomination was generally known, in the State of New York, after the Dutch colonial government had surrendered to the British in 1664. The Hollanders who settled New York and Albany, and intermediate places, came over as members of the "Reformed Church of the Netherlands" and representatives of "the Reformed Religion." It was not until thirty years after the cession of the province to the British that the word "Dutch" was incorporated in the style and title of a single Church when William III of England gave a charter to the Netherland Reformed Congregation in the city of New York as the "Reformed Protestant Dutch Church." In resuming its original name the Church has lost none of its historical associations, and has only dropped what had long been regarded by many as a hindrance to her advancement.

II. *Reformed Church in Holland.*—The Reformed Church of the Netherlands was a legitimate outgrowth from the great Reformation of the 16th century. The conflict for civil and religious liberty in the Low Countries was preceded by the labors of those "Reformers before the Reformation," Wessel Gansevoort and Rudolph Agricola. Both of these illustrious scholars and teachers were natives of Groningen. They were students of the Bible, who, fifty years before Martin Luther, came to a clear knowledge of the great doctrines of the faith with which he shook the world. But it was not until many years after he had taken his position that he saw the writings of Gansevoort, and then he felt constrained to make the fact public, lest his enemies should use their agreement of views to his own disadvantage. Gansevoort was an eminent teacher at Heidelberg, Louvain, Paris, Rome, and at last, as head of a celebrated school, in his native Groningen, where he died in 1489. Agricola was professor in the University of Heidelberg, and was noted for his classical and scientific attainments, and especially for his skill in the use of the Greek New Test. The labors of these great and good men mightily prepared the way for the civil and religious conflict which followed under Charles V and his son Philip II of Spain. Evangelical truth struck its roots deep down into the hearts of the people. Confessors and martyrs for Christ were never wanting for the persecutions of the government and the Inquisition. The poor people called their churches "*the Churches of the Netherlands under the Cross.*" They worshipped privately for many years, in scattered little assemblies, until they crystallized into a regular ecclesiastical organization. The ban of the empire and the curse of the Romish Church could not keep down the rising spirit of the heroic believers in Christ and liberty. Every new act of tyranny fanned the sacred flame. Popular field-preachers, like Herman Strijker and Jan Arentsen, gathered thousands of people beneath the open sky to listen to their powerful eloquence. The whole country was stirred to its depths. The hymns of Beza and Clement Marot, translated from the French, rang out the pious enthusiasm of the multitudes. Babes were brought for baptism, and alms were collected for the poor. At length three pastors were set apart to the ministry of the Church in Amsterdam, deacons and deaconesses were appointed to distribute alms to the needy saints, and churches were organized. In 1563 the Synod of Antwerp was held, which adopted the Belgic Confession, and laid the foundations of that noble Church to which subsequent synods only gave more permanent shape. Her scholars and theologians, her schools and universities, her pure faith and holy living, her active zeal and martyr spirit, gave the Reformed Church of Holland the leading position among the sister churches of the Continent. Her catholic feeling and religious liberty made her a refuge for the persecuted of other lands. The Waldenses and the Huguenots, the Scotch Covenanters and the English Puritans,

found a welcome at her altars; and John Robinson and the voyagers of the Mayflower learned in Holland some of the best lessons which they brought with them to Plymouth Rock.

III. *History of the Reformed Church in America.*—1. *Origin.*—The Reformed Church in America was founded by emigrants from Holland, who formed the colony of the New Netherlands, under the authority of the States-General and under the auspices of the Dutch East India Company. Hendrick Hudson arrived in New York harbor Sept. 11, 1609, in the Half Moon, and proceeded as far as Fort Orange (now Albany). Trading-posts were established there and on Manhattan Island (New York) in 1614. The emigrants came for trade, but they did not neglect religion and the public worship of God. They had no ordained minister and no organized Church for several years; but two "krank-besoeckers," or "zieken-troosters"—literally "comforters of the sick," pious persons who were often commissioned as aids to the ministers of the Gospel in the mother-country—came over with governor Minuit in 1626. These were Jansen Krol and Jan Huyck. "They met the people on Sundays in an upper room above a horse-mill, and read the Scriptures and the creeds to them. This was *the beginning of public worship in New Amsterdam.*" There is evidence, however, that "a considerable Church was organized in that city as early as 1619," and that "a list of members in full communion of the Church of New York is still extant, dated 1622" (*Life of Dr. John H. Livingston*, p. 79, note).

The first minister of the Gospel who came to this country from Holland was the Rev. Jonas Michaelius, a graduate of the University of Leyden, and afterwards a missionary in San Salvador and Guinea. He preached in New Amsterdam from 1628 to 1633, and then returned to Holland. See MICHAELIUS. In the spring of the same year his successor, the Rev. Everardus Bogardus, arrived, bringing with him the first schoolmaster, Adam Roelandsen, who organized the parochial school of the Collegiate Reformed Dutch Church. This school is still in existence, without a break in its succession of nearly two hundred and fifty years. It is sustained by the Collegiate Church, and has always been "an instrument of much good to the Church and to the community." A history of it has been published in a small volume by its present principal, Mr. Dunshee. This intimate connection of the Church and the school was characteristic of the early Reformed churches, and it antedates the claim of priority made for the New England Puritans by several years. The upper room in Francis Molemaker's horse-mill was relinquished as a place of worship upon the arrival of dominie Bogardus in 1633, and a plain, frail wooden church-building and a parsonage were erected near what is now Old Slip, on the East River. In 1642, at the suggestion of the famous navigator David Petersen de Vries, funds were raised for the erection of a stone edifice within the fort (now the Battery), where the people worshipped until the church was finished in Garden Street in 1693. A church was planted in the colony of Rensellaerswyck (Albany) under the patronage of Kilian van Rensellaer, a pearl-merchant from Amsterdam, who founded a colony upon the large tract of land of which he was the first patron. In 1642 he secured the services of the Rev. Johannes Megapolensis, whose call states that "By the state of navigation in the East and West Indies a door is opened through the special providence of God, also in the New Netherlands, for the preaching of the Gospel of Jesus Christ for the salvation of men, as good fruits have been already witnessed there through God's mercy." He was also the first Protestant missionary to the Indians in this country, preceding the labors of John Eliot near Boston by three or four years. See MEGAPOLENSIS. His successors Dellius and Lydius did the same good work.

2. *First Period.*—"The Dutch rule in Manhattan lasted fifty years from the establishment of the first trading-station. The Church had been organized about thirty years. The city of New Amsterdam, at the date of the surrender, contained only 1500 inhabitants; and there were but five Reformed churches in the whole province—New York, Albany, Flatbush and Flatlands, Esopus (or Kingston), and Breuckelen (Brooklyn). There were six ministers—the two Megapolenses, Drisius, Schaats, Polhemus, and Blom." They were men of thorough education, and, as far as we can learn, diligent in the ministry. There were also a church at Bergen, which was the first of any denomination in New Jersey, organized in 1660, and one at New Amstel, Del., which subsequently dropped out of the connection. The Hollanders numbered, at the time of the surrender, about 10,000 souls. This first period of the Church was necessarily one of very small beginnings. The churches were planted in the wilderness. They encountered all the difficulties of new colonies—surrounded by savage tribes, separated by long distances from each other, and dependent entirely upon Holland for their clergy and school-teachers. Civil affairs were sometimes unhappily mixed up with religious interests, and the growth was slow indeed.

3. The *second period* covers nearly three quarters of a century (1664 to 1737), during which about fifty churches were added to the denomination. Of these fourteen were in New Jersey, about twenty on the banks of the Hudson River, about half as many in the valleys of Schoharie, Orange, and Ulster, and a half-dozen on Long Island and Staten Island. Forty-two ministers began their labors, some of them only remaining a short time, among these churches; and at the close of the period there were sixty churches, and seventeen ministers of Hollandish extraction in America. When the English rule began in New York, emigration from Holland almost ceased. Frequent collisions occurred with the British governors of the province. Governor Andros sent a minister of the Church of England [see VAN RANSLAER, NICHOLAS] to Albany to take possession of the Dutch church there; and governor Fletcher, failing to impose the use of the English language by law upon the Hollanders, procured the passage of a bill by the Assembly settling a maintenance for ministers, which was so worded that, while it might apply to dissenters, it practically subserved the Church of England, and made it substantially the Established Church in the counties of New York, Kings, Queens, Richmond, and Westchester. Church-rates were exacted by the government for the support of these Episcopalian ministers. The line of separation between the Dutch and English gradually became more distinct. Many of the Hollanders, to escape English oppression, removed to New Jersey, and settled principally in Middlesex, Somerset, Monmouth, and Bergen counties, where they laid the foundations of churches that have long been great and powerful. Some French Huguenots, who fled from religious persecutions in the Old World, also settled in New York, Westchester, and Ulster counties, and on Staten Island. For their benefit, the Collegiate Church of New York called Samuel Drisius, who could preach in French as well as in Dutch and English; and Daillé, Bonrepos, and Perret ministered to the pious exiles. They fraternized heartily with the Dutch churches, and ultimately were absorbed in the one organization. Their descendants in the same localities still form a strong constituent element of the Reformed Church in America.

In 1709 a large body of Germans from the Palatinate, fleeing from religious persecution, settled upon Livingston Manor, in Schoharie County, N. Y., and in the valley of the Mohawk. Among them were many Swiss, who sought the same shelter in the New World. Unable to obtain help from the Church in their fatherland, and living beside their Dutch neighbors, they naturally sought and received assistance from them. The Classis of Amsterdam, at the request of the Church of the Palatinate, agreed to aid the Germans upon condition that

they would adhere to the Heidelberg Catechism, the Palatinate Confession of Faith, the Canons of the Synod of Dort, and the Rules of Church Government of Dort. Ministers were sent over. A cœtus or American Classis was formed by the direction and under the jurisdiction of the Synod of Holland, which charged the Classis of Amsterdam with the supervision of the affairs of the German Church in America, which then extended among the German settlements in Pennsylvania, Maryland, Virginia, the Carolinas, New Jersey, and New York. This relation subsisted forty-six years, until 1793, when the cœtus asserted its independence of the Church in Holland. See GERMAN REFORMED CHURCH IN AMERICA. In Schoharie and Columbia counties, and in the valley of the Mohawk, the German and Hollandish elements have, to a great degree, united in the Reformed churches.

4. The *third period* in this history dates from the first effort of the Dutch churches to secure an independent organization—1737 to 1792. Their entire dependence upon the Church in Holland for ministers, their growth in numbers and their distance from the mother country, the necessities of a new country, and the lack of facilities for educating their clergy, the delays, expense, and anxieties occasioned by the necessity of sending young men to Holland for training and ordination, and other good reasons growing out of their position and the ecclesiastical restrictions of the Classis of Amsterdam, led to the organization of a cœtus, or ecclesiastical association, in New York in 1737. A plan was carefully framed, submitted to the churches, and sent to Holland for approval by the classis. This plan embraced a yearly meeting of clerical and lay delegates for the transaction of ecclesiastical business only, to promote the welfare of the churches, and in entire subordination to the Classis of Amsterdam. But nine years passed away before that body gave its sanction. The first meeting of the cœtus was held in September, 1747, and the first German cœtus in the same month.

The powers of this body were too limited to make it really effective. It had no authority to ordain any man to the ministry without special permission, nor to decide finally upon any question. But these restrictions only roused the spirit of independence in the younger ministry, and generated the powerful opposition of the adherents of the policy of the mother Church. In 1753 measures were taken for forming an American Classis, which was organized in 1755. This event caused the withdrawal of the conservatives, who were thereafter known as the "*Conferentie*," the Dutch word for the Latin *cœtus*. From this time until 1771 the conflict between these parties rent the Church asunder. Ministers, churches, and people entered into the strife with the most bitter animosities. The cœtus were noted for their practical zeal, their pious and progressive earnestness, and their high sense of the rights and duties of the Church in this country. The conferentie possessed more learning, and some of its members occupied the highest places in the Church. In numbers they were nearly equal. In spirit, while both were often extremely culpable, the Conferentie are generally credited with being the most intemperate. Yet they should be regarded as impelled by their zeal for a thoroughly educated ministry, and for the order and worship of the Church. But the quarrel grew apace. Preachers were sometimes disturbed in their pulpits; public worship was often interrupted, or actually stopped, by violence. Church doors were locked against one or the other party by their opponents. Tumults were excited on the Lord's day at the doors of the sanctuaries. Personal, domestic, and public divisions were made between those who had always before been friends. Religion suffered sadly, and the Church seemed almost on the brink of ruin, when at length the hour of deliverance and the deliverer came.

In 1766 John H. Livingston, then a young man, arrived in Holland to study for the ministry at the University of Utrecht. His heart was filled with anxiety for the churches at home, whose dissensions he had witnessed and deplored. With great wisdom he embraced every opportunity to spread information and take counsel with leading men in Holland respecting the state of things in America. He prepared a plan of union, secured the assent of the ecclesiastical authorities, and returned to New York as pastor of the Church in that city, in 1770, with his olive-branch. In October, 1771, a convention was held in New York, at which there were present twenty-two ministers and twenty-five elders, from thirty-four churches. The plan of union was presented by Dr. Livingston, discussed in a friendly manner, with a sincere desire for peace, ratified by that body, and transmitted to Holland for final approval by the Classis of Amsterdam. In 1772 their favorable answer was received, dated Jan. 14 in that year. (A translation is printed in full in Corwin's *Manual of the Reformed Church*, p. 11, 12.) This practically ended the long strife. A general synod was organized, with five classes. The power of licensing and ordaining ministers was granted to the new and independent body, and the way was thus peacefully prepared for the formal and final organization. The articles of union were only intended as a temporary scaffolding for the erection of a more permanent ecclesiastical structure. In 1788 the doctrinal symbols of the Church, and the articles of Church government used in Holland, were translated by a committee of the synod. In 1792 the whole work was reviewed by the synod, adapted to the wants of the Church in this land, and adopted as the constitution of the Reformed Dutch Church. At this time there were one hundred and thirty churches and fifty ministers. During the whole period of strife ninety new churches were organized, and eighty-eight ministers began their labors among them. Before the first attempts at independent organization, for forty years prior to 1730, the average growth in ministers and churches was only seven of each per decade. During the next sixty years, the average per decade arose to seventeen. These facts tell the story of the differing policies of the cœtus and conferentie.

The separate organization which was thus secured has remained to this day, a monument of providential interposition, and of the wisdom and piety of its chief human agent, Dr. Livingston, who is justly revered as the father of the Reformed Church in America. The constitution adopted in 1792 continued in force for the space of forty years. In 1832 it was revised, and again in 1874.

5. *Causes of Slow Growth.*—It has often been a matter of surprise to persons unacquainted with these and other facts that this oldest Presbyterian Church organization in this country has been of such slow growth. The reasons are self-evident. The Dutch rule in New Amsterdam lasted only about thirty years; and when it ceased, the population of the city was but 1500. The English Episcopal Church rose almost to the power of a state establishment. "The Presbyterians of Ireland and Scotland, for a hundred and twenty-five years, were practically excluded by the continued use of the Dutch language from the Church assemblies of the Reformed, and they established their own churches nearly half a century before an English word was heard in a Dutch church." The introduction of English preaching by the Rev. Dr. Laidlie, who was called by the Church of New York for this purpose, was the result of a long strife, and the commencement of a longer struggle against the use of this restrictive tongue. The damage to the Church from this cause alone was almost incalculable, keeping multitudes away from its sanctuaries, and driving many of the younger families into the Episcopal and Presbyterian churches. The first English sermon was preached in the church in New York in 1764 by Dr. Laidlie. The dependence of the American churches upon the mother Church in Holland for more than a hundred and fifty years also produced its natural results

in dwarfing their growth and diminishing their strength. They were mere attachments to a foreign body, without ecclesiastical organization on the spot, save by a consistory, with no powers of legislation, licensure, or ordination, with no college or theological seminary to supply a new ministry, distracted by internal troubles, and bound hand and foot by Old-World alliances, prejudices, and powers. The only wonder is that the Reformed Church maintained its separate existence, and that it achieved its independence at last. After the articles of union were adopted in 1772, the Revolutionary War added greatly to the embarrassments of the Church. Many ministers were obliged to leave their flocks for years. Church edifices were sometimes used for British cavalry stables and riding-schools, and military prisons; and the fairest portions of the goodly heritage were occupied by the opposing armies. After peace was declared, the Church grew slowly but surely, and laid the foundations of her educational and benevolent institutions upon a broad and enduring basis. The tenacity of the Dutch character is abundantly illustrated in the extreme difficulty with which this Church has been induced to break off its old traditional relationships and attachments to its foreign origin. It never has yielded one of them until it was compelled to do so by long conflicts.

IV. *Theological Standards.*—The doctrinal symbols of the Reformed Church in America, which are still the same with those of the Reformed Church in Holland, are, (1) the Belgic Confession; (2) the Heidelberg Catechism, and the Compendium of the Christian Religion, which is an abridgment of the Heidelberg Catechism, designed for the young and to prepare for the Lord's supper; (3) the Canons of the Synod of Dordrecht. The use of the Westminster Shorter Catechism in Sunday-schools has been also sanctioned by the General Synod. The Hellenbroek Catechism was formerly much employed by pastors and in Sabbath-schools, but it is now out of use.

These standards harmonize with each other, and in all essential points with the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England, with the Westminster Confession of Faith, and with the confessions of the Reformed churches of Germany, France, and Switzerland. The theology of the Reformed Church is "Calvinistic," in the moderate sense of that historical term, and it is Calvinistic simply because she believes it to be scriptural. The liberality with which she holds her standards is sufficiently attested by the very large number both of ministers and communicant members whom she has received from other evangelical bodies. The Heidelberg Catechism is held in the sense in which it is interpreted by the Synod of Dort.

V. *Church Government.*—The government of the Church, in common with that of all Reformed churches, is strictly Presbyterian. Her constitution recognises "the offices of the Church of Christ to be:

"1. Ministers of the Word.
"2. Teachers of theology.
"3. Elders.
"4. Deacons."

1. *Ministers of the Word.*—"No person shall be allowed to exercise the office of a minister without being regularly inducted thereto, according to the Word of God and the order established by the Church" (*Constitution*, art. ii, § 1). Great care is required in the education of students and in the examinations of candidates for the holy office by the classes, which have the power of licensure, ordination, and installation. The candidates for both licensure and ordination are required to sign certain "formulas," pledging themselves to a hearty belief and persuasion of the theological standards of the Church, and "diligently to teach and faithfully to defend the same without either directly or indirectly contradicting the same by our public preaching or writings." If difficulties, or doubts, or change of views occur respecting doctrine, they engage that they "will neither publicly nor privately propose, teach, or defend the same, either by preaching or writing, until they have first revealed such sentiments to the consistory, classis, or synod, that the same may be there examined; being always ready cheerfully to submit to the judgment of the consistory, classis, or synod, under the penalty of being, in case of refusal, *ipso facto* suspended from office." Other provisions, however, guard the rights of conscience and of individual judgment against any harsh or unjust treatment.

Ministers are regarded as bound to the service of the sanctuary for life, and are not at liberty to secularize themselves "except for great and important reasons, concerning which the classis shall inquire and determine." Superannuated and disabled ministers may be "declared *emeriti*, and be excused from all further service in the Church during such infirmity." In the case of pastors thus incapacitated and retired, congregations are required to provide a reasonable support, with the approval of the classis.

The parity of the ministry is effectually secured by the following article of the constitution: "All ministers of the Gospel are equal in rank and authority. All are bishops or overseers in the Church, and all are equal stewards of the mysteries of God. No superiority shall therefore be ever claimed or acknowledged by one minister over another, nor shall there be any lords over God's heritage in the Reformed churches" (art. ii, § 16).

Licentiates and ministers of churches with which the Reformed Church holds correspondence are received upon the usual certificates of dismission from those bodies; unless there be grounds of presumption against their doctrines and morals; and then inquiries are to be proposed to satisfy the classis as to the propriety of proceeding freely in each case. Foreign ministers must present their credentials before the classis prior to invitation by any consistory to preach in its church; and no classis can receive any such minister without strict observance of the rules of the Church provided for these cases. Ministers coming from non-corresponding bodies must always be examined respecting their theological views before they can be received.

2. *Teachers of theology*, or professors in the theological seminary, are to be appointed only by the General Synod—the office is for life, or during good behavior—"and to that synod a professor of theology shall always be amenable for his doctrine, mode of teaching, and moral conduct." He is also required to sign a constitutional formula expressing fidelity to the Church and her theological standards, etc. And, to complete the independence and personal responsibility of the professor to the General Synod, it is provided (art. iii, § 4), that "no professor, while in office, shall have the pastoral charge of any congregation, or be a member of any ecclesiastical assembly or judicatory; but, as a minister of the Gospel, may preach and administer, or assist in administering, the sacraments in any congregation, with the consent of the minister or consistory." Six months' notice of intention to resign his office must be sent to the president of the General Synod before it can be accepted by that body. Most of these provisions respecting teachers of theology are peculiar to the Reformed Church. Their practical effect has been excellent.

3, 4. *Elders* and *deacons.* See "Consistory," below.

VI. *Judicatories.*—These are:

1. The Consistory.
2. The Classis.
3. The Particular Synod.
4. The General Synod.

1. *The Consistory* is the primary ecclesiastical body, corresponding to the *session* of the Presbyterian Church. It is composed of the *minister, elders, and deacons* of a Church. To the *elders*, with the minister, are committed the chief spiritual functions of the Church, especially in admitting persons to the communion, in maintaining discipline, and in choosing delegates to the classis. To the *deacons* is confided the care of the poor. "When joined

together in one board, the elders and deacons have an equal voice in whatever relates to the temporalities of the Church, to the calling of a minister, or the choice of their own successors, in all which they are considered the general and joint representatives of the people" (art. vi, § 2). In New York and New Jersey the minister, elders, and deacons constituting the consistory are the legal trustees of the corporate rights and property and temporal interests of the churches which they represent. It is believed that this plan possesses superior advantages to that which prevails in the Presbyterian churches, which have a separate board of trustees, chosen from the congregation, and are often composed of men who are not professors of religion.

In another important respect the consistory of the Reformed Church differs from the session of the Presbyterian Church. In the latter the elders are chosen for life, and thus make a permanent body of officers. In the Reformed Church elders and deacons are elected by the male communicants for two years. The term of one half of the consistory expires each year; they are eligible for immediate re-election if it is deemed desirable to retain their services, and this often occurs. This principle of rotation in office has its obvious and great advantages, harmonizing with our republican system of government in Church and State, bringing gradually into active service all the best available talent of each congregation, and permitting such changes as may be demanded for the welfare of the Church and congregation without giving needless offence to any who may pass out of office.

The *Great Consistory* is an *advisory* body, intermediate between the consistory and the classis, and is composed of all who have previously been elders and deacons in the same Church. This arrangement works admirably in cases upon which the acting consistory may need counsel; as, for instance, in the settlement of a pastor, the erection of Church buildings and parsonages, etc. This is an institution peculiar to the Reformed Church alone in this country, and has stood the test of the whole history of its organization.

In this way also the Presbyterian principle of "once an elder always an elder" is practically preserved, the official character of both elders and deacons being recognised in this body, although they may not be in active service in the consistory. Besides this, it often happens that persons who have not been acting as elders in any given Church for many years are appointed and sit as delegates in the Particular and General synods.

2. *The Classis* is the body next above the consistory, and corresponds to the Presbytery of the Presbyterian Church in its general organization and functions. It is composed of not less than three ministers, and one elder from each Church represented, within certain limits which are prescribed by the Particular Synod. Stated meetings are held twice a year. To the classis belongs the right to license, ordain, install, dismiss, suspend, and depose ministers, to exercise a general supervision over the spiritual interests and concerns of the several churches, and to try and decide cases of appeal from judicial decisions of consistories, subject also to appeal to the Particular Synod. For promoting the doctrinal purity, the spiritual interests, and the general welfare of the churches each consistory is required annually, at the spring session of classis, to present a full report, in writing, with statistical information respecting its religious condition. At the same meeting the following constitutional questions are asked of every pastor and elder:

1. Are the doctrines of the Gospel preached in your congregation in their purity, agreeably to the Word of God, the Confession of Faith, and the Catechisms of our Church?
2. Is the Heidelberg Catechism regularly explained, agreeably to the Constitution of the Reformed Church?
3. Are the catechising of the children and the instruction of the youth faithfully attended to?
4. Is family visitation faithfully performed?
5. Is the 5th section, 2d article, 2d chapter of the Constitution of our Church (which relates to oversight and discipline of Church members) carefully obeyed?
6. Is the temporal contract between ministers and people fulfilled in your congregation?

The replies are required to be noted in detail in the minutes of the classis, and sent up to the Particular Synod for inspection. It is now also required to report whether the contributions enjoined by the General Synod for specific benevolent objects have been taken in each church.

3. *The Particular Synod* dates back to the year 1794. Previous to that time the only ecclesiastical bodies were the consistory, classis, and synod, or, as they were denominated, the Particular and General bodies. These met annually. The first synodal assembly was only provisional; it possessed and exercised the right to examine students of theology for licensure until the year 1800. This function was afterwards devolved upon the classes alone. The Particular Synod is a court of appeal in judicial cases which are carried up from the classes. It has power to form new classes, to transfer congregations from one classis to another, and has a general supervisory power over its classes. It also confirms the nominations of the classes for delegates to the General Synod. It meets annually, and is composed of four ministers and four elders from each classis.

The four Particular synods now existing are those of *New York*, organized in 1800, composed of nine classes; *Albany*, organized in 1800, composed of ten classes; *Chicago*, organized in 1856, composed of five classes; *New Brunswick*, organized in 1869, composed of nine classes. At the session of the General Synod held in 1869 the Particular synods were reorganized upon the basis of a plan which is intended to increase their previously limited powers, and to bring them into more systematic and direct contact with the spiritual interests and benevolent agencies of the Church. See *Minutes of Gen. Synod*, 1869, p. 626, 633.

4. *The General Synod.*—The long conflict between the cœtus and conferentie which ended in 1771 resulted in an assembly of representatives of both parties, who styled themselves "A Reverend Meeting of Ministers and Elders." They organized what were called a "General" and five "Particular" bodies, which were subsequently called by the names familiar in Holland, "synod" and "classis." The General Body was merely a provincial and provisional assembly—a sort of ecclesiastical bridge over which the Church passed from her dependence upon the mother Church in Holland to her condition of real independence and separate American organization. At first it was a conventional assembly, consisting of all the ministers in the Church, with an elder from each separate Church. It met triennially. In 1800 it was made a delegated body, consisting of eight ministers and eight elders from each of the two Particular synods of New York and Albany, which were constituted in that year, only two ministers and two elders being admitted from each classis. In 1809 the delegation was increased to three ministers and three elders, who are nominated by each classis and confirmed by their respective Particular synods. By the present Constitution, each classis having more than fifteen churches is entitled to one additional delegate for each additional five churches. In 1812 the sessions were made annual. This body meets on the first Wednesday in June, and it continues in session about ten days. It exercises a general supervision over the entire Church. It is the court of last resort in appeals of judicial cases from the lower bodies. It has power to form and change the Particular synods. It elects professors of theology and has supreme control of the theological seminaries. The benevolent boards of the Church are its creations. It maintains friendly correspondence with various ecclesiastical assemblies of other denominations. It has no power to alter or amend the Constitution of the Church, but can only recommend such changes, which must be submitted, through it, to

the classes, and can be adopted only by the votes of a majority of these bodies. The General Synod was incorporated in 1818 by an act of the Legislature of the State of New York.

The fiscal concerns of the whole Church are managed under this charter by the *Board of Direction of Corporation*, which is elected annually by the General Synod, and consists of a president, three directors, and a treasurer. The personal and real estate and all the synods' property are confided to the custody of this board, which is thus made the chief fiscal agent of the Church. Its affairs are reported annually to the synod. For more than sixty years it has managed its large trust with the most exemplary diligence, fidelity, and success, and with scarcely the loss of a dollar from all its investments. The board reported in 1878 that the assets in the hands of the treasurer, June 1, amounted to $451,411.69; this was in addition to the large real estate owned by the synod at New Brunswick, N. J., in the buildings and grounds of the theological seminary, and in those of Hope College, at Holland, Mich.

VII. *Usages.*—1. *Mode of Worship.*—All the Reformed churches of the Continent adopted liturgies for the observance of public worship, including the offices for the administration of sacraments, the ordination of ministers, elders, and deacons, and for the infliction of discipline in excommunication, etc. The Scottish Reformer John Knox prepared a liturgy for the Church of Scotland which was used for some time, but which was ultimately swept away by the same anti-ritualistic storm in which Puritans and Presbyterians were driven to the opposite extreme of bold simplicity in public worship. The liturgy of the Reformed Church of Holland—with the omission only of a prayer in the marriage service and an article on the consolation of the sick—is accurately given in the English translation, which is now in use in the Reformed Church of America. It is "precisely what it was in 1619, and substantially as when first adopted in 1568 by the Synod of Wesel." Like all the Reformed liturgies, it is based on that of John Calvin. But its shape was given chiefly by John Alasco, the popular pastor of the Reformed Church in London, which numbered, under his ministry, over three thousand members, who were refugees from persecution in their native land. This Church still exists. Alasco also prepared a new liturgy, using his old one and that of Strasburg, a translation of which, from the French, was published by Pollanus, Calvin's successor, who founded a Church at Glastonbury, England. It was written in Latin, and then, in 1551, translated into Dutch by John Uytenhove, an elder of the Church in London. The liturgy of the Reformed Church in the Netherlands was prepared by Peter Dathenus, an eminent minister, who, when driven from Holland by persecution, settled with some of his fellow-exiles in the Palatinate at Frankenthal, near Heidelberg. He first translated the Heidelberg Catechism into the Holland language, and also the psalms of Beza and Marot from their French originals. He dedicated the volume containing these symbols (psalms, catechism, and liturgy) "to all the churches and ministers of Jesus Christ sitting and mourning under the tyranny of antichrist." Subsequently, the "Form for Adult Baptism," and the "Consolation of the Sick and Dying," and the "Compendium of the Christian Religion," a condensation of the Heidelberg Catechism—which was in place of another brief catechism—for persons who intended to unite with the Church, were issued. In 1574 the Synod of Dordrecht directed the liturgy to be used in all the churches. For a full account see *Eutaxia, or the Presbyterian Liturgies*, ch. xi; and Prof. Demarest's *History and Ecclesiastical Characteristics of the Ref. Ch.* ch. viii.

The liturgy is officially declared to be a part of the Constitution of the Reformed Church (*Minutes of Gen. Synod*, iv, 425, 426). The offices for the administration of baptism and the Lord's supper, for ordination of ministers, elders, and deacons, and those for excommunication and for readmitting the excommunicated are also declared by the Constitution to be essential, and must be used. The forms of prayer, marriage-service, etc., are not essential, but simply remain as formulas and specimens, which may or may not be used, at the option of the minister. The prayers were used for a time, but always in connection with extempore prayer. Since the latter part of the 17th century they have been dropped in public worship in Holland. When English preaching had been established in the Church of New York, three years after Dr. Laidlie's advent, a translation of this liturgy into English—which is more accurate and faithful than elegant in style—was procured and introduced by the collegiate consistory. The same year also (1767) singing in the English language was commenced in that Church. The volume used was an amended edition of Brady and Tate's version, in which the old music was retained and the rhyme adapted to it. See PSALMODY.

Several attempts have been made to revise the liturgy, all of which have failed of final adoption by the classes, to whom, under the constitution, they were referred for final decision.

2. *Other Customs* (essential and non-essential).—In 1814 the General Synod adopted a report of a committee on this subject which is still the law of the Church. The essential customs and usages which are deemed necessary to be continued in the Church are expressed in the explanatory articles of the constitution; such as singing the psalms and hymns approved of and recommended by the General Synod; preaching from the Heidelberg Catechism; observing the forms in the administration of baptism and the Lord's supper, etc., as contained in the liturgy, etc. "Other customs and usages prevail in the Church which are deemed non-essential, and in many instances are either wholly dispensed with or partially retained in our congregations, according to the taste or circumstances of pastors or people; such as the arrangements observed in the performance of public worship—the number of times of singing psalms and hymns; reading sermons and preaching them from memory or extemporaneously; sprinkling in baptism one or three times; sitting or standing in receiving the Lord's supper; preaching on Ascension-day, Good-Friday, and other days which have long been observed both in Holland and America" (*Minutes*, 1814, p. 31, 32). In the Constitution adopted in 1832, however, "for the purpose of uniformity in the order of worship," a directory is set forth which "is to be observed in all the churches." In Holland all the clergy wear the official pulpit dress or gown during their performance of public worship. In this country the custom prevails chiefly in the cities of Philadelphia, New York, Albany, Newark, New Brunswick, etc., and in some of the country and village churches.

VIII. *Institutions.*—1. *Colleges.*—Zeal for the training and perpetuation of an educated ministry—which produced the unhappy division of the Church in the last century—soon led to various plans for the establishment of proper schools for that purpose in this country. Few ministers came from Holland; and the time, cost, and dangers, the difficulties and disappointments, incurred in sending youth to be educated in the universities of the mother country were too great to furnish a supply from this source. The number of churches rapidly outgrew the pastors. In 1754, in order to defeat the movements of the cœtus for independence, a plan was adopted, by a provision which was inserted in the charter of King's (now Columbia) College, in New York, giving the consistory of the Church of New York the right to appoint a professor of theology in that institution. But, fearing that such an arrangement would produce an episcopalian defection, the Rev. Theodore Frelinghuysen, of Albany, projected an academy or seminary, in which the Dutch language only should be used, and which should combine the advantages of both the German gymnasia and the university system. In 1759 he sailed for Eu-

rope to urge his project; but he never returned, having been lost at sea upon his homeward voyage. The conferentie opposed his plan, in a letter to the Classis of Amsterdam, and it perished with him.

Ten years later—in 1770—and chiefly by the powerful influence of Rev. Dr. Jacob R. Hardenbergh, its first president—a charter was obtained from governor William Franklin of New Jersey, then a British province, for a college, the object of which is stated to be "the education of the youth in the learned languages, liberal and useful arts and sciences, and especially in divinity, preparing them for the ministry and other good offices." It was called—in honor of the queen of George III—"Queen's College," and retained this name until, in 1825, it was changed—in memory of one of its principal benefactors, Col. Henry Rutgers—to "Rutgers College." It is located at New Brunswick, N. J. This institution was suspended during the Revolutionary War, and again in 1795, when it was revived, chiefly by the efforts of the Rev. Dr. Ira Condict, its vice-president. Dr. John H. Livingston was appointed president in 1810. But in 1816 its doors were closed again until, in 1825, it resumed its work, which has continued without interruption since that time. The centennial year was celebrated, with appropriate services, at the commencement held in June, 1870. A large endowment has been secured. The course of instruction has been greatly enlarged and the standard of scholarship elevated. The faculty is full, and the number of students in 1878–79 was 173. In 1864 *a scientific school* was organized in connection with the college, and designated by the Legislature of New Jersey "the State College for the Benefit of Agriculture and the Mechanic Arts," as provided for by an act of the Congress of the United States in 1862. It was opened in 1866. The course of study embraces mining, metallurgy, agricultural chemistry, civil engineering, and mathematics, with other branches of scientific education. The college possesses an astronomical observatory, a museum of natural history, an agricultural farm of one hundred acres, and ample facilities for the illustration of scientific studies. The grammar-school, which is as old as the college, occupies a large and appropriate building opposite the college grounds. The college faculty embraces a president, vice-president, eleven professors, and an assistant professor. The buildings include the main college edifice; Van Nest Hall, in which are the rooms of the literary societies and lecture-rooms; Geological Hall, which contains an armory, the museum of geology, mineralogy, and natural history, and the chemical laboratory; the Kirkpatrick Chapel, a large and handsome Gothic building erected in 1873, in which also is the library of the college; the Schenck Observatory; and the president's house. There are no dormitories belonging to the college. The library is of great value, although not adequate to the wants of the institution. The museum is extensive and contains many rare curiosities and specimens. Valuable prizes are given at each commencement to successful competitors in oratory, composition, classics, mathematics, mineralogy, spelling, English grammar, modern history, mental and moral philosophy, and for the best essay on Christian missions.

The Vedder Lectureship was founded by Mr. Nicholas F. Vedder, of Utica, who gave a fund of $10,000, in 1873, on this among other conditions, that the General Synod should "every year elect some member of the Reformed Church in America to deliver to the students of the seminary and of Rutgers College at least five lectures on the present aspects of modern infidelity, including its cause and cure." The following courses of lectures have been delivered upon this foundation: 1874, by Isaac S. Hartley, D.D., of Utica, on *Prayer and Modern Criticism;* 1875, by Tayler Lewis, LL.D., of Union College, on *Nature and the Scriptures;* 1876, by Talbot W. Chambers, D.D., of New York, on *The Psalter, a Witness to the Divine Origin of the Bible;* 1877, by William R. Gordon, D.D., of Schraalenberg, N. J., on *The Science of Revealed Truth Impregnable, as shown by the Argumentative Failures of Infidelity and Theoretical Geology.* All of these lectures have been published under the general title of *The Vedder Lectures.*

"Hope College," located at the city of Holland, Mich., was chartered in 1866, and grew out of a flourishing academy which was started as a civil and parochial school in the infancy of the colony of Hollanders, founded by the Rev. Dr. Albertus C. Van Raalte, on Black River and lake, in that state, in the year 1846–47. This institution embraces a preparatory school, collegiate, scientific, and theological departments, under the ecclesiastical supervision of the General Synod, and in the immediate charge of its council and faculty. It possesses ample college grounds, good buildings, an endowment of funds which are augmenting yearly, a tract of land called "the James Suydam farm of Hope College," after a great benefactor, and many appliances for a liberal training. The course of instruction is thorough, and will be expanded with the demands of the times. The faculty consists of a president and five professors, with subordinate teachers. The whole number of pupils in June, 1878, was 98, of whom 65 were in the preparatory department, and 33 in the academic course.

2. *Theological Seminaries.*—A professor of theology, Dr. John H. Livingston, was chosen in 1784, and at the same time Dr. Hermanus Meyer was appointed professor of languages, and two years later, also, as lector in theology. In 1792 Drs. Solomon Froeligh and Dirck Romeyn were appointed additional professors of didactic theology. Other appointments were subsequently made—Rev. Drs. John Bassett, Jeremiah Romeyn, and John M. Van Harlingen. All of these professors and lectors originally taught their students at their own places of residence. The seminary proper, under Dr. Livingston, was located in 1796 at Flatbush, L. I., and in 1804 was transferred to New York, where it remained until its final location, in 1810, at New Brunswick, N. J.

These facts substantiate the claim that the Reformed Dutch Church in America was *the first of all her Protestant sisters to reduce theological education to a system, the first to demand that it be in charge of a professional instructor,* and *the first to appoint a theological professor.* But for the outbreak of the Revolutionary war, her theological seminary would have been started in the year of American independence, 1776. Dr. Livingston occupied the professorial chair from 1784 to 1825; and previous to the removal to New Brunswick he and his colleagues sent forth 91 students into the ministry. After various ineffectual efforts to secure a proper endowment, the professorship was merged in Queen's College by a covenant between the synod and the trustees of that institution. In the year 1825, the seminary had three resident theological professors, and was fully organized. Additional articles of agreement were now entered into with the trustees, by which a theological college was organized, and the name changed from Queen's to Rutgers. Three years later, a Board of Education was established to care for beneficiaries. In 1865 another theological professorship was added, and the covenant between the synod and the trustees of Rutgers College formally annulled. The following year, Hope College was organized in Holland, Mich., and in a twelvemonth more a theological department in the same place. In the year 1856, Mrs. Anna Hertzog, of Philadelphia, donated $30,000 for the erection of a suitable edifice for the use of the seminary, upon the condition that it should bear the honored name of her deceased husband, "the Peter Hertzog Theological Hall." The building was speedily erected—three stories in height, 120 feet long—and contains a small chapel, double rooms for sleeping and study purposes, to accommodate about sixty students; lecture-rooms for the professors, rector's residence, and refectory. It stands in the midst of seven acres of land, which were also donated for the purpose by Messrs. James Neilson, David Bishop, and

Charles P. Dayton, and Francis and Wessell Wessells. The site is commanding. Three professors' houses have been built upon it, and another one, directly opposite, has been bought and presented to the General Synod by Messrs. James Suydam and Gardner A. Sage, of New York, at a cost of $18,000. Mrs. Hertzog also left by will $10,000 to be invested, the interest of which is to keep the hall in repair. By the munificence of its friends the building has been thoroughly refitted and furnished in the best manner to make it a pleasant Christian home for the students. In 1873 the James Suydam Hall was opened for use. This large, substantial, and costly building, containing a chapel, lecture-rooms, museum, and gymnasium, was the gift of the late James Suydam of New York, who laid its corner-stone but did not live to see it completed. Mr. Suydam also endowed the professorship of didactic and polemic theology which bears his name, in the sum of $60,000; and these, with various gifts and legacies to the theological seminary and other specific Church purposes, amount to more than $250,000. This was in addition to other bequests to the American Bible and Tract societies; and the seminary and the Bible Society were also made his equal residuary legatees. A bronze statue of Mr. Suydam, somewhat larger than life size, the gift of friends, was unveiled on the day of dedication of the hall. The Gardner A. Sage library building is the gift of the generous founder whose name it bears, and who superintended its erection and has provided for its maintenance and support. It is perfectly fire-proof, and combines every modern arrangement for heating, ventilation, light, and security from dust and other annoyances. It has room for about 100,000 volumes. The library at present numbers over 30,000 volumes, to which additions have been constantly made by donations, and principally from a fund of $53,763, of which a balance of about $15,000 remains unexpended. The selection of books is confided to a competent committee of the General Synod, in co-operation with the theological professors. The library has a very complete Biblical critical apparatus, including fac-similes of the Sinaitic, Vatican, and other MSS.; the *Acta Sanctorum* (Bollandist), 60 vols.; Migne's *Patrology*, 320 vols., embracing all the fathers, Greek and Latin; and many of the best and rarest editions of standard works imported from Europe.

The permanent endowment of the seminary, which is still in progress, now amounts to over $200,000, besides the real property held for its uses. There are four professors, and thirty-two students now in its classes, while the hall is filled with other young men of the college and preparatory school who are on their way to the ministry. The course of instruction is thorough, and embraces the usual departments of theological study in similar institutions, with the addition of those subjects which are specially related to the Reformed Church, such as the Confession of Faith, Canons of Dort, Heidelberg Catechism, the ecclesiastical polity, and the constitutional law of the denomination. The whole number of graduates from its establishment in 1810 to 1879 is 609. The government of the seminary is vested in the faculty and in a Board of Superintendents, which is chosen by the General Synod and meets annually. A standing committee of the synod has the charge of its temporal affairs.

The "Theological Seminary in Hope College" had for its first professor Rev. Cornelius E. Crispell, D.D., who was elected by the General Synod in 1867 to the chair of didactic and polemic theology, and the other professors in Hope College were invited to act as lectors. In 1869 two additional professors were elected. There is a Board of Superintendents, which consists of the Council of Hope College, with duties and prerogatives like those of the seminary at New Brunswick. The endowment of this institution has been begun. In 1878, on account of financial embarrassments, the theological department was suspended and the students went to other institutions. A few young men have gone out from its walls to preach the Gospel, two of them as foreign missionaries.

3. *Parochial Schools.*—A few of these are aided by the Board of Education. They are almost exclusively confined to the German and Holland Churches.

4. *Foreign Missions.*—From her earliest days, her ministers gave special care to the evangelization of the heathen Indians. During the existence of the United Foreign Missionary Society, she statedly contributed to its funds; and when that organization was dissolved, and its stations transferred to the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, she continued her efforts in connection with it. In 1832 the General Synod appointed its own Board of Foreign Missions, proposing to organize missions of their own Church to be conducted through the medium of its prudential committee. In 1836 the first band of missionaries went out to seek a settlement in Northern India, but subsequently located in the island of Borneo. After working a long while harmoniously in this relation, prompted by a desire to accomplish the utmost that might be gained by an independent denominational effort, it was thought most desirable to sever the connection existing between their society and that of the American Board. This was accordingly done in 1858. The number of members is twenty-four—one half being laymen, and one third elected annually by the General Synod. A number of missionaries at several times, under the auspices of the board, have been sent out to China, India, and Japan. Chief among the servants of the Church in the foreign field were the Rev. John Scudder, M.D., of the Madras Mission; the Rev. David Abeel, D.D., the first American missionary to China; and the Rev. Dr. Cornelius V. A. Van Dyck, the translator of the Arabic Bible, who, although in the employ of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, yet retains his relation to the Reformed Church, from which he went out as a missionary physician. The Mission to the Dyaks in Borneo was given up in 1849, some of the missionaries having been transferred to Amoy in China, and the others returned to America.

The China Mission was organized at Amoy in 1844, at the original suggestion of the Rev. David Abeel, D.D., who visited that city in 1842, just after it had been declared one of the five open ports. The first missionaries were Rev. Messrs. William J. Pohlman and Elihu Doty. Its prosperity has been wonderful. The Mission now (1879) consists of seven churches and seventeen stations, comprising, according to the last report, a membership of 598 communicants. Over these in Amoy and adjacent cities there are now four missionaries and four assistants, with three native pastors settled over and sustained by two churches in the city of Amoy and the Church of Kang-than and Opi. The Mission employs twelve native catechists or preachers and has eight students under theological instruction. A building for the theological students has been erected at Kolongsu, called "the Thomas De Witt Theological Hall." Contributions for religious and benevolent purposes from the native Christians in 1889 were $2866.70 in gold.

The Arcot Mission in India was organized in 1854, being composed of the sons of the celebrated missionary the Rev. John Scudder, M.D., of Madras, with their families. The Classis of Arcot was formed in 1854, with the clerical missionaries and three native elders. According to the report of 1877, the classis is composed of twenty churches, with a membership of 1755 communicants. With them are connected 86 stations and out-stations, the whole number of regular attendants upon the means of grace being 4398. Contributions for religious and benevolent purposes in 1889 amounted to $756 in gold. There are 8 missionaries and 6 assistants in this important field of labor, with 2 native pastors and 21 catechists, 26 Bible-readers, 28 teachers, and 19 colpor-

teurs. There are 4 seminaries for males and females, a preparandi school for training native catechists and pastors, and 97 day-schools with 2503 scholars. The missionaries and native helpers make frequent tours into the surrounding country. The statistics of this work for 1889 were, 18,006 sermons preached to 395,979 hearers, and 14,000 books and tracts distributed.

The press is used freely to print the Scriptures, catechisms, and practical, religious, and educational works. The hospital and medical dispensary at Arcot has received the highest official praise from lord Napier, the governor-general, and an increased allowance from the government. The number of patients treated in 1889 was 6358, an average of 17 per day. A medical class of young natives is connected with it. The Gospel is daily preached to all comers, and portions of the Scriptures, tracts, and good books are offered to all who can read. A simple and brief story of Christ's love to fallen man is carried away by every patient on the printed ticket given to him on his first application, and which he must show at each subsequent visit.

The Japan Mission originated at a monthly concert for prayer for missions held in Feb., 1859, in the South Reformed Church, New York, when one elder offered to give $800 per year to support a missionary in Japan, another made a similar promise, and the Church pledged itself for a third like sum. On May 7, 1859, the Board of Foreign Missions sent out three missionaries—Rev. Samuel R. Brown, M.D. (who had been a missionary in China for several years), Rev. Guido F. Verbeck, and D. Simmons, M.D., with their wives, and Miss Caroline E. Adriance—who reached Kanagawa Nov. 1 of that year. Rev. James H. Ballagh was sent out in 1862, and Rev. Henry Stout in 1868. Dr. Simmons and wife resigned in 1860, and Miss Adriance went to Amoy, where she became an assistant missionary, and died in 1863. She always bore her own expenses as a volunteer missionary. The missionaries engaged chiefly at Yokohama, Nagasaki, and Tokio in teaching the government schools, translating the Word of God, circulating the Scriptures, tracts, and books in Chinese, and instructing inquirers in the way of salvation. Mr. Ballagh began a Japanese religious service in 1866, the average attendance being about twenty persons. The first two native converts, Wakasa, a nobleman, and Ayabe, his younger brother, were baptized by the Rev. G. F. Verbeck, May 20, 1866, the day of Pentecost, at his residence in Yokohama. Wakasa's attention was first drawn to Christianity by a copy of the New Test. in English, which some Japanese picked up out of the water in the bay of Nagasaki, and which was probably lost overboard from an American or English ship. He did not rest until, five or six years after, he procured a Chinese translation of it, which he eagerly read. Thus this "bread cast upon the waters" was found "after many days" in the soul of the first Japanese convert to Christianity. In March, 1872, the first native Christian Church was organized by the Rev. James H. Ballagh at Yokohama with eleven members. In 1877 it had 145 communicants. The edifice in which it worships cost about $6000, of which the first thousand was given by the native Christians of Honolulu, Sandwich Islands. It seats about 450 persons. In 1889 there were 2 stations and 19 out-stations, and preaching-places with communicants enrolled to the number of 1969 belonging to this mission. The entire native contributions amounted to $8324.70. The mission has been very successful in the last three years.

The present missionary force of this Church in Japan consists of 9 missionaries and 11 assistant missionaries, with 18 native ordained ministers and 2 catechists or preachers. There is one academy at Yokohama, the Isaac Ferris Seminary, for girls, of whom there were 135 at latest date. A theological class or school of 32 young men is also established, under the instructions of the Rev. James L. Amerman. Another school for girls is at Nagasaki. The Rev. Dr. G. F. Verbeck has been for many years connected with the Imperial University at Yeddo, under the auspices of the government, and he has also been engaged with Drs. Brown, Hepburn, and others in the work of translation of English works into Japanese and of Japanese works into English. Of the large number of Japanese youth who came to this country for education, a score or more were students in Rutgers College and its grammar-school. Several of them have united with Christian churches in the United States, and some have gone back to Japan to preach the Gospel and to serve Christ in other stations. The outlook of this mission work in Japan is full of promise. Dr. Brown has long been engaged with Dr. Hepburn and others in translating the Bible into Japanese.

In addition to these Oriental Missions, the board has also co-operated with other missionary boards in the plan of Indian agencies under the government of the United States. The tribes assigned to it are the Pimas, Maricopas, and Papagoes; the Mohaves on the Colorado River Reserve; and the Apaches on the White Mountain Reserve, numbering in all about 9000 souls.

The Woman's Board of Foreign Missions, an efficient auxiliary to the Synod's Board, was organized in February, 1875. It has between fifty and sixty auxiliaries; is devoted to the increase and maintenance of woman's work for women in heathen lands; and contributes liberally to the general work. Its principal field is Nagasaki, Japan, where it has undertaken to establish a female seminary; and it has also begun to labor for China. It has published in an elegant volume, with maps and many illustrations on wood, a very complete *Manual of Foreign Missions of the Reformed Dutch Church in America* (8vo, 326 pp.).

The ordinary appropriations of the Board of Foreign Missions for the year ending June 1, 1879, were $55,600.

5. *Home Missions.*—The Board of Domestic Missions consists of twenty-four members, half of whom are laymen, and one third are elected annually by the General Synod. It was reorganized in 1849, with a corresponding secretary exclusively devoted to its service. Previous to this, for a number of years, the duties of that office were performed voluntarily by settled pastors. All the Reformed churches were on missionary ground until the independent organization of the denomination was secured in 1771. Soon after this event, ministers and elders were occasionally sent out upon tours of exploration among destitute populations to preach the Gospel, and to establish mission stations and churches. As the result of these labors, a few new churches were organized—one in Virginia, six in Kentucky, six in Lower Canada, and elsewhere in the regions of the Delaware and Susquehanna rivers, and Central New York. It was then determined to concentrate efforts nearer home, and the distant churches—some of which yet live in other denominations—were left alone. In 1822 the "Missionary Society of the Reformed Dutch Church" was organized in the city of New York. A Northern Board, located at Albany, was appointed by the Synod in 1828 to act under the society located at New York, and a new impetus was given to the work. In 1831 a new Board of Missions was constituted for the whole Church, all the mission work being confided to its care, of which the present board is the lineal successor. It was incorporated in 1867, and now holds its own funds. The Church Building Fund and the Sabbath-school interests of the denomination, excepting publications, are confided to its care. More than half of the churches of the denomination owe their existence to the fostering care of this board. In the West, nearly the whole of the English churches of the Particular Synod of Chicago have grown up under its benign influence. The Holland churches have been mostly self-sustaining. During the year ending June, 1878, this board aided 102 churches, of which fifty-eight were at the East, forty-two in

the West, and two in the South. The number of families in the Mission churches was 6787 and 8896 Church members, of whom 1040 were received during the year. There were 134 Sabbath-schools, with 11,339 scholars. The income from all sources for the missionary operations was $35,130.32. Since 1832 more than three hundred churches have been organized—about half of these in the single decade of 1850–60—and many of these under the auspices of this board. Thousands of Hollanders, most of whom are in this denomination, have settled in Michigan, Wisconsin, Iowa, and adjoining states during the last thirty years. These have formed an important element in the missionary growth and extension of the Church in the North-west. Of its nearly 79,000 members, about 11,000 are Hollanders.

6. The *Board of Education*, which was organized as a voluntary society in the city of New York in 1828, was adopted by the General Synod in 1832. It consists of twenty-four members, who are elected for three years each, one third of whom are elected annually. It has the immediate care of all the beneficiaries and educational interests of the Reformed Church, including such beneficiaries as receive aid from the Van Benschoten and Knox funds, which are held by the trustees of Rutgers College. Every beneficiary must be a member in good and regular standing in the Reformed Church, and must also have been a member of some Protestant Church for one year previous to making his application for aid. He must be recommended to the board by the pastor and consistory of the Church, and by the classis to which said Church belongs, after sustaining a satisfactory examination as to his need of assistance, and physical, mental, and spiritual qualifications for study and for the holy ministry. Every precaution is taken against the introduction or continuation of improper candidates. Repayment of all money received from the board is required from those who do not complete their course of ministerial preparation, unless they are, in the judgment of the board, providentially hindered. The board will accept from all beneficiaries after their licensure two years' service under the care of the Board of Domestic Missions, as a full satisfaction for all aid rendered to them by the Board of Education. This is a wise provision, which has secured many excellent young laborers in the home missionary field. All the students are considered as under the pastoral care of the corresponding secretary. In 1865 the powers of the board were enlarged to enable it to co-operate with the various classes in the establishment of academies and classical schools within their bounds. The board became incorporated in 1870, to enable it to hold legal possession of its funds and to secure others that may be devised to it by will. In addition to the Knox Fund ($2000), the Van Benschoten Fund ($20,313.57), the Smock Fund ($500), the Mandeville Fund ($2000), and the Voorhees Fund ($26,000), which are held by the trustees of Rutgers College, and the interest of which is paid out to beneficiaries of this board, it holds twenty-five scholarships, ranging from $1700 to $10,000, making in all a capital of over $120,000, besides the annual Church collections and private donations, amounting in 1877–78 to $11,299.74—all for the education of young men for the ministry. It also holds certain trust funds for Hope College, and receives moneys for parochial schools which are under its care. The total income for the year ending June 1, 1878, was $33,508, and the total number of young men under its care for the same period was eighty-three.

About one third of the present ministry of the Church have been aided by this board in their studies for the sacred office. Its beneficiaries are not confined to any particular *literary* institution, but must study theology in one of the seminaries of the Reformed Church.

7. The *Board of Publication* was organized in 1855 by authority of the General Synod. It consists of twelve ministers and twelve laymen, one third of whom are elected annually by the Synod. To it are "intrusted, with such directions as may from time to time be given by the General Synod, the superintendence of all the publications of the Reformed Church, and the circulation of such works pertaining to the history, government, doctrines, and religious literature of said Church and of other evangelical denominations as shall be properly approved." It has a corresponding secretary and general agent, and a depository located in the city of New York. Its printing and binding are done by contract. It publishes a semi-monthly newspaper called the *Sower and Gospel Field*, which is the accredited organ of all the boards of the Church. The catalogue of its books and tracts, for denominational and general uses, is large, and constantly receiving new additions. Sales are made at a moderate profit. Gratuitous distributions and liberal discounts are made to weak churches, poor Sunday-schools, and for missionary purposes. During the civil war in the United States, it sent forth large gratuitous supplies into the armies of the Union; and since the cessation of hostilities it has done a good and large work of benevolent circulation in the South, particularly among the freedmen. In India it has published the Heidelberg Catechism in Tamil during the year ending June, 1870; and a supply of its elementary books for Sabbath-school and general instruction has been asked for and sent to Japan for use in the government schools under the care of the missionaries of the Reformed Church. The total assets of the board, June 1, 1878, were reported to the Synod as $12,343.64. Receipts for the year, $9,102.39.

8. The *Widows' Fund*, or *Relief Fund*, for disabled ministers and the widows and orphaned children of deceased ministers, was organized in 1837. Its benefits are limited to subscribing ministers who may pay $20 in full, or $10 or $5 annually, and who shall receive, pro rata, the annuities which may be due upon personal disability, or, at their own decease, by their families. Congregations are urged to secure an interest in the fund for their pastors by making the requisite contribution yearly. The funds, which are intrusted to the Board of Direction of Corporation, are invested in bonds and mortgages and in government bonds. One half of the annual payments by ministers, and donations, when specially directed by the donor, are considered income; the other half of the annual payments by ministers, all other donations, and church collections, are considered as principal, and the interest thereof only is used as income. The maximum amount to be paid to parties interested in the fund are: to a minister disabled by sickness or age, $200 per year; to a minister's widow, $200; to children of clergymen, both of whose parents are deceased, $75 per year each until they are sixteen years of age. Other provisions regulate minor payments. The amount of each annuity is of course dependent upon the number of annuitants, and may vary yearly. The maximum may be increased when the state of the fund shall warrant it. The amount of this fund June 1, 1878, was $49,307.99; and the sum paid to annuitants during the previous year was $2,259.99.

9. The *Disabled Ministers' Fund*, which reaches a class who cannot avail themselves of the Widows', or Relief, Fund, was organized in 1855, under the title of the Sustentation Fund. It is also in trust of the Board of Direction of Corporation. Its moneys are to be kept invested, and to be "used for the support of disabled ministers and the families of deceased ministers, *when such may be in need*." Applications for aid are made through and recommended by the classes to which the applicants belong. Contributions which are donated specifically for principal are so used; all other contributions go to the yearly disbursements, and any surplus that remains is carried to principal and placed at interest upon first-class securities. Aged and infirm ministers are thus assisted, and also the needy families of deceased clergymen. The amount of this fund reported June 1, 1878, was $19,614.85, of which $14,222 was appropriated to its beneficiaries.

10. The *Church-building Fund* is held in trust and dispensed by the Board of Domestic Missions at its discretion. Aid is given from it only to churches which shall have no debt after receiving assistance from this fund. A first bond and mortgage is taken from such church, and the Domestic Board may remit the interest thereon; but the church must then make a yearly contribution for the fund; and every church aided is to pay back the aid received as soon as practicable. The receipts for the year ending June 1, 1878, were $9,659.80.

IX. *Correspondence.*—The General Synod holds official correspondence, by interchange of delegates (or by letter), with the following ecclesiastical bodies: the Synod of the Canada Presbyterian Church; the General Synod (triennial) of the (German) Reformed Church in the United States; the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States; the General Synod of the Reformed Presbyterian Church; the General Assembly of the United Presbyterian Church of North America; the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States (South); the General Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in the United States; and the General Council of the Reformed Episcopal Church. With the Reformed Church in South Africa, and the Waldenses of Piedmont, occasional correspondence is held by letter, and also with the Free Church of Scotland and other ecclesiastical bodies in Europe. The spirit of this correspondence is well described by one of the Church's most venerated ministers, in these words, respecting her *catholic sentiments and action:*

"Our Church has been distinguished by a steady and united adherence to her standards and order, and at the same time by a kind and friendly relation to other evangelical denominations. She has enjoyed peace within her own bosom, while agitating questions have troubled, and even rent, other churches. She has borne a full proportionate share in contributions to Christian benevolent institutions, such as the American Bible Society, the American Tract Society, and others. She is desirous and anxious, in a sense of privilege and responsibility, to employ greater efforts for increasing the degree and extent of her influence in doing all she can for the spread of the Gospel and the salvation of souls. Her pacific character, her freedom from the ultraisms of the day, her evangelical principles, the peculiar features of her government and order, and the attitude in which she has been found by the side of other evangelical denominations, all tend to commend her to the favorable regard of all the friends of evangelical truth who desire the 'peace and prosperity' of the Church of Christ."

X. *Statistics.*— 1. *Numbers and Funds.*—In June, 1878, the Reformed Church embraced 4 particular synods, 33 classes, 505 churches, 542 ministers, 6 candidates for the ministry, 43,490 families, 78,666 communicants, of whom were received during the previous year 3943 on confession and 1966 by certificates; baptisms of infants, 3874; of adults, 1044; catechumens, 24,445; Sabbath-school scholars, 80,109; contributions for religious and benevolent purposes, $203,103; for congregational purposes, $788,222. In July, 1889, there were returned 546 churches, 566 ministers, 88,812 communicants.

2. *Periodicals.*—The *Christian Intelligencer*, weekly, owned and edited by private individuals; the *Sower and Gospel Field*, semi-monthly paper, organ of the Church boards; and *The Mission Monthly*, published by the Board of Foreign Missions.

XI. *Denominational Literature.*—The following are some of the most important publications:

1. *Theological and Exegetical.*—John H. Livingston, D.D., late Professor of Didactic and Polemic Theology, *Lectures on Theology;* an *Analysis* by Rev. Ava Neal (1 vol. 12mo, out of print); James S. Cannon, D.D., Professor of Church History and Government and Pastoral Theology, *Lectures on Pastoral Theology* (1 vol. 8vo, 616 pp.), an exhaustive work; Alexander McClelland, D.D., Professor of Biblical Criticism and Sacred Languages, *Canon and Interpretation of Scripture* (1 vol. 12mo, 336 pp.); John T. Demarest, D.D., *Commentaries on the 1st and 2d Epistles of Peter* (2 vols. 8vo); John T. Demarest, D.D., and William R. Gordon, D.D., *Christocracy* (1 vol. 12mo); other works by W. R. Gordon, D.D.: *Child's Guide in Reading the Scriptures*, 132 pp.; *Supreme Godhead of Christ*, 188 pp.; *Particular Providence Illustrated by the Life of Joseph*, 492 pp.; *A Threefold Test of Modern Spiritualism*, 408 pp.; *The Church of God and her Sacraments*, 208 pp.; A. R. Van Nest, D.D., *Life and Letters of George W. Bethune, D.D.* (1869, 1 vol. crown 8vo); Geo. W. Bethune, D.D., *Lectures on the Heidelberg Catechism* (2 vols. crown 8vo); other works by the same author: *Sermons* (1 vol.); *Orations and Addresses* (1 vol.); *Poems* (1 vol.); *History of a Penitent*, being an exposition of Psalm cxxx (1 vol.); *Early Lost, Early Saved* (1 vol.); *Fruit of the Spirit* (1 vol.); Rev. John Van der Kemp, *Sermons on the Heidelberg Catechism* (2 vols. 8vo, out of print); *The Vedder Lectures*, 1874, 1875, 1876, 1877. Among the American contributors to Schaff's edition of Lange's *Biblical Commentary* are Prof. Tayler Lewis, LL.D. (Genesis, Job, Ecclesiastes), M. B. Riddle, D.D. (Romans, Galatians, Ephesians, Colossians), T. W. Chambers, D.D. (Amos, Zechariah), John Forsyth, D.D., LL.D. (Joel), and C. D. Hartranft, D.D. (Numbers). A critical edition or version of the *Heidelberg Catechism* is now in process of preparation by a Committee of Synod, of which a tentative copy, with a historical introduction, was published in *Minutes of General Synod*, 1878, p. 185–222. See also list of works issued by the Board of Publication, including three vols. of *Tracts* and many miscellaneous books illustrating the history, polity, theology, and usages of the Reformed Church. Besides these are a number for general circulation, and not denominational. The *New Brunswick Review*, edited by the late Prof. John Proudfit, D.D., reached only a few numbers; the *Evangelical Quarterly Review*, edited by Rev. Joseph F. Berg, D.D., late professor of didactic and polemic theology, extended over about two complete volumes. Both of these reviews are valuable contributions to the literature of the Church.

2. *Historical and Biographical.*—Brodhead, *History of New York* (2 vols.); *Colonial History of New York* (3 vols.); *Documentary History of New York* (4 vols.); David D. Demarest, D.D., Professor of Church Government and Pastoral Theology, *History and Characteristics of the Reformed Protestant Dutch Church* (1 vol. 12mo, 221 pp.); Benjamin C. Taylor, D.D., *Annals of the Classis and Township of Bergen* (1 vol. 12mo, 479 pp.); Sprague, *Annals of the Reformed Dutch Church*, vol. ix, with historical introduction; Rev. E. T. Corwin, *Manual of the Reformed Church in America* (1 vol. 8vo; 2d ed. revised and enlarged, 1879), an invaluable work; Alex. Gunn, D.D., *Memoirs of Rev. John H. Livingston, D.D.* (1 vol. 12mo); *Magazine of the Reformed Dutch Church* (1827, 4 vols.), containing a valuable series of articles by the late Rev. John B. Romeyn, D.D., on the history of the Reformed Church in Holland and in this country; Rev. John A. Todd, D.D., *Memoirs of Rev. Peter Labagh, D.D.* (1 vol. 12mo); E. P. Rogers, D.D., *Historical Discourses on the Reformed Protestant Dutch Church in Albany* (1858, 1 vol. 8vo, 120 pp.); Thomas De Witt, D.D., *Reformed Dutch Church in New York* (1857, 1 vol. 8vo, 100 pp.); *One Hundred and Fiftieth Anniversary of the Reformed Church in New Brunswick, N. J.*, memorial volume, Richard H. Steele, D.D., pastor (1867, 1 vol. 8vo, 222 pp.); Francis M. Kip, D.D., *One Hundred and Fiftieth Anniversary of the Reformed Church in Fishkill, N. Y.* (1866, 64 pp.); *Minutes of the General Synod*, 1771–1870; *Constitution and Digest of Acts of General Synod* (revised, 1874); articles published in the *Christian Intelligencer* by Thomas De Witt, D.D., mostly from original documents procured by loan from the Classis of Amsterdam, Holland, and others from John R. Brodhead, Esq., the historian of New York; W. Carlos Martyn, *The Dutch Reformation* (Amer. Tract Society, N. Y., 1870, 1 vol. 12mo); *Eutaxia, or the Presbyterian Liturgies*, by a Presbyterian Clergyman (New York, M. W. Dodd, 1855, 259 pp.); Rev. George R. Williamson, *Life of David Abeel, D.D.;* Rev. J. B. Waterbury, *Life of Rev. John Scudder, M.D.; Works* of Dr. Scudder and Dr. Abeel; Von Alpen, *History of the Hei-*

delberg Catechism, translated by Prof. J. F. Berg, D.D. (Phila. 1854, 1 vol. 8vo). Dr. Berg also published several volumes on prophecy, the Second Advent, Church and State, etc.; *Centennial Discourses*, a series of twenty-two sermons delivered in the year 1876 by order of the General Synod, intended to set forth the relations of the Reformed Church to liberty and to faith and education, and other topics appropriate to the Centennial year of the republic (8vo, 601 pp.). *Quarter-Millennial Anniversary of the Reformed Protestant Dutch Church of the City of New York*, 1628–1878 (1879, 8vo, 104 pp.). (W.J.R.T.)

Reformed Episcopal Church, the official designation of a distinct body of Christians in America and Great Britain.

I. *History.*—This ecclesiastical organization took its rise in the city of New York December 2, 1873. The Rt. Rev. George David Cummins, D.D., assistant bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the diocese of Kentucky, separated from that Church, in a letter to presiding bishop Smith dated November 10, 1873. Within one month from that date, the Reformed Episcopal Church was organized, with Dr. Cummins as its first bishop. Bishop Cummins was born December 11, 1822. He was related on the maternal side to the celebrated bishop Asbury, of the Methodist Episcopal Church, but was of Episcopal descent on both sides. He was graduated at Dickinson College, Carlisle, in 1841, in the nineteenth year of his age. In the year 1843 he became connected with the Episcopal Church, and in 1845 was ordained to the diaconate by bishop Alfred Lee, of the diocese of Delaware. After a ministry of great eloquence, power, and success in different prominent fields of labor during twelve years, he was consecrated to the episcopate as assistant bishop of the diocese of Kentucky in 1866. During October, 1873, the Evangelical Alliance met in New York city. Bishop Cummins was in attendance, and on the eighth day of that month delivered an address on the subject—*Roman and Reformed Doctrines on the Subject of Justification, Contrasted.* On the 12th, Sunday, the bishop participated in a joint communion in the Presbyterian Church of which Dr. John Hall is the pastor, delivering an address and administering the cup. The storm of adverse criticism that followed this act served to mature and intensify the conviction that had been gathering form and volume before in the bishop's mind, that the Church he had loved and served so well had fully and finally drifted from its old evangelical and catholic position. It was about this time, just at what point we do not know, that the thought of a separation from the old Communion arose, and ripened into fixed purpose. The first outward movement looking towards the organization of a separate Communion took place October 30. An account of the meeting then held is here given in the language of a prominent clergyman—Rev. Dr. B. B. Leacock—who was present and participated in its deliberations:

"By invitation of bishop Cummins, five clergymen and five laymen were brought together at the residence of Mr. John A. Dake, of New York city. The bishop startled them by announcing his determination of withdrawing from the Protestant Episcopal Church. When urged to reconsider his decision, he promptly stated that this was not debatable ground—that it was a question between himself and God, and as such he had settled it, and that his determination was unalterable. He then said that his object in calling us together was to advise as to his future. There were two propositions before him. He had been invited to go to Mexico, and give himself to the work of the organization and building-up of the Church of Jesus. Should he do this? or should he remain in this country, and here exercise his ministry and his episcopal office? Those who felt free to speak advised his remaining in this country by all means, and then and there he determined that this country should be the 'sphere of labor' to which he would transfer his 'work and office.' Steps were taken before the adjournment of this meeting looking towards placing in the hands of the printer the book which the bishop refers to in his letter of resignation, written Nov. 10—'I propose to return to that Prayer-book sanctioned by William White.' We may regard this meeting as the first movement, outside of bishop Cummins himself, towards the formation of the Reformed Episcopal Church."

November 10, the bishop addressed a letter to bishop Smith, his superior in the diocese of Kentucky, and the presiding bishop of the general Church, resigning his position as a bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church. On the 12th of November he paid an unannounced visit to the Rev. Marshall B. Smith, at Passaic, N. J., seeking rest and quiet of mind. Mr. Smith had withdrawn from the same church, for the same causes, and connected himself with the ministry of the "Reformed Church of America" in the year 1869. During this visit, without any prearrangement, he was met by the Rev. Mason Gallagher, who had also withdrawn from the Protestant Episcopal Church in 1871, and Col. Benjamin Aycrigg, a prominent layman of that church in New Jersey, who had withdrawn October 30, 1873. These gentlemen testify that, in the deeply serious and interesting interview, which was greatly protracted, there was, in the beginning, no foreshadowing of its practical issue. They cannot recall the precise point in the conversation where the thought of concerted action took shape. Under what they fully believe Divine guidance, that thought did rise, take form and body, and grow into purpose, until, in the form dictated by the bishop, the call for a meeting of clergymen and laymen of like mind was written and issued. It was in these words, inserted here as important history:

"New York, Nov. 15, 1873.

"Dear Brother,—The Lord has put into the hearts of some of his servants who are, or have been, in the Protestant Episcopal Church, the purpose of restoring the old truths of their fathers, and of returning to the use of the Prayer-book of 1785, set forth by the General Convention of that year, under the especial guidance of the venerable William White, D.D., afterwards the first bishop of the same church in this country. The chief features of that Prayer-book, as distinguished from the one now in use, are the following: 1. The word 'priest' does not appear in the book, and there is no countenance whatever to the errors of sacerdotalism. 2. The Baptismal Offices, the Confirmation Office, the Catechism, and the Order for the Administration of the Lord's Supper contain no sanction of the errors of baptismal regeneration, the real presence of the body and blood of Christ in the elements of the communion and of a sacrifice offered by a priest in that sacred feast. These are the main features that render the Prayer-book of 1785 a thoroughly scriptural liturgy, such as all evangelical Christians who desire liturgical worship can use with a good conscience. On Tuesday, the second day of December, 1873, a meeting will be held in Association Hall, corner of Twenty-third street and Fourth avenue, in the city of New York, at 10 o'clock A.M., to organize an Episcopal Church on the basis of the Prayer-book of 1785—a basis broad enough to embrace all who hold 'the faith once delivered to the saints,' as that faith is maintained by the Reformed churches of Christendom; with no exclusive and unchurching dogmas towards Christian brethren who differ from them in their views of polity and Church order. This meeting you are cordially and affectionately invited to attend. The purpose of the meeting is to *organize*, and not to discuss the expediency of organizing. A verbatim reprint of the Prayer-book of 1785 is in press, and will be issued during the month of December. May the Lord guide you and us by his Holy Spirit.

"George David Cummins."

That meeting was held on the day appointed, and the "Reformed Episcopal Church" organized with eight clergymen and twenty laymen, all of whom were at the time, or had been, ministers or laymen in the Protestant Episcopal Church and actively identified with the Evangelical or "Low-Church" party in that Church, no one being allowed to vote but those who had signed the call. The Rev. Charles Edward Cheney, of Chicago, was elected bishop, his consecration to the office taking place later in the same month.

In justification of this action, writers in the interest of the Reformed Episcopal Church point to the actual state of the Evangelical school or party in the Protestant Episcopal communion. The errors and excesses of the Tractarian school had been in process of development for a period of nearly forty years. Often and thoroughly confuted on the ground of scriptural argument, they had grown to such widespread influence and strength as to be fast absorbing all the vital forces of

the Church. They had become proscriptive, and, by legislative enactment and judicial trials, were repressing evangelical life and energy. Efforts had been made to procure the condemnation and expulsion of these errors from the Church. The results were of so partial and inadequate a character as to encourage rather than check the reactionary movement towards mediæval error and superstition. Then efforts were made to secure revision of the Prayer-book, but only with humiliating failure. Petition after petition to the General Convention was treated with scarcely concealed contempt. Even the poor relief of liberty to use alternate phrases in the Baptismal Offices was unceremoniously denied to a numerously signed petition. In these efforts to obtain relief many participated who are not as yet in the Reformed Episcopal Church, but whose action shows how deeply and earnestly men who loved the pure truth of the Gospel then felt on the subject. Thus, at a meeting in Chicago, June 16 and 17, 1869, among others who strongly advocated revision of the Prayer-book was Rev. Dr. Andrews, of Virginia, one of the ablest presbyters of the Protestant Episcopal Church, and a member of the General Convention. Rev. Dr. Richard Newton, the present rector of the Church of the Epiphany, Philadelphia, introduced the following resolutions:

"*Resolved* (as the sense of this Conference), That a careful revision of the Book of Common Prayer is needful to the best interests of the Protestant Episcopal Church."

"*Resolved*, That all words and phrases seeming to teach that the Christian ministry is a priesthood, or the Lord's supper a sacrifice, or that regeneration is inseparable from baptism, should be removed from the Prayer-book."

These resolutions were unanimously adopted. But neither these nor any other efforts to obtain redress were of any avail. An imperious and haughty majority bound and held every conscience, and the Church followed the sacramentarian drift unchecked. Those who organized the Reformed Episcopal Church were convinced, by a long course of stubborn facts, that the cause dear to them, as the cause of the true Gospel of Christ, was at stake; that they must either sacrifice the truth or go outside of the old organization to defend and propagate it. Conviction and conscience led them to their action.

The Church thus taking shape in ecclesiastical history, though yet comparatively a small body, has, during the five years of its existence, grown, it is believed, with almost unexampled rapidity. Its apologists emphasize certain facts in this growth:

1. *The Extent of Territory it Covers.*—Christian denominations have, for the most part, been local in the early stages of their history, as the causes out of which they have sprung have been local. The imperative need of this Church is shown by the fact that it sprang up almost simultaneously in remote parts of the land, as from a soil quite prepared for the seed. Wherever the Episcopal Church was in existence, the reaction towards mediæval corruptions in doctrine and ritual was more or less pronounced; and the recoil from these developments of error equally decided. The Reformed Church took immediate and strong hold of many and widely separated communities, quickly absorbing all the means and ministers which the infant communion could supply. Within two years from its origin it held positions at various points from South Carolina to Vancouver's Island, on the extreme west of the British North American possessions. The Church is now planted firmly in fifteen states in this country, in the maritime provinces and the various larger cities in the Dominion of Canada. In May, 1877, the General Council resolved, in answer to repeated solicitations, to introduce its work into Great Britain and Ireland. Already that work has extended into some ten or twelve dioceses.

2. *The Friendliness with which this Church has been received by Protestant Christians and Churches.*—The old Protestant Episcopal Church had met with opposition in many places, and the habitual complaint of its ministers and missionaries was that the growth of the Church was hindered by the prejudice and unfriendly criticism of the people. The Reformed Episcopal Church finds no such difficulty. The people everywhere seem willing that it should take its place in the sisterhood of churches, and gather from all communities its appropriate elements. The freedom from assumption in this Church thus wins its welcome, and opens for it that path of progress which, it is believed, leads on to a great future.

3. *The Overruling Hand of God in Harmonizing Internal Differences among the Leading and Influential Minds in the Church.*—It is no easy thing, under the most favorable auspices, for a number of men severing their connection with an old organization and constructing a new, to agree together in anything like a moderate position. In this case the difficulty was enhanced by the circumstances of the separation. The men who left the old Church, though actuated by a common opposition to particular errors in that body, held views, in many cases, divergent in regard to the positive principles to be incorporated in the new organization. These differences have at times appeared so grave that no human wisdom could find a path through them along which all could travel in harmony. Some conservative by habit of mind; others with an equally strong tendency to reach out towards the true ideal of a Church for the age we live in; and all men, by the very necessities of their stand, of a somewhat independent tone of mind, it was found by them hard to yield individual and personal views and preferences far enough to coalesce in a really organic structure. In every case of difficulty in the councils arising from these causes, however, the Spirit of the Lord appeared to lead the way. His presence and agency was at times so manifest as to awaken lively emotions of wonder and gratitude. Though in this Church at present, as in all others where intelligent men are free to think and to maintain their views, all do not think alike in everything, there is perhaps as much harmony as can be found in any, and much more than marks most other, communions. In this fact of special divine guidance, this Church seems to see the pledge of future growth and success in its work.

II. *Doctrines and Usages.*—1. Speaking generally, the doctrines of the Reformed Episcopal Church may be identified as those of Orthodox and Evangelical Protestantism. The men who organized the Church were of that class of clergymen and laymen in the old Protestant Episcopal Church who had been largely associated with the Christians of other Protestant Churches, and harmonized with them in belief and practice. In their choice and adjustment of doctrinal standards, they could but give expression to this agreement. When they set forth in the "Declaration of Principles" the belief that "the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments are the Word of God, and the sole Rule of faith and practice," thus making the Bible the only ultimate fountain of authority in the settlement of religious questions; and when they revised the old Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England, not changing their substance, but making them more distinctive, and adapting them to present phases of life and thought, they but put the Church squarely on the great platform of Evangelical Christianity. This Church, if not broader, is somewhat less *particular* in its doctrinal basis than some of its sister Communions. Thus, like the old Episcopal Church, it holds in its bosom, and freely tolerates, clergymen of the Calvinistic and Arminian schools of thought. The eighteenth "Article of Religion," entitled "Of Election, Predestination, and Free Will," runs thus: "While the Scriptures distinctly set forth the election, predestination, and calling of the people of God unto eternal life, as Christ saith, 'All that the Father giveth me shall come to me,' they no less positively affirm man's free agency and responsibility, and that salvation is freely offered to all through Christ. This Church, accordingly, simply affirms these doctrines as the Word of God sets them forth, and submits them to the individual judgment of its members, as

taught by the Holy Spirit; strictly charging them that God commandeth all men everywhere to repent, and that we can be saved only by faith in Jesus Christ." This is the only distinct effort we are aware of to unite in one article of religion the two hemispheres of truth that lie, one on the side of divine sovereignty, the other on the side of man's freedom and responsibility. How far this effort has been successful, the judgment of Christian men must decide. One result of it, however, is evident. The general course of conviction among the clergy of this Church runs nearer the line of separation on these high ranges of doctrine than in most other Communions. The freedom to differ rather constrains to harmony than ministers to license. With but little disposition to censorious criticism, its ministers of either tendency of doctrinal thought find a fair field for united and harmonious action in extending and building up the kingdom of Christ.

In adopting the Nicene Creed as one of its symbols, this Church takes its stand on the historical Church doctrine of the Trinity, asserting not a mere modal distinction, but an essential, tri-personal distinction in the divine nature. Justification by faith, as held and taught by the clergy generally, is not a mere negative state of the remission of sin, but positive, resulting from the imputation of Christ's righteousness. The doctrines that cluster around these, as in a measure dependent upon them, are stated in the articles in harmonious and systematic order.

2. Among the distinctive usages of this Church, the following may be specially designated:

(*a.*) *Worship.*—The Reformed Episcopal is a Liturgical Church. Those who organized and those who, since its organization, have come into it and helped to form its system and direct its course in history, have been men either trained in the old Protestant Episcopal Church, where they had long practical experience of the value of liturgic forms in public worship, or convinced from experience, in churches whose worship is purely extemporal, of the importance of a liturgy from the actual lack of it. They have been convinced that the evils connected with liturgic services in the old parent Church are not justly chargeable to a liturgy as such, but to certain doctrinal corruptions retained in those services at the æra of the Reformation. During the reign of Edward VI, rapid strides were made in the line of a thorough Protestant revision of the Service-book. Under Mary the reforming work was undone, and the Romish worship restored. Elizabeth, in the spirit of statecraft, enforced a revision that should, if possible, unite in common worship both the Reformed and the Roman Catholic classes of her subjects. The two streams of doctrine were forced into one channel of Church liturgy, where they have been confined in incongruous mixture ever since. Out of the stream thus formed, and flowing down through history, the exhalations of sacramentarianism and ritualism in this age have risen. In the revision of the Reformed Episcopal Church, it is claimed, these elements of erroneous doctrine have been taken out of the stream. The liturgy in this Church embodies the richest and best contributions yielded by the most devout ages of the Church's history, shorn of the accretions of superstition and error gathered in the descent. Though it does not claim to be perfect, it does claim to be Protestant, evangelical, scriptural. As such, its use is made obligatory on occasions; and, by usage that is almost common law, is seldom omitted on any occasions of regular public worship. Yet provision is made for free prayer. Meetings for extempore prayer are encouraged, when the stately services of the liturgy are laid aside, either wholly or in part. Even on occasions of regular public worship, the minister is free to add, extempore, to the prescribed prayer. Dignity and propriety are thus united to that warmth and earnestness which a more unstudied way of approach to God is suited to enkindle. Thus the continued use of liturgic forms, with their chastening and educating influence, is secured by law, and also that liberty for times and seasons when, by rising out of the limits of prescription, worship can be adapted to all the demands of evangelistic and revival work. This, it is believed, is as near an approach as can be made to a perfect system of worship.

(*b.*) *Government.*—This is distinctly a Church of Law. Neither in the individual membership, nor in the relations of the separate churches, nor yet in the connection of the larger ecclesiastical divisions is the bond of union that of mere association, under any proper conception of that term. Opinion, whether it refer to doctrine, to polity, or to Christian life, finds its legitimate expression in the councils. In this way, in free debate, it passes by vote into particular law under the organic law expressed in the constitution; and then all, whether sections or persons, are bound by the law. The legal system is a body of canons like the old historical episcopal canon law, simply shorn of those arbitrary and tyrannical features of the old system derived from monarchical institutions in the State and autocratic episcopal rule in the Church. The application of a system of government, whether strong or weak, to actual life in a Church is not easy; for there is a constant tendency under ecclesiastical rule either to arbitrary severity or to the entire relaxation of discipline, according to the temper of persons and times and the class of influences that prevail. But it is believed important advantages attend this system of government by canon law. It is *stable* government. That system which is historical, having stood the test of the ages in the stress of human passion and the strife of opinion and interest, cannot but be strong and conservative. Canon law has ruled nearly all the Christian ages, adjusting itself to each age and growing into greater definiteness of form in each. If, in the purification of the doctrines of the Church, wisdom dictates, not the destruction, but the cleansing and reforming, of the system, it would seem to follow that the same wisdom teaches a like course in relation to government. Purify it, take away its tyranny; in place of its arbitrary and unequal distribution of powers and functions, introduce the checks and balances of enlightened statesmanship, and you have in the Church a fair analogy to law in the State, where the principles and forms of the Roman law are not arbitrarily thrown aside, but enlarged, purified, developed into that grand system that secures the rights of men under the Christian civilization of this modern age. Such is the work this Church has sought to do. It has purified and adapted the old system of canon law, not abandoned it. Thus it has united steadfastness and liberty in its scheme of government.

This system of government by canon law is a *safeguard against the spread of error.* Where the churches of an ecclesiastical organization are independent, or only connected by certain rules of association having no other than moral force, there is apt to be less jealousy and less exciting debate in the meetings of association, because the tendency of opinion and the results of controversy cannot crystallize into forms that bind under penalty. But this very fact is apt to lead to looseness of conviction and a light estimate of the responsibility of a teacher. And when error is taught, because the teacher cannot be arraigned under binding law, he cannot be hindered from spreading it to the full extent of his talents and influence. Under a system of canon law such as governs the Reformed Episcopal Church, such a result, with ordinary faithfulness on the part of those appointed to administer it, is impossible. Not only is dereliction in either doctrine or life liable to strict discipline, but the persons by whom and the processes in which such discipline is to be administered are prescribed, and the duty actually imposed upon the administrator. If soundness of doctrine can be enforced and innocency of life secured in a Church, such a system would seem to present the best means to the end.

(*c.*) *Constitution and Relations of the Ministry of this Church.*—In common with the parent Church, the Re-

formed retains a threefold distinction in the ministry—that of bishops, presbyters, and deacons. There is, however, this difference between the two communions in regard to the distinction in question. In the old Church it is generally regarded as a threefold distinction in *orders*. The prevailing view among the representative writers of that Church is that the Christian ministry is divinely constituted on the Jewish pattern, and answers, in the relations of the New-Test. Church, to the orders of high-priest, priest, and Levite in the Old-Test. economy. The Reformed Church rejects this view as unscriptural and unhistorical. The episcopate it regards as an *office* rather than a divine *order*. The opinion that the bishop is an apostle in the scriptural meaning of that term, and as such the divinely ordained fountain of Church authority and Church life, and that the presbyterate *descends* from the episcopate in virtue of this inherent power to create it and to constitute it as a separate order, is rejected by the Reformed Episcopal Church. Looking at the subject historically, it finds the precise opposite of this to be the true statement. In the earliest infancy of the Church, under apostolic agency, deacons and elders were ordained and their respective functions assigned. About the close of the apostolic age, the emergencies of the growing Church created a need for supervision, not merely of individual flocks by the presbyters as settled pastors, but of the general Church, both pastors and flocks. This want was supplied by a gradual process, in which able and prominent presbyters were elevated to a general superintendence of the churches. Thus they became ἐπίσκοποι, overseers by pre-eminence, presbyters in *order*, bishops in *office*. The Reformed Episcopal Church observes this distinction. Its episcopate, as in primitive times, is an office of supervision, not an order of divine command, separated from the presbyterate and with inherent control over it.

According to this scheme, the bishop has no inherent and necessary rights and powers above the legislative control of the Church. He cannot fall back upon essential, divinely given, irresponsible authority to rule. His office and its functions are, under God, wholly from the Church, to which, therefore, he is, in the entire range of his official position and work, responsible. Episcopal tyranny is well-nigh impossible in a system like this. Yet the episcopate is not degraded because deprived of the claim to inherent divine right. The bishops are overseers in the true and worthy sense. They draw to themselves not only personal respect and reverence for their characters, but intelligent official regard. In ordination and confirmation they are the chiefs, because the Church makes them so. In the difficulties in parishes their advice, or, in extreme cases, their acts of discipline according to canon law have full force, and have already settled troubles which, under another scheme, would have been formidable. They are evangelists so far as, in the infancy of the Church, they can be spared from parochial charges, and thus become a most important agency in Church extension.

The diaconate in this Church is a subordinate order. In theory the deacon is the helper of the presbyter; in practice his position is, thus far, only a sort of preparatory school for the presbyterate. Just what the office will become in the growth and development of the Church as it passes further into history can hardly be foreseen. Perhaps its relation to the general ministry will not differ greatly from that which prevails in the old Protestant Episcopal Church. This historic ministry is prized, not because of any belief in the notion of an "apostolic succession" in the ministry either as a doctrine or a fact, but partly because the historic element in a Church is always important, since Christianity itself is a historical religion, and partly because the peculiar mission of this Church is in the line of the English Reformation. In the vital and historical connection of its ministry with that of the English Reformers the Reformed Episcopal Church has the basis for its development and work. The ministry thus constituted, identical with that of the English Church, gives the Church a vantage-ground where it can stand on an acknowledged equality with the old communion, while it is purified from its errors, and is free to recognise the ministry of other Evangelical Churches as equally valid with its own. It thus stands in the gap, never heretofore bridged, between Episcopal and Presbyterian churches. It has the ministry of both. It may be destined to be the medium of reconciliation between them, as it does not arrogate superiority to the one, and lacks nothing the other justly claims.

(*d.*) *Church Councils.*—These are of three grades, corresponding to the threefold organization of the Church—Parochial, Synodical, and General.

(1.) The individual parish is organized by charter under civil law, and is, in that relation, conditioned by the laws of the state in which it is situated. But in its own internal structure it is composed of rector or pastor, as the case may be, two wardens, and a certain number of vestrymen. The control of the temporal affairs of the Church is in the vestry, as also the choice of a pastor in case of vacancy. But, in addition to the vestry, provision is made for the election, by the communicants exclusively, of a Parish Council. The members of this council hold an advisory relation to the pastor, are associated with him in the reception and dismission of members, and share with him the duty and responsibility of discipline. Thus the parish is organized for both the temporal and spiritual supervision of its interests. To the parish council is committed all the distinctly spiritual work of the given congregation outside of the pastor's immediate agency as the shepherd of the flock. It is possible this organization of the parish council may not be permanent in its present form, as there is some diversity of opinion on the subject in the Church. But either in its present form or by investing the wardens *ex officio* with the functions now restricted to the council elected by the communicants of the parish, this feature of polity will unquestionably become historic in the Church.

(2.) *The Synodical Council* is yet in its incipient stage, as the synod has not thus far taken practical existence and form in more than one or two instances. Provision is made for a certain number of parishes to form themselves into a synodical body under a bishop, who, though he may be nominated by the synod, must be confirmed by the General Council and hold his local position at its will. As the synods multiply in numbers, and their field of work and their immunities become clearly discriminated in the general system of the Church, there will be stated conciliar assemblies at which all legislative and routine business pertaining to the jurisdiction it covers will be transacted. Probably the basis of representation will be so modified that instead of appointments from the several churches, as now, the synodical councils will elect representatives to the General Council.

(3.) *The General Council* is the largest representative body of the Church, and is vested with supreme authority of legislation. It meets, as yet, annually, as its relations in the infancy of the Church are directly, not mediately, to the parishes. Already, however, steps have been taken looking to a change in the system of representation in the council, decreasing its number of members and lengthening the intervals of meeting. Eventually this council will, it is believed, meet not oftener than, if so often as, once in three years, and confine its deliberations to those general questions of doctrine and polity that affect the whole Church.

(4.) There is looming up through the mists of the near future a representative assemblage of a still wider and more comprehensive character—something like an *œcumenical council*. It is the policy of this Church, in the spirit of its founders, to preserve an organic unity, unbroken by the lines that separate states or nations. It is evident, however, that this can only be done by a

large and liberal allowance for the peculiarities of peoples living under contrasted systems of civil government, and growing up with tastes and social habits and modes of thought of distinct types. The Reformed Episcopal Church in America and in England is the same Church, yet the streams that flow out of the one fountain, as they diverge into these several nationalities, are immediately modified by the civil, social, and ecclesiastical soil and climate they find. Identical in doctrine, spirit, and organic life, they vary somewhat in the forms of organization and worship that adapt them to their respective spheres. Already a policy is taking shape by which each national Church shall enjoy a limited independence of legislation, discipline, and worship, thus to work out its own history and destiny. Just what shall constitute the *nexus*, the vital ligature that shall make the Church, however widely extended, a unit, an organic body, cannot yet be identified. Such, however, will undoubtedly be the connection that it will embrace provision for the meeting of a council within a certain term of years, and having under its control those wide questions that affect the character and interests of the Church as a whole. This Church was not organized for a day or for a place, but for the world and for time.

These statements in regard to doctrines, orders, worship, discipline, and general usages are little more than an expansion of the original declaration of principles adopted at the organization of the Church, Dec. 2, 1873, which is given as a comprehensive summary:

I. The Reformed Episcopal Church, holding "the faith once delivered to the saints," declares its belief in the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as the word of God, and the sole rule of faith and practice; in the creed commonly called the Apostles' Creed; in the divine institution of the sacraments of baptism and the Lord's supper; and in the doctrines of grace substantially as they are set forth in the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion.

II. This Church recognises and adheres to episcopacy, not as of divine right, but as a very ancient and desirable form of Church polity.

III. This Church, retaining a liturgy which shall not be imperative or repressive of freedom in prayer, accepts the Book of Common Prayer, as it was revised, proposed, and recommended for use by the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church, A.D. 1785, reserving full liberty to alter, abridge, enlarge, and amend the same, as may seem most conducive to the edification of the people, "provided that the substance of the faith be kept entire."

IV. This Church condemns and rejects the following erroneous and strange doctrines as contrary to God's Word:

First, That the Church of Christ exists only in one order or form of ecclesiastical polity.

Second, That Christian ministers are "priests" in another sense than that in which all believers are a "royal priesthood."

Third, That the Lord's table is an altar on which an oblation of the body and blood of Christ is offered anew to the Father.

Fourth, That the presence of Christ in the Lord's supper is a presence in the elements of bread and wine.

Fifth, That regeneration is inseparably connected with baptism.

III. *Statistics.*—The statistics of this Church thus early in its history are necessarily few and simple. If, however, they are carefully noted, they will, it is believed, indicate wider extension and more rapid growth than have marked most other ecclesiastical bodies in the beginning of their history.

1. *The Number of Clergymen* as reported to the council of 1878 was eighty-eight, of whom six were bishops, sixty-one presbyters, and twenty deacons. Already the list has swollen to more than one hundred, and is increasing as rapidly as places and means of support can be provided for those received or ordained; while the number of applicants for orders and for admission from the ministry in other churches, against whom the door is necessarily closed for want of ability to sustain them, is larger than ever before. The tabular report of the Committee on the State of the Church, covering other items made at the council, May, 1878, was very imperfect, as many of the parishes had failed to report. In its statement of the number of communicants it is thought to be very much below the actual number. It is as follows:

Communicants (assumed)	10,000
Sunday scholars	7,814
Sunday-school teachers	744
Baptized, i. e. during the year preceding	744
Confirmed in said year	615
Contributions of the parishes for all objects during same year	$280,785
Value of Church property at time of council	600,031
Other property for educational purposes	200,000

"This exhibit shows an increase of more than $172,000 over the amount reported in 1877, notwithstanding the perhaps unparalleled depression of the past year." In July, 1890, there were returned 109 churches, 120 ministers, 10,100 communicants.

2. *Literary Institutions.*—Of these the Reformed Episcopal Church can, as yet, boast but one, and that only in the infancy of what it is hoped will, in due time of maturity, be a vigorous and influential life. The University of the West is at present organized substantially on the plan of the London University. Non-resident professors prepare questions on which students are required to stand rigid examinations by written answers. In this university scheme, only the Martin College of Theology is thus far in organized working order. This has taken precedence to meet the wants of the Church in the education of its ministry. The times demand a ministry not only of thorough scholastic attainments, but well taught in theology in connection with the peculiarities of the Church they are to labor in. The Church seeks to compass this end by subjecting all students in theology to a uniform system of questions in all departments of theological learning. The present plan may be modified when a sufficient endowment fund shall have been secured to meet the requirements of a local institution. Through the munificent liberality of a gentleman of the State of New York, Edward Martin, Esq., the Church is in possession of landed estate in the suburbs of Chicago of large present and much larger prospective value. On this property the authorities of the university propose, eventually, to erect suitable buildings for the several colleges as they shall, from time to time, take form. It is their purpose, as the ability of the Church increases, to spare no pains to make the institution worthy of the Church and of the country.

3. *Church Literature.*—The Reformed Episcopal Church supports two papers that set forth its principles and defend its interests. *The Episcopal Recorder*, published in Philadelphia, is a weekly paper which has become historic. It was the oldest weekly issue in the Protestant Episcopal Church, in which, during more than a half of the century, it advocated those principles of ecclesiastical polity and Christian life and doctrine that are still emblazoned on its banner. Transferred to the Reformed branch of the Church, it but continues its old work in new relations, and proves a highly important agent in the defence and extension of the truth in the newly organized communion. *The Appeal* is published in Chicago and New York, and issued bi-weekly. While aiming specially to meet the needs of the Church in the great West, it has extensive circulation in all parts of the land; and, though only about three years of age, displays much energy and ability. Its editor-in-chief is the present presiding bishop, Dr. Samuel Fallows, and he is aided by an efficient staff of clergymen of large ability and culture. This paper exerts wide influence in the Church. So early in its history, and with the time and energy of its clergy severely taxed by initial parochial work, this Church has not as yet produced literary or theological works of extensive and standard character. Its ephemeral productions, however, from the nature of the case largely apologetic, are already numerous. Nearly all the prominent clergymen of this Church have been forced by attacks, often from the

highest sources, to defend both their Church and their personal action in conforming to it. These writings constitute a body of argument, doctrinal and ecclesiastical, to which the Church points all inquirers with entire confidence, and the more so since, so far as is known, there has been no attempt to confute any single one of the many publications in question.

Such, in brief, are the history and principles of the Reformed Episcopal Church — an organization called into existence, its advocates believe, by the providence and spirit of God, and destined to exert a very deep, extensive, and lasting influence, not only in the country of its birth, but in the world. (J. H. S.)

Reformed German Church. See GERMAN REFORMED CHURCH.

Reformed Methodist Church, an American offspring of the Methodist Episcopal Church, had its origin in 1814, and was started by a body of local preachers and exhorters, the most prominent and influential of whom was the Rev. Elijah Bailey, an ordained local preacher in the Vermont Conference. They had become dissatisfied with the polity of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and especially that part of it which relates to the powers and prerogatives of the episcopacy. They asserted that a leaning towards prelacy as it exists in the Roman Catholic hierarchy was developing in the Methodist Episcopal Church, and, their fears not receiving that general guard for which they prayed, they at length concluded to separate themselves from the old Church and found a new and reformed body. For the purpose of gaining a large number of ready, active laborers for their new organization, they resorted to the formation of a community of goods on a farm which they purchased at Bennington, Vt., and sustained for about two years. But the attempt to maintain themselves as a community proved abortive, and the members of it soon scattered to different parts of the states of Vermont and New York, and to Upper Canada. In the British territory they succeeded in raising up a number of Reformed societies. In the States, however, their success was small. The dispersion of the community above alluded to operated favorably to the interests of the Church as a whole, as, after that period, they were favored from time to time with gracious revivals of religion. Thousands, no doubt, in following years have been converted to God through the instrumentality of the preachers of this Church. As a denomination, however, they did not prosper like other organized orthodox churches. They suffered much from dissensions in their own ranks and important secessions from their numbers. About half of their ministers and many of their most flourishing societies left them and joined the Protestant Methodists; and at one time an entire conference of Reformed preachers went over to that denomination. At the time of their greatest prosperity they had five annual conferences and about seventy-five ministers and preachers, and from three to four thousand members. After the organization of another Methodistic branch in the United States (the Wesleyan), most of the ministers and members of the Reformed Church became identified with that branch, and finally the body was merged into the so-called *Methodist Church.*

Doctrines.—In all matters of theology the "Reformers" are, or were, Methodistic, if we except their belief in the gift of healing, by which physical maladies might be removed through the power of faith. This belief had gained for the Reformers the names of fanatics and enthusiasts; but they have returned the compliment by accusing their calumniators of scepticism and infidelity.

Church Government.—The form of Church government selected by the Reformers was strictly congregational, admitting of lay representation in their general and annual conferences; the former body not meeting periodically, but only at the call of the latter bodies. Their general rules are similar to those of the parent body, with the addition of some forbidding war, slavery, etc.

The only periodical published under the auspices of this Church at any time was the *Luminary and Reformer,* edited by Mr. Bailey, a son of the founder of the Church. The paper, however, has for years been discontinued. See METHODISM (20).

Reformed Presbyterian Church. This body, like many others, is known by different names: its members have been designated as *Mountain Men, Old Dissenters, Cameronians,* and *Society People;* but their most common designation is *Covenanters.* The name of "Mountain Men" was given them because they are a remnant of those who were driven to hills, moors, and other uninhabited places by persecution in the reign of the Stuarts in Scotland. They are called "Cameronians" from Richard Cameron, one of their leaders during that persecution. They were called "Society People" because they were often confined to prayer-meetings in private as their only means of social worship when their ministers were killed or banished. For the name "Covenanters," see that article in vol. ii of this work. The *history* of these people has been given well, though briefly, under articles CAMERON; COVENANTERS; PRESBYTERIAN (REFORMED) CHURCH; SCOTLAND, CHURCH OF. This article is intended to present their peculiar characteristics, the leading points in which they differ from other Presbyterian bodies.

1. A prominent feature is their separation from the State. In this country, as well as in the British isles, they withhold an oath to the government, whether in naturalization, in taking office, or anything which implies full allegiance; nor do they vote for any officer so qualified, whether the office be legislative, judicial, or executive; neither do they sit on juries under oath. This position they occupy, not as the Quakers, who object to an oath entirely as well as to the forcible execution of law. Covenanters in this country approve of the representative system, and of a definite constitution reduced to writing as a righteous measure, and one which should be adopted by every nation under heaven. From the beginning they gave their sanction and encouragement to the cause of American independence; and they would gladly enjoy the full privileges of citizenship were it not for the evils connected with the government. However they may fail in particular instances, their design and desire are to promote the influence of all the good regulations and laws of the country, and to live quiet and peaceable lives in all godliness and honesty.

2. They give great prominence to the universal dominion of the Lord Jesus Christ. They hold that as king in his Church, he has settled all her institutions and ordinances. Other denominations admit this in the general, while many claim the right of modifying, altering, instituting, or abolishing religious observances. With the decreeing of rites and ceremonies Covenanters have no sympathy. Besides this kingship in his Church, they claim for Christ, according to the gift of the Father, uncontrolled dominion over all things, outside of the Church as well as within; and that this extensive authority is used by him for the benefit of his body, the Church; that he may send his messengers into heathen countries; that he may use angelic powers at his pleasure; that he may supply his people with temporal support and subdue all their enemies; that he may raise the dead and judge the world at the last day (Psa. ii, 6; lxxxix, 19; cx, 3; Isa. ix, 6, 7; Dan. vii, 14; Matt. xi, 27; xxviii, 18; Luke i, 32; John iii, 35; v, 27; xvii, 2; Rom. xiv, 9; Eph. i, 20; Heb. ii, 8; 1 Pet. iii, 22).

3. They consider the Church and the State as the two leading departments of Christ's visible kingdom on earth, or, as Merle d'Aubigné has designated them, the two poles of human society. In this view they labor much for the purity and power of the two great ordinances, the Gospel ministry and the civil magistracy; both being equally of God, both being under the sov-

ereignty of Christ, and each, in its sphere, to be regulated, in a Christian land, by the *written law*. Where this law is either entirely disregarded or flagrantly violated, they refuse to take any part either in Church or State.

4. They lay great stress on the *witnessing* character of the Church (Isa. xliii, 10: "Ye are my witnesses, saith the Lord"). This idea enters largely into the constitution of the New-Test. organization—Acts i, 8: "But ye shall receive power, after that the Holy Spirit is come upon you; and ye shall be witnesses unto me both in Jerusalem, and in all Judæa, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth." This presents the double aspect of the Church's work—one, the salvation of men; one, the glory of God; both harmonizing in the services of ministers and people together (Acts i, 22; ii, 32, 40; iii, 15; iv, 33; v, 32; x, 39; xiii, 31; xx, 21; xxii, 15, 18; xxvi, 16, 22; xxviii, 23; Rev. i, 2, 9; vi, 9; xi, 3–12; xii, 11, 17; xix, 10).

This feature is presented often in the epistles, and implies three things: (*a*) setting forth the whole truth of God, keeping nothing back; (*b*) applying that truth to the parties addressed; (*c*) pointing out the contrary evils. Following out this idea, Covenanters have, besides their Confession (*d*), a Testimony specifying the evils of the time.

5. Among other things, they bear a practical testimony against the moral evils in the Constitution of the United States. In one important particular the Constitution has already been amended—the clauses bearing on slavery. In this amendment Covenanters rejoice, and take courage to labor for further advance. In the antislavery conflict they stood among the foremost; they preached, they wrote, they labored in all available ways against the slave-holding interest. The articles which they still wish to see amended are such as the following:

(1.) In all the Constitution there is no recognition of God, the Sovereign of the world and Source of all authority and power. Justice Bayard and other authors labor earnestly in offering apologies for this defect; but all these apologies are set aside by the *Declaration of Independence*, in the simple fact that the Supreme is repeatedly acknowledged in that memorable document as nature's God, as the Creator, as Divine Providence, and as the Judge of the world; as One on whose protection the nascent empire could exercise a "firm reliance" while struggling for existence. When independence was achieved and a prosperous career fairly entered, his name is lopped off in the new Constitution; and, although the document has been repeatedly amended, the place for his name is still left a blank. In fact, Benjamin Franklin could not succeed in having prayer offered in the convention that framed the Federal Constitution. We think this is the first nation known to history that has set up a government without acknowledging any deity whatever. True it is that many of their deities were not worth the honor, while we as a nation have refused to honor "the God in whose hand our life is, and whose are all our ways." That he should be acknowledged in the Constitution and obeyed in the administration is shown by the following, among other considerations: (*a.*) He is not only the Creator of men, but he is the Author of *national blessings*. He gave the nation its existence at the first, and holds the entire control of all its destinies. (*b.*) Civil government is one of his institutions for the good of men and for his own glory among men. Not only did he direct the people of Israel to set up judges and officers, but in the New Test. he recognises such officers as his ministers, and their power as his ordinance. He claims obedience to them as his representatives, and that honor shall be given to them for his sake, while he tells all nations that there is no authority unless it be of God (Rom. xiii, 1–7; 2 Pet. ii, 13–17; Tit. iii, 1). All Christians are agreed that civil government set up on moral principles is the "ordinance of God." This implies, requires even, an acknowledgment of him in the Constitution as well as elsewhere. (*c.*) There are many very solemn services in the exercise of civil rule. Take one of many: A fellow-mortal is charged with murder, and must be dealt with, whether he be a citizen or not. This dealing is a solemn affair in the sight of God: (i) whether we let him loose on society; (ii) whether we hang him up by the neck until he is dead; (iii) whether he is sent to the penitentiary for life; (iv) whether he is found guilty or innocent of the charge. In any and all of these cases civil rulers have the destiny of that man in their control for life, as well as an influence which may reach, for good or for ill, to eternity. This responsibility cannot be evaded, and it can be properly met in the fear of God only. So of war and peace, where thousands are involved at once. So of sanitary regulations. So of license to sell strong drink, gunpowder, and poisonous drugs. (*d.*) He severely threatens and awfully punishes the nations that will not honor and serve him. (*e.*) He has given abundant promises to nations who will serve him. (*f.*) There is the same responsibility on a nation that there is on an individual to serve the Lord (Job xxxiv, 29). (*g.*) The United States have received such favors from God, in quality and quantity, as have never been bestowed on any other nation, not even on the chosen family of Israel. Why should we not acknowledge in the most solemn and public manner the hand of him that gives?

(2.) The *qualifications for rulers* are very defective in the Constitution of the United States. Some officers are required to be of a certain age, and born in the country. It is taken for granted that they will be men of ability. This is right so far as it goes; but if a ruler is to be regarded as the minister of God, some degree of *moral character* ought to be required, and the Constitution is the proper place to begin; then the people can select men of the highest order of Christian morality.

(3.) The law of God as supreme law is formally set aside, superseded by three provisions: (*a*) the will of the people as stated in the preamble; (*b*) the Constitution itself as the expression of that will; (*c*) laws of Congress and treaties with foreign powers in carrying out the Constitution, art. vi, § 2. If these provisions meant no more than the relation to particular states, it would not be objectionable; but there is no allusion to a higher law in any part of the document.

6. Covenanters claim the universal application of the divine law to all the institutions of men, and to the man in all his relations—the Church, the family, the civil, military, commercial, financial, legislative, judicial, social, and all possible connections of man with man. They take no stock in street-car or railroad companies, or any institutions which desecrate the Sabbath or otherwise trench on any of the ten commandments. They have always excluded freemasons from their fellowship.

7. They hold the Old Test. as still the word of God, and of equal authority with the New.

8. In praise they use exclusively the book of Psalms. They also disapprove of instrumental music in churches.

9. They claim that the *prayer-meeting*, in which ministers and people stand on the same level, is a divine ordinance as much as family worship and public preaching. On this item they and the Methodists were long the only witnesses. For some twenty-five years the idea has been spreading, until all respectable bodies have their prayer-meetings, to say nothing of irregular associations. While other denominations regard rather the *utility*, *propriety*, and *expediency* of these meetings, Reformed Presbyterians stand for their *divine institution* as well, basing their position on such Scriptures as the following: Heb. x, 25; Col. iii, 16; Mal. iii, 16; John xx, 19; Acts xvi, 13.

10. Besides their adherence to the Scottish covenants, they hold that *covenanting* is an ordinance of the New Test. as well as of the Old. This they find held forth in prophecy (Isa. xix, 18–21; xliv, 5; lxii, 4; Jer.

1, 5) and exemplified in the apostolic Church (2 Cor. viii, 5).

11. They hold strictly *close communion*, on a doctrinal as well as practical basis, according to Acts ii, 42; 2 Thess. iii, 6; xiv, 15. (R. H.)

Reformed, True, Church. See TRUE REFORMED CHURCH.

Reformed Wesleyans. See WESLEYANS.

Reformers. See CAMPBELLITES.

Reformers, Wesleyan. See UNITED FREE CHURCH; METHODISTS.

Refrigerium. Refreshment is one of the elements of happiness which the Church implores for her dead: "locum refrigerii," says the *Memento of the Dead* of the mass canon, "ut indulgeas deprecamur." These words are found in the oldest liturgies; we find them in a prayer (*Ante Sepulturam*) of St. Gelasius's sacramentary (see Muratori, *Lit. Rom. Vet.* i, col. 749): "Ut digneris dare ei . . . locum refrigerii;" and in a collect of the same liturgical monument (*ibid.* i, col. 760): "Dona omnibus quorum hic corpora requiescunt refrigerii sedem."

I. The word *refrigerium* is generally employed by the sacred and ecclesiastical authors for a *meal*, or any refreshment of the body by food. In the Book of Wisdom (ii, 1) the wicked express thus the idea that death puts an end to all material enjoyments: "Non est refrigerium in fine hominis." Paul, speaking of the hospitable treatment he had experienced at the hands of Onesiphorus (2 Tim. i, 16), says, "Sæpe me refrigeravit." Tertullian calls the *agape* a refreshment given by the rich to the poor (*Apolog.* xxxix): "Inopes refrigerio isto juvamus." According to the same author the mitigations of the rigor of the fast (*De Jejun.* x) are a refreshment for the flesh of the Christian ("carnem refrigerare"). In several passages of the *Acts of St. Perpetua*, "refrigerare" is used of those meals which the faithful were sometimes allowed to enjoy with the martyrs in their jails. "Why," says Perpetua to the tribune, "do you not grant us some refreshments [Quid utique non permittis refrigerare]? We are noble convicts—Cæsar's own convicts—destined to fight on his anniversary. You ought to make it a point that we should appear on that occasion in good, fleshy condition [si pinguiores illo producamur]."

Paradise being in the Scriptures, especially in the New Test. (Matt. xxii, 2; xxv, 10, etc.; Rev. xix, 7, etc.), often compared to a banquet, it was but natural that refreshment should be used in a figurative sense for the heavenly banquet: "Justus . . . si morte præoccupatus fuerit, in refrigerio erit." The following passage of the Acts (iii, 20) is also understood of the refreshment at the Lord's table: "Cum venerint tempora refrigerii a conspectu Domini." Tertullian (*De Idol.* xliii) employs the same image in describing the felicity of Lazarus, who, driven away, while living, from the table of the rich man, sits down, after his death, with Abraham, to the eternal banquet: "Lazarus apud inferos in sinu Abrahæ refrigerium consecutus." This same *refrigerium* is the favor which the faithful wife implores for her dead husband: "Pro anima ejus orat, et refrigerium adpostulat" (*De Monogam.* x). St. Perpetua saw her brother Dinocrates in that place of refreshment: "Video Dinocratem refrigerantem" (*Act.* cap. viii). The prayer mentioned above, from the sacramentary of St. Gelasius, and which is still recited in the Roman Catholic Church, seems literally to request for the faithful soul a seat at the heavenly table ("refrigerii sedem").

II. This idea is expressed on a number of Christian tombs, the *refrigerium* being spoken of as enjoyed by the saints, or as wished to those from whom it is still withheld in expiation of their sins. With the former meaning we find: "In refrigerio" (Boldetti, p. 418); "In refrigerio anima tua" (Fabretti, p. 547); "In refrigerio et in pace" (Gruter, 1057, 10); "In pace et in refrigerio" (*Act. Sanct.* v, 122). In most cases it is a wish plainly expressed. The verb may be understood, as in "Ob refrigerium" (Fabretti, p. 114, n. 283); or "Dulcissimo Antistheni conjugi suo refrigerium" (Collect. of M. Perret [lxi, 5]). But we find the same wish expressed in a verbal form: "Victoria refrigereris spiritus tuus in bono" (Wiseman, *Fabiola*, p. 2); "Augustus in bono refrigeres dulcis" (*Act. Sanct.* v, 80); "Refrigera cum spirita sancta" (Marangoni, *Cose Gent.* p. 460). The same formula is found on a marble of the year 291 (see Boldetti, p. 87): "Caio Vibio Alexandro et Atisiæ Pompeie refrigeretis" (Perret. v, xlvi, 10). If there were any doubt as to the meaning of these formulæ, it would be removed by a comparison with those inscriptions in which the name of God appears, e. g.: "Antonia anima dulcis tibi Deus refrigeret" (Boldetti, p. 418); "Deus refrigeret spiritum tuum" (Lupi, *Sev. Epit.* p. 137); "Refrigera Deus animam hom. . . ." (Perret, xxvi, n. 115); "Spirita vestra Deus refrigeret" (Boldetti, p. 417); "Cuius spiritum in refrigerium suscipiat Dominus" (Muratori, *Nov. Thesaur.* p. 1922, 1). The following was found by Marchi on the cemetery of St. Callixtus, in Greek characters: "Deus Christus Omnipotens spiritum tuum refrigeret." Sometimes the refreshment is asked for the deceased by the intercession of the saints.—Martigny, *Dict. des Antiq. Chrétiennes*, s. v.

Refuge. See ASYLUM; CHURCH.

REFUGE, CITIES OF. See CITY OF REFUGE.

Refugee (Fr. *refugié*), a name given to persons who have fled from religious or political persecution in their own country and taken refuge in another. The term was first applied to those Protestants who found an asylum in Britain and elsewhere at two different periods, first during the Flemish persecutions under the duke of Alva in 1567, and afterwards, in 1685, when Louis XIV of France revoked the Edict of Nantes and drove so many of the *Huguenots* (q. v.) into involuntary exile. Of the numerous French artisans who settled in England on this last occasion, the most part Anglicized their names, as by substituting Young for "Le Jeune," Taylor for "Tellier," etc., so that their posterity can now hardly be recognised as of foreign origin. According to Lower (*Patronymica Britannica*), De Preux became Deprose, and "Richard Despair, a poor man," buried at East Grimstead, was, in the orthography of his forefathers, Despard. There were also refugee families of a higher class, some of whose descendants and representatives came to occupy a place in the peerage. The Bouveries, earls of Radnor, are descended from a French refugee family. The refugee family of Blaquière was raised to the Irish peerage; and Charles Shaw Lefevre (lord Eversley) is the representative of a family of Irish refugees. The military employment offered in Ireland after 1688 maintained a considerable number of foreign Protestants. General Frederick Armand de Schomberg was raised by William III to the peerage, becoming eventually duke of Schomberg. A Huguenot officer of hardly less celebrity was Henry Massue (marquis de Ruvigny), created by William III earl of Galway. Lord Ligonier was also of a noble Huguenot family, and England has had at least one refugee bishop in Dr. Majendie, bishop of Chester, and afterwards of Bangor. Among other refugees of note may be enumerated Sir John Houblon, lord mayor of London in 1695, one branch of whose family was represented by the late lord Palmerston; Elias Bouherau, or Boireau, D.D., whose descendant was created a baronet as Sir Richard Borough of Baselden Park, Berkshire; as well as Martineaus, Bosanquets, and Papillons, whose descendants have attained more or less eminence in the country of their adoption. The first French Revolution brought numerous political refugees to England, and Great Britain is noted throughout Europe for affording a ready asylum to refugees of all classes, both political and religious. See Weiss, *History of the French Protestant Refugees, from the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes to the Present Time*, translated by Hardman (Lond. 1854); Burns, *History of the French, Walloon,*

Dutch, and other Foreign Protestant Refugees settled in England (Lond. 1846); Smiles, *The Huguenots, their Settlements, Industries, etc., in England, Ireland, and America* (N. Y. 1868).

Regālè, the name given to the privilege by which the king of France claimed to enjoy the revenues of a see during its vacancy. See REGALIA.

Regalia (or REGALE), RIGHT OF, is the possession of certain privileges in ecclesiastical things. As the *regalia Petri* we distinguish the various rights and high prerogatives which, according to Romanists, belong to the pope as a kind of universal sovereign and king of kings. Under *regale*, however, is generally understood the right which sovereigns claim in virtue of their royal prerogative. The question as to the extent of these privileges has frequently been the subject of controversy between kings and popes. It involved several points as to presentation to benefices, most of which formed the object, from time to time, of negotiation by concordat; but the most serious conflict arose out of the claim made by the crown to the revenues of vacant benefices, especially bishoprics, and the co-ordinate claim to keep the benefice or the see vacant for an indefinite period, in order to appropriate its revenue. This plainly abusive claim was one of the main grounds of complaint on the part of the popes as to the practice of lay investiture (q. v.), and it reached its height in England under the first Norman kings, especially William Rufus. The most memorable conflict, however, on the subject of the regalia was that of Innocent XI (q. v.) with Louis XIV, which was maintained with great pertinacity on both sides for several years, the king extending the claim to some of the French provinces which had until then been exempt from it, and the pope refusing to confirm any of the appointments of Louis to the sees which became vacant as long as the obnoxious claim should be persisted in. The dispute continued till after the death of Innocent, Louis XIV having gone so far as to seize upon the papal territory of Avignon in reprisal; but it was adjusted in the following pontificate, the most obnoxious part of the claim being practically abandoned, although not formally withdrawn. The contest grew out of the interpretation of French canon law which gives the right to the kings of France to enjoy the revenues of all bishoprics during their vacancy, and also to present to their prebends and all other their dignities without cure of souls. Such presentations might be made whether the dignity were vacant both *de jure* and *de facto*, as by death, or only either *de jure*, as if the incumbent were convicted of a crime or had accepted another dignity, or *de facto*, as if the regale should open after the presentation of an incumbent, but before he had taken possession. The regale lasted till a new admission to the bishopric was fully completed by taking the oath of allegiance, when a mandate was issued by the Chambre des Comptes to the commissary of the regale to restore the revenues. This right had one or two singular privileges: it occurred not only on a vacancy, but also when a bishop was made a cardinal, and lasted till he repeated the oath of allegiance; it lasted thirty years as regarded patronage, so that if the king should leave a dignity vacant and the new bishop fill it up, the king might appoint a fresh incumbent at any time within this date; it was absolutely in the king's discretion, and subject to no other constitutions whatever. The regale was at different times deprived of much of its original extent: certain bishoprics, as those of Languedoc, Provence, and Dauphiné, claimed entire exemption; and though a decision of Parliament pronounced at one time that the right extended over the whole kingdom, this was afterwards quashed, and the question remained undecided. Abbeys which were formerly subject to the regale were discharged, and an attempt to replace them under it quite failed. Finally all right to the revenues was resigned by Louis XIII and that of patronage was retained. See *Commentaire de M. Dupuy sur le Traité des Libertés de M. Pithon*, i, 146. See also SUPREMACY, PAPAL.

Regals (perhaps from *rigabello*, an instrument used prior to the organ in the churches of Italy), a small portable finger-organ in use in the 16th and 17th centuries, and perhaps earlier. Many representations exist of this instrument, including one sculptured on Melrose Abbey. The tubes rested on the air-chest, which was filled by the bellows; and the bellows were managed with one hand, and the keys with the other.

Re'gem (Heb. *id.* רֶגֶם, *friend;* Sept. Ῥεγέμ v. r. Ῥαγέμ), the first named of six sons of Jahdai (q. v.), apparently of the family of Caleb (1 Chron. ii, 47). B.C. post 1658.

Re'gem-me'lech (Heb. *Re'gem Me'lek*, רֶגֶם מֶלֶךְ, *friend of* the *king;* Sept. Ἀρβεσεὲρ [v. r. Ἀρβεσεσὲρ] ὁ βασιλεύς; Vulg. *Rogommelech*), the name of a person who, in connection with Sherezer, was sent on behalf of some of the captivity to make inquiries at the Temple concerning fasting (Zech. vii, 2). B.C. cir. 517. In the A. V. the subject of the verse appears to be the captive Jews in Babylon and Bethel, or "the house of God" is regarded as the accusative after the verb of motion. The Sept. takes "the king" as the nominative to the verb "sent," considering the last part of the name Regem-melech as an appellative, and not as a proper name. What reading the Sept. had it is difficult to conjecture. In the Vulgate, Sherezer, Regem-melech, and their men are the persons who sent to the house of God. The Peshito-Syriac has a curious version of the passage: "And he sent to Bethel, to Sharezer and Rab-mag; and the king sent and his men to pray for him before the Lord;" Sharezer and Rab-mag being associated in Jer. xxxix, 3, 13. The Hexaplar-Syriac, following the Peshito, has "Rab-mag." On referring to Zech. vii, 5, the expression "the people of the land" seems to indicate that those who sent to the Temple were not the captive Jews in Babylon, but those who had returned to their own country; and this being the case, it is probable that in ver. 2 "Bethel" is to be taken as the subject: "and Bethel," i. e. the inhabitants of Bethel, "sent." From its connection with Sherezer, the name Regem-melech (lit. "king's friend," comp. 1 Chron. xxvii, 33) was probably an Assyrian title of office. See RAB-MAG.

Regeneratio, a term applied to *baptism* because when any one becomes a Christian he enters upon a real and new spiritual life. See BAPTISM.

Regeneration (παλιγγενεσία, Tit. iii, 5, *a being born again*), that work of the Holy Spirit by which we experience a change of heart. It is expressed in Scripture by being born anew (John iii, 7, "from above"); being quickened (Eph. ii, 1); by Christ being found in the heart (Gal. iv, 19); a new creation (2 Cor. v, 17); a renewing of the mind (Rom. xii, 2); the washing, i. e. the *purifying* of regeneration (Tit. iii, 5); a resurrection from the dead (Eph. ii, 6); a putting off the old man, and a putting on the new man (iv, 22-24). And the subjects of this change are represented as begotten of God (John i, 13; 1 Pet. i, 3); begotten of the Spirit (John iii, 8); begotten of water, even of the Spirit (ver. 5); new creatures (Gal. vi, 15); and partakers of the divine nature (2 Pet. i, 4). The efficient cause of regeneration is the divine spirit. Man is not the author of the regeneration (John i, 12, 13; iii, 4; Eph. ii, 8, 10); the instrumental cause is the word of God (James i, 18; 1 Pet. i, 23; 1 Cor. iv, 15). / The change in regeneration consists in the recovery of the moral image of God upon the heart; that is, so as to love him supremely and serve him ultimately as our highest end. Regeneration consists in the implantation of the principle of love to God, which obtains the ascendency and habitually prevails over its opposite. Although the inspired writers use various terms and modes of speech to describe this change of mind, styling it conversion, regeneration,

a new creation, etc., yet it is all effected by the word of truth or the Gospel of salvation gaining an entrance into the mind through divine teaching, so as to possess the understanding, subdue the will, and reign in the affections. In a word, it is faith working by love that constitutes the new creature or regenerate man (Gal. v, 6; 1 John v, 1–5). Regeneration, then, is the recovery of the moral image of God, and consequently of spiritual life, to a soul previously dead in trespasses and sins. It is the work of the Holy Spirit, opening the eyes of the mind, and enabling the sincere penitent to believe the Gospel and receive Christ as his only Saviour. This gracious work is in accordance both with the character of the Holy Spirit and with the constitution of man; hence, by it no violence is done to any physical, intellectual, or moral law or mode of action in human nature. The change is produced in the will, or heart, that is, in the *moral*, and not the natural, faculties of the soul. As depravity is wholly in the will and heart, the source and seat of all moral action, the divine operation consists in renewing the heart, and communicating a change of views, with a relish for the things of the Spirit. As justification places us in a new *relation* to God, so regeneration produces *in* us a new *state* of mind. In the case of children dying in infancy, they, of course, need regeneration to fit them for the eternal world. And there can be no difficulty in conceiving that they are regenerated by the Holy Spirit, in virtue of Christ's death, in the same sense in which they are depraved, in consequence of Adam's transgression; the disposition to sin is removed, the disposition to holiness is implanted, and thus their salvation is secured. The evidences of regeneration are conviction of sin, holy sorrow, deep humility, knowledge, faith, repentance, love, and devotedness to God's glory. The properties of it are these: 1. It is a receptive work, and herein it differs from conversion. In regeneration we receive from God; in conversion we are active and turn to him. 2. It is a powerful work of God's grace (Eph. iii, 8). 3. It is an instantaneous act, for there can be no medium between life and death; and here it differs from sanctification, which is progressive. 4. It is a complete act, and perfect in its kind; a change of the whole man (2 Cor. v, 17). 5. It is a great and important act, both as to its author and effects (Eph. ii, 4, 5). 6. It is an internal act, not consisting in bare, outward forms (Ezek. xxxvi, 26, 27). 7. Visible as to its effects (1 John iii, 14). 8. Delightful (1 Pet. i, 8). 9. Necessary (John iii, 3). See Conversion; New Birth.

Our Lord in one instance (Matt. xix, 28) uses the term *regeneration* for the resurrection state. Accordingly, Dr. Campbell translates it "the renovation," and remarks that the relation is here to the general state of things in the future world, where all things will become new. See New Creation; Restitution.

REGENERATION BY WATER. In our Lord's discourse to Nicodemus (John iii) occurs this remarkable statement: "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." This coupling of water-baptism with spiritual regeneration as an essential condition to Christian privilege has occasioned considerable difficulty to expositors, controversialists, and pious inquirers. A view of the entire context is important as a preliminary to the just interpretation of this passage.

Nicodemus sought a private interview with Jesus, evidently for the sincere purpose of information as to the Great Teacher's doctrine. Waiving all complimentary prefaces, Jesus at once propounds the one essential condition of discipleship—namely, the new birth. Nicodemus finds two difficulties in this—first, in his *age*, and, secondly, in the *physical* paradox itself. The latter perplexity evidently arose from his understanding the requirement in a *literal* sense. It is not so clear whether the former difficulty is but the same expressed in another form or an entirely different one—namely, the hardship of demanding a religious change in a person of such a confirmed standing as himself. In favor of the latter view are adduced the traditionary allusions to the baptism of proselytes to Judaism (which, however, do not very certainly establish that custom, or, at least, its special significance), and especially the baptism by John (which excited no surprise, showing that its significance was readily understood); but there is little or no evidence that these or any similar Judaic lustrations were currently designated by the peculiar terms here employed, γεννηθῆναι ἄνωθεν, *born from above*, or *born again*. See Proselyte. But, however this may have been, it is plain that Nicodemus was chiefly stumbled by the apparent necessity of understanding the words of Jesus in a strictly literal or physical sense. Hence our Lord explains that not a *fleshly*, but a *spiritual*, birth is meant, and he repeats this distinction in varied form (the "water" and "Spirit" of ver. 5 respectively corresponding to and being further interpreted by "flesh" and "Spirit" in ver. 6). This serves to show that the expression "born of water" (γεννηθῆναι ἐξ ὕδατος) has reference, not to a spiritual purification, but to a physical ablution; that is, to personal baptism, such as Nicodemus was already familiar with, and such as was to be instituted by Christ himself. (We discard as precarious and offensive an interpretation which we have heard propounded of this expression as referring to the *semen virile*, based upon the alleged use of מַיִם in that sense in Isa. xlviii, 1; for that signification is not well established anywhere, even in Hebrew, much less in the Aramaic, which it is assumed that Christ here spoke, and certainly not in the Greek by which the conversation is represented.) The only real difficulty to us in the passage arises from the conjunction of baptism and regeneration as being *both* requisite in the case; thus giving apparent countenance to the dogma of baptismal regeneration, or, at least, to the doctrine that baptism is essential to a Christian's acceptance with God. This difficulty is relieved by the following considerations drawn from the passage itself and from others parallel with it:

1. The principal stress is laid by Christ upon the second part of the requirement—namely, the spiritual birth. This is evident from the omission of all reference to baptism in vers. 6 and 8.

2. The language of ver. 5 can, at most, only mean that baptism and regeneration are both essential, but not necessarily in the same sense or to the same degree; certainly not that they are identical, nor that one implies the other. The phraseology positively forbids such a confusion of the two.

3. The association here of baptism with a spiritual change is no more emphatic than in several other passages similarly laying down the conditions of Christianity—e. g. "Teach all nations, baptizing them" (Matt. xxviii, 19); "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved" (Mark xvi, 16; but note the omission in the clause following, "He that believeth not shall be damned"); "Repent and be baptized every one of you" (Acts ii, 38); "Arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins" (xxii, 16).

4. Our Lord himself dispensed with baptism in the admission of at least one member into his kingdom, namely, the dying thief (Luke xxiii, 42, 43).

5. Christ certainly does mean to attach importance to water-baptism as an initiative rite into his Church or kingdom. The body of believers exists under two aspects, the visible and the invisible—the outward or nominal, and the inward or real. Baptism is as imperative a mark of admission to the former as spiritual new birth is to entrance into the latter. In order to full recognition as a member of both, the two acts are truly essential. This doctrine, which orthodox ecclesiastics have always maintained, is thus strictly in accordance with the tenor of the text in question.

On the dogma of *baptismal regeneration*, see the *Bi-*

bliotheca Sacra, April, 1876; *Prot. Episc. Quar. Rev.* Oct. 1860; *Meth. Quar. Rev.* Oct. 1854.

Regensburg. See RATISBON.

Reggio, ISAAC SAMUEL, a Jewish writer, was born Aug. 15, 1784, at Görz, in Illyria. As the son of a rabbi, he received a thorough Jewish education, and with his brilliant powers he soon became master of Jewish literature, and acquired an extraordinary knowledge of Hebrew. His talents and fame secured for him the appointment to the professorship of mathematics at the Lyceum when Illyria became a French province. He succeeded his father in the rabbinate of his native place, and died Aug. 29, 1855. Of his many writings, we mention, מאמר תורה מן השמים, a treatise on the inspiration of the Mosaic law, incorporated in the introduction to the Pentateuch (Vienna, 1818):—ס' תורת אלהים, *colla Traduzione Italiana ed un Comento Ebreo*, an Italian translation of the Pentateuch, with a Hebrew commentary and a most elaborate introduction, in which he gives an account of 148 Hebrew expositions of the Pentateuch of various ages (ibid. 1821, 5 vols. 8vo):—*On the Necessity of having a Theological Seminary in Italy*, written in Italian (Venice, 1822); in consequence of which the *Collegium Rabbinicum* was opened at Padua in 1829, for which he had drawn up the constitution:—התורה והפילוסופיאה, *Religion and Philosophy* (Vienna, 1827):—a disquisition, *Whether Philosophy is in Opposition to Tradition*, אם התורה התנגד אל־התקבלה (Leipsic, 1840):—*Il Libro d' Isaia, Versione Poetica fatta sull' Originale Testo Ebraico* (Vienna, 1831):—a historico-critical introduction to the book of Esther, entitled מפתח אל־מגלת אסתר (ibid. 1841). Besides these, Reggio wrote numerous treatises on various points connected with the Hebrew Scriptures and literature in the different Jewish periodicals. See Fürst, *Bibl. Jud.* iii, 139–142; Steinschneider, *Catalogus Libr. Hebr. in Biblioth. Bodl.* col. 2135–2137; Geiger, *Leo da Modena* (Breslau, 1856), p. 57–63; id. *Nachgelassene Schriften* (Berlin, 1875), ii, 272; Jost, *Gesch. d. Judenth. u. s. Secten*, iii, 346; Dessauer, *Gesch. d. Israeliten*, p. 534; Zunz, *Die Monatstage des Kalenderjahres* (Berlin, 1872; English transl. by the Rev. B. Pick in the *Jewish Messenger*, N. Y. 1874–75). (B. P.)

Regĭna Cœli (Lat. for *Queen of heaven*), an appellation often given by the ancient Romans to *Juno*.

Region-round-about, THE (ἡ περίχωρος). This term had perhaps originally a more precise and independent meaning than it appears to a reader of the A. V. to possess. It is used by the Sept. as the equivalent of the singular Hebrew word *hak-kikkâr* (הַכִּכָּר, literally "the round"), a word the topographical application of which is not clear, but which seems in its earliest occurrences to denote the *circle* or oasis of cultivation in which stood Sodom and Gomorrah and the rest of the five "cities of the *Ciccar*" (Gen. xiii, 10–12; xix, 17, 25, 28, 29; Deut. xxxiv, 3). Elsewhere it has a wider meaning, though still attached to the Jordan (2 Sam. xviii, 23; 1 Kings vii, 46; 2 Chron. iv, 17; Neh. iii, 22; xii, 28). It is in this less restricted sense that περίχωρος occurs in the New Test. In Matt. iii, 5 and Luke iii, 3 it denotes the populous and flourishing region which contained the towns of Jericho and its dependencies in the Jordan valley, enclosed in the amphitheatre of the hills of Quarantana, a densely populated region, and important enough to be reckoned as a distinct section of Palestine—"Jerusalem, Judæa, and all the *arrondissement* of Jordan" (Matt. iii, 5; also Luke vii, 17). It is also applied to the district of Gennesaret, a region which presents certain similarities to that of Jericho, being enclosed in the amphitheatre of the hills of Hattin and bounded in front by the water of the lake, as the other was by the Jordan, and also resembling it in being very thickly populated (Matt. xiv, 35; Mark vi, 55; Luke vi, 37; vii, 17). It is perhaps nearly equivalent to the modern Arabic appellation of the *Ghôr*. See TOPOGRAPHICAL TERMS.

Regionarii, one of the three classes of subdeacons at Rome, appointed in the 11th century, and employed in various occupations in the several *regiones* or districts of that city. The other classes were called PALATINI (q. v.) and STATIONARII (q. v.).

Regis, JEAN BAPTISTE DE, a French Jesuit and geographer, was born at Istres, in Provence, about 1665, and was sent as a missionary to China about 1700. His scientific attainments gained him a place at court and the favor of the emperor Hang-he, who, in 1707, placed him at the head of a commission of Jesuits to make a survey and draw up a map of the Chinese empire. His labors were interrupted in 1724 when the emperor Yung-ching proscribed the Christian religion. He wrote a full history of his labors, a condensation of which may be found in Du Halde's *Déscription de la Chine*. He translated into Latin the *Yih-king*, edited by Julius Mohl (Stuttgart and Tübingen, 1834, 2 vols.). The MS. is in the National Library, Paris.

Registers. See DIPTYCHS.

Registers OF ORDINATION were first ordered to be preserved in 1237 in the bishop's house or in the cathedral.

Registers, PARISH, were required to be kept as a record of baptisms, marriages, and burials in 1538 by Cromwell, by the royal injunctions of 1547, and the 70th Canon of 1603.

Regium Donum, a sum of money annually allowed by government to dissenting ministers. It originated in a donation, made in the way of royal bounty, by George II, in the year 1723, consisting of £500, to be paid out of the treasury, for assisting first of all the widows, and afterwards either ministers or their widows, who wanted help. The first motion for it was made by Mr. Daniel Burgess, who had for some time been secretary to the princess of Wales, and was approved by lord Townshend, secretary of state, and Sir Robert Walpole, chancellor of the exchequer, who entered readily into the measure because the Dissenters proved themselves very friendly to the house of Brunswick, and he wished to reward them for their loyalty. When the money was paid, a strict charge was given that the matter should be kept very secret. Some few years after, the sum was raised to £850 half-yearly; and at present, though no longer a *regium donum*, it is still annually granted by Parliament, amounting to about £5000, but including the relief granted to "Poor French refugee clergy, poor French Protestant laity, and sundry small charitable and other allowances to the poor of St. Martin's-in-the-Fields, and others."

REGIUM DONUM, IRISH, a pecuniary grant, voted annually by the British Parliament, out of the national exchequer, to aid certain bodies of Presbyterians in Ireland by providing stipends for their ministers. This grant, which now amounts to about £40,000 a year, is divided among six different bodies of Presbyterians, viz.: 1. The General Assembly, comprising the two bodies formerly known as the Synod of Ulster and the Synod of Seceders. 2. The Secession Synod. 3. The Remonstrants, or Unitarian Synod of Ulster. 4. The Presbytery of Antrim. 5. The Synod of Munster, Unitarian. 6. The Presbytery of Munster, orthodox. During the reign of James I Presbyterianism was introduced into Ireland, and under the mild sway of Usher their clergymen became incumbents of parishes, and were permitted to enjoy tithes and other emoluments. But after the accession of Charles II they were wholly dependent upon their flocks. In 1672 the king gave Sir Arthur Forbes £600 to be divided among them. William III issued an order, June 19, 1690, authorizing the payment of £1200 to Patrick Adair and six other clergymen. In the following year this bounty was removed from the customs, and made payable out of the Irish exchequer.

Such was the origin of the Regium Donum in its present permanent character. There was this important change made, however: the power of allocating the amount was taken from the trustees and transferred to the lord lieutenant. In 1831 the grant was placed on the Irish miscellaneous estimates, and in 1838 the classification principle was abandoned, and £75 Irish currency was promised to every minister connected with the Synod of Ulster and the Secession Synod, with the proviso (1840) that he was to receive at least £35 of yearly stipend. The amount required was increasing at the rate of £400 a year, to meet the demands of new congregations. The Regium Donum was withdrawn by the act of 1869, which came into force Jan. 1, 1871, disendowing the Irish Episcopal Church.

Regius, the Latinized name of *Urban König*, a learned theologian, preacher, and writer, and also an influential promoter of the Reformation. He was born in 1490 of parents in moderate circumstances, and resident at Langenargen, near Lake Constance. At the age of seventeen he was admitted to the University of Fribourg as a student of theology, and by his application and progress won the favor of his professors; but an injudicious defence of the disputations of John Eck, later the noted opponent of Luther, led to his suspension from the university and to his subsequent removal to Basle. After a brief sojourn in Basle, he was called to the chair of poetry and oratory in the University of Ingolstadt, where Eck was likewise employed as professor of theology, and where a circle of humanists were then striving to bring the classics into honor. Regius distinguished himself to such a degree as to receive from the hands of the emperor Maximilian a laurel crown in recognition of his services, and saw his classes grow continually. But his success was interrupted by the neglect of patrons to settle bills which he had been compelled to assume for their sons who were his pupils, so that, in utter discouragement, he became a soldier in the imperial army—a situation from which he was fortunately delivered by the interference of Eck, who secured his discharge from the army and also the payment of his debts, as well as an increased salary for the future.

Regius, however, began to dislike the studies in which he was engaged, and to manifest a growing predilection for theology. He was especially impressed with the influence of the Wittenberg reformatory movements, and found greater pleasure in the evangelical doctrines taught by Luther and Melancthon than in scholasticism. The consequence was a growing coolness between Eck and himself, which led him to seek a release from the university. The influence of John Faber, vicar-general of the see of Constance, and a book written by himself, entitled *De Dignitate Sacerdotum*, recommended him to bishop Hugo of Constance, and secured from that prelate the appointment of episcopal vicar *in spiritualibus*. A year later he was made doctor of theology (1520), and appointed preacher at the Augsburg cathedral. His evangelical attitude excited the opposition of the papal party against him, and compelled his removal; but he soon returned, and labored with great energy for the extension of the evangelical doctrines, from 1522 to 1530, by presenting them to the people in sermons from the pulpit of St. Ann's Church, and by disputations and controversial writings. Luther came to regard him as the principal supporter of evangelicalism in Suabia, while Eck charged him with black ingratitude, and persecuted him with passionate hatred and malicious cunning. It was perhaps owing to the bitterness of such experiences that he concluded to imitate the example of other Reformers and establish for himself the refuge of a home. He married Anna Weissbrück, a native of Augsburg, who sustained him faithfully while he lived, and by whom he became the father of thirteen children.

The fame of Regius had in the meantime become so extended that his counsel and aid were frequently sought even by distant cities and countries. Duke Ernest of Lüneberg, surnamed the Confessor, urged him to assist in introducing the Reformation into that territory, and Regius pledged his services to that end, removing to Celle, and assuming the functions of court preacher. He was soon appointed general superintendent over the whole duchy, and in that position was enabled, by judicious counsels and restless activity, to rapidly advance the interests of the Reformation. Two years were spent in superseding the Romish clergy and their services with an evangelical ministry and worship, in improving the schools and gymnasia of the country, and also in establishing the infant Church on a legal foundation, and in securing the transfer of the confiscated goods of monasteries to the use of the Church and of schools. A call to return to Augsburg at this time (1532) was declined, and his life was thenceforward spent in the service of the prince and people of the duchy of Lüneberg, though he took an active part in the introduction and development of Protestantism in other places: e. g. the county of Hoya, the cities of Hildesheim, Hanover, Brunswick, Minden, and Hörter, the territory of Schaumburg, etc. He also responded to the request of count Enno for evangelical preachers by sending Martin Ondermark and Matthias Günderich to East Friesland. He ranks, accordingly, as one of the leading Reformers in North Germany. In 1537 he accompanied duke Ernest to the convention at Smalcald, and signed the *Smalcald Articles;* in 1538 he was present at the Convention of Brunswick, and in 1540 at Hagenau, where an abortive attempt at reconciliation between the papal and the evangelical parties was made, and where the king, Ferdinand, issued a decree for a religious conference at Worms. Physical inability prevented Regius from participating in the proceedings of the latter diet. A severe cold incurred on his return from Hagenau resulted in a dangerous sickness, and on May 23, 1541, he ended his useful life. The veneration of his contemporaries proved his worth.

In appearance, Regius was a man of medium height and spare and delicate figure, easy and yet resolute in his bearing, and characterized by an air of intelligence and moral earnestness. His writings breathe the same Christian spirit which belonged to his personality. They number ninety-seven different works, which were published at Nuremberg in 1562, the German in four parts, and the Latin in three. His exegetical works deserve attention on account of their practical aim, and the thoroughness and skill with which the sense of Scripture is developed in them; and, in addition, the following are worthy of note: *Formulæ quædam caute et citra Scandalum Loquendi de Præcipuis Christianæ Doctrinæ Locis* (1535), which has almost reached the position of a symbolical book:—*Catechismus Minor* (1536), and *Catechismus Major* (1537), which are peculiar in that the questions are placed in the mouth of the pupil, and the answers are assigned to the teacher:—*Erklärung der zwölf Artikel des christlichen Glaubens* (1523); and others, among them several books on Church discipline, which have been often reprinted.

Literature.—The writings of Urban Regius himself contain sources respecting his life, as does also the *Vita Urbani Regii*, etc., written by his son Ernest. Comp. also Bertram, *Ref.- u. Kirchenhist. d. Stadt Lüneberg* (1719); Meier, *Ref.-Gesch. d. Stadt Hannover* (1730); Lauenstein, *Hildesheim Reformationshistoria* (1720); Geffken, *Dr. Urb. Regius, seine Wahl zum ersten Hamb. Superintendenten*, etc.; Schlegel, *Kirchen- u. Ref.-Gesch. v. Norddeutschl.* (Hanover, 1828), vol. ii; Havemann, *Gesch. d. Lande Braunschweig und Lüneburg* (Götting. 1855), vol. ii; Heimbürger, *Urbanus Regius*, etc. (Hamb. and Gotha, 1851); Hagen, *Deutschlands lit. u. rel. Verhältnisse im Ref.-Zeitalter* (Erlangen, 1841–44); Uhlhorn, *Urban Regius im Abendmahlsstreite*, in the *Jahrb. f. deutsche Theologie* (1860), vol. v, No. 1.—Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* s. v.

Regius Codex. See PARIS MANUSCRIPT.

Regnum, a name for the tiara or diadem of the popes, encircled with three crowns. It is (says Innocent III. cir. 1200) the imperial crown, representing the pope's power as plenary and absolute over all the faithful. According to some authors, Hormisdas first wore a crown which had been sent to him as a mark of fealty by the emperor Anastasius, to whom Clovis had presented it in 550, while some refer it to a gift of Constantine to pope Sylvester. At the entrance of a church the pope, when borne on his litter, laid aside the regnum and put on a precious mitre, but resumed the former when he left the building. Paul II made a new regnum, and enriched it with precious stones, when its use had long lain dormant. At first it was a tall round or conical cap, ending in a round ball, and wreathed with a single gold crown, representing regal and temporal power. It is mentioned in the 11th century. In the 9th century, on mosaics, Nicholas I is represented wearing two circles, the lower labelled "The crown of the kingdom, from God's hand," and the upper inscribed "The crown of empire, from St. Peter's hand." Boniface VIII (1294–1303) added a second or spiritual crown, while Benedict XII (1334), others say John XII or Urban V, contributed the third coronet of sacerdotal sovereignty, and about that time the ornament assumed an oval form, and was no longer straight-sided. The patriarch of Constantinople wears two crowns on the tiara. On putting on the tiara, the cardinal-deacon says to the pope, "Receive the tiara, adorned with three crowns, and know that thou art father of kings and princes, the ruler of the world." The crowns represent the three realms of heaven, earth, and purgatory, according to Baur; but as Jewel explains it, the three divisions of the earth — Europe, Asia, and Africa. Pope Adrian VI's effigy at Viterbo has no crowns on the tiara. See TIARA.

Regŭla Fidēi. See FAITH, RULE OF.

Regular Canons (Lat. *Canonici Regulares*, canons bound by rule), the name given, after the reform introduced into the system of cathedral clergy in the 11th century, to the members of those canonical bodies which adopted that reform. They were thus distinguished from the so-called "secular canons," who continued exempt from rule, and who are represented down to modern times by the canons, prebendaries, and other members of cathedral chapters, in those churches in which the full cathedral system of the Roman Catholic Church is maintained. The rules of the regular canons being variously modified in different countries and ages, a variety of religious orders arose therefrom—Augustinians, Premonstratensians, etc. See CANONS, REGULAR.

Regular Clerks are modern religious orders founded for preaching, medicine, or education. The principal are the Theatines (q. v.), founded by Paul IV, and the Oratorians (q. v.), instituted in 1550 by Philip Neri, of Florence.

Regulars or **Regulārès.** During the 4th and 5th centuries it was not customary to place monks, as such, on an equal footing with the clergy, nor were they regarded as part of the clerical body until the 10th century. Before this they were distinguished by the name of *religiosi* or *regulares*, and afterwards a distinction was carefully made between *clerici sæculares*, i. e. parish priests, and those who were charged with the care of souls, and *clerici regulares*, i. e. those belonging to monastic orders. This name was applied to the latter because they were bound to live according to certain rules (*regulæ*).—Riddle, *Christian Antiq.*

Rehabi'ah (Heb. *Rechabyah'*, רְחַבְיָה, *enlarged* by *Jehovah*; also, in the prolonged form, *Rechabya'hu*, רְחַבְיָהוּ, 1 Chron. xxiv, 21; xxvi, 25; Sept. Ῥααβιά or Ῥααβίας, v. r. Ῥαβιά or Ῥαβίας), the only son of Eliezer, son of Moses; himself the father of many sons (1 Chron. xxiii, 17), of whom the eldest was Isshiah (1 Chron. xxiv, 21) or Jeshaiah (1 Chron. xxvi, 25). B.C. post 1618.

Rehearse, in the Prayer-book, is understood to imply distinctness of utterance, in opposition to a low and hesitating manner, as in the catechism—"Rehearse the articles of the belief." Sometimes the word simply denotes saying or reading, or a recapitulation; as where Latimer remarks in a sermon, "I will therefore make an end, without any *rehearsal* or recital of that which is already said."

Rehfuss, CARL, *Dr.*, a Jewish rabbi, was born Feb. 9, 1792, at Altdorf, in Breisgau. When fifteen years of age he went to Yverdun, in Switzerland, to attend the lectures at the Pestalozzi Institution there. He then entered the lyceum at Rastatt, and after due preparation was enabled to attend the lectures at the Heidelberg University, where he was promoted, Aug. 25, 1834, as doctor of philosophy. Having completed his studies, he was appointed preacher of the Jewish congregation at Heidelberg, where he died, Feb. 18, 1842. He translated into German the סִ֫דּוּר חִתּוּרִים, a Jewish ritual used for the sick, etc. (Frankfort-on-the-Main, 1834). Besides, he published a number of school-books. See Fürst, *Bibl. Jud.* iii, 142 sq.; Kayserling, *Bibliothek jüdischer Kanzelredner*, i, 358 sq.; Steinschneider, *Bibliogr. Handbuch*, p. 115; Zunz, *Die Monatstage des Kalenderjahres* (Berlin, 1872; Engl. transl. by Rev. B. Pick in the *Jewish Messenger*, N. Y. 1874–75); *Allgemeine Zeitung des Judenthums*, 1842, p. 248. (B. P.)

Re'hob (Heb. *Rechob'*, רְחֹב [twice רְחוֹב, 2 Sam. x, 8; Neh. x, 11], a *street*, from its width; Sept. Ῥαάβ v. r. Ῥοώβ, etc.), the name of two men and also of three places in the north of Palestine.

1. The father of the Hadadezer, king of Zobah, whom David smote at the Euphrates (2 Sam. viii, 3, 12). B.C. ante 1043. Josephus (*Ant.* vii, 5, 1) calls him *Araüs* (Ἀράος), and the old Latin version *Arachus*. The name possibly had some connection with the district of Syria called Rehob, or Beth-rehob (2 Sam. x, 6, 8).

2. A Levite who sealed the covenant with Nehemiah (Neh. x, 11). B.C. 410.

3. The northern limit of the exploration of the spies who explored Canaan (Numb. xiii, 21). It is specified as being "as men come unto Hamath," or, as the phrase is elsewhere rendered, "at the entrance of Hamath," i. e. at the commencement of the territory of that name, by which in the early books of the Bible the great valley of Lebanon, the Bika'ah of the prophets, and the Bŭka'a of the modern Arabs, seems to be roughly designated. This, and the consideration of the improbability that the spies went farther than the upper end of the Jordan valley, seems to fix the position of Rehob as not far from Tell el-Kady and Bânias. This is confirmed by the statement of Judg. xviii, 28, that Laish or Dan (Tell el-Kady) was "in the valley that is by Beth-rehob." Dr. Robinson (*Later Bib. Res.* p. 371) proposes to identify it with *Hunîn*, an ancient fortress in the mountains north-west of the plain of Huleh, the upper district of the Jordan valley. But since the names Ruheib, of a valley, and *Deir-Rabba*, of an Arab ruin, are found near Bânias, Thomson (*Land and Book*, i, 391) prefers that vicinity. There is no reason to doubt that this Rehob or Beth-rehob was identical with the place mentioned under both names in 2 Sam. x, 6, 8, in connection with Maacah, which was also in the upper district of the Huleh. See BETH-REHOB.

4. One of the towns allotted to Asher (Josh. xix, 28), and which from the list appears to have been in close proximity to Zidon. It is named between Ebron, or Abdon, and Hammon. Schwarz, from some Jewish writer, gives it a position seven and a half miles east of Tyre, on the river Leontes; referring, perhaps, to the modern village *Rezieh* or *Harziyeh*.

5. Asher contained another Rehob (Josh. xix, 30). One of the two was allotted to the Gershonite Levites (xxi, 31; 1 Chron. vi, 75), and of one its Canaanitish inhabitants retained possession (Judg. i, 31). The mention of Aphik in this latter passage may imply that the Rehob referred to was that of Josh. xix, 30. This, Eusebius and Jerome (*Onomasticon*, s. v. "Roob") confound with the Rehob of the spies, and place four Roman miles from Scythopolis. The place they refer to still survives as *Rehab*, three and a half miles south of Beisân, but their identification of a town in that position with one in the territory of Asher is obviously inaccurate. The Rehob in question is possibly represented by the modern *Tell Kurdâny*, south of the river Belus, near the northern base of which is a village with a perennial spring (Robinson, *Later Bib. Res.* p. 104).

Rehobo'am (Heb. *Rechabâm*, רְחַבְעָם, *enlarger of the people* [see Exod. xxxiv, 24, and comp. the name Εὐρύδημος]; Sept. Ῥοβοάμ; Josephus, Ῥοβόαμος, *Ant.* viii, 8, 1), the only son of Solomon, by the Ammonitish princess Naamah (1 Kings xiv, 21, 31), and his successor (xi, 43). Rehoboam's mother is distinguished by the title "the (not 'an,' as in the A. V.) Ammonite." She was therefore one of the foreign women whom Solomon took into his establishment (xi, 1). In the Sept. (1 Kings xii, 24, answering to xiv, 31 of the Hebrew text) she is stated to have been the "daughter of Ana (i. e. Hanun) the son of Nahash." If this is a translation of a statement which once formed part of the Hebrew text, and may be taken as authentic history, it follows that the Ammonitish war into which Hanun's insults had provoked David was terminated by a realliance. Rehoboam was born B.C. 1014, when Solomon was but twenty years old, and as yet unanointed to the throne. His reign was noted for the great political schism which he occasioned, and which continued to the end of both lines of monarchy.

From the earliest period of Jewish history we perceive symptoms that the confederation of the tribes was but imperfectly cemented. The powerful Ephraim could never brook a position of inferiority. Throughout the book of Judges (viii, 1; xii, 1) the Ephraimites show a spirit of resentful jealousy when any enterprise is undertaken without their concurrence and active participation. From them had sprung Joshua, and afterwards (by his place of birth) Samuel might be considered theirs; and though the tribe of Benjamin gave to Israel its first king, yet it was allied by hereditary ties to the house of Joseph, and by geographical position to the territory of Ephraim, so that up to David's accession the leadership was practically in the hands of the latter tribe. See EPHRAIM, TRIBE OF. But Judah always threatened to be a formidable rival. During the earlier history, partly from the physical structure and situation of its territory (Stanley, *Syr. and Palest.* p. 162), which secluded it from Palestine just as Palestine by its geographical character was secluded from the world, it had stood very much aloof from the nation [see JUDAH, TRIBE OF], and even after Saul's death, apparently without waiting to consult their brethren, "the men of Judah came and anointed David king over the house of Judah" (2 Sam. ii, 4), while the other tribes adhered to Saul's family, thereby anticipating the final disruption which was afterwards to rend the nation permanently into two kingdoms. But after seven years of disaster a reconciliation was forced upon the contending parties; David was acknowledged as king of Israel, and soon after, by fixing his court at Jerusalem and bringing the tabernacle there, he transferred from Ephraim the greatness which had attached to Shechem as the ancient capital and to Shiloh as the seat of the national worship. In spite of this he seems to have enjoyed great personal popularity among the Ephraimites, and to have treated many of them with special favor (1 Chron. xii, 30; xxvii, 10, 14), yet this roused the jealousy of Judah, and probably led to the revolt of Absalom (q. v.). Even after that perilous crisis was passed, the old rivalry broke out afresh and almost led to another insurrection (2 Sam. xx, 1, etc. [comp. Psa. lxxviii, 60, 67, etc., in illustration of these remarks]). Solomon's reign, from its severe taxes and other oppressions, aggravated the discontent, and latterly, from its irreligious character, alienated the prophets and provoked the displeasure of God. When Solomon's strong hand was withdrawn, the crisis came (B.C. 973). Rehoboam selected Shechem as the place of his coronation, probably as an act of concession to the Ephraimites, and perhaps in deference to the suggestions of those old and wise counsellors of his father whose advice he afterwards unhappily rejected. From the present Hebrew text of 1 Kings xii the exact details of the transactions at Shechem are involved in a little uncertainty. The general facts, indeed, are clear. The people demanded a remission of the severe burdens imposed by Solomon, and Rehoboam promised them an answer in three days, during which time he consulted first his father's counsellors, and then the young men "that were grown up with him and which stood before him," whose answer shows how greatly during Solomon's later years the character of the Jewish court had degenerated. Rejecting the advice of the elders to conciliate the people at the beginning of his reign, and so make them "his servants forever," he returned as his reply, in the true spirit of an Eastern despot, the frantic bravado of his contemporaries, "My little finger shall be thicker than my father's loins. . . . I will add to your yoke; my father hath chastised you with whips, but I will chastise you with scorpions" (i. e. scourges furnished with sharp points; so in Latin, *scorpio*, according to Isidore [*Origg.* v, 27], is "virga nodosa et aculeata, quia arcuato vulnere in corpus infligitur" [Facciolati, s. v.]). Thereupon arose the formidable song of insurrection, heard once before when the tribes quarrelled after David's return from the war with Absalom:

> "What portion have we in David?
> What inheritance in Jesse's son?
> To your tents, O Israel!
> Now see to thy own house, O David!"

Rehoboam sent Adoram or Adoniram, who had been chief receiver of the tribute during the reigns of his father and his grandfather (1 Kings iv, 6; 2 Sam. xx, 24), to reduce the rebels to reason, but he was stoned to death by them, whereupon the king and his attendants fled in hot haste to Jerusalem. So far all is plain, but there is a doubt as to the part which Jeroboam took in these transactions. According to 1 Kings xii, 3 he was summoned by the Ephraimites from Egypt (to which country he had fled from the anger of Solomon) to be their spokesman at Rehoboam's coronation, and actually made the speech in which a remission of burdens was requested. There is no real contradiction to this when we read in ver. 20 of the same chapter that after the success of the insurrection and Rehoboam's flight, "when all Israel *heard* that Jeroboam was come again, they sent and called him unto the congregation and made him king." We find in the Sept. a long supplement to this 12th chapter, possibly ancient, containing fuller details of Jeroboam's biography than the Hebrew. See JEROBOAM. In this we read that after Solomon's death he returned to his native place, Sarira in Ephraim, which he fortified, and lived there quietly, watching the turn of events until the long-expected rebellion broke out, when the Ephraimites *heard* (doubtless through his own agency) that he had returned, and invited him to Shechem to assume the crown. From the same supplementary narrative of the Sept. we might infer that more than a year must have elapsed between Solomon's death and Rehoboam's visit to Shechem, for, on receiving the news of the former event, Jeroboam requested from the king of Egypt leave to return to his native country. This the king tried to prevent by giving him his sister-in-law in marriage; but on the birth of his child Abijah, Jeroboam renewed his request, which was then granted.

It is probable that during this year the discontent of the northern tribes was making itself more and more manifest, and that this led to Rehoboam's visit and intended inauguration. The comparative chronology of the reigns determines them both as beginning in this year.

On Rehoboam's return to Jerusalem he assembled an army of 180,000 men from the two faithful tribes of Judah and Benjamin (the latter transferred from the side of Joseph to that of Judah in consequence of the position of David's capital within its borders), in the hope of reconquering Israel. The expedition, however, was forbidden by the prophet Shemaiah, who assured them that the separation of the kingdoms was in accordance with God's will (1 Kings xii, 24). Still, during Rehoboam's lifetime peaceful relations between Israel and Judah were never restored (2 Chron. xii, 15; 1 Kings xiv, 30). Rehoboam now occupied himself in strengthening the territories which remained to him by building a number of fortresses of which the names are given in 2 Chron. xi, 6–10, forming a girdle of "fenced cities" round Jerusalem. The pure worship of God was maintained in Judah, and the Levites and many pious Israelites from the North, vexed at the calf-idolatry introduced by Jeroboam at Dan and Bethel, in imitation of the Egyptian worship of Mnevis, came and settled in the southern kingdom and added to its power. But Rehoboam did not check the introduction of heathen abominations into his capital. The lascivious worship of Ashtoreth was allowed to exist by the side of the true religion (an inheritance of evil doubtless left by Solomon), "images" (of Baal and his fellow-divinities) were set up, and the worst immoralities were tolerated (1 Kings xiv, 22–24). These evils were punished and put down by the terrible calamity of an Egyptian invasion. Shortly before this time a change in the ruling house had occurred in Egypt. The twenty-first dynasty of Tanites, whose last king, Pisham or Psusennes, had been a close ally of Solomon (iii, 1; vii, 8; ix, 16; x, 28, 29), was succeeded by the twenty-second of Bubastites, whose first sovereign, Shishak (Sheshonk, Sesonchis, Σουσακίμ), was himself connected, as we have seen, with Jeroboam. That he was incited by him to attack Judah is very probable. At all events, in the fifth year of Rehoboam's reign the country was invaded by a host of Egyptians and other African nations, numbering 1200 chariots, 60,000 cavalry, and a vast miscellaneous multitude of infantry (B.C. 969). The line of fortresses which protected Jerusalem to the west and south was forced, Jerusalem itself was taken, and Rehoboam had to purchase an ignominious peace by delivering up all the treasures with which Solomon had adorned the Temple and palace, including his golden shields, 200 of the larger and 300 of the smaller size (x, 16, 17), which were carried before him when he visited the Temple in state. We are told that after the Egyptians had retired, his vain and foolish successor comforted himself by substituting shields of brass, which were solemnly borne before him in procession by the body-guard, as if nothing had been changed since his father's time (Ewald, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, iii, 348, 464). Shishak's success is commemorated by sculptures discovered by Champollion on the outside of the great temple at Karnak, where among a long list of captured towns and provinces occurs the name *Judah Malkah* (kingdom of Judah). It is said that the features of the captives in these sculptures are unmistakably Jewish (Rawlinson, *Herodotus*, ii, 376, and *Bampton Lectures*, p. 126; Bunsen, *Egypt*, iii, 242). After this great humiliation the moral condition of Judah seems to have improved (2 Chron. xii, 12), and the rest of Rehoboam's life to have been unmarked by any events of importance. He died B.C. 956, after a reign of seventeen years, having ascended the throne at the age of forty-one (1 Kings xiv, 21; 2 Chron. xii, 13). In the addition to the Sept. already mentioned (inserted after 1 Kings xii, 24) we read that he was sixteen years old at his accession—a misstatement probably founded on a wrong interpretation of 2 Chron. xiii, 7, where he is called "young" (i. e. *new to his work, inexperienced*) and "tender-hearted" (רַךְ־לֵבָב, *wanting in resolution and spirit*). He had eighteen wives, sixty concubines, twenty-eight sons, and sixty daughters. The wisest thing recorded of him in Scripture is that he refused to waste away his sons' energies in the wretched existence of an Eastern zenana, in which we may infer, from his helplessness at the age of forty-one, that he had himself been educated, but dispersed them in command of the new fortresses which he had built about the country. Of his wives, Mahalath, Abihail, and Maachah were all of the royal house of Jesse. Maachah he loved best of all, and to her son Abijah he bequeathed his kingdom. See Kiesling, *Hist. Rehabeami* (Jena, 1753). See JUDAH, KINGDOM OF.

Portrait of Rehoboam. (From the Egyptian monuments.)

J u d h k m a l k

Hieroglyph of the above. (The final character, read *kah*, denotes a region or country.)

Re'hoboth [many *Reho'both*] (Heb. *Rechoboth'*, רְחֹבוֹת [once רְחֹבֹת, Gen. x, 11], *wide* places, i. e. *streets*, as in Prov. i, 20, etc.), the name of three places.

1. REHOBOTH THE WELL (Sept. εὐρυχωρία; Vulg. *latitudo*), the third of the series of wells dug by Isaac in the Philistines' territory (Gen. xxvi, 22). He had dug several wells before, but was obliged to abandon them in consequence of the quarrels of the Philistines. When this one was completed they did not strive for it. He celebrated his triumph and bestowed its name on the well in a fragment of poetry of the same nature as those in which Jacob's wives gave

names to his successive children: "He called the name of it Rehoboth (*room*) and said,

> 'Because now Jehovah *hath made room* for us
> And we shall increase in the land.'"

The name was intended to indicate the fact that the patriarch had at length got *space* to rest in. Most of the ancient versions translate the word, though it must evidently be regarded as a proper name. Isaac had left the valley of Gerar and its turbulent inhabitants before he dug the well which he thus commemorated (ver. 22). From it he, in time, "went up" to Beersheba (ver. 23), an expression which is always used of motion towards the land of promise. The position of Gerar has not been definitely ascertained, but it seems to have lain a few miles to the south of Gaza and nearly due east of Beersheba. In this direction, therefore, if anywhere, the wells Sitnah, Esek, and Rehoboth should be searched for. The ancient Jewish tradition confined the events of this part of Isaac's life to a much narrower circle. The wells of the patriarchs were shown near Ashkelon in the time of Origen, Antoninus Martyr, and Eusebius (Reland, *Palæst.* p. 589); the Samaritan version identifies Gerar with Ashkelon; Josephus (*Ant.* i, 12, 1) calls it "Gerar of *Palestine*," i. e. of *Philistia*. It is a remarkable fact that the name clings to the spot still. In the wilderness of et-Tîh, about twenty-three miles south-west of Beersheba, is a wady called *er-Ruhaibeh*, in which and on the adjoining heights are remains of antiquity thus described by Robinson: "In the valley itself is the ruin of a small rough building with a dome, built in the manner of a mosque. On the right of the path is a confused heap of hewn stones, the remains of a square building of some size, perhaps a tower. On the acclivity of the eastern hill we found *traces of wells*, a deep cistern, or rather cavern, and a fine circular threshing-floor, evidently antique. But on ascending the hill on the left of the valley we were astonished to find ourselves amid the ruins of an ancient city. Here is a level track of ten or twelve acres in extent entirely and thickly covered over with confused heaps of stones, with just enough of their former order remaining to show the foundations and form of the houses, and the course of some of the streets. The houses were mostly small, all solidly built of bluish limestone, squared and often hewn on the exterior surface. Many of the dwellings had each its cistern, cut in the solid rock; and these still remained quite entire. . . . Once, as we judged upon the spot, this must have been a city of not less than twelve or fifteen thousand inhabitants" (*Bib. Res.* i, 106). This identification is adopted by Rowlands (in Williams, *Holy City*, i, 465), Van de Velde (*Memoir*, p. 343), Stewart (*Tent and Khan*, p. 343), and Bonar (*Desert of Sinai*, p. 316). Dr. Robinson could not find the well itself. Dr. Stewart found it "regularly built, twelve feet in circumference," but "completely filled up." Mr. Rowlands describes it as "an ancient well of living and good water."

2. Rehoboth the City (Heb. *Rechoboth' 'Ir*, רְחֹבֹת עִיר, i. e. *Rehoboth City;* Sept. Ῥοωβὼθ πόλις v. r. Ῥοωβώς; Vulg. *plateæ civitates*), one of the four cities built by Asshur, or by Nimrod in Asshur, according as this difficult passage is translated. The four were Nineveh, Rehoboth-ir, Calah, and Resen, between Nineveh and Calah (Gen. x, 11). It has been supposed by recent commentators that these four constituted *one great city*. They argue that the first name, *Nineveh*, is the chief, and that the other three are subordinate. "He built Nineveh, with (taking ו, not as a copulative, but as the sign of subordination) Rehoboth-ir, Calah, and Resen, between Nineveh and Calah." From this it would follow that the four places formed a large composite city, or range of towns, to which the general name "Nineveh" was given (see Keil and Delitzsch, *ad loc.*). This appears to put too great a strain upon the passage; and it is better, because more natural, to take them as distinct places. They were most probably not far distant from each other; and as Nineveh and Calah stood on the Tigris, the others may be looked for there also. The Samaritan seems to understand *Sittace* in South Assyria, which was thence called Sittacene (Ptolemy, vi, 1, 2), and is different from the Mesopotamian Sittace near the Tigris (Xenoph. *Anab.* ii, 4, 13; comp. Mannert, *Geogr.* v, ii, 383 sq.), on the site of the modern Old Bagdad. Ephrem has *Adiabene*, a well-known district of Assyria; but not, as Michaelis supposes (*Spicil.* i, 243), also a city. Schulthess (*Parad.* p. 117) refers it to the Euphrates, and considers it the same as *Rehoboth Han-nahar* (No. 3, below). In that case we must understand Assyria in a wide sense, as the Assyrian empire, which is improbable. Bochart gives a far-fetched supposition, resting on conjectural etymology (*Phaleg*, iv, 21). Jerome, both in the Vulgate and in his *Quæstiones ad Genesim* (probably from Jewish sources), considers Rehoboth-ir as referring to Nineveh, and as meaning the "streets of the city." The readings of the Targums of Jonathan, Jerusalem, and rabbi Joseph on Gen. and 1 Chron., viz. *Platiah, Platiûtha*, are probably only transcriptions of the Greek word πλατεῖαι, which, as found in the well-known ancient city Platæa, is the exact equivalent of Rehoboth. The name of *Rahabeh* is still attached to two places in the region of the ancient Mesopotamia. They lie, the one on the western and the other on the eastern bank of the Euphrates, a few miles below the confluence of the Khabûr. Both are said to contain extensive ancient remains. That on the eastern bank bears the affix of *malik*, or royal, and this Bunsen (*Bibelwerk*) and Kalisch (*Genesis*, p. 261) propose as the representative of Rehoboth. Its distance from Kalah-Sherghat and Nimrûd (nearly 200 miles) is perhaps an obstacle to this identification. Sir H. Rawlinson (*Athenæum*, April 15, 1854) suggests *Selemiyah* in the immediate neighborhood of Kalah, "where there are still extensive ruins of the Assyrian period," but no subsequent discoveries appear to have confirmed this suggestion.

3. Rehoboth by the River (Heb. *Rechoboth' han-Nahar'*, רְחֹבוֹת הַנָּהָר, i. e. *Rechoboth of the River;* Sept. Ῥοωβὼθ [v. r. Ῥωβὼθ] ἡ παρὰ πόταμον; Vulg. *de fluvio Roboth*, or *Rohoboth, quæ juxta amnem sita est*), the city of a certain Saul or Shaul, one of the early kings of the Edomites (Gen. xxxvi, 37; 1 Chron. i, 48). The affix "the river" fixes the situation of Rehoboth as on the Euphrates, emphatically "*the* river" to the inhabitants of Western Asia (see Gen. xxxi, 21; xv, 18; Deut. i, 7; Exod. xxiii, 31). The Targum of Onkelos adds, "Rehoboth, *which is on the Phrat.*" There is no reason to suppose that the limits of Edom ever extended to the Euphrates, and therefore the occurrence of the name in the lists of kings of Edom is possibly a trace of an Assyrian incursion of the same nature as that of Chedorlaomer and Amraphel. At all events, the kings of Edom were not all natives of that country. Schultens in his note (*Index Geogr. in Vit. Salad.* s. v. "Rahaba") identifies it with Rehoboth of Gen. xxxvi, 37; and this is the view of Bochart (*Opp.* i, 225), Winer, Gesenius (*Thesaur.* p. 1281), and others; but as the Euphrates was far distant from the site of Nineveh, there is a strong probability against this opinion. *Rahabah* is mentioned by Abulfeda. In his day there was a small village on the site. The name still remains attached to two spots on the Euphrates—the one, simply *Rahabeh*, on the right bank, eight miles below the junction of the Khabûr, and about three miles west of the river; the other four or five miles farther down on the left bank. The latter is said to be called *Pahabeh-malik*, i. e. "royal" (Kalisch, Kaplan), and is on this ground identified by the Jewish commentators with the city of Saul. The existence of the second locality, however, rests but on slender foundation. It is shown on the map in Layard's *Nineveh and Babylon*, and is mentioned by the two Jewish authorities named above; but it does not appear on the map of colonel Chesney.

The other locality is unquestionably authentic. Chesney says, "On the right bank of the Euphrates, at the north-western extremity of the plain of Shinar, and three and a half miles south-west of the town of Mayadin, are extensive ruins around a castle still bearing the name of Rehoboth" (i, 119; ii, 222).

Re'hum (Heb. and Chald. *Rechum'*, רְחוּם, *compassionate;* Sept. Ῥεούμ, but in Neh. iii, 17 Ῥαούμ), the name of five men.

1. One of the "children of the province" who returned from the Babylonian captivity with Zerubbabel (Ezra ii, 2). B.C. 536. In the parallel passage (Neh. vii, 7) he is called NEHUM.

2. One of the priests who returned from Babylon at the same time (Neh. xii, 3). B.C. 536. In a subsequent verse (ver. 15) he seems to be called HARIM (q. v.).

3. A Persian officer in Samaria, joint author with Shimshai of a letter which turned Artaxerxes against the building-plans of the Jews (Ezra iv, 8, 9, 17, 23). B.C. 535. "He was perhaps a kind of lieutenant-governor of the province under the king of Persia, holding apparently the same office as Tatnai, who is described in Ezra v, 6 as taking part in a similar transaction, and is there called 'the governor on this side the river.' The Chaldee title, בְּעֵל־טְעֵם, *bĕél-tĕém*, literally 'lord of decree,' is left untranslated in the Sept. Βαλτάμ and the Vulg. *Beelteem;* and the rendering 'chancellor' in the A. V. appears to have been derived from Kimchi and others, who explain it, in consequence of its connection with 'scribe,' by the Hebrew word which is usually rendered 'recorder.' This appears to have been the view taken by the author of 1 Esdr. ii, 25, ὁ γράφων τὰ προσπίπτοντα, and by Josephus (*Ant.* xi, 2, 1), ὁ πάντα τὰ πραττόμενα γράφων. The former of these seems to be a gloss, for the Chaldee title is also represented by Βεελτὲθμος"

4. A Levite, son of Banï, and one of the builders of the wall of Jerusalem under Nehemiah (Neh. iii, 17). B.C. 445.

5. One of the chief Israelites who signed the covenant with Nehemiah (Neh. x, 25). B.C. 410.

Re'ï (Heb. *Reÿ'*, רֵעִי, *friendly;* Sept. Ῥηί v. r. Ῥησί), one of king David's officers, who refused to rebel with Adonijah (1 Kings i, 8). B.C. 1015. "Jerome (*Quæst. Hebr.* ad loc.) states that he is the same with 'Hiram the Zairite,' i. e. Ira the Jairite, a priest or prince about the person of David. Ewald (*Gesch.* iii, 266, note), dwelling on the occurrence of Shimei in the same list with Rei, suggests that the two are David's only surviving brothers, Rei being identical with RADDAI. This is ingenious, but there is nothing to support it, while there is the great objection to it that the names are in the original extremely dissimilar, Rei containing the *Ain*, a letter which is rarely exchanged for any other, but apparently never for *Daleth* (Gesenius, *Thesaur.* p. 976)"

Reich, GEORG, a German doctor of theology, was born in 1813, and died Oct. 1, 1862, as pastor of Reichelsheim, in Hesse. He wrote, *Die Auferstehung des Herrn als Heilsthatsache*, with special reference to Schleiermacher (Darmstadt, 1845):—*Die Lehrfortbildung in der evangelisch-protestantischen Kirche, auf dem Grund der augsburgischen Confession* (Hamburg and Gotha, 1847):—*Die evangelisch-lutherische Kirche im Grossherzogthum Hessen* (Stuttgart, 1855). See Zuchold, *Bibl. Theol.* ii, 1043, 1355, 1369. (B. P.)

Reichardt, JOHN CHRISTIAN, a minister of the Episcopal Church, was born at Ruhrort, on the Rhine, in 1803. He was educated first at the public school in his native place, and afterwards pursued his studies at the gymnasium at Duisburg. Feeling a desire to devote himself to missionary work, he was recommended to the missionary society at Barmen, which received him, and he was sent by it to the excellent Jänicke's Missionary Institution at Berlin. Jänicke had no funds at command to enable him to send forth missionaries, but the missionary societies in England, in Holland, and elsewhere were thankful to avail themselves of those who had been trained by the venerable pastor in Berlin. In the year 1824 the London Society for Propagating the Gospel among the Jews appointed Mr. Reichardt for the mission in Poland, in connection with Mr. Becker, a former pupil of father Jänicke. During 1825 and 1826 he travelled extensively through Poland; from 1827 to 1830 he was engaged in frequent missionary journeys in Holland and Bavaria, and in 1831 he was active, together with the late Rev. M. S. (afterwards bishop) Alexander, in preaching the Gospel to the Jews in London and the principal towns of England. From that time his permanent residence was at London, in prosecution of the missionary work in behalf of his society. In October, 1857, Mr. Reichardt left England on a special mission to Jerusalem, where he also remained for a time. After his return from Jerusalem, his time and efforts were mainly directed to the work of the society in England, with occasional visits to various missionary stations. His main work, however, was the revision of the text of the Hebrew New Test., which was printed and published several times, and in correcting for the press multiplied editions of the Old Test., which the London Society, as well as the British Bible Society, published. He also took part in the training of candidates for missionary employment, and, after he was permitted to labor until his death, March 31, 1873. In connection with his missionary work, he published a number of pamphlets, which have been translated by his fellow-laborers into Dutch, French, etc., viz. משיח בן דויד, or *Proofs that Jesus of Nazareth is the Son of David* (Lond. 1851, and often):—משיח צמח ה', or *Proofs that the Messiah, the Son of David, is also the Son of God* (ibid. 1851, and often):—שמע ישראל ה' אלהינו, ה' אחד, *The Scriptural Doctrine of the God of Israel* (ibid. 1851, and often):—שתי הבריתות, *The Two Covenants, or Mosaism and Christianity* (2d ed. ibid. 1857):—*Investigation of the Prophet Joel with Special Reference to the Coming Crisis* (ibid. 1867). See *Jewish Intelligencer* (Lond.), 1851, p. 427 sq.; 1867, p. 34 sq.; May, 1873; *Dibre Emeth, oder Stimme der Wahrheit* (Breslau, 1873), p. 97 sq.; Delitzsch, *Saat auf Hoffnung* (1873), x, 228 sq.; Fürst, *Bibl. Jud.* iii, 143; Zuchold, *Bibl. Theol.* ii, 1044. (B. P.)

Reiche, JOHANN GEORG, a German doctor and professor of theology, was born in the year 1794 at Leese, in Hanover. Having completed his studies, he was appointed in 1817 collaborator at the gymnasium in Celle, and in 1819 he became *Repetent* at Göttingen. In the year 1821 he travelled extensively, and after his return in 1822 he commenced his private lectures at the University of Göttingen. In 1827 he was appointed extraordinary professor of theology, and in 1835 doctor and ordinary professor, which position he occupied till his death, Aug. 9, 1863. Reiche is best known as a commentator on the New Test., and as such he published, *Authentiæ Posterioris ad Thessalonienses Epistolæ Vindiciæ* (Göttingen, 1829):—*Versuch einer ausführlichen Erklärung des Briefes Pauli an die Römer* (ibid. 1832, 1834, 2 pts.):—*Codicum MSS. N. T. Græcorum aliquot Insigniorum in Bibliotheca Regia Parisiensi Asservatorum Nova Descriptio et cum Textu Vulgo Recepto Collatio præmissis quibusdam de Neglecti Codicum MSS. N. T. Studii Causis Observationibus* (ibid. 1847):—*Commentarius Criticus in N. T., quo Loca Graviora et Difficiliora Lectionis Dubiæ accurate Recensentur et Explicantur* (ibid. 1853–62, vol. i–iii):—*Commentarii in N. T. Critici Specimen* (ibid. 1863). See Winer, *Handbuch der theol. Literatur*, i, 89, 257, 258, 414, 450, 725; Zuchold, *Bibl. Theol.* ii, 1044 sq.; *Literarischer Handweiser fürs kathol. Deutschland*, 1864, p. 73. (B. P.)

Reichel, JOHN FREDERICK, a distinguished bishop

of the Moravian Church, was born at Leuba, in Altenburg, Germany, May 16, 1731. His father and grandfather were both Protestant clergymen, and the latter was expelled from Bohemia on account of his faith. Reichel studied theology at the University of Jena, and entered the ministry of the Lutheran Church, but after a service of only four years he joined the Moravian communion, for which he had always had a strong predilection. He labored in various capacities and in various countries until 1769, when he was elected to the executive board of the Unitas Fratrum, known as the Unity's Elders' Conference. In this body he remained for forty years, until his death. After his consecration to the episcopacy in 1775, he undertook many official visitations, extending them as far as the East Indies and the Cape of Good Hope. The most remarkable was that which he held in America in the midst of the Revolutionary War, from 1778 to 1782. He visited nearly all the Moravian churches of this country, in many of which the war had caused unfortunate agitations and strife, and succeeded in restoring peace. He died at Berthelsdorf, in Saxony, Nov. 17, 1809. (E. de S.)

Reid, Adam, D.D., a Presbyterian minister, was born at Wishaw, Lanarkshire, Scotland, Jan. 4, 1808, was educated in Glasgow University, and at the Theological Seminary of the Secession Church under Dr. Dick. Having completed his studies in 1842, he came to America. He supplied the First Presbyterian Church in Amenia, N. Y., about a year and a half, when he was called to the Congregational Church of Salisbury, Conn. His reputation as a preacher was very extensive, and he received calls at different times to important charges in Baltimore, Boston, Chicago, and Buffalo. His habits were very regular; he gave a part of each evening to the preparation of his sermons, which he wrote out with great care and regularly committed to memory. As a memoriter preacher he was unusually effective. His style was logical and impressive, being adorned with the choicest diction. He did very little pastoral work, but his congregation was more than paid by the richness of the intellectual feasts which he constantly served. He was above the medium height, slender and straight as an arrow, and very clerical in his appearance, which gained for him the sobriquet of "priest Reid," by which he was known in all the surrounding country. When at home he wrote a sermon every week, many of which, however, he never preached. When he had passed his seventieth year, his congregation reluctantly accepted his resignation and appointed him pastor emeritus. He died Nov. 2, 1878. (W. P. S.)

Reid, John Wilson, a Presbyterian minister, was born in Cabarras Co., N. C., in 1807. He pursued his early studies amid many embarrassing circumstances, and his literary and scientific studies chiefly under Dr. John Robinson, of North Carolina. In 1831 he removed to Georgia and opened a classical school, during which time he studied theology under the direction of S. K. Talmage, D.D., of Augusta, Ga., was licensed by Hopewell Presbytery in September, 1833, and soon after ordained by the same presbytery, and was subsequently connected with Olivet, South Liberty, Lincolnton, Double Branches, Salem, Woodstock, Bethany, and Lexington churches, and also as a general domestic missionary agent. He died at his residence in Woodstock, Ga., July 11, 1867. Mr. Reid for about thirty years laboriously followed the occupation of teaching in connection with the exercise of his ministry. The village of Woodstock, Oglethorpe Co., Ga., was built up by the subject of this sketch and a few other gentlemen of wealth and intelligence, for the sake of social, educational, and religious privileges. For a few years Mr. Reid carried on simply a high-school; but his capacity, skill, and success in training young men rapidly increased his reputation: it was thought, therefore, advisable to secure still greater privileges by establishing a more regular organization. Consequently, quite a full literary, classical, and scientific curriculum was arranged in four divisions, and the school henceforth took the name of Philomathean Collegiate Institute. The change was made at the suggestion and by the aid of the Hon. Alexander H. Stephens, and the organization accomplished all that its friends expected. See Wilson, *Presbyterian Historical Almanac*, 1868, p. 365. (J. L. S.)

Reid, Joseph, a Presbyterian minister, was born in 1842, near Romeo, Mich. He was of Scotch parentage and received a careful religious training. He was graduated at the Michigan University and received his theological training in Union Seminary. He was regularly ordained, and went to Kansas to enter the missionary field. At a place called Manhattan, and the region around, he spent five years of arduous toil, when he returned to Michigan, that he might be near his parents and comfort them in their feebleness. He remained in Michigan, preaching as opportunity permitted, and was looking forward to a settlement when he was attacked with a disease which ended his life. He died at Romeo in 1877, after a ministry of only seven years. (W. P. S.)

Reid, Thomas, a celebrated Scotch divine and metaphysician, was born at Strachan in 1710. He was educated at Marischal College, Aberdeen, and became its librarian, a position which he resigned in 1736. In 1737 he was presented by King's College, Aberdeen, to the living of New Machar, Aberdeenshire, and was appointed professor of moral philosophy in the above-named college in 1752. In 1764 he succeeded Adam Smith as professor of moral philosophy in the University of Glasgow, retiring in 1781. He died Oct. 7, 1796. He published, *Essays on the Powers of the Human Mind* (Edinb. 1819, 3 vols. 8vo):—*Inquiry into the Human Mind* (Edinb. 1763; 5th ed. 1801, 8vo). These and numerous *Essays*, etc., were collected and published under the title of *The Works of Thomas Reid, D.D., now fully Collected*, etc. (6th ed. Edinb. 1863, 2 vols. 8vo). See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s. v. See Scottish Philosophy.

Reid, William Shields, D.D., a Presbyterian minister, was born in West Nottingham, Chester Co., Pa., April 21, 1778, and graduated with honor at Princeton College in 1802. He was then for about two years assistant teacher in an academy in Georgetown, D. C., afterwards in Shepherdstown, Va.; then, about 1804, he became professor in Hampden Sidney College, and finally president of that college some two years later. He was licensed by the Presbytery of Winchester in the spring of 1806, and dissolved his connection with the college about eighteen months afterwards. In 1808 he settled at Lynchburg, Campbell Co., Va., where he opened a school for males as a means of support, and at the same time labored to build up a Presbyterian Church in the village. In this he succeeded, and was installed as pastor in 1822. Still, his principal field of labor was his school, which after a while became a boarding-school for young ladies, and stood first among similar institutions in Virginia. Here his labors for the good of his charge were crowned with distinguished success. Having become incapacitated for public labor, he resigned his charge in 1848, and lived in retirement till his death, June 23, 1853.—Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, iv, 388.

Reily, James Ross, a minister of the German Reformed Church, was born in Meyerstown, Lebanon Co., Pa., Oct. 31, 1788. He began his theological studies with Dr. Becker, of Baltimore, Md., in 1809, was licensed in 1812, and became pastor of churches in Lyken's Valley, Dauphin Co., Pa. In 1813 he was sent as an exploring missionary to North Carolina, after which he returned to his charge. He was called to Hagerstown, Md., in 1819; resigned in 1825, to accept the appointment of agent to go to Europe with a view of securing aid from the Reformed churches there for the endowment of the Theological Seminary of the German

Reformed Church and collecting books for its library. In this he was successful, returning in November, 1826. He became pastor in York, Pa., in 1827. His health failing, he resigned in July, 1831. He now supported himself in a secular calling amid continued ill-health, and died March 18, 1844. Mr. Reily was a man of great energy and originality, and withal somewhat eccentric; in the pulpit he was grave, earnest, and more than ordinarily eloquent. He preached in German and English.

Reily, John, a minister in the Reformed Presbyterian Church, was born in Ireland about 1770, and came to this country when about seventeen. He engaged in teaching in Philadelphia and vicinity for several years, but studied theology, and was licensed to preach by the Special Presbytery at Philadelphia, May 24, 1809. He was taken on trial Aug. 15, 1812, ordained in 1813, and sent as missionary to South Carolina, Kentucky, and Ohio. He had not been long in South Carolina before he was installed as pastor of the united congregations of Beaver Dams and Wateree, where he labored with great acceptance and success until his death, August, 1820. Mr. Reily was a man of childlike simplicity, godly sincerity, singleness of purpose, and undaunted intrepidity.—Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, ix, 60.

Reimarus, Hermann Samuel, a learned German philologist, was born at Hamburg, Dec. 22, 1694, and studied first under his father and afterwards under Wolf and Fabricius. He next went to study at Jena, and later at Wittenberg. After having travelled over Holland and England, he was appointed rector at Weimar in 1723, and in 1729 was called to Hamburg as teacher of Hebrew in the gymnasium. He died there, March 1, 1765. His theological writings are a *Dissertatio de Assessoribus Synedrii Magni* (Hamb. 1751, 4to):—*Die vornehmsten Wahrheiten der natürlichen Religion* (ibid. 1754), and a few others of less importance. He is especially credited with the editorship of the famous *Wolfenbüttel Fragments* (q. v.). See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* s. v.

Reinbeck, Johann Gustav, a German theologian and philosopher, was born Jan. 25, 1683. His father, Andreas, was superintendent at Brunswick, and published two enormous volumes on the Hebrew accents. Johann studied theology at Halle, pursuing Hebrew under Michaelis, and philosophy under Wolf. He was called in 1709 as preacher to the Friedrichswerder Church in Berlin, and in 1716 became pastor of the Church of St. Peter at Cologne. He was a favorite with Frederick William I, and also with Frederick the Great. He died Aug. 21, 1741. Reinbeck is the author of several Biblical, homiletical, and philosophical works, which are enumerated in Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.

Reineccius, Christian, a Lutheran divine, was born Jan. 22, 1668, at Grossmühlingen, in Zerbst, and died Oct. 18, 1752, at Weissenfels, where for about thirty years he had acted as rector of the academy. Reineccius was a voluminous writer, and his *Dissertations*, which he published as rector of Weissenfels, are still very valuable. Besides his edition of Lankisch's *Concordantiæ Bibliorum Germanico-Hebraico-Græcæ* (Lips. 1718), and of *Vetus Testamentum Græcum ex Versione Septuaginta Interpretum, una cum Libris Apocryphis*, etc. (ibid. 1730–57), he published תורה נביאים וכתובים, i. e. *Biblia Hebraica, ad Optimorum Codicum et Editionum Fidem Recensita*, etc. (ibid. 1725). In the preface we are told, as is already indicated in the title-page, that in editing this Bible MSS. have been perused, but their use is nowhere pointed out. An alphabetical table of the Parashioth and a table of the Haphtaroth are given at the end. The type is correct. A second edition of the Hebrew Bible was published in 1739, which is but a reprint of the first, repeating even its mistakes, and making still greater ones. A third edition was published in 1756, after Reineccius's death, by C. G. Pohl, who also wrote the preface, in which he speaks of the changes made by him. In 1793, Döderlein and Meissner published Reineccius's Bible *Cum Variis Lectionibus ex Ingenti Codicum Copia a C. Kennicotto et J. B. de Rossi Collatorum*, which is very valuable. It was republished by Knapp (Halle, 1818). Reineccius also wrote, *Index Memorialis, quo Voces Hebraicæ et Chaldaicæ V. T. Omnes*, etc. (Lips. 1723, and often), which is appended to some editions of his Hebrew Bible:—*Manuale Biblicum ex Concordantiis Græcis Adornatum, in quo Voces Græcæ Omnes in LXX Interpretum Versione Bibliorum Græca et in Apocryphis V. T., nec non in Textu Originali Græco N. T. Occurrentes*, etc. (ibid. 1734):—*Biblia Sacra Quadrilinguia V. T. Hebr.* giving the Hebrew, Greek (according to Grabe's text), the German of Luther, and Latin translation of Seb. Schmid, 3 vols., the three containing the Apocrypha in Greek, Latin, and German (ibid. 1751):—*Janua Hebraicæ Linguæ V. T.* etc. (ibid. 1704; last ed. by Rehkopf, 1788). See Fürst, *Bibl. Jud.* iii, 144 sq.; Rosenmüller, *Handbuch für die Literatur*, i, 236 sq.; Winer, *Handbuch der theol. Literatur*, i, 35, 39, 47, 120, 321, 527, 591; ii, 726; *Theol. Universal-Lexikon*, s. v.; Carpzov, *Critica Sacra* (2d ed. 1748), p. 408, 425; Kitto, *Cyclop.* s. v. (B. P.)

Reinhard, Franz Volkmar, an eminent German Protestant theologian, was born in the duchy of Sulzbach in 1753. He studied with his father, a clergyman, until he was sixteen, when he entered the gymnasium of Ratisbon. Here he remained five years, and in 1773 removed to the University of Wittenberg. In 1782 he was appointed professor of theology, and in 1784 preacher to the university and assessor of the consistory. In 1792 he was preacher to the court at Dresden, ecclesiastical counsellor and member of the supreme consistory, and held these positions until his death, Sept. 6, 1812. He published, *Sermons* (Sulzbach, 1811, 36 vols.):—*Christian Ethics* (5 vols.):—*Confessions*, etc.

Reinhard, Lorenz, a German doctor of theology, was born Feb. 22, 1700, at Hellingen, in Franconia. After the completion of his studies, he was first tutor and afterwards professor at the gymnasium in Hildburghausen. In 1727 he was called as deacon and professor of the gymnasium to Weimar, and in 1744 as superintendent to Buttstädt, where he died, Nov. 15, 1752. He wrote, *De Libro Sapientiæ non Canonico*, etc. (Wittenb. 1719):—*Die Theologie der Patriarchen vor und nach der Sündfluth*, etc. (Hamb. 1737):—*Observationes Philol.-exeg. in Evangel. Marci Selectissimæ* (Lips. 1737):—*Breviar. Controversiar. cum Reformatis, una cum Breviario Controversiar. cum Arminianis* (Weimar, 1735):—*Chronotaxis Cantici Canticorum Salomonis*, etc. (ibid. 1741):—*Commentatio de Assapho*, etc. (ibid. 1742):—*Erklärung und Zergliederung des Buches Hiob*, etc. (Leips. 1749–50). See Winer, *Handb. der theol. Literatur*, i, 247, 353; ii, 727; Fürst, *Bibl. Jud.* iii, 147. (B. P.)

Reins, a name for the *kidneys*, derived from the Latin *renes*, and in our English Bible employed in those passages of the Old Test. in which the term for kidneys (כְּלָיוֹת, *kelayôth*) is used metaphorically, i. e. except in the Pentateuch and in Isa. xxxiv, 6, where this word is rendered "kidneys." In the ancient system of physiology the kidneys, from the sensitiveness of that part of the person, were believed to be the seat of desire and longing, which accounts for their often being coupled with the heart (Psa. vii, 9; xxvi, 2; Jer. xi, 20; xvii, 10, etc.). See Kidneys.

The word "reins" is once used (Isa. xi, 5) as the equivalent of חֲלָצַיִם, *chalatsáyim*, elsewhere translated "loins" (q. v.).

Reischl, Wilhelm Carl, a German Roman Catholic divine, doctor and professor of theology at Munich, was born in that city Jan. 13, 1818. Having completed his studies in his native place, he was made a priest in

1835, and, after having occupied several positions as priest and chaplain, he was promoted in 1842 as doctor of theology. For some time he lectured at Munich, but in 1845 went to Amberg, occupying the chair of professor of dogmatics and exegesis. In 1851 he was called to Regensburg as professor of Church history and canon law, till he was recalled to his native city in 1867 as professor of moral philosophy, where he died, Oct. 4, 1873. In connection with others, he published a commentary on the Holy Bible, the New-Test. part being his sole work. See *Literarischer Handweiser*, 1873, p. 494. (B. P.)

Reiser, Anton, a German theologian, was born at Augsburg, March 7, 1628. He was first preacher at Schemnitz, and in 1659 became pastor of the Lutheran church at Presburg. Having in 1672 espoused Calvinism, he was thrown into prison and at length banished. Eventually, however, he served as rector of the gymnasium at Augsburg, preacher at Oeringen, and after 1678 as pastor of the Church of St. James at Hamburg, where he died, April 27, 1686. He was the author of a number of theological treatises, enumerated in Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.

Reiske, Johann, a German theologian, was born May 25, 1641, and died at Wolfenbüttel, Feb. 20, 1710. He is the author of *Exercitatio Philologica de Sadducæis* (Jena, 1666):—*Theocratia, Respublica sine Exemplo* (ibid. 1670):—*De Linguâ Vernacula Jesu Christi* (ibid. 1670):—*Conjecturæ in Jobum et Prov. Salom.* (Lips. 1679):—*De Scriptorum Romanorum Judaicam circa Historiam Falsis Narratiunculis*, etc. (Wittenb. 1691):—*Exercitationes de Vaticin. Sibyll.* (Lips. 1688). See Fürst, *Bibl. Jud.* iii, 150; Winer, *Handb. der theol. Literatur*, i, 137, 557, 562; ii, 728; Jöcher, *Gelehrten-Lex.* s. v. (B. P.)

Reissmann, Johann Valentin von, a German doctor of theology, and bishop of Würzburg, was born Oct. 12, 1807, at Allersheim, in Lower Franconia. He completed his studies at the University of Würzburg, which honored him with the degree of doctor of philosophy and theology. Towards the end of the year 1830 he was ordained priest and appointed to Volkach, but in 1834 he was called to Würzburg as ordinary professor of exegesis and Oriental languages. This prominent position he occupied till Dec. 7, 1846, when he became a member of the chapter, and for a number of years he stood at the head of the diocesan government. In 1861 he was made provost of the cathedral; and when, in 1870, his bishop died, he was appointed by the king of Bavaria, Oct. 23, 1870, bishop of Würzburg, and confirmed by the pope in the following year. He occupied the episcopal see only a few years, and died Nov. 17, 1876. See *Literarischer Handweiser*, 1876, p. 53 sq. (B. P.)

Reiter, Ernst Anton, a Roman Catholic priest, was born in 1821 at Arnsberg. He received holy orders in 1846, and came in 1854 as missionary to the United States. In 1859 he was appointed pastor of the German church of the Trinity at Boston, Mass., and died May 5, 1873, at Erie, Pa. He wrote a very important work on the statistics of the Roman Catholic Church of the United States, entitled *Schematismus der katholischen deutschen Geistlichkeit in den Ver. Staaten Nordamerikas* (N. Y. 1869). See *Literarischer Handweiser für das katholische Deutschland*, 1869, p. 465 sq.; 1873, p. 271. (B. P.)

Reiter, William, a minister of the German Reformed Church, was born in Lancaster County, Pa., Sept. 13, 1799, and spent his youth in Westmoreland County, Pa. He studied theology privately with several ministers successively in Stark County, O., preaching meanwhile in the way of missionary tours under their direction. He was ordained in 1823, and took charge of a number of German Reformed congregations in Tuscarawas County, O., in whose service he continued up to the time of his death, May 8, 1826. He was a diligent student, and a minister that had much of the true missionary spirit.

Reithmayr, Franz Xaver, doctor and professor of theology, a Roman Catholic divine of Germany, was born in 1809 at Illkofen, near Regensburg. In 1832 he was made priest; in 1836 the Munich University made him doctor of theology; in 1837 he was extraordinary professor; in 1841 ordinary professor of the New Test. exegesis, and died Jan. 26, 1872. Reithmayr was one of the most prominent theologians of the Roman Catholic Church, and published in 1838 a work on patrology, in 1845 a *Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* (Regensb. 1845). In 1832 he published his *Introduction to the Canonical Books of the New Testament* (ibid.); and in 1865 a *Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians*. His last great work was the edition of a German translation of the fathers, which he edited in connection with others, and which is still in the course of publication at Kempten, under the title *Bibliothek der Kirchenväter*. See Zuchold, *Bibl. Theol.* ii, 977, 1051; *Literarischer Handweiser*, 1871, p. 52 sq., 106; 1872, p. 142. (B. P.)

Re'kem (Heb. *id.* רֶקֶם, *variegation*, or perhaps i. q. *Regem*), the name of three men, and of a city.

1. (Sept. Ῥοκόμ; A. V. *Rakem*, the name being "in pause," רֶקֶם.) Brother of Ulam, and a descendant of Machir, the son of Manasseh, by his wife Maachah; apparently a son of Sheresh (1 Chron. vii, 16). B.C. ante 1619.

2. (Sept. Ῥοκόμ v.r. Ῥεκόμ.) One of the five kings of the Midianites slain by the Israelites along with Balaam (Numb. xxxi, 8; Josh. xiii, 21). B.C. 1618.

3. (Sept. Ῥοκόμ, Ῥαέμ, v. r. Ῥεκόμ.) The third named of the four sons of Hebron, and father of Shammai, of the tribe of Judah (1 Chron. ii, 43, 44). B.C. post 1618. "In this genealogy it is extremely difficult to separate the names of persons from those of places—Ziph, Mareshah, Tappuah, Hebron, are all names of places, as well as Maon and Beth-zur. In Josh. xviii, 27, Rekem appears as a town of Benjamin, and perhaps this genealogy may be intended to indicate that it was founded by a colony from Hebron"

4. (Sept. Ῥέκεμ.) A city in the territory of Benjamin, mentioned between Mozah and Irpeel (Josh. xviii, 27). Josephus, in speaking of the Midianitish kings slain by Moses (*Ant.* iv, vii, 1), mentions a city named after Rekem (No. 2, above), which was the chief city of all Arabia, and was called Ἀρεκέμη, *Arreceme*, by the Arabians, but *Petra* by the Greeks. This is, of course, different from the Rekem of Benjamin. As the latter is in the group situated in the south-west quarter of the tribe, the site was possibly that of the present ruins called *Deir Yesin*, about three miles west of Jerusalem (Robinson, *Researches*, ii, 141; Bädeker, *Palästina*, p. 288).

Rekesh. See Horse.

Reland, Adriaan, a celebrated Orientalist, was born July 17, 1676, at Ryp, a village in Northern Holland, where his father was pastor. He early devoted himself to the study of Oriental languages under Leusden, with the aid of Henry Sicke. After staying six years for this purpose at Utrecht, he went to Leyden to finish his theological studies. He was soon afterwards offered a professor's chair at Linigen, but he preferred to return to his aged father. In 1699 he was made professor of philosophy and Oriental languages at Harderwyck, and two years afterwards was called to teach Oriental languages and ecclesiastical antiquities at Utrecht, a position which he filled to the end of his days, having in 1713 refused a professor's chair at Franeker, and in 1716 another at Leyden. He died of small-pox, Feb. 5, 1718. Reland is admitted to have been by far the greatest Orientalist of his day, and his writings display exhaustive learning, the most painstaking accuracy, and sound judgment. He was also not lacking in imagination, as some of his earlier prolusions show. To these admirable qualities he added great affability of manners and a noble sweetness of

character. Of his numerous writings we here mention only the most important: *Analecta Rabbinica* (Ultraj. 1702):—*De Religione Mohammedica* (ibid. 1705 and later):—*Dissertationes Miscellaneæ* (ibid. 1707):—*Antiquitates Veterum Hebræorum* (ibid. 1708):—*De Numis Vet. Hebræorum* (ibid. 1709):—*Palæstina ex Monumentis Veteribus Illustrata* (ibid. 1714), a work which in its way can never be superseded:—*De Spoliis Templi* (Traject. 1716):—*Elenchus Philologicus* (Ultraj. 1709). See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* s. v.

Relic-case. See RELIQUARY.

Relics. By this term are usually understood the bodies or clothes of saints and martyrs, or the instruments by which they were put to death or suffered torment, which were so revered in the Romish Church as to be worshipped and carried about in procession. The honoring of the relics of saints, on which the Church of Rome afterwards founded her superstitious and lucrative use of them, as objects of devotion, as a kind of charms, or amulets, and as instruments of pretended miracles, appears to have originated in a very ancient custom that prevailed among Christians, of assembling at the cemeteries or burying-places of the martyrs for the purpose of commemorating them and of performing divine worship. Here they displayed their affection for their brethren by such rites as were dictated by fervent affection and were consistent with the principles of religion. In the 4th century the boundary between respect and worship was passed. Helena, the mother of Constantine, made a journey to Jerusalem and there discovered, as she supposed, the wood of the true cross, a part of which she gave to the city of Jerusalem, and sent the other part to Constantine, who encased it in his own statue and regarded it as the palladium of his new city. When the profession of Christianity obtained the protection of the civil government, under Constantine the Great, stately churches were erected over sepulchres, and the names and memories of the departed were treated with every possible token of affection and respect. This reverence, however, gradually exceeded all reasonable bounds; and those prayers and religious services were thought to have a peculiar sanctity and virtue which were performed over their tombs; hence the practice which afterwards obtained of depositing relics of saints and martyrs under the altars in all churches. This practice was early thought of such importance that St. Ambrose, in the 4th century, would not consecrate a church because it had no relics; and the Council of Constantinople, in Trullo (A.D. 692), ordained that those altars should be demolished under which were found no relics. Such was the rage for them at one time that even Mabillon, the Benedictine, justly complains that the altars were loaded with suspected relics, numerous spurious ones being everywhere offered to the piety and devotion of the faithful. He adds, too, that bones are often consecrated which, so far from belonging to saints, probably do not belong to Christians. From the catacombs of Italy, Sicily, and other places which had served as the burial-places of the primitive Christians, although the catacombs have both before and since been used for other purposes, numerous relics have been taken. Even as early as 386 Theodosius was obliged to pass a law forbidding the people to dig up the bones of martyrs or traffic in their remains. The superstition grew until, in the 9th century, these relics were not only treated with veneration, but were supposed to have the virtue of healing disorders of body and mind and defending their possessors against the devices and assaults of the devil. Nor was this efficacy destroyed or lessened when the relic was distributed in fragments. In the 11th century relics were tried by fire, and those which did not consume were reckoned genuine, and the rest not. Relic-collecting has been carried to great lengths in Europe, the Italian churches especially being full of fictitious relics. The following is only a sample of those in the Church of Santa Croce de Gerusalemme: three pieces of the true cross, the title placed over the cross; two thorns from the crown of our Lord; the sponge extended to our Lord with vinegar and gall; a piece of the veil and hair of the Virgin; a phial full of the blood of Jesus; some of the manna gathered in the desert, etc.

Relics of saints were regarded as the palladia of cities. as St. Martin's body was carried out to the gates of Tours in 845 to repel a siege by the Danes. St. Werburgh's relics were borne in procession to quell a fire at Chester, and the canons bore them through the diocese to invite alms for the erection of Salisbury Cathedral. At Lichfield the bells were rung at their departure and return. In the 6th century the custom of swearing upon relics, as later upon the Gospels, began. Relics were, and still are, preserved on the altars whereon mass is celebrated, a square hole being made in the middle of the altar large enough to receive the hand, and therein is deposited the relic, being first wrapped in red silk and enclosed in a leaden box. In Catholic countries these relics are popularly esteemed the most precious treasures of the churches, and in earlier times they had even a high marketable value, large sums having been often raised by necessitous princes by the sale or mortgage of pieces of the "true cross," etc. Before the Reformation relics were in demand in Scotland, and their sale was a fertile source of revenue to the monks. They were forbidden to be brought into England by several statutes, and justices were empowered to search houses for them and to deface and destroy them when found. This folly has not been without learned and labored defence, antiquity and Scripture both having been appealed to in its support. Bellarmine cites the following passages: Exod. xiii, 19; Deut. xxxiv, 6; 2 Kings xiii, 21; xxiii, 16–18; Isa. xi, 10; Matt. ix, 20–22; Acts v, 12–15; xix, 11, 12. But there is no doubt that the worship of relics is an absurdity, without the guarantee of Scripture, directly contrary to the practice of the primitive Church, and irreconcilable with common-sense. Latin monographs upon relics and relic-worship have been written by Cellarius (Helmst. 1656), Jung (Hanov. 1783), Kortholt (1680), Morellus (Rome, 1721), Steger (Leips. 1688), Batti (1655), Kiesling, Rambach (Halle, 1722). See Barnum, *Romanism as It Is; Methodist Quar. Rev.* Oct. 1866; Mosheim, *Eccles. Hist.*; Neander, *Hist. of Christian Church.*

Relief Synod (or CHURCH). See SCOTLAND, CHURCHES OF.

Religion (Lat. *relego*, *religo*). This word, according to Cicero (*Div. Instit.* 4), is derived from, or rather compounded of, *re* and *legere*, to read over again, to reflect upon or to study the sacred books in which religion is delivered. According to Lactantius (*De Civit. Dei*, lib. x, c. 3), it comes from *re-ligare*, to bind back, because *religion* is that which furnishes the true ground of obligation.

Religion has been divided into natural and revealed. By natural religion is meant that knowledge, veneration, and love of God, and the practice of those duties to him, our fellow-creatures, and ourselves, which are discoverable by the right exercise of our rational faculties, from considering the nature and perfections of God, and our relation to him and to one another. By revealed religion is understood that discovery which he has made to us of his mind and will in the Holy Scriptures. As respects natural religion, some doubt whether, properly speaking, there can be any such thing; since, through the fall, reason is so depraved that man, without revelation, is under the greatest darkness and misery, as may be easily seen by considering the history of those nations who are destitute of it, and who are given up to barbarism, ignorance, cruelty, and evils of every kind. So far as this, however, may be observed, the light of nature can give us no proper ideas of God, nor inform us what worship will be acceptable to him. It does not tell us how man became a

fallen, sinful creature, as he is, nor how he can be recovered. It affords us no intelligence as to the immortality of the soul, the resurrection of the body, and a future state of happiness and misery. The apostle, indeed, observes that the Gentiles have the law written on their hearts, and are a law unto themselves; yet the greatest moralists among them were so blinded as to be guilty of, and actually to countenance, the greatest vices. Such a system, therefore, it is supposed, can hardly be said to be religious which leaves man in such uncertainty, ignorance, and impiety. See NATURAL THEOLOGY. Revealed religion forms the correlate of natural religion, or the religion of reason. It is not the result of human investigation, but being the result of an extraordinary communication from God, is therefore infallible; whereas, on the contrary, all processes of human thought are more or less subjected to error. Hence we can explain why it is that religion gives itself out to be, not a product of the reason merely, not anything which originated from human inquiry and study, but a result of a divine revelation. The religious feeling is undoubtedly a propension of human nature; yet without a divine revelation the mind would sink in dark and perpetual disorder. Of the whole family of man, existing in all ages, and scattered over every quarter of the globe, there is not one well-authenticated exception to the fact that, moved by an inward impulse, and guided by revelation or tradition, man worships something which he believes to be endowed with the attributes of a superior being. Even the occasional gleamings of truth found in the various idolatrous systems are but the traditions of ancient revelations, more or less corrupted, which have descended from the first worshippers. Revealed religion comprehends, besides the doctrines of natural religion, many truths which were beyond the reach of human reason, though not contradictory thereto, and for a knowledge of which we are indebted directly to the Old and New Testaments. While other religions had been variously accommodated to the peculiar countries in which they flourished, Christianity was so framed as to be adapted to the whole human family. It is the one thing needful for the elevation of our race, and is destined alike to universality and perpetuity.

In all forms of religion there is one part, which may be called the *doctrine* or dogma, which is to be received by faith; and the *cultus*, or worship, which is the outward expression of the religious sentiment. By religion is also meant that homage to the Deity in all the forms which pertain to the spiritual life, in contrast with theology, the theory of the divine nature and government. See THEOLOGY.

RELIGION, PHILOSOPHY OF, the science of religion; the application of philosophical principles to the discussion of its general character, origin, and claims. It presents, 1, religion in general; 2, revealed religion; 3, the Christian religion; 4, the Christian Church. This subject is discussed by Apelt (1860), Beneke (1840), Chateaubriand, Deuzinger (1857), Fichte, Hegel (*Werke*, vol. xi), Kant (*Religion innerhalb*, with Kirchmann's notes), Krug (1819), Morrel (*Philosophy of Religion;* see the *Methodist Quarterly Review*, July, Oct., 1850), Pascal (*Pensées*), Otto Pfleiderer (1869), Heinrich Ritter (1858, 1859), Arnold Ruge (1869), Schleiermacher (*Monologen*), F. X. Schmid (1857), and Spinoza. See Fleming and Krauth, *Vocabulary of Philosophy*, p. 854.

RELIGION, PRIMITIVE. Far in the distance, behind Buddhism, Brahminism, Zoroastrianism, Confucianism, and all the ten religions so graphically set forth by Freeman Clarke, there lies a primitive faith of great power, to which our attention is called in Heb. xi, 2: "For by it the ancients obtained a good report." To this primitive religion all the later forms of truth, of error, and of idolatry, with all the mixtures of good and evil pertaining to religions now ancient, owe their origin, whether we can or cannot trace the genealogy. The faith of all the patriarchs anterior to the call of Abraham may be reckoned to this early form of the knowledge, fear, love, and service of the true God. How it came that descendants of Shem, of Ham, of Japhet, are soon found precipitated in ignorance, crime, and abominable idolatry, we are told in Rom. i, 28: "And even as they did not like to retain God in their knowledge, God gave them over to a reprobate mind." Thus they lost that faith in which they had been instructed by Noah during three centuries after the deluge. Some there were who held the truth in part long centuries after others had become utterly apostate. Abraham kept the straight course of truth, broadening, deepening, and accumulating strength, through Moses, David, Solomon, Ezra, John the Baptist, Christ himself, the apostles, Wycliffe, Luther, and the Reformed churches, to the present day. Deviations of more or less latitude from this line have been found in every age, as well as in our own, many of these deviations holding enough of the Gospel to secure for long periods the validity of their claim to a *share* of the primitive religion, bringing glory to God and salvation to men. To delineate briefly the relation of these to the main trunk is the object of this article.

I. *Egyptian.*—When Abraham went to Egypt to escape the famine (Gen. xii, 10), he found that the Lord held intercourse with Pharaoh, and that Pharaoh and his men had regard to the Lord's will, and rendered that obedience which is better than sacrifice. This fear of the Lord we find very happily developed in the time of Joseph, when he had interpreted Pharaoh's dreams. The king of Egypt not only believed the revelation, as from God, but he and his counsellors went to work to improve their opportunity. "The thing was good in the eyes of Pharaoh, and in the eyes of all his servants. And Pharaoh said to his servants, Can we find such a one as this is? a man in whom the Spirit of God is?" (Gen. xli, 38). It might be well for the nations now that are nominally Christian to take lessons from this king and his court. Whatever was the form of their religion, it is there recognised as valid for the welfare of the nation. And when Joseph, at a later date, bought up the land for Pharaoh, the land of the priests was reserved to them. When Joseph's father is introduced to Pharaoh, the king, after conversing with him, condescended to receive the blessing of Jacob, when it was well understood that "the less is blessed by the better." It was not until another dynasty took possession of the throne—a king that knew not Joseph—that we hear in that court the haughty challenge, "Who is the Lord that I should obey his voice? I know not the Lord, neither will I let Israel go." Under this new *régime*, Egypt was transformed into an apostasy, on which were executed the ten plagues; and, finally, the king and his army were precipitated to the bottom of the sea. The sphinx of Egypt belongs to this ancient religion, and had nothing to do with the grovelling ideas of worshipping crocodiles and other crawling things. Even in Joseph's time, and no doubt in Abraham's, the ancient religion had declined, or the Egyptians would not have held "every shepherd" in abomination, as Moses was in danger of being stoned should he offer sacrifice in their land.

II. *Philistine.*—Abimelech, king of the Philistines, had a remnant of the true religion. When Abraham came to Gerar, he thought, "Surely the fear of God is not in this place." This proved to be a great mistake, for God came to Abimelech in a dream by night; Abimelech heeded the warning, restored Sarah, sought reconciliation through Abraham's prayer, and dealt very liberally with the patriarch, giving him presents, and offering him his choice of the land. Soon after Abraham's return from the Philistine country, Abimelech and Phicol, the general of his army, made a visit, and entered into a friendly covenant with him at Beersheba. Although the friendly feeling was much diminished in the days of Isaac, the Philistine government entertained a high respect for Isaac, not merely as Abraham's son, but as the Blessed of the Lord. Abimelech, Ahuzzath,

and Phicol the general, came to Isaac and renewed their covenant of peace at the same place where they had made it with his father. During the time of Jacob we find no friendly association with the Philistines. In Joshua's time their land was to be given to Israel. During the period of the Judges we find only hostility, civil and religious. The worship of Dagon and other idols had now supplanted every vestige of the ancient faith. Beelzebub was the god of Ekron. David burned the images that he found in the conquered camp. The overthrow of Saul was published in the house of their idols, and his armor deposited in the temple of Ashtaroth. Their soothsaying is noted by Isaiah (ii, 6). The illegal associations formed with Ashdod in the days of Nehemiah were most damaging to the people of the Lord. Goliath defied the God of Israel, and cursed David by his gods.

III. *Canaanitish.*—Another illustration of the primitive religion we have in Melchizedek and his people. He was king of Salem, priest of the Most High, and a very eminent type of the expected Deliverer. While Melchizedek lived, and others of the same faith, in sufficient numbers to have influence in the nation, it was announced to Abraham that the iniquity of the Amorites was "not yet full." Some four hundred years were yet allowed them to improve or misimprove their privileges. A very few, like Rahab of Jericho, were willing to obey the truth; but the seven nations, as such, had wholly apostatized to the grossest idolatry. It is possible, almost probable, that there was still some regard for the true religion among those known as Jebusites, although they did not surrender to Joshua. The following considerations are in their favor: (*a.*) They were long spared after the other nationalities had been broken up. They held their capital till the time of David. (*b.*) This capital was the ancient seat of Melchizekek, where we might expect the truth to be kept in families when the nation had given it up. (*c.*) Araunah the Jebusite is honorably noted in the history of David, after their capital had surrendered. (*d.*) At Araunah's threshing-floor the destroying angel suspended his work. (*e.*) He made to David a noble offer—victims for the sacrifice, and wood to burn it from his farming implements. (*f.*) He is living in Jerusalem, not as an idolater, but apparently like the people around him. (*g.*) In 2 Sam. xxiv, 23, the Hebrew reading is, "All these did king Araunah give to the king." This would indicate that he was a lineal descendant of the royal line of Melchizedek, and was king of the Jebusites when they surrendered to David. At all events, he was possessor of the soil, though a conquered subject; and he readily fell in with the new religion, although it was an advance on that of his ancestors. For some such reasons, he readily sold the old homestead—the *floor* for fifty shekels of silver, the *farm* for six hundred shekels of gold.

IV. *Mesopotamian.*—Terah and his sons, Abram, Nahor, and Haran, in Ur of the Chaldees, were brought up in this primitive religion; but it had become corrupted by idolatrous excrescences, and although they belonged to the witnessing line, they became involved in the idolatry, as we read (Josh. xxiv, 2), "They served other gods." To preserve yet a faithful testimony, Abraham was called out of that land when he was about seventy years old, had the covenant of God renewed to him, and commenced a renovated service on the basis of the old faith, with new revelations. Abraham, after the death of his father, removed to Canaan, leaving a residue at Haran, where he had resided five years. Thus freed from all family connections, except those under his own control, he carried down the true religion in its purity to Isaac and Jacob, with their adherents, all living as strangers in a foreign country. The ancient religion still received new developments of the coming Deliverer, superadded to all former revelations; nor was it a new religion, but a new edition of the old, that was given to Moses. Meantime, the old religion retained, in the family of Nahor, some at least of the old corruptions. The teraphim, for example, Rachel wished to introduce into Jacob's family. Laban called these his gods; the Sept. calls them idols. On what terms of religious observance Jacob lived in Laban's family we have nothing specific; but after the parting we find that each had his own distinct religion. Laban swears by the God of Abraham and the God of Nahor—the God of their father. Jacob appeals to the God of Abraham, *and the Fear of Isaac* (Gen. xxxi, 42, 53). The memorial pillar points to him who is the Rock of Ages, while the heap of gathered stones seems to indicate the Church's confession of imperishable truths, on which we all hold communion with one another and with God in his ordinances. How long this imperfectly organized Church continued in Padan-aram we have no indication, but we know that the Aramites were no friends to Israel in the days of the kings. A very interesting item on the religion of Bethuel's family is connected with the visit of Abraham's prime minister. The friends of Rebekah recognise Jehovah, the covenant God; and they give their farewell blessing in the name of the promised Deliverer: "Let thy seed possess the gate of those who hate *him*." Excepting Luther, translators have made sad work with this verse (xxiv, 60).

Perhaps to this connection belongs Balaam the soothsayer; from Aram, from the mountains of the east, from the river of his people, from Pethor of Aram-naharaim. From some source he had obtained a profound knowledge of God and of his ways; yet so perverted was his heart that he endeavored to bring all that knowledge to effect the destruction of Israel. From the tops of the rocks he could see the Deliverer coming, yet so deep was his malignity that he could meet death in this world and damnation in the next rather than have this man rule over *him*. He furnishes an awful example of those who hold the truth in unrighteousness.

V. *Midianitish.*—In those days we have brought up a most beautiful example of the ancient faith—Jethro, the prince and priest of Midian. It is true that the Midianites were descended from Abraham by Keturah; but their relations with Isaac and his descendants would not have kept up, and did not keep up, the faith of Abraham in its advanced stages. All that they received directly from Abraham needed some kind of support after they were sent away from Isaac; this support could come only from the scattered fragments of primitive religion floating among their new associations, and collected into a focus by such a man as Jethro. So soon as he is off the stage, superannuated or dead, and his son Hobab has joined the camp of Moses, we find no more faith among the Midianites, nor any friendship for the people of the Lord.

VI. *Magian.*—In the court of Persia, as late as the captivity, we find traces of the primitive religion. Not only was Cyrus individually called for special service, but there was much favor shown to the Jews by native Persians, while foreign satraps, like Sanballat, Tobiah, and Geshem, used all their craft, as well as their power, to frustrate the labors of Nehemiah in restoring the city. How often they obtained a partial success needs not to be told here; nor does this invalidate the idea of friendly relations when these could have fair play. Writers like James Freeman Clarke, after tracing far into antiquity the Zoroastrian faith, are unwilling to recognise an ancient faith to which belong the *griffin*, the *serpent*, the *sacred fire*, the *sacred tree*, and other items, while traces of it are found mixed in with later observances. Such writers can see any religion only as the philosophical outgrowth of the human mind, but not as a divine revelation. Of a different cast is a late writer in the *British and Foreign Evangelical Review*, the Rev. J. Murray Mitchell, LL.D. When treating of another, though adjoining, country, he uses the following phraseology: "While we can now trace the great religion of India without interruption almost up to its fountain-head . . . for nearly four thousand years, *it is far otherwise with*

the ancient religion of Persia." See the *Methodist Quarterly Review*, January, 1879. India itself! Is there not enough truth (though seen through a distorted medium) to carry us far beyond the period of the Vedas? To say nothing of moral precepts, a *Creator*, a *Triad*—Brahma, Vishnu, and Siva—the *Incarnation* of Vishnu in the ten Avatars, these and other items claim our attention as remnants of patriarchal revelation.

However much or little they may have learned from the return of Balaam's retinue, after he was killed in battle (Numb. xxxi, 8), certain it is that the primitive religion furnished a healthy stock on which to engraft the "Star of Jacob" in Persia and all over the East, whence came the Magi to Jerusalem when Christ was born in Bethlehem of Judæa.

VII. *Arabian.*—Among the very interesting details of the ancient religions we find Job and his friends. Without going into minute inquiry, let us place him somewhere about the period of Terah, the father of Abraham. He is classed with "the sons of the East;" yet we cannot locate him in the far East like the Persian Magi. His own name, and the names of his friends, resemble more than any other the names of the Seirites, among whom, in later times, Esau and his posterity intermingled and intermarried. In Gen. xxxvi we find the names *Temanite*, *Jobab*, *Eliphaz*, *Teman*, with others not identical, but of the same general cast as the names of Job's associates. The faith of these godly men, wherever they may have lived, is of a very high order, and their knowledge of God and of his ways is of the highest degree. Neither by Job nor by any of his friends is there the least allusion to the covenant of Abraham. Whatever mistakes they labored under, they are recognised as true worshippers, and God deals with them as his own.

VIII. *Assyrian.*—Late discoveries by Layard and Rawlinson have brought us into contact with the ancient Assyrians in much of their religion, as well as war and civil policy. Among the sculptures exhumed, none are more interesting than the winged quadrupeds finished off with a human head, or the human form with eagle's head and wings. These carry us back to the early cherubim, the forms of which must have been preserved by Noah and his sons. At first sight these Assyrian images may seem no more than mere idols—false gods; but that would not account for their close affinity with the living creatures of Ezekiel and the τέσσαρα ζῶα of John's Revelation. While no one of the Assyrian sculptures embodies the four principles of Ezekiel and John, yet two of them, taken together, do embody the four identical principles, *and no more*. The winged lion and the winged ox have the *aspect* of a man, lion, eagle, ox, and nothing besides. The reason for making them double arose from the difficulty of distinguishing the body of the ox from that of the lion in the same figure. Nor is it impossible that the Assyrians could have borrowed from Ezekiel; almost equally certain that they did not borrow from Moses. This leaves us the only course, that of authentic tradition from Noah and Shem, as *they* had the figures down from the garden of Eden. Whether these winged figures were worshipped by the Assyrians or not, it is of importance to notice that they were not the highest objects of adoration, for they are found bowing themselves before the Supreme, the symbol of Supreme Deity being a human form sitting in a winged circle or globe. While the races of Shemites occupied one part of Mesopotamia and the Hamites another, they were sufficiently contiguous to afford the opportunity of corrupting one another in the matter of worship, as well as in the manner. We have already seen that the best family of the Shemites—Terah and his sons—had gone into idolatry in connection with the true worship, and needed reformation in the days of Abraham; we may safely infer that other Shemites, as well as the families of Ham, were more deeply involved, and went still further from the truth till the days of Sardanapalus, Nebuchadnezzar, and Belshazzar. Whether in the Abrahamic line there was kept any physical type of the original cherubim until renewed by Moses is nowhere recorded. Yet there are some hints worthy of our serious consideration. (*a.*) Rebekah went somewhere to inquire of the Lord and received a specific answer. May not this have come from sacred utensils still in the custody of Abraham? (*b.*) Before Moses had set up the new tabernacle there was some kind of tabernacle in use (Exod. xxxiii, 7). (*c.*) A sacred chest belonged to many of the ancient idolatries. Was it copied from a true original? (*d.*) In the higher rank of families the teraphim were long retained in connection with the true religion. Not only did Rachel import them from Laban's house, but Michal brought one into David's; and they are classed with recognised symbols in Hos. iii, 4. On the other side they are classed with idols, and were used by the king of Babylon for idolatrous purposes. May they not have been like the brazen serpent, at first a mere memorial of truth, afterwards turned into an object of false worship. See TERAPHIM.

IX. *Inferences.*—Other ancient religions we must pass over here in order to take a survey of the leading features of the primitive, from which they are all derived, and from which they all inherit some features in common, while each seems to have dropped other matters, according to their various tastes and circumstances (see *Princeton Rev.* July, 1872; Tayler Lewis, *The Primitive Greek Religion*).

On what foundation did the primitive faith rest its confidence?

1. The knowledge, fear, and reverence which Adam retained even after the fall. Let it be fairly admitted that Adam, by transgression, was *lost*—lost to all spiritual good accompanying salvation; that the first of all the commandments—love—was completely obliterated in his heart; that he was *dead* in trespasses and sins. Still the apostle tells us that where the law of love had been written there was still left τὸ ἔργον τοῦ νόμου γραπτόν, the "work" of the law, which work is still written in the heart of even the heathen (Rom. ii, 14, 15). This *work* he places largely in the domain of knowledge, and even conscience, yet it is not in any degree the law of love (i, 32): "Who, knowing the judgment of God, that they who commit such things are worthy of death, not only do the same, but have pleasure in them that do them." This by nature is our own moral state; yet, blessed be God, knowledge, memory, reason, conscience, have not been entirely destroyed, though conscience has been seared, and all the faculties greatly debilitated. Adam, on leaving the garden, still retained the sad remembrance of happiness in great variety, now lost, lost! lost!! Lost *forever* through the former channel. With all that he had lost, who is there among us that would not travel a long, long pilgrimage to hear him tell the beauty of the garden inside; the perfect satisfaction of everything he saw, heard, felt, while innocent; the nature of that holiness which is only now to be regained by incessant labor, suffering, and watching; unimpeded communion with God. Darwin himself, and the modern race of improved baboons, might envy the intellect which he retained even then. Acquaintance with God! Fellowship of the Spirit! Seeing him as he is! Social worship in the holy family! The first Sabbath-day!

2. The promise of a Seed, a coming Deliverer, while as yet he had no child. Modern theologians can see in the first promise a deliverance, but many of us cannot see a personal Deliverer. It was not so with Eve, the mother of all living (Gen. iv, 1): "I have obtained a man, the Lord."* What if she were mistaken in the time, the individual, and many other material considerations? What if she were a Millenarian? An *Adventess?* Such can be found under brighter skies to-day.

* The particle אֵת here, however, is correctly rendered "from" in the English version.—ED.

She had faith in One who is able to save to the uttermost. See SEED OF PROMISE. Through all those ancient faiths noted above there are traces of the coming One. Some of them retain this idea while they have lost many others, and sunk into dark paganism. Witness the ten Avatars of Vishnu, as well as the "Desire of all nations" (Hag. ii, 7).

3. The institution of sacrifice. This needs not here to be discussed; how early it was observed, how extensively propagated, however altered and perverted, it held a place in all ancient religions, teaching in some sense or other the doctrine of atonement by blood, as well as of purification by blood and water. See ALTAR; ATONEMENT; SACRIFICE.

4. The cherubim. For the structure and uses of these, see the word. For their spiritual meaning, see LIVING CREATURES; SERAPHIM. Set over against the sword of flame, they were the symbols of mercy to those reconciled by the sacrifice. Their place in the ancient religions is well known, even after those religions had departed far from primitive rectitude, both in ritual and moral code.

The sphinx of Babylon and Egypt; the griffin of Assyria, Persia, Egypt, Greece, and Rome; the Serapis of Egypt, Greece, and Rome; the apes of Egypt; the Moloch of Moab and the Ammonites; the Baals of Syria, in all their variety; the ox of Bengal; the live buffalo of Calcutta; the triform idol of Chiun; and hundreds of other sacred images, including the teraphim—these all were derived from the original cherubim at the east of Paradise. At first these imitations may have been considered as mere memorials of the early devotion of honored and godly ancestors; but, in process of theological improvements, they became associated with the sun, moon, stars, fructifying and other general powers of nature, as well as with the more spiritual demands of man's higher nature, till they are seen clothed with the attributes of deity, and worshipped and served more than the Creator. To the tradition of the early cherubim, we think, more than to the inventive genius of any priesthood, must be traced these homogeneous idols with all their diversities of aspect. The true symbolism of the cherubim belonged to the universal and primal religion; the idolatrous imitations had their diversities from human fancy. This will account for the worship of the golden calf, to which the Israelites themselves were so easily seduced. Of all the depreciated forms of the early cherubim the Assyrian quadrupeds are the most complete. Layard passes high encomium on the skill and judgment of the inventors (?) in selecting the four highest forms of mundane life to represent the higher sphere of existence, while he utterly ignores the divine originals from which they were copied.

The cherubs at the Garden of Eden set over against the sword of flame, as well as those seen by Ezekiel evolved from a mass of fire, evidently were intended to symbolize that mercy which rejoices against judgment and delivers from wrath to come.

5. The flaming sword kept before the mind of worshippers the Justice to be satisfied. Whether we trace this to the sword of flame, the death of the victim, or the universal conscience, it is equally a portion of the primitive religion. The soul that sinneth deserves to die (Rom. i, 32). And we know no better symbol that could have been introduced to exhibit the wretchedness of those who are twice dead.

6. The tree of life, untouched, waved its laden branches in the garden long after the expulsion of our first parents. While this emblem must of necessity call up the feeling of deep regret, it would, at the same time, after the door of mercy was opened, call for all the joy and all the effort that belong to a well-grounded hope. *That* tree could never be regained, perhaps not desirable *now* that it should be; but another Tree of Life in a higher paradise yields its fruit every month (Rev. xxii).

Here it may be proper to observe that each of these early emblems of man's recovery is, from the very gate of Eden, carried uninterruptedly down the stream of revelation till we come to the last chapter of the last book; while other emblems have been added as occasion might demand. The rainbow had an early place, and holds its position till the last (Rev. x, 1).

7. Occasional revelations made to such men as Enoch, Noah, and perhaps Lamech, the father of Noah (Gen. v, 29), were still added to the former stock, and thus were all advances made to rest on the word of God. Before the use of writing, and even after, we find appeals made to what had been taught to the ancestors, whether by Providence or by revelation (Job viii, 8; xv, 10, 18; Deut. iv, 31; xxxii, 7; Psa. xliv, 1). We think that none of the revelations that God has made have ever been lost.

X. *Features.*—Having seen the sure basis of this early religion, it is proper to glance at some of its characteristics.

1. It was a universal religion, adapted to *man as such* in every climate and for all time, having its primary relation to eternity. It was the work of evil men *then*, as it is *now*, to lop off and add to the truth of God till they had as many religions as languages throughout the world.

2. It was monotheistic: one Lord, one faith, one Spirit, one Mediator, one God and Father of all. The question whether the Persians borrowed from the Hebrews or the Hebrews from the Persians has no place here; the origin of both from one primitive source is sufficient to account for all the items of similarity, or even identity, in the two religions. So, also, we may reckon of the Hebrews and Egyptians, the Hebrews and the Greeks, and all affinities of this kind. While the primitive religion was monotheistic, there are many indications of a plurality of persons, as in Gen. i, 1, where a singular verb is joined with אֱלֹהִים, as in a thousand other instances. So, too, ch. i, 24 and iii, 22.

3. Delight in all that God has revealed of himself—the fact, as well as the doctrines, of inspiration. Adam was extensively a prophet—a seer. Not merely had he the intimation of the Deliverer, but there was given to him the future history of the whole race—the standing, irrepressible conflict, the numerous progeny, the heavy labor, the sore pain, the deep sorrow, all ending in the death of the body and its return to dust. On the other hand, the productiveness of the soil for constant support, acceptance of his service, occasional victories over evil, final triumph over sin and Satan in the One Seed. The third chapter of Genesis is too little studied. If John the Baptist could point to the Lamb of God, Adam had the first intimation of his coming, whether Adam was born of woman or not. So happily and largely are the words of inspiration connected with our redemption that Christ is pleased to wear the happy name, the Word of God.

But here, again, while the nations in separating from one another took, each one, some degree of respect for the Word revealed, or for some part of it, it was reserved to one nation only to preserve it pure and entire. "To the Jews were committed the oracles of God." Other nations retained a glimmering tradition, a tetragrammaton, a holy phrase, of which they knew not the meaning and used it merely as a charm—a φυλακτήριον. How the true believer in every age and country appreciates the *word*, we may learn, if not by happy experience, by Psa. cxix. Under these beams of the Sun of Righteousness, Enoch walked with God. Light and life and love are again restored. If we come to the particular doctrines of this primitive religion, we have many scattered hints of, say, acceptance with God, in the sacrifice of Abel; a higher life, in the translation of Enoch; retribution, in the conscience of Cain; calling on the name of the Lord, in the days of Enos; judgment combined with mercy, in the deluge and the cities

of the plain; intercession, by Abraham; and from the same source, that the Judge of all the earth will do right; family government and instruction; covenant with God; precepts given to Noah; and many, very many, of the doctrines of Christianity. But what a vacuum we should have just here were it not for the book of Job! Wherever the patriarch may have lived, or in whatever age, besides the *lesson* of his own biography, we have, in the speeches of himself and of his friends, a very full development of the patriarchal theology. Whether each particular doctrine of Watson's *Institutes* or Hodge's *Outlines* could be deduced from the book of Job, or whether each expression in it is to be relied on as correct, we shall not here inquire; but certain it is that each chapter contains a mass of theological thought befitting our age as well as that in which it was delivered. It opens with the doctrine of holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord. Next we have God's blessing on all that Job possessed, as in Psa. cvii, 38. Then his anxiety about his children—their liability to sin. We have the atonement in his offering sacrifices; particular atonement, "to the *number of them all*." The humblest resignation when all was taken from him—"Blessed be the name of the Lord." The Kinsman—a living Redeemer, and his coming to the earth. The speciality of providence is iterated and reiterated. But, not to dwell on the more common doctrines, we find some of those which would be an attainment even in our own time. Civil-service reform is taught, or rather taken for granted, in ch. xxxiv, 17, 18; and national reform in all its depth comes in ver. 29, 30: "When he giveth quietness, who then can give trouble? and when he hideth his face, who then can behold him? whether it be done against a nation or against a man only: that the hypocrite reign not, lest the people be ensnared." Let any one take up the book of Job under this aspect, and he will see how much of the Gospel there is in such passages as ch. xxii, 21–30; xxxiii, 14–30. Altogether, apart from the plot of the poem, there is wrought into the speeches a vast amount of the deep knowledge of God, not by the inspiration of the several speakers, but by their earnestness in using the floating capital which belonged to the patriarchal faith. The occasion was such as made an extraordinary call on their knowledge, and on their skill in using it.

We must here pass in silence the ancient religions of those respective nations which issued in the many gods of Greece and Rome, of the Celtic tribes, and the Gothic hordes. There was truth underlying them all, but oh, how deeply buried in the filth and rubbish of ages!

It is not to be denied that the worship of mere nature furnished the element of these fallen religions. We have enough of that in Jer. xliv among the chosen people. But it is never to be admitted that any religion was ever *originated* by man, however it may have been manipulated "by art and man's device." No historian can feel that Mohammed, even with the assistance of the monk Sergius, originated Islam; his claim was to restore the ancient religion of the world. Mecca was a place of pilgrimage ages before he was born. All his revelations were ostensibly to restore and improve the primitive faith of Adam, of Abraham, and of Ishmael. A large amount of popery, even, is, independent of divine revelation, brought down from ancient traditions much later than the primitive faith. Paul preached at Athens the service of God, who made the world and all things therein (as the people had been taught by their own poets); though he was still, in a great measure, the Unknown, and the apostle was esteemed a setter-forth of strange deities. While we rejoice in the abundance of our Scriptures, it is to be remembered that Adam, Seth, and Enos did not require so much as we do. They were born to a bright inheritance near the throne of their heavenly Father. "Adam who was the son of God." Thus, while we have added line upon line as it was needed, the true religion is, like its Author, "the same yesterday, to-day, and forever." (R. H.)

Religiōsi, a term applied, until the 10th century, to those who led a monastic life, to distinguish them from the clergy and laity. They were also called Canonici and Regulares (q. v.).

Religious, in a general sense, is something that relates to religion; and, in reference to persons, that which indicates that they give their attention to religion, and are so influenced by it as to differ from the world. It was also applied to members of monastic orders. See RELIGIOSI.

RELIGIOUS CORPORATIONS. In the United States, as there is no civil patronage to the Church, societies for public worship are incorporated in accordance with the statutes of the several states. In most of them there is a provision enabling any body of persons composing a fixed congregation to constitute themselves a corporation, and to elect trustees to hold and manage the property in its behalf. Some of the older denominations are incorporated under special acts and with particular regulations. A convenient digest of these legal prescriptions is given in Hunt's *Laws of Religious Corporations* (N. Y. 1876, 8vo). In many states there are likewise general laws for the incorporation of most kinds of benevolent, literary, and other bodies of a religious and social character. See CHURCH AND STATE.

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION. Both nature and revelation teach that it is the duty of parents to care for the religious education of their children. The mind of the child is in a receptive condition, and the first light it receives should be light from heaven, the first truths those that are eternal and immutable, never to desert them. The mind of the child cannot be shut up until he is of an age to investigate and determine for himself. It becomes, therefore, a high duty to furnish the expanding intellect with truths such as piety cherishes. The apostle says, "Fathers, bring up your children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord" (Eph. vi, 4). In the education of children several mistakes are to be avoided: (1.) That the habits of children only are to be regarded, and that, in time, principles will follow of course. Habits, without principles of piety, are nothing better than a citadel ungarrisoned and uncommanded. (2.) That many of the subjects of religion are beyond the capacity of children, and that, therefore, to instruct them in Christianity is only to load their memories with words. Yet we do not defer other kinds of instruction till their nature and use can be completely understood by the pupil. But, in fact, the principles of religion are some of the most simple and intelligible which can be proposed to the human mind. (3.) That to furnish children with religious ideas is to infuse into them prejudices. But we must be careful to discriminate between religious ideas and prejudices, for the latter is an unexamined opinion. And, further, by this very conduct we prejudice him against religion as something unworthy his concern, or beyond his comprehension. We do not so treat literature, politics, or science. (4.) That the child will acquire in school and the public institutions of the Gospel an adequate sentiment and knowledge of religious truths. But if the love or natural interest of the parent in the child does not stimulate him to this duty, can it be expected that it will be voluntarily assumed by others? The institution of Sunday-schools does not diminish, in the least, the responsibility of those having charge of children to train them for God. See PÆDAGOGICS.

RELIGIOUS LIBERTY is the absolute freedom of religious opinion and worship based upon the fact that all men are bound by the laws of God and are responsible to him. From this primary and supreme obligation the conscience cannot be freed, and hence no human government has a right to hinder any form of religion, nor to support any to the injury of others. This implies the equality of all churches, religious associations, or persons in the matter of protection or restraint by the civil

powers. We must not confound religious liberty with religious toleration, for the latter is the assumption of the right by civil process to regulate religious affairs; and to permit implies the right to prevent. This severance of spiritual and civil affairs is emphatically taught by our Lord: "My kingdom is not of this world" (John xviii, 36). A distinctive American principle of government is that what is religious is necessarily, from its very character, beyond the control of the civil government. In the United States, therefore, religious liberty is an absolute *personal* right. All denominations, churches, and religious faiths are equal and free in the eye of the law, none receiving gratuities, none subjected to inequalities. There is, thus, an entire divorce of Church and State. The Constitution of the United States contains these two articles: "No religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States;" and "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." The state constitutions are equally emphatic, and generally more specific in the expression of their jealousy of ecclesiastical ambition and sectarian intolerance. This example was set by Rhode Island, which has the honor of being the first state in the world to incorporate in its organic law, and to practice, absolute religious liberty. Under the influence of this American principle of government much change has been wrought in other countries. Toleration is becoming general, and the tendency is towards unrestrained liberty of worship. France bestows patronage upon several denominations; Germany, though claiming the management of ecclesiastical affairs, interferes but little with the right of worship. In Russia, Spain, and Italy there is less of former exclusiveness, and in the two latter countries different forms of faith are entitled to protection. Under English rule the colonies enjoy perfect religious liberty; the Anglican Church has been disestablished in Ireland, and there is in Great Britain no public position, not ecclesiastic, for the tenure of which a particular religious belief is required, except the throne and governorship of a few colleges. The connection of Church and State is increasingly regarded as corrupting to the Church, destructive of the purity and spirituality of religion, and antagonistic to the rights of men. See Brook, *History of Religious Liberty;* Madison, *Memorial and Remonstrance;* Wayland, *Discourses.*

RELIGIOUS SOCIETIES, associations for the promotion of personal piety established among members of the Church of England about 1678, and which existed until the rise of the Methodist. They began with a few young men who had been impressed by the preaching of Dr. Horneck, preacher at the Savoy, and of Mr. Smithies, lecturer at St. Michael's, Cornhill. The organization was somewhat similar to the societies of St. Vincent de Paul in Paris, or like those of the Collegiants and other pietistic communities in Holland and Germany. The members met once a week for religious conference and devotion, the meetings being conducted with singing, Scripture reading and exposition, and with special preparation for the holy communion. They added also practical works of charity, the establishment and maintenance of schools, the visitation of the poor, and support of missions in America. They were closely connected with the Society for the Reformation of Manners, established in 1691, and efficient allies to the Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge. That at Oxford was joined by John and Charles Wesley, and by George Whitefield. One of the last of the annual meetings of the London religious societies was held at Bow Church in 1738. See Woodward, *Rise and Progress of Religious Societies;* Nelson, *Address to Persons of Quality;* id. *Festivals and Fasts* (Preface); Blunt, *Hist. of Sects*, etc., s. v.

Reliquary, a vessel for holding relics, and enclosing, in the 13th century, three grains of incense in honor



Ancient Portable Reliquaries.

of the Holy Trinity. It usually took the form of the building in which it was kept, as at the Sainte-Chapelle in Paris and Nivelles at the end of that century. In the 14th century cathedrals adopted for their reliquaries the form of a church, while in chapels and parish churches preference was given to images of gold and silver. Sometimes they take the shape of a coffer, or a transparent bier carried by ecclesiastics; a case-like cruet, a rose, a quatrefoil, a canister in an angel's hand; horns, as at Canterbury; a triptych, like the triple entrance of a church; a lantern tower and spire, etc. In some cases the church bearing the name of a saint has his monument, but in other cases the relics only were preserved in portable shrines. Sometimes the reliquary took the form of some popular saint, a chest, or an altar. At Chichester the relic-chest of St. Richard is of oak, contains a door which was opened when the relics were exposed, and a slit for the reception of offerings in the cross-bar below it. At first the reliquaries were portable, to form accessories of a procession. In 745, relics and the cross were carried in the Rogation processions in England. At Rome the "three relics" are exhibited on Good-Friday — the portion of the true cross, the blade of the spear that pierced the Redeemer's side, and the veronica (q. v.). About the beginning of the 13th century the reliquaries upon the altar took the form of the limb or bust, called a corset (or corselet). They were arranged on great festivals on the rood-beam or retable above the high-altar.

Modern Stationary Reliquaries.

Relly. See RELLYANITES.

Rellyanites, or RELLYAN UNIVERSALISTS, the followers of Mr. James Relly. He first commenced his ministerial character in connection with Mr. Whitefield, and was received with great popularity. Upon a change of his views he encountered reproach, and was pronounced by many as an enemy to godliness. He believed that Christ as a Mediator was so united to mankind that his actions were theirs, his obedience and sufferings theirs, and, consequently, that he has as fully restored the whole human race to the divine favor as if all had obeyed and suffered in their own persons; and upon this

persuasion he preached a finished salvation, called by the apostle Jude "the common salvation." The Rellyanites are not observers of ordinances such as water baptism and the sacrament, but profess to believe only in one baptism, which they call an immersion of the mind or conscience into truth by the teaching of the Spirit of God; and by the same Spirit they are enabled to feed on Christ as the bread of life, professing that in and with Jesus they possess all things. They inculcate and maintain good works for necessary purposes, but contend that the principal and only work which ought to be attended to is the doing real good without religious ostentation; that to relieve the miseries and distresses of mankind according to our ability is doing more real good than the superstitious observance of religious ceremonies. In general they appear to believe that there will be a resurrection to life and a resurrection to condemnation; that believers only will be among the former, who as first-fruits, and kings and priests, will have part in the first resurrection, and shall reign with Christ in his kingdom of the millennium; that unbelievers who are after raised must wait the manifestation of the Saviour of the world under that condemnation of conscience which a mind in darkness and wrath must necessarily feel; that believers, called kings and priests, will be made the medium of communication to their condemned brethren, who, like Joseph to his brethren, though he spoke roughly to them, in reality overflowed with affection and tenderness; that ultimately every knee shall bow and every tongue confess that in the Lord they have righteousness and strength; and thus every enemy shall be subdued to the kingdom and glory of the Great Mediator. Relly was succeeded (in 1781) by an American preacher, Elhanan Winchester, who had been a Calvinistic Baptist, but the congregation in London was soon broken up. This movement by Relly was the first attempt to consolidate a sect of which Universalism should be the leading tenet. A Mr. Murray belonging to this society emigrated to America, and preached these sentiments at Boston and elsewhere. Mr. Relly published several works, the principal of which are, *Union:—The Trial of Spirits:—Christian Liberty:—One Baptism:—The Salt of Sacrifice:—Antichrist Resisted:—Letters on Universal Salvation:—The Cherubimical Mystery.* See UNIVERSALISTS.

Rely, JEAN DE, a French preacher, was born about 1430. He was made doctor of theology at Arras, and became successively canon, chancellor, and archdeacon of Notre Dame at Paris, and rector of the university. In this capacity he drew up in 1461 the *Remonstrances* which the Parliament presented to Louis XI for the maintenance of the Pragmatic Sanction, written with remarkable energy of style, and often reprinted both in French and in Latin. In 1483 he was deputy to the States-General of Tours, and presented to Charles VIII the result of their deliberations. In 1490 he became canon of St. Martin of Tours, and in Dec., 1491, he was elected bishop of Angers. He accompanied Charles VIII to Italy, where he was charged with several duties near pope Alexander VI. Rely died at Saumur March 27, 1499. Besides the *Breviary* of St. Martin of Tours, he revised by royal commission the translation of the historical books of the Bible by Guyart de Moulins (1495, fol.).—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.

Remali'ah (Heb. *Remalyáhu*, רְמַלְיָהוּ, *protected of Jehovah;* Sept. Ῥαμελίος or Ῥομελίος, v. r. Ῥομελία), the father of Pekah, king of Israel (2 Kings xv, 25, 27, 30, 32, 37; xvi, 1, 5; 2 Chron. xxviii, 6), probably a man whose character was such as to make his name a reproach to his descendants (Isa. vii, 4, 5; viii, 6). B.C. ante 756. See PEKAH.

Rembrandt, commonly called *Rembrandt van Rhyn*, was the son of Hermann Gerritsz, and was born in his father's mill on the banks of the Rhine, between Leyderdorp and Koudekerk, near Leyden, June 15, 1606 (or 1608). The former date rests on the authority of Orlers, *Description of Leyden* (1641). The latter date rests on the painter's marriage certificate, lately discovered, dated June 10, 1634, in which Rembrandt's age is stated to be twenty-six. He became the pupil of Jacob van Swanenburg, with whom he remained three years. He studied also under Pieter Lastman at Amsterdam, and Jacob Pinas at Haarlem. He settled at Amsterdam in 1630, and appears to have died there, according to Immerzeel, July 19, 1664; but no register of his burial has yet been discovered. Rembrandt was equally distinguished as an etcher and a painter. His etchings amount to nearly 400, and they are dated from 1628 to 1661. The chief characteristic of his works is forcible light and shade. Among his most remarkable historical paintings are *Moses Destroying the Tables of the Law:—The Sacrifice of Abraham:—The Woman Taken in Adultery:—The Descent from the Cross:—The Nativity:—Christ in the Garden with Mary Magdalene:*—and *The Adoration of the Magi.* There are 640 of his paintings specified in Smith's *Catalogue.* The best of them are still owned in Holland. He is well represented in the National Gallery, and his influence has been more direct upon the British school of painters than that of any other master. See Immerzeel, *Aanteekeningen op de Lofredd op Rembrandt*, also *De Levens en Werken der Hollandsche en Vlaamsche Kunstschilders*, etc. (1843); Bartsch, *Le Peintre-graveur;* Burnet, *Rembr. and his Works* (1848); Middleton, *Etched Work of Rembr.* (Lond. 1879).

Re'meth (Heb. *id.* רֶמֶת, *height;* Sept. Ῥαμμάθ v. r. Ῥαμμάς), a city in the territory of Issachar (Josh. xix, 21), called, as it seems, RAMOTH (q. v.) in 1 Chron. vi, 73. As the place is named in the first of the above passages next to En-gannim (Jenîn), the site is possibly represented by a *tell* with ruins south of Zerîn (Jezreel) between Sundela and Mukeibileh. Dr. Porter (in Kitto's *Cyclop.* s. v.) suggests that the place may be identical with the ruined fortress and village called *Wezar*, perched upon the northern rocky face of Mt. Gilboa (Robinson, *Researches*, iii, 157, 160; new ed. iii, 339).

Remi. See REMIGIUS.

Remigius OF AUXERRE was a learned French Benedictine monk in the 9th century, and was brought up in the abbey of St. Germain, Auxerre. He was appointed teacher to the schools belonging to the monastery, afterwards taught at Rheims, then went to Paris and opened the first public school in that city after learning had sunk under the ravages of the Normans. His works are, *Commentarius in Omnes Davidis Psalmos* (Cologne, 1536):—*Enarrationes in Posteriores XI Minores Prophetas* (Antwerp, 1545), with the *Commentaries* of Œcumenius on the Acts and Epistles, and those of Arethas on Revelation:—and *Expositio Missæ.* See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.

Remigius, or **Remi** (*St.*), OF LYONS, a celebrated French archbishop in the 9th century, and grand almoner to the emperor Lothaire, succeeded Amolo in the above see about the year 853 or 854. It is supposed to be this St. Remigius who, in the name of the Church of Lyons, wrote an answer to the three letters of Hincmar of Rheims, and others, in which he defends St. Augustine's doctrine on grace and predestination. This answer may be found in the *Vindiciæ Predestinationis et Gratiæ* (1650, 2 vols. 4to), and in the library of the fathers. He presided at the Council of Valence in 855, and others of the same kind; and, after founding some pious institutions, he died Oct. 28, 875. See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.

Remigius, or **Remi** (*St.*), OF RHEIMS, a very celebrated French archbishop, was raised to the see of Rheims about 460. He distinguished himself by his learning and virtue, converted and baptized king Clovis, and died Jan. 13, 533. Some *Letters* and a *Testament* in the library of the fathers are attributed to him. See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* s. v.

Remigius, or **Remi,** OF STRASBURG, a bishop known only for having founded the monastery of Aschau. He died in 803. He is often confounded with *abbé* REMI of Münster, who died in 768. See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.

Reminiscĕre (*remember*), a name sometimes given to the second Sunday in Lent, from the first word of the *Introit*, "Remember, O Lord, thy tender mercies," etc. (Psa. xxv, 6).

Remling, FRANZ XAVER, a Roman Catholic divine, was born in 1803 at Edenkoben. In 1827 he was ordained a priest, and in 1852 he became a member of the chapter. In 1853 the Academy of Munich appointed him as corresponding member, and in 1856 the Munich University honored him with the degree of doctor of philosophy. He died June 28, 1873. He wrote, *Das Reformationswerk in der Pfalz* (Mannheim, 1846):—*Geschichte der Bischöfe zu Speyer* (Mainz, 1852–54, 2 vols.):—*Urkundenbuch zur Geschichte der Bischöfe von Speyer* (ibid. 1852, 1853 sq.). See Zuchold, *Bibl. Theol.* ii, 1054; *Literarischer Handweiser*, 1865, p. 443 sq.; 1866, p. 298; 1873, p. 430. (B. P.)

Rem'mon (Josh. xix, 7). See RIMMON.

Rem'mon-meth'oär [some *Metho'är*] (Josh. xix, 13). See RIMMON.

Remoboth and SARABAITES, names given to associations of hermits in the early Church who refused to submit to monastic regulations. The *Remoboth*, whose name originated in Syria, are mentioned as belonging to this class by Jerome (*Ep.* 18 *ad Eustochium, De Custodia Virginitatis*). He says that they were more numerous than other monks in Syria and Palestine; that they lived in the towns in complete independence, and in companies of not more than two or three persons; that they supported themselves by labor, and often quarrelled among themselves. A similar class of hermits, living in Egypt, is mentioned in Cassian (*Collatio*, xviii, c. 7) under the name *Sarabaïtes*, said to have been applied to them because they separated themselves from the monasteries and personally made provision for their needs.—Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* s. v.

Rémond (or **Ræmond**), FLORIMOND DE, a French historian, who was born about 1540, and died in 1602, is noteworthy here only for his spleen against the Huguenots, which he vented especially in his *Antichrist*. He also wrote in refutation of the story of the popess Joan (q. v.), as did likewise his son, *abbé* CHARLES REMOND, among other things. See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.

Remonstrance, a complaint framed by the Commons of England in 1628, and addressed to Charles I, setting forth the increase of popery in consequence of the relaxation of the penal laws; the preferments given to papists; and a commission being issued to compound for the penalties incurred by popish recusants. It also described the discouragement shown to orthodox preachers and teachers, and the prohibition of their books. The king attempted to suppress this remonstrance, and afterwards published an answer to its allegations.

Remonstrants, a name given to the ARMINIANS (q. v.) by reason of a remonstrance which, in 1610, they made to the States of Holland against the decree of the Synod of Dort, which condemned them as heretics. Episcopius and Grotius were at the head of the Remonstrants. The Calvinists presented a counter-address, and were called *Contra-remonstrants*.

Rem'phan (Ῥεμφάν v. r. Ῥεφάν) is named in Acts vii, 43 as an idol worshipped by the Israelites in the desert, in a passage quoted by Stephen from Amos v. 26, where the Sept. has Ῥαιφάν (v. r. Ῥομφᾶ), for the Heb. כִּיּוּן, *Chiun*. In the following discussion we review the various explanations given of this word. Much difficulty has been occasioned by this corresponding occurrence of two names so wholly different in sound. The most reasonable opinion seemed to be that Chiun was a Hebrew or Shemitic name, and Remphan an Egyptian equivalent substituted by the Sept. The former, rendered *Saturn* in the Syriac, was compared with the Arabic and Persian *Kaywân*, "the planet Saturn," and, according to Kircher, the latter was found in Coptic with the same signification; but perhaps he had no authority for this, excepting the supposed meaning of the Hebrew Chiun. They, indeed, occur as such in the Coptic-Arabic Lexicon of Kircher (*Ling. Ægypt. Restit.* p. 49; *Œdip. Ægypti*, i, 386); but Jablonski has long since shown that this and other names of planets in these lexicons are of Greek origin, and drawn from the Coptic versions of Amos and the Acts (Jablonski, *Remphan Ægyptior.*, in *Opusc.* ii, 1 sq.). Egyptology has, moreover, shown that this is not the true explanation. Among the foreign divinities worshipped in Egypt, two, the god Renpu, perhaps pronounced Rempu, and the goddess Ken, occur together. Before endeavoring to explain the passages in which Chiun and Remphan are mentioned, it will be desirable to speak, on the evidence of monuments, of the foreign gods worshipped in Egypt, particularly Renpu and Ken, and of the idolatry of the Israelites while in that country.

Besides those divinities represented on the monuments of Egypt which have Egyptian forms or names, or both, others have foreign forms or names, or both. Of the latter, some appear to have been introduced at a very remote age. This is certainly the case with the principal divinity of Memphis, Ptah, the Egyptian Hephæstus. The name Ptah is from a Shemitic root, for it signifies "open," and in Heb. we find the root פָּתַח, and its cognates, "he or it opened," whereas there is no word related to it in Coptic. The figure of this divinity is that of a deformed pygmy, or perhaps unborn child, and is unlike the usual representations of divinities on the monuments. In this case there can be no doubt that the introduction took place at an extremely early date, as the name of Ptah occurs in very old tombs in the necropolis of Memphis, and is found throughout the religious records. It is also to be noticed that this name is not traceable in the mythology of neighboring nations, unless, indeed, it corresponds to that of the Πάταικοι or Παταϊκοί, whose images, according to Herodotus, were the figure-heads of Phœnician ships (iii, 37). The foreign divinities that seem to be of later introduction are not found throughout the religious records, but only in single tablets, or are otherwise very rarely mentioned, and two out of their four names are immediately recognised to be non-Egyptian. They are Renpu, and the goddesses Ken, Anta, and Astarta. The first and second of these have foreign forms; the third and fourth have Egyptian forms: there would therefore seem to be an especially foreign character about the former two. (1.) Renpu, pronounced Rempu (?), is represented as an Asiatic, with the full beard and apparently the general type of face given on the monuments to most nations east of Egypt, and to the Rebu or Libyans. This type is evidently that of the Shemites. His hair is bound with a fillet, which is ornamented in front with the head of an antelope. (2.) Ken is represented perfectly naked, holding in both hands corn, and standing upon a lion. In the last particular the figure of a goddess at Maltheiyyeh, in Assyria, may be compared (Layard, *Nineveh*, ii, 212). From this occurrence of a similar representation, from her being naked and carrying corn, and from her being worshipped with Khem, we may suppose that Ken corresponded to the Syrian goddess, at least when the latter had the character of Venus. She is also called Ketesh, which is the name in hieroglyphics of the great Hittite town on the Orontes. This in the present case is probably a title, קְדֵשָׁה: it can scarcely be the name of a town where she was worshipped, applied to her as per-

sonifying it. (3.) Anata appears to be Anaïtis, and her foreign character seems almost certain from her being jointly worshipped with Renpu and Ken. (4.) Astarte is of course the Ashtoreth of Canaan. On a tablet in the British Museum the principal subject is a group representing Ken, having Khem on one side and Renpu on the other; beneath is an adoration of Anata. On the half of another tablet Ken and Khem occur, and a dedication to Renpu and Ketesh.

We have no clue to the exact time of the introduction of these divinities into Egypt, nor, except in one case, to any particular places of their worship. Their names occur as early as the period of the 18th and 19th dynasties, and it is therefore not improbable that they were introduced by the Shepherds. Astarte is mentioned in a tablet of Amenoph II, opposite Memphis, which leads to the conjecture that she was the foreign Venus there worshipped, in the quarter of the Phœnicians of Tyre, according to Herodotus (ii, 112). It is observable that the Shepherds worshipped Sutekh, corresponding to Seth, and also called Bar (that is, Baal), and that under king Apepî he was the sole god of the foreiguers. Sutekh was probably a foreign god, and was certainly identified with Baal. The idea that the Shepherds introduced the foreign gods is therefore partly confirmed. As to Renpu and Ken we can only offer a conjecture. They occur together, and Ken is a form of the Syrian goddess, and also bears some relation to the Egyptian god of productiveness, Khem. Their similarity to Baal and Ashtoreth seems strong, and perhaps it is not unreasonable to suppose that they were the divinities of some tribe from the east, not of Phœnicians or Canaanites, settled in Egypt during the Shepherd period. The naked goddess Ken would suggest such worship as that of the Babylonian Mylitta, but the thoroughly Shemitic appearance of Renpu is rather in favor of an Arab source. Although we have not discovered a Shemitic origin of either name, the absence of the names in the mythologies of Canaan and the neighboring countries, as far as they are known to us, inclines us to look to Arabia, of which the early mythology is extremely obscure.

The Israelites in Egypt, after Joseph's rule, appear to have fallen into a general, but doubtless not universal, practice of idolatry. This is only twice distinctly stated and once alluded to (Josh. xxiv, 14; Ezek. xx, 7, 8; xxiii, 3), but the indications are perfectly clear. The mention of Chiun or Remphan as worshipped in the desert shows that this idolatry was, in part at least, that of foreigners, and no doubt of those settled in Lower Egypt. The golden calf, at first sight, would appear to be an image of Apis of Memphis, or Mnevis of Heliopolis, or some other sacred bull of Egypt; but it must be remembered that we read in the Apocrypha of "the heifer Baal" (Tob. i, 5), so that it was possibly a Phœnician or Canaanitish idol. The best parallel to this idolatry is that of the Phœnician colonies in Europe, as seen in the idols discovered in tombs at Camirus in Rhodes by M. Salzmann, and those found in tombs in the island of Sardinia (of both of which there are specimens in the British Museum), and those represented on the coins of Melita and the island of Ebusus.

We can now endeavor to explain the passages in which Chiun and Remphan occur. The Masoretic text of Amos v, 26 reads thus: "But ye bare the tent [or "tabernacle"] of your king and Chiun your images, the star of your gods [or "your god"], which ye made for yourselves." In the Sept. we find remarkable differences; it reads, Καὶ ἀνελάβετε τὴν σκηνὴν τοῦ Μολόχ, καὶ τὸ ἄστρον τοῦ θεοῦ ὑμῶν Ῥαιφάν, τοὺς τύπους αὐτῶν οὓς ἐποιήσατε ἑαυτοῖς. The Vulg. agrees with the Masoretic text in the order of the clauses, though omitting Chiun or Remphan. "Et portastis tabernaculum Moloch vestro, et imaginem idolorum vestrorum, sidus dei vestri, quæ fecistis vobis." The passage is cited in the Acts almost in the words of the Sept.: "Yea, ye took up the tabernacle of Moloch, and the star of your god Remphan, figures which ye made to worship them" (Καὶ ἀνελάβετε τὴν σκηνὴν τοῦ Μολόχ, καὶ τὸ ἄστρον τοῦ θεοῦ ὑμῶν Ῥεμφάν, τοὺς τύπους οὓς ἐποιήσατε προσκυνεῖν αὐτοῖς). A slight change in the Hebrew would enable us to read Moloch (Malcam or Milcom) instead of "your king." Beyond this it is extremely difficult to explain the differences. The substitution of Remphan for Chiun cannot be accounted for by verbal criticism. The Hebrew does not seem as distinct in meaning as the Sept.; and if we may conjecturally emend it from the latter, the last clause would be "your images which ye made for yourselves;" and if we further transpose Chiun to the place of "your god Remphan," in the Sept., את סכות מלכם would correspond to את כוכב אלהיכם כיון; but how can we account for such a transposition as would thus be supposed, which, be it remembered, is less likely in the Hebrew than in a translation of a difficult passage? If we compare the Masoretic text and the supposed original, we perceive that in the former כיון צלמיכם corresponds in position to כוכב אלהיכם, and it does not seem an unwarrantable conjecture that כיון having been by mistake written in the place of כוכב by some copyist, צלמיכם was also transposed. It appears to be more reasonable to read "images which ye made" than "gods which ye made," as the former word occurs. Supposing these emendations to be probable, we may now examine the meaning of the passage.

Babylonian Cylinders, with figures of gods and stars.

The tent or tabernacle of Moloch is supposed by Gesenius (*Thesaur.* s. v. סִכּוּת) to have been an actual tent, and he compares the σκηνὴ ἱερά of the Carthaginians (Diod. Sic. xx, 65). But there is some difficulty in the idea that the Israelites carried about so large an object for the purpose of idolatry, and it seems more likely that it was a small model of a larger tent or shrine. The reading *Moloch* appears preferable to "your king;" but the mention of the idol of the Ammonites as worshipped in the desert stands quite alone. It is perhaps worthy of note that there is reason for

supposing that Moloch was a name of the planet Saturn, and that this planet was evidently supposed by the ancient translators to be intended by Chiun and Remphan. The correspondence of Remphan or Raiphan to Chiun is extremely remarkable, and can, we think, only be accounted for by the supposition that the Sept. translator or translators of the prophet had Egyptian knowledge, and being thus acquainted with the ancient joint worship of Ken and Renpu, substituted the latter for the former, as they may have been unwilling to repeat the name of a foreign Venus. The star of Remphan, if indeed the passage is to be read so as to connect these words, would be especially appropriate if Remphan were a planetary god; but the evidence for this, especially as partly founded upon an Arabic or Persian word like Chiun, is not sufficiently strong to enable us to lay any stress upon the agreement. In hieroglyphics the sign for a star is one of the two composing the word Seb, "to adore," and is undoubtedly there used in a symbolical as well as a phonetic sense, indicating that the ancient Egyptian religion was partly derived from a system of star-worship; and there are representations on the monuments of mythical creatures or men adoring stars (*Ancient Egyptians*, pl. 30 a). We have, however, no positive indication of any figure of a star being used as an idolatrous object of worship. From the manner in which it is mentioned, we may conjecture that the star of Remphan was of the same character as the tabernacle of Moloch, an object connected with false worship rather than an image of a false god. According to the Sept. reading of the last clause, it might be thought that these objects were actually images of Moloch and Remphan; but it must be remembered that we cannot suppose an image to have had the form of a tent, and that the version of the passage in the Acts, as well as the Masoretic text, if in the latter case we may change the order of the words, gives a clear sense. As to the meaning of the last clause, it need only be remarked that it does not oblige us to infer that the Israelites made the images of the false gods, though they may have done so, as in the case of the golden calf; it may mean no more than that they adopted these gods.

It is to be observed that the whole passage does not indicate that distinct Egyptian idolatry was practiced by the Israelites. It is very remarkable that the only false gods mentioned as worshipped by them in the desert should be probably Moloch and Chiun and Remphan, of which the latter two were foreign divinities worshipped in Egypt. From this we may reasonably infer that while the Israelites sojourned in Egypt there was also a great stranger-population in the Lower Country, and therefore that it is probable that then the Shepherds still occupied the land. See Schröder, *De Tabernac. Molochi et Stella Dei Remph.* (Marb. 1745); Maius, *Dissert. de Kium et Remphan* (1763); *Journ. Sac. Lit.* Oct. 1852, p. 1039; Gesenius, *Thesaur.* p. 669, 670. See CHIUN.

Renaissance (Fr. *new birth*), a term used alike in architecture, sculpture, and ornamental art, to designate a revival period or style after the Middle Ages. The Renaissance had its origin in Italy, where, at best, Gothic architecture secured but a precarious hold. The discovery (early in the 15th century) of the productions of the ancients in statuary and painting, and the bringing to light of long-hidden stores of Greek and Latin MSS. (as, for instance, Vitruvius on the architecture of the ancients), could not fail to bring Roman buildings into prominent notice, and to predispose the public mind in favor of the classic style. A new system was consequently developed, during the first stages of which (namely, the Transition period) the elements of Roman architecture came again into use, although the forms which belong to the Later-Romanesque period—as, for instance, the division of the window-arches by mullions—were not entirely abandoned. Starting in Italy, this new style reached its zenith in that country in the course of the same century. Although derived from that of Italy, each country had its peculiar Renaissance, described accordingly as French, German, and English Renaissance, preserving a general likeness, but each exhibiting traits exclusively its own.

1. *Italian.*—At the early epoch of its existence, the new style of architecture displays not so much an alteration in the arrangement of the spaces and of the main features of the buildings as in the system of ornamentation and in the aspect of the profiles. During the early period the endeavor was maintained to adapt classical forms with more or less freedom to modern buildings, while later (in the 16th century), a scheme based on ancient architecture was universally prescriptive. Two distinct styles belong to this first period, viz. the Early Florentine and the Early Venetian. In the Roman Renaissance, the system of the second period, which confines itself more closely to classical elements, is more prevalent. The decoration of the interiors of the buildings of the Renaissance is copied from ancient Roman architecture. The rooms are either vaulted or have flat ceilings; but in both cases they are adorned with paintings, after the manner of those discovered in the Baths of Titus. Ornamented panels were employed in large palaces for horizontal ceilings, as also in churches, though in the latter case they were more often applied to cupola vaultings, as notably in St. Peter's. See ROME.

2. *French.*—France was the first to introduce the new style north of the Alps, Fra Giocondo, an Italian artist, having been summoned thither by Louis XII. Giocondo erected for cardinal D'Amboise, the minister of that monarch, the celebrated Château Gaillon. At this time the Flamboyant (q. v.) style was still in its vigor, and the consequence was that a blending of the two styles



Central Pavilion of the Tuileries (as designed by Delorme).

temporarily prevailed. After the period of Philibert Delorme, who completed the chapel of the Château d'Anet in the Renaissance style (1552), the Gothic style was, as a rule, abandoned. At the same time, the general arrangement of the Gothic churches was retained, and it was only the Renaissance system of decoration which was substituted for the Gothic. The ground-plan, the proportions, and the whole structure, with its flying buttresses, pinnacles, clustered columns, and deeply recessed portals, are borrowed from the pointed style. It was only in the details and in the ornamentation that the Renaissance was followed. The Tuileries, as built for Catherine de Medicis, is a great example of French Renaissance when at its best. In its elevation richness is perceptible without excess, and symmetry is attained without stiffness: in fact, it presents a design in which æsthetic laws are fully considered, and the details harmoniously, if not magnificently, executed.

3. *German.*—The Renaissance style was not employed in Germany before the middle of the 16th century, and the most noteworthy instances of it are the Belvedere of Ferdinand I on the Hradschin at Prague, and the so-called Otto Henry buildings at Heidelberg Castle. In Germany, as in other countries, the elements of the preceding style are intermingled with those of the Renaissance during the early period of its prevalence. The fault of the German Renaissance style is a certain heaviness—an exuberance, not to say extravagance, in its constructive character and decorative details.

4. *Spanish.*—In Spain an Early Renaissance style appears, a kind of transitional Renaissance, belonging to the first half of the 16th century. It consists of the application of Moorish and pointed-arch forms in conjunction with those of classical antiquity. In this way a conformation was produced which was peculiar to Spain, and the style is characterized by bold lightness, by luxuriance in decoration, and by a spirit of romance. In the reign of Charles V, this ornate Early Renaissance style gave place to a later one, which, in reality, belongs to the Rococo style. Among the Renaissance edifices of Spain may be mentioned the upper gallery of the cloister of the Convent of Huerta, the town-hall of Saragossa and of Seville, and the Alcazar at Toledo.

5. *English.*—The Italian Renaissance style was introduced into England about the middle of the 16th century by John of Padua, the architect of Henry VIII. English buildings of this style are distinguished by capricious treatment of forms, and generally exhibit a deficiency of that grace and dignity, both in details and ensemble, which lend a peculiar charm to Italian structures in the same style. Longleat House, Wiltshire, and Wollaton Hall are specimens of this style. See *English Cyclop.* s. v.; Rosengarten, *Architectural Styles.* See Rococo; Romanesque Architecture.

Renanah. See Peacock.

Renaudot, Eusèbe, a French savant, was born at Paris, July 20, 1646. His early studies were carried on among the Jesuits, and in the College of Harcourt. On their completion he entered the Congregation of the Oratory, but without taking orders. Though he remained but a short time in this institution, the whole of his life was passed in similar ones, and was devoted to his favorite studies of theology and Oriental literature. His knowledge of ecclesiastical affairs caused him to be employed in many negotiations with foreign countries, and his talent made him a favorite at court. In 1700 abbé Renaudot went to Rome, and received from Clement XI the priory of Frossay, in Brittany. During his whole career he endeavored to re-establish the printing of the Oriental classics, and interested the duke of Orleans in the subject, but it was never accomplished. He died at Paris, Sept. 1, 1720. Renaudot's writings were numerous, though he published nothing until a few years before his death. We mention, *Défense de la Perpétuité de la Foi,* etc. (Paris, 1708):—*Gennadii Patriarchæ Homilæ de Eucharistia,* etc. (ibid. 1709):—*La Perpétuité de la Foi de l'Église sur les Sacrements,* etc. (ibid. 1713):—*Historia Patriarcharum Alexandrinorum Jacobitarum,* etc. (ibid. 1713). This is the most complete work ever written upon the history of Egyptian Christianity. It is based upon the Arabic narrative of bishop Severus, and contains a complete list of the Jacobite patriarchs from Cyril to John Touki, who lived early in the 18th century:—*Liturgium Orientalium Collectio* (ibid. 1715–16):—*Anciennes Relations des Indes et de la Chine,* etc. (ibid. 1718). Besides these, he left works on purely literary subjects, and several valuable MSS.:—*Histoire de Saladin:*—*Histoire des Patriarches Syriens et de la Secte Nestorienne,* and *Traité de l'Église d'Éthiopie.* See De Beri, *Hist. de l'Acad. des Inscript.* v; Nicéron, *Mémoires,* xii and xx.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale,* s. v.

Rend is the translation of several Heb. and Gr. words in the Bible. The following only are of special significance.

1. The rending (קָרַע, *ῥήγνυμι*) of one's clothes is an expression frequently used in Scripture as the token of the highest grief. Reuben, to denote his sorrow for Joseph, rent his clothes (Gen. xxxvii, 29); Jacob did the like (ver. 34), and Ezra, to express the concern and uneasiness of his mind, and the apprehensions he entertained of the divine displeasure on account of the people's unlawful marriages, is said to have rent his garments and mantle (Ezra ix, 3), that is, both his inner and upper garment. This action was also an expression of indignation and holy zeal; the high-priest rent his clothes, pretending that our Saviour had spoken blasphemy (Matt. xxvi, 65), and so did the apostles when the people intended to pay them divine honors (Acts xiv, 14). See Clothing.

To rend the garments was in Eastern countries and among ancient nations a symbolical action, expressive of sorrow, fear, or contrition. (See the monographs on the subject in Latin by Grünewold [Hafn. 1708]; Hilliger [Wittenb. 1716]; Röhrensee [ibid. 1668]; Schröder, [Jen. 1716]; and Wickmannshausen [Wittenb. 1716].) The passage in Joel (ii, 13), "Rend your hearts, and not your garments," is in allusion to this practice. But the phrase here is a Hebraism, meaning "Rend your hearts *rather than* your garments," or "Rend your hearts, and not your garments only;" for the prophet does not forbid the external appearances of mourning, but he cautions them against a merely hypocritical show of sorrow, and exhorts them to cherish that contrite and broken spirit which is acceptable in the sight of God. See Burial; Mourning.

2. In the prophet Jeremiah (iv, 30), when he denounces the divine judgments upon the people, it is said, "Though thou rentest (קָרַע) thy face with painting;" the Hebrew has, instead of face, "eyes," and the expression is an allusion to the Eastern practice of painting the eyes, which we have explained under the words Eye and Paint.

Rendu, Louis, a French prelate, was born at Meyrin, Dec. 19, 1789. He entered the priesthood and spent his life in teaching and scientific research. In 1833 he published a work entitled *De l'Influence des Lois sur les Mœurs et des Mœurs sur les Lois.* This gained for the author a wide reputation. He was afterwards made bishop of Annecy. His works were entirely scientific—on geology, meteorology, chemistry. He died Aug. 18, 1859. See *Mgr. Louis Rendu,* by the abbé G. Mermillod. —Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale,* s. v.

Renée d'Este, duchess of Ferrara and princess of France, whose career was closely interwoven with the history of the Reformation, was the second daughter of king Louis XII and Anne of Brittany, and was born at Blois, Oct. 29, 1510 (according to some authorities, Oct. 10 or 25; we follow Bonnet [J.], *Lettres de J. Calvin,* i, 43). She was married July 30, 1527, to duke Hercules

of Ferrara, and became the mother of five children; and in the exercise of her tastes for literature and art she made the court of Ferrara a centre of culture which emulated that of Florence and the Medici. Her sympathies, directed no less by personal conviction than by the traditions of her family and her early education, were with the Reformation. She encouraged Bruccioli to prepare an Italian version of the Bible, and allowed him to dedicate to her the first edition (1541), and she afforded a refuge to fugitive Protestants. Calvin availed himself of this asylum in 1535, and thus began a relation which was of great value to the duchess while he lived. He was allowed to pray and expound the Scriptures in a chapel which is still shown, until remonstrances from Rome induced the duke to banish him, and with him all the Protestant friends of his consort, down to the servants brought with her from France. The same influence led to the persecution of Renée in person. The relations of Ferrara with France had been broken off, and political added to religious prejudices aggravated the situation; but beyond restraints and disrespect she suffered little, until in 1545 the Inquisition was established in Ferrara and the reconquest of the land to Romanism began. The co-operation of Henry II of France was secured; Renée was compelled to listen to sermons in denunciation of her principles; her husband caused her to be imprisoned with two of her women, and placed her daughters Leonora and Lucretia in a convent. These measures broke her spirit and brought her to confession and attendance on the mass. She was restored to liberty Dec. 1, 1554, after an imprisonment of two and a half months. She had enjoyed the counsel of Protestant friends during much of her period of trial: Calvin had written frequent letters, and had sent Francis Morel (of Collanges) to act as her spiritual adviser; and her former secretary, Léon Jamez, had also sustained her faithfully; but, in the heat of a persecution in which but few stood firm, her resolution gave way. The unfaltering fidelity of the whole of her subsequent life atoned for that single and temporary lapse. The experience of Renée was sufficiently trying in other respects as well. Her daughter Anna was married, against the earnest protest of her mother, to the chief opponent of the Protestant cause, duke Francis of Guise (Sept. 29, 1548). Her eldest son, Alphonso, quarrelled with his father and fled the country in 1552. Her husband died Oct. 3, 1559, after exacting from her an oath that she would no longer correspond with Calvin, from which she was, however, absolved by Calvin. Alphonso succeeded his father, and, influenced by pope Pius IV, at once compelled his mother to renounce his country or her faith. She chose the former alternative, and returned to France in September, 1560, leaving her children in Ferrara. France was at this period troubled with the disputes of Navarre and Condé with the Guises, and Condé lay in prison awaiting death. Renée did not hesitate to censure the disloyal cruelty of the Guises; and when their power was broken, on the death of Francis II, she became the open promoter of the Reformation. She invited Protestant clergymen into the country and caused Protestant worship to be held at her seat of Montargis and wherever she might make a temporary home in other places; but she was none the less earnestly engaged in promoting peace between the contending parties. At Montargis she so compromised their disputes that they were definitively laid aside. Her charities and her counsels were expended upon applicants of every class. When her son-in-law, the duke of Guise, began the war which during thirty years drenched France with blood, she determined that Montargis should be a refuge to all Protestant fugitives. Francis of Guise died Feb. 24, 1563, and the peace of Amboise was declared in March of the same year; and, as she was thereafter forbidden to celebrate the worship of her Church in Paris, even in her own house, she retired permanently to Montargis, though she subsequently accompanied Charles IX on his tour through the kingdom. She founded a school, enlarged and beautified the town, and took a lively interest in the translation of the New Test. into Spanish. At this time she received a last letter from Calvin, written (April 4, 1564) while he was on his death-bed, by the hand of his brother. From this period the records of her life become rare. The second religious war (Sept., 1567, to March, 1568) did not disturb her. She was at the Hôtel de Laon in Paris during St. Bartholomew's Night, but was exempted from the general massacre, and succeeded in rescuing several of her coreligionists, whom she carried to Montargis and aided to effect their ultimate escape. She ended her noble life June 12, 1575. An eloquent testimony to her faith was included in her will. Her remains were interred in the church at Montargis. See Münch [Ernst], *Renata von Este und ihre Töchter* (1831–33, 2 vols.), not important and not always trustworthy; Catteau-Calleville, *Vie de Renée de France* (Berl. 1781–83). Brief biographies are given in M'Crie, *Hist. of the Ref. in Italy;* and Gerdes, *Specimen Italiæ Reformatæ;* and a more detailed life in Young, *Life and Times of Aonio Paleario* (Lond. 1860, 2 vols.); Bayle, *La France Protestante*, viii; Bonnet [Jules], *La Vie d'Olympe Morate;* and *Lettres de Jean Calvin.*—Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* s. v.

Renesse, Ludwig Gerard van, a Dutch ascetic author, was born at Breda, May 11, 1599. As an evangelical minister he preached at Maerssen, in the province of Utrecht. In 1638 he was called to Breda, where he founded a college, of which he was the first director and professor of theology. The University of Oxford conferred upon him the degree of doctor of theology. He was a fine linguist, and corresponded with the most celebrated theologians of his time. His principal works are, *Painted Jezebel* (1654):—*Treatises on the Care, Authority, and Duty of Elders in the Church* (1659–64):—and *Meditations* on religious subjects. These are all written in Flemish.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.

Rennell, Thomas (1), D.D., an English clergyman, was born in 1754, and was educated at Eton and at King's College, Cambridge. He became curate of Barnack, and prebendary of Winchester (resigned 1797); rector of St. Magnus's, London Bridge, in 1792; master of the Temple from 1797 to 1827; dean of Winchester in 1805; rector of Alton, Hants, in 1809; vicar of Barton Stacey, Hants, in 1814. He died in 1840. He published, single *Sermons* (Lond. 1793–98), and a volume of *Discourses* (ibid. 1801). Mr. Pitt styled him "the Demosthenes of the pulpit." See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s. v.; Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliogr.* s. v.

Rennell, Thomas (2), D.D., a learned English divine, son of the above, was born at Winchester in 1787, and was educated at Eton and at King's College, Cambridge. He became Christian advocate at Cambridge and vicar of Kensington in 1816; and master of St. Nicholas's Hospital and prebendary of Salisbury in 1823. He died in 1824. Mr. Rennell was one of the editors of and contributors to the (Eton) *Miniature* and the *British Critic*, and a contributor to the *Museum Criticum.* He published, *Palentes Morbi:—Animadversions on the Unitarian Version of the New Test.* (1811, 8vo):—*Remarks on Scepticism* (1819, 12mo; 6th ed. 1824):—*Proofs of Inspiration*, etc. (1822, 8vo):—*Sermons* (3d ed. Lond. 1831, 8vo). See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s. v.; Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliogr.* s. v.

Renniger, or **Rhanger,** Michael, was born in Hampshire, 1529, and was educated at, and a fellow of, Magdalen College, Oxford. He embraced the principles of the Reformation, resided chiefly at Strasburg during the reign of Mary, and was made chaplain to Elizabeth on her accession. He became prebendary of Winchester in 1560, precentor and prebendary of Lincoln in 1567, archdeacon of Winchester in 1575, and prebendary of St. Paul's, in 1583. He died Aug. 26, 1609, and was buried in the church of Crawley. He wrote: *Car-*

mina in Mortem Duorum Fratrum (Lond. 1552, 4to):—*De Pii V et Gregorii XIII Furoribus contra Elizabetham Reginam Angliæ* (1582, 8vo):—*Exhortation to True Love, Loyalty, and Fidelity to Her Majesty* (1587, 8vo):—*Syntagma Hortationum ad Jacobum Regem Angliæ* (1604, 8vo):—*Translation from Latin of Bishop Poynet's Apology or Defence of Priests' Marriage.* See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth.* s. v.

Renou, Jean Baptiste, a French Orientalist, was born at Angers. He entered the Congregation of the Oratory, and was superior of the convent of the order at Laon, where he died Dec. 26, 1701. Two of his posthumous works may be mentioned: *Méthode pour apprendre facilement les Langues Hébraïque et Chaldaïque* (Paris, 1708):—and a *Dictionnaire Hébraïque* (ibid. 1709).—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.

Renoult, Jean Baptiste, a French controversialist, was born about 1664. After passing four years in the order of the Cordeliers, he laid aside his habit, embraced Protestantism, and in 1695 went to London, where he openly taught Calvinism. He served the parish of Hungerford (1706), then that of the Pyramid (1710), and was finally called to Ireland. The date of his death is unknown. His works are, *Le Vrai Tableau du Papisme* (Lond. 1698):—*Taxe de la Chancellerie Romaine* (ibid. 1701):—*Les Aventures de la Madonna et de François d'Assise* (Amst. 1701):—*L'Antiquité et la Perpétuité de la Religion Protestante* (ibid. 1703; Geneva, 1737; Neufchâtel, 1821):—*Histoire des Variations de l'Église Gallicane* (Amst. 1703). See Haag Brothers, *La France Protestante.*—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.

Renovation. Those who hold to baptismal regeneration make a distinction between renovation and regeneration. "Regeneration," says Dr. Hook, "comes only once in or through baptism; renovation exists before, in, and after baptism, and may be often repeated." Renovation takes up the work of regeneration, daily renewing the person in God's grace. Another difference between regeneration and renovation is usually made by Calvinistic theologians, that regeneration once given can never be totally lost any more than baptism, and so can never need to be repeated in the whole; whereas renovation may be totally lost. See Regeneration.

Renshaw, Richard, a Presbyterian minister, was born in Manchester, England, April 1, 1776. He received a fair education, which was improved by foreign travels, an account of which was published in Manchester in 1804. He entered the ministry as a Wesleyan, and began preaching in 1808 among the New Connection Methodists, but afterwards became an Independent. He emigrated to America in 1856, and in 1858 was admitted as a member of the Iowa Valley Presbytery. His extreme age prevented him from taking a Church, though he was willing to preach whenever opportunity offered. He died Sept. 5, 1859. Mr. Renshaw was a man of great decision of character and of undoubted piety. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1861, p. 163. (J. L. S.)

Rensselaer, Van. See Van Rensselaer.

Renunciantès (*renouncers*), a name applied to monks, from their formal renunciation of the world and all secular employments. Many of them kept their estates in their own hands, but had no more use of them than if they had been transferred to others.

Renunciation, a form which constitutes a characteristic portion of the baptismal ceremonial. The person about to be baptized (or his sponsors, if an infant) renounces the works of the devil and of darkness, especially idolatry and the vices and follies of the world. This renunciation is of very great antiquity, and it was probably of apostolic origin. In the Roman Catholic Church the question is, "Hast thou renounced Satan, and all his works and all his pomps?" The candidate is expected to answer in the affirmative, turning to the west as the place of darkness. In the baptismal service of the Church of England and of the Methodist Episcopal Church the question is asked, "Dost thou renounce the devil and all his works, the vain pomp and glory of the world, with all covetous desires of the same and the carnal desires of the flesh, so that thou wilt not follow nor be led by them?" The answer is, "I renounce them all."

Renunciatōrès. See Apotactici.

Renwick, James, a noted Nonconformist divine, was born at Dumfriesshire, Scotland, Feb. 15, 1662. He was an uncompromising Covenanter, and was executed Feb. 17, 1688, for "denying the king's authority, owning the covenants," etc. He wrote, with Alexander Shields, *An Informatory Vindication of the Covenanters* (Edinb. 1744, small 8vo):—*A Choice Collection of Prefaces, Lectures, and Sermons*, etc. (Glasgow, 1777, 8vo).

Reordination, the repetition of the sacramental ordinance of ordination, has ever been held to be contrary to the true theory of sacraments, and has been forbidden by the Church under pain of severe penalties. The ground of this prohibition is well expressed by Morinus, quoting the Council of Trent (Sess. xxiii, c. 4): "In the sacrament of orders, as in baptism and confirmation, a character is conferred which cannot be effaced or taken away." The historical evidence as to both the doctrine and practice of the Church is full and complete. The 68th apostolical canon condemned it, and pronounced sentence of deposition on the ordainer and the ordained. The third Council of Carthage (canon 52) forbade it along with rebaptism. Whether the ordinations of heretics and schismatics are to be held valid, and whether those who have received them are on their reconciliation to be received in their several orders, is a question in respect to which the practice of the Church has varied considerably. The Council of Nice decreed that those who had been ordained by Meletius should be admitted to serve the Church by reordination. The 68th apostolical canon, while condemning the reordination of those once ordained in the Church, allows that of those who had only received heretical ordination. The second Council of Saragossa (A.D. 592) ratifies the baptism of the Arians, but condemns their ordinations. In later times the practice of the Roman Catholic Church has also been very contradictory. Thus the ordinations of Formosus were declared null by Stephen VI, considered valid by John IX, and again declared invalid by Sergius III. The modern Roman practice of reordaining those ordained in the Church of England is not based on any decree of the Church, and has not been invariable. The custom of the Church of England forbids reordination in the case of those ordained within the Church, and asserts the indelibility of the ordination character. See Aquinas, *Summ.* pars iii, qu. xxxviii, art. ii; Augustine, *Cont. Parmen.* lib. ii, c. 13; *Ep.* 50 *ad Bonifac.* ii, 661 (ed. Bened.); Bingham, *Christian Antiq.* bk. iv, ch. 7; Courayer, *Valid. Angl. Ord.* (Oxf. 1844); Palmer, *On the Church*, pt. vi, ch. vi. See Ordination.

Repairs of Churches. Canon 85 of the Church of England enacts, "The church-wardens or questmen shall take care and provide that the churches be well and sufficiently repaired, and so from time to time kept and maintained," etc., specifying the work upon windows, floor, churchyard, walls, and fences. They are also to "see that at every meeting of the congregation peace be well kept, and that all persons excommunicated, and so denounced, be kept out of the church." Canon 86 adds, "Every dean, dean and chapter, archdeacon, and others which have authority to hold ecclesiastical visitations by composition, law, or prescription, shall survey the churches of his or their jurisdiction once in every three years in his own person, or cause the same to be done," etc. Usually the repair of the church belongs to the rector, and that of the nave to the parishioners.

The repairing of the Established churches in Scotland belongs to the heritors, who, if they resolve to build a new church, must build it so large as to accommodate two thirds of the examinable permanent population, or persons above twelve years of age. The presbytery can ordain the heritors to make the necessary repairs, can appoint a visitation to a decayed church, receive the report of the tradesmen, and come to a decision. Unendowed congregations build and repair their own places of worship.

Repentance (נָחַם, *μετάνοια*) signifies a *change of the mind* from a rebellious and disaffected state to that submission and thorough separation from iniquity by which converted sinners are distinguished (Matt. iii, 2–8). Repentance is sometimes used generally for a mere change of sentiment, and an earnest wishing that something were undone that has been done. In a sense analogous to this, God himself is said to repent; but this can only be understood of his altering his conduct towards his creatures, either in the bestowing of good or infliction of evil—which change in the divine conduct is founded on a change in his creatures; and thus, speaking after the manner of men, God is said to repent. In this generic sense also Esau "found no place of repentance, though he sought it carefully with tears;" that is, he could not move his father Isaac to repent of what he had done, or to recall the blessing from Jacob and confer it on himself (Heb. xii, 17; Rom. xi, 29; 2 Cor. vii, 10). There are various kinds of repentance, as (1) a *natural* repentance, or what is merely the effect of natural conscience; (2) a *national* repentance, such as the Jews in Babylon were called unto, to which temporal blessings were promised (Ezek. xviii, 30); (3) an *external* repentance, or an outward humiliation for sin, as in the case of Ahab; (4) a *hypocritical* repentance, as represented in Ephraim (Hos. vii, 16); (5) a *legal* repentance, which is a mere work of the law and the effect of convictions of sin by it, which in time wear off and come to nothing; (6) an *evangelical* repentance, which consists in conviction of sin, accompanied by sorrow for it, confession of it, hatred to it, and renunciation of it. A legal and an evangelical repentance are distinguished thus: 1. A legal repentance flows only from a sense of danger and fear of wrath, but an evangelical repentance produces a true mourning for sin and an earnest desire of deliverance from it. 2. A legal repentance flows from unbelief, but evangelical is always the fruit and consequence of a saving faith. 3. A legal repentance consists of an aversion to God and to his holy law, but an evangelical flows from love to both. 4. A legal repentance ordinarily flows from discouragement and despondency, but evangelical from encouraging hope. 5. A legal repentance is temporary, but evangelical is the daily exercise of the true Christian. 6. A legal repentance does at most produce only a partial and external reformation, but an evangelical is a total change of heart and life. The author as well as object of true repentance is God (Acts v, 31). The subjects of it are sinners, since none but those who have sinned can repent. The means of repentance is the Word and the ministers of it; yet sometimes private consideration, sanctified afflictions, conversation, etc., have been the instruments of repentance. The blessings connected with repentance are pardon, peace, and everlasting life (xi, 18). The time of repentance is the present life (Isa. lv, 6; Eccles. ix, 50). The evidences of repentance are faith, humility, prayer, and obedience (Zech. xii, 10). The necessity of repentance appears evident from the evil of sin; the misery it involves us in here; the commands given us to repent in God's Word; the promises made to the penitent; and the absolute incapability of enjoying God here or hereafter without it. See Dickinson, *Letters*, let. 9; Owen, *On the 130th Psalm;* Gill, *Body of Divinity*, s. v. "Repentance;" Ridgley, *Body of Divinity*, quest. 76; Davies, *Sermons*, vol. iii, serm. 44; Case, *Sermons*, serm. 4; Whitefield, *Sermons;* Saurin, *Sermons* (Robinson's transl.), vol. iii; Scott, *Treatise on Repentance.* See Penance; Penitence.

Repentīnæ, a term for *State holidays.*

Repetition. Our Lord in his sermon on the Mount (Matt. vi, 7) cautions his followers against *using vain repetitions* (*βαττολογέω*) in prayer. See Prayer, Forms of. It is well to distinguish that this is not directed against simple repetitions, which may often arise in the fervor and urgency of earnest supplication, but against the *vain* repetitions of such as think, whether in theory or practice, "that they shall be heard for their *much* speaking." The idea that a prevailing merit was attached to much speaking in prayer with multitudinous repetitions has been, and is, found in most of the false systems of religion. Perhaps we find it among Baal's worshippers, who "called upon the name of Baal from morning to noon, saying, O Baal, hear us!" (1 Kings xviii, 26). The practice was certainly common among the classical heathen, and is noticed by some of their more serious writers with disapprobation and laughed at by their satirists. If we may judge by the hymns of Homer, Orpheus, and Callimachus, we may suppose that the pagan prayers were so stuffed up with synonymous epithets and prerogatives of the Deity as to be justly liable to the censure of "vain repetitions." The Jews adopted this and other bad practices, insomuch that it was one of their maxims, "He that multiplies prayer shall be heard." The same idea was inculcated with much earnestness by Mohammed, and is at this day exhibited in full force among his followers. Witness the following from the *Mishat-ul-Masabih:* "The prophet said, Shall I not teach you an act by which you may attain the greatness of those who have gone before you, and by which you shall precede your posterity, excepting those who do as you do? Then they said, Instruct us, O prophet of God. He said, Repeat after every prayer *Subhàn Alláh!* [O most pure God!] eleven times, and *Allaho acber* [God is very great] eleven times, and *Alhamdo lilláhi* [praise to God] eleven times." Compare this puerility with the sublime instructions of our Saviour. But again: "Whoever says *Subhàn Alláh* and *Bihamdihi* a hundred times in a day, his faults shall be silenced, though they be as great as the waves of the sea. Whoever says, morning and evening, *Subhàn Alláh* and *Bihamdihi* a hundred times, no one will bring a better deed than his on the day of resurrection, except one who should have said like him, or *added* anything thereto." To these instructions the Mohammedans have been most attentive. There are those among Christians, especially Roman Catholics, who repeat the Lord's Prayer and other forms a great number of times, and vainly think that the oftener the prayer is repeated the more efficacious it is, i. e. if repeated two hundred times it will be twice as good as if repeated only one hundred times. (See the literature in Volbeding, *Index Programmatum*, p. 33; Hase, *Leben Jesu*, p. 229.) See Ave Maria; Paternoster; Rosary.

Repetitions in the Liturgy. An objection has been made to the Liturgy of the English Church that it involves vain repetitions and a useless prolixity. It is replied, repetition is one thing, but a *vain repetition* quite another. The repetitions in the Liturgy are principally in the cry "Have mercy upon us," and in the use of the Lord's Prayer twice, or at most thrice, in the longest services, and in the responses in the Litany and the Decalogue. Reference is also made to the example of our Saviour who prayed thrice in Gethsemane, "saying the *same words*" (Matt. xxvi, 44). Further, the petitions which we address to Heaven must, for the most part, have the same general drift; and there can be no advantage in arranging them in a perpetually changing dress, nor will they be the better received because of their novelty.

Re'phaël (Heb. *Rephaël'*, רְפָאֵל, *healed of God;*

Sept. Ῥαφαήλ), a son of Shemaiah the Levite, of the house of Obed-edom, an able-bodied porter in the service of the house of God in David's reign (1 Chron. xxvi, 7). B.C. cir. 1015.

Re'phah (Heb. *Re'phach*, רֶפַח, *riches;* Sept. Ῥαφή), a son of Beriah, of the tribe of Ephraim, ancestor of Joshua (1 Chron. vii, 25). B.C. post 1618.

Rephaï'ah (Heb. *Rephayah'*, רְפָיָה, *healed of Jehovah;* Sept. Ῥαφαΐα v. r. Ῥαφαία, etc.), the name of five Israelites.

1. The second named of six sons of Tola, head of a family in Issachar (1 Chron. vii, 2). B.C. ante 1658.

2. Son of Binea, and eighth in lineal descent from Saul's son Jonathan (1 Chron. ix, 43). B.C. long post 1000. He is also called RAPHA (1 Chron. viii, 37).

3. Son of Ishi, and one of the chieftains of the tribe of Simeon, in the reign of Hezekiah, who headed the expedition of five hundred men against the Amalekites of Mt. Seir and drove them out (1 Chron. iv, 42). B.C. cir. 725.

4. Son of Hur, and ruler of "the half" of Jerusalem. He aided in rebuilding the wall (Neh. iii, 9). B.C. 445.

5. Son of Hananiah and father of Arnan, among the descendants of Zerubbabel (1 Chron. iii, 21); the same with RHESA (q. v.) of the genealogy of Christ (Luke iii, 27).

Repha'ïm [many *Reph'aïm*] (Heb. usually with the art. *ha-Rephaïm'*, הָרְפָאִים [see below]), a name which frequently occurs, and in some remarkable passages, as that of a race of unusual stature, who originally dwelt in the country east of the Jordan. The earliest mention of them is the record of their defeat by Chedorlaomer and some allied kings at Ashteroth Karnaim (Gen. xiv, 5). They are again mentioned (xv, 20); their dispersion recorded (Deut. ii, 10, 20), and Og the giant king of Bashan said to be "the only remnant of them" (iii, 11; Josh. xii, 4; xiii, 12; xvii, 15). Extirpated, however, from the east of Palestine, they long found a home in the West; and in connection with the Philistines, under whose protection the small remnant of them may have lived, they still employed their arms against the Hebrews (2 Sam. xxi, 18 sq.; 1 Chron. xx, 4). In the latter passage there seems, however, to be some confusion between the Rephaim and the sons of a particular giant of Gath, named Rapha. Such a name may have been conjectured as that of a founder of the race, like the names Ion, Dorus, Teut, etc. (Böttcher, *De Inferis*, p. 96, note); Rapha occurs also as a proper name (1 Chron. vii, 25; viii, 2, 37). It is probable that they had possessed districts west of the Jordan in early times, since the "valley of Rephaim" (*κοιλὰς τῶν Τιτάνων*, 2 Sam. v, 18; 1 Chron. xi, 15; Isa. xvii, 5; *κ. τῶν γιγάντων*, Joseph. *Ant.* vii, 4, 1), a rich valley south-west of Jerusalem, derived its name from them. That they were not Canaanites is clear from there being no allusion to them in Gen. x, 15–19. They were probably one of those aboriginal peoples to whose existence the traditions of many nations testify, and of whose genealogy the Bible gives us no information. The few names recorded have, as Ewald remarks, a Shemitic aspect (*Gesch. des Volkes Isr.* i, 311); but from the hatred existing between them and both the Canaanites and Hebrews, some suppose them to be Japhethites, "who comprised especially the inhabitants of the coasts and islands" (Kalisch, *on Gen.* p. 351). See CANAANITE.

רְפָאִים is rendered by the Greek versions very variously (Sept. Ῥαφαείμ, *γίγαντες, γηγενεῖς, Θεόμαχοι, Τιτᾶνες,* and *ἰατροί* [Psa. lxxxvii, 10; Isa. xxvi, 14, where it is confused with רֹפְאִים; comp. Gen. l, 2], and sometimes *νεκροί, τεθνηκότες,* especially in the *later* versions). In the A. V. the words used for it are "Rephaim," "giants," and "the dead." That it has the latter meaning in many passages is certain (Psa. lxxxviii, 10; Prov. ii, 18; ix, 18; xxi, 16; Isa. xxvi, 14, 19). The question arises, how are these meanings to be reconciled? Gesenius gives no derivation for the national name, and derives ר׳׳ = *mortui*, from רָפָא, *sanavit*, and the proper name Rapha from an Arabic root signifying "tall," thus seeming to sever *all* connection between the meanings of the word, which is surely most unlikely. Masius, Simon, etc., suppose the second meaning to come from the fact that both spectres and giants strike terror (accepting the derivation from רָפָה, *remisit*, "unstrung with fear," R. Bechai, *on Deut. ii*); Vitringa and Hiller from the notion of *length* involved in stretching out a corpse, or from the fancy that spirits appear in more than human size (Hiller, *Syntagm. Hermen.* p. 205; Virg. *Æn.* ii, 772, etc.). J. D. Michaelis (*ad Lowth S. Poes.* p. 466) endeavored to prove that the Rephaim, etc., were troglodytes, and that hence they came to be identified with the dead. Passing over other conjectures, Böttcher sees in רָפָא and רָפָה a double root, and thinks that the giants were called רְפָאִים (*languefacti*) by a euphemism; and that the dead were so called by a title which will thus exactly parallel the Greek *καμόντες, κεκμηκότες* (comp. Buttmann, *Lexil.* ii, 237 sq.). An attentive consideration seems to leave little room for doubt that the dead were called Rephaim (as Gesenius also hints) from some notion of Sheol being the residence of the fallen spirits or buried giants. The passages which seem most strongly to prove this are Prov. xxi, 16 (where obviously something more than mere physical death is meant, since that is the common lot of all), Isa. xxvi, 14, 19, which are difficult to explain without some such supposition, Isa. xiv, 9, where the word עַתּוּדִים (Sept. *οἱ ἄρξαντες τῆς γῆς*), if taken in its literal meaning of *goats*, may mean evil spirits represented in that form (comp. Lev. xvii, 7), and especially Job xxvi, 5, 6. "Behold the gyantes (A. V. "dead things") grown under the waters" (Douay version), where there seems to be clear allusion to some subaqueous prison of rebellious spirits like that in which (according to the Hindû legend) Vishnû the water-god confines a race of giants (comp. *πυλάρχος*, as a title of Neptune, Hesiod, *Theog.* 732; Nork, *Brammin. und Rabb.* p. 319 sq.). See GIANT. Branches of this great unknown people were the following:

1. EMIM (אֵימִים; Sept. Ὀμμίν, Ἰμμαῖοι), smitten by Chedorlaomer at Shaveh Kiriathaim (Gen. xiv, 5), and occupying the country afterwards held by the Moabites (Deut. ii, 10), who gave them the name אֵימִים, "terrors." The word rendered "tall" may perhaps be merely "haughty" (*ἰσχύοντες*). See EMIM.

2. ANAKIM (עֲנָקִים). The imbecile terror of the spies exaggerated their proportions into something superhuman (Numb. xiii, 28, 33), and their name became proverbial (Deut. ii, 10; ix, 2). See ANAKIM.

3. ZUZIM (זוּזִים), whose principal town was Ham (Gen. xiv, 5), and who lived between the Arnon and the Jabbok, being a northern tribe of Rephaim. The Ammonites who defeated them called them *Zamzummim*, זַמְזֻמִּים (Deut. ii, 20 sq., which is, however, probably an early gloss). See *Jour. Sac. Lit.* Oct. 1851, p. 151 sq.; Jan. 1852, p. 363 sq.; April, 1852, p. 55 sq.; July, 1852, p. 302 sq.; Oct. 1852, p. 87 sq.; Jan. 1853, p. 279 sq. See ZUZIM.

REPHAIM, VALLEY OF (Heb. *E'mek Rephaïm'*, עֵמֶק רְפָאִים; Sept. *ἡ κοιλὰς τῶν Τιτάνων* or *Γιγάντων*; in Josh. *γῆ* or Ἐμὲκ Ῥαφαΐν; in Isa. *φάραγξ στερεά*; Vulg. *vallis Raphaim* or *gigantum;* A. V. "valley of the giants" in Josh. xv, 8; xviii, 16), a valley beginning adjacent to the valley of Hinnom, south-west of Jerusalem, and stretching away south-west on the right of the road to Bethlehem (Josh. xv, 8; xvii, 5; xviii, 6; 2 Sam. v, 18, 22). The valley appears to derive its name from the ancient nation of the Rephaim. It may be a trace

of an early settlement of theirs, possibly after they were driven from their original seats east of the Jordan by Chedorlaomer (Gen. xiv, 5), and before they again migrated northward to the more secure wooded districts in which we find them at the date of the partition of the country among the tribes (Josh. xvii, 15; A.V. "giants"). In this case it is a parallel to the "mount of the Amalekites" in the centre of Palestine, and to the towns bearing the name of the Zemaraim, the Avim, the Ophnites, etc., which occur so frequently in Benjamin.

The valley of Rephaim is first mentioned in the description given by Joshua of the northern border of Judah. The passage is important: "The border went up by the valley of the son of Hinnom unto the south side of the Jebusite: the same is Jerusalem; and the border went up to the top of the mountain that lieth before the valley of Hinnom westward, which is at the end of the valley of the giants northward" (xv, 8). The last clause in the Hebrew is not quite clear (בקצה עמק־רפאים צפונה). It may mean that the boundary-line was north of the valley, or that the valley was north of the boundary. The latter construction is possible; but the former is unquestionably the more natural, and is supported by the Sept. and the Vulgate, and also by most commentators. If this interpretation be admitted, the situation of the valley is certain: it lay on the south of the hill which enclosed Hinnom on the west. This view is further strengthened by the notice in Josh. xviii, 16. When David was hiding from Saul in the cave of Adullam, we are told that the Philistines, no doubt taking advantage of intestine troubles, invaded the mountain fastnesses of Israel. A band of them pitched in the valley of Rephaim, and at the same time seized and garrisoned Bethlehem, David's native place (2 Sam. xxiii, 13, 14). It was then that three of his warriors, to gratify a wish of their chief, broke through the enemies' lines and drew water from the well by the gate of Bethlehem. The narrative shows clearly that the valley of Rephaim could not have been far distant from Bethlehem (1 Chron. xi, 15–19). The "hold" (ver. 14) in which David found himself seems (though it is not clear) to have been the cave of Adullam, the scene of the commencement of his freebooting life; but, wherever situated, we need not doubt that it was the same fastness as that mentioned in 2 Sam. v, 17, since in both cases the same word (הַמְּצוּדָה, with the definite article), and that not a usual one, is employed. The story shows very clearly the predatory nature of these incursions of the Philistines. It was in "harvest time" (ver. 13). They had come to carry off the ripe crops, for which the valley was proverbial (Isa. xvii, 5), just as at Pas-dammim (1 Chron. xi, 13) we find them in the parcel of ground full of barley, at Lehi in the field of lentiles (2 Sam. xxiii, 11), or at Keilah in the threshing-floors (1 Sam. xxiii, 1). Their animals (חַיָּה) were scattered among the ripe corn receiving their load of plunder. The "garrison," or the officer in charge of the expedition, was on the watch in the village of Bethlehem. On two other occasions, soon after David was proclaimed king, the Philistines invaded the mountains and drew up their armies on the same plain; they were at once attacked by David's veterans and routed with great slaughter (2 Sam. v, 18, 22; 1 Chron. xiv, 9–13). The destruction inflicted on them and on their idols was so signal that it gave the place a new name, and impressed itself on the popular mind of Israel with such distinctness that the prophet Isaiah could employ it, centuries after, as a symbol of a tremendous impending judgment of God—nothing less than the desolation and destruction of the whole earth (Isa. xxviii, 21, 22). See PERAZIM, MOUNT.

But from none of these notices do we learn anything of the position of the valley. Josephus in one place (*Ant.* vii, 4, 1) says that the *valley of the giants* was near Jerusalem; and in another place (vii, 12, 4), when narrating the story of the drawing of water from the well at Bethlehem, in which he makes a strange blunder, he says the valley extended from Jerusalem "to the city of Bethlehem." Eusebius and Jerome, on the other hand, place it on the *north* of Jerusalem (*Onomast.* s. v. "Raphaim"), and in the territory of Benjamin (*ibid.* s. v. "Emec Raphaim"). Their notices, however, are brief and unsatisfactory (see *Onomast.* s. v. "Cœlas Titanorum," and the excellent note by Bonfrère). A position north-west of the city is adopted by Fürst (*Handw.* ii, 383 b), apparently on the ground of the terms of Josh. xv, 8, and xviii, 16, which certainly do leave it doubtful whether the valley is on the north of the boundary or the boundary on the north of the valley; and Tobler, in his last investigations (*Dritte Wanderung*, p. 202), conclusively adopts the *Wady Dêr Jasin* (*W. Makhrior*, on Van de Velde's map), one of the side valleys of the great Wady Beit Hanîna, as the valley of Rephaim. This position is open to the obvious objection of too great distance from both Bethlehem and the cave of Adullam (according to any position assignable to the latter) to meet the requirements of 2 Sam. xxiii, 13. Since the latter part of the 16th century the name has been attached to the upland plain which stretches south of Jerusalem, and is crossed by the road to Bethlehem—the *Bŭk'ah* of the modern Arabs (Tobler, *Jerusalem*, ii, 401). Dr. Robinson says, "As we advanced (towards the holy city) we had on the right low hills, and on the left the cultivated valley or plain of Rephaim, or the 'giants,' with gentle hills beyond. This plain is broad, and descends gradually towards the south-west until it contracts in that direction into a deeper and narrower valley, called *Wady el-Werd*, which unites farther on with Wady Ahmed, and finds its way to the Mediterranean. The plain of Rephaim extends nearly to the city, which, as seen from it, appears to be almost on the same level. As we advanced the plain was terminated by a slight rocky ridge, forming the brow of the valley of Hinnom" (*Researches*, i, 219). It is true that this tract has more of the nature of a plateau or plain considerably elevated than a valley in the ordinary sense. But on the south-west it does partake more of this character (see Bonar, *Land of Promise*, p. 177), and possibly in designating so wide and open a tract by the name of the Rephaim valley there was a sort of play on the giant race with which it was associated, as if it, like them, must set at naught ordinary dimensions. South of Mount Zion—the most southern part of the valley of Gihon—is called *Wady Rafaath* by the Arabs, which corresponds to *Rephaim* in Hebrew. Hence Schwarz infers that this is the true valley of Rephaim, though usually taken for that of the son of Hinnom (*Palest.* p. 240). See JERUSALEM.

Repha'ims, so the Hebrew plural Rephaim (q. v.) is incorrectly pluralized again in English in the A. V. (Gen. xiv, 5; xv, 20).

Reph'idim (Heb. *Rephidim'*, רְפִידִים, *supports*, i. e., perhaps, *resting-places;* Sept. and Josephus, Ῥαφιδίν), a station of the Israelites on their journey through the Arabian desert, to which they passed from the Desert of Sin (Exod. xvii, 1), situated, according to Numb. xxxiii, 14 sq., between Alush and the wilderness of Sinai. Here the Amalekites attacked Israel, but were repulsed (Exod. xvii, 8 sq.). Here also Moses struck the rock, from which the fountain of water leaped forth; to which the later Jewish traditions added many other wonders, as that the rock itself followed the people in their journey, supplying water always (see Wettstein and Schöttgen, *on* 1 *Cor. x*, 4; Buxtorf, *Exercit.* p. 391 sq.). The knowledge of this miraculous gift of water reached the Romans. Tacitus alludes to it (*Hist.* v, 3), and supposes that Moses was guided by wild asses, and then by the green pasture, to the exact spot where water was concealed (comp., in the Grecian mythology, especially Pausan. iv, 36, 5; but the legend of Hippocrene [Ovid, *Met.* v, 256 sq.] has scarcely any points of resemblance). The most definite indication as to the situation of Reph-

idim is incidentally supplied in the Scripture account of the above miracle. While encamped at Rephidim, "there was no water for the people to drink," and they murmured against Moses. He was therefore commanded to "go on (עֲבֹר, *pass*, i. e. cross the desert shore) before the people," and with his rod to smite "the rock in Horeb," upon which (עַל הַצּוּר, the towering cliff bounding the range et-Tîh) Jehovah stood. (This admirably suits the entrance of Wady Hibrân, but is utterly vague and inapt if spoken of the interior.) In consequence of this, Rephidim was called *Massah* ("temptation") and *Meribah* ("chiding"). As the Israelites, though encamped in Rephidim, were able to draw their needful supply of water from "the rock *in Horeb*," the two places must have been adjacent. Assuming Jebel Mûsa to be Sinai (or Horeb), and that the Israelites approached it by Wady es-Sheik, which is the only practicable route for such a multitude coming from Egypt, it follows that Rephidim was not more than one march —and apparently a short one—distant from the mountain. Notwithstanding this indication, however, the position of Rephidim has created much discussion among travellers and sacred geographers. Josephus appears to locate it very near to Sinai, and states that the place was entirely destitute of water, while in their preceding marches the people had met with fountains (*Ant.* iii, 1, 7, and 5, 1). Eusebius and Jerome say it was near Mount Horeb (*Onomast.* s. v. "Raphidim"). Cosmas places it at the distance of six miles, which agrees pretty nearly with that of Nebi Saleh (*Topographia Christiana*, v, 207 sq.). Robinson removes it some miles farther down Wady es-Sheik to a narrow gorge which forms a kind of door to the central group of mountains. He gets over the difficulty in regard to the proximity of Horeb by affirming that that name was given, not to a single mountain, but to the whole group (*Bib. Res.* i, 120). See HOREB. Mr. Sandie places Rephidim at the extreme end of Wady er-Râhah, and identifies it with a *Wady Rudhwan*. He supposes that the Israelites marched from the coast plain of el-Kâa by Wady Daghadah (*Horeb and Jerusalem*, p. 159). This route, however, would scarcely be practicable for such a multitude. Lepsius (ed. Bohn, p. 310 sq.), Stewart (*Tent and Khan*), Ritter (*Pal. und Syr.* i, 738 sq.), Stanley (*Syr. and Pal.* p. 40 sq.), and others, locate Rephidim in Wady Feirân, near the base of Mount Serbâl, especially at the oasis of *el-Hesmeh* or the rock *Hesy el-Khatatin* (Palmer, *Desert of the Exodus*, p. 135). The great distance from Sinai—twelve hours' march—and the abundance of water at Feirân appear to be fatal to this theory. No spot in the whole peninsula has such a supply of water, and Feirân is on this account called "the paradise of the Bedawîn." The position of Rephidim, it is thus seen, largely depends upon the route which the Israelites may be supposed to have taken from the Desert of Sin to Mount Sinai. Murphy (*Comment. on Exod.* p. 174 sq.) regards that by way of Wady Hibrân as being out of the question, partly on account of its length (whereas it is really little, if any, farther than either of the two other practicable ones, especially the northern one by way of the Debbet er-Ramleh, which he prefers), and partly on account of the narrow and difficult passes (especially Nagb Ajâmeh) along it, which, however, are no worse than many others in different parts of their identified route (see Palmer, *Desert of the Exodus* [Amer. ed.], p. 228). Keil, who likewise prefers the same northern route for reaching Sinai, observes (*Comment. on Pent.* [Clarke's ed.] ii, 75) that Rephidim lay at only one day's distance from Sinai (Exod. xix, 2). He therefore locates Rephidim at the point where the Wady es-Sheik opens into the plain er-Râhah, although this would be almost at the foot of Sinai, and past several fountains which would have relieved their thirst without the need of a miracle. If, on the other hand, we should place Rephidim at the other end of the Wady es-Sheik, this, according to Keil's own showing, would be about as far from Sinai as the mouth of Wady Hibrân, which last is, after all, only twenty miles, following the windings of the valleys. The great objection to the access by way of the Debbet er-Ramleh is that although this (as the name signifies) is in the main a sandy plain, yet there are not wanting springs at various points along its course—one especially, Ain el-Akdar (i. e. "the green"), being situated just at its junction with Wady es-Sheik (Robinson, *Bib. Res.* i, 125). By the way of the plain el-Kâa and Wady Hibrân, on the contrary, there is total drought, so that the Israelites, as the narrative requires, would have exhausted the stock brought probably from Elim, without having been meanwhile in a region where their scouts could have procured water within any reaching distance. For the same reason, the most natural route of all—by way of Wady Feirân—must be suspected, which, as already said, is the best watered and most fertile of all in that vicinity (*ibid.* i, 126). There is still another route from the Red Sea at Ras Abu-Zenimah (where the Israelites evidently encamped) to Sinai—namely, by way of Sarabet el-Khadîm. This, although not so smooth as by wadies Feirân and es-Sheik, is nevertheless quite practicable, and is often taken by modern travellers. This route is advocated by Knobel, Keil, Cook (in his *Speaker's Commentary*), and others, who find the Desert of Sin in Debbet er-Ramleh, Dophkah in Wady Tîh, and perhaps Alush in Wady el-Esh. The water supply on this route is good, but the presence of a military force of Egyptians at the mines in Sarabet el-Khadîm is a grave objection to its having been followed by the Israelites. There are two traditionary spots fixed upon as the scene of Moses' smiting of the rock, and hence called *Hajr Mûsa*, or "Moses's Rock." One is pointed out by the Arabs in Wady Feirân, and the other by the monks in Wady Lejah. The former is too distant and the latter too near for the Biblical account. See MERIBAH. If the Israelites approached Sinai by way of Wady Hibrân, we should look for Rephidim at the entrance of that valley from the plain along the Red Sea, as suggested under the article EXODE; but if they reached Mount Sinai by way of Wady Feirân, as most writers suppose, or by way of Sarabet el-Khadîm, then we must probably look for Rephidim somewhere near the entrance from Wady es-Sheik to the plain er-Râhah, perhaps at the pass of *el-Watiyeh*, indicated above by Robinson. This defile was visited and described by Burckhardt (*Syria*, etc., p. 488) as at about five hours' distance from where it issues from the plain er-Râhah, narrowing between abrupt cliffs of blackened granite to about forty feet in width. Here is also the traditional "seat of Moses." Within the pass the valley expands, affording ample space for a large camp. The nearest water is in Wady Sheb, two miles distant to the south-west (Porter, *Hand-book*, p. 65). See Ridgaway, *The Lord's Land*, p. 57 sq. The arguments in favor of the location of Rephidim at el-Watîyeh are forcibly presented by Mr. Holland in *Jerusalem Recovered*, p. 420 sq. See SINAI.

Reposoir. 1. A receptacle for the tabernacle in the procession of Corpus Christi. 2. A chapel and shelter for travellers on the wayside, common in Italy: one of the 13th century is near Fismes. A pilgrim's chapel remains on Lansdown, near Bath.

Repoussé, a French artistic term signifying *hammered work*.

Representation. The theological use of this word by English writers of the 16th and 17th centuries was, in the strict sense of its Latin original, that of "presenting over again" in reality; the subordinate idea of "portrayal" as in a picture, being little, if at all, in use by them. Thus when bishop Pearson writes, "by virtue of his death, perpetually represented to his Father, 'he destroyeth him that hath the power of death,'" the word refers to our Lord's continual pleading of the sacrifice once offered. It is of importance to

remember this use of the term "representation," as it is not unfrequently used with reference to the eucharistic sacrifice; and by losing sight of the sense in which the word was understood by former writers, modern readers have understood "representation" to mean a dramatic or pictorial imitation rather than a real and actual making present, and offering over again, of that which is present by virtue of the once only offered sacrifice.

Representation, Lay. See Lay Representation.

Representers, or Marrow Men. See Marrow Controversy.

Reproach (usually חֶרְפָּה, ὄνειδος), the act of finding fault in opprobrious terms, or attempting to expose to infamy and disgrace. In whatever cause we engage, however disinterested our motives, however laudable our designs, reproach is what we must expect. But it becomes us not to retaliate, but to bear it patiently; and so to live that every charge brought against us be groundless. If we be reproached for righteousness' sake, we have no reason to be ashamed, nor to be afraid. All good men have thus suffered, Jesus Christ himself especially. We have the greatest promises of support. Besides, it has a tendency to humble us, detach us from the world, and excite in us a desire for that state of blessedness where all reproach shall be done away.

Reprobation is equivalent to *rejection;* and by it is usually understood the Calvinistic doctrine, that a portion of mankind, by the eternal counsel or decree of God, has been predestined to eternal death. Conditional reprobation, or rejecting men from the divine mercy, because of their impenitence or refusal of salvation, is a scriptural doctrine. Against the unconditional, absolute reprobation taught by rigid Calvinists, the following objections may be urged: 1. It cannot be reconciled to the love of God. "God is love." "He is loving to every man, and his tender mercies are over all his works." 2. Nor to the wisdom of God; for the bringing into being a vast number of intelligent creatures under a necessity of sinning and of being eternally lost, teaches no moral lesson to the world; and contradicts all those notions of wisdom in the ends and processes of government which we are taught to look for, not only from natural reason, but from the Scriptures. 3. Nor to the grace of God, so often magnified in the Scriptures. For it does not, certainly, argue superabounding richness of grace, when ten thousand have equally offended, to pardon one or two of them. 4. Nor to those passages of Scripture which represent God as tenderly compassionate and pitiful to the worst of his creatures. "I have no pleasure in the death of him that dieth;" "The Lord is long-suffering to us ward, not willing that any should perish." 5. Nor to his justice. We may affirm that justice and equity in God are what they are taken to be among reasonable men; and if men everywhere would consider it as contrary to justice that a sovereign should condemn to death one or more of his subjects for not obeying laws which it was utterly impossible for them to obey, it is manifestly unjust to charge God with acting in precisely the same manner. In whatever light the subject be viewed, no fault, in any right construction, can be chargeable upon the person so punished, or, as we may rather say, destroyed, since punishment supposes a judicial proceeding which this act shuts out. Every received notion of justice is thus violated. 6. Nor to the sincerity of God in offering salvation by Christ to all who hear the Gospel, of whom this scheme supposes the majority, or at least great numbers, to be among the reprobate. That God offers salvation to those who he knows will never receive it, is true; but there is here no insincerity, for the atonement has been made for their sins. 7. Nor with the scriptural declaration, that "God is no respecter of persons." To have respect of persons is a phrase in Scripture which sometimes refers to judicial proceedings, and signifies to judge from partiality and affection, and not upon the merits of the question. "Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons; but in every nation he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him" (Acts x, 34, 35). But if the doctrine of reprobation be true, then it necessarily follows that there is precisely this kind of respect of persons with God. 8. This doctrine brings with it the repulsive and shocking opinion of the eternal punishment of infants. The escape from this is either by annihilation of those dying in infancy, or by assuming that they are among the elect. 9. This doctrine destroys the end of punitive justice. That end can only be to deter men from offence, and to add strength to the law of God. But if the whole body of the reprobate are left to the influence of their fallen nature without remedy, they cannot be deterred from sin by threats of inevitable punishment; nor can they ever submit to the dominion of the law of God: their doom is fixed, and threats and examples can avail nothing. Comp. Election.

Reproof (תּוֹכַחַת, גְּעָרָה, ἔλεγχος), blame or reprehension spoken to a person's face. It is distinguished from a reprimand thus: he who reproves another, points out his fault, and blames him; he who reprimands affects to punish, and mortifies the offender. In giving reproof, the following rules may be observed: 1. We should not be forward in reproving our elders or superiors, but rather to remonstrate and supplicate for redress. What the ministers of God do in this kind, they do by special commission as those that must give an account (1 Tim. v, 1; Heb. xiii, 17). 2. We must not reprove rashly; there should be proof before reproof. 3. We should not reprove for slight matters, for such faults or defects as proceed from natural frailty, from inadvertency, or mistake in matters of small consequence. 4. We should never reprove unseasonably, as to the time, the place, or the circumstances. 5. We should reprove mildly and sweetly, in the calmest manner, in the gentlest terms. 6. We should not affect to be reprehensive; perhaps there is no one considered more troublesome than he who delights in finding fault with others. In receiving reproof, it may be observed, 1. That we should not reject it merely because it may come from those who are not exactly on a level with ourselves. 2. We should consider whether the reproof given be not actually deserved; and whether, if the reprover knew all, the reproof would not be sharper than it is. 3. Whether, if taken humbly and patiently, it will not be of great advantage to us. 4. That it is nothing but pride to suppose that we are never to be the subjects of reproof, since it is human to err.

Reptile, a word not used in the A. V., which designates this class of animals by the term "creeping thing" (q. v.), but covers thereby a much wider range of creatures. The following are the true *reptilia* mentioned in Scripture. They almost exclusively consist of various unknown species of serpents and lizards. Of course both these classes were unclean to the Hebrews.

Crocodile	*livyathân*	"Leviathan."
	tannîm	"dragon."
Frog	*batrâchos*	"frog."
	tsephardéä	"frog."
Lizard	*chômet*	"snail."
	kôăch	"chameleon."
	letaâh	"lizard."
	semamith	"spider."
	tinshémeth	"mole."
	tsâb	"tortoise."
Serpent	*akshûb*	"adder."
	aspis	"asp."
	drakon	"dragon."
	echidna	"viper."
	ephéh	"viper."
	péthen	"adder."
	shephiphôn	"adder."
	tsépha	"cockatrice."

Requiem, a musical mass for the dead in the

Church of Rome, so called from the words of the Introit, "Requiem æternam dona eis, Domine," Give them eternal rest, O Lord, etc. (2 Esdr ii, 34, 35); and the antiphon for the psalms in place of the *Gloria Patri*.

Rerédos (written also *lardos*, from Fr. *l'arrière-dos*), the wall or screen at the back of an altar, seat, etc. It was usually ornamented with panelling, etc., especially behind an altar, and sometimes was enriched with a profusion of niches, buttresses, pinnacles, statues, and other decorations, which were often painted with brilliant colors. Reredoses of this kind not unfrequently extended across the whole breadth of the church, and were sometimes carried up nearly to the ceiling, as at St. Alban's Abbey, Durham Cathedral, Gloucester Cathedral, St. Saviour's Church, Southwark; Christ Church, Hampshire, etc. In village churches they were generally simple, and appear very frequently to have had no ornaments formed in the wall, though sometimes corbels or niches were provided to carry images, and sometimes that part of the wall immediately over the altar was panelled. Remains of these, more or less injured, are to be found in many churches, particularly at the east ends of aisles, as at St. Michael's, Oxford; Hanwell and Enstone, Oxfordshire; Solihull, Warwickshire, etc.; and against the east wall of the transept, as in St. Cuthbert's, Wells. It was not unusual to decorate the wall at the back of an altar with panellings, etc., in wood, or with embroidered hangings of tapestry-work, to which the name of reredos was given: it was also applied to the screen between the nave and choir of a church. The open fire-hearth, frequently used in ancient domestic halls, was likewise called a reredos. See Altar.



Reredos of Altar, Enstone, cir. 1420.

Rescissory Act, an act of the Scottish Parliament passed on the restoration of Charles II, annulling all acts passed between 1638 and 1650 for religion and the Reformation; denouncing the Solemn League and Covenant and the Glasgow Assembly of 1638, and declaring that the government of the Church, as an essential royal prerogative, belongs alone to the crown.

Rescript, or Codex Rescriptus, a manuscript, the original writing of which had been virtually wiped out, and the works of some saint or father written over it. A codex of this class is that called *Codex Ephraemi* in the Imperial Library of Paris. Several works of the Syrian father were written on portions both of the Old and New Testaments. It has been published by Tischendorf, with a curious fac-simile of the older and newer handwriting. By the application of a chemical tincture, the original writing of a rescript can now be well deciphered. See Ephraim Manuscript; Palimpsest.

Resemblance to God. See Image of God.

Res'en (Heb. *id.* רֶסֶן, a *halter*, as in Isa. xxx, 20; Sept. Δασέμ v. r. Δασή), an ancient town of Assyria, described as a great city lying between Nineveh and Calah (Gen. x, 12). Many writers have been inclined to identify it with the *Rhesina* or *Rhesæna* of the Byzantine authors (Amm. Marc. xxiii, 5; Procop. *Bell. Pers.* ii, 19; Steph. Byz. s. v. Ῥέσινα), and of Ptolemy (*Geograph.* v, 18), which was near the true source of the western Khabour, and which is most probably the modern *Ras el-Ain*. There are no grounds, however, for this identification except the similarity of name (which similarity is perhaps fallacious, since the Sept. evidently reads דסן for רסן, but not the Samar.), while it is a fatal objection to the theory that Resæna or Resina was not in Assyria at all, but in Western Mesopotamia, 200 miles to the west of both the cities between which it is said to have lain. Biblical geographers have generally been disposed to follow Bochart (*Phaleg*, iv, 23) in finding a trace of the Hebrew name in *Larissa*, which is mentioned by Xenophon (*Anab.* iii, 4, 9) as a desolate city on the Tigris, several miles north of the Lycus. The resemblance of the names is too faint to support the inference of identity; but the situation is not irreconcilable with the scriptural intimation. Ephrem Syrus (*Comment.* ad loc.) says that *Rassa*, which he substitutes for Resen (the Peshito has *Ressin*), was the same as *Rish-Ain* (fountain-head); by which Assemani understands him to mean, not the place in Mesopotamia so called, but another Rish-Ain in Assyria, near Saphsaphre, in the province of Marga, which he finds noticed in a Syrian monastic history of the Middle Ages (Assemani, *Biblioth. Orient.* iii, 2, p. 709). It is, however, still uncertain if Rassa be the same with Rish-Ain; and, whether it be so or not, a name so exceedingly uncommon (corresponding to the Arabic Ras el-Ain) affords a precarious basis for the identification of a site so ancient. The Larissa of Xenophon is most certainly the modern Nimrûd. Resen, or Dasen—whichever may be the true form of the word—must assuredly have been in this neighborhood. As, however, the Nimrûd ruins seem really to represent Calah, while those opposite Mosûl are the remains of Nineveh, we must look for Resen in the tract lying between these two sites. Assyrian remains of some considerable extent are found in this situation, near the modern village of *Selamiyeh*, and it is perhaps the most probable conjecture that these represent the Resen of Genesis (see Rawlinson, *Ancient Monarchies*, i, 204). No doubt it may be said that a "great city," such as Resen is declared to have been (Gen. x, 12), could scarcely have intervened between two other large cities which are not twenty miles apart; and the ruins at Selamiyeh, it must be admitted, are not *very* extensive. But perhaps we ought to understand the phrase "a great city" relatively—i. e. great, as cities went in early times, or great, considering its proximity to two other larger towns. If this explanation seem unsatisfactory, we might perhaps conjecture that originally Asshur (Kileh-Sherghat) was called Calah, and Nimrûd Resen; but that, when the seat of empire was removed northwards from the former place to the latter, the name Calah was transferred to the new capital. Instances of such transfers of name are not unfrequent. The later Jews appear to have identified Resen with the Kileh-Sherghat ruins. At least the Targums of Jonathan and of Jerusalem explain Resen by Tel-Asar (תלסר or תלאסר), "the mound of Asshur." See Assyria.

Resentment, generally used in an ill sense, implying a determination to return an injury. Dr. Johnson observes that resentment is a union of sorrow with malignity; a combination of a passion which all endeavor to avoid with a passion which all concur to detest. The man who retires to meditate mischief and to exasperate his own rage; whose thoughts are em-

ployed only on means of distress and contrivances of ruin; whose mind never pauses from the remembrance of his own sufferings but to indulge some hope of enjoying the calamities of another, may justly be numbered among the most miserable of human beings—among those who are guilty, who have neither the gladness of prosperity nor the calm of innocence.

Reservation, or **Restriction**, in ethics, is the keeping back in the mind; equivocation, by a phrase which means one thing to the users and another to those who hear it. It may be distinguished as *real* and *mental*.

1. *Real restriction* takes place when the words used are not true if strictly interpreted, but there is no deviation from truth if the circumstances be considered. One man asks another, Have you dined? and the answer given is, No. The party giving this answer has dined, times without number; but his answer is restricted by the circumstances, as *to-day*, and in that sense is true.

2. *Mental restriction* consists in saying so far what is true and to be believed, but adding mentally some qualification which makes it not to be true. A debtor, asked by his creditor for payment of his debt, says, "I will certainly pay you to-morrow," adding to himself, "in part;" whereas the words audibly uttered referred to the whole amount. See Fleming and Krauth, *Vocabulary of Philosophical Science*, s. v.

Reserve IN TEACHING. This is the *suppression*, in the instruction of the great mass of Christians, of a portion of those Gospel doctrines which are most earnestly set forth in Scripture, as if they were a sort of esoteric mystery of which ordinary believers are unworthy, and which should be reserved as a reward for a long course of pious submission. The maintainers of this system of teaching affect great mystery about the highest and most sacred doctrines of Christianity (such as the atonement, the divinity of our Lord, etc.); they regard them as too solemn and divine to be *vulgarized* by being explicitly and prominently put before the Christian world at large. They would therefore "economize" the knowledge of such deep doctrines, *reserving* them for communication to those worthy of being initiated, meanwhile asserting that the ordinary Christian is put in possession of these truths, and to a certain degree derives virtue out of them, by partaking of the sacraments, etc. It is on the authority of the fathers that the advocates of "reserve" chiefly dwell as most fully and expressly supporting the principle; but they adduce also, in justification of the system, the reverence it has a tendency to beget for sacred things (as if it were reverence, and not superstition, in those who know not what they are reverencing), and allege that doing thus they are acting a merciful part in keeping those in ignorance who would not make a profitable use of knowledge (just as if they had the power of discerning spirits). They contend that they are imitating the most perfect Pattern of wisdom and mercy, who thus economizes light and knowledge (e. g. concealing the Gospel at first under the veil of the Mosaic ritual), as if it were a system of philosophy of their own they undertook to teach, or as if they were imitating the Deity in concealing what he had revealed. The example of our Lord is appealed to, who, they say, taught openly by parables, but privately explained the mysteries of his kingdom to his disciples; a case quite inapplicable, as our Lord used *reserve*, not to his disciples, but towards wilful unbelievers. The system is also vindicated by studiously confounding it with the *gradual* initiation of Christians in the knowledge of their religion, and the necessity of *gradual* teaching; and the care requisite to avoid teaching anything which, though true in itself, would be falsely understood by the hearers is confounded with the system of withholding a portion of Gospel truths from those able and willing to receive it. It is almost needless to add that the entire system is opposed to the Word of God, which commands ministers not to shun to declare to the people "*all* the counsel of God," and that it is calculated to throw doubt and uncertainty upon the whole Christian religion; for, as in this system of "reserve" there may be an indefinite number of degrees, none can ever be sure that he has fathomed the system and ascertained what is the real inmost doctrine of its advocates. See the Rev. Dr. West's *Sermon on Reserve in Teaching*.

Reserved Cases, among Roman Catholic casuists, are certain sins which are to be dealt with by higher ecclesiastics than the mere priest, who may, however, bestow absolution if the penitent be at the point of death. To this class of sins belong heresy, simony, sacrilege, and certain offences against the priesthood.

Re'sheph (Heb. *id.* רֶשֶׁף, *flame*, as often; Sept. Ῥασέφ v. r. Σαράφ), one of the descendants of Ephraim, a "son" of Beriah (q. v.) (1 Chron. vii, 25). B.C. post 1658.

Residence. In the early Church there were laws regulating the residence of the clergy, and their design was to bind them to constant attendance upon their duty. The Council of Sardica had several canons relating to this matter. The seventh decreed that no bishop should go εἰς στρατόπεδον, to the emperor's court, unless the emperor by letter called him thither; but if any petition was to be preferred to the emperor relating to any civil contest, the bishop should depute his *apocrisarius*, or resident at court, to act for him, or send his *œconomus*, or some other of his clergy, to solicit the cause in his name, that the Church might neither receive damage by his absence nor be put to unnecessary expenses. Another canon of the Council of Sardica limited the absence of a bishop from his church to three weeks, unless it were upon some very weighty and urgent occasion. Another allowed the same time for a bishop to collect the revenues of his estate, provided he there celebrated divine service every Lord's day. By two other canons, presbyters and deacons were similarly tied. The Council of Agde made the like order for the French churches, decreeing that a presbyter or deacon who was absent from his church for three weeks should be three years suspended from the communion. By a rule of the fourth Council of Carthage, every bishop's house was to be near the church. The fifth council prescribed that every bishop should have his residence near his principal or cathedral church, which he should not leave, to the neglect of his cure.

In Great Britain, at the present time, residence is now regulated by 1 and 2 Vict. c. 106. The penalties for it, without a license from the bishop, are, one third of the annual value of the benefice when the absence exceeds three but does not exceed six months; one half of the annual value when the absence exceeds six but does not exceed eight months; and when it has been for the whole year, three fourths of the annual income are forfeited. Certain persons are exempted from the penalties of non-residence, as the heads of colleges at Oxford and Cambridge, the warden of Durham University, and the headmasters of Eton, Winchester, and Westminster schools. Privileges for temporary non-residence are granted to a great number of persons who hold offices in cathedrals and at the two universities of Oxford and Cambridge. See Bingham, *Christian Antiq.* bk. vi, ch. iv, p. 7; Eadie, *Eccles. Cyclop.* s. v.

Resignation, a patient, unresisting submission to the will of God, acknowledging both his power and right to afflict. The obligations to this duty arise from: 1. The perfections of God (Deut. xxxii, 4). 2. The purpose of God (Eph. i, 11). 3. The commands of God (Heb. xii, 9). 4. The promises of God (1 Pet. v, 7). 5. Our own interest (Hos. ii, 14, 15). 6. The prospect of eternal felicity (Heb. iv, 9). See PATIENCE.

RESIGNATION, ECCLESIASTICAL. The ancient Church was very strict in the matter of resignations,

and yet there were cases in which they were allowed: 1. When a bishop, through the obstinacy, hatred, or disgust of any people, found himself incapable of doing them any service, and that the burden was an intolerable oppression to him; in that case, if he desired to resign, his resignation was accepted. Thus Gregory Nazianzen renounced the see of Constantinople because the people murmured at him as a stranger. 2. When in charity a bishop resigned, or showed himself willing to resign, to cure some inveterate schism. Thus Chrysostom announced his willingness to resign if the people had any suspicion that he was a usurper. In such cases canonical pensions were sometimes granted. The following are the rules that prevail in the Church of England: It can be made only to a superior, and it must be to such superior as the one from whom it was *immediately* obtained; for example, where institution was required, the party having the right to institute is the same to whom resignation is to be made; and in the case of donatives, resignation is to be made to the patron. Resignation must be made personally, and not by proxy: that is, it must be made either by personal appearance before the ordinary, or by an instrument properly attested and presented to him. It must be made without any condition annexed; in the words of the instrument, it must be made "absolute et simpliciter," and it must further be, in the words of the same instrument, "sponte et pure." It must also be made voluntarily, and it must not proceed from any corrupt inducement. If an incumbent take any pension, sum of money, or other benefit, directly or indirectly, for or in respect of the resigning of a benefice having cure of souls, such a transaction is criminal in the view of the law, and both the giver and receiver in it are liable to legal penalties. No resignation can be valid till accepted by the proper ordinary, but the law has provided no remedy if the ordinary should refuse to accept. In as far as legal decisions have hitherto gone, the ordinary is no more compellable to accept a resignation than he is to admit persons into holy orders. When a resignation has been accepted, notice is to be given to the patron, if different from the ordinary; and lapse does not begin to run, as against the patron, until notice of the vacancy has been properly given to him. A Presbyterian minister resigns to the presbytery in whose bounds his charge is. See Bingham, *Christian Antiq.* bk. vi, ch. iv, p. 2; Eden, *Theol. Dict.* s. v.

Resolutioners, or **Resolutionists**, were those who approved of the answer given by the commissioners of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland (which met at Perth in the time of Charles II) to the question proposed to them by the Parliament, viz. what persons were to be admitted to rise in arms against Cromwell. The resolution was, that all persons capable of bearing arms were to be admitted, except those of bad character, or obstinate enemies to the Covenant. Those who supported it were called *Resolutioners*, while those who opposed it were designated *Protesters* or *Anti-Resolutioners*.

Respect OF PERSONS (προσωπολημψία, Rom. ii, 11; Eph. vi, 9; Col. iii, 25; James ii, 1; a later Greek word, found only in the New Test., and modelled after the use of שְׂאֵת with פָּנִים), *partiality* for individuals. God appointed that the judges should pronounce sentence without respect of persons (Lev. xix, 15; Deut. xvi, 17, 19). That they should consider neither the poor nor the rich, the weak nor the powerful, but should attend only to truth and justice. God has no respect of persons. The Jews complimented our Saviour that he told the truth, without respect of persons, without fear (Matt. xxii, 16; Isa. xxxii, 1–16). Jude (ver. 16), instead of the phrase "to have respect of persons," has "to admire persons."

Our English term *respect* seems to imply some kind of deference or submission to a party; but this is not always the proper meaning to be annexed to it in Scripture. When we read (Exod. ii, 25) "God had respect to the children of Israel," it can only express his compassion and sympathy for them; when God had respect to the offering of Abel (Gen. iv, 4), it imports *to accept favorably*, to notice with satisfaction. (Comp. 1 Kings viii, 28; Numb. xvi, 15.)

Respond, before the Reformation, was a short anthem interrupting the middle of a chapter; when two or three verses had been read, the respond was sung, after which the chapter proceeded.

Respond, Fotheringay, North Hants.

RESPOND, a half-pillar or pier, in Middle-age architecture, attached to a wall to support an arch, etc. Responds are very frequently used by themselves, as at the sides of the entrances of chancels, etc., and are also generally employed at the terminations of ranges of pillars, such as those between the body and aisles of churches. In these last-mentioned situations they usually correspond in form with the pillars, but are sometimes different. The name frequently occurs in mediæval contracts, and may have its origin in the notion of the two pilasters responding to, i. e. corresponding with, each other. Thus the breadth of the nave of Eton College chapel "between the *responders*" was directed by the will of king Henry VI to be thirty-two feet. See ARCH.

Responsālès were a sort of residents in the imperial city in the name of foreign churches and bishops, whose office was to negotiate as proctors at the emperor's court in all ecclesiastical causes wherein their principals might be concerned. The institution of the office seems to have been in the time of Constantine, or not long after, when, the emperors having become Christians, foreign churches had more occasion to promote their suits at the imperial court than formerly. However, we find it established by law in the time of Justinian. It does not appear from that law that *responsales* were clergymen, but from other writings we may easily collect it. See Bingham, *Christian Antiq.* bk. iii, ch. xiii, p. 6.

Response. Among the Hebrews the usual response by the people to prayer was by the utterance of the word *Amen* at the close; and this practice was naturally adopted, or rather continued, by Christians likewise. This word (אָמֵן), literally "firm, true," was used as a substantive, "that which is true," "truth" (Isa. lxv, 16). It was employed in strong asseverations, fixing, as it were, the stamp of truth upon the assertion which it accompanied, and making it binding as an oath (comp. Numb. v, 22). In the Sept. of 1 Chron. xvi, 36; Neh. v, 13; viii, 6, the word appears in the form Ἀμήν, which is used throughout the New Test. In other passages the Hebrew is rendered by γένοιτο, except in Isa. lxv, 16. The Vulgate adopts the Hebrew word in all cases except in the Psalms, where it is translated *fiat*. In Deut. xxvii, 15–26, the people were to say "Amen" as the Levites pronounced each of the curses upon Mount Ebal, signifying by this their assent to the conditions under which the curses would be inflicted. In accordance with this usage we find that among the rabbins "Amen" involves the ideas of swearing, acceptance, and truthfulness. The first two are illustrated by

the passages already quoted, the last by 1 Kings i, 36; John iii, 3, 5, 11 (A. V. "verily"), in which the assertions are made with the solemnity of an oath and then strengthened by the repetition of "Amen." "Amen" was the proper response of the person to whom an oath was administered (Neh. v, 13; viii, 6; 1 Chron. xvi, 36; Jer. xi, 5, marg.); and the Deity, to whom appeal is made on such occasions, is called "the God of *Amen*" (Isa. lxv, 16), as being a witness to the sincerity of the implied compact. With a similar significance Christ is called "the *Amen*, the faithful and true witness" (Rev. iii, 14; comp. John i, 14; xvi, 6; 2 Cor. i, 20). It is matter of tradition that in the Temple the "Amen" was not uttered by the people, but that instead, at the conclusion of the priest's prayers, they responded, "Blessed be the name of the glory of his kingdom for ever and ever." Of this a trace is supposed to remain in the concluding sentence of the Lord's Prayer (comp. Rom. xi, 36). But in the synagogues and private houses it was customary for the people or members of the family who were present to say "Amen" to the prayers which were offered by the minister or the master of the house, and the custom remained in the early Christian Church (Matt. vi, 13; 1 Cor. xiv, 16). And not only public prayers, but those offered in private, and doxologies were appropriately concluded with "Amen" (Rom. ix, 5; xi, 36; xv, 33; xvi, 27; 2 Cor. xiii, 13, etc.). See AMEN.

Responses. Short sentences, so called from their being the *answers* of the people to the officiating minister. The design of responses is, by giving to the people a part in the service, to quicken this devotion and engage their attention. It is much to be regretted that congregations do not in general join in the parts of the service allotted to them, as such neglect is the means of making our worship appear to many both cold and formal. Anciently all the people were allowed to join in psalmody and prayers, and make their proper responses. Of the latter there were several. (1.) Amen. This, in the phraseology of the Church, is denominated *orationis signaculum*, or *devotæ concionis responsio*, and intimates that the prayer of the speaker is heard, and approved by him who gives this response. (2.) Hallelujah. This was adopted from the Jewish psalmody, particularly from those psalms (cxiii–cxviii) which were sung at the Passover, called the Great Hillel, or Hallel. The use of this phrase was first adopted by the Church at Jerusalem, and from this was received by the other churches, and was restricted to the fifty days between Easter and Whit-Sunday. In the Greek Church it was expressive of grief, sorrow, and penitence, while in the Latin it denoted a joyful spirit. (3.) Hosanna. The Church, both ancient and modern, has ascribed to this word a meaning similar to that of hallelujah. The true signification is "Lord save" (Psa. cxviii, 25). (4.) "O Lord have mercy"—*κύριε ἐλέησον*. The Council of Vaison, A.D. 492, canon 3, ordained that this response should be introduced into the morning and evening worship, and into the public religious service. Gregory the Great introduced a threefold form, "O Lord," "Lord have mercy," "Christ have mercy." (5.) "Glory, glory in the highest," in use on festive occasions in the 5th century, and in general use in the 7th century. (6.) "The Lord be with you;" "Peace be with you," ordained by the Council of Braga, A.D. 561, to be the uniform salutation of bishops and presbyters when addressing the people. The last-mentioned salutation alone was in use in the Greek Church. See Coleman, *Christ. Antiq.*; Eden, *Theol. Dict.* s. v.

Responsorii PSALMI mean either the repetition of the verses by the people, or the repetition of the last words of the psalm, with the addition of the "amen" or the doxology; or that the psalms were so selected as to correspond to the subject of the lessons which had been read.—Eadie, *Eccles. Cyclop.* s. v. "Psalmody."

Ressaunt, Redcliffe Church, Bristol.

Ressaunt (probably Fr. *ressentir*), an old English term for an ogee moulding. It was also applied to other architectural members that had the inflected outline of this moulding.

Rest, or **Repose**, was enjoined upon the Israelites on the Sabbath day for the glory of God, in that he rested after the six days of creation. See SABBATH.

Rest also signifies a fixed and secure habitation. "Ye shall go before your brethren until the Lord shall give rest to your brethren, as well as to you, and until ye are come into the land whither ye are going to possess it" (Deut. iii, 20). So also Deut. xii, 9: "For ye are not as yet come to the rest and to the inheritance which the Lord your God giveth you," i. e. you are not as yet settled in that land which you are to possess. Naomi says to Ruth, "My daughter, shall I not seek rest for thee, that it may be well with thee?" (Ruth iii, 1)—i. e. I shall endeavor to procure you a settlement. David, speaking of the ark of the covenant, which till his time had no fixed place of settlement, says, "Arise, O Lord, into thy rest, thou and the ark of thy strength" (Psa. cxxxii, 8). Likewise Eccles. xxxvi, 15: "O be merciful unto Jerusalem, thy holy city, the place of thy rest."

Rest has the following figurative meanings: *to lean*, or *trust in* (2 Chron. xxxii, 8); *to continue fixed* (Isa. li, 4); *to come to an end* (Ezek. xvi, 42; xxi, 17); *cease from war* (Josh. xiv, 15).

Rest, like sleep, is in the Scriptures sometimes used as the symbol of *death*. Thus the patriarch exclaims, "For now should I have lain still and been quiet, I should have slept; then had I been at rest, with kings and counsellors of the earth" (Job iii, 13); and thus a charge is given to Daniel: "Go thou thy way till the end be: for thou shalt rest, and stand in thy lot at the end of the days" (Dan. xii, 13). This phrase also occurs in 1 Sam. xxviii, 15; Job xi, 18; Acts ii, 26; Rev. vi, 9; and is common on Jewish monuments for the dead, as "May his rest be in the garden of Eden, with the other just men of the world." "May his soul rest in peace till the Comforter come." "May his rest be in the garden of Eden, with other just men. Amen, amen, amen, Selah."

In a moral and spiritual sense, rest denotes a cessation from carnal trouble and sin (Matt. xi, 28, 29). Finally, it is used to represent the fixed and permanent state of repose enjoyed by the blessed in heaven; and to this Paul makes an application of what is said of the settlement of the Israelites in the Land of Promise: "I sware to them in my wrath that they should not enter into my rest," i. e. into the land of Canaan (Psa. xcv, 11). "Therefore," says Paul (Heb. iii, 17–19; iv, 1–3), "as they could not enter therein by reason of their unbelief, let us be afraid of imitating their example: for we cannot enter but by faith," etc. See SABBATISM.

Restitution, a term applied in the A. V. in two very different senses.

1. *Penal* (שָׁלַם, *to repay*, Exod. xx, 1–14, etc.; elsewhere "requite," etc.; but in Job xx, 18, תְּמוּרָה, *exchange*, as elsewhere rendered), that act of justice by which we restore to our neighbor whatever we have unjustly deprived him of; a point insisted on under both the old and the new covenant (Exod. xxii, 1; Luke xix, 8). Justice requires that those things which have been stolen or unlawfully taken from another should be restored to the party aggrieved, and that compensation should be made to him by the aggressor. Accordingly various fines or pecuniary payments were exacted by the Mosaic law: as, (1.) Fines, עֹנֶשׁ, *onesh*, strictly so called, went commonly to the injured party, and were of two kinds: fixed, i. e. those of which the amount was determined by some statute as, for instance, that of Deut. xxii, 19, or xxii, 29; and undetermined, or where the amount was left to the decision of the judges (Exod.

xxi, 22). (2.) Twofold, fourfold, and even fivefold restitution of things stolen, and restitution of property unjustly retained, with twenty per cent. over and above. He who, by ignorance, should omit to give to the Temple what was appointed by the law—for example, in the tithes or first-fruits—was obliged to restore it to the priests and to add a fifth part besides, over and above which he was bound to offer a ram for his expiation. Nehemiah prevailed with all those Israelites to make restitution who had taken interest of their brethren (Neh. v, 10, 11), and Zacchæus (Luke xix, 8) promises a fourfold restitution to all from whom he had extorted in his office as a publican. The Roman laws condemned to a fourfold restitution all who were convicted of extortion or fraud. Zacchæus here imposes that penalty on himself, to which he adds the half of his goods, which was what the law did not require. (3.) If a man killed a beast, he was to make it good, beast for beast (Lev. xxiv, 18). If an ox pushed or gored another man's servant to death, his owner was bound to pay for the servant thirty shekels of silver (Exod. xxi, 32). In the case of one man's ox pushing the ox of another man to death, as it would be very difficult to ascertain which of the two had been to blame for the quarrel, the two owners were obliged to bear the loss between them; the living ox was to be sold, and its price, together with the dead beast, was to be equally divided by them. If, however, one of the oxen had previously been notorious for goring, and the owner had not taken care to confine him, in such case he was to give the loser another and to take the dead ox himself (ver. 36). (4.) If a man dug a pit and did not cover it, or let an old pit remain open and another man's beast fell into it, the owner of such pit was obliged to pay for the beast and had it for the payment (vers. 33, 34). (5.) When a fire was kindled in the fields and did any damage, he who kindled it was to make the damage good (xxii, 6). See DAMAGES.

Moralists observe respecting restitution: (1.) That where it can be made in kind, or the injury can be certainly valued, we are to restore the thing or the value. (2.) We are bound to restore the thing with the natural increase of it, i. e. to satisfy for the loss sustained in the meantime and the gain hindered. (3.) Where the thing cannot be restored and the value of it is not certain, we are to give reasonable satisfaction according to a middle estimation. (4.) We are at least to give by way of restitution what the law would give, for that is generally equal and in most cases rather favorable than rigorous. (5.) A man is not only bound to restitution for the injury he did, but for all that directly follows from the injurious act; for the first injury being wilful, we are supposed to will all that which follows upon it.

2. *Apocatastăsis*, a term which, in its Greek form, occurs but once in the New Test. in the phrase "restitution of all things," ἀποκατάστασις πάντων (Acts iii, 21). As an event, it is in that passage connected with the "refreshing (ἀνάψυξις) from the presence of the Lord" (ver. 19). The grammatical construction as well as exegetical interpretation of the whole passage has been greatly disputed by commentators (see Meyer, *Commentar.* ad loc.); but Alford (*Greek Test.* ad loc.) regards both these as being decisively settled by the parallel expression of our Saviour—that Elijah "will restore all things," ἀποκαταστάσει πάντα (Matt. xvii, 11). The principal opinions of interpreters are thus summed up by Kuinöl (*Comment.* ad loc.): (*a*) De Dieu, Limbach, Wolf, and others understand by the times of "refreshing" and "restitution" (i. e. the predicted period when the due position will be assigned each one), the days of the *last judgment*, the times of affliction to the impious and contumacious, but of relief, quiet, and safety to the saints. In support of this view they adduce the frequent argument of the sacred writers to induce Christians to diligence and hope drawn from the prospect of the last day (Acts xvii, 30 sq.; 2 Pet. iii, 7; xi, 13 sq.; comp. especially the similar language of 2 Thess. i, 7; ii, 16), and the fact that Jewish writers were accustomed so to speak of it (*Pirke Aboth*, iv, 17). (*b*) Schulz (in his *Dissert. de Temporibus* τῆς ἀναψύξεως, in the *Biblioth. Hagan.* v, 119 sq.) understands the *time of death*, the terminus fixed to each man's life, the future rest of the dead in the Lord; a view which Barkey (*ibid.* p. 411) justly opposes by this, among other considerations, that if this had been Peter's meaning it is strange he had not used clearer and more customary phraseology. (*c*) Kraft (*Obss. Sacr.* fascic. ix, 271 sq.) remarks that Peter on this passage derives his argument not merely from the hope of pardon, but also from the benefits already bestowed by God, and therefore considers this "refreshing" to be the *liberation afforded by Jesus from the ceremonial yoke of bondage* of the Jewish law, an exposition which is well refuted by Barkey (*Bibl. Hag.* iii, 119 sq.), who pertinently remarks that Peter at this very time was not himself free from legal prejudices. (*d*) Barkey (*ibid.* v, 397 sq.) thinks these "times of refreshing" are the period of *the delay of the divine judgment upon the Jews*, the time of the divine long-suffering, in which the zeal of the Almighty's vengeance was remitted or relaxed. He regards the expression "Jesus Christ" here as put for "the word of Jesus Christ," and so refers the words "he shall send," etc., to the preaching of the doctrine of Jesus. (*e*) In the opinion of Grotius, Hammond, and Bolten, the "times of refreshing" are the time of the freedom of Christians from Jewish persecution and the calamities impending over the wicked and refractory Jews (Matt. xxiv, 33; Luke xxi, 28); while the "times of restitution" are the time of the fulfilment of the predictions concerning the overthrow of the capital and polity of the Jews (comp. Matt. xxiv, 15, 30). (*f*) Ernesti (in his *Opusc. Theol.* p. 477), who finds a follower in Döderlein (*Institutio Theol. Christ.* ii, § 223, obs. 6), interprets the term *apocatastasis* as meaning a new, greater, and truer *perfection of religion*, the doctrine of the Gospel clear and free from all shadows of figures and rites; first announced by John, then promulgated by Jesus among the Jews, and finally propagated by the apostle everywhere. This view he fortifies by the observation that "times of restitution" is equivalent to "time of reformation" (διόρθωσις, Heb. ix, 10). (*g*) Also Eckermann (*Theologische Beiträge*, I, ii, 112 sq.) interprets the "apocatastasis of all things" to mean the universal emendation of religion by the doctrine of Christ, and the "times of refreshing" to be the *day of renewal*, the times of the Messiah. The same writer, however, afterwards (*ibid.* II, i, 188 sq.) rejects this exposition on the ground that the parallel passages (Matt. xi, 17; Mark ix, 12) speak of *Elijah* as to precede and rectify Jewish faith and morals. He therefore concludes that Peter was referring to a restoration of the Jewish polity in its original splendor. Yet finally (in his *Erklärung aller dunkeln Stellen des N. T.* ii, 184) he returns to his original opinion. (*h*) Rosenmüller, following Morus, understands the "times of refreshing" to denote *happy times*, not merely the day of the resurrection of the dead, but also spiritual benefits of every kind which Christians enjoy in this and the future life (Morus: the Messianic times), and refers the "times of restitution" (full and perfect fulfilment of prophecy) to the consummation of that auspicious period when all enemies shall be subdued (1 Cor. xx, 25 sq.; Heb. x, 12, 15; comp. Psa. cx, 1), and every influence opposing true religion removed. Many of these interpretations are obviously fanciful, and most of them too vague, although some contain an element of truth. The word ἀποκατάστασις signifies *emendation, restoration* to a pristine condition, *change* to a better state. (So Josephus, *Ant.* xi, 3, 8; iv, 6; Philo, *De Decal.* p. 767 b; *De Rer. Div. Her.* p. 522 c. Hesychius and Phanorinus likewise explain it by τελείωσις; but the scholiast in the Cod. Nosq. *ad loc.* renders συμπλήρωσις, ἔκβασις. In like manner ἀποκαθιστάνειν signifies to *complete*, bring to a conclusion; see the Sept. at Job viii, 6, where it corresponds with שָׁלֵם; so in Gen. xli, 13; Jer. xxii, 8; comp. Polyb.

iv, 23, 1; Diod. Sic. xx, 34.) By the expression "until the times of the *apocatastasis* of all things which God hath spoken," etc., Peter means the time when all affairs shall be consummated, all the prophetical announcements shall be accomplished, including the inauguration of the kingdom of the Messiah and its attendant events, the full extension of the Gospel, the resurrection, judgment, etc.—in short, the end of the world (see Olshausen, De Wette, Hackett, and most others, *ad loc.*). See ESCHATOLOGY.

Restoration, THE, a name generally given to the return of the Church of England to the previously appointed ecclesiastical polity, and to their allegiance to the regular prince, Charles II, which took place in 1660. It has been appointed, by authority, that May 29 in every year shall be kept with prayer and thanksgiving to Almighty God for this event.

RESTORATION OF THE JEWS. This term is applied to two very different classes of prophecies relating to the Hebrew race.

1. *Their Return from Captivity.*—It is maintained by Von Bohlen (*Genesis*, p. cxvi) that the ten tribes intermarried so freely with the surrounding population as to have become completely absorbed; and it appears to be a universal opinion that no one now knows where their descendants are. But it is a harsh assumption that such intermarriages were commoner with the ten tribes than with the two; and certainly, in the apostolic days, the *twelve* tribes are referred to as a well-known people, sharply defined from the heathen (Acts xxiv, 7; James i, 1). Not a trace appears that any repulsive principle existed at that time between the Ten and the Two. "Ephraim no longer envied Judah, nor Judah vexed Ephraim;" but they had become "one nation;" though only partially "on the mountains of Israel" (Isa. xi, 13; Ezek. xxxvii, 22). It would seem, therefore, that one result of the captivity was to blend all the tribes together, and produce a national union which had never been effected in their own land. If ever there was a difference between them as to the books counted sacred, that difference entirely vanished; at least, no evidence appears of the contrary fact. When, moreover, the laws of landed inheritance no longer enforced the maintenance of separate tribes and put a difficulty in the way of their intermarriage, an almost inevitable result in course of time was the entire obliteration of this distinction; and, as a fact, no modern Jews know to what tribe they belong, although vanity always makes them choose to say that they are of the two or three, and not of the ten tribes. That all Jews now living have in them the blood of all the twelve tribes ought (it seems) to be believed, until some better reason than mere assertion is advanced against it.

When Cyrus gave permission to the Israelites to return to their own country, and restored their sacred vessels, it is not wonderful that few persons of the ten tribes were eager to take advantage of it. In two centuries they had become thoroughly naturalized in their Eastern settlements; nor had Jerusalem ever been the centre of proud aspirations to them. It is perhaps remarkable that in Ezra ii, 2, 36 (see also x, 18, 25), the word *Israel* is used to signify what we might call the laity as opposed to the priests and Levites, which might seem as if the writer were anxious to avoid asserting that all the families belonged to the two tribes. (If this is not the meaning, it at least shows that all discriminating force in the words *Israel* and *Judah* was already lost. So, too, in the book of Esther, the twelve tribes through all parts of the Persian empire are called Jews.) Nevertheless, it was to be expected that only those would return to Jerusalem whose expatriation was very recent, and principally those whose parents had dwelt in the holy city or its immediate neighborhood. The re-migrants, doubtless, consisted chiefly of the pious and the poor; and as the latter proved docile to their teachers, a totally new spirit reigned in the restored nation. Whatever want of zeal the anxious Ezra might discern in his comrades, it is no slight matter that he could induce them to divorce their heathen wives—a measure of harshness which Paul would scarcely have sanctioned (1 Cor. vii, 12); and the century which followed was, on the whole, one of great religious activity and important permanent results on the moral character of the nation. Even the prophetic spirit by no means disappeared for a century and a half; although at length both the true and the false prophet were supplanted among them by the learned and diligent scribe, the anxious commentator, and the over-literal or over-figurative critic. In place of a people prone to go astray after sensible objects of adoration, and readily admitting heathen customs; attached to monarchical power, but inattentive to a hierarchy; careless of a written law, and movable by alternate impulses of apostasy and repentance, we henceforth find in them a deep and permanent reverence for Moses and the prophets, an aversion to foreigners and foreign customs, a profound hatred of idolatry, a great devotion to priestly and Levitical rank, and to all who had an exterior of piety; in short, a slavish obedience both to the law and to its authorized expositors. Now first, so far as can be ascertained (observe the particularity of detail in Neh. viii, 4, etc.), were the synagogues and houses of prayer instituted and the law periodically read aloud. Now began the close observance of the Passover, the Sabbath, and the sabbatical year. Such was the change wrought in the guardians of the sacred books that, whereas the pious king Josiah had sat eighteen years on the throne without knowing of the existence of "the book of the law" (2 Kings xxii, 3, 8), in the later period, on the contrary, the text was watched over with a scrupulous and fantastic punctiliousness. From this æra the civil power was absorbed in that of the priesthood, and the Jewish people affords the singular spectacle of a nation in which the priestly rule came later in time than that of hereditary kings. Something analogous may, perhaps, be seen in the priestly authority at Comana, in Cappadocia, under the Roman sway (Cicero, *Ep. ad Div.* xv, 4, etc.).

In their habits of life, also, the Jewish nation was permanently affected by the first captivity. The love of agriculture, which the institutions of Moses had so vigorously inspired, had necessarily declined in a foreign land; and they returned with a taste for commerce, banking, and retail trade, which was probably kept up by constant intercourse with their brethren who remained in dispersion. The same intercourse in turn propagated towards the rest the moral spirit which reigned at Jerusalem. The Egyptian Jews, it would seem, had gained little good from the contact of idolatry (Jer. xliv, 8); but those who had fallen in with the Persian religion, probably about the time of its great reform by Zoroaster, had been preserved from such temptations, and returned purer than they went. Thenceforward it was the honorable function of Jerusalem to act as a religious metropolis to the whole dispersed nation; and it cannot be doubted that the ten tribes, as well as the two, learned to be proud of the holy city, as the great and free centre of their name and their faith. The same religious influences thus diffused themselves through all the twelve tribes of Israel. See DISPERSED.

2. *Their Future Return to Palestine.*—It is a favorite view with many that the Israelitish race, now scattered over the face of the earth, will eventually be brought back to their own land. To this is generally added the belief that they will yet return in a converted, i. e. Christian, state. The final ingathering of the Jews, no less than of all Gentiles, is certainly taught, not only in the Old Test., but likewise in the New (see Rom. xi, 11–25). But it appears to be an error to infer that, therefore, they will generally be restored to their original home. See Swaine, *Objections to the Restora-*

tion of the Jews (3d ed. Lond. 1861); Browne, *Restoration of the Jews* (Edinb. 1861); Clarke, *Restoration of the Jews* (Lond. 1861). See MILLENNIUM.

Restorationists, the name assumed by a body of professing Christians who are to a very great extent identical with the Unitarians, on the one hand, and the Universalists, on the other. Their peculiar doctrine is, that all men will ultimately become holy and happy. They maintain that God created men only to bless them, and that he sent his Son to "be for salvation to the ends of the earth." They further teach that man's probation is not confined to this life, but extends throughout the mediatorial reign of Christ; and that, as he died for all, all will eventually be saved. They consider that punishment is reformatory in its character, and has for its object the conversion of the sinner. Although the Restorationists, as a separate body, have only existed for a few years, their sentiments are by no means new. Some of the early fathers — Clemens Alexandrinus, Origen, Didymus of Alexandria, Gregory Nyssen, and others — believed and advocated the restoration of all fallen intelligences. A branch of the German Baptists, before the Reformation, held and propagated the doctrine. In Europe many prominent names may be cited as its advocates. It was introduced into America about the middle of the 18th century, but not much taught until about 1775 or 1780, when John Murray and Elhanan Winchester became its advocates. Afterwards we find Dr. Chauncey, of Boston; Dr. Rush, of Philadelphia; Dr. Smith, of New York; and Mr. Foster, of New Hampshire, as advocates, although most of them continued in the ranks of the various sects. In 1785 a convention was organized at Oxford, Mass., under the auspices of Messrs. Winchester and Murray; and as all who believed in universal salvation believed that the effects of sin and the means of grace extended into a future life, the terms *Restorationist* and *Universalist* were synonymous, and the convention adopted the latter as their distinctive name. In 1818 the Rev. Hosea Ballou, of Boston, advanced the doctrine that all retribution is confined to this world; to which was added by others the doctrine of the mortality of the soul, that the whole man died a temporal death, and that the resurrection would introduce all men into everlasting happiness. As a result a distinct sect, by the name of *Universal Restorationists*, was formed at Mendon, Mass., Aug. 17, 1831; but it soon became extinct. The Restorationists maintain that a just retribution does not take place in time; that men are invited to act with reference to a future life; that there are grades of reward and punishment; that it is not death or the resurrection that introduces men into heaven. The Restorationists have never been numerous; they are found more extensively in Massachusetts, although they have a few societies in other states. At one time they published a weekly newspaper, and had from twenty to thirty ministers, with from two to three thousand members. Very many, however, are found in the other sects who entertain the peculiar views of the Restorationists. See Ballou, *Ancient History of Universalism;* Belcher, *Religious Denominations;* Foster, *Examination of Strong;* Hudson, *Letter and Reply;* Chauncey, *Salvation of all Men;* Hartley, *On Man;* Stonehouse, *Universal Retribution;* Smith, *On Divine Government.* See UNIVERSALISM.

Resurrection (*ἀνάστασις*) OF THE BODY, the revivification of the human body after it has been forsaken by the soul, or the reunion of the soul hereafter to the body which it had occupied in the present world. This is one of the essential points in the creed of Christendom.

I. *History of the Doctrine.*—It is admitted that there are no traces of such a belief in the earlier Hebrew Scripture. It is not to be found in the Pentateuch, in the historical books, or in the Psalms; for Psa. xlix, 15 does not relate to this subject; neither does Psa. civ, 29, 30, although so cited by Theodoret and others. The celebrated passage of Job xix, 25 sq. has indeed been strongly insisted upon in proof of the early belief in this doctrine; but the most learned commentators are agreed, and scarcely any one at the present day disputes, that such a view of the text arises either from mistranslation or misapprehension, and that Job means no more than to express a confident conviction that his then diseased and dreadfully corrupted body should be restored to its former soundness; that he should rise from the depressed state in which he lay to his former prosperity; and that God would manifestly appear (as was the case) to vindicate his uprightness. That no meaning more recondite is to be found in the text is agreed by Calvin, Mercier, Grotius, Le Clerc, Patrick, Warburton, Durell, Heath, Kennicott, Döderlein, Dathe, Eichhorn, Jahn, De Wette, and a host of others. That it alludes to a resurrection is disproved thus: 1. The supposition is inconsistent with the design of the poem and the course of the argument, since the belief which it has been supposed to express, as connected with a future state of retribution, would in a great degree have solved the difficulty on which the whole dispute turns, and could not but have been often alluded to by the speakers. 2. It is inconsistent with the connection of the discourse; the reply of Zophar agreeing, not with the popular interpretation, but with the other. 3. It is inconsistent with many passages in which the same person (Job) longs for death as the end of his miseries, and not as the introduction to a better life (ch. iii; vii, 7, 8; x, 20–22; ch. xiv; xvii, 11–16). 4. It is not proposed as a topic of consolation by any of the friends of Job; nor by Elihu, who acts as a sort of umpire; nor by the Almighty himself in the decision of the controversy. 5. The later Jews, who eagerly sought for every intimation bearing on a future life which their Scriptures might contain, never regarded this as such; nor is it once referred to by Christ or his apostles. 6. The language, when exactly rendered, contains no warrant for such an interpretation; especially the phrase "yet *in* my flesh shall I see God," which should rather be rendered "*out of* my flesh." See JOB, BOOK OF.

Isaiah may be regarded as the first Scripture writer in whom such an allusion can be traced. He compares the restoration of the Jewish people and state to a resurrection from the dead (xxvi, 19, 20); and in this he is followed by Ezekiel at the time of the exile (ch. xxxvii). From these passages, which are, however, not very clear in their intimations, it may seem that in this, as in other matters, the twilight of spiritual manifestations brightened as the day-spring from on high approached; and in Dan. xii, 2 we at length arrive at a clear and unequivocal declaration that those who lie sleeping under the earth shall awake, some to eternal life, and others to everlasting shame and contempt.

In the time of Christ, the belief of a resurrection, in connection with a state of future retribution, was held by the Pharisees and the great body of the Jewish people, and was only disputed by the Sadducees. Indeed, they seem to have regarded the future life as incomplete without the body; and so intimately were the two things—the future existence of the soul and the resurrection of the body—connected in their minds that any argument which proved the former they considered as proving the latter also (see Matt. xxii, 31; 1 Cor. xv, 32). This belief, however, led their coarse minds into gross and sensuous conceptions of the future state, although there were many among the Pharisees who taught that the future body would be so refined as not to need the indulgences which were necessary in the present life; and they assented to our Lord's assertion that the risen saints would not marry, but would be as the angels of God (Matt. xxii, 30; comp. Luke xx, 39). So Paul, in 1 Cor. vi, 13, is conceived to intimate that the necessity of food for subsistence will be abolished in the world to come.

In further proof of the commonness of a belief in the resurrection among the Jews of the time of Christ, see Matt. xxii; Luke xx; John xi, 24; Acts xxiii, 6-8.

Josephus is not to be relied upon in the account which he gives of the belief of his countrymen (*Ant.* xviii, 2; *War*, ii, 7), as he appears to use terms which might suggest one thing to his Jewish readers and another to the Greeks and Romans, who scouted the idea of a resurrection. It is clearly taught in the Apocryphal books of the Old Test. (Wisd. iii, 1, etc.; iv, 15; 2 Macc. vii, 14, 23, 29, etc.). Many Jews believed that the wicked would not be raised from the dead; but the contrary was the more prevailing opinion, in which Paul once took occasion to express his concurrence with the Pharisees (Acts xxiv, 15).

But although the doctrine of the resurrection was thus prevalent among the Jews in the time of Christ, it might still have been doubtful and obscure to us had not Christ given to it the sanction of his authority, and declared it a constituent part of his religion (e. g. Matt. xxii; John v, viii, xi). He and his apostles also were careful to correct the erroneous notions which the Jews entertained on this head, and to make the subject more obvious and intelligible than it had ever been before. A special interest is also imparted to the subject from the manner in which the New Test. represents Christ as the person to whom we are indebted for this benefit, which, by every variety of argument and illustration, the apostles connect with him, and make to rest upon him (Acts iv, 2; xxvi, 3; 1 Cor. xv; 1 Thess. iv, 14, etc.).

II. *Scripture Details.*—The principal points which can be collected from the New Test. on this subject are the following: 1. The raising of the dead is everywhere ascribed to Christ, and is represented as the last work to be undertaken by him for the salvation of man (John v, 21; xi, 25; 1 Cor. xv, 22 sq.; 1 Thess. iv, 15; Rev. i, 18). 2. All the dead will be raised, without respect to age, rank, or character in this world (John v, 28, 29; Acts xxiv, 15; 1 Cor. xv, 22). 3. This event is to take place not before the end of the world, or the general judgment (John v, 21; vi, 39, 40; xi, 24; 1 Cor. xv, 22–28; 1 Thess. iv, 15; Rev. xx, 11). 4. The manner in which this marvellous change shall be accomplished is necessarily beyond our present comprehension, and therefore the Scripture is content to illustrate it by figurative representations, or by proving the possibility and intelligibility of the leading facts. Some of the figurative descriptions occur in Matt. xxiv; John v; 1 Cor. xv, 52; 1 Thess. iv, 16; Phil. iii, 21. The image of a trumpet-call, which is repeated in some of these texts, is derived from the Jewish custom of convening assemblies by sound of trumpet. 5. The possibility of a resurrection is powerfully argued by Paul in 1 Cor. xv, 32 sq., by comparing it with events of common occurrence in the natural world. (See also ver. 12–14; and comp. Acts iv, 2.)—Kitto. 6. The numerous instances of an actual raising of individuals to life by our Lord and his apostles, not to speak of a few similar acts by the Old-Test. prophets, and especially the crowning fact of our Lord's resurrection from the grave, afford some light on these particulars. (See below.) 7. The fact of the general judgment (q. v.) is conclusive as to the literal truth of this great doctrine.

But although this body shall be so raised as to preserve its *identity*, it must yet undergo certain purifying changes to fit it for the kingdom of heaven, and to render it capable of immortality (1 Cor. xv, 35 sq.), so that it shall become a glorified body like that of Christ (ver. 49; Rom. vi, 9; Phil. iii, 21); and the bodies of those whom the last day finds alive will undergo a similar change without tasting death (1 Cor. xv, 51, 53; 2 Cor. v, 4; 1 Thess. iv, 15 sq.; Phil. iii, 21).

III. *Theories on the Subject.*—Whether the soul, between the death and the resurrection of the present body, exists independent of any envelope, we know not. Though it may be that a union of spirit with body is the general law of all created spiritual life, still this view gives no countenance to the notions of those who have attempted to prove, from certain physiological opinions respecting the renewal—every few years—of the human frame during life, and the final transmission of its decomposed elements into other forms of being, that the resurrection of the body is impossible. The apostle asserts the fact that the "dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed; for this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality" (1 Cor. xv, 35–53). While this passage affirms the identity of the body before and after the resurrection, it by no means affirms the identity of the constituent particles of which the body is, at different periods, supposed to be made up. The particles of a man's body may change several times between infancy and old age; and yet, according to our ideas of bodily identity, the man has had all the time "the same body." So also all the particles may be changed again between the process of death and the resurrection, and the body yet retain its identity (see the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, ii, 613 sq.). Doubtless the future body will be incorruptible, infrangible, and capable of being moved at will to any part of the universe. The highest and most lengthened exercises of thought and feeling will doubtless not occasion exhaustion or languor so as to divert in any way the intellect and the affections from the engagements suited to their strength and perfection (see the *Brit. and For. Evang. Rev.* April, 1862). But that there is *no* analogy—that the new body will have no connection with, and no relation to, the old; and that, in fact, the resurrection of the *body* is not a doctrine of Scripture—does not appear to us to have been satisfactorily proved by the latest writer on the subject (Bush, *Anastasis*, N. Y. 1845); and we think so highly of his ingenuity and talent as to believe that no one else is likely to succeed in an argument in which he has failed.

Among the speculations propounded as a solution of the problem of the resurrection, the most ingenious, perhaps, as well as fascinating, is the *germ* theory, which assumes that the soul at death retains a certain ethereal investiture, and that this has, by virtue of the vital force, the power of accreting to itself a new body for the celestial life. This is substantially the Swedenborgian view as advocated by the late Prof. Bush, and has recently received the powerful support of Mr. Joseph Cook in his popular lectures. It is thought to be countenanced especially by Paul's language (1 Cor. xv) concerning the "spiritual body" of the future state (ver. 4), and his figure of the renewed grain (ver. 37). This explanation, however, is beset with many insuperable difficulties.

(*a.*) The apostle's distinction between the *psychical* (ψυχικόν, "natural") and the *pneumatical* (πνευματικόν, "spiritual") in that passage is not of *material* (φυσικόν, physical) as opposed to immaterial or disembodied; for both are equally called *body* (σῶμα, actual and tangible substance), such as we know our Lord's resurrection body was composed of (Luke xxiv, 39). It is merely, as the whole context shows ("corruptible—incorruptible," "mortal—immortal," etc.), the difference between the feeble, decaying body of this life in its present *normal* state, and the glorious, fadeless frame of the future world in its *transcendent* condition hereafter; in short, its aspect as known to us here from *natural* phenomena, and its prospect as *revealed* to us in Scripture. This appears from the contrasted use of these terms in another part of the same epistle (1 Cor. ii, 14, 15) to denote the unregenerate as opposed to the regenerate heart, the former being its usual or depraved, and the latter its transformed or gracious, state.

(*b.*) In like manner the apostle's figure of grain as sown, while it admirably illustrates, in a general way, the possibility of changes in the natural world as great as that which will take place in the resurrection body, yet—like all other metaphors—was never intended to teach the precise *mode* of that transformation, and accordingly it fails in several essential particulars to correspond to the revival of the body from the grave. 1. The seed never actually *dies*, nor any part of it. It is

the *germ* alone that possesses vitality, and this simply expands and develops, gathering to itself the material of the rest of the seed, which undergoes chemical and vital changes fitting it for nutriment until the young plant attains roots and leaves wherewith to imbibe nourishment from the outer world. This whole process is as truly a *growth* as that anywhere found in nature; it is, in fact, essentially the same as takes place in the hatching of an egg or the gestation of an animal. 2. The real *identity* of the original plant or seed and its successor or the crop is lost in this transmutation, as the apostle himself intimates (ver. 37). It is, in fact, the reproduction of another but similar thing rather than the continuation or renewal of the same. The old plant, indeed, perishes, but it never revives. The seed is its offspring, and thus only represents its parent. Nor is the new plant anything more than a lineal descendant of the old one. We must not confound the resurrection with mere propagation. The young plant may, we admit, in one sense be said to be identical with the germ sown, notwithstanding the great change which it takes on in the process of growth; and this is the precise point of the apostle's simile. But we must not press his figure into a literal strictness when comparing things so radically different as the burial of a corpse and the planting of grain. The principle of life is continuous in the latter; but this is not a distinct substance, like the soul; it is merely a property of matter, and in the case of the body must cease with physical dissolution.

(*c.*) We would ask those who maintain this theory a simple question: Is the so-called germ or "enswathement" which is supposed to survive, escape, or be eliminated from the body at death—is it matter or is it spirit? We presume all will admit that there are but these two essential kinds of substance. Which of these, then, is it? It must, of course, belong to the former category. Then the body does not actually and entirely die! But this contradicts all the known phenomena in the case. The whole theory under discussion is not only a pure begging of the question really at issue, but it is improbable and inconsistent. There is absolutely not the slightest particle of scientific or historical evidence that the body leaves a vital residuum in dissolution, or evolves at death an ethereal frame that survives it in any physical sense whatever as a representation. We remand all such hypotheses to the realm of ghostland and "spiritualism."

(*d.*) In the case of the resurrection of the body of Jesus, which is the type of the general resurrection, and the only definite instance on record, it is certain that this theory will not apply. Not only is no countenance given to it by the language of Holy Scripture concerning the agency which effected that resuscitation, viz. the direct and miraculous power of the Holy Spirit, but the circumstances obviously exclude such a process. There was the defunct person, entire except that the spark of life had fled. If it be said that there still lingered about it some vital germ that was the nucleus around which reanimation gathered, what is this but to deny that Jesus was truly and effectually dead? Then the whole doctrine of the atonement is endangered. In plain English, he was merely in a swoon, as the Rationalists assert. It may be replied, indeed, that the revivification of our Lord's body, which had not yet decomposed, of course differed in some important respects from that of the bodies of the saints whose elements will have dissolved to dust. But on the ordinary view the two agree in the essential point, viz. an actual and full return to life after total and absolute extinction of it; whereas under the theory in question one main element of this position is denied. It matters little how long the body has been dead, or to what extent disorganization has taken place—whether but a few hours, as in the case of the son of the widow of Nain; or four days, as in that of Lazarus; or thousands of years, as in that of the saints—at the final judgment. It is equally a resurrection if life have utterly left the physical organism, and not otherwise.

We conclude, therefore, that there is no scriptural, consistent, or intelligible view except the one commonly entertained by Christians on this subject, viz. that the pure and immaterial soul alone survives the dissolution of the body, and that at the last day almighty power will clothe this afresh with a corporeal frame suitable to its enlarged and completely developed faculties, and that the identity of the latter will consist, not so much, if at all, in the reassemblage of the individual particles of which its old partner was composed, much less of some subtle and continuous *tertium quid* that emerged from the decaying substance and reconstructs a new physical home for itself, but in the similar combination of similar matter, similarly united with the same immortal spirit, and with it glorified by some such inscrutable change as took place in our Saviour's body at the transfiguration, and as still characterized it when preternaturally beheld by Saul on his way to Damascus.

IV. *Literature.*—This is very copious (see a list of works on the subject in the appendix to Alger's *Doctrine of a Future Life*, Nos. 2929–3181). We here mention only a few of the most important: Knapp, *Christian Theology*, translated by Leonard Woods, D.D., § 151–153; Hody, *On the Resurrection;* Drew, *Essay on the Resurrection of the Human Body;* Burnet, *State of the Dead;* Schott, *Dissert. de Resurrect. Corporis, adv. S. Burnetum* (1763); Teller, *Fides Dogmat. de Resurr. Carnis* (1766); Mosheim, *De Christ. Resurr. Mort.*, etc., in *Dissertatt.* ii, 526 sq.; Dassov, *Diatr. qua Judæor. de Resurr. Mort. Sentent. ex Plur. Rabbinis* (1675); Neander, *All. Geschichte*, etc., I, iii, 1088, 1096; II, iii, 1404–1410; Zehrt, *Ueber d. Auferstehung d. Todten* (1835); Hodgson, *Res. of Hum. Body* (Lond. 1853). See RESURRECTION OF CHRIST.

RESURRECTION OF CHRIST. This great fact, by which "he was declared to be the Son of God with power," stands out everywhere prominently on the pages of the New Test. as the foundation of the Christian faith (Rom. i, 2; Acts xiii, 32, 33; 1 Cor. xv, 3–15). According to the Scriptures the disciples were assured, by the testimony of their senses, that the body of Christ, after his resurrection, was the same identical body of human flesh and bones which had been crucified and laid in the sepulchre (Matt. xvi, 21; xxvii, 63; xxviii, 5–18; Mark xvi, 6–19; Luke xxiv, 5–51; John xx, 9–26; Acts i, 1–11). Our Lord himself took special pains to make the impression upon the minds of his disciples that in his crucified body he was actually raised to life. He appealed to the testimony of their own senses: "Behold," says he, "my hands and my feet, that it is I myself; handle me, and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me here." He showed them his hands and his feet, which the nail-prints attested to be the same which had hung upon the cross. Our Lord also invited Thomas to thrust his hand into his wounded side; and, to remove the last remaining shadow of doubt from the minds of his disciples that it was he himself in the same human body, "he called for food, and he took and did eat before them" (Luke xxiv, 39–43; John xx, 27). The fact also that our Lord continued forty days upon earth after his resurrection, in the same human body in which he was crucified, shows plainly that he did not rise from the tomb in a glorified body. And the evidence is equally strong that he now dwells in heaven in a glorified body (Phil. iii, 21; Col. iii, 4).

Since this event, however, independently of its importance in respect to the internal connection of the Christian doctrine, was manifestly a miraculous occurrence, the credibility of the narrative has from the earliest times been brought into question (Celsus, apud Origen. *cont. Cels.* i, 2; Woolston, *Discourses on the Miracles*, disc. vi; Chubb, *Posth. Works*, i, 330; Morgan, *The Resurrection Considered* [1744]). Others who have admitted the facts as recorded to be beyond dispute, yet have attempted to show that Christ was not really dead, but that, being stunned and palsied, he wore for a time the appearance of death, and was afterwards restored to

consciousness by the cool grave and the spices. The refutation of these views may be seen in detail in such works as Less, *Ueber die Religion*, ii, 372; id. *Auferstehungsgeschichte, nebst Anhang* (1799); Döderlein, *Fragmente und Antifragmente* (1782). The chief advocates of these views are Paulus (*Hist. Resurrect. Jes.* [1795]), and, more recently, Henneberg (*Philol.-histor.-krit. Commentar üb. d. Gesch. d. Begräbn., d. Auferstehung u. Himmelfahrt Jesu* [1826]). "If the body of Jesus Christ," says Saurin, "were not raised from the dead, it must have been stolen away. But this theft is incredible. Who committed it? The enemies of Jesus Christ? Would they have contributed to his glory by countenancing a report of his resurrection? Would his disciples? It is probable they would not, and it is next to certain they could not. How could they have undertaken to remove the body—frail and timorous creatures, people who fled as soon as they saw him taken into custody? Even Peter, the most courageous, trembled at the voice of a servant-girl, and three times denied that he knew him. Would people of this character have dared to resist the authority of the governor? Would they have undertaken to oppose the determination of the Sanhedrim, to force a guard, and to elude, or overcome soldiers armed and aware of danger? If Jesus Christ was not risen again (I speak the language of unbelievers), he had deceived his disciples with vain hopes of his resurrection. How came the disciples not to discover the imposture? Would they have hazarded themselves by undertaking an enterprise so perilous in favor of a man who had so cruelly imposed on their credulity? But were we to grant that they formed the design of removing the body, how could they have executed it? How could soldiers, armed and on guard, suffer themselves to be overreached by a few timorous people? Either (says St. Augustine) they were asleep or awake; if they were awake, why should they suffer the body to be taken away? If asleep, how could they know that the disciples took it away? How dare they then depose that it was stolen?"

The testimony of the apostles furnishes us with arguments, and there are eight considerations which give the evidence sufficient weight. 1. The nature of these witnesses. They were not men of power, riches, eloquence, credit, to impose upon the world; they were poor and mean. 2. The number of these witnesses. (See 1 Cor. xv; Luke xxiv, 34; Mark xvi, 14; Matt. xxviii, 10.) It is not likely that a collusion should have been held among so many to support a lie, which would be of no utility to them. 3. The facts themselves which they avow: not suppositions, distant events, or events related by others, but real facts which they saw with their own eyes (1 John i). 4. The agreement of their evidence: they all deposed the same thing. 5. Observe the tribunals before which they gave evidence: Jews and heathens, philosophers and rabbins, courtiers and lawyers. If they had been impostors, the fraud certainly would have been discovered. 6. The place in which they bore their testimony. Not at a distance, where they might not easily have been detected, if false, but at Jerusalem, in the synagogues, in the prætorium. 7. The time of this testimony: not years after, but three days after, they declared he was risen; yea, before the rage of the Jews was quelled, while Calvary was yet dyed with the blood they had spilled. If it had been a fraud, it is not likely they would have come forward in such broad daylight, amid so much opposition. 8. Lastly, the motives which induced them to publish the resurrection: not to gain fame, riches, glory, profit; no, they exposed themselves to suffering and death, and proclaimed the truth from conviction of its importance and certainty.

Objections have also been raised upon the apparent discrepancies of the Gospel narratives of the event. These discrepancies were early perceived; and a view of what the fathers have done in the attempt to reconcile them has been given by Niemeyer (*De Evangelistarum in Narrando Christi in Vitam Reditu Dissensione* [1824]). They were first collocated with much acuteness by Morgan in the work already cited, and at a later date by an anonymous writer, whose fragments were edited and supported by Lessing, the object of which seems to have been to throw uncertainty and doubt over the whole of this portion of Gospel history. A numerous host of theologians, however, rose to combat and refute this writer's positions, among whom we find the names of Döderlein, Less, Semler, Teller, Maschius, Michaelis, Plessing, Eichhorn, Herder, and others. Among those who have more recently attempted to reconcile the different accounts is Griesbach, who, in his excellent *Prolusio de Fontibus unde Evangelistæ suas de Resurrectione Domini Narrationes hauserint* (1793), remarks that all the discrepancies are trifling, and not of such moment as to render the narrative uncertain and suspected, or to destroy or even diminish the credibility of the evangelists, but serve rather to show how extremely studious they were of truth, "and how closely and even scrupulously they followed their documents." Griesbach then attempts to show how these discrepancies may have arisen, and admits that, although unimportant, they are hard to reconcile, as is indeed evinced by the amount of controversy they have excited. The principal one of these discrepancies has been discussed under APPEARANCE.

For works on the general subject, besides those referred to under the preceding article, see Malcolm, *Theological Index*, s. v.; Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliog.* (see Index); and for monographs on the various points connected with our Lord's resurrection, see those cited by Volbeding, *Index Programmatum*, p. 67 sq.; and by Hase, *Leben Jesu*, p. 160, 221, 225, 227, 230; also the following: Clausenitz, *De Mortuorum Tempore Resurrect. et Chr. Resurrectione* (Hal. 1741); Kunadius, *De Sanctis Redivivis* (Viteb. 1665); Hobichhont, *De Sanctis Resurgente Christo Resurgentibus* (Ros. 1696); Schürzmann, *De Anastasi Atheniensibus pro Dea Habita* (Lips. 1708). Numerous articles on the subject are to be found in religious periodicals, among which, as the latest, we name *Journ. Sac. Lit.* Jan. 1853, Oct. 1854; *Studien u. Kritiken*, 1870, i; *Zeitschr. f. wissenchaftl. Theol.* 1863; *Theol. and Lit. Journal*, Oct. 1857, Oct. 1858; *Lond. Bib. Rev.* April, 1849; *Brit. and For. Ev. Rev.* April, 1862; *Bibl. Sacra*, June, 1852, Oct. 1860, Oct. 1869; *New-Englander*, May, 1857; *Meth. Quar. Rev.* Oct. 1873, Oct. 1877; *Christian Quar.* April, 1876; *Amer. Presb. and Theol. Rev.* July and Oct. 1867; *South. Presb. Rev.* Oct. 1860; *Mercersb. Rev.* April, 1861; *Danville Rev.* March, 1863; *Universalist Quar.* April and Oct. 1861. See JESUS CHRIST.

Reticulated Work (Lat. *opus reticulatum*=network), masonry constructed with diamond-shaped stones, or square stones placed diagonally. In the city of Rome this mode of decorating the surface of a wall is generally characteristic of the period of the early empire; it was frequently imitated in Romanesque work in the tympanum of a door-way, especially in Norman work.

Retribution, FUTURE. That man is a responsible being, and that his responsibility extends into his future state of existence, is generally admitted throughout the world. The denial of *all* punishment in a future state, rests chiefly upon the two unscriptural and contradictory dogmas—the *immaculate spirituality* and the *mortal materialism* of the human soul. The position believed to be taught in the Scriptures is this, that all sinners who do not repent and take refuge in the Saviour in the present life shall in the future state suffer everlasting punishment, as the necessary and just retribution of their sins. This doctrine, however awful it must be acknowledged by all to be, appears to be taught in the Scriptures, and has been held by very large portions of the Church in all ages. We shall not, however, depend upon this fact as a *proof*, though it affords what logicians call a *violent presumption*, that it was an original part of Christianity. We present the following as Scripture proof, and urge,

1. Those passages which declare that certain sinners shall not enter the kingdom of heaven (Matt. v, 20; vii, 13, 21–23; xviii, 3; Mark x, 23–27; Luke xiii, 24, 26; John iii, 3–5; 1 Cor. vi, 9, 10; Gal. v, 19–21; Eph. v, 5; Heb. iii, 19; iv, 1, 13). If some men, according to the language of these Scriptures, are to be excluded from heaven, they must necessarily sink to hell; for the Scriptures give us no intimation of a middle state.

2. Those passages of Scripture which describe the future and final state of men in contrast (Psa. xvii, 14, 15; Prov. x, 28; xiv, 35; Dan. xii, 2; Matt. iii, 12; vii, 13, 14, 21; viii, 11, 12; xiii, 30–43, 47–50; xxiv, 46–51; xxv, 23–46; Mark xvi, 16; Luke vi, 23, 24, 47–49; John iii, 16; v, 29; Rom. vi, 21–23; ix, 21–23; Gal. vi, 7, 8; Phil. iii, 17–21; 2 Thess. i, 5–12; 2 Tim. ii, 19, 20; Heb. vi, 8, 9; 1 Pet. iv, 18). These passages are believed to refer to the final state of man because—(1) in several of them the state is expressly called their *end*. (2) The state of the righteous and that of the wicked are put in exact opposition to each other; and if one is not final, neither is the other. (3) There is a dead silence about any succeeding state; and (4) the phraseology of some of the passages will admit of no other interpretation.

3. Those passages of Scripture which apply the terms "everlasting" "eternal," "forever," and "for ever and ever" to this future state (Dan. xii, 2; Matt. xviii, 8; xxv, 41–46; Mark iii, 29; 2 Cor. iv, 18; 2 Thess. i, 9; 2 Peter ii, 17; Jude 6, 7, 13; Rev. xiv, 10–13; xix, 3; xx, 10).

4. Those passages which express future punishment by phrases which imply its everlasting duration (Matt. x, 28; xii, 31, 32; Mark iii, 39; ix, 43–48; Luke ix, 25; xiv, 26; John iii, 36; viii, 21; xvii, 9; Phil. iii, 10; Heb. vi, 2; x, 26, 27; James ii, 13; 1 John v, 16).

5. Those passages which intimate that a change of heart and a preparation for heaven are confined to this life (Prov. i, 24–28; Isa. lv, 6, 7; Matt. xxv, 5–13; Luke xiii, 24–29; John xii, 36; 2 Cor. vi, 1, 2; Heb. iii, 1–10; xiii, 15–22; Rev. xxii, 11).

6. Those passages which foretell the consequences of rejecting the Gospel (Psa. ii, 12; Prov. xxix, 1; Acts xiii, 40–46; xx, 26; xxviii, 26, 27; Rom. x, 12; 1 Cor. i, 18; 2 Cor. ii, 15, 16; iv, 3; 1 Thess. v, 3; 2 Thess. i, 8; ii, 10–12; Heb. ii, 1–3; iv, 1–11; x, 26–31, 38, 39; xxii, 25–29; James ii, 14; 1 Pet. iv, 17, 18; 2 Pet. ii, 1–21; iii, 7). The Gospel being the only way of salvation for man (Acts iv, 12), its rejection is that of the only method of salvation. See PUNISHMENT, EVERLASTING; UNIVERSALISM.

Rettberg, FRIEDRICH WILHELM, a German theologian, was born at Cello, Aug. 21, 1805. After teaching in several small institutions, he became professor of theology at Marburg, where he died, April 7, 1849. His works are, *De Parabolis Jesu Christi* (Göttingen, 1827): —*Cyprianus nach seinem Leben und Wirken* (ibid. 1831): —*Heilslehren des Christenthums nach den Grundsätzen der lutherischen Kirche* (Leips. 1838):—*Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands* (Göttingen, 1846–48).—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.

Retz, Henri de Gondi de, a French prelate, was born at Paris in 1572. He was canon of Notre Dame, and held many rich abbeys. In 1596 he became coadjutor of his uncle, cardinal Pierre de Gondi, bishop of Paris, with the promise of succeeding to his title. He received the cardinal's hat in 1618, and, as cardinal de Retz, took part in the affairs of State. He published one work, *Ordonnances Synodales*. He was the last bishop of Paris. His death occurred at Béziers, Aug. 2, 1622. —Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.

Retz, Jean François Paul de Gondi, *Cardinal de*, often written *Rais*, a French prelate, was born at Montmirail in Oct. 1614. By birth he was a Knight of Malta, and was destined by his father for the Church, in the hope that he might succeed his uncle as archbishop of Paris. The ecclesiastical life was wholly distasteful to him, and his earlier years were spent in prodigality and excesses of all kinds; but, at the same time, he prosecuted his theological studies with great success, and received valuable benefices. He was made canon of Notre Dame in 1627, and adopted the title of abbé de Retz. His ambition and hardihood gained for him the friendship of the count de Soissons, and by the conspiracy planned by that nobleman he hoped to be released from his ecclesiastical life and enter upon a political one, which was more congenial to his intriguing nature. After the death of the count, he devoted himself with more regularity to his profession, and succeeded in gaining so great a popularity that Louis XIII, on his death-bed, appointed him coadjutor to his uncle, the bishop of Paris. In this position he gained the hearts of the people by his charities and great attention to all the outward requirements of religion. During the wars of the Fronde he rendered valuable assistance to the royal cause; but finding that he was distrusted, he finally became the secret leader of the popular party, and the greatest opponent of cardinal Mazarin. He was made cardinal in 1652, and received tempting offers of a position as ambassador of France to the Holy See; but before he had decided to accept this proposition, he was arrested by order of Louis XIV, and was kept closely confined at Vincennes. On the death of his uncle, March 21, 1654, his friends took possession of the archbishopric in his name. By resigning his claims, he succeeded in gaining a change of residence, and was removed to the Château of Nantes. He escaped from his confinement Aug. 8, 1654, and after many adventures reached Spain. Philip IV offered him an escort, and he immediately hastened to Rome, where he declared himself archbishop of Paris, the pope having refused to acknowledge his resignation. Retz subsequently travelled through Europe; and having been prohibited by Louis XIV from occupying his archbishopric in person, he governed it by vicars and subordinates until 1662, when he formally resigned all claim to it in consideration of receiving other valuable benefices. He was reconciled to the king, and received permission to establish himself at Commercy, where he kept up a petty state, and occupied himself in study and works of charity. He died at Paris, Aug. 24, 1679. His writings are chiefly political, and as such are not of interest here. But his greatest work is his *Mémoires*, composed during his years of retirement. They were first published in 1717, and have been translated into several foreign languages. See *Mémoires du Cardinal de Retz; Lettres de Madame de Sévigné;* Voltaire, *Siècle de Louis XIV.*—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.

Retz, Pierre de Gondi de, a French cardinal, was born at Lyons in 1533. After entering the ecclesiastical life, he received many favors from Catherine de' Medici, and advanced rapidly. He was made bishop of Langres in 1565, and was transferred to the see of Paris in 1570, and became grand-almoner, chancellor, and chief of the council of Charles IX. He was several times ambassador to the Holy See, and in 1587 was created cardinal. He refused to take the oath of allegiance, and explained his reasons in a letter, to which the writers of the League replied with passion. In 1592 he was sent by Henry IV on an embassy to the pope. He died Feb. 17, 1616. Retz was an honest but parsimonious man, and possessed little genuine talent.—*Biog. Universelle*, s. v.

Re'ü (Heb. *Reü'*, רְעוּ, *friend;* Sept. Ῥαγαῦ v. r. Ῥαγαύ, 1 Chron. i, 25), the son of Peleg and father of Serug in the Abrahamic ancestry (Gen. xi, 18, 21; 1 Chron. i, 25). B.C. cir. 1950. He is called *Ragau* in Luke iii, 35. He lived 239 years. "Bunsen (*Bibelwerk*) says Reu is *Roha*, the Arabic name for Edessa, an assertion which, borrowed from Knobel, is utterly destitute of foundation, as will be seen at once on comparing the Hebrew and Arabic words. A closer resemblance might

be found between Reu and *Rhagæ*, a large town of Media, especially if the Greek equivalents of the two names be taken"

Reu'ben (Heb. *Reüben'*, רְאוּבֵן, *see a son* [see below]; Sept. and New Test. Ῥουβήν), the name of one of the Jewish patriarchs and of the tribe descended from him. The following account is chiefly compiled from the Scriptural statements. See JACOB.

1. Reuben was Jacob's first-born child (Gen. xxix, 32), the son of Leah, apparently an unexpected fruit of the marriage (ver. 31; Josephus, *Ant.* i, 19, 8). B.C. 1919. This is perhaps denoted by the name itself, whether we adopt the obvious signification of its present form — *reü'bên*, i. e. "behold ye, a son!" (Gesen. *Thesaur.* p. 1247 b)—or the explanation given in the text, which seems to imply that the original form was רָאוֹ בְעָנְיִי, *raû bĕonyî*, "Jehovah hath *seen my affliction*," or that of Josephus, who uniformly presents it as *Roubel* (Ῥούβηλος, so also in *Ant.* ii, 3, 1), and explains it (*Ant.* i, 19, 8) as the "pity of God"—ἔλεον τοῦ Θεοῦ, as if from רָאוּר בְּאֵל (Fürst, *Heb. Lex.* p. 1269). The Peshito (*Rûbil*) and the Arabic version of Joshua agree with this last form. Redslob (*Die alttestamentl. Namen*, p. 86) maintains that Reubel is the original form of the name, which was corrupted into Reuben, as Bethel into the modern Beitin, and Jezreel into Zerin. He treats it as signifying the "flock of Bel," a deity whose worship greatly flourished in the neighboring country of Moab, and who under the name of Nebo had a famous sanctuary in the very territory of Reuben. In this case it would be a parallel to the title, "people of Chemosh," which is bestowed on Moab. The alteration of the obnoxious syllable in Reu*bel* would, on this theory, find a parallel in the Merib*baal* and Esh*baal* of Saul's family, who became Mephi*bosheth* and Ish*bosheth*. But all this is evidently fanciful and arbitrary.

The notices of the patriarch Reuben in the book of Genesis and the early Jewish traditional literature are unusually frequent, and on the whole give a favorable view of his disposition. To him, and him alone, the preservation of Joseph's life appears to have been due. B.C. 1895. His anguish at the disappearance of his brother, and the frustration of his kindly artifice for delivering him (Gen. xxxvii, 22); his recollection of the minute details of the painful scene many years afterwards (xlii, 22); his offer to take the sole responsibility of the safety of the brother who had succeeded to Joseph's place in the family (ver. 37), all testify to a warm and (for those rough times) a kindly nature. We are, however, to remember that he, as the eldest son, was more responsible for the safety of Joseph than were the others, and it would seem that he eventually acquiesced in the deception practiced upon his father. Subsequently Reuben offered to make the lives of his own sons responsible for that of Benjamin, when it was necessary to prevail on Jacob to let him go down to Egypt (vers. 37, 38). The fine conduct of Judah in afterwards undertaking the same responsibility is in advantageous contrast with this coarse, although well-meant, proposal. For his adulterous and incestuous conduct in the matter of Bilhah, Jacob in his last blessing deprived him of the pre-eminence and double portion which belonged to his birthright, assigning the former to Judah and the latter to Joseph (xlix, 3, 4; comp. vers. 8–10; xlviii, 5). Of this repulsive crime we know from the Scriptures only the fact (xxxv, 22). In the post-Biblical traditions it is treated either as not having actually occurred (as in the Targum Pseudo-Jonathan), or else as the result of a sudden temptation acting on a hot and vigorous nature (as in the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs)—a parallel, in some of its circumstances, to the intrigue of David with Bathsheba. Some severe temptation there must surely have been to impel Reuben to an act which, regarded in its social rather than in its moral aspect, would be peculiarly abhorrent to a patriarchal society, and which is specially and repeatedly reprobated in the law of Moses. The Rabbinical version of the occurrence (as given in the Targum Pseudo-Jonathan) is very characteristic, and well illustrates the difference between the spirit of early and of late Jewish history. "Reuben went and disordered the couch of Bilhah, his father's concubine, which was placed right opposite the couch of Leah, and it was counted unto him as if he had lain with her. And when Israel heard it, it displeased him, and he said, Lo! an unworthy person shall proceed from me, as Ishmael did from Abraham, and Esau from my father. And the Holy Spirit answered him and said, All are righteous, and there is not one unworthy among them." Reuben's anxiety to save Joseph is represented as arising from a desire to conciliate Jacob, and his absence while Joseph was sold, from his sitting alone on the mountains in penitent fasting. These traits, slight as they are, are those of an ardent, impetuous, unbalanced, but not ungenerous, nature; not crafty and cruel, as were Simeon and Levi, but rather, to use the metaphor of the dying patriarch, boiling up (פַּזְתָּ, A.V. "unstable," Gen. xlix, 4) like a vessel of water over the rapid wood-fire of the nomad tent, and as quickly subsiding into apathy when the fuel was withdrawn.

2. *The Tribe of Reuben.*—At the time of the migration into Egypt (or rather at the time of Jacob's decease), Reuben's sons were four (Gen. xlvi, 9; 1 Chron. v, 3). From them sprang the chief families of the tribe (Numb. xxvi, 5–11). One of these families—that of Pallu—became notorious as producing Eliab, whose sons or descendants, Dathan and Abiram, perished with their kinsman On in the divine retribution for their conspiracy against Moses (xvi, 1; xxvi, 8–11). The census at Mount Sinai (i, 20, 21; ii, 11) shows that at the Exodus the numbers of the tribe were 46,500 men above twenty years of age, and fit for active warlike service. In point of numerical strength, Reuben was then sixth on the list, Gad, with 45,650 men, being next below. On the borders of Canaan, after the plague which punished the idolatry of Baal-peor, the numbers had fallen slightly, and were 43,730; Gad was 40,500; and the position of the two in the list is lower than before, Ephraim and Simeon being the only two smaller tribes (xxvi, 7, etc.). During the journey through the wilderness the position of Reuben was on the south side of the Tabernacle. The "camp" which went under his name was formed of his own tribe, that of Simeon (Leah's second son), and that of Gad (son of Zilpah, Leah's slave). The standard of the camp was a deer with the inscription, "Hear, O Israel! the Lord thy God is one Lord!" and its place in the march was second (Targum Pseudo-Jonathan [Numb. ii, 10–16]).

The Reubenites, like their relatives and neighbors on the journey, the Gadites, had maintained through the march to Canaan the ancient calling of their forefathers. The patriarchs were "feeding their flocks" at Shechem when Joseph was sold into Egypt. It was as men whose "trade had been about cattle from their youth" that they were presented to Pharaoh (Gen. xlvi, 32, 34), and in the land of Goshen they settled "with their flocks and herds and all that they had" (ver. 32; xlvii, 1). Their cattle accompanied them in their flight from Egypt (Exod. xii, 38); not a hoof was left behind; and there are frequent allusions to them on the journey (xxxiv, 3; Numb. xi, 22; Deut. viii, 13, etc.). But it would appear that the tribes who were destined to settle in the confined territory between the Mediterranean and the Jordan had, during the journey through the wilderness, fortunately relinquished that taste for the possession of cattle which they could not have maintained after their settlement at a distance from the wide pastures of the wilderness. Thus the cattle had come into the hands of Reuben, Gad, and the half of Manasseh (Numb. xxxii, 1), and it followed naturally that when the na-

tion arrived on the open downs east of the Jordan, the three tribes just named should prefer a request to their leader to be allowed to remain in a place so perfectly suited to their requirements. The country east of Jordan does not appear to have been included in the original land promised to Abraham. That which the spies examined was comprised, on the east and west, between the "coast of Jordan" and "the sea." But for the pusillanimity of the greater number of the tribes it would have been entered from the south (xiii, 30), and in that case the east of Jordan might never have been peopled by Israel at all. Accordingly, when the Reubenites and their fellows approach Moses with their request, his main objection is that by what they propose they will discourage the hearts of the children of Israel from going over Jordan into the land which Jehovah had given them (xxxii, 7). It is only on their undertaking to fulfil their part in the conquest of the western country, the land of Canaan proper, and thus satisfying him that their proposal was grounded in no selfish desire to escape a full share of the difficulties of the conquest, that Moses will consent to their proposal.

The "blessing" of Reuben by the departing lawgiver is a passage which has severely exercised translators and commentators. Strictly translated as they stand in the received Hebrew text, the words are as follows:

"Let Reuben live, and not die,
And let his men be a [small] number."

As to the first line there appears to be no doubt, but the second line has been interpreted in two exactly opposite ways. 1. By the Sept.,

"And let his men be many in number."

This has the disadvantage that מְסָפָר is never employed elsewhere for a large number, but always for a small one (e. g. 1 Chron. xvi, 19; Job xvi, 22; Isa. x, 19; Ezek. xii, 16). 2. That of our own A. V.,

"And let *not* his men be few."

Here the negative of the first line is presumed to convey its force to the second, though not there expressed. This is countenanced by the ancient Syriac version (Peshito) and the translations of Junius and Tremellius, and Schott and Winzer. It also has the important support of Gesenius (*Thesaur.* p. 968 a, and *Pent. Sam.* p. 44). It is, however, a very violent rendering. 3. A third and very ingenious interpretation is that adopted by the Veneto-Greek version, and also by Michaelis (*Bibel für Ungelehrten*, Text), which assumes that the vowel-points of the word מְתָיו, "his men," should be altered to מֵתָיו, "his dead"—

"And let his dead be few"—

as if in allusion to some recent mortality in the tribe, such as that in Simeon after the plague of Baal-peor. These interpretations, unless the last should prove to be the original reading, originate in the fact that the words in their naked sense convey a curse, and not a blessing. Fortunately, though differing widely in detail, they agree in general meaning. The benediction of the great leader goes out over the tribe which was about to separate itself from its brethren, in a fervent aspiration for its welfare through all the risks of that remote and trying situation. Both in this and the earlier blessing of Jacob, Reuben retains his place at the head of the family, and it must not be overlooked that the tribe, together with the two who associated themselves with it, actually received its inheritance before either Judah or Ephraim, to whom the birthright which Reuben had forfeited was transferred (1 Chron. v, 1).

From this time it seems as if a bar, not only the material one of distance, and of the intervening river and mountain-wall, but also of difference in feeling and habits, gradually grew up more substantially between the Eastern and Western tribes. The first act of the former after the completion of the conquest, and after they had taken part in the solemn ceremonial in the valley between Ebal and Gerizim, shows how wide a gap already existed between their ideas and those of the Western tribes. The pile of stones which they erected on the western bank of the Jordan to mark their boundary—to testify to after-ages that, though separated by the rushing river from their brethren and the country in which Jehovah had fixed the place where he would be worshipped, they had still a right to return to it for his worship—was erected in accordance with the unalterable habits of Bedouin tribes both before and since. It was an act identical with that in which Laban and Jacob engaged at parting, with that which is constantly performed by the Bedouin of the present day. But by the Israelites west of Jordan, who were fast relinquishing their nomad habits and feelings for those of more settled permanent life, this act was completely misunderstood, and was construed into an attempt to set up a rival altar to that of the sacred tent. The incompatibility of the idea to the mind of the Western Israelites is shown by the fact that, notwithstanding the disclaimer of the two and a half tribes, and notwithstanding that disclaimer having proved satisfactory even to Phinehas, the author of Joshua xxii retains the name *mizbêach* for the *pile*, a word which involves the idea of sacrifice—i. e. of *slaughter* (see Gesenius, *Thesaur.* p. 402)—instead of applying to it the term *gal*, as is done in the case (Gen. xxxi, 46) of the precisely similar "heap of witness." Another Reubenitish erection, which long kept up the memory of the presence of the tribe on the west of Jordan, was the stone of Bohan ben-Reuben which formed a landmark on the boundary between Judah and Benjamin (Josh. xv, 6). This was a single stone (*Eben*), not a pile, and it appears to have stood somewhere on the road from Bethany to Jericho, not far from the ruined khan so well known to travellers.

The doom, "Thou shalt not excel," was exactly fulfilled in the destinies of the tribe descended from Reuben, which makes no figure in the Hebrew history, and never produced any eminent person. No judge, no prophet, no hero of the tribe of Reuben is handed down to us, unless it be "Adina the Reubenite, a captain of the Reubenites, and thirty with him" (1 Chron. xi, 42). In the dire extremity of their brethren in the north under Deborah and Barak, they contented themselves with debating the news among the streams (פַּלְגֵי) of the Mishor. The distant distress of his brethren could not move Reuben: he lingered among his sheepfolds, and preferred the shepherd's pipe and the bleating of the flocks to the clamor of the trumpet and the turmoil of battle. His individuality fades more rapidly than Gad's. The eleven valiant Gadites who swam the Jordan at its highest, to join the son of Jesse in his trouble (1 Chron. xii, 8–15); Barzillai; Elijah the Gileadite; the siege of Ramoth-gilead, with its picturesque incidents—all give a substantial reality to the tribe and country of Gad. But no person, no incident, is recorded to place Reuben before us in any distincter form than as a member of the community (if community it can be called) of "the Reubenites, the Gadites, and the half-tribe of Manasseh" (ver. 37). The very towns of his inheritance—Heshbon, Aroer, Kirjathaim, Dibon, Baal-meon, Sibmah, Jazer—are familiar to us as Moabitish, and not as Israelitish, towns. The city life so characteristic of Moabitish civilization had no hold on the Reubenites. They are most in their element when engaged in continual broils with the children of the desert, the Bedouin tribes of Hagar, Jetur, Nephish, Nodab; driving off their myriads of cattle, asses, camels; dwelling *in their tents*, as if to the manner born (v, 10), gradually spreading over the vast wilderness which extends from Jordan to the Euphrates (ver. 9), and every day receding further and further from any community of feeling or of interest with the Western tribes. See MOAB. Thus remote from the central seat

of the national government and of the national religion, it is not to be wondered at that Reuben relinquished the faith of Jehovah. "They went after the gods of the people of the land whom God destroyed before them," and we hear little more of them till the time of Hazael, king of Syria, who ravaged and for a time held possession of their country (2 Kings x, 33). The last historical notice which we possess of them, while it records this fact, records also as its natural consequence, that the Reubenites and Gadites and the half-tribe of Manasseh were carried off by Pul and Tiglath-pileser, and placed in the districts on and about the river Khabûr, in the upper part of Mesopotamia—"in Halah, and Habor, and Hara, and the river Gozan" (1 Chron. v, 26).

The following is a list of all the Biblical localities in the tribe of Reuben, with their probable identifications. For the boundaries, see TRIBE.

Abarim.	Mountains.	*El-Belka.*
Almon-diblathaim.	Town.	[N. of Dhiban]?
Arnon.	River.	*Mojeb.*
Aroer.	Town.	*Arair.*
Ashdoth-pisgah.	Brooks.	See PISGAH.
Ataroth.	Town.	*Atarus.*
Baal-meon.	do.	*Main.*
Bajith.	do.	See BAAL-MEON.
Bamoth (-baal).	Hill (=Misgab?).	[*Jebel Humeh*]?
Beer (-elim).	Well.	[On Seil Hadan]?
Beon.	Town.	See BAAL-MEON.
Beth-baal-meon.	do.	See BAAL-MEON.
Beth-diblathaim.	do.	See ALMON-DIBLATHAIM.
Beth-jeshimoth.	do.	*Beit-Jismuth*?
Beth-meon.	do.	See BAAL-MEON.
Beth-peor.	Temple.	[N. W. of Hesban]?
Bezer.	Town.	[*Burazin*]?
Dibon [or Dimon].	do.	*Dhiban.*
Elealeh.	do.	*El-Al.*
Heshbon.	do.	*Hesban.*
Jahaz.	do.	[*Khan es-Shib*]?
Kedemoth.	do.	[*Ed-Duleilat*]?
Kirjathaim.	do.	*Kureyat*?
Lasha.	do.	See CALLIRRHOË.
Mattanah.	do.	[In plain Ard Ramadan]?
Medeba.	do.	*Medaba.*
Mephaath.	do.	[*Em el-Weled*]?
Minnith.	do.	*Minyah.*
Misgab.	do.	See BAMOTH.
Nahaliel.	do.	[N. of Wady Maleh]?
Nebo.	Mount.	*Jebel Neba.*
Nophah.	Town.	[*El-Habeis*]?
Pisgah.	Mount.	See NEBO.
Shebem, Shebman, or Sibmah.	Town.	[*Es-Sameh*]?
Zareth-shahar.	do.	*Zara*?
Zophim.	Field.	[Plain of Medeba]?

The country allotted to the Reubenites extended on the south to the river Arnon, which divided it from the Moabites (Josh. xiii, 8, 16); on the east it touched the desert of Arabia; on the west were the Dead Sea and the Jordan. The northern border was probably marked by a line running eastward from the Jordan through Wady Hesban (vers. 17–21; Numb. xxxii, 37, 38). This country had originally been conquered and occupied by the Moabites; but they were driven out a short time before the Exodus by Sihon, king of the Amorites, who was in his turn expelled by the Israelites (Deut. ii; Numb. xxi, 22–31). Immediately after the captivity the Moabites again returned to their old country and occupied their old cities. This is the reason why, in the later prophets, many of the cities of Reuben are embraced in the curses pronounced upon Moab (Jer. xlviii). The territory was divided into sections—the western declivities towards the Dead Sea and the Jordan valley, which were steep, rugged, and bare, with the little section of the lower plain of Jordan (called in Scripture "the plains of Moab" [Numb. xxii, 1]) at their base; and the high table-land stretching from the summit of the ridge away towards Arabia. The latter, from its even surface, as contrasted with the rocky soil of Western Palestine, received from the accurate sacred writers the appropriate name Mishor (q. v.). Under its modern name of the *Belka* it is still esteemed beyond all others by the Arab sheepmasters. It is well watered, covered with smooth, short turf, and losing itself gradually in those illimitable wastes which have always been, and always will be, the favorite resort of pastoral nomad tribes. The whole region is now deserted; there is not a single settled inhabitant within its borders. Its great cities, mostly bearing their ancient names, are heaps of ruins. The wild wandering tribes of the desert visit it periodically to feed their flocks and herds on its rich pastures, and to drink the waters of its fountains and cisterns. See Burckhardt, *Travels in Syria*, p. 365 sq.; Irby and Mangles, *Travels*, p. 460 sq.; Porter, *Hand-book for Syria*, p. 298 sq.

Map of the Tribe of Reuben.

Reu'benite (Heb. with the art. *ha-Reubeny'*, הָרְאוּבֵנִי; Sept. Ῥουβήν, occasionally *οἱ υἱοὶ* Ῥουβήν or Ῥουβηνί), a descendant of Reuben (Numb. xxvi, 7, etc.).

Reuchlin, JOHANN VON, an eminent German scholar, who adopted the Græcized name of *Capnio*, was born at Pforzheim in 1454. After serving in different political functions, he became, in 1520, professor of Greek and Hebrew at Ingolstadt, whence he removed to Tübingen, thence to Stuttgart, where he died, Dec. 28, 1521. Besides his memorable services in connection with classical literature and general culture, he may be regarded as the principal promoter of the study of Hebrew in his day. He published a Hebrew grammar and lexicon under the title *Ad Dionysium Fratrem suum de Rudimentis Hebraicis Libri III* (s. l. 1506, 4to), of which an improved edition, by Seb. Münster, appeared in 1537 (Basel, fol.). Reuchlin wrote also *De Accentibus et Orthographia Ling. Heb.* (Hagenau, 1518, 4to).

Reü'el (Heb. רְעוּאֵל, *friend of God;* Sept. Ῥαγουήλ; A. V. *Raguel* [Numb. x, 29]), the name of three or four men.

1. A son of Esau by Bashemath (Gen. xxxvi, 4, 10; 1 Chron. i, 35, 37); his four sons (Gen. xxxvi, 13) were princes, i. e. chiefs of the Edomites (ver. 17). B.C. post 1963. See ESAU.

2. A Midianitish priest and nomadic herdsman in the wilderness, to whom Moses fled from Egypt, and whose daughter Zipporah he married (Exod. ii, 16 sq.); but in Exod. iii, 1; iv, 18, JETHRO is called father-in-law of Moses, and in iii, 1 is made priest and herdsman. Various methods are suggested for meeting the difficulty: (1.) Josephus (*Ant.* ii, 12, 1) considers Reuel and Jethro as two names of one man. So Lengerke (*Kenaan*, i, 393) and Bertheau (*Isr. Gesch.* p. 242). (2.) Aben-Ezra, followed by Rosenmüller, understands by *father* in Exod. ii, 18, *grandfather*. (3.) Ewald (*Isr. Gesch.* ii, 14) thinks "Jethro son of" has fallen out of the text before Reuel in Exod. ii, 18. (4.) Ranke (*Pentat.* ii, 8) understands the word *chothen'*, חֹתֵן, rendered father-in-law, to mean brother-in-law, and compares the ambiguous use of the Greek γαμβρός. We must then suppose that Jethro had succeeded to the priesthood and flocks of his deceased father (Exod. iii, 1). (5.) Others find a

double genealogical tradition (Hartmann, *Pentat.* p. 223 sq.; comp. De Wette, *Einleit. ins A. T.* p. 196). On this supposition the "compiler" must have been very careless. The third explanation derives no support from the fact that the Sept., in Exod. ii, 16, twice mentions Jethro as father of seven daughters. The translators might have considered Reuel as the grandfather, and this would support No. 2. The fourth supposition is forced. If we must decide for any particular view, it seems simplest to understand *grandfather* for father (Exod. ii, 18), since Reuel was the father of the house until Jethro acquired independence. See HOBAB; RAGUEL.

3. Father of Eliasaph, the leader of the tribe of Gad at the time of the census at Sinai (Numb. ii, 14). In the parallel passages (i, 14; vii, 42, 47; x, 20) the name is given DEUEL (q. v.).

4. Son of Ibnijah, father of Shephatiah (1 Chron. ix, 8), of the tribe of Benjamin. B.C. ante 1618.

Reü'mah (Heb. *Reümah'*, רְאוּמָה, *elevated* [Gesen.], or *pearl* [Fürst]; Sept. Ῥεσμά), a concubine of Nahor, Abraham's brother; and by him mother of Tebah and others (Gen. xxii, 24). B.C. cir. 2040.

Reuss, BENIGNA VON (*Countess*), a German hymnist, was born at Ebersdorf Dec. 15, 1695, where she also died, Aug. 1, 1751. She was a sister of count Henry XXIX of Reuss-Ebersdorf, and of the countess Erdmuth Dorothea, wife of count von Zinzendorf. She was a godly woman, and wrote some hymns, one of which has been translated into English: *Komm Segen aus der Höhe* (Engl. transl. in *Sacred Lyrics from the German*, p. 155, "Attend, O Lord, my daily toil"). (B. P.)

Reuterdahl, HENRIK, a Swedish Protestant divine, was born in 1795 at Malmö, in Sweden. He studied at Lund, and in 1817 commenced lecturing as "privat docent" of theology. In 1824 he was made adjunct to the theological faculty, in 1826 prefect of the seminary, in 1827 member of the chapter, in 1838 librarian, and in 1844 professor of theology at Lund. In 1852 he was appointed state-councillor and head of the department for religious matters, which position he occupied till 1855, when he was made bishop of Lund, and in 1856 archbishop of Upsala. He died in 1870. He wrote, *On the Study of Theology* (Lund, 1834):—*Introduction to Theology* (ibid. 1837):—*History of the Swedish Church* (ibid. 1838–63, 3 vols.). Besides, he also published since 1828 the *Theologisk Quartalskrift*, and continued the *Apparatus ad Historiam Suedo-Gothicam*, commenced by Celse. His *De Fontibus Historiæ Ecclesiasticæ Eusebianæ*, published in 1826, in 4 pts., is still of great value. See Winer, *Handbuch der theologischen Literatur*, i, 833, 892, ii, 730; Zuchold, *Bibl. Theol.* ii, 1059 sq. (B. P.)

Reval-Esthonian Version OF THE SCRIPTURES. This version, which is used by the inhabitants of the north of Livonia, including the three adjacent islands of Oesel, Dagden (or Dagöe), and Mohn, was first printed at Reval in 1739, and partly published at the expense of the celebrated count Zinzendorf. In 1815, through the zeal of Dr. Paterson, and the aid afforded by the British and Foreign Bible Society, an edition of 10,000 copies of the New Test. was printed. Prior to 1824 the Russian Bible Society published 5100 copies of the Old Test., and some recent editions have been issued at Dorpat. Of late the American Bible Society has undertaken the publication of the whole Bible in the Reval-Esthonian, now printing at Berlin, which is probably now ready, having the previous year (1876) issued an edition of 20,000 copies of the New Test., with the Psalms, in 12mo. We subjoin the Lord's Prayer in that dialect, from Dalton's *Das Gebet des Herrn in den Sprachen Russlands*, p. 65: "Meie iza, kes sa oled taewas, pühitsetud sägu sinu nimi, sinu rïk tulgu, sine tahtmine sündigu kui taewas nenda kä mä peal; meie igapäewane leib anna meile täna-päew; ja anna andeks meile meie wõlad, kui kä meie andeks anname oma wõlglastele; ja ära säda meid mitte kiuzatuze sisse, waid peasta meid ära kurjast; sest sinu päralt on rïk, ja wägi ja au igaweste. Amen." See *Bible of Every Land*, p. 330 sq.; Dalton, *Das Gebet des Herrn in den Sprachen Russlands*, p. 25 sq., 65; *Annual Reports of the American Bible Society*, 1876, 1877. (B. P.)

Revelation (ἀποκάλυψις), a disclosure of something that was before unknown; and divine revelation is the direct communication of truths before unknown from God to men. The disclosure may be made by dream, vision, oral communication, or otherwise (Dan. ii, 19; 1 Cor. xiv, 26; 2 Cor. xii, 1; Gal. i, 12; Rev. i, 1). Revelation is not to be confounded with *inspiration*. The former refers to those things only of which the sacred writers were ignorant before they were divinely taught, while the latter has a more general meaning. Accordingly revelation may be defined that operation of the Holy Spirit by which truths before unknown are communicated to men; and inspiration, the operation of the Holy Spirit by which not only unknown truths are communicated, but by which also men are excited to publish truths for the instruction of others, and are guarded from all error in doing it. Thus it was revealed to the ancient prophets that the Messiah should appear, and they were inspired to publish the fact for the benefit of others. The affecting scenes at the cross of Christ were not revealed to John, for he saw them with his own eyes (John xix, 35); but he was inspired to write a history of this event, and by supernatural guidance was kept from all error in his record. It is therefore true, as the apostle affirms, that every part of the Bible is given by inspiration of God (2 Tim. iii, 16), though every part of the Bible is not the result of immediate revelation. For convenience' sake, we call the whole Bible a revelation from God, because most of the truths it contains were made known by direct communication from God, and could have been discovered in no other way; and generally it is only the incidental circumstances attending the communication of these truths that would be ascertained by the writers in the ordinary modes of obtaining information.

Concerning a divine revelation, we remark that, 1. It is possible. God may, for aught we know, think proper to make known to his creatures what they before were ignorant of; and, as a Being of infinite power, he cannot be at a loss for means of communication. 2. It is desirable; for while reason is necessary to examine the matter of revelation, it is incapable, unaided, of finding out God. 3. It is necessary; for without it we can attain to no certain knowledge of God, of Christ, and of salvation. 4. Revelation must, to answer its ends, be sufficiently marked with internal and external evidences. These the Bible has. 5. Its contents must be agreeable to reason. Not that everything revealed must be within the range of reason; but this may be true, and yet there be no contradiction. To calm, dispassionate reason there is nothing in doctrine, command, warning, promises, or threatenings which is opposed thereto. 6. It must be credible; and we find the facts of Scripture supported by abundant evidence from friend and foe. 7. Revelation also must necessarily bear the prevailing impress of the circumstances and tastes of the times and nations in which it was originally given. The Bible, however, though it bears the distinct impress of Asiatic manners, as it should do, is most remarkable for rising above all local and temporary peculiarities, and seizing on the great principles common to human nature under all circumstances; thus showing that as it is intended for universal benefit, so will it be made known to all mankind. The language of the Bible is the language of men, otherwise it would not be a divine revelation to men. It is to be understood by the same means and according to the same laws by which all other human language is understood. It is addressed to the common-sense of men, and common-sense is to be consulted in its interpretation

In a narrower sense, "revelation" is used to express the manifestation of Jesus Christ to Jews and Gentiles (Luke ii, 32); the manifestation of the glory with which God will glorify his elect and faithful servants at the last judgment (Rom. viii, 19), and the declaration of his just judgments in his conduct both towards the elect and towards the reprobate (ii, 5-16). There is a very noble application of the word revelation to the consummation of all things, or the revelation of Jesus Christ in his future glory (1 Cor. i, 7; 1 Pet. i, 13). See Brown, *Compendium of Natural and Revealed Religion;* Archbp. Campbell, *On Revelation;* Delany, *Revelation Examined;* Ellis, *On Divine Things;* Fuller, *Works;* Horne, *Introduction;* Leland, *Necessity of Revelation; View of Deistical Writers.* See INSPIRATION; MIRACLES; PROPHECY.

REVELATION, BOOK OF. This, the last of the books of the New Test., according to their usual arrangement, is entitled in the A. V. "The Revelation (*Ἀποκάλυψις, Apocalypse*) of [St.] John the Divine (*τοῦ Θεολόγου*)," but in Codices Alex., Sinait., and Ephr. Rescrip. it is simply *Ἀποκάλυψις Ἰωάννου*; and in Cod. Vat. it takes the fuller and more explicit form of *Ἀποκάλυψις Ἰωάννου Θεολόγου καὶ Εὐαγγελιστοῦ*, thus clearly identifying the author with the writer of the fourth gospel. The true and authoritative title of the book, however, is that which it bears in its own commencing words, *Ἀποκάλυψις Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*; which has been restored by Tregelles in his critical edition of 1844, and which has been adopted by most of the critical authorities and versions since.

I. *Canonical Authority and Authorship.*—These two points are intimately connected with each other. If it can be proved that a book, claiming so distinctly as this does the authority of divine inspiration, was actually written by John, then no doubt will be entertained as to its title to a place in the canon of Scripture. Was, then, John the apostle and evangelist the writer of the Revelation? This question was first mooted by Dionysius of Alexandria (Eusebius, *H. E.* vii, 25). The doubt which he modestly suggested has been confidently proclaimed in modern times by Luther (*Vorrede auf die Offenbarung*, 1522 and 1534), and widely diffused through his influence. Lücke (*Einleitung*, p. 802), the most learned and diligent of modern critics of the Revelation, agrees with a majority of the eminent scholars of Germany in denying that John was the author. But the general belief of the mass of Christians in all ages has been in favor of John's authorship.

1. *Evidence in Favor of the Apostolic Authorship.*—This consists of the assertions of the author and historical tradition.

(1.) The author's description of himself in the first and twenty-second chapters is certainly equivalent to an assertion that he is the apostle. (*a*) He names himself simply John, without prefix or addition—a name which at that period, and in Asia, must have been taken by every Christian as the designation, in the first instance, of the great apostle who dwelt at Ephesus. Doubtless there were other Johns among the Christians at that time, but only arrogance or an intention to deceive could account for the assumption of this simple style by any other writer. He is also described as (*b*) a servant of Christ, (*c*) one who had borne testimony as an eye-witness of the word of God and of the testimony of Christ—terms which were surely designed to identify him with the writer of the verses John xix, 35; i, 14; and 1 John i, 2. He is (*d*) in Patmos for the word of God and the testimony of Jesus Christ: it may be easy to suppose that other Christians of the same name were banished thither, but the apostle is the only John who is distinctly named in early history as an exile at Patmos. He is also (*e*) a fellow-sufferer with those whom he addresses, and (*f*) the authorized channel of the most direct and important communication that was ever made to the seven churches of Asia, of which churches John the apostle was at that time the spiritual governor and teacher. Lastly (*g*), the writer was a fellow-servant of angels and a brother of prophets—titles which are far more suitable to one of the chief apostles, and far more likely to have been assigned to him than to any other man of less distinction. All these marks are found united together in the apostle John, and in him alone of all historical persons. We must go out of the region of fact into the region of conjecture to find such another person. A candid reader of the Revelation, if previously acquainted with John's other writings and life, must inevitably conclude that the writer intended to be identified with John. It is strange to see so able a critic as Lücke (*Einleitung*, p. 514) meeting this conclusion with the conjecture that some Asiatic disciple and namesake of the apostle may have written the book in the course of some missionary labors or some time of sacred retirement in Patmos. Equally unavailing against this conclusion is the objection brought by Ewald, Credner, and others, from the fact that a promise of the future blessedness of the apostles is implied in xviii, 20 and xxi, 14; as if it were inconsistent with the true modesty and humility of an apostle to record—as Daniel of old did in much plainer terms (Dan. xii, 13)—a divine promise of salvation to himself personally. Rather those passages may be taken as instances of the writer quietly accepting as his just due such honorable mention as belongs to all the apostolic company. Unless we are prepared to give up the veracity and divine origin of the whole book, and to treat the writer's account of himself as a mere fiction of a poet trying to cover his own insignificance with an honored name, we must accept that description as a plain statement of fact, equally credible with the rest of the book, and in harmony with the simple, honest, truthful character which is stamped on the face of the whole narrative.

Besides this direct assertion of John's authorship, there is also an implication of it running through the book. Generally, the instinct of single-minded, patient, faithful students has led them to discern a connection between the Revelation and John's gospel and epistles, and to recognise, not merely the same Spirit as the source of this and other books of Holy Scripture, but also the same peculiarly formed human instrument employed both in producing this book and the fourth gospel, and in speaking the characteristic words and performing the characteristic actions recorded of John. This evidence is set forth at great length and with much force and eloquence by J. P. Lange in his essay on the connection between the individuality of the apostle John and that of the Apocalypse, 1838 (*Vermischte Schriften*, ii, 173-231). After investigating the peculiar features of the apostle's character and position, and (in reply to Lücke) the personal traits shown by the writer of the Revelation, he concludes that the book is a mysterious but genuine effusion of prophecy under the New Test., imbued with the spirit of the Gospel, the product of a spiritual gift so peculiar, so great and noble, that it can be ascribed to the apostle John alone. The Revelation requires for its writer John, just as his peculiar genius requires for its utterance a revelation. This special character of the Apocalypse as an inspired production under remarkably vivid circumstances is the true key to its diction, which certainly exhibits many striking differences as compared with John's other well-accredited writings. At the same time, there are not a few marked coincidences in the phraseology. Both of these points have been developed at great length by the writers above named and by others in their commentaries and introductions, to which we must refer the reader for details. Arguments of this nature are always inconclusive as to authorship, and we therefore rest the conclusion upon evidence of a more palpable character. (See § iii below.)

(2.) The historical testimonies in favor of John's authorship are singularly distinct and numerous, and

there is very little to weigh against them. (*a.*) Justin Martyr (cir. A.D. 150) says: "A man among us whose name was John, one of the apostles of Christ, in a revelation which was made to him, prophesied that the believers in our Christ shall live a thousand years in Jerusalem" (*Tryph.* § 81, p. 179, ed. Ben.). (*b.*) The author of the Muratorian Fragment (cir. A.D. 170) speaks of John as the writer of the Apocalypse, and describes him as a predecessor of Paul, i. e. as Credner and Lücke candidly interpret it, his predecessor in the office of apostle. (*c.*) Melito of Sardis (cir. A.D. 170) wrote a treatise on the Revelation of John. Eusebius (*H. E.* iv, 26) mentions this among the books of Melito which had come to his knowledge; and as he carefully records objections against the apostle's authorship, it may be fairly presumed, notwithstanding the doubts of Klenker and Lücke (*Einleitung*, p. 514), that Eusebius found no doubt as to John's authorship in the book of this ancient Asiatic bishop. (*d.*) Theophilus, bishop of Antioch (cir. 180), in a controversy with Hermogenes, quotes passages out of the Revelation of John (Eusebius, *H. E.* iv, 24). (*e.*) Irenæus (cir. 195), apparently never having heard a suggestion of any other author than the apostle, often quotes the Revelation as the work of John. In iv, 20, § 11, he describes John the writer of the Revelation as the same who was leaning on Jesus' bosom at supper, and asked him who should betray him. The testimony of Irenæus as to the authorship of Revelation is, perhaps, more important than that of any other writer: it mounts up into the preceding generation, and is virtually that of a contemporary of the apostle. For in v, 30, § 1, where he vindicates the true reading (666) of the number of the Beast, he cites in support of it, not only the old correct copies of the book, but also the oral testimony of the very persons who themselves had seen John face to face. It is obvious that Irenæus's reference for information on such a point to those contemporaries of John implies his undoubting belief that they, in common with himself, viewed John as the writer of the book. Lücke (p. 574) suggests that this view was possibly groundless because it was entertained before the learned fathers of Alexandria had set the example of historical criticism; but his suggestion scarcely weakens the force of the fact that such was the belief of Asia, and it appears a strange suggestion when we remember that the critical discernment of the Alexandrians, to whom he refers, led them to coincide with Irenæus in his view. (*f.*) Apollonius (cir. 200) of Ephesus (?), in controversy with the Montanists of Phrygia, quoted passages out of the Revelation of John, and narrated a miracle wrought by John at Ephesus (Euseb. *H. E.* v, 18). (*g.*) Clement of Alexandria (cir. 200) quotes the book as the Revelation of John (*Stromata*, vi, 13, p. 667), and as the work of an apostle (*Pæd.* ii, 12, p. 207). (*h.*) Tertullian (A.D. 207), in at least one place, quotes by name "the apostle John in the Apocalypse" (*Adv. Marcion.* iii, 14). (*i.*) Hippolytus (cir. 230) is said, in the inscription on his statue at Rome, to have composed an apology for the Apocalypse and Gospel of St. John the apostle. He quotes it as the work of John (*De Antichristo*, § 36, p. 756, ed. Migne). (*j.*) Origen (cir. 233), in his commentary on John, quoted by Eusebius (*H. E.* vi, 25), says of the apostle, "he wrote also the Revelation." The testimonies of later writers, in the 3d and 4th centuries, in favor of John's authorship of the Revelation are equally distinct and far more numerous. They may be seen quoted at length in Lücke, p. 628–638, or in dean Alford's *Prolegomena* (*N. T.* vol. iv, pt. ii). It may suffice here to say that they include the names of Victorinus, Methodius, Ephrem Syrus, Epiphanius, Basil, Hilary, Athanasius, Gregory, Didymus, Ambrose, Augustine, and Jerome.

All the foregoing writers, testifying that the book came from an apostle, believed that it was a part of Holy Scripture. But many whose extant works cannot be quoted for testimony to the authorship of the book refer to it as possessing canonical authority. Thus (*a*) Papias, who is described by Irenæus as a hearer of John and friend of Polycarp, is cited, together with other writers, by Andreas of Cappadocia, in his commentary on the Revelation, as a guarantee to later ages of the divine inspiration of the book (Routh, *Rel. Sacr.* i, 15; Cramer, *Catena* [Oxford, 1840], p. 176). The value of this testimony has not been impaired by the controversy to which it has given rise, in which Lücke, Bleek, Hengstenberg, and Rettig have taken different parts. (*b*) In the epistle from the churches of Lyons and Vienne, A.D. 177, inserted in Eusebius, *H. E.* v, 1–3, several passages (e. g. i, 5; xiv, 4; xxii, 11) are quoted or referred to in the same way as passages of books whose canonical authority is unquestioned. (*c*) Cyprian (*Epp.* 10, 12, 14, 19, ed. Fell) repeatedly quotes it as a part of canonical Scripture. Chrysostom makes no distinct allusion to it in any extant writing; but we are informed by Suidas that he received it as canonical. Although omitted (perhaps as not adapted for public reading in church) from the list of canonical books in the Council of Laodicea, it was admitted into the list of the third Council of Carthage, A.D. 397.

2. *Evidence against John's Authorship.*—Marcion, who regarded all the apostles except Paul as corrupters of the truth, rejected the Apocalypse and all other books of the New Test. which were not written by Paul. The Alogi, an obscure sect (cir. A.D. 180), in their zeal against Montanism, denied the existence of spiritual gifts in the Church, and rejected the Revelation, saying it was the work, not of John, but of Cerinthus (Epiphanius, *Adv. Hær.* li). The Roman presbyter Caius (cir. A.D. 196), who also wrote against Montanism, is quoted by Eusebius (*H. E.* iii, 28) as ascribing certain revelations to Cerinthus; but it is doubted (see Routh, *Rel. Sacr.* ii, 138) whether the Revelation of John is the book to which Caius refers. But the testimony which is considered the most important of all in ancient times against the Revelation is contained in a fragment of Dionysius of Alexandria (cir. A.D. 240), the most influential, and perhaps the ablest, bishop in that age. The passage, taken from a book *On the Promises*, written in reply to Nepos, a learned Judaizing Chiliast, is quoted by Eusebius (*H. E.* vii, 25). The principal points in it are these: Dionysius testifies that some writers before him altogether repudiated the Revelation as a forgery of Cerinthus; many brethren, however, prized it very highly, and Dionysius would not venture to reject it, but received it in faith as containing things too deep and too sublime for his understanding. (In his *Epistle to Hermammon* [Euseb. *H. E.* vii, 10] he quotes it as he would quote Holy Scripture.) He accepts as true what is stated in the book itself, that it was written by John, but he argues that the way in which that name is mentioned, and the general character of the language, are unlike what we should expect from John the evangelist and apostle; that there were many Johns in that age. He would not say that John Mark was the writer, since it is not known that he was in Asia. He supposes that it must be the work of some John who lived in Asia; and he observes that there are said to be two tombs in Ephesus, each of which bears the name of John. He then points out at length the superiority of the style of the Gospel and the First Epistle of John to the style of the Apocalypse, and says, in conclusion, that whatever he may think of the language, he does not deny that the writer of the Apocalypse actually saw what he describes, and was endowed with the divine gifts of knowledge and prophecy. To this extent, and no further, Dionysius is a witness against John's authorship. It is obvious that he keenly felt the difficulty arising from the use made of the contents of this book by certain unsound Christians under his jurisdiction; that he was acquainted with the doubt as to its canonical authority which some of his predecessors entertained as an inference from the nature of its contents; that he deliberately rejected their doubt and accepted the contents of the book as given by the inspiration of God; that, although

he did not understand how John could write in the style in which the Revelation is written, he yet knew of no authority for attributing it, as he desired to attribute it, to some other of the numerous persons who bore the name of John.

A weightier difficulty arises from the fact that the Revelation is one of the books which are absent from the ancient Peshito version, and the only trustworthy evidence in favor of its reception by the ancient Syrian Church is a single quotation which is adduced from the Syriac works (ii, 332 c) of Ephrem Syrus. Eusebius is remarkably sparing in his quotations from the "Revelation of John," and the uncertainty of his opinion about it is best shown by his statement in *H. E.* iii, 39, that "it is likely that the Revelation was seen by the second John (the Ephesian presbyter), if any one is unwilling to believe that it was seen by the apostle." See JOHN THE PRESBYTER. Jerome states (*Ep. ad Dardanum*, etc.) that the Greek churches felt, with respect to the Revelation, a similar doubt to that of the Latins respecting the Epistle to the Hebrews. Neither he nor his equally influential contemporary Augustine shared such doubts. Cyril of Jerusalem, Chrysostom, Theodore of Mopsuestia, and Theodoret abstained from making use of the book, sharing, it is possible, the doubts to which Jerome refers. But they have not gone so far as to express a distinct opinion against it. The silence of these writers is the latest evidence of any importance that has been adduced against the overwhelming weight of the testimony in favor of the canonical authority and authorship of this book. See CANON OF SCRIPTURE.

II. *Time and Place of Writing.*—The date of the Revelation is given by the great majority of critics as A.D. 95–97. The weighty testimony of Irenæus is almost sufficient to prevent any other conclusion. He says (*Adv. Hær.* v. 30, § 3), "It [i. e. the Revelation] was seen no very long time ago, but almost in our own generation, at the close of Domitian's reign." Stuart's attempt to interpret this of Nero's reign (*Comment.* ad loc.) is evidently forced. Eusebius also records as a tradition which he does not question, that in the persecution under Domitian, John the apostle and evangelist, being yet alive, was banished to the island of Patmos for his testimony of the divine word. Allusions in Clement of Alexandria and Origen point in the same direction. There is no mention in any writer of the first three centuries of any other time or place. Epiphanius (li, 12), obviously by mistake, says that John prophesied in the reign of Claudius. Two or three obscure and later authorities say that John was banished under Nero.

Unsupported by any historical evidence, some commentators have put forth the conjecture that the Revelation was written as early as the time of Nero. This is simply their inference from the style and contents of the book. But it is difficult to see why John's old age rendered it, as they allege, impossible for him to write his inspired message with force and vigor, or why his residence in Ephesus must have removed the Hebraistic peculiarities of his Greek. It is difficult to see in the passages i, 7; ii, 9; iii, 9; vi, 12, 16; xi, 1, anything which would lead necessarily to the conclusion that Jerusalem was in a prosperous condition, and that the predictions of its fall had not been fulfilled when those verses were written. A more weighty argument in favor of an early date might be urged from a modern interpretation of xvii, 10, if that interpretation could be established. Galba is alleged to be the sixth king, the one that "is." In Nero these interpreters see the beast that was wounded (xiii, 3), the beast that was and is not, the eighth king (xvii, 11). For some time after Nero's death the Roman populace believed that he was not dead, but had fled into the East, whence he would return and regain his throne; and these interpreters venture to suggest that the writer of the Revelation shared and meant to express the absurd popular delusion. Even the able and learned Reuss (*Théol. Chrét.* i, 443), by way of supporting this interpretation, advances his untenable claim to the first discovery of the name of Nero Cæsar in the number of the beast, 666. The inconsistency of this interpretation with prophetic analogy, with the context of Revelation, and with the fact that the book is of divine origin, is pointed out by Hengstenberg at the end of his *Commentary on ch. xiii*, and by Elliott, *Horæ Apoc.* iv, 547.

It has been inferred from i, 2, 9, 10, that the Revelation was written in Ephesus, immediately after the apostle's return from Patmos. But the text is scarcely sufficient to support this conclusion. The style in which the messages to the seven churches are delivered rather suggests the notion that the book was written in Patmos. See JOHN THE APOSTLE.

III. *Language.*—The thought first suggested by Harenberg, that the Revelation was written in Aramaic, has met with little or no reception. The silence of all ancient writers as to any Aramaic original is alone a sufficient answer to the suggestion. Lücke (*Einleit.* p. 441) has collected internal evidence to show that the original is the Greek of a Jewish Christian.

Lücke has also (p. 448–464) examined in minute detail, after the preceding labors of Donker-Curtius, Vogel, Winer, Ewald, Kolthoff, and Hitzig, the peculiarities of language which obviously distinguish the Revelation from every other book of the New Test. In subsequent sections (p. 680–747) he urges with great force the difference between the Revelation, on one side, and the fourth Gospel and first Epistle, on the other, in respect of their style and composition and the mental character and attainments of the writer of each. Hengstenberg, in a dissertation appended to his *Commentary*, maintains that they are by one writer. That the anomalies and peculiarities of the Revelation have been greatly exaggerated by some critics is sufficiently shown by Hitzig's plausible and ingenious, though unsuccessful, attempt to prove the identity of style and diction in the Revelation and the Gospel of Mark. It may be admitted that the Revelation has many surprising grammatical peculiarities. But much of this is accounted for by the fact that it was probably written down, as it was seen, "in the spirit," while the ideas, in all their novelty and vastness, filled the apostle's mind, and rendered him less capable of attending to forms of speech. His Gospel and Epistles, on the other hand, were composed equally under divine influence, but an influence of a gentler, more ordinary kind, with much care, after long deliberation, after frequent recollection and recital of the facts, and deep pondering of the doctrinal truths which they involve.

Gebhardt has recently given the coincidences in language between the Gospel and the Revelation of John in a most convincing manner (*Doctrine of the Apocalypse*, etc.; transl. from the German, Edinb. 1878): "There are underlying identities of style which demonstrate identity of authorship. The subjects, of course, are stupendously different, and so require even of the same writer a stupendous difference of style. In the Apocalypse the pictorial imagination is perpetually on the utmost stretch; events and objects are crowding upon each other with intense rapidity. The scenery and pictorial material are generally borrowed from the Hebrew Scriptures, with immense improvements. More than all, the mind of the writer, steeped in Hebraism, is in a preternatural state. He who was in his youth a son of thunder has all the thunder of his youth preternaturally renewed within him. Rightly, the extraordinary conditions demand an extraordinary change of style, both in thought and language. Yet, underlying all this change, the natural style and mind unmistakably disclose themselves. He who cannot see this was never born a critic, and can never be reconstructed into one" (*Meth. Quar.* 1878, p. 739). See JOHN (*Gospel* and *Epistles*).

IV. *Contents.*—A full analysis of the book would involve much that is disputed as to its interpretation. We therefore here content ourselves with a general outline, in which the main visions are specified.

The first three verses contain the title of the book, the description of the writer, and the blessing pronounced on the readers, which possibly, like the last two verses of the fourth gospel, may be an addition by the hand of inspired survivors of the writer. John begins (i, 4) with a salutation of the seven churches of Asia. This, coming before the announcement that he was in the spirit, looks like a dedication not merely of the first vision, but of all the book, to those churches. In the next five verses (i, 5–9) he touches the key-note of the whole following book, the great fundamental ideas on which all our notions of the government of the world and the Church are built—the person of Christ; the redemption wrought by him; his second coming to judge mankind; the painful, hopeful discipline of Christians in the midst of this present world; thoughts which may well be supposed to have been uppermost in the mind of the persecuted and exiled apostle even before the divine inspiration came on him.

a. The first vision (i, 7–iii, 22) shows the Son of Man with his injunction, or epistles to the seven churches. While the apostle is pondering those great truths and the critical condition of his Church which he had left, a Divine Person resembling those seen by Ezekiel and Daniel, and identified by name and by description as Jesus, appears to John, and, with the discriminating authority of a lord and judge, reviews the state of those churches, pronounces his decision upon their several characters, and takes occasion from them to speak to all Christians who may deserve similar encouragement or similar condemnation. Each of these sentences, spoken by the Son of Man, is described as said by the Spirit. Hitherto the apostle has been speaking primarily, though not exclusively, to some of his own contemporaries concerning the present events and circumstances. Henceforth he ceases to address them particularly. His words are for the ear of the universal Church in all ages, and show the significance of things which are present in hope or fear, in sorrow or in joy, to Christians everywhere.

b. In the next vision (iv, 1–viii, 1), Patmos and the Divine Person whom he saw are gone. Only the trumpet voice is heard again calling him to a change of place. He is in the highest court of heaven, and sees God sitting on his throne. The seven-sealed book or roll is produced, and the slain lamb, the Redeemer, receives it amid the sound of universal adoration. As the seals are opened in order, the apostle sees (1) a conqueror on a white horse; (2) a red horse, betokening war; (3) the black horse of famine; (4) the pale horse of death; (5) the eager souls of martyrs under the altar; (6) an earthquake, with universal commotion and terror. After this there is a pause, the course of avenging angels is checked while 144,000, the children of Israel, servants of God, are sealed, and an innumerable multitude of the redeemed of all nations are seen worshipping God. Next (7) the seventh seal is opened, and half an hour's silence in heaven ensues.

c. Then (viii, 2–xi, 19) seven angels appear with trumpets, the prayers of saints are offered up, the earth is struck with fire from the altar, and the seven trumpets are sounded. (1) The earth, and (2) the sea, and (3) the springs of water, and (4) the heavenly bodies are successively smitten; (5) a plague of locusts afflicts the men who are not sealed (the first woe); (6) the third part of men are slain (the second woe), but the rest are impenitent. Then there is a pause: a mighty angel with a book appears and cries out; seven thunders sound, but their words are not recorded; the approaching completion of the mystery of God is announced; the angel bids the apostle eat the book, and measure the temple with its worshippers, and the outer court given up to the Gentiles; the two witnesses of God, their martyrdom, resurrection, ascension, are foretold. The approach of the third woe is announced, and (7) the seventh trumpet is sounded, the reign of Christ is proclaimed, God has taken his great power, the time has come for judgment and for the destruction of the destroyers of the earth.

The three preceding visions are distinct from one another. Each of the last two, like the longer one which follows, has the appearance of a distinct prophecy, reaching from the prophet's time to the end of the world. The second half of the Revelation (ch. xii–xxii) comprises a series of visions which are connected by various links. It may be described generally as a prophecy of the assaults of the devil and his agents (i. e. the dragon, the ten-horned beast, the two-horned beast or false prophet, and the harlot) upon the Church, and their final destruction. It appears to begin with a reference to events anterior, not only to those which are predicted in the preceding chapter, but also to the time in which it was written. It seems hard to interpret the birth of the child as a prediction, and not as a retrospective allusion.

d. A woman (ch. xii) clothed with the sun is seen in heaven, and a great red dragon with seven crowned heads stands waiting to devour her offspring; her child is caught up unto God, and the mother flees into the wilderness for 1260 days. The persecution of the woman and her seed on earth by the dragon is described as the consequence of a war in heaven in which the dragon was overcome and cast out upon the earth.

The Revelator (ch. xiii), standing on the sea-shore, sees a beast with seven heads, one wounded, with ten crowned horns, rising from the water, the representative of the dragon. All the world wonders at and worships him, and he attacks the saints and prevails. He is followed by another two-horned beast rising out of the earth, who compels men to wear the mark of the beast, whose number is 666.

Next (ch. xiv) the lamb is seen with 144,000 standing on Mount Zion, learning the song of praise of the heavenly host. Three angels fly forth calling men to worship God, proclaiming the fall of Babylon, denouncing the worshippers of the beast. A blessing is pronounced on the faithful dead, and the judgment of the world is described under the image of a harvest reaped by angels.

John (ch. xv, xvi) sees in heaven the saints who had overcome the beast, singing the song of Moses and the Lamb. Then seven angels come out of the heavenly temple having seven vials of wrath, which they pour out upon the earth, sea, rivers, sun, the seat of the beast, Euphrates, and the air, after which there are a great earthquake and a hail-storm.

One (ch. xvii, xviii) of the last seven angels carries John into the wilderness and shows him a harlot, Babylon, sitting on a scarlet beast with seven heads and ten horns. She is explained to be that great city, sitting upon seven mountains, reigning over the kings of the earth. Afterwards John sees a vision of the destruction of Babylon, portrayed as the burning of a great city amid the lamentations of worldly men and the rejoicing of saints.

Afterwards (ch. xix) the worshippers in heaven are heard celebrating Babylon's fall and the approaching marriage-supper of the lamb. The Word of God is seen going forth to war at the head of the heavenly armies; the beast and his false prophet are taken and cast into the burning lake, and their worshippers are slain.

An angel (xx–xxii, 5) binds the dragon, i. e. the devil, for one thousand years, while the martyred saints who had not worshipped the beast reign with Christ. Then the devil is unloosed, gathers a host against the camp of the saints, but is overcome by fire from heaven, and is cast into the burning lake with the beast and false prophet. John then witnesses the process of the final judgment, and sees and describes the new heaven and the new earth, and the new Jerusalem, with its people and their way of life.

In the last sixteen verses (xxii, 6–21) the angel solemnly asseverates the truthfulness and importance of the foregoing sayings, pronounces a blessing on those who keep them exactly, gives warning of his speedy

coming to judgment, and of the nearness of the time when these prophecies shall be fulfilled.

V. *Schemes of Interpretation.*—Few, if any, books of the Bible have been the sport of so great differences of view as this, arising largely from prejudice and the passion of the times. We can give here but a brief outline of these conflicting opinions, which prevail even to the present day.

1. *Historical Review.*—The interval between the apostolic age and that of Constantine has been called the Chiliastic period of Apocalyptic interpretation. The visions of John were chiefly regarded as representations of general Christian truths, scarcely yet embodied in actual facts, for the most part to be exemplified or fulfilled in the reign of Antichrist, the coming of Christ, the millennium, and the day of judgment. The fresh hopes of the early Christians, and the severe persecution they endured, taught them to live in those future events with intense satisfaction and comfort. They did not entertain the thought of building up a definite consecutive chronological scheme even of those symbols which some moderns regard as then already fulfilled; although from the beginning a connection between Rome and Antichrist was universally allowed, and parts of the Revelation were regarded as the filling-up of the great outline sketched by Daniel and Paul. The only extant systematic interpretations in this period are the interpolated commentary on the Revelation by the martyr Victorinus, cir. A.D. 270 (*Bibliotheca Patrum Maxima*, iii, 414, and Migne, *Patrologia Latina*, v, 318; the two editions should be compared), and the disputed treatise on Antichrist by Hippolytus (Migne, *Patrologia Græca*, x, 726). But the prevalent views of that age are to be gathered also from a passage in Justin Martyr (*Trypho*, 80, 81), from the later books, especially the fifth, of Irenæus, and from various scattered passages in Tertullian, Origen, and Methodius. The general anticipation of the last days of the world in Lactantius, vii, 14–25, has little direct reference to the Revelation.

Immediately after the triumph of Constantine, the Christians, emancipated from oppression and persecution, and dominant and prosperous in their turn, began to lose their vivid expectation of our Lord's speedy advent and their spiritual conception of his kingdom, and to look upon the temporal supremacy of Christianity as a fulfilment of the promised reign of Christ on earth. The Roman empire, become Christian, was regarded no longer as the object of prophetic denunciation, but as the scene of a millennial development. This view, however, was soon met by the figurative interpretation of the millennium as the reign of Christ in the hearts of all true believers. As the barbarous and heretical invaders of the falling empire appeared, they were regarded by the suffering Christians as fulfilling the woes denounced in the Revelation. The beginning of a regular chronological interpretation is seen in Berengaud (assigned by some critics to the 9th century), who treated the Revelation as a history of the Church from the beginning of the world to its end. The original *Commentary* of the abbot Joachim is remarkable, not only for a further development of that method of interpretation, but for the scarcely disguised identification of Babylon with papal Rome, and of the second beast or Antichrist with some universal pontiff. The chief commentaries belonging to this period are that which is ascribed to Tichonius (cir. A.D. 390), printed in the works of Augustine; Primasius of Adrumetum in Africa (A.D. 550), in Migne, *Patrologia Latina*, lxviii, 1406; Andreas of Crete (cir. A.D. 650), Arethas of Cappadocia, and Œcumenius of Thessaly in the 10th century, whose commentaries were published together in Cramer's *Catena* (Oxon. 1840); the *Explanatio Apoc.* in the works of Bede (A.D. 735); the *Expositio* of Berengaud, printed in the works of Ambrose; the *Commentary* of Haymo (A.D. 853), first published at Cologne in 1531; a short treatise on the seals by Anselm, bishop of Havilberg (A.D. 1145), printed in D'Achéry's *Spicilegium*, i, 161; the *Expositio* of abbot Joachim of Calabria (A.D. 1200), printed at Venice in 1527.

In the dawn of the Reformation, the views to which the reputation of abbot Joachim gave currency were taken up by the harbingers of the impending change, as by Wycliffe and others; and they became the foundation of that great historical school of interpretation, which up to this time seems the most popular of all. (For the later commentaries, see § vi, below.)

2. *Approximate Classification of Modern Interpretations.*—These are generally placed in three great divisions.

(1.) The *Præterist* expositors, who are of opinion that the Revelation has been almost, or altogether, fulfilled in the time which has passed since it was written; that it refers principally to the triumph of Christianity over Judaism and paganism, signalized in the downfall of Jerusalem and of Rome. The most eminent expounders of this view are Alcasar, Grotius, Hammond, Bossuet, Calmet, Wettstein, Eichhorn, Hug, Herder, Ewald, Lücke, De Wette, Düsterdieck, Stuart, Lee, and Maurice. This is the favorite interpretation with the critics of Germany, one of whom goes so far as to state that the writer of the Revelation promised the fulfilment of his visions within the space of three years and a half from the time in which he wrote.

Against the *Præterist* view it is urged that prophecies fulfilled ought to be rendered so perspicuous to the general sense of the Church as to supply an argument against infidelity; that the destruction of Jerusalem, having occurred twenty-five years previously, could not occupy a large space in a prophecy; that the supposed predictions of the downfall of Jerusalem and of Nero appear from the context to refer to one event, but are by this scheme separated, and, moreover, placed in a wrong order; that the measuring of the Temple and the altar, and the death of the two witnesses (ch. xi), cannot be explained consistently with the context.

(2.) The *Futurist* expositors, whose views show a strong reaction against some extravagances of the preceding school. They believe that the whole book, excepting perhaps the first three chapters, refers principally, if not exclusively, to events which are yet to come. This view, which is asserted to be merely a revival of the primitive interpretation, has been advocated in recent times by Dr. J. H. Todd, Dr. S. R. Maitland, B. Newton, C. Maitland, I. Williams, De Burgh, and others.

Against the *Futurist* it is argued that it is not consistent with the repeated declarations of a speedy fulfilment at the beginning and end of the book itself (see i, 3; xxii, 6, 7, 12, 20). Christians, to whom it was originally addressed, would have derived no special comfort from it had its fulfilment been altogether deferred for so many centuries. The rigidly literal interpretation of Babylon, the Jewish tribes, and other symbols which generally forms a part of *Futurist* schemes, presents peculiar difficulties.

(3.) The Historical or *Continuous* expositors, in whose opinion the Revelation is a progressive history of the fortunes of the Church from the first century to the end of time. The chief supporters of this most interesting interpretation are Mede, Sir I. Newton, Vitringa, Bengel, Woodhouse, Faber, E. B. Elliott, Wordsworth, Hengstenberg, Ebrard, and others. The recent *Commentary* of dean Alford belongs mainly to this school.

Against the historical scheme it is urged that its advocates differ very widely among themselves; that they assume without any authority that the 1260 days are so many years; that several of its applications—e. g. of the symbol of the ten-horned beast to the popes, and the sixth seal to the conversion of Constantine—are inconsistent with the context; that attempts by some of this school to predict future events by the help of Revelation have ended in repeated failures.

Two methods have been proposed by which the stu-

dent of the Revelation may escape the incongruities and fallacies of the different interpretations, while he may derive edification from whatever truth they contain. It has been suggested that the book may be regarded as a prophetic poem, dealing in general and inexact descriptions, much of which may be set down as poetic imagery—mere embellishment. But such a view would be difficult to reconcile with the belief that the book is an inspired prophecy. A better suggestion is made, or rather is revived, by Dr. Arnold in his sermons *On the Interpretation of Prophecy:* that we should bear in mind that predictions have a lower historical sense, as well as a higher spiritual sense; that there may be one, or more than one, typical, imperfect, historical fulfilment of a prophecy, in each of which the higher spiritual fulfilment is shadowed forth more or less distinctly. See DOUBLE SENSE.

In choosing among the various schemes of interpretation, we are inclined to adopt that which regards the first series of prophetical visions proper (ch. iv–xii) as indicating the collapse (in part at the time already transpired) of the nearest persecuting power, namely, Judaism; the second series (ch. xiii–xix) as denoting the eventual downfall of the succeeding persecutor, i. e. Rome (first in its pagan and next in its papal form); and the third series (xx, 1–10) as briefly outlining the final overthrow of a last persecutor, some yet future power or influence (figuratively represented by a name borrowed from Ezekiel). These three opponents of Christianity are set forth as successive developments of Antichrist, and the symbols employed are cumulative and reiterative rather than historical and consecutive. For special explanations, see ANTICHRIST; MAGOG; NUMBER OF THE BEAST, etc.

VI. *Commentaries.*—Most of the above questions are treated in the regular commentaries and introductions, and in numerous monographs, published separately or in periodicals. The following are the exegetical helps solely on the whole book; to the most important we prefix an asterisk: St. Anthony, *Expositio* (in *Opp.* p. 645); Victorinus, *Scholia* (in *Bibl. Max. Patr.* iii, 414; Galland. *Bibl. Patr.* iv, 49; also Par. 1549, 1609, 8vo); Berengaud, *Expositio* (in Ambrosii *Opp.* ii, 499); Trichonius, *Expositio* (in Augustini *Opp.* xvi, 617); Primasius, *Commentarius* (in *Bibl. Max. Patr.* vol. x); Andreas Cæsar, *Commentarius* (*ibid.* v, 590); Arethas, *Explanationes* (*ibid.* ix, 741; also in Œcumenii *Opp.* vol. ii); Bede, *Explanatio* (in *Opp.* v, 701; also in *Works*, i, 189; xii, 337); Ambrosius Autpert. *In Apocal.* (in *Bibl. Max. Patr.* xiii, 403); Alcuin, *Commentarii* (in Mai, *Script. Vet.* ix, 257); Bruno, *in Apocal.* (in *Opp.* vol. i); Hervæus, *Enarrationes* (in Anselmi *Opp.* ed. Picard, 1612); Rupert, *In Apocal.* (in *Opp.* ii, 450); Anon. *Glossa* (Lips. 1481, 4to); Albert, *Comment.* (Basil. 1506, 4to; also in *Opp.* vol. xi); Joann. Viterb. *Glossa* (Colon. 1507, 8vo); *Joachim, *In Apocal.* (Ven. 1519, 1527, 4to); Huss, *Commentarius* (ed. Luther, Vitemb. 1528, 8vo); Lambert, *Exegesis* (Marp. 1528; Basil. 1539, 8vo); Aimo, *Commentarius* (Colon. 1529, 1531, 1534; Par. 1540, 8vo); Melch. Hoffmann, *Auslegung* (Argent. 1530, 8vo); Bullinger, *Conciones* (Basil. 1535, 1570, and often, fol.; also in English, Lond. 1573, 4to); Thomas of Wales, *Expositio* (Flor. 1549, 8vo; also in Aquinas, *Comment.* Paris, 1641); Bibliander, *Commentarius* (Basil. 1549, 8vo); Meyer, *Commentarius* (Tigur. 1554, 1603, fol.); Fulke, *Prælectiones* (Lond. 1557, 1573, 4to); Conrad, *Commentarius* (Basil. 1560, 1574, 8vo); Borrhaus, *Commentarius*, (ibid. 1561; Tigur. 1600, fol.); Serranus, *Commentaria* (Complut. 1563, fol.); Chytræus, *Commentarius* (Vitemb. 1563, 1571, 1575, 8vo; Rost. 1581, 4to); Artopæus, *Explicatio* (Basil. 1563, 8vo); Selnecker, *Erklärung* (Jen. 1567, 1568, 1608, 4to); Gyfford, *Sermons* (Lond. 1573, 4to); Marloratus, *Exposition* (from the Latin, ibid. 1574, 4to); Brocardus, *Interpretatio* (L. B. 1580, 1590, 8vo; also in English, Lond. 1583, 4to); De Fermo [Rom. Cath.], *Enarratio* (from the Italian, Antw. 1581, 8vo); De Melo [Rom. Cath.], *Commentarius* (Pint. 1584, fol.); Foxe, *Prælectiones* (Lond. 1587, fol.; Geneva, 1596, 1618, 8vo); Bulenger [Rom. Cath.], *Ecphrasis* (Paris, 1589, 1597, 8vo); Junius, *Illustratio* (Heidelb. 1591; Basil. 1599, 8vo; and in *Opp.* vol. i, 1694; also in French, Basle, 1592, 1598; in English, Lond. 1592, 1596, 4to; 1616, 8vo); De Ribera [Rom. Cath.], *Commentarius* (Salam. 1591, fol.; Lugd. 1593, 4to; Antw. 1603; Duoc. 1623, 8vo); Gallus, *Clavis* (Antw. 1592, 8vo); *Napier, *Interpretation* (Edinb. 1593, 1611, 1645, 4to; in French, Rupp. 1603, 1607; Geneva, 1643, 4to; in Dutch, Magdeb. 1618; in German, Leips. 1611; Frankf. 1615, 1627, 8vo; Ger. 1661, 4to); Funcke, *Erklärung* (Fr.-a.-M. 1596, 4to); Du Jon, *Exposition* (from the French, Lond. 1596, 4to); Foorthe, *Revelatio* (ibid. 1597, 4to); Winckelmann, *Commentarius* (Francf. 1600, 1609; Lub. 1615, 8vo); De la Périe, *Paraphrase* (French, Geneva, 1600, 1651, 4to); Eglin, *Epilysis* (Tigur. 1601, fol.; Hanov. 1611, 4to); Viegas [Rom. Cath.], *Commentarii* (Ebor. 1601, fol.; Lugd. 1602, 1606; Ven. 1602, 1608; Colon. 1603, 1607; Par. 1606, 1615, 1630, 4to); Richter, *Die Offenbarung* (Leips. 1602, 4to); Dent, *Exposition* (Lond. 1603, 1607, 4to; 1623, 8vo; 1644, 4to); Pererius, *Disputationes* (Lugd. 1606; Ven. 1607, 4to); Brightmann, *Scholia* (Francf. 1609, 4to; 1618; Heidelb. 1612, 8vo; also in English, Amst. 1611, 1615, 4to; Lond. 1616; Leyd. 1644, 8vo; and in *Works*, Lond. 1644, 4to); Taffin, *Exposition* (French, Fless. 1609; Middelb. 1614, 8vo); Hoe, *Commentarii* (Lips. 1609–11, 2 vols. 4to; 1671, fol.); Broughton, *Revelation* (Lond. 1610, 4to; also in *Works*, p. 408); Becan, *Commentarius* (Mogunt. 1612, 12mo); Lucius, *Notæ* (Hanov. 1613, 8vo); Forbes, *Commentary* (Lond. 1613, fol.; also in Latin, Amst. 1646, 4to); Cottière, *Expositio* (Salm. 1614; Sedan, 1625, 4to); Alcassar. [Rom. Cath.], *Investigatio* (Antw. 1614; Lugd. 1618, fol.); also 5 additional *Libri* (Lugd. 1632, fol.); Graser, *Commentarius* (Tigur. 1614, 4to); Cramer, *Erklärung* (Stet. 1618, 4to); Pareus, *Commentarius* (Heidelberg, 1618, 1622, 4to; also in English, Amst. 1644, fol.); Lautensack, *Erklärung* (Frankf. 1619, 4to); Cowper, *Commentary* (Lond. 1619, 4to; and in *Works*, p. 811; also in Dutch, Amst. 1656, fol.; and in German, Leips. 1671, 8vo); Montacut, *Paraphrasis* (Lond. 1619, fol.); Cluver, *Morgenlicht* (Gosl. 1620, 8vo; in Latin, Lub. 1647, fol.); Wolter, *Auslegung* (Rost. 1625, 1629, 4to); De Dieu, *Animadversiones* (L. B. 1627, 4to); *Mede, *Clavis* (Cambr. 1627, 1629, 1649, 4to; also in English, ibid. 1632; Lond. 1643, 1650, 4to; 1831, 12mo; 1833, 8vo; both with additional notes in *Works*, vol. ii); Baaz, *Commentary* (in Swedish, Calmar, 1629, 8vo); Anon. *Explication* (French, Leyd. 1633, 4to); Le Bux, *Paraphrase* (French, Genev. 1641, 4to); Gerhard, *Adnotationes* (Jen. 1643, 1645; Lips. 1712, 4to); Gravius, *Tabulæ* (L. B. 1647, fol.); also *Auslegung* (Hamb. 1657, 4to); Holland, *Exposition* (Lond. 1650, 4to); Hartlib, *Revelation* (from the Dutch, ibid. 1651, 8vo); Ferrarius [Rom. Cath.], *Commentaria* (Mediol. 1654, 3 vols. fol.); De la Haye [Rom. Cath.], *Commentarii* (Par. 1654 sq., 2 vols. fol.); Guild, *Explanation* (Aberdeen, 1656, 12mo); Fromond [Rom. Cath.], *Commentarius* (Lov. 1657, 4to; also [with other books] Par. 1670, fol.); Durham, *Commentary* (Glasg. 1658, fol.; 1680, 1764, 1788, 4to; Edinb. 1680, 4to; Amst. 1660, 4to; Falkirk, 1799, 2 vols. 8vo); Amyrald, *Introduction* (French, Hag, 1658, 4to); Bordes, *Elucidatio* (Par. 1658, 2 vols. fol.); also *Explicatio* (ibid. 1659, fol.); Kromayer [J.], *Commentarius* (Lips. 1662, 1674, 4to); De Sylveira [Rom. Cath.], *Commentaria* (Lugd. 1663, 1669, 1700, 2 vols. fol.); Diest [A.], *Analysis* (Arnh. 1663, 4to); More, *Apocalypsis* (Lond. 1666, 1680, 4to); and *Ratio* (ibid. 1666, 4to; in English, ibid. 1680, 4to; both in his *Opp.* ibid. 1675, fol.); Brenius, *Verklaaringe* [includ. Joh.] (Amst. 1666, 4to); Pegan, *Erklärung* (Frankf. 1670, 1676, 12mo); Schindler, *Delineation* (German, Brunsen. 1670, 4to); Grellot, *Prodromus* (L. B. 1675, 4to); Kircher [Rom. Cath.], *Explicatio* (Colon. 1676, 4to); Matt. Hoffman, *Chronotaxis* (Jen. 1678, 1687, 4to); Heunisch, *Synopsis* (ibid. 1678, 4to); also *Hauptschlüssel* (Schleus. 1684, 4to;

Leips. 1697, 8vo; and in Latin, Rottenb. 1684; Lips. 1698, 4to); Muller, *Elucidatio* (Hard. 1684, 2 vols. 4to); Hervé [Rom. Cath.], *Explanatio* (Lugd. 1684, 4to); Heidegger, *Diatribe* (L. B. 1687, 2 vols. 4to); Van Wesel, *Verklaaring* (Ench. 1688, 4to); Bossuet [Rom. Cath.], *Explication* (French, Par. 1689, 8vo); Cressener, *Explication* (Lond. 1689, 4to); also *Demonstration* (ibid. 1690, 4to); also *Paraphrase* (ibid. 1693, 4to); Marck, *Commentarius* (Fr.-a.-Rh. 1689, 1699, 4to); La Cherlardie [Rom. Cath.], *Explication* (French, Par. 1692, 8vo; 1702, 1708, 4to); Petersenias, *Anleitung* (Leips. 1696, fol.); Brunsmann, *Phosphorus* (Hafn. 1696, 1699, 8vo); Gebhard, *Isagoge* (Gryphsw. 1696, 1697, 4to); Durer, *Erklärung* (Hanov. 1701, 12mo); Biermann, *Clavis* (Fr.-a.-Rh. 1702, 4to); Vitringa, *Anacrisis* (Franeck. 1705; Amst. 1719; Wessenf. 1721, 4to); Whiston, *Essay* (Cambr. 1706, 1744, 4to); M. Kromayer, *Erklärung* (Leips. 1708, 4to); Schweizer, *Erklärung* (Ulm, 1709, 8vo); Grönewegen, *Auslegung* (from the Dutch, Frankf. 1711, 4to); Kerckerdere [Rom. Cath.], *Systema* (Lov. 1711, 12mo); Brussken, *Schlüssel* (Offenb. 1713, 4to); Maudit [Rom. Cath.], *Analyse* (Par. 1714, 8vo); Weple, *Paraphrase* (Lond. 1715, 4to); Boekholt, *Verklaaring* (Had. 1717, 4to); Driessen, *Meditationes* (Fr.-a.-Rh. 1717, 4to); Wells, *Help* (Oxf. 1718, 8vo); *Daubuz, *Commentary* (Lond. 1720, fol.); Abbadie, *Ouverture* (Amst. 1721, 2 vols. 12mo; also in Dutch, by Monbach, ibid. 1726, 2 vols. 4to); Bomble, *Chronotaxis* (ibid. 1721, 4to); Reinbeck, *Erörterung* (Berl. 1722, 8vo); Scheuermann, *Erklärung* (Lipstad. 1722, 4to); Andola, *Clavis* [includ. other passages] (Leon. 1726, 4to); De Dioneus, *Essai* (Amst. 1729, 4to); Lange [J.], *Erklärung* (Hal. 1730, fol.); Dimpel, *Einleitung* (Leips. 1730, 8vo); Lancaster, *Commentary* (Lond. 1730, 4to); Robertson, *Exposition* (Edinb. 1730, fol.); Lösecken, *Erklärung* (Hal. 1731, 4to); Sir I. Newton, *Observations* (Lond. 1733, 4to; also in Latin, Amst. 1737, 4to); Pyle, *Paraphrase* (Lond. 1735, 1795, 8vo); Van den Hornet, *Dissertationes* (L. B. 1736, 4to); Lowman, *Notes* (Lond. 1737, 1745, 4to; 1791, 1807, 8vo; and since); *Bengel, *Erklärung* (Stuttg. 1740, 1746, 8vo; new ed. ibid. 1834, 8vo; in English, Lond. 1757, 8vo); Reinhard, *Chronotaxis* (Vinar. 1741, 4to); Cremer, *Commentarius* (Zutph. 1757, 4to); Harenberg, *Erklärung* (Brunsw. 1759, 4to); Fehr, *Anleitung* (Altenb. 1761, 4to); Taylor, *Essay* (Lond. 1763, 8vo); Swedenborg, *Revelatio* (Amst. 1766, 4to; in English, Lond. 1832, 2 vols. 8vo); Gill, *Exposition* (ibid. 1776, 4to); Murray [J.], *Sermons* (ibid. 1778, 8vo); Reader, *Remarks* (ibid. 1778, 8vo); Herrnschneider, *Tentamen* (Argent. 1786, 4to); Mrs. Bowdler, *Observations* (Bath, 1787, 1800, 8vo); Pfeiffer, *Anleitung* (Stuttg. 1788, 8vo); Purves, *Observations* (Edinb. 1789–93, 2 vols. 8vo); *Eichhorn, *Commentarius* (Gött. 1791, 2 vols. 8vo); Johnstone, *Commentary* (Edinb. 1794, 1807, 2 vols. 8vo); Semler, *Erklärung* (Leips. 1794, 1811, 8vo); Hagen, *Anmerk.* (Erl. 1796, 8vo); Gilbert, *Reflections* (French, Guernsey, 1796, 8vo); Snodgrass, *Commentary* (Paisley, 1799, 8vo); Jung, *Erklärung* (Nürnb. 1799, 1822, 8vo); Mitchell, *Exposition* (Lond. 1800, 8vo); J. Galloway, *Commentaries* (ibid. 1802, 8vo); Whitaker, *Commentary* (ibid. 1802, 8vo); Woodhouse, *Notes* (ibid. 1805, 8vo); also *Annotations* (ibid. 1828, 8vo); Thruston, *Researches* (Coventry, 1812, 2 vols. 8vo); Fuller, *Discourses* (Lond. 1815, 8vo; also in *Works*, p. 436); Holmes, *Elucidation* (ibid. 1815, 8vo); also *Fulfilment* (ibid. 1819, 8vo); *Heinrichs, *Annotatio* (Gött. 1818, 1821, 2 vols. 8vo; also in Koppe's *New Test.*); Culbertson, *Lectures* (Edinb. 1818, 8vo); Girdlestone [C.], *Observations* (Oxf. 1820, 8vo); Herder, *Commentary* (from the German, Lond. 1821, 12mo); Gauntlett, *Exposition* (ibid. 1821, and later, 8vo); Laurmann, *Prælectio* (Groning. 1822, 8vo); Tilloch, *Dissertations* (Lond. 1823, 8vo); Park, *Exposition* (ibid. 1823, 8vo); also *Explanation* (ibid. 1832, 12mo); Murray [R.], *Introduction* (Dubl. 1826, 8vo); Holzhauser, *Erklärung* (Leips. 1827, 8vo); Croly, *Interpretation* (Lond. 1827, 4to; 1838, 8vo); *Ewald, *Commentarius* (Lips. 1828, 8vo; in German, Gött. 1862, 8vo); Matthäi, *Erklärung* (Gött. 1828, 8vo); Scholz, *Erläuterung* (Frankf. 1828, 8vo); Allwood, *Key* (Lond. 1829, 2 vols. 8vo); *Lord, *Exposition* (N. Y. 1831, 8vo); Irving, *Lectures* (Lond. 1831, 4 vols. 12mo); Lösecke, *Erklärung* (Hal. 1831, 4to); *Lücke, *Einleitung* (Bonn. 1832, 1852, 8vo); Basset, *Explication* (French, Par. 1832–33, 3 vols. 8vo); Cooper, *Commentary* (Lond. 1833, 8vo); Anon. *Unveiling* (ibid. 1833, 12mo); Roe, *Arrangement* (Dubl. 1834, 4to); Ashe, *Notes* (ibid. 1834, 8vo); Boost, *Erklärung* (Darmst. 1835, 8vo); Hutchinson, *Guide* (Lond. 1835, 8vo); Pearson, *Consideration* (Camb. 1835, 8vo); Jones, *Interpreter* (Lond. 1836, 12mo); Vivien, *Explication* (French, Par. 1837, 12mo); Sanderson, *Essays* (Lond. 1838, 12mo); Lovett, *Explanation* (ibid. 1838, 8vo); Anon. *Studies* (ibid. 1838, 12mo); Franz, *Betrachtungen* (Quedlinb. 1838–40, 3 vols. 8vo); Tinius, *Erklärung* (Leips. 1839, 8vo); *Tüllig, *Erklärung* (ibid. 1840, 2 vols. 8vo); Habershon, *Exposition* (Lond. 1841, 8vo; 1842, 1844, 2 vols.); Paulus [H. E. G.], *Philosophie* (Berl. 1843, 8vo); Govett, *Revelation* (Lond. 1843, 12mo); *Stuart, *Commentary* (Andover and Lond. 1845, 2 vols. 8vo); Clifford, *Exposition* (Lond. 1845, 4 vols. 8vo); Storey, *Notes* (ibid. 1845, 12mo); Von Brandt, *Erklärung* (Leips. 1845, 1847, 8vo); De Burgh, *Exposition* (Dubl. 1845, and later, 12mo); Galloway [W. B.], *Exposition* (Lond. 1846, 2 vols. 8vo); Newton [B. W.], *Thoughts* (ibid. 1846, 1853, 8vo); Hooper [J.], *Explanation* (ibid. 1847, 8vo); Girdlestone [H.], *Notes* (ibid. 1847, 8vo); Rogers, *Lectures* (ibid. 1847, 12mo); *De Wette, *Erklärung* (Leips. 1848, in his *Exeg. Handb.*); Hoare, *Harmony* (Lond. 1848, 8vo); Tregelles, *Translation* (ibid. 1848, 12mo); Wordsworth, *Lectures* (ibid. 1848, 8vo), also *Notes* (ibid. 1849, 12mo); also *Harmony* (ibid. 1851, 4to); Kelly, *Interpretation* (ibid. 1849–51, 2 vols. 12mo); Cumming, *Lectures* (ibid. 1849–52, 3 vols. 12mo); also *Readings* (ibid. 1853, 12mo); Gräber, *Erklärung* (Heidelb. 1850, 8vo); Frere, *Notes* (Lond. 1850, 8vo); *Elliott, *Horæ Apoc.* (English, ibid. 1851, 4 vols. 8vo), Goodwin, *Exposition* (ibid. 1851, 8vo); Wickes, *Exposition* (ibid. 1851, 8vo); James, *Lectures* (ibid. 1851, 12mo); *Hengstenberg, *Erläuterung* (Berl. 1852, 2 vols. 8vo; in English, Edinb. and N. Y. 1851–53, 2 vols. 8vo); *Jenour, *Rationale Apoc.* (English, Lond. 1852, 2 vols. 8vo); Barnes, *Notes* (N. Y. 1852, 12mo); Williams, *Notes* (Lond. 1852, 8vo); *Ebrard, *Erklärung* (Königsb. 1853, 8vo, in Olshausen's *Commentar*); Scott, *Interpretation* (Lond. 1853, 8vo); *Auberlen, *Offenbarung*, etc. (Basel, 1854, 1857, 8vo; in English, Edinb. 1856, 8vo); Graham, *Readings* (Lond. 1854, 12mo); Sutcliffe, *Lectures* (ibid. 1854, 8vo); Stern [Rom. Cath.], *Commentar* (Schaffh. 1854, 8vo); Wächtler, *Predigten* (Essen. 1854–55, 2 vols. 8vo); Grieves, *Analysis* (Lond. 1855, 8vo); Desprez, *Fulfilment* (ibid. 1855, 8vo); Pollok, *Lectures* (ibid. 1855–58, 2 vols. 12mo); Godwin, *Translation* (ibid. 1856, 8vo); Skeen, *Lectures* (ibid. 1857, 8vo); C. Paulus, *Blicke* (Stuttg. 1857, 12mo); Winslow, *Examination* (Lond. 1857, 12mo); Huntingford, *Interpretation* (ibid. 1858, 12mo; 1871, 1873, 8vo); Porter, *Lectures* (Edinb. 1858, 8vo); *Düsterdieck, *Handbuch* (Gött. 1859, 8vo, in Meyer's *Commentar*); Monk, *Interpretation* (Lond. 1859, 12mo); Galton, *Lectures* (ibid. 1859, 2 vols. 12mo); Brandt, *Anleitung* (Amst. 1860, 8vo); Kelly [W.], *Lectures* (Lond. 1860, 1871, 8vo); Curzon, *Key* (ibid. 1860, 12mo); Benno [Rom. Cath.], *Erklärung* (Munich, 1860, 8vo); Maurice, *Lectures* (Cambr. 1861, 8vo); Hooper [F. B.], *Exposition* (Lond. 1861, 2 vols. 8vo); Harper, *Exposition* (ibid. 1861, 2 vols. 8vo); Smith, *Exposition* (ibid. 1861, 8vo); Luthardt, *Erklärung* (Leips. 1861, 8vo); Williams, *Notes* (Lond. 1861, 1873, 8vo); *Volkmar, *Commentar* (Zür. 1862, 8vo); Sabel, *Erklärung* (Heidelb. 1862, 8vo); Tucker, *Explanation* (Lond. 1862, 12mo); Kemmler, *Erläuterung* (Tüb. 1863, 8vo); Vaughan, *Lectures* (Lond. 1863, 2 vols. 8vo); Bleek, *Vorlesungen* (Berl. 1863, 8vo; in English, Lond. 1875, 8vo); Jessin, *Erklärung* (Leips. 1864, 8vo); Blech, *Uebersicht* (Dantz. 1864, 8vo); Pacificus, *Erläuterung* (Leips. 1864, 8vo); Lämmert, *Auslegung* (Stuttg. 1864, 8vo); Clay, *Exposition* (Lond. 1864, 8vo); Richter, *Auslegung* (Leips. 1864, 8vo);

Hirschfeld, *Erläuterung* (Saarb. 1865, 8vo); Diedrich, *Erläuterung* (Neu Rupp. 1865, 8vo); W. A. B., *Lectures* (Dubl. 1865, 8vo); De Rougemont, *Explication* (French, Neuchâtel, 1866, 8vo); Böhmer, *Versuch* (Bresl. 1866, 8vo); Garrett, *Commentary* (Lond. 1866, 8vo); Harvey, *Exposition* (ibid. 1867, 8vo); Riemann, *Erläuterung* (Halle, 1868, 8vo); Armstrong, *Illustration* (Lond. 1868, 8vo); Tomlin, *Interpretation* (ibid. 1868, 8vo); Snell, *Notes* (2d ed. ibid. 1869, 8vo); Seirs, *Lectures* (ibid. 1869, 8vo); Stone, *Explanation* (ibid. 1869, 12mo); Vaughan, *Lectures* (3d ed. ibid. 1870, 2 vols. 8vo); Kienlen, *Commentaire* (Paris, 1870, 8vo); Anon. *Commentary* (Lond. 1870, 8vo); *Cowles, *Notes* (N. Y. 1871, 12mo); Anon. *Exposition* (ibid. 1871, 8vo); Pond, *Opening* (Edinb. 1871, 8vo); Glasgow, *Exposition* (ibid. 1872, 8vo); Gärtner, *Erklärung* (Stuttg. 1872, 8vo); Harms, *Erläuterung* (Leips. 1873, 8vo); *Kliefoth, *Erklärung* (ibid. 1874, 3 vols. 8vo); Lincoln, *Lectures* (Lond. 1874, 12mo); Füller, *Erklärung* (Nordl. 1874, 8vo); Henley, *Musings* (Lond. 1874, 12mo); Robinson, *Expositions* (ibid. 1876, 8vo); Baylee, *Commentary* (ibid. 1877, 8vo); Wolfe, *Exposition* (ibid. 1877, 8vo). See NEW TESTAMENT.

The following are exclusively on the epistles to the seven churches: Laurentius, *Expositio* (Amst. 1649, 4to); Ramirez, *Commentarius* (Lugd. 1652, fol.); More, *Exposition* (Lond. 1669, 12mo); Smith, *Epistola* [topographical] (ibid. 1678, 8vo); Johnson, *Laodicean Age* (ibid. 1733, 8vo); Allen, *Improvement* (ibid. 1733, 8vo); Wadsworth, *Lectures* (Idle, 1825, 12mo); Theime, *Commentatio* (L. B. 1827, 4to); Wichelhaus, *Predigten* (Elberf. 1827, 8vo); *Arundel, *Visit* [descriptive] (Lond. 1828, 8vo); Milner [J.], *Sermons* (ibid. 1830, 8vo); Milner [T.], *History* (ibid. 1832, 8vo); Withy, *Lectures* (ibid. 1833, 8vo); Hyatt, *Sermons* (ibid. 1834, 12mo); Muir, *Sermons* (ibid. 1835, 12mo); *M'Farlane, *Seven Churches* [descriptive, with etchings] (ibid. 1836, 4to); Blunt, *Exposition* (ibid. 1838, 12mo); Carr, *Sermons* (ibid. 1840, 12mo); Wallace, *Consideration* (ibid. 1842, 8vo); West, *Discourses* (ibid. 1846, 12mo); Thompson, *Sermons* (ibid. 1848, 8vo); Stathan, *Lectures* (ibid. 1848, 12mo); Heubner, *Predigten* (Berl. 1850, 8vo); Tom, *Die sieben Sendschr.* (Bayr. 1850, 8vo); Cumming, *Lectures* (Lond. 1850, 12mo); Parker, *Interpretation* (ibid. 1852, 12mo); Chamberlain, *Seven Ages* (ibid. 1856, 8vo); Biber, *Sermons* (ibid. 1857, 12mo); *Trench, *Commentary* (ibid. and N. Y. 1861, 12mo); *Svobode, *Seven Churches* [with 20 photographs, and *Notes* by Tristram] (Lond. 1869, 4to); *Plumptre, *Exposition* (ibid. 1877, 12mo); Anon. *Symbolic Parables* (Edinb. 1877, 12mo). See ASIA MINOR.

REVELATIONS, SPURIOUS. The Apocalyptic character, which is occupied in describing the future splendor of the Messianic kingdom and its historical relations, presents itself for the first time in the book of Daniel, which is thus characteristically distinguished from the former prophetical books. In the only prophetical book of the New Test., the Apocalypse of John, this idea is fully developed, and the several apocryphal revelations are mere imitations, more or less happy, of these two canonical books, which furnished ideas to a numerous class of writers in the first ages of the Christian Church. We here consider those especially which profess to be of a prophetic character. The principal spurious revelations extant have been published by Fabricius, in his *Cod. Pseudep. V. T.*, and *Cod. Apoc. N. T.*, and their character has been still more critically examined in recent times by archbishop Laurence (who has added to their number), by Nitzsch, Bleek, and others, and especially by Dr. Lücke, in his *Einleit. in die Offenbarung Johan. und die gesammte apocalyptische Literatur.* (See the preceding article.) Tischendorf, in his *Apocalypses Apocryphæ* (Lips. 1866, 8vo), has published the following: "Apocalypsis Mosis" (Gr. ed. princeps); "Apocalypsis Esdræ" (Gr. ed. pr.); "Apocalypsis Pauli" (Gr. ed. pr.); "Apocalypsis Johannis" (Gr. ed. pr.); "Johannis Liber de Dominatione Mariæ" (Gr. ed. pr.); "Translatio Mariæ" (Lat. ed. pr.); another "Translatio Mariæ" (Lat.); "Additamenta ad Acta Apost. Apocrypha;" "Ad Acta Andreæ et Matthiæ, ex codice unciali;" "Ad Acta Philippi, ex codd. Parisiensi et Barocciano;" "Ad Acta Thomæ, e codd. Moncrensi et Bodleiano;" "Acta Petri et Andreæ, in fine mutila, e cod. Barocciano." In the account below we have brought together the most important of these works. See APOCRYPHA.

I. *Pseudo-Revelations Purporting to Refer to Hebrew Characters.*—These are principally the following:

1, 2. The *Apocalypse of Adam* and that of *Abraham* are cited by Epiphanius (*Hæres.* xxxi, 8) as Gnostic productions. They are now wholly lost.

3. The *Book of Enoch* is one of the most curious of the spurious revelations, resembling in its outward form both the book of Daniel and the Apocalypse; but it is uncertain whether this latter work or the book of Enoch was first written. See ENOCH, BOOK OF.

4. The *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* is a similar apocryphal production. See TESTAMENT OF THE TWELVE PATRIARCHS.

5. The *Apocalypse of Moses*, mentioned by Syncellus (*Chronog.*) and Cedrenus (*Comp. Hist.*), fragments of which have been published by Fabricius (ut sup.), is conjectured by Grotius to have been a forgery of one of the ancient Christians.

In addition to this and the above work published by Tischendorf, there has lately been discovered an "Ascension" or "Assumption (Ἀνάληψις) of Moses," in the library at Milan, which has been published by Ceriani (*Monumenta Sacra* [Mediol. 1861]); Hilgenfeld (*N. T. extra Canonem* [Lips. 1866]); Volkmar (*Handb. z. d. Apokr.* [Leips. 1867, vol. iii]); and Merx (*Archiv f. wiss. Erforsch.* etc. [ibid. 1867, vol. ii]). It represents an interview between Moses and Joshua just before the death of the former, and professes to depict the future history of Israel. It seems to have been written by a Jew of the early Christian times (Ewald, *Jahrbücher*, 1852, 1853). See MOSES.

These are different works from the so-called "Little Genesis." See JUBILEES, BOOK OF.

6. *The Ascension and Vision of Isaiah* (Ἀναβατικὸν καὶ Ὅρασις Ἡσαΐου), although for a long time lost to the world, was a work well known to the ancients, as is indicated by the allusions of Justin Martyr, Origen, Tertullian, and Epiphanius. The first of these writers (*Dial. c. Tryph.* ed. Paris, p. 349) refers to the account therein contained of the death of Isaiah, who "was sawn asunder with a wooden saw—a fact," he adds, "which was removed by the Jews from the sacred text." Tertullian, also (*De Patientia*), among other examples from Scripture, refers to the same event; and in the next (the 3d) century Origen (*Epist. ad African.*), after stating that the Jews were accustomed to remove many things from the knowledge of the people which they nevertheless preserved in apocryphal or secret writings, adduces as an example the death of Isaiah, "who was *sawn asunder*, as stated in a certain apocryphal writing, which the Jews perhaps corrupted in order to throw discredit on the whole." In his *Comm. on Matt.* he refers to the same events, observing that if this apocryphal work is not of sufficient authority to establish the account of the prophet's martyrdom, it should be believed upon the testimony borne to that work by the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews (Heb. xi, 37); in the same manner as the account of the death of Zechariah should be credited upon the testimony borne by our Saviour to a writing not found in the common and published books (κοίνοις καὶ δεδημευμένοις βιβλίοις), but probably in an apocryphal work. Origen cites a passage from the apocryphal account of the martyrdom of Isaiah in one of his *Homilies* (ed. De la Rue, iii, 108). The *Apostolical Constitutions* also refer to the apocryphal books of Moses, Enoch, Adam, and Isaiah as writings of some antiquity.

The first writer, however, who mentions the Ascension of Isaiah by name is Epiphanius, in the 4th century, who observes (*Hæres.* xl.) that the apocryphal As-

cension of Isaiah was adduced by the Archonites in support of their opinions respecting the seven heavens and their archons, or ruling angels, as well as by the Egyptian Hieracas and his followers in confirmation of their heretical opinions respecting the Holy Spirit; at the same time citing the passage from the Ἀναβατικόν to which they refer (Ascens. of Isaiah ix, 27, 32–36; xi, 32, 33). Jerome also (in *Esai. lxiv*, 4) expressly names the work, asserting it to be an apocryphal production originating in a passage in the New Test. (1 Cor. ii, 9). St. Ambrose (*Opp.* i, 1124) cites a passage contained in it, but only as a traditionary report, "plerique ferunt" (Ascens. of Isaiah v, 4–8); and the author of the *Imperfect Work on Matthew*, a work of the 5th century erroneously attributed to St. Chrysostom (Chrysost. *Opp.* hom. 1), evidently cites a passage from the same work (Ascens. of Isaiah i, 1, etc.). After this period all trace of the book is lost until the 11th century, when Euthymius Zigabenus informs us that the Messalian heretics made use of that "abominable pseudepigraphal work the *Vision of Isaiah*." It was also used (most probably in a Latin version) by the Cathari in the West (P. Moneta, *Adv. Catharos*, ed. Rich. p. 218). The Vision of Isaiah is also named in a catalogue of canonical and apocryphal books in a Paris MS. (No. 1789), after the *Quæst. et Resp.* of Anastasius (Cotelerius, *PP. Apost.* i, 197, 349). Sixtus of Sienna (*Bibl. Sanct.* 1566) states that the Vision of Isaiah, as distinct from the *Anavasis* (as he calls it), had been printed at Venice. Referring to this last publication, the late archbishop Laurence observes that he had hoped to find in some bibliographical work a further notice of it, but that he had searched in vain; concluding, at the same time, that it must have been a publication extracted from the Ascension of Isaiah or a Latin translation of the Vision, as the title of it given by Sixtus was "Visio Admirabilis Esaiæ Prophetæ in Raptu Mantis, quæ Divinæ Trinitatis Arcana et Lapsi Generis Humani Redemptionem continet." Dr. Laurence observes also that the mode of Isaiah's death is further in accordance with a Jewish tradition recorded in the Talmud (*Yebammoth*, iv); and he supposes that Mohammed may have founded his own journey through seven different heavens on this same apocryphal work. He shows, at the same time, by an extract from the *Raboth*, that the same idea of the precise number of *seven* heavens accorded with the Jewish creed.

There appeared now to be little hopes of recovering the lost Ascension of Isaiah, when Dr. Laurence (then regius professor of Hebrew in the University of Oxford) had the good fortune to purchase from a bookseller in Drury Lane an Ethiopic MS. containing the identical book, together with the canonical book of Isaiah and the fourth (called in the Ethiopic the *first*) book of Esdras. It is entitled the *Ascension of the Prophet Isaiah*, the first chapters containing the martyrdom, and the rest (for it is divided in the MS. into chapters and verses) the Ascension, or Vision, of Isaiah. At the end of the canonical book are the words, "Here ends the prophet Isaiah;" after which follows the Ascension, etc.; concluding with the words, "Here ends Isaiah the prophet with his Ascension." Then follows a postscript, from which it appears that it was transcribed for a priest named Aaron, at the cost of a piece of fine cloth twelve measures long and four broad. The Ascension of Isaiah was published by Dr. Laurence at Oxford in 1819, with a new Latin and an English version. This discovery was first applied to the illustration of Scripture by Gesenius (*Comm. on Isaiah*). Some time afterwards the indefatigable Dr. Angelo Mai (*Nova Collect. Script. Vet. e Vat. Codd.* [Rome, 1828]) published two Latin fragments as an appendix to his *Sermon. Arian. Fragment. Antiquiss.*, which he conjectured to be portions of some ancient apocryphal writings. Niebuhr, however, perceived them to be fragments of the Ascension and Vision of Isaiah; and Dr. Nitzsch (*Nachweisung zweyer Bruchstücke*, etc., in the *Theolog. Stud. und Kritik.* 1830) was enabled to compare them with the two corresponding portions (ii, 14–iii, 12; vii, 1–19) of the Ethiopic version. Finally, in consequence of the more complete notice of the Venetian edition of the Latin version given by Panzer (*Annal. Typog.* viii, 473), Dr. Gieseler had a strict search made for it, which was eventually crowned with success, a copy being discovered in the library at Munich. This work, the date of whose impression was 1522, contained also the *Gospel of Nicodemus* and the *Letter of Lentulus to the Roman Senate.* The Latin version contains the Vision only, corresponding to the last chapters of the Ethiopic version.

The subject of the first part is the martyrdom of Isaiah, who is here said to have been sawn asunder in consequence of the visions which he related to Hezekiah, in the twenty-sixth year of the reign of that monarch, different from those in the canonical book. These relate principally to the coming of "Jesus Christ the Lord" from the seventh heaven; his being changed into the form of a man; the preaching of his twelve apostles; his final rejection and suspension on a tree, in company with the workers of iniquity, on the day before the Sabbath; the spread of the Christian doctrine; the last judgment; and his return to the seventh heaven. Before this, however, the arch-fiend Berial is to descend on earth in the form of an impious monarch, *the murderer of his mother*, where, after his image is worshipped in every city for three years seven months and twenty-seven days, he and his powers are to be dragged into Gehenna.

The second portion of the work gives a prolix account of the prophet's ascent through seven heavens, each more resplendent and more glorious than the other. It contains distinct prophetical allusions to the miraculous birth of Christ of the Virgin Mary at Bethlehem; his crucifixion, resurrection, and ascension; and the worship of "the Father, his beloved Christ, and the Holy Spirit." The mode of the prophet's own death is also announced to him. "The whole work," observes its learned translator, "is singularly characterized by simplicity of narration, by occasional sublimity of description, and by richness as well as vigor of imagination." Dr. Laurence conceives that the writer had no design of imposing upon the world a spurious production of his own as that of the prophet, but rather of composing a work, avowedly fictitious, but accommodated to the character and consistent with the prophecies of him to whom it is ascribed.

As to the age of this work, Dr. Laurence supposes, from the obvious reference to Nero and the period of three years seven months and twenty-seven days, and again of three hundred and thirty-two days, after which Berial was to be dragged to Gehenna, that the work was written after the death of Nero (which took place on June 9, A.D. 68), but before the close of the year 69. Lücke, however (*Einleitung*), looks upon these numbers as purely arbitrary and apocalyptical, and maintains that the dogmatical character of the work, the allusion to the corruptions of the Church, the absence of all reference to the destruction of Jerusalem, and the Chiliastic view, all point to a later period. All that can be considered as certain respecting its date is that the first portion was extant before the time of Origen and the whole before Epiphanius. It has been doubted whether the work does not consist of two independent productions, which were afterwards united into one, as in the Ethiopic version; but this is a question impossible to decide in the absence of the original. The Latin fragments discovered by Mai correspond literally with the Ethiopic; while they not only differ from the Venetian edition in single phrases, but the latter contains passages so striking as to induce the supposition that it is derived from a later recension of the original text.

The author was evidently a Jewish Christian, as appears from the use made of the Talmudical legend already referred to, as well as by his representing the false

accuser of Isaiah as a Samaritan. The work also abounds in Gnostic, Valentinian, and Ophitic notions, such as the account of the seven heavens and the presiding angels of the first five, the gradual transmutation of Christ until his envelopment in the human form, and finally the docetic conception of his history on earth. All this has induced Lücke (ut sup.) to consider the whole to be a Gnostic production of the 2d or 3d century, of which, however, the martyrdom was first written. Dr. Laurence finds so strong a resemblance between the account of the seven heavens here and in the testament of Levi (*Twelve Patriarchs*), that he suspects the latter to "betray a little plagiarism." If this learned divine were right in his conjecture respecting the early age of this production, it would doubtless afford an additional testimony, if such were wanting, to the antiquity of the belief in the miraculous conception and the proper deity of Jesus, who is here called the Beloved, the Lord, the Lord God, and the Lord Christ. In respect, however, to another passage, in which the Son and Holy Spirit are represented as worshipping God, the learned prelate truly observes that this takes place only in the character of angels, which they had assumed.

Dr. Lücke observes that the drapery only of the apocalyptic element of this work is Jewish, the internal character being altogether Christian. But in both form and substance there is an evident imitation, if not of the Apocalypse of St. John, at least of the book of Daniel and of the Sibylline oracles. The use of the canonical Apocalypse Lücke (op. cit. § 16) considers to be undeniable in viii, 45. Comp. Rev. vii, 21–23; xix, 10; xxii, 8, 9. See ISAIAH.

7. The *Epistle of Baruch* is given as the "First Book of Baruch" in the Paris and London Polyglots in Syriac and Latin, the "Second Book of Baruch" being there what is commonly known as the apocryphal book of Baruch. This letter is also contained in the Syriac "Apocalypse of Baruch" noticed below.

(I.) *The Design of this Epistle* is to comfort the nine tribes and a half who were beyond the river Euphrates, by assuring them that the sufferings which they have to endure in their captivity, and which are far less than they deserve, are but for a season, and are intended to atone for their sins; and that God, whose love towards Israel is unchangeable, will speedily deliver them from their troubles and requite their oppressors. They are therefore not to be distracted by the prosperity of their wicked enemies, which is but momentary, but to observe the law of Moses, and look forward to the day of judgment, when all that is now perplexing will be rectified.

(II.) *The Method or Plan* which the writer adopted to carry out the design of this epistle will best be seen from a brief analysis of its contents. Being convinced of the unchangeable love of God towards his people (i, 2), and of the close attachment subsisting between all the tribes (ver. 3), Baruch feels constrained to write this epistle before he dies (ver. 4) to comfort his captive brethren under their sufferings (ver. 5), which are far less than they deserve (ver. 6), and are designed to atone for (ver. 7, 8), as well as to wean them from, their sins (ver. 9), so that God might gather them together again. Baruch then informs them, first of all, that Zion has been delivered to Nebuchadnezzar because of the sins of the children of Israel (ver. 11, 12). That the enemy, however, might not boast that he had destroyed the sanctuary of the Most High by the strength of his own arm, God sent angels from heaven to destroy the forts and walls, and also to hide some of the vessels of the Temple (ver. 13–16); whereupon the enemy carried the Jews as captives to Babylon, and left only few in Zion (ver. 17), this being the burden of the epistle (ver. 18, 19). But they are to be comforted (ver. 20), for while he was mourning over Zion and praying for mercy (ver. 21, 22) the Lord revealed words of consolation to Baruch that he might comfort his brethren, which is the cause of his writing this epistle (ver. 23, 24), viz. that the Most High will punish their enemies, and that the day of judgment is nigh (ver. 25, 26). The great prosperity of the world (ver. 27), its splendid government (ver. 28), great strength (ver. 29) and glory (ver. 30), luxurious life (ver. 31), barbarous cruelty (ver. 32), and glorious dominion (ver. 33) which the Gentiles now enjoy, notwithstanding their wickedness, will speedily vanish, for the day of judgment is at hand (ver. 34), when every thought and deed will be examined and made manifest (ver. 35, 36). The captive Jews are therefore not to envy any of the present things, but patiently to look forward to the promises of the latter days (ver. 37, 38), the fulfilment of which is rapidly approaching, and for which they are to prepare themselves, lest, by neglecting this, they might lose both this world and the world to come (ver. 39–41). All that now happens tends to this truth (ii, 1–7). This Baruch sets forth to lead his brethren to virtue (ver. 8), and to warn them of God's judgment before he dies (ver. 9), that they may give heed to the words of Moses, who, in Deut. iv, 26; xxviii; xxx, 19; xxxi, 28, foretold what would befall them for leaving the law (ver. 9–12). Baruch also assures them that after they have suffered and become obedient they shall receive the reward laid up for them (ver. 13, 14), charges them to regard this epistle as a testimony between him and his brethren that they may be mindful of the law, the holy land, their brethren, the covenant of their forefathers, the solemn feasts and Sabbaths (ver. 15, 16), to transmit it, together with the law, to their children (ver. 17), and to be instant in prayer to God that he may pardon their sins and impute unto them the righteousness of their forefathers (ver. 18, 19), for "unless God judges us according to the multitude of his mercies, woe to us all who are born" (ver. 20). He, moreover, assures them that notwithstanding the fact that they have now no prophets and holy men in Zion to pray for them as in former days, yet if they rightly dispose their hearts they will obtain incorruptible treasures for their corruptible losses (ver. 21–27), and admonishes them constantly to remember these things, and prepare themselves, while in possession of this short life, for the life that is to come (ver. 28–35), when repentance will be impossible, as the judgment pronounced upon every one will be final (ver. 36–39); and to read the epistle on the solemn fast (ver. 40, 41).

(III.) *The Unity of the Epistle.*—The foregoing analysis will show that every part of this epistle contributes to the development of the main design of the writer, thus demonstrating the unity of the whole. This is, moreover, corroborated by the uniformity of diction which prevails throughout this document. It must, however, be admitted that hypercriticism may find some ground for scepticism in the latter part of it, viz. ii, 21–41. But even if it could be shown that this is a later addition, it would not interfere with the design of the whole.

(IV.) *The Author, Date, and Canonicity of the Epistle.*—With the solitary exception of the learned and eccentric William Whiston (who has translated it in *A Collection of Authentic Records* [Lond. 1727]), this epistle has been, and still is, regarded by all scholars as pseudepigraphic, and we question whether a critic could be found in the present day bold enough to defend its Baruchic authorship. All that we can gather from the document itself is: 1. That it was written by *a Jew*, as is evident (*a*) from the Hagadic story, mentioned in i, 13–15, about the destruction of the walls and forts by the angels and the hiding of the holy vessels (comp. also 2 Macc. ii, 1–4); (*b*) from the solemn admonition strictly to adhere to *the law of Moses;* (*c*) from the charge that this epistle be transmitted by the Jews to their posterity, together with the law of Moses, and be read in their assemblies at their fasts; and 2. That it was written most probably about the middle of the 2d century B.C., as appears from the admonition to be patient under the sufferings from the Gentiles, and to wait for

the day of judgment which is close at hand (i, 37–41), and the frequent reference to a future life. Ewald (*Gesch. Isr.* iv, 233) and Fritzsche (*Exeget. Handb. zu den Apokr.* i, 175) contemptuously dismiss it in a few lines, and most unjustly regard it as written "in a prolix and senseless style" *by a monk*. Besides the London and Paris Polyglots, the Syriac is contained in the beautiful edition of the Apocrypha just published (*Libri Veteris Testamenti Apocryphi Syriace, recogn.* Paul. Anton. de Lagarde, Lond. 1861), and the Latin may be found in Fabricii *Cod. Pseudepigr. V. T.* ii, 147 sq. See BARUCH.

8. The *Apocalypse of Baruch* was discovered in a Syrian manuscript, judged by Cureton to belong to the 6th century, and was first published by Cerrain in 1866 in a close Latin translation (*Mon. Sac. et Prof.* I, ii, 73–98), and in 1871 in the original Syriac (*ibid.* V, ii). The last few chapters, however, had long been known as the "Epistle of Baruch" noticed above.

(I.) *Contents.*—The composer of this work has, like the author of the book of Baruch in the ordinary Apocrypha of the Old Test., chosen as the fictitious writer of his revelations the friend and amanuensis of Jeremiah. The scene is laid in or near Jerusalem; and the supposed time is that immediately preceding and following the destruction of the city and the transportation of the people to Babylon. The author professes to give the exact year, "the twenty-fifth of Jechoniah of Judah." Jechoniah must here stand for Jehoiakim, and the twenty-fifth year ought to be the eleventh. The work divides itself into seven parts, if we treat the letter to the nine and a half tribes as a kind of appendix. Baruch is throughout represented as the speaker, referring to himself in the first person, except in the opening of ch. i and lxxviii, which are of the nature of a title.

The first part (ch. i–ix) opens by telling how the Word of the Lord came to Baruch, and warned him of the destruction impending over Jerusalem on account of the wickedness of its inhabitants. The punishment should last only for a time, and the ruin of the city should not be accomplished by the hands of its enemies. The next day the army of the Chaldæans surrounded Jerusalem; and when the sacred vessels had been committed to the safe custody of the earth, to be kept till the last times, angels overthrew the walls, the enemy were admitted, and the people were led captive to Babylon. Then Baruch and Jeremiah rent their clothes and fasted seven days.

In the second part (ch. x–xii) Jeremiah is sent to Babylon, but Baruch is told to remain amid the desolation of Zion, that God may show him what will come to pass at the end of days. So Baruch sits before the gates of the Temple and utters a lamentation over the fate of Zion, and prophesies vengeance against the victorious land now so prosperous. Having thus given vent to his grief, he again fasts for seven days.

In the third part (ch. xiii–xx) he stands upon Mount Zion, and is told that he shall be preserved till the end of times, that he may bear testimony against the nations which oppressed his people. He answers that only few shall survive in those days to hear the word of the Lord, and complains that those who have not walked in vanity like other peoples have derived no advantage from their faithfulness. The Lord answers that the future world was made on account of the just, "for this world is a contest and trouble to them in much labor, and therefore that which is to come is a crown in great glory." In further conversation Baruch is advised not to estimate the blessings of life by its length, and to look rather to the end than the beginning. He is then desired to sanctify himself and fast for seven days.

In the fourth part (ch. xxi–xxx) he comes from a cave in the valley of Cedron, whither he had withdrawn, to the place where God spoke with him before. It is sunset, and he begins to deplore the bitterness of life, and calls upon God to hasten the promised end. In reply he is reminded of his ignorance, and told that the predetermined number of men must be completed, but "that the end is not far distant." Baruch then says that he does not know what will happen to the enemies of his people, or at what time God will visit them. The signs of the end are accordingly enumerated, the last time being divided into twelve parts, each with its distinguishing characteristic. These parts, however, are to be mixed together and to minister to one another. The specified signs shall affect the whole earth, "and then Messiah will begin to be revealed." A description of the Messianic period follows, on which we need not dwell. With this the conversation terminates, and though the usual fast is not mentioned, the section evidently comes to a close.

In the fifth part (ch. xxxi–xliii), having consoled the people by telling them of the future glory of Zion, he goes and sits upon the ruins of the Temple. While he laments he falls asleep, and has a vision of a vine and a cedar, of which the interpretation is afterwards given to him. The vision relates to the triumph of the Messiah. Baruch then asks, To whom and to how many shall these things be, or who shall be worthy to live in that time? for many of God's people have thrown away the yoke of the law, but others have left their vanity and fled for refuge under God's wings. God answers him, To those who have believed will be the predicted blessings, and to those who despise will be the opposite of this. Baruch is then commanded to go and instruct the people, and afterwards to fast for seven days, preparatory to further communications.

In the sixth part (ch. xliv–xlvii) he calls together his first-born son, his friend Gadelii, and seven of the elders of the people, and tells them that he is going to his fathers, according to the ways of all the earth. He exhorts them not to depart from the law, and promises that they shall see "the consolation of Zion." He dwells on the rewards and punishments of the future world, desires them to advise the people, and assures them that, though he must die, "a wise man shall not be wanting to Israel, nor a son of the law to the race of Jacob." He then goes to Hebron, and fasts for seven days.

In the seventh part (ch. xlviii–lxxvi) he prays for compassion on this people, the people whom God has chosen, and who are unlike all others. He is told that the time of tribulation must arise, and many of its circumstances are recounted. He deplores such sad consequences of the sin of Adam, and in answer to an inquiry he is informed about the resurrection and its results. At last he falls asleep and has a vision. As this vision (ch. liii) and its interpretation (ch. lvi–lxxiv), though they bring us to no definite date, throw an interesting light upon the uncertain methods in which history was parcelled out into periods, we may notice them at more length than would otherwise be necessary. A cloud ascended from the great sea, and it was full of white and black waters, and a similitude of lightning appeared at its extremity. It passed quickly on and covered the whole earth. Afterwards it began to discharge its rain; but the waters which descended from it were not all alike, for first there were very black waters for a time, and afterwards the waters became bright, but of these there were not many. Black waters succeeded and again gave place to bright, and so on for twelve times; but the black waters were always more than the bright. At the end of the cloud it rained black waters, and these were darker than all that had been before, and fire was mingled with them, and they brought corruption and ruin. After these things the lightning which he had seen in the extremity of the cloud flashed so that it illumined the whole earth, and it healed those regions where the last waters had descended. After this twelve rivers ascended from the sea and surrounded that lightning, and were made subject to it. At this point Baruch awoke through fear. In answer to his prayer

for the interpretation of the vision, the angel Ramiel was sent to satisfy his request. The cloud symbolized "the length of the age." The first black waters were the sin of Adam, with its consequences, including the fall of the angels and the flood. The second—the bright waters—were Abraham and his descendants, and those who were like them. The third (black) waters were the mixture of all the sinners after the death of these just men, and the iniquity of the land of Egypt. The fourth (bright) waters were the advent of Moses, Aaron, Miriam, Joshua, Caleb, and all who were like them, in whose time "the lamp of the eternal law shone upon all who were sitting in darkness." The fifth (black) waters were the works of the Amorites, and the sins of the Israelites in the days of the judges. The sixth (bright) waters were the time of David and Solomon. The seventh (black) waters were the perversion of Jeroboam, and the sins of his successors, and the time of the captivity of the nine and a half tribes. The eighth (bright) waters were the righteousness of Hezekiah. The ninth (black) waters were the universal impiety in the days of Manasseh. The tenth (bright) waters were the purity of the generations of Josiah. The eleventh (black) waters were the calamity which had just happened to Zion. The rest of the interpretation is, of course, given in the future tense. "As for the twelfth (bright) waters which thou hast seen, this is the world. For the time shall come after these things when thy people shall fall into calamity, so as to be in danger of all perishing together. But nevertheless they shall be saved, and their enemies shall fall before them. And they shall for some time have much joy. And in that time, after a little, Zion shall be again built, and its oblations shall be again established, and the priests shall return to their ministry, and the nations shall again come to glorify it, but nevertheless not fully, as in the beginning. But it shall come to pass after these things that there shall be the ruin of many nations. These are the bright waters which thou hast seen." The other waters, which were blacker than all the rest, after the twelfth, belonged to the whole world, and they represented times of trouble and conflict, which are described at some length; and all who survived these should be delivered into the hands of the Messiah. These last black waters are, in the interpretation, succeeded simply by bright waters, representing the blessedness of the Messianic time. Baruch, having heard the words of the angel, expressed his wonder at the goodness of God. He is informed that, though he must depart from the earth, he shall not die. But before his removal he must go and instruct the people.

We are next told (ch. lxxvii) how Baruch went to the people and admonished them to be faithful, holding out hopes that their brethren might return from the captivity. The people promised to remember the good that God had done to them, and requested him to write a letter before his departure to their brethren in Babylon. He promised to do so, and send the epistle by the hands of men, and also to forward a letter to the nine and a half tribes by means of a bird. Accordingly, he sat alone under an oak and wrote two letters. One he sent by three men to Babylon, and the other to the tribes beyond the Euphrates by an eagle which he called. He charged the eagle not to pause till he reached his destination, and, to encourage him, reminded him of Noah's dove, of Elijah's ravens, and how "Solomon, in the time of his reign, whithersoever he wished to send or to seek anything, commanded a bird, and it obeyed him as he had commanded it." Then the letter is subjoined (ch. lxxvii–lxxxvi). It consists of a general exhortation to the captive tribes to be faithful, in the hope of being soon restored to a happier lot. The last chapter (lxxxvii) relates how he folded and sealed the letter, tied it to the eagle's neck, and despatched it.

(II.) *Author, Date, etc.*—The work, according to its title in the MS. in which it has been preserved, was "translated from Greek into Syriac." Notwithstanding the Hebraic coloring of its thought and language, it may very well have been written originally in Greek. There can be no doubt that it was written by a non-Christian Jew. Though it is rich in Messianic passages, no expression betrays a Christian hand. The book is pervaded by the strong and exclusive feeling of a Jew, confident, amid the most terrible humiliation, in the divine election of his race. It bears a strong resemblance in general structure, and even in particular thoughts and expressions, to the fourth book of Ezra. We must, of course, assign it a similar time and authorship to the epistle of Baruch above noticed, which Ewald locates in the reign of Domitian (*Gesch. Isr.* vii, 84 sq.). This is confirmed by allusions to the destruction of the Temple (ch. xxxix), and the references to Daniel's "times" as if fulfilled. See Drummond, *The Jewish Messiah* (Lond. 1877), p. 117 sq. See BARUCH.

9. The *Fourth Book of Ezra* (the *first* according to the Ethiopic and Arabic) is, from its apocalyptic character, styled by Nicephorus (*Can.* iii, 4) the *Apocalypse of Ezra* (Ἀποκάλυψις Ἔσδρᾶ). See ESDRAS, SECOND BOOK OF.

10, 11. The *Apocalypse of Zephaniah* and that of *Zechariah* are referred to by Jerome (*Ep. ad Pammach.*), and cited as lost apocryphal books in an ancient MS. of the Scriptures in the Coislinian Collection (ed. Montfaucon, p. 194).

II. *Pseudo-Revelations Purporting to Refer to Christian Characters.*—Of these the most important are the following:

1. The *Apocalypse of St. Peter* is mentioned by Eusebius (*Hist. Eccles.* iii, 3, 25), and was cited by Clement of Alexandria, in his *Adumbrations*, now lost (Euseb. *loc. cit.* vi, 14). Some fragments of it have, however, been preserved by Clement, in his *Selections from the Lost Prophecies of Theodotus the Gnostic*, and are published in Grabe's *Spicilegium* (i, 74 sq.). From these we can barely collect that this apocalypse contained some melancholy prognostications, which seem to be directed against the Jews, and to refer to the destruction of their city and nation. This work is cited as extant in the ancient fragment of the canon published by Muratori, a document of the 2d or 3d century, with this proviso, that "some of us are unwilling that it be read in the Church," as is perhaps the signification of the ambiguous passage, "Apocalypsis Johannis et Petri tantum recipimus; quam quidam ex nostris legi in ecclesia nolunt." Eusebius designates it at one time as "spurious," and at another as "heretical." From a circumstance mentioned by Sozomen (*Hist. Eccles.* vii, 19), viz. that it was read in some churches in Palestine on all Fridays in the year down to the 5th century, Lücke infers that it was a Jewish-Christian production (of the 2d century), and of the same family with the *Preaching of Peter*. It is uncertain whether this work is the same that is read by the Copts among what they call the apocryphal books of Peter.

There was also a work under the name of the *Apocalypse of Peter by his Disciple Clement*, an account of which was transmitted to pope Honorius by Jacob, bishop of Acre in the 13th century, written in the Saracenic language; but this has been conjectured to be a later work, originating in the time of the Crusades.

In the ancient Latin stichometry in Cotelerius (*Apostolic Fathers*), the *Apocalypse of St. Peter* is said to contain 2070 stichs, and that of John 1200. It is cited as an apocryphal book in the *Indiculus Scripturarum* after the *Quæstiones* of Anastasius of Nicæa, together with the *Apocalypse of Ezra* and that of Paul. There is in the Bodleian Library a MS. of an Arabic *Apocalypse of St. Peter*, of which Nicoll has furnished an extract in his catalogue, and which may possibly be a translation of the Greek apocalypse. See PETER.

2. The *Apocalypse of St. Paul* is mentioned by Augustine (*Tract.* 98 *in Ev. Joan.*), who asserts that it abounds in fables, and was an invention to which occasion was furnished by 2 Cor. xii, 2–4. This appears from

Epiphanius (*Hæres.* xxxviii, 2) to have been an anti-Jewish Gnostic production, and to be identical with the Ἀναβατικόν of Paul, used only by the anti-Jewish sect of Gnostics called Cainites. It is said by Sozomen (*Hist. Eccles.* vii, 19) to have been held in great esteem. It was also known to Theophylact and Œcumenius (*on* 2 *Cor. xii,* 4), and to Nicephorus in the 9th century (*Can.* iii, 4). Whether this is the same work which Dupin (*Proleg.* and *Canon*) says is still extant among the Copts is rendered more than doubtful by Fabricius (*Cod. Apoc.* ii, 954) and Grabe (*Spicileg.* i, 85). The *Revelation of St. Paul,* contained in an Oxford MS., is shown by Grabe (loc. cit.) to be a much later work. Theodosius of Alexandria (Ἐρωτήματα περὶ προσωδιῶν) says that the Apocalypse of St. Paul is not a work of the apostle, but of Paul of Samosata, from whom the Paulicians derived their name. The Revelation of St. Paul is one of the spurious works condemned by pope Gelasius, together with the Revelations of St. Thomas and St. Stephen.

3. There was an apocryphal *Revelation of St. John* extant in the time of Theodosius the Grammarian, the only one of the ancients who mentions it, and who calls it a pseudepigraphal book. It was not known what had become of it, until the identical work was recently published, from a Vatican as well as a Vienna manuscript, by Birch, in his *Auctarium,* under the title of "The Apocalypse of the Holy Apostle and Evangelist John the Divine." From the silence of the ancients respecting this work, it could scarcely have been written before the 3d or 4th century. Lücke has pointed out other internal marks of a later age, as, for instance, the mention of *incense,* which he observes first came into use in the Christian Church after the 4th century (although here the author of the spurious book may have taken his idea from Rev. v, 8; viii, 3); also of *images* and *rich crosses,* which were not in use before the "4th and 5th centuries." The name *patriarch,* applied here to a dignitary in the Church, belongs to the same age. The time in which Theodosius himself lived is not certainly known, but he cannot be placed earlier than the 5th century, which Lücke conceives to be the most probable age of the work itself. Regarding the object and occasion of the work (which is a rather servile imitation of the genuine Apocalypse), in consequence of the absence of dates and of internal characteristics, there are no certain indications. Birch's text, as well as his manuscripts, abounds in errors; but Thilo has collated two Paris manuscripts for his intended edition (see his *Acta Thomæ, Proleg.* p. lxxxiii). Assemani (*Bibl. Orient.* III, i, 282) states that there is an Arabic version among the Vatican MSS.

III. *Pseudo-Revelations bearing Extracanonical Names.* —Of these the following deserve special notice:

1. The *Prophecies of Hystaspes* were in use among the Christians in the 2d century. This was apparently a pagan production, but is cited by Justin Martyr, in his *Apology,* as agreeing with the Sibylline oracles in predicting the destruction of the world by fire. Clemens Alexandrinus (*Strom.* vi) and Lactantius (*Instit.* vii, 15) also cite passages from these prophecies, which bear a decidedly Christian character.

2. The ancient romantic fiction entitled the *Shepherd of Hermas* is not without its apocalyptic elements. These, however, are confined to book i, 3, 4; but they are destitute of signification or originality. See Hermas.

3. The *Apocalypse of Cerinthus* is mentioned by Eusebius (*Hist. Eccles.* iii, 28), and by Theodoret (*Fab. Hæret.* ii, 3). Eusebius describes it as a revelation of an earthly and sensual kingdom of Christ, according to the heresy of the Chiliasts. Of the Revelations of St. Thomas and St. Stephen, we know nothing beyond their condemnation by pope Gelasius, except that Sixtus of Sienna observes that, according to Serapion, they were held in high repute by the Manichees; but in the works of Serapion which we now possess there is no allusion to this. There is, however, an unpublished MS. of Serapion in the Hamburg Library, which is supposed to contain a more complete copy of his work. See Cerinthus.

4. The *Sibylline Oracles* is the title of an apochryphal work, evidently of Christian origin, of the early centuries of our æra, written as a sort of parody on the famous Roman traditionary books of that name. See Sibylline Oracles.

Revenge (נְקָמָה, ἐκδίκησις) means the return of injury for injury, or the infliction of pain on another in consequence of an injury received from him further than the just ends of reparation or punishment require. Revenge differs materially from resentment, which rises in the mind immediately on being injured; but revenge is a cool and deliberate wickedness, and is often executed years after the offence is given. By some it is considered as a perversion of anger. Anger, it is said, is a passion given to man for wise and proper purposes, but revenge is the corruption of anger, is unnatural, and therefore ought to be suppressed. It is observable that the proper object of anger is vice; but the object, in general, of revenge, is man. It transfers the hatred due to the vice to the man, to whom it is not due. It is forbidden by the Scriptures, and is unbecoming the character and spirit of a peaceful follower of Jesus Christ. See Anger.

Revenues of the Church. It is clearly taught in the New Test. that it is the duty of Christians to give temporal support to their teachers. The general principle was laid down by our Lord (Luke x, 7) that the laborer is worthy of his hire. Paul says, "Even so hath the Lord ordained that they which preach the Gospel should live of the Gospel" (1 Cor. xix, 14). The following passages treat of the relation which subsists between the ministers and the Church in this respect: Acts xviii, 3; xxiv, 17; 2 Cor. xi, 7, 8; xii, 13; Phil. iv, 16–18; 1 Tim. vi, 5; Titus i, 11. So we see that the Church is bound to provide for the maintenance of its pastors; but, at the same time, the pastor is to act in a liberal spirit, and not to make unnecessary demands upon the Church. These principles were carried out in the apostolic times and subsequently. Fixed stipends were not paid in early times, because the Church did not possess property, and therefore the contributions were voluntary. These voluntary offerings were of two sorts: 1. The weekly or daily oblations that were made at the altar; 2. The monthly oblations that were cast into the treasury of the Church. And then arose the custom of dividing up the monthly contribution and paying the clergy their share, according to their order. Another sort of revenue was such as arose annually from the lands and possessions given to the Church, which were greatly increased in the time of Constantine, who authorized the bequeathing of property to the Church. A third source of revenue was the granting to the clergy an allowance out of the public money. Constantine both gave the clergy particular largesses, as their occasion required, and also settled upon them a standing allowance out of the exchequer. A fourth source of revenue was the estates of martyrs and confessors dying without heirs, which were settled upon the Church by Constantine. Still later rulers (Theodosius the younger and Valentinian III) settled upon the Church the estates of clergymen dying without heirs. Besides these sources of revenue, there were others, such as the donation of heathen temples and sometimes their revenues, heretical conventicles and their revenues, the temporal estates of clergymen or monks who became seculars again. Great care, however, at first was taken not to receive estates donated to the Church to the great detriment of others. Respecting the ancient way of managing and distributing these revenues, we may remark that the revenues of the whole diocese were in the hands of the bishop, and by his care distributed among the clergy. As a safeguard against mismanagement, he was obliged to give an account of his administration in a provincial synod; after a while this rule obtained in the Western Church. The division was usually into

three or four parts—one to the bishop, a second to the rest of the clergy, a third to the poor, and a fourth to the necessary uses of the Church. Suspension from participation in the revenues was one method of punishment visited upon the clergy. See Bingham, *Christ. Antiq.* bk. v, ch. vi, p. 1–6.

Reverence (usually some form of יָרֵא, *φοβέομαι*, *to fear*), a respectful, submissive disposition of mind arising from affection and esteem, from a sense of superiority in the person reverenced. Hence children reverence their fathers even when their fathers correct them by stripes (Heb. xii, 9); hence subjects reverence their sovereign (2 Sam. ix, 6); hence wives reverence their husbands (Eph. v, 33); and hence all ought to reverence God. We reverence the name of God, the house of God, the worship of God, etc.; we reverence the attributes of God, the commands, dispensations, etc., of God; and we ought to demonstrate our reverence by overt acts, such as are suitable and becoming to time, place, and circumstances. For though a man may reverence God in his heart, yet unless he behave reverentially and give proofs of his reverence by demeanor, conduct, and obedience, he will not easily persuade his fellow-mortals that his bosom is the residence of this divine and heavenly disposition; for, in fact, a reverence for God is not one of those lights which burn under a bushel, but one of those whose sprightly lustre illuminates wherever it is admitted. Reverence is, strictly speaking, perhaps the internal disposition of the mind, *φόβος* (Rom. xiii, 7); and honor, *τιμή*, the external expression of that disposition.

Reverend, a title prefixed by courtesy to the name of any clergyman, though "clerk" (*clericus*) is the legal and strictly proper description of clergymen, and is, in official documents, placed *after* (as "Reverend" is *before*) their names.

In the Church of England and the Protestant Episcopal and Roman Catholic churches the title is given to ecclesiastics of the second and third orders, the bishops being styled "right reverend." In some churches ordained abbesses and prioresses are called "reverend mothers."

Revision OF THE BIBLE. See AUTHORIZED VERSION.

Revivals OF RELIGION, a phrase commonly used to indicate renewed interest in religious subjects, or a period of religious awakening. It comes from *revive* (Lat. *revivo*), to *live again*, and is often improperly applied to excitements which can hardly be called religious, because they do not apprehend, or propose to *revive*, the real, inner, spiritual life of the soul, which alone constitutes true religion. Setting out with erroneous views as to the work to be effected, such excitements necessarily fall short of its accomplishment.

These words are also used to denote the conversion of sinners as well as the quickening of believers. This arises from the fact that the two events are generally (not always) coincident. Sinners, who withstand God himself, may resist the Church in her best estate; and they are sometimes converted when the Church, as a body, is spiritually asleep. Yet such is the influence of spiritual life, and such the usual sanction given by the Holy Ghost to its loving endeavors to save men, that a real revival of the Church leads directly to the conversion of others. Therefore "a revival is simply an increase of the best desires, affections, and exertions of persons who are already pious and benevolent, such an increase as, by the blessing of Heaven, awakens in the ungodly an anxiety for their salvation. . . . When these evidences of increased engagedness in the cause of Christ are unequivocally manifested anywhere, it is too late for an impartial observer to doubt that a genuine revival of religion has there commenced." To understand this subject in its bearings upon the different classes to be benefited, it is necessary to have just conceptions of religion itself, the means of its attainment and revival, and the evidences by which it is distinguished. These points, with some others necessarily involved, are indicated by the following propositions.

1. That all men unrenewed by the grace of God are sinners. Paul represents them as dead in trespasses and in sins, walking according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air, having their conversation in the lusts of the flesh, fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the mind, and as by nature children of wrath.

2. This being their condition—corrupt in heart and disobedient in practice—they need two important works effected in and for them; namely, the *pardon* of all their sins, exempting them from the penalty of the law, and the *renewal* of their souls in righteousness, conforming them to the moral image of God, and thus fitting them to do his will from the heart here, and enjoy the holiness of heaven hereafter.

3. That the atonement of Christ provided for just these results, as may be seen by the following announcements: "If we confesss our sins, he is faithful and just to *forgive* us our sins, and to *cleanse* us from *all unrighteousness*" (1 John i, 9). "But ye are *washed*, but ye are *sanctified*, but ye are *justified* in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God" (1 Cor. vi, 11). And to show the absolute necessity of this double work, Jesus said to Nicodemus, "Except a man be *born again*, he cannot see the kingdom of God" (John iii, 3). Revivals which aim at anything short of this are not revivals of *religion* in the proper sense of that word. They may arouse the fears of men and improve their habits, but they do not *save* in the Gospel sense, nor will their results be satisfactory to the depraved and guilty sinner, or to any spiritual Church.

4. Another important fact to be remembered is, that this is the *work of God*. He only can forgive sins, or renew the heart. The object of a true revival is, therefore, not to absolve sinners, but to bring them to God; in other words, to persuade them to accept the terms of reconciliation, that he may save them. Pronouncing them converted on their avowing a "desire" or "purpose" to seek the Lord is unauthorized, and exceedingly dangerous. We should instruct and encourage them to wait in the way of duty till God shall do the work, when they will need no absolution from man. Many, it is to be feared, have been misled right at this point, to their eternal sorrow. They have been taught to believe that religion is all their own work, a mere change of opinion or position; that they are to convert themselves. It is sometimes called a *growth;* whereas it is first a new *creation*, a *new life*, and adoption into the family of God by his own sovereign act. Like all other acts, it must be done at some *specific time*—in a moment. One must be born again before he can grow. If backslidden, he must repent and be forgiven as at the first, and have the old "joy of salvation" restored unto him.

5. When this work is accomplished, it will be verified, *first*, by the Holy Spirit witnessing to the fact as it witnesses in conviction to the sinner's guilt, condemnation, and danger; and, *secondly*, by its fruits, "love, joy, peace, long suffering," etc., and aversion to former sins and associations. How does an awakened sinner know that he is a sinner? He *feels* that he is, and this is confirmed by the uniform conflict of his life and temper with the Word of God. How does a real convert know that he is converted? Because he now feels the same assurance in his heart that he is a Christian which he felt before that he was a sinner, and he knows that he is living a life of obedience; whereas, before, he lived in rebellion. He can say from the heart, with Paul, "Being justified by faith, we have *peace* with God through our Lord Jesus Christ, . . . and *rejoice* in the hope of the glory of God" (Rom. v, 1, 2); and, with John, "We *know* that we have passed from death unto life because we *love* the brethren" (1 John iii, 14). Converts who stop short of a joyous experience of the love of God will go limping through life, if they do not utterly fall away.

6. The revival of this style of religion is best pro-

moted by the inculcation of the fundamental truths of the Gospel, such as human depravity, natural and acquired; the sinfulness of men in rebellion against God, and in refusing to accept of offered mercy; the certainty of their loss of heaven, and the endurance of eternal punishment, if they do not repent; the amplitude of the atonement for every one who will deny himself, take up his cross, and follow Christ, according to the light that is in and around him; the ability of sinners, by grace, to so repent and believe as to be saved; and the blessedness on earth and in heaven which God will bestow upon all who seek him with their whole heart.

As to the best manner of presenting these truths, there is room for difference of opinion. Under ordinary circumstances, however, where the Word of God is freely circulated, their earnest, sympathetic, persuasive *proclamation* is more effective than any attempt to prove them. Many give infidelity too much credit, and spend their time and strength in defending to the understanding what they ought to preach to the *heart*. They controvert and argue where they should persuade and entreat. The people in the circumstances supposed generally *believe* the Gospel as really as their preachers, but neglect its claims from worldly considerations. These obstacles need to be neutralized or removed. This can be more successfully done by showing their triviality in comparison with the tremendous interests at stake on the side of religion than by the explosion of heretical sentiments which their hearers would be glad to have true, but in which they have little confidence.

The most effective suggestion that we can make on this point is, perhaps, that the preacher *aim* to promote the revival of his Church and the conversion of sinners. Those who fail to do so seldom win souls to Christ. Revivals are not produced by such indifference. Says the immortal Richard Baxter to pastors: "If your heart is not set on the end of your labors, and if you do not long to see the conversion and edification of your hearers, and study and preach in *hope*, you are not likely to see much success. It is a sign of a false, self-seeking heart when a person is contented to be still doing without seeing any fruit of his labor. . . . He never had the right ends of a preacher in view who is indifferent whether he obtains them or not; who is not grieved when he misses them, and rejoices when he can see the desired issue."

With this *aim*, and a proper understanding of human nature and the Gospel, one will not seriously err in the selection of subjects. Nor will he preach so much *about* the people as *to* them. Effective efforts have always been characterized by their directness. Said Nathan to David, "*Thou* art the man;" and Joshua to Israel, "Choose *you* this day whom you will serve." When Peter preached on the day of Pentecost, "Let the house of Israel know assuredly that God hath made that same Jesus, whom *ye have crucified*, both Lord and Christ," his hearers were "pricked in their hearts, and said, Men and brethren, what shall we do?"

But revivals must not be left alone to preachers, or preaching. Every talent of the Church should be enlisted in all appropriate ways. *Testimony* as to personal experience is a powerful agency, and should be largely employed in private, and often in public. The same is true of lay instruction, exhortation, and persuasion. When these means fail, the object may be gained by a *tract* or *book*. The printed page has won grand fields inaccessible to living agencies, and where these have toiled in vain. *Prayer* is another powerful means of revivals, which often prevails where everything else fails. Their history glows with the wonders of its power. *Singing* Gospel truths in an impressive manner is often effective. It attracts and softens many who care little for preaching or prayer. It has always been prominent in this work, but never more successful than at the present time.

7. Revivals are *necessary* from many considerations. First, because, as a matter of fact, most Christians do backslide more or less from their first love. The history of God's ancient people is little more than a consecutive account of their backslidings and recoveries. The apostolic age was clouded by similar defections, and followed by the "Dark Ages." The slumbers of that long night were unbroken until the revival trumpet of Luther was heard from Wittenberg calling for reform. Even the Puritans of New England declined. Says Mr. Tracy, in speaking of their condition at the commencement of the great revival under Edwards, Whitefield, and others, "Such had been the downward progress in New England that there were many in the churches, and even some in the ministry, who were yet lingering among the supposed preliminaries to conversion. The difference between the Church and the world was vanishing away, and yet never, perhaps, had the expectation of reaching heaven at last been more general or confident." That revival changed all this for the time, but in less than half a century there was another sad relapse. When the Wesleys and Whitefield awoke to the claims of religion in England, the new birth was a dead letter, and conversions were scarcely known; while drinking, gambling, cock-fighting, and every species of popular vice were patronized by the Church and many of the clergy.

In view of these facts, what would have become of religion but for revivals? Had Joshua, and David, and Josiah, and Ezra, and Luther, and Edwards, the Wesleys, Whitefield, and other revivalists, clung to established customs, and opposed innovations, as some did, and as others do now, the name of God would hardly have been preserved from oblivion.

The same tendency is observable in individuals and some churches now. They are in close fellowship with sin and the world, without God, and without any well-grounded hope.

Revivals are also necessary because there is no other cure for the evils to be remedied. Spiritual life can never spring out of the dead, worldly policy which eschews revivals: reason, common-sense, and history are all against it. We may fill the Church with man-made converts, who have been coaxed into a profession of religion without having the first elements of a Christian character; but that is not God's work, nor is it religious; it is rather an attempt to cover the wolf in sheep's clothing, to be stripped of his false pretence when it is too late to repent and be saved. Nearly all the religion of the ages is attributable to revivals. Every device to supersede their necessity has failed. It may be added with special emphasis that revivals are necessary to the triumph of *moral reforms*. Experience has taught many that they cannot reform without the grace of God. Such were their habits of licentiousness, profanity, intemperance, fraud, sinful amusements, etc., that all attempts at reform were fruitless until they came to God for salvation. Then they found deliverance, not from the *habit* only, but from all disposition to follow it. This is the only solid basis of reform, when bad appetites, passions, and habits are fully established. God only can save in these extreme cases.

8. Revival measures require great courage, zeal, and decision in their leaders to make them most effective. Because, first, they generally encounter opposition from without, and often from professors of religion. It may be silent, but still it is real and hurtful. Sometimes it takes the form of friendship, as in the case of Nehemiah and Sanballat, and suggests damaging complications, which require clear perception and invincible firmness. At others it is outspoken and threatening, which is less hurtful. But not unfrequently genuine but misguided friends of the work have to be restrained to prevent their hindering what they fain would help. To do this successfully often requires much decision and tact. But it must be done. A few weak and fanatical people have sometimes been allowed to neutralize the best efforts. But there seems to be little danger from that quarter at the present time. These measures suffer more from

spiritual *death* than from overaction. And yet with some there is so much dread of excitement that they hardly dare to light the fires of revival for fear of an explosion. These circumstances call for courage to venture. But many who wish well to the cause have *no faith* in God or man. They cannot see how success is to be achieved, and therefore they hesitate to attempt it. Here is another call for courage. Many of the great revivals of the ages commenced with one man. He alone believed, and worked it up; but when it became manifest that God was with him, others rallied to his support. In the progress of the work this same unbelief, during every little reverse, is prompt to predict that it is going to stop. This calls for more faith in the leader, who will do well to review the book of Nehemiah. Then churches sometimes get weary, and want their evenings for rest, business, or recreation, and propose to suspend the meetings. A proper zeal will suggest some little modification of measures, and strike for new achievements. Revivals have been successfully carried on for years under this policy; not so much by holding meetings every evening as by making every meeting, whether regular or extra, to advance the work.

Literature.—Thoughts on the Revival of Religion in New England [1740]; to which is prefixed *A Narrative of the Surprising Work of God in Northampton, Mass.* [1735] (N. Y.); Porter, *Revivals of Religion, showing their Theory, Means, Obstructions, Importance, and Perversions. with the Duty of Christians in regard to them* (N. Y. and Cincinnati, 1877); Finney, *Lectures on Revivals of Religion* (Oberlin, O. 1868); Fish, *Handbook of Revivals, for the Use of Winners of Souls* (Boston, 1874). See *North Brit. Rev.* Nov. 1860; *Mercersb. Rev.* Jan. 1872. (J. P.)

Revocātus was a Christian martyr under Severus, a catechumen of Carthage, and a slave. On the day appointed for the execution, he was led to the amphitheatre, and, having denounced God's judgment upon his persecutors, was ordered to run the gantlet between the hunters. He was then destroyed by wild beasts, A.D. 205.—Fox, *Book of Martyrs.*

Revolution. The name given to that *change* in the civil and ecclesiastical constitution of England which took place when James II had been expelled from the throne in the year 1688, and his son-in-law, William, prince of Orange, was elected by the voice of the people. The immediate occasion of the Revolution was a fallacious proclamation issued by James, under the pretence of extending toleration; but the true object of which was to place all the offices of trust in the hands of the papists, whose hopes had been revived by the death of Charles II. Some Protestant Dissenters were imposed upon by this specious pretence; but the sagacity of the bishops justly apprehending the intended consequences, they strenuously contended and petitioned against the proclamation, and alarmed the fears of Protestants throughout the kingdom.

Revolution Settlement. The settlement of the Church of Scotland under William and Mary is so-called. It was dictated by policy, and did not restore the platform of 1638, but adopted the ratification of 1592. Its object was to restore peace and order, to put an end to agitation, and by the appearance of moderation to curb extremes, to take away all pretext for violence, and induce all classes of the people to exhibit a loyal spirit to the new occupants of the British throne. See SCOTLAND, CHURCH OF.

Rex Christe, FACTOR OMNIUM, is the beginning of a hymn ascribed to Gregory the Great (q. v.). Luther is said to have pronounced this to be the best hymn. We subjoin the first verse in both Latin and English:

"Rex Christe, factor omnium,
Redemptor et credentium,
Placare votis supplicum
Te laudibus colentium."

"O Christ, our king, Creator, Lord,
Saviour of all who trust thy Word,
To them who seek thee ever near,
Now to our praises bend thine ear."

This is the translation as given in the *Lyra Domestica*, p. 266. Into German it has been translated by Simrock, in his *Lauda Sion Salvatorem*, p. 91, "Christ, König, Schöpfer aller Welt;" by Rambach, in his *Anthology*, i, 113, "O Christus, König aller Welt;" by Königsfeld, in his *Hymnen u. Gesänge*, i, 72, "Christ, König, Schöpfer aller Welt," which is also adopted by Bässler, in his *Auswahl altchristlicher Gesänge*, p. 67, and by Fortlage, in his *Gesänge christl. Vorzeit*, p. 76, "O Christus, Herr der Majestät." Besides these translations, Koch enumerates a number of others (*Opp.* i, 74). (B. P.)

Rey, CLAUDE, a French prelate, was born at Aix, Nov. 27, 1773. In 1800 he concluded his theological studies at the Seminary of St. Sulpice at Paris, and became secretary to the vicar-general. In 1816 he was titular canon of Aix, and prebend in 1821. In consequence of the stand he took concerning the new heads of the State, not considering it necessary to omit mentioning them in the public prayers of the Church, he was obliged to defend his position by a pamphlet. Notwithstanding this controversy, he was made capitulary vicar-general, Nov. 24, 1830. In 1831 he was appointed bishop of Dijon. This was the first bishop appointed by Louis Philippe, whose claim to the throne was held by the high clergy to be illegitimate. The court of Rome hesitated to confirm the appointment, but finally Gregory XVI preconized Rey, and authorized that he should be consecrated by a single bishop, assisted by two dignitaries. But such was the feeling against the proceeding that for a long time no one would consent to consecrate him. At last the ceremony was performed by the bishop of Carthagena. The episcopacy of Rey lasted for six years, and was a constant contest for the rights of his position. A remonstrance was at last issued against his exercising his public functions, and he was forced to resign. He left Dijon, June 21, 1838, and retired to Aix as canon of the Church of St. Denis, where he died, Aug. 17, 1858. His writings are, *Prières pour la Consécration d'un Évêque* (1808):—*Précis Historique de Notre Dame d'Aix* (Aix, 1816):—*Réflexions sur les Affaires Ecclésiastiques du Diocèse de Dijon*, etc.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.

Reyes, NATHAN ABBOT, a minister of the German Reformed Church, was born at Toilton, N. H., Dec. 26, 1807. He graduated at Dartmouth College with honor in 1835, and afterwards studied theology at Andover and at Lane seminary. Having been appointed by the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions as a missionary to Syria, he sailed for Beirut in 1840. Political and other disturbances, together with his impaired health, induced him to return, which he did, with the approbation of the board, in 1844. He now spent some time in ministerial labor in Charlemont and South Royalton, Mass.; and in the spring of 1847 was called to the pastorate of the German Reformed Church in Lancaster, Pa., in whose service he continued till 1855, when he resigned and took charge of a church in Princeton, Ill., and after one year was called to Griggsville, Ill. Before his removal, however, he was called away by death, March 31, 1857. He was a man of fine talents, good education, warm zeal, and excellent life.

Reymond, HENRI, a French prelate, was born at Vienne, Dauphiné, Nov. 21, 1737. He studied in the Jesuit college of his native village, was ordained priest, and became vicar of St. George's at Vienne. At the time of the Revolution he embraced the popular ideas, and in 1792 was elected bishop of Isère. During the Reign of Terror he was arrested and kept in close confinement for nearly a year. He took part in the council of 1797, and was charged with publishing its acts. In 1802 he signed the formula of retraction required by the pope, and was consecrated bishop of Dijon. During the empire he advocated the cause of Napoleon, which caused his removal by Louis XVIII, but he afterwards returned

to his diocese. He died at Dijon, Feb. 20, 1820. His principal writings are, *Droits des Curés et des Paroisses*, etc. (Paris, 1776):—*Droits des Pauvres* (ibid. 1781):—*Observations sur l'Enseignement Élémentaire de la Religion* (1804):—a *Mémoire Justificatif* of his own life, printed in the *Chronique Religieuse*.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.

Reyna, Cassiodoro de, a Spanish Hebraist, was born at Seville. He embraced the ecclesiastical life, but renounced it upon leaving his native country. He established himself in Frankfort and engaged in business, which he abandoned to take charge of a French congregation in London. From thence he went to Antwerp, and again lived in Frankfort, where he openly avowed his acquiescence in the Confession of Augsburg. It is supposed he was living at Basle when his version of the Scriptures in Spanish was published. In the preface to this work he makes himself appear a Catholic, in order to secure a greater sale for the book. The title is *La Biblia, que es los Sacros Libros del V. y N. Testamento, trasladada en Español* (Basle, 1569, 4to). Reyna pretended to have translated directly from the Hebrew, but it is said that he never saw any original except the Latin version of Pagnini. A new edition was prepared by Cyprian de Valera (Amst. 1596). Another work of Reyna is *Annotationes in Loca Selectiora Evangelii Joannis* (Frankfort, 1573). Reyna died at Frankfort, March 15, 1594. See Antonio, *Bibl. Nova Hispana*; Lelong, *Bibl. Sacra*.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, s. v.

Reynolds, Edward, D.D., an English prelate, was born in Southampton, November, 1599. In 1615 he became postmaster of Merton College, and in 1620 probationer fellow. He was made preacher at Lincoln's Inn, and rector of Braynton, in Northamptonshire; but in the rebellion of 1642 he sided with the Presbyterians. In 1643 he was one of the Westminster Assembly divines, and took the covenant. In 1648 he became dean of Christ Church and vice-chancellor of the University of Oxford. He refused the Engagement (1651) and was ejected from his deanery; was vicar of St. Lawrence's, Jewry, London; restored to his deanery in 1659, and in 1660 was made chaplain to Charles II. In the same year he was elected warden of Merton College, and made bishop of Norwich. He died in July 1667. He published *Sermons*, *Theological Treatises*, *Meditations*, etc.

Reynolds, Joshua (*Sir*), considered the founder of the English school of painting as regards its special characteristics, was born at Plympton, in Devonshire (where his father was rector), July 16, 1723. He was intended for the medical profession, but was induced by the perusal of Richardson's *Essays on Painting*, etc., to take up painting as a profession. A handsome edition of these essays was in 1773 dedicated to Sir Joshua by Richardson's son, comprising *The Theory of Painting*, *Essay on the Art of Criticism*, and *The Science of a Connoisseur*. Reynolds's first master was Hudson, the portrait-painter, with whom he was placed in 1741. He first set up as a portrait-painter at Devonport, but in 1746 settled in London, in St. Martin's Lane. In 1749 he accompanied Commodore Keppel in the Centurion to the Mediterranean, and remained altogether about three years in Italy. He commenced business again in London in 1752, and soon became the most prominent painter of the capital. In 1768, when the Royal Academy was established, Reynolds was unanimously elected president at the first meeting of the members, Dec. 14 of that year, and he was knighted by George III in consequence. In 1784 he succeeded Allan Ramsay as principal painter in ordinary to the king; and, after an unrivalled career as a portrait-painter, died at his house in Leicester Square, Feb. 23, 1792. He was buried with great pomp in St. Paul's Cathedral, where a fine statue by Flaxman is placed immediately below the dome, in honor of his memory. His large fortune, about £80,000, was inherited by his niece, Miss Palmer, who became afterwards marchioness of Thomond. His collection of works of art sold for nearly £17,000. Sir Joshua Reynolds, notwithstanding his careless and feeble drawing, was indisputably a great painter; some of his portraits are among the first masterpieces of the art, whether as simple portraits or as fancy pieces; as, for instance, *Lord Heathfield*, in the National Gallery, of the former class, and *Mrs. Siddons as the Tragic Muse*, at Dulwich, of the latter. His pictures are necessarily very numerous. Their chief excellence is their natural grace, fulness of expression, substantial character, and frequently a charming richness of color and light and shade. Among the most remarkable are *The Cardinal and Christian Virtues*, *Nativity*, and *Holy Family*. His eulogium cannot be better expressed than in the words of Burke: "He was the first Englishman who added the praise of the elegant arts to the other glories of his country.... The loss of no man of his time can be felt with more sincere, general, and unmixed sorrow." Sir Joshua has bequeathed to posterity, besides his paintings, fifteen elegant and valuable *Discourses*, of which a magnificent edition, edited by John Burnet, was published by James Carpenter in 1842. A later edition was published (Hudson, O. 1853, 12mo); and his *Life and Discourses* (N. Y. 1859, 12mo). There is a full *Life of Reynolds* by Northcote (Lond. 1819, 2 vols. 8vo).

Reys, Manoel dos, a Portuguese Jesuit, was taught at Coimbra, and preached with great power and success. He died at Braga, April 21, 1699. His *Sermons* were printed at Evora (1717-24).

Re'zeph (Heb. *Re'tseph*, רֶצֶף, *a hot stone*, as in 1 Kings xix, 6; Sept. Ῥασέφ, Ῥαφείς, v. r. Ῥαφές), one of the places which Sennacherib mentions, in his taunting message to Hezekiah, as having been destroyed by his predecessor (2 Kings xix, 12; Isa. xxxvii, 12). He couples it with Haran and other well-known Mesopotamian spots. It is supposed to be the same that Ptolemy mentions under the name of *Rhesopha* (Ῥησώφα) as a city of Palmyrene (*Geog.* v, 15); and this, again, is possibly the same with the *Rasapha* which Abulfeda places at nearly a day's journey west of the Euphrates. The name is still a common one, Yakût's *Lexicon* quoting these two and seven other less important towns so called. See Sennacherib.

Rezi'a (Heb. *Ritsyah'*, רִצְיָה, *delight*; Sept. Ῥασιά), the third named of three sons of Ulla, of the tribe of Asher (1 Chron. vii, 39). B.C. perhaps cir. 1618.

Re'zin (Heb. *Retsin'*, רְצִין, *firm*, perhaps *prince*), the name of two men.

1. (Sept. Ῥασίν, Ῥαασσών.) A king of Damascus, contemporary with Pekah in Israel, and with Jotham and Ahaz in Judæa. The policy of Rezin seems to have been to ally himself closely with the kingdom of Israel, and, thus strengthened, to carry on constant war against the kings of Judah. He attacked Jotham during the latter part of his reign (2 Kings xv, 37); but his chief war was with Ahaz, whose territories he invaded, in company with Pekah, soon after Ahaz had mounted the throne (B.C. cir. 740). The combined army laid siege to Jerusalem, where Ahaz was, but "could not prevail against it" (Isa. vii, 1; 2 Kings xvi, 5). Rezin, however, "recovered Elath to Syria" (ver. 6); that is, he conquered and held possession of the celebrated town of that name at the head of the Gulf of 'Akabah, which commanded one of the most important lines of trade in the East. Soon after this he was attacked by Tiglath-pileser II, king of Assyria, to whom Ahaz in his distress had made application. His armies were defeated by the Assyrian hosts; his city besieged and taken; his people carried away captive into Susiana; and he himself slain (ver. 9; comp. Tiglath-pileser's own inscriptions, where the defeat of Rezin and the destruction of Damascus are distinctly mentioned). This treatment

was probably owing to his being regarded as a rebel, since Damascus had been taken and laid under tribute by the Assyrians some time previously (Rawlinson, *Herodotus*, i, 467).

2. The head of one of the families of the Nethinim who returned from Babylon (Ezra ii, 48; Neh. vii, 50). B.C. ante 536.

Re'zon (Heb. *Rezon'*, רְזוֹן, *prince;* Sept. Ῥαζών v. r. Ἐσρώμ), the son of Eliadah, a Syrian, who, when David defeated Hadadezer, king of Zobah, put himself at the head of a band of freebooters and set up a petty kingdom at Damascus (1 Kings xi, 23). B.C. post 1043. Whether he was an officer of Hadadezer, who, foreseeing the destruction which David would inflict, prudently escaped with some followers, or whether he gathered his band of the remnant of those who survived the slaughter, does not appear. The latter is more probable. The settlement of Rezon at Damascus could not have been till some time after the disastrous battle in which the power of Hadadezer was broken, for we are told that David at the same time defeated the army of Damascene Syrians who came to the relief of Hadadezer, and put garrisons in Damascus. From his position at Damascus he harassed the kingdom of Solomon during his whole reign. With regard to the statement of Nicolaus in the 4th book of his history, quoted by Josephus (*Ant.* vii, 5, 2), there is less difficulty, as there seems to be no reason for attributing to it any historical authority. He says that the name of the king of Damascus whom David defeated was Hadad, and that his descendants and successors took the same name for ten generations. If this be true, Rezon was a usurper, but the origin of the story is probably the confused account of the Sept. In the Vatican MS. of the Sept. the account of Rezon is inserted in ver. 14 in close connection with Hadad, and on this Josephus appears to have founded his story that Hadad, on leaving Egypt, endeavored without success to excite Idumea to revolt, and then went to Syria, where he joined himself with Rezon, called by Josephus *Raazarus* (Ῥαάζαρος), who, at the head of a band of robbers, was plundering the country (*Ant.* viii, 7, 6). It was Hadad, and not Rezon, according to the account in Josephus, who established himself king of that part of Syria and made inroads upon the Israelites. In 1 Kings xv, 18, Benhadad, king of Damascus in the reign of Asa, is described as the grandson of Hezion; and from the resemblance between the names *Rezon* and *Hezion*, when written in Hebrew characters, it has been suggested that the latter is a corrupt reading for the former. For this suggestion, however, there does not appear to be sufficient ground, though it was adopted by Sir John Marsham (*Chron. Can.* p. 346) and Sir Isaac Newton (*Chronol.* p. 221), as well as by some later translators and commentators (Junius, Köhler, Dathe, Ewald). Against it are, (*a*) that the number of generations of the Syrian kings would then be one less than those of the contemporary kings of Judah. But then the reign of Abijam was only three years, and, in fact, Jeroboam outlived both Rehoboam and his son. (*b*) The statement of Nicolaus of Damascus (Josephus, *Ant.* vii, 5, 2) that from the time of David for ten generations the kings of Syria were one dynasty, each king taking the name of Hadad, "as did the Ptolemies in Egypt." But this would exclude not only Hezion and Tabrimon, but Rezon, unless we may interpret the last sentence to mean that the official title of Hadad was held in addition to the ordinary name of the king. Bunsen (*Bibelwerk*, i, 271) makes Hezion contemporary with Rehoboam, and probably a grandson of Rezon. The name is Aramaic, and Ewald compares it with *Rezin*.

END OF VOL. VIII.

This is the property of
Southern Evangelical Seminary
3000 Tilley Morris Rd., Matthews, NC 28105

BR95 .M35 1894

McClintock, John, 1814-1870.
Cyclopedia of biblical,
theological, and
ecclesiastical literature



SOUTHERN EVANGELICAL SEMINARY
37387000507259